

MARRIAGE: .

ITS HISTORY, CHARACTER, AND RESULTS;
ITS SANCTITIES, AND ITS PROFANITIES;
ITS SCIENCE AND ITS FACTS.

DEMONSTRATING

ITS INFLUENCE, AS A CIVILIZED INSTITUTION,

ON THE

HAPPINESS OF THE INDIVIDUAL

AND THE

PROGRESS OF THE RACE.

PART I.—HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL.

PART II.—NARRATIVE AND ILLUSTRATIVE.

PART III.—THEORETICAL AND SCIENTIFIC.

BY

T. L. NICHOLS, M.D., and MRS. MARY S. GOVE NICHOLS.

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY T. L. NICHOLS.

1854.

~~7/7/80~~
Soc 5228.1

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

1880, Oct. 2.

Gift of
O. C. J. W. Higginson,
of Cambridge.
(H. L. 1841.)

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1854, by
T. L. NICHOLS, M.D., AND MRS. MARY S. GOVE NICHOLS,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, for
the Southern District of New York.

7
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

PREFACE.

WE have done our appointed work.

We have written this little book with a calm faith in God, and his great Future.

We have written it with an earnest hope that it may aid in the sublime work of human redemption.

We believe that our cause is the cause of Truth, of Right, of Purity, of Holiness.

We believe, therefore, that it is safe, and that it will be triumphant.

We cannot doubt the justice of God, and the happy destiny of Humanity.

We feel that, in this work, we appeal to the deepest sympathies and highest aspirations of our common nature.

Above all, we appeal to those eternal, self-existent, and self-evident Principles which no reasonable being can deny, and which every honest being must admit, as the foundation of his opinions, and the law of his life.

As a work of art, this book may have many faults ; as an expression of motives, it is never the echo of one ignoble thought or base desire ; as an exponent of principles, we proudly lay it on the altar of Humanity, whose holiest rights we vindicate.

cate; whose foulest wrongs we would do some thing to remove.

If our work is condemned, even by those for whose good it was written, we shall suffer, not without precedent, and in a glorious company; if we are denounced in the present, we appeal to the future; if our brethren and sisters condemn us, we appeal to the **SEARCHER OF HEARTS**; if we are rejected on earth, we shall soon find our Home in the Heavens.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THIS book will be published at the uniform price of One Dollar a copy, for which sum it will be sent by mail, post-paid, on application to the publisher. As few persons in the book trade will have the courage to keep this, or our other works, this will be the most convenient method to obtain them.

The profits of this, and all our works, will be devoted to the propagation and realization of their principles; especially in building the **INSTITUTE OF DESAROLLO**, as a School of Life, and the germ of a New Social Organization.

Every person who reads this work, should also read the **ESOTERIC ANTHROPOLOGY**, which is published in the same style, and at the same price. It is, as its name imports, an *interior* or private treatise, on the Science of Man; his Anatomy, Physiology, Pathology, and Therapeutics, both physical and passional, or psychical. It is especially full, on all that concerns or relates to the sexual or generative functions, and is carefully illustrated. More than twelve thousand copies were sold, in the first year of its publication, and the laudations it has received are such as have never been given to any work of a similar character.

CONTENTS.

PART FIRST.

HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL.

BY T. L. NICHOLS, M.D.

	Page
CHAPTER I.—Introductory.....	9
II.—Definitions and Explanations.....	18
III.—Marriage, in the Old Testament.....	27
IV.—Marriage, in the New Testament.....	41
V.—Marriage, its Further History.....	49
VI.—The Facts of Marriage.....	59
VII.—Conventional Moralities.....	68
VIII.—Marriage in Civilization.....	74
IX.—Marriage as it is.....	81
X.—Marriage and Slavery.....	90
XI.—Marriage and other Institutions of Civilization.....	96
XII.—The Arguments in Favor of Marriage....	105
XIII.—Marriage and Woman's Rights.....	115
XIV.—Monogamy, Polygamy, and Omnigamy....	121
XV.—Free Love; or, The Doctrine of the Perfectionists.....	137

	Page
CHAP. XVI.—Marriage, by one of its Defenders.....	135
XVII.—“Love, Marriage, and Divorce”.....	144
XVIII.—The Love Doctrines of Fourier.....	159
XIX.—The Wrongs of Marriage.....	177



PART SECOND.

NARRATIVE AND ILLUSTRATIVE.

BY MRS. MARY S. GOVE NICHOLS.

CHAPTER I.—Woman an Individual.....	189
II.—Illustrations of Law.....	208
III.—Fidelity to the Law of one's own Life....	218
IV.—Illustrative Cases.....	224
V.—Facts and Illustrations.....	233
VI.—The Murders of Marriage	238
VII.—Faith and Love.....	245
VIII.—Attraction and Repulsion	251
IX.—Conclusion.....	263



PART THIRD.

THEORETICAL AND SCIENTIFIC.

BY T. L. NICHOLS, M.D.

CHAPTER I.—Liberty and Humanity.....	269
II.—Principles and Laws.....	273

	Page
CHAP. III.—Human Rights.....	279
IV.—The Relations of the Sexes.....	283
V.—Attraction and Repulsion.....	287
VI.—The Duration of Love.....	289
VII.—Plurality of Loves.....	293
VIII.—Society Destroyed.....	298
IX.—Jealousy.....	302
X.—What will become of the Children?....	306
XI.—Woman's Right to Love and Maternity ..	309
XII.—Of Variety in Love.....	312
XIII.—What is Morality?.....	316
XIV.—What is Immorality?.....	318
XV.—Is Freedom Safe?.....	323
XVI.—Freedom a Preventive of Crime.....	329
XVII.—The Law of Expediency.....	339
XVIII.—What we ought to do.....	347
XIX.—The Functions of Government.....	351
XX.—The Results of Freedom.....	357
XXI.—The Loves of the Future.....	363
XXII.—One Case in a Million.....	372
XXIII.—The Social Conditions of Freedom.....	377



APPENDIX.

	Page
Institute of Desarrollo.....	389
Our School of Life.....	401
Promise of the Future.....	406
Fourierism.....	416
Communism.....	424
Conclusion.....	427

PART FIRST.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

"HUMANITY lies prone under the errors of ages; and what we cherish as truths are often among the most hurtful of these errors. The strength of error is in the support of venerated authority. The miseries of mankind are but the symptoms of its errors of thought and life. There is no disease without a cause, and the cause is closely related to the remedy. The world is cursed by ERROR and DISCORD—it must be saved by TRUTH and LOVE."

These are the concluding sentences of the Introduction to my *ESOTERIC ANTHROPOLOGY*, written one year ago, and which I cannot but hope has been, or soon will be, in the hands of every reader of this volume. Toward the close of the same work, I have said—

"I hope that a time is coming when men and women, from their birth, will have some chance for a free and true development of what is noble in humanity. I have given here my idea of the nature and relations of man. To his social relations I have only alluded; I hope to be able at no distant day, to write further upon this branch of my subject; for a work is yet to be written upon social physiology and social health. The laws of

the Grand Man, Society, are precisely analogous to those of the Individual. And society has its complex and beautiful Anatomy, its wonderful and mysterious Physiology, its terrible Pathology, and its simple and efficient Therapeutics. These are the subjects to which I would willingly devote my future life. I feel that for man, the Individual, I have performed my duty!"

The reasons for writing this book will best appear in the book itself. They cannot be given in a few introductory paragraphs. They are too many, and too great. The world is filled with them. Every man may find them in his own consciousness; in his observation of society; in the whole history of our race.

The Civilized Marriage demands the light of free discussion more than any existing institution, because it is more intimately and more vitally connected with the problems of our future destiny. The organization, birth, education, development, and happiness of the individual, and the constitution, influences, and progress of society, all depend upon the nature of the Marriage relation. Being the fountain of life, it is closely connected with all of good or evil that belongs to our existence.

I see no reason why the Marriage Institution should not be submitted to the test of scientific investigation. It seems to me a legitimate object of philosophical inquiry; a matter of such importance, indeed, that every one should wish to know the truth concerning it. Why, then, has it been made a mystery? Why this universal "hush!"—this apprehensive "hands off!"—this fear and consternation, at the approach of this delicate subject?

Many reasons might be given. Those who con-

sider Marriage a religious ordinance, one of the sacraments, have the same feeling of sacredness about it that attaches to other religious rites. It is a holy mystery, not to be questioned any more than the Trinity, or the Incarnation. Others, whose perverted imaginations give a tinge of obscenity to the union of the sexes, and the generation of the race, shrink from such an inquiry as indelicate; but we do not find this delicacy sufficient to hinder them from plunging into all the evils and the miseries connected with the actual state of the Marriage Institution. Some believe Marriage, in its existing forms, to be the key-stone of the arch which supports the social edifice; and imperfect, rickety, and miserable as that structure is, they yet fear its ruin, should this institution be disturbed.

Whatever may be the reasons, it is certainly true, that a fierce martyrdom has been the lot of all who have dared even to *investigate* the claims of marriage; and some of the purest, the noblest, and the most angelic men and women, that have ever lived upon the earth, have been victims of the Inquisitorial fires of public reprobation.

The world has grown wiser, we doubt not. It has more freedom—perhaps more love of truth. The agitations of various political, moral, and social questions, during the last twenty years, have not been in vain. These discussions have educated the whole people into more independence of thought and life. The contests of political parties and factions; the struggles of opposing religious sects; the excitements of temperance and Maine Law Reformers; the appeals and denunciations of abolitionists, have all done their work for the edu-

cation of man up to the plane of free thought and action.

When two lawyers disagree, or two judges make opposite decisions, a man begins to think of determining for himself what justice or equity requires. When doctors disagree, we perceive the necessity of using our own judgment, as to the best means of preserving health, or curing diseases. When clergymen get into controversies on points of faith, or concerning interpretations of Scripture, free inquiry springs up among laymen. If the guides point in various directions, the traveler is left to choose his own path.

Under a despotism of Church and State, "pure and simple," there can be no discussion of any question of religion or politics, or of any social institution depending upon them; for so long as the despotism remains, no such discussion can be of any practical use. Whenever a people begin to investigate, despotism is in danger. A nation is free, just in proportion as its thought is free. If there is any subject on which a man dares not think, so far is he a slave. If there is any subject on which he cannot fully express his freest thought, so far is he under a despotism. If there be any question, then, in regard to which the press feels the necessity of being silent, on which it dares not utter its thought, so far is that press shackled and chained, by a despotism as real, and effectual, as the edict of Napoleon, or the ukase of the Czar. It may be a despotism of one, of a few, or of a majority;—of a man's wife, a woman's husband, of rich and influential friends, or of that vague generalization, "public opinion;" but it is still a despotism, galling, humiliating, crushing the soul

out of every human being who bows to it in tame submission.

No man has the right to call himself a free man who fears to investigate anything in the universe of matter, or of mind ; no man is free, who is, in any manner, hindered in the *freest expression of his freest thought*. We claim freedom for ourselves—we demand it for all : Freedom, with the condition of Freedom ; FREEDOM IN RIGHT.

When the world is ready for a new Thought, it is born, and lives, and does its work. The Thought of Freedom, as an element of human progress, development, and happiness, which this book, in certain things, defines and illustrates, we hope the world is ready for. In that hope we perform our duty to humanity. The freedom we claim for ourselves, and which we ask for others, is, first, the Freedom of a clear and full investigation of every subject connected with individual or social welfare ; second, the Freedom to act in harmony with the Truth discovered by such investigation. And we claim the right to think freely, and to act as freely,—with this single proviso, that we take upon ourselves, so far as justice requires, the burthensome consequences of our own actions. It remains to be seen whether the rights we claim will be accorded to us. We shall stand by them, at all events. We take our stand upon the broad platform of Human Rights ; let us see who will drive us from it. Ours is a Declaration of Individual Independence and Sovereignty. With all who respect our right to declare and maintain it, we are at peace ; with all who deny that right, and would hinder us in its exercise, whoever they may be, we are at open war. And we stand not

alone. Scattered over the vast chaos of civilization, are thousands of heroic souls, aspiring to a life of truth and freedom, and sworn to an eternal hostility to falsehood, and the despotisms by which it is maintained.

The progress of humanity, though in many things calm and steady, is not without agitation and convulsion. Just in proportion to the resistance of error must be the force that overcomes it; and the shock bears some relation to the rapidity of the operation. To overthrow a despotic government there may be required a fierce and bloody revolution; while changes are effected in a free constitution by the action of a deliberative assembly, and the confirmation of the ballot-box. A Bastille goes down in flame and blood—a monarchy and privileged aristocracy perish on the guillotine. And in all the world's progress, past and future, the violence will be found proportional to the wrongs of the people and power of their oppressors. The discussion of the marriage question will inevitably produce violence, persecution, and martyrdom. For free thought, there will be social ostracism—for free action, the prison. Once, if a man prayed contrary to law, he was burnt. In most countries, a man opposes the government at the risk of being shot or hanged. Now, in many of our States, a man who loves contrary to law, or otherwise than has been prescribed in some statute, is sent to State-prison. Those who are not prepared to suffer in this contest, must be careful how they engage in it. In Maine, or Massachusetts, the right to vote, to pray, to do many things freely, is acknowledged and guaranteed; but not the right to love. In this you must con

form to the laws made and provided, or suffer the penalties they inflict. Freedom in the relations of love has scarcely entered into the thought of the great mass of our people, more than freedom in politics and religion had a thousand years ago among Oriental despotisms. In all matters of the affections slavery is the habit of our lives, and it is not easy to think, or speak, or write, much less to act, in freedom. Still the spirit of Freedom is alive; and all lesser struggles are a preparation for the last and highest achievement of Individual Sovereignty.

If the bigots and fanatics of this country could have their way, an army would now be marching upon the Territory of Utah, to put down Mormon Polygamy with fire and sword. Thank God for an ever-increasing army of Free Men and Free Women, who can teach bigots and fanatics the necessity of toleration. Or, if the sect of religious Perfectionists in this State, who teach and practice the doctrine of Omnigamy, or simple promiscuity, as a religious dogma, were living in Maine or Massachusetts, doubtless they would have all been sent to State-prisons, in violation of their constitutional right to religious freedom; since it is pretty evident that the Perfectionist doctrine of universal marriage is less a violation of nature, and less an offense against the State, than the tolerated creed of the Shakers, which aims at its absolute destruction, by the annihilation of mankind. But all these matters will be fully considered in their proper places.

We claim freedom of thought, and all modes of its expression. We seek to infringe upon the rights of no other being; we only ask our own.

We write and publish this book for those who want it; not for any others. We deprecate no *fair* criticism, and seek to shun no *foul*. Filth comes from the filthy—"to the pure all things are pure." Those who know us, or our writings, will expect "the truth in love." We shall endeavor not to disappoint them in any reasonable expectation.

The writers of this work know something, by personal experience, of this subject. They have lived for six years in a marriage of ever-increasing love and uninterrupted happiness; as blessed a union, probably, as now exists, or ever existed, upon this earth; and it is in all the sanctity and all the happiness of this union of mutual love, that they write this book on marriage. If, therefore, they could have any prejudices, on personal grounds, they would be favorable to the institution. This fact, if it tend to make us less impartial reasoners, will at least acquit us of the charge of making an institution responsible for our own unfitness for it, and consequent unhappiness in it. The slaveholder's condemnation of slavery may be less pathetic than that of the slave, but it is not likely to be less effectual. The protest of a poor man against the social machinery which crushes him, may move our pity, but when a rich man argues against the monopoly of wealth, though we may look for less passion we shall probably have a more convincing logic. If we did not believe ourselves qualified, in many respects, to write such a book as is needed, we should not have undertaken the task; and it is no common feeling of duty and responsibility which could make us calmly dare the odium which all narrow minds, and all vulgar

souls must, out of their own cramped or perverted natures, pour upon us.

But we shall have our reward, in the consciousness of a brave performance of duty, and in the approbation of all who are true, and pure, and wise enough to judge rightly of us and of our work.

[In Esoteric Anthropology, speaking of Mr. S. P. ANDREWS, and his admirable work on the "Science of Society," it was announced that he was preparing a special work on MARRIAGE: Soon after, he was led into the Discussion with HENRY JAMES, and HORACE GREELEY, on "LOVE, MARRIAGE, AND DIVORCE," to which we have devoted a chapter in this book, with copious extracts. During this discussion, Mr. Andrews was forced to bring out in a partial, and controversial way, such ideas as he had intended to give in a more elaborate and scientific manner. From that circumstance, and the continuance of ill health, he abandoned, for the time at least, his original design, and is now engaged upon a much larger undertaking, for which he has aptitudes, acquirements, and intellectual adaptedness of a peculiar character.

This work is nothing less than an attempt to demonstrate the UNITY OF ALL THE SCIENCES; or the existence of certain fundamental Principles and Analogies, which relate equally to the kingdoms of Matter and of Mind; which will constitute, when discovered and explained, the key to a scientific system of reasoning from one kingdom to the other, and be the Inclusive or CENTRAL SCIENCE, of which all others are but branches, or special applications of principles already understood as Generals or Universals. The title of the proposed

work is to be "The Unity of all the Sciences; or, an Essay toward the Exposition of a Universal Science, with a new method of Scientific Investigation."

That this is a grand conception will be readily acknowledged by every man of thought. It may, indeed, be doubted whether the present stage of human knowledge is sufficiently advanced for the successful prosecution of an undertaking of such magnitude and difficulty; but this is to be tested by the result. The work is in progress, and the portions completed promise well for the whole; but it is of necessity a work of labor and time, and no definite period can be announced for its completion.]

Meantime, this book was to be written. Our other works had prepared the way for it; the word struggled for utterance; it is here. What there is in it of error, must inevitably die—that which is truth, is God's and Humanity's, **AND MUST LIVE FOREVER.**

CHAPTER II.

DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATIONS.

A CAREFUL explanation of some of the terms we may have most frequent occasion to use, and of certain principles by which we shall be guided in his discussion, will aid the reader in understand

ing the subject, and may save us from misapprehension.

MARRIAGE has been defined, "the legal union of one man to one woman for life." In our general treatment of the subject, we shall use the word in this, its common acceptation; but in some cases we must take a broader meaning. This is defective in several particulars. Marriage exists, in various countries, between one man and several women, one woman and several men, and for shorter periods than during life. We might define marriage as the legal union of the sexes, were it not that concubinage is also legalized in many countries; and were it not also, that in many others, marriage is a simple matter of custom or usage. Marriage may be defined as being, in any society, the form of the sexual relation, having the sanction of custom or law. This is the sense in which we shall use the word,—in its widest application; but there is another meaning. Marriage is a term used by many persons to express the union of mutual love, and this alone. All other unions, however legalized or enforced, they regard as adulterous.

CONCUBINAGE is defined by Webster, as "The act or practice of co-habiting, as man and woman, in sexual commerce, without the authority of law or legal marriage. In a more general sense, this word is used to express any criminal or prohibited sexual commerce, including adultery, incest, and fornication. In some countries, concubinage is marriage of an inferior kind, or performed with less solemnity than the true and formal marriage; or, marriage with a woman of inferior condition, to whom the husband does not convey his rank or

quality. This is said to be still in use in Germany."

Concubinage, in Oriental countries, as long ago as the patriarchs, was less honorable than marriage, but by no means dishonorable; and the "left-handed marriages," now allowed in Germany, bring no reproach to the parties who contract them. In the Scriptures, the term concubine is in common use, but never as a term of reproach. Solomon had seven hundred wives, and three hundred concubines. Some of the sons of Jacob were children of his wives, others of his concubines, who are also sometimes called his wives, and no distinction is ever made between them.

MONOGAMY is the strictest form of single, indissoluble marriage. It is the union of one man with one woman for life. Those who believe this to be the only true relation, do not admit of divorce, or second marriages; holding that the marriage is eternal. This is the simple idea of monogamy, which supposes that the only true marriage is the union of two souls, to make one complete and perfect being. A second marriage, after divorce, or even the death of one of the parties, would be thought adulterous.

Monogamy, in a less restricted sense, is the union of one man to one woman, according to the laws and usages of most civilized countries.

BIGAMY, considered a crime in most Christian countries, is the marriage of a second husband or wife, while the first is living undivorced. The term Bigamist is, however, applied to men who marry several wives.

POLYGAMY is the marriage of many; of one husband to several wives, or, in rarer cases, of one

wife to several husbands. The latter relation is sometimes called polyandrous.

OMNIGAMY is a word not to be found in Webster ; but may be used to describe that condition of communism, in which each man in an association is held to be the husband of every woman and each woman the wife of every man. This doctrine has been charged upon several schools of communistic reformers. It was alleged against the early Christians ; and has been actually the practice of some modern and existing sects, which we shall fully describe hereafter.

DIVORCE is the legal dissolution of the bonds of marriage, or the separation of husband and wife by judicial sentence. There is a less complete divorce, *a mensa et toro*, from bed and board. Such separations are decreed in cases where the laws will not permit a complete divorce ; and in such cases the parties cannot contract other marriages. In Catholic countries, there is no divorce, except by special dispensation. In this country the laws vary widely in different States, so that what is allowed in one village is a crime in the next ; and the act which may be done with impunity in one room of a house, built, as houses sometimes are, upon a State line, in another room of the same house would be a felony ! Such are the absurdities of arbitrary legislation.

ADULTERY is a word of no fixed meaning. Webster defines it, " Violation of the marriage bed ; a crime, or a civil injury, which introduces, or may introduce, into a family a spurious offspring. In common usage, adultery means the unfaithfulness of any married person to the marriage bed. By the laws of Connecticut, the sexual inter-

course of *any* man with a *married* woman is the crime of adultery in both ; but such intercourse of a *married* man with an *unmarried* woman, is fornication in both, and adultery of the man, within the meaning of the law respecting divorce, but not a felonious adultery in either, or the crime of adultery by common law, or at statute."

The Mosaic law, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," is explained to comprehend all offenses of a licentious or obscene character. Jesus said, in relation to this commandment, "Whoso looketh on a woman, to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart:" but we doubt whether the meaning of this expression is well understood. Probably the best definition of adultery is, "Sexual commerce unsanctified by mutual love;" but this is far from the popular meaning.

FORNICATION is sexual intercourse without marriage; or, by the laws of some States, such intercourse of a married man with an unmarried woman.

PROSTITUTION differs from fornication in being confined almost entirely to one sex, and in its being of a mercenary character, or of the nature of a trade or calling. It is as ancient as history; exists almost universally, and in different ages and countries has been honored, encouraged, tolerated, condemned, or punished. The marriage of a woman to a man she does not love, is sometimes called legal prostitution, or legalized adultery.

The terms COURTESAN, and HARLOT, are sometimes applied to women who indulge in varied amours, not always of a mercenary character. Thus Ninon de L'Enclos is called a courtesan, but she can hardly be termed a prostitute.

SEDUCTION is defined by our great lexicographer, "the act, or crime, of persuading a female, by flattery or deception, to surrender her chastity." "Crime," when made such by the laws of particular States, otherwise it is an "act."

CHASTITY, that which the female is said to surrender, when she becomes the victim of seduction, is "purity of the body; freedom from all unlawful commerce of the sexes; before marriage, purity from all commerce of sexes; after marriage, fidelity to the marriage bed."

VIRTUE, applied to women, has the same sense as chastity.

RAPE AND RAVISHMENT are "the carnal knowledge of a woman, forcibly, or against her will." The Dictionary should have added, contrary to law; for the rape or ravishment of a married woman by her husband, accomplished by whatever violence and outrage, is not deemed a crime, as marriage destroys all personal rights.

These words, most of which we shall have frequent occasion to use, are here explained in their usual, technical, and legal signification. We shall be obliged to entirely change the significance of some, and widen the meaning of others.

There are other terms, and principles, a brief explanation of which will greatly facilitate our discussion. We demand to be understood; and hope to make our meaning, and the whole subject, clear to every reader.

RIGHT.—When we say a thing is right, we wish to be understood as meaning that it is in harmony, or accordance with the laws of nature, or, what is the same thing, the laws of God. The law of every organized being is written in, or indicated by, its

constitution. Whatever is in accordance with that law, for that being, is *right* ; whatever is opposed to it, is *wrong*. Man carries in his structure, faculties, and attractions, the law of his life, and the fixed rule of right. As far as individuals are alike, in their natures, faculties, and healthy attractions, the same law may govern them ; but wherever they differ, in these respects, the rule of right must vary accordingly.

LAW is the written expression of the governing power, whatever that power may be. The laws of the Hebrews, and of most ancient States, were supposed to be the direct edicts of the Deity. In despotic governments, laws are the edicts of the ruler. In aristocracies they are the dicta of the governing class ; in republics, the supposed wisdom and will of the majority of the people. If we could rely upon priests as the true mediums of the Divine Will ; if we were sure of the Divine Right, and wisdom of kings ; if we could trust an aristocracy, or rely upon the intelligence of a majority, we might believe in laws ; were it at the same time possible to adapt them to all the varieties of human character, circumstance, and want.

In the absence, of such possibility of minute adaptedness, the only safety for wise and conscientious legislators, is to make only such general laws as are most needful ; such, in fact, as would be adopted by common consent, and without formal legislation.

Laws, the most just, are only needed for the ignorant, or the depraved. Those who are, in intelligence and goodness, equal to the law makers, not only have no need of laws, but such laws are an impertinence.

GOVERNMENT, the law making and law executing power, seems needful, as a combination of the wise and good, for protection against the ignorant and bad. As men increase in intelligence, government becomes less needful. As the only proper function of government is *protection of rights*, it becomes a tyrannical usurpation, when it goes one step beyond. Each individual in the community appears to have a right to the protection of every other, from any harm, injustice, or outrage, with which he may be threatened—but the duty to protect, does not give the right to oppress, restrain, or injure. Yet the freest governments in the world are full of such oppressions; and unjust laws are on every statute book. These points, briefly stated here, will be fully illustrated hereafter.

“LIBERTY,” says DUMAS, in his latest work, warm with the impulse of the Revolution, “is the right every one has to follow his own interests, satisfaction, amusement, glory; everything that does not injure another.” I would say, everything that does not trespass upon the *rights* of another. Or I would adopt the formula of WARREN, and ANDREWS—“THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE INDIVIDUAL; TO BE MAINTAINED AT HIS OWN COST.” I use Freedom as a synonymous term.

And nothing short of this is Freedom. Whoever interferes to prevent my doing anything I may rightfully choose to do, restrains my liberty—so far enslaves me; and the only warrant any man, or collection of men, can rightfully have for hindering me in any act of my choice, is to be found in the fact that my act will be a wrong to some other.

Now the ways in which one Individual may

trespass upon the rights of another, are few, simple, and easily understood. The nearer men are brought together, in false social conditions, the greater the difficulty of defining rights, and preventing wrongs; but even now, the best thing that could be done by any legislature, would be to repeal a large portion of the laws on every statute book; many of which are actually repealed by public opinion. In this country the vitality of a law is in the support of public opinion, and the remedy for the evils of false legislation is in the public enlightenment.

JUSTICE and EQUITY are words of a similar signification. Justice is uprightness, fitness, adaptedness. Equity is the balancing of interests or an equality of rights. Every privilege is a violation of equity. Every advantage, which one man has over another, by law, or custom, or from any social institution, is a violation of equity. In trade, equity requires the exchange of exact equivalents, and does not admit of profit making. In social life equity demands that each individual have a free, and equal opportunity for development, spontaneous action, and enjoyment, according to his capacity and desires.

MORALITY.—Some one defined Orthodoxy, as *my* doxy—others' doxys were, of course, heterodoxy. A man is moral, who does what you think right. Morality in New Orleans differs from morality in Boston. The moral man in Constantinople, if he lived in New York, would be sent to Sing Sing. The conventional definition of morality varies with the religious notions, laws, and customs of every country. To be immoral is to live in non-conformity with such opinions and usages.

There is an absolute law or rule of right, the foundation of a true morality; but it is scarcely understood. It is the law, written in the constitution of each individual, and demanding liberty, for its development. It is in this sense that every man, as every animal, should be "a law unto himself." The true morality is a conformity to that law—the higher law, the highest law.

God, whose being we shall here assume, not stop to prove, has made a stupendous revelation of his character, in the Universe he has created. The Universe is the expression of God. Just as far as we understand Nature, we understand its Author. All truth is God's Truth. Each truth is in harmony with all other truth. As God and Nature stand in the harmonious relation of cause and effect; we have only to live in harmony with Nature, to be in harmony with, and perfect conformity to, the will of God. [See further on this point, Esoteric Anthropology, Chapters I., V., VI., etc.]

CHAPTER III.

MARRIAGE, IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

"So God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it."

"And the Lord God said, It is not good that man should be alone ; I will make him a help meet for him."

"And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh ; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh."

"Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow, and thy conception ; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children ; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."

"And Lamech took unto him two wives ; the name of the one was Adah, and the name of the other was Zillah."

"And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair ; and they took them wives of all which they chose."

These passages, copied from the first six chapters of Genesis, give us all the account of marriage to be found in what is regarded by many as the authentic and primitive history of the Human Race, in the antediluvian period. Taking this remarkable record as a literal verity, we find the creation of a single pair, from whom all the varieties of the human race are descended ; the necessity of general incest in the first generations ; the bigamy of Lamech, the father of Noah, during the life-time of Adam ; and, finally, the fact that

the sons of God freely intermarried with the daughters of men, from whom there sprang a race of giants.

Our next account of the marriage institution in the early period of Oriental History, relates to Abram, the chosen Father of God's peculiar people, the Hebrew Race.

"Now Sarai, Abram's wife, bare him no children; and she had a handmaid, an Egyptian, whose name was Hagar. And Sarai said unto Abram, Behold now, the Lord hath restrained me from bearing; I pray thee go in unto my maid; it may be that I may obtain children by her. And Abram hearkened unto the voice of Sarai. And Sarai, Abram's wife, took Hagar, her maid, the Egyptian, after Abram had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan, and gave her to her husband, Abram, to be his wife."

Further on it is said—

"Then again Abraham took a wife, and her name was Keturah:"—who bare him six sons.

"And Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac, but unto the sons of the concubines which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts, and sent them away from Isaac his son, (while he yet lived,) eastward, unto the east country."

The marriage of Jacob, the son of Isaac, to the two sisters, Leah and Rachel, for each of whom he served their father seven years, is familiar to all readers of the Scriptures. As was customary, each of Jacob's wives had a handmaid or favorite female slave, a wedding present from her father. Rachel was from the first, best beloved, as she was the youngest and most beautiful of his wives. But Leah bore children, while Rachel was barren,

who, therefore, resorted to the same expedient that had been adopted by Sarai. "And she gave him Bilhah, her handmaid, to wife." Not to be outdone by this maneuver, "When Leah saw that she had left bearing, she took Zilpah, her maid, and gave her Jacob, to wife." Of these four women, the two original wives of Jacob, and the two handmaids of his wives, given to him to wife, but whose children they claimed as their own, came the twelve sons of Jacob, fathers of the twelve tribes of Israel. It is not apparent that any difference was made between them on account of their birth, save that Jacob seems to have had a more tender love for the children of his best beloved wife.

The following sentences from this narrative, give a vivid idea of the state of the marriage institution at this period.

"And Reuben went, in the days of the wheat harvest, and found mandrakes in the field, and brought them unto his mother Leah. Then Rachel said unto Leah, give me, I pray thee, of thy son's mandrakes. And she said unto her, Is it a small matter that thou hast taken away my husband? and wouldst thou take away my son's mandrakes also? And Rachel said, Therefore shall he lie with thee to-night for thy son's mandrakes. And Jacob came out of the field in the evening, and Leah went out to meet him, and said, Thou must come in unto me; for surely I have hired thee with my son's mandrakes. And he lay with her that night. And God hearkened unto Leah, and she conceived, and bare Jacob the fifth son. And Leah said, God hath given me my hire, because I have given my maiden to my husband."

After two thousand years have passed, over

four-fifths of the eastern hemisphere we find the institution of marriage, or the relation of the sexes, existing almost without change. The description of Patriarchal life in the Book of Genesis, would apply with little alteration to the customs of most Oriental countries.

When the institutions and laws of the Jewish nation were given to Moses, we find some specific regulations respecting marriage.

Among the commandments, it is said, "Thou shalt not commit adultery:" and further on, "thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's."

The laws of Moses, or of God through Moses, regulating the duties of masters and slaves or purchased servants, have also a bearing upon the marriage relation.

"If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve, and in the seventh year he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself he shall go out by himself; if he were married, then shall his wife go out with him. If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons and daughters, the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free; then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him unto the door, or the door post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him forever."

"And if a man sell his daughter to be a maid servant, she shall not go out, as the men servants do. If she please not her master, who hath be-

trothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed ; to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her. And if he have betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters. If he take him another wife, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage shall he not diminish. And if he do not these three unto her then shall she go out free without money."

Farther on, as a continuation of the Law, given on Mount Sinai, under the impressive sanction of **THUS SAITH THE LORD**, it is written :—

"And if a man entice a maid that is not betrothed, and lie with her, he shall surely endow her to be his wife. If her father utterly refuse to give her unto him, he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins."

"And whosoever lieth carnally with a woman that is a bondmaid, betrothed to a husband, and not at all redeemed, nor freedom given her, she shall be scourged : they shall not be put to death, because she was not free. And he shall bring his trespass offering unto the Lord * * and the sin which he hath done shall be forgiven him."

"And the man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbor's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death."

Of the priests—the sons of Aaron—it is directed that "They shall not take a wife that is a whore, or profane ; neither shall they take a woman that is put away from her husband." And of the High Priest it is commanded that "He shall take a wife in her virginity. A widow, or a divorced woman, or profane, or a harlot, these shall he not take :

and he shall take a virgin of his own people to wife."

The manner of trial of a woman by the waters of jealousy, for a suspected adultery, is particularly directed by the Lord in the fifth chapter of Numbers, which read.

The power of the husband over the wife, in allowing or disallowing her religious vows, is shown in Numbers xxx, where, in conclusion, it is said, "Every vow, and every binding oath to afflict the soul, her husband may establish it, or her husband may make it void."

The estimation in which women were held, and the regard paid to sexual purity, is shown by the command of God respecting the apportionment of booty taken in war. In the expedition against the Midianites, this booty consisted of women and children, cattle, asses, sheep, &c.

"And Moses said unto them, Have ye saved all the women alive? Now, therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women-children that have not known man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves." These were accordingly divided, in this instance, among the people, the army, and the priests and Levites, who had the Lord's share, "thirty-and-two thousand persons in all of women that had not known man;" and these, as in all succeeding times, in the wars of Israel, became their wives, and concubines, and slaves.

The more special regulations concerning the treatment of female captives, and relating to marriage, may be found in Deuteronomy xxi:

"When thou goest forth to war against thine

enemies, and the Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive, and seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldst have her to thy wife; then thou shalt bring her home to thine house, and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails; and she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month: after that, thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife; and it shall be that if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her."

"If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the first-born son be hers that was hated, then it shall be that when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath," he shall give a double portion to the first-born, though son of the hated wife.

"A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord, even to his tenth generation shall he not enter into the congregation of the Lord."

"When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her; then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife. And if the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, and giveth it in her hand,

and sendeth her out of his house ; or if the latter husband die, which took her to be his wife, her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled, for that is an abomination before the Lord."

"When a man hath taken a new wife, he shall not go out to war, neither shall he be charged with any business, but he shall be free at home one year, and shall cheer up his wife which he hath taken."

"If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger ; her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of a husband's brother unto her. * * * And if the man like not to take his brother's wife, * * * then shall his brother's wife come unto him in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from off his foot, and spit in his face ; and shall answer and say, So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house. And his name shall be called in Israel, the house of him that hath his shoe loosed."

There are illustrations of marriage scattered through the Old Testament, of which we copy the most interesting. In Judges xi, it is written :

"Now Jephthah, the Gileadite, was a mighty man of valor, and he was the son of a harlot ; and Gilead begat Jephthah. And Gilead's wife bare him sons : and his wife's sons grew up, and they thrust out Jephthah, and said unto him, Thou shalt not inherit in our father's house, for thou art the son of a strange woman."

Samson married a woman of the Philistines, but getting into a difficulty with his relatives, he was

absent for a time, and found, on returning to his father-in-law, that "his wife was given to his companion, whom he had used as his friend." "And her father said, I verily thought that thou hadst utterly hated her, therefore I gave her to thy companion: is not her younger sister fairer than she? take her, I pray thee, instead of her."

The story of the Levite and his concubine, commencing at the 19th chapter of Judges, is one of the most extraordinary narratives in Ancient History; and as it is curiously illustrative of the condition and treatment of women among the tribes of Israel, we condense it from the record, retaining as far as convenient the language of the original:

"A certain Levite, sojourning on the side of Mount Ephraim, took to him a concubine out of Bethlehem-Judah. And his concubine played the whore against him," and went back to her father's house, "and was there four whole months. And her husband arose and went after her, to speak friendly unto her, and to bring her back again." The woman and her father, who is called his father-in-law, as he is termed her husband, received him hospitably, and he remained several days, which were spent in festivity, after which they departed, and on their journey home sought and found hospitality with a worthy citizen of Gibeah.

"Now as they were making their hearts merry, behold, the men of the city, certain sons of Belial, beset the house round about, and beat at the door, and spake to the master of the house, the old man, saying, Bring forth the man that came into thine house, that we may know him."

It is difficult for us to conceive of this unnatural enormity, but a similar circumstance is related of

the visit of the angels to Lot in Sodom, and the crime they purposed to commit is hence called sodomy.

“And the man, the master of the house, went out unto them, and said unto them, Nay, my brethren, nay, I pray you, do not so wickedly; seeing that this man is come into mine house, do not this folly. Behold, here is my daughter, a maiden, and his concubine; them I will bring out now, and humble ye them, and do unto them what seemeth good unto you, but unto this man do not so vile a thing.”

It was under precisely similar circumstances that Lot said to his neighbors in Sodom, “I pray you, brethren, do not so wickedly. Behold now, I have two daughters which have not known man; let me, I pray you, bring them out unto you, and do ye to them as is good in your eyes.”

What must have been the estimation in which women were held, when such men as Lot, and the hospitable old gentleman of Gibeah, could make such a cowardly, and to our notions, shocking and horrible proposition?

In the latter case, the proposal was in part accepted. The record says:

“So the man took his concubine, and brought her forth unto them; and they knew her, and abused her all the night until the morning; and when the day began to spring, they let her go. Then came the woman, in the dawning of the day, and fell down at the door of the man’s house, where her lord was, till it was light. And her lord rose up in the morning, and opened the doors of the house, and went forth to go his way; and, behold, the woman, his concubine, was fallen down

at the door of the house, *and her hands were upon the threshold.* And he said unto her, Up, and let us be going: but none answered."

She was dead. He took her poor outraged corpse upon his ass, and carried it home. Then he took a knife, and cut her body into twelve pieces, and sent one piece to the chiefs of each of the twelve tribes, with the horrid story of her wrongs.

The children of Israel rose as one man, and demanded the punishment of the men who had committed this crime. The Benjamites refused to give up the offenders. A war of extermination was declared, and the whole tribe slaughtered, men, women and children, with the exception of six hundred men who took refuge in an impregnable mountain fastness. The other tribes had also sworn to give no wives to the children of Benjamin. So one of the tribes was in danger of extermination. The Lord was appealed to for direction in this difficulty.

Upon inquiry, it was found that one city in Israel had not joined in the massacre of the Benjamites. Twelve thousand men were therefore sent, with this order, "Ye shall utterly destroy every male, and every woman that hath lain by man." Men, women and children were all destroyed, all but four hundred virgins, and these were brought to the Benjamites to be their wives; but these were not sufficient. So the elders of Israel remembered that there was a feast at Shiloh, in which the young women came out into the vineyards, with songs and dances. They therefore directed the Benjamites, who were unprovided by the massacre of Jabesh-Gilead, to lie in wait, and seize upon the daughters of Shiloh, and ϵ wives

were provided for all the children of Benjamin. Read the whole story in the last three chapters of the Book of Judges.

Elkanah, the father of the Prophet Samuel, had two wives, Hannah and Peninnah.

David was married to Michal, the daughter of Saul, who, when he had quarreled with his son-in-law, gave his wife to another. David next married Abigail, the widow of Nabal, and Ahinoam of Jezreel. Subsequently, he procured the death of one of his captains, and married his beautiful wife Bathsheba. He had also the supply of concubines usual with Eastern princes. Ten of these, for an infidelity with his son Absalom, "he shut up, until the day of their death, living in widowhood."

But Solomon far exceeded his father David. "And God gave Solomon wisdom and understanding exceeding much, and largeness of heart, even as the sand that is on the sea-shore. And Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the East country, and all the wisdom of Egypt. * * * And he spake three thousand proverbs; and his songs were a thousand and five. * * * And there came of all people to hear the wisdom of Solomon, from all kings of the earth which had heard of his wisdom. * * * But Solomon loved many strange women (together with the daughter of Pharaoh), women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites. * * * Solomon clave unto these in love. And he had seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines; and his wives turned away his heart."

The Book of Esther gives us a glimpse of the marriage relations at the Court of Persia. Vashti the queen had refused to present herself at a feast

of princes, and the king held a council to decide on her punishment. "And Memucan answered before the king and the princes, Vashti the queen hath not done wrong to the king only, but also to all the princes, and to all the people that are in all the provinces of the king Ahasuerus. For this deed of the queen shall come abroad unto all women, so that they shall despise their husbands in their eyes, when it shall be reported.—The king Ahasuerus commanded the queen to be brought before him, but she came not. Likewise shall the ladies of Persia and Media say this day unto all the king's princes, which have heard of the deed of the queen. Thus shall there arise too much contempt and wrath." After advising to depose the queen, and choose another, the sage proceeds: "And when the king's decree, which he shall make, shall be published throughout all his empire (for it is great), all the wives shall give to their husbands honor, both to great and small." Beautiful virgins were sought in all parts of the empire, who, after their purification, went by turns unto the king, and thence to the harem, coming to the king no more, unless by particular desire; all of which is minutely described in the Book of Esther.

We have seen in this whole History the servitude of woman, the want of all recognition of any right over her person or actions. Polygamy and concubinage, violence and rapine, are sanctioned by the highest authority and examples. The right of property in woman is rigidly guarded by the severest laws; but the equality of woman with man, from first to last, is nowhere admitted, but rather everywhere denied. The record is before us—let us read and judge.

CHAPTER IV.

MARRIAGE, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In the Gospel according to St. Matthew, Jesus saith :

“Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery ; but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.”

“It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement ; but I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery ; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.”

“The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause ? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning, made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh ? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away ? He saith unto them, Moses, because of the hard-

ness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives ; but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it shall be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery ; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away, committeth adultery."

"His disciples say unto him, If the case of a man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry. But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs which were so from their mother's womb ; and there are some eunuchs which were made eunuchs of men ; and there be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

The meaning of some portion of the above is not quite plain to us ; but the main doctrine is repeated in the Gospel by Luke :

"And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one tittle of the law to fail. Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery ; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery."

When the Saducees tempted Jesus by asking him whose wife a woman would be in the resurrection, who had successively married seven brothers, according to the Mosaic Law—"Jesus, answering, said unto them, The children of this world marry and are given in marriage. But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage ; neither

can they die any more ; for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

To the woman of Samaria, Jesus said, "Thou hast well said, I have no husband ; for thou hast had five husbands, and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband ; in that saidst thou truly."

As Jesus taught in the Temple, "the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery ; and when they had set her in the midst, they say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. Now, Moses in the law commanded us that such should be stoned ; but what sayest thou ?" Jesus at first pretended not to hear them, but when the question was pressed upon him, he said, "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." When they had all gone out, leaving the woman with Jesus, He said to her, "Woman, where are those thine accusers ? Hath no man condemned thee ? She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee ; go, and sin no more."

These are all the recorded words of Jesus respecting the marriage institution. His meaning has been variously interpreted. Some think he contended for the legal marriage, according to the Mosaic law, but without divorce. Some find the monogamic or conjugal relation in its simplest, purest, and most enduring form. Others hold that he was entirely opposed to marriage. Dr. Lazarus gives these two passages as the mottoes of his "LOVE vs. MARRIAGE" :

"In the kingdom of heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage."

"Thy kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven."

The writers of the Epistles are still more explicit. Paul, especially, treats of this subject with great earnestness. In his Epistle to the Romans, he says :

"For the woman which hath a husband, is bound by the law to her husband, so long as he liveth ; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So, then, if while her husband liveth she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress ; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law ; so that she is no adulteress though she be married to another man."

To the Corinthians, he writes :

"Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me : It is good for a man not to touch a woman. Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband. Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence ; and likewise also the wife unto the husband. The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband ; and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife. Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer ; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency. But I speak this by permission, and not of commandment. For I would that all men were even as I myself ; but every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that. I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for

them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry ; for it is better to marry than to burn. And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband ; but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband ; and let not the husband put away his wife. But to the rest speak I, not the Lord, If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and if she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which hath a husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband ; else were your children unclean ; but now are they holy. But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases ; but God hath called us to peace."

"Art thou bound unto a wife ? seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife ? seek not a wife. But and if thou marry, thou hast not sinned ; and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned ; nevertheless such shall have trouble in the flesh ; but I spare you. But this I say, brethren, The time is short ; it remaineth, that both they that have wives be as though they had none ; and they that weep, as though they wept not ; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not ; and they that buy, as though they possessed not ; and they that use this world, as not abusing it ; for the fashion of this world passeth away. But I would have you without carefulness. He that is unmarried, careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord ; but he that

is married, careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife. There is difference also between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit; but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband. And this I speak for your own profit; not that I may cast a snare upon you, but for that which is comely, and that ye may attend upon the Lord without distraction. But if any man think that he behaveth himself uncomely toward his virgin, if she pass the flower of her age, and need so require, let him do what he will, he sinneth not; let them marry. Nevertheless, he that standeth steadfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart that he will keep his virgin, doeth well. So then he that giveth her in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better. The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to marry whom she will; only in the Lord. But she is happier if she so abide, after my judgment; and I think also that I have the Spirit of God."

And as to the relative position of women in the church, and in society, the apostle is emphatic. He says: "The head of the woman is the man." "But the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." "Nevertheless, neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man in the Lord."

“Let your women keep silence in the churches ; for it is not permitted unto them to speak ; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home ; for it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church.”

To the Galatians also he writes :

“Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church ; and he is the Savior of the body. Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything. * * So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies ; he that loveth his wife, loveth himself. * * Let every one of you in particular so love his wife, even as himself ; and the wife see that she reverence her husband.”

And to Timothy he writes :

“Let the woman learn in silence, with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived ; but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression.”

“A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife.” “Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife.”

“Let not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man, well reported of for good works. * * But the younger widows refuse ; for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry ; having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith.”

Peter, also, in his first General Epistle, says :
“ Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands.” * * “ Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life ; that your prayers be not hindered.”

Such are the doctrines of Christ and the Apostles. If the sayings of the former are doubtful or mystical, those of the latter are sufficiently clear. Monogamy is clearly required of bishops, deacons, and elders of the Church ; but not of laymen. Polygamy continued in the Christian Church until a comparatively recent period, and was allowed by Luther and the Fathers of the Protestant reformation, as it also is to this day, under certain circumstances, by our Boards of Foreign Missions.

We have thought it right to give fully and fairly the whole teaching of the Bible on this subject. It is upon this authority that all the laws and customs of civilization are founded. If we acknowledge this authority, we must submit to its teachings, whatever they may be ; but if we find it vague, contradictory, or for any cause unsatisfactory, then we must look further for the true law of Life, and of Society, which is the object of our inquiry. The time has come when a clear-minded, honest man, may examine any doctrine, even if it come prefaced by “ **THUS SAITH THE LORD.**”

CHAPTER V.

MARRIAGE—ITS FURTHER HISTORY.

HAVING given an account of the institution and laws of Marriage in the Books of the Old Testament, and the doctrines concerning it in the Gospels and Epistles of the New, we turn to the profane or common History of Mankind, for further examples illustrative of our general subject.

Wherever woman has been considered the property and slave of man, there have been laws regulating the transfer, possession and protection of this property. The right of a human female to possess herself, has seldom been acknowledged ; and in the rare instances where this right of self-possession has been allowed, when a woman has sold or given herself to a man in marriage, she has been considered her own property no longer. She belongs to him, for his sole use and pleasure.

The laws regulating the transfer and possession of this kind of property are among the earliest in the records or traditions of every nation, since this was one of the first things to be provided for. In the savage state all rights have been trampled upon by the will of the strongest—the rights of woman first, longest, and most completely.

When a man sold his daughter or the captive he had taken in war to another, the contract was celebrated by some solemnity, which tended to give it a binding force. The most common was a feast, as from an early period eating together was a

pledge of amity and good faith. So we read of Marriage feasts, from the earliest times—and among religious peoples the priest was called upon to give more sacredness to the ceremony. Menes, the first king of Egypt, is said to have introduced Marriage, and fixed the laws concerning it; the Greeks attribute the same institution to Cecrops; the Chinese to Fo Hi; the Peruvians to Manco Capac; the Jews to God, who gave their laws to Moses.

The fact of the existence of Polygamy from the earliest ages, and that it is now tolerated by the laws and usages of four-fifths of the human race, is no more a proof of its being right, than the similar fact of the existence of slavery, and the despotisms of wealth and power.

When wives and children were a man's property, and could be bought and sold; when each wife and each child added otherwise to his wealth, power, and influence, it is not strange that he should get as many as possible. Every wife was a servant—every wife was also a hostage for the friendship of the family to which she belonged. Wives were the pledges of peace, exchanged between rival potentates.

As women, considered as property, were monopolized by the rich, they became expensive luxuries to the poor; and were subjected to commercial regulations. In ancient Assyria, all the marriageable girls in a province were assembled once a year at a fair, where, after being exhibited and inspected by the men who wished for wives, they were put up for sale at public auction. First were put up the most beautiful, and the competition of the rich carried their prices to the highest point.

But the ugly were also to be provided for, and it became a question, not how much a man would give, but what he should receive, as a dowry. The extravagant prices paid for the beautiful went to make up the dowries of those less favored by nature. The idea of property in wife and children, is still recognized by our common law, since a man may recover pecuniary damages for the seduction of his wife or daughter.

The interference of the government of Assyria for the better regulation of marriages, is not the only example in antiquity. In Thrace the fairest virgins were sold for the benefit of the State; and the magistrates of Crete exercised the sole power of selecting wives for their young men—the good of the State being the only object of attention. So, in Sparta, the happiness of the individual was habitually sacrificed to the strength of the nation.

The Romans recognized three kinds of marriage, Conferration, Co-emption, and Use. Conferration was the august ceremonial used in the marriages of pontiffs and priests; in co-emption the parties formally pledged themselves to each other; the marriage of use was a simple cohabitation, without any ceremonial.

It was among the northern nations of Europe that the highest existing idea of the rights of woman arose, and where something approaching to her equality with man was first acknowledged. From the earliest antiquity, those nations practiced a strict monogamy. The father gave away his daughter with these words: "I give thee my daughter in honorable wedlock, to have the half of thy bed, the keeping of the keys of thy house, one-third of the money thou art at present pos-

sessed of, or shalt have hereafter, and to enjoy the other rites appointed to wives by law."

Let those who believe that the highest form of equal marriage, and the best condition of woman comes from the Mosaic and Christian dispensations, compare these with the chivalric customs of Northern Europe, centuries before the introduction of the Christian faith.

Marriages in Europe were performed by parents and magistrates, until it was formally ordained by Sotor, fifteenth Bishop of Rome, that no marriage should be considered valid which was not solemnized by a priest; and marriage was soon after declared a sacrament of the church.

In China, it is considered so much a public duty to marry and have children, that a bachelor of twenty is an object of contempt. Wives are purchasable commodities; and children are betrothed in their infancy, by their parents. On coming to the proper age, the young gentleman receives his wife, but can send her back, if he is not pleased with her. The lady, however, has no such right of refusal. She is sold, and must live with her owner, if he chooses to take her. Polygamy is tolerated, and practiced by all who can afford it. The first wife is superior, and mistress of the family, but no difference is made in the children of wives and concubines. A beautiful woman of the upper classes costs from two to three thousand dollars. American merchants, living in China, often buy wives, to whom they become much attached, and by whom they have families of children. This is also the fact in many parts of the East Indies.

Tartars of the Lama creed practice monogamy, with free divorce for both parties. The Calmuck

Tartar seizes the bride of his choice, carries her off on horseback, and if he succeeds in keeping her one night a prisoner, she becomes his wife. The marriage of the Soonga Tartars is determined by a race on horseback. The lady has a fair start. If she permits her suitor to overtake her she becomes his wife. The Buraits have from one to five wives, each one costing the husband a certain number of cattle, sometimes as many as five hundred. In Western Tartary women vary in price from two or three roubles up to two or three hundred. Every one has as many as he can afford, and rich merchants have wives at different points they visit. Among the honest Siberians, the marriage customs are very significant. In one tribe, after the marriage feast, the wife pulls off the husband's boots, as a sign of her obedience; in another the bride's father presents the bridegroom with a whip, with which he is expected to discipline her as often as he finds occasion; in another, the bride is carried at night on a mat to the bridegroom, with these words: "There, wolf, take thy lamb." Among the Ostiaks the husband can live with his wife, at her father's, when he has paid half the price set on her, but he cannot beat her without the father's consent, nor carry her away until the whole price is paid.

In Sumatra, the Battas have as many wives as they please, generally five or six, who all live in one common apartment with the husband, each having a separate fire-place. Husbands purchase their wives of their fathers-in-law, and gamble them away or sell them, whenever they choose.

In New Holland, before a girl is given to her husband, two of her front teeth are knocked out. the happy lover then throws a kangaroo skin over

her shoulders, spits in her face several times, marks her with painted stripes of different colors, orders her to carry his provision bag to his hut, and if she does not go fast enough to please him, gives her a few kicks by the way. Wives are commonly stolen among these savage tribes. When the heroic New Hollander sees a woman unprotected, he rushes upon her, knocks her down with his club, and drags her through the woods. Her tribe retaliates by the commission of a similar outrage. This is the savage ultimatum of the power of man over woman; and the same principle, active in the highest civilization, has similar ultimations. Our women are not usually subjected to these physical outrages and coarse brutalities; but they have their spiritual analogies.

The Moors marry early—matches are made by parents, and the father of the girl cannot refuse the offer of any one who is able to purchase his daughter, unless there is some stain upon his character. Any right of choice on the woman's part is unthought of. It would probably be considered a very indecent thing for a woman to have any choice respecting the man who is to be the father of her children. This is rendered probable from the fact that even now, and here, the assertion that "a woman has a natural right to choose who shall be the father of her child," is considered a shocking social heresy.

In Bambeck, one of the African tribes, the marriage ceremony consists in the bride coming to the hut of her future husband, with a calipash of water, with which she washes his feet, wiping them with her mantle. In Congo, the negroes take their wives a year on trial; at the end of this time the

relation may cease at the requirement of either party. When the Catholic missionaries tried to abolish this custom, the mothers resisted, declaring that they would not risk their daughters' happiness, by binding them to an indissoluble union with a man who might prove a wholly unsuitable companion! O mothers of civilization! how many bitter tears might be spared you and your daughters, if you had the sense of a Congo negress in this one particular.

In Abyssinia there is no marriage ceremony. Parties live together as long as they please, and their connections are dissolved and renewed as often as they think proper.

In Dahomey, all unmarried females are the property of the Sovereign. Wives are a state monopoly, like tobacco in France. Once a year all the girls who have arrived at the age of puberty, are brought before the king, who selects those he wishes for himself, and then sells the others to his subjects. Each man pays a certain price, and takes whatever woman the king sees fit to give him. This king has three thousand wives; but the king of Ashantee has three thousand three hundred and thirty-three, and the prosperity of the kingdom is believed to depend upon his keeping up this exact number.

Polygamy, practiced by the patriarchs, was continued among the Jews, as long as they continued to be an independent nation. Maimon, a Jewish historian, informs us that it was the custom for every man to have as many wives as he pleased or could maintain, even to a hundred, provided he could perform toward them all the duties of a husband, in which he was not to fall more than one month in arrears. The laws of all Mohammedan

countries also proffer wives this protection, and any woman who feels herself aggrieved, can complain to the magistrate, and may even procure a divorce. Polygamy has been allowed and practiced in China, Hindoostan, Persia, Turkey, Arabia, and nearly all Africa. It was also the practice of Peru and Mexico, and the most of the aboriginal tribes on this continent.

The opposite of this rule has a few rare instances. In Thibet one woman becomes the wife of a whole family of brothers; and this custom prevails in all classes of society. The oldest brother chooses the bride, and consummates the family marriage. Travelers relate instances of five or six brothers living under one roof in this manner, in great harmony. In some provinces of ancient Media, women had a plurality of husbands. On the coast of Malebar, in the East Indies, the number was limited to twelve; and the Jesuit missionaries relate that among the Iroquois Indians, the instances of women having several husbands were not uncommon. Melville assures us that the women of Typee, in the Marquesas, had two husbands, the one her senior by many years, the other of her own age, all three living together in the greatest harmony. We find a similar custom in some of the most polished European nations at the present day.

The ancient Egyptians and Greeks, though not generally, or extensively polygamists, allowed of concubinage. Socrates had two wives, as also Euripides. When population had declined in Athens, a decree was made that men might have children by other women than their wives.

Polygamy was common over a large portion of Europe until a comparatively recent period, though

discouraged by the Greeks, prohibited by the Romans, and finally, though not until a late era, interdicted by the church.

Monogamy became the law of Rome, from the scarcity of women in its early stages. When wives were obtained with difficulty—and even violence was at times resorted to, as in the rape of the Sabines,—a brave people would not permit of any such monopoly as existed in Oriental countries.

In Christian Europe, as late as the sixth century, it was enacted that any man, married to several wives, should do penance. It was ordained at the Council of Narbonne, that such clergymen as were the husbands of two wives should only be presbyters and deacons, but not be allowed to perform marriage or consecration. A plurality of wives was allowed in some of the European States, in the sixteenth century. When Luther was applied to by Philip, Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, for permission to marry a second wife, while living with his own, the Princess of Savoy, he assembled a synod of six of the principal Reformers. They decided that as the Gospels nowhere in express terms commanded monogamy, and that as polygamy had been practiced by the highest dignitaries of the church, the required permission should be granted.

Of the actual results of polygamy, we have different accounts, prompted, probably, by the prejudices of those who give them. Some travelers assure us that in Central Africa, where many wives share one husband, their only strife is to see which shall do most to render him happy. There is no other rivalry, and not the least jealousy. Each has her turn—her week of attendance. The neight of honor and felicity is to be permitted to

share his bed, and this is the reward of good conduct. But a higher honor even than this, is to bestow a favorite wife temporarily upon some stranger who is partaking of the husband's hospitality.

The Maroons of Jamaica formerly had several wives; each had her own house, and the husband spent two days with each in rotation. The only jealousy was occasioned by the husband noticing the children of one wife, while claimed by another for the time being. When the missionaries tried to break up these relations, their converts found it very difficult to believe that the good God had commanded anything which seemed to them so unnatural and abhorrent. This is the grand obstacle to the success of Christianity in all heathen countries—an obstacle so insuperable, that the American Board of Commissioners has been compelled to decide upon the policy of temporizing, and bringing about the gradual adoption of the monogamic system.

But it is easy to see that the Mormons, who have ingrafted the Patriarchal system of polygamy upon the Christian creed, and who are now sending their missionaries into every quarter of the world, will have more success than any other sect, as they have not this obstacle to encounter.

The Mormon system of a plurality of wives, springing out of the bosom of the Christian Church and flourishing in the midst of the civilization of the nineteenth century, is a remarkable element of social progress. It is the right and the duty of every Mormon saint, under the approval and direction of the head of the church, to marry as many wives as he can in all respects provide for, and this is the custom, now, in our territory of

Utah, an integral portion of the United States. These wives, to whatever number, either live in the same house, or in different dwellings, each taking charge of her own children, and assisting to provide for the comfort of her husband. The laws against any other relation are severe. Adultery, as under the Jewish dispensation, is punishable with death; and seduction is an odious crime.

But, as in most countries, there is no equality of rights. A woman has no right to more than one husband. The polygamic relation is completely one-sided, and wives are directed to obey their husbands.

The influence of these varied marriage relations, on the happiness of men and women, in the past, and the present time, we must reserve for future chapters. We wish to make these points as distinct as possible. We have given here a general statement of marriage, in its external aspect, reserving some cases of particular interest, and omitting, in this connection, our own familiar customs and laws, which require a more elaborate and searching examination.

CHAPTER VI.

THE FACTS OF MARRIAGE.

WE are not ready to reason, until all the facts bearing upon our case are fairly presented. The last chapter gives an outline sketch of marriage as it has existed, and now exists, in various parts

of the world, leaving out the external and obvious features of the marriages of Christian civilization, at the present day. These facts we have condensed from our history of "Woman in all Ages and Nations," a book crowded with curious and important facts, bearing upon individual and social interests. From the sixth part of the same work we condense the statement of the treatment and condition of one of the parties to the marriage relation, from which the character and conduct of the other may be inferred. We ask for these facts, which are believed to be authentic, a careful consideration. They will prepare the reader's mind for much of a corresponding character, which is to follow.

The low estimation in which women are still held in the East, is shown in the fact that while male children have a joyous welcome to the world, females are treated with little consideration; and are often destroyed, or exposed to perish. They are, in many parts of the world, considered a burthen and misfortune.

It is true that the refinements of eastern luxury have done much to make the slavery of the sex endurable. It is true, that with rich dresses, music, dancing, and story-telling to amuse them, the women of the harem have no conception of any higher life. While the women of the rich spend their days in indolent dissipation, trying to please their husbands, taking some comfort with their children, those who belong to the lower classes, are toiling drudges who perform most of the labors of life.

Circumstances forced civilization upon Egypt at a very early period. Women engaged in trade

and commerce. The laws prohibited polygamy, and female chastity was guarded by severe penalties. The queens of Egypt, who were both wives and sisters of their kings, were held in equal honor. It is said that men promised to obey their wives; and that daughters were required to support their parents. Women inherited property, and managed their families. Among the Phœnicians and Carthaginians, women were treated with high consideration, and if taken prisoners in war, three or four men were given in exchange for one woman.

In Greece, women were secluded and uncultivated. The only women of much distinction were foreigners and courtesans. In Sparta, men and women lived separately, and seem to have had no intercourse but such as was necessary to keep up a vigorous population. Grecian women had no judicial or political existence; and performed many slavish, and what we should consider indelicate, offices, such as attending men at baths. Wives in some States were loaned by their husbands. By the laws of Solon, any young man might demand the wife of a less handsome and robust citizen, under the pretense of raising up vigorous children for the State. Once, when a Spartan army had been absent for a long period, a delegation was selected, and sent home to perform the duties of husbands for all. In the earlier ages of Greece, women were allowed to vote, but not to hold office; but the privilege of voting was afterwards abolished. Their right to the inheritance of property was liberally guarded.

As in the early ages of Rome, women were scarce and difficult to be obtained, they were

treated with a corresponding consideration. The Roman Senate, to reward their Sabine wives for their noble conduct, granted them many distinctions and privileges. All immodest and licentious discourse was forbidden in their presence; no indecent objects were to be brought before them, and every one was ordered to give way to them in the street. These senatorial edicts show how women were commonly treated.

But with all the consideration shown for women by the Romans, in the most virtuous period of their history, there were many circumstances of tyranny and injustice. At no age, or in no condition, had they ever the management of their own property; in certain cases, their evidence was not admitted in courts of justice; sumptuary laws prescribed their dress and ornaments; wine was forbidden them; husbands finding their wives drinking have killed them on the spot; the husband could divorce the wife, almost at pleasure; and they were chastised, not only by their husbands but by slaves, at his orders. Beautiful women were led in triumph as captives through the streets of Rome; the daughters of Boadicea were scourged as well as ravished. Still, at different periods, women enjoyed much freedom and honor. They were priestesses in the temples, were buried in the field of Mars with honors due to a hero, and for a short period there was a female senate in Rome, over which the mother of the Empress presided.

The ancient Gauls revered and protected women, who seem to have had an almost equal share in public counsels. Still, in many respects, they were treated as inferiors. They ate after

the men had finished: They inherited but a small share of the husbands' property. The husband of an adulteress could assemble her relations, strip her naked and whip her through the village. The ancient Franks could kill their wives for adultery ; and if they killed them without cause, in a moment of anger, they were but slightly punished.

Still, Chivalry, that religion of which woman was the divinity, which held the whole sex in extravagant veneration, arose in Middle and Northern Europe. In the height of this curious fanaticism, the least contemptuous word uttered against any woman, disqualified a knight. At the same time, severe laws protected women from all outrage. It may however be doubted, whether this age of woman's glory was also to her a period of happiness.

As chivalry declined, and the world became more peaceful, women of the higher ranks sought and found distinction in politics and learning. In the reign of Ann of Austria, French women took the lead of political factions ; the French princess had a regiment, and ladies of the court took rank as marshals in the army. Women preached in public, supported controversies, published and defended theses, harangued in Latin, and wrote Greek and Hebrew. Ladies took degrees in the universities, became doctors of law, and filled professorships. About this time works were written in several languages, to prove that women were superior to men. Much of this has changed ; and woman, after the extravagances of chivalry, finds her position in civilization—such as we shall faithfully describe it in succeeding chapters.

We shall glance very briefly at the most striking facts connected with the present and relative con-

dition of the sexes in various parts of the world at or near the present time.

In all the Mohammedan countries women are kept in seclusion and entire subjection. They are generally treated with kindness ; but this depends entirely on the benevolence of their owners. In Barbary it is an insult even to ask a man about his wives, and two brothers may live in the same house for years without either ever seeing his sisters-in-law.

The Moors, lazy and tyrannical, are supported by their women, whom they beat for the slightest offenses. If foreigners express surprise, they say, "Why should such inferior creatures be allowed to eat and drink with us? If they commit faults, why should they not be beaten? They were made to bring us children, make our oil, and do our drudgery ; these are the only purposes to which their degraded natures are adapted." But while women are beaten, imprisoned, and fattened, they have some privileges. The harem is sacred from intrusion. A woman can procure a divorce and go back to her parents.

In Senegal, the girls work, the boys play. A man can sell his daughters, and his wives if he can detect them in any fault. He has only to expose one to a temptation he knows she has not strength to resist, to enable him to sell her as a slave.

On the slave coast a son inherits the harem of his father, which he takes as his own, selling as many of his father's wives, and his own sisters, as he finds it convenient to dispose of. In Javra, the slaves, who are merely the nominal wives of the king, if taken in an amour, are punished with a most horrible death. When the king dies, his six

favorite wives are buried alive with him. The general condition of women in Africa, is that of the most humiliating slavery.

The Eastern arguments for polygamy give a curious exposition of the condition of the married parties under that system. "With us," they say, "custom makes everything easy; our absolute rule prevents complaints; if our wives do not love us they are obliged to pretend they do, which answers just as well; whereas, if a man is confined to one wife, there is no redress. If she prove bad or is sick, he must hate her or be afflicted for her; besides, where there is but one wife, she seldom knows the duty of submission."

In Persia, among the rich, the wife, who is purchased of her parents, without ever having seen her husband, is the mistress of his concubines. If unfaithful to him, she is hurled from the loftiest minaret of the mosque. These cases are rare, as they must be in a country where it is a matter of religion never to look at another man's wife, nor even toward the prison where she is confined.

In Turkey, the women enjoy more liberty than in most Mohammedan countries, and some travelers compare their condition favorably with that of the women of Europe. A man is permitted to divorce his wife three times, but after the third time he cannot take her back, unless she has in the meantime been married to some other man, and divorced. Adultery is punishable with death.

In Georgia and Circassia, men have a plurality of wives, and exchange them at pleasure. The girls are sold to supply the harems of Persia, Turkey, and even Egypt. They go joyfully, in the hope of captivating some rich man, living in mag-

nificence, and making the fortunes of their relatives.

No Hindoo woman is allowed to give evidence in a court of justice, and a Brahmin has the right to put an unfaithful wife to death. Among other castes, the punishment is lighter. The murder of a wife by a jealous husband is frequent, and it is taken little notice of. But men and women part at pleasure, and marry others. In the higher castes the women are kept in great seclusion, and have been murdered to prevent their being ever seen by strangers. These women of India, capable of a devotion which makes them burn themselves alive with a dead husband or lover, are betrothed in infancy by their parents. If the betrothed husband dies before their marriage, they are condemned to perpetual celibacy. If married, their husband can lend, or sell, or gamble them away. If he dies they either burn themselves on his funeral pile, or become miserable slaves and dependents. Under the British government, in India, much of this is changed within the last century, but its spirit remains.

In Tonquin, wives and daughters are sold. A husband may divorce his wife for the slightest cause, but she cannot get rid of him, unless he is guilty of some heinous crime. Women convicted of adultery are killed by an elephant, trained to the office.

In Cochin China, the women do all the work and are very hardly treated. They have a saying that "a woman has nine lives, and bears a great deal of killing." Men sell their wives, or hire them out; but a woman who grants a favor without her husband's consent is barbarously killed.

In Siam, the women live in much freedom, and carry on most of the trade of the country. In cases of divorce, the principal wife claims the first, third, fifth child, and so on through the odd numbers; the husband taking the even ones. The subordinate wives are not as well treated.

The Burmans have but one wife, but keep as many mistresses as they can afford, who wait upon the wife. If he dies, they become the property of the widow. The Burman women engage in trade, manufactures, and even in ship-building, but they are liable to be sold for the husband's debts. Foreign merchants sometimes buy them, and find them very useful.

Among all barbarous and savage tribes, in Asia and America, with few exceptions, women are considered as property, slaves, drudges, beasts of burden, and are treated, or are liable to be treated, with great cruelty by their husbands, owners, and masters, these being almost synonymous terms.

Sometimes, in a particular tribe, we find singular and marked exceptions to this general rule. It is said that women rule among the sensual Kamtschatkians; and there must be everywhere individual cases in which beauty and talent produce their natural effects. But, so far as we have examined the world's history, the marriage relation is one of ownership and despotism on one side; and of bondage and, at least, the liability to suffering, on the other.

An examination of the relative condition of the two sexes, and the influences of the marriage relation, at the present time, and in the highest state of civilization, will form the subject of other chapters.

CHAPTER VII.

CONVENTIONAL MORALITIES.

WE have given an account of the marriage institution, as existing in the primitive ages, and in savage and barbarous countries, or those whose civilization differs from our own. We have quoted fully all the laws and ordinances respecting it, to be found in those ancient writings, which are the bases of our religion and laws. We have given the facts of history and the observations of travelers, to show the actual condition of men and women, living under the various forms of this institution. There is another class of facts which may be properly stated here, showing to what extent the principle of marriage has been observed or violated ; or the actual condition of sexual morality, according to the conventional standard.

Chastity, even in its ordinary meaning, was not the virtue of the early ages of the world. Sacred and profane historians alike give us accounts of a general licentiousness. Thus Abraham, on two occasions, made his wife pass for his sister, fearing that he might be murdered on her account. The Scriptural accounts of prostitution show its early existence and toleration. The thousands of female captives, taken in the wars of the Israelites, were, by the express command of God, given to the people as concubines and slaves.

Some of the accounts of unchastity recorded in ancient history are too gross and extravagant

for belief. When we are told that a king of Egypt sought through his whole nation to find one chaste woman, and that the daughter of another king procured the stones to build a pyramid, by each of her lovers giving one, as the price of her favors, we must doubt the literal truth of these stories, though we may accept them as indications of general dissoluteness. Even the religions of many ancient nations were full of what seems to us gross indecency and profligacy, and the ancient historians, who were not much afflicted with squeamishness, were ashamed to describe the public debaucheries of religious festivals. At Babylon, a law obliged every woman, once in her life, to make a public sacrifice of her chastity in the Temple of Venus. The marriage laws of Lydia and Cyprus permitted no woman to marry, until she had accumulated a suitable dowry by public prostitution. It is stated that in these cases, both the women who had sacrificed to Venus, and those who had been prostitutes before marriage, were inflexibly virtuous ever after. A people of Scythia is said to have introduced a community of wives, or system of general promiscuity. Among the Lydians, the daughters of their monarchs could with difficulty protect themselves from outrage. The Ausi, a people of Lybia, had their women in common, and when a child came into a public assembly, the first man it spoke to was considered its father.

The early history of Greece is full of murders, rapes, and usurpations. The Grecian princes who assembled at the siege of Troy, were guilty of enormous crimes, and when they returned home were mostly murdered by their wives, who had formed other connections during their absence.

In Sparta, both sexes bathed and danced together, in a state of nudity, and this under a legal regulation to promote population. In Athens, public prostitution not only incurred no disgrace, but courtesans were the chosen companions of statesmen and philosophers. Solon commended the young men who kept accomplished mistresses; Socrates not only visited courtesans himself, but took his wives and daughters to visit them. True, these courtesans, who were foreigners, were rich, educated, highly accomplished, and in all respects superior to the uncultured and secluded wives and daughters of Greece.

In the early ages of Rome, her women were famed for chastity; and though men could divorce their wives at pleasure, it was five hundred and twenty years from the foundation of the Republic to the first divorce—a fact to be considered by those who believe that free divorce, now, would be attended by a general breaking up of existing relations, and that morality is best promoted by making marriage indissoluble. There are familiar instances in Roman history where women killed themselves, or were killed by their husbands or fathers, to save them from sexual dishonor. A senator was struck from the rolls for kissing his wife in the presence of his daughter. Julius Cesar divorced his wife, when he heard some scandal concerning her, without any inquiry into the facts, saying, "The wife of Cesar must not even be suspected."

But Rome, from conquest, luxury, and the introduction of foreign men, women, and manners, finally went to the other extreme of voluptuousness and debauchery, which became fashionable, while

chastity was ridiculed as an antiquated virtue. Libertinism spread over Rome. Women danced naked on the stage, bathed promiscuously with men, and committed every sort of irregularity. There was a general revolt against the constraints of marriage; and a conspiracy was even formed among married women to poison their husbands. When laws were passed to regulate and restrain public prostitution, women of the highest rank applied for licenses, and put upon their houses their names, and the prices of their favors. When Severus became Emperor, he found on the roll of untried causes three thousand prosecutions for adultery. It was in Rome that it first became a general custom for women to become public prostitutes in their own country. We have thus, in the history of Rome, every phase of sexual morality, from the Blue Law puritanism, that punished a man for kissing his wife in the presence of their daughter, to the extreme debauchery of a Nero, or a Messalina.

Among the northern nations of Europe, chastity was guarded, as in the early ages of Rome. Tacitus pays the highest tribute to the conjugal virtues of the Germans and Goths. Women were protected by the severest laws. Men were punished for kissing, or even touching a woman, against her will, and in some cases even with her consent. These severe virtues existed long before the introduction of Christianity; and it was not until after this religion was spread over Northern Europe, that extreme chastity gave place to a general debauchery. In the reign of Charlemagne, public prostitution had become common, and little respect was paid to female virtue.

The priesthood, in the middle ages, fell into gross corruptions, and convents and monasteries were the scenes of lewdness and debauchery.

Such are the accounts of historians, which, however, are to be taken with some allowance. Chastity runs into fanaticism under certain circumstances; from this comes a reaction to the other extreme. We shall endeavor to give the laws of these facts in the proper place.

If we turn to the accounts of travelers and voyagers, who have visited people we call savage and barbarous, we find many curious facts which aid us in our inquiries.

In some of the tribes of North American Indians, men lent their wives to each other; in others they offered them to their visitors. Among the Natchez, to refuse such an offer was a gross indignity. Among the Hurons, prostitution produced no disgrace. Among the Ancient Peruvians, a man felt himself injured if his wife had been chaste. A similar feeling is said to have existed in Thibet and in some of the South Sea Islands. Women were freely offered to strangers by their husbands, fathers, or themselves, among the natives of Brazil, Pegu, Siam, Cochin-China, Cambodia, the coast of Guinea, and in most groups of Polynesia. Indeed, the inhabitants of the Pacific groups, separated from each other, and from all the world, do not appear to have the least idea that chastity is a virtue, or its opposite a vice. If women are constant to one man, it is from simple inclination, and not from the force of opinion, custom, or law.

In Japan, China, the East Indies, and most Oriental countries, where governments and institutions

are despotic and patriarchal, the chastity of the woman is carefully guarded by custom and law. at the same time there are, in all these countries, large numbers of public prostitutes, who are protected and often honored. In India they rank with the ministers of religion, and are to be found in all the temples. Where the rich can monopolize wives and concubines by scores and hundreds, it becomes a matter of necessity to make such a provision for those who are left destitute.

But in many parts of the East, there is a class of men who, under the sanction of religion, and with an assumption of superior holiness which protects them and admits them everywhere, perform a function corresponding to that of the Bayaderes. These are the Fakirs, a set of religious vagabonds, so holy that they go naked—so perfect, that no act they can commit is a sin. Eastern jealousy is no match for religious fanaticism, and no husband presumes to cross the threshold of his wife's apartment, when she has a Fakir for a visitor.

In India the Brahmins are monogamic, and models of constancy. Other classes pay no such regard to chastity, but the general character of the women of India seems amiable and truthful. The women of all Mohammedan countries live in a state of compulsory virtue. What they would be or do, in a state of freedom, is not easy to determine.

What inferences are to be drawn from these scattered facts, which are much fewer and more imperfect than we could desire? They are so from necessity; for casual visitors to distant countries are liable to make mistakes; their accounts do not agree with each other; and few of their state-

ments are to be depended upon. We give them for what the reader may think them worth, wishing to cover the whole ground, and to treat the whole subject, not as a partisan of any theory, but as a philosopher who wishes, above all things, to find out what is the truth. Having taken this sweeping and imperfect view of the past and the distant, we shall come to the consideration of Marriage and its coincident or resulting moralities, in our present civilization.

CHAPTER VIII.

MARRIAGE IN CIVILIZATION.

THE monogamic marriage is held to be the most sacred and useful of all the Institutions of Civilization. It may be divided into two kinds, the marriage of Convenience, and that of Inclination. The former prevails over a large part of the Continent of Europe; the latter is found chiefly in England and the United States. Doubtless there are love-matches in all civilized countries; and marriages of interest in all; we state the rule, and admit the exceptions.

In each case the contract is the same. There is a solemn promise on the part of the man to "love, cherish, and sustain"; and on the part of the woman to "love, honor, and obey," until death shall part them. In the marriage of interest or convenience, a portion of this contract is a mere

formality ; in the marriage of inclination or choice from affection, it may soon become so.

In France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, and much the largest part of the Continent of Europe, marriages are arranged by the parents of at least one of the parties. A girl, educated in seclusion, sees her intended husband but twice before he leads her to the hymenial altar ; once to be formally introduced, once to sign the marriage contract. If he has a suitable position and fortune, it is enough ; he may be old, ugly, repulsive ; he has been chosen as her husband, by those who ought to know what is best for her, and she accepts him, with disgust, because she must ; or with indifference, because she knows no better.

Married, she becomes his property, and may become his victim, his slave. She must live where he wishes her to live ; she must submit to his embraces, however loathsome ; she must bear his children, whether she wish to do so, or not ; her property, her liberty, her comfort, her person, her life, are all in his power. He will probably be punished for an outright murder by poison or steel, but there are many ways of killing, which she has no power to resist. The subject of his caprices, the victim of his lusts, starved in her sympathies, it may be crushed in her affections, living in a spiritual inanition, this human being has but one duty, and that is *obedience*.

In the marriage of Inclination, which supposes a certain freedom of choice, or at least a freedom to accept or refuse, there seems a better chance for a certain degree of happiness. But the conditions of the contract are the same. The parties are liable to be mistaken in their estimate of each

other, or in the permanency of their affections. The love may last a month ; the promise to love is forever, and with it, on one side, is the promise to obey. In the marriage of convenience a woman sells herself, and makes, or her friends make for her, the best bargain they can ; in the love match, the woman gives herself away ; and experience has shown that the indifference of a merely conventional relation is often better than the disgust and discord that succeed a changed affection.

In the old societies of Europe, while religion and law require fidelity to the hypocritical compact, custom allows of palliations and compensations of a remarkable character. It is a curious fact, that in two countries more under the despotisms of Church and State than most others, there should really exist a certain degree of freedom for the affections. In Spain and Italy, the customs of society permit a married woman to enjoy that love, out of marriage, which no one expects to find in it ; and in France, where no freedom is allowed to any woman of the middle and higher classes before marriage, much is often taken and tolerated when once the ceremony has been performed. Monogamy in those countries, then, is only the external and nominal form of marriage, while there is a real and general polygamy of both sexes, understood and sanctioned by a public opinion, which overrules all law.

These are matters of universal notoriety, and we only need to quote the testimony of Lord Byron, who had the best opportunities for observation, and whose evidence is perfectly conclusive. In writing of Venice, he says :

“The general state of morals here is much the

same as in the Doges' time. A woman is virtuous, according to the code, who limits herself to her husband and one lover; those who have two, three, or more, are a little *wild*; but it is only those who are indiscriminately diffuse, or form a low connection, who are considered as overstepping the modesty of marriage. * * * There is no convincing a woman here that she is in the smallest degree deviating from the rule of right, or the fitness of things, in having a lover. The great sin seems to lie in concealing it, or in having more than one—that is, unless such extension of the prerogative is understood and approved of by the prior claimant." He writes of Ravenna: "But it is a dreadfully moral place, for you must not look at any body's wife except your neighbor's—if you go to the next door but one, you are scolded, and presumed to be perfidious." Of Italian society in general, he writes: "Their moral is not your moral; their life is not your life; you would not understand it; it is not English, nor French, nor German, which you would all understand. * * * Their system has its rules, and its fitnesses, and its decorums, so as to be reduced to a kind of discipline, or game at hearts, which admits of few deviations, unless you wish to lose it. * * * In short, they transfer marriage to adultery, and strike the 'not' out of that commandment. *The reason is that they marry for their parents, and love for themselves.* They exact fidelity from a lover as a debt of honor, while they pay the husband as a tradesman—that is, not at all. You hear a person's character canvassed, not as depending on their conduct to their husbands or wives, but to their mistress or lover. It is to be observed that

while they do all this, the greatest outward respect is to be paid to the husbands, not only by the ladies, but by their *serventi*—particularly if the husband serves no one himself, which is not often the case, however ; so that you would often suppose them relations, the *serventi* making the figure of one adopted into the family. Sometimes the ladies run a little restive, and elope, or divide, or make a scene ; but this is at starting, generally, when they know no better, or when they fall in love with a foreigner, or some such anomaly, and is always reckoned unnecessary and extravagant.”

The notorious affair of Lord Byron with the young Countess Guichioli, is an illustration of all he has said of Italian morals. She was a beautiful girl of twenty, just married to an old Italian noble of sixty, his third wife. Byron's passion for her saved his life ; and it met with no opposition from the husband, her relatives, or the public. The Count treated him with hospitality, and often took him to ride in a coach and six. The father and other relatives of the Countess were the friends of Byron, and when the Count got angry at being entirely deprived of his wife's society, they took part with the lovers, against the husband. Had Byron been an Italian these difficulties would probably have been avoided, and all parties would have lived together in harmony, for though love is as exclusive in Italy as elsewhere, marriage is not considered any interference with the sentiment. It is an established condition for which an allowance is to be made. This state of things exists in all civilized countries to a greater or less extent. It is so in New York, in London, and in Paris, but it is in Italy that it is reduced to a system.

The morality of an Italian woman would seem to consist in her sincerity, and in being as true to herself as circumstances will admit. There are not wanting instances of matrimonial fidelity, in our sense of the term, but these cases are where the marriage has been from love, or where love has been the result of marriage—in a word, where the husband and the lover are combined in one. In this case, though ladies may formally allow the attentions of a *cavalier servente*, they are not the less constant to the real object of their affections.

Lord Byron spent a short period in Spain. In one of his letters to his mother, descriptive of the society of Cadiz, he says :

“I beg leave to observe that intrigue here is the business of life; when a woman marries she throws off all restraint, but I believe their conduct is chaste enough before. If you make a proposal, which in England would bring a box on the ear from the meekest of virgins, to a Spanish girl, she thanks you for the honor you intend her, and replies, ‘wait till I am married, and I shall be too happy.’ This is literally and strictly true.”

“The Spanish lady may have her cortejo, as well as the Italian her *cicisbeo*. It is Spanish etiquette, for gentlemen to make love to every woman with whom they have the opportunity, and a Spanish lady of rank has said that she would heartily despise the man, who, having a proper opportunity, did not strenuously solicit every favor she could grant. Every Spanish woman reckons this as a tribute due to her charms; and though she may be far from granting all the favors a man can ask, she is not the less affronted if he does not ask them.”

Marriages in France, among the educated classes, are almost entirely those of interest and convenience, when people think it worth their while to marry at all. Among the higher classes, a man and wife who have met but once before marriage, are extremely civil to each other, live in separate apartments, each having their own servants, and pursuing their own pleasures. This is the influence of fashion, and custom, in modifying the laws of marriage. Love is separated from marriage—because marriage is separated from love. The courts of love, as long ago as the twelfth century, decided that there could be no true love between married couples, because love was inconsistent with the restraints of that condition. Of late years a deep protest has grown up in France, against the whole system of forced and mercenary marriages, of which so many women are the wretched victims; for though fashion may do much to free them from the most galling fetters of this slavery, men have still the power to demand all the privileges that the law gives them in the marriage contract.

In our own country, with the condition of whose society we are most familiar, and in which we are naturally most interested, the marriage of inclination, contracted freely by both parties, is more common probably than in any other country. Our young people of both sexes enjoy a degree of freedom unheard of elsewhere. In France, young girls make no part of society; in Spain and Spanish countries young persons of different sexes are never permitted to be together, without some one is present to protect them from improper conduct. But here, except where fashion has introduced

something of foreign manners, young persons have a freedom, limited only by the fear of scandal. Love matches are common; and as there is supposed to be no excuse for violations of the marriage vow, none are tolerated. Those who promise to be constant to each other, usually do so in good faith, and nowhere in the world are such promises more faithfully observed. Here, then, the monogamic marriage exists under the best conditions, and in its highest state of perfection, and here, therefore, is the place to examine its character and its results.

CHAPTER IX.

MARRIAGE AS IT IS.

THE motives to marriage are few and simple. There is a yearning of the heart for love, and its satisfaction, which the laws and customs of society will not permit to be gratified in any other way than by marriage. If a man is attracted to a woman, he cannot enjoy her intimate society, but with the implied understanding that he wishes to be married to her. No provision is made for any attachment but one, and that must endure for life. Whoever loves, therefore, must marry as the penalty. It is the price every man must pay, for the love of every virtuous and respectable woman.

Thus the powerful desire for the sexual union, active in most men, and in many, but not so many,

women, can only be gratified, legally and respectably, in marriage; and this is often a motive to hasty, passionate, but ill-assorted and miserable unions. Marriage, in this case, is often a blunder; but it is one we are not permitted to correct. Every other mistake, short of suicide, a man may remedy. If he joins the wrong party in politics, or the wrong sect in religion; if he adopts a profession which is unsuited to him, or a career of any kind in which he is unsuccessful, he can change; but if he gets married to the wrong woman, there is no redress. A life of disappointment, regrets, and misery, must pay the penalty of his passion and folly. The general verdict of society is, "It serves him right." He should have been more prudent; as if passion and prudence were so commonly united!

A man marries for position and business, and because he wishes to have an establishment and family, like the respectable men around him. A clergyman or a physician finds it necessary to his success to have a wife. Connection, family influence, property, all assert their claims, and combine with a man's passions to make him marry. Sometimes these motives of interest have an undue influence; and many a man, even here, marries a rich girl of a good family, for whom he cares very little, while he loves some pretty girl who is destitute of these advantages.

Women marry from motives which differ somewhat from these. Most women are capable of sentimental love; few in this country are controlled by passion, and a vast majority never feel the sexual desire as a controlling motive; perhaps we may say with truth that a large proportion never

feel it at all. But the whole influence of our society urges women into the marriage relation, with an almost resistless force. It is the only respectable position—the sole career of woman. To live unmarried is the horror of civilization. Old maids are pitied and ridiculed. Mothers are anxious to have their daughters married, or “settled in life,” as it is called; daughters see no other end in their existence.

And while marriage is the one tolerated condition of love, and maternity, and ambition—often the only means of support and the only escape from dependence or actual want—there is but a limited range of choice. Manage as they may, girls must still wait for offers, and to be the choice generally of a very narrow circle; and there is always a great temptation to accept the first for fear of never having another. Simple, confiding, and susceptible, girls are too apt to mistake gratitude, or an excited vanity, or benevolence, for love, and to engage themselves to men for whom they have no real attraction. In fact, our whole system of courtship is little more than a voluntary or involuntary deception. Neither party can see the real character of the other. Friends and relatives interfere, the match is made up, and the happy couple, entering upon a rapturous honeymoon, may find ennui and disgust before they get to the end of it. Then the gloomy future, then the blank despair of a vital mistake, for which there is no remedy but death!

And this marriage, when thus entered upon, let us see more fully what it is. A man binds himself by the most solemn contract, perhaps with the ceremonies of religion, to love a woman as long

as both shall live. In the next hour he may have no power to keep that promise; but it is made, and his whole life is cursed. If he is a conscientious man, he suffers from remorse as well as disappointment. If he tries to keep his contract, in its externals, he lives a false and wasted life, deprived of all chance of the enjoyment of a real love, should it come, as come it may, to make his misery more unendurable. Slave to his promise, to the laws, to society, to his wife, his existence is a living death. Such men plunge into business, seek excitement in politics, or stupefaction in stimulants, or compensations in debauchery. If children are born in this unloving union, they are so many bonds for its continuance; and the discordance of the parents is impressed upon the characters of their children. A large portion of the discord and crime of civilization comes from the loveless and indissoluble marriage.

In this marriage a man is bound to live with a woman he does not love, and to renounce all hope of enjoying any intimate relation with any other woman whom he does love; for the law of marriage makes such enjoyment a crime punishable in many States by a long imprisonment. He must support a woman for whom he has no attraction; one who, from the very fact of a loveless marriage, becomes peevish, ill-tempered, and finally diseased. Our graveyards are filled with the corpses of women who have died at from thirty to thirty-five years of age, victims of the marriage institution. The children are, from the laws of hereditary descent, ill-tempered, sick, and often short-lived. The cares, the responsibilities, the monotony, the dissatisfaction, the disgust, the per-

petual struggle between inclination and duty, make life a burthen and death a welcome relief.

If such may be the sufferings of a man in a compact in which he is the superior, and in which he has many advantages, what must they be to a woman?

She has married for a home—for position—because her friends will not hear of her refusing a good offer, or because she has been fascinated or magnetized into the belief that she really loved her suitor. From whatever motive, she marries. The chances are as three to one, under the most favorable circumstances, that the love is not a genuine and mutual passion founded on adaptedness of character. But the die is cast, and the irrevocable sentence pronounced. Henceforth she is the prisoner of a Bastile, from which there is no escape but through the portal of death, or that of disgrace, which many fear more than death itself.

She has married a husband, perhaps she finds a tyrant; she thought to be united to a tender lover, and finds in him a monster of lust, who profanes her life with disgusting debaucheries. She is his slave, his victim, his tool. Her duty is submission. Her body is prostituted to his morbid passions, her mind must bend submissive to his will, which henceforth is her only law. By the marriage law, the husband can shut his wife up, carry her from one place to another, provide such food and clothing as he sees fit, seize upon and squander her property, and inflict corporal chastisement. The flogging of wives by their husbands, in England, is so common a thing among all classes as to have called out denunciations from the public press, similar to those excited by the inhuman punish-

ments in the army and navy. These brutalities exist wherever there are brutal men to inflict them; and if anything can make men brutal, it is living in the hell of a discordant and repulsive marriage. Thousands of women suffer where one complains. The minister, the physician, or sometimes an intimate friend, hears of these things; but there is a deep *hush*! Respectability, and the sacredness of the marriage institution, demand silence. The physicians of this city could testify to bruises, and even broken bones, which wives have received from their husbands, in the "most respectable families." In lower ranks of life, where marital brutality is less restrained, wives are not unfrequently murdered outright, as they are everywhere killed by inches.

And from all this there is no escape, without violation of law and the outrage of public opinion. Women are everywhere instructed that it is better to endure everything than to attempt to change their positions. It is for the good of society; for the sake of the children they have been compelled to have against their will. They are sacrificed to the great Moloch of society. When we examine this social system further, we shall see whether it is worth the miseries it imposes on its victims.

The lesser evils of marriage, which bear upon the weaker party to the contract, are still of sufficient importance to call for remedy. For a human being to surrender up all right of choice and will, during her whole life, to another; to merge her legal, political, and to a great extent, her social existence in his; to have no separate individuality or sphere of action; to be during his life a meek, mild, submissive adjunct, a house-keeper, nurse,

and slave, and after his death a *relict*;—is a sad lot for any being whom God has endowed with a human soul.

The wife, except where special laws have been recently enacted for the amelioration of marriage, has no right to the property she has brought to her husband, or may earn. He can spend her estate, reduce her to poverty, and then seize upon the scanty pittance she may earn, according to the law of marriage which makes her his property. If the husband dies, she has a one-third life interest in his real estate, and a scanty pittance of personal property, consisting of such furniture and utensils as the law supposes to be needful. During his life the husband is absolute owner of her clothing, jewels, furniture, and property of every kind; and can sell the dress from her person, and the bed on which she lies; except in those States where a humane public opinion has somewhat modified the barbarity of this institution.

Let it not be said that we exaggerate the condition of mutual ownership, and of female servitude, which are the bases of the civilized marriage. The canons of the Church and the civil law alike prove the truth of our allegations. In the Religious Rite of Marriage, used in the Protestant Episcopal Church, we find the following ceremonial:

The minister shall say to the man,

“Wilt thou have this woman to thy wedded wife, to live together after God’s ordinance in the holy estate of matrimony? Wilt thou love her, comfort her, honor her, and keep her, in sickness and in health, and, forsaking all others, keep thee only unto her, so long as ye both shall live?”

The man shall answer, "I will."

Then shall the minister say unto the woman,

"Wilt thou have this man to thy wedded husband, to live together after God's ordinance, in the holy estate of matrimony? Wilt thou obey him, and serve him, love, honor and keep him, in sickness and in health, and, forsaking all others, keep thee only unto him, so long as ye both shall live?"

The woman shall answer, "I will."

Then the man, taking the woman by the hand, shall say,

"I take thee to my wedded wife, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death do us part."

And the woman repeats the same form, substituting for "to love and to cherish," the vow of perpetual servitude—"to love, honor and obey."

Here, in the religious rite, are perpetual ownership, the right of property without the possible alleviation of transfer, and the vow of perpetual love, obedience, and servitude.

The maxims and principles of the Common Law, which prevail in this country in full force, except as modified by statutory enactments, correspond with, and explain, the nature of marriage as a civil contract.

Under this contract, the woman, with all her movable goods, passes wholly into the power and disposal of her husband.

Man and wife are one person in law, so that the very being and existence of the woman is suspended during the coverture, or entirely merged or incorporated in that of her husband.

A man cannot grant anything to his wife, or enter into covenant with her, as this would be to suppose her separate existence.

If the wife be injured in her person or property she can bring no action for redress without her husband's concurrence. Of course she has no redress against her husband, for injury inflicted by himself or with his consent. Man and wife cannot give evidence for or against each other. All deeds executed by the wife are void.

As the wife is supposed to be under the perpetual control of her husband, she is free from the responsibility of offenses short of murder or treason committed at his instigation, his presence being the evidence of that instigation.

This legal identity cannot be dissolved by any act of the parties.

A woman cannot make any deed during marriage nor dispose of her property after being engaged.

Marriage revokes any power of attorney given by the wife.

Such is the fearful, irrevocable, indissoluble power which the institution of marriage gives one human being over another; by which the rights, will, conscience, and civil existence are suspended, or rather hopelessly destroyed.

The position of the wife under our marriage laws is so closely analogous to that of the African slave, that there is scarcely a break in the parallel between them. This comparison is worthy of a separate chapter.

CHAPTER X.

MARRIAGE AND SLAVERY.

ALL truths are in harmony ; all falsehoods resemble each other. There are strong analogies between all goods, and also between all evils. The vices and wrongs of civilization seem all linked together, and dependent upon each other. Its peculiar institutions are of a similar character.

In the institution of slavery, which is nearly or quite as old as marriage, and which is as fully sanctioned by the commands of God, in the laws of Moses, and the teachings of Christ and his apostles, we find almost precise analogies with the marriage institution.

The Mosaic law of slavery, elsewhere repeated and often confirmed, in both the Old and New Testaments, is given with the sanction of "Thus saith the Lord," in Leviticus xxv, beginning at the 44th verse :

"Both thy bondmen, and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you : of them shall ye buy bondmen, and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families which they beget in your land ; and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession ; and they shall be your bondmen forever."

Here is chattel slavery, authorized and commanded, in express terms, as clear and unmistakable as the law of marriage, already quoted; thus we find slavery as much a positive command as marriage, with express laws for its regulation. And here we may begin our parallel.

In the early ages slave and wife were convertible terms. The slave became the wife of her master, the wife no less became his slave. In both cases they were sometimes purchased, sometimes taken captives in war; sometimes they were presents, given as the hostages of peace and friendship.

Christ and his apostles found slavery and marriage both existing among the Jews, and the surrounding nations. They did not condemn either in direct terms; they rather advised conformity to custom, and obedience in both cases. But it may be claimed that the spirit of the teachings of Christ is opposed to both, and in this doctrine there are many sincere believers.

In Oriental countries, both slavery and marriage differ from the same institutions among us, and these differences are controlled by the same circumstances.

In many parts of the world, persons are sold into slavery by their parents, or rulers. Wherever marriages are generally those of interest or convenience, women are, in the same way, sold to their husbands by parents, guardians or magistrates.

Slaves are kidnapped, and carried off forcibly. The process by which a young girl is fascinated and decoyed from her home, and into the arms of a man, who becomes her master for life, is often a

spiritual kidnapping, closely analogous to the physical appropriation. But the single fact that a woman gives her consent, under whatever hallucination, or moral compulsion, for such there always is—the compulsion of law, custom, and public opinion,—she is none the less captured or sold.

She is henceforth the legal property of her master, as much as the slave. He can demand her wages, seize her earnings or inheritance, and recover damages of any one who trespasses upon her person, to which the law gives him the sole right.

The great wrong of slavery consists in the power which it gives to one human being over another. A husband has almost precisely the same power over the wife that the master has over the slave.

The slave can be torn from his home, and separated from his kindred—so can the wife; and every day, marriage severs the tenderest ties of affection between parents and children, brothers and sisters, and life-long friends. The husband can not only carry his wife to the remotest corner of the world, but anywhere he has the power to forbid the visits of any acquaintance, and to make her a close prisoner. The slave does not require a “pass” from the overseer more than the wife requires the consent of her husband to go on any visit or journey.

The slave can be separated from wife, or husband, and children. The husband can leave the wife, for business or pleasure, and be absent for months or years. He can take away her children, send them off to school, or in any way exercise absolute power over her and them.

The love of the slave may be thwarted or de-

nied. So may, and so is, the love of a married woman; the only difference is, that on the whole, the slave has more liberty in the vital realm of the affections. It may be doubted whether there is not more freedom and enjoyment, in the domestic relations of our negro slaves, than among the same number of our free white population.

The female slave may be compelled to submit to the embraces of her master—the wife is compelled to submit to the embraces of her husband, however disagreeable, painful, revolting, or dangerous to health and life. No one but the physician knows the consequences. The whole train of what are called female diseases, are mainly caused by the legalized and sanctified brutalities of the civilized marriage.

The female slave has little chance of choosing who shall be the father of her children—the civilized wife has still less power of choice. Though the man to whom she is married be repulsive to her, and unfit in health, constitution, and character, to be a father, she must take him, or, if such a choice is permitted, abandon the instinct of maternity, and live and die without the blessing of offspring. But the power to refuse does not exist in one case in a thousand. The world of civilization is full of children born in repulsion and disgust. The wonder is not that there is so much disease, crime, and premature mortality, but that humanity makes the brave struggle it really does against the evils of this institution.

The master may be a kind and benevolent man, giving his slave every indulgence; so may the husband; but the wife, in vital matters concerning the

affections, is far less likely to be indulged in freedom than the slave.

The slave may love the master with constancy and devotion, and prefer his service to the chances of freedom; so may, and often does, the wife who is faithful and obedient to the most sensual and brutal of tyrants, under the restraints of conscience and duty.

But the master may be capricious, tyrannical, and cruel—he may be a Legree in barbarity; and so may be, and so often is, the husband.

The laws nominally protect the slave from the brutality of a bad master; so they do the wife; but in neither case are they of much practical value.

The more intimate the relation between two human beings in a false condition, the deeper the evil; and many of the wrongs of marriage are greater than those of slavery can be. Slavery is said to be an evil and oppression to the master as well as the slave; marriage is an evil to the husband as well as the wife.

The slave may buy his freedom, if able—he has the chance of manumission; the wife has no corresponding chance, except in the death or disgrace of her husband.

Slaves are often treated with great cruelty, and sometimes even killed. We believe that there is more cruelty practiced in this city, by husbands, upon wives, than in any part of the United States, in the same population, by masters on slaves. Wives are murdered by their husbands, oftener than slaves are killed by their masters.

When a slave runs away, he is advertised, perhaps hunted with dogs; when the wife escapes from her husband, she also is advertised, and the

dogs of the law, and the bloodhounds of scandal tear her soul in pieces.

There are hundreds of fugitives from both institutions—for both there is a fugitive law; the one to save the Union, the other to save society; both really to protect the “right of property,” claimed by one human being in another. A woman who escapes from her husband, has as little mercy to expect from the conservatives, as the runaway negro has from the Silver Grays and Adamantines. Negro catching and wife catching are alike supported by the respectability, morality, religion and laws of civilization; and thousands who have revolted at the one, still uphold the other. Marriage is now to have its abolitionists; its “Uncle Tom’s Cabin” is to be written.

The analogy may be carried out to any extent, and down to the minute particulars of both institutions. If it be said that marriage is the best condition of a low degree of development—this is the argument for slavery. If women need care and protection, so do negroes. If the wife in many and perhaps in most cases, would not take her liberty, the same is asserted of the negro; but in neither instance is there any extensive trial of the experiment. It is said that if the negroes were all made free by law, a large number would still remain with their masters. No doubt many wives would also remain with their husbands—probably in each case, all would do so who ought to do so. But would it be equally safe to give both the trial? Not safe in either case, probably, as a question of property; whether it would be right, is another question. It may also be doubted whether either women or negroes could take care of themselves

if thrown at once upon their own resources. Both have been degraded and protected so long, that they are generally disqualified for any independent life. Both will need much care and assistance from their masters.

The two institutions, sanctioned alike by Divine and Human laws, are alike in their principles and their results. We do not see how any man who sustains one can condemn the other.

The conditions are analogous, the principle is the same. It is the subjection of one human being to the will of another. It is depriving a human being of the inalienable right to freedom—to life, and all its rights; liberty, and all its advantages; and the free pursuit of individual happiness. Marriage and slavery are alike the grave of human liberty, and that which comes nearest to the inner life is, of the two, the greater wrong.

CHAPTER XI.

MARRIAGE AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS OF CIVILIZATION.

No view of marriage can be complete, which does not include its relations to all other institutions. Those who claim that marriage is a fundamental or pivotal institution in society, are right. Of that system of superstition, bigotry, oppression, and plunder, which we call civilization, the monogamic, indissoluble marriage is the center and the soul. It cements all the elements of wrong which

make up the mean and barren present—it presents a stern barrier to any progress toward a happier future.

Marriage controls education, and especially the education of women. Our girls are educated, not to develop their faculties as human beings; not to give the freest scope to their talents, and aid them in the pursuit of happiness; not to qualify them for the struggle of an earnest life, for honorable independence by industry, art, or literature. No, they are educated, ostensibly and at the best, to make good wives and mothers, frequently that they may be successful in catching husbands. Whatever knowledge a husband may think desirable, whatever accomplishments may aid them to entice and entrap some man of a suitable position to marry them; whatever may fit them to shine, in those resorts of fashion and gayety which are our matrimonial markets;—in these things our daughters receive instruction. The shallow, superficial education of women is everywhere complained of—but few understand the cause. The supply is governed by the demand. The amount of education that makes a meek, subservient, housekeeperly wife, is just what our female schools endeavor to give. Men do not like their wives to know too much; they dread intellectual superiority; they understand well that ignorance is an element of obedience. It is for this reason that women are not admitted to our colleges, and that the whole tone of society is opposed to their receiving anything like a high culture, or a thorough integral education. Women will never be well educated, so long as it is their destiny to be the loving and obedient wives of the existing marriage institution.

It is not women alone who suffer. Ignorant mothers are but poor teachers of their sons. Young men hurry through their education, that they may engage in business, and get married. To acquire the means of supporting a family, they become hard, selfish and avaricious. Marriage is, in most cases, the end of development. Satiety brings monotony, and monotony favors exhaustion. The ambition of life is at an end. There is no more study, no more development, because there is no longer a stimulus to ambition. The romance of life has closed, as all the romances end, with marriage. The curtain has fallen. The eagle is caged. Society has lost its charm; and life has henceforth the monotony and the stupidity of the isolated home. Those who find relief from this in professional activities, in politics, in art, in literature, are exceptions, and these are all more or less hampered, whether conscious of it or not, by the incubus of the indissoluble tie.

But marriage is the spur of business, the fountain of selfishness, the universal excuse for plunder. If a man is an extortioner in trade, his ready excuse is that he must support his wife and children; perhaps a horde of needy and helpless relatives, victims, in another way, to the same institution. It is his excuse for cheating all with whom he has dealings—for robbing labor of its rights, for every species of legalized fraud. The robberies of civilization, under the name of business, are chiefly for the purpose of maintaining the thousand petty and expensive private establishments, or harems with one wife, necessary for the safety of the monogamic marriage.

For this wife, secured by the sanctions of relig-

ion and law, is still to be guarded with watchful jealousy. There must be an exclusive home—a complete establishment, no matter what the expense, that this precious piece of property may be kept in security. No gadding about—no going into society without the husband—no shadow of freedom is allowed her. The Christian wife is, in nine cases in ten, as much guarded as the Mohammedan, and has no more real freedom. The whole community guard her, and are ready to punish the least transgression—nay, the least “impropriety.” Congress can make no Fugitive Slave Law that will guard Southern slavery half as effectually as marriage is guarded by the society of which it is the central institution. Every community is made up of men and women who are mutually enslaving each other. The husband dares not act without consulting his wife—the wife does not dream of doing any act or thing without the consent of her husband. Marriage is thus “the grave of spontaneity.” Wherever the recognized marriage bond exists, there is no freedom; wherever there is any true freedom, there is no longer any marriage, in its defined and popular acceptation.

That finance is a vast engine of oppression and plunder; that commerce is a huge system of robbery; that every fortune is an accumulation of petty thefts, all know, who have examined the structure of our society, and seen its machinery in actual operation; but that marriage, the act by which two human beings steal each other, is the center and mainspring of this whole system of oppression, wrong, and outrage, has scarcely been suspected. Fourier has shown that the isolated household, with all its monotony and waste, and

the whole system to which it belongs, depends upon marriage; he has shown that all the selfish institutions of civilization center here; and that while there can be no true social reform without the abrogation of marriage, there can also be no such marriage as now exists, in any true society.

If these statements be doubted, or these reasonings be questioned, as of course they will be, by all who are interested in the preservation of this "time-honored institution," and of all its corresponding and dependent abuses, we will turn to some of the acknowledged evils of society, and see how they are connected with the marriage under consideration.

Intemperance is one of the grand vices of civilization; and more men and women have been made drunkards by the exhaustion, monotony and disgust of a false indissoluble marriage, than by all other causes combined. The lover, in the excitement of courtship, or the enjoyment of the honeymoon, seeks for no other intoxication. It is when love is past, and the soul sees no future for its affections; it is in the satiety, the weariness, the hopelessness of an indissoluble bondage, that a man seeks for the excitement of stimulants, and the temporary oblivion of drunkenness.

And woman, too, in the flushing light of her "love's young dream," does she ever send for a pitcher of gin to the corner grocery? No; it is when love has given place to loathing, to steep her senses in forgetfulness, to deaden her sensibilities, to enable her to submit to the embraces of a sensual brute, to whom the law, and public opinion, more potent than law, bind her in a perpetual and disgusting slavery.

Drunkenness is a slow suicide. Were the secrets of all lives made known, it would be seen that both men and women sometimes find, in more sudden modes of death, a relief from this hopeless bondage of the heart and life.

Poverty, with its concomitant evils, of ignorance, disease and crime, is the result of marriage, and its correlative institutions. Marriage is the spur of the selfishness which induces the acquisition of wealth; and it is the accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few, that brings poverty to the many. Marriage, and the isolated household to which it belongs, takes men and women out of the human brotherhood, and makes them look upon all others as strangers. Marriage destroys general philanthropy, and devotion to the good of all. It is an excuse, good against charity and patriotism. "I must provide for my own family," is the ready answer to every appeal.

And while marriage causes poverty in this way, by favoring selfish plunderings and accumulations, it directly perpetuates and increases what it has produced. It makes men and women sick, by amative exhaustion, far more exhausting when divorced from love. It burthens them with large families of children, crowds them into miserable dwellings, often the abodes of discord and vice; it rears a population in filth and ignorance, and in all ways perpetuates and increases its own evils. If you doubt this, go among the poor, and ask the wretched women the secret of their unhappy lot. You will find them the meek slaves of brutal husbands, or the victims of diseased ones; their health destroyed by amative indulgence, for which they have no attraction, for which they often feel a pro-

found disgust; compelled to submit to the toils and sufferings of a maternity for which they have no desire, and which they know not how to avoid; and if they knew the means, probably a mistaken sense of duty would prevent their using them; for the duty of a woman to bear children against her own will, is a part of the marriage system—a system which justifies any outrage upon a woman whom the law has given to a man to be his wife. To the unmarried woman, a rape, or the violent possession of her person, is an outrage, which the laws of most countries punish with death, and very often she would die rather than have it inflicted; but when a few words have been said by the priest, not only does the law justify the outrage, but she is severely blamed by a virtuous society for not submitting to the man, to whom her person, her whole being forever belongs!

Many a woman, compelled to submit to this outrage by a man whom she may have loved once, but whom she loves no longer, has said—“Take my body, selfish tyrant, abuse it as you will, and as the law gives you power to do; *my heart is my own.*” In the rich and in the poor, among the refined and the ignorant, marriage sanctions these brutalities. I wish there were some forceful word, less unjust to the more decent brutes. No wonder romance stops where marriage begins. Such things exist everywhere. Have we not heard of men in our good society who have brutally kicked and beaten their wives, because they hesitated to become their loveless and disgusted victims.

There is more freedom in a brothel; a common prostitute is no worse abused, no more a victim. O sanctity of the marriage state!—holy and indis-

soluble! And what is the relation of our great vice of prostitution to marriage? It is to protect marriage, that seduction is punished with outlawry. It is to make men and women marry, that poor girls are made an example of, and driven from society, until they are compelled to form a society of their own. These poor girls are driven out in disgrace, and then held up as terrible examples. They are made outcasts, and then the fact of their being outcasts is held up as a warning to others. If every young girl, who in the simplicity of her heart gives herself up to her own passions or the importunities of a lover, were treated kindly by her parents and friends, and the society around her; if, having committed an error, she were sheltered in the arms of love and guided into prudence and virtue, even of the conventional standard, there would be no such prostitution as we see around us. But no; the protection of the marriage institution, its sanctity and respectability, demand that all violations of its requirements be punished by the most hideous penalties; and so thousands and millions of beautiful and glorious women have been trodden in the mire, crushed and sacrificed—driven into the depths of vice, profligacy and despair, that marriage may still be the sacred institution of civilization.

There is another relation of marriage to prostitution. In Athens, courtesans were encouraged by respectable citizens, because they engaged the attention of attractive young men, and made more secure the virtue of their wives and daughters. This motive has had its weight everywhere, and in all times. In some cases prostitution has been en-

couraged, honored and rewarded, for this its manifest use.

But in our society it is found necessary first to tolerate prostitution, for the protection of marriage, and then to make it as odious and degrading as possible, to neutralize the attractiveness of its superior freedom. Often the only real difference between a wife and a prostitute, is that the former is compelled to sleep every night with one man whom she does not love, while the latter has the happiness of sometimes sleeping with one she does love. But the respectability makes up the difference; and many a prostitute would give up freedom and love, coupled with disgrace, for slavery and indifference, or hate, attended with a good position in fashionable society. Many would do this, but there are many more who would not. It must be confessed that such a choice of evils is attended with no slight difficulty.

Disease and crime are the legitimate products of the Marriage Institution. They are the inevitable results of the discordance which in a certain proportion of cases must attend this condition. The condition of a healthy parentage is mutual love and harmony in the parents. The children of discord are discordant in their natures, and discord is disease. Whatever of satiety, monotony, disgust, or disease grows out of the marriage relation, is thrown upon the offspring of that relation. The only really healthy children in the world are the children of love. Love is the simple condition of a pure and healthy generation. All this I have shown very fully in my *ESOTERIC ANTHROPOLOGY*, where the whole subject of the Love Relations is physiologically discussed.

I have only to say here that marriage, if discordant, unsuited, unhappy, or even indifferent, is of necessity the source of those idiosyncracies, physical and mental, which produce disease and crime; as the union of the two sexes under the happy impulses of mutual love, tends to produce a healthy, harmoniously developed offspring. Consequently, the perpetuation of indifferent, or discordant unions, by indissoluble marriage, is one of the greatest social evils, and tends more than any other to hinder the progress of the race.

CHAPTER XII.

THE ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF MARRIAGE.

It is our earnest desire and firm intention to treat this subject fairly. We shall therefore state here, and examine, the arguments in favor of the marriage institution—meaning by this term the indissoluble monogamy recognized by our religion, customs, and laws.

Marriage, it is claimed, is a *Divine Institution*, *ordained and commanded by God himself*.

In one sense, it may be said that every existing institution is of Divine origin; but if this is held in the more particular sense, that God has positively commanded men and women to live together in this particular relation, and we accept the authority on which this command is given, we are bound to live in accordance with its requirements.

What is the fact? It is, firstly, that the marriage ordained by God in the Mosaic dispensation was not an indissoluble monogamy, but a dissoluble polygamy, admitting of wives and concubines, who were divorced or sold at the pleasure of the husband. And these marriage laws, given by God to Moses, were not effectively repealed in the early ages of the Christian dispensation.

And the same laws of God, which instituted this form of marriage, also instituted and commanded war, slavery, and a general massacre and plunder of whole nations. Monarchy can be shown by the Scriptures to be a Divine institution, both by the Old and New Testaments. Both support the divine right and authority of kings. "Fear God, honor the king," is a Christian rule of life, laid down by the Apostle. There is no argument from Scripture in favor of marriage in any form, much less indissoluble monogamy, so strong as the arguments from the same source in favor of monarchy, slavery, war, and capital punishment; extended, as was the latter, by the Mosaic law, under the sanction of "Thus saith the Lord," to more than thirty different offenses. There is no fairness in invoking the Scriptural authority in favor of one institution, and rejecting its positive commands in regard to another. He who brings the authority of the Old Testament in favor of marriage, even if it were applicable to the form of marriage which we are now considering, must by the force of a consistent logic believe also in the divine right of kings, and the duty of all men to give them implicit obedience; in slavery as a divine institution; in war, with the horrors of indiscriminate massacre and rapine; in a bloody

criminal code, which inflicted the punishment of death for numerous, and some of them trivial, offenses—for some in fact that are not considered even misdemeanors on our statute books. If these Scriptures are to be taken as authority, let them have their full and consistent force. But, whatever their authority, we have shown that it cannot be urged in favor of indissoluble marriage.

But Christianity commands the monogamic marriage.

If it does, those who believe in its divine authority, must accept of it as a divine institution; but they must also, in this as in the other case, accept of the same argument in favor of the other institutions.

Christ, who is held up as an example to all his followers, was not born in wedlock, nor did he ever marry, nor did he ever command his disciples to marry. Paul would not marry himself, and advised all others to live single. But it may be worth while to give the few passages from the New Testament already quoted, a more critical examination.

Christ is said to have made two statements respecting marriage. One is, "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." It becomes a question, then, of what God hath really joined together; and on this point we hope to throw some light. We shall only say here, that our marriage institution constantly brings and keeps those together whom God has not joined; and as constantly separates those whom God made for union with each other. We accept this saying of

Jesus, in its broadest and fullest meaning. Let it be obeyed.

Jesus asserts that divorce, for any cause but fornication, causes both parties to commit adultery. If we have correctly defined adultery, as sexual union without the sanctification of mutual love, then all loveless unions, however brought about, and however existing, are adulterous.

We do not understand the meaning of these passages—we doubt if they were understood by those who transcribed them, and, as they now stand, they are too vague and equivocal to be taken as safe guides in faith or practice. But the spirit of the teachings of Christ is in favor of purity, truth, and freedom in all the relations of life, and this spirit we accept.

The exhortations and directions of the Apostles are to be interpreted by the spirit of the Gospel; and the whole Scripture argument, as it appeals to faith and authority, is out of the sphere of reason, and so far beyond the scope of argument. If a man or woman says, I believe in the Bible; I accept it as of divine authority; I will follow its teachings;—then he has no need to reason on any subject, any further than to decide upon what seems contradictory, and to find out for himself, or let his minister or the church find out for him, what the Bible actually commands. Such persons have no business with this inquiry.

Leaving the Scriptural or religious argument, therefore, for those who are willing to give a blind obedience to whatever they may recognize as of divine authority, let us examine the arguments for marriage based upon moral and social considerations.

Marriage is necessary to the existence of human society.

No doubt the intercourse of the sexes is necessary to the continuance of the human species ; and this is all. If society means the continued existence of certain aggregations of human beings, the monogamic, indissoluble marriage is not necessary to that result. There is society in Japan, China, India, Persia, Turkey. In France and Italy, where the form of legal marriage is utterly nullified by the customs of society, that society still exists, with much social freedom and enjoyment. In those States where there is a certain freedom of divorce, we do not find that there is any destruction of society in consequence.

The truth is, that our monogamic system of marriage, with the isolation of families, the shutting up and tabooing of men and women, almost annihilates society. It breeds coldness, distrust, and restraint everywhere. Every man is afraid that his neighbor will rob him of his rights. Having but one woman, and the legal right to only that one, his poverty makes him stingy. Women, in the same condition, are distrustful and jealous of each other. There is no true friendship, cordiality, or freedom. Our meetings together for social intercourse are cold and heartless, to the last degree. The only real sociability and enjoyment is with the young and unmarried. The moment a man or woman is understood to be engaged, they are tabooed. The moment they are married they are unfit for society. The man goes to his business, the woman to her nursery, and social enjoyment is gone forever. No ; marriage is the bane and destruction of society. It divides

it up into parties of two; the next step to universal hermitage and isolation. We appeal to the experience and observation of every reader if this is not a true statement.

Marriage is the basis of the family, and the family is the basis of the State.

The Family, says Fourier, is a petty organization of compound selfishness. The State is an aggregation of individuals, who have entered into a compact for mutual protection and defense. It does not appear at all that the family is necessary to the State. An unmarried man or woman may be a very good citizen. Generally he is a better citizen, so far as real service is concerned. Marriage is a positive disqualification for many important public posts. The State needs soldiers and sailors; the public safety requires firemen, police, &c. Marriage gives no fitness for these functions, but the reverse. Marriage, in many countries, exempts a man from the public service. Men talk of fighting for their homes and firesides, their wives and children, but when a war comes, it is the young unmarried men, mostly, who do the fighting.

If we take our own observation of society around us, aside from the increase of population, it is hard to see what marriage and family have to do with the preservation of the State. A married man is no more anxious for a free government than a single one; he is not more ready to defend it, but the reverse; he has actually less of the spirit of patriotism, and generous devotion to the public welfare. He is more inclined to look out for number one, more unsocial, more selfish, more avaricious.

A young man, before he is merged in the sel

fishness of monogamy, loves and adores, and is ready to protect and defend, not one woman, but all womankind. This is the true spirit of chivalry and glory; but it seldom lasts long after marriage. It dies in monotony, selfishness, and isolation.

But marriage is the guardian of the public morals.

This is a good argument in its favor, if it be a true one. It is not. In the first place, the public morals are so bad *with* this marriage, that they could scarcely be worse without it; in the second, marriage, as we have already shown, vitally contributes to this very badness. If by bad morals you mean general selfishness and rapacity, these are favored by the isolation and the necessities of the marriage institution. If you mean by bad morals, sexual license *out of marriage*, read your magdalen reports, your statistics of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, and see what marriage really does. With eighty thousand prostitutes in London, with some such proportional number in every Christian city, marriage has little to boast of as a moral conservator. But he who looks for more than a sham morality, must understand the great, appalling fact that sexual licentiousness *in marriage* is a hundred-fold greater, and attended with worse evils, than all the fornication, adultery, and prostitution from which the marriage institution fails to save us—for much of which it may be justly held accountable.

Who are the "heartless seducers," the "libertines," the best patrons of houses of ill fame? Inquire, and you will find them the victims of unloving, unhappy, indissoluble marriages.

I have spoken of the relations of marriage to

drunkenness, prostitution, and general profligacy. It is the isolation of our homes, the shutting up of women, the destruction of all genuine society, which drives our young men to the billiard saloons, the gambling houses, the bar rooms, and the brothels. If these young men could have the society, and the refining and purifying influence of the thousands of beautiful, intellectual, and virtuous women in this city, they would never frequent such resorts of dissipation. But all the women best worth knowing, and who might influence and benefit them, are appropriated, and deprived of all freedom. If a man visits them he risks the anger of a jealous husband. There is no social freedom possible; the influence of woman to refine and bless is lost; and we have immorality and vice as the natural consequence.

Examine this subject, carry it out to its ultimate conclusions, and you will not fail to see that marriage has taken out of our society its purifying influences, and is accountable for all its consequent disorders and corruptions.

But marriage is necessary to the care of children.

The marriage of which we are speaking has only a partial and very imperfect existence among one-fifth or one-sixth part of the human race; yet the children of the rest of the human race are cared for, not in the best way, perhaps, but somehow. A pretty large proportion of the children in Paris, Vienna, Munich, and other European cities, are born out of wedlock; but they are taken care of in some way; not worse, we imagine, than some thousands of young vagabonds in New York. The experience of the world does not show that the compulsory, indissoluble unions of monogamy

are of absolute necessity, or that they afford absolute protection. We have only to look around us to see parents, so married, falling sick, becoming paupers, dying and leaving their children orphans, or bringing them up in ignorance and vice. It cannot be made to appear that children born out of marriage, or brought up by others than their parents, are worse members of society than others.

But allowing that, in the present state of things, the bastard is an outcast, and a pest, which is not the fact; allowing that the child born in wedlock, and nurtured in the family, is likely to be better off, which is true, it is by no means proven that this is the best condition.

A married father is not, of necessity, the best teacher of a child. Thousands of children are badly born and miserably nurtured in these isolated homes. They are spoiled by indulgence, or perverted by discordant associations, or crushed by the family despotism. We have seen it in too many cases. There are thousands of children who would be better off under any average care that might be provided for them, than in these homes of rancor and strife.

But marriage is necessary, because people must be taken care of.

This is not exactly the expression, perhaps, but the idea is that if people were not married they would run into excesses of promiscuous love.

This is a shameful allegation, but there are very moral people who are not ashamed to make it. Do they judge others by themselves, or by some imaginary standard? There are in our communities many thousands of men, young and old, who are not married; and thousands more of girls and

women, maidens and widows. What is the fact respecting them? Do they run into all the excesses of unrestrained licentiousness? Not at all; but they would, you think, but for the influence of the marriage institution. Well, what makes you think so? Would you? Would the people, men and women, of your acquaintance? Would men, and especially women, violate all their instincts of truth and purity, and plunge into lives of abandoned license? It is a very uncharitable and unreasonable supposition. There are thousands of men, and a vastly greater number of women in this country, who never intend to get married. Yet we do not see them outraging the public sense of decency by their indiscriminate amours. No, the licentiousness that prevails in our society, and which is destroying its health, and undermining its mental and physical energies, is that which is committed *in* wedlock, and not out of it. Abolish all marriage this day—leave all men and women free to have or to refuse the sexual embrace, and there would ensue ten times the moral purity, and consequent health and energy, that now exists. It is marriage, and the license which it gives, which debauches, enervates, degrades, and pollutes society!

The real idea of those who advocate the marriage system, is that *women must be taken care of*; and in order to be taken care of they must be *owned*. Hence the analogy between marriage and slavery, holding good in almost every particular. No woman presumes to own herself, or be the mistress of her own life. She is the property of her husband. No other man has a right even to speak to her, but by his consent. This is so much the fact, in our society, that no man ever addresses

a married woman, writes to her, visits her, except by the understood permission of her husband; and no woman would think of entering into correspondence of the most innocent character, or receiving friendly visits from any man, unless by permission—or by stealth, and at the risk of ruin, if detected. This ownership of women, by men—this absolute right of one human being to control the life of another—this essence of all despotism and slavery, is held up as the necessary condition of civilized virtue, as it is the basis of all kinds of marriage, and especially of that most intense of all ownerships and slaveries, the indissoluble monogamic marriage of civilization.

CHAPTER XIII.

MARRIAGE AND WOMAN'S RIGHTS.

HERE, as well, perhaps, as elsewhere, may be briefly stated the relation between this question of marriage, and that of Woman's Rights, which is now agitating society.

The following declaration of the wrongs of woman was made at a Female Convention, held at Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848. We shall use it as a text for the remarks we have to make upon this branch of our subject.

“The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment

of an absolute tyranny over her. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

"He has never permitted her to exercise her inalienable right to the elective franchise.

"He has compelled her to submit to laws in the formation of which she has no voice.

"Having deprived her of this first right of a citizen, the elective franchise, thereby leaving her without representation in the halls of legislation, he has oppressed her on all sides.

"He has made her, if married, in the eye of the law, civilly dead.

"He has taken from her all rights in property, even to the wages she earns.

"He has made her, morally, an irresponsible being, as she can commit many crimes with impunity, provided they be done in the presence of her husband. In the covenant of marriage she is compelled to promise obedience to her husband, he becoming in all intents and purposes her master—the law giving him power to deprive her of her liberty, and to administer chastisement.

"After depriving her of all her rights as a married woman, if single and the owner of property, he has taxed her to support a government which recognises her only when her property can be made profitable to it.

"He has denied her the facilities of obtaining a thorough education—all colleges being closed against her.

"He has endeavored in every way that he could, to destroy her confidence in her own powers, to lessen her self-respect, and to make her willing to lead a dependent and abject life."

We have, in the above terse and vigorous state-

ment, parodied from the Declaration of Independence, abundant evidence that the Woman's Rights Movement is an attack upon the marriage institution, which is the center and soul of the whole system of wrongs of which she complains.

Woman's one, single, and supreme right, and the one which includes all others, is her right to herself.

The absolute tyranny, of which woman complains, is the tyranny of marriage, or that which is necessary to its existence as an institution. So long as a woman is bound to obey a man in all things; to study his interest and pleasure; to be a part of him, his property, his slave; she could never go to the polls and vote against him, and to go with him, and vote as he wished her to, would be simply giving every married man two votes instead of one. Voting, to be of any use, must be done by free men and free women. It would be a gross injustice to allow married women, slaves, or children under the control of their parents, the right of suffrage. It would be a shame and an imposition. There can never be suffrage for women, while marriage exists, in its present form and with its present obligations. Woman's "inalienable right to the elective franchise" is alienated most effectually, the moment she stands up before priest or magistrate, and promises to "love, honor, and obey." When a woman resigns her own individuality, and becomes the wife of some man, she loses all political existence. Consequently, she can have no voice in the making of laws. Why should she? The will of her husband is her only law; and if not married she is still a victim to the system which holds that she may or ought to be. An unmarried woman is like a

free negro in a slave State. She is not enduring the positive wrongs of slavery ; but she is not free. Rather she has many of its evils, without its compensating advantages of protection and support.

“He has oppressed her on every side.” Of course he has, for where did one human being ever have power over another without abusing it ? But the actual oppression, and the source of all her wrongs, is in her belonging to another, instead of to herself.

It is right that she should be “in the eye of the law civilly dead,” when she is so in reality, with no will of her own, no interest, no freedom of action. Marriage is the grave of spontaneity. The married woman is dead to all other men than her husband. Why should other men, then, in making laws, recognize her as a living being ?

To give a married woman rights of property, is an anomaly and an inconsistency. All pretense of such right is a sham, as every husband and every wife knows, where laws have been passed to attempt to ameliorate the condition of the sex. Either the marriage is a sham, or the pretense to a separate interest in property is one. The chief use of such laws is to enable men to put property into the hands of their wives for safe keeping, and out of the reach of their creditors. Whatever gives a woman pecuniary independence loosens the bonds of marriage, and is a blow struck at the vitality of that institution. A slave may as well have the right of property as a wife.

The seventh paragraph of this manifesto is a graphic and most truthful description of the marriage institution. It is not men as individual human beings, who oppress women. It is men as

husbands, and only in this relation. Abolish marriage, and women would have property, rights and responsibilities, like any free human being. But where freedom, the basis of all rights and all responsibilities, is wanting, what can woman be but the irresponsible, dependent slave that marriage makes her?

Ladies of the Woman's Rights movement, you must look this question full in the face. You cannot dodge it much longer. When you demand Woman's Rights, you demand the abrogation of the civilized marriage. When you declare independence, it is independence of man in the relation of marriage. You can have no right until you assert your right to yourselves. You think that all you require is a concession here, a privilege there, permission to be better educated, and to have a wider sphere of action. You are like the colonies, petitioning your monarch and avowing your loyalty. What you want, and the only thing, and that which includes everything else, is INDEPENDENCE. You want freedom in all the relations of life, and above all, in the highest and purest—the realm of the affections.

But the world moves. VICTOR HUGO, at the grave of Pauline Roland, a French Socialist, and one of the martyrs of Liberty, said:

“Friends, in future times, in the beautiful, and peaceful, and tender, and fraternal, social republic of the future, the sphere of woman will be great, but what a glorious prelude to this sphere are such martyrdoms, so heroically sustained! Men and citizens, we have more than once said in our pride, ‘The eighteenth century has proclaimed the right of man, the nineteenth century will proclaim

the right of woman ;' but we must confess, citizens, we have not hastened ; grave considerations, which should be carefully examined, have arrested us ; and at this moment, at the degree of progress at which we have arrived, among the best republicans, among the purest and most genuine democrats, many excellent minds still hesitate to admit the equality of the human soul in man and woman, and the consequent assimilation, if not the complete identity, of civil rights."

Socialism in Europe, Socialism everywhere, asserts the rights of woman as well as the rights of man, but the marriage institution denies both. It is a veritable Bastile.

"When people understand," says Lord Stowell, in the case of *Evans vs. Evans*, 1st Consistory Reports, p. 36, "that they *must* live together, they learn, by mutual accommodation, to bear that *yoke* which they know they *cannot shake off* ; they become good husbands and wives (!) from *the necessity of remaining* husbands and wives, for *necessity is a powerful master in teaching the duties which it imposes.*"

This is the principle of marriage law—the law that gives the person, the property, the reputation of a woman into her husband's keeping, with the power to outrage and abuse her person, to squander her property, and to destroy her reputation, at his pleasure.

If a man slanders his wife in public, or libels her through the press, charging her with conduct the most criminal and infamous, she has no legal redress. There is no law, so far as we can find, in any civilized country, that will do her justice.

What a folly, then, to talk of Woman's Rights, while upholding an institution which comprehends all of Woman's Wrongs !

CHAPTER XIV.

MONOGAMY, POLYGAMY, AND OMNIGAMY.

It is time now that we should state, more fully and particularly, the views of marriage prevalent in our most advanced civilization, and give a brief examination of each theory.

The first is that of pure monogamy, or the conjugal love of Swedenborg. This supposes the existence of two imperfect beings, each the half of the other, the male and female portion in body and soul, which require to be united to make up the perfect human being. Each of these parts is created for the other, and can fit no other half. Such persons are the true conjugal partners, and such marriages are made in heaven, or, having their real existence in the spiritual sphere, are ultimated in the material. Such marriage, of course, admits of no divorce, and of no second union. The two souls unite to make a single angel in the spiritual world.

The difficulty attending this theory is its manifest impracticability, without the interposition of a special providence, of which there is little appearance, in the marriages of the world around us. Every marriage but the true conjugal relation is held to be false and adulterous, and by no means binding on those who are so unhappy as to have been mistaken in the election of their partners. Some Swedenborgians, having made such blunders, suffer on, and wait for death to release them from

the false relation, and allow them to form a true one; others, not content to live in their adulterous unions, set themselves free, and seek for their true partners—again, perhaps, to find themselves mistaken. Some are very persevering in this search after their other halves, and though each trial prove a blunder, they hope for better success in the next attempt; and their excuse for a series of brief amours, is that they are engaged in the earnest, though unfortunately unsuccessful, effort to find their true conjugal partners.

The next theory is that of a pure monogamy, not based upon the same idea of spiritual affinity, perhaps, but upon that notion of sexual purity which admits of but a single union. The man and woman once united in what is held to be the holy sacrament or divine ordinance of wedlock, are joined irrevocably and forever. This marriage also admits of no divorce, but only a separation; and any second tie, even after the death of one of the parties, is considered adultery. This theory is based upon a literal interpretation of the words of Jesus in regard to marriage and adultery, quoted in a former chapter. It is the puritan, high-church, or extreme conservative view of the marriage institution.

Next comes the moderate monogamy of the ordinary civilized marriage, the one of which we have chiefly spoken in this work. This admits of repetitions and divorces. A man may marry a dozen wives, but can only have one at a time. He must get some legislature or court to divorce him from one wife, or she must die, before he can marry another. This is a polygamy differing only in the element of time from that of the Turks.

The laws of Christian States differ in respect to divorce. In some there is none allowed—in others divorce can only be given for adultery; but in many of our States it may be procured by any who choose to assign the most trivial reasons. This granting of divorces for any than the highest cause, or even for that, is nothing less than the abrogation of marriage itself; and what are called liberal divorce laws are consequently strenuously opposed by all who understand and believe in marriage. Marriage, with free divorce, becomes only a limited copartnership, which may terminate by limitation, or at the option of the parties; and though this compact may have all the advantages claimed for indissoluble marriage, and many of its disadvantages, it is not the genuine thing. It is the pretense of freedom without its actualization. It compares with indissoluble marriage as the wages-slavery of the North does with the chattel-slavery of the South. They differ little while they last—they are the same in principle, but one *may be* escaped from. In neither is there any true freedom; and in either case a change is probably only changing one master for another.

The polygamy sanctioned by the Mosaic and Mohammedan laws—practiced over four-fifths of the world—existing actually in the most polished countries in Europe, by force of custom, though not by law, and now introduced as a religious and social element into one of the territories of this republic—needs only to be glanced at in this connection. It has many of the evils of the monogamic system, but not all. A single slave has probably a harder task than a dozen, though he may also have more privileges. When a man

has three or four wives, it is not so likely that any one will become so crushed and miserable a victim as we often see the wives of civilization. She has a better chance for life, for peace, if not for happiness.

But the one-sided tyranny of the system is its salient point. It is true that most women have less passion than men; but this rule has its exceptions—the marriage laws have none. There are physiological reasons which are favorable to polygamy, as compared with monogamy, which will be found stated at length in ESOTERIC ANTHROPOLOGY.

The kind of polygamy which prevails in Southern Europe, in connection with laws of the strictest monogamy, is a more equitable system than that of the Turks or the Mormons; for while every married man is permitted to be the lover of one or more women, every married woman may also have one or more lovers. This regular, recognized and systematic way of ameliorating the miseries of the monogamic marriage, in its most detestable form of the marriage of convenience, is worthy of the attention of the moralist and philosopher. In one respect, it cannot fail to be beneficial. Most of the children, though considered legitimate, are doubtless the children of love, and are consequently more healthy and harmonious beings than those born of discordant and unloving unions.

We have but one phase more of marriage to give, and that a very curious one, if it can be considered marriage. It is the form of *omnigamy*, or the marriage of all to all, as taught and practiced by the religious sect of Perfectionists, existing in this and the neighboring States. This sect is an

offshoot from Presbyterianism, and is claimed to be an ultimatum, and consistent carrying out of that creed. The Rev. J. H. Noyes, the founder of the sect, now living in Brooklyn, Long Island, where he preaches, and publishes a weekly religious paper, was educated at Yale College, for the ministry, and is a man of acute mind, and much force of logic. Most of the members of this church or sect, which claims to be Pentecostal, apostolic, and as living up to the idea of Christian perfection, reside, in an association or community, like that of the primitive church, on their domain, called the Oneida Reserve, in Madison county, in this State.

Their marriage—or perhaps we should call them anti-marriage—doctrines are set forth with great plainness and perspicuity in the first annual report of the Association, published in 1849. From that report we shall make a brief summary of their belief and practice respecting the sexual or marital relation.

This doctrine of omnigamy, based as it is on religion and the interpretation of the Scriptures, is of sufficient importance to demand a separate chapter.

CHAPTER XV.

FREE LOVE ; OR, THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERFECT-
TIONISTS.

THE portion of the First Report of the Oneida Association, devoted to an exposition of their doctrine of the Love Relations, is entitled "Bible argument, defining the relations of the sexes in the kingdom of Heaven." It is given in a series of propositions, with explanatory notes, which we shall condense into the greatest brevity consistent with a proper understanding of the argument.

The Bible predicts the coming of the kingdom of heaven on earth. The administration of the will of God in his kingdom on earth will be the same as in heaven ; this kingdom will supplant all human governments. In the kingdom of heaven, the institution of marriage, which assigns the possession of one woman to one man, does not exist—"they neither marry nor are given in marriage." In this kingdom, the intimate union of life and interests, which in the world is limited to pairs, extends to the whole body of believers ; that is, complex marriage takes the place of simple. The universal unity of the members of Christ is described in the same terms that are used to describe marriage unity. This, however, does not exclude special companionships, founded on special affinities of nature or position ; it only denies exclusive appropriation.

After the day of Pentecost, and the effusion of

the Holy Ghost, the disciples had all things in common. The same spirit would abolish exclusiveness in regard to women and children. Paul places property in women and in goods in the same category. "The time," he says, "is short; it remaineth that they that have wives be as though they had none; and they that buy as though they possessed not." It is fair to infer that "the fashion of the world" is to pass away in regard to marriage as to property; that exclusiveness is to be abolished, and free love or complex marriage take its place. The abolition of appropriation is involved in the very nature of a true relation to Christ in the Gospel.

The abolishment of sexual exclusiveness is involved in the love relation required between all believers, by the express injunction of Christ and the Apostles, and the whole tenor of the New Testament. The new commandment is that we love one another—not in pairs, but *en masse*. We are required to love one another *fervently*, or *burningly*. As religious excitements act on amateness, this is an indication of the natural tendency of religion to love. The union of hearts expresses and ultimates itself in union of bodies.

The anti-legality of the Gospel takes off restraints on love. Paul, speaking of this, says, "All things are *lawful* to me, but all things are not expedient." Love is simply attraction. Love seeking unity, is desire—in unity, it is happiness. Love between man and woman is a closer union than between man and man; and consequently a greater happiness. In unobstructed love, or the free play of the affinities, sexual union is its natural expression.

The abolishment of the marriage system is in-

volved in Paul's doctrine of the end of ordinances. Marriage is one of these. It stands on the same basis with the Sabbath. Both are "shadows of good things to come." There is to be a perpetual Sabbath, and a universal marriage of the Church of Christ. The nullification of circumcision was as revolting to the Jew, as that of marriage can be to the Gentile. The law of marriage is the same as the Jewish law of meats and drinks and holy days. All experience testifies that sexual love is not naturally restricted to pairs. Second marriages are contrary to the one-love theory, and yet are often the happiest. Men and women find universally that their susceptibility to love is not burnt out by one honeymoon, or satisfied by one lover. On the contrary, the secret history of the human heart will bear out the assertion, that it is capable of loving any number of times and any number of persons, and that the more it loves the more it can love. This is the law of nature, thrust out of sight and condemned by common consent, and yet secretly known to all. There is no occasion to find fault with it. Variety is as beautiful and useful in love as in eating and drinking. The one-love theory is based not on experience, but on jealousy ; it comes not from the loving heart, but the greedy claimant. It is true that each one will find a special mate, whose nature best matches his own, and whom he will love most ; but this will no more prevent other unions than it will conversation. The fact that a man loves peaches best, is no rule why he should not on suitable occasions eat apples or cherries. Poverty of taste is as odious in love as in any other affection. Adam in the garden had nobody to talk with but Eve, but this is no rea-

son why a man should talk with nobody but his wife.

The law of marriage "worketh wrath." It provokes to secret adultery, actual or in the heart; it ties together unmatched natures; it sunders matched natures; it gives to sexual appetite only a scanty and monotonous allowance, and so produces the natural vices of poverty, contraction of taste and stinginess, or jealousy; it makes no provision for this appetite when it is strongest, and so causes disease, masturbation, prostitution, and general licentiousness. The only hopeful scheme of Moral Reform is one which will bring the sexes together *naturally*. If this desire is dammed up, it will break out irregularly and destructively. The only way to make it safe and useful is to give it a free and natural channel. The irregularities and excesses of amateness are explosions incident to unnatural separations of the male and female elements; as in the disturbance of the electric forces. Even in the world it is known that the mingling of the sexes, to a certain extent, is favorable to purity; and that sexual isolation, as in colleges, monasteries, &c., breeds salacity and obscenity. A system of complex marriage, which shall match the demands of nature, both as to time and variety, will open the prison doors both to the victims of marriage and celibacy; to those in married life who are starved, and to those who are oppressed by lust; to those who are tied to uncongenial natures, and to those who are separated from their natural mates; to those in the unmarried state who are withered by neglect, diseased by unnatural abstinence, or plunged into prostitu-

tion and self-pollution by desires which have no natural channel.

These are the Free Love or Universal Love doctrines of the Christian Perfectionists, and some of the arguments on which they are based. Their religious theory is that of carrying obedience to, and the worship of, God into all the affairs of life. Their profession is, that whether they eat or drink, or whatever they do, to do all to the glory of God. They believe in the higher law, and acknowledge Christ as their only ruler. Their social system is a Christian communism like that of the primitive Christians, but extending also to the love relations. This is not an absolute communism, for they admit of special affinities and partnerships, but not to the exclusion of others. In the close bond of Christian fellowship they believe that each man should love every woman, and each woman every man, constituting omnigamy, or a universal marriage, not of one man to one woman, but of all men to all women, bounded, however, by the church or society to which they belong, for this rule extends only to believers, and not to the world of the profane and ungodly.

It is a curious spectacle to observe the differences in faith and practice in this one particular of sexual morality which have sprung out of the bosom of the Christian Church in this nineteenth century—Shakerism with its utter denial and proscription of the sexual relation; Mormonism with its sanctified polygamy; and Perfection with its free love and omnigamy.

But the study of all these doctrines, and their practical workings, cannot fail to light the path of the sincere inquirer after the truth.

As to the practical workings of this system of religious omnigamy, we have no personal knowledge. Their annual reports represent the society as living in great harmony and happiness, and in a good state of temporal prosperity. Their members testify to great improvement in health, education, and enjoyment. Their children seem to be admirably taken care of. They have but few. Women are not compelled to become mothers against their wills, or when unfit to bear children, and every woman who wishes to have a child chooses its father by the attraction of love, and for his superior fitness for the paternal office.

The report of the Association from which we have condensed the preceding statement, contains the testimony of many of its members in regard to the effects of free love upon their characters. Some extracts will probably interest the philosophic reader :

JOHN ABBOTT says, "I am sure that the free love theory has had a great effect in bringing me into love and union with God, and all the family of God; and to cause me to seek to improve my character and make myself attractive."

LAURA A. ABBOTT.—"The effect of our social theory upon my character has been to enlarge my heart toward God and his children, and to root out selfishness. I feel that he has given me that love which seeketh not her own; and that it is fast restoring me to the vigor of youth."

JONATHAN BURT.—"It has brought to light an unsanctified state of my amative passions, discovering to me the true nature of the spirit of lust, which worketh to envy, and is ungovernable and

restless in its character. It has revived in my spirit a new and energetic feeling of loathing toward the spirit of selfishness in all its forms."

SARAH A. BRADLEY.—"I used to make a distinction between brotherly love and the love which I had for my husband; but I was brought to see that there is but one kind of love in the kingdom of God. I have found that true love is a great stimulus to improvement."

HENRY W. BURNHAM.—"It invigorates with *life*, soul and body, and refines and exalts the character generally."

ABBY S. BURNHAM.—"The effect that free love has had upon my character has been to raise me from a state of exclusiveness and idolatry, to a greater enlargement of heart, and freedom of communication with God and this body."

SARAH A. BURNHAM.—"It has a tendency to enlighten my understanding, and to try, enlarge, and purify my heart."

GEORGE CRAGIN.—"The evidence of its truth is as *firmly rooted* and *grounded* in my heart, as the gospel of salvation from sin; it has greatly enlarged my heart, by purging it from exclusiveness; it has tamed and civilized my feelings, purified my thoughts, and elevated into the presence of God and heaven the strongest passions in the social department of my nature."

MARY E. CRAGIN.—"Love without law, yet under the control of the Spirit of God, is a great beautifier of character in every respect, and puts the gilding on life. It is the manifestation of the resurrection power, revivifying soul and body."

ERASTUS H. HAMILTON.—"It has brought me

into a positive purity of feeling, that I am confident could come from no source but God. The effect it has had upon the relation with my wife has been directly opposite to what the world would expect to be its legitimate results; and for its fruits in this one relation alone, I should feel willing to give my decided testimony of approval."

SUSAN C. HAMILTON.—"It has had the effect of destroying selfishness, shame, and false modesty. It has also refined, strengthened, and increased my *respect* for love; and I look upon amativeness, not as a low, sensual passion, but (under the influence of God's Spirit) as holy and noble. I think our theory is the greatest safeguard against sensuality."

ELEAZER L. HATCH.—"It expands and elevates the heart, roots out and destroys selfishness in its various forms, destroys isolation, unlocks a fountain in the soul unknown before, and leads us to the boundless ocean of God's love."

STEPHEN A. LEONARD.—"The effect has been to greatly quicken my energy for self-improvement, and for every good work. It has brought me into more perfect sympathy with the designs of God, and has given force and direction to my whole character. It has opened the fountain of my heart, and increased its capabilities of loving a hundred-fold."

FANNY M. LEONARD.—"The effect is like fire which purifies and refines. On my character it has produced an enlargement of the heart, and a softening of the spirit. It destroys envyings and jealousies, and draws us out from an isolated and egotistical state, into the sunshine of God's free

and eternal love—that love which envieth not, and seeketh not its own.”

HARRIET A. NOYES.—“It has enlarged my heart, and developed in it love that *thinketh no evil, envieth not, and seeketh not its own*. It has increased my happiness, my justification, and my acquaintance with God.”

TRYPHENA SEYMOUR.—“I am confident that these principles, controlled and guided by the Spirit of God, will purge selfishness from the world, and restore man to the original purity and innocence of the Garden of Eden.”

HARRIET H. SKINNER.—“I think we are realizing the splendid idea of vital society, or organic union. I conceive of common society as vapid and lifeless. It is like inorganic matter, while ours is like animate nature, in which there is a heart-spring, circulation, growth, and infinite change. I think that community of the affections gives play to all the noble and generous sentiments—brings out all the qualities of charity; while marriage-exclusiveness covers selfishness and littleness, which we should despise in respect to other things. I should withhold honor where honor is due, if I did not say that free love had improved my character very much.”

ZEZIAH WORDEN.—“With regard to the social theory, I can say in the spirit of truth and soberness, that I have seen great beauty and celestial purity in it, and I am sure that nothing but Omnipotence could create such blissful, soul-expanding, and mind-elevating realities.”

Such is the testimony, the most extraordinary, no doubt, that was ever taken, of a number of men and women, apparently intelligent and pious,

who had lived in the monogamic marriage, and afterwards in the omnigamic, and who give their evidence as to the effects of each. The reader must be his own judge of the value of such testimony.

CHAPTER XVI.

MARRIAGE BY ONE OF ITS DEFENDERS.

It is curious to see how an advocate of marriage, a scientific man, Dr. Michael Ryan, in his work entitled the *Philosophy of Marriage*, unconsciously criticises the institution. The book, intended to be conservative and conventional to the last degree, is in reality, from its simple and candid statement of facts, one of the strongest witnesses against the very system it is advocating, that of indissoluble monogamy.

In the Introduction, to show the importance of the subject, he quotes from Mrs. Jameson the following remarks, to be found in her "*Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada*." In traveling with an American prelate, the conversation turned upon matrimonial infelicity, and led to the following observations :

"In conversing with him and the missionaries on the spiritual and moral condition of his diocese, and these newly settled regions in general, I learned many things which interested me very much ; and there was one thing discussed which especially surprised me. It was said that two-thirds of the misery

which came under the immediate notice of a popular clergyman, and to which he was called to minister, arose from the infelicity of the conjugal relations; there was no question here of open immorality and discord, but simply of infelicity and unfitness. The same thing has been brought before me in every country, every society in which I have been a sojourner and an observer; but I did not look to find it so broadly placed before me here in America, where the state of morals, as regards the two sexes, is comparatively pure; where the marriages are early, where conditions are equal, where the means of subsistence are abundant, where the women are much petted and considered by the men—too much so.

“For a result then so universal, there must be a cause or causes as universal, not depending on any particular customs, manners, or religion, or political institutions. And what are these causes? Many things do puzzle me in this strange world of ours—many things in which the new world and the old world are equally incomprehensible. I cannot understand why an evil everywhere acknowledged and felt is not remedied somewhere, or discussed by some one with a view to a remedy; but no—it is like putting one’s hand into the fire only to touch upon it; *it is the universal bruise, the putrefying sore*, on which you must not lay a finger, or your patient (that is, society) cries out and resists, and, like a sick baby, scratches and kicks its physician.”

Further on, in condemning seduction, an offense which depends directly on marriage, and could not exist in freedom, Dr. Ryan says:

“It must be admitted by every man who is

well acquainted with the natural inclinations of the softer sex, that for one who is seduced or dishonored by inclination, there are a hundred who have been duped or imposed on, or actuated by necessity. This fact has been well observed by many of the most eminent physiologists and writers on medical jurisprudence; and the most ample proof of the sad truth of this position is daily afforded by our public press. Look at our police and criminal reports, and you will see it daily attested; peruse the reports of the Society for the Prevention of Prostitution in this metropolis, under the patronage of the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London, in 1836-39, and you will want no further evidence as regards the extent of seduction in this country. According to these reports, it appears 'it has been proved that upwards of 400 individuals in London procure a livelihood by trepanning females, from eleven to fifteen years of age, for the purposes of prostitution. That during the last eight years there have been no less than 2700 cases of disease arising from this cause, in children from eleven to sixteen years of age, admitted into three of the largest hospitals of London. Not less than 80,000 prostitutes exist in London, a great proportion of whom are of tender age. It is computed that 8000 die every year, and yet the number is on the increase. It is lamentable to observe that scarcely a day passes without bringing to light, by means of the public papers, some new act of seduction, of desertion; and how often has the humane mind bitterly reflected on the amount of life sacrificed either by disease or suicide.'

"An account still more horrible and lamentable,

will be found in M. Parent Duchatelet's work on Prostitution in Paris, 1836, which was reviewed in our periodicals. 'In 1835, it appears that 9637 boys, and 9207 girls were born in wedlock in private houses in Paris; and out of wedlock, 2747 boys, and 2669 girls. The lawful children in hospitals were, 283 boys, and 234 girls, and the illegitimates, 2237 boys, and 2207 girls, more than one-third of the births being thus out of wedlock.'"

Yet for all this vice and misery the Marriage Institution, the laws and public opinion which protect it, and the society it creates, must be held to a strict account.

Of the effects of English law—laws made expressly to sanction and guard this marriage institution—we have the following statements, copied from a Parliamentary report:

"It may safely be affirmed that the virtue of female chastity does not exist among the lower orders of England, except to a certain extent among domestic female servants, who know that they hold their situations by that tenure, and are more prudent in consequence. Among the residue, all evidence goes to prove that it is a nonentity. A daughter grows up—she learns what her mother was; she sees what her sisters and neighbors are—finds that nobody thinks the worse of them, and that nothing is expected of herself, and that there is a short road to marriage or a maintenance. The English law has abolished female chastity, self-respect, proper pride, and all the charities of domestic life, derived from and connected with its existence. It has destroyed, likewise, the beneficial influence which this virtue in women reflects on the character of men."

Of the motives to marriage, he says:—

“The motives which influence the majority of the world in contracting matrimonial unions, are generally false, selfish, and most detrimental to the procreation of sound and vigorous offspring; such as ambition, wealth, rank, title, interest, a love of independence, of an establishment, a desire to escape parental restraint, anger, a determination to disinherit relations, disdain for a faithless lover or mistress, necessity, obligation, passion, imitation, and very rarely the only proper motive, pure and virtuous affection. It is also generally admitted that parental authority cannot reasonably or morally compel alliances when the inclination of the individual most concerned is opposed; although we see too many forced and unhappy marriages which are to be ascribed to this cause.

“It is scarcely necessary to observe, that love is implanted by the Deity in human beings; all grades of mankind have felt the power of this passion—it is the same in all—as the poet has it, “*amor omnibus idem*”—or, more strictly speaking, in almost all, for it is alleged that some few have never felt its influence. It is equally powerful in the palace and in the cottage; it is universal, or very nearly so; it glows in almost every breast, and it has been sung by the sweetest bards of ancient and modern times. Its power so strongly attaches two individuals, that no human law or intervention can separate them; for though united to others, they never can be happy, nor their offspring vigorous.”

Curious facts, respecting the relations of marriage and poverty are also given, from Parliamentary reports respecting Ireland:—“Laborers say, the poorer a man is, the earlier he marries. The most

destitute are the most reckless, in contracting marriage, under a belief that nothing can render their situation worse. A girl of the poorest class is always ready to marry; it takes her out of other people's mouths; that is, *it removes her from censure*. In fact, poverty is not only the consequence of early marriages; it is frequently the cause of them. The poorest always marry first, and often borrow the money for the marriage fees; the only requisite then is to get a shelter for the night." Idleness is also set down as a cause of early marriages. As these early marriages are held to be the great cause of Irish poverty, of course late marriages are prescribed as the remedy.

The chapter on unhappy marriages is rich in pertinent illustration of our subject. We quote a large portion:—

"Of all temporal evils, an unhappy marriage is the greatest. It is the source of confusion, misery, and vice, of a bad education of children, of bad citizens, and of a violation of every duty. No one, therefore, ought to engage in this contract without the most mature deliberation and a virtuous intention.

"One marries for love or sensual gratification, which he imagines will be perpetual; but this passion is soon subdued or extinguished if founded on beauty or other fading qualities. Another embraces this state for fortune, splendor, title, and so on; and he, too, will, in general, be disappointed. Most persons expect happiness, pleasure, wealth, &c., but disappointment is the commonest result. Marriage, unless based on religion, virtue, and nature, is seldom happy.

"A philosopher compared a man going to marry

to one who was about to put his hand into a sack, in which were ninety-nine serpents and one eel; the moral of which is, that there are ninety-nine chances to one against a fortunate selection.

“He might have urged, with much more reason and sense, that a thousand times more chances were against the female sex. A good husband or wife is rarely found in highly civilized countries.

“A marriage, without mutual love, is the most unfortunate; for a perpetual cohabitation with one whose person and conversation are disagreeable, and who is an object of aversion, conjoined with the thought that a divorce only or death can be the deliverance, renders such a union much more uneasy than can be expressed or described.

“Every imperfection, capricious temper, vanity, folly, &c., appear in the married state. The demeanor towards the world is agreeable and obliging; but, in domestic life, the mask is thrown off, and an individual appears such as he or she really is. Hence it is incredible how much a wife has to bear from a husband who is capricious, haughty, choleric, dyspeptic, and intractable; or what a sensible husband has to endure from a silly, unreasonable, and intractable wife. It is difficult for married persons to acquire each other's tastes, feelings and opinions.

“Marriage is a fairy land—the land of promise; but what constitutes its felicity is to many, if not to most, an indistinct and undefinable question: the universal consent of mankind has pronounced it good and salutary; it is the hope of many who can assign no definite reason or motive for its indulgence.

“Although polygamy is interdicted by our laws,

it does not exist the less in the hearts of most men who profess to be monogamous, but who are not less polygamous by their actions. Polygamy naturally affords more attraction to men than to women, as it is better suited to them than monogamy, because, according to the rights of nature, but contrary to human laws, they could engender with many women while their wives were periodically affected, pregnant, in childbed, or nursing. St. Augustine, Grotius, and other moralists, admit this truth, but declare it would be contrary to morals, the interests of society, and the increase of population. Nevertheless, polygamy, or concubinage, is common among the higher classes in all civilized countries. The toleration of this immorality was one of the principal causes of the rapidity with which the religion of Mahomet spread in eastern countries, as the prophet allowed persons as many wives as they could support.

“It is, however, true, that by the law of nations, independently of social laws, the promiscuity of the sexes would be justifiable according to many writers (Pliny, Diodorus Siculus, &c.), and that there are some few eastern countries in which a community of women was, and even now is tolerated. Plato wished to establish it in his republic, in which every one was considered as his parents, the young as his infants, and his contemporaries as his brothers and sisters; and a preposterous attempt has lately been made to revive it by the St. Simonians, in France, and by Owen, in this country.

“Lycurgus thought that freely imparting their wives to each other was the best way of preventing jealousy, ridiculing those who thought the violation

of their bed an insupportable injury, supposing that children were not so much the property of their parents as of the State, in which all had an interest.

“Among the ancient Britons, in very remote times, it was customary to have the women of ten or twelve families, who dwelt under one roof, in common, even to brothers. It is said that Julia, wife of the Emperor Severus, reproaching a Briton with this custom, received the following answer, ‘that the Roman ladies ought not to reproach the British ladies on this account, as what the latter did publicly with men of merit, the former did privately with the worst, and sometimes with their slaves.’”

Finally, after giving the opinions of Napoleon I. and of Luther, against the monogamic marriage; after giving numerous facts in physiology, which tend to promote, and, in a scientific point of view, seem to justify the instinct for variety, our author concludes as follows:

“There are other causes of conjugal infidelity which may be mentioned. Most women, on account of the delicacy of constitution and greater liability to diseases than men, become delicate, and fall into a bad state of health, which is unfavorable to amorous impulse, and opposed to reproduction.

“Men are more robust and vigorous, and retain their generative power to a much more advanced age, as already stated. It is also to be remembered, that the males of all mammiferous animals satisfy numerous females, examples of which are afforded by all the more perfect quadrupeds, as already mentioned—a power possessed by man to a still greater extent, as the most perfect of mam

miferous animals. Nevertheless, he alone is morally bound to support and maintain his offspring, and not to desert them like the brute and irrational animal. He is influenced by reason and religion, while less perfect animals are deprived of both."

CHAPTER XVII.

"LOVE, MARRIAGE, AND DIVORCE."

THIS work would not have the completeness we desire to give it, if it did not contain some proper notice of the "Discussion" by HENRY JAMES, HORACE GREELEY, and STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS; and perhaps there is no better way of giving the views of these philosophers, than by a review of the pamphlet with the above quoted title, edited by Mr. Andrews.

Mr. James replied in the *Tribune* to an attack on his marriage doctrines in the *Observer*; Mr. Andrews published in the *Tribune* some "Queries" to Mr. James; Mr. Greeley thought proper, while admitting their various heresies, to define his own position; but he soon brought the discussion to an abrupt termination, by refusing to publish a reply of Mr. Andrews; and this reply is included in the pamphlet, as also a general explanatory and critical introduction.

We propose to give the more striking observations of each of these writers respecting the marriage institution. Mr. James is a liberal transcen-

dentalist ; Mr. Greeley on this subject is curiously, and not very consistently as a Woman's Rights advocate and a sort of Fourierist, an ultra conservative ; while Mr. Andrews, as is well known, takes the broadest ground of "individual sovereignty."

First, the views of Mr. James. He says to the editor of the *Observer* : "The drift of your assault is to charge me with hostility to the marriage institution. I have invariably aimed to advance the honor of marriage, by seeking to free it from certain purely arbitrary and conventional obstructions in reference to divorce. / It is not essential to the honor of marriage that two persons should be compelled to live together in the reciprocal relations of cat and dog. / I have contended for a greater freedom of divorce, but not to weaken the respect of marriage. Is there no security for faithful unions but the police office ? Many persons would live together in constancy were all marriage laws abolished. Marriage is to be respected for its uses. If salutary, it is honorable ; if mischievous, deplorable. Marriage is bad, because badly administered. There is a very enormous clandestine violation of this relation ; the remedy is in freely legitimating divorce. Marriage fidelity is then no longer a bare legal bondage of the parties, but rests in their reciprocal inward sweetness or humanity. For it is evident to every honest mind, that if our conjugal, parental, and social ties generally can be safely discharged of the purely diabolic element of *outward force*, they must instantly become transfigured by their own inward, divine, and irresistible loveliness."

The positions of Mr. James, as stated by Mr. Andrews, are the following :

"1. The whole and sole substance of marriage is the *legal bond* or *outward force* which unites the parties for life.

"2. This legal bond or outward force is a diabolical element, and should be wholly abolished and dispensed with.

"3. By dispensing with marriage altogether—that is, with all outward form or legal bond—you do thereby strengthen the respect for marriage, and purify and sanctify the institution!

"Position No. 4 goes a step further, and proposes not merely to allow parties to unmarry themselves *ad libitum*, but to still further purify what remains of marriage (after the whole of it is abolished) by turning disorderly members out, as they turn members out of church."

Mr. Greeley sees very clearly the logical absurdity of all this, and takes a widely different position. He says, "We court rather than decline discussion on the subject, and are satisfied that the temper and tendencies of our times render such discussion eminently desirable, if not vitally necessary. A hundred cases might be cited in which the happiness of all the parties immediately concerned would be promoted by liberty of divorce; and yet we have not a doubt that such liberty, if recognized and established, would lead to the most flagrant disorders and the most pervading calamities.

"The liberty of divorce has been recognized by great historians as one main cause of the corruption and downfall of the Roman Empire. The sentiment of chastity becomes ridiculous where a woman is transferred from husband to husband, as caprice or satiety may dictate.

[Yet, as we have elsewhere stated, this liberty of divorce existed five hundred years before it was resorted to in any recorded instance!]

"Society, by the institution of indissoluble marriage, exacts of the married the strongest practical guarantee of the purity and truth of their affection, and thereupon draws the broadest possible line of demarkation between them and the vile crew whose aspirations are purely selfish, and whose unions are dissolved, renewed and varied, as versatility or satiety may dictate.

"We have no doubt this wise law, while essential to the progress of the race in intelligence and virtue, is eminently conducive to the happiness of individuals. True, there are unhappy marriages, discordant marriages, unions sanctioned by law which lack the soul of marriage—but these occur, not through any inherent vice or defect in the institution, but through the levity, rashness, avarice, or over-mastering appetite of one or both of the parties, who marry in haste, or from the impulse of unworthy motives, when the law counsels deliberation and demands pure affection. If a general proclamation were issued to-morrow, with the sanction of all our civil and ecclesiastical authorities, authorizing every married couple to obtain a divorce by merely applying for it within two months, and, in default of such asking, to remain undivorced ever afterward, we do not believe one couple in ten would apply for a divorce. But let it be understood that marriages would hereafter be sanctioned and honored, binding the parties to regard each other as husband and wife only so long as should be mutually agreeable, and leaving them at perfect liberty to dissolve this tie and form new

ones at pleasure, and we believe marriages *would be* contracted and dissolved with a facility and levity now unimagined. Every innocent young maiden would be sought in marriage by those who now plot her ruin without marriage, and the facility of divorce would cover the arts and the designs of the libertine with all the panoply of honorable and pure affection. How many have already fallen victims to the sophistry that the *ceremony* of marriage is of no importance—the *affection* being the essential matter? How many are every day exposed to this sophistry? Marriage indissoluble may be an imperfect test of honorable and pure affection—as all things human are imperfect—but it is the best the State can devise; and its overthrow would result in a general profligacy and corruption such as this country has never known, and few of our people can adequately imagine.

“We are inflexibly opposed, therefore, to any extension of the privileges of divorce now accorded by our laws; but we are *not* opposed to the discussion of the subject. On the contrary, we deem such discussion vitally necessary and already too long neglected. The free trade sophistry respecting marriage is already on every libertine’s tongue; it has overrun the whole country in the yellow-covered literature which is as abundant as the frogs of Egypt, and a great deal more pernicious. It is high time that the press, the pulpit, and every other avenue to the public mind, were alive to this subject, presenting, reiterating, and enforcing the argument in favor of the sanctity, integrity, and perpetuity of marriage.

“We do, indeed, believe that most parties are now as happy and contented in their marriage re-

lations as their own natures will allow ; because we believe that marriages are now contracted with a very general understanding, that they are practically indissoluble ; that nothing short of death or the deep demoralization and lasting infamy of one of the parties can ever dissolve them. But let it be understood that marriages may be dissolved whenever the parties are tired of each other, and we can conceive no essential modification of our present system which will not amount practically to this, and we believe more false than true marriages would be contracted ; because libertines would resort to marriage as a cloak for their lecherous designs, which the legal penalties of bigamy and adultery now compel them to pursue by a more circuitous and less shaded path.

"Our own conviction and argument decidedly favor 'Indissoluble Marriage,' any existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. But for the express words of Christ, which seem to admit adultery as a valid ground of divorce, we should stand distinctly on the Roman Catholic ground of no divorce except by death. As it is, we do not object to divorce for the one flagrant and gross violation of the marriage covenant, though we *should* oppose even *that* if it did not seem to be upheld by the personal authority of Christ. Beyond it we are inflexible.

"The world is full of perilous fallacies and sophisms respecting marriage and divorce, which, we are confident, are mischievous only because they burrow in darkness and are permitted to do their deadly work unopposed. Let them be exposed to the light of discussion, and they will, they *must* be divested of their baneful power. We hope to do our share toward this consummation."

So far the brave Mr. GREELEY, whose courage, however, was of short duration. The *Tribune*, very soon after this was closed to the discussion, and has not since been re-opened. Now for the opposite and ultra views of Mr. ANDREWS. We shall give the substance of his argument as concisely as possible using his own language when we can do so.

“At the commencement of the Protestant Reformation, three centuries ago, the world lay bound by three strong cords of superstition, the Ecclesiastical, the Governmental, and the Matrimonial. The Church, the State, and the Family, each claimed to be of divine origin, and to exist by divine right.”

Freedom of thought is denounced in the sphere of religion; freedom of action in the sphere of politics; freedom of affection in the sphere of the family.

“Mr. Greeley denounces me as favoring impurity and adultery. It is clear, as I have said, that whether I do so or not, depends upon the definitions of the terms. If by adultery is meant a breach of a legal bond, binding a man and woman, between whom there are repugnance and disgust instead of attraction and love, to live together in the marital embrace, then there may be some grounds for the charge; but if, as I choose to define it, adultery means a sexual union, induced by any other motive, however amiable or justifiable in itself, than that mutual love by which nature prompts the amative conjunction of the sexes, materially and spiritually, then do I oppose and inveigh against, and then does Mr. Greeley defend and uphold adultery. I am as honestly and thoroughly opposed to adultery,

for example, as the editor of the *Tribune* can be, except that we might differ in the definition. I *charge* adultery upon nine-tenths of the married couples in this city, committed not out of, but within, the limits of their marriage bonds."

Of the preservation of sexual purity, as one object of the marriage institution, Mr. Andrews says :

"To determine whether perpetual and exclusive marriage is essential to that end, we must first answer the question, What constitutes purity? To this question, the common, I may say the vulgar answer, Mr. Greeley's answer, is fidelity to the marriage relation (or, in the absence of that bond, no sexual relations at all). Put into categorical formula, the two propositions are then simply as follows : 1. The marriage institution is sacred because it is indispensable to the preservation of purity. 2. Purity is the preservation of the marriage institution. Of course this rotary method of ratiocination is simply absurd, and cannot, for a moment, satisfy the really philosophical or inquiring mind.

"Let me, then, give a different answer to this question and see who will demur. *Sexual purity*, I will say, is *that kind of relation, whatever it be, between the sexes, which contributes in the highest degree to their mutual health and happiness, taking into account the remote as well as the immediate results.*

"No pretension can be made that purity, in the sense in which I use the term, has ever yet been attained by laws to enforce it. Prostitution, in marriage and out of it, and solitary vice, characterize Society as it is.

"The results of marriage are mental imbecility and bodily disease. There is hardly one woman

in ten in our midst, who knows, from year's end to year's end, what it is to enjoy even tolerable health. The few who, despite the system, attain some development, are tortured by the consciousness and the mortifications of their dependency, and the perpetual succession of petty annoyances incident to it, of which their lordly companions, self-gratulatory for their own intentions of kindness, are profoundly unconscious. Shut up to the necessity of this continuous and exhausting endurance, wives have the same motives that slaves have for professing contentment, and smile deceitfully while the heart swells indignantly, and the tear trembles in the eye. / Man complains habitually of the waywardness and perversity of woman, and never suspects that he himself, and his own false relations to her, are the key to the thousand apparent contradictions in her deportment and character. / The last thing that the husband is likely to know, in marriage as it is, is the real state of the heart that throbs next him as he lays his head upon his own pillow. Woman, as well as the slave, must first be wholly free before she can afford to take the risk to speak freely. She dare not utter boldly her own complaint, and she will even denounce openly, while she prays fervently in secret for the God-speed of the friend who does it for her.

“The great lesson for the world to learn is, *that human beings do not need to be taken care of.* What they do need is, such conditions of justice, and freedom, and friendly co-operation, *that they can take care of themselves.* Provided for by another, and subject to his will as the return tribute, they pine, and sicken, and die. This is true equally of women as of men ; as true of wives as it is of vassals or serfs.

Our whole existing marital system is the house of bondage and the slaughter-house of the female sex. /

"A liberty which anybody else in the universe has a right to define, is *no* liberty for me. A pursuit of happiness which some despot, or some oligarchy, or some tyrannical *majority*, has the power to shape and proscribe for me, is not the pursuit of *my* happiness.

"A mere handful of individuals, along with myself, do now, for the first time in the world, accept and announce the Sovereignty of the Individual, with all its consequences, as the principle of *order* as well as of liberty and happiness among men, and challenge its acceptance by mankind.

"Crime springs solely from two causes. 1. The existence of arbitrary institutions, and the ignorant and false ideas in men's minds growing out of our relation to those institutions, whereby acts are construed to be crimes, which, by the institutes of natural law, are no crimes; and, 2. The denial of equity, growing out of ignorance of the scientific principle of equity, and out of the want of sufficient intelligence and expansion of the intellect to enable men to see that their interests lie in adopting and acting upon that principle, when known. In other words, out of the denial of the Sovereignty of the Individual in all things, and out of a false or unscientific commercial system.

"I *have* no special doctrine on the subject of marriage. I regard marriage as being neither better nor worse than all other of the arbitrary and artificial institutions of society—contrivances to regulate Nature, instead of studying her laws. I ask for the complete emancipation and self-ownership of woman, simply as I ask the same for man.

The 'Woman's Rights Women' simply mean this, or do not yet know what they mean. So of Mr. James. So of all reformers. The *Observer* is logical, shrewd, and correct, when it affirms that the whole body of reformers tend the same way, and bring up sooner or later against the legal or prevalent theological idea of marriage. It is not, however, from any special hostility to that institution, but from a growing consciousness of an underlying principle, the inspiring soul of the activities of the present age—the Sovereignty of the Individual. The lesson has to be learned that order, combining with freedom, and ultimating in harmony, is to be the work of science, and not of arbitrary legislation and criminal codes. Let the day come!

"I claim individually to be my own nation. I take this opportunity to declare my National Independence, and to notify all other potentates, that they may respect my Sovereignty. I may have to fight to establish my claim, but the claim I make, and sooner or later I will come to the recognition of it. You have notified me that you will resist it.

"If two cats are tied up in a bag, the tendency of this 'too close connection' will be toward contest and clamor. You will probably have to choke them to keep them tolerably quiet. If the bag is, then, assumed to be a *necessary institution*, to be maintained at all hazards, and if quiet is also a desideratum, the choking will also remain a perpetual necessity. Even when the discovery is made—and it is to this point that I ask your special attention—that the cats are well enough disposed to be quiet if you will let them out, it may

still be necessary to keep your fingers on their throats until the bag can be cautiously and safely untied, the cats extracted, and a little time allowed them to become convinced of their prospective good treatment. If an existing bad system cannot be changed at once without some bad consequences, they are to be charged, not upon the right system which is to follow, but upon the remaining influence of the old and vicious one.

“ I would have the order of society so founded on a scientific knowledge of the nature, organization, and purposes of man, and of that Divine law which overrules and irradiates all, that there shall be no thief, no burglar, no maimer, and no murderer ; and I take the burden of proof upon myself to show, that the principles are now known, in accordance with which it is just as practicable to have such a society, as to have the ‘ Pandemonium ’ we now have. This whole harvest of gallows-birds is the fruit of your tree, not of mine, and while you continue to produce them, it belongs to you to provide for them.

“ The Sovereignty of the Individual which I talk about is the sovereignty of every individual ; it teaches me and every one who accepts it the most scrupulous deference for the absolute freedom of every human being, prohibiting me and them from arrogating any control or government over others, (except when we have to assume the cost of their actions, as in the case of children, and become thereby entitled to the deciding power.) It demands of me that I permit every man and every woman to think, speak, and do whatsoever seemeth good to them in their own eyes, laying down the least shadow of claim to the right on my part

to suppress them, either directly or through the power of the State, the Church, public odium, or otherwise—only limited by the line that they do not throw the burdensome consequences of their conduct on me, and that they leave me the same amount of freedom. All this I hold as the essential principle of order and harmony, and growth in purity and intelligence, and rational happiness among men.

“My doctrine is, simply, that it is an intolerable impertinence for me to thrust myself into your affairs of the heart, to determine for you what woman (or women) you love well enough or purely enough to live with, or how many you are capable of loving. I demand that you simply let me alone to settle the most intimate, and delicate, and sacred affairs of my private life in the same manner. You publicly notify me that you won’t.

“Let the idea be completely repudiated from the man’s mind that that woman, or any woman, could, by any possibility, belong to him, or was to be true to him, or owed him anything, farther than as she might choose to bestow herself, as far as he could inspire her with affection and no farther; and from that hour the sentiment of jealousy dies out, and the motive to one kind of murder is removed.

“Mr. James claims freedom because, for his part, he believes that freedom will lead people to act just in that way which he personally thinks to be right. I, on the contrary, claim freedom for all men and all women, for no such personal reason, but because they have an inalienable, God-given right, high as heaven above all human legislation, to judge for themselves what it is moral, and

proper, and right for them to do or abstain from doing ; so long as they do not cast the burdens of their conduct on me. I plant myself on that Principle, and challenge the attention of mankind to it as the *law* of order, and harmony, and elevation, and purity among men. Herein we do radically differ. I take the position, which, saving the judgment of my critics, is *exceedingly* new in the world, that I have no better right to determine what it is *moral* or *proper* for you to do, than I have to determine what it is *religious* for you to BELIEVE ; and that, consequently, for me to aid in sending you or another man to prison for fornication, or bigamy, or polygamy, or a woman for wearing male attire, and the like, is just as gross an outrage, in kind, upon Human Rights, as it would be to aid in burning you at Smithfield for Protestantism or Papacy, or at Geneva for discarding the doctrine of the Trinity.

"We are rapidly discarding force, and recognizing the truth, and purity, and potency of love or attraction, in government, in education, in social life, and everywhere.

"The restraints of marriage are becoming daily less. Its oppressions are felt more and more. *There are to-day in our midst ten times as many fugitives from matrimony as there are fugitives from slavery ; and it may well be doubted if the aggregate or the average of their sufferings has been less.* There is hardly a country village that has not from one to a dozen such persons.

"Indeed, it may be stated as the growing public sentiment of Christendom, already, that the man and woman who do not LOVE have no right, before God, to live together as MAN and WIFE, no matter

how solemn the marriage service which may have been mumbled over them. This is the **NEGATIVE** statement of a grand **TRUTH**, already arrived at and becoming daily louder and more peremptory in its utterance. How long, think you, it will be before the converse, or **POSITIVE**, side of the same truth will be affirmed, namely, that the man and woman who do **LOVE**, can live together in **PURITY** without any mummary at all—that it is **LOVE** that *sanctifies*, not the blessing of the Church?

“The truth will ere long be apparent that there is no middle ground upon which a man of sense can permanently stand, between *Absolutism, Blind Faith, and Implicit Obedience to authority, on the one hand, and on the other, ‘the Sovereignty of the Individual.’*”

These extracts, it may be, do not give the fullest or fairest idea of this remarkable discussion, but they give something of its spirit and thought. Those who wish to know more will read it. They will find Mr. Greeley asserting despotism as the condition of order, and legal force as the only possible guarantee of purity; Mr. James in a state of foggy betweenity; and Mr. Andrews boldly demanding the ultimatum of the Principle of Human Liberty in the Realm of the Affections.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE LOVE DOCTRINES OF FOURIER.

THERE could be no fair presentation of our subject, if we failed to give the theory of Marriage, or of Love, set forth by the great Philosopher of the Social School of the Phalansterie. This theory is to be found, more or less clearly stated or indicated, in all his works; but we find a statement adapted to our purpose in a remarkable work, written by Dr. M. E. LAZARUS, entitled LOVE vs. MARRIAGE. The motto of this book consists of two texts of Scripture:

“For in heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God.”

“Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is done in heaven.”

The dedication is also significant: “TO ALL TRUE LOVERS; to the modest and the brave of either sex, who believe that God reveals to each heart the laws which he destines it to obey, who fear not to follow the magic clew of charm, but defy the interference of all foreign powers, the author dedicates this work.”

This book, as an energetic and scientific protest against the evils of the existing marriage, and as also pointing to a social condition of harmony and happiness, is worthy of the attention of the curious and philanthropic reader. Our extracts will give some idea of the book, both in its critical and its constructive character. We begin them almost at

the beginning, from the introductory chapter ; those who would know more, will read the book itself.

“ Marriage is the only institution in which civilized nations recognize the existence of mutual love. There are reasons sufficient why romances and pictures of life’s ideal beauty should find in the altar their tomb ; for the chattel property in persons, the arbitrary, permanent, exclusive connection, the monotonous drudgeries of housekeeping, and the general ignorance of the laws of harmony, through whose darkness love’s celestial instincts flashed only while untrammelled by our institutions, kill the ideal, and often make a hell of the actual. Poets and novelists feel this well enough, and notwithstanding a charming exception here and there, they feel that in writing for the public they would only make themselves ridiculous by painting life after marriage with the colors of romance. The unnatural constraint which our marriage institution imposes on the parties, engenders, by reaction, libertinism among those who keep aloof from it, and adultery among those who have accepted it without submitting to it, as it cramps and falsifies the natures of those who submit themselves to it in good faith, exception falling upon the few cases where the parties are spiritually mated to each other ; hence it is not surprising that French wit and good sense should have permitted indifference and ridicule towards this ‘first bond of society,’ that the corruption of manners should have brought adultery into comparative honor there.

“ We bring into the world with us the germs of every passion, and the aptitudes for every relation

to which circumstances may afterward present the corresponding objects. When this occurs early in life it is well ; when it occurs late it is not therefore evil. During the reign of social harmony, fresh-springing loves will charm all the ages of life, as flowers every season of the equatorial year.

“ For latitude, freedom, and variety in the relations of love, it is necessary, then, that woman should be independent and self-sustaining as well as man, and that the child should from an early age find an opportunity and functions open to it where it may earn as much as it consumes, either with or without the formal intervention of the State or Society.

“ Or 2d. That those sustaining numerous and varied love relations should be possessed of *great wealth*, in which case they are usually *parasites* upon the industry of the producing mass, as well as monopolists of its beautiful women.

“ Or 3d. That they should be *swindlers* in love, casting the burden of supporting their children upon the mothers they have seduced.

“ Or 4th. That a state of *disgraceful promiscuity* should exist, as in the abandoned hells of our great cities, where the women are either too disorderly or too much diseased to bear children, or else dispose of them by child-murder or the foundling hospital.

“ Hitherto, the tendency to numerous and varied love relations, either with or without inconstancy, has developed itself among both men and women, under all forms of religion, government, and moral customs, as far as wealth or other circumstances have given some freedom of choice and action. It

is represented in civilization under the hideous features of prostitution, or the more specious forms of libertinism and adultery; in barbarism by the seraglio and the bayaderes; in the savage state by the Eden societies of the South Seas, whereof Cook and others have brought us such glowing accounts.

“Marriage is an institution rendered compulsory on both sexes by the loss of caste consequent on free unions, and the absence of provision for the nurture of children.

“Marriage converts lovers into owners of personal property, and often renders the most charming love relations at last indifferent or odious by the meannesses, monotony, and exclusiveness of the isolated household, and the arbitrary connection or collision of a thousand impertinences of fortune, interest, domestic cares, and individual tastes and pursuits with the natural tie of love. How perfectly absurd, besides, to dispose irrevocably of our whole future and its opportunities in one hour or one phase of feeling, which, even when it has fed on expectation for months or years, has never completed itself—never ripened from the phase of desire into that of attainment, or triumphantly passed the supreme test of true love, the possession of its object.

“Why force two young persons, in whose favor ‘the gods have intervened,’ as Plato expresses it, as a condition of enjoying their happiness, to bind themselves mutually to exclude all future ‘intervention of the gods’—to swear that they will always love and be sufficient to each other, as they now are, or fancy themselves, and at the very time when they are about to be placed in the most stu-

pid of circumstances—those of the isolated family household. Truly it has been said that ‘marriage is the tomb of love,’ and most have found it thus, so that the best-assorted unions generally come in the end to be but familiar friendships, alliances of domestic interests, and intrigues with parental affections and anxieties. The grace with which men and women resign their respective liberties to these compensations comes cheap, since they have really nothing to resign, society and the law permitting no development to the passion of love in any other condition than marriage.

“Natures the most gracious and spontaneous, in the limited freedom of relations they have enjoyed before marriage, become as sour as verjuice, and thorny termagants, by the harrassing routine of domestic trifles ; the voice becomes sharp and shrill, unerring indication of the sacrifice of the internal to the external life ; and the finest souls suffer most, because they become most denaturalized, and find it most impossible to take an interest in the narrow routine of an isolated family, where there is nothing noble and graceful in the common details of work, no spiritualization of labor or of enjoyment.

“With the best good-will in the world, the laws of physiology, phrenology, temperament, and passion, refuse their most celestial gifts to the monotony of fixed possession. The brilliant intellect refuses to unlock its stores of knowledge, wit, genius, and taste, to its familiar bed and table companion. Men talk to every one except their wives ; they already feel as if they knew each other so well that conversation was superfluous, besides, a kiss is so much easier.

“Soon these also become scarce in the satiety of possession. Thus the tendency of marriage is constantly downward, from the spiritual into the animal life. Let a woman explore and exploit well her lover’s brilliant side while he is still her lover, for she will find the husband a sober friend, at best. That charm which links earth with heaven, the finite with the infinite, will evaporate. It is love alone, in his untrammelled liberty, that can inclose the spirit of nature in the form of the adored. Our stupid laws and social conventions do but represent the inertia of matter. How should they imprison the celestial? It comes unbidden with the innocence of a babe, and clasps in holiest union those who ask no other sacrament than itself.

“Independence and the charms of maternity are both illusions in more than seven-eighths of civilized marriages. To have a house of one’s own to keep, or even superintend, is a systematic slavery, an immolation of one’s personal predilections and pursuits on the altar of the family and domestic comfort. /It may pass among the virtues of negative Christianity or crucifixion, but not to be desired for its own sake. The charms of maternity are cut down by the anxieties, bad adaptations, and accidents of the isolated household, to a bare minimum, still oftener turned into tortures, and all the force of a mother’s devotion is necessary to bring the child through the painful crises and filthy experiences of an infancy more protracted, inferior, and helpless than that of any other animal. Who dares to talk of the charms of maternity in civilization, in the face of statistics which prove that one-half of all children die under the fifth year,

while the rest are ailing, on an average, near half the time, and the whole family together scarcely ever well.

“Nothing can be truer than that woman, and man also, ought to possess in their amatory relations each other’s tenderest and most concentrated affection, their independence or spontaneity of movement secured, and the charms of paternity and maternity in their most exalted degree; but it is equally true that exclusive marriage vows and the order of the isolated household never have secured these blessings, and never can secure them, save in the smallest exception.

“Were not marriage the most absurd, inexpedient and enslaving of relations to both parties, the indecency of its forms would alone be sufficient to condemn it.

“Marriage involves individual destinies in inextricable complication. Hence the instinctive aversion of genius to marriage, and especially of women of genius, who are almost fatally compromised by it. It is by no means only for women that marriage in the family household is the crucifixion of genius. * * * Love gives wings to genius, but marriage clips them.

“Marriage, as I show in other chapters, and as the experienced well know, is the grave of spontaneity. Hence Christ virtually condemns marriage with the whole force of this doctrine, as well as of this life. How can marriage, then, the civilized marriage, that perpetual offense against spontaneity, against decency and against humanitarian elevation—how can civilized marriage, with its spawn, the isolated family household and separate interests, stand against this doctrine?

“Marriage—mark it well—is the pivotal character of civilization, the foundation of the isolated household and competitive interest, the corner-stone of that arch of oppression under which the laborer lies crushed. Christ tells us that in the kingdom of heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage. The kingdom of heaven is no other than the practical incarnation of love in uses. The kingdom of heaven is also to come on earth, since Christ prays the Father, ‘Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in the heavens.’

“It is an infamous and insolent lie in the face of the most numerous facts of our observation and experience, to confound the civil and legal marriage with the true and celestial union of souls or of characters, of which it pretends to be the representative.

“The civil marriage makes personal property of woman, and in a less degree of man also; a kind of property differing widely from the definition of property as an extension of one’s own personality by love and truth ultimating themselves in uses, which is Swedenborg’s formula of the heavenly marriage.

“If concubinage and seraglios have been permitted by the Divine wisdom in adaptation to patriarchal and barbarous nations, where great wealth and absolute power belong to the heads of families and tribes, exclusive monogamy, the civilized marriage, has been permitted in adaptation to periods of general poverty and social treachery, when no man dares trust another, and when the isolated household becomes a little fortress, in which he may intrench himself against the world. Shall we not conclude that other customs and ties in love

relations are approved by God in adaptation to the brighter destiny which now opens for us, to a period when the practical application of science to industry and the arts, brings forth each day some glorious conquest over matter, some new proof of the unison of human with divine intelligence, and when, to crown those brilliant successes in mechanics and chemistry which make man virtually king of nature, and increase so immensely his means of production and wealth, the social discovery has also been made; when we know how to organize labor attractively, to make of the passions industrial levers, and to consummate the liberty and happiness of the people by the true order of social relations. Is it not now full time to abandon the slavish, cramping, love-poisoning marriage forms of civilization, and to accept from the distributor of passional affinities, those rich soul-satisfying joys which He reserves in the delicious harmony of characters, in free love, for those who shall keep His covenants and His commandments to do them?

“Charles Fourier has shown, since 1808, to every clear and strong mind, how the human race may within a very few years be raised to a state of universal abundance, refined comfort, health, vigor, and happiness, in which all the Christian virtues will be as common in practice as they have hitherto been rare and exceptional.

“By a social organization, in which self-love is fully conciliated with the love of the neighbor, and every one's passions placed in harmony with themselves, with reason, and with the public welfare, property will be respected without the interference of law; all criminal proceedings will be done

away with, from the absence of any criminals; the poorer will desire, equally from good-will to others and on account of their own interests, the prosperity of the richer; ties and alliances will be firmly cemented between all the classes and interests of society; *integral education, practical and industrial* in its methods, and *developing body and soul together*, will fill this earth with the knowledge of the Lord, so that God's will shall be done, and His kingdom established in harmony, on earth as in the heavens.

“Marriage is the cause of prostitution. Defrauded by the married classes and civil system based on marriage, of the means of an honorable living, women are reduced to sell the abuse of their bodies for bread, and once having been thrust down into this pit of hell, the hatches are closed upon them by the fashion, morality, and hypocritical religion of the more fortunate classes, who not only refuse to associate with them, but to give them employment, to suffer them to work even in menial capacities, or for the most inconsiderable wages.

“It is only by thus discrediting, slandering, and stigmatizing all other love ties, that the institution of marriage preserves its power and ascendancy.

“It is a social vampire; its crimes are worse than any that the civil law punishes with death, for it poisons the souls of whole societies, and feeds upon the corrupted life-blood of their passions. A yoke upon the neck, a pebble in the shoe, a thorn in the side, a dishclout on the breech, of those who submit to it, and become its representatives; it spurts its venom over all that refuse it, and renders impossible every true, honorable, and expedient

love relation, from kings and queens down to the humblest day laborer in civilization.

✓“Marriage is personal robbery and embezzlement under false pretenses, inasmuch as it sequesters from the passional resources of society two individuals, interdicting to them henceforth, and to all others with respect to them, the recognition and cultivation of ties of affection, both spiritual and sensual. It perpetrates this high-handed act of arbitrary authority under the false pretense that love for two or more persons at the same or at successive periods in life, is incompatible with truth to either, and to individual virtue and social safety. It pretends, by an act of the civil law, to control the manifestation of love, and denies the inherent rights and ties of passional affinity implanted in our souls and organizations, and by which the Author of our being signifies His desire that society should be strengthened in unity by the warmest and nearest of mutual ties.

“Every marriage, if virtually fulfilled, robs the two individuals who submit to it of their chances of passional affinity in love relations with a great number of others; thus rendering the equilibrium and full harmony of their lives in this line of development impossible. It robs by the same act all the other individuals of society who may happen to be, or at any future time to come, into passional affinity with either of these two persons, of the natural and legitimate satisfaction of their love.

“Thus marriage engenders spiritual poverty in the societies which it spoliates, and deprives of their passional resources, as it engenders material poverty, by the separation of households and sequestration of property in the hands of a few.

As by engendering material poverty and oppression, it drives women to prostitution, so by engendering spiritual poverty it drives men to libertinism and gross sensuality. What man would ever go to a brothel, were he not obstructed on every side in the development of his affections? What man could not find a home for his heart, were not half the women of his acquaintance already monopolized and sequestered under false pretenses by the civil marriage, and the other half afraid of marriage and equally afraid of love relations without marriage, on account of the stigma attached to them?

“This vampire of society says to the young man—As the condition of satisfying your natural and irrepressible desires, of changing your torture into pleasure, you shall either choose, woo, and win one woman, coming under bond to love and live with her only during her life, or you shall seduce and destroy the reputation of an honorable woman, or you shall immolate all that you feel is pure, true, and celestial in love, to the relief of brutal lusts by promiscuous relations with strumpets. Now take your choice, provided you have money; if you have not, you may still choose between the tortures of prolonged repression and the maladies thereon consequent, and the equally fatal vice of self-pollution.

“Thus man and woman owe each other both love and liberty. Wherever, on the contrary, dislike and constraint are met with between the two sexes, it is the opposite of true marriage; it is a violent and abnormal state, which nothing can justify, and which ought not to continue.

“An ill-assorted marriage is no more indissolu-

ble than any other ill-organized association. Can intelligent beings voluntarily and rationally engage to torment each other and render each other irretrievably wretched?"

Such are some of the criticisms of Fourier and the Fourierites, upon civilization, and marriage, its most cherished and most peculiar institution. A few additional extracts from the concluding chapters will show us the nature of the Love Relations contemplated in the Phalanx :

"Woman will never be free, save in the large home, the varied and attractive industry of the Phalanx, where she has her choice of all the departments of domestic, mechanical, and agricultural labors and arts, and can move in thirty groups of friends and of labors in the course of the same month. There the real charms of maternity will be enjoyed, because there, in the unitary nurseries and miniature workshops, children can be safely and happily provided for, either in the presence or absence of the mother; and the children mutually amuse each other, without requiring, each of them, the continued attention of one or more adults."

The constancy and absorption of mutual love "is recognized by the Phalanx as a divine relation, and fully respected; but the parties form no binding civil contract before others, subject themselves to no criminal law, and are as free at any time to dissolve their relation or to form others which modify this in regard to its exclusiveness, as they were at first to form this one.

"All children born of such union are accepted by the phalanx, and entitled to precisely the same advantages of nurseries, industrial playshops, tuition, pleasures, honors, and general development,

which it furnishes to all children indiscriminately who are born in its sphere, and to whom the public or social instinct of its own preservation and advantage, as well as the sentiment of honor and humanity, guarantee the best education possible.

“Thus the phalanx emancipates love from the two principal arbitrary causes of exclusiveness in marriage; to wit, the civil law, and the personal obligation to the support of their children in the isolated household. If exclusive constancy obtain in the love relations of man and woman, it is then no longer an arbitrary fact, nor based on the necessities of poverty, as at present, but an entirely free and spontaneous passional fact, and as such entitled to the respect which it obtains.

“There is no reason left in the phalanx why a woman should yield her person to a man, except the impulse of her own heart, and no control of the person of the other possible to either party, except through the fascination of sympathy.

“This is not all, however. Two persons thus related to each other in the ties of exclusive love are respected in the phalanx, but not, therefore, accounted better than those whose love relations are very different.

“Love is free: it is prowess in industry and the arts which confers honor, and personal fascination that wins favor.

“Love is free: that is to say, there are many other relations, equally legitimate, recognized and respected as much, and some of them more so, than exclusive monogamy, because they are more useful in their social effects of promoting harmony.

“The exclusive absorption of one man in one woman, and of one woman in one man, is a sort of

social sleep ; and all the respect it can receive from society is, not to be disturbed. In a social sphere, whose organization of labor fully conciliates interests, and whose integral refinement of education promotes the most charming and friendly relations among its members, there are very few persons who will not naturally form numerous and varied love relations, some purely spiritual, and others composite in their character, and which may even co-exist with a permanent relation with one favored lover, whose charm is enhanced by these inconstancies or modulations in other varieties of love.

“ Jealousy, the inversion of love, will be deprived of its stronghold, where no arbitrary and exclusive rights are sanctioned by law or custom—where all is an open question of magnetism, fascination, or passional conquest, preserved by ever-renewed fascination, and where bonds of friendly interest connect all the associates. Luxury, refinement of intellect and character, a high industrial tone, and the stimulus of ambition, create alternations and diversions in the sphere of love itself, and in those of other passions, soon enabling a disappointed lover to regain his equilibrium.

“ Love is a source of varied and exquisite happiness in the phalanx, but not an affair of life and death, not a source of duels, suicides, chronic diseases, and broken hearts, as in civilization.

“ The conservative civilizees, then, are more than half right in suspecting that the phalanx will break up marriage. Marriage as they understand it, and as it is now generally understood in the world, is totally incompatible with social harmony, and must be excluded from any successful phalansterian institution.

“I see no use in temporizing with blockheads and bigots, who believe in the essential depravity of man and his passions, and who have no conception of order as the harmony of perfect freedom, resulting from the spontaneous expression of individual wills and characters in a social and industrial sphere, adapted to the play of these wills and characters.

“Order, for the civilizee, means nothing more nor less than the compression and repression of the individual, by the authority of the mass in democratic countries, and compression of the mass by the authority of the individual in despotic countries. Leaving the generation of vipers to sting themselves to death, we proceed.

“The family, as it now exists, is destined to be absorbed by the phalanx, to pass into a state of myth, to be considered a monstrosity, to be regarded by the children of harmony who read of it in the ancient histories as an amusing horror, like our story of Bluebeard, or Little Red Riding-hood.

“These ties in the loves of harmony are of different degrees, of which the principal is the pivotate or league of composite constancy—love in all the degrees, which amalgamates with all others.

“An affection is called pivotal when it allies with all others, and is sustained in concurrence with other loves more recent and more ardent. The names of congeniality and of conjugal love have been applied to it in civilization.

“Every well-balanced character must have in harmony pivotal lovers male or female, besides the current loves of successive passions, and the flirtations of transient loves, which are very bril-

liant in the passage of the industrial armies, wherein both sexes are enrolled.

“The loves with which two persons are beloved by a third are different as the characters and temperaments of these two persons. The love and understanding of one may reflect a light upon the nature of the other, but if this other be also a subject of passional affinity, that affinity will be strengthened rather than weakened by the relations of analogy or of contrast which it may bear to the other. Love, like the other faculties of the soul, requires for its vigor and permanence in action, the charm of variety, the alternation of its objects; the eye is fatigued with resting constantly, even on green, and the most fascinating volume becomes a stupid bore, if we must keep reading it always, instead of frequently distracting our thoughts with other books and objects of interest. Hence, monotony, monogamy, or exclusive constancy, are for love a true suicide, and could be endured by no one, were it not for the long absences and passional calms in which love sleeps, and the beloved person becomes nearly indifferent or irksome in the ordinary civilized marriage and isolated household.

“Jealousy is occasioned by poverty in every sense, both spiritually and materially; it is a subversive or infernal expression of the instinct of self-preservation, in the sphere of love, where it is more out of place than in any other, because there, devotion, absolute devotion to the object beloved, normally reigns; and there is no true love worthy the name, where there are any selfish reservations.

“Civilization, in compelling these, in narrowing, depraving, and degrading the soul down to these, poisons love. Where there are so few chances of

love, and half one's life has been turned to anguish by the privation of it, it is a matter of course, that the starved soul should greedily grapple and strive to absorb entirely, and appropriate all to itself, the single being in whom it has found affection. Yes, poverty explains all, excuses all, but itself. It is the mother serpent, into whose maw retreat all the infernal little snakes that envenom the social relations of incoherent societies (civilized, barbarous, patriarchal, savage).

"When poverty has driven men to monogamy, then jealousy appears with marriage, or exclusive property in persons and other chattels. In barbarous countries, where the chattelism of woman is still more strongly organized than with us, jealousy goes to the greatest extremes, and any infraction of the right of exclusive property in wives or daughters is punished by the death of both parties. The Seraglio, the Sultan, the Sac, and the Sea.

"Abolish property or chattelism in woman, restore her independence, and you abolish jealousy; but this kind of property, like other capital, is an institution of poverty, a re-action of individuals against the poverty of the mass.

"Woman's dependence vitiates every love relation, whether in or out of marriage.

"The combined serial order will, in due season, pass from an idea into a social and industrial fact, and then we shall probably witness at once in parallel development, associations admitting the freedom of love, and others which admit only the conjugal tie, composed, perhaps, exclusively of those who have already contracted this, and of persons who recognize it fully as their ideal. Agreed in other respects, and adopting the same organiza-

tion of labor, the difference of customs in love, will be a point of rivalry between them, and furnish a check to arbitrary oppression among those who recognize only the conjugal tie, as on the other side, a check to disorder and indelicacy among those who accord a wider range in amatory relations.

"Between different phalanxes we may have the same emulation reproduced, which in a softened degree exists between the Vestalate, and the *Demoisellate*; or choirs of chastity and of constancy, and between these, together, and the choirs of greater latitude, *Bayadere*, *Angelicate*, *Faquirate*, and others in the same phalanx, where love adopts without moral restriction the serial order of its developments."

For further and fuller explanations of the doctrines of the Fourierites on the Relations of Love, read "*LOVE vs. MARRIAGE*," "*Passions of Human Soul*," "*Universal Unity*," "*Love in the Phalansterie*," &c., &c.

Enough, here and now, for our present purpose. More, elsewhere, and in the GREAT FUTURE.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE WRONGS OF MARRIAGE.

WE must draw to a close this portion of our work, historical, descriptive, and critical. We must close and sum up the testimony. Illustrative facts, from the actual life around us, will fol

low to enforce and confirm our generalizations. We have "searched the Scriptures," examined history, culled pertinent observations from voyagers and travelers, quoted the opinions of conservatives and radicals, and unfolded some of the mysteries of civilization; but, on reviewing our work thus far, we find that we have omitted many important considerations, some of which we must now group together, under a title which will not be considered entirely inappropriate.

The Russian bride, we are told, is crowned with a garland of wormwood, as a fit emblem of the bitterness and trials of marriage state. Does a thoughtful woman ever stand before the altar without some bitterness in her heart?

One of the hideous evils of our marriage system is the unnatural celibacy that it forces upon vast numbers. Love, with its ultimations, enjoyments, and results, is the right, as it is the function, of every human being. Physical and mental diseases and miseries are the consequences of a deprivation of this right. Any social system is false which fails to provide for this great necessity of health, and use, and happiness. Our marriage system does fail to provide for the wants of thousands; more, it, interposes insuperable barriers. It is thus a violation of the laws of nature, a crime of so grave a character as to demand universal reform.

Take, for example, the State of Massachusetts. Of persons between the ages of twenty and forty years of age, there are nearly or quite twice as many women as men. The surplus female population is condemned by the laws of that State, and by the public opinion on which its laws are based,

to perpetual celibacy—to the starvation and immolation of the affections—the deprivation of all the happiness connected with love, and to all the miseries of its deprivation.

Were this result produced by the edict of a despot, humanity would be appalled by the outrage on its rights. It is produced by the marriage institution, which is thus the Moloch, the Jugger-naut, to whom these unhappy victims are sacrificed. If but one woman in the world were deprived of the rights of love and maternity, it would be an outrage; but this institution robs hundreds of thousands of this right, as effectually as if they were seized and forcibly confined in convents, under sentence of perpetual celibacy. For marriage, which condemns the married parties to one single love, or one chance for love and happiness, also sentences those whom it excludes to the loss of even that poor chance—a chance so poor, that it is with many a matter of doubt whether it be worth the taking.

Next to this total deprivation of the rights of love, is the partial one, imposed on both sexes, but especially on women. Glance along our New England seaports, and you will find thousands of women living in almost perpetual widowhood and passional starvation, because married to men who are absent for months or years on long mercantile or whaling voyages, but who still claim, as society claims for them, the sole right to the persons and affections of their wives. When these unions are not those of love, the absence may be a welcome relief; but then comes the terrible anticipation of the return, and the revolting prostitution to which the unhappy wife must be the victim. If the wife,

on the other hand, loves her husband, as is more likely to be the case than if he were constantly with her, who can tell the sufferings from absence, apprehension, and disappointment? But in neither case can she be allowed the compensation of another love. Forlorn as her condition may be, whether loving or loveless, she is cut off remorselessly from all human sympathy. She is taught to look to God for consolation, by those who forget that God's ministers of comfort are men and women with loving hearts. These poor victims, bound in the chains of marriage, may pray God and the Savior to love them, but they have no right to the love of the best man whom God has created in his own image!

We have spoken of the slavery of women in marriage, and the almost total deprivation of their natural rights. But there was never yet a wrong perpetrated by one party on another in which both did not suffer. / Men, by making women either the toys of luxury or the drudges of the isolate family, condemn themselves to lives of toil and misery. / How many a man, here and everywhere, with a wife, indifferent, expensive, and luxurious; daughters, extravagant and useless; perhaps a swarm of dependent female relatives—drones and burthens, because made such by these social relations—becomes a mere money-making machine, on whose whole round of toil there never falls one ray of happiness! Yet this man is the lord and master, the privileged being of this institution. As the despoiled laborer goes to his humble home with a lighter heart than the rich capitalist, so the inmates of the civilized harem may be unconscious of the cares and labors of their owner and master. The

wrong is everywhere—suffering is everywhere ; but those who feel it least are sometimes the most to be pitied.

The wrongs and sufferings of children from the marriage institution have been glanced at, but not sufficiently exposed. Home, family, and the care and culture of children, are the strong arguments in favor of indissoluble marriage. Yet infants are put out to nurse ; young children are sent to boarding schools ; and youth of both sexes to academies and colleges. How little of the education of life do we really find in these homes ! How often are they scenes of selfishness, tyranny, wrangling, bickerings, and disgusts !

There can be no greater wrong to any human being than to be born in a loveless, discordant marriage. It is a condition impressed upon the very nature—the body and the soul of every child so born. Next is the wrong of being compelled to spend the flower of existence, the childhood which should be all love and joy, amid the coldness, the discords, perhaps the outrages, of this home. Marriage, while it gives a thankless and miserable existence to millions, who for themselves and for society had better never have been born, compels these children to all the sufferings and malign influences of the domestic hells which this institution has scattered over the world.

Compulsory child-bearing, the duty of a married woman to submit to the embraces of, and become pregnant by, any wretch, brute, drunkard, or scoundrel, who may chance to be her *lawful* husband, is one of those hideous wrongs which cannot be too often denounced—a wrong so unnatural, such a violation of all principles of right, that

every clear-minded man must shudder at its existence ; yet it is a wrong which pervades our whole society ; and the marriage institution rests upon it. It is upheld by every advocate of marriage. Says HORACE GREELEY, one of the most fanatical of pro-matrimonial advocates, "*I utterly abhor what you term the right of a woman to choose the father of her own child !*" An honest man, who read this sentence, said, "Then he is in favor of committing rapes." The expression may seem harsh, but is it not true? The man who upholds indissoluble marriage, with the power it gives the husband over the wife, with the utter absence of all ownership of herself, or right over her soul or her body, is in favor of rapes, and every kind of sensual outrage which men inflict upon miserable women under the "sanction" of the marriage institution. What higher right, under the broad heaven, can a woman have, than the right to choose the father of her child? Yet marriage denies this right, and forces women to loveless and adulterous embraces, and to bear the children of sin, who either die young or suffer in loveless and stricken lives, for this violation of the law of nature, forced upon them by the marriage laws, upheld by such "reformers" as Mr. Greeley.

The injustice of the conventional code of virtue, which punishes with the utmost severity the same acts in women that are scarcely noticed in men, also belongs to the marriage code. Man, the master, has the right to exact chastity and fidelity which he does not give, and women everywhere in our society acknowledge this right, by punishing women who violate the law with the utmost disgrace. A man will be received in our best soci-

ety with smiles of welcome, though he come from the arms of a woman whom his fashionable friends would almost spit upon, in the rage of their wounded virtue. So negroes in the South assist in hunting and capturing runaway slaves. So the victims of tyranny over the whole world aid in its oppressions. Women chain and scourge their sisters, because they themselves are slaves. Women whose souls are free pity, and as far as they have the power, protect the poor victims of this all-pervading wrong.

Marriage, like political despotism, religious tyranny, slavery, and other social institutions, creates crimes, and with them punishments. Freedom seems to us a natural thing; but our freedom, exercised in Italy or Austria, would send us to the prison or the gallows. Belief seems to us involuntary, and we claim, though we are not always ready to give, religious liberty, or the "right of private judgment," in matters of faith. Yet we have seen Protestants imprisoned in Italy by law, and convents and churches burned in America by the mob. Acts entirely innocent in freedom, are crimes in slaves. In the same way the marriage institution converts the most natural actions into crimes. That two young persons of opposite sexes should love each other, and give to each other expressions of love, no one will contend is unnatural; yet the marriage morality makes this a crime, for which such moralists as Mr. Greeley would send at least one of the parties to State-prison. The offenses of fornication, seduction, bigamy, and adultery, are all made such by the marriage law; the same as many trivial actions were made heinous offenses, and even

punished with death, under the bloody code of the Mosaic dispensation.

What the law calls fornication, when it is the union of mutual love, may be the holiest action two human beings can engage in. The real, essential nature of the act can be changed by no ceremony. It is either good or bad, right or wrong, in itself, and as it is sanctified by a mutual sentiment and attraction to which no law or ceremony can impart any additional sanction; yet this act, without regard to its inherent character, our marriage morality pronounces a crime, and punishes with ignominy.

So bigamy, sanctioned by even antediluvian usages, by patriarchal example, by the authority of the Mosaic law, and by the practice of the greater part of mankind in all ages—which seems to be imperiously demanded wherever there is a considerable preponderance of one sex over the other—is a State-prison offense in all our statute books; yet who can explain in what the injury to society consists? So far as it is a fraud it may be punished as a fraud; but if a woman, knowingly and voluntarily, becomes the second wife of a man with the consent of all the parties concerned, how is it any more an offense against the State than if she had waited a year or two, until the first wife was dead, and then married her husband? So far as it is desirable for women to have the love, protection, and support of men *in marriage*, the repeal of the laws against bigamy is the right of the whole surplus female population. If the State, taking upon itself the regulation of this matter, cannot provide every woman a whole husband, it inflicts a griev-

ous wrong in prohibiting her from getting a share in one.

The statutory crime of adultery is equally factitious, and equally a trespass on natural right. The real adultery of unsanctified sexual intercourse exists chiefly in marriage, where men, and especially women, are compelled to submit to it. But what the law calls adultery, may be the highest and truest relation of which two persons are capable. Yet this virtue, for such it truly may be, is punished as a crime by our marriage laws, which have no regard for the human affections, but protect married persons in the possession of each other, the same as they protect property in houses, slaves, or cattle.

In these, and in many ways, marriage perverts all correct ideas of justice, converts crimes into virtues, and virtues into crimes. All this we trust to show so clearly in the third part of this work, that men and women shall know the real difference between right and wrong by something higher than the standard of conventionality, custom, and law.

There is one evil result of our marriage system, which makes it abhorrent to the barbarians of Asia and the savages of Africa. Those who have read my exposition of the laws of generation, in *ESOTERIC ANTHROPOLOGY*, will need no further enlightenment on this point. It is that of the marital intercourse during gestation and lactation. Among the veriest savages a woman is considered sacred from the demands of sexual passion from the beginning of pregnancy until her babe is weaned. Our monogamic marriage knows no such sanctity of the maternal function, and women are

compelled to bear what no animal even, in its natural state, ever submits to; and by which the rights of both mother and child are trampled on, the health of both injured, and often one or both destroyed. This civilized infamy, to which men are driven and women compelled, is alone and of itself sufficient to condemn the marriage institution, which cannot stand a moment under the investigations of physiological science.

All the discord, strife, clamor, persecution, scandal, jealousy, legal prosecutions, elopements, duels, assassinations, which grow out of the Marriage Institution, are chargeable upon it, and for them I hold it responsible.

The remedy for discord is separation. If two persons in another copartnership disagree, they separate; but in matrimonial discords, this simple, natural, and effectual remedy is denied us. It is a crime for the husband to leave the wife, or the wife the husband.

Jealousy, and all the outrages and crimes which it causes, grows out of the idea of the right of property in some man or woman, and this idea is the basis of marriage. If Mr. Forrest, educated in the school of the drama, and full of the spirit of such plays as "Othello," "Taming the Shrew," "The Honeymoon," "Rule a Wife and have a Wife," had had any proper idea of the right of his wife to her heart and her person, and to bestow them where she pleased, we should never have had the scandal of his divorce suit. All the evils of that monstrous outrage, on both sides, would have been entirely avoided had these two accomplished and in many respects amiable

persons been able to respect each other's rights as human beings.

It is the same with the frequent cases of duels, or less formal assassinations, growing out of the same cause.

We charge all these brutalities and crimes upon the Marriage Institution ; the same as we charge revolutions, imprisonments, banishments, and political executions upon Despotisms ; the same as we charge the Inquisition, with its dungeons, tortures, and *auto de fe*, upon Religious tyranny ; the same as we charge the horrors of the middle passage, the possible and actual cruelties of Legree, and the fugitive slave law, upon the institution of Slavery.

As long as there is despotism of any kind, political, religious, or domestic, we must have all the conditions of such despotism. Austria must have a standing army, prisons and the gallows ; Rome once had tortures and the stake ; Slavery has whips and chains ; Marriage has law and public opinion—absolute power and its abuses.

They all belong to the same system—the wrong of one human being assuming to control and govern another. Kossuth, escaping from the power of Austria ; a fugitive slave running for Canada ; and a fugitive wife escaping from her husband, are parallel cases. Kossuth was born subject of Austria ; the negro was born a slave ; the woman was born and educated to be a wife, and knew no other destiny.

The same great principle applies to every case ; the right of Individual Sovereignty solves every difficulty.

Of the minor evils and miseries of marriage we

have no time nor space to speak. They are such as come naturally with, if they are not inseparable from, the exclusive and indissoluble monogamy. Our comic, satirical, and dramatic works are full of them. Marriage has often been ridiculed, seldom seriously attacked. Men like Luther, Milton, Napoleon, Shelley, Godwin; women like Mary Wolstencraft, Frances Wright, George Sand, have wholly or in part protested against it. It is left to our time, and to the course of events which makes this question *now in order*, to bring out its full discussion; to be followed by its final approval or its utter condemnation.

"Some years ago," says Dr. Lazarus in the work *LOVE vs. MARRIAGE*, from which we have elsewhere so largely quoted, "Political Liberty was the subject of a life-struggle for the American people. Now comes the question of Passional and Social Liberty, and there is another declaration of independence to be made, and another revolution to be achieved for the conquest of that happiness, the right to whose pursuit constitutes one of the prominent articles in our last declaration. That was the shadow, the sham fight, the parade, the external contest with foreign powers, but now comes the substance, the real fight, the battle of souls, the struggle without quarter between the forces of heaven and hell in our midst, and the hottest of the fight must be fought upon this central position of the love relation between the sexes. To this all human actions ultimately converge. It is the pivotal thesis of social science, and gives its pivotal and distinctive character to every social period."

PART SECOND.

BY MRS. GOVE NICHOLS.

CHAPTER I.

WOMAN AN INDIVIDUAL.

THE most sacred idea of marriage, that of union in love, seems to be in most minds. It is really a part of the religion of the heart in this whole country. Most persons feel that it is wicked and dishonorable to live in marriage without love, and to quarrel and disagree. Hence there is a uniform concealment of domestic unhappiness, and deception as to the real state of the affections. I know that there is much love, and much happiness in married life, in this country, but at the same time those who "dwell in decencies forever," mocking themselves and others with semblances, and suffering the inevitable consequences, are too numerous.

Their dissimulation and concealment are a tribute of respect to truth and love, daily and hourly rendered. It is a terrible fact for human virtue and happiness, that many can do no better service for the life giving love, and the life purifying truth. But of thousands of married persons living in dis-

cord, hate, or indifference, and pretending harmony and affection, it must be said, "they have done what they could." They can only escape their bonds by death, or by submitting to a punishment worse than death; for the sacrifice of children and support, and the being cast out from the sympathies of friends and the public, is often harder to bear than many deaths. •

It has been said by Abolitionists; "the very kernel and life of slavery is, that the negro is not recognized as a man, belonging to himself, having inalienable rights." This is true. The first of all questions to be answered respecting women and negroes is this, Are they human beings, responsible to God for their acts, having certain inalienable rights, amongst which are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"? If we can obtain no affirmative answer to this question; if any number of persons decide that these two classes of human beings are appendages to another, higher, stronger, and wiser class, why then I have nothing farther to say to those who thus decide, whether they are women, negroes, or white men. It is said that government derives its authority from the consent of the governed. I have no plea to make for those women, or those negroes, who desire masters. I see the need of masters for such.

Those to whom I wish to appeal are they who believe that women and negroes are human individuals, responsible to God, and to be governed by His laws, and not to be subjected to the forcible requirements of other human beings. When the right of self-ownership and individual responsibility is established for women and all who are enslaved, then all bonds are really broken. This right is

conceded by many to negroes, but by very few to woman.

There is now in this free country only the faint dawn of a legal existence for woman.

Few are aware of the legal disabilities under which women live, and fewer still see in how many ways they are regarded as property. In order to test the general recognition of woman as an appendage of man, to be governed and protected by him, let us for one moment consider her as an independent being, sustaining herself, and bestowing herself in love upon the man who seems in her judgment to be most divinely hers—conceive of her doing this without reference to law or public opinion—considering herself competent to decide who shall be the recipient of her love and the father of her babe. It is barely possible that society might forgive a woman once for so bestowing herself in love, if she was in no wise a cost, or charge, or if she ministered to some popular want—if she were a great actress, or a great singer, or a skillful physician. But if we contemplate her separating herself from this man whom she voluntarily chose, and whose babes she has borne, to unite herself in the same way to another man, what will be the judgment of society? In the first instance that I have supposed, it is hardly possible that a woman could be forgiven in this country, for thus assuming the ownership of herself. In the second case forgiveness would be an utter impossibility.

Some years since, in England, a very noble woman escaped from a very brutal husband, and came to this country with a man who was her teacher, and who assisted her to escape, and made her talents of great avail to herself and the public.

He has ever since filled the place of lover, husband, and parents to this woman. Still, though she has for years lived in the most civilized fidelity to this relation, she has been publicly taunted by the best portion of the press of this country, within a few months, as being the wife (the property), of the man from whom she had escaped, a man who had many times brutally beaten her—I say she has been taunted with the fact that she was this man's wife, and consequently the harlot of the chosen one of her heart and life.

Now I should not wish to excuse this most lovely woman for leaving her husband by the fact of his brutality. Those who believe that a slave belongs to his master and a woman to her husband, may want to excuse the escape of the victims from both these relations, by the intolerable condition to which the slave and the wife are sometimes reduced. Believing, as I do, that all human beings have a right to themselves; that no man owns me by virtue of my sex, or complexion, I cannot justify myself, or another, for leaving a master because he is a cruel one. Jesus said "Call no man master"—no words were ever spoken more pregnant with wisdom than these. This principle would destroy all obedience to any law but the law of one's own life.

On this principle I stand. If I want advice or instruction I will seek and accept them, but for my acts I alone am responsible. I have been through all sorts of slaveries. I have been the slave of the Church, of the Scriptures and the interpretation that men have given them, of law, and public opinion, and of a marriage that was an abyss of evil that I can never describe. No life was ever

written. I shall write a part of the bitter lives of many, my own included—still it will be but a portion.

The parallel between marriage and slavery has been more perfect than it is now. Formerly, in most of these States, a married woman had no right of property. This is true now in many of the States. The slave has no right of property. Indeed, the first condition of liberty is the right to possess and use property. The time has been when I earned all that my husband possessed. My earnings went into his hands, and he would not allow me six cents unless the purpose for which I wanted it pleased him. I was allowed to work, to lecture for the education and elevation of woman, on condition that I would render into the hands of this man whom the law called my husband, every penny that I earned. The slave does no more than this. He works and renders his wages to his master. The slave does not own his children. They are the property of his master. I did not own mine. The law declared them and the money that I earned the property of this husband. He could choose the place of my abode or service; he could oblige me to bear his children, and he could take my children and my earnings and do what he pleased with both, and all according to law. Now what more can the master do with his slave than this? Is not the parallel complete? One answers, "no, because you consented to be married, and the slave did not consent to be sold." I answer, I was as much kidnapped as thousands of slaves and married women have been, and will be again—and I gave as little my consent to the transaction.

I was persuaded into a promise to marry, and was made to believe that hell was the reward of broken vows. My promise was given when appeals had been made to my benevolence, and I was assured that I might avert great evil if I gave this promise. Under a false excitement I gave my word, and then dared not break it. The day that I married I had no hope but in the death of one of the parties to this miserable union—and many, very many have gone to the altar as sad and hopeless as I was. There was no escape for me. I would have been considered mad, or wicked to the last degree, if I had had the courage to avow my real feeling—my detestation of the man to whom I was married.

The ceremony performed, I became the property of this man. The Church said the Scripture saith, "obey your husband." The Church did not add "in the Lord," who had said, "call no man master." Public opinion and the law demanded obedience to this man, who had no true understanding of my character or wants. He was incapable of self-government, and therefore chose the church for his governor, and was badly enough governed then; but he arrogated the rule over my soul and body, with the utmost confidence. I was to do his bidding. First, I was to work and not read. Reading, except the Bible, and a few "religious books," was a great evil—a waste of time—a sort of dissipation. Next, I was not to write. Poetry was dreaded as the black art was anciently. Stories and novels were still more wicked. I was to go only to his meeting, unless on funeral occasions. I was to hold no friendship with any not of his denomination. I was not to send a letter to any friend,

unless he read it, and if a sentence in it displeased him, I was obliged to destroy the letter. I could not leave the house, or call on a neighbor for fifteen minutes, without his consent, and I was enjoined and expected to "love, honor, and obey" a man who was mean enough to require all this. I could obey him, and I did, nearly to the stultification of all my powers, mental and material. But what woman, who is worthy the name, can love or honor disease, stupidity, and a blind arrogance of authority? Yet the Church and the World said this man's will was to be my law.—He was my husband—I must therefore obey him.

There is a conservative principle in the human mind which makes people cling to institutions, even after all vitality and use have departed from them. This has been seen in the destruction of monarchy, and in the repudiation of the authority of the Church. Men have always feared freedom; and however much confidence each has had in himself, the idea has been prominent that everybody else ought to be taken care of. So far as people need care and government they must have them; but we have learned, as a nation, that the government is best which governs least; and many have learned that individuals are in a better condition of growth when not hindered, than when helped. The babe whose body is tightly swathed in the old fashioned band, till each breath is laborious and painful, whose limbs are denied motion by the fetters of clothing a yard and a half long, is now seen by many to be a very ill-used and injured, if not murdered, child.

When the child sinks into disease under this unwise treatment, a doctor comes with blisters,

bleedings, and deadly poisons, to save the child's life. All that was needed for the infant was freedom—first from the compression and fetters, and next from all poisons and other unhealthy conditions. Life and health are natural, disease and death induced.—Now this same system of repression is practiced upon woman and upon society, that is practiced upon the babe. States are trying to cure their diseases by the allopathy of prisons and the surgery of the gallows. Ministers and doctors are laboring in a manner perfectly analogous. Freedom for all—Individual Liberty to do all we wish, so that we do not unjustly injure others, is a thought just dawning in the minds of those foremost in human culture and development. Old institutions are not made for the new thought of the times. Woman must be an appendage of man, really a slave, till she can sustain herself. We have to make our way out of a wilderness of falsehood. Our best choice is often a choice of evils. Woman cannot be freed but by the wisdom of man. When he knows what her pure, free love is worth; what a high, holy and creative power it is, he will be willing to guarantee freedom to her at the price of his life.

— I have said to men, "Love is marriage. There is no true union but that which is in mutual love. All other marriage is adulterous." My words have seemed sad and shocking, in view, not of their falsity, but of the terrible facts that surround us—facts that every one recognizes, the moment escape is essayed. I feel the force of existing circumstances as much as any one can. Have I not bowed myself in the prison house, and had no more freedom of will or action than my southern

sister, who is *called* a slave?—or than the beast of burden, who obeys in all things a master's will? I know that when I ask freedom for woman it is a new thing under the sun. Thousands of years the blue heavens have bent over woman a slave—the creature of man's care and pleasure. In civilization, the highest state to which the world has reached, the question may be asked for woman, as for the slave, "How can she take care of herself?" I can ask more such questions. What is a woman to do with freedom when it is only liberty to starve body, and soul? When she is owned by a man who can maintain her, though he is loathsome almost as death to her; when her health is utterly lost in bearing his children, and in being the legal victim of his lust; when her children are not hers, but his, according to inexorable law; when she has no power to work, and no means of sustenance but from this owner; when public opinion will brand her with shame, most probably, if she leaves her husband, and most certainly if she enter upon ever so true and loving relations with another man;—what is such a woman to do but to live a false and unholy life? She may have the joy of loving God and her children, but purity and virtue are not for such as she is. A new thought has dawned upon the world—that of fidelity to one's self. The thought of freedom for man has been a glorious inspiration. The earth has been baptized in blood, in the assertion of this thought. The freedom of woman is now to be asserted and achieved. Everywhere fidelity to a husband, though he be a most hateful being, is required of woman. A new gospel and a new requirement comes to her in this day—the gospel

of freedom, and the requirement that she be faithful to herself; that she go not shuddering and loathing to the bed of the drunkard, or any diseased monster, or any honest and good man whom she does not love, because the law and public opinion require this sacrifice, this so-called fidelity to the marriage bond. But the question comes, "How can I be true? How can I do otherwise than to submit to this terrible violation? I have no means to live. I am at this man's mercy. He owns my children, and the property that I earned when I had health, before I was his victim, or that I inherited from my father. He has my good name in his keeping. What can I do for life, for babes which are more than life, for my friends? What can I do but submit to degradation and disease? My little ones need my love and care; my helpless parents depend on my husband for support, and many poor would suffer without the charity that I may give if I remain where I am. Above all, I have no life left to struggle; day after day a weakening hemorrhage drags me downward, or nervous disease unfits me for acting or judging." Alas! all this, and more, is poured into the ear of the physician. Physicians are the world's confessors, and as powerless to give the conditions of purity and health as to give absolution for sin. What can I say to the wretched who seek counsel and comfort? I can only advise them to live in false relations, to live in adultery, as I must consider unloving marriage, so long as the resulting good is greater than the evil.

In the annunciation of principles we are often met with the answer, "What you say may be true, but it is impracticable. It cannot be carried out."

God never made an impracticable truth. The impossible of to-day becomes the possible of to-morrow. Many must die in their sins, but many will live to righteousness. We can conceive of health, and health creating conditions, but we cannot cure the incurable. As I have said, our best choice is often a choice of evils, and we must do right with prudence. Some are for reforming the world in easy chairs, with great honor to themselves, and peace and happiness to others. Something of this may be done. I congratulate all who can do it, but for myself I have little faith in the truth being preached or lived, even now, without much suffering.

It is for me to assert my right to myself; to assert individual sovereignty for woman, as for man; and to give the facts which constitute the pathology of marriage. Although I consider marriage mostly in its results to women and children, I by no means forget that all parties to a false institution are of necessity sufferers. Men are bound to disease and misery; to the burden of supporting the weak and sick; often they go weary and comfortless to the grave, or drown sorrow in drunkenness. I suppose the lot of man is really as hard and bitter as that of woman, but I know woman's life of suffering and endurance better than I do man's—I have more facts to give in her history than in his. I ask for the freedom of all, for the good of all, not for "the greatest good of the greatest number." The human race is one—and I labor and pray for no less an object than the redemption of the human race, and the planet which is our home.

The great need of knowledge is the great hind-

rance to its diffusion. In reforms in morals difficulties are constantly brought forward as arguments. "What is to become of children if parents separate?" What becomes of them now? Little graves, full prisons, miserable, unhealthy, and immoral lives, and no very small allowance to the gallows, answer the question so often asked for the present social order. The great argument which I bring against our present nearly indissoluble marriage is, the children that are born in it.

The most ignorant farmer would not esteem his cow or his horse if they were as unhealthy as his wife. Bloody milk is never eaten; and the thought of sick veal or beef is not pleasantly entertained. Calves and lambs as much "out of health" as our children would not be thought worth raising. We use our common sense to hinder us from having invalid animals, and to improve in every way the breed. What can be done for the improvement of children with indissoluble marriage? People are constantly asking the question, What would become of children if married persons were allowed to separate? *Let me tell conservatism that nine-tenths of the children that now burden the world would never be born.* Couples are held together by their own prejudices and the pressure of public opinion till a child is born. This child belongs to the father, and he wants a housekeeper and a nurse for it; he wants some one to reputably supply the amative want; perhaps the woman may be attractive to him—besides, the whole social mechanism holds this couple as in a vice together. The wife may have an utter indifference to the husband, or a loathing and abhorrence of him; but she must bear more children as a condition of support, and

for the privilege of keeping the babe of her love in her bosom—of having something to fill her poor, desolate heart, and compensate her for a life of impurity which her spirit revolts against, till its oft violated instincts are unable to distinguish good from evil. The sense of smell becomes so depraved by being exposed to bad odors, that foul air becomes pleasant. The sense of taste accepts tobacco after a time as a pleasant thing. The love of purity, the distinction between good and evil, is violated in woman from the cradle. Everybody kisses the baby, and an infant who rejects and chooses is very rare and very disagreeable to the democratic taste of our community. I have known a grandmother drive a child of two years from her presence because the infant did not wish to kiss her, and refused to do the false thing. The general idea and feeling, whether we know it or not, is that woman is property. She has no right to herself if she is married. Nine tenths of the children born in marriage are not desired by the mother, often not by the father, though it is a great blessing that great love is born with them. Women have not, as a universal fact, the passion that asks the sexual indulgence. Vast numbers of the women of civilization have neither the sexual nor maternal passion. All women want love and support. They do not want to bear children, or to be harlots for this love or this support. In marriage as it at present exists, the instinct against bearing children and against submitting to the amative embrace, is almost as general as the love for infants after they are born. The obliteration of the maternal and sexual instincts in woman is a terrible pathological fact. It has not been defined by theologians, phy-

sicians, or political economists. People know no more its meaning than they know the meaning of purity in woman.

A healthy and loving woman is impelled to material union as surely, often as strongly, as man. Would it not be great injustice in our Heavenly Father to so constitute woman as to suffer the pangs of childbirth with no enjoyment of the union that gives her a babe. The truth is that healthy nerves give pleasure in the ultimates of love with no respect to sex; and the same exhausted and diseased nerves, that deny to woman the pleasures of love, give her the dreadful pangs of childbirth.

The apathy of the sexual instinct in woman is caused by the enslaved and unhealthy condition in which she lives. Many inherit from mothers, who are victims in unloving marriage, the diseased amateness that makes them early subject to masturbation; and this habit destroys the health of the nervous system. Others inherit an apathetic state that does not impel them to any material union. Healthy and loving women are destroyed by being made bond-women, having no spontaneity, and bearing children more rapidly than they ought, and in unhealthy condition.

I have in my mind now a fact that will shock moralists sufficiently. A lady had borne a large number of children in a hateful marriage in great suffering, and had never known any pleasure in the sexual union. Her husband was at last induced by principle, by a sense of her rights, and sorrow for her great suffering, to protect her in bearing a child to a man she did love. With this child of love she knew no pain, and had the heaven-ordained

happiness that sin only has severed from the ultimates of love.

Will the world forever cling to its crimes and diseases, and crucify those who tell the truth?

I might have suppressed this instance, and have given many illustrations of the same truth drawn from happy and unhappy marriages, but I choose to show my utter contempt and abhorrence of the law of man when it contravenes the Higher Law, the law of Health and Purity. These opinions, "scandalous" and revolutionary as they are, and shocking as they must seem to moralists who obey arbitrary laws, are sacred to me. If I am mad, and speak not the words of truth and soberness, my fidelity to God and the faith in my own soul, must win the respect of honest men and women, whilst libertines, without law or according to law, must curse me by a necessity of their nature.

A delicate, nervous, and unhealthy girl marries. Every right-judging person may know that she has no ability to bear children. She may live to have half a dozen abortions or miscarriages, and to be subjected to more amative abuse than any paid harlot, to have less liberty of refusal and of self-protection, as much loathing, and not even the chance of choice that the unmarried prostitute has; and yet the murder of this woman, and the numberless violations of her purity and her person, have the sanction of the law and the church. There is but one drop of comfort in the bitter cup she is compelled to drink. She is self-justified in her degradation and destruction. She is the victim of a "Divine Institution," and believes in the ~~rightness of her life and death~~, as the slaves of an Eastern despot consider it an honor to be slain by

the sword of royalty. This gentle being, so loving to God that she is the meekest child of the Church, so submissive to man as to assert no instinct of her heart or life, feeling that she has "no rights, only duties," that her husband is her head, that she is to have no will but his, that she was made for smiles and submission, has still the strength to spurn a healthy, loving woman who, in the assertion of a divine right, should give herself to the man of her heart, in obedience to the Higher Law, but in violation of the law of the land. This sick and sensitive child of unrecognized sin, who perhaps abhors her husband, and has no more power worthily to fill the place of wife than she has to carry burdens with Hercules, would think her husband a most wicked wretch if in his healthy instinct he should turn from her and choose a woman who could return life and love for the same gifts, and bear him healthy, and beautiful, and good children. And she would spurn just as much and without discrimination her poor sister prostitute, who allowed herself to be destroyed without law, as she herself is destroyed within the pale of established law and order. When it is everywhere understood and believed that union without love is prostitution, the multitude who now say, "Stand by, I am holier than thou," will be greatly diminished. Prostitution, or union without love in marriage and out of it, is the sin of civilization. Its consequences are every where revealed in sickness and suffering. No word is so terrible to a civilized woman as prostitute and its synonyms. Its real meaning will be more terrible still when once it is known.

In the freest newspaper in this free country, the

assertion of what constitutes purity in woman, was refused insertion, on the ground that it was "unfit," meaning indecently "unfit for publication." I subjoin the statement that was refused, that an enlightened public may see what Mr. Greeley of the *New York Tribune* considered "*unfit*" for the columns of his paper.

✱ The woman who is truly emancipated, who has health, in the deep significance of that word—health of body and of spirit—who believes in God, and reverently obeys his laws in herself—this woman is pure, and a teacher of purity. She needs no human law for the protection of her chastity; virtue is to her something more than a name and a regulation—something far other than a legal restriction. It is high as the sky above Mr. Greeley's lower law, and just as far removed from all license. Such a woman has a Heaven conferred right to choose the father of her babe.

"We say man has the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; yet he abuses life, falls into bondage, and seeks and does not find happiness. The woman who chooses the father of her child may go as far wrong. The failure of freedom to bring wisdom and right action at once, is no argument against freedom. Because woman has not equitable and attractive industry and adequate remuneration, and cannot, therefore, appropriately maintain the babe she would bear and love, does that abrogate her right to be a mother? Did not God make her to be the mother of the race? and the healthy mother of healthy children? If she is fixed in indissoluble marriage with a man she must abhor—a selfish, sensual tyrant—who makes her his victim and perpetuates

in her children his lust of flesh and of gain, and all the deep damnation of his nature, must Woman lie prone under all this, suffering and transmitting the disease and crime which are its ordained product, because it is according to law?

"Often the greatest crime a man can commit is to reproduce himself, though it be done legally.

"We *must* have a Maine Law and capital punishment for the children born of hate in indissoluble marriage. Hundreds of women in such marriage murder their children rather than bear them.

"Intemperance, madness, murder, and all other vices, are hereditary. Shall indissoluble marriage go on, year after year, producing so many thieves, drunkards, prostitutes, and murderers, and in pre-assignable proportions—so mathematical in its operation—and remain unquestioned? Or shall it be honored with such defenders as Mr. Greeley, who whitewash it with legal sanctity in our Legislatures, and plead, through the public press, for Maine Laws to restrain and punish the murderers, and seducers, and drunkards born in its decent, and respectable, and legal limits?

"There is a large and increasing class of women in our land who know what purity is. They know that it is not an exhausted nervous system, which prompts to no union—which enables them to walk quietly in the common thoroughfare of custom. They know, also, that it is not fidelity to a legal bond, where there is no love—where there is force on one side and fear on the other—where rascals are born by immutable God's law, and where diseases are engendered that make the grave an earnestly coveted refuge from "lawful" whoredom.

“ Could any Woman, worthy the name—any other than a legal slave—*choose* to bear worse children than those we hang out of our way—than those who become seducers out of marriage, and destroyers in it ?

“ In the Medical College, at Albany, there is an exposition of indissoluble marriage, which should be studied by all those who begin to see that a legalized union may be a most impure, unholy, and, consequently, unhealthy thing. In glass vases, ranged in a large cabinet in this medical museum, are uterine tumors, weighing from half a pound to twenty four pounds. A viscus that in its ordinary state weighs a few ounces, is brought, by the disease caused by amative excess—in other words, licentiousness and impurity—to weigh more than twenty pounds. Be it remembered, these monstrosities were produced in lawful and indissoluble wedlock. The wives and mothers who perished of these evils, and left this terrible lesson to the world, knew only of legal purity. *They* lived in obedience to the Law of Marriage—pious, virtuous, reputable, ignorant women. God grant that their suffering be not in vain ! God grant that they may be the Teachers of Purity, who being dead yet speak !

“ In an age hardly past, ‘ Honor God and the King ’ was the great commandment. In this age, ‘ Honor God and a Husband ’ holds the same place. Men have learned that the first contains a solecism ; Women are learning the same lesson of the last.”

CHAPTER II.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF LAW.

It may be asked, How are we to live in the world without conforming to the law of marriage? Public opinion is above law. A few years since, divorce without deep disgrace was impossible. That day is past, to the deep sorrow of conservatism. Marriage is not the indissoluble thing, the *fate* from which there is no escape, that it was a few years since. People dare to think of emancipation, and they dare achieve it. A pretty large number of intellectual and excellent New England women have become fugitives from the marriage institution within a few years. They have since married men who believed in their right to change, if they had once loved their husbands from whom they separated, and in their right to themselves. I do not know an instance of divorce which has occurred under my own observation, where the condition of the wife has not been greatly improved, and in most instances that of the husband has been quite as much bettered. The condition of the children of these unhappy marriages, when removed from the discord of an unloving home, has been as much improved as that of the parents. The most serious evil in the lot of these persons has been the degree of disgrace and ostracism that conservatism has been able to effect. This is becoming less every year; and I have heard the fact adduced as an evidence of both progress and degeneracy by

persons of different opinions. People gravely ask me if I would advise young lovers not to marry. I advise all to be true to their highest idea of right so far as they can. A wigwam is a poor shelter, but better than none. An isolate household in a convenient domicile, is a vast improvement over the wigwam. The unitary home of the next era to civilization—the associative, or harmonic era—will be as far removed from the home of civilized life, as that is beyond the tent of the Arab, or the hut of the savage.

People who love can unite to protect each other's rights even when the law deprives them of these rights. My husband can respect my individuality, my freedom, my fidelity to myself, and protect me as no other human being can in the present state of society, and he can profane and injure me as no other can. If marriages can be leagues for mutual protection, they may be of great use, till society shall change so much as to make purity possible, without the present penalties which go far toward annihilating it.

New York is considered one of the best and freest states. There is a law by which property is in some way secured to women, but with such disabilities that only those who have friends enough to care for them without law seem to be much benefited. Two recent cases illustrative, are in my mind now.

A sweet Irish girl came to me some years since as a servant. She was very pretty and very good, and industrious. I encouraged her to lay up her wages, and put the money in the bank for her so that it would draw interest. I observed an ill-looking fellow who came often to see her, and

when I discovered that she disliked him I sent him away. After a time he came again, and by constantly following and teasing the girl, he at last made her promise to marry him. I might have wondered how all this was brought about, when the girl really disliked the man, but I remember that I had been kidnapped by a man equally distasteful to me. Young and foolish women do very unaccountable things in the repressions, slavery, and monotony of the society in which they live, and these very mistakes might be brought as arguments against their being allowed self government. It may be said "they make such bad marriages that they ought not to be trusted with themselves." The falls of an infant and its burns are as good arguments against its being allowed to walk, or make the acquaintance of fire; and besides, we don't condemn the child never to get up when it falls, and never to get out of the fire which is burning its flesh.

My servant married the young man to whom she was promised. She took the money she had saved, and furnished a little home. The first month he paid the rent, but made no other provision, and came home drunk every night. At the end of three months he sold the household furniture, and the young wife found herself literally turned into the street, without a penny. We had left the city, but a girl who had formerly lived with us loaned her money to come to us, and she has not again left us. She has had no information since of the scamp whom she has sworn to "love, honor and obey," but by the law of the State, and the church to which she belongs, she is a wife, and must remain so always. Certainly, there is one

crime which by the law of this State would divorce her; but she has no means or opportunity to avail herself of this provision of the law. I believe if she does not see or hear from the husband for seven years, she is considered entitled to a divorce by our law, if she can pay for it; but if the poor, drunken wretch should stagger against her in the street once during that time, or commit an outrage on her person, it takes away her claim. I think, however, that she has no desire for any farther experience of the peculiar institution, and will never seek a divorce to marry again.

Another case now pending comes to my thought. Some years since, a young woman attended my lectures in this city, and sought my acquaintance. She was the daughter of a clergyman, had an inquiring mind, some culture, and great conscientiousness. She was very uncongenially married. Her husband was a well-meaning, sick, and very wilful man. She had a family of children, who were diseased from the father, and they all died at an early age. She had but one living. She tried Water-cure for them with our best skill and care, but death was their inevitable doom. They were not born to live, but to die. The history of her suffering and anguish in bearing and burying these children, her unwillingness to be only a death-breeding animal, with no choice in anything—loathing her bonds, her heart lacerated by the sickness and death of her babes, who never lived to the age of two years except in one instance; she had one little girl who numbered five years, and who was an angel to the mother, but the doom was upon her also, and the mother was stricken to the very dust by her death;—all this tale of sorrow is

but the experience of many. The story of one slave, with slight variations, deeper and lighter shades of misery, is the story of another. After the death of this last child, I invited the lady to become a pupil in our Hydropathic Institute. I thought at the time not much of the future, but of her depressed and terrible present. She would be occupied, and the memory of her trouble might be dimmed, and so I gave her a ticket to the lectures of the Institute. She was a good and earnest scholar, thoughtful beyond many. I remember how new truths startled her, but how intellect and conscience always triumphed. She, with others, was shocked by my saying, in a lecture to the class in 1851, that a woman should decide when she would bear a babe, and should choose the father of her child. This annunciation of what seemed to me a natural and inalienable right, was met in the class with a little astonishment, though soon accepted. In the world it was considered the synonym of license. (See p. 205, statement refused insertion in the *New York Tribune*.)

On repeating my lecture to her husband, the lady was met by assurances of the great danger of such doctrines. Now for one moment let us contemplate this danger. This mother would refuse in time, when fully convinced of the evil, to be this man's property. She would cease to give her body to pollution, and suffering babes would not be born to agonize through a short life, and die early and dreadful deaths. She would not be the drudge of an isolate household, cooking pork and other edibles for a gluttonous man, ministering to the base of his brain and life, and blotting out all useful and pleasant existence for herself. All this dan-

ger has been realized. This woman in two years has grown to the assertion of her right to herself. She is truthful and conscientious. She refuses any longer to be a wife; and her husband, whose property she has helped to accumulate, whose children she has borne and nursed into their little graves, this man declares she shall leave his home without one dollar. He says she shall go into the street with only her clothing upon her, or go to a place he has provided, which would be a worse than prison. She has been his care-taker, his servant; she has soothed his sickness and his sorrow, and would be always his friend, for she is a kind and gentle woman, and knows what good is in him better than any other. But he wants a wife, a subservient wife, and not a friend. She cannot consent to be this convenient harlot; and the consequence is, with a man of low development, that he makes war upon her, deprives her of every penny of the property she has earned, because it is his by law; he deprives her of her good name so far as is possible; accuses her of adultery, and does all he can to destroy her—and yet she is conscious that she has only to violate her thought of purity, to give herself to this man as a wife, and all would be changed. He would then protect his property, and prosecute, perhaps with the utmost rigor, any who should repeat his own slanders.

But a new conscience is being born in woman. This lady, a gentle, timid creature, fearful of offending, and disposed in all ways to surrender her own rights, has become strong to do as well as to suffer. She has learned the meaning of purity. She has a conscience now, in rebellion, as she has had in submission. She has not only

become convinced that her union with her husband was adulterous, but also that she is her own—that she has a right to bestow her love and her person upon a good man, who gives her love and life in return. She will get divorced, if possible, but if this is denied, she will live her own true, pure and loving life, as far as disgrace, poverty and persecution will allow her to do so.

She understands Water-cure well; she is a good physician and a good nurse; she lives purely and simply on a vegetable diet, and is a water drinker. She knows the worth of character and the worldly value of reputation, but she will starve sooner than be any longer a legal prostitute. Many such women are growing amongst us. The revolution of pure principles has begun. It may have many martyrs; but though we make our way amid social ostracism, through prisons, or over crosses, we will yet reach freedom, purity, self-ownership.

The age has dawned in which woman shall stand between God and man, the arbiter of her own fate and the medium of inspiration, not to an owner, but to another self. This will be a sublime and heavenly life. Woman, with the internal riches of health, and the external riches which attractive and properly remunerated industry must give, is a sublime conception, and will be a sublime actualization. Babes will no longer be born in hate, and nurtured in deception and discord, when woman owns herself and gives herself only for love. When man ceases to recognize woman as property, and when she ceases to regard herself as such, then she will be truly a responsible being—an individual, obeying God in the laws of her own nature, instead of enthralling and deceiving, and being enslaved and deceived.

There is a wide difference between a woman having the right of property, and the woman who does not own any garment that she wears, provided she is married. There will be a vastly wider difference in the new world of equity and attractive industry, where there will be self-reliance and freedom ; where there will be no forced maternity, no hateful marriages, and no sacrifice of the affections ; where will be all the life of true liberty that comes from attraction gratified ; where no fear of infamy, starvation, and the robbery of her infants shall force woman to be impure. I have myself had these words addressed to me : "If thou separate from me, I will take thy child from thee and blast thy name. Public opinion is such, that a woman who leaves her husband can be ruined in reputation, and I will see that it is done in thy case if thou dare to leave me !"

People talk of the sanctity of marriage. Is there any sanctity where there is force on the one side, and fear on the other ? And yet men have no faith in themselves, and less than none in women. They say, "We must keep to such a state as this for fear we should fall into something worse." The perpetuation of hate, discord, and impurity in children, is the lowest and worst that I can conceive for our human race.

I was recently conversing with a popular clergyman on the subject of evil marriages and their indissolubility. He was giving some instances to show how fiend-like people can be to each other, when bound remedilessly in a bundle of antipathies. I said, "Do you believe in such marriage?"

"No," said he, "but I tell people I do, for fear they will fall into something worse." *Something*

worse! One might well be curious to see that something. Milton speaks of a lower depth than the lowest deep.

Because I speak of the false and evil, I am by no means unconscious of the good and true. There is much love and consequent sanctity in our marriages; but there are sad mistakes, and horrible, adulterous unions. When marriage becomes what it must be in a true freedom, *union in love*, it will be divinely beautiful. When it is a bargain, a sacrifice, made from other motives than affection, and, besides, is indissoluble, it is shocking to all true moral sense. When we consider love as alone sanctifying the union of the sexes, then we see the necessity of divorce, to prevent people living in adultery, who have married without love, or who have ceased to love after marriage.

After all, better beings are wanted more than better laws. The divine law of love would take the place of all other laws most worthily, were men and women ready to admit it in their hearts and lives. I know worthy families, the heads of which are self-divorced, and happily married again, the children living with father or mother as they choose; and yet the question continues to be asked, What will become of children if parents separate? I say again, the real want of the world is better men, and better women. Woman wants wisdom to understand the law of her life, and freedom to act in accordance with it.

But what a fact it is, in this nineteenth century, that a brutal husband—in other words, owner—has the legal right to turn the noblest and truest woman into the street, without a penny of ever so large a property, that she may have earned or in-

herited! He can turn her out with only the clothes she has on her person; and if another man takes her away, and protects and provides for her, the husband can sue him for the garments she wore when he thrust her forth. It may be said the husband has no legal right to thrust out his wife. If she assumes the ownership of herself, and bestows any caress upon another man, the law would not punish him should he kill the man she may thus favor; and if she is ever so "faithful" to her husband, he can choose her place of abode, and make her so wretched that it is equivalent to making her an outcast.

Who ever heard of a husband being prosecuted for slandering his wife? and yet the most terrible wrongs have been inflicted on wives in this way. When I first opened a Water-cure house in New York, I heard from every quarter that my husband stated that I kept a brothel—(if I had kept a house of infamy, he found that there was one sensualist who could not be admitted into it)—and this black-hearted calumny was believed and circulated amongst those whose natures were like his. He would thus have deprived me and my child of food and clothing; he would have starved and frozen us, if he could have done so, with as firm a will, and probably as good a conscience, as caused the death of so many, in the days of crosses and martyr fires. I do not say God forgive him!—there are sins for which we cannot pray; but I pray for his growth out of these evils, and that a consequent happier life may be his.

CHAPTER III.

FIDELITY TO THE LAW OF ONE'S OWN LIFE.

THE good that is possible to us is ours ; only this—freedom, emancipation, elevation, come to us, or we come to them, in the process of growth. Woman needs now to know what is right. Her conscience is to be trusted when she knows. Her fidelity to a master will be equalled by her fidelity to truth, when she understands it. Now she is faithful to law and authority, to death, and a protracted and most miserably suffering life and death.

The work of informing women in this country began some twenty years since, or more. Different persons have been schoolmasters to woman, to give her a knowledge of herself, and to lead her to see and acknowledge the laws of health, and the laws of mind, and the great truth that she is the owner of herself, that she is to be faithful to her own nature. Some of these teachers will be the first to repudiate this deduction from their teachings—the first to brand woman with a name of infamy, if she assumes to be a law to herself. I am well aware that the great majority of women need masters, as much as the slaves. They can't take care of themselves. The measure of freedom really possible to us, is what we know how to enjoy and use, without harm to ourselves, or others. "The sovereignty of the individual at his own cost," is probably the best expression we can find of our right to freedom ; common ideas of right

and wrong are so conventional and unnatural, that they are despicable, and yet each individual should be faithful to his conscience, though he do a wrong. Thus he will make experiences that will instruct him in what is best and right. If his acts are very mischievous, his neighbors will defend themselves by restraining and punishing him, and thus aid in educating the ignorant. The government that governs least is best, because it allows the largest experience, and consequent education. Why should I not think as I please, or rather as I must? Why should I not act as I choose, so long as I do no wrong to another? The idea of self-ownership has come to a few women in different ages of the world—to more in this than any previous age. Still the number is very limited at present, who recognise no authority but their own highest sense of right. Most women will quote the Bible as authority for their bondage. They believe that they are bound to obey their husbands. I once believed that I ought to obey my husband, if my life languished in consequence, if my usefulness were destroyed, and happiness were unknown to me. Recently a lady called on me with reference to becoming a student in Water-cure with us. She had read our writings on Water-cure, and believed in us as teachers. She had not read Esoteric Anthropology, or our Journal. Her husband had read the book, and disapproved part of it. I counselled her to read and understand us. Said I, "You owe it to yourself and your friends, to the husband who sustains you, to understand our ideas before you seek our Institution, especially as your husband does not wholly approve the work which we think most valuable."

Lady. "My husband is willing to trust me, wherever I may choose to go. He is not afraid that I will get wrong opinions, or do wrong."

"Still," said I, "it is right that you should know our belief. I believe in being faithful to my deepest love, my highest idea of duty. If that involves fidelity to my husband, or any one else, it is well; if not, it is well. Do you not see how this opinion cuts up by the roots the idea of fidelity in marriage, as commonly received? The common idea is, that a woman must be faithful to her husband, the husband to his wife. They must admit no other love in their lives. Dr. Nichols and I have a very different faith. We believe in fidelity to the law of our own life; if this bind us together in the loving and heavenly union in which we have lived since our great love came to us, we shall be happy, and thankful for the blessing. If not, we must each be true to the life-law, and not in bondage to one another."

L. "Do you not believe that there is adultery? Do you not fear it? What says the word of God respecting adultery and fornication?"

I answered—"We believe there is adultery and fornication. Union without love constitutes to us these great crimes against God and man. We charge indissoluble marriage with causing these crimes, and the criminals that are born of unloving union. A child born of mutual love, and nurtured in it, can never be a criminal."

L. "But if people were left free, they would love more than one, and the Bible says, a man should be the husband of one wife."

"There is a slight inaccuracy," said I, "in your Biblical quotation. 'A bishop should be the hus-

band of one wife.' I do not assert that freedom would, or would not bring a plurality of marital loves. If it did, if the highest and the truest development should give many such loves to human beings, I should not complain of God and growth. But I do not see what manner of beings we shall be. I see what we are now. Women are sick unto death, weak, wretched, useless to a great degree. I ask that woman be left free from the oppression of unequal laws, from being the victim of legal lust. I find in my own heart one highest, most integral love. If another woman as honestly finds many just as precious loves, I cannot complain. Love is a blessing I would pray for, not a curse from which I would escape."

L. "But suppose women should have children by different men?"

"I have had children by two different men," said I, "and my only sorrow respecting the fact is, that I did not love one of the fathers. If a woman marries seven husbands in succession, and has a child by each, you do not complain of her, provided she was seven times legally married, and seven times a widow. Suppose these men were each dead to her, or suppose she loved them all in turn, and continued to love them, what harm is it to you? Does the fact of her great love hurt you? Would the loving union of one man with seven women, and of one woman with seven men, provided no health law were violated, and no harm in any way done to society—would this love be a curse to you, or to others? Mark me. I am not pleading for a plurality of love relations, but for freedom, and truth. I want no liberty to violate one

law of my nature, or to trespass upon one right of another."

L. "Your doctrine would lead to promiscuous intercourse—and to children by different men—children who would not be taken care of."

"Do you think that women are so sensual that they would rush into promiscuous intercourse, when now, more than nine-tenths deprecate sexual union as a great evil, and do not wish to have children."

L. "I think the majority of women do not wish this intercourse, and do not wish to have children. But some would go all wrong."

"By your admission then," said I, "sensuality would be much lessened by freedom, and the number of children greatly diminished." *W. P. 202*

L. "I know many women who are being destroyed by the sensuality of their husbands, but I am not prepared to say that they should be released from their marriage vow. I am willing to leave this subject; I want to learn Water-cure; girls get married for a home; there is a great deal of wrong in the world; I want to do good, and think I can do more as a physician than any other way."

I said, "I am prepared to say that the marriage vow is not binding, in truth and right, upon the poor wretches who are its victims—who are subjected to greater sin and suffering often than women in a brothel. You may alleviate this suffering, but you cannot cure, while the cause remains. Many a wretched wife have I strengthened by Water-cure to return to her bonds, or to remain in them, and to be more a victim, more a harlot than before—especially if she received light enough to be no longer self-justified. I will always relieve suffering

whilst I can, but my business now is to dig up the root of this giant evil—this universal disease of woman.”

I think I threw a little light upon this woman's mind, but prejudice, custom, authority bind her. I think she was convinced that Dr. Nichols and I were exposing the evils of marriage, from the center of a holy and happy union ; that we were pleading for a principle, and not advocating a licentious life. It is much when people have purity enough to see and feel this—for many see in our assertion of freedom only the wish to do evil, to engage in some foul sensuality. Such judgment recoils with terrible force upon those who render it, although they suppose they are doing something very creditable to their honesty and purity.

The hereditary evils to children born in a sensual and unloving marriage are everywhere visible. They are written in every lineament of the Present,—sensuality, sickness, suffering, weakness, imbecility, or outrageous crime. I speak what I know, and testify what I have seen in a long and varied medical practice, when I assert that masturbation in children, and every evil of sensuality, spring from the polluted hot-bed of a sensual and unloving marriage, where woman is subjected to a destroying sensualism during pregnancy and lactation. I have been consulted by mothers for children born without love, where the mother was subjected to intercourse during pregnancy. The children seemed incurable masturbators, and though with good intellect and much clear perception, and delicacy, and modesty, it was often a work of time, and much labor and care to cure them. I have also known cases where subsequent children, born in a second

marriage which was loving and healthful, had no such tendency. They were pure from birth, as the first were impure.

CHAPTER IV.

ILLUSTRATIVE CASES.

A LADY of intelligence and worth, formerly having a high position in New York city, although she does not now reside there, was for a long time my patient. She had the following experience: She married a man for whom she had a most adoring love. Owing to a false and unhealthy birth and training, this woman had not the amative passion, and had a very weak nervous system. The husband was a strong man, exceedingly sensual, living in the usual false and stimulating manner, and drinking largely of wine and ardent spirits, though not so as to hinder him from being a fascinating member of society, and a good business man, for some years. The first child born to them was a delicate girl, partaking of the best mental characteristics of the two parents, but sensualized so as to be a victim of masturbation from an early age, and to have always a very slight hold on life. The next child was a coarse animal, whom it seemed impossible to cultivate above a very low degree, and who was a mortification to his mother and friends. Before the birth of this second child, the father had sunk into a degrading sensuality, and

was often drunk. He abused his wife in such a manner that she had ten abortions in succession. She was reduced by constant bleeding, and by the demands made upon her strength by her drunken and brutal husband, to the very verge of the grave. In this condition she obtained a little rest, and two years after bore an idiot child. Her husband had meanwhile become so poor that he allowed her to go to her relatives for a little time. Here I first saw her, and urged her to assert her right to herself, so far as to separate from her husband. She was nearly insane, and weak and wretched to the last degree.

The husband came for her after a few weeks, and she refused to go with him. She had the advice and sympathy of one sister, and my sympathy, though I had not then separated from my first husband; but I was thinking much on the subject, and the facts in this case were so revolting that I was sure she would be justified. It was not so, however. She was severely blamed by many, and her good name shamefully blackened, and for no reason but that she left this man. She slowly recovered her health, and maintained herself and children by needle-work for a time. Her two eldest children married, and she finally sought a home in a foreign land, with her idiot daughter—going with friends who needed her care and skill, for with recovered health she developed great capacity for usefulness. A volume would not tell this woman's suffering; but I verily believe her hardest trial was in bearing entirely unmerited abuse and scandal from a *virtuous* community, because she freed herself from a drunken, sensual scoundrel, whom she had promised to "love,

honor, and obey." Many times I have parted my last dollar or my last shilling with her, when we were both likely to be starved by the outraged morality of the Christian public, that we could easily have conciliated by giving up our bodies and spirits to the oppression and whoredom of a system as much worse than Juggernaut as its mischiefs are more universal.

The world says such fugitives are licentious—they want a lascivious liberty. The world blunders insanely. Woman asks love, not licentiousness. Alas, poor, desolate woman! The evils of indissoluble marriage are by no means confined to woman. They reflect upon man with terrible power whilst the union continues, and his hereditary evils can never be reckoned. It is painful to me to lay bare the secrets of the confessional, for facts confided to a physician are truly such, but evils to be cured must be known. Each particular case that I shall give is the representative of a class. I have now in my mind two cases which were of a very painful kind, and were perhaps as afflictive to the husband as to the wife. A lady of great beauty, refinement, and culture, was for some years my patient. She was the daughter of a sea captain, and had inherited scrofula, and a diseased amativeness, which early made her the victim of masturbation. Her health was always bad in consequence of the inherited scrofula, and the drain upon her system by solitary vice. She was pious and conscientious in the highest degree. She was considered the holiest woman in the church to which she belonged. Her husband was one of the healthiest men in the world, with a more perfect phrenological development than is

seen in many thousands of men. They married for love, loving each other devotedly. The amative want had been destroyed in this woman previous to marriage, by the false gratification, and a disease induced which was called leucorrhea, but which had all the characteristics of malignant gonorrhea. The husband was infected with it, and on consulting a physician found that it was not uncommon. He was set apart from his wife and cured, but no treatment availed to cure her. The scrofulous matter seemed constantly drained from the system by this malignant discharge, and the husband was constantly diseased. She had children rapidly, who were as much diseased as one must expect from such a mother. Not having the amative want, she came to have the opinion that it was an impurity and sin. She constantly drove her husband from her by this opinion, and her disease, till all love was destroyed between them, and he at length became the lover of another woman—a woman pure, refined, healthy and intelligent as himself. His love only caused him misery, for he was bound forever to a hopelessly diseased woman, who could give him no marital happiness, and who yet held him in an iron clutch as her husband. Though she no longer loved him, and knew that his love for her was gone, she kept to the letter of the law, and thus the light of life was forever darkened for two human beings. Without the marriage relation she would have been a woman possessing great beauty and fascination, and able to diffuse much happiness in her sphere in life. When she had health enough to go into society, she was a star of the first magnitude. In the church she was greatly esteemed—

mast.

in the female prayer meeting she was the most gifted. But she was wholly unfit to be a wife or a mother. She tortured her husband by constant nervous disease. She gave him sick and wretched children, for whom in the bitterness of his anguish he was almost disposed to take his own life. She burdened his life with a loathsome disease, and she crucified a high and pure love for another woman, who could have blessed him and herself with a true and noble happiness. Then the children of this union—who shall write the history of their inherited evil? Most of them were born, and all of them were nurtured, in great discord—a discord intensified by the culture, refinement, and capacity for suffering in all parties. Ten children have been born in that miserable marriage. Five of them live to curse their children and society with the sad inheritance of scrofula and sin—of unloving and discordant life, which indissoluble marriage has forced into so many human souls and bodies. Can God forgive such marriage and such birth? Never. It is the unpardonable sin, that He will punish through generations, till love fulfills the law of life, and redeems the wretched.

Another instance of this kind, though not so aggravated in its character, nor attended with like results, is revived in my memory. A lady of the finest intellect, most devoted piety, great fascination and charm of manner and qualities, but delicate and weak in health, was loved and sought in marriage by a truly great man; one of the best our present age has had the good fortune to produce. This lady was from an early age a victim of diseased amativeness in the form of solitary vice. Her standard of purity was that uncon-

sciously adopted by the Church and the world, that a woman should be "chaste as ice;"* that there should be no attraction felt by her, or, at least, manifested for the masculine principle; that all such attraction derogates from feminine purity and propriety. This lady, as hundreds of others have done, brought her disease and false virtue to me. She told me that she felt herself pure, that God had delivered her from all temptation to a sensual life. That though she loved her husband most tenderly, she had never the slightest sensual attraction toward him. He was a man of great strength, and delicacy, and beauty of character; she said though not delivered by God from the temptation to amative indulgence, he still respected her slightest wish, and was as separate from her, as if not her husband, and yet perfectly faithful to the bond of marriage.

She gave him great credit for his forbearance toward her, and his self government, but lamented very sincerely his temptations to a sensual life. In the early years of her marriage she had several times miscarried, proving that she had no right to be a mother, for she was placed in the best conditions for bearing her children, and yet was not able to nourish the foetus above three or four

* I remember a distinguished Physiologist once boasted to me that his wife was "chaste as ice." The poor creature was so destroyed by amative disease, that the uterus was nearly or quite cancerous, and the marital union was of course a terror and a curse to her, in such a situation. The comfort the husband found in such condition was, that his wife was "chaste as ice"—that she would never be tainted by the breath of scandal—that she was a woman of undoubted piety and purity. Purity!! Pah!

months. She told me the story with self righteous complacency, and yet she was full of sorrow for her husband. Whilst she talked, I silently took the measure of my auditor and patient. Could she understand me? Would she confess that she was a victim to masturbation? Could she know how false, diseased, and impure she was, and could she be made to see that her noble and self sacrificing husband was a true, pure and natural human being. I mentally answered my own questions in the affirmative.

"My dear," said I, "you are very sick and weak. Your nervous system is drained of its life. It is not natural, or true, for woman to be without the amative passion. It is a great wrong in her nature when she is deprived of the wish and power for amative pleasure. She is diseased, and this disease has a cause." "What is the cause?" said she, thoughtfully. "Atony of the nervous system from birth, or a diseased amativeness that causes solitary vice, and thus results in the same atonic condition which is termed virtue and purity in woman." I talked on in this way—she bowed her beautiful head in tears and deep humiliation. So sudden and woman-like was her perception, that she saw her life of falseness, her whole inheritance of evil, and all the injustice she had done her husband at a glance.

"From a child," said she, "I was given to solitary vice, until I was old enough to feel that it must be wrong, and then I lost all wish for the indulgence, doubtless through exhaustion, and from coming to take cold baths, and live very simply. I thought I was pure because I felt no amative want—no material attraction to my husband. I

see the whole broad web of wrong." So much she saw ; but if any had then spoken to her of allowing her husband to love another, to have a child by another, who was ever so great and true, and able to bear a child worthy of him, then all the power of an originally great woman, all the strength and bitterness of bigotry, all the selfishness of arbitrary, personal property, would have burst forth. I could do just what I did—unveil her sick state to her—no more ; the feeling of personal and arbitrary property in a husband or wife, or lover, is the last and innermost evil from which humanity is to be redeemed. Very few on the earth have a dawning of the idea of this redemption. If you speak of freedom to love all that is lovely, the best persons around you seem to think you intend to violate the conjugal principle. The odor of all flowers belongs to me, so far as I can receive and enjoy it. If I pluck a single flower it is mine, but it withers in my keeping. All who attempt to hold property in a lover, a husband, or wife, will find blasting and death come to their possessions. The feeling of the slaveholder is, "That man, or that woman, is *mine*. No one else has a right to their labor." The feeling of marriage is, "He is *my* husband and has no right to love another : she is *my* wife and I alone have the right to her person and her love." There is no redemption for either of these classes, but in growth. The first lesson for the world now seems to be, that love is not a sin, not an evil—but a great good, an enlivening and creative principle ; that we make it an evil by our selfish claims in our poverty of being, and in our legal enactments which correspond to the internal poverty of our

life. The next lesson is, that one true love never conflicts with another—that we do not love one child less because we have many to love, or one friend less because we have many friends; that we love the rose no less because we love the lily, or the pink, or orchards full of apple blossoms. I know how mean minds will drag down what I have just said, into the mud of their own unsanctified materialism. Nevertheless, I must bear testimony to the highest truth I know, though I should wait the remnant of my life to be understood by any considerable number of persons.

A high and varied culture, and freedom of the affections, will redeem people inevitably from the absorbing evil of a predominating sensualism. The mere material union without love will no more be sought than we should build fires in an orange grove amid the warmth and perfume of summer. When men and women live together in a loving freedom, eating bread and fruits, and daily bathing in pure cold water, and obeying the law of exercise in a healthful and attractive industry; when they know the laws of health and obey them, then they will know who is most dear to them.

Whatever the life law of the affections may be, it is only in a pure, healthy, and free society that it is to be learned.

The slavery, and consequent unsanctified sensuality of the present and past, have debased and degraded the world's idea of material union, until their thought is as impure as their deed. The human mind must be redeemed from this impurity and disgust, and love is the only redemption. The law of life and of growth, of all good, is—We must be free to act, so long as we do not unjustly interfere with the well-being of others.

CHAPTER V.

FACTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

THE world is full of aspirations of prayer and of earnest endeavor after a true and pure life. The young often think they can live purely, truly; that they can speak all the truth that is clearly revealed in their minds. Of this class was Shelley. He spoke his thoughts respecting marriage, and acted in accordance with them, and was made an outcast. Persecution for his honesty of expression and of action drove him from his native land, and he died far from the home of his kindred. The folly of attempting to live a truth far in advance of all our fellow-creatures, may be illustrated by many common examples. Take the atmosphere of a city, for example; we may see that the air we breathe should be pure in order to sustain us in health. But how is one person, or a few, to make it so? Filth is *everywhere*, in all lanes, alleys and streets. Tobacco is everywhere, in all dwellings, and its fumes load the air. Diseased persons are all around us, throwing out their evils at every pore. If we take a place in an omnibus or a car, we may find an assortment of bad breaths, tobacco exhalations, air exhausted of its oxygen, cologne, patchouli, rum, onions, and most imperfect ventilation. How are we to be free and independent, and able to breathe a pure and healthful atmosphere, in such conditions?

One may as well attempt to walk through walls

and houses, in order to keep a straight path, as to live a pure life amidst laws and institutions that forbid it.

A young lady who has been taught in the school of Swedenborg that the only true marriage is that of the deepest and purest love, has acted upon her creed, which most of its disciples are too prudent, too worldly, too weak, or too false to do. She was beloved by a man legally but unhappily married. She came to love him, and to consider him her conjugal partner, or husband, for time and eternity. She gave herself up to this love, and finally after the gentleman had separated from his wife, she became in her own estimation his wife—in the sight of the world his mistress. The following is a letter which I wrote to this young lady after she had for some time lived as the “wife,” or “mistress,” of this gentleman. She wrote me with regard to spending some time at our home, and this is my answer :

“It is my opinion that woman belongs to herself, and is to be faithful to herself, as you well know. So long as you and Mr. — are united in love, so long the outward expression of that love in your material life is right, is holy. If Mr. — cannot acknowledge your union, it may be an inconvenience, or source of sadness to you both, but it cannot alter the righteousness of your relation. If from unworthy motives he refuses to acknowledge you, then you are no longer his, and must take care of your own life, and not bestow it unworthily.

“As your own, recognizing the relation that has existed, you can come to us. As the wife of Mr. —, openly or concealed, you can come to

us, provided we feel that he is worthy of this relation to you.

"You are to cultivate in yourself constantly the feeling of fidelity, not to man, but to God; or in other words, to the highest in yourself. Because you have been Mr. ——'s wife is no sufficient reason that you should continue to be. He must be worthy of your love, and must have it, else you have no divine right to be his.

"If you continue with him from the outward pressure of the world, because you have committed an act deemed unworthy by the world, and are 'disgraced,' without the deepest love for him, then you are no better than the harlots of legal marriage, who from any other than true motives remain 'married.' The time has come for individual fidelity; that is, that woman feel that she belongs to herself, and can only bestow herself for love; and when the love ceases the relation that it sanctifies must cease also. The great fight for purity has begun. Mr. Andrews and Mr. Greeley are discussing the question of marriage in the *Tribune*. One way and another the truth is likely to come home to us for defense.

"God will prosper the right. You will find a home and friends here when you choose to come, and Mr. —— will find all that he is worthy of, through your love. 'He that would save his life shall lose it, but he that would lose his life for Christ's sake, shall find it.' People are nothing to me now, only as they are worthy.

"It seems to me a worthwhile work for this time, to show where is responsibility. We have been responsible to the mob, made up of church and public, long enough. Our country threw off a

king, but took thousands of tyrants instead. Indeed, everybody is a spy on everybody, and a man's foes are of his own household. I declare independence of all. I must be myself, if no one else is; and all I wish to do for others is to give them the chance to be.

"Dear —, what I want for us both is the true recognition of our own sovereignty—of fealty to ourselves. There has been enough of sacrifices and burnt-offerings.

"But you must live my thought before you will know it. I trust it is your own now.

"In love, yours."

This young lady has acted nobly thus far, losing her fair good name with the world, and submitting to social outlawry for her love. Whether she would have strength to repudiate this relation if the love should die in her heart, is another and far weightier consideration than the first step. I had almost said, God grant she may never have this trial; but it is not for me to determine, in my short-sighted mercy, what is the best discipline for a human soul—especially of such as are noble enough to accept bitter cups from the hand of our FATHER.

When a conservator of public morals, such as Horace Greeley, regards with horror the assertion that woman has the right to choose the father of her child, the fact proves much—alas! how much. It proves the low estate from which woman has just begun to emerge. She is degraded by law and custom even lower than the beasts which perish; and if one asserts her right to any ownership of herself, so-called moralists and philosophers

reject the thought with horror. Is there no sacredness left in this man's heart? Does he wish to be the father of babes when the mother has no choice, when she would come loathing to his arms, feeling that the union scarred her soul for eternity, and with the thought of murder in her mind rather than bear the babe thus forced upon her? Is this Mr. Greeley's morality when he says, "I utterly abhor what you term the right of a woman to choose the father of her child"? Alas for woman if men are not better than this creed! They are, and they are not. The best are enslaved by law, custom and organization, and go on murdering frail wives, not daring to think of any escape from the necessity, not even when their material wants are healthful and legitimate, and a wife utterly unfit to be a wife or a mother. I have no doubt that Mr. Greeley has at times the conception of what love and purity are, and what they would do for the world in pure births; but the bondage of public opinion, and his own nature is upon him. He has not leisure or ability to comprehend a world's want, and he only asks that mankind be saved from a worse estate than their miserable present; and the only means of salvation he sees is law, binding people to an outward decency, if possible, whilst their internal life is a foul, rotting ulcer—and if their children live they perpetuate the sad state of their parents. Thus the world is filled with disease, misery, crime and premature death.

It is time that the world should be unveiled to itself—that men pause and look at the humanity on this planet, and that they learn the way of redemption.

CHAPTER VI.

THE MURDERS OF MARRIAGE.

SOCIETY is full of unrevealed and unrecorded tragedies. My heart is full of the confessions of the robbed and spoiled. A most gentle and noble creature was my friend ten years since. I have seldom seen so great material and spiritual beauty as she possessed. Her presence seemed to hallow all places, so pure, so truthful, so charming was her life. She was the daughter of a widow who lived in poverty in a remote country town, and she was induced to accept a man as her husband who was wealthy and educated, and could give her an elegant home and the society of a city. She was very young when she married, and she was at once separated from her mother and friends, for her husband was so miserly that he would have grudged twenty-five cents given to any one, friend or foe, forever. He took her to a fashionable home, but the griping poverty in which she lived there was known only to herself, and those who were so placed for observation that they could not but see. The husband was not unkind, not ignorant, not an unpleasant man to those about him; but pinching meanness was a habit with him that involved all his life. The wife was in all things disappointed. She knew that her mother, whom she loved adoringly, was sewing for a living when she had no strength to sit up, but lay and sewed in bed—that she was alone, dying very slowly of consumption,

without even the comfort of a letter from her daughter, because of the expense of postage, which this lady could not get money to pay, though she lived in a house worth thousands of dollars. If she had married with the hope of sustaining her mother, or having her with her, how bitter was the disappointment.

The young wife bore her heavy burden in silence—oh how many burdens are thus borne!—till her health failed. She bore three children in rapid succession, and with suffering that only a mother can know, and then commenced having miscarriages and abortions. She begged her husband to allow her to come to me, and have the benefits of Water-cure. I was sure I could cure her if I had her away from her destroyer; but he was her legal owner, and for six years she died constantly. Six times she miscarried or aborted, and a sickening horror of her false relation of soul and body, a daily and hourly misery, and constant flooding, was her lot. Her peerless beauty faded, and her glorious life became nearly insanity at times; and again a resigned and almost torpid idiocy seemed to possess her.

Every effort was made by friends to induce the husband to place her under my care, but in vain. He asserted his ownership to her latest breath, and after twelve years of agony and resignation, a human soul was blotted out, and the lifeless clay, beautiful to the last, was alone left to him who never had a thought but that she was his property, as much as his horses, or his house. He would have punished any infidelity to the marriage bond, as he would have punished the thief of his horses, or the incendiary who had burned his dwelling—

and yet his presence had been a hateful horror to his wife. She had been his victim, by far worse used than his harlot would have been, had he been so immoral as to keep one, but he was not. He was a rich, respectable, and moral murderer, who had probably no more idea of his true character than society had. He had only starved his wife in her sympathies, and made her the slave of his senses, whilst he lived in his business, his dollars, his dinners, and what is called domestic life, receiving much sympathy that his beautiful wife was always sick and sad, and not pleasant company.

To regenerate individuals, and produce a harmonic society is a very gradual work. Great numbers, great majorities must die in their sins, getting no relief from seeing new truth. A state of intellectual darkness may be more comfortable, than to be enlightened, and yet powerless. Still the evil of the present is no argument for its continuance, though a very good reason. We must speak truth though it render enslaved and dominant classes ever so wretched. Jesus said—"I came not to send peace on earth, but a sword." I have come to the task of exposing evils and falseness, but there are evils in a sensual and unloving life, especially to woman, that cannot be told. They are known to few, except physicians. They are reflected upon man with a dreadful force, still woman is the deepest sufferer.

There is a hopelessness in indissoluble marriage, that is one of its greatest evils.

"No after thought when once a wife,
The die is cast and cast for life."

Husband and wife feel that their fate is irrevoc-

cable, and that they may make the best or the worst of it. If they do not love each other, there is no love for them, unless they meanly conceal a preference which they feel guilty for indulging. The men engage in business, get money, smoke, chew tobacco, or drink ardent spirits, and make themselves sick with gluttony, because life has no good for them. Women do better often than this. They love their children, they love God, and their minister and doctor. If they do not find these compensations, they are apt to take to strong tea, snuff, and scandal. But is a truly loving, refined and healthful life often found? We may boast of the purity of our marriages, and the virtue of our women, because there is a fidelity to an arbitrary law. But fidelity to a higher law is needed, before our wives and mothers will be healthy and happy, and our children have harmonious natures. I look abroad, and the evil that meets my view seems incurable. I ask myself, can these people who fill grave yards with little children, who empty apothecaries' shops of poisonous drugs, and who crowd churches, or not, on Sunday, can they ever learn the law of their being? I cannot idealize about the dignity of manhood, when men beat their wives because they are property, or kill them in the drunkenness of rum, anger or jealousy; when wives poison their husbands, and women, married and single, murder their babes. I clip an illustration from yesterday's paper:

"CHILD SUPPOSED TO BE MURDERED BY ITS MOTHER.—On Thursday a servant girl living at the house of S. T. Wright, Esq., West Morrissiania, who was pregnant, was suspected by some of

the family of intending to use foul means to dispose of her infant when born. They followed her; finding she was likely to be detected, she drew a knife she had in her hand across the child's throat, but in her hurry she did not strike the throat, but nearly cut off its jaw, then throwing it down the sink, left it. The alarm was immediately spread, and the neighbors, throwing off the building, discovered the child already dead. An investigation was held by Coroner Johnson, which resulted in the arrest of the inhuman mother."—*Tribune*.

"If a black mother or slave at the south had committed such a crime, we should have been told that it was to save the child from the horrors of slavery, and another 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' would be written. But black mothers do not commit such follies, and the crime is too common among our white servants to meet more than a passing notice."—*Day Book*.

Here is a crime, committed under one oppressive institution, made a sort of indirect apology for another institution which is nearly parallel in its evils. This servant girl, who is the horror of almost all who read of her crime, may have a more natural and loving heart than many who shudder at her sin. She may have been utterly maddened by her terrible conditions, and therefore irresponsible. For eight years I knew a servant girl who lived in the family of a friend of mine. She was one of the most faithful, trustworthy and affectionate young women I ever knew. She read much and wrote a good hand; she was above her class, and consequently separated very much from any society. She was greatly attached to the fam-

ily where she lived, but much to their surprise, after living with them eight years, and being housekeeper and servant, and trusted like a child, she gave warning and left, notwithstanding all entreaties that she should remain. There was something suspicious in her appearance after she was settled in her new place, and the lady watched her, and became fully satisfied that she bore an infant, and destroyed it. She was a woman of great humanity and kept silence in the matter except to her husband, who said, "For God's sake don't say anything, the poor girl has the worst of it." I was the lady's physician, and had known the girl well, having boarded a good while in the family where she formerly lived. I had more respect and esteem for her than any servant I ever knew. Under these circumstances the lady told me the facts. The girl's health was destroyed, and she wished me to give her advice. Subsequently I obtained her confidence. I can never do justice to her story. She had not a living relative that she knew in the world. Her parents, and a sister whom she tenderly loved, had died ten years previous. Her heart was formed for love; a more gentle, tender and self sacrificing creature never lived. She had taken care of her employer's son through a long and dangerous illness. Love grew between them, as was most natural. He was not in anything her superior, except in property and position. But he could not think of marriage with her, for his parents and society would have cast him off, and besides he was engaged to a young lady, and bound by his honor to marry her. The poor girl must be sacrificed. She left his father's house and determined never to see him

again. She told me that her babe was born dead in a cold winter's night, and that she arose and went to the kitchen, and put it in the range and burned it to ashes before the morning. Her agony in this fearful hour from pain and terror, and outraged love, can never be told. Again and again during that awful night, she determined to take her life, but said she, "I could not; I had too much to do, and to suffer."

A little incident that occurred some time after will assist in explaining the gentle kindness and lovingness of her nature. I was visiting at the house where she lived, and the father of her baby was also on a visit there with his wife, and young infant. At dinner the lady kept her babe in her arms. She waited at the table, and devoured the infant with most affectionate looks. As soon as possible, she begged to be allowed to take the child. I remained with her after all had retired from the dining room, and I never saw a mother express more love for her child, even when she had been separated from it, than this poor bereaved one expressed for this infant, whose father had caused her such fatal suffering. There was evidently no bitterness in that lonely spirit. My emotions almost choked me, as I saw her press that infant to her heart, and thought of her own burned baby;—and if she had indeed taken its little life in her hour of peril; is not her punishment greater than the gallows or the rack? And who caused the crime and the punishment? Who but a society steeped in murder and adultery? for at this same time I had a lady patient, the wife of a man worth half a million, who confessed to me that she had six times had abortion procured, and by her fami-

ly physician, too. "I could not bear children to such a brute," were her words of excuse.

Again the question occurs, What is to become of children if married people are allowed to separate? The answer again is what becomes of them now?

I believe that the number of children murdered in marriage before birth, is as much greater than by unmarried women, as the proportion of children born in marriage, is greater than the number of illegitimate offspring. Society asks, What is to become of children that women are forced to bear? Society provides prisons for them, and the death penalty now. Might it not be well to leave women the liberty to choose whether they will bear children to be hung, or not?

CHAPTER VII.

FAITH AND LOVE.

SADLY and sorrowfully do I make these terrible records. The dignity and possible divinity of a race that lies prone under such evils becomes obscure. I cannot have faith at all times, and especially when I look at all these fearful wrongs. But I reflect, our human race has grown steadily from the savage to the barbarous, and then to the civilized state—man's instincts have forever urged him onward to wisdom and achievement—to-day, we have palaces, poets, and philoso-

phers, where were once huts, savages, gladiators, and most brutal men of all grades. Onward is the word of destiny. No power can restore the past, or keep alive a falsehood that the human heart and mind recognizes as such. The leaves must fall in autumn, and old falsehoods are as sure to wither, and new truths are as sure to bud, and blossom, and bless us, as the trees to renew their foliage in spring. "There is a divinity that shapes our ends."

There is a beneficent fate that we cannot escape. No work for humanity was ever done for naught. No suffering was ever endured in vain. Our race has had many baptisms of blood, and of fire. The baptism of truth, and its correspondent water, remains to us. Ours is a doomed race—doomed to immortality. We cannot lose ourselves—therefore let us work. But I would gladly escape the task assigned me. Gladly would I bury forever in my own heart the secrets of this terrible institution, that is crushing human beings like Juggerhaut, beneath its so-called sacred burden.

Some time since a beautiful woman came to me for advice in Water-cure. She was married when almost a child, to a man much older than herself. She had never loved him in the least, and had never had any reason to, except that he maintained her most elegantly. He was proud of her beauty, which was rare and exquisite. I had been but a few moments in her presence, before I felt penetrated by a great sadness. I looked at her to see if I could divine the reason. There was little in her outward seeming to justify my feeling, for though thirty years old, she did not look above twenty. Her form was plump, her cheeks rosy, her com-

plexion like the lily in fairness. The only mark of suffering, that could not be mistaken, was a dark circle around a sunken eye. "You think I look well," said she. "Very well, with the exception of your eyes," said I. She took a little bottle of cologne from her bag, and poured some upon her handkerchief, and passed it over her face. A frightful pallor succeeded, and she held her handkerchief toward me, covered with rouge. "I am made up," said she; "I have not one tooth that is not artificial; I am bloated with porter, and I am as wretchedly sick and nervous as you can ask—but just now I don't wish to speak of my general health. I am infected with a loathsome disease from my husband, who has been three months absent, and says he is not at all to be blamed, and I suppose that he is not. But will water cure me?" I said "Yes." "Without caustic?" "Yes."

"Oh, if I can be cured! but what is the use? Life has nothing left for me." She put her hand in her dress pocket, involuntarily as it seemed, and drew out a letter. I glanced at it, and her face became crimson, and she burst into an agony of tears. "Can I tell you *all*?" said she. "*All*," said I, most pityingly. "For fifteen years I have been married—Oh how I hate that word *married*. If I had been sold at the South at fifteen, I believe I should have been less wretched. I have hated my husband from my first real knowledge of him, and yet he is not a bad man—but he is not for me. He does not know me, any more than if he had never seen me. He thinks me a hysterical, sentimental fool. My antipathy to him is a feeling that I can't account for, because I think him a very good man, but from my marriage day I have had

✓) a horror of sharing his bed. I would have escaped from him on any terms, if it had not been for the thought of my father and mother. He is their idol—he maintains them—he is everything to them—and I was their idol too. I suppose because I was beautiful once.” \

“And you are still,” said I.

✓) “O, don’t mock me,” said she; “for years I have not gone to bed one night sober. I have been drunk on brandy, or beer, or some horrible thing. I never could have slept with him all these years, if I could not have got drunk.” She seemed to have a dreadful pleasure in using the word “drunk.” “I am safe—I *know* I am safe with you. I know you will never betray me. I know you will pity me,—you pity all poor, miserable married women, because you know how to. Now can you do me any good?”

“Not whilst you continue a drunkard.”

Again she grasped that letter. “Oh if I had anything to love—if I had ever had a child to love—you do not know what it is to be utterly desolate.”

“That letter is from one you love,” said I, impulsively.

“It is, it is,” said the weeping woman. “But if scandal should taint my name, what would become of my father and mother, and my young sister? O God! I cannot, dare not think of loving any one, or of being saved from the life I lead. But I must be cured of this dreadful disease. My dearest friend said you could cure me. My husband told him—and he said I must come to you. I am like one in the fire. I cannot tell you what I suffer in my body; my spirit suffers more—and yet bad as

I am—a drunkard”—she shuddered at the thought —“there is one that loves me—I am sure of it—and I have promised him, and I now promise you, to drink only water. O, he is so good, so true. He would save me for time and eternity if he could.”

“Then you are saved,” said I. “Is your husband jealous?”

“No, oh no! If I look well in public he is satisfied; that is why I learned to paint. When I lost my good looks I saw that it was a real trouble to him.”

I said, “You will not need artificial roses if you take Water-cure, and do as well as you can.”

“But is it not wicked for me to love Mr. —, and do all for him? I don’t care enough for myself to do anything. Even for my dear parents I could do nothing. If I had a child, I could do anything and everything for such a love. Tell me, am I a guilty woman?” She then told me the name of the man who was trying to save her—so full was her confidence.

“Turn not away from this love,” said I solemnly. “It is the only sacred thing left to you. Your friend is a most worthy man, and you are safe in following his counsel.”

“Then you are sure it is not wicked for me to love him?”

“As sure as I am that your life has been polluted, and your health and happiness ruined, in your marriage.”

She seemed greatly relieved and calmed, and entered immediately upon Water-cure treatment. The local disease was cured in six weeks, and in as many months the natural rose color returned to

her cheeks, and she was more healthy and happy than she had ever hoped to be in her great misery.

It may seem strange that I can so well recollect conversations. It is a peculiarity in my memory. I remember remarks made to me thirty years since, and even any singular intonation, or pronunciation, as if the words had just been uttered in my hearing.

The question comes, Why should this lady go to the grave without love and without children? She would have borne any suffering for a babe—one being that she could love. Thousands of women have children forced upon them, whilst a few are denied the blessing, even when they ask it from their deepest life. Is this just or natural? Must woman forever be denied the holiest right of her being—the right to love and to incarnate her love in a child? To me there is nothing out of heaven so beautiful as a love baby. So sacred, so sweet an innocence would shame men out of false marriage laws, if anything could do it. But love children have been stigmatized as bastards, and their lives blasted throughout England and America. What people need to know is, that it is not the marriage ceremony, or its absence, that authorizes and blesses a child, but the harmony existing between the parents. A true health and true love are the great needs of parentage. We can never have a good race of men and women till these facts are known and acted upon. God speed the day of this redemption!

CHAPTER VIII. *

ATTRACTION AND REPULSION.

LET no one suppose that I believe that the work of regenerating our race is to be a legal one. Men would not be rendered pure or impure by the abolition of unjust and oppressive laws. If a law emancipating all slaves were passed to-day, it would not make them wise, or able to be freemen at once. Where the weak and the strong dwell together with no understanding of equity, there must and will be tyranny, under any institution, be it marriage or slavery.

Many seem to suppose that indiscriminate sensual relations must follow the abrogation of oppressive marriage laws. There is a great wrong in this supposition. The moral sense of man is not as delicate as that of woman, because he is oftener forced into false and wicked relations by his stronger passions. Still many men revolt against and refuse adulterous unions, and they revolt as strongly against such union in marriage, as when no mummery has been said.

Freedom brings delicacy and discrimination to men as surely as to women. Human beings may be denied food as in shipwrecks, and may be starved to eat human flesh. Prisoners may be fed on offal, and eat it rather than perish of hunger; but delicacy in the choice of food comes amid plenty. The depraved consider it freedom for a man to be forced by a depraved nature, or the

customs of the world, into a house of prostitution. Every pure and right-judging person must see that it is the entire opposite of freedom, as is marriage without love. The liberty to do wrong can be had in marriage and out of it. The freedom to do right is what we seek.

Women have been able to brave the world for conscience' sake, and leave men they did not love, and to be outcasts for true purity. Trial after trial in this country has been before the people; the brand of shame has been burned into noble women year after year, but still they revolt, still bear disgrace, rather than be prostitutes in the sight of Heaven.

A friend has just handed me the annexed letters. They speak a mind so clear, a heart so true and sorrowful, that I insert them. Martyrs are all about us, known or unknown. I am constantly receiving letters from true-hearted, noble women, who would escape from their adulterous lives if any way of escape offered. Alas! there is no Canada for them—no place where they can earn an honest living; and then many of them have children, and their children have owners. Oh, what a bottomless pit is dugged for woman in the indissoluble marriage of our boasted civilization!

These letters were published some time since in one of the daily papers of this city. They were a portion of the legal proceedings, which the victim who wrote them could not escape. They tell not only the heart history of the writer, but of many a miserable wife and mother. Let them tell their own story:

"Before you left, you one day said to me that for the last few years you had lived very un-

happily with me ; also, that when married people ceased to regard each other kindly, they had better separate. These remarks, and many others you have been pleased to make to me, have determined me to speak openly of things to you, that have long weighed heavily on my mind. After much deliberation and reflection I have decided never more to live with you as a wife ; as soon as you return I shall go somewhere for the ostensible purpose of the restoration of my health. This step will prevent gossip and comments that might annoy your family and mine. I shall die living as I latterly have. I ask of you a small sum, just to defray my expenses for a short time. Were I a Catholic, I would seek a convent. As for the children, I daily feel I am not necessary to them at all. Mary is of an age when a mother's affection is exchanged for another ; W. is independent of all affection, and Helen will love who ever takes care of her. I am dead, as it were, to all exterior affairs. You, I am certain, will be far happier if I am removed from you, and I know I may have some moments more pleasurable than any I have latterly experienced. My mind is irrevocably made up on this subject. No one need know of it save ourselves, and I feel in a short time you will be released by an eternal separation. I have not the scruples and fears that torment other people about being away from natural friends. I am ill to weakness from mental agitation ; in three weeks I have lost six pounds of flesh ; I have no appetite, and cannot make the least exertion. It is almost imposible for me to get up in the morning. I beg you not to be angry, for this is best for us all ; you can then manage the children and

all affairs without the least opposition. Mary and Helen can be placed at Mr. A.'s school, Walter can be with you, and you can all live very happily and well without me. The moment I separate my lot from yours, prosperity will return, and good luck will attend all your plans. If you object to this, I shall place a barrier between us you cannot surmount, for my resolute determination is never to live with you as a wife any more. I would not like to be reduced to the sad extremity of disgracing myself to compel your consent. My God, the mental misery I have endured would have crazed any other woman; as it is, I am at times most wild. Of what use to lead such a life? I will not any more; all good feelings are destroyed by this perpetual harrassment. No one suspects my illness to arise from mental ailments. Well may my state puzzle a doctor. I have had a bad cough, and raised some blood, this last month, but it has ceased now, but I am so weak, have no appetite, and am almost prostrate from debility. From my absence, the relief you will obtain will feel as an incubus lifted from you, which heavily oppressed you. I will withdraw to Michigan, and you can obtain a divorce, marry another, and be happy. I am weary with writing. I have not seen any one this morning; for more than a day I have not eaten or drunken at all—the expressing these opinions wearies me to faintness, but let me assure you they are unalterable.

“Ere this reaches you, my last letter will have been received, and the determination then expressed is unalterable; it is useless to write this; the conviction must force itself upon you, that it is for our mutual advantage to be separated. Not

an argument can you advance but has as much weight in my favor as yours—this one, the precarious hold I have on life, is particularly for me—for how can I, with death staring me in the face, any longer play the hypocrite? I cannot live with a man who thinks of me as you so often have expressed yourself to me. You assert you have always been convinced of my utter disregard of you, and if so, why, when I have the courage to speak the truth, expect me to retract it? How absurd to wish for a continuance of that which makes us so unhappy! I have no sin upon my conscience with regard to you; no woman ever tried harder to be a good, conscientious wife and mother than I, and my Maker is my judge, and I fear not to appeal to him; if I could not love you it was not my fault; we cannot make our affections. I have for a long time felt, unless I decided to leave you my life would be short—for to weakness of body and weariness and sickness of soul, life soon succumbs under such a load.

“You have three children, of whom any father might be proud; my management of them has given you much dissatisfaction—take them under your own charge; make them what you like. Mary can take charge of Helen, and with Charlotte you can keep house or put your children to school. I am not necessary to them at all. If I remain here, I shall surely die of a broken heart. If I separate from you I die to you also, for never more shall you see me. You are unjust to perpetually taunt me with extravagance. I have lived on small means, and I have not wearied you with reproaches or complaints; and in what has my extravagance consisted? Not in personal finery,

jewelry or furniture, but occasionally purchasing a book. It was our misfortune that there was not more similarity of taste between us. I am as much dissatisfied as you have been, and never again can I live with you; if you do not see fit to allow me quietly, and without noise to separate myself from you, I shall be forced to bring disgrace and reproach upon you, your children and our families. I have no fault to find with your virtuous traits; I never denied your merits, but I do not wish to live in intimate companionship with one towards whom I feel, as to you, with a lie forever in my heart. No, a thousand times better labor with the sweat of my brow. I have vainly endeavored to govern these feelings, and the struggle has nearly cost me my life. You can, I am of this certain conviction, better supply my place, and I shall not be a bar long. Have you not expressed for me the most bitter contempt—preferred humiliating me before the whole household, to please me? You fancy you know me; you do not—no one does, nor ever will; taunt me not with vanity; you well know never woman possessed less than I. I never dreamed of priding myself on my personal attractions, for I was always told I possessed them not; there was in me a natural wish to please others; it came to me without effort or calculation; I was utterly destitute of coquetry or the wish to attract, else I had run away from you long ago. I have latterly thought much and deeply, on the wickedness of living with a person from whom one wished to divest themselves; my thorough conviction is, I am as culpable as if openly living in prostitution. This I truly feel—I will not any longer outrage my feelings, and I am con-

vinced as soon as I leave you luck will flow in upon you in all things. In your affection and care for your children, you can soon think of me as dead, and I wish you to. I will make myself so hideous to you, that a remembrance of me will give only disgust. I do not wish you to live apart from your family and friends—I being the offender, will absent myself. If I live, I do not doubt my capability to support myself entirely; if I die, adieu, then, to care and sorrow. I feel developed in me new thoughts and feelings, I dreamed not of possessing. Come back at the time appointed; I will go home to my mother a while, and then return and go south. My health actually requires a change of climate. I have no appetite—I do not sleep without an anodyne, and I am weaker and weaker each day. I am useless and inefficient here, and have an utter disinclination to exert myself. I am weighed down with grief and sadness. Mary will be pretty and intelligent; and in the management of her and Helen, and the development of their faculties, you can free yourself from the responsibilities attached to the duties of a parent. My efforts have not pleased you—I renounce you all. I am the curse of your household, the bane of your life. I feel this at my heart's core. No inducement, argument or entreaty will affect me. Let me quietly depart, and I will bless you for your forbearance. Oppose me, and you will weep in bitter repentance that you ever saw or knew me. I shall go home with Sarah in July; before you return, you can make arrangements for me to go to Florida, and I will no more be an expense to you. Thank me you will, eventually, that I came to this decision. Feel no bitterness, only that a relief is

afforded you, that you dreamed not of. I am sincere in my avowals, and shall abide my decision."

The following was read, it would appear, as an addenda to the above letters :—

"You are mistaken in supposing I shall retract. That letter was calmly and deliberately written; and long ere this you must have received the second, reiterating the same views. Finding me absent on your arrival, you will feel convinced of my sincerity. I do not wish you to follow me to my mother's, for any efforts on your part to alter my determination will be useless. You reproach me with faults, which you say are inherent in my nature. These yet exist, and will continue. These same reasons, which made so much unhappiness, will continue to influence me. My nature cannot change for you. Let me depart in peace. I am ill, wretchedly ill, as all in the house can testify to. My physician prescribes for me travelling and absence from here a year. I require an entire change. What is there in such an absence to excite calumny? I fear it not; and unless you proclaim to the world the differences between us, who is to know that there is aught unpleasant in your domestic affairs? Look upon me as one dead, for I am as eternally separated from you, as if death arose between us. Drive me not to desperate acts, for I am capable of committing crime. My feelings are not new or recent, as you well know; but only one alternative was left me, either to brave your displeasure by avowing them, or suffer the concealment of them to wholly destroy me. You have always felt convinced that I did not regard you with affection. We cannot agree on any two subjects; our views of all things totally differ;

there is not the slightest assimilation in our dispositions.

"I am weary of this life of hypocrisy I have led ; I cannot any longer control my feelings. You will yet thank me for sparing you so much unhappiness, for I am convinced of the utter and absolute impossibility of our living together in the same house with peace.

"You remark you are willing to attribute my feelings to ill-health ; but you are wrong ; it is this perpetual struggle within me to seem the being I am not, which has made me ill. My feelings have caused my illness. This is the secret why physicians are so puzzled as regards my disease. You have always heard me express this wish, that I cared not to live beyond the period when Mary could take care of herself. My presence can well be dispensed with. I have been so much ill, and wished for quiet ; have lived almost apart from all of the family this past year, they do very well without me.

"One would suppose from your remonstrances, I intended to elope with some one ; but lovers for women of my age are scarce, and amongst the gentlemen of our acquaintance know you of one who would be burdened with me ? Could you read my heart, see in it the feelings of coldness and dislike towards you, and the utter indifference I have to all that pertains to you, you would shrink from me, shun all contact with one so unnatural. I cannot help it. Vain have been my efforts to acquire different emotions. I no more can struggle, believing it is wisest to occasion some discomfort to you, than sacrifice myself. The past is hateful to me ; I wish not to think upon it. I would not

✓ for all the wealth of the world live over these seventeen years. Think you, with a mind in this state, I can live with you? Pray, which are to be dreaded the most, the sneers and censure of the world, or the pains of an unquiet conscience?

“If we are not satisfied with ourselves, the praise of the world is valueless. One hour of self-approval is worth all the world’s applause. When all is clear between me and my conscience, I defy all censure; I have long felt that you could all do without me. This belief has confirmed me in my resolution. I ask of you a small sum. I am entitled to a portion from my inheritance from my father; if you refuse me, I can sell my right in that which yet remains. Let not your displeasure against me obscure all other feelings. I wish not unnecessarily to annoy or distress you, and if in speaking plainly I have grieved you, I beg you to pardon me; but the truth was to be told. You have never understood me—never appreciated me. I was not intended to minister only to a man’s sensual feelings; it was revolting and degrading to me to find all my happiness was to depend on such submission. We never could agree on that subject, and surely would not now; and as it led to my dislike and aversion, the cause would still exist. I leave all things in order here. By the care of your children you will soon forget all about me, and in their improvement under your management you will find consolation.

✓ “I have no fear of suicide, and would resort to it rather than live with you any more. Watch me wherever I go; you will not find much to reward you. I do not expect to live long; I ask not for life, only for quiet and repose. I have some

alarming symptoms, and if I wish to remove myself away, attribute to my oddity all that is strange.

"I know I am faulty, but I think in me the good has predominated over the bad—that there are strong redeeming points to oppose to my errors.

"Do not brave me to any rash acts, by acting on the supposition that the fear of censure will influence me; for avowing to others our difference, will only lead me openly to disgrace you and your children and family."

I add a letter from one of my patients, this day received. It tells the same sad story. After speaking of her inability to follow my advice with regard to her cure, she says :

"I labor still, doing all the work for my family, although suffering with leucorrhea, together with painful and profuse menstruation. Cold weather agrees with me; when spring comes, oh then, Mrs. Nichols, I want a new body, a new life, a new sphere for action, for activity with me is but another name for life. I must have work for head and hands. With many persons the wane of health is that of happiness, but with me it is far different; for as the business of life seems drawing to a close, there is happiness in the heavenly aspirations—the hope that in the quick-coming future each holy wish shall find its full realization, is a cheering joy that the most zealous but poorly appreciate. But with a comfortable degree of health, this plodding on week after week in one monotonous round of employment, bearing and forbearing, ever striving to seem pleased and happy, while I am crushing and smothering the deep

yearnings of my soul, thereby feeling wretchedness unspeakable, loathing of life, misanthropy and skepticism. Was I, as my parents ever strove to make me believe, formed to fulfil but one object in life, that of maternity? If that is the only sphere for woman, then why is she endowed with other capacities? I know there are many and precious joys for those who live in the enjoyment of reciprocated affection. Although it has, like other earthly sweets, its attendant drops of gall, yet in it there is so much that is consoling, that answers the soul's fond askings, that makes every duty easy, and lends hope's bright sunshine to each dim path of life—that were I living *such* a life, I should aspire to nothing more, nor ask a greater blessing. I was educated, or rather left uneducated, with the assurance that I had only to marry an honest, industrious man to be happy. And when I have begged and entreated, amid tears and sighs, to be sent to school with my brothers, I was told that I had learning enough to be a good wife; and thus was I married without ever feeling that spiritual love which, as Dr. Nichols expresses it, 'must begin in the soul as a sentiment, come down into the heart as a passion, before it can descend into the body as a desire.' Not that I condemn the system of educating girls to be good wives and mothers—far, far from it—but I would have the training in accordance with the laws of God and the requirements of our natures. Love is stronger or more all-engrossing than connubial affection; and when *that* love is ungratified, life is indeed sad and sorrowful, and the question, Whence comes this evil? may seem unanswerable. To me it appears to arise primarily from defective social institutions—

laws based on false grounds ; and secondarily from the dictation of friends and ignorant advisers ; from the great want of individual liberty. My husband would allow me to come to you, and would do something toward defraying my expenses, if he thought I could get good health ; but I have other objects beside health in view, which are unknown to all. I seek an avenue to self-maintenance and happiness. But my child ! I can never give her to another's care. You have a heart to sympathize with the wretched, and those who yield you their confidence will find no traitorous deception. I commit to you in confidence these breathings of an overburdened spirit."

CHAPTER IX.

CONCLUSION.

THE last thought that comes to man is that of self-government, and to woman it must come later still. We can hardly at this day and in this country have any idea of the force with which people cling to monarchy—how sacred a thing loyalty seems to men born in a kingdom. The democrat substitutes the idea of a government by majority, and the tyranny of the many is established instead of that of one. No man, and no body of men, can dictate to me, or to any individual, what is right, or duty, when we take the cost of our own actions—when we do not unjustly injure others. The

tyranny of a majority may be as bad as that of a Nero or a Nicholas. The only true government, the only one worthy of a mature humanity, is self-government—individual fidelity, so wise that it never interferes with the rights of another. We have seen how this self-government must interfere with all arbitrary relations to kings, majorities, or rulers of any sort.

Transitions have, so far in the world's history, been painful. Transitions from all oppressions and despotisms to a freer and better state, have been accomplished by more or less disastrous revolutions. A change from our present social and domestic oppressions must be accompanied with sufferings; but none compared with the diseases and vices of false birth, the crimes of commerce, and the universal disintegration of man's interests.

I have said that the great argument I bring against indissoluble marriage is the children born in it. The suffering in which they are born is another terrible argument. From generation to generation the evils of sensual and unloving marriage pass onward. Woman, a slave, with no spontaneity, the sensualized subject of man, gives her own weakness and disease to her children; at the same time the evils of the father are mingled;—and the sick and unhappy, the sinful and criminal population of our planet is the result.

Women born of loving and healthy parents, and reared in health conditions, who have their individuality respected, who live in loving union, never being enslaved by impure and diseased amative-ness, obtain immunity from suffering in child-bearing, and give pure and healthy children to the world.

[I know the truth of what I say.] I have been "the thing called a wife," having no individuality, no spontaneity. I have suffered a degradation that the Church and the world call purity and virtue. (I have borne children in torture that the rack could no more than equal. I have had abortions and miscarriages that were as truly murders as if my infants had been strangled, or had had their brains beaten out, by a brutal father. I have had my life drained away by uterine hemorrhage, and worse than all, I have had the canker of utter loathing and abhorrence forever eating in my heart, and for one who was, like the frogs of Egypt, sharing my bedroom and spoiling my food. And yet he too was a victim of a system, and a diseased brain and body. He believed that a wife should obey her husband, and his morbid impulses forced him to ask a deathly obedience.] Men do what they can; oppression is a necessity to them, and when they have irresponsible authority forced upon them, as a divine institution, can they be expected to do otherwise than exercise it injuriously? Rebellion has taught all sorts of tyrants respect for their fellows. Men must learn from woman to respect the sex. So long as she is a parasite, she must take a parasite's portion. When she can stand self-supported, and responsible only to God and herself, then she can know freedom—and not till then.

The day that I was able to say, I owe no fealty to a husband, or any human being, I will be faithful to myself, was my first day of freedom.

In this fidelity I have gained life as from the dead. I have borne a babe beautiful and healthful, and with an immunity from suffering astonishing

even to those who knew that I had emerged from darkness to light—that I had come from sorrow and slavery into the liberty of a true and unselfish love.

And pure love and free thought are daily gathering to be a wondrous power in many hearts. Even of the present it may be said—

“One voice comes forth from many a mighty spirit,
Which is the echo of three thousand years,
And the tumultuous world stands mute to hear it,
As some lone man who in a desert hears
The music of his home. Unwonted fears
Fall on the pale oppressors of our race,
And faith and custom, and low-thoughted cares,
Like thunder-stricken dragons, for a space
Leave the torn human heart, their food and dwelling-
place.”

The changes in the outward are correspondences of spiritual changes. Freedom of thought and love will spread through the world of mind, as the Magnetic Telegraph carries with lightning the messages men send of minor things.

Devotion to truth is not born in one heart here and another there in isolated instances, but it is springing fresh and free as the flowers of spring in thousands of noble human souls. The day of true purity has dawned on the earth. Woman's long night of suffering, lighted by the stars of faith, and an immortal and almost superhuman patience, wanes to its close.

“The heavens are built on the hells,” says the wise Swedenborg. How high must be the heaven of woman, if built on the deep hell from which she is now being redeemed!

I might give many more histories. I might

multiply painful letters from sick and dying women, or those who are enduring life for the sake of children. I have only given a class of representative facts. For each one of these I have a multitude. But everybody has such facts; if not in their own lives, they are amongst their families and friends. Everybody knows the evils of the marriage institution, but like disease and death they are regarded as inevitable. People have gone into marriage hitherto as the atheist goes to his grave, with no hope of resurrection. They have said, "If I draw a prize in this lottery it is mine—if a blank it is all I can have." Though my facts are gathered mostly from the life of women, I am fully aware that husbands suffer also, often as intensely as wives. Blasting and blight are upon the spirit of man, and he needs salvation as much as woman. At this day all creeds, and every institution, must be examined. This is a portion of the growth of humanity, and no one can hinder it. We may as well put back Niagara with the hand, or stay the years in their cycles, as crush the truth that has come into the hearts and minds of men. It is henceforth a part of the race, and must grow and bear fruit.

In the perfect trust that I am God's, and that all truth is His, and in the full confidence that His providence is around me, and His care over all, I give these thoughts and facts to the world. As a wearied child rests on the bosom of its mother, so I rest in my heavenly Father's love. All who have an identity of life with me, whether in the angelic societies, or still in the body, will give me of their living strength in any conflict that may come for the great truth.

In a union so loving and life giving, that it may well be called heavenly, we are able to speak to the world—not selfishly, but calmly and clearly, of its wants and woes. We can say with Shelley,

“ Truth’s deathless voice pauses among mankind !
If there must be no response to my cry,
If men must rise, and stamp with fury blind
On his pure name who loves them,—thou and I
Sweet friend ! can look from our tranquility
Like lamps into the tempestuous night,
Two tranquil stars, whilst clouds are passing by
Which wrap them from the foundering seamen’s sight,
That burn from year to year, with unextinguished light.”

PART THIRD.

CHAPTER I.

LIBERTY AND HUMANITY.

IN the former portions of this work, marriage, or the existing legally imposed form of love relations, has been treated Historically and Critically; but not, except by inference, Theoretically and Scientifically. We have given a description of marriage as it is; or of the sexual relations of the human race with the marriage institution; and we find those relations full of wrong,—full of misery. The tree is known by its fruits. The fruits of the marriage system are bondage; isolation; perpetuity of error; sacrifice of health and all the conditions of happiness; compulsory and disgusting intercourse; compulsory and unwelcome maternity; voluntary and involuntary abortions; deformed and diseased offspring; terrible infantile mortality; generations born into physical and passional discordance and perversion; compulsory chastity of surplus male or female populations; seduction and prostitution; the falsehood and hypocrisy of a pretentious moralism; rapacity of the higher, and oppression and poverty of the lower ranks; general reign of fraud, treachery, and social Ishmaelism.

No man can deny the actual existence of these

evils; the great, important questions for the philanthropist are, What produces them? How can they be removed?

I have attempted to show that they are either dependent upon, or inextricably and inevitably connected with, the great social system of monogamic or indissoluble marriage; that they are the necessary consequences of the slavery of the affections. And, I shall now attempt to show, that the great remedy for these social evils, which are paralyzing, deforming, and destroying the human race, is to *set the affections Free!*

First of all, as the first condition of health, of progress, and of happiness, I demand LIBERTY. Of all that is glorious in the social destiny of man, nothing can be achieved in the Egyptian bondage of existing institutions. We have had the plagues. A murrain hath fallen upon us; the waters have been turned into blood; we have borne intrusion, venom, and parasites; the land is filled with *little graves*; there has been darkness, there has been death; up, out of this Egypt, this house of bondage! Let the Pharaoh of conservatism strangle in the Red Sea; it is for us, who have free souls, to worship the God of Freedom, though it be on the sands of the desert.

America, the advance guard of humanity, has given life to the great ideas of religious and political freedom. Still in advance, it now belongs to us to give vitality the still higher and more important thought of social freedom. The liberty we have is valuable, chiefly, because it gives us the opportunity to grasp the liberty we still require; and without which all we have is barren of the glorious fruits of human culture and happiness.

Much has been achieved, by the overthrow of despotisms. The energies and capacities of humanity ask only freedom to develop all their boundless resources. All that we have, is the result of so much liberty as we have gained. Every shackle that is broken from the body or the mind, leaves it more free to act, and to enjoy. And when every yoke is broken, when every shackle falls, when every authority is disregarded, and every despotism overthrown, *then*, and not till then, will Humanity stand erect, free, pure, noble, —the holy and the happy being, worthy of the earth, his home, the universe, to which it belongs, and the benign God over all ; the sublime, eternal Father, who has not mocked his human children with dreams never to be realized —aspirations never to be fulfilled.

I denounce, as impious and atheistic, whoever denies the happy destiny of man ; to doubt it, is to doubt the power, the benevolence, yea, the very being of a God. If the world has come by chance —if it be the work of capricious and malignant demons ; if the universe has no order, and humanity no principle of development, and no power to realize its cherished ideals, let me lay down my pen ; abandon all hope and all effort to benefit mankind ; plunge reckless into the gambling, scrambling, plundering contest for wealth, honors, and pleasures ; and selfish and corrupt, “go in for what I can make.”

God protect me from so despicable a self-annihilation ! Suicide may be cowardly or brave, mean or noble, the result of insanity or the highest reason, a heinous sin, or a holy martyrdom ; but the selfish soul-immolation of a man who abandons

humanity to take care of himself, is the most contemptible of all suicides. Such a man is a universal traitor, and in his selfishness is self-punished. It is the great law of nature that whosoever shuts his heart to the sympathies of humanity, shuts it at the same time against the ingress of all happy influences. They have no other door to enter by. Isolate the human heart, and it withers and dies; open it wide to all sympathies, all loves, and every day increases the capacity for happiness. Think then of the miserable millions shut up in the bondage and prison-house of an indissoluble marriage, with law and conscience guarding the gates and tightening the fetters—some with one poor, cramped, and starving love to comfort them, like a sick bird in a cage; but more with hearts all desolate, withered, or turned to stone! It is the penalty, self-inflicted and inevitable, of the selfishness, isolation, and inhumanity of this social institution.

Society struggles against the evil. All our social gatherings, our parties, balls, and public amusements of every kind, are instinctive efforts to escape, for short intervals, from the prison of the social institution, into the freedom of harmonic society—efforts miserable and abortive, like prisoners dancing in their chains, and holding them the more tightly to prevent the noise of their clanking.

In the world of fashion, here as in the capitals of Europe; among the most refined and cultivated, and those to whom wealth and position have given the semblance of freedom, there is a manifest revolt against the proprieties of conjugality. Husbands and wives are ashamed of being perpetual spies on each other. Married ladies have their acknowledged admirers; married men pay their *devoirs* at

other shrines besides the matrimonial altar. I am not a society man ; I have neither time, taste, nor opportunity for its frivolities and hypocrisies . but I know thoughtful men and women, who live in what is called society, and who feel that even the freedom it accords is accompanied with so much hypocrisy as to make it unworthy of honest and brave humanity.

I know that this book will shock many of its readers. God grant that it may. There must be many a shock before the walls of the world's bastiles totter to their final fall ; but the shocks must come, come if they frighten the poor timid prisoners ; and the walls must totter, and must fall.

O reader ! if you be human, for the sake of our common humanity free yourself from every prejudice that can fetter the mind and wither the heart of man, and join in the great work of emancipating a human race, as miserable in its present condition as it is noble in its capabilities, its aspirations, and its heaven-assured destiny.

CHAPTER II.

PRINCIPLES AND LAWS.

SOCIAL problems are not solved by passionate appeals, or indignant declamation. We have seen enough, it may be, of what is wrong ; let us endeavor to find out what is right.

And to know the right, to be right, and do

right, is the high aspiration of every healthy human soul.

Depravity, arising from ignorance, oppression, and perversion, is the sad lot of humanity ; a condition incident to all the past stages of its development ; but depravity, as an intelligent choice of evil over good, wrong over right, and misery over happiness, exists only as a state of disease, the result of perverting conditions and discords, and is exceptional, not universal.

The doctrine of total depravity, as taught by some theologians, is impious, and worse than atheistic ; it is diabolic. Whoever entertains this dogma, suffers from a mental strabismus ; and, until rid of it, is out of the pale of reason.

Not only this, but every prejudice must be laid aside. We must "clear our minds of cant." The principles of nature are simple, and easily understood by those who are in the sincere love of the truth, and clear of false doctrines. The evidence of the truth is the truth itself. We must have "the demonstration patent in the laying down of the thesis." Every fact, clearly stated, is self-evident. A thing is not true because God says so, or Christ says so, much less because Moses or Matthew say that God or Christ have said so. Nothing is proven by the assertion of any being. A miracle, or a thousand miracles, could not prove a lie true, or the truth a lie. But every truth which I have the power to comprehend, I see to be the truth, independent of all authority. I need no revelation, and no miracle, to prove to me that two and two make four.

Every principle is self-existent, uncreated, eternal. No being made, or could make, the mathe-

mathematical principles upon which depend the harmonies of the universe. They exist. We have in our glorious universe Matter, Soul, or vital energy, and Principles, or laws.

Force, action, life, thought, passion, belong to the domain of the soul.

Form, expression, and ultimation belong to matter.

Principles, modes, laws, adaptations, and harmonies belong to the realm of mathematics.

The grand key of all science is to be found in universal analogy. All changes in matter, and all action of mind, being governed by the unchanging principles of mathematics, we have a harmonious universe, each part corresponding to every other; where an infinite variety can never destroy the universal harmony.

The law of every sun and every planet in the universe is to be found in its structure and its relations. According to these, it takes its place, and holds its course, guided by its attractions and repulsions; and the minutest atom of the universe is governed by the same law.

The law of a vegetable is found in its structure, organs, functions, and relations. We study these, and find little trouble in giving to the plants we cultivate the conditions needful for their development. Wanting these, the plant withers; it becomes diseased; it cannot perform its functions, or these functions are perverted.

The same is true of an animal. Every animal has a certain structure, organs, functions, and relations to the sun, the earth, the air, the water, and their productions. The relations of the tiger and the polar bear to the sun are very different, and

the difference in these relations is in harmony with their varying structure ; and these varying structures or organizations depend upon the varying passions or attractions of their souls. The tiger loves his torrid jungle, the polar bear his iceberg ; and the cold-defying coat of the bear is the expression of his savage northern nature, the outgrowth of his soul. So of every

“ Beast, bird, fish, insect,”

each has its own nature, its own life, its own law ; and the naturalist reads that law in its organism, sometimes in a fragment of one of its organs.

Every part of nature is adapted and related to every other, with a mathematical precision which the energy of the soul, presiding over all, alone has the power to swerve and pervert. And the greater the energy of soul, the greater the power of perversion, and possibility of sin.

Here, then, we come to the proper definition of evil, or sin. Whenever any being, by the power of its soul, or free will, acts contrary to the harmony of nature, there is discord and suffering as the necessary result.

Freedom is a necessary attribute of a human soul ; and with freedom comes the liability to perversion, or discord. With this sublime freedom, attribute of a high soul, man has been gifted also with a sublime intelligence, enabling him to study, and, in time, to achieve his destiny.

By observation and experience, man learns his relations to the earth, the elements, and the productions of nature. With wood and metals, winds and fire, he sails upon the sea ; he is making his first rude efforts to navigate the atmosphere ; he

forces the earth and animals to clothe and feed him ; and has begun to make use of the subtle forces of electricity.

Splendid as these efforts and achievements seem to us, they are really crude and imperfect. Our ships are wrecked ; steam boilers explode ; cars are hurled from the rails that should guide them ; the earth is miserably tilled ; soils are exhausted for want of the manures which great cities allow to run into the sea ; men spend their lives in making diseased food of animals, when the vegetable world affords a far purer and more healthful nutriment.

In the highest civilization, human society presents corresponding developments. We have a bigoted clergy preaching total depravity and an eternal hell ; just as if a man could not see the world without, or feel the God within him. We have kings, laws, prisons and the gallows ; by which men oppress, repress, confine, and kill each other. We have war, with its wholesale butcheries ; and medicine, with its ignorance and poisons, killing more than the sword. We leave ourselves a prey to famines by our ignorance and neglect ; and we make for ourselves the pestilence, and the conflagration ; and in every case, we simply act contrary to some law of nature. And the gravest of these errors, and resulting miseries, are the remains of the savage and barbarous conditions, through which we have passed. Our conservatism clings fast to the most fatal of these errors.

All the science, all the progressive spirit of the age, is favorable to the freedom, harmony, and happiness of man. Philosophers are cosmopolitan. Citizens of the world, they make no bloody

quarrels about nationalities. Philosophers are tolerant. They understand Mumbo Jumbos, and their uses. They doubt the expediency of frightening infants with Bug-a-boo; or grown up children with Beelzebub. They do not contest claims to sanctity, or inspiration—they only examine them. What they do contest, is the right of any one being in the universe to control any other. They see that every organized being, from the simplest plant to the highest intelligence, has its own nature, relations, laws, and rights.

The nature, structure, and functions of the Human Being, I have treated of in a former work, to which this is a companion and sequel. Assuming that the reader knows something of his anatomy and physiology, his faculties and passions, I shall come to the special consideration of his sexual relations—that is, the relations which the two sexes, in which humanity is developed, bear to each other. As a matter of pure science, examining man as we would any other animal, let us endeavor to find out the relations of the sexes, indicated by organization, attraction, and adaptation; that social condition, in which his affections, in harmony with all his faculties, will have the freest scope, the fullest development, and be attended with the highest good, and greatest happiness, to the individual and the race, immediate and permanent, temporal and eternal.

Such is the work before us. Will any reasonable being shrink from such an inquiry? Is there any one who will not assert the dignity and freedom of his nature, in contending for the right to be governed in his life, by the results of such an investigation; or, are we all cowards and slaves?

CHAPTER III.

HUMAN RIGHTS.

EVERY thinking reader has seen, or will see, that the Law of Nature and the Law of God, are expressions having the same signification. The whole universe is but the expression of the wisdom, power, and character of God. A law of nature, then, is the highest law, and the holiest. Give me a clear idea of the structure and functions, attractions and repulsions, of any individual, and I read in them the law of its life. This is the Divine "higher law." Whatever dogma of religion, or edict of despot, or act of legislature, is in harmony with nature, is right; whatever is opposed to natural law, is wrong.

Wrong in principle, in the abstract; wrong, judged by the rules of science; but the real wrong is not always an actual wrong. The positive wrong may be relatively right. "The end sanctifies the means." This maxim of high wisdom has been perverted and abused; but it is not the less true. It is lawful to do whatever is necessary to the highest good.

To do right may not be in our power; but to see the right should be the desire of every one. Men and women are bound up in a vast network of wrongs. Falsehood, fraud, hypocrisy, plunder, and oppression, make up the conventional life of our civilization. It may be difficult—to many it will be impossible—to escape from these discords and perversions; but for the sake of the dawning

future of truth, justice, and harmony, we must not shut our eyes to the evils of our present state.

The relations which a man bears to his fellow-men, when uncomplicated and undisturbed by creeds, usages and laws, are easily defined. Each individual man is, naturally, the owner and sovereign of himself. He is born with a right to as much pure air as he can breathe; as much pure water as is needful to lave his body and quench his thirst; and the use of as much of the earth and its productions, as is necessary to feed, clothe, and shelter him. His eye has a right to all that is beautiful in creation, and whoever mars, destroys, or hides those beauties, inflicts on him a wrong. His ear has a right to the enjoyment of all the sweet music of nature, and all the harmonies of art—and no one has the right to afflict it with hideous and discordant noises. His nose has a right to the odors of all flowers, and should not be outraged with the thousand disagreeable smells of a filthy and degraded civilization. Every sense, every faculty has similar rights. The power of locomotion, and the desire to travel, give the right to move freely over the surface of the earth, and whoever hinders any man in the enjoyment of this right inflicts a wrong. To every organ, to every faculty, to every natural desire, there is attached a right. Man has, then, as many rights as he has organs, faculties, and desires. For all excess, for all irregularity, for all that is unnatural—nature has provided a remedy. If we rush into the water, the penalty is to drown; into the fire, to burn; if we eat to excess, we have repletion and disgust; if we take poisons, we are diseased and destroyed. Happiness, we find to be the result of conformity

to natural law ; and experience guides us into the path of virtue.

The natural rights of one man can scarcely clash with those of another. The earth is large enough for all ; the sun shines for all ; flowers bloom for all ; and food, clothing, and shelter may be produced in abundance by the labor of all. There is no need that any man in the world should trespass on the rights of any other. The only natural relations of men, are those of friendly co-operation, and interchange of product for product, or labor for labor, on principles of absolute equity.

And the law of human rights has been formulated in the axiom, "The sovereignty of each individual to be maintained at his own cost;" while the formula of equity in the commercial relations of mankind is said to be "Cost, the limit of price." Civilization, with its creeds, sects, and churches ; its governments and laws ; its commercial and financial systems ; its social institutions ; has raised up a vast of army of despots, oppressors, and plunderers of every kind, who in ten thousand ways infringe upon individual sovereignty, and violate every principle of equity.

The principles of individual sovereignty, or independence, and of equity, which apply to the simplest of human relations, apply to all. Every principle is of universal application. A principle is like the multiplication table ; applicable to every calculation.

The first duty of every man, with respect to every other, is to do him no wrong ;—not to annoy, repress, oppress, or plunder him in any way, nor in any way to prevent the entire use and enjoyment of every faculty he may possess. This is the

law of simple equity for me, toward my neighbor; and his the same toward me. Each belonging to ourselves—each accountable only to the law written in our own natures; we have no right to interfere with any thought, or act, which is not an encroachment upon the rights of the other. This is the negative statement. We must violate no right of any creature of God; it is a wrong to do so, and every wrong carries with it its own inexorable penalty. This is the law, high as Heaven, broad as the universe.

“Cease to do evil—learn to do well.” To let men alone; to cease from all violations of individual sovereignty and social equity, is the first principle of justice. It gives to every being freedom, and the opportunity for development and happiness. This is to cease to do evil. To learn to do well, is for men to co-operate with each other, so as to combine the highest development of the individual, with the most harmonious combinations of society. Two men who simply let each other alone, “cease to do evil;” two men who join to aid each other in industry, art, science, or anything that can add to their riches or happiness, have so far learned “to do well.”

We require first of all, the simple, negative justice, to be let alone. We demand freedom; self-ownership; toleration; non-intervention. “Hands off!” humanity is the present watchword. Benevolence, generosity, munificence, devotion, the enthusiastic achievements of harmonious co-operation, and scientific association, belong to the great future, whose rosy dawn is seen afar by those who have taken their stand upon the mountain tops of

human life; who tell the dark and slumbering world it comes!

But we must leave these generalities, and come to the application of the principles of natural science, or positive philosophy, to the subject before us, and which is worthy of all our thoughts.

CHAPTER IV.

THE RELATIONS OF THE SEXES.

MANKIND, as with most animals, and many vegetables, exist in two varieties or sexes, the individuals of which differ from each other, in structure, function, and consequently in law.

So far as men and women are alike, the same laws govern them. In most things the relations which exist between a man and a woman are the same as exist between different men, or women. There are the same inalienable and inviolable rights to freedom, to individual self-ownership or sovereignty, to equity, to the independent and unimpeded pursuit of happiness.

Women, it may be said, are not so strong as men; but some men are stronger than others, and some women stronger than some men. A difference in strength gives only the power to injure, oppress, enslave, and plunder; never the right. A weak man, or a weak woman, loses no right, because of such weakness. He has only a greater claim to the benevolence of protection in his rights.

The same rule applies to differences in intellectual vigor. Women do not differ more from men, in these respects, than men or women differ from each other; and there is no difference which in any case justifies the violation of sovereign right.

But there is a sphere, where a real and vital difference does exist—that of the sexual structure and relations. These are governed by peculiar attractions, and repulsions; intended by nature to produce and regulate the sexual union necessary to the continuance of the species.

Every function of nature is fulfilled in consequence of some impelling want, desire, or attraction. Thus we have hunger, the want; the desire for food to satisfy it, and the attraction to certain kinds of aliment which we believe best adapted to satisfy our desires. A hunger may be morbid;—a desire for food may be diseased; the taste or attraction for aliments is very commonly perverted. I am speaking of what is natural.

In fulfilling the law of the reproductive function, we have the same process: the want, the desire, and the attraction for the object that seems best adapted to gratify the desire, and satisfy the want. So far the sexes are alike, in kind, if not in degree. The attraction which exists between men and women, is called love; a pervading, vivifying sentiment, enlivening and invigorating, because it belongs to the very sources of life, and its highest manifestations and enjoyments.

Highest and holiest; around which cluster the sweetest and most beautiful sentiments and enjoyments of our lives. Flowers are not only the emblems of love; they are the actual manifesta-

tion, and organism, of the reproductive function, in the plant, of which they are the glory. The rose, whose odor you inhale, on whose petals you look with delight, is the nuptial couch of vegetable loves and embraces.

The real relations of the sexes, must be defined by the difference in the functions they perform. The want which brings them together, seems to be almost the same—but there is in woman a desire for offspring, much stronger than in man. A man asks love—a woman asks love and maternity. Organs and functions correspond. When a man has joined in the sexual union which is the ultimatum and satisfaction of his love, so far as it is a sexual desire, his part in the reproductive function is accomplished. Not so the woman. For nine months, she nourishes in her body, and feeds with her life's blood the new being, of which she furnished the germ;—for months more, she loves, and warms, and feeds it from her bosom. The child belongs to the woman who bears it. It was she who evolved the germ, she who has nourished its life from a microscopic globule to a full grown babe; she that has borne it, and nurtured it. In the vegetable world, the stalk which bears and matures the fruit, is the mother—the pollen which comes flying through the air, or clinging to the legs of some insect, performs the paternal office. The same holds good of animals. All analogies point to the superior rights of the mother; who is the Heaven-appointed nourisher, and educator of her child; and who has the right to choose, by the instinctive attraction of her love, who shall be its father.

It is not, then, the right of a man to say, "I want children to inherit my riches, therefore I will

enslave some woman, and compel her to bear them to me." This is savagism—this is barbarism—to a deplorable extent, this is civilization ; but it never was right, though thundered on Sinai. Even in the world's moral darkness, women have retained, in semblance at least, and therefore in recognition, the right, for once, to choose ; so far as it may be a choice, to accept, or to reject.

The woman has the right to choose the father of her child, in the attraction of a holy love, spiritual and material, because that upon her falls the burthen or cost of its development, birth, and nurture. And she has in her free and unperverted state, the necessary instinct to make a suitable choice. This instinct, natural to woman, as to the females of all animals, is perverted, corrupted, and destroyed, by our social institutions and laws, and especially by the institution and laws of marriage, so that in the highest civilization, half the children born, perish in infancy, and of those who survive, a large proportion are diseased, crippled, imbecile, perverse, discordant, and fit only for the slaveries and crimes of civilization.

All this evil is the result of bigoted and despotic interference with the simple and beautiful operations of the laws of nature, especially in the institution of compulsory monogamy, and indissoluble marriage ; by which the rights, the instincts, and the attractions of humanity are outraged and perverted, and the world filled with disease, crime, and their consequences.

"MEN DO NOT GATHER GRAPES OF THORNS, OR FIGS OF THISTLES."

CHAPTER V.

ATTRACTION AND REPULSION.

WE are attracted by what seems beautiful to us; we are repelled by what is disgusting. Everything, in an unperverted state of our faculties, seems beautiful to us, when it is adapted to satisfy some longing of our soul; everything is disgusting, and repugnant, which has a tendency to injure or destroy us. Man makes perversions, but nature does not make mistakes.

These active forces, which appear to be properties of the molecules, or ultimate atoms of which all matter is composed, and by which all forms and organizations are produced, seem to be no less the governing powers of the human soul. As the atoms of matter, drawn together by their attractions, held apart at ever-varying distances by their repulsions, find their exact adaptation to each other in the formation of all natural substances; so men, left free to follow their impulses, will come together in society, each person completely an individual, yet all uniting to make up a harmonious whole. The difference between the society of conventionalism, or arbitrary laws, and that which would result from the free play of the great moral forces of attraction and repulsion, is the difference between a brick and a crystal.

The simple conditions of a true love, or attraction, between the sexes, are health and freedom. We spontaneously seek those relations with each

other which are the most natural, and therefore best adapted to promote the happiness of the individual, the harmony and well-being of society, and the vigor of the race.

A hungry man, with no power to gratify his tastes, gorges himself upon any coarse food he can get; a prisoner is obliged, whatever his disgust, to eat his rations. These cases are analogous to the two civilized institutions of prostitution and marriage, when the latter exists without the charm and attraction of mutual love. We are not to judge of humanity by the results of such conditions.

Doubtless, the highest, and the purest love, which springs up between two persons of opposite sexes, comes from the attraction of their souls, and this exists, often at first, and sometimes always, without descending into the physical ultimatum of the sexual embrace. But we do not know how far this sentimental, or Platonic love, as it is sometimes called, is natural. It may be the result of repressions, or incomplete or inharmonious development.

In our opinion, wherever a healthy soul finds its full expression in a healthy body, the passion of love pervades the whole being, and demands every expression and ultimatum, and this seems to us to be the holiest love. Any sexual union is incomplete, and must fail of producing its legitimate object, if it does not comprehend all the sentiment and all the passion that combine to make an integral love. And the results of such union to the individuals, and to their offspring, must correspond to this imperfection.

The necessity of the free play of attractions and

repulsions to the happiness of those who come together in sexual relations, is evident enough ; but the effect of these attractions and repulsions on the development of the race, deserves our most serious consideration. Men, seeking to gratify the longings of their souls, and the desires of their bodies, are attracted by the fresh, healthful, charming, and beautiful ; women, far more fastidious than men, as gifted specially with the right of choice, and having, except in marriage, prostitution, or rapine, the power to reject, choose the strong, the brave, the noble, and the wise. Every union of such persons, animated by a mutual passion, is likely to enrich the world.

Each man an individual sovereign ; each woman the owner of herself, and the controller of her own actions ; each independent of the other, and drawn together solely by the charm of a mutual attraction, coming from a mutual fitness and adaptation to the spiritual and material loves, or passional desires of each other ;—such a union seems to us to constitute the true marriage of mutual love in perfect freedom.

CHAPTER VI.

THE DURATION OF LOVE.

Is love enduring ? If a love is the highest and truest of which two persons are capable ; if their adaptedness and congeniality are far superior to

all causes of repulsion ; if they move on in life and development together, making equal progress ; if the same causes which operated to bring them together, continue to exist—I see no reason why the love may not continue for an unlimited period ; but to decide that it will and must do so, by solemn vow and act of legislature—to make two persons swear that they will continue all their lives in this relation to each other, and to compel them to remain together, whether they do or not, is quite another affair. Until men and women are set free from the bondage of law and custom, we have not the means of deciding what they might, could, would, or should do.

But where two persons come together, drawn by a great, and a true attraction, but after a time discover repulsive qualities in each other, not at first suspected ; or where one leaves the other behind in the course of development, though well matched for the time ; or where either, from any cause, loses attraction, becomes enfeebled, diseased, depraved, or in whatever way discordant, the love must cease. A love may be genuine and true for the time, and not for all time. The woman who filled my ideal twenty years ago, may have no attraction for me now.

Doubtless, the more free the choice, and the more perfect the love, the greater is the chance of its continuing ; while the more restricted the chance of choice, the more it is governed by social conventionalities, the less genuine and complete is it likely to be, and the less is the prospect of its permanence. The miserable loves of civilization have seldom life enough in them to last through the honeymoon, which begins with weak raptures,

and ends with strong disgusts. But civilization decides that every love ought to be eternal, and so ties the parties together "for better, for worse."

Our observation of life is that very few loves endure. In marriage, the love sometimes becomes friendship, or a business and family copartnership—sometimes a mere passive tolerance, or endurance of a bond that cannot be got rid of—often a long persecution of mutual disgusts, criminations, and petty annoyances. The church, conscience, law, and public opinion, or the fear of what the world will say, keep people together, until death brings a relief to both.

Every passion, it has been said, asserts its eternity. What we feel strongly, we believe, at the time, we shall always feel. It is very hard to convince us of the probable speedy termination of any ardent feeling. There is a saying that "hot love is soon cool," but it must get cold before we believe it. In whatever way we are excited, in politics, religion, philanthropy, or love, there comes to us no thought of change; but the change comes nevertheless. And it must come to many, many loves. Some of them are annual, some biennial, few perennial.

As there are all degrees in the intensity of loves, and in the extent and variety of the attractions which bring men and women together, there may also be all degrees of duration, from the fleeting fancy of a day, to the pivotal love of a life.

A love, like every living thing, has its germination, its growth, its maturity, and may have its decay and death. It may die prematurely by accident or disease; it may wither for lack of nourishment—die of atony, or in a convulsion; be

starved, or perish of repletion and excess. Each love has its own peculiar life—it may be short or long ; but whatever its genuine life, let it be lived, and when it dies, let it be buried. There is no more miserable lot for any being, than to be chained to the corpse of a dead love. This is the crime of the indissoluble marriage.

But what kind, and degree, and duration of love, will sanctify the sexual relation, or the true marriage? Of that, each individual must be the judge. No one can possibly judge for him. The Church or the State may assume to do so, but every such decision is arbitrary and despotic, and liable to be contrary to the laws of nature.

The true life seems to be, to live each day the life of the day, leaving the past, and taking little thought of the future. I know how I feel to-day—what are my attractions, my desires, my loves. I act to-day, according to the law of my being. What I shall be in ten years, or what I shall do ; who I shall love, or what life may mingle with mine ; how do I know ? What promise can I make concerning it ? Next week, or next year, I may rise to a higher life, and a higher love, or sink to a lower. All that God requires, is that we live our own lives truly—and there is no truth but in freedom.

NO TRUTH BUT IN FREEDOM—AND NO FREEDOM BUT IN TRUTH.

CHAPTER VII.

PLURALITY OF LOVES.

THE system, or institution of monogamic and indissoluble marriage, rests upon the assumption, that there can be, or should be, but one love, and that this one should last the life of at least one of the parties. Admitting that marriage is, or should be, the union of mutual love, if we can show that one love may not last, or that there may be more than one at the same time, we entirely destroy the marriage theory. There is nothing new, however, in the world being governed by false assumptions. The Church assumes that men *ought* to believe, in a certain way, and *ought* to love in a certain way ; as if belief and love were voluntary actions. Both are out of the domain of volition. We believe as we are taught, or according to our perception of truth—we love according to our natures and attractions. How can a man say, “Now, I will believe in this religious doctrine, and I will love that woman?” He may promise both, pretend both, and in both be a hypocrite.

Can there be more than one love? There are few live human hearts, male or female, that have throbbed through forty years, without being able to answer, “Yes, many, many loves.” We have our loves in every stage of life—the loves of youth and of manhood—of girlhood and of womanhood. Few will deny the possibility, and even the frequency of a succession of loves. All second mar-

riages are supposed to result from second loves. It must be a great, long love, that can fill any life; or it must be a poor, mean life, that can produce but a single love, like a plant, that can bring forth but a single flower.

The fact of the plurality of loves, it will be seen, follows of necessity from the evanescent character of many. If a great, full love were to last forever, there would be no need, perhaps no room, for such another, though even then there might be other loves, as flowers may spring around the roots of the tree. But if all loves lasted, our hearts would be full; as the earth, if no one died, would be crowded with inhabitants. If our loves, then, are brief, we must have more of them, for a loveless heart is a desert, where no plant flourishes and no flower blooms.

But a graver question, perhaps, and one to which an affirmative answer will not be so readily conceded, is that of the possibility of two or more loves existing in the same person, at the same time. Upon the assumption of such an impossibility, we have based our institution of monogamic marriage, and our law which makes bigamy or polygamy a felony.

Yet polygamy is and has been the law and custom of much the largest portion of the human race; and all polygamic practise is based upon the theory of a plurality of loves.

As a question of fact, it is as well settled as any such question can be, that men and women differ in their capacities for loving, as in other matters. Some have but little talent in this direction—others are more highly gifted. Some are poor, others rich, in affectional endowments. Some love

strongly and but one—others may love several in different degrees. Some seem born for constancy, others for variety. Why not? This corresponds with the development and manifestation of the other passions and faculties. Some love to see many countries, others always stay contentedly at home; some love a simple melody, others a grand harmony; some like a single flower, or a single dish—others will have a bouquet or a feast. One person always seeks a private conversation with a single friend, another prefers the animating and varied discussions of a group of persons. So of a thousand things—and these analogies are the true key to every mystery. The man who likes one place, one dress, one dish, a simple air, a single figure in a picture, is likely to be a monogamist in love. The man who loves many flowers, costumes, places, dishes, the opera, and a world of variety, cannot be what is called constant—that is, exclusive, in love.

In the vegetable and animal kingdoms we have many varieties of the sexual relation—and they seem to be all combined in the human species.

If in many persons, or even in one person, it is found that more than one love can exist at the same time, it is proved, beyond question, that one love does not necessarily or immediately destroy another. In all the analogies of nature, all harmonies, tastes, and faculties strengthen and improve each other. Higher tastes or pursuits may unfit us for lower ones; or the reverse. But there may always be a group of tastes or loves that harmonize with and improve each other. It is sameness that wearies, not variety; and a single enduring love seems only possible with a great and

varied object. If a woman possess so many charming qualities of intellect, person, and character, as in herself to present a ceaseless variety, she alone may satisfy a man of varied wants and large capacities.

There are loves, so intense and burning in their culmination, as, for a time at least, to absorb all the faculties, and make another active sentiment impossible. So, at least, it has seemed to us: but we never knew how much of such phenomena was due to the repressions and distortions of civilization.

There is no evident reason why the law of variety, which extends to studies, pursuits, pleasures, tastes, and passions—that love of variety which has the whole varied universe for its gratification—should fail when it comes to the question of variety in love. The facts of human experience, in this regard, are all around us. Full as the world is of deceit, dissimulation, and hypocrisy, forced upon men and women by false and tyrannical institutions, there is yet truth enough in the world to let us see that few men and women, of any considerable development, are restricted in their power of loving to a single person.

As there may be a prevailing taste, or genius, or talent for some special pursuit, so there is likely to be what Fourier terms pivotal loves, more pervading and enduring than most others—the central loves, around which the minor passions and fancies revolve. If ever freedom comes to men and women, we shall see, in the free play of the affections, all their possible combinations and harmonies. Every true love will increase the happiness of its possessor; and one true love cannot interfere

with another. The true may kill the false, the false destroy the true; but all truths are in harmony with each other.

Women do not seem to differ from men in their capacity to love; but as they have less freedom, and more disease, we see less variety of manifestation. The maternal function would seem to confine a woman to one lover at a time in the intimate relation necessary to the production of offspring; but this is not always the fact, for every medical reader knows of cases in which women have had twin children by different fathers. The power of loving two or more men at a time is a simple question of capacity, and is to be decided, not according to any notion of propriety, but as a matter of fact. That women have this power, there is no manner of question. I know of too many facts of this kind to be mistaken in the assertion; and there is no good reason for setting them aside as abnormal or idiosyncratic. They exist in women, as healthy, as natural, and as noble as any in the world.

There is nothing contrary to nature, so far as I can see, in one man loving several women, or one woman loving several men; and this variety of affections may be conducive, or even necessary, to that full harmony of the passions which shall produce the highest degrees of happiness. We may be sure that in the organization of man God has made no mistake; and if any mischief comes, it is all in consequence of our absurd tinkering. It is as if the admirable Jullien, with orchestra all tuned, every instrument at its proper pitch, and every player able to produce all its varied melodies, should raise his jeweled baton, and give the signal to commence; when he is interrupted by a

committee of the Common Council, or some other equally sagacious legislative body, and required to tune all strings to one note, and confine each instrument to one sound. We can fancy what sort of a monotonous and discordant tooting the result would be. Just so it is when men, with false science, false theories, and false beliefs, attempt to regulate the divine passions of the human soul.

CHAPTER VIII.

SOCIETY DESTROYED.

BUT if nature has given to men and women the power, and consequently the right, to love more than one person at the same time—to have and to enjoy a succession and a variety of passions,—this destroys marriage. Of course it does. If nature had contemplated the monogamic and indissoluble marriage as the invariable law of our species, she would have made men and women accordingly. Nature never commits the blunder of making animals with passions or attractions not adapted to their conditions. We do not see quadrupeds trying to fly up into the clouds, nor fishes walking about on the land. If the good God had intended men and women to be monogamists, he would have made them such. In the vast variety of human characters, He may have made such beings. I have never seen them; but I have seen and heard of vast numbers who are not.

But if we destroy marriage, we destroy society.³ Very true. If marriage is false it must be destroyed; and the social system that rests upon a falsehood, must be false, as every one sees and feels society to be—false and rotten to its heart's core; rotten and corrupt. Let it be destroyed; the sooner, the better. The great earth will move on in its orbit, if our miserable, selfish, hypocritical society is destroyed; the sun will shine in the heavens; the holy stars will keep their places on high; the birds will sing, and the trees will blossom. In God's name, let us destroy society, the only false, mean, wicked, miserable, diseasing, depraving thing in the universe. If the truth will destroy it, let it be destroyed.

What is this society? It is made of men and women, and children, is it not? These are destroyed quite sufficiently as it is, especially the children. In this society men combine together to tyrannize over and plunder each other. It is a world of shams. What we call society is a great lie; truth lives in humanity, and shines out in spite of society.

But how could we get along without the marriage institution? How can we get along without a monarchy? has been just as serious a question; or, how can we get along without slavery? Republicans have got along without kings; other forms of slavery may be abolished, and the time may come, when every human being will own and govern himself; and when the right of every man, and every woman, to be his or her own, will be everywhere acknowledged. Destroy every wrong that exists in human society, and humanity, with all that God has made it, honest, loving, and

true, will still remain. Man with his fetters off, and let out of prison, will not be the less a man; woman, with her soul freed from the crushing bondage of her hideous wrongs, will not be less a woman.

I would destroy society, if thereby I can save humanity. It needs not me to destroy it. It must die of its own rottenness. I may write its epitaph. Let society be destroyed, and humanity redeemed. Let the world awake from the oppressions and wrongs of ages, to the vigor of Health, the light of Intelligence, and the loving joy of Freedom.

The society that we want, is men and women, living in freedom, sustaining themselves by their own industry, dealing with each other in equity, respecting each other's sovereignty, and governed by their attractions; no one presuming to interfere in the delicate, the private, and personal matters of the affections.

The great law of the new society, which is to replace the old, is that of non-interference. The right which every individual will demand, that of deciding for himself in every matter, that does not concern any other, and being governed by the law of his own life, and not that of another's,—that right, which every one demands, he must be willing to concede.

How does it happen to be any business of society, or of any individual, who I love, or how many I love, or whether I love the same person to-day, that I loved ten years ago? My neighbor, who lives in the next room, separated only by a brick partition, knows nothing about my loves, nor I of his; he does not concern himself about who I sleep with, or what I have for breakfast. This negligent

member of society knows nothing of all this, and cares as little ; but if I knock a brick through into his parlor, or break his windows, I encroach upon his individuality, and it becomes his business to attend to what I am doing—not who I love, but why I throw a brick-bat into his parlor windows.

If every marriage law were abolished to-morrow, men and women would live—all the avocations of life would go on—the world would spring forward with new vigor, and all that is vital of society would still remain to us. The emancipation of woman, and her assumption of her rightful place in the world as an independent being, self-sustained by her own industry, self-controlled in the bestowal of her affections, would add a new element to the power of the human race ; would more than double its energies, and increase its happiness beyond the power of human computation.

The only society we have now in the world, worth calling by that name, has been inaugurated and is presided over by women, who, from talent and position, have achieved some degree of freedom. Make all women free, and we should have something fit to be called society.

CHAPTER IX.

JEALOUSY.

ONE great seeming obstacle to the application of the principle of Individual Sovereignty, or Freedom, to the love relations of the sexes, is Jealousy—the green eyed monster—which is the cause of so many of the outrages of civilization.

Jealousy is ridiculed in plays, in novels, in society; but still it everywhere finds sympathy, and in the present state of the world is a real, and a very fearful thing. Few days pass that there is not committed, in this country, some terrible tragedy, some horrible crime,—murder, suicide, or both combined, from Jealousy. And this malignant passion is not only a cause of crime, but is held to be a sufficient excuse. It would be hard to find, in this country, a jury who would convict a man of murder, if he could show that he had a reasonable suspicion, that his victim had been the lover of his, the murderer's, wife.

There is one phrase in common use, that throws a flood of light on this complication. It is the term "Jealous Tyrant." Jealousy and tyranny always go together. A tyrant is always jealous; a jealous person is always tyrannical. Jealousy is a passion of property, claim, or assumed right. We are jealous of any infringement of what we suppose to be our peculiar privilege. The feeling is not confined to love,—it is almost universal. Men are jealous of their honors, rank, titles, domains, of

everything which they claim as their own. Singers and actors are jealous of plaudits, fashionables of precedence, landlords of trespass. In England, men are shot down, for poaching on the manor of an aristocrat. Jealousy is the rage of exclusivism, when it is trespassed upon, whatever the exclusive claim may be. No man is jealous, in regard to anything to which he has not set up a claim of exclusive right.

Now the marriage institution pretends to give men and women an exclusive right to each other. It is *my* husband, *my* wife, *my* lover, *my* mistress. This claim and feeling of property is the basis of all jealousy; and the more unjust, exclusive and tyrannical the claim, the more violent the jealousy. Just in proportion as men and women are enslaved, is the violence of this passion; just in proportion as they hold each other free, jealousy disappears—and in entire freedom, such as we demand for every man, and every woman, there could be no jealousy.

I charge, then, jealousy, with all its sufferings, and all its crimes, which ensanguine the records of civilization, upon the marriage institution, as its direct result; the same as I charge the scourgings, imprisonments, and executions of despotism upon the similar institution of tyranny. It is marriage that fills civilization with murders and suicides. It is freedom that brings peace and security, by removing all cause for these outrages.

When every man acknowledges the holy and in-born right of every woman to give her person to the attraction of the highest love; when he ceases to claim any woman as his property, his slave;—he will no more strangle her, or shoot a man whose

only crime was in being beloved and chosen by her.

Jealousy is so far from being an excuse for murder, that it is truly an aggravation, for the very feeling of jealousy depends upon a crime—a selfish and unjustifiable usurpation over the affections of another.

Prove to me that one human being has the right to hold the person and love of another as his property, and you justify jealousy, and go far to justify any measures necessary to the defense and preservation of that right. Marriage asserts this right, excuses jealousy, or the rage caused by an infringement on a vested privilege, and justifies all the murders it has produced.

Oriental jealousy imprisons women, and inflicts death on all offenders. American jealousy guards its victims with the dread of ignominy, and justifies murder. Both are entirely right, according to the ethics of the marriage institution. So slavery hunts down its fugitives, and lynches those who teach negroes to escape from bondage. And while marriage and slavery exist, husbands and masters are right. They act in the full spirit of these institutions. It is not they, but the institutions that are to be held responsible. When John Mitchell said he would like to have a good plantation in Alabama, well stocked with fat negroes, it was no more than for an honest Turk to say, I would like to have a fine harem of beautiful Circassian girls in Constantinople; or for an equally honest New Yorker to say, I would like to have a fine house and a charming wife in the Fifth Avenue. In each case is involved the right of one human being to control the life of another. Establish the

right in either case, and any infringement upon it would produce jealousy, and its usual consequences.

Freedom in love, the sacred right of every human being to the freedom of the affections, the same as to freedom of thought, belief and worship, is the only cure of jealousy. Religious, political, and domestic despotisms are all alike. Religious persecution, political proscriptions and executions, and the outrages of jealousy, all come from the denial of individual rights. Grant toleration in religion, liberty in government, and freedom in love, and all difficulties are at an end. The right of private judgment in matters of faith, the right of self-government in peoples, and the right to freedom of choice and action in matters of the affections, are all parts of the same great right of universal freedom.

The ground to be taken by every man and every woman is this: "I claim freedom for myself; I desire freedom for all. I will neither be a slave, nor an enslaver. Sovereign of my own heart and life, I respect the same sovereignty in others." This assertion of the broad principle of freedom, does away with all cause for jealousy, and all excuse for the outrages it inflicts.

26*

CHAPTER X.

WHAT WILL BECOME OF THE CHILDREN?

DOUBTLESS this question has sprung to many a lip along the progress of this discussion. The strong argument for indissoluble marriage, is its alleged necessity, for the care of the offspring. I have much to say on the subject of maternity, for it awakens my strongest sympathies. That which should be the pride, the joy, and the blessing of woman, marriage has made her dread, her shame, and her curse.

Marriage, with its almost invariable attendant, an involuntary, compulsory, often repugnant, and almost always, painful maternity, is the cause of disease, suffering, and premature death to both mother and offspring. Among the results of marriage, in this city, last year, were twelve thousand little corpses. Count the heart-pangs if you can—the agonies that gave them birth, the lamentations that followed them. This is maternity *with* marriage. We are threatened with something more hideous without it. It may be doubted if that more hideous and terrible something be possible. Let us see if it be even probable.

Freedom in love will put an end to all involuntary, compulsory, and repugnant maternity. When women are set free from the domestic servitude of marriage; when they sustain themselves in independence by their own industry;—no man will have the power to force them to have children

contrary to their own desires. The hundreds of thousands of miserable beings that now perish in infancy *will not be born*. When women have children, it will be because they wish to have them; and the maternal instinct of every female animal prompts her to provide for her offspring.

The children, born in the attraction and passion of a mutual love, will be strong and healthy; and thus freedom will soon give vigor to the race.

When men are drawn by the attraction of beauty, grace, elegance; and women are free to follow their natural attraction for strength, courage, and every manly and noble quality,—the constant tendency will be toward the improvement of the race. A few generations of freedom would change the whole aspect of society. Hereditary diseases and deformities would be eradicated. Every child would be the result of the highest love and the best conditions of which its parents at the time were capable.

But these children, how are they to be supported, cared for, and educated?

When women are free, and self-sustaining, they will be prompted by the most universal instinct of nature, to provide for all the children they have, or to have no children for whom they cannot provide. This instinct being weaker in man, he is more reckless in the gratification of his passions; and this is the reason why so many children are now unprovided for, and why this whole affair of maternity should be under woman's control. To her who bears its burdens, it properly belongs.

In some races of animals, the male parent assists the female in the care of offspring. Our legislators have not found it necessary to pass any

law to compel them to do so. They act according to their instincts. Now if man is one of those animals whose males assist in taking care of their offspring, men will continue to do so to the end of time, even if some stupid despot or majority should make it a crime. But we know that the mother does not forget the child of her love; she often sacrifices her life to her children born of hate. We need not doubt that fathers, when they are no longer in the false position of despots and masters, will obey the instincts of nature, and the promptings of honor and parental love.

The beautiful, healthful, and happy children, who are born from unions of mutual love, of independent, self-relying, self-sustaining women, are not likely to be a burthen to any society, or an onerous charge to any State. Everywhere such children will be a pride and a blessing. Rich will be the country that gives them birth. Let us have such children, and we shall soon see what will become of them.

In the domestic institution as it now exists, far too much authority is assumed by the father, whose rights over a child are by no means so great as the mother's. There may be an age when the child will leave the mother and go to the father, but all natural instincts are so thwarted now, that the wisdom of God is obscured by our absurd attempts to regulate His harmonies into our discords.

CHAPTER XI.

WOMAN'S RIGHT TO LOVE AND MATERNITY.

Our last two chapters have been episodes. They give brief answers to ever-recurring questions, which we were willing, for the time at least, to dispose of and lay aside. We return to a consideration of the laws of love, or the union of the sexes, of which marriage is the civilized perversion, and of which perversion we have pointed out some deplorable results.

The maternal function, peculiar to woman, and which constitutes the connection between love and the race, gives her of right that control over the relation which man has usurped. This wrong, like every other, is attended with corresponding evils. All the evils of maternity, its pains and its dangers, are only symptoms of the perversion of this function. No natural function, naturally exercised, is accompanied by pain. There is no more necessity for sickness in pregnancy, and pain in childbirth, than in the exercise of any other natural function. Of this we have abundant evidence. Both Mrs. Nichols and I have seen it in our practice, and recorded it in our medical writings. Women who think our thoughts and live our lives, bear children without pain, simply because they violate no natural law.

The right of a woman to herself is the first and highest of woman's rights, and includes all others; and among these is the right to bestow herself in

love according to her attractions ; in other words, to choose the father of her child.

In this country, where to a great extent women are left free to choose their husbands, owners, and masters, the right of a woman to choose some one man to be father of her children, will scarcely be disputed. If he should die, she may choose another, and so on. But this is not enough. A young and inexperienced woman may possibly make a bad choice. She may give herself to a diseased or a discordant man. She may be imposed upon by a hypocrite. This liability to error makes the right and necessity of freedom ; while if it did not exist, and women could make no mistakes, where would be the excuse for regulating marriage at all ?

Granting the possibility of error, for the good of the woman, of the man, and especially of *society*, it is necessary that she should not be compelled to live in the repetition of this error. The woman who has made the mistake of giving herself to a man whom she finds on closer intimacy to be repulsive to her, or who has given birth to one discordant or diseased child, as the result of such a union, has suffered enough. To compel her ever to submit to that man's embraces again, or to bear another child to him, is a fiendish barbarity ; and though it be inflicted in the name of heaven, it has its birth in hell.

No human being who has the misfortune to commit one error, should ever be compelled to repeat it ; and this is the hideous characteristic of our two great civilized institutions, marriage and prostitution, and is also seen, though not to the same extent, in theft and other disgraceful crimes.

The right to love, is the right of every woman who has health and womanliness, to make her love a happiness to herself and a blessing to the man she loves.

The right to love and to be loved carries with it the right to have children. This is the right of a woman to choose the father of her child.

It is this sacred right, which our civilization denies. A woman has no right to have children, unless she will enter into the bondage of an indissoluble marriage, with its perjuries and oppressions, or its falsehoods and shams; and, being married, she has no acknowledged right to choose any but her lawful husband to be the father of her children.

There are in this city thousands of women,—maidens who will not risk the marriage servitude; widows who have escaped from it; women divorced by law, or by their own wills, to whom the greatest blessing in life would be a healthy and beautiful child. They are able to maintain children, to educate, to give them every care. They yearn for the blessing of maternity with inexpressible longings; they ask for children, they ask for love; but the social despotism says *No!* Sign away your freedom—give up all control of yourself, become that adjunct and parasite of humanity, a wife; or bear your lot of loveless, childless solitude; or be cursed with social infamy and outlawry.

And this outrage on holy nature is upheld by all the canting moralism of the age. There are few women in the world who are strong enough to defy it. It is only those who are above, or below the fear of public censure, who can have loves, and children, out of marriage. Within its pale, there are every day coming to be more and more, who

make it a mutual protection. A woman of surpassing talent, like Mademoiselle Rachel, the great actress, may have lovers and children. A woman in the lower ranks of French and English, and in some cases of American society, can do the same. But such cases are exceptional.

To the great mass of the women of civilization, the merest chance of a happy love, or a happy maternity, is coupled with the slavery, isolation, dependence, and utter abnegation, of the civilized marriage.

CHAPTER XII.

OF VARIETY IN LOVE.

If the law of variety which pervades the whole domain of life, enters into the love relations of the sexes, it is in vain—much worse than in vain—that we attempt to destroy its action. If the God of Nature has given variety as an element of love, and necessary to its harmonies, we shall only make discords by our denial of this law. The world is full of such discords. Let us see if this is one of the causes that produce them.

I enter a garden of beautiful and odorous flowers. I love their perfume. I delight in their colors and forms. I am attracted to the blushing rose; next I inhale the aroma of a pink; I admire the gorgeous dies of the tulip, or the pure loveliness and sweet fragrance of the lily; I bend to the modest

violet; I breathe the breath of the mignonnette. The owner of the garden comes. "Sensual and immoral man!" he cries, "stop this roving from flower to flower. Choose one, look at that, smell it, enjoy it all your life, but never think of any other."

I pass to the orchard. Here are apples, pears, peaches, plums, cherries, grapes; ripe, tempting, luscious. I begin to pluck and eat—but my monogamic friend is at my elbow. "Eat apples, or pears, or peaches, or any fruit you prefer; but having made up your mind, and tasted one, do not think of ever tasting any other."

I enter the drawing room; music is proposed. There are a harp, a pianoforte, a guitar. On the music stand are songs, waltzes, polkas; I like them all; but my friend who is opposed to the enjoyment of any variety, confines me to hearing one instrument and one tune. It becomes rather monotonous, after being played over, and over; and I begin to fancy that I don't like music so well as I thought I did.

I begin to converse with the ladies; but having spoken to one, I am told that I must continue to talk with her, and not speak to any other. My partner soon grows tiresome—the others seem more entertaining—but as I look around the room, I find the whole company paired off in this way, each one forbidden to speak to anybody else, and all looking bored and miserable, while a few of each sex are sitting by themselves, sucking their thumbs in silence, rather than run the risk of something more stupid.

Why should I not enjoy the beauty and fragrance of many flowers? Why not mingle or contrast

the flavors of many fruits? Why not have the harmony of a variety of instruments, and the alternation of different musical compositions? Why must I weary of monotony, and all around me be alike wearied, when one impulse of freedom, would give us all a much greater chance of happiness?

God has given to men and women, the noblest and most true, a passion for variety. Some have more—some less, according to their individuality. The individual man is various in moods. I am not always the same, in person, feeling, or thought, or love. Is any man, or any woman? Some are much more so than others. I do not question that there may be monogamic men and women; and if two such should happen to meet, and be attracted to each other, and find a mutual adaptation, and satisfaction, we might find, in the infinite variety of creation, a true monogamic marriage.

There will be no dispute as to the existence of a passion, or spiritual want, of variety, in most men and women, in other things and relations. Every sense, every faculty demands it. The question is whether this demand for variety extends to the passion of love, the same as to all the other passions of the soul, or do we find here an exception to what seemed a universal law. What are the facts of human experience? They are, that in all ages, men and women, so far as they have had the power, have satisfied a manifest desire for variety, in the gratification of this, as of every other passion. No fact is better settled, than the wide spread, if not universal existence of the desire for alternation or variety in the affairs of the heart. The very existence of laws against it, and their supposed necessity, prove it. The terror of free

dom to conservatives is, the certainty that people will enter into various amours; and many, seeming to judge of others by their own repressed and morbid desires, apprehend a general promiscuity of sexual relations. If there be not in the human heart this desire for alternation and variety in love, whence this apprehension, and where the necessity of law and religion to prevent it?

I assume it as a fact of human experience, that such a passion does exist—that the principle of variety, change, and alternation, as an element of healthy enjoyment, belongs to every passion of the human soul, and that the passion of love forms no exception.

Moralists will not deny this—they will only say, it is sinful, and it is our duty to strive against it. Here is the point on which we are at issue. I assert that no instinct or desire of a healthy humanity is sinful, or to be struggled against or subdued, more than that of any vegetable or animal. I assert that every organ, every faculty of man, was made for use; in that use consists his happiness. The eye was no more made to see the whole universe of beautiful forms and colors, the ear to listen to all varieties of pleasant sounds, the sense of smell to enjoy all sweet odors, the taste all flavourous delights, the imagination all the sublimities and glories of mortal conception, than the passional nature and desires of men and women for their full, varied, and complete gratification.

The morality which teaches men that it is their duty to be miserable, has existed long enough. It is the moralism of penance and torture; hair shirts, filth, poverty, and fasting; of perpetual celibacy, self-denial, and self-abasement. It is the

moralism of the church, and the church has influenced the law. It is the *Taboo* of civilization. It is time that men had found out the folly of crucifying themselves or others; making themselves miserable here that they may be saved from misery hereafter. The marriage system is a part of this precious morality.

CHAPTER XIII.

WHAT IS MORALITY?

It is time for us to examine, and settle this question. If I say, morality is a conformity to the law of God, the most "orthodox" will not dispute the assertion. I accept the definition fully—I insist upon it. The law of God is impressed upon the constitution of every being, and belongs to its organization. The use of every faculty, possessed by any being, the gratification of every instinctive desire, the exercise of every power, the enjoyment of every happiness, is the fullest possible conformity of that being to the law of God.

No one will dispute this, if asserted of the lower animals. We never think of their instinctive acts being immoral.

I assert the same of man. He has no sense, faculty or passion that was not made for use, and whose use does not contribute to his happiness. These faculties are liable to perversion and disease. These diseases arise chiefly from repressions, or

efforts to control, thwart, or suppress them. Acting in freedom, their tendency is to harmony. Confined, dammed up, tabooed, they break out into injurious excesses and diseased manifestations, like the gluttony of those who have been starved, or the riotous saturnalia of slaves.

Man's morality, his most perfect conformity to the law of God, is his fullest and most harmonious exercise of all his natural faculties, and the complete gratification of all his natural desires. No talent is to be buried in a napkin ; no organ is to be sacrificed or perverted from its natural use and enjoyment. If we fail to develop one faculty, or to satisfy one inborn desire of our natures, we fail in our duty to God, in our conformity to nature, in justice to ourselves, and bring discordance into the universal harmony.

The rigid moralist, according to the civilized standard, is therefore the most immoral of beings ; he is one who lives in a continual violation of the laws of God, as they are impressed upon his own mental and physical organization.

The Hindoo devotees who refuse to move their arms, holding them still until they wither up, are exact types of our Christian moralists, who do precisely the same thing with passions of the soul, which are as necessary and as much intended for constant and varied use and pleasure as our muscles, limbs, and senses.

The morality of nature is pure, holy, universal, harmonious, and produces the greatest happiness every being is capable of enjoying. The moralism of civilization is obscene, impious, partial, discordant, and produces everywhere disease of body and

misery of soul, plunging man into a hideous concatenation of discord and crime.

It is my right, it is my highest duty, to use every organ, every sense, every faculty which God has given me. In the exercise and use of all these faculties, in the performance of every natural function of my life, I find the greatest possible pleasure, and the most complete and perfect happiness of which my nature is capable. This is true morality; this only is true virtue; this is a perfect conformity to the will of God. When all men and women are developed up to this thought and life, then will the will of God be done on earth as it is in heaven.

To do this, to be truly moral and truly virtuous, men and women must act in freedom. They must not be governed by outward constraints, but guided by inward laws. Each one must be a law unto himself, and not attempt to make his impulses the law of another's life. *Your* nature is not *my* nature; *your* virtue is not *my* virtue. There is no true virtue but in PERFECT FREEDOM.

CHAPTER XIV.

WHAT IS IMMORALITY?

WHATEVER act violates the natural law of any individual, is for that individual immoral. It is immoral for me to do anything contrary to nature, and therefore wrong; or to refrain from doing

what nature demands, and what is therefore right. In either case I violate the law of God, impressed upon and inherent in my organization.

As the development, by exercise, use, and consequent enjoyment, of all our powers and faculties, is the highest expression of our lives, and the fulfilling of all our relations, this is all we can conceive of duty to God, to our fellow beings, and to ourselves ; and this is therefore morality or virtue. And anything short of this is immoral.

If I fail to exercise and develop any faculty, I sin against my own nature, and I deprive the world of whatever use or pleasure it had a right to expect from such faculty.

For example : In a fit of self-sacrifice, such as we see everywhere, I put out my eyes. By this act I deprive myself of their use and enjoyment ; I cut myself off from one avenue to the sympathy of the race, and make myself an object of pity and disgust.

Or, I am a Quaker, and though I do not put out my eyes, I crucify the natural taste for the beautiful, robe myself in ugliness, and shock this taste in all around me.

Or, I have a talent for music, giving me the power of expressing beautiful ideas and sentiments in melody and harmony of sounds. Neither with respect to myself nor others have I a right to let this gift of nature lie dormant. And so of every faculty.

And God has so wisely made the world, that the natural and healthful exercise of every faculty and passion of the human soul is not only a happiness to ourselves, but to all with whom we are in any proper relation. Whoever wrongs his own

nature, wrongs at the same time other beings around him, diminishes the amount of their enjoyment and their power of giving happiness to others, and so lessens the sum of happiness for the race.

But in all these things every man is of right, and must be of necessity, the sole judge of his own actions. It is not for me to make any man feel, or think, or act, as I may desire him to do. He is the sovereign of his own individuality, and he must take upon himself the primary cost and chief consequences of his own actions. If a man refuse to make himself attractive, he is neglected; if he chooses to be repulsive, he is shunned; if he will not give exercise to his faculties, they fall into atony; if he smother or starve his passional desires, they will die. We have a healthy horror of suicide; but whoever destroys any portion of his life, so far kills himself. Are not men and women all around us who have been compelled to destroy the best part of themselves, their sweet affections? Has society compelled them to do this? Then they are not suicides, but it is society that is the murderer—society, that great witherer of human hearts!

My duty to myself, and consequently my highest morality, is self-preservation, the keeping in health, vigor, and fresh activity of all that makes up the **ME**; it is the exercise, use, and enjoyment of every faculty that is a part of me, in all its relations, according to the laws of harmony impressed upon the constitution of things.

My duty, and what morality requires with respect to all other beings is, that I should simply fulfill my proper relations to them; that I in no

manner do them an injury, or hinder them in the exercise, development, and enjoyment of themselves; but that, in whatever way our faculties harmonize with each other, we act together, in a co-operation of mutual satisfaction and delight.

In applying these principles to the love relations of men and women, we shall find a perfect adaptation to all the requirements of man and society.

If love is in my being, I have the right to love. I do involuntarily love any woman who is attractive to me, as naturally as I love fruit or flower, not all alike, but all in degrees corresponding to their excellence or fitness. As there are no two individuals alike, so no two are attracted in the same way by the same person. To love what is lovely is consistent with the highest morality. God has made us to desire what seems to us desirable, and not otherwise, though he has made us liable to diseased tastes and perverted appetites. These, the growth of repression, like unnatural longings for food in starvation, like the sad appetites born in poverty, are to be carefully guarded against, and as fast as possible cured.

My moral right to love all things that are lovely to me, cannot be questioned on the ground of any natural law. My right to love any lovely woman is included in that universal right. So is her right to accept and to reciprocate my love. If there be a mutual attraction, my love to her is no more my right to give, than her love to me is my right to receive. And her rights are the same as mine.

But as the fruition or physical ultimatum of this love may involve the exercise of the maternal function, and as this is the function of woman, it is always for her to decide whether a love shall find

its fullest and holiest expression in the sexual embrace.

If the woman who is beloved wishes to become a mother, she has a heaven-born right, high above all earthly legislation, to have a child. He who forbids it, commits a crime against nature of scarcely less enormity than murder itself!

There may be good reasons, in her own constitution or circumstances, or those of her lover, why a woman should not wish to bear his children; and in this case she has the undoubted right to refrain from exercising the maternal function, and of preventing it by any means that are needful to that end, even by the extreme measure, if that were necessary, of refusing for herself and for him the pleasure of the sexual embrace.

Unquestionably, the highest morality is for a woman to give herself to the man she loves, and bear his child. All nature points to this as the most perfect fulfillment of the law of God.

Just as unquestionably it is immoral for any woman to refuse to so give herself without strong natural reasons for such refusal—just as immoral as it would be to give herself to a man she did not love.

Sexual morality is therefore (or rather, should be) in the keeping of woman, guarded by her holy instincts, controlled by her attractions, repulsions, and intuitions, and governed by the sacred function of maternity.

CHAPTER XV.

IS FREEDOM SAFE ?

MR. ANDREWS has very justly observed, that when two cats, which are scratching each other to death, because they are tied up in a bag together, come to be let out, it may be needful to keep your hands upon their throats until they look about, and have time to perceive that they are at liberty to let each other alone !

There is a real terror, on the part of all conservatives, about the unsafeness of *people letting each other alone*. Everybody seems to feel that though each one, individually, is able to take care of himself, and manage his own private affairs, nobody else in the world is to be trusted to do the same. Hence despotism—hence law—hence such “order,” as “reigns at Warsaw,” and as reigns with its attendant tyrannies, discords, and perversions, to a greater or less extent, over the civilized world.

The subject of so general a terror, however, may be worthy of examination, to see if the prevalent fear be well founded. Let us listen to the exclamations that rise around us.

“People would plunge into universal licentiousness !”

Would you, sir ? Madam, would you ? What right have you to judge of your neighbors, unless you judge of them by yourselves ? Even this may be, and often is, unjust judgment. Beware how you make it, on this point. I ask you, beautiful

and sensitive lady, would you willingly give yourself to a man you did not love? Can you conceive of doing such a thing, except in the bondage of a civilized marriage, or a prostitution compelled by poverty and social outlawry? If not, this objection is answered. Those who would be licentious in any case are licentious now; and thousands of women are compelled every day to submit to the embraces of men they do not love, because they are their lawful husbands. Freedom would give all these slaves of license, the life of purity for which they long. Freedom, in religion, in government, and in the social affections, will lead to harmony, and purity, and peace.

"But children will not know the fathers that begot them!"

There is a saying now, that "it is a wise child that knows its own father." If this knowledge is so desirable, it is now but imperfectly secured. At present many a child never knows its real father, because the mother never dares to tell him the truth. A man who had been admitted into a masonic lodge came home in great glee to his wife, proud of having a secret he was obliged not to tell her. "I also have a secret," said she; "I have had five children, and I know who is the father of every one of them; and you don't.

In a state of freedom, where no true love or its expression, its ultimatum, or its natural results will be outlawry, and disgrace—where it will be recognized as a strictly individual right, and not a subject for censure, much less for legal penalties, there will be no reason why every child should not know its own father; for there will be no motive for concealment. Now, there are thousands of fathers

who dare not acknowledge their children—thousands of children, who never know their fathers. In the free future, every father may proudly acknowledge his paternity; every child may know the author of his being.

“There would be the liability to incest !”

No—it is in the concealed amours, and compulsory secrecy of the present system that this liability exists. In freedom, when every child would know its mother, of course, and might and would know its father, all near relationships would be recognized. Now they are not, and cannot be. Running through many families are secret amours. Children are born of these, the parents die, and the marriage of half-brothers and sisters is always possible, and doubtless of frequent occurrence. In freedom, such a thing could not occur, if, as we must believe, a true instinct leads persons to avoid such unions.

Thus I hurl back this objection, with a hundred others, upon the Marriage institution, which, of itself a wrong, is the parent of unnumbered wrongs and outrages upon humanity.

But what could women do without love and protection ?

They would not do without it. Just now it was feared that love would be forced upon them, and that they would have too much. Now they are to be starved. Wherever there are men, there will be no lack of protection to women, if you only leave men free to give and women to receive it. Every man loves and protects just as much as society allows him to. The coldest lovers, and the most ungallant protectors are husbands—unfortunates, for whom marriage has changed an attraction

happily united? Not in the least. Will it force any man or any woman to have loves they do not want? Not at all. Everything good, valuable, or worth preserving, it leaves as it now is. If a man is a monogamist, no one, in a state of freedom, can compel him to be otherwise. The compulsion, the violence, the wrong is all on the other side.

Destroy the marriage institution to-day, and every true love, every real union would remain just as true and just as strong as ever. Wherever, on the face of the earth, any man and woman were joined together in a mutual love, that union would remain. Whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. He would not if he could, he could not if he would; without the exercise of the very arbitrary control over the human heart, that we protest against in the marriage institution.

It is this institution that breaks this command of God. Everywhere there are men and women whom God hath joined together by the power of a fervent and mutual love, but whom this marriage institution inexorably puts, and keeps asunder.

I accept this saying of Christ, as the very essence of freedom in the relations of love. Men have perverted it for two thousand years, as they have perverted all truth in their ignorance, poverty, and selfishness. I denounce, therefore, the civilized marriage, as a violation of the laws of nature, and the commands of God.

CHAPTER XVI.

FREEDOM A PREVENTIVE OF CRIME.

IN the first part of this work, I have given an exposition of some of the relations existing between the marriage institution and other social abuses. It is proper that I should here point out the probable influences of Freedom in the Love Relations, on certain vices and crimes, now unhappily prevalent in our society.

SEDUCTION is considered an outrage, a misdemeanor, a crime ; and in some States is punished as a felony. It is often held to be a valid excuse for the assassination of the offender by the father, brother, or husband of the victim, or by the victim herself.

In a state of freedom, where men and women stand upon the same platform of equal rights, where women are no longer considered as property to be guarded, and liable to be stolen, like a horse, or a negro, the idea of seduction, as the simple act of charming, fascinating, seeking, and obtaining a woman's affections, and any natural expression of love, being a crime, is simply absurd. Whether the man seduces the woman ; or, as may happen often, the woman seduces the man, and in either case there is the full consent of both parties to the same act, which affects the rights and interests of no other being in the universe, there is no crime affecting society, or extending beyond the individuals concerned ; and no other person is called upon, or has the least right to interfere.

But in the present state of things, with marriage a popular, though much ridiculed institution ; with women owned, and supported by men ; with the liability of their reputations being damaged, their characters destroyed, and some mysterious ruination inflicted on their persons, seduction is a real, and a terrible thing.

There is no more equity in love than there is in commerce ; and in both we have consequently sharpers, swindlers, thieves, plunderers, and out-laws of all kinds. Men join to execrate and punish a seducer as they would a horse-thief ; and for the same reason. There is a property to be guarded ; and a seducer carries off this property, or spoils its value.

But, assuming woman's right to her own person, and to the bestowal of her own affections, she is to judge of the worthiness of her lover. Her virtue, her chastity, her virgin heart, are in her own keeping. The frank avowal of an honest love, and its frank acceptance, cannot be called a seduction.

If, in any case, fraud, or deception of any kind, is made use of, an injury is inflicted by these ; and there may be good ground for demanding redress. But here the crime consists in the fraud.

The common law of England takes the only consistent ground on this subject. Considering an unmarried woman the property and servant of her father, and a married woman as belonging to her husband, for his sole use and pleasure, it considers seduction as a kind of trespass, and awards pecuniary compensation to the injured husband or father, expressly and distinctly on the ground of loss of service, and damage thereby.

In New York, a man may be sent to prison for

seducing a woman, under a certain age, with a promise of marriage, which he afterwards fails to perform. This statute is a miserable trap, its only effect being to make scoundrels or cheats marry their dupes rather than be sent to prison. In all cases, when a man is arrested under this act it is optional with him to go to Sing Sing as a felon, or walk out of court a "Happy Bridegroom"!

In freedom, with the education and independence of women, and with their everywhere-acknowledged right to love, and to bestow themselves in love, we shall hear no more of the crime of seduction, and read no more of those absurd paragraphs of maudlin sentimentality, in religious novels and family newspapers, about the "vile seducer." These vile seducers would be as rare, in a state of free affections, as those equally detestable kidnapers, or negro-stealers, or, if you please, abolitionists, will be, when slavery shall have been abandoned, because either morally, socially, or pecuniarily unprofitable.

At least, we may very safely come to the conclusion that freedom in the relations of love will go far to relieve society of the odium and evil consequences of seduction.

While these pages are being put in type, I find the following record of a not unfrequent event, in the local columns of the *Daily Tribune*; a fine sample of the sanctity of the civilized marriage. Scarcely a day passes, that people are not united by a similar compulsion, exercised, not by police officers, perhaps, but by parents, relatives, friends, and "society."

"A WEDDING—*Almost*.—As Judge Morris, of the Circuit Court, was about to leave, after ad-

jourment, on Monday afternoon, a police officer entered the Court room and asked the judge to remain a short time, there being a couple below, he said, in the Chief's office, who were desirous of being married. The Judge consented to remain a few minutes, and was left nearly alone, there being but one other person in the Court room. In a few minutes some eight or ten persons, who had heard, in the hall, of a marriage being on the tapis, entered and seated themselves in the spectators' seats. Soon afterward, some four or five police officers, dressed in full uniform, came in, being accompanied by a lady somewhat above the middling height, straight features, red cheeks, and very light hair smoothly combed down each side of her forehead, and about 22 or 23 years of age, and a gentleman some ten years, apparently, older, both being handsomely dressed. They advanced toward the bench, the lady taking a seat. The Judge then approached them, and inquired of the lady if the contemplated marriage was with her entire wish and consent. She replied that it was not. The announcement was rather startling. The Judge remarked, 'Then I will not marry you,' and was about turning away. The gentleman by this time had also taken a seat, which had been placed for him near the lady's side. One of the police officers spoke up, and asked the Judge if he would please not to go away, as there was some misunderstanding about it, as the lady had expressed at the Chief's office her entire willingness to be married. The gentleman, he said, was under an arrest for seduction on complaint of the friends of the lady, but he had agreed to marry her forthwith and not go to prison, and the lady

had assented to the marriage. The Judge then inquired of the lady if she was willing to marry the gentleman. She replied that she was willing to marry him if he would remain with her afterward, but he had just told her that he would marry her and then immediately leave her, and she did not wish to get married on such terms as those. The gentleman was asked if that was his determination. He replied that he would marry her as he had been requested to do, but he should not afterward live with her. 'Then,' repeated the Judge, 'I shall not marry you,' and he took up his cane with a view to leaving the Court room. One of the new Councilmen, who was present, said to them, 'Well, if the Judge won't marry you, I will.' The Judge at this looked round rather severely upon the speaker and said, 'None of that, sir; you must not use such language while I am present.' A gentleman present appeared to be related to the lady, and was anxious apparently (something being hinted as to the advantage of their being so in respect to character) that the parties should be married; and one of the police officers said he thought an arrangement to that effect might yet be made. The Councilman took the swain somewhat severely to task, but apparently without effect. A number of persons had by that time assembled in the Court room. The Judge left, as did soon afterward the company, including the recently supposed bride and bridegroom—the latter still unmarried, and the gentleman, as before stated, remaining under arrest. It appeared, judging from the expression of her face as she looked, while they sat together, for a

moment upon him, that she is fond of him. The glance verified the saying, 'Love has eyes.'

"N.B.—Since writing the above, we understand the connubial knot was tied, after all. A magistrate coming into the Hall, he was applied to by the police officers to marry the couple; an adjournment was had to the Mayor's office, and, after some little negotiation, they stood up, the usual ceremonial of marriage was gone through with, and they were pronounced 'man and wife.' The gentleman was then asked to salute his bride, but he declined to do so, and walked five or six times back and forth the floor—finally he relented, glanced toward her, approached and kissed her willingly turned and truly fair cheek. Thus ended the nuptials—a wedding—in fact. The gentleman from appearance is rather well to do in the world. He has got a handsome looking wife—whether a good one or not will be for him, and his treatment toward her, and time to tell."

DOMESTIC INFIDELITY is the term used to express the unfaithfulness of a man or woman to the marriage vow. When such vows shall cease to be made; when men and women shall be faithful to themselves, and not to an arbitrary tie, a false relation, a hateful bond,—there will be no more trouble about infidelity to the marriage bed. The only adultery will be sexual union without love, and for that, in a condition of social equity and general riches, there can be scarcely any conceivable motive. Every person of any true sensibility must feel that what is called fidelity to a false marriage relation, may be the most terrible infidelity to all that is most pure and sacred in the human heart. The whole idea of domestic infidel-

ity, then, is based upon the existence of an arbitrary bond, which is to be enforced by all the power of the social machinery against every genuine attraction.

Freedom will put an end to domestic infidelity in a simple fashion. When people are wise enough not to make irrevocable promises, which all experience shows they may have no power to keep, this crime will no longer be heard of. No longer will the lover sing, "Thou'rt false to me!" to a woman who has been simply, and most rightfully true to herself, and her highest love. No more of the savageism of Othello; no more scandalous actions for crim. con. and trials for divorce; no more bloody tragedies. Give to woman the right to herself, let men and women mutually acknowledge the right of each to control their own actions, and all this trouble, brutality, and outrage would cease forever. There would be then no motive to falsehood, deception, treachery, and the thousand depraving and debasing hypocrisies of the marriage slavery.

PROSTITUTION, with all its horrors, and all its woes, depends upon, and is the counterpart of the civilized marriage, as I have shown in Part First. Loveless and mercenary unions of the sexes exist in marriage and out of marriage. It is like gambling in stocks, and gambling at faro; the only real difference is that one is respectable and the other is not; so of prostitution, in and out of marriage.

But, truly, judged by the great standard of divine and natural law, one is just as bad, just as false, just as base, as the other. The marriage institution compels both.

But in freedom, there is no conceivable reason to apprehend the existence of such a vice as prostitution at all. Let the recognition of women's rights and the principles of equity place all women above the necessity of selling their embraces, either in marriage or out of it; and does any man—does any woman, believe they would do it?

I do not contend that we should not for a time suffer from the consequences which the marriage institution has inflicted on mankind. Neither men nor women can be expected in one generation to grow pure and healthy; but the constant tendency of all the influences of freedom would be in that direction. Men and women, and especially women, naturally prefer a loving sexual relation, to an unloving one. A relation of mutual love is never prostitution. It is holy in the sight of heaven. Priests may go on for centuries to come, as they have for centuries past, blessing the nuptial couch of unloving marriages; but God has cursed, and will curse them ever. They may go on, in their bigotry and blindness, cursing the free and happy unions of mutual love, but God must bless them, for they are the result of the holy impulses he has implanted in all human hearts.

Freedom, then, must soon put an end to all the sin, all the degradation, and all the horrors of prostitution, legal and otherwise.

The crime of RAPE, or forcible violation, comes of the repressions and false conditions of civilization, and is one of its common brutalities. It exists chiefly in the marriage relation. A few women are violated by the terrors of knife or pistol; or are overcome by some potent drug; but in

most cases, it is the terrors of law, religion, or public opinion, or the fear of starvation, or the robbery of her children, or the narcotic of stupefying bigotry, that makes them submit to unwished-for, or hateful embraces. Rape, in any case, in marriage or out of it, is a brutal crime, and is deserving of execration, and punishment. In a state of freedom, and of corresponding social conditions, the great majority of cases now occurring in marriage, would cease, and we may reasonably expect that in the small proportion, out of marriage, there would be a corresponding diminution.

INFANTICIDE, the murder of infants, is a crime at which humanity shudders. This is almost exclusively the crime of marriage; and one for which it is chiefly responsible. In oriental countries female children are destroyed, because women are in a state of degradation and slavery. In civilization, children are destroyed by thousands in marriage, before birth and after, voluntarily and involuntarily, because women are compelled to bear them against their wills; while out of marriage they are killed, to enable their wronged and unhappy mothers to escape from the infamy with which the marriage institution punishes the consequences of illicit amours.

If married women were not forced to have children, they would not destroy them. If unmarried women were permitted to bear the children of their loves, without disgrace, they would have no motive to prevent or conceal their birth.

When, in the freedom of the affections, no woman will be compelled to bear a child contrary to her desires, and no one deprived of the right and blessing of maternity who wishes for it, there will

be no motive for the destruction of children before birth, or after. Voluntary abortion has come to be far more common in marriage, than out of it. It is one of the "necessary evils"—one of the legitimate results of the institution. Women, in this deplorable way, are asserting their right to refuse to bear the children forced upon them in marriage—they will soon assert the more humane right of having children when they desire them, out of marriage, and by fathers of their own free choice. No one can blame any woman for not wishing to bear the child of discord, or hate;—no one *ought* to blame any woman for wishing to bear the child of harmony and love.

It is perfectly safe to assert that nine-tenths of all the abortions voluntarily procured in this city, are by married women, who feel justified in using this dreadful and dangerous method of ameliorating the burthens of marriage. Of this subject, its relations, and the means of avoiding these terrible civilized perversions, I have treated elsewhere.

For all these evils, freedom in the relations of love, is the effectual, and the only true remedy. I can see no other. If any one can, let him point it out. I challenge the world to show that freedom is not the only real remedy for the evils of despotism—and to this rule the marriage despotism, the strongest, most pervading, and most intimate, forms no exception.

The freedom I mean is the right to do right; there cannot exist a right to do wrong. But the right must be *my* right, and not that of any other.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE LAW OF EXPEDIENCY.

I HAVE the faith in humanity to believe that no man or woman upon whom God has bestowed the gift of reason, and whose mind is not utterly perverted and blinded, has read this book thus far without being deeply convicted of the truth of its principles. I feel a deep commiseration for those who can see the beauty of holiness and the righteousness of freedom, and are yet bound hand and foot in the prison of social falsehoods and wrongs.

“What shall I do to be saved?” will be a cry of agony wrung from many hearts. “Shall I break my fetters, fly in the face of society, leave all for the truth’s sake?” If you have a call to be a martyr in this cause, you *must*. No effort of ours will prevent it. But be very sure that it must be “through much tribulation that we shall enter the kingdom of heaven.” There is no inconsiderable portion of the people of this country ripe for bloodshed on this very question. There are many men who would murder the Mormons for being polygamists, while they are ready to fight for the Turks. Mormon polygamy is a very one-sided affair, and very far from freedom; still it may be considered a step in advance of an exclusive and indissoluble monogamy; and an institution that is patriarchal, and copied after David and Solomon, ought to be more respected!

I have elsewhere asserted the law of expediency.

I have accepted the maxim, "the end sanctifies the means," as based on a true philosophy, which looks through actions to their far-reaching consequences. The abstract right may be an actual wrong. For a democrat in Austria to cause himself to be imprisoned, or executed, without effecting a corresponding benefit to the cause of freedom, is mere folly. For an abolitionist to provoke lynch law, where no great and permanent good is to be accomplished, is a mere fatuity. We are not to cast our pearls before swine, nor plunge into a den of lions, for nothing.

It is good to suffer—good to give up life itself, wisely and worthily; but not stupidly, and for no good end. In the present case, if those who read and accept our doctrines were to attempt to live them, there would be persecution, imprisonment, and in some cases the violence of the mob, whose indignant virtue is never so thoroughly aroused as by any attack upon the "purity of the marriage institution." The press, too, the conservative press, and some of the half-way reformers, would side with the mob.

We say, then, to all lovers of truth, and purity, and freedom, that in this question, as in all others, there is a law of expediency to be observed, and a certain regard to vested rights. Property in marriage, like other property, is the result of great wrongs, and a violation of every principle of equity. I know that "property is plunder"—that every great fortune is an accumulation of thefts, frauds, and spoliations—that every great income is wrung, cent by cent, and dollar by dollar, with no corresponding equivalent, from the sinews of labor. I know that the rich, and those who wish to be

rich, or to share their plunder, have built up this system of robbery, and guarded it by laws, and that the maintenance of this system of plunder, and those laws which protect it, is what they call "the good order of society." I see here a perfect correspondence between the property interest, and the marriage institution.

Well, in the one case, I do not turn thief, and run the risk, for taking some of my natural rights, to be sent to Sing-Sing; nor shall I do so in the other. So long as I live in any country, I pay a certain outward respect to its laws, customs, and institutions, though I may think them detestable. When I wish to live in equitable relations in regard to property or love, I will seek some place where people can be honest in both without the risk of martyrdom, and a martyrdom that can be of little probable benefit.

But each individual must be the judge of his own actions. Each one knows the temperature of his own hell. I do not say bear, or forbear. Each must decide what he can bear, and for what. Mothers will continue to sacrifice themselves for their children, and it may be well in some cases that they should do so; but when a true woman awakens to the full conception of the holiness of a love, and to the deep loathing of adultery, she will be a martyr, because she cannot be a slave. She would escape, if she must walk over hot plowshares, or through a fiery furnace. She will sacrifice friends, position, fortune, good name, every worldly consideration, to be pure and free.

Such women,—and there are coming to be many now,—will stand by each other, and all true men will give them sympathy and aid. The fugi-

tive negro flies to Canada. It is a hard, cold, comfortless home; but it offers him freedom; and if he prefers liberty to comfort, God forbid that any free man should hinder him in taking his choice. We may doubt perhaps whether he is fit for freedom, or freedom for him; we may doubt whether the slavery he escapes to is not on the whole about as bad as the one he escapes from; but that is his affair. Liberty is his right to choose between them; and if he wants to go back, we are not aware that there is any law to prevent his doing so. Slaves do sometimes go back to their masters; it may be that women go back to their husbands.

But there is no Canada for runaway wives—the fast-increasing multitude of fugitives from this other peculiar institution. New Hampshire, Connecticut, Ohio, and some other Western States have laws of divorce, available to all who have money and influence. There is distance, and concealment is possible, where there are the means of escape. But there will soon be wanted some city of refuge—some home of equity, where a woman who prefers freedom and purity to a legal prostitution, can find sympathy and the means of support.

There is now growing up one such place, the City of Modern Times, based in all its spiritual and material foundations on the principles of equity and individuality, and destined, we believe, to a rapid and vigorous growth.

I append to this chapter extracts from two letters, both written while these pages are in the hands of the printers. The first is from a young married lady of beauty, cultivation, great sweet-

ness of character, and living in a position of the most conservative respectability—a lady of the most unsullied reputation and civilized morality. Speaking of her first reception of the thought of freedom, she writes :

“But of this great question of freedom, my dear sir, I have hitherto had but very imperfect ideas. Now I seem to feel a new light breaking in upon my heart, and it is really wonderful what an effect this shadow of hope has upon me. Why, I feel almost well. *I* hopeful? *I* happy? It is all too beautiful for realization. More like a fairy vision it seems to me, who have so long lived in this hopelessness, in this despair. I can never express what I have suffered during several years past, for much of my history remains untold; but worst of all was the thought that I *must live on* in a bondage worse than death—to feel that I *must* close the avenues of my heart against affection, sympathy, and every blessed thing, or be branded as the vilest of the vile, has often called forth a prayer that I might *cease to be*. If I have a heart capacitated to receive the angel of love, and if that power to love be God-given, why must I crush it out? I cannot—I *cannot*! Struggle as I may against the yearning sympathies of my heart, I—but how shall I emancipate myself from my bonds? I am determined that I will be a *slave* no longer. Do you think I could obtain a situation in New York whereby I can maintain myself independently? I am willing to struggle and toil for freedom.”

What answer was to be given to such an appeal? We all know what answer every moral civilizee would give. Chains, whips, and the dungeon, spir-

itual if not material, would be held up before her. I will give an extract from the letter I wrote, without the thought of its publication here, as it lies open, waiting to be enveloped and mailed to its destination. I said :

“The book is nearly done. I shall send you a copy, and you will see our whole idea of freedom. This you are to accept, if you can—to *live*, if you can. But it must be you, in your own heart, and thought, and life, that must decide for yourself the question of freedom or slavery. We cannot give you freedom. It can come of no personal attraction or sympathy. God forbid that any one should have a mere external and arbitrary freedom. It must be in the quiet of your own home, surrounded by home scenes and influences, removed far from the sphere of all who may have attracted or influenced you, that you are to decide upon the important question of your life’s destiny.

“I may not presume to control or guide you, but I may offer you my advice, as you have my sympathy. I think you are to put our book into the hands of your father, to tell him of your wish to be free, and to see if he will not give you his aid and protection. When you have done that, if he refuse to help you, and if you feel freedom to be worth any price, in God’s holy name make any sacrifice necessary to obtain it. Freedom is one thing, and to be considered by itself. What may be yours in freedom, is another matter, and belongs to the future. You have no rights until this first of rights is asserted and obtained.

“It is my opinion that you are not to be a fugitive and an outcast, except in the last necessity. What is to hinder you from making a frank avow-

al of your opinions and your feelings to your husband, and appealing to his generosity and justice to set you free? How do you know that he is not as ready for freedom and equity as you are? This is worthy of consideration.

“Our future is all clouded, and I cannot see what of material prosperity is coming to us. I would be glad to do you any service. There may soon be a place, and work in freedom for all who are worthy to enjoy it. Now I know of no place, and no occupation that would not enslave you; but doubt not that when you in yourself are ready for freedom, a way will be opened for you, if it is through the Red Sea.”

It is to be hoped that this woman, and hundreds and thousands more, may find a refuge where at least their right to purity, to chastity, to fidelity to their own instincts, may be respected by all around them. If only the negative right of refusing to live with those they do not love were guaranteed to women, the greater portion would cheerfully compromise with civilized morality, and renounce the higher and positive right to give themselves to those they love.

Freedom, let us repeat the thousandth time, is not licentiousness, but is the only safeguard of purity and virtue. Society, in the institution of marriage to guard against some possible unchastity, condemns millions of women to all the horrors of legalized prostitution and adultery.

As a realization of the higher, positive idea of social organization, with “Health, Intelligence, and Freedom,” we hope soon to be able to welcome some of the choice spirits of the New Dispensation to the Institute of Desarrollo, a school of life, where,

by development in industry, art, and education, we may at least make some preparation for the next higher epoch, which is to succeed civilization.

“Be ye therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves.” Transitions are painful. The wrongs and outrages of civilization need not be avenged upon their victims. We must not forget that it is with institutions, not men and women, that we are in conflict. The true policy of reformers is to do the greatest possible good, by inflicting the least possible injury.

The truth will prevail, because it must. Justice will be done, because it is in harmony with the highest impulses of humanity. Freedom must come into the most intimate relations of life, because, it is there that it is most needed. It will come—it comes; because humanity demands it. No sigh was ever breathed, no drop of blood was ever shed for it in vain.

The law of progress requires that we move onward; the law of expediency requires that we do so at the least cost, and to the greatest advantage.

It is probable that we should find, upon a close analysis, and in view of all circumstances, that the right, the just, the benevolent, and the expedient, are all comprised in the same action. All terms of goodness express but one good—all varieties and modifications of evil, center in a single wrong.

CHAPTER XVIII.

WHAT WE OUGHT TO DO.

THE world is full of preachers and moralists, who are telling men what they ought to do. For thousands of years men have preached Duty. We ought to think in a certain way; we ought to feel meek, humble, penitent, and good; we ought to believe all the contradictory and incomprehensible things that are taught us; we ought to do exactly contrary to every impulse and attraction of our natures!

What we ought to do, according to the moralism of civilization, is to have no loving desire for one of the other sex, until we are of a suitable age to be married, and take upon us the cares and dignities of a family, as well as to have acquired the means of maintaining one. It happens, in the order of nature, that love comes burningly into our whole physical frames, at from fourteen to seventeen; but we are counselled to wait ten years or so, before we give it the least expression.

Then we ought to love some suitable person. We may have loved many—some more, some less, some for a longer, some for a shorter period. But no indulgence is to be given to any passion, until our “intentions are honorable,” which means, very often, that we intend to do one of the meanest and most dishonorable things in the world. All this time we ought to preserve a monastic chastity, more particularly the woman must do this. To

be sure, the man ought to do so as well, but if he does, he never makes any boast of it. Now this well matched pair ought to go through a formal, well bred courtship, the gentleman never offering, and the lady most certainly never permitting the slightest impropriety, which, indeed, would be the greatest possible insult, and would wound her delicacy beyond all reparation.

When the matter is finally agreed upon, the happy couple ought to send for a fashionable parson, and bind themselves, by the most solemn promises, to love each other, as long as they both shall live; when, after receiving his benediction, they ought to go to bed together, and have it published in the newspapers, and formally announced to all their friends that they have done so, and intend to do so, henceforth, as long as life lasts; as if this fact were of the greatest public importance. Perhaps they ought to make a bridal tour, to make the matter a little more public, sleep in bridal state rooms on steamboats, and in the bridal chambers of fashionable hotels; for this is a part of the civilized delicacy and decency, in the relations of love.

The drama is ended—the curtain falls—two human hearts are locked up—the parson has the key, and nothing but death can ever unlock them. This is what ought to be. What this marriage is likely to be we have fully described, and need not repeat.

What would be thought of a naturalist, who in giving accounts of beasts, birds, fishes or insects, should gravely go to work to tell us what these animals ought to do; how they should manage their sexual relations, or bring forth their young;

laying down arbitrary laws for the regulation of elephants, horses, and horned cattle, and denouncing as highly immoral and criminal—beastly, perhaps—any conduct that was different from what it ought to be.

Now man has a nature, instincts, feelings, passions, desires, and faculties which make up his peculiar character, and govern his life, just as the elephant, or the lion has ; and it is just as absurd to set down, in a theoretical and arbitrary way what he ought to do. He will do what it is his nature to do—or in other words, what God has made him to do ; and the enforcement of any arbitrary rule of life, varying from this, cannot fail to pervert his whole nature, and produce deplorable consequences.

What we mean by freedom, is to leave man with the power, at least of finding out, by giving scope to his attractions, what was really the intention of nature, in regard to his social condition. We have not said—we have not intended to say—men and women ought to do this or that ; we say only, men and women have a right to act in freedom, so as to be able to do what God wishes them to do, and intended, by their very organization, that they should do.

We do for man only what a truly scientific naturalist would do for any animal ; we point out what seems to us to be the natural result of his organization ; and all we ask is that he may have freedom from arbitrary constraints, to live the pure and natural and beautiful life, that we believe is his natural destiny. And this may be called naturalism, as opposed to moralism, which is, in so many things, an arbitrary perversion and contra-

diction of nature; unscientific, unphilosophical, absurd, and, in a religious point of view, impious, or blasphemous.

Moralism is based upon the dogma of human depravity—that is, that the natural instincts of man are wrong, and consequently, to act contrary to them is right. Our doctrine is the reverse of this, we believe that the natural instincts of man are right, and that all the wrongs of which we complain, are the result of this moralistic perversion; the real depravity now existing having been produced, by this very denial of nature, and this contradiction and repression of the divine instincts of humanity.

To enquire how this first came about, and grew into systems, and spread over the world, would occupy more space than we can now give. The fact must be evident to every candid inquirer. "God made man upright, but he hath sought out many inventions."

Let us stop saying what man ought to do, and be content to leave him in freedom to follow the best light he can see, and live up to the highest impulses of his own nature. This is what we ought to do.

It is in morals as in medicine. The first thing is to be sure that we do no mischief; we must be careful not to interfere with the efforts of nature; and when we do anything, we must only aid her efforts, acting with her, when we are sure that we know what she requires.

To know what man ought to do, we must know man; and it is for this reason that human Physiology or Anthropology is the true basis of all moral and social science.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT.

BUT what are we to do without government and laws, social order and a police, and all the institutions of society in civilization? Conservatives and progressives will ask such questions; and it seems needful that we should try to point out the true function of government, and to show how much regulation is consistent with freedom.

There is a prevalent idea, that in the social compact we surrender natural rights as a price paid for protection; that government, in its best form, must be a compromise, or choice of evils. This idea we reject. All that is necessary or beneficial, of government, law, or enforced order, we believe may be obtained without the sacrifice of a single individual right. It is only in a government of wrongs that rights are sacrificed.

The true and sole function of government is the protection of individual rights. The moment any government passes this line, and trespasses on the Sovereignty of the Individual, that moment it is a despotism.

The agreement of a number of persons to mutually protect each other against all aggression on their individual rights, to prevent, and, if need be, punish all wrongs or infringements of individual sovereignty and equity, is the only just government. In agreeing to such a compact as this, and in contributing my share of the cost of such pro-

tection, I not only surrender no right, but I make an express agreement that every right of mine shall be protected. There is no possible right on the part of any individual despot, any church, any aristocracy, any combination of interests or classes, any majority, however large, to deprive me of any individual right, or to inflict upon me any burthen.

We talk about the right of majorities to govern, and of the value of representation. A majority may oppress, plunder, and enslave a minority against every principle of right; and the representative of a minority has no power to enforce the claims of justice in behalf of his constituents.

Every individual in any community has the right to demand of every other, first, that there shall be no invasion of his rights—no violation of the principle of equity in regard to him; and second, he has the right to agree with them that they will mutually defend and protect each other against all such aggressions. All beyond this, as compacts for co-operation in industry, or enterprises of any kind, do not belong to the province of government, or police regulations.

Existing theories and practices in government and laws are based upon the dogma of human depravity or natural dishonesty. We take issue on this fundamental ground. We assert that it is the natural impulse of man to do right—to respect the rights of others. And men do this whenever their own rights are respected. That the man who is robbed should rob again; that the slave should be treacherous; that the oppressed should commit violence; that men should in some way, and often very blindly, avenge their injuries;—is not strange. The criminals of society are its victims. But these

are not the manifestations of a healthy, intelligent, free humanity; but of beings diseased, ignorant, and enslaved.

Give all men freedom and equity, and violence and dishonesty would soon disappear. Even now intelligent wrong is exceptional and rare. With all the injustice that fills the world, most men mean to be honest. They wish to do right. They are as good as circumstances permit. If it were not that the principle of goodness is far more powerful than that of evil; if there were not more benevolence than malevolence,—the present social system could not endure a day. The oppressors of humanity *live* only by the martyr-like and most patient sufferance of the oppressed. It is the humanity of the millions of enslaved and oppressed peoples that is the safety of their oppressors. It is this long suffering humanity that looks in patience and hope to God and the future for the justice that man and the present deny them.

It is this inherent goodness, honesty, and virtue of humanity which ages of subversion, ignorance, and slavery have not destroyed, upon which I predicate the safety of freedom—the safety of right.

Government, like all other things, should be subject to the principle of supply and demand. To force any government upon a man against his will, is a simple usurpation. A man should never know that there is a government, unless he violates the rights of some other person, or needs protection against some wrong. All laws which interfere with any natural right are an impertinence and a despotism.

It is probable that most of the functions now performed arbitrarily, imperfectly, and at great

cost by governments, could be done much better by voluntary individual action. If in any community there was a demand for the kind of protection afforded by a police officer, what should hinder any man who had an attraction for that kind of business, from adopting it as his profession, and receiving for his services an equitable remuneration? Why should not any man of knowledge, experience, and known integrity, put up his sign, and officiate as judge, in all civil actions, or disputes concerning equity?—though, were the principles of equity acknowledged, and its laws understood, few misunderstandings would ever arise.

Where people are conscious of ignorance, and of their need to be taught, let them seek instruction. Where they need direction in the management of their affairs, let them engage competent overseers. It is better in all respects that the demand should govern the supply, than that even the ignorant and incapable should be subjected to all the possible abuses of arbitrary power.

The true function of government I hold to be the protection of every individual against every invasion of his rights. The necessity for government must be in proportion to the dangers of such an invasion. The universal acceptance of the principles of individual sovereignty and commercial equity, will do away with almost every necessity for governmental protection. There will be nothing to protect against. We may safely leave the rest to benevolent co-operation, voluntary and spontaneous.

A thousand questions, which arise in the daily affairs of society, and which are now settled by arbitrary rules, sometimes one way, and sometimes

another, differently in different States, and by different magistrates in the same State, yield to the scientific solution of equitable principles. But in our society one wrong makes many. When men enslave other men, laws must be made to guard the institution of slavery. Where men seize upon, and monopolize the soil of a country, and by means of rents, interest, and commercial profits, absorb the entire of the industry of its inhabitants, above the bare minimum necessary for their support, there is needed a strong government, police, and army, to maintain their iniquitous usurpation. The chief function of all governments, now, is to protect men in defrauding, oppressing, and enslaving each other. This is exactly the opposite of what it should be. Its true office is protection of rights.

The application of these principles to the love relations of the sexes is evident. There needs power and force to support and maintain existing wrongs. Men and women, who have usurped control over each other—who have seized upon, and monopolized each other's affections and persons—call for the strong arm of the law to maintain these usurpations. But if the affairs of the heart were left to be governed by its own attractions, in perfect freedom from all arbitrary control, there would be no possible demand for governmental or legal interference.

In a free society, it would be a very absurd thing for a man and woman, drawn together by a mutual attraction, to go before a magistrate or priest to be married. If there could be persons so foolish, we can imagine them saying:

“Respected sir, we love each other.”

"Very good," the magistrate or parson replies; "but that is no affair of mine."

"But you represent the function of public justice, and we thought——."

"Well, what is it? Have you any complaint to make? Does any one pretend to hinder your loving each other, just as much, and as long as you please? I should think that was *your* affair, not mine, or the public's."

"Yes, your honor, but we thought it might be best to get married."

"Very well—who hinders you? Get married as fast as you choose—stay married as long as you like. It is nobody's business but your own. Be good to each other. Deal justly and equitably. If you have children, madam, take good care of them; and you, sir, will do the handsome thing, if you give her any assistance she may require. Peace be with you!"

"But, sir, this is not enough. We wish to be bound together, so that we shall be compelled to love each other, live together, and never love anybody else, as long as we both do live."

"Yes," says the man; "I want this woman to promise to love, honor, and obey me."

"And, your honor," says the woman; "I want him to promise to love, and support, and cherish me always."

"Then," interposes the magistrate; "you are two precious fools. You ask me to do for you something you cannot do for yourselves. If you want to always love each other, and live together, and love nobody else, go and do it. Who hinders you? But I shall be a party to no such foolish compact. You may both alter your minds in a

week ; and then you would be tied together, tormenting each other's lives out. Go—if you love, that is your own particular business, and none of mine—if you continue to love, you have my free consent, and I presume no sensible person will make any objection ; but I will have nothing to do with any absurd agreement to do what may neither be desirable, nor even possible for either ; and as to shutting two persons up together, who do not wish it, there can be no greater calamity, and no greater injustice.”

CHAPTER XX.

THE RESULTS OF FREEDOM.

HITHERTO, I have said much of the right of Freedom ; I have endeavored to vindicate it against the fear of evil consequences, showing that Freedom, as a good, cannot result in evils ; but I have yet to show how great will be the benefits that must naturally, spontaneously, and inevitably flow from the freedom and equity of the love relations.

Equity in commerce would lead very rapidly to harmonious social relations and general riches ; but of these there could be little enjoyment, without the extension of the principle to the realm of the affections. All the intercourse of human beings with each other must be governed by the same principles, which, according to their application, take the names of right, justice, truth, goodness,

equity, liberty ; which are all obviously but various expressions of the same great law of Harmony.

In the same way, all terms of badness, wrong, injustice, falsehood, wickedness, evil, are expressions of the opposite principle of discord. All true, and beautiful things, are of one family, have one common origin, and promote one common end—the happiness of all beings. All evils are in the same way linked together in intimate correspondence, and in the relation of cause and effect, and their single result is misery.

If freedom be a good, we may expect all good to flow from it ; if love be a good, then there should be freedom in love ; and from this union of goods and truths, for such I hold them unquestionably to be, we should have a brood of blessings.

One of the first results of freedom in love will be that of increased individual development, worthiness, and attraction. As love is the want of every human being, the true food and riches of the soul, giving life, vigor, and joy, every person will endeavor to render himself, or herself, as attractive as possible. The demand will govern the supply.

All that is now needed for a young man is an elegant or imposing appearance, to dress well, to have good manners, a respectable position, and money. The mere appearance of some of these is sufficient, in the present modes of courtship, to secure the hand of a desirable woman. On the other side, there is required the semblance of innocence or ignorance, accomplishment, manner, and some degree of beauty, or fortune ; any or all of which may be deceptive. The knot once tied, all care on this score is at an end. Education is henceforth at a stand-still ; accomplishments are neglected ;

even manners and habits are disregarded. The destiny of life, so far as this relation is concerned, is accomplished.

In freedom, all this will be changed. When there is no arbitrary tie, and all are free to be joined by their attractions, or to be separated by their repulsions, there will be new, more powerful, and continuous motives for development.

As the happiness of each man's life will depend, not upon a legal bond, but upon his own personal and continual attractiveness, he will increase this by all the means in his power; in the improvement of his person, the cultivation of his mind, and the acquisition of all those accomplishments and qualities, which he finds by observation and experience, will be most likely to give him success with those whose sympathy is most desirable.

And as he will constantly, habitually, and all his life, endeavour to make himself attractive, and worthy of those to whose affection he will naturally aspire; so he must as sedulously avoid every thing that can make him repulsive. Such vices as uncleanness, slovenliness, uncouth actions, and degrading habits, as the use of foul language, ardent spirits, or tobacco, and all the unseemly and repulsive practices of civilization would cease, by virtue of this single charm.

If it appears that women love men for truth, manhood, intelligence, refinement, generosity, and nobleness; all men who desire to be loved—and who does not?—would aspire to the possession of these qualities. And in this case it would not be enough to *seem*—it would be necessary to *be*. Now, a woman, deceived by specious hypocrisies, is the life-long victim to the base deception. Then, the

love will end, as soon as the cheat is discovered, and no arbitrary law will compel a woman to a life of hypocrisy, shame, and suffering.

Nor will it be worth while for any man to play the hypocrite. He would soon be found out, known, and shunned. And when, as in the society of the future, many intimate acquaintanceships could be formed, and a free choice made from great numbers and a variety of characters, the intuitions of women would have better opportunities to protect them.

If freedom would naturally produce such effects upon the manners, habits, and educational development of men, we may expect that women, who are still more formed for love; who have in a higher degree the desire of admiration; with whom it is a passion to be charming; whose mission is to attract, and love, and bless humanity;—we may expect that women, even more than men, will gain in development, and in the cultivation of all that can increase their attractions to those whose affections they will be most ambitious to gain.

Thus it will be that love, in freedom, will be for both sexes, and for all humanity, the main-spring of improvement; the stimulus of every noble ambition; the teacher of refinement, grace, elegance; the charm of society; the dispenser of all blessings.

Every where we see, and painfully feel the want of this principle, which has now but a limited, partial, and temporary existence. Every man knows that his truest life, and his best aspirations, have spring out of some passionate love. If men could be always lovers, they might always be manly, noble, chivalric. With any opportunity, and ob-

ject, they commonly are so, from fifteen to twenty-five, or until they are married. And women, at the same age, are in most cases, even under present disadvantages, very charming. But marriage comes, and puts an end to all this. The true life of the affections; the life of aspiration, ambition, and development, is at an end. There is no more to be accomplished. For man, henceforth, business, politics, brandy, and tobacco; for woman, household cares, and compulsory maternity. An English poet has described her lot in one pithy line :—

“To suckle fools, and chronicle small beer.”

Could I impress on all men and women, as I feel, the blessings of freedom, in all the relations of life, but more in this than any other, the world would soon be free; and its progress in all material and spiritual advancement would be rapid, in proportion to the added stimulus of aspiration, and the added vigor of a true life; while so many clogs and fetters, holding us back, would be removed. Political freedom is a glorious boon—freedom of thought, of worship, of speech and of the press, is much to be thankful for; but who will tell me that freedom of the affections, more intimate than all, and more connected with our happiness, is not of all others the most precious right?

All other freedoms, all other rights seem but as the stepping-stones to this highest freedom, and highest right.

Individual development, and improvement, would be the immediate and primary result of freedom in love, or the abolition of all the despotisms of

the marriage institution. This individual improvement, continuous and perpetual as it would be, must produce, necessarily, a corresponding social condition. There would be no more of the present compulsory isolation. The social wants of man, for the first time in the history of the world, would be satisfied. When every man is doing his best to win the approbation, the esteem, the friendship, and the love of every woman, toward whom he finds himself attracted; when every woman is doing her utmost to delight, and charm all who come within her circle; when a noble emulation has taken the place of the mean jealousies, and malicious scandals and persecutions, that spring from the present system; there will be such an enjoyment of social life, as we can now scarcely conceive.

And this society will not be transient, fragmentary, and spasmodic, as now; but constant, integral, and a thing of course. The society of civilization consists of formal morning calls, and stupid evening parties. There are mobs of uncongenial people, with the greatest amount of splendid discomfort, mixed with the least possible enjoyment, consisting for the most part of stolen flirtations, the mere shadows and fragments of the enjoyments of freedom. But the society of the future will be a perpetual school of intellectual and moral improvement, in which men and women will grow every day more brilliant, more excellent, more estimable, more adorable.

And, as every improvement in the soul of man is manifested in a corresponding improvement in his organization; and especially in the spiritual and material organization of his offspring, there

will be an immediate and vast improvement in the children of freedom. Generated under the most favorable circumstances ; born of parents who are in their best conditions ; reared in a state of harmony and happiness ; there is no reason to doubt that they will influence the rapid development of the human race up to its highest capability.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE LOVES OF THE FUTURE.

WERE it possible, I would anticipate all objections, and answer, beforehand, all possible inquiries ; for it is my desire to throw all the light I can on every part of this subject, which, every reader must see, is of no secondary importance.

Marriage, if a mistake, is a terrible one ; if a wrong, it is one of a most fearful character. I believe that I have proved it a mistake and a wrong.

It will be said—there are undoubtedly false marriages, but there are also true ones. If by marriage is meant an indissoluble monogamy, or the legal, exclusive bond of the civilized institution, I deny that it ever is, or ever can be right.

I assert that the promise of a man to love any woman, as long as he lives, is wrong ; because it is a promise he may not have the power to fulfill.

I assert that for a man to live, in the relation of husband and wife, with a woman he no longer loves, is a wrong, a sin against nature, and one

which is productive of vast evils to the individual and to society.

I assert that the very relation imposed by the marriage vows, and marriage laws, is a wrong to both parties, and especially to the woman, who bears the severest burthens.

There can be no true marriage, which contains these falsehoods and wrongs. Indissoluble marriage is false in theory, false in practice, and its results are evil, only evil, and that continually. Whatever there is that is good, sweet, pleasant, and productive of happiness in marriage, comes of such true love between the parties, as is not dependent on marriage, existed previous to it, and continues in spite of it. Love is the good—marriage is the evil. Love may exist in spite of marriage, but never on account of it. Apply the parallel of slavery here—I need not repeat it.

What then, it may be asked, is the true marriage? If you are anxious to preserve the word, and give to it a better meaning, I would say, true marriage is the union of mutual love, in entire freedom, between whomsoever it may occur, and for whatever period it may continue.

But the marriage of civilization is the legal union of two persons for life, who may not love each other at all. The true marriage, as above defined, is no marriage, according to the standard of civilization.

Are the sexes upon an equality in the exercise of the right to love in freedom? Yes, and No. They differ in function and capacity; but there are compensations that make them equal. The function of maternity, throwing upon woman the chief cost of the ultimation of love, also gives her the

deciding power in regard to it. St. Paul, though learned in the Jewish law, and a wise man in many respects, seems not to have been much of a physiologist, if he meant that women should submit themselves to men, in sexual intercourse. God never intended a thing so monstrous. No legalization of a rape can make it the less an outrage.

There is an idea prevalent, that the ultimation of love in the sexual union, is intended solely for the production of offspring. There is no physiological foundation for this belief. The desire for the sexual union, is not adapted to, or governed by, this result in man or in woman,—especially in man.

In woman the maternal function ceases at the age of forty-five or fifty, but the desire to love, and the faculty of enjoying the sexual embrace continues to a much later period. In men, the sexual desire and the generative power both exist from puberty to old age, lasting, in some cases, more than a hundred years.

In each case, the individual attraction must define the law of life, for in all the universe, "attraction is proportional to destiny." Nature has doubtless provided wisely for all the wants of all her creatures. If we, in the exercise of our free will, enter into voluntary compacts, or force each other into slaveries, in which these wants cannot be satisfied, we do it at the risk of all the injurious consequences that must necessarily follow.

There is no doubt that the amative propensity attains a morbid activity in the constraints and repressions of civilization, and it is certain that freedom would result in a more healthful moderation. The greater the repression of any natural desire,

the more inordinate becomes any permitted gratification.

The social relations of the sexes, in freedom, will be just the opposite of the civilized theory, and the full carrying out of what is clearly indicated in the most refined practice of ancient and modern civilization. In the savage state, woman is a drudging slave; in the barbarous, a petted slave; in civilization, she is sometimes one, sometimes the other; but we see, here and there, women who are ahead of civilization—women whom some rare good fortune has placed in a position to anticipate something of the destiny of her sex.

The Greek Aspasia, and the French Ninon de l'Enclos, perhaps in some degree the English Lady Blessington, are examples of women who have filled something like a true social position. Walter Savage Landor has done some tardy justice to the noble genius of Aspasia; Ninon lived in health, beauty, love, and happiness, admired and respected by all who knew her, charming as a fresh young girl at eighty, and retaining her loveliness and her power to love. Lady Blessington was, at least, the intellectual life of an elegant coterie. These may be considered as faint types of the women of freedom, who will be the centers of attraction and the dispensers of refined enjoyment.

Can any man say that these women would have been better, or happier, or more useful to the world, had they been the meek, submissive, soulless wives that civilized morality requires? The very idea of a wife forbids any brilliant destiny, any elevated sphere, any true life to a woman of beauty and genius. Marriage, in destroying woman, and utterly unfitting her for her true sphere

in life, has destroyed any possibility of a true society. We must give up one or the other. If we retain marriage, we can have no society; if we are to have a true society, there can be in it no marriage. For over every true human society woman must preside; and no woman can thus preside attractively and independently who stands to any man in the relation of the wife of civilization. She must be free. The woman who gives up her freedom, sacrifices everything that is most noble, everything most useful in her social destiny.

Left to the instincts of freedom, will women have many lovers? Probably not. Some more than others. For a long time, and until men greatly improve, there will be a sad lack of the proper material. There are too few men in the world worthy of the love of a refined and noble woman. There is no fear of there ever being too many.

Will women have children by different lovers? They do now, often. It is difficult to tell what freedom and the future will bring us. When a woman loves a man, the most beautiful keepsake he could give her would be a living likeness in a child. It is better than a daguerreotype. There are women now who have such precious souvenirs, and dearly do they treasure them.

There is reason to suppose that the child of a fresh and ardent love is stronger and better, other things being equal, than any other. It will be admitted that children should be born in love. It will not be disputed that a woman who has had a child by one man, may love another as well, or even better, than the first. I know of no natural reason why a woman may not have a child by a

second husband, or a second lover. It would seem to be in harmony with some of the similar operations of nature, to suppose that the mere change might be beneficial; but when the change is from a diseased parent to a healthy one—from an inferior to a superior, there can be no question whatever. The right of a woman to choose the father of her child, carries the right to choose at any time the one she deems most desirable.

Will love be always mutual? In freedom, what should hinder it? With a wide range of choice, through varied characters and passional endowments, there will scarcely be a lack of mutual adaptation and attraction. It is only in poor, mean societies, where men are driven to advertise in the newspapers to find any female acquaintance, that people take what is nearest, and think that a poor lover or husband may be better than none. When all men and women are free, they will be drawn together by a strong attraction. The great attraction of the sexes will bring together men and women; their particular congenialities or contrasts will gather them in groups; finally, individuals will be drawn together by the intimate relation of their spheres, or the subtle magnetism that surrounds them. A woman of a pure life and true instincts feels out the man who can love her, and whom she can love, the moment he comes into her presence. Before she sees him, or hears him speak, the destiny of both may be decided—not the final and fatal destiny of marriage, but the timely and beautiful destiny of a mutual love.

Who ought to make the first advances? The woman fascinates, charms, attracts, and draws the man to herself. In the spiritual reality, it is she

who chooses him, because he belongs to her. This is true in the vegetable world and among all animals. It is the universal law of nature. But in the outward expression, it is man who offers himself, and woman who accepts or rejects. This is natural, true, and right; it gives woman her proper empire in the realm of love, and makes her the guardian of its freedom and purity.

A woman, in freedom, may have many loving relations to different men, which is quite impossible in the restraints of civilization. These relations may be loving or affectionate, without being amative. They may be paternal, brotherly, filial, or friendly, and all very beautiful. In civilization, a young woman can have but one man, who stands to her in the relation of father, without the fear of scandal. If her own father dies, she is an orphan indeed. But in freedom, a young girl or woman might find many men capable of filling that tender, protective, and beautiful relation.

Now a woman can have no brother, unless he is born such. There may be many men around her, of congenial and beautiful natures, not adapted to excite her amative desires, or satisfy her deepest love, with whom she might yet have a chaste and sisterly friendship, full of improvement and happiness. Our society permits nothing of this. No man, not a near blood relation, can be anything to a single woman but an affianced, or to a married woman, anything but an actual, husband. There is possible no brother, no friend, no companion, without risking loss of character, social ostracism and scandalous persecution.

Is there not manhood and womanhood enough in this "free country" to put down these puritan-

nical despotisms, which make our lives a waste and a desert?

In the full enjoyment of a mature life, rich with passion, rich with culture of the mind and heart, a man requires various relations with persons of both sexes, and particularly with the sex which, in every stage of life, has for him the supreme attraction. I can imagine such a man filling his hours of leisure with many such happy associations; pleased with the charming prattle of infancy; inhaling the aroma of young girlhood; receiving the confiding tenderness of the young maiden, just blossoming into the full fragrance of passional life; sharing the full pivotal love of a noble woman, his equal in age and endowment; and giving a tender devotion to women still more advanced in life, whose souls, uncrushed by the bonds of civilization, would gain peculiar charms, and ever entitle them to a respectful, reverential, and enthusiastic adoration.

But such a noble and true life, now, in our false and base society, would surround a man with the howlings of wild beasts.

Love, in freedom, would be surrounded and protected by a delicacy and sacredness which now is found only in the early periods of youthful and romantic passion, and which everything connected with the marriage institution tends to profane and destroy. There is no reason why love should not always enjoy the charm of secrecy and mystery with which it involuntarily surrounds itself. Why should all the world know that a tender love exists between two young persons? Why need it become the town talk? Why, as the law demands in some States, should the fact that such a love

exists, and that the parties intend its consummation, be posted upon the walls of the most public places, or be yelled out by the town crier? And when the blissful moment arrives for this sacred love to demand its holiest ultimatum, why must it be a public spectacle, and all its details made the gaze and conversation of the whole community? Why must the fact of the consummation be advertised in the newspapers?

These are the indelicacies, the obscenities, and the outrages on every natural instinct, committed by the marriage institution, which from first to last, and in every possible way, violates the laws of nature, and inflicts its injuries on society.

In the loves of freedom all this will be changed. When every man and every woman is left entirely free to choose and determine what relations they do naturally and will actually sustain to each other; when no one will presume to interfere, nor even have the right to inquire into the nature of that relation; the whole charm of mystery, and all the delicate secresy, of the most refined passion may be preserved. Loves will be known only as the parties choose to avow them. Delicate young girls, blushing at the least apprehension of discovery, will not be dragged into all the publicity of town criers and the newspapers. It need not be known whether a woman has one or many loves. She may be a vestal without ridicule; she may love without scandal; she may be a bride without being made a public exhibition.

CHAPTER XXII.

ONE CASE IN A MILLION.

As I pause, before writing the final chapter of this book,—perhaps already too long, perhaps already too full, in its earnest reiteration of the great principles of freedom and justice—my eye falls upon a sketch, written some weeks ago, which, as it has the vividness of a life reality, which, as it gives one case of a million of similar ones, where the thought of freedom now is, or soon is to be, I give as it was written.

EMMA BRUCE, five years ago, was a patient of mine; and as she was a very bright, sweet, intelligent, and loving girl, I took a deep interest, first in the cure of her disease, and then in the unfolding of her character. In time she became more a pupil than a patient.

Her disease was scrofula, often the inheritance of intellect and beauty. There came a swelling on her neck, a curvature of the spine, and sometimes an unpleasant tendency to bronchitis, or even more serious pulmonary disease. Under my advice she took a course of thorough packing in the wet sheets and blankets, alternating with the douche; and accompanied by progressive and appropriate gymnastics, under the Madame Hawley, who was then, and still is the best gymnast in New York.

Emma improved as fast as I, or her anxious parents, could desire. She became straight, lithe,

very strong, and as graceful as strong. Her movements were full of the spring of a pervading life, but as full of ease and dignity. And as the swelling subsided from her neck, and the scrofulous matter was brought out by the continued packing; and her whole system built up on a pure diet of farinacea and fruit, her complexion was wonderful. Her transparent skin, rosy cheeks, and brilliant eyes, full of expression, and telegraphing every emotion, made her one of the most beautiful of all the beautiful girls of sweet seventeen it has been my fortune to know.

Could I help thinking of this girl's future? I seemed to have an interest in the life I had saved, perhaps; for it is hardly possible that she could have lived long, but for the water-cure. We became very good friends; and when she asked me questions, deep in the science of human life, I was true to my highest mission, and answered her as I believed.

"What am I to do?" she asked me one day, when I had made a friendly morning call, during her last vacation.

"Your father is rich—what need is there of your doing anything?"

"Rich!"—and her beautiful lip curled; "rich! how I abhor that word, which has in it all despotisms and all slaveries. What are his riches to me? I have not earned them—he may not keep them. You tell me only that I have the power to live in idleness. It is not that I want. I ask for life, action, usefulness, a career in the world—some true relation to my fellow beings."

I listened calmly to this outburst, for I had seen the seed fall into a genial soil, and I was not sur-

prised to see it germinate, and come to this fruition; but willing to know how true an idea she had of the real wants of life, I said—

“Well, you need not be dependent on your father—doubtless you will marry.”

“To be a thousand times more dependent on a husband? I know not what bitter destiny may be in reserve for me, but I pray God that I may never submit to the humiliation of a civilized marriage.”

“But you may love.”

“I know I may love—perhaps I have loved, or do love; but I will not enact the perjury of marriage. You look surprised, but I have reason for this earnestness. My mother has found a suitable match for me already; and the system of persecutions by which we poor girls are coaxed or driven to the altar is already begun. But this sacrifice is not for me.”

“But what objection can you have to Frank Austin?” I asked; knowing from common report that this was the match she talked of. “He is young, handsome, talented, rich; in a good social position, and with many amiable qualities.”

“I appreciate his good qualities. I even like him. If he were not urged upon me in a way to repel me, I might love him, perhaps—but marry him? never! I have not seen—I never expect to see the man to whom I would make the sacrifice of marriage, or of whom I could accept such a sacrifice in turn. O you know what this marriage is—how can you think I could submit to it?”

Here was a case! A more decided rebel to civilization I had not dreamed of. It seemed necessary to reason with my philosophical and also most practical pupil. I said then—

"Women, in all times, have felt as you feel; but they have learned to submit to the inevitable."

"The more shame—if this is what you call inevitable. But they do not. There is an army of heroic——"

"Old maids!"

"Martyrs, sir, martyrs! Oh, this sneer is unworthy of you. You know that marriage is a slavery of body and soul—an abyss of perjury and wretchedness, and yet you join in ridiculing those who refuse to enter it."

"I am afraid that you place rather too high an estimate upon both the understanding and motives of most of the maidenly sisterhood. If a true woman understandingly refuses to make a promise she is not sure she can keep, and which no one has the right to exact of her; and if she voluntarily sacrifices her life or her life's life, which is her love, to a high sense of duty, no man will honor her more than I—no man more deeply deplore the social despotism which gives her only such alternatives, to be false, to be infamous, or to starve."

"Forgive me," said Emma, through her starting tears; "I know that you understand me. But you must not ask me to make a compromise with my own ideas of duty. I have weighed the matter well. I have thought it all over many times, and I tell you, that whatever career I may choose, marriage will not be one of its conditions. I will be an artist, and find in my pencil the expression of the beautiful—an author, and find it in my pen—an orator, if I have the gift and the mission—or I will be one of the great world's workers, in the production of the staples of human necessity. But I will be an independent human being, and not the mere

appendage and parasite that every married woman, by law and custom, must be."

"But home?"

"If I have a home it must be *mine*, and not dependent upon the caprice, or faith of another."

"And love?"

"I have told you. I know what love is to a woman. I know how very desolate her life must be without it. But what assurance have I of love in marriage? To how many that you know is marriage the grave of love? I take no share in such a lottery, when even a prize is accompanied with humiliating conditions. No, sir; if your beautiful society says I shall not have love, unless I submit to its imposed condition, or infamy, then I must renounce the hope of love."

"And maternity?"

Emma grew pale, and gasped; for never were all the instincts of the woman more truly developed than in her.

"My God!" she cried; "what can I do? It is in this way you force us into all the falseness, oppression, and outrage of this institution; by making it the only condition of our life. We accept a curse to avoid a curse. Because a woman asks love and would have children, you compel her to submit to all the horrors of the slavery of marriage, and we submit—all who are weak enough, or foolish enough. But you will see that there is one who will not. I do not wish you to compromise yourself with my parents, by saying a word to me upon the subject. You have urged the holiest motives, such as could almost sanctify what I feel to be a crime. My mind is made up. If my life must be sacrificed, it shall be in a way of my own

choosing. Good bye. I owe you life, and more than life. My life shall not disgrace your skill, nor my conduct your teachings. If there comes a time, in my life-time, or can be found a place, where a true woman can love in freedom, giving no bonds and asking none; neither risking a perjury in herself, nor in another; neither enslaved nor enslaving, then I may live the life of my aspirations. Till then I shall wait and work."

I took the hand of the enthusiast, and pressed it reverently to my lips. There was nothing to be said. God forbid that I should combat the earnest intuition of any human soul. I find, of late, that there are many who are beginning to think, and feel, and who soon may speak, like my fair patient; who, strong in her integrity, has so far conquered the world around her, and is still looking hopefully for the "good time coming."

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE SOCIAL CONDITIONS OF FREEDOM.

It is evident that any change in the sexual relations of men and women must require corresponding changes in the whole social organization. Marriage and the present social system belong to each other. With society as it is, we must have marriage; with marriage, we can have no other than society as it is. No reformation, no change for

the better can take place in one, without a corresponding change in the other.

It is for this reason that there can be no recognition of woman's rights, such as the right to employment, or pecuniary independence, to suffrage, &c., while the civilized marriage exists. Every step toward equity and the recognition of individuality, brings us up all standing against the marriage institution; and the religious conservatives, who allege that all the efforts of reformers tend to destroy marriage, are entirely correct. The efforts of all true reformers tend to the abolition of every kind of despotism and slavery, and of this among the number.

But since the present social condition and the present marriage institution must stand or fall together; since our society can no more exist in freedom, than freedom can exist in our society;—we must find out, if possible, the kind or state of society necessary to freedom and consonant with it—the social state which freedom will produce, and which will be in harmony with freedom.

First of all, the society of freedom must be one of equity. There must be in it no wrong. When ever one man habitually imposes burthens on another, defrauds, pillages, plunders, there must be the despotism of arbitrary power, in some form of government, law, or custom, to sustain and defend him in his usurpation; and this is the end of freedom. We have no freedom in anything in the present social state. All we have is by privilege, sufferance, or toleration.

The principle of equity, which extends to all the relations of life, and which is now violated in them all, is most clearly seen to be wanting in our com-

mercial and financial relations. The present social state is based upon a system of general fraud, robbery, and spoliation.

The great principle of commerce, to buy cheap and sell dear, involves a double robbery—a double violation of the principle of equity. What every man has a right to ask for anything, and what he ought to give for it, is its exact equivalent, or as Mr. Warren has expressed and formulized it, **COST IS THE LIMIT OF PRICE.**

If I give a man less for any article of merchandise than its equivalent, or what it cost, I rob him of so much; if I take of any man more than the exact cost or equivalent of a thing, I also rob him.

Profit is the excess which we get for anything over its cost—consequently all profit is plunder.

The cost of a thing is all the time and labor that has been expended in producing it, including its transportation and sale. This is the principle of equitable commerce. There is in it the earning of money, not the making of money. It admits of no speculation, gambling, or any form of robbery.

In the present system, every man takes what he can get for everything he sells, and gives no more than he can help for everything he buys. If a merchant in New York, on account of some calamity, could buy goods for half their cost one day, and sell them for double their cost the next, he would deposit the result of this double robbery in bank, and go to church with a clear conscience. More than this; the prevailing system of finance, by means of which capitalists share in the plunder of trade, will enable the man who has accumulated a certain amount to live idly, he and his heirs for

ever, after indulging in all the luxuries of life, at the expense of labor, and giving no sort of equivalent.

For all this robbery falls somewhere at last. Every pound of bread, all the necessities and luxuries of life, consumed by the profit-making and interest-receiving classes, the great usurpers and robbers of civilization, must be the product of labor.

While such a system as this continues, there can be no freedom in love—no freedom in life. The plunderers must have every advantage over the plundered. Women cannot be on an equality of rights with men, nor the weak with the strong, nor honest men with rogues. In a social system based upon general plunder, it is the weak who are victims of the strong; the bad triumph over the good; honesty is the prey of scoundrelism; and the richest man is simply the most successful and the most extensive robber of his fellows.

Now plunder and oppression of all kinds go hand in hand. If I rob my neighbor of his labor, I do not hesitate to rob him of all his rights. In the actual result, women are worse wronged than any others. The marriage system, which defines the sphere of woman, which tells her what clothes she shall wear, and what employments she shall engage in, fixes her compensation also at such rates as to drive her into either marriage or prostitution. Equity in commerce, and the abolition of the iniquity of finance, would give women at once equality with men in material riches, enabling every woman to support herself and any children she might choose to have, without the humiliation of dependence or the necessity of slavery. Equ'ty

would also place men so nearly upon an equal footing in their power to acquire wealth, that the great temptation, now existing, of men and women to sell themselves, would be removed.

When everybody sees wealth to be only accumulated plunder; when the rich are regarded as successful robbers, living upon labor by means of the fraudulent systems of finance, rents, and commercial profits; when the popular intelligence shall make this whole system odious and disgraceful as highway robbery or piracy;—we shall have the reign of equity, and with it freedom in all relations.

The “cost principle” is one of the principles of social science, lucidly developed and illustrated in the writings of Josiah Warren and Stephen Pearl Andrews.

In any social system allowing of freedom in the relations of love, there must be a clear recognition of the sovereignty of the individual. If I may be governed in any thing, I may be governed in all things. I must be, sovereignly and entirely, the master of my own life; of all its emotions, and all its expressions. I must be as “free and independent” as God is free. No relations to any being, higher or lower, must interfere with this. There must be an end of all authority, and all subordination. The only scientific limit to the sovereignty of any individual, is that he bear the cost of his own actions; or so far as his relations with others are concerned, that he trespass upon or violate no other sovereignty. Men, in their social relations, should be like the ultimate atoms of matter, which in the whole universe, and in all forms of existence never touch each other.

In the present social state, this sacred personality is invaded every day, and every hour, from the cradle to the grave. Every one governs and is governed; trespasses and is trespassed upon; robs and is robbed.

It is clear that, in the present social system, where there is neither individual sovereignty nor equity, there can be no true freedom of any kind, and least of all in relations in which the personal and the social feelings are so intimately blended, as in sexual love. There can be no independence in the isolate home, the marriage, and the family of civilization.

In this country, public opinion, that Egyptian pest, which finds its way into our kneading troughs, has decided that a man and his wife shall have but one bed. What individuality, or freedom, is consistent with such an arrangement? If two persons mutually wish to sleep in the same bed, it can be no one's business to hinder them;—I speak of the slavery of any man or woman being compelled to submit to this requirement.

Where two persons are compelled to live in the same house, they can scarcely avoid being a constraint to each other. One must govern—the other must submit. The convenience of one must give way to that of the other; unless there is an absolute sympathy between them. The isolate household is prolific of despotisms.

In our society, people are beginning to find that there is more personal freedom, or less personal constraint, in a large hotel, than in a private dwelling. Where men and women are subject to frequent observation, at table and in the drawing room, they are ashamed to act the tyrant or the

shrew. Besides, each finds occupation and amusement with the people around them, and they are not left to prey upon each other.

The social and architectural arrangements necessary to secure individual sovereignty and equity, and of absolute necessity, therefore, to freedom in the sexual relations, must provide,

First, that every man and every woman have the opportunity to gain an independent subsistence, and such property as they require for this purpose. The right to the soil, is as simple and natural a right as the right to breathe. No monopoly of land, or charge for improvements, beyond their cost, is consistent with equity. With the land free, with the full avails, or absolute equivalent of all labor secure to every individual, there would be no difficulty in securing personal rights.

Secondly, Freedom, and all it comprehends, requires that each person, in this climate, shall have his own individual home ; just as he has his own personal garments. The house, the apartment, or domicile of each person should be entirely distinct from that of every other ; and each one should be sovereign of his, or her own house, with the right to go and come at pleasure, to exclude all intrusion, and to receive any company that is welcome or desirable, without espionage, or the least right of censure.

Whether this independence and freedom can be best secured in separate cottages, with little farms or gardens ; or in unitary edifices, with the larger domain, the experience of the future will decide. There are vast economies and conveniences in the unitary dwelling, or assemblage of independent homes, and the ingenuity of our architects will be

tasked to construct them in such a manner as to make the utmost sacredness of individual rights consistent with all the advantages of the combined order.

In such an edifice, whatever its size, or whatever the number of persons it might shelter, there need be but one kitchen, one laundry, one apparatus for warming and lighting; and in the refined enjoyments of social life, all might meet together, with entire convenience.

The co-operation of numbers, and the economies of labor and expenditure of all kinds, would allow of a higher scale of luxuries and enjoyments. A large unitary edifice could readily furnish a band of music, perhaps a full operatic and dramatic company, a large library and reading room, lectures, balls, and every kind of improving or amusing relaxation—while the various operations of a large domain would afford attractive industry.

In the social life of the future—in the reign of freedom and equity—there will be no demand for the amount of labor now performed by the working classes; or the same labor will produce vastly greater results.

Now, from the result of every day's labor, must be made certain deductions. A part goes to the revenues of the general government, and supports army, navy, and officials of all kinds. A part goes as interest to foreign or domestic capitalists, who hold in government, or state bonds, a mortgage on a proportion of the products of all industry. A part is seized by commercial plunderers, with their parasites, a vast horde of professional beggars or thieves of the most respectable character. In short, every blow I strike, and every day's labor, helps

to feed many mouths, to clothe many bodies besides my own; and for which I get no equivalent. On the contrary, the man whose labor feeds, may live in a garret, dress in rags, and wear out body and soul in irksome toil, while the man who is fed lives in a palace, wears fine linen, and fares sumptuously every day?

O slaves of civilization, are ye less owned, or less oppressed, that the negro you pity? Can you any more escape? The only escape now possible is into the ranks of the oppressors. The whole struggle in civilization is to avoid being robbed by becoming a robber, or a parasite, in some of the professions that live upon the wealthy class of social plunderers and despots. What freedom, or right, can there be in such a social system, and what man, with one sentiment of honor, or one idea of honesty, will not aid in substituting equity and freedom for this huge complication of wrongs and slaveries?

In the experiments at social organization which have been tried, and which have failed, there have been radical errors and defects. In communism, individual sovereignty is lost sight of entirely. A community is simply a chaos. So long as some person, or some idea, governs it, it may hold together; but it has no organic life, and is liable, at any moment, to fall to pieces. Joint stock associations, under the direction, or at the mercy of capitalists, and working for their benefit, may be an improvement upon the usual system of isolate effort, and wages servitude. Some of these associations seem to have achieved a good degree of industrial prosperity, and some social improvement; but, either from old habits, or some defect

in the system, there is a lamentable want of spontaneity, and passionnal development and harmony.

There are individual conditions necessary to freedom in a true society, to which comparatively few have yet attained. Health, and habits of cleanliness, diet, and physical and mental refinement and culture, necessary to social enjoyment, are as yet possessed by few. A diseased person, one with a foul skin or a foul breath; a man saturated with beer, or brandy, or tobacco, is a social nuisance—repulsive to every pure person, and his near proximity is an invasion of the individual sovereignty of every one, who is not steeped in the same evils.

If a man will carry a foul pipe in his mouth, or a pet skunk in his pocket; if either the filth of his person, or the vulgarity of his conversation, make him a nuisance, he has no right to approach any one to whom these peculiarities are offensive. It is a violation of the rights of the senses. He has no right to give a natural offense to my eye, my nose, or my ear, any more than he has to commit a direct assault upon my other sense of feeling.

He has the right of individual sovereignty—the right, so far as I am concerned, to be dirty, drunken, or a blackguard; but it must be at his own cost. He has no right to annoy me. I have the right to resist any such annoyance. I have the right to seek and obtain any aid needful in freeing myself of such a nuisance. Therefore, I must not be mixed up with discordant or repulsive persons. I must have my own skin, my own clothes, my own room or domicile of whatever kind, necessary to secure me from intrusion; and until men become more cultivated and better harmonized, perhaps it

will be needful that each should have his own separate domain.

When a musician has made a certain degree of progress in learning an instrument, he can begin to practice in the orchestra, without the risk of producing discords.

The remedy for all discordances, disagreements, and annoyances, is separation. The first thing to be accomplished is the separating of all arbitrary unions. Individual sovereignty is the repulsive force that drives all asunder—the attractions of society, friendship and love, will draw them together, and where there are the conditions of health, intelligence, and freedom, they can come together in harmony, and with the result of general happiness.

At present, I look for social contests and convulsions. Conservatives will labor hard to prop up the old, rotten, and ricketty social edifice—and will bitterly assail the reformers or destructives who are trying to pull it down. Down it must come, notwithstanding. It would fall, if let alone. The principle of individual sovereignty, and the efforts at its simple realization, with a study of the laws of health, and educational efforts, will be like the process of separating, and clearing each individual brick and stone of its associations and prejudices, or other bricks and mortar, preparatory to its taking its proper place in the new social edifice, on which will shine the sun and stars of the world's glorious future.

For I believe that the true destiny of man is now unfolding; that the "good time coming" is now dawning upon the earth; that a social condition of equity and freedom, of harmony and happiness, dimly seen, and often predicted as the millenium,

or the kingdom of heaven—a state of physical health, intellectual culture, moral purity, and passion enjoyment, such as will realize all human aspirations, and satisfy all the yearnings of the soul, will succeed to the perversion, discords, and wrongs of the present social state.

And I accept the prophecy, that in that time there will be neither marrying, nor giving in marriage; but that we shall live in a state of loving and angelic freedom,—of loving and angelic bliss.

“THY WILL BE DONE,

ON EARTH,

AS IT IS IN HEAVEN.”

AMEN.

APPENDIX.

From "Nichols' Journal," October, 1853.

INSTITUTE OF DESARROLLO.

A SCHOOL OF LIFE.

PERHAPS we can in no manner give the reader a clearer idea of our views of a true Life, and a true Education in Health, Science, Industry, and Art, than by a simple description of the intended Institute of Desarrolo, or *Desarrolio*, as it might be written, to correspond with its pronunciation.

The site of Desarrolo is near the center of Long Island, but nearer the southern than the northern shore. It is forty miles from New York, on the railroad, and about two hours' travel. The country is level, with a range of highlands on the north, and the great South Bay, Fire Island, and the ocean on the south; the soil is a sandy loam of from one to four feet in depth; an equable climate, mild in winter and cool in summer; an air of exceeding purity, entirely free from the intermittent malaria which is the scourge of so much of the country near New York; the water, at a depth of forty feet, pure, soft, and abundant.

The domain of Desarrolo consists of one hundred acres, to which may be added thousands more

at a moderate price, which are lying unimproved around it. This land is easily worked, free from weeds, and with the manures, furnished in abundance by New York, is capable of the highest cultivation, with but little labor. Every acre can be made a garden, and there is an unlimited demand for its products. Industry will make it a veritable Eden.

Upon this domain, or in this Eden, we have commenced to build the edifices of our Institute. The main building, already commenced, will be 126 feet long, by 43 in depth, four stories and basement, with a tower sixty feet high in the rear center, for the reservoir and bath rooms. In the two lower stories will be a lecture room forty feet square and twenty-two feet high, with library, suites of parlors, drawing rooms, &c., while the two upper stories will contain single rooms of ample size for nearly sixty inmates. This building will accommodate nearly one hundred persons.

Our plan is, after the completion of this edifice, to build two side wings, extending back, each 100 feet by 25, to contain on their first floors, a large dining saloon, gymnasium, picture gallery, and artists' studios. Then, enclosing the square, we shall have our printing-office, stereotype foundry, power-presses, and book-bindery, model kitchen, bakery, and laundry, with an engine-house in the center, with steam to carry all the machinery, raise the water, cook, wash, and warm the whole range of buildings, and supply warmth to the winter garden in the central square. Here will be a fountain, springing up fifty feet, rare exotics, statuary, and every thing which can make it a charming resort. In a balcony of this square, the band

of the Institute will discourse sweet music; and here, in pleasant weather, will the great family assemble in its oft-recurring festivals.

Of the life and its enjoyments, in the home we hope to accomplish, it is not easy to give a definite conception. Even with our limited means and numbers, heretofore, there has been so much happiness, that to many a weary spirit our home has seemed a heaven. Many have said, in all seeming sincerity, that they never knew what life was until they felt it in the pure and loving freedom of our happy circle. This will seem strange and absurd to many; but it is yet a simple verity. Let us try a little picture; or, rather, an outline sketch of what our school of Desarrollo may be, when it numbers two hundred members.

An hour before sunrise, while all the east is glowing with the coming day, we shall be awakened, not by the clangor of gong, nor bells even, but by a full band, playing some musical orison. For half an hour, the baths will be in full operation, and the fountains in full play. There will be a parade at sunrise. The flags will be flung to the breeze, and saluted with a morning song. Then, dividing into groups, there will be two hours of cheerful labor. Then breakfast in little parties, not at a formal long table, but in congenial groups, as one breakfasts with his merry friends at Taylor's. After breakfast, desultory reading and conversation, rest in fact, an hour, and then the morning lecture. This gives the key-note for the study and conversation of the day. It will take an hour more to digest this intellectual meal; some will make notes of its suggestions; some consult authorities in the library, but most will talk it over

in little groups. This will bring us to ten o'clock in summer, or eleven in winter, and now we may give two or three hours to work, physical, artistic, or intellectual. Then the bath, and the meeting of band and music classes, for practice—an excellent thing for the appetite. As all the harmonies of the universe, material and spiritual, have their correspondence in music, this is a science and art worthy of all honor. Then dinner—a feast of reason and a flow of soul. The groups will be larger, and there will be, not a mere dull exercise of eating, but wit, mirth, eloquence, and song. The band will give its inspiring melodies; and after dinner, there will probably be music, with the poetry of motion in a social dance. Yes, there is a time to dance, says Solomon, and we think midday a better time than midnight. Now, another lecture. Study, lessons, work, excursions; parade at sunset, flags lowered with fitting ceremonies; supper, lecture, debates, or other literary exercises: a social assembly, ball, concert, play, or some pleasant festivity. At ten o'clock the band plays the evening hymn, and the lights are extinguished; but surprise serenades may be given, once or twice a week, at any hour before midnight.

Some of the work, in farm, garden, and printing-office, will go on without cessation, when requisite, but it will be done by relays of volunteers, working in short sessions and attractive groups. There will be one worker that will need no rest—the steam-engine. But for all others, there will be no task, no toil; only one long festal holiday.

But will there be no disorder? you ask. No, most surely not. The government will be perfect. Every one will be a law unto himself, and it will

be seen and felt that what is best for each one is best for all. In all acts affecting others, there must be entire adaptation or harmony—in all things affecting only the individual, there will be entire toleration. The sovereignty of each individual is to be maintained at *his own cost*—not at another's. There can be, therefore, no intrusion, no annoyance. Every one's *rights* will be protected—and, as soon as understood, will be respected. The principles of etiquette, or good breeding, will be taught and practiced. There are persons so diseased, perverted, and insane, as to be unfit for such a home. Such, as far as possible, will be rejected, if they apply; or if received, will be expelled, as soon as their discordant characters become known, especially when they are evidently past recovery, or the cost would be too great to attempt it. It would require the whole space of our Journal to give all the details of such an institution. It must be realized; and when once in operation, it will be the normal school, furnishing teachers for hundreds more, which will spring up over the whole country, changing the entire aspect of education, and very soon of civilization.

Alas! this civilization, what is it? A discordant assemblage of the elements of all good and all evil. Wealth and poverty, health and disease, festivity and death, all intermingled. Conservatism would keep poverty, disease, and all the woes of premature mortality. We doubt the wisdom of such conservatism. The reformers of the age must accept of whatever is good, and separate from it its discordant evil. We propose nothing more than to exclude from education its manifest evils—to make it practical—to have one genuine

School of Life. Shall we not have, at least, the chance of carrying out an experiment we have already so satisfactorily tested?

It is our wish to gather here a **SCHOOL OF LIFE**, where men, women and children, may not only *prepare* to live, but **LIVE**; not only *prepare* for usefulness, but **BE USEFUL**; not merely *look forward* to happiness, but **BE ACTUALLY HAPPY**. And to this end we shall pursue the following objects:

HEALTH.—There will be a pure air, a genial climate, pleasant associations, abundant exercise, thorough ventilation, absolute cleanliness, a physiological diet, and facilities for daily bathing. We intend to have, besides the ordinary plunge and douche baths, large swimming baths, sheltered, and warmed by steam to the proper temperature, so as to be used in winter as well as summer. To every inmate will be afforded all means necessary to preserve or restore physical and intellectual vigor. There will also be, as heretofore, a special department for the education of men and women as physicians.

EDUCATION.—There will be full and thorough courses of lectures upon the circle of Science and Philosophy, with lessons and every needful assistance in abstruse and difficult branches. Music, Languages, the Arts of Design, Agriculture, and Horticulture, will be pursued by all, according to their tastes and aptitudes. A library of standard works for study and reference, and a choice selection of newspapers and periodicals, will form a part of the establishment.

INDUSTRY.—Every person will have the privilege of learning and practicing different kinds of labor, in short and varied sessions, so as to have all the

charm of variety, and to avoid the tedium of monotonous toil. The kitchen, dining-room, laundry, bakery, printing-office, bindery, and the constantly varying work of the farm, orchard, and garden, with the artists' studios, will afford much employment of a more or less attractive character, the prices being graduated according to its repugnance. Each person will be credited for all the work performed, as equitably as possible. No one will be forced to work, but on the contrary, as the tendency will be to do too much, the superintendents will limit the amount of labor when needful.

GOVERNMENT.—It will be supposed that such an Institution will require severe and unremitting discipline. This idea is not a strange, but still a very mistaken one. We shall not have a garrison, nor a state's prison. All who come to us, come from attraction. We shall rigidly reject and exclude all who are not suited to such a life. Any person will be free to leave at any time. We shall make education, art, industry, and social life all attractive, and remove, as far as possible, every repulsive feature. Every person will live in entire freedom *to do right*. No person can do wrong without inflicting injury upon others; and as no person has a right to injure others, no one has a right to do wrong. And the only test of wrong will be some injurious consequence. Every person, old and young, will be expected to govern himself by the principles of equity. He will exercise his individual sovereignty at his own cost. No person will be allowed to make himself really disagreeable. The first offense will bring a reprimand; the second will produce a temporary suspension of amicable relations, or withdrawal of sympathy;

the third, *expulsion*. Children and sick persons may be favored with more indulgence or a longer probation, as circumstances may seem to require.

We wish to have our relation, as teachers and principals, to those who come to us, clearly understood, so that all may know the exact amount of responsibility we assume. We shall, as far as possible, give to every one the material basis of a true life. Shelter, food, employment for body and mind, society, and varied recreations. We shall give them the best instruction we can in the laws of life, and our relations to God and each other. But we shall set every one free, if possible, from all arbitrary constraints, despotisms, and slaveries. We shall cultivate the graces of spontaneity, and not try to enforce compulsory, and therefore hypocritical virtues. Freedom is a chief element of our life. All who come to us, will be free agents, responsible for every abuse of their freedom. We shall not plant sentries around the forbidden fruit; but those who do evil, can no longer dwell in Eden.

The student who comes to us will pass an examination; be assigned a room which is to be his own, and for which he will be charged a certain rent; he will order his meals in the dining saloon, at cost, from an ample bill of fare; will select his studies, teachers, employments, asking advice if he needs it. Left in freedom, governed by the free play of instinctive likes and dislikes, or attractions and repulsions, every person who has a place will find it, and no one will be crushed into a place in which he does not belong. If we see any one in danger of mistakes, he will be warned; if he makes a blunder, he will receive an admonition, if the

natural consequence is not sufficient ; if he does a wrong, he must suffer the consequences. The same principles will apply to both sexes, and to all ages. Women and men will be, in all respects, upon a perfect equality of rights.

We take no further responsibility than this. Those who want jailers and taskmasters must find them. That is not our business. We can, and shall exercise a friendly and protective supervision. We shall endeavor to be surrounded by an atmosphere of truth and purity ; we will do our best to guard against both moral and physical contamination ; if any who come to us get sick, we will do our best to cure them ; if they sin, we will do our best to amend and forgive them ; but we cannot insure the *lives* or the *morals* of any. Persons are born with hereditary diseases, physical and moral. We shall do the best we can, in both cases ; but if persons come to us who are incurable liars, consumptives, thieves, dyspeptics, sensualists, or monomaniacs of any kind, we may decline to receive them ; and when we feel sure that we can do them no good, we shall feel it our duty to do so.

TERMS.—The fees for education will be paid in advance, in all cases, unless hereafter specified to the contrary. These will be general, for the common lectures and instructions, and special, in the particular branches, requiring time and care, as in the languages, arts of design, &c. They will probably be from fifty to one hundred dollars a year : all other expenses will be paid by the student, on the cost principle. He will rent his room, as he would hire a house in the city. He will take his meals, as at a refectory, and so of all charges for washing, mending, clothing, &c. Everything will

be at cost. He *might* live, probably, for fifty cents a week.

Per contra.—All the work he chooses to do will be credited him, up to a certain limit, which will be set with reference to his health and harmonious development, so that he may earn his living, and perhaps have refunded part or the whole of his tuition. This will depend upon the demand for labor and the price it will bring. But, as a measure of security in case of sickness or otherwise, at the outset, every student must have money to pay his expenses. No person intending to stay a year should deposit less than one hundred dollars, and in that proportion for a less period, which deposit may of course be withdrawn if circumstances require him to leave.

Such is a faint outline of the plan of our Institution, as we wish it to be, and intend it shall be. We find it difficult to convey a proper idea of the kind of life and the scope of educational development we aim at. There is nothing in the world like it. To those who get an idea of it, it seems an impossible fairy-land; a thing not to be realized on earth. But we know, by the experience of two years past, that it may be. We have seen body and soul expand into health, beauty, and a life of happiness, under this loving culture and light of truth.

Men who are thoroughly selfish, sensual, and debased, cannot understand our ideas of humanity, purity, and freedom; but there are now thousands of noble spirits longing for a higher life than any civilized society can give them. Of the best of these, the youthful, the hopeful, and the truthful,

we shall gather a society which may light up the dawn of a happy future.

To carry out our idea of integral education on the basis of health, industry, and freedom, we require that the people shall be enlightened. We wish to extend the circulation of this paper into every town and village in the United States. A thousand energetic agents could make a living employment in getting subscribers for it, and in selling our published works. Wherever women make the effort they meet with the greatest success. Nine-tenths of our large clubs, ranging from forty to one hundred and fifty subscribers, have been procured by earnest and devoted women. There is something about them, when engaged in a good cause, that no man can resist.

During the past year we have sold over twelve thousand copies of ESOTERIC ANTHROPOLOGY. We hope to sell, during the coming year, twenty thousand more. To this end, we ask the aid of every one who believes it will be a benefit to humanity: we ask it frankly, and with no selfish motive. Every dollar it brings us will be expended upon the Institute of Desarrollo. Every dollar is for the cause of human freedom and happiness. We have no desire for riches for any other purpose.

With no other aid than this, we shall be able, in time, and we hope in no long time, to open our School of Life. But buildings, machinery, improvements of all kinds, involving materials and labor, cost *money*. Thousands, hundreds of thousands, are annually expended in benevolent enterprises, which seem to us less useful than ours. No mission to the heathen, no tract distribution, no school of theology, seems to us to have so much of pro-

mise of good to the world, as our normal School of Health and Integral Education, as we mean to establish it. Is there no money, then, for such an enterprise? Will no benevolent capitalist loan us the money we need for five years, on bond and mortgage, at legal interest? Or, better still, reducing the cost of rent and food to every student, will no one give some portion of the twenty thousand dollars required to complete this establishment?

What man or woman, or company of men and women, will give one thousand dollars, to found a PERPETUAL FREE SCHOLARSHIP, in which some young person may get a thorough education, with *all* expenses free?

Twenty such scholarships might be founded, and the required capital furnished. In whatever way, we are determined that this work shall be done. With aid or without it, we shall perform our mission. Help will make our work rapid and easy; but if ever so slow, and ever so difficult, *it must be done*, and, with the blessing of the Almighty, *it shall be*.

Perhaps no further word of ours can add to the force of this appeal. It has already found its way to many hearts. There must be, among our many thousand readers, some men of wealth and benevolence, who are able to endow free scholarships at Desarrollo. These free scholarships do not merely pay for tuition, but they give entire support. We wish for these, as a permanent nucleus and element of harmony in our school. To these scholars it would be peculiarly a HOME. Who will give the thousands, the hundreds, the

tens, the dollars, for the Free Scholarships of Desarrollo?

And you, who cannot afford the luxury of giving—who have your own futures to provide for, what can you loan to build our Institute? We shall be no idlers there. With our domain a garden, and our workshops a scene of Industry, we shall be able to repay all that is lent us. We ask then, that every one, who may not feel able to *give*, but who can *spare* us a few dollars, as a *loan*, will do so. If it is but one dollar, it will help to raise our walls, or cover our roof—it will plant an apple tree, or a grape vine.

From "Nichols Journal," November, 1853.

OUR SCHOOL OF LIFE.

BY MRS. GOVE NICHOLS.

THE first and last word of progress, the burden of all prayer, and the earnest of all fulfillment is—WANT.

Want, that terrible power that is the animus of the furious and energizing Marsellaise hymn; that is uttered in the cry of "Bread or Blood!" that is overthrowing despotisms and monarchies—the tyranny of majorities and opinions; and, last and greatest, which is to harmonize the passions of man, and give freedom to the individual!

The first want of our world is health. Everybody knows this, but so universal is sickness, that

men, Christians, and God's ministers, do not recognize disease as a crime—a sin against the laws of God, established for the government of our complex being. In the world as it is, no individual can obey these laws, so as to have integral health. It is an impossibility. We approximate towards health just so far as we and others become wise. If my neighbor poisons the air with filth, or is himself a cage of diseases, of unclean things in the form of tobacco and other evils, and radiates badness wherever he goes, I know that I must suffer with him and for him. There is a unity in the race that makes another man's disease and sin mine. I cannot repudiate this unity, any more than I can cast away my own pained finger, or fevered and throbbing heart or head.

I cannot be healthy alone—I cannot be honest alone. If one steals my dinner, I must steal that of another, or starve; and where dishonesty is the fashion, as it is everywhere, though people do not understand it, why, I can't willingly be so unfashionable as to starve.

We know that there is a true science of society—that there is a passional harmony wherein no man will steal from another, where no passion or faculty of the soul defrauds another, where no man has diseased and overmastering amativeness, or alimentiveness, or acquisitiveness, or reverence, or caution, or a preponderance of any faculty, to enslave the individual, and lead him to rob, and defraud, and tyrannize over his fellow-man, as man's faculties are now enslaving and defrauding each other, and thus rendering him a slave. All who have studied phrenology can understand the passional discord of present society, where licen-

tiousness, covetousness, and alimentiveness rule the masses—where laws against these excessive developments are continually being enacted. There can be no integral health, and no true freedom, until there is harmony of the passions or faculties of the soul.

The mysteries of marriage are yet to be written! It is, perhaps, my work, but not now. Now, we wish to build a School of Life, where men, women, and children shall not only be cured of their diseases, but be allowed to live pure and true lives, and keep the health they have inherited or attained,—a home where health and intelligence are the basis, and freedom a safe and sure consequence—a school of industry, where men, women, and children can have healthful work and honest payment. Men can fight their way to work in a field of competition; but woman is weak—a being made for affection, and not for strife. Almost all avenues to industry are closed against her. Her very garments are a set of fetters. Bondage is written upon her; and she must be fortunate exceedingly in the character of her protectors, or possess an almost superhuman strength, or she is a slave. This word may seem a hard one; but in many of our States a woman has no rights of property, and in all, almost all means of producing property are denied her. She may keep school, or keep a boarding-house, or sew, if the machine has not come into her neighborhood—she may be a clerk in a store, if the men will allow—but female phrenologists, barbers, shoemakers, penny-posts, post-mistresses, ticket-sellers, preachers, doctors, or lawyers, are very rarely met with in this “freest country on the globe.”

The woman who cannot supply her own wants, who has no health or freedom to labor, cannot be a free and independent being. Her father, her husband, or brother *may* give her all she wants, and never thwart her will or abridge her freedom, and I might own a slave, and do the same thing, but the chances are greatly against it. Whoso feeds can control. Bread is a powerful and terrible argument.

How many women would leave uncongenial homes, and false, hateful marriages, if they could sustain themselves, and *own their babes*? A great deal is said of men who own black children, but white children are not the property of the mother who bore them.

Again and again have these terrible words rung in a wother's ears, who was living in the hell of a hateful marriage :

"If you leave me, I will take your children from you, and blast your name."

What woman can be free and virtuous against such an overmastering power? Children are hostages given to the Evil One for the perpetuation of false marriage, of legal licentiousness.

We would have a School of Life, where the law of health and purity can be taught, and where attractive industry and equitable remuneration will save woman from selling herself for a home—where she would learn what true union and purity is, and be able to sustain herself, and live the truth she learns. Many persons, men and women, know that they are living false lives, that they are not living a life of love, but they are inextricably bound. They would save their children from the barrenness or misery of their own lives. Such

will give their children a true education in health, in industry and art, when once they know that they *can* do it—that there exists an institution where an integral education can be gained.

There is a law of growth for all vitality in materiality. The tree has its law. If an acorn is planted in a proper soil, the sun shines, and the rain falls upon it through many years, it becomes a tree. It may become stunted, if not allowed to fulfill the law of its life. With man there is a law of growth and development. If obeyed in freedom, health and happiness must be the result. We deny no human law that is consonant with the Divine law. We fulfill all such, and no one needs the lower while obeying the higher law. But can I respect legal enactments that contravene most plainly and palpably the requirements of heaven? When the law of man robs the mother of her children, or when it binds woman, in legal impurity, to a dreaded and unloving maternity, whose end is premature mortality—the prison, the gallows, and the perpetuation of a life as false as that the victims of law and custom have themselves inherited—is such a law to be revered and obeyed?

I glory in the confession that I would teach a higher purity than that of the world as it is.

Let my name be cast out as evil—let the idea of me be the synonym of blackness and darkness—whilst men put darkness for light, and say, “Evil, be thou my good.”

I can be stoned, sawn asunder, or slain with the edge of the sword, sooner than the world’s thought of purity can be my thought.

The great want of my life, from my early youth,

has been holiness. For this I have prayed, studied, and "wrought with earnest pain." As the laws of life have been made plain to me, I have taught them; faithfully I have spoken all words that God has given me, and now he has given me the last, greatest thought of a Home where men, women, and children shall learn what constitutes a true life and true holiness, and shall live this truth. A School of Life, whose base or continent is a healthful and desirable industry, with equitable remuneration—where all can learn, as they will, of useful and ornamental knowledge—where they shall be free to create an Eden of beauty, and fragrance, and use—where the sympathies and loves of all hearts, expanded and purified in a true freedom, will be a harmonic hymn forever ascending to heaven and to God.

From "Woman in all Ages and Nations," by T. L. Nichols.

PROMISE OF THE FUTURE.

THE more we compare the condition of woman in the past and present, with our reasonable hopes of the future, the better shall we be satisfied with the existence in which we find ourselves; and when the reason of all our past and present miseries shall be revealed to us, we shall enjoy still more the happiness that is in store for us. Were the world now to come to an end, it must be pronounced a failure; the same as a plant is a failure, if it wither before coming to maturity. So exist-

ence would be a failure, should it cease at death. Justice demands immortality for the individual, and progress toward perfection for the race.

We have seen woman a slave to man—ignorant, abused, degraded. We have seen her the purchased instrument of his pleasures, caged up singly, in dozens and hundreds, like pretty birds in gilded cages. We have seen her the victim of mercenary speculations, and bestowed in a falsely named marriage, but real prostitution, by her relatives, as the interests of families dictated. We have seen woman languishing in the chains of indissoluble marriages, bound by the forms of church and law, and social custom, to men of whom they had a horror, and spending wretched lives in the miseries and agonies of such a terrible condition—for there is no misery so great, and no sin so fearful, as the forced conjunction of unloving hearts. It is a sin against nature, and a violation of the commands of God ; a sin, too, that carries its own punishment. In one word, it constitutes the crime of adultery. Whether committed in marriage or out of it, adultery is the sensual union of unloving hearts.

To this, opposed as it is to all her instincts, woman, in all ages, has been compelled to submit ; and all curses heaped together have not rested upon her nature with the weight of this single heaven-cursed iniquity. Her toils, her pains, her wrongs, could have been easily borne, had the rights of her nature been respected in this ; but the coarse, perverted, sensual appetite of man has worked her misery and his own.

But the future opens for woman a bright contrast to the past. Woman—strong, intelligent,

and beautiful—will be the owner of herself. The fetters of custom are cracking around us. Our laws are more and more recognizing the right of woman to her property and herself. Petitions for divorce crowd upon our legislatures. Men and women, by voluntary separations, cease from the sin of living together in unions not made holy by love. Every day greater respect is paid to the command, "Thou shalt not commit adultery."

And all this shows that ignorance is the cause of perversity—the root of all social depravity. Truth is so much more beautiful than falsehood—right is so much more attractive than wrong—that all we require is, to see clearly what is true and right, to follow them with enthusiasm. We have been blinded in ignorance, and now the light is breaking forth. God has made us with reference to these principles. Is it to be supposed that we have been so created as to prefer the false and the wrong? What a blasphemy!

In the future, then, woman, instead of being the drudge and slave of man, will be his assistant and companion, in the avocations of life. She will be condemned neither to monotonous toil, nor to voluptuous indolence; but will be able to choose, from the whole round of attractive industry, the employments most congenial to her nature and genius. In the care and education of children, the fashioning of clothing, the artistic decoration and embellishment of dwellings, the culture of flowers and fruits, the preparation of various articles of food, either for preservation or immediate consumption, the care of bees, the management of silk-worms, the rearing of poultry, and the production of a thousand articles of taste and elegance,

woman will find full scope for all her faculties, and a rich enjoyment of the luxury of doing good.

As woman, joined to man, makes up the fullness of his nature, so that he can by no possibility develop his true character, until woman assumes her proper relative position—it follows that woman must be interested not only in the results, but in all the operations of reformatory movements. The perfection of her character is necessary to the harmony of the species; and wherever she has been left in slavery, in ignorance, and in a condition that forbids development, there man has stopped short in his progress, or relapsed into ignorance and barbarism. Not only is it not good for man to be alone, but he can accomplish nothing alone to any good purpose. He needs the influence of woman in all his actions; and it may be believed, that, as few men have advanced to any true greatness who have not acted under the influence of woman, so, in a still greater degree, no society can advance to any measure of refinement and prosperity, where the female influence is not of an elevated character.

Woman is the mother, the teacher, the guiding spirit of the race. She gives the physical constitution, and modifies the mental and moral development. She brightens infancy with the sunshine of her love, or darkens it with the fretfulness or ill-temper of a disordered nervous system. She lays the foundation of our education, and finishes the superstructure of masculine accomplishment. In all the forming period of the life of manhood, the influence of the other sex must be paramount, or the character is unformed. Her influence softens, refines, and elevates; and in this the sphere of woman is pointed out. The best thing that can be

done for humanity, is to extend this influence. All its tendencies are to purity. The more men associate with women, the less likely are they to do them dishonor; and when men shall enjoy all the benefits and pleasures of female society, the horrible vices which are a blot upon civilization will be unknown. The dignity of female virtue will be respected; there will be no possibility of seduction, no demand for prostitution, and no temptation to adultery.

For such a state of society as this—for a condition so congenial to the best aspirations of humanity, and so in harmony with all nature—woman should exert all her influence. She can never be truly honored, and loved, as her heart yearns to be loved, in all the social relations, until this reform is accomplished. Men may busy themselves in repulsive toils—may amuse themselves with idle ambitions—may be absorbed in the pursuit of an unsubstantial fame, or a wealth gained by injustice, and which can never be half enjoyed; but, until society is brought into harmony with the Divine laws, there is no sphere, no ambition, no happiness for woman. Whether doomed to toil or idleness, each will be her curse. Her only real happiness in the present is to labor, with understanding and hope, for the future. She must give health and intelligence to the race—purify the bodies and the minds of those around her—elevate the aspirations and encourage the hopes of man—working ever with the assurance that whatever benefits mankind in the present, will hasten the fulfillment of his destiny.

The savage never looked for civilization—yet it came. The traveler of a century ago did not con

ceive of steam navigation and railroads, from his ignorance of mechanical powers; and men despair of a new order of society, because of their ignorance of the workings of human passions. The freedom and enlightenment in which we live, would have seemed as strange and impracticable to those who suffered under the ignorance and despotisms of the middle ages, as our bright picture of the future seems to the doubters of to-day. We have less progress to make than has been made already, with far greater facilities for advancement. We have the tools in our hands, and have only to use them. Life is a spiral, every turn of which carries us upward. It is an advancing tide, which, with all its receding waves, goes ever onward.

But, hark! Here comes the doleful whine, that this is a world of sin and misery. It is, and has been; but there is far from being any proof that it always will be. It has been a world of mammoths and megatheriums—but they exist no longer. The face of the planet has changed—the races that inhabit it have changed—human society has changed; and who is to stay the progress of these changes? It is a world of glorious beauty, placed in a universe of admirable harmony—inhabited by a human race of noble though perverted passions, and of great but undeveloped qualities. Time, and the power of the Almighty, bring all things to perfection. Let us not put down man as the only imperfect creation—a failure of Omnipotence—a reproach to Infinite Wisdom and Goodness.

We are appointed to another state of existence. There is an immortality for every individual of the race; and in this there must be compensations for

all our miseries ; but, if God can bestow happiness on man anywhere, he can bestow it here. It was not for nothing that the earth was made fertile and beautiful ; it was not for nothing that man was created with capacities for inexpressible happiness. God has made us with certain passions ; he has created the means for their gratification ; and although we have lived through ages of discord, there is no reason why we may not yet exist through ages of harmony. The best preparation for a state of bliss hereafter, is a condition of happiness here. This planet was made for a more beneficent object than to be the scene of a sad and weary pilgrimage—a place to be born in, to suffer and die.

The proof of immortality is, that man aspires to it. The proof that man is fitted for and destined to a happy state of society on earth is, that he seeks for it with an inexpressible longing. It has been for ages the world's bright dream of the future. It is the great attraction of the human race—and, throughout the universe, in all the worlds of matter and of mind, "attraction is proportional to destiny."

God has created human instincts, wants, aspirations, and reasoning powers ; and he has created these in harmony with the laws of his universe. All these point man to a condition of grandeur and felicity ; and God cannot disappoint the expectations he has formed in our souls. To doubt is blasphemy—is atheism. To deny a happy future to humanity, is to accuse the justice and call in question the beneficence of the Almighty Father. Doubt not, that in the course of Providence the human race will be guided to the happiness in store for it ; and doubt not, that the goodness of the

Almighty Father will be vindicated, in spite of all seeming evil. In the economy of Providence, nothing is wasted, and nothing lost. The earth is not a failure—and man will yet enjoy the fulfillment of all his hopes. The time is coming, when peace and plenty, knowledge and happiness, shall cover the whole earth; and men are beginning to see how these predictions are to be accomplished.

Woman's life in the future will, in almost all respects, present a striking contrast to her past and present condition. In civilized society, not one woman in a hundred enjoys a sound constitution and uninterrupted health. It is only those who have had opportunities of extensive observation, who know how large a proportion of the sex suffer from various weaknesses and diseases to which women are peculiarly liable. The very race is sick, and every individual feels the pain. A thousand untold miseries spring of a disordered nervous system, and from passional and functional irregularities. But in the harmony of the future, when the laws of life will be understood and obeyed, as the only means of happiness, all this will be changed to health and beautiful development. Disease will be the rare exception, if not entirely unknown. We shall not be burthened with miseries of our own, nor oppressed with sympathy for others.

This reform in health must be the pivot of all other reforms. A sick race can do nothing well. The first thing for men to learn is, how to get health; that secured, all other reforms are comparatively easy. Nothing seems difficult to a sound mind in a sound body; but every obstacle throws a weakened imagination into despair. We want more life, in

order to live to any purpose. Death is not merely the end of sickness, but all sickness is so much death; and just so far as a man is sick, just so far is he from being fully alive. The man who makes himself sick, therefore, by neglect of cleanliness, by breathing an impure air, by living upon improper food, by using narcotic poisons, by indulging in licentiousness, or by lowering his vitality in any way, really commits suicide, in depriving himself of so much life; and it is doubtful whether it is not as great a moral wrong for a well man to make himself sick, as for a sick man by cord or knife to deprive himself of the miserable remnant of his vitality. A healthy man never commits suicide; but, when a man, by his sins of ignorance, by his excesses and vices, deprives himself of all of life that had enjoyment, it is little wonder if he flings away the rest, as of no farther use to him.

But men are beginning to learn the laws of health, and this fundamental reform will pave the way for all others. The quackeries of medical poisoning will soon be among the barbarism of a benighted past. Men will learn that the Creator intended this life to be one of pleasure and health, instead of pain and disease; and, in time, they will also learn that man was made for a condition of wealth, harmony, and happiness, instead of poverty, discord, and misery.

What a sad world were this, for man and woman, were it not for this hope of the future! What incentive would there be to exertion, did we believe that the world was to be the same in the future that it has been in the past? There is madness in such a belief! It is the slough of despond—an eternal despair!

If we believe that the world is to revolve for ever, without making any progress—that human society is to go up to a certain point of civilization, and then relapse into barbarism—that we are to alternate between republics and despotisms—that mankind is always to be as full of superstition, bigotry, and oppression, as in the experience of the past—that the cunning will always rule the ignorant, and the strong overpower the weak—that selfishness, isolation, and destructive competition will forever be the order of society—if we believe that the world and humanity have made no real progress, and have none to hope for,—who could have the heart to endeavor to do anything for the good of his race? Why should we try to palliate these evils, or vainly strive to work against human destiny?

God has either made the race for progress, or he has not. If progress and happiness are not the destiny of man, nor within the scope of divine Providence, then, so far as we can see, the world is a failure, and the sooner it is burned up, the better.

But, there is a terrible impiety in such a belief. It is opposed to all the highest and holiest impulses and aspirations implanted in our nature. We adore the true, the harmonious, the beautiful. We wish to improve the condition of mankind; we pray earnestly, "Thy kingdom come;" and God, who has given us our aspiration for the beautiful and true, our philanthropy and our desires for a better condition, will not insult us with such a mockery as the existence of such attractions as these, were they to be forever unsatisfied. God has not inspired his children with hopes, and wishes, and prayers, and encouraged them with prophecies, and all the

analogies of nature, to doom them to eternal disappointment. We cannot ascribe "Glory to God in the highest," but in a lively faith in the coming of "Peace on earth, good will to men!"

FOURIERISM.

HAVING made reference, in different portions of this work, to the system or theory of social science advanced by CHARLES FOURIER, which receives, from those who have but a vague idea of it, the designation of Fourierism, but which is more properly termed the Science of Association, it seems right that I should attempt to give some idea of that system. I condense, therefore, from a short biography of Charles Fourier, contained in *Nichols' Journal*, Jan. 14, 1854, the following statement:—

Considering attraction and repulsion as the governing forces of all nature, and God as the Creator and Distributor of attractions and repulsions, Fourier inferred that those attractions and repulsions were distributed exactly in proportion to the functions of every order of beings in the general harmony of the universe. If this be true in the lower animals and vegetables, and also in the systems of the universe, how can it be that man is the single exception to all the works of God? From such considerations he derived his axiom:

"The permanent attractions and repulsions of every being in the creation, are exactly in proportion to their

expressive functions and real destinies in the universe." or, as it is more briefly expressed,

"ATTRACTIONS ARE IN PROPORTION TO DESTINIES."

Observing the perfect analogy that exists between all parts of the universe, he reasoned that as the Creator is one and the same Being, Infinite, and Eternal in his attributes, all in all, it was impossible for him to create anything foreign to his own attributes. God being a harmonious Being, all his works must be harmonious. The CREATION must of necessity reflect the attributes of the CREATOR. Another axiom of Fourier, therefore, is:

"The Creator being one infinite harmonious Being, everything in Nature must be an imitation of his own attributes, and therefore there exists a universal analogy in every order of Creation."

This axiom is commonly expressed in the simple phrase,

"UNIVERSAL ANALOGY."

Previous to the discovery of these principles, Fourier had satisfied himself that in every order of creation, from the highest to the lowest of beings, animate and inanimate, there is a universal distribution according to a law of ascending and descending progression; these distributions he called series, and his first grand axiom was,—

"All the harmonies in the universe are distributed in progressive series;" or,

"THE SERIES DISTRIBUTE THE HARMONIES."

Having satisfied himself that these were the laws of the universe, Fourier believed that he possessed in them the basis of a true social science; and that by their aid he could develop a system of social organization, which would bring the human race to harmony and happiness. With a sublime

faith in God, and an earnest devotion to humanity, he patiently worked out the minutest details of his theory.

It is not easy, in a brief space, to give a clear idea of a system of social organization. Fourier would bring the human race into harmony with all the universe, by a social organization adapted to its attractions or passions. His idea is one of universal unity—unity of man with God in true religion; unity of man with man in true society; unity of man with nature, in creation, art, and industry. "God," says Fourier, "sees in the human race but one great family, all the members of which have a right to his favors,—he designs that they shall all be happy together, or else no one people shall enjoy happiness."

The means of securing this condition of social harmony is by association. Its rude efforts have brought us from savageism to civilization. By its aid we have roads, bridges, villages, cities, railroads, steamboats, and a thousand contrivances for our comfort and amusement, and in the carrying out and perfection of the principle it is expected that all possible blessings will be realized.

The competitive industry of civilization operates by the smallest number of persons, in works and households; by occupations of the longest duration and the greatest monotony, and the greatest complication. The motives to labor are chiefly the compulsion of task-masters, or that of necessity. Its results, as seen under the most favorable circumstances, are collective poverty, fraud, and imposition, oppression, war, pestilence, and famine.

In the association of Fourier, the combined industry will operate by large assemblages, working

together with enthusiasm, in occupations of short duration and great variety, and by the easiest division of labor, a group being engaged in each detail. The result of such a system of industry, with all its economies and attractions, will be general riches, practical truth in all relations, or universal honesty, real liberty, peace, health, and happiness.

The first step toward the realization of this grand scheme of human amelioration, and which Fourier hoped all his life to see accomplished, is the organization of a single township. Take a town, for example, of six miles square, inhabited by three hundred families. Instead of three hundred little farms, with their buildings, fences, stocks and implements, let there be one magnificent edifice, sufficiently spacious to accommodate in comfort, and even luxury, every family; for three hundred farms let there be one grand domain, cultivated with the combined science, skill, and labor of the whole township. Let all work together for the good of all, each according to his capacity, and each secure of his reward.

Let us first consider the economies of such a plan. The land will cost no more, but can be cultivated, as regards the adaptation of crops, to much greater advantage. The palace of an association need not cost more than three hundred inconvenient dwellings. Many miles of fences, with all quarrels about boundaries, and other vexations will be abolished. One collection of barns, granaries, and other outhouses will answer instead of three hundred. One great furnace to warm the entire building, with heated air or steam, will take the place of say a thousand fire-places, with their immense

waste of fuel. A single kitchen, and a small group of cooks, will take the place of three hundred women roasting over three hundred kitchen fires. One small gas apparatus will light the whole building in the neatest and most economical manner. All trade will be wholesale, and all goods dispensed at cost price, saving all profits and frauds. In every isolated family there is a great waste of fuel, provisions, labor, and expenditure of every sort. It is easy to see how all this may be avoided.

The economies of production are not less striking. The land properly parceled, and scientifically cultivated, can be made to quadruple its products. There will be congenial work for all tastes and talents, in the variety of agricultural, horticultural, mechanical and manufacturing employments. With change, variety, and an agreeable society, and the friendly competition of rival groups, work will be performed with pleasure and enthusiasm. Suitable employments will be found for women, and children from three years old will be able to earn their support. The sales of the products of agriculture and the arts, being made by wholesale and at the great markets, the highest prices will be realized.

Among the results of such an organization of a township we should have universal practical education. The whole body would be a school or lyceum for mutual improvement. The public health would be an object of the first attention, and would be secured by a proper diet, well-ventilated apartments, good clothing, freedom from care, and other hygienic conditions. General honesty must come from a union of interests, and the absence of all motives to fraud or theft. Women, having an in-

dependent position, would be governed by affection alone—or the principle of attraction.

By an equitable division of yearly profits all would increase in riches, and there would be an entire freedom from care and anxiety, which are with so many the bane of existence. Every man, woman, and child would feel an interest in the prosperity of the whole. All would share in the right of property. It would be *our* Phalanstery, *our* domain, *our* trees, *our* gardens.

That this life in association is the natural destiny of man, as natural to him as herding is to cattle, or hiving to bees, Fourier demonstrated from the nature of the human passions or attractions, which such a social state is alone fitted to gratify, and which are all more or less thwarted in our present condition.

These passions are the five sensitives—sight, hearing, taste, smell, touch; four affective—friendship, love, ambition, and paternity; three distributive—the emulative, alternative, and composite. The sensitive and affective passions require no explanation. It is easy to see whether they can best be gratified in the present state of society, or in association.

The emulative passion is that which governs rivalry, the desire to excel, and the wish for honors, rewards, and approbation. It has little gratification now, but it is easy to see how it might become a powerful stimulant to useful industry and art.

The alternating passion is the natural love for variety of employment, exercise or avocation, so that all parts of the system shall be suitably exercised. The want of this variety produces ennui

and weariness, but when men can change from one occupation to another, each is a recreation.

The composite passion requires that two or more of the others be gratified at once, and requires the combination of every charm of material riches and moral enjoyment.

The whole system of Fourier has its foundation in the deepest sentiments of religion, in a profound faith in God, as the Father of the human race, and a universal love for men as brethren of the same great family. It is an attempt to realize the idea of the Gospel of "peace on earth, good will to men."

The system of association, proposed by Fourier, is not to be looked at as an arbitrary contrivance: but he believed it to be the natural condition of man, and the only kind of life adapted to the satisfaction of all his desires, capabilities, and passions.

While we accept the principles of Fourier as true, we do not necessarily give our adhesion to every detail, as he has worked it out, in the absence of all experiment. If he has allowed undue force to one passion or attraction, over another, such an error would vary the results,—but one or many such practical errors can no more destroy a principle, than an error in the working of a sum in arithmetic can prove the falsity of its fundamental rules.

One of the prime errors, as it now seems to us, of Fourier's working speculations, was produced by his desire to enlist great capitalists in social reform, by offering them profitable investment. Perhaps the reason no Prince Capitalist ever met his views, and organized a Phalansterie, was because

he saw, better than the philosopher, that men would soon revolt against such a slavery to money. No man will pay interest, rent, or profits one day longer than he is compelled to do so. No system can stand, that is not based on equity; and there is no equity in usury.

Probably, as long as I am compelled to borrow money, I shall do my part in sustaining the existing system. Money enables me to do, now, what I could not do without it. So, having made certain profits by the use of money, I give a share of the plunder to the man who furnished the "means."

In a complicated system of fraud and oppression, where every principle of equity is set at defiance, by every person who has the power, there is no use in making a "testimony" against any special item. It is like the attempt to free ourselves from the contact with slavery, when the clothes we wear, the bread we eat, the books and papers we read, everything around us is in some way connected with the pervading institution.

/ But if Fourier erred in practical details, in any part of his system, he did not err in its great principles, nor, as I believe, in their general results. I have advocated, here and elsewhere, Individualism. It is that which must be first developed, and above all maintained. Without individuality, there can be no harmony. There must be men and women, true, integral and harmonic in themselves, before there can be any true association.

True, association will do much for individual development; associations will give such opportunities for culture as do not now exist; but before one association can be formed upon a true basis, the whole idea of individual sovereignty and free

dom must come into men's thoughts and lives. An association of civilizees, with their repressions, moralities, and jealousies, would be a simple intensification of existing evils. All such have failed, and must fail. Every association of people, to be permanent, prosperous, and harmonious, must be made in such a way as to provide for the most absolute freedom, with its simple, rightful limitation—freedom to do anything of which I can bear the cost; which will inflict injurious consequences upon no other being. In any association there must be entire freedom, with the best conditions for preserving it. All else must be left to the attractions and repulsions which govern the universe of matter and of mind.

COMMUNISM.

As this book will fall into the hands of many persons who have not yet been attracted to social theories—who may perhaps class all schemes for human improvement under the general term Socialism, without distinguishing between them, it may be well to give some idea of the doctrine of COMMUNISM, showing how it differs from other systems.

(Communism, taught by Owen, Cabet, and various religious sects, asserts equality in its widest application. In a community, all goods are common property, and there is in respect to all things an entire abandonment of individual right. In

some cases this extends to clothing, of which there is a common stock; all feed out of a common granary, and eat at a common table. Every selfish, exclusive, appropriative, or personal feeling is sacrificed. The community is everything, the individual nothing.

But in this community of goods, and interests, and labors, there is the necessity for some governing principle. So long as there is the fervor of a religious zeal, as among the early Christians, with apostles whose words were received as inspiration; so long as there is a real leadership and controlling power, of whatever kind, this unindividualized mass may act together; but whenever there comes up an opposing will, or many such, discord and disruption seem to be the inevitable results. If any society fail to give freedom to the individual, it must be able to crush him, or he will destroy that society. This is why despots send reformers to prison. It is the instinct of self-preservation. This is what every society must do. Our society must "crush out" the ideas contained in this book, or these ideas will revolutionize society.

Doubtless there is an underlying truth in the idea of Communism. In our societies we have many things in common. The air is tolerably free, though many are debarred from the opportunity of breathing it where it is purest. Water is more monopolized, but is too plentiful to be much appropriated. The earth is the common heritage of man, and will soon be wrested from the great and small usurpers who have seized upon it. We have public highways, bridges, pleasure grounds, and shade trees, common as sunshine. This principle may be extended in time to shelter, artificial

warmth, light, and even to food ; to statues, pictures, and many of the results of decorative art.

We have free galleries, free libraries, free schools. These are all examples of association ; and, so far as they are owned and shared by all alike, of communism. There is a sort of partial communism in our poor laws, and in all public charities. The principle of Human Brotherhood has a wide acknowledgment, but as yet in most things a very imperfect application.

But there are, and ever will be, some things which a man will feel to be his own, and pertaining to his special individuality. No two beings are exactly alike, and each must be left free, so far as they differ, to live a different life. It is *my* brain that governs *my* muscles ; these are *my* muscles that obey *my* brain. These are *my* thoughts, *my* affections ; and I must indulge them in freedom.

There is attraction enough in men and women to bring them together in all desirable relations ; there must also be allowed repulsion enough to keep them from such as would mar the integrity of their individual characters. Communism seems opposed to this variety of character and life. Its tendency, so far as I can judge, is to bring all things to a dull level and uniformity.

CONCLUSION.

THAT a work, revolutionary in its character, and deliberately intended to subvert and destroy what the whole moral and religious world considers necessary to the good order of society, should meet with a corresponding opposition and denunciation, is to be expected. It will be denounced from the pulpit, and by the conservative press. So has my **ESOTERIC ANTHROPOLOGY** been denounced; but it has also been read by many thousands. It contains in its scientific exposition of human physiology the fundamental principles, of which this work contains the social ultimatum. That work has prepared the way for this—this will prepare the way for those which are to follow it. Both will find many thousands of readers, men and women, the purest, the bravest, the noblest, that now live upon this wrong-covered and blood-stained planet.

Individual as we may be, sovereign and free, there is yet a sacred bond in our common humanity. "We are all members, one of another." This human race of ours, to which we all belong; this afflicted world, from which we cannot escape, is to be redeemed. It is God's work, and our work. Man is to redeem the earth and the race. As each one makes a part of the great body of humanity, let it be his care to make that part as good, as pure, and instinct with vitality, as he can. We must banish disease, banish poverty, banish every oppression, and every slavery over the body, mind, and affections of man.

We see the horrors of war, pestilence, and famine. Some of us are keenly alive to the degradation of Intemperance, the injustice of chattel Slavery, and the miseries that cluster around the haunts of Ignorance, Poverty and Vice. We feel that something must be done—and we form Peace Societies, Non-resistance Societies, Temperance Societies, and Five Points' Houses of Industry; and pass Maine laws. We do what we can, *resisting evil* with all our might.

But high above all these petty and abortive efforts, serene as the heavens above us, is the great principle of Freedom, in which, by which, and through which, all reforms are to be accomplished. It is not by making laws that the world is to be reformed. Pile up your statute books till they load the earth and darken the heavens, make every other man a police officer, every other house a prison, and every other tree a gallows, and you cannot by any such means reform humanity.

Despotisms make wars—freedom results in peace. Despotisms cause famine and the pestilence; freedom brings plenty, and enables men to live in the conditions of health. Assert the broad principle of human freedom, and you need not be troubled with any form of oppression. Remove the causes of Intemperance, and you need not attempt the thousand times abortive effort to enforce a compulsory virtue.

But when you assert Freedom, make no partial assertion of a universal principle. It must be the freedom that gives justice to all. To each one it must be the Sovereignty of the Individual at his own cost. Freedom without intrusion, encroach-

ment, or oppression ; the universal reign of justice, or respect for the rights of another.

In this country we assert liberty of conscience—the right of every one to govern his life by his own sense of duty ; we assert this, and then cover our statute books with laws to prevent men from enjoying this liberty. One State imprisons a man for blasphemy, another for breaking the Sabbath, another for bigamy, and so on through a long list of acts, which may be in accordance with the highest conscience of the individual who commits them. Liberty of conscience, or freedom to do what we believe right, or what is our highest attraction, has no social limitation, except upon the ground that it encroaches upon the similar right of another.

It will be said by the defenders of these laws, that a majority of the people having decided that these acts will be an injury to them, no one has the right to commit them.

In the first place, these laws against blasphemy, Sabbath-breaking, and bigamy, for instance, have not been made in this manner. They are simply the unrepealed bigotries and despotisms of the past.

For me to deny the existence of God, or not to be able to believe in the immortality of the soul, may be misfortunes ; our laws make them crimes. If I believe that work is worship, and effort prayer, and hoe my corn on Sunday while my neighbors are at church, this is my conscience and my right. But there are strenuous asserters of the principle of religious liberty who would send me to jail. Or I am a Mormon, or a Mohammedan, and marry two wives, they assenting, and to the manifest

injury of no human being, but according to our highest ideas of religious duty ; and now the asserters of religious freedom and liberty of conscience send me to State prison, shave my head, and by a series of indignities and outrages, add another to the long list of martyrs.

All this inconsistency, all this subversion of justice and denial of right, because men do not know what right is. But truth, right, justice, all expressed and ultimated in one word, Freedom, will prevail.

Falsehood, wrong, oppression, and all the slaveries will cease.

In the achievement of the destiny of man there must be, first of all, as an absolute condition, FREEDOM ; next, as a means, SCIENCE ; with Science, in Freedom, men will develop social and passional HARMONY ; and the final result will be UNIVERSAL HAPPINESS.

THE END.

20

29

25