

This being true, the harmonics of life depend upon the balance and harmony attained between the individual man and woman.

Evolution is nothing more nor less than the spiritual principle of polarity or affinity in operation, and  
"Love is the fulfilling of this law."

## CHAPTER XVII.

## NATURAL MARRIAGE.

What constitutes natural human marriage is, as yet, an unsettled question in the mind of the average student.

The school of physical science faces certain facts of social development which are hard to reconcile with its preconceived theories as to the meaning and purpose of marriage.

It observes, first, that promiscuity in the sex relation is almost unknown in human society; secondly, that the masculine half of humanity inclines to polygamy either by law or in defiance of law; and thirdly, that prostitution is the universal accompaniment of all social life, primitive or highly developed. Finally it discovers that monogamous union is adopted by the most highly developed nations and individuals.

If the sex relation, as physical materialism claims, were a mere matter of sex appetite, there appears to be no scientific reason why promiscuity should not have been the true and natural sex relation.

The fact, however, that there is a universal tendency directly opposed to promiscuity, should suggest to the scientist that there is a universal principle involved. Physical science finds no better explanation for this phenomenon than a "caprice" or an "inexplicable" fancy which causes one individual to seek union with another particular individual. While it can but admit that this peculiarity of individual preference is a fact and factor in sex selection, physical science fails to follow the clue to a scientific solution.

To say that general promiscuity is prevented by caprice or even by individual fancy, is in no sense an explanation of why

such caprice or fancy arises, nor why it is so universal and persistent in its demands.

On the contrary, this phenomenon clearly opens the way for those explanations which Natural Science has to offer. It plainly suggests that spiritual principle of affinity, or law of correspondence, by which the higher science explains "individual preference" as a universal law.

While physical science admits that promiscuity is not the natural relation of the human sex, it finds, however, that either polygamy or prostitution has characterized all times, all peoples, and all forms of government. It, therefore, and very logically, holds that a certain range of choice in the sex relation is both natural and desirable.

To one familiar with physical life and development only, but unfamiliar with spiritual laws and principles, this would appear to be an inevitable conclusion.

On the other hand, physical science admits that rational regulation of this natural sex relation has proved highly beneficial. It confesses that the highest types of societies and individuals are found under monogamous systems. It concedes that the most progressive nations adopt monogamy by law and public practice. It observes, further, that monogamous and indissoluble marriage is the ideal of the most highly cultured individuals.

This leaves physical science in a difficult position. It must now explain why an "unnatural" regulation of the sex relation produces the best results both in society and upon the individual. It must explain why the ideals of the most highly developed, universally point to "unnatural," monogamous marriage.

Physical science cannot answer these questions, inasmuch as the answer involves certain definite knowledge of the spiritual principle involved in marriage. Here, as elsewhere, the higher science supplements the modern school and offers to explain these apparently contradictory facts. It proceeds by answering directly that initial inquiry as to what constitutes natural marriage.

Nature declares that monogamy is the natural marriage relation, and that indissoluble union is the intent of natural law. The proof of this declaration rests, primarily, upon that universal spiritual principle which impels every entity to seek vibratory correspondence or self-adjustment in another like individual of opposite polarity.

Secondarily, the proof in question rests upon the commonest facts and experiences of human life, viz., the expectation, the hope and desire (of every normal man and woman), which point to some one individual as the ideal and inseparable lover and companion.

Physical materialism sees in the institution of marriage nothing but the "regulation of the sex appetite" in the interests of species. Nevertheless, in its study of the evolution of marriage it admits those facts which weaken that assumption and clearly sustain the deductions of Natural Science.

One important fact illustrating the natural spiritual law of selection is given by M. Letorneau in connection with the subject of promiscuity in sex relations.

The author says:\* "We are warranted in believing that the very inferior stage of promiscuity has never been other than exceptional in humanity. If it has existed here and there, it is, that by the very reason of the relative superiority of his intelligence, man is less rigorously subject to general laws, and that he knows sometimes how to modify or infringe them; there is more room for caprice in his existence than in the life of the animals."

This "general law" referred to by this eminent French authority, is none other than the general law of affinity which guides the animal, and ordinarily the human, in sex selection. This "general law," as already explained, is none other than the law of individual preference. This law, though permitting an experimental range of choice, yet discourages promiscuity.

\*"The Evolution of Marriage," p. 38.

Physical science is correct in assuming that man may defeat this general law by reason of a more independent will and individual powers of execution. Physical disease and deformity and mental and moral degeneracy testify to man's ability to defy and contravene the universal spiritual laws of Nature.

The fact that man is not generally promiscuous in sex relations leads physical science to rightly regard such practice as unnatural. It is, however, led to other conclusions concerning polygamy. From history and observation the physical scientist concludes that the natural sex relation is polygamous, that is, upon the masculine side. In support of this theory it cites the almost universal practice in savage and semi-barbarous life. It refers to the various forms of slavery, to the legal concubinate, and to divers forms of religious polygamy. It reinforces this evidence by the indisputable fact of prostitution in all countries, among all grades of development, in all races and under all religions.

The author, in referring to prostitution, which is the same in principle as polygamy, says:\* "To sum up, the origin of prostitution goes back to the most primitive societies; it is anterior to all forms of marriage, and it has persisted down to our own day in every country, and whatever might be race, religion, form of government, or conjugal régime prevailing. Taken by itself, it would suffice to prove that monogamy is a type of marriage to which mankind has found it very difficult to bend itself."

These facts it were idle to dispute.

The conclusions of physical science, based upon these facts, are perfectly logical—from the physical scientist's point of view.

Physical science concludes from these undeniable facts that polygamy, or a certain range of choice, is the natural sex relation. It makes other discoveries, however. It finds that monogamy is adopted by the most highly developed peoples; and further, that the ideal of marriage entertained by the finest indi-

\*"The Evolution of Marriage," p. 160.

vidual types, is universally a monogamous and indissoluble union. From this, physical science is forced to concede that monogamy accompanies the highest national and individual development.

As will be seen, the two sets of facts and several conclusions lead physical science into a paradox. It first declares that polygamous sex relations must be natural. Next, it admits that monogamy accompanies the highest national and individual development. This leaves the physical scientist in the position of declaring that natural law does not produce the best results for man; or the reverse, that man reaches the highest development under direct violation of natural law.

It will be recalled that physical science holds that the institution of marriage has no other meaning than "regulation of the sex appetite." It finds, nevertheless, that the best results as to reproduction are effected by love unions, or union by individual choice. On the strength of this fact a third proposition is added.

The physical scientist has already declared:

- (1) That polygamy appears to be a natural relation.
- (2) That monogamy accompanies the highest known development.

He now adds his third proposition, which, to say the least, is inconsistent with the second. Satisfied that love unions produce the finest progeny, the scientist therefore concludes, not merely that love marriages should be encouraged, but he declares that the individual should be permitted to form as many love marriages as he chooses. This conclusion of the scientist is clearly stated in his chapter on "Marriage of the Future." The author says in substance: "Marriage, if monogamous, should be made and dissolved at pleasure."

Thus quoting this bald proposition, makes it appear more repulsive than when presented in the author's attractive style. The theories of physical science, however, like other monstrosities, are always rendered more repulsive when stripped of an attractive garb.

The position taken by this eminent French scholar is not exceptional. His bold proposition quite accords with the moral philosophy of Darwinism and the entire school of modern physical science.

This, however, is a position which the great common sense of civilization will condemn. It is an extreme position, possible only to minds that have become so engrossed with the functions of physical nature as to lose sight of those higher laws and principles which govern intelligent and moral nature. This is a position which reduces man to the animal, levels love to a matter of lust, and eliminates the question of moral responsibility in the family relation.

The natural corollary to this singular proposition is frankly set forth when the writer admits that his scientific system would mean that children become wards of the state, cared for by public officials at public expense. This "improved" system, it will be seen, eliminates the parents and natural guardians. It discards, as unnecessary, parental and family love which have so long been regarded as the foundation of the social order.

This, however, is a logical outcome of Darwinian doctrine. Here we have, not merely a marital, but a social, educational and ethical system outlined upon the theory that "man is a mammal like any other with a better cerebral development than a horse or a dog."

Thus, in the very face of a system which admittedly accompanies the highest development on earth, it is suggested that we substitute a practically free selection; plainly speaking, a successive polygamy sanctioned by law. Here we have it seriously suggested that parents be relieved of their natural and moral responsibility for their own children, and that children be deprived of parental love and personal influence whenever those parents desire to form other ties. We have also a marriage system proposed that shall be governed by the caprice or passion or self-interest of the individual.

Physical science rightfully defines promiscuity as an unnat-

ural practice. It states facts when it claims that polygamy or prostitution has been or is the accompaniment of all grades of social development. It is also correct in assuming that strict monogamy characterizes the highest civilization, and that it is best for the whole people. It is right again when it finds that the best results as to reproduction depend upon love unions.

Herbert Spencer was partly right when he said: "A time will come when union by affection will be considered the most important, and union in the name of the law the least important, and men will hold in reprobation those conjugal unions in which union by affection is dissolved."

Mr. Spencer, however, might better have said, the time will come when husbands and wives who have ceased to respect and love each other will abstain from all intimate relations; or, the time will come when the mismated will cheerfully preserve the legal form of marriage so long as mutual obligation to their own children demands such self-denial.

The evolution of marriage, up to our present system of strict monogamy, represents the evolution of the rational intelligence and the moral nature of man. If we admit that the present Christian nations of the earth represent the highest stage of evolution, we must also admit that its marriage system has produced the best results. The progress of civilization unquestionably proves that the rational mind and the spiritual intuitions of man set steadily toward monogamous and indissoluble union.

Such a marriage system has been made possible only by reason of the fact that man recognizes in himself something more than an animal. It means that he recognizes and accepts the responsibilities imposed upon a rational and moral being. It means that little by little he rises above the animal side of his nature and conforms to regulations which satisfy the higher nature of the intelligent soul.

Nor could any evolution of marriage have been possible, except for the fact that man realized such restrictions as beneficial. Even the very individuals who secretly indulge and traffic in ani-

mal propensities would not, if they could, repeal the laws which guard the physical, mental, moral, material and social well-being of the race.

When physical science talks of the "naturalness" of polygamy and prostitution, it considers merely the animal elements and impulses which are a part of human nature. It fails to recall that the evolution of rational intelligence and moral perceptions has been universally accompanied by a more and more rigid system of monogamous union. It ignores the fact that the highest nature of man universally inclines to such a system. No man, and surely no woman, well balanced morally as well as mentally, could condemn monogamy in its principle. Even the libertine and prostitute would admit it to be an essential in the development of government, society and the home.

The average individual condemns it only when he has mistakenly assumed its obligations and is cheated of his personal happiness. Even the average of men in civilized life, those given to personal indulgences, would be the first to resent that return to barbarism which is implied by, "marriage made and dissolved at pleasure." It is safe to say that the great majority who enjoy the benefits of civilization and Christian development, would protest against any scientific system that reduces marriage to a question of individual caprice, cupidity or passion, and eliminates the responsibility of parents, consigning children to the care of the state.

The rational and moral evolution of the average man has been carried too high for serious consideration of any system which would wipe out all that makes life worth living, viz., the mutual love and loyalty of men and women in the marriage relation, the moral responsibility to children, and those ideals which bind men and women and children to the home.

Nature and history sustain physical science up to a certain point. There are, however, other facts in Nature which contravene those theories of physical science concerning the practices of polygamy and prostitution. These other facts, at present un-

known to the physical scientist, show, on the contrary, that such practices are not the intent of Nature. These other facts go to show that such a marriage system as outlined by physical science, if universally applied, would mean the physical, intellectual and moral degradation of humanity.

Promiscuity is unnatural in that it directly contravenes the universal law of affinity. Polygamy and prostitution represent, not fulfillments of the natural law of marriage, but *the effort to fulfill it.*

Every entity, from atom to man, is an individual seeking vibratory correspondence in another individual of opposite polarity. Every individual seeks a correspondence in each and all of the life elements of which it is composed. The requirements of each entity are, therefore, simple or complex, according to its place in the scale of development; for example, the mineral atom whose energies are electro-magnetic only, finds an affinity or mate more readily than a man who represents the combined elements of electro-magnetism, vito-chemical life, spiritual life, and the life of the soul.

Every human being, as a distinct individual in Nature, is a vibratory law unto himself. That is to say, he has a degree of material refinement and a rate of vibratory action in both his physical and spiritual organisms, which are distinctively his own. He has also a psychical nature, that is, a quality of intelligence and a code of morals, which are peculiar to himself.

These, indeed, are the peculiar conditions, qualities and properties which constitute individuality.

Nature designs that this individual shall seek his complementary half, or his polar opposite, in another individual who must be in such correspondence with himself that the two shall represent the completed individuals.

This natural law of vibration or affinity is the pathway along which Nature guides the individual in his sex selections. Individual preference, in such selection, is the only sign by which Nature informs man of his obedience to law. The scope and