

Chapter Three

The Essence of Western Marriage

Section One

Kant's Contractual View of Marriage

3.1: The problem of Sex

According to Kant, marriage resolves two moral problems underlying sexual activity. Each of which concerns the humiliation of humanity by the disposal of the body. We degrade our humanity if we compromise our ability to set goals for action for ourselves. According to Kant, our ability to set goals of action is materialized when we use ourselves as mere means to some further goal. The act of sex involves using our bodies as mere means to some further goal, namely, sexual gratification. While disposing of our bodies for sexual gratification qualifies as compromising our ability to set goals of action, and so qualify as a debasement of humanity.

The first moral problem with sex is that it involves the degradation of humanity in our own person. For Kant, disposing of one's own person as a mere means is morally wrong, but still, we can do it to have sex. In his *Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant goes on to say that 'disposing of oneself as a mere means to some discretionary end is debasing humanity in one's person.' The second moral problem with sex involves the degradation of the humanity of another. Humans have a particular impulse directed toward their own enjoyment of another person – a sexual impulse. Kant refers to the sexual impulse as a kind of love. In this context, he finds a distinction between 'love from sexual appetite' and 'love from true human affection'. Sex as a sign of love merely satisfies the sexual appetite of others. It involves using someone as an object. Sex in the context of love forms true human affection. But sex still vitiates the purpose of morality as sex

involves using the other person as an object. When someone becomes the object of another's satisfaction, 'all motives of moral relationship fall away. For Kant, sexual impulse is inherently human-debasing because in such a case our goal is always sexual satisfaction and never includes the other human as human.

3.2: Moral sexuality

The question then *is: can marriage resolve the problem of sex?* In this regard, Kant asserts that marriage can resolve the problem of sex. In marriage a person morally allows himself to be used for sexual satisfaction because in such a case he dedicates himself as a whole person. In marriage, one enjoys not only sex with the other person but also the overall happiness and life of the other person. In this regard, Kant says, "This right to dispose over the other's whole person relates to the total happiness and to all circumstances bearing upon the person."³³ In such a case one gives one's whole person – the composite body as well as personality- over to the other. In this regard, sex is morally justified and legitimized in marriage. In such a case they are considered morally inseparable. Thus in the case of moral sex or moral sexuality, one person has to obtain the other person as *a human subject* in addition to her body by freely submitting his own whole person over to the other. It is only through mutual submission that sex can be enjoyed morally. According to Kant, moral submission of the whole personhood through which sex is rendered morally permissible constitutes an essentially contractual view of marriage. Kant remarks, "I give the other person a right over my whole person, and this happens only in marriage. *Matrimonium* signifies a contract between two persons, in which they mutually accord

³³ Kant, Immanuel, *Lectures on Ethics*, translated by Peter Heath, Schneewind, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1997, 27:388.

equal rights to one another, and submit to the condition that each transfers his whole person entirely to the other so that each has a complete right to the other's whole person.”³⁴

3.3: Marriage as Contract

Kant conceives marriage as a contract. For Kant, a contract is a particular means of acquiring property involving a transfer of possession from one person to another. It needs negotiation in terms of offering an assent. It involves promise and acceptance. The acquisition of a promise consists of the conferment of a right. Although Kant conceives marriage as a kind of contract, however, he does not spell out the process of marriage in terms of his mechanics of contract. What is mutually promised and accepted in a marriage contract is the possession of a whole person. By the term whole person, Kant means personality and body. In marriage when I promise my wife's possession of my whole person (personality and body) and I accept her promise to do the same. In Kantian ethics, the concept of promise has a strong moral dimension. It means making a promise is to keep the promise at the end. This kind of union involved in a marriage is generated only by the mutual acquisition of each other's whole person. Here promised is performed based on mutual acceptance. However, for Kant, a marriage contract is ‘consummated only by conjugal sexual intercourse’³⁵ A marriage contract remains a mere ‘simulated contract’ so long the partners have sex. Thus for Kant, no formal, public ceremony is necessary to constitute a marriage. The enjoyment of another person's body is after all the aim and objective of the marriage contract. In this regard, Kant goes on to say that marriage is nothing but purely a union between two people with an aim “for lifelong possession of each other's sexual attributes.”³⁶

³⁴ Ibid., 27:388.

³⁵ Kant, Immanuel, *The Metaphysics of Morals*, translated by Marry J. Gregor, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 6: 279.

³⁶ Ibid., 6:277.

Section Two

3.4: Hegel non-contractual view of marriage

Hegel in his *Philosophy of Right* asserts that a marriage is only established after a wedding ceremony. For Hegel, marriage is the *immediate institution* of his ideal conception of community. As a result of that, marriage involves a sense of membership that we can experience in our social life. For Hegel, marriage is not contractual. To understand the perception of Hegel's marriage, one has to apprehend the role of the wedding ceremony because Hegel inclines to say that the wedding ceremony is necessary for constituting a marriage. In this regard, he goes on to say that the point of marriage comes 'only after this ceremony has first taken place. Hegel understands the ceremonial declaration of consent to be the performative act. The force of such an act actually transforms a relationship into a marriage where the agreement to marry be declared publicly. A public declaration is essential in marriage according to Hegel. The declaration of consent is involved in the wedding ceremony.

Hegel denies the Kantian contractual view of marriage. For Hegel, the Kantian contractual view of marriage is wrong. In this regard, Hegel remarks that "marriage is not a contractual relationship as far as its essential basis is concerned."³⁷ Unlike Kant, Hegel further contends that marriage cannot be subsumed under the concept of contract as Kant did. According to Hegel, normally marriage involves *a union of wills* that is essentially different from the kind of common will generated in a contract. Unlike Kant, Hegel thinks of marriage consent as consent to surrender one's personality. In marriage, the partners consent to constitute a single person and to give up their natural and individual personalities within this union. Later on, Hegel says marriage involves personality or individuality which enters into and surrenders itself to this relationship.

³⁷ Hegel, G. W. F., *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*, translated by H. B. Nisbet, Allen Wood, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991, 163R.

The marriage agreement is nothing but consent to the free surrender by both sexes of their personalities'. In marriage, each person gives his or her personality in exchange for membership in a new personality. Thus, there is a transformation from personality to a new personality in the marriage system. However, such transformation does not lead us to assume that I part with my personality and take on to others. Instead, both the partners would constitute a new person. Besides, consent in marriage also involves the subordination of sexuality. For Hegel, in marriage, the inward union of the natural sexes is eventually be transformed into a spiritual union through self-conscious love. This position of Hegel is very close to the Indian spiritualistic aspect of marriage. In Indian tradition, it is said that real marriage is nothing but the spiritual union of separate selves. It is an everlasting bond and it will remain inseparable even after the death of the husband.

According to Hegel, before marriage, the partners in the relationship lack a loving disposition. The union only has existence through sex, but it needs to have an existence in the partners' self-conception if it is to be a marriage. Here the concept of sex plays a vital role. In a relationship in which sex is unsubordinated, marriage can remove this deficiency. Moreover, the ethical character of love is the higher suppression than mere natural drive. For Hegel, marriage consent consists in the free choice to make the sexual drive inferior to the considerations of the ethical bond. This subordination of sexuality becomes real after the declaration has been uttered in the ceremony. Hegel further narrates the ethical determination of marriage as a 'pledging' that reduces the sensuous moment to a merely conditional one. It is conditioned by the true and ethical character of the relationship. In this regard, the recognition of the marriage bond is an ethical one. This would minimize the potency of romantic love and make marriage a happy conjugal tie. More specifically, it can be said that consent in the marriage ceremony is consent to make the end of the relationship an ethical one instead of one based on sexual satisfaction. This

does not however mean to say that the whole issue of marriage is to subordinate the sexual drive to some ethical purpose. The ethical perspective is relevant in the case to determine the motive of the partners to bring good progeny through sex. In such a case the partners vow to invest a principal interest in the well-being of this new person. Once married the lovers' approach to their relationship is not defined by a preoccupation with sexual gratification. In that case, sex is enjoyed merely in the context of an ethical relationship. This is where the relevance of sex ethics hinges on. In short, it can be said that the main objective of marriage consent is to surrender their *personalities* to constitute a new person. In such a case sexual gratification is subordinated to a higher-end, the higher end towards new progeny.

Why marriage is not contractual according to Hegel? Marriage is not a contract is that a contract is an agreement to exchange individual external things and only things of this kind are subject to alienation. However, marriage is an agreement between two people to surrender their personalities. Though they own their personalities as property, the partners cannot rightfully alienate their personalities because a personality is not an individual external thing. The surrender of personalities involved in marriage cannot be just like a trade-exchange that appears to be under Kant's view of marriage. Marriage and contract differ from each other. Marriage results in a transformation of one's self-identification whereas contract does not. Marriage for Hegel is not a contractual relationship rather the nature of marriage is to begin from the point of view of contract, i.e., that of individual personality as a self-sufficient unit to supersede it. The very transformation involves in marriage requires overcoming the individualistic self-identification from which we enter and leave the contract. For Hegel, when two persons enter into a contract, each of them is and remains a will distinctive for itself and not identical with each other. Marriage is founded on the disposition to have self-consciousness of one's individuality within this unit. As a result of that, in this system, one is present in it not as an

independent person but as a member. Thus for Hegel, marriage is not a contract because the common will generated in marriage is predicated on an overcoming of the individualistic self-identification from which we enter and leave contracts. Thus a new sense of membership can be acquired in marriage, but not in the contract. Here the partners' personalities become unified through their dispositions of mutual love and care. For Hegel, the ethical aspects of marriage consist of the consciousness of this union as a substantial-end. He then goes on to refer to this type of consciousness as a 'disposition' as the 'ethical spirit'. Marriage is different from the contract in two significant ways. First, marriage does not require the kind of trade exchange based on contractual relationships, and secondly, marriage results in a transformation from the contractual, self-interested disposition to a loving, communal disposition.

3.5: The Importance of Wedding Ceremony

Hegel put emphasized more on the wedding ceremony. For Hegel, the subordination of sexual desire, the surrender of personality, and the transformation of disposition or spirit take place in the wedding ceremony. Marriage thus differs from contract precisely because it involves a transformation in a disposition that overcomes the deficiency of a self-sufficient life. Hegel thus takes the wedding ceremony to be a necessary component of marriage. The loving disposition constitutes a marriage that lifts the wedded out of the deficient. We cannot ignore the dispositional force of speech acts. There is the solemn declaration of consent spoken during the wedding ceremony. Marriage is constituted when both the members of the relationship achieve a loving disposition. However, this relationship cannot be transformed into marriage so long the wedding ceremony is completed. A wedding ceremony is an occasion where there is felt familiarity and a shared life. Dr. S. Ciavatta says, "The actual shared life we have come to live is itself the expression of our commitment to each other- a durable, living actualization of spirit that

says more than any contractual commitment could.”³⁸ Hegel then says that after the ceremony do the sexual act and the desire for it become subordinate to the substantial concerns of the marital unit. The declaration of consent binds each partner to the agreement to marry. In addition to this binding, the marriage union must be considered permanent. It cannot rely solely on love. Love is feeling. Therefore simply expressing one’s love is inappropriate for the kind of relationship of marriage. As love as a mere feeling is too capricious and transient. The feeling must take a rational form. It becomes rightfully ethical love. It is rationalized as a decision. It is thus expressed as an agreement, as the free consent of each partner. It is thus up to the partners to maintain the agreement indefinitely. This indissolubility feature is a key aspect of a marriage. For Hegel, marriage should be regarded as indissoluble in itself. If love is not rationalized, then in such a case the relationship depends on mere feeling which leaves the relationship quite susceptible to dissolution. Moreover, a relationship based on mere feeling cannot be regarded as ethical. Hegel says, “Love, as a feeling, is open in all respects to contingency, and this is a shape which the ethics may not assume. Marriage should therefore be defined more precisely as rightfully ethical love, so that the transient, capricious, and purely subjective aspects of love are excluded from it.”³⁹ The feeling is crucial for a successful marriage, but the arbitrariness of pure feeling must be overcome. There can be no marriage if the partners’ feelings are never rationalized. Thus for Hegel, instead of feeling, we need to have rationalized feelings.

To Hegel, the concept of the wedding ceremony has a different philosophical connotation. He conceives the wedding ceremony as the conclusion of the marriage. It is through the wedding ceremony the essence of the bondage is expressed and confirmed as an ethical quality. There are two aspects of the wedding ceremony, such as the formal aspect and the non-formal aspect.

³⁸ Ciavatta, David V., *Spirit, Family and the Unconscious*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 2010, p.104.

³⁹ Hegel, G. W. F., *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*, translated by H. B. Nisbet, Allen Wood, op. cit., 161A

Attending the civil relationship and edification is the formal aspect of the wedding ceremony. Hegel then goes on to say that the function of the ceremony goes beyond merely reporting on some pre-established decision or feeling. For Hegel mere understanding and interpretation of the wedding ceremony is mistaken. The essential purpose of the ceremony is the norm-generating, performative act of the decision of consent. It may be tempting to think of the marital declaration of consent as a promise. According to the standard performative interpretation of promise, what I do when I promise is to enter into an obligation to do something in the future. To make a promise and to break a promise is not the real ethical force of promise. The ethical force of promise entails an obligation. That means to promise is entering into an obligation to keep the promise intact. In the case of a traditional wedding ceremony, there are various promises or promises like utterances made. Here the partners thereby oblige themselves to behave in certain ways in the future, such as, to love, to honor, to have and to hold, etc. However, the declaration of consent, according to Hegel, is not a promise. For Hegel, a promise is an expression of one's intention to do something in the future, but the fact is that a promise remains a '*subjective determination of the will*'.⁴⁰ Now if the agreement in the wedding ceremony were a promise, then in such a case the wedding ceremony would involve the expression of an intention to behave a certain way for the rest of the lovers' lives. The agreement in a marriage is expressed as *free choice*, the autonomy of will, to be unified, just as the expression of the agreement in a contract 'is itself already the existence of [the] will's decision'.⁴¹ Hegel also talks in favor of publicity besides the wedding ceremony. For Hegel, publicity of the declaration is necessary because it facilitates the perception that the marriage is indissoluble. Once it is announced in front of the family and community, it will have always been announced. Moreover, the function of the public aspect of the ceremony is to provide a basis for the endurance of the union. Moreover, the declaration of

⁴⁰ Ibid., 79R.

⁴¹ Ibid., 79R.

consent implies the permanence of the new marital person because it is the rationalization of the partner's feelings for each other. The wedding ceremony entails leading an ethical life. Through the declaration of consent, the partners affirm their union with one another. Here marriage as an institution of ethical life is witnessed and understood as rational.

3.6: Marriage and Ethical life

It thus seems that the insights of Hegel's wedding ceremony in marriage are to strengthen our ethical life. It is not implausible to think that marriage as a fundamental aspect of Hegel's ethical life always requires this type of confirmation from its participants. In this regard, Hegel inclines to say that to enter into marriage is to surrender one's personality for the sake of a new marital person. It thus seems to require an agreement to a self-limitation. To consider marriage as a self-limitation may make it undesirable to many people. The so-called wedding ceremony demonstrates that the institution is good because it adequately reflects the ethical spirit. Here one sacrifices his personality, one's individuality, in the way peculiar to love. Thus the act of marriage in some sense or other demonstrates marriage to be a rationally endorsable institution. While illuminating the ethical aspect of Hegel's marriage perception, Hardimon remarks, "Hegel thinks that marriage involves a transformation not only of one's public status but also of one's private self-conception. In his view, marriage is not, strictly speaking, a partnership – a union in which the separateness of the parties is perceived – but, instead, a deeper and more thoroughgoing union in which the separateness of the parties is overcome. We might take exception to this view, but it is crucial to recognize that it is the view that Hegel holds."⁴² Thus the very objective of marriage is to overcome the separateness of two individuals. It is also crucial for understanding Hegel's claim that the agreement to marry be declared and recognized by an audience. In marriage, the two parties surrender their personalities to form a new person. For Hegel, part of

⁴² Hardimon, M. O., *Hegel's Social Philosophy*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994, p.180.

being a person in the fullest sense involves recognition by others, so these two individuals, as a new marital person, would require recognition by an outside party, namely, their society and community. In this regard, Hegel further contends that part of being a person in a fully ethical sense means relating to and being recognized by others. To be a fully ethical, right-bearing person, a subject must enjoy the freedom of a person who relates only to himself, and in doing so, he relates himself to another person. Thus the commandment of right is, therefore, to be a person and respect others as persons. It implicitly means that personhood requires some mutual recognition. The declaration of the agreement to surrender one's personality for the new marital person itself has the power to activate the loving disposition required to constitute a marriage. However, this new marital person is not technically a person until it is recognized by its community. This is where the philosophical and social significance of the wedding ceremony hinges on. After marriage, they are members of a personality with new ends, and to be a fully ethical person, their union requires the recognition afforded in the wedding ceremony.

Putting everything into perspective, we can say that Hegel's view of marriage is non-contractual. In this regard, Hegel differs from Kant as we saw that the Kantian view of marriage is contractual. In contrast, things are exchanged to make use of them, but no exchange proper takes place in marriage. A contract is for the sake of transference of things, whereas a marriage is for the sake of a new mode of self-identification. A contractual account of marriage is not based on love and feeling, but on the use and ownership of one's partner as Kant suggested. In contrast, a common will is forged from two self-sufficient wills, yet those wills remain self-sufficient. In marriage, a union is formed from two self-sufficient wills through which their self-sufficiency is overcome. Hegel's loving disposition is activated once the wedding ceremony is conducted. It is normatively binding as an embodiment of will. It has a performative force. It is not a mere expression of my will, but an embodiment of my will. The union formed in marriage endures

because it is built upon a rationalized feeling of unity, not of self-interest. For Hegel, the ceremony of marriage is an unambiguous symbol of ethical life. The public aspect of the ceremony is necessary because marriage consists of the creation of a new person. Personhood requires recognition by other persons. Thus it can be concluded by saying that to be a person, the couple's union needs to be recognized by Hegel.

Section Three

3.7: Mill's View about Ideal Marriage

John Stuart Mill conceives the necessity of an ideal marriage to form an ideal family, a new type of family grounded in *the classical union of friendship*. He conceives the notion of friendship as a relationship between equals and not on hierarchy and domination and extinction. Mill desires a kind of family formed through marriage that would be the *hub of a school of moral and civil education*. Mill's philosophical commitment is to overcome the artificial dichotomy between feminine and masculine. According to Mill, such artificial distinction is based on prejudice. In this regard, Sigmund Freud remarks, "Mill was perhaps the man of the century who best managed to free himself from the domination of customary prejudices."⁴³ However, Freud in this regard disagreed with Mill. According to Freud, Mill tried to *avoid any preconceived distinction between men and women*. Freud then estimated this attitude of Mill as a sign of a misunderstanding of the relationship between the sexes. Mill, on the other hand, revealed dated prejudice in Freud's perception of women. While rejecting the segregation of feminine and masculine, Mill explicitly gestured toward the unity of human beings beyond sexual difference. He subscribes to sexuality as something mechanical or pure physical factors. In this regard Mill distinguishes between sex and gender, i.e., between biological and social spheres. Biological sexuality was an accidental factor. Psychological qualities are not linked to sexual

⁴³ Jones, Ernest, *The Life and the Works of Sigmund Freud*, New York: Basic Books, 1953, p.176.

determinations and that, properly speaking; masculine and feminine do not exist. According to the Freudian classification of theories of sexuality, Mill could be considered as a ‘sociologist’, because he thought that pure masculinity and femininity could not be defined in a biological sense. What is called feminine and masculine involves the existence of qualities that would be good for everyone to possess to develop their character in the best way. As a result of that what people call feminine and masculine are not incompatible properties at all. Mill, in his book *The Subjection of Women*, talks in favor of women’s opportunities for education, employment. According to Mill, women would choose marriage as a carrier. Friendship in marriage is crucial if marriage were to become a ‘school of genuine moral sentiment’. Male-female equality was essential to marital friendship and to the progression of human society. Mill’s vision of marriage is conceived as a locus of sympathy and understanding between autonomous adults not only reforms our understanding of his feminism, but also draws attention to an often submerged or ignored aspect of liberal political thought. In this regard, Mill put emphasized the value of non-instrumental relationships in human life. Marriage may be corrupt as well as well ordered. His interpretation of both corrupt and well-ordered marriage traces the relationship of family order to the right political order. His vision of marriage as a locus of mutual sympathy and understanding between autonomous adults stands as an unrealized goal for those who believe that the liberation of women requires not only formal equality of opportunity but measures that will enable couples to live in genuine equality, mutuality, and reciprocity.

3.8: Mill’s Reconstruction of Marriage

Mill’s reconstruction of marriage is based on friendship. It was preceded by one of the most devastating critiques of male domination in marriage in the history of western philosophy. To outline the perception of marriage, Mill repeatedly used the language of ‘master and slave’ or ‘master and servant’ to describe the relationship between husband and wife. Mill called the

dependence of women upon men “the primitive state of slavery lasting on”.⁴⁴ The wife is the actual bond-servant of her husband: no less so, as far as legal obligation goes than slaves commonly so-called.”⁴⁵ There remain no legal slaves, except the mistress of every house. The women had no right to care about anything except how they may be the most useful and devoted servants of some man. To Auguste Comte, he wrote comparing women to ‘domestic slaves’ and noted that women’s capacities were spent “seeking happiness not in their own life, but exclusively in the favor and affection of the other sex, which is only given to them on the condition of their dependence.”⁴⁶ In what sense Mill conceives married women as chattel slaves? According to Mill, the position of married women resembled that of slaves in several ways. The social and economic system gives women little alternative except to marry. Marriage is an inevitable event and destiny for women. Once married, the legal personality of the woman was subsumed in that of her husband. Moreover, the abuses of human dignity permitted by custom and law within marriage were egregious. In Mill’s eyes, women were in a double bind. On one hand, they were not free within marriage, and on the other hand, they were truly free not to marry. If a woman is unmarried belongs to either the middle class or upper class, she could not attend any of the English universities. As a result of that, she was literally ‘barred from a systematic higher education’.⁴⁷ Even if somehow she acquired a professional education, the professional associations usually barred her from practicing her trade. It is said, “No sooner do women show themselves capable of competing with men in any career, than that career, if it is lucrative or honorable, is closed to them.”⁴⁸ In this regard Mill cited a glaring example of a young lady, Miss Garrett. The situation of working-class women was even worse off. They were enjoyed low wages due to the prejudice of society which making almost every woman, socially

⁴⁴ Mill, J.S. *The Subjection of Women*, 1969, 1:130..

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 2: 158.

⁴⁶ Mill, J.S., *The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963, p.609.

⁴⁷ Strachey, Ray, *The Cause*, London: G. Bell, 1928, pp.124-165.

⁴⁸ Hansard, V., 1867, P.189.

speaking, an appendage of some men enables men to take systematically the lion's share of whatever belongs to both. Moreover, women were the surplus of female labor for unskilled jobs. Law and custom predestined that 'a woman has scarcely any means open to her of gaining a livelihood, except as a wife and mother'.⁴⁹ Putting everything into perspective, Mill says, "Marriage was a "Hobson's choice" for women, "that or more " ".⁵⁰ Women's status is involved in marriage. Here Mill was talking of English common law about women's marriage. According to English marriage, common law deprived a married woman of a legal personality independent of that of her husband. According to Biblical notion, a man shall leave his father and his mother and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be one flesh.⁵¹ According to Blackstone, by marriage, the husband and wife are one person in law, and that 'person' was represented by the husband. This is what we call patriarchic society where women, in general, were subdued by men. Blackstone further contends, "The very being or legal existence of the women is suspended during the marriage, or at least is incorporated and consolidated into that of the husband."⁵² Thus in a sense, married women lacked ownership of their earnings. As the matrimonial couple was 'one person, and that person is 'husband', the wife's earnings during the marriage were controlled by her husband. When Mill was an elected Member of Parliament, he supported a Married Women's, Property Bill. The Bill was placed in the Parliament to oppose the view that 'society can't exist on a harmonious footing between two persons unless one of them has absolute power over the other.' The Bill stated this stage as a 'savage state'. In this regard Mill argued that 'wife's position under the common law of England [concerning property] is worse than that of slaves in the laws of many countries.'⁵³ Mill also regarded the husband's exclusive guardianship over the married couple's children as a sign of the women's dependence on her

⁴⁹ Mill, J. S., *The Principles of Political Economy*, 1848, p.394.

⁵⁰ Blackstone, W. *Commentaries on the Laws of England 4 vols.*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1765, p.430.

⁵¹ Genesis, ii, 22-23.

⁵² Blackstone, W. *Commentaries on the Laws of England 4 vols.*, op. cit., p.430

⁵³ Mill, J.S., *The Subjection of Women*, 1969, 2: 158-59.

husband's will. In Mill's eyes, she denied any role in life except that of being 'the personal body-servant of a despot'.

3.9: Wife to be the slave of the husband

According to Mill, there are two main reasons for which wives to be the slaves of husbands. The assimilation of the wife to the slave was *her inability to refuse her master* and more importantly, her inability to obtain a legal separation from her husband. Mill in this regard goes on to say that no matter how brutal a tyrant a husband might be, and no matter how a woman might loathe him, he can claim from her and enforce the lowest degradation of a human being. A man and wife being one body, rape was by definition a crime that a married man could not commit against his wife. By marriage, sexual relation is legitimized both legally and morally. As marriage unifies two independent selves into one unified self, a wife by law could not leave her husband on account of a sexual offense. According to Mill, the most vicious form of male domination of women is rape within marriage. Mill attributes it as vicious because it is legal. Thus for Mill there we perceive a legally sanctioned system of domestic slavery that shaped the character of marriage in his day. In the modern era, however, marriage is a relationship grounded on the consent of the partners to join their lives. Mill thinks the other way round. To Mill, that the presumed consent of women to marry was not, in any real sense, a free promise, but *one socially coerced by the lack of meaningful options*. Moreover, the laws of marriage go against the interest of women. Laws of marriage in some sense or other deprived a woman of many of the normal powers of autonomous adults, such as controlling her earnings, entertaining contracts, to defending her bodily autonomy by resisting unwanted sexual relations. Marriage, for Mill, is a hierarchical relationship, a one-way dictatorship that does not reflect the relationship which should exist between those who were truly equal. Besides, Mill's view of marriage as slavery suggested a significantly more complicated and skeptical view of what constituted a free choice

in society. Hobbes, for example, regarded men as acting 'freely' even when moved by fear for their lives. Locke disagrees with Hobbes, but he talked about the individual's free choice to remain a citizen of his father's country. Mill's analysis of marriage demonstrated the great complexity of establishing that any presumed agreement was the result of the free violation and that an initial consent could create a perpetual obligation. In his *The Subjugation of Women*, Mill exposed the inherent fragility of traditional conceptualizations of free choice, autonomy, and self-determination so important to liberals, showing that economic and social structures were bound to limit and might coerce any person's choice of companions, employment, or citizenship. However, Mill did not rule out the possibility that marriage can be based on true consent. Even some individuals in his day established such associations of reciprocity and mutual support. He then suggested that to create conducive conditions of a marriage of equals rather than one of master and slave, marriage law itself would have to be altered. In such a case women would have to be provided equal educational and enjoyment opportunities where men and women would have to become capable of sustaining genuinely equal and reciprocal relationships within marriage. This may be treated as an alternative proposal of the marital relationship through which the master-slave is maintained.

3.10: Fear of Equality:

Marriage creates fear of equality in the mind of men. While establishing legal equality in marriage and equality of opportunity would require that men sacrifice those political, legal, and economic advantages they enjoyed 'simply by being born male'. Mill supported such measures and attributed them to *women's suffrage*. For example, the Married Women's Property Bills, the Divorce Act of 1857, and the repeal of the Contagious Disease Acts are cases in point. According to Mill, women's participation in civic decisions enables married women to protect themselves from male-imposed injustices such as lack of rights to child custody and to control of

their income. Besides, access to education and jobs would give women alternatives to marriage. It would also provide a woman with self-support in the case of separation or divorce. The divorce act of 1857 would enable women and men to escape from intolerable circumstances. A married women's property act would recognize the independent personalities that would enable them to meet their husbands more nearly as equals. However, Mill thinks that the subjection of women could not be ended by law alone, but only by law and the information of education, of opinion, of social inculcation, of habits, and finally of the conduct of family life itself. Men fear living with equality. Marriage was retained as 'a law of despotism' that men shut all other occupations to women. Men who have a real antipathy to the equal freedom of women' were at the bottom afraid 'least [women] should insist that marriage is on equal conditions'. In this regard Mill remarks," Women disabilities in law are only clung to maintain their subordination in domestic life; because the generality of the male sex cannot yet tolerate the idea of living with an equal."⁵⁴ The public discrimination against women was a manifestation of a disorder rooted in family relationships. For the sake of the progression of humankind, the master-slave relationship should be eliminated from marriage.

However, Mill did not mention any single explanation of the origin of men's fear of female equality. His account of the fear of equality was not psychoanalytic. However, he did undertake to depict the consequences of marital inequality both for the individual psyche and for social justice. Women were affected by the denial of association with men on equal footing. According to Mill, women's confinement to domestic concerns was a wrongful 'forced repression'. For a woman, no public-spirited dimension to her life is possible. However, Mill was convinced that men were corrupted by their dominance over women. Unlike men, women were taught to live for others. Hegel in his book *The Phenomenology of Mind* conceived the relationship between

⁵⁴ Ibid., 3:181.

husband and wife as master and slave. The master thinks that he is autonomous, but in fact, he relies totally upon his slave, not only to fulfill his needs and desires but also for his identity. Thus, without slaves, he is no master according to Hegel.

3.11: Call for a Friendship

The master-slave relationship can be overcome to a great extent through the notion of marital friendship. According to Mill, friendship was the ideal of marriage. The same was reflected in Hegel as well. Hegel also voiced in favor of friendship. The ideal of friendship was ‘a union of thoughts and inclination’ which created a ‘foundation of solid friendship’ between husband and wife. Thus, Mill praises marital friendship. In this regard Mill wrote: “When each of two persons, instead of being a nothing, is a something; when they are attached and are not too much unlike, to begin with; the constant partaking of the same things, assisted by their sympathy, draws out the latent capacities of each for being interested in the things... by a real enriching of the two natures, each acquiring the tastes and capacities of the other in addition to its own.”⁵⁵ Here Mill subscribes that human capacities did not exhaust the benefits of friendship. A friendship develops the abolition of selfishness, the capacity to regard another human being as fully as worthy as oneself. Therefore, a friendship of the highest order could only exist between those equal in excellence. But the problem here is that women are far below men in this regard. For precisely this reason, philosophers from Aristotle to Hegel had consistently argued that women could not be men’s friends, for women lacked the moral capacity for the highest forms of friendship. It is common to distinguish the marital bond from friendship not solely based on sexual and procreative activity, but also because women could not be part of the school of moral virtue which was found in friendship at its best. Thus, Mill like Nietzsche put emphasized adopting the language of friendship in the discussion of marriage. According to Mill, the true

⁵⁵ Ibid, 4: 233.

virtue of human beings is the fitness to live together as equals. Friendship is all about reciprocity and it has been a remarkable characterization of family life.

Mill repeatedly insisted that his society had no general experience ‘of the marriage relationship as it would exist between equals’. Such marriage would be impossible until men rid themselves of the fear of equality and the will to dominate. Women were to be regarded as equals not only to fulfill the demand of individual rights but also so that women and men could form ethical relations of the highest order. In this regard, men and women alike had to learn to cultivate their strongest sympathy with an equal in rights and cultivation. In his *On Liberty*, Mill explicitly rejected von Humbolt’s characterization of marriage as a contractual; relationship which could be ended by ‘the declared will of either party to dissolve it’. To Mill, marriage involved a person’s expectations for the fulfillment of a ‘plan of life’ and thereby ‘created a new series of moral obligations toward that person, which may be overruled, but cannot be ignored’. Thus in a sense, there lie moral imperatives of such a friendship. Mill put forward for the fostering of the society of equals was providing equal opportunity to women in areas outside the family. In this regard, he remarked in his *On Liberty* that ‘nothing more is needed for the complete removal of the almost despotic power of husbands over wives than those wives should have the same rights and should receive the same protection of the law in the same manner, as all other persons.’ Within marriage there we observe a division of labor between husband and wife. Man earns the income and the wife superintends the domestic expenditure just like the most suitable division of labor between the two persons. Mill also indicates that women alone would care for any children of the marriage, what he called the ‘care which nobody else takes’. As far as child care is concerned, nobody to compete with them. As a man when he chooses a profession, so, when a woman marries, it may be in general understood that she chooses the management of a household.’ However, Mill’s acceptance of the traditional gender-based division of labor in the

family has led some recent critics to fault Mill in various respects. Mill wanted the family to become a school of moral and civic education, i.e., a modern adaptation of the ideal of the ancient polis. Only cultural friendship could save humanity. Ideal marriage may be conceived as a school of freedom where equality, justice, and friendship are well secured. For Mill true marriage transforms the couple into a single being because it fulfills everyone's need for completeness. Thus, it can be said after Mill that the notion of an ideal marriage, of a soul mate, was a topos. Marital friendship, based on conjugal androgyny, could also represent a great opportunity to overcome the traditional division of domestic roles. In this regard Mill writes: "The association of men with women in daily life is much more complete than it was ever before. Men's life is more domestic. Formerly their pleasures and chosen occupations were among men, and in men's company: their wives had but a fragment of their life."⁵⁶

Section Four

3.12: Russell's View about Marriage

While outlining the essence of Western marriage, we particularly confine ourselves within Russellian interpretation of marriage as the paradigm of it. In the first few lines of the introduction of his book *Marriage and Morals*, Russell remarks, "In characterizing a society, whether ancient or modern, there are two elements, rather closely interconnected, which are of prime importance: one is the economic system, the other the family system."⁵⁷ Based on that there develop different types of thought of which one is primarily concerned with *economic sources* and the other derives everything from *family or sexual sources*. The former one is linked with Karl Marx and the latter one is linked with Freud. Russell did not go with either one of these as he thought there is no interconnection between the two. Of course, it would be true to

⁵⁶ Ibid., p.335.

⁵⁷ Rusell, Bertrand, *Marriage and Morals*, London and New York, 2015, p.1.

say that the industrial revolution has a profound influence upon sexual morals and vice-versa, but Russell did not prepare to assign primary either the economic or the sexual factor. Russell attempts to show in what sense sex and economy are linked and interconnected with each other. According to Russell, the sexual morals of the community will be found to consist of several layers. The first would be the positive institutions embodied in law, for example, monogamy in some countries and polygamy in others. Next, there is a layer where the law does not intervene but public opinion is emphatic and finally there is a layer that is left to individual discretion in practice if not in theory. The fact is that sexual ethics and sexual institutions are not based on rational considerations except Soviet Russia. In Soviet Russia, sexual ethics are not the outcome of superstition and tradition. Otherwise, the perception of sexual ethics would vary from country to country, from situation to situation. Therefore, the effects of sexual ethics are of most diverse kinds, such as, *personal, conjugal, familial, national, and international*, and their effects would also vary good in some respect and bad in others. In the case of sexual relations, the psychological element plays significant role. It is even true to say that some sex relations have more value than others. Even many would say that sex relation is better when it has a large psychological element. Love in the real sense of the term increases in value in proportion based on the personalities of the concerned man and woman. According to the poet, sexual relation and the value of it actually hinges on the psychic element and their perception of love as an equal relation. In this regard polygamy, for example, cannot be regarded as an ideal system. Thus for Russell, it would be a prerequisite to count both marriage and extra-marital relations because extra-marital relations will vary according to the marriage system.

3.13: The Structure of the family

The structure of the family also plays important role in marriage. There are different kinds of family groups, but the patriarchal has a very large impact on polygamy. The primary objective of

sexual ethics of Western civilization since pre-Christian times has been to secure the degree of female virtue without which the patriarchal family becomes impossible. Within a monogamy family again there are many varieties. It may be decided by the parties themselves or by their parents. Even in some countries, the bride is purchased and in others, for example, in France, the bridegroom is purchased. As a result of that, there occur all kinds of jittery, such as divorce and others. In the Catholic extreme divorce is not permitted, but in China, a man can divorce his wife for being a chatterbox.

3.14: Matrilineal Societies

Russell subscribes to three factors, such as, *instinctive, economic, and religious*, as far as marriage customs are concerned. Russell reveals many laws and customs about sex. Some custom has a religious origin and it might not survive over a period. For example, shops are closed on Sundays has a religious origin, but now it is an economic fact. Accordingly, it would really be difficult to make the distinction between what is religious and what is instinctive. For Russell religion has a strong instinctive basis linked with tradition. For example, love and jealousy are both instinctive emotions but religion accepts love as a great virtue and decrees jealousy. The custom of religious defloration is another instinctive one. Polyandry is another custom that an unlearned white man would suppose contrary to human nature. The word instinct is hardly the proper one to apply to anything so far from rigid as human behavior in sexual matters. Thus in the strict sense of the term, the sexual act is not instinctive. According to Russell, all civilized modern societies are based upon the patriarchal family and as a result of that, the whole conception of family virtue has been built up to make the patriarchal family possible. For example, the feeling of a mother towards her child is not at all difficult to understand because there is a close psychical tie. However, the relation of the father to a child is indirect, hypothetical, and inferential. It is bound up with beliefs as to the virtue of the wife. Thus, the

concept of paternity would be a very complex one. According to Russell, Christianity is a patriarchal religion and it cannot be made emotionally or intellectually intelligible to people who do not recognize fatherhood. Instead of the Father', it would be necessary to speak of the Maternal Uncle'. But this does not reflect the right meaning since fatherhood implies both *power and love*.

Malinowski maintains that if a man remains with his wife during pregnancy and childbirth, he has an instinctive tendency to be fond of the child when it is born and this is the basis of paternal sentiment. He then remarks that human paternity can be shown to be deeply rooted in natural endowment and organic need. If a man is absent from his wife during pregnancy he would not instinctively feel affection for the child at first, although if customs and tribal ethics lead to associate with the mother and child. Affection will develop with the mother throughout. The important human relations, socially desirable acts are enforced by social ethics. Russell remarks, "Customs enjoins that the mother's husband shall care for the children and protect them while they are young, and this custom is not difficult to enforce, since it is, as a rule, in line with instinct."⁵⁸

3.15: Patriarchal Systems

Russell then claims that as soon as the psychological fact of paternity is recognized, a new element would enter into paternal feeling. It is necessary for the creation of patriarchal societies. The father recognizes that the child is his seed. It is also available in the Bible. In such a case father's sentiment towards his child is reinforced by two factors, such as the love of power and the desire to survive death. According to Russell, a man's decedents are in a sense his own achievements, and their life is a continuation of his life. In fact, *the discovery of fatherhood would make human society more competitive, more energetic, more dynamic, and hustling than it*

⁵⁸ | bid., p.13.

had been in the matrilineal stage. Under the patriarchal system, a legitimate child is a continuation of a man's ego, and his affection for the child is a form of egoism. But if the child is not legitimate, the putative father is tricked into lavishing care upon a child with whom he has no biological connection. As a result that the discovery of fatherhood led to the subjugation of women, both physical and mental, as the only means of securing their virtue. Due to the subjugation of women, there has not been developed genuine companionship between husbands and wives. According to Russell in most communities women have been denied almost all experience of the world and of affairs. They have been kept artificially stupid and it was even reflected in Plato's dialogue. The domination of patriarchy is revealed everywhere. Daughters throughout civilization, and sons in a great many countries, could not marry without their father's consent. It was usual for the father to decide whom they should marry. Russell says, "A woman had in no period of her life any independent existence, being subject first to her father and then to her husband. At the same time, an old woman could exercise almost despotic power within the household; her son and their wives all lived under the same roof with her and her daughters-in-law were completely subject to her."⁵⁹

3.16: The Role of Christian ethics in Marriage

The role of Christian ethics has paramount philosophical significance in marriage. Westermarck says, "Marriage is rooted in the family rather than family in marriage".⁶⁰ This clearly suggests that the *fate and peace of the family at large depends on the quality of marriage*. It is clearly stated in the Christian religion. Christianity and more particularly St. Paul introduced an entirely novel view of marriage not at all related to the procreation of children, but to prevent the sin of fornication. In Indian religion, we notice the same. It states that the nature of progeny/offspring

⁵⁹ Ibid., p.18.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p.27.

actually depends on the *novel idea of marriage*. According to St. Paul, the views on marriage are set forth with a clarity that leaves nothing to be desired. Some of the views St. Paul set forth are as follows:

- (i) It is good for a man not to touch a woman
- (ii) To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife and every woman have her own husband.
- (iii) Let the husband render unto the wife due to benevolence and likewise also the wife unto the husband.

Here St. Paul makes no mention of whatever children. Thus the biological purpose of marriage appears to be wholly unimportant. St. Paul also holds that sexual intercourse, even in marriage, is something of a handicap in the attempt to win salvation. However, married people can be saved, but fornication is a deadly sin. The Old Testament forbids adultery, but it means adultery intercourse with a married woman. For example, when Abraham goes to Egypt with Sarah he tells the king that Sarah is his sister, and the king, believing this, takes her into his harem; when he subsequently transpires that she is Abraham's wife. The king is shocked to find that he has without knowing committed sin. He then reproaches Abraham for not having told him the facts. According to Russell, a woman who had intercourse outside marriage was thought ill of, but a man was not condemned unless he had intercourse with the wife of another. The Christians view that *all intercourse outside marriage is immoral and it was based upon the view that all sexual intercourse, even within marriage, is regrettable*. This view certainly goes against biological facts. However, the fact is that it is embedded in Christian ethics and it made Christianity, throughout the whole history, a force tending towards mental disorders and unwholesome views of life. St. Paul's views were emphasized and exaggerated by the early Church. The Church attacked the habit of the bath that makes

the body more attractive and it tends towards sin. The purity of the body according to St. Paul, 'means the impurity of the soul'.⁶¹ According to the Church, sexual relations when they occurred would tend to be brutal and harsh very similar to drinking under pollution. *The art of love was forgotten and marriage was brutalized.*

It thus seems that *from an ethical point of view marriage and sexual relations were completely abandoned in Christianity, in the Church, and by St Paul.* We cannot ignore the religious impact on marriage. When any strong religious fervor fell upon a husband or a wife, its first effect was to make a happy union impossible. The more religious partner immediately desired to live a life of solitary asceticism or at least an unusual life of separation in marriage. It was even reflected in St. Abraham. St. Abraham ran away from his wife on the night of his marriage. What we gather from St. Paul is that for him marriage is to be regarded solely as a more or less legitimate outlet for lust. It was not clear whether he would have any objections to birth control, but what he would lead to suppose that he would regard as dangerous the periods of continence involved in *pregnancy and child-birth.* The Church has taken a different view. In the orthodox Christian, marriage has two purposes of which one has been recognized by St. Paul and the other is the procreation of children. The consequence has been to make sexual morality even more difficult than it was made by St. Paul. Further not only is sexual intercourse only legitimate within marriage but such relation even within husband and wife it becomes a sin unless it is hoped that it will lead to pregnancy. The desire for legitimate offspring is, in fact, according to the Catholic Church, the only motive which can justify sexual intercourse. But this motive always justifies it, no matter what cruelty may accompany it. If the wife hates sexual intercourse, if the child is likely to be diseased or instance, if there is not enough money to prevent the utmost extreme

⁶¹ Ellis, Havelock, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, vol. iv. P.31.

of misery, that does not prevent the man from being justified in insisting on his conjugal rights, *provided only that he hopes to beget a child*. According to Catholic teaching besides asceticism, marriage is good because *it will bring into the world as many souls as possible*. Every soul is capable of salvation. Even though souls are equally capable of damnation is not taken into account. The recognition of children is one of the purposes of marriage is very partial in catholic doctrine. It exhausts itself in drawing the inference that intercourse not intended to lead to children is sin. Thus, it has never gone so far as to permit the dissolution of a marriage on the ground of sterility. A man may desire children and if his wife is barren he has no remedy in Christian ethics. The positive purpose of marriage plays a very subordinate part and *its main purpose is the prevention of sin*. Having said marriage is still regarded essentially as a somewhat less regrettable alternative. It thus seems to us that the Catholic Church has tried to cover up the low view of marriage by the doctrine that *marriage is a sacrament*. It lies in the inference that marriage is indissoluble. However, unlike the Catholic Church, we have a different perception of the outlook of Protestantism about marriage. The text suggests that ‘it is better to marry than to burn’. Luther inferred that he and the nun had the right to marry; otherwise, he would have been *led to mortal sin*. This is where the philosophy of marriage actually hinges on. Thus the Protestantism denies the Catholic Church's position about marriage and gives a different view about marriage. Unlike the Catholic, Protestantism was more rigid in its moral condemnations. The Catholic Church expected a certain amount of sin, the Protestants, on the other hand, abandoned the Catholic practices of confession and forgiveness and thereby left the sinner in a much more hopeless position than he occupies in the Catholic Church. One sees this attitude in both its aspects in modern America, where divorce is exceedingly easy, but adultery is condemned with far more severity than in most Catholic countries.

In Christian ethics, though emphasis had been laid on sexual virtue, it did a great deal to degrade the position of women. Since the moralists were men, women appeared as the temptress. Again since the woman was the temptress, it was desirable to curtail her opportunities for leading man into temptation. As a result of that responsible women were more circumvented with restrictions. Women were regarded as *sinful* because they were not respectable. However, throughout history women regained their respect. It is only in modern times that women have regained the degree of freedom in the Roman Empire. The patriarchal system did much to enslave women, but a great deal of this was undone just before the rise of Christianity. In fact, the writings of the fathers are full of invectives against the woman. According to them, “woman was represented as the door of hell, as the mother of all human ills. She should be ashamed at the very thought that she is a woman. She should be ashamed of her dress, for it is a memorial of her fall. She should be especially ashamed for her beauty, for it is the most potent instrument of the demon. Physical beauty was indeed perpetually the theme of ecclesiastical denunciations...Women were even forbidden by the provincial Council, in the sixth century, on account of their impurity, to rescue the Eucharist into their naked hands. Their essential subordinate position was continually maintained.”⁶²

3.17: The Concept of Romantic Love bangle

Love is an important virtue in marriage. The ancient world was vicious, but not brutal. In the Dark Ages, religion and barbarism combined to degrade the sexual side of life. In marriage, the wife had no rights; outside marriage, there was no object in curbing the natural beastliness of the uncivilized male. It was only towards the end of the thirteenth century that the clergy of the clergy was radically enforced. The clergy, of course, continued to have illicit relations with women, though they could not give any dignity or beauty to these

⁶² Westermarck, op. cit., p.170.

relations because they considered them immoral and impure. Romantic love was unknown before the middle Ages. Romantic love appeared in the middle Ages. At first, it was not directed with whom the lover could have either legitimate or illegitimate sexual relations. It was directed towards women of the highest respectability. Romantic love is a form of passion and in this sense Romantic love is Platonic. According to Russell, it had become impossible to feel any poetic sentiment towards a lady unless she was regarded as unattainable. Accordingly, love, if it was to have any beauty, had to be Platonic. It is very difficult for the modern to feel in imagination the psychology of the poet's lovers in the Middle Ages. Thus the concept of love was taken as a novel spirit in the middle Ages. But our human instincts were to them the products of corruption and original sin. They have hatred the body and its lusts. Pure joy was to them only possible in ecstatic contemplation of the kind that seemed to them free from all sexual alloys. In the sphere of love, this outlook could not but produce the kind of attitude which we find in Dante. A man who deeply loved and respected a woman would find it impossible to associate with her the idea of sexual intercourse since all sexual intercourse would be to him more or less impure. His love would therefore take poetic and imaginative forms, and would naturally become filled with symbolism.

Romantic love reached over the period its summit in the Romantic Movement and Shelley was its chief apostle. Shelley when he fell in love was filled with exquisite emotions and imaginative thoughts of a kind lending them to expression in poetry. He revealed it very well that the emotion that produced these results was fully good and he saw no reason why love should ever be restrained. His argument, according to Russell, was rested upon bad psychology. It was the obstacles to his desires that led him to write poetry. Romantic love as it existed in Shelley actually depends upon a state of unstable equilibrium, where the conventional barriers still exist but are not quite insuperable. If the barriers are rigid,

romantic love is not likely to flourish. Let us explain an extreme Chinese system where a man never meets with any respectable woman except his own wife and when he feels her insufficient, he goes to a brothel. His wife is chosen for him and is probably unknown to him until the wedding day. As a result of that, all his sex relations are entirely divorced from love in the romantic sense. In a state of complete freedom, a man capable of great love poetry is likely to have so much success through his charm that he will seldom need of his best imaginative effort to achieve conquest. Thus, love poetry depends upon a certain delicate balance between convention and freedom. Love poetry is not the only purpose of love and romantic love can still be flourishing without artistic expression. According to Russell, romantic love is the source of the most intense delights that life has to offer. Russell says, "In the relation of a man and woman who love each other with passion and imagination and tenderness, there is something of inestimable value, to be ignorant of which is a great misfortune to any human being."⁶³ The social system should permit joy as an ingredient in life in the secondary sense.

In modern times, particularly, about the period of the French Revolution, an idea has been developed that marriage should be treated as the **outcome of romantic love**. According to Malaprop's principle, that love and aversion both wear off in matrimony. When people marry without previous sexual knowledge of each other and under the influence of romantic love, each imagines the other to be possessed of more than moral perfections and conceives that marriage is going to be one long dream of bliss. This is actually more relevant to a woman if she has been brought up ignorant and pure, and therefore incapable of distinguishing sex hunger from congeniality. The problem with romantic marriage is that it is not lasting long. It was noticed in America. In America, where the romantic view of marriage has been taken

⁶³ Russell, Bertrand, *Marriage and Morals*, op. cit., p.46.

more seriously than anywhere else, and where law and custom alike are based upon the dream of spinsters, the result has been an extreme prevalence of divorce and an extreme rarity of a happy marriage. This clearly suggests that marriage is something more serious than the pleasure of two people in each other's company. Marriage is just like an institution that forms part of the *intimate texture of society*, and it has an importance extending far beyond the personal feelings of the husband and the wife. Of course, Russell did not deny the relevance of romantic love in marriage. In this regard, he goes on to say that romantic love helps to form *the motive of marriage*. However, the kind of love which will enable a marriage to remain happy and to fulfill its social purpose is not at all romantic but is something more intimate, affectionate, and realistic. In romantic love, the beloved object is not seen accurately but through a glamorous mist. As a result of that, there always remains a possibility for a certain type of woman to remain wrapped in this mist even after marriage, provided he has a husband of a certain type. This motive helps one to forget the real intimacy of a woman with her husband. Romantic love is essential to marriage is too anarchic, and like St. Paul's view, such marriage actually forgets that children are what makes marriage important.

3.18: Emancipation of Women

The emancipation of women is essential when we talk of sexual morality. According to Russell, the emancipation of women is part of the democratic movement that begins with the French Revolution. Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792) is a product of the ideas that were caused and were caused by the French Revolution. After that, the demand of women to equality with men has been asserted with continually increasing emphasis and success. John Stuart Mill's *Subjection of Women* is a very pervasive and well-reasoned book, which had a great influence upon the more thoughtful members of the

generation. After Wollstonecraft lot of modification was taken place in favor of women's emancipation of which the influence of democracy is one and women's engagement outside their home was another. As a result, women did not depend for the comfort of their daily lives upon the favor of fathers or husbands. This transition was radical and it gives a perception of women's attitude. The rights of women did not, of course, in fact, depend upon any belief that women were morally or in any other way superior to men. They depend solely upon their rights as human beings or rather upon the general argument in favor of democracy. The political emancipation of women, however, concerns our theme only indirectly. It is their social emancipation that is deeply connected with marriage and morals. The virtue of women was secured by segregating them. In fact, no attempt was made to give them inward self-control. On the contrary, everything was done to take away all opportunity for sin.

The demand of equality between men and women concerned itself from the first not only with political matters but also with sexual morality. The motive of female virtue in the past was chiefly fear of hell-fire and the fear of pregnancy.

3.19: Marriage and Family

Marriage plays a significant role in social construction and the construction of the family. There are many facets of marriage and it varies from culture to culture, community to community, state to state. Having said marriage is prevailing everywhere. The main objective of marriage is to bring good progeny or soul to the world. It has many implications, such as social, religious, etc. There are other responsibilities involved in marriage. *Marriage is a social tie where the husband and wife love each other, take care of each other, and ensure economic and social commitment and responsibility as well.* Marriage in the real sense of the term enhances social dignity as well. It would be a misnomer to perceive marriage as a

sexual tie. Even sexual objectivity of marriage was not supported by religion as well. According to Russell, the main contention of marriage is to bring progeny. In fact, *marriage without reference to any progeny does not bear any sense*. In such a case there is no relationship between husband and wife, in such a case the relationship would be treated as men and women.ⁱ This clearly suggests that marriage is not a *mere sex relation*. It is also supposed to be a legal institution. According to Indian literature, marriage has two origins, , religious and legal. The religious implication in Indian culture and Shastras is so important where even legal marriage is ignored. In rural India within economic backward classes even today religious marriage is supposed to be the dominant practice. Indian Shastras believe in the *divinity of life*. There is a forceful religious commitment based on spirituality where marriage is taken to be a divine tie. Of course, legal marriage gradually comes into human life because it would be required when divorce and to protect wealth and rights. Russell also mentions the religious aspect of marriage. However, he thinks that a legal institution is more deniable than a religious institution.ⁱⁱ In this regard, Russell goes on to say that it would be the legal aspect that matters the most. Russell even goes beyond humans when he speaks of the legal aspect. In this regard, he goes on to say that the legal aspect is not only confined to humans even it goes beyond humans. It exists not only among the so-called primitive men but also existing in apes and other animals.ⁱⁱⁱ Russell conceives the practice of animals actually a sort of marriage wherever the cooperation of marriage is necessary to the nurture of the infantile. Accordingly, it can be said, after Russell, that animal marriages are monogamic and it is revealed among the anthropoid apes.

3.20: The Concept of Primitive Monogamy

Thus it seems to us that Russell fined the religious background of marriage in apes. He then goes on to say that there is a hidden religious conviction which states that if such the systems

are taken into account and thereby it is believed that such fortunate animals are not faced with the problems. It eventually beleaguered with human communities. Accordingly, it is believed that once a male married a woman, it virtually ceases to be attracted to any other female and once a female is married to a man, it virtually ceases to be attracted to any other male. Thus it seems to us that marriage is *a social tie* that appears as a religious and legal mark through which the status of both the male as well as the women has changed radically. It addresses social recognition and designation in a very specific way. Here Russell goes on to assert that it is true to say that even though the anthropoid apes, do not have the assistance of religion, but still it can be said that their instinct suffices to produce virtue. He notes it clear that there are evident even among the lowest races of savages where we can observe a similar state of affairs. In this regard Russell cites Bushmen. They are monogamous in the strict sense of the term. He further claimed that the Tasmanians, which no longer exist now, were customarily faithful to their wives. In this regard, Russell inclines to say that careful study would reflect that even in civilized mankind some faded marks of monogamic can be revealed at times. However unlike animals, human has peculiar mental set up from which vices and intelligence are developed parallel. As a result of that human power of imagination breaks up a habit and there it sets off new lines of conduct over instinct. 3.21: Economic motive and breakdown of Monogamy

So long economic issue was not prevailing in the society; the society at large was dominated by monogamy. However when the concept of economy entered the mind of the primitive people, then they left the concept of monogamy and favored polygyny. Under polygyny, the sexual relationship between the husband and the wife becomes secondary and more and more importance was given to slavery where a tendency was grown towards slavery of relations. It thus seemed that in early agricultural and rural communities both wives and children were an

economic asset to man. It was thought that the wives and sons accumulated economy and helped the man at large. As a result of that, the tendency of a manifold of marriages was developed in the minds of the people simply for economic benefit. They believed at large that the wives worked for him, and the children after the age of five to six began to be useful in the field and they were also helpful in tending beasts. Therefore, more and more children were desirable at that point in time. As a result of that the most powerful men at that time would be one who had many wives and many children. The heat of this tendency is felt even in today's society. There are some religious communities and castes who in the name of religion desire to have many wives and many children.

However, it should be kept in mind that though polygyny was prevailing it was no longer a general practice at that time. The practice was limited only to those powerful people in the society and community. In this regard, Russell says that polygyny can hardly ever see as a general practice of a community. Due to the scarcity of women in the society, it was a prerogative of only chiefs and affluent men. However, it was the clear perception at this point of time that many wives and children would form a valuable property and this would further open the path of enhancing their privileged position of their owners. Powerful men just needed more wives for the sake of economic benefits. At that time the primary function of wives was actually based on nurturing profitable and well-financing related domesticated animals. As a result of that their sexual relationships were radically subdued and it becomes secondary to them. Women at that time were more prone towards economic accumulation and they were least bother about a sexual relationship. They focused more on the economy and considered themselves mere slaves. They revealed that relations can be purchased with regard to slaves. Thus as a civilization grows over the century economic issues get more and more important and relevant in the context of survival both to men and women. As a result of

that, the so-called husband-wife relationship was based just on economic matters and issues, and where there is no economic outcome in the desired sense the relationship between the husband and the wife is broken. Thus there arises the concept of divorce in the realm of conjugal life.

3.22: Divorce and Dowry

Divorce and dowry are responsible for the economic outlook. The present society is materialistic in nature. It is all about individualism, materialism, subjectivism where money matters the most. As a result of that, the present society takes marriage as an agreement based on the economic outlook. It is a general hidden tendency, acknowledgeable or not acknowledgeable, that marriage, in turn, will boost economic affluence in some sense or other. Either the wife would be economically solvent or doing a job that would ensure economic demand and desire after marriage or the husband demand dowry from the wife's parent to fulfill his needs and demands through marriage. It thus forgoes the essence of marriage that was prevailing among primitive people at large. In this situation, divorce law is a prerequisite because the wife would be the loser if the divorce will happen in the conjugal life. Divorce law is framed in order to separate living and at the same time, it is framed to regain the properties of women from the husband after divorce. Otherwise, it would almost impossible for a wife to divorce her husband from a realistic perspective.

Russell in this context brings back the concept of adultery or faithlessness. He then goes on to remark that at the very low level of civilization, adultery is tolerated at times. The Samoans at the time of their journey expect that at the time of their absence from home, the wives of them would console themselves for their absence.^{iv} However, at the slightly higher level of civilization, adultery in women is punished with death and with very severe

penalties. Adultery is a humanly moral and ethical crisis. It is not good for the well-ordered society and the well-ordered community at large. It would vitiate the human mind, perturbed human minds in the wrong direction. The domination of men over women was prevailing everywhere in the past and it was equally prevailing even in the minds of great thinkers like Aristotle, Plato, and Rousseau. As a result of that, the modern forceful theory of feminisms is developed where exploitation and subjugation of women in the name of gender are criticized. Russell reveals it very well. In this regard, he subscribes that a man who had intercourse with another man's wife was treated as a criminal, but a man who had intercourse with an unmarried woman did not incur any blame unless *he diminished her value in the marriage market*. The term marriage market is important here. Russell termed it in terms of value. It seems from his remark that unrecorded or secret intercourse by a man to an unmarried man was allowed at that time. However, he rightly confessed that the marriage market value of a woman can be diminished if it would be vital to society. The same is prevailing right now in our society. If it is transmitted to the community that an unmarried woman is engaged in sexual relationships with a married man or even with an unmarried man, the marriage market value of that woman would hamper or so to speak would decline. However, over the course, this perception is changed. With the advent of religion, particularly, Christian religion this outlook was changed. More sanction was laid on sexual intercourse. With the appearance of Christianity, the part of religion in marriage was amplified at large. The infraction of the marriage law has been blamed on grounds of taboo rather than of property. Besides the sanction of law on sexual relation, the sanction of God for the same was injected. Accordingly, it was said that in the eyes of law to have sexual intercourse with another man's wife is punishable and to have any sexual intercourse outside marriage was an offense against God. According to Church, it would be treated far graver matter in the eyes of religion. Thus, with the advent of Christianity religion eventually became a sacrament. It has

been a lifelong matter. The same is reflected in the Indian marriage system. In Indian literature and Shastras, it was admitted that there is life even after death because the soul is immortal. The body is perishable whereas the soul is not perishable according to Indian Shastras. Accordingly, it is said that from a religious perspective, *marriage is an eternal relation*. It may be missed from a physical point of view when either the husband or the wife after marriage has died, but their *souls remain the same*. So even there appeared physical detachment, but there is no mental detachment. Therefore, marriage as a relation between two souls cannot be dissected in the true sense of the term.

What can we gain out of a religious interpretation of marriage? To me, the religious interpretation of marriage is actually portrayed the real philosophical essence of marriage. Marriage is not a mere social tie or engagement. The essence of marriage actually hinges in somewhere else. Marriage is an honest commitment both from an empirical and religious perspective. To realize this is good for society. Marriage in the real sense of the term is not a system of slavery where the economy matters the most. Women were, are, and will be the most sufferers of the marriage system from a non-religious perspective. That is why feminism has appeared. However, women are always subdued by nature. Women are passive in nature and in most general cases they intend to be subdued. By nature, women are very close to nature or the environment. The religious sanctions also work as the background of women where more restrictions are laid on women rather than on men. If we go through the history of religion we find that there are many religious sanctions laid on women and by talking about all these sanctions, men's outlook on women was backed up and such things do not bear any significance from a rational perspective. Russell mentions a few of them. According to Russell, among peasants, the life of married women has always been a very hard one. It is equally true in India as well. The majority of Indian people are living in a rural

village, the majority of them are peasants and maintaining their livelihood through agriculture. Moreover, they are a firm believer in religion. Every Indian living in the rural area is religious-minded people even today in the 21st century. The impact of religion in the mind of Indian rural people is colossal. As a result of that women had to abide by the religious sanctions laid on them. More importantly, every religion including *Manusmriti* emphasized has been laid on men and lots of religious sanctions were imposed on women in the form of serving their husbands. There is nothing to hide to say that peasants everywhere in the world are less civilized than others. A less civilized community anywhere in the world is dominated by religion. When peasants are less civilized, women's jobs and livelihood would be harder. Russell then reminds the outlook of barbaric men towards women. In the barbaric society or community, women were treated old at the age of twenty-five. They felt that after the age of twenty-five, a woman cannot retain her beauty. Women in the barbaric society were just treated very similarly to domesticated animals. As a result of that for women, it actually meant a life of extreme toil and hardship. According to Russell, there is no question of doubt that Christianity in the name of religion created or prescribed some worse sanctions on women and thereby made women's life tougher on the religious front. But the only point that Christianity acknowledged in favor of women is that it treated all men and women equally from a religious perspective. That means it ensured religious justice to all men and women. This is indeed a fair point. Therefore women should be abided by the instructions given to them from a religious perspective and these religious sanctions would remain inviolable in any situation whatsoever. Christianity denies that women are the property of their husbands. According to Christianity, a married woman cannot have the right to go away her husband for another man, but she could leave her husband for leading a life of religion. Thus Christianity has offered two paths to women. Either lead a conjugal life with

the husband or leave the husband to lead a religious life. No other alternative is possible under the *womb of Christianity*.

3.23: Wherein lays the happiness of Marriage?

The pertinent question that needs to be taken care of is that *where lies the happiness of marriage*. Why people in most general cases have prompted to engage with conjugal life? This question is difficult to answer. There are multifarious means and ways for which every people is desired to engage with marriage. Of course, there is no point in saying that people are reluctant to engage in marriage to have happiness. Certainly, it would not be the case. People, of course, do expect happiness while engaging with marriage than unhappiness. However, there is no guarantee to assume that the objective of marriage is fulfilled concerning happiness. Marriage at times brings unhappiness and it eventually leads people towards divorce or separation. Happiness arising out of marriage does not relate with the civilized man or uncivilized man as such. It seems that the more civilized people become the less capable of lifelong happiness with one partner. According to Russell, Irish people still believe that the conjugal life after marriage would be much happier if the marriage is organized by the parents or the ancestors. For Russell marriage would be easier where people are least differentiated. This is indeed the great agony of modern society. The modern civilized society is the hallmark of differentiation. If there is the least differentiation between the husband and the wife, the conjugal life would be happy enough. In this regard Russell goes on to say that when a man differs little from other men and a woman differs little from other women, then there would not be any particular reason to regret it. As a result of that, there would not create an alternative view to marry one instead of the other. Unhappiness, therefore, is created because of so *much excessive differentiation between man and man and between woman and woman and also between man and woman*. That is why Russell

justified in saying that marriage is the easiest where people are least differentiated. The paper ends with two important issues. First, the difference between man and man and woman and woman has to be minimized, and secondly, even in the globalized environment, we cannot forgo the impact of religion in marriage.

To me happiness should not be determined based on expectation; rather it should be *based on realization*. If marriage is supposed to be a hypothetical agreement based on the hidden consequence, then happiness in the real sense would be difficult to come by. There are so many expectations in present couples and they think to each other that fulfilling expectation by any means is the basic objective of marriage. The other point is not that marriage is likely to be what is called happy if husband, nor wife ever expected to get much happiness out of it. The expectation on either side vitiates the sanctity of marriage at great length. It makes the marriage conditional and hypothetical in nature. Here both the husband and the wife must be sensible and respect and tribute each other. To make marriage *conditional is uncalled for*. Our social customs are set forth to prevent unhappy marriages. The point is that if that of the bond of marriage is recognized as final and irreversible and immutable, then there is no need for outside motivation or spur for mitigating imaginary ecstatic happiness. When we talk of marriage concerning family, we are primarily concerned with domestic peace and happiness where this state of mind exists. Therefore, the best-proposed solution is that here neither the husband nor the wife should fall disgracefully below the commonly recognized standard of decency. One must take lesson it from family customs and family cultures.

3.24: Causes of Unhappiness of Marriage

According to Russell, marriage does not ensure or bring happiness among the so-called civilized people in the modern world. It seems that not many marriages after the first few

years are happy. Some of the causes for unhappiness are bound up with civilization. Modern civilization is responsible at large for bad sexual education and it is far common among the well-to-do than it can ever be among peasants. Unlike the children of well-to-do, the children of peasants early became accustomed to the real facts of life. They can observe not only in human beings but also animals as well. They are lucky in the sense that they are thus saved from both ignorance and fastidiousness. We have a different situation in the case of civilized children. Fortunately or unfortunately the carefully educated children of the economically affluent families are shielded from all practical knowledge of sexual matters and even the most modern parents who teach their children out of books; do not give them the sense of practical familiarity which the children of peasants acquired much earlier. This is where the relevance of Christina's teachings actually hinges on. The triumph of Christian ethics is when a man and woman marry without either having had previous sexual experience. According to Russell, sexual behavior among human beings is not instinctive, so that the inexperienced bride and bridegroom find themselves overwhelmed with shame and discomfort. It would be better when the woman alone is innocent but the man has acquired his knowledge from prostitutes. Even most men do not realize that a process of persuading is necessary after marriage. Many well brought up women do not realize what harm they do in marriage by remaining reserved and physically aloof. All this could be put right by better sexual education. There is a widespread belief among women that they were morally superior to men on the ground that they had less pleasure in sex. That means extreme sexual desire would hamper the ethical and moral perception of men. Sex is mere passion and it is nothing but external bodily gratification. It would hamper the ethical perception of men. As women are morally superior to men because of less sexual urge, it would not be possible to develop companionship between man and woman. It is asserted that failure to enjoy sex is a mere physiological or psychological deficiency like a failure to enjoy food.

According to Russell, there are other causes of modern unhappiness in marriage which cannot be ignored. One main reason is, of course, related to uninhibited civilized people. In such a case men and women are generally polygamous in their instincts. As a result of that, they may fall deeply in love and for some years they entirely absorbed in one person. But the problem is that love based on sexuality did not last long. According to Russell, sooner or later *sexual familiarity dulls the edge of passion*. As a result of that, they began to look elsewhere for a revival of the old thrill. This tendency cannot be overcome without developing a sense of morality. That means the development of moral sense may help one to overcome such outward tendency. However, it is not easy to come out from the existing propensity. As a result of that extreme unhappiness was created among the couples. Even with the growth of women's freedom, there has come a much better opportunity for conjugal infidelity or disloyalty than the earlier. This sort of opportunity gives rise to the thought; the thought gives rise to the desire and in the absence of a religious sense of right and wrong the desire gives rise to the act. This is where the justification of marriage with morals actually hinges on. Marriage based on sexual desires creates voluminous problems without a moral foundation. Only morality helps one to rationalize sexual desire or outlook. According to Russell, women's emancipation has in various ways made marriage more difficult. In old days women were subdued and they blindly respect their husband and had to adapt herself to the husband. Even in the old day, the husband did not have to adapt himself to the wife. Thus the dominant culture of a wife by the husband was prevailing in the old day. However, over time women are being enlightened in every respect and they are very much concerned about their rights as well. Nowadays it is observed that many wives on the ground of women's right to their own individuality and their own career are unwilling to adapt themselves to their husbands beyond a point. Side by side while men who still hanker after the old tradition of masculine domination, see no reason why they should do all the adopting. This problem is

created in connection with disloyalty. In the old days, the husband was occasionally and in most general cases it was unknown to the wife. If the wife came to know it, he confessed that he had sinned and made her believe that he was apologetic. She, on the contrary, was usually virtuous as he used to be. If she was not and if it is known to her husband, then is such a case the marriage was broken. In many modern marriages, it seems that mutual faithfulness is not demanded and the instinct of jealousy survives and often proves fatal to the persistence of any deeply rooted intimacy where no overt quarrels occur. It thus seems that the human ego outruns everything and making marriage a hub of unhappiness. Where there is the human ego, there is extreme anthropocentrism and subjectivism. It would vitiate the dignity of man. The dignity of man actually rested on a moral foundation. If we desire happiness out of marriage, the first and foremost aspect is to have a sound moral foundation of both husband and wife.

There is another difficulty in the way of modern marriage which is felt especially in those who are most conscious of the value of love. Love can only flourish so long it is free and spontaneous. However, it tends to be killed by the thought that it is a duty. Love is no longer a duty. It cannot be conditioned. In fact, conditional love is no longer love. Love is spur-of-the-moment. It is impulsive by nature. Thus we cannot say that you have to love so and so. It would then be the surest way to cause you to hate him or her. Marriage is a combination of love with legal bonds thus falls between two tools. Marriage actually detaches one's outlook of love from elsewhere. It diminishes receptivity and sympathy and the opportunity for valuable human contacts. It is to do violence from something which is in itself desirable. Very similar to restrictive morality it tends to promote what one may call a policemen's outlook upon the whole of human life. It would be a sort of outlook which is always looking for opportunities to forbid something. For all these reasons many of which are bound up with things undoubtedly good.

Marriage has become difficult if it is not to be a barrier to happiness. It must be conceived in a somewhat new way. When marriage creates unhappiness and becomes difficult, one can take a divorce to overcome the problem. There are many grounds based on which divorce can be admitted, but Russell did not think that **easy** divorce would be a solution to the troubles of marriage. However, Russell thinks that when marriage is childless, divorce may be often the right solution. It would even be the case when both parties behave decently. This suggests begetting progeny is the main objective of marriage. One may engage with marriage for bringing good soul/s into the world. There is no other alternative. For this purpose sexual engagement is acceptable after marriage. However, if there is no possibility of becoming a mother /father, then one may take a divorce. However, when there are children, the stability of marriage is a matter of considerable importance according to Russell. In this regard, Russell goes on to say that when a marriage is fruitful in the real sense of the term when happiness is associated with marriage when both parties are reasonable and decent, there is of course an expectation that *it would be lifelong*. There is no point in sexual exclusion and exclusion of sex relations. A marriage that begins with passionate love and leads to children and loved ought to produce so deep a tie between man and woman. In such a case they will realize something *infinitely precious in their companionship*. In such a case sexual limitation or sexual dissatisfaction does not hamper their happy conjugal life.

However, such melodious marriage has been prevented by jealousy. Jealousy is an instinctive emotion. However, it can be controlled if it is recognized as bad and not supposed to be the expression of just moral indignation. Russell in this regard contrasted between an old love and new love. He then goes on to say that there is no justification for developing or searching for new love through a marriage where companionship is last for so many years, where so deeply many felt events are involved or recorded and has a richness of contents that were not present in the first day of love. There is a passage of time when marriage relation focuses on the enhancement of values and there is no point to throw away such companionship for the sake of

new love. Thus it is possible and even desirable for both civilized men and women to be happy in marriage. However, it has to fulfill so many conditions. There must be a feeling of trust and complete equality on both sides. Secondly, there must be *no interference with mutual freedom*. Thirdly, there must be the most complete physical and mental intimacy. Fourthly, there must be a certain similarity regarding standards of values. The value is very important. If one favors instrumental value and dislike intrinsic value and the other favors just the opposite, then all sorts of problem would be created in the conjugal life. Value parameter actually determines the longevity of marriage. In summarizing all these as cited above, Russell goes on to say, *“I believe marriage to be the best and most important relation that can exist between two human beings. If it has not often been realized hitherto, that is chiefly because husbands and wives have regarded themselves as each other’s policemen. If marriage is to achieve its possibilities, husbands and wives must learn to understand that whatever the law may say, in their private lives they must be free.”*^v

3.25: Marriage and Prostitution

Prostitution is another hub of sexual intercourse. If marriage is eyed *as a mere sexual relation and nothing else*, then it would be very similar to prostitution. According to Russell, marriage is legal prostitution. However, it would not be the case so long the virtue of respectable women is regarded as a matter of great satisfaction. In this regard, Russell remarks, ‘the institution of marriage has to be supplemented by another institution which may really be regarded as a part of it – I mean the institution of prostitution.’^{vi} The term ‘prostitution’ is a well-known language and Lecky ‘speaks of prostitutes as safeguards of the sanctity of the home and of the innocence of our wives and daughters.’^{vii} Moralists, of course, would deny Lecky because his remark makes them feel furious even though they have not succeeded in showing that what he said was untrue. The moralists assert that if men followed his teaching, there would be no prostitution. Thus, the relevance of prostitution would be a moral fall out; it would be a great deterioration of human

morality. Russell, however, does not deny the need for prostitution. Prostitution may be required for those men who are either unmarried or away from the wives on journeys. Such men are not content to remain continent. In a conventionally virtuous community, they do not find respectable women available to them. As a result of that society sets apart a certain class of women for the satisfaction of those masculine. Russell, however, reveals some advantages of a prostitute. In this regard, he goes on to say that prostitute has the advantage not only that she is available at very short notice, but that she can remain hidden without difficulty. On the other hand, a man who has been with her can return to his life, his family, and his church with unimpaired dignity and self-respect. She despite the undoubted service she performs, although she safeguards the virtue of wives and daughters and the apparent virtues of churchwardens, is universally abhorrent to the community. She is thought to be an outcast and she is not allowed to associate with ordinary people except in the way of business. Having said, we can say that the real offense of the prostitute is that she shows up the hollowness of moralistic professions. There are at least two grave objections against prostitution, first, the danger to the health of the community, and second, the psychological damage to men. The danger to the health of course counts the most. It is mainly through prostitutes that venerable disease is spread. The real problem is that those who acquire a venerable disease often postmen treatment because they are ashamed. There is no question of doubt that prostitution existing at present is a kind of undesirable kind of life. It demoralizes life. It tends to excessive drinking. It has a great drawback as well. It is a life against instinct, quite as much against instinct as the life of a nun. Putting everything into perspective we can say that prostitution as such is not a desirable carrier. It had a bad psychological effect upon a man. He will get into the habit of feeling that is not necessary to please to have sexual intercourse. Even some men are incapable of desiring sexual intercourse with a woman whom they deeply love and respect. Even many old-fashioned men treat their wives with exaggerated respect and prevent them from experiencing sexual pleasure.

We find the opposite scenario as well. Sexual intercourse should occur when both desire it. It is the outcome of mutual desire and any sexual desire without the desire of a woman would accordingly be treated as rough and brutal. It would produce disgust in the mind of the wife and it would be very difficult to eradicate.

Russell further contends that the intrusion of the economic motive into sex is equally disastrous. Sexual relations should be a mutual delight, a spontaneous impulse of both parties. Otherwise, it does not bear any moral value. Then it would be treated as a brutal act deeply associated with bodily gratification. It then lacks respect because it is performed for the sheer strength of the physical urge. It applies not only to prostitution but also to marriage. For women, marriage is the commonest mode of livelihood, and morality in sexual relations consists essentially of respect for the other person. We have already mentioned that after Russell there is no rational justification of marriage without children. According to Russell, a disinfected marriage should be easily dissoluble. If children are the main objective of marriage, then it is through children alone that sexual relations become of importance to society. Thus in an institutional sense without the purpose of begetting children, there is no point in marriage and therefore there is no point or issue of sexual intercourse. Even in the recent past, it seems that there are western societies where sexual relation has been treated as a legitimate practice even before marriage. It is no longer allowed in Indian culture and traditions.

3.26: Call for Sexual ethics

We think that sex plays an important role in marriage. Marriage does not bear any sense without a sexual relationship. The prime objective of marriage in any society whatsoever is to bring good progeny. Without sexual relation, the question of producing progeny simply does not arise. However, sexual relation has many dimensions and it needs to be evaluated within ethics. That means sexual ethics is pertinent in a sexual relationship. In the context of family, there is a rational basis for the limitation of sexual freedom. There is sin in sex and sexual ethics resist the

sin in sex. Sin in sex can be eliminated by the combination of marriage with the desire for offspring. Indeed the degree of stability in sex relations has been demanded by the interests of children. Thus in a sense, we have to consider the family as a reason for a stable marriage. However, divorce seems contrary to the interests of the children. For Russell, the whole question of the connection of marriage with the interests of children needs to be considered without any prejudice.

3.27: Marriage and Family

According to Russell, the family is a pre-human institution where the help of the father during pregnancy and lactation tends to the survival of the young. The primitive father does not know that the child has any biological connection with himself. Rather the child is the offspring of the female whom he loves. Since he has seen the child born, it produces the instinctive tie between him and the child. At this stage, he sees no biological importance in safeguarding his wife's virtue. At this stage, he has no sense of property in the child. The child is the property of his wife and his wife's brother, but his relationship with the child is merely one of affection. However, with the development of intelligence, he becomes aware that the child springs from his seed, and he must therefore make sure of his wife's virtue. Gradually the wife and the child become his property and from an economic perspective, they became valuable property. He brings religion to bear, to cause his wife and children to have a sense of duty towards him. The growth of civilization had increased the strength of the family. In this regard, we notice a considerable difference between Russell and Buddhism on the economic front. Buddhism did not believe in any economic relevance in human marriage, but Russell thinks the other way round. For Buddhism economy can vitiate an individual soul, but Russell did not think so. For Russell, economic salvation is important and it may solve a bit through marriage.

The position of the family at the present day has been weakened. Earlier all family members were living together, cooperating with each other as one economic unit. Now the family is

drastically reduced to the parents and their younger children. The children spend most of the time in school and they learn there what the state thinks good for them. This sort of teaching may not be at par with their parent's desire. Even the State provides medical and dental care and feeds the child if the parents are impoverished. As a result of that the functions of the father are reduced. In a primitive state of affairs, the father was necessary. The family is important at the present day, more through the emotions with which it provides parents than for any other reason. For Russell, parental emotions in men as well as in women are perhaps more important than any others in their power of influencing action. Both men and women who have children as a rule regulate their lives largely concerning them. One cannot ignore the impact of individual psychology within the family. There is no question of doubt that an individual is affected by family relations; there is the effect upon children, upon the mother, and upon the father. Since the family is a closely-knit unit and anything that affects the parents affects also their influence upon the children. If we believe Freud, the emotions of a young child towards the other members of his family have a somewhat desperate character. A boy hates his father, whom he regards as a sexual rival. He hates his brothers and sisters because they absorb some part of the parental attention. The effects of these turbulent passions are of the most diverse and terrible kinds, varying from homosexuality at best to mania at worst. Thus, the relevance of marriage is not only to bring good progeny by birth, but it needs massive attention for proper development of the progenies. This is one of the important aspects which have been caught in Russell's mind. He talks of individual psychological development and also brings back the relevance of economy as the basic objective of marriage at large.

3.28: Marriage and Divorce

The concept of divorce is an integral part of marriage. When marriage is based on legal ground, divorce is also based on legal ground. The concept of divorce is permitted in most ages and countries for reason. Where marriage life seems to be intolerable, the relevance of divorce is a

possible best means. Divorce laws are different in different countries, but what is common in all forms of divorce is the separation between the husband as well as the wife. In some cases, divorce is good for the husband or rather to say that divorce has been very easy for a husband to obtain, and in other cases, it has been easy for a wife. The Mosaic Law allows a husband to give a bill of divorcement; the Chinese law allows divorce provided the property which the wife had brought into the marriage was restored. The Catholic Church, on the ground that marriage is a sacrament, does not allow divorce for any purpose whatsoever. Protestants recognized divorce for adultery. However, nowadays the great majority of clergymen in the Church of England are opposed to all the divorce.

Section Five

3.29: Friedrich Nietzsche's view about the ideal marriage

Friedrich Nietzsche talks of the philosophy of marriage and in this regard, he offers various measures. According to Nietzsche, there are ten important tips for a great or ideal marriage. In this section, we propose to analyze the philosophical insights of ten tips for a great marriage after Nietzsche. While talking of ideal marriage, Nietzsche admires the ancient Greek model of relationships where friends were great, men were warriors, and women were for their recreation. According to Nietzsche, friendship is the highest form of love, because great friends inspire each other and even push others towards the ideal superman (Übermensch). Nietzsche conceived friendship as essential to a good marriage. Sex, in contrast, creates complications. According to him, a relationship based on romantic feelings is unlikely to endure a lifetime. The ontological differences between man and woman eventually tend to turn love into a war. So owing to overcome the power games highest form of friendship is a prerequisite. Thus it would really be a great challenge to the lover of becoming a great friend. Nietzsche is not a firm believer of modern marriage which is predominantly concerned with love, or so to speak romantic love. He elsewhere views modern marriage as another example of the collapse of standards in our

hedonistic world which eventually heading towards nihilism. Nietzsche estimated it as a predicament. He then advocated a philosophy of ‘aristocratic radicalism’⁶⁴ It is a philosophical stage where a few courageous and strong human beings take up the challenge of becoming a superman who transcends, strives passionately and creatively to go beyond lives life to the fullest. He thus constantly combats and overcomes obstacles to be a greater person while rejecting comfort and security. While explicating the insight of ideal marriage after Nietzsche, his time of appearance is very important. Nietzsche lived from 1844 to 1900. It was an era in which the roles of men and women in society were very different from today. At that time the dominant role of women was to be wife and mother. Moreover, one might be tempted to conclude that as Nietzsche said some critical things about women, he is a misogynist. In fact, Nietzsche talked contemptuous things not only about women but also about many different groups of people, including men. In his book *Human, All Too Human*, he says, “The perfect woman is the highest type of human being than the perfect man.”⁶⁵ This position of Nietzsche reminds us of the philosophical outlook of Swami Vivekananda about women. This remark of Nietzsche reflects it clearly that he had immense respect for women. It seems to us that many of Nietzsche’s remarks about women, loving relationships, and marriage are, at face value, outrageous by modern standards. But the very intention of Nietzsche is to explore a few of his suggestions relating to love relationships and marriage is to embrace his challenge, to acknowledge his contradictions, and to look beyond the provocation. In this regard, Nietzsche suggests ten important tips for an ideal or great marriage. We explain his ten tips one after another and also try to unearth his philosophy about marriage.

3.30: First Tip: *Don’t Marry for Love, (Marry someone ugly but whom you like talking to.)*

⁶⁴ Fuss, P. and Shapiro, H. (eds), *Nietzsche: A self- portrait from his letters*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971, p.104.

⁶⁵ Nietzsche, F., *Human, All To Human*, translated by R. J. Hollingdale, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996, p.150.

According to Nietzsche, a marriage based only on romantic love is on shaky ground because it is fleeting or short-lived. He says, "Sexuality often makes love grows too quickly so that the root remains weak and is easy to pull out."⁶⁶ Before marriage, true friendship must be developed where there is no sexual attraction. Thus, it has paramount importance not to confuse between friendship and sexual attraction. This is indeed the problem of modern romantic marriage. Romantic love is a fleeting love, and it has been grown out of sexual attraction. It is mainly directed towards bodily gratification. Nietzsche in this regard quips: "How many married men there are who have experienced the morning when it has dawned on them that their young wife is tedious and believes the opposite."⁶⁷ Nietzsche tries to avoid this complication arising out of romantic love. In this context, he recommends preparing lovers for the inevitable evaporation of attraction to curb the disappointment when it happens. In this regard, he says, "Sometimes it requires only a stronger pair of spectacles to cure the lover, and he who had the imagination to picture a face, a figure twenty years older would perhaps pass through life very undisturbed."⁶⁸ According to Nietzsche, romantic love relationships are bound to crackle and fizzle. In this regard, Zarathustra, the protagonist of Nietzsche's argues that romantic love relationships are just brief follies. It is stupid to turn a folly into a long-term commitment. Romantic love is transitory; it has no long-term commitment which is very essential for becoming a life-partner. Nietzsche equally stresses the insanity of love-matches. He says, "Marriage contracted from love (so-called love-matches) have an error for their father and need for their mother."⁶⁹ Marriage based on romantic love actually undermines the whole institution by basing it on an idiosyncrasy. But this

⁶⁶ Nietzsche, F., *Beyondgood and evil*, translated by Hollingdale, London, UK: Penguin Books, 1990, p.98.

⁶⁷ Nietzsche, F. *Daybreak: Thoughts on the prejudices of morality*, translated by Hollingdale, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, p.150.

⁶⁸ Nietzsche, F., *Human, All To Human*, translated by R. J. Hollingdale, op. cit., p.150.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p.151.

is not desirable. For Nietzsche, “You never ever base an institution on an idiosyncrasy.”⁷⁰ Nietzsche further contends do you believe that you are going to enjoy talking with this woman up into your old age if you engage with marriage based on romantic love? He then says that everything else in marriage is transitory, only devotion to the conversation will be lasting at the end of life. That is why forgo romantic love in marriage, but bank on conversation, concentrate on the conversation with whom who is your ever-lasting friend. Thus, for Nietzsche, true friendship gets priority over romantic love in the case of marriage. However, to retain or so to speak preserve a friendship between a man and a woman, *a slight physical antipathy* is required. Nietzsche was extremely pessimistic about marriage. In his famous *Twilight of the Idols*, he notes that ‘marriage has become completely irrelevant and irrational’.⁷¹ Nietzsche in his *Daybreak* also highlighted that marriage is ‘very often and almost as a general rule refuted’. As a result of that marriage has introduced a very great deal of hypocrisy and lying into the world. Instead of marriage, it would be better to remain as friends and lovers. In such a case one can avoid unnecessary complications with vows that would inevitably be broken. The ethics are that if you vow or promise in marriage, it should be kept from a moral perspective. However, in most general cases it will be broken. As a result of that, it would create unnecessary complications in human life. Nietzsche says, “We ought not to be permitted to come to a decision affecting our whole life while we are in the condition of being in love, not to determine once and for all the character of the company we keep based on a violent whim: the oaths of lovers ought to be publicly declared invalid and marriage denied them: the reason being that one ought to take marriage enormously more seriously!”⁷²

⁷⁰ Opiel, F. N., *Nietzsche on gender: Beyond man and woman*, Charlottesville, VA and London, UK: University of Virginia Press, 2005, p.215.

⁷¹ Nietzsche, F. *Twilight of the Idols*, translated by J. Norman, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005b, p.215.

⁷² Nietzsche, F. *Daybreak: Thoughts on the prejudices of morality*, translated by Hollingdale, op. cit. p.150.

We think that Nietzsche did not undermine the essence of marriage, but he certainly undermined the logic of romantic marriage which creates unnecessary complications in human life. He had high regard for the ancient Greek marriage system. For him, we have to look at why marriage existed? Greek ancient marriage system was based on solid foundations and rules were very clearly defined. In ancient Greek marriage, couples could not get divorced and love was not a factor in the decision. For Nietzsche, marriage ‘knew how to hear above the accidents of feeling, passion, and the distractions of the moment.’ But unfortunately today in western cultures the ancient Greek marriage idea seemed old-fashioned. However, there are many cultures where arranged marriages are still prevailing. Nietzsche tells that it would be sensible and advisable to marry not only because the individuals happen to be in lust, but by taking other factors into account, such as being able to talk to the spouse and to maintain the family’s power, influence, and wealth for future generations. This is essential for strong and healthy offspring.

3.31: Second Tip: Make Super-Babies

There is no question of doubt that owing to producing strong and healthy progeny is the main objective of marriage. But Nietzsche would be hugely disappointed with what he saw going on with the modern marriage. As modern people marrying for love and romance, mate-selection is based on chance, and making progenies is, thus, a random exercise. If the objective of marriage is romance and the appearance of progeny is a mere chance, then the progeny cannot be healthy and strong. Mankind is capable of amazing things and that creating new generations of even more amazing individuals is a great achievement. Therefore, it is actually in the individual’s greatest self-interest to marry not for love but *to create strong, healthy, well-educated children*. Nietzsche acknowledges that we can improve the human species and can build great civilizations through careful mate selection. Zarathustra says, “You should propagate yourself not only forward, but upward.” Interestingly, *Nietzsche talked in favor of gene matching. He claimed that through gene matching, the parents should be able to create children greater than*

themselves. Nietzsche thinks that marriage is not a necessary condition for procreation. However, the family unit will assist in building those new generations. Even maybe the garden of marriage helps one to do this. Even though Nietzsche denies the essence of a loving marriage, but there is no guarantee that love marriage and the intention of producing a super-baby are mutually exclusive. There may be cases where better progeny will produce through love-marriage. For even in love partners may tend to think very highly of each other. In such a case it is logically possible that the lovers would also think that their partners would be able to produce good offspring. Nietzsche perhaps thinks that love-marriage actually means 'mere romantic marriage', where romanticism overrules sexual responsibility, sexual obligations, mutual trust, and responsibility. It would then be a sort of barbarism or a sort of animalism. Marriage needs everlasting love and perpetual love. As love is the outburst of emotion and irrational feeling, it cannot be everlasting in the true sense of the term.

3.32: Third Tip: Never Promise Everlasting Love

According to Nietzsche, to promise everlasting love is false. Love cannot be everlasting. For him, if romantic love is ephemeral and transient, promising to love your partner forever would simply be absurd and a lie. Everlasting love is an exception, not the rule. For Nietzsche, like any other feeling love is not within the individual's power. For him, love is a feeling. Feelings are involuntary. What is involuntary is beyond control. Therefore, love as a promise cannot be made based on something that one has no control over it. When love is taken as a promise, it is treated as an action. Thus in a loving relationship, one can promise actions that 'are usually the consequence of love'.⁷³ Then in such a case love would be treated as a consequence. Then again it would be treated as conditional love. Therefore, it would be much more appropriate to recognize this contingency and one has to be honest about it. To avoid deception in wedding

⁷³ Nietzsche, F., *Human, All To Human*, translated by R. J. Hollingdale, op. cit., p.42.

vows, Nietzsche recommends saying something along these lines: “For as long as I loved you I shall render to you the actions of love; if I cease to love you, you will continue to receive the same actions from me, though from other motives.”⁷⁴ That means my actions will remain the same to you whether I love you or do not love you. There is no scope of deception because one is promising to act as if still in love, rather than mistakenly promising the feeling of love. Thus one needs to have a candid confession. In such a case the beloved can still say that ‘I do’ to marriage when confronted with a partner who is uncertain about how long the loving feeling will last. Since love is feeling and feeling is involuntary, therefore love is not a choice. Nietzsche is right in recognizing the absurdity of promising a feeling. The key point here is that if both partners are consciously aware of what they are promising on their wedding day, there is a much better chance of the marriage enduring. Since romantic love relationships are often not strong enough to endure a lifetime. Therefore to endure a marriage lifetime affair, other considerations are needed.

3.34: Fourth Tip: Try Serial Monogamy

Here Nietzsche intends to say that to avoid the problem of the temporary nature of romantic love relationships, why do people not agree to short-term marriage upfront? He termed it as ‘serial monogamy’. In fact, Nietzsche at one stage of his life considered the option of *two-year marriage*. To understand the insight of his perception of ‘serial monogamy’, let us explain his view of friendship. In this regard, Nietzsche refers to a noble kind of friendship called a ‘star friendship’. He remarked, “ We are two ships, each of which has its own goal and course: we may cross and have a feast together as we did – and then the good ships lay so quietly in one harbor and in one sun that it may have seemed as if they had already completed their course and had the same goal. But then the almighty force of our projects drove us apart once again, into

⁷⁴ Ibid., p.42.

different seas and sunny zones...”⁷⁵ Nietzsche in his life experienced that some of his own star friendship eventually turned into sour and they lasted for a short period of time. He applied the same concept to romantic love relationships. In this regard, he goes on to say that the risk for lovers is not only that the loving feeling may diminish, but that people over time change too. In this regard he says like ships that come together and separate in the star friendship, so too do lovers have their personal goals and seek to pursue their own path. As a result of that, it seems that the custom of marriage when two people are bound together for life is *mutually untenable*.

Nietzsche in this regard talks in favor of serial monogamy. In his book *Human, All too Human*, he inclines to say that it would be prudent to prefer serial monogamy considering the fragility of marriage. In this regard, men can do act out of their own customs for one wife for life. Instead ‘one might very well consider whether nature and reason do not dictate that a man ought to have two marriages.’⁷⁶ Thus as serial monogamy, Nietzsche suggests two marriages. The first marriage is the most important and necessary for *a man’s education about conjugal life*. It should be when the man is twenty-two years old to a woman who is “intellectually and morally his superior and who can lead him through the perils of the twenties.”⁷⁷ A second marriage though useful but not necessary should be during a man about thirties and to a younger disciple ‘whose education he would himself take in hand.’⁷⁸ In his later work, Nietzsche cites a raft of great philosophers who have not been married as evidence for this incompatibility between marriage and personal fulfillment. Socrates, Heraclitus, Plato, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Kant, Schopenhauer did not engage with marital relationships or engagement. It should be noted here that Nietzsche does not go into detail about the benefit of serial monogamy, but he acknowledges that it would require generosity on their part. More specifically, it would create an opportunity

⁷⁵ Nietzsche, F., *The Gay Science: With a prelude in German rhymes and an appendix of songs*, translated by J. Nauckhoff and A. Del Caro, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001, p.159.

⁷⁶ Nietzsche, F., *Human, All Too Human*, translated by R. J. Hollingdale, op. cit., p.150.

⁷⁷ Ibid., p.156.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p.156.

for female generosity. Moreover, the star friendship is not just a male domain. However, once children are introduced or in case of a strong family unit for a child's upbringing and education, it reflects a contradiction with Nietzsche's position. We think Nietzsche actually offers us various alternatives of leading a conjugal life and he does not mean that either one of the proposals is absolutely good for a systematic solution.

3.35: Five: Make it Work

According to Nietzsche, marriage needs a plan, a systematic one. One has to think about whether he is fit for a great marriage. For Nietzsche, it is indeed a big thing always to be with another. The problem is that without understanding the burden and responsibility of great marriage, people very often rush into marriage. But when it goes wrong, it causes the couple as well as everyone around them a great deal of aggravation and annoyance. Just be honest in marriage. In this regard, Zarathustra says, "We love each other: let us see to it that we stay in love! Or shall our promise be a mistake."⁷⁹ According to Nietzsche, it would be prudent to promise the semblance of love, but not the continuation of the feeling of love. In such a case it would have been easier to keep the promise and to stay together. One has to realize and one should try to convince the other that love actually is irrelevant in a marriage. In this regard, Nietzsche remarks, "Suppose she loves me, how burdensome she should become to me in the long run! And supposing she does not love me, how really burdensome she would become to me in the long run! It is essentially a position of two different kinds of burdensome- therefore let us get married."⁸⁰ For Nietzsche, low expectations will avoid disappointment in the long run. During marriage life, a married couple will face inevitable problems. It is reality. Therefore couple has to keep in mind other alternatives for *how to make the marriage work*.

3.36: Tip Six: Give Her a Baby

⁷⁹ Nietzsche, F., *Thus spoke Zarathustra*, R. J. Hollingdale, London, UK: Penguin Books, 1969, p.228.

⁸⁰ Nietzsche, F. Nietzsche, F. *Daybreak: Thoughts on the prejudices of morality*, translated by Hollingdale, op. cit. P.172.

It is a general perception that becoming a mother is a great achievement in life. It cannot be denied. Therefore, one of the main intentions of a married woman is to bring a pregnancy to life. In this regard, Zarathustra says, “Everything about women is a riddle, and everything about woman has one solution: it is called pregnancy.”⁸¹ For Nietzsche, pregnancy is the solution because it is the only reason that a woman needs a man. In this sense man is for a woman a means, the purpose is always the child. While taking these comments at face value, Diethe reads Nietzsche as saying that *women are ‘completely defined by the reproductive urge’ and more importantly their ‘sole instinct is to create for children, permanently craving for sex, women are predators or ‘vamp-like femmes fatales’ who seduce men simply for impregnation’*. It is also true that people should choose mates based on the criteria of attempting to produce strong offspring. It is very natural for women to use their skills of seduction to this end. According to Ackermann, it is still unclear whose pregnancy is being discussed because elsewhere Nietzsche also uses pregnancy as a metaphor for creativity. Thus there we have two different interpretations, such as *women as sex animals and women as stimulating creativity*. They are not mutually exclusive. Of course, women are capable of being independent. They do not need a man for anything except sperm. Women for her urge to create a super-baby uses man to impregnate her. It could also mean that men and women use each other as fertilized for creativity. In this regard, they use marriage as a launching pad to greater things and to achieve greater goals.

3.37: Tip Seven: Get a Little Action on the Side

Nietzsche asserts that man put a huge strain on women while conceiving her good wife, (friend, assistant, mother, family head, and housekeeper), businesswoman, and concubine to boot. For him, it would be too much to demand of her. However, the reality was there in the Western country a century before, according to Abbey. According to Nietzsche, men naturally need sex

⁸¹ Nietzsche, F., *Thus spoke Zarathustra*, R. J. Hollingdale, London, UK: Penguin Books, 1969, p.91.

more than women and his solution is not to help a wife out with the housework, but to realize women of the burden of satisfying their husband's sexual desires by finding a "*natural assistant*, namely, concubinage". Nietzsche urges women to think of the higher conception of marriage as a 'soul friendship. We think this is very significant and this view has proximity with Indian tradition. In Indian spiritualism, it is said that marriage is a spiritual bond, the union of two souls and such a spiritual bond is eternal and everlasting in nature. We think the perception of 'soul-friendship' differs from the perception of 'body-friendship'. The former is internal whereas the latter is external. If one focuses mainly on 'body-friendship' in marriage, then it would be mere prostitution and in such a case the possibility of separation is comparatively high than other forms of marriage. By the term 'soul-friendship', Nietzsche really desires to say that in such a case 'sexuality is a rare, occasional means to a greater end'⁸², i.e., creating children. When marriage is treated as 'soul-friendship', then in such a case sexuality is functioning as per sex-ethics. In such a case the very objective of sexuality is to bring good progeny. Elsewhere Nietzsche suggests that trustworthiness comes naturally to a woman but not to a man. In Nietzsche's time, contraception was not widespread. As a matter of that sex often resulted in reproduction. For Nietzsche, the role of a woman as a mother is different from that of a woman as a sex partner. This distinction is pertinent to Nietzsche as he thinks that there is no supporting evidence for this essentialist idea that women are naturally faithful. Nevertheless, it is plausible that introducing a concubine into a marriage may only increase a wife's stress.

3.38: Tip Eight: Let Him Suffer:

According to Nietzsche, the very nature of women is different from the very nature of men. Women, unlike men, usually like peace and comfort. On the other hand, men just want the opposite. Unlike women, men welcome challenges and obstacles. Women hate to see men suffer

⁸² Nietzsche, F., *Human, All To Human*, translated by R. J. Hollingdale, op. cit., p.150.

and try to help them to have easier lives by removing obstacles. But this is again is very frustrating to men. In this context, Zarathustra shares the most harrowing experiences: “You must be ready to burn yourself in your own flame: how could you become new, if you had not first become ashes?” Like giving birth, great creations and achievements are painful. Nietzsche remarks, “All becoming and growth, everything that guarantees the future involves pain.”⁸³ Becoming is painful. This position of Nietzsche reminds Buddhism. Buddha said that pain is an integral part of life. Every moment is momentary and painful as well. This is where the significance of the remark let him suffer. Nietzsche experienced it very well when he was ill. In a letter to a friend, he wrote: “My illness has been my greatest boon: it unlooked me, it gave me the courage to be myself.” While overcoming the obstacles and challenges in life, he proved the strength of character and could bring the greatest rewards and creativity. One of Nietzsche’s most enduring maxims that he truly believes is, “What does not kill me makes me stronger.” It actually links with the assumption – ‘the greater the challenge, the greater the achievement when it is overcome’. Max Stirner, like a predecessor, asserts that preserving life only to squander it. Nietzsche admires those people who care more about challenging than safeguarding themselves. In this regard, he says, “I love those with my whole love those who can down and perish: for they are going beyond.”⁸⁴

3.39: Tip Nine: Take a Whip to Her!

According to Nietzsche, do not forget your *whip* when you are visiting women. Taken literally, one might believe it suggests a disregard for women and advocates physical violence against them. This is not the real meaning of whip. It is advice, a secret one. It is given to Zarathustra by an old woman and she warns him *to keep it a secret*. There is a possibility that in the wrong hands it would be misunderstood. Nietzsche says elsewhere that love is war and the deadly

⁸³ Nietzsche, F., *Twilight of the idols*, op. cit. p.228.

⁸⁴ Nietzsche, F., *Thus spoke Zarathustra*, R. J. Hollingdale, London, op. cit., p.217.

hatred between the sexes. Distance is essential to keep power over oneself. A whip is essential either creating or preserving a 'motivational distance'. Distance from women is very important for Nietzsche for safeguarding *the mystery and beauty of the feminine*. It is also reflected in Derrida. Derrida reveals the power struggle between men and women. He in this regard suggests that a man must keep his distance to avoid falling under the spell of a woman's beguiling song of enchantment' and to remain free to 'seduce without being seduced'.⁸⁵ We think the term *whip* has a different connotation. For Nietzsche, it does not mean physical violence. The comment of the whip is rather metaphorical where the term *whip* is used by either or both lovers to preserve distance from one another *to avoid forgetting their individuality*. Even the concept of the whip to give to a woman will him be even greater. For Nietzsche, the best type of relationship is one where the partners are brave enough to 'whip each other into shape'.

3.40: Tip Ten: Marry Your Best Friend

The concept of *best friendship* is the fundamental aspect of a great marriage. For Nietzsche, marriage does not bear any sense in life without the virtue of friendship. As a philosopher, his understanding of friendship is not at par with laymen's interpretation of friendship. Friendship is a very common concept, but real friendship is hard to come by. A best friend can be known when you are in a real crisis. During conjugal life, a crisis would be inevitable. At that time the friendship between husband and wife will help to overcome the crisis. Real friendship will endure or carry out marriage. What then is friendship according to Nietzsche? For Nietzsche, friendship is the 'ultimate ideal' of love and 'a kind of ideal of Being-with-Others'.⁸⁶ Nietzsche always thinks highly of the ancient Greek ideal of friendships between men and in this regard he agreed with Aristotle that great friends could inspire each other. This kind of friendship is neither

⁸⁵ Derrida, J., *Spurs: Nietzsche's styles*, translated by B. Harlow, Chicago, IL and London, UK: The University of Chicago Press, 1979, p.49.

⁸⁶ Solomon, R. C., *Living with Nietzsche: What the great 'immoralist' has to teach us*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2003, p.95.

about mutual benefit nor based on pleasure and enjoyment. Real great friends help one another to become better people through ‘a shared the highest thirst for an ideal above them’. For Nietzsche, in the case of real friendship, each friend acts like a ‘catalytic muse’⁸⁷ for the other. If an individual is left alone for too long without friends, he too easily falls into a groove. In this regard, Nietzsche warns, “He who fights with monsters should look to it that he himself does not become a monster. And when gaze long into an abyss the abyss also gazes into you.”⁸⁸ Following Sartre, it can be said that the friend is valued not so much for his or her gaze, rather for his or her ability to pull the individual up from the depths of the abyss and be a launching pad to a greater existence. However, becoming a great friend will not be an easy task. The best teachers are the harshest critics and should be wary of being too sympathetic towards the friend. Zarathustra says, “Let your pity for your friend conceal itself under a hard shell.”⁸⁹ In this regard, the view of Succumb is particularly relevant as he goes on to say that “friends do not unquestioningly uphold, reinforce and echo our attitudes but provides new perspectives and interrogate our presuppositions.”⁹⁰ Having said that we cannot rule it out those at times great friends must be so ruthless that they are also the enemy. In this regard, Nietzsche says, “If you want a friend, you must also be willing to wage war for him; and to wage war; you must be capable of being an enemy.”⁹¹ Thus it seems to us that Nietzsche is challenging all of us to be better friends. He urges loves not to get caught up in power games, rather help each other find the way to becoming an *Übermensch*, i.e., the best kind of love-longing for Superman. This kind of love propels us to want to be the best kind of person. This kind of great friendship will make a

⁸⁷ Lungstrum, J. ‘Nietzsche writing woman/Woman writing Nietzsche: The sexual dialectic of palingenesis’ included in *Nietzsche and the feminine*, edited by P. J. Burgard, pp.135-157, UK: University Press of Virginia, 1994, p.137.

⁸⁸ Nietzsche, F., *Beyond Good and Evil*, 1990, p.102.

⁸⁹ Nietzsche, F. *Thus spoke Zarathustra*, London, UK: Penguin Books, 1969, P.83.

⁹⁰

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p.82

great marriage. In fact, “The best friend will probably acquire the best wife because a good marriage is founded on the talent for friendship.”⁹²

Thus real friendship would be the great virtue of marriage. Marriage is the will of two to create the one who more than those who created it. It is not a lack of love, but a lack of friendship that makes unhappy marriages. There is no parity between love and friendship. Real friendship may be missing in romantic love. Romantic love is *a sort of illusory love, a mere glimpse of love*. Good friendship ensures talk and most of the time in married life is taken up by talking. The quality of a marriage is proven by its ability to tolerate an occasional exception. Nietzsche had no faith in modern marriage. For him, all sense has gone out of modern marriage. Here he had no objection to marriage but to modernity.

⁹² Nietzsche, F. *Human, all too human*, op. cit, p.150.