

Paper 82 — The Evolution of Marriage

© 2015 Matthew Block

Most endnotes and Urantia Book cross-references have been deleted to enhance readability.

Sources for Paper 82, in the order in which they appear

- (1) William Graham **Sumner** and Albert Galloway **Keller**, *The Science of Society, Volume III* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927)
- (2) William Graham **Sumner**, Albert Galloway **Keller**, and Maurice Rea Davie, *The Science of Society, Volume IV* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927)
- (3) M. F. **Ashley Montagu**, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942)

Key

- (a) **Green** indicates where a source author first appears, or where he/she reappears.
- (b) **Yellow** highlights most parallelisms.
- (c) **Tan** highlights parallelisms occurring further apart, usually not in the same row.
- (d) An underlined word or words indicates where the source and the UB writer pointedly differ from each other.
- (e) **Blue** indicates original (or “revealed”) information, or UB-specific terminology and concepts. (What to highlight in this regard is debatable; the highlights are tentative.)

Matthew Block
12 March 2015

Work-in-progress Version 12 March 2015
© 2015 Matthew Block

PAPER 82 — THE EVOLUTION OF MARRIAGE

XLI: WHAT MADE MARRIAGE
(Sumner & Keller 1485)

§331. The Condition of Bi-sexuality.
(Sumner & Keller 1485)

The fact of bi-sexuality has constituted a condition of life calling for the development of folkways, mores, and institutions in adjustment to it (S&K 1485).

82:0.1 Marriage—mating—grows out of bisexuality.

Marriage is man's reactional adjustment to such bisexuality,

while the family life is the sum total resulting from all such evolutionary and adaptative adjustments. Marriage is enduring; it is not inherent in biologic evolution, but it is the basis of all social evolution and is therefore certain of continued existence in some form. Marriage has given mankind the home, and the home is the crowning glory of the whole long and arduous evolutionary struggle.

82:0.2 While religious, social, and educational institutions are all essential to the survival of cultural civilization, *the family is the master civilizer*. A child learns most of the essentials of life from his family and the neighbors.

82:0.3 The humans of olden times did not possess a very rich social civilization, but such as they had they faithfully and effectively passed on to the next generation. And you should recognize that most of these civilizations of the past continued to evolve with a bare minimum of other institutional influences because the home was effectively functioning. Today the human races possess a rich social and cultural heritage, and it should be wisely and effectively passed on to succeeding generations. The family as an educational institution must be maintained. Mating is an innate propensity, and marriage is its evolutionary social repercussion.

1. THE MATING INSTINCT

§334*. **The Making of Marriage.** (Sumner & Keller 1494)

[I]n physical functions, mental characteristics, practical aptitudes and disabilities, ethical traits, and capacity for the discharge of societal duties the two sexes are diverse, complementary to one another, and mutual in their coöperative activities.

Between the sexes, thus differently endowed,

nature has placed an attraction that has secured the perpetuation of the race (S&K 1494).

82:1.1 Notwithstanding the personality gulf between men and women,

the sex urge is sufficient to insure their coming together for the reproduction of the species.

This instinct operated effectively long before humans experienced much of what was later called love, devotion, and marital loyalty.

Sex-feeling is **not so dominant** and bestial among savages as certain detractors of “lower” races would have us believe; indeed, savages are not seldom reported to be sexually cold (S&K 1496).

Sex is to them too much a matter of course; only when it is shrouded in mystery does it challenge the fancy and invite a sort of **absorption** (S&K 1496).

82:1.2 Sex interest and desire were **not dominating** passions in primitive peoples;

they simply took them for granted.

The entire reproductive experience was free from imaginative embellishment.

The all-absorbing sex passion of the more highly civilized peoples is chiefly due to race mixtures, especially where the evolutionary nature has been stimulated by the associative imagination and beauty appreciation of the Nodites and Adamites. But this Andite inheritance was absorbed by the evolutionary races in such limited amounts as to fail to provide sufficient self-control for the animal passions thus quickened and aroused by the endowment of keener sex consciousness and stronger mating urges.¹ Of the evolutionary races, the red man had the highest sex code.

XLII: THE MARRIAGE-INSTITUTION (Sumner & Keller 1519)

§339. The Regulation of the Sex-Impulse.
(Sumner & Keller 1523)

The **evolution of civilization** reveals a long series of successes in the discipline of sex-passion (S&K 1526).

82:1.3 **The regulation of sex** in relation to marriage indicates:

82:1.4 1. The relative **progress of civilization.**

Civilization has increasingly demanded that sex be gratified in useful channels and in accordance with the mores.

82:1.5 2. The amount of Andite stock in any people.

Sex-passion takes hold of the highest and lowest parts of human nature, both physical and mental (S&K 1523-24).

Among such groups sex has become expressive of both the highest and the lowest in both the physical and emotional natures.

XLI: WHAT MADE MARRIAGE (Sumner & Keller 1485)

§334.* **The Making of Marriage.** (Sumner & Keller 1494)

82:1.6 The Sangik races had normal animal passion,

“The indifference of [African] natives to human physical beauty, which practically amounts to its total elimination as a factor in the relations between the sexes, has often been commented upon...” (S&K 1496).

but they displayed little imagination or appreciation of the beauty and physical attractiveness of the opposite sex.

What is called sex appeal is virtually absent even in present-day primitive races; these unmixed peoples have a definite mating instinct but insufficient sex attraction to create serious problems requiring social control.

§332. **Conflict of Interests.** (Sumner & Keller 1487)

82:1.7 The mating instinct is one of the dominant physical driving forces of human beings;

Rather than sacrifice any chance of race-perpetuation, [Nature] imposes checks upon most forms of individual self-realization in favor of reproduction; the **driving force** of sex-passion, for instance, is calculated to render the individual obtuse to the call of career and to practical considerations in general (S&K 1490).

it is the one emotion which, in the guise of individual gratification, effectively tricks selfish man into putting race welfare and perpetuation high above individual ease and personal freedom from responsibility.

82:1.8 As an institution, marriage, from its early beginnings down to modern times, pictures the social evolution of the biologic propensity for self-perpetuation. The perpetuation of the evolving human species is made certain by the presence of this racial mating impulse, an urge which is loosely called sex attraction.

The reproductive function so powerfully affects welfare—it is so prolific in pleasure and in pain and its discharge is enforced by so dominant a need—that, **becoming for the earliest of men the interest-center** of a great group of mores, it enforced upon the most primitive of societies the development of a sex-code and sex-policy (S&K 1487).

This great biologic urge **becomes the impulse hub** for all sorts of associated instincts, emotions, and usages—physical, intellectual, moral, and social.

XLII: THE MARRIAGE-INSTITUTION
(Sumner & Keller 1519)

§340. **Function of Marriage.** (Sumner & Keller 1526)

82:1.9 With the savage, the food supply was the impelling motivation,

As for “nutrition” (self-maintenance) being egoistic, it is true, first of all, that nutrition leads on to reproduction—whether we think of the savage who has won **food enough**, or of the civilized man who, having wealth and satiety on the side of property, turns his care, effort, and ambition to marriage and family (S&K 1530-31).

§339. The Regulation of the Sex-Impulse.
(Sumner & Keller 1523)

[The sex-function] is so preoccupying among animals that if it were not **periodic** it is difficult to see how they could have pursued the struggle for existence with success.

The fact that it is **not periodic** for mankind,

renders **control** all the more needful; and in human society it meets another sort of check characteristic of societal, not of organic evolution (S&K 1524).

Sex-passion in its **unbridled** satisfaction is destructive to the individual and therefore to the society because it enervates in mind and body the active and responsible component members of the latter (S&K 1525).

Everyone by reason of living in society must **submit** to a limitation of independence and freedom by something outside of his personality (S&K 1525).

but when civilization insures **plentiful food**, the sex urge many times becomes a dominant impulse

and therefore ever stands in need of social regulation.

In animals, instinctive **periodicity** checks the mating propensity,

but since man is so largely a self-controlled being,

sex desire is **not altogether periodic;**

therefore does it become necessary for society to impose **self-control** upon the individual.

82:1.10 No human emotion or impulse, when **unbridled** and overindulged, can produce so much harm and sorrow as this powerful sex urge.

Intelligent **submission** of this impulse to the regulations of society is the supreme test of the actuality of any civilization.

Self-control, more and more self-control, is the ever-increasing demand of advancing mankind. Secrecy, insincerity, and hypocrisy may obscure sex problems, but they do not provide solutions, nor do they advance ethics.

2. RESTRICTIVE TABOOS

XLIII: THE FORMATIVE STAGE
(Sumner & Keller 1547)

§343.* **Rudimentary Regulation.** (Sumner & Keller 1547)

[T]he **evolution** of the marriage-institution has been the evolution of **restriction** (S&K 1547).

82:2.1 The story of the **evolution** of marriage is simply the history of sex control through the pressure of social, religious, and civil **restrictions**.

XLI: WHAT MADE MARRIAGE
(Sumner & Keller 1485)

§331. **The Condition of Bi-sexuality.**
(Sumner & Keller 1485)

[Nature] cares nothing for the **individual** interest and even less for canons of human propriety; it is the race-interest, calling for numbers, that is the absorbing consideration (S&K 1486).

Nature hardly recognizes **individuals**;

Human reproduction is ... a natural fact which has no **moral** quality any more than has eating, breathing, or sleeping ... (S&K 1486).

it takes no cognizance of so-called **morals**;

“Nature” (to personify, for convenience sake, “natural law”), seems to care only, though fanatically, that life shall be passed on and on (S&K 1486).

it is only and exclusively interested in the reproduction of the species.

§333. **Inconsistency in the Sex-Mores.**
(Sumner & Keller 1492)

[contd] These collisions of interest are due to the complexity of societal relations that attends upon the reproductive function—a function upon whose discharge nature compellingly insists and which, none the less, as respects its consequences, has been largely removed from nature (S&K 1492).

Nature compellingly insists on reproduction but indifferently leaves the consequential problems to be solved by society,

thus creating an ever-present and major problem for evolutionary mankind.

This social conflict consists in

[T]he inevitable war of ethics with nature is only one more striking example of the general disaccord of things resulting from the entrance of a new grade of evolution in which the basis of selection is societal rather than natural (S&K 1492).

the unending war between basic instincts and evolving ethics.

XLIII: THE FORMATIVE STAGE
(Sumner & Keller 1547)

§343.* **Rudimentary Regulation.** (Sumner & Keller 1547)

[I]t is a logical inference that the slight restriction encountered under the most primitive of conditions was preceded by no regulation at all—none, that is to say, in the mores (S&K 1547).

82:2.2 Among the early races there was little or no regulation of the relations of the sexes.

§344.* **License.** (Sumner & Keller 1553)

It is exceedingly hard to find among primitive peoples examples of prostitution which deserve the name.... While there are plenty of instances of premarital license, lending of wives and daughters, and other loose sexual relationships in primitive life, professional harlots are conspicuous only by their absence (S&K 1555).

Because of this sex license, no prostitution existed.

§343.* **Rudimentary Regulation.** (Sumner & Keller 1547)

Of certain African pygmies it is reported: "One cannot speak even of a family-institution, for they follow their animal-instincts wholly, without restraint." [Etc.] (S&K 1547)

§344.* **License.** (Sumner & Keller 1553)

In general, it is unintelligible nonsense to cite savage customs as examples of "immorality." The morality of the backward peoples can be measured only against the standards of their own mores (S&K 1557).

§343.* **Rudimentary Regulation.** (Sumner & Keller 1547)

What men did before the formation of society is a matter of considerable indifference to us; there may have been a state of promiscuity then; but we cannot see that any human society could have established itself or could have long endured without subjecting the sex-relation to control (S&K 1549).

Today, the Pygmies and other backward groups have no marriage institution;

a study of these peoples reveals the simple mating customs followed by primitive races.

But all ancient peoples should always be studied and judged in the light of the moral standards of the mores of their own times.

82:2.3 Free love, however, has never been in good standing above the scale of rank savagery.

The moment societal groups began to form, marriage codes and marital restrictions began to develop.

Mating has thus progressed through a multitude of transitions from a state of almost complete sex license to the twentieth-century standards of relatively complete sex restriction.

XLIV: EVOLUTION BY RESTRICTION (Sumner & Keller 1567)

§347. **Action of the Taboo.** (Sumner & Keller 1567)

The general sex-taboo may be conceived of as a measure for keeping male and female apart;

it has covered more or less the whole intercourse and relation of the sexes: the food-quest, forms of industry, of ornamentation, of religious function.

In respect to the union of the sexes, it has defined a wife and matrimony by ordaining the limits upon absolute freedom;

then marriage has come, from one angle, to be the specification of the conditions under which, the mode by which, and the person by whom the sex-taboo might be broken through, and not otherwise; for other violations of the taboo were vice, crime, and sin (S&K 1567).

XLIII: THE FORMATIVE STAGE (Sumner & Keller 1547)

§343.* **Rudimentary Regulation.** (Sumner & Keller 1547)

On certain occasions, notably in connection with religious festivals, all forms of sex-regulation are set aside or much relaxed (S&K 1551).

82:2.4 In the earliest stages of tribal development the mores and restrictive taboos were very crude,

but they did keep the sexes apart—

this favored quiet, order, and industry—and the long evolution of marriage and the home had begun.

The sex customs of dress, adornment, and religious practices had their origin in these early taboos

which defined the range of sex liberties

and thus eventually created concepts of vice, crime, and sin.

But it was long the practice to suspend all sex regulations on high festival days,

Wilken cites the **May** festival of license (S&K 1552).

especially **May** Day.

§344.* **License.** (Sumner & Keller 1553)

82:2.5 Women have always been subject to more restrictive taboos than men.

[*Note:* S&K cite several cases among various peoples where women are expected to be faithful to their husbands after having been free before marriage. But S&K also cite cases where women are not required to be faithful to their husbands. See endnote.]

The early mores granted the same degree of sex liberty to unmarried women as to men, but it has always been required of wives that they be faithful to their husbands.²

Primitive marriage did not much curtail man's sex liberties, but it did render further sex license taboo to the wife.

L: WEDLOCK: STATUS OF WOMAN (Sumner & Keller 1731)

§381. **The Marriage-Mark.** (Sumner & Keller 1756)

There are many customs in different countries that **set off** the married woman in such manner as to discourage attention (S&K 1757).

Married women have always borne some mark which **set them apart** as a class by themselves,

In parts of the Sahara the method of **hair-dressing** distinguishes maiden and wife (S&K 1758).

such as **hairdress,**

Among the Zulus married women **clothe** themselves (S&K 1758).

clothing,

[S]he must lay aside **ornament,** wear a **veil,** and otherwise render herself unattractive or withdraw into a sort of **seclusion** from men (S&K 1757).

veil, seclusion, ornamentation,

Again, married women [in certain tribes of India] mark the brow with vermilion and put on toe-**rings,** while widows shave the head and partially cover it (S&K 1758).

and **rings.**

3. EARLY MARRIAGE MORES

82:3.1 Marriage is the institutional response of the social organism to the ever-present biologic tension of man's unremitting urge to reproduction—self-propagation. Mating is universally natural, and as society evolved from the simple to the complex, there was a corresponding evolution of the mating mores, the genesis of the marital institution.

XLII: THE MARRIAGE-INSTITUTION (Sumner & Keller 1519)

§338. **Scope of the Institution.** (Sumner & Keller 1519)

Marriage is a societal organization by virtue of the regulations in the **mores** to which it is subject; so soon as there is any regulation not “in nature,” the institution has begun to be (S&K 1519).

Wherever social evolution has progressed to the stage at which **mores** are generated, marriage will be found as an evolving institution.

XLI: WHAT MADE MARRIAGE (Sumner & Keller 1485)

§332. **Conflict of Interests.** (Sumner & Keller 1487)

All that the **law** can deal with is **external**

and the mores cannot exercise any immediate control over that which may remain indefinitely **secret** within the walls of the home (S&K 1489).

82:3.2 There always have been and always will be two distinct realms of marriage:

the mores, the **laws** regulating the **external** aspects of mating,

and the otherwise **secret** and personal relations of men and women.

The institution of marriage has been such that **individuals have rebelled** against it as against a yoke under which they were brought before they knew what it was and in subjection to interests other than their own (S&K 1489).

Always **has the individual been rebellious** against the sex regulations imposed by society;

and this is the reason for this age-long sex problem:

Self-maintenance is individual, but carried on socially;

Self-maintenance is individual but is carried on by the group;

self-perpetuation is social but secured by individual impulse (S&K 1490).

self-perpetuation is social but is secured by individual impulse.

XLIV: EVOLUTION BY RESTRICTION (Sumner & Keller 1567)

§349.* Taboos of Narrower and Wider Scope. (Sumner & Keller 1578)

What happens is that the powerful stress of sex-passion is actually neutralized by the mores, for the very existence of even sex-attraction between those very closely consanguine is deemed shameful. This case of the suppression of what is perhaps the strongest of human passions by convention forms one of the best illustrations of the disciplinary control exercised by the **mores** (S&K 1581).

82:3.3 The **mores**, when respected, have ample power to restrain and control the sex urge, as has been shown among all races.

Marriage standards have always been a true indicator of the current power of the mores and the functional integrity of the civil government.

XLI: WHAT MADE MARRIAGE
(Sumner & Keller 1485)

§332. **Conflict of Interests.** (Sumner & Keller 1487)

Although the shaping of all the notions and ordinances has been at the call of expediency, still the interests of the parties to the marriage—including parents and ancestors of the contractants, remoter relatives, the group, children, and remoter posterity—have never been accordant (S&K 1489).

But the early sex and mating mores were a mass of inconsistent and crude regulations.

Parents, children, relatives, and society all had conflicting interests in the marriage regulations.

But in spite of all this, those races which exalted and practiced marriage naturally evolved to higher levels and survived in increased numbers.

XLII: THE MARRIAGE-INSTITUTION
(Sumner & Keller 1519)

§341. **Marriage and the Other Institutions.**
(Sumner & Keller 1532)

Since a man cannot secure a wife until he has won glory in some way, by taking a head or a scalp or performing some other deed of valor, the possession of a wife or wives is a badge of distinction (S&K 1534).

82:3.4 In primitive times marriage was the price of social standing;

the possession of a wife was a badge of distinction.

“The Korean is nobody until he is married.... The wedding-day is the entrance on respectability and manhood, and marks a leap upwards on the social ladder...” (S&K 1534).

The savage looked upon his wedding day as marking his entrance upon responsibility and manhood.

Among the ancients marriage was “only a political institution destined to furnish citizens for the fatherland”—“only the sacrifice of a personal pleasure to public duty” (S&K 1537).

XLVIII: FURTHER PRELIMINARIES TO MARRIAGE (Sumner & Keller 1665)

§365.* **Group-Consent and Test.** (Sumner & Keller 1665)

It is said of a rude tribe under Russian rule that **stealing** is a badge of merit. A girl will often say to a youth, “You haven’t yet succeeded in stealing even one horse or redeeming a single captive” (S&K IV 926).

Among a group in the Punjab, “when a girl is marriageable, an **athletic competition** is held, and the competitors jump, run, and so on.

The winner has right to marry the girl, but she has no choice” (S&K IV 926).

Among head-hunting peoples, like the Dyaks and Alfurs, the youth may not marry **till he possesses one or more heads** (S&K 1668).

In British New Guinea, “no young man could marry, as no woman would have him, without skulls. Often a family would leave, and go far away for a length of time, and then return with skulls—perhaps all of them were bought—so that it might be said he said they had skulls...” (S&K IV 925).

In one age, marriage has been looked upon as a social **duty**; in another, as a religious obligation; and in still another,

as a political requirement to **provide citizens for the state.**

82:3.5 Many early tribes required feats of **stealing** as a qualification for marriage;

later peoples substituted for such raiding forays, **athletic contests** and competitive games.

The winners in these contests were awarded the first prize—choice of the season’s brides.

Among the head-hunters a youth might not marry **until he possessed at least one head,**

although such skulls were sometimes purchasable.

Test by riddle is a curious practice....
 “There is a class of stories in which the bride is won by the solution of a riddle. In another class the bride proposes the riddle, and the suitor who fails to answer it correctly is killed ...

And yet the use of riddles in courtship, described in European folklore, survives to this day in the plantation courtship among the negroes” (S&K 1669).

The examples will show that [the test of virility] is imposed not infrequently at the hand of the girl sought in marriage

and that she is often able to do her own choosing among suitors by making the test lighter for the man she likes—which is yet another piece of evidence against the current belief that woman has been hopelessly dominated throughout the ages (S&K 1666).

The qualities tested in man are those which go to make up virility according to current standards: chiefly prowess in war and the chase and ability to provide for a family (S&K 1667).

The [Seri] groom ... must for one round of the seasons provide for and protect the entire family of the bride, displaying “skill in turtle-fishing, strength in the chase, subtlety in warfare, and all other physical qualities of competent manhood.” Then also, although sharing his future wife’s sleeping-robe, he must maintain continence (S&K IV 927).

As the buying of wives declined,

they were won by riddle contests,

a practice that still survives among many groups of the black man.

82:3.6 With advancing civilization,

certain tribes put the severe marriage tests of male endurance in the hands of the women;

they thus were able to favor the men of their choice.

These marriage tests embraced skill in hunting, fighting, and ability to provide for a family.

The groom was long required to enter the bride’s family for at least one year, there to live and labor

and prove that he was worthy of the wife he sought.

The chief qualities that are tested in the primitive woman are industry and fecundity; she must be an effective partner in both maintaining and perpetuating the family (S&K 1669).

The test of woman as a worker has been brought out in preceding connections: she must weed and plant a field **within a reasonably short time** or exhibit her skill in cookery or other specialties of her sex (S&K 1670).

Such views of the importance of children ... throw light upon the custom whereby the first-born child is surrendered to the wife's father as purchase-value for the wife; herein is explained also the **value** often attached to the woman who had **borne children prior to marriage** (S&K 1670).

XLII: THE MARRIAGE-INSTITUTION (Sumner & Keller 1519)

§342.* **Normality of Marriage.** (Sumner & Keller 1538)

Among the Tlinkits "... [i]t is considered a **disgrace** for a girl to remain many months without being married after she becomes a woman" (S&K IV 845).

In ancient Indo-Aryan usage, it is conceived to be a **sin** if a marriageable maiden remains unmarried ... This **explains to some degree the custom of child-marriage** (S&K IV 844).

The Fijians believe that those who die unmarried **are shut out of the spirit-world** (S&K 1541).

82:3.7 The qualifications of a wife were the ability to perform hard work and to bear children.

She was required to execute a certain piece of agricultural work **within a given time.**

And if she had **borne a child before marriage**, she was all the more **valuable;**

her fertility was thus assured.

82:3.8 The fact that ancient peoples regarded it as a **disgrace**, or even a **sin**, not to be married,

explains the origin of child marriages;

since one must be married, the earlier the better.

It was also a general belief that unmarried persons **could not enter spiritland,**

The Dyak or Batak girl is often betrothed **at birth** and married at six, though she continues with her parents until fullgrown (S&K 1539).

In India children are **sometimes** espoused even **before birth** (S&K 1539).

The conviction of the normality and even necessity of marriage leads to union with the **dead**.

“In the northern parts of the Realm [China] it is customary, when an unmarried youth and an unmarried girl breathe their last, that the two families each charge a **match-maker** to demand the other party in marriage...” (S&K IV 844).

On the island of Nias ... the rule is to marry as soon as **puberty** is reached, and the unmarried, especially women, are held in low esteem (S&K 1542).

The conclusion has been ventured that the marriage-age of women depends upon the degree of **civilization** (S&K 1540).

and this was a further incentive to child marriages

even **at birth**

and **sometimes before birth**, contingent upon sex.

The ancients believed that even the **dead** must be married.

The original **matchmakers** were employed to negotiate marriages for deceased individuals.

One parent would arrange for these intermediaries to effect the marriage of a dead son with a dead daughter of another family.

82:3.9 Among later peoples, **puberty** was the common age of marriage,

but this has advanced in direct proportion to the progress of **civilization**.

Religious and especially sacerdotal **celibacy** is a practice that generally goes with a more developed civilization.... The Aztec priesthood was reckoned in the millions, and its celibacy was sanctioned by the death-penalty. Similarly with the brides of the Sun in Peru, and certain women in some Brazilian tribes, who deserted woman's duties and copied the ways of men (S&K 1542-43).

Early in social evolution peculiar and **celibate** orders of both men and women arose;

they were started and maintained by individuals more or less lacking normal sex urge.

XLIII: THE FORMATIVE STAGE (Sumner & Keller 1547)

§343.* **Rudimentary Regulation.** (Sumner & Keller 1547)

In "expiation for marriage," the existing regulations as to sex-relations are violated at the time when a woman is taken to wife; on that occasion a broader right to her seems to be asserted on the part of the **males of her group**, before she shall pass under the monopoly of a husband (S&K 1550).

82:3.10 Many tribes allowed **members of the ruling group** to have sex relations with the bride just before she was to be given to her husband.

Herodotus reports of a tribe in the western Sahara region that they have wives in common and that when a marriage (exclusive union) occurs, the bride must entertain all the guests in turn, **each of whom is bound to give her a present** (S&K 1550).

Each of these men would give the girl a present,

and this was the origin of the custom of giving wedding presents.

A curious custom is the *casa das tintas* (house of the dyes) or *kumbeh* of West Africa. It is a show-house for the prospective bride, where she is displayed and instructed.... The **presents** she gets from her visitors often constitute a rich **dower** (S&K 1551).

XLI: WHAT MADE MARRIAGE
(Sumner & Keller 1485)

§335. **Marriage and Maintenance.** (Sumner & Keller 1505)

An antithesis to romance occurs among the Guiana Indians: "When the young men arrive at a marriageable age they hand over to them the oldest widows in the place for wives,

and when they are **left widowers** they give them a young girl. . . .

To marry a boy and a girl is to join a pair of **fools** who don't know how to conduct themselves, whereas by marrying the young man to an old woman she teaches him as to how the house has to be managed and how he must work to live. When he becomes a widower and marries a young girl, she benefits by his instructions" (S&K 1508).

Among some groups it was expected that a young woman would earn her **dowry**,

which consisted of the **presents** received in reward for her sex service in the bride's exhibition hall.

82:3.11 Some tribes married the young men to the widows and older women

and then, when they were subsequently **left widowers**, would allow them to marry the young girls,

thus insuring, as they expressed it, that both parents would not be **fools**, as they conceived would be the case

if two youths were allowed to mate.

XLV: ENDOGAMY AND EXOGAMY
(Sumner & Keller 1595)

§353.* **Divisional and Tribal Exogamy.**
(Sumner & Keller 1601)

Sex relations are tabooed outside one's **age-group** [in Australia]; and that is not all, for within it too restriction prevails, inasmuch as "lateral" selection is limited by the kin-taboo (S&K 1602).

Relative age supersedes other criteria [in Australia]: thus, male cousins would be father and son if one was a married adult and the other a youth not yet marriageable ... But, evidently, a real father and daughter or mother and son could never be in the same life-status group; and the taboo on marriage between **age-grades** alone would prevent this form of **incest** (S&K 1603).

[?]

LII: DISSOLUTION OF WEDLOCK
(Sumner & Keller 1831)

§394.* **Widowhood.** (Sumner & Keller 1841)

When we come to the case of the widow, we encounter a series of prescriptions that clearly exhibit woman as an attachment of man rather than an independent person. If he is going to need her in the future life, it is frequently the practice to **kill** her or for her to **commit suicide**;

Other tribes limited mating to similar **age groups**.

It was the limitation of marriage to certain **age groups** that first gave origin to ideas of incest.

(In India there are even now no age restrictions on marriage.)

82:3.12 Under certain mores **widowhood** was greatly to be feared,

widows being either **killed** or allowed to **commit suicide** on their husbands' graves,

for they were supposed to go over into spiritland with their spouses.

if she survives, her mourning for him is protracted and painful (S&K 1842).

Wilkins quotes a Hindu widow's description of the treatment she receives. She is addressed as if she were to blame for her husband's death; her head is shaved; she is allowed only one meal a day; and must frequently fast. She says a suttee is better (S&K IV 1014). [*See also S&K 1847.*]

Among the Natchez Indians and in Guatemala there was a practice of burning the widow on the pyre of the dead husband (S&K 1844). [*See other cases in Case Book.*]

So strongly has the re-marriage of a widow been disapproved by Hindu mores that it had to be established by the English through a special law, in 1856 (S&K IV 1020). [*Note: The Case Book cites numerous examples of peoples approving remarriage for widows.*]

XLIII: THE FORMATIVE STAGE (Sumner & Keller 1547)

§344.* License. (Sumner & Keller 1553)

“In European morals the [Lumbwa] tribe would be deemed fragrantly immoral, in fact, they are non-moral.... A man may not have relations with his wife if she is a virgin; she is deflowered by her former lover with his tacit and uninquiring consent. . . . Every woman has a lover and every man a number;

The surviving widow was almost invariably blamed for her husband's death.

Some tribes burned them alive.

If a widow continued to live, her life was one of continuous mourning and unbearable social restriction

since remarriage was generally disapproved.

82:3.13 In olden days many practices now regarded as immoral were encouraged.

it is literally true that the common practice is for a wife to bring girls to her hut for her husband's gratification, and the more lovers he has amongst the unmarried girls the **prouder** woman she is" (S&K IV 853).

[contd] Among the Akamba, "**chastity** is neither expected nor valued among women before marriage ...

Although it sometimes happens that in the case of unmarried girls pregnancy results from their intercourse with their lovers, this condition of the girl is no bar to her marriage with another man, but rather a recommendation, **since he is sure of at least one child from her**" (S&K IV 853-54).

XLVIII: FURTHER PRELIMINARIES TO MARRIAGE (Sumner & Keller 1665)

§365.* **Group-Consent and Test.** (Sumner & Keller 1665)

There is a special form of **trial** which is aimed chiefly at the determination of the woman's fecundity and which has no parallel in the case of man, for the childlessness of the union is ascribed, so far as our cases indicate, solely to the wife (S&K 1671).

If the woman bears a child or **becomes pregnant**, the marriage takes place (S&K 1671).

The marriage of a Bechuana is valid only after a **child is born** (S&K 1672).

In Borku, "... If this event does not happen, the wife remains altogether in her parents' dwelling and her father must repay the purchase-price" (S&K 1672).

Primitive wives not infrequently took great **pride** in their husbands' affairs with other women.

Chastity in girls was a great hindrance to marriage;

the bearing of a child before marriage greatly increased a girl's desirability as a wife **since the man was sure of having a fertile companion.**

82:3.14 Many primitive tribes sanctioned **trial** marriage

until the woman **became pregnant**, when the regular marriage ceremony would be performed;

among other groups the wedding was not celebrated until the first **child was born.**

If a wife was barren, she had to be redeemed by her parents,

The idea is that a married couple simply must **have issue** (S&K 1671).

In the parts of Scandinavia where trial-marriage is in vogue, says a Norwegian of the very highest sensitiveness and refinement, there is **no license or indecency of any kind** connected with the system as such; if a young man is known to be visiting a young woman, all other suitors keep away, for he is known to have been accepted pending the test and she is meanwhile to be treated as a wife (S&K 1673).

A marriage contracted with the possibility of **divorce in view**

is really a **trial-marriage**; its kinship with the latter form will appear when we come to divorce (S&K 1674).

and the marriage was annulled.

The mores demanded that every pair **have children**.

82:3.15 These primitive trial marriages were **entirely free from all semblance of license**;

they were simply sincere tests of fecundity.

The contracting individuals married permanently just as soon as fertility was established.

When modern couples marry with the thought of convenient **divorce in the background** of their minds if they are not wholly pleased with their married life,

they are in reality entering upon a form of **trial marriage**

and one that is far beneath the status of the honest adventures of their less civilized ancestors.

4. MARRIAGE UNDER THE PROPERTY MORES

XLII: THE MARRIAGE-INSTITUTION
(Sumner & Keller 1519)

§341. **Marriage and Other Institutions.**
(Sumner & Keller 1532)

In general, property acts as a stabilizer to marriage (S&K 1534).

At a very early period, it is true, religion entered into this field, as into all other societal departments, in its functions as sanction of the mores (S&K 1535).

XLI: WHAT MADE MARRIAGE
(Sumner & Keller 1485)

§335. **Marriage and Maintenance.** (Sumner & Keller 1505)

Among the Ama-Xosa a young man must have a wife in order to get wealth and position.... When he buys her, he regards it as an investment of capital which he is to exploit (S&K 1506).

In Matabeleland, “the native, in many instances, enters into marriage as a business speculation, just as the white man engages in and carries on commerce through the medium of money” (S&K 1506).

“Like the Hindu, the Singhalese marries early; and, like the former, with him too it is not an affair of the heart between the two chief participators but a sober, business agreement between their parents...” (S&K 1507).

82:4.1 Marriage has always been closely linked with both property and religion.

Property has been the stabilizer of marriage;

religion, the moralizer.

82:4.2 Primitive marriage was an investment,

an economic speculation;

it was more a matter of business than an affair of flirtation.

“ ... [T]he essential and fundamental characteristic [among the North American Indians] is the collective motive under which marriage is prescribed for the **welfare of the group**, rather than inspired by individual appetite and selfish inclination” (S&K 1508).

The ancients married for the advantage and **welfare of the group**;

wherefore their marriages were planned and arranged by the group, their parents and elders.

And that the property mores were effective in stabilizing the marriage institution is borne out by the fact that marriage was more permanent among the early tribes than it is among many modern peoples.

XLII: THE MARRIAGE-INSTITUTION (Sumner & Keller 1519)

§340. The Function of Marriage. (Sumner & Keller 1526)

Adultery is a violation of the taboo on the wife; since among many primitive peoples the wife is property, this crime is found to be assimilated with theft (S&K 1528).

82:4.3 As civilization advanced and private property gained further recognition in the mores, stealing became the great crime.

Adultery was recognized as a form of stealing, an infringement of the husband's property rights; it is not therefore specifically mentioned in the earlier codes and mores.

L: WEDLOCK: STATUS OF WOMAN
(Sumner & Keller 1731)

§380.* **Woman as Property.** (Sumner & Keller 1751)

[contd] There is no question but that in history a woman has been the **property of her father**, brothers or other male relatives, **husband**, or son; on the other hand, none of these males has ever been her property unless by some irregular extension of the term or by some rare exception (S&K 1751-52).

In the commandment, “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife,” the connotation is one of **property** (S&K IV 974).

The **Koran** states that men are superior to women because of the qualities by which God has placed them above women and because men employ their wealth to endow women (S&K IV 974).

§382.* **Types of Disposition over Women.** (Sumner & Keller 1760)

If the wife is so special a piece of property that the stealing of her is particularly irritating, she is also, among some peoples, so distinctly the property of her husband that he may **lend** her at will (S&K 1760).

One Australian lent the least useful of his wives to a **friend**, saying, “Poor fellow, he is a widower, and has a long way to go, and will feel very lonely” (S&K 1761).

The Samoyeds used to lend wives, daughters, and sisters to **guests** (S&K 1761).

Woman started out as the **property of her father**,

who transferred his title to her **husband**, and all legalized sex relations grew out of these pre-existent property rights.

The Old Testament deals with women as a form of **property**;

the **Koran** teaches their inferiority.

Man had the right to **lend** his wife

to a **friend**

or **guest**,

Wilutzky sees the custom worldwide, lasting in the Teuton nation down to the sixteenth century; this ancient German usage is represented by a survival, where sex-relations were tabooed, in the Netherlands (S&K 1762).

§383.* **Infidelity.** (Sumner & Keller 1764)

This [modern] insistence upon the mutual monopolization of husband and wife rests, not upon any instinct, but upon standards that are the product of a long course of societal evolution. Sexual jealousy is not innate any more than language or morals are (S&K 1766).

The resentment which civilized and uncivilized harbor at trespasses on property is far removed from “jealousy”; but this is the sentiment of the uncivilized about their wives (S&K 1767).

This topic is an extension of a foregoing allusion to the power of self-disposal within wedlock. The wife’s right in this respect has always been a vanishing or non-existent quantity in comparison with the husband’s; she has been held to fidelity as he has not, and the double standard thus existing within matrimony has been reflected in life outside of it (S&K 1764).

The salient consideration behind this contrast, going back as it does to biological fact, is that descent, inheritance, and succession are perturbed by the infidelity of a wife as they are not by that of a husband (S&K 1764).

[In Colombia the illegitimate child “is reputed a bad animal and is so called, and the mother is so disgraced that no Indian will marry her” (S&K 1933).] [See also S&K IV 932.]

and this custom still obtains among certain peoples.

82:4.4 Modern sex jealousy is not innate; it is a product of the evolving mores.

Primitive man was not jealous of his wife; he was just guarding his property.

The reason for holding the wife to stricter sex account than the husband

was because her marital infidelity involved descent and inheritance.

Very early in the march of civilization the illegitimate child fell into disrepute.

[Compare S&K 1776.]

In Togo the husband has the **right to kill** the adulterer or to castrate him, according to the council's decision, "whereby the culprit has his sex parts crushed with stones" (S&K IV 977).

XLVIII: FURTHER PRELIMINARIES TO MARRIAGE (Sumner & Keller 1665)

§366.* **Chastity.** (Sumner & Keller 1674)

Is not the **chastity-taboo** a parallel to the **property** taboo? (S&K 1679)

[*Note:* S&K suggest that the chastity taboo on wives went hand in hand with the chastity taboo on daughters, both wives and daughters being considered property of the husband-father. See endnote.]

It cannot be demonstrated that the demand for chastity came from the **suitor's** side; it is more likely to have been prescribed from that of the **father**, as an extended safeguard to property (S&K 1680).

"... Chastity merely increases the girl's value as a **commercial asset...**" (S&K IV 932).

At first only the woman was punished for adultery;

later on, the mores also decreed the chastisement of her partner,

and for long ages the offended husband or the protector father had the full **right to kill** the male trespasser.

Modern peoples retain these mores, which allow so-called crimes of honor under the unwritten law.³

82:4.5 Since the **chastity taboo** had its origin as a phase of the **property** mores,

it applied at first to married women but not to unmarried girls.⁴

In later years, chastity was more demanded by the **father** than by the **suitor**;

a virgin was a **commercial asset** to the father—she brought a higher price.

As chastity came more into demand, it was the practice to pay the father a bride fee in recognition of the service of properly rearing a chaste bride for the husband-to-be.

Where people prize premarital chastity, they have been wont to adopt severe methods for securing and testing it. Girls are not merely secluded—a familiar process—but **actually caged** (S&K 1682).

[contd] In New Britain, girls of the poorer classes wear a fringe across the shoulders until they are marriageable, while rich girls are veritably caged until that age in huts admitting no light and little air. There they stay **for four or five years**, in a cramped position, watched over by an old woman, and may be seen only by their own relations...” (S&K 1682).

If, on any island of the Gilbert Group, a girl was discovered at the marriage-ceremony to have failed in the test of virginity, ... “... [she] was disowned from the moment of detection; she was branded with the name of *nikira-n-roro* (lit., *the remnant-of-her-generation*) and earned her living by the favour of promiscuous suitors. . . . Wilkes mentions that women were offered in traffic to his sailors by the people of Tabiteuea and other islands, and deduces that the islanders had a low standard of morality. The fact was that the girls offered were *nikira-n-roro*, whose existence argues a high standard of virginity” (S&K IV 935).

When once started, this idea of female chastity took such hold on the races that it became the practice **literally to cage up** girls,

actually to imprison them **for years**, in order to assure their virginity.

And so the more recent standards and virginity tests automatically gave origin to the professional prostitute classes;

they were the rejected brides, those women who were found by the grooms’ mothers not to be virgins.

5. ENDOGAMY AND EXOGAMY

XLIV: EVOLUTION BY RESTRICTION (Sumner & Keller 1567)

§350.* **Cause of the Taboo.** (Sumner & Keller 1584)

According to a report of the ninth century, A.D., “the Chinese hold that crossing of races produces a sounder offspring, with stronger body, longer life, more robust health, and other advantages” (S&K 1587).

[*Note:* Sumner & Keller cite the Chinese case above as an exception, asserting that the evidence of primitive peoples’ awareness of the biological advantages of outbreeding and the biological ills of inbreeding is “extremely slight and uncertain” (S&K 1587).]

§351. **In-breeding in General.** (Sumner & Keller 1590)

Assuming that in-breeding is biologically only a little worse than outbreeding, closely endogamous groups are handicapped in the struggle for existence over the exogamous.... Inbreeders will tend, therefore, to **disappear**, and their **mores** with them, where competition is keen (S&K 1593).

82:5.1 Very early the savage observed that race mixture improved the quality of the offspring.

It was not that inbreeding was always bad, but that outbreeding was always comparatively better; therefore the mores tended to crystallize in restriction of sex relations among near relatives.

It was recognized that outbreeding greatly increased the selective opportunity for evolutionary variation and advancement.

The outbred individuals were more versatile and had greater ability to survive in a hostile world;

the inbreeders, together with their **mores**, gradually **disappeared**.

§350.* **Cause of the Taboo.** (Sumner & Keller 1584)

[See note four rows down.]

Of the Maori it is said: “Anyone outside of brother and sister could marry, although marriage of first cousins was greatly disliked. They seem aware of the **weakening** effect of ‘in-breeding.’ ... (S&K 1586).

§351. **In-breeding in General.** (Sumner & Keller 1590)

[*Note:* Sumner & Keller state the opposite: “No reasonable grounds can exist for believing primitive peoples to be rationally aware of the asserted biological ills of in-breeding...” (S&K 1587). They suggest that taboos against consanguineous mating arose for other reasons.]

XLV: ENDOGAMY AND EXOGAMY
(Sumner & Keller 1595)

§352.* **Divisional and Tribal Endogamy.**
(Sumner & Keller 1595)

Endogamy within a **faith** or sect is a familiar historical prescription (S&K 1601).

[See 82:5.6, below.]

This was all a slow development; the savage did not consciously reason about such problems.

But the later and advancing peoples did,

and they also made the observation that general **weakness** sometimes resulted from excessive inbreeding.

82:5.2 While the inbreeding of good stock sometimes resulted in the up-building of strong tribes,

the spectacular cases of the bad results of the inbreeding of hereditary defectives more forcibly impressed the mind of man, with the result that the advancing mores increasingly formulated taboos against all marriages among near relatives.

82:5.3 Religion has long been an effective barrier against outmarriage;

many religious teachings have proscribed marriage outside the **faith**.

Woman has usually favored the practice of in-marriage; man, outmarriage.

In Madagascar, “tribes and even families generally marry amongst themselves ..., so as to keep landed and other **property** together” (S&K 1598).

Of course propinquity and the **preservation of craft-secrets** may lead to endogamy; there is, however, more to the case than that (S&K 1599).

XLIV: EVOLUTION BY RESTRICTION (Sumner & Keller 1567)

§348.* **Consanguine Marriage.** (Sumner & Keller 1571)

Property has always influenced marriage,

and sometimes, in an effort to conserve **property** within a clan, mores have arisen compelling women to choose husbands within their fathers’ tribes.

Rulings of this sort led to a great multiplication of cousin marriages.

In-mating was also practiced in an effort to **preserve craft secrets**;

skilled workmen sought to keep the knowledge of their craft within the family.

82:5.4 Superior groups, when isolated, always reverted to **consanguineous mating**.

The Nodites for over one hundred and fifty thousand years were one of the great in-marriage groups. The later-day in-marriage mores were tremendously influenced by the traditions of the violet race, in which, at first, matings were, perforce, between brother and sister. And brother and sister marriages were common in early Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, and throughout the lands once occupied by the Andites.

The Egyptians thought the marriage of brother and sister the most proper, citing the example of Osiris and Isis; in their love-songs the words brother and sister take the sense of lover and mistress (S&K 1574).

“The object of the institution of consanguine marriage was originally the keeping pure of the blood, the holding-off of alien elements” (S&K 1574).

“Among the present-day Persians consanguine marriage is likewise no great exception; here it is plainly a survival out of antiquity” (S&K 1574).

Again, a Beduin has the exclusive right to marry his cousin; though he is not obliged to do so, she may not marry another without his consent (S&K 1578).

Wilken ... quotes from Burckhardt: “All Arabian Bedouins acknowledge the first cousin’s prior right to a girl, whose father cannot refuse to bestow her on him in marriage, should he pay a reasonable price; and that price is always something less than would be demanded from a stranger” (S&K IV 868).

Abraham says of Sarah: “And moreover she is indeed my sister, the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother; and she became my wife” (S&K IV 862).

A union of this order was denounced by Ezekiel, who cites incest as one sin of the Jews (S&K IV 862).

[?]

The Egyptians long practiced brother and sister marriages

in an effort to keep the royal blood pure,

a custom which persisted even longer in Persia.

Among the Mesopotamians, before the days of Abraham, cousin marriages were obligatory;

cousins had prior marriage rights to cousins.

Abraham himself married his half sister,

but such unions were not allowed under the later mores of the Jews.

82:5.5 The first move away from brother and sister marriages came about under the plural-wife mores because the sister-wife would arrogantly dominate the other wife or wives.⁵

XLV: ENDOGAMY AND EXOGAMY
(Sumner & Keller 1595)

§354. **Miscellaneous Restrictions.** (Sumner & Keller 1611)

Plainly the modern taboo comes from the Old Testament; among the ancient Hebrews, however, a man might not take his dead brother's wife,

though he was under obligation to beget a son by her for that brother (S&K 1612).

§356. **The Expedience of Exogamy.** (Sumner & Keller 1617)

If endogamy is bad, the extremest endogamy is worse.... The whole matter is, nevertheless, on the societal plane and in the mores, not on the **biological** plane and in **instinct** (S&K 1621).

§352.* **Divisional and Tribal Endogamy.** (Sumner & Keller 1595)

“Naturally the parents of the female would rather keep their daughter and her children with them than give her away ‘among the enemy’; because they could then more easily put pressure on the son-in-law. For the **man**, however, this point of view would, on the contrary, be a motive whereby he would prefer not to get his wife from his own camp” (S&K 1600).

Some tribal mores forbade marriage to a dead brother's widow

but required the living brother to beget children for his departed brother.

There is no **biologic instinct** against any degree of in-marriage; such restrictions are wholly a matter of taboo.

82:5.6 Outmarriage finally dominated because

it was favored by the **man**; to get a wife from the outside insured greater freedom from in-laws.

Familiarity breeds contempt; so, as the element of individual choice began to dominate mating, it became the custom to choose partners from outside the tribe.

XLIV: EVOLUTION BY RESTRICTION (Sumner & Keller 1567)

§349.* **Taboos of Narrower and Wider Scope.** (Sumner & Keller 1578)

Among certain Australians, a man “may not marry a woman of his own **clan**,” nor of any other clan that has the same **totem** as his own (S&K IV 872).

Inter-caste union is tabooed among the Nairs. “... A . . . girl is not allowed to contract a marriage with men of a lower subcaste. She can marry either in her own subcaste or in **castes** above hers...” (S&K IV 873).

XLV: ENDOGAMY AND EXOGAMY (Sumner & Keller 1595)

§353.* **Divisional and Tribal Exogamy.** (Sumner & Keller 1601)

Haddon has “more than once called attention to the fact that among some Papuans marriage restrictions are **territorial** and not totemic. Dr. Rivers has shown that in Murray Island [in the region of Torres Straits] **marriages are regulated** by the places to which the natives belong...” (S&K IV 884).

82:5.7 Many tribes finally forbade marriages within the **clan**;

others limited mating to certain **castes**.

The taboo against marriage with a woman of one’s own **totem** gave impetus to the custom of stealing women from neighboring tribes.

Later on, **marriages were regulated** more in accordance with **territorial** residence than with kinship.

There were many steps in the evolution of in-marriage into the modern practice of outmarriage.

XLIV: EVOLUTION BY RESTRICTION (Sumner & Keller 1567)

§348.* **Consanguine Marriage.** (Sumner & Keller 1571)

Several African cases show a relaxation of the taboo on incest in the case of the royal family.

In Gaboon the king was wont to marry his grown daughter, the queen her eldest son—an extreme divagation **in the effort to keep the royal blood pure** (S&K 1573).

XLV: ENDOGAMY AND EXOGAMY (Sumner & Keller 1595)

§356. **The Expediency of Exogamy.** (Sumner & Keller 1617)

Exogamy is “an institution which resists the tendency of uncultured populations to disintegrate, cementing them into **nations** capable of **living together in peace** and holding together in war, till they reach the period of higher **military** and political organisation” (S&K 1618).

Even after the taboo rested upon in-marriages for the common people, chiefs and kings were permitted to marry those of close kin

in order to keep the royal blood concentrated and pure.

The mores have usually permitted sovereign rulers certain licenses in sex matters.

82:5.8 **The presence of the later Andite peoples had much to do with increasing the desire of the Sangik races to mate outside their own tribes.** But it was not possible for outmating to become prevalent until neighboring groups had learned to **live together in relative peace.**

82:5.9 Outmarriage itself was a peace promoter; marriages between the tribes lessened hostilities.

Outmarriage led to tribal co-ordination and to **military** alliances;

“Trade and the practice of exogamy were the main factors in breaking down the barriers that separated one community from another” (S&K 1618).

Endogamy provided for no contacts, while exogamy secured them in regular, frequent, and peaceable form; then followed the contagion of ideas or what has been called the “cross-fertilization of culture” (S&K 1618).

Let it now be supposed that group A begins to get women, by stealing, trading, or *connubium*, from B.

These women bring with them the mores of the group in which they have been reared ... Further, the incoming women from B have over the next generation in A an influence which is at least equal to that of the men of A and the children grow up naturally into the possession of a good part of the mores of both A and B (S&K 1619).

it became dominant because it provided increased strength; it was a nation builder.

Outmarriage was also greatly favored by increasing trade contacts;

adventure and exploration contributed to the extension of the mating bounds

and greatly facilitated the cross-fertilization of racial cultures.

82:5.10 The otherwise inexplicable inconsistencies of the racial marriage mores are largely due to this outmarriage custom

with its accompanying wife stealing and buying from foreign tribes,

all of which resulted in a compounding of the separate tribal mores.

XLIV: EVOLUTION BY RESTRICTION (Sumner & Keller 1567)

§350.* **Cause of the Taboo.** (Sumner & Keller 1584)

In fact, the taboos upon marriages other than those of parents and children or of brothers and sisters, seem to represent adjustments between the **societal** organization ... and marriage, rather than to reflect concern with in-breeding as a **biological** matter.

The regulations allow what we know to be unions of the same germ-plasm, as in certain cousin-marriages, and forbid others, between **relatives-in-law**, for instance, where there is **no blood-relationship** in evidence (S&K 1584-85).

That these taboos respecting in-marriage were **sociologic**, not **biologic**,

is well illustrated by the taboos on kinship marriages, which embraced many degrees of **in-law relationships**, cases representing **no blood relation** whatsoever.

6. RACIAL MIXTURES

82:6.1 There are no pure races in the world today. The early and original evolutionary peoples of color have only two representative races persisting in the world, the yellow man and the black man; and even these two races are much admixed with the extinct colored peoples. While the so-called white race is predominantly descended from the ancient blue man, it is admixed more or less with all other races much as is the red man of the Americas.

82:6.2 Of the six colored Sangik races, three were primary and three were secondary. Though the primary races—blue, red, and yellow—were in many respects superior to the three secondary peoples, it should be remembered that these secondary races had many desirable traits which would have considerably enhanced the primary peoples if their better strains could have been absorbed.

VIII: THE CREATIVE POWER OF “RACE” MIXTURE (Ashley Montagu 97)

[See AM 98 for references to “half-castes” and “hybrids”.]

As Castle has written, “Since there are no biological obstacles to crossing between the most diverse human races, when such crossing does occur, it is in disregard of social conventions, race pride and race prejudice. Naturally therefore it occurs between antisocial and outcast specimens of the respective races, or else between conquerors and slaves...” (AM 98).

82:6.3 Present-day prejudice against “half-castes,” “hybrids,” and “mongrels” arises because

modern racial cross-breeding is, for the greater part, between the grossly inferior strains of the races concerned.

You also get unsatisfactory offspring when the degenerate strains of the same race intermarry.⁶

82:6.4 If the present-day races of Urantia could be freed from the curse of their lowest strata of deteriorated, antisocial, feeble-minded, and outcast specimens, there would be little objection to a limited race amalgamation. And if such racial mixtures could take place between the highest types of the several races, still less objection could be offered.

It is through the agency of interbreeding that nature, in the form of man's genetic system, shows its creative power. Not so long ago, when it was the custom to personify nature and to speak somewhat metaphysically of "her" as the purposive mother of us all, we should have said that crossing is one of nature's principal devices for the uninterrupted production of ever **new and more vigorous** types of life (AM 99-100).

Hybridization of **plants** in nature is a continuous phenomenon, in lower **animals** it is perhaps not as frequently observed, but in **man** it is an age-old process which was unquestionably operative among his proto-human ancestors (AM 100).

The phenomenon of increased **vigor** following upon hybridization has been long recognized by biologists and is known as *heterosis*, or hybrid vigor. By hybrid vigor is meant the phenomenon frequently observed as a result of the crossing of the members of two distinct species, varieties or groups, in which the hybrid ... exceeds both parents in size, **fecundity**, resistance or other adaptive quality (AM 101).

82:6.5 Hybridization of superior and dissimilar stocks is the secret of the creation of **new and more vigorous** strains.

And this is true of **plants, animals,** and the **human species.**

Hybridization augments **vigor** and increases **fertility.**

Race mixtures of the average or superior strata of various peoples greatly increase *creative* potential, as is shown in the present population of the United States of North America. When such matings take place between the lower or inferior strata, creativity is diminished, as is shown by the present-day peoples of southern India.

The new types which emerge in this way generally exhibit something more than merely the blended sum of the properties of the parental types, that is, they show some **characters and qualities altogether new**, characters not originally possessed by the groups from which the parents have been derived (AM 102).

Such hybrids are not inferior to their parents, but exhibit qualities far **superior** to those possessed by either of the parental stocks (AM 103).

There can be little doubt that those who deliver themselves of unfavorable judgments concerning race-crossing are merely expressing their **prejudices**. For in the framework which encloses the half-caste we are dealing with a conspicuous example of the action of socially depressing factors and not with the effects of the **biological** ones (AM 99).

It is believed that hybrid vigor is caused as a result of each parent supplying **dominant genes** for which the other parent is recessive. In other words, characters or qualities which would not normally be expressed or come into being were each of the parents to breed within their own groups, are newly created when there is cross-breeding between the members of different groups (AM 102).

82:6.6 Race blending greatly contributes to the sudden appearance of **new characteristics**,

and if such hybridization is the union of **superior** strains, then these new characteristics will also be **superior** traits.

82:6.7 As long as present-day races are so overloaded with inferior and degenerate strains, race intermingling on a large scale would be most detrimental,

but most of the objections to such experiments rest on social and cultural **prejudices** rather than on **biological** considerations.

Even among **inferior** stocks, hybrids often are an improvement on their ancestors.

Hybridization makes for species improvement because of the role of the **dominant genes**.

Racial intermixture increases the likelihood of a larger number of the desirable *dominants* being present in the hybrid.⁷

Over the greater part of the earth today human hybridization is proceeding at vastly more rapid rates than at any previous period in the history of man, and a vastly greater number of peoples are being involved in the process at one and the same time (AM 107).

82:6.8 For the past hundred years more racial hybridization has been taking place on **Urantia** than has occurred in thousands of years.

NEGRO-WHITE CROSSES (Ashley Montagu 115)

Davenport has made the claim that hybridization sometimes produces **disharmonies**, and he has further claimed to have discovered such disharmonies in some of the mixed Jamaicans who were examined and measured by Steggerda. In a work in which a simple table can be headed “Traits in which Browns are *inferior* to Blacks and Whites,” when the word “intermediate” would more accurately have described the nature of the table, one is not surprised to discover that the facts upon which this claim rests **have been most strangely exaggerated** (AM 116).

The danger of gross **disharmonies** as a result of crossbreeding of human stocks **has been greatly exaggerated.**

The chief troubles of “half-breeds” are due to social prejudices.

SOURCE OR PARALLEL

URANTIA PAPER 82

POLYNESIAN-WHITE CROSSES (Ashley Montagu 108)

[contd] In the year 1790 nine English sailors and about twelve Tahitian women and eight Tahitian men landed on the isle of Pitcairn in the mid-Pacific.... A large proportion of these hybrids were long-lived, and they had had unusually long-lived descendants. The modern Norfolk and Pitcairn islanders are taller than the average Tahitian or Englishman, are more vigorous, robust and healthy, and mentally they are perfectly alert (AM 108).

82:6.9 The Pitcairn experiment of blending the white and Polynesian races turned out fairly well because the white men and the Polynesian women were of fairly good racial strains.

Interbreeding between the highest types of the white, red, and yellow races would immediately bring into existence many new and biologically effective characteristics. These three peoples belong to the primary Sangik races. Mixtures of the white and black races are not so desirable in their immediate results, neither are such mulatto offspring so objectionable as social and racial prejudice would seek to make them appear.

AUSTRALIAN-WHITE CROSSES (Ashley Montagu 110)

[contd] Social conditions could not be more unfavorable for the offspring of aboriginal-white crosses than they are in Australia, yet all unprejudiced observers agree that the offspring of such crosses represent an excellent physical type, and that both the aborigines and the hybrids are possessed of considerable mental ability (AM 110).

Physically, such white-black hybrids are excellent specimens of humanity,

notwithstanding their slight inferiority in some other respects.

82:6.10 When a primary Sangik race amalgamates with a secondary Sangik race, the latter is considerably improved at the expense of the former. And on a small scale—extending over long periods of time—there can be little serious objection to such a sacrificial contribution by the primary races to the betterment of the secondary groups. Biologically considered, the secondary Sangiks were in some respects superior to the primary races.

82:6.11 After all, the real jeopardy of the human species is to be found in the unrestrained multiplication of the inferior and degenerate strains of the various civilized peoples rather than in any supposed danger of their racial interbreeding.

82:6.12 [Presented by the Chief of Seraphim stationed on Urantia.]

1. *Compare*: “A pure-blooded Indian,” says Morgan, “has very little animal passion”; it is in the half-breed that “it is sensibly augmented and when the second generation is reached with a cross giving three-quarters white blood, it becomes excessive and tends to indiscriminate licentiousness” (S&K 1496).

2. Young girls are wholly free and are habituated to wide license; but “the woman who, being betrothed, is unfaithful to her groom, or, married, commits adultery, pays for her transgression with her life.” This is the case with many peoples of the [Indonesian] Archipelago (S&K IV 856). [*See similar cases elsewhere in Case Book.*]

3. Re “the unwritten law”: In his 1938 book, *Living a Sane Sex Life*, William S. Sadler - paraphrasing Millard S. Everett, Ph.D.’s 1932 book, *The Hygiene of Marriage: A Detailed Consideration of Sex and Marriage* - wrote:

Some people foolishly marry with the idea that jealous watchfulness is normal, and may even boast that they are not going to let their husbands or wives out from under their eyes. The popular concept of morals is in part responsible for this attitude because it tacitly approves jealousy and even murder for marital infidelity—the unwritten law.

Everett had written:

Some foolish people, however, even enter marriage with the assumption that jealous watchfulness is the normal thing and may be heard to boast how they are not going to let their husband or wife out from under their eyes. The popular moral tradition is partly to blame for this because it tacitly approves jealousy and sometimes even murder (“the unwritten law”) in the case of marital infidelity (p. 99).

4. The common insistence upon fidelity in a wife, explicable as it is by reason of the fact that unfaithfulness results in property-complications incident to illegitimacy, is plainly a property-taboo. That a man, especially where the *patria potestas* is marked, by owning his wife owns also her offspring, is sufficiently attested; and, in such case, he is generally found to be highly resentful of any infringement upon his rights over his daughters ... (S&K 1679).

5. *Compare:* In Egypt the chief wife of Pharaoh was, if possible, his sister, as the only one who could be his equal in blood. She lived a free and equal life by his side, while his other wives were more or less cloistered (S&K IV 1041).

6. The same results follow the marriages of low-grade stocks within the same homogeneous racial group, as witness the Jukes, the Ishmaelites and others (Frank H. Hankins, *The Racial Basis of Civilization* [1926], 338).

Note: Ashley Montagu writes of Hankins’ book: “This work contains an excellent discussion of ‘race’ mixture” (AM 130).

7. *Compare:* [The appearance of hybrid vigor] is doubtless a consequence of the combination of an unusual number of dominant factors for growth and vigor in the first cross; its tendency to disappear results from the loss of some of these genes through segregation or their recombination with genes affecting growth and vigor adversely (Hankins 331-32).