

1938

Acculturation in marriage institutions in India.

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/16926>

"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis
ACCULTURATION IN MARRIAGE INSTITUTIONS IN INDIA

by

Chanduben Parekh
(A.B., All India Women's University, 1935)

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

1938

Four eyes met. There were changes in two souls.
And now I cannot remember whether he is a man
and I a woman,
Or he a woman and I a man. All I know is,
There were two; Love came, and there is one . . .

¹ Margaret E. Nobel, The Web of Indian Life, p. 41.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	v
(a) Purpose of the thesis	v
(b) Method	vi
I. MARRIAGE AS A SOCIAL INSTITUTION	1
(a) Definition	1
(b) The characteristics of social institutions	2
II. WESTERN PURPOSE OF MARRIAGE	7
(a) Three motives	9
1. Economic advantage	9
2. The production of offspring	10
3. The need of love	10
(b) Present theories of marriage	17
1. Romantic theory	17
2. Sex license	18
3. Fellowship theory	19
III. THE CHANGING WESTERN MARRIAGE IDEALS AND THEIR EFFECTS	23
(a) Economic evolution	23
(b) Motives of women in seeking employment	26
(c) Disorganization in the family	29
(d) Effects of machinery	35

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. INDIAN IDEALS OF MARRIAGE	42
(a) Marriage for communal life	42
(b) Marriage for spiritual advantage	45
(c) Eugenic point of view	47
(d) What part love plays in marriage	51
V. COMPARATIVE DESCRIPTION OF MARRIAGE PATTERNS	55
(a) The control of reproduction	55
(b) The pattern of marital status	57
(c) Marital selection and the social structure	60
(d) Segregation pattern	64
VI. AN ACCULTURATION IN MARRIAGE INSTITUTIONS IN INDIA	72
(a) Love marriage	77
(b) Abolition of child marriage	79
(c) New ideals for life without marriage	81
(d) Widow remarriage	82
(e) Intercaste marriage	83
CONCLUSION	86
DIGEST	91
BIBLIOGRAPHY	94

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the thesis

This thesis is concerned with the effects of Western European culture upon the institution of marriage in India. Ever since Westerners entered India it has been to them a country of mystery and allurements, as well as of economic opportunity. As a result, many books have been written by European residents and travelers in India to satisfy the curiosity of their countrymen about it. Unfortunately, the depth and meaning of Indian culture is not readily appreciated even by competent observers, and many authors can hardly lay claim to either competency or impartiality. In fact, most works on India have been written either by English government officials, who have become apologists for the beneficence of English rule, or by tourist-travelers whose stay has been altogether too brief to give them anything but superficial and distorted impressions.

The author of this thesis has the advantage in discussing Indian marriage of being a native of that country and a student of its sociology with access to its literature. Since this thesis is concerned with the impact of European culture upon Indian marriage, however, it does involve a reasonable understanding of Western culture, which is probably as difficult for the Indian to obtain as

is an understanding of Indian culture for an European. The author, however, is relieved of the burden of being a propagandist for a ruling nation, and has had the advantage of more than a year of travel and study in America under native teachers and with reading access to its literature. Since American culture, though unique in details, is fundamentally of Western European type, it is felt that this background should permit a reasonably adequate appraisal of the problem of marriage acculturation in India and that an awareness of limitations may further guard against distortions in interpretation.

Method

As a preliminary step to the consideration of Western and Indian marriage and the effect of the one upon the other, the first chapter is devoted to a definition of marriage as a social institution and to a search into the past to find the source of the family.

As the purpose of this thesis is to show an acculturation in marriage institutions in India, it is necessary to enumerate the Western purposes of marriage and its changing ideals.

A comparative description of marriage patterns obviously makes it clear that Western and Indian ideals are widely different. As India is introducing Western

culture it is inevitable that its marriage ideals will eventually be replaced by the freer Western ones, as demonstrated in the sixth chapter.

CHAPTER I

MARRIAGE AS A SOCIAL INSTITUTION

Definition

Marriage is generally used as a term for a social institution which may be defined as,

a relation of one or more men to one or more women that is recognized by custom or law, and involves certain rights and duties both in the case of the parties entering the union and in the case of children born out of it. These rights and duties vary among different peoples and cannot, therefore, all be included in a general definition; but there must, of course, be something that they have in common.¹

Marriage is the institutional relation of man and woman in which they regulate their sex impulses. Man is the kind of animal who feels sex desire in every season. Under the stress of this desire he shows, physically and mentally, either his good or his bad nature. Sex passion, covering a great emotional field, has many moral disciplines.² It is like a mighty ocean with its huge waves which are very hard to control: without control, like a tidal wave, it engulfs all before it.

A man can control his passions by reason and by socially approved mores and customs; but without control

¹E. A. Westermarck, The Future of Marriage, p. 3.

²W. G. Sumner and A. G. Keller, The Science of Society, p. 1522.

his passions will follow the easiest trend, even though harm thereby comes to himself and society. Man is a social being and, as such, is much dependent upon society and its institutions. He must pass through the social institutions before he becomes a civilized being. He must put limitations on his conduct and as a consequence he establishes institutions. Marriage puts limitations on his conduct and regulates sex impulses, just as other institutions regulate one or more of the other fundamental needs of being a social as well as a civilized being. So, marriage works as a social institution in taking care of two sexes, and adjusting and shaping them according to the social customs and taboos.

The characteristics of social institutions

Then, let us consider the characteristics and structure of social institutions in general and, more particularly, of marriage and family institutions.

First, a social institution arises out of and as a result of repeated groupings of interacting human individuals in response to elemental needs or drives (sex, hunger, fear, etc.). Second, common reciprocating attitudes and conventionalized behavior patterns develop out of the process of interaction (affection, loyalty, cooperation, domination, subordination). Third, cultural objects (traits) that embody symbolic values in material substances are invented or fabricated and become the cue stimuli to behavior conditioned to them (the idol, cross, ring, flag, etc., are charged with emotional and sentimental meaning). Fourth, cultural objects (traits) that embody utilitarian values

in material substances are invented or fabricated and become the means of satisfying creature wants for warmth, shelter, etc., (buildings, furniture, etc.). Fifth, preserved in oral or written language, externally stored and handed down from one generation to the next, there is description and specification of the patterns of interrelationship among these elemental drives, attitudes, symbolic culture traits, and utilitarian culture traits.¹

These five are the concepts of social institutions. They are combined and interdependent in a functional sense. The total function of these five traits produces an institution. These are dynamic, living, changing, or growing, but, nevertheless, they do not affect the characteristic quality of an institution.

The analysis shown on the following page will help us in understanding the structure of the family institutions and other social institutions.

¹ E. B. Reuter and J. R. Runner, The Family, p. 134.

SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS¹

Types	Parts of Structure	Family	State	Religion	Industry
1	Attitudes and behavior patterns	Love Affection Devotion Loyalty Parental respect	Devotion Loyalty Respect Domination Subordination Fear	Reverence Awe Fear Loyalty Devotion Subordination	Fair play Loyalty Cooperation Conflict Workmanship Thrift
2	Symbolic culture traits	Marriage ring Crest Coat of arms Heirloom	Flag Seal Emblem National anthem Army Navy	Cross Ikon Idol Shrine Hymn Altar	Trademark Patent sign Advertising emblem
3	Utilitarian culture traits	Home equipment Personal property	Public buildings Public works Warlike equipment	Church buildings Cathedral Temple Altar Sanctuary	Stores Shops Factories Ships Railroads Machinery
4	Oral or written specification	Will Marriage license Genealogy MORES	Treaties Constitution Charter Laws Ordinances MORES	Creed Doctrine Hymn Bible Sacred books MORES	Franchise License Contracts Partnership papers Articles of incorporation MORES

¹ E. B. Reuter and J. R. Runner, The Family, p. 135.

When these four parts of structure work together in a combination they produce an institution. Institutions specialize in one or another necessity of life and train the individuals as good citizens. A church helps to create pious and religious feelings in us and teaches kindness to the poor and the socially discarded people; while the state, through education and laws, teaches us to cooperate, to love and to be useful to our neighbors and the nation. They all try to build a firm foundation of character in us with the hope of giving moral strength in the fight against the storms of society and of our minds.

In the past the marriage and family institutions were so arranged that the children got all qualifications for citizenship in the home. They were given that strong background through the family institutions, and the state and church only filled the gaps. But today marriage and family institutions have lost, to some extent, their place in training the children, who take their place in society without any essential background for ideal citizenship, and who look to the state and church with eager eyes, hoping for some help in acquiring the background they lack. They find themselves lost in society, as the students of any science find themselves lost when they enter into that particular field of science without having the knowledge of the first basic theories. Unfortunately, state and

church have not yet adjusted themselves to provide these children the lacking basic ground which will enable them to adjust themselves in the wide world.

The following chapter emphasizes the above discussed fact, that marriage institutions were the best institutions for fostering the growth of children physically, mentally, and spiritually. Though people had various motives for entering the marriage institution, and though these have been interpreted in different ways, yet, the wish for children and the desire for their welfare was the most common motive.

CHAPTER II

WESTERN PURPOSE OF MARRIAGE

It is probable that most anthropologists and social writers are in agreement concerning the biological meaning of marriage. The word has reference to "a union of the male and female which does not cease with the act of production but persists after the birth of offspring until the young are capable of supplying their own essential needs."¹ If this view be accepted, it becomes clear at once that marriage exists among birds and some of the higher animals. Indeed, birds furnish an excellent example of parental care and affection. Together, the male and female build the nest, gather the food, and teach the young.

It seems clear that the sexual instinct of itself could not have brought about permanent relationship between male and female. So fluctuating a desire could hardly have constituted a firm basis for family life among animals and among cave-men, who were our original ancestors.²

They did not have any conception of love, which today binds men and women together in the strongest of human ties. Neither did men have need to protect their wives in order that the bond of union might be lasting, as the female was

¹ Ibid., p. 100.

² W. Goodsell, History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution, p. 7.

as strong and capable of self-defense as the male. Then the source of marriage must be in the utter helplessness of new-born offspring and its need to protection. "Thus it appears that marriage has its source in the family, rather than the family in marriage."¹

Different motives are ascribed for entering the marriage institution, varying according to the social situation. In the literature of the past, marriage was exclusively for regulating sex behavior, giving security to the family, and providing for a more advantageous division of labor between the sexes. The anthropologist finds these motives of lesser importance in various groups at different periods. It is true that "from the very beginning marriage provided a greater security, especially in safeguarding the economic interests of the wife by providing for her a family background. . . .In spite of this, marriage must not be thought of as merely the gateway into family experience."²

History fails to show a steady advance in the evolution of marriage, because marriage has not progressed in an orderly, evolutionary manner as time has gone on. It should be remembered that marriage adapts itself to the existing social conditions of any period and we know, even as social

¹ Ibid., p. 8.

² E. R. Groves, Marriage, p. 29.

conditions vary at the present time in different geographical areas and in unlike social groups, so they also varied in the past. Many different motives for marriage are found among individuals of any group. Any degree of individuality is possible when culture reaches its highest point.

Three motives

Economic advantage. There are three important motives which draw people into marriage: these are, the need of love, the production of offspring, and the mutual helpfulness of husband and wife. These three fundamental urges are expressed in different proportions during three periods of the cultural history of man.¹ In the evolution of the cultural periods of man, each of these three dominant motives in marriage has come to the fore at a given time. In the first period, when man was a simple, unsophisticated being, the economic motive was all-important. He knew little of jealousy and romance as they are interpreted today: his love was a simple concept quite in keeping with the simplicity of his entire life. While sex was present, it was not thought necessary to satisfy it only within the marriage bond. The idealism of love as we now know it had not then developed; we, therefore, cannot say that at this

¹ Ibid., p. 31.

period love had much to do with marriage. Desire for children was secondary to the economic motive, while the emotion of love was the most submerged of all three motives.¹

The production of offspring. The second period advanced in what we call civilization and women had to do more housekeeping than manual work, which now fell upon slaves. In this period wealth was more easily accumulated and the idea that property could be passed on by inheritance from parents to children came into existence. The desire of having heirs became strong in the purpose of marriage, and the order changed and it became, children, economical advancement, love.²

The need of love. In the third period machinery was introduced, which became the substitute for the slave; child labor ceased to be profitable for the parents, and children were no longer a satisfactory insurance against old age, so the economic motive for entering marriage had no value. The motive of love came to the front, that motive which had a small place in primitive life, and the order now appeared as, love, children, and economic

¹ Ibid., p. 31.

² Ibid., p. 32.

advancement.¹

Ruth Reed explains that what seems like sacrifice of personal convenience and security on the part of the mother for the sake of nurturing her infant can be interpreted in terms of physical pleasure derived with great satisfaction from the tactile stimulus that she receives in fondling and being caressed by her offspring. The mother finds, particularly in the act of nursing, that through the stimulation of the mammary glands, she experiences great physical satisfaction. "Through elaboration and association with these elemental stimulations there is built up that complex and powerful emotion - mother love. Nursing by the mother of her own child is therefore regarded as a great factor in building up maternal affection."² Reed quotes Thorndike as saying that,

all women possess from early childhood to death some interest in human babies and a responsiveness to the looks, gestures, and cries of infancy, being satisfied with childish gurglings, smiles, and affectionate gestures and moved to instinctive comforting acts by childish signs of pain, grief, and misery. This series of situations and responses constitutes the maternal instinct in its most typical form. . . . To a woman who has given birth to a child, a baby to see and hold and suckle is perhaps the most potent satisfaction that life can offer; its loss the cause of the saddest yearning.³

¹ Ibid., p. 32.

² Ruth Reed, The Modern Family, p. 4.

³ Ibid., p. 4.

According to McDougall,

the maternal impulse came into existence as an indispensable attitude in the struggle for existence, and by the process of natural inheritance was transmitted to the young of both sexes. Thus, the male also developed impulses of love and protectiveness although these are not identical with those of the female because of the differences in bodily structure and functioning.¹

Thorndike defines the paternal instinct as follows:

To offer a child scraps of food and to see it eat, to snatch it from peril of animals and to smile approvingly at its more vigorous antics, seems to me to be the truly original tendency of the human male. Male thoughtlessness and brutality toward children, or toward whatever living being or thing which makes a similar appeal, is due not to a total loss of kindness, but rather to the presence of competing tendencies of the hunting instinct, which is as much stronger in men than in women as the maternal instinct is stronger in women than in men.²

Among the more favored groups there is a great tendency for the father to identify himself with his children and to take great pride in their successes and achievements. Many times they want to fulfil their dreams through their children.

Like these two instincts, the instinct of filial love also plays a part in constituting the family institution.

It was the opinion of Herbert Spencer that the development of a more worthy type of filial love should be the next step in the evolution of a simplified monogamic family. Certainly there has been no develop-

¹ Ibid., p. 8.

² Ibid., p. 8.

ment of this type of affection at all comparable with mother-love or father-love.¹

While Groves says that the family performs two most important functions: not only is its purpose to nurture the child through its years of biological and social need for protection; the very act of cherishing the offspring, caring for its physical needs, molding its personality development in right channels, does something to the parents themselves, something much farther reaching than mere care of the child alone. Few couples seriously consider the end of marriage or seek to gain these concomitant experiences of child-rearing; rather, the new personality within the family group, the child, has all at once presented the parents with a new and unexpected social experience. "Biologically the mother and father transmit their hereditary traits to the child, socially they build into his growing personality his social heritage as they maintain for him the prospective environment necessary for his survival."²

On the other hand, Popenoe gives other desires which impel men and women into marriage. According to him, the desire for comfort, children, and completion of life is highly prevalent among human beings for making a marriage institution. Man gets tired of eating in restaurants or

¹ Ibid., p. 10.

² E. R. Groves and W. F. Ogburn, American Marriage and Family Relationships, p. 5.

living in boarding-houses; he wants to settle down, and wants someone who will be interested in his welfare and who will devote a large part of her life to making him comfortable. He wants someone who can be a mother in feeding him, a perfect mate in sex life, a servant in doing the housework, and an able adviser and counselor. He realizes that men and women are not supplementary but complementary to each other. Not only that, he also acknowledges the fact that married life is a more regular and careful life. One gets better food, exposes oneself to fewer risks, and has fewer mental and nervous breakdowns.

With the advancement of the new era, and the ever changing condition of society, men and women began to feel forsaken. They recognized the necessity of the warmth of love in life and wished to love someone and to be loved by others. Getting real love they acknowledged the value of it and felt that if there were anything better than to be loved, it was to love. In this happy condition of life one wishes to have children who are the fruit of love and who fill the house and life with innocent laughter and love. Many people have some kind of mission to fulfil in their lives. Some couples, like Sidney Webb and his wife, are willing to sacrifice their lives for the sake of studying the condition of the workers with the hope of bringing about a solution of their problems; while others, such as

Mr. and Mrs. Russell, realize life's success in giving new and practical plans for the evolution of society; still others attain satisfaction in seeing children fulfilling their dreams. They want to make the greatest contribution that can be made to the future of the human race, by giving it superior children. Not only that, but

children give a unique experience and education to the parents. It is not possible to appreciate the extent and nature of this at second-hand; it must be felt. Man's personality and character (as well as woman's) is an incomplete - hopelessly and pathetically incomplete - thing unless it has included the joys, and the occasional sorrows, of bringing up a family of children.¹

"Some, indeed," says John M. Cooper, "break under the test and training, but they are the exceptions. How frequently, in the case of newly married couples, particularly after the birth of their first child, do we see the vital change that comes over both husband and wife - a putting away of the trivial and weakly sentimental, a deepening and enriching of the finer sentiments, a sobering sense of marital and parental responsibility, a flowering of unselfishness. Under the magic of family responsibility, even the painted doll often grows into a woman and the callow stripling into a man."²

Children "bring rejuvenation. Watching the development of his child, sharing its experiences, its pleasures and pains, the parent lives over again, in memory and imagination, his own boyhood."³

¹ P. B. Popenoe, Modern Marriage, p. 175.

² Ibid., p. 175.

³ Ibid., p. 176.

Where there are no old age pensions, social agencies or other social institutions which can take care of the old people, men and women are much dependent upon children, and the children seek their support in the home with their parents, who care for them and provide all facilities for physical as well as biological and social development. Thus, the parents and children are practically bound together for life, as a result of which the home and family were established.

As man's intellectual range became broader and deeper, as the differentiation between him and the animals became more clearly marked, as his higher mentality--evidenced by the refinement of his emotions and the more critical evaluation of the things that brought him satisfaction--became more and more developed, his conjugal relations and his family life assumed more intricate relationships. But he paid for this evolution of mentality; he was more sensitive to pain on the failure of marriage than the savage, because he was able to gain much more from a happy marriage than the savage was. He received what he gave to the marriage. The home was the only place where he could find material comforts, regularity and tranquillity of life. Apart from the physical comforts and children, he recognized marriage as necessary for mental and intellectual contentment. A husband and wife

together can produce such an institution, one in which they can learn to cooperate, to work for others as well as for themselves, to sacrifice selfish motives to make other people happy, and in the marriage institution they realized the fact that only by helping others they could help themselves in every way. Figuratively, they knew they would receive by the left hand what they gave by the right hand. In short, they recognized the marriage institution as conducive to their benefit. Because of such advantages, instincts, and tendencies, men and women are driven towards marriage.

Present theories of marriage

Romantic theory. Besides these motives, there are three theories which lead men and women into marriage. The first and most important of these is the theory of romance in marriage. Aristotle thought that happiness was the ultimate end of life: happiness in marriage, according to the romance theory, is its ultimate end. Therefore, for each soul who comes into this world there is but one corresponding soul with whom this perfect happiness can be achieved. To find that perfect mate, without whom life can never reach its fullness, is the ideal search of the young. Of course, in this search there is the risk of being betrayed by a false attraction. Mistakes in judgment

may be made, the wrong mate may be chosen inadvertently: those who make such a mistake are doomed never to reach life's greatest possibilities; to go through it with a cheated feeling, an unsatisfied longing for which nothing can ever quite compensate. But for those who make the perfect adjustment, a happiness beyond measure is achieved.

Those who govern themselves by this theory have no difficulty in explaining marriage failure. Obviously, those who are unhappy in a relationship that ought to bring absolute bliss have been led astray in their searching for the one and only lifemate. It is as if happiness were locked in a safety vault opened only by the use of two separate keys, one in the possession of a certain woman and the other in the hands of a particular man. Only in marriage can it be known whether the keys brought together actually fit the lock.¹

Sex license. The second theory is based quite on the natural plane; it is that of sex license. Biologically equipped to be a predatory animal, seeking the satisfaction of his physical passion through pursuit of the woman, man needs to give her a legal status for her protection and advantage. Here the state steps in and demands that he limit his activities to a given sphere by giving to one woman the legal status of wife, and accepting the responsibilities ultimately evolving from the marital state. As compensation the wife brings, through marriage, a social

¹ E. R. Groves, Marriage, p. 33.

position of permanence and security to the man.¹

Fellowship theory. No term seems to carry the thought quite so well as "fellowship" for the third theory of marriage purpose. The word "fellowship" includes "economic cooperation, sex union, emotion, intellectual and spiritual intimacy, mutual protection, and, in case of offspring, a working together for the nurture and education of the children."² Fellowship may have many forms: there is that depth of spiritual fellowship found only between devotees of the same religion; the freedom and loyalty of fellowship between fraternity brothers; the devotion in fellowship sometimes found in the height of battle between soldiers in the same army; keen intellectual fellowship found between congenial workers in the same laboratory; but the fellowship that is the brightest jewel of them all, that has the greatest number of facets, that sparkles the most brilliantly, that is the most complex in its structure, and carries with it associations of the greatest emotions, is marriage. How successful a marriage may be is dependent upon the capacities that the contracting parties may have for fellowship. As the harp may send forth beautiful harmonies or jangling discord, according to the skill of

¹ Ibid., p. 33.

² Ibid., p. 35.

the player, so any given marriage presents success or failure according to the capabilities of each mate to skilfully bring out in the other harmony or discord. In the ideal state of marriage, there must be complete fellowship brought about by education and training. In marriage there must be coordination in the various planes of life; there should be at least a proximation of equality on the mental plane, mutual understanding in the spiritual plane, and a spirit of unselfishness and adjustment for both on the physical plane. "Marriage is a public confession and legal registration of an adventure in fellowship, a fusion that fulfils the complementary craving which Plato has so well described."¹ Evidently there is no standard motivation which alone can bring happiness. All sorts of people are married and are happy, and all sorts of people are married and are unhappy. But it is fruitless to say that the motive and justification of marriage is to get happiness. Affection is one of the steps for getting happiness and making the marriage successful. As a matter of fact, affection is powerful and has a large place in marriage relationship. It brings sympathy, tolerance, forbearance, and cooperation, which are the most essential elements in marriage happiness. Affection is a quality of character

¹ Ibid., p. 36.

not equally possessed by all personalities. All too often one nature brings to marriage a depth of affection not understood, not appreciated by the other, the lack of which in the other makes for great unhappiness. The possession or lack of this quality is not dependent upon class, race, or intellectual development. Happily, this quality can be and purposely should be lavished on the child in its early life. When it is more clearly realized by those attempting to bring about a better social structure, that affection is the one quality that aids more than any other in maintaining the permanence of the marriage relation, then--and only then--will be brought about in childhood conscious and intelligent education in a cultural form of affection.

The above discussion shows that people have found different motives at different times for entering the marriage institution. Some have found that it is mainly an institution for the care of the children, whose state of dependence is prolonged far beyond that of the offspring of other animals. Others maintain that it had its origin in private property and was organized for the purposes of inheritance. Others, again, say that the marriage institution came into existence because of the need of love and on account of loneliness arising from the industrial development and social conditions. In this materialistic country, the viewpoints of life have changed and they will

continue to change in order to keep pace with the society which is most unstable. However, it is true that "a complete change in attitude, often in the form of a violent revolt against the formal ideals and customs affecting the marriage relation, is in full swing, and general uncertainty and instability in the relation is probably more marked in America than in any other country."¹

¹ H. A. Keyserling, The Book of Marriage, p. 216.

CHAPTER III

THE CHANGING WESTERN MARRIAGE IDEALS AND THEIR EFFECTS

Economic evolution

It has been shown in the second chapter that marriage has a two-fold character; first, it is an institution, and secondly, it is a purely personal relationship between a man and a woman. Formerly, personal affection was not an important consideration in the conclusion of a marriage, but the institutional character of it has prevailed through the centuries. This institutional character in marriage was closely connected with economic conditions of the pre-industrial era.

As long as the family was a productive unit, it was necessary to stay together. But the extensive economic changes of modern times have effected a transformation in every respect. "The family is no longer a unit of production, its connection with economic life, as far as that survives at all, is extremely loose. . . .The present economic organization requires the working power of the individual, not that of the family."¹

¹ H. A. Keyserling, The Book of Marriage, p. 264.

The employment of wives outside the home is a revolutionary experiment. This change is due to the movement for the emancipation of women and the industrial revolution in the nineteenth century. There is a great opposition against the employment of women in industry or outside the home. The main argument is based upon the fact that "in woman's womb rests the future of the people; in her soul its heart."¹ Her chief duty is to bear and rear children. Her employment outside the home means the neglect of her children. She fails to give good training to her offspring and comforts to her family. She must feel her responsibility of child-bearing and fulfil her debt to her people and nation. She must consider it as a term of spiritual experience and willingly perform her duty. Her employment means the weakening of the power and the supremacy of the male, which have always been his rights. On the other hand, the woman fails to establish a powerful influence on the man by making him comfortable and happy. "Thus the role of the modern wife has been radically changed within a century from a subordinate housewife and child-bearer to a partner in a common enterprise, sharing equally with her husband in the privileges and responsibilities."²

¹ H. Newitt, Women Must Choose, p. 42.

² E. R. Mowrer, The Family, p. 270.

Through these changes, marriage as a social institution has lost its basic foundations. With the evolution of machinery the factory took over many of the domestic occupations of women, and man began to be more and more busy in the pursuit of material values. It offered him an opportunity for exploitations and made him greedy. This formed a gap between husband and wife, and between parents and children, which was difficult to close. Thus, the women and children were left by themselves in one place, while the men engaged themselves in another. Thus, the social ties were loosened through the loss of mutual affection and tender regard.

The men, after their intensive labor, had little time or energy for the family or the love-life, or for the development of those cultural and spiritual values which underlie a true companionship and are so necessary to women for any satisfactory married relationship.¹

As a substitute for this they gave money and material prosperity to their wives, thus enabling them to seek pleasure which they themselves were too busy to share.

Now, when women had fewer duties within or outside the home they became idle and unhappy, "a waste product without meaning or purpose." With time and money readily available, they began to seek pleasure and personal gratification with which they could fill their empty hours,

¹ H. A. Keyserling, The Book of Marriage, p. 221.

outside of their homes, which made havoc not only of the marriage relations, but also of the moral character of many women. This restlessness and dissatisfaction led women into industrial, educational, and professional work. They did not like to belong to a parasitic class, despite wealth and leisure.¹ They wanted to find compensation for their unsatisfied love and sought it in activities and through contact with people outside the home. Their ideals changed and they substituted ambitions other than motherhood, expecting satisfaction. No longer could they find this in bearing and rearing children, and in the pursuit of their new aims they even found children a hindrance.

Motives of women in seeking employment

Women's motives in seeking employment outside the home are various and intermingled; there is no one specific motive for women in choosing work outside the home. Their decision is a result of complex desires. Home is not the place where they can satisfy their impulses, and they prefer to go out to work. In a man, this attitude is a natural course, but in a woman it is not expected and, therefore, is often considered queer. Women are thought to be domesticated by their sex equipment and it is assumed

¹ Ibid., p. 223.

that their place is in the home.

Collier, in her study, found that the most persistent answer to the question, Why are you seeking a career? was, It is a congenial occupation that adds to my happiness and thereby to that of the family. Less than one-tenth of the women she studied claimed to be motivated by financial necessity while nearly one-half affirmed that their one purpose was to find an outlet for energy and desire that the family enterprise could not satisfy.¹

Goodsell's findings fully agree with the above statement. She points out that in time the married woman, especially if she has no children, finds that her home environment, her church, club, and social interests fail to afford her sufficient self-expression and she reaches outside of these circles for greater stimulation. There is nothing strange or unnatural in the attitude of women who have for a goal the achievement of careers. It is the result of the very complex society of today; it is the natural result produced by machinery and the greed of the people; it is a product of selfishness and pleasure philosophy of life; it has its roots far back in the past, in the revolt against submerged individuality and economic dependence. Nevertheless, woman has performed two-fold duties, the natural and the desired. Some women have proved themselves worthy in maintaining the management of their families and simultaneously carrying on professional

¹ E. R. Groves, Marriage, p. 317.

careers. If they have ample opportunities and get wages on an equal level with men, they cause havoc in society. However, the poorer women were forced to go to work to supplement their husbands' earnings sufficiently to support the family. Machinery was a giant who worked hard, produced on a large scale, but whose efficiency had to be maintained; this could be done only at a great expense and the owner met this by introducing cheap labor.

Machinery opened many avenues for workers and so, naturally, increased competition and multiplied the laboring classes: this resulted in the standard of living getting higher and higher, which induced women to leave their homes and children and take jobs in industry to acquire money.

The capitalist, coveting large profits, wanted to hire workers for low wages. Women were willing to work even if forced to do it more cheaply than men. The poorer class of women, who had real need of money, preferred the work offered by the capitalist, even at low wages, to the work that had hitherto fully occupied their day without any monetary return. They revolted against their past sacrifices of their individuality and personal needs and wishes for the sake of the lives and interests of their husbands.

It is needless to say that when a person gets freedom he uses it with a vengeance in the beginning, but after

some experience and knowledge he molds himself in a socially made form and self-accepted way. Women were offered the opportunity to come out of their protected environment and wander freely according to their wish. Freed from the customary control, women, naturally, took every advantage of the new freedom. Thus, the evolution of economic independence relieved the women from their household affairs and now they have won the possibility of a life of their own, though this has caused disorganization in the family. Gillin says, "In the torrent of social change that has altered the course of the river of the social life, one more peaceful but powerful eddy has been swept out into the main current."¹

Disorganization in the family

A woman's work is no longer around her house and her husband; she has extended her field. The revolutionary change which has come into her life is reflected in the functions of the family. The family is less united; father, mother, and children are all independent of each other. The family does not play a considerable role either in training the young ones or giving unique experience to the parents. When the children become matured they find

¹ J. L. Gillin, Social Problems, p. 249.

it difficult to stay with their parents, who are busy in earning money and seeking pleasure in their own ways, and who neglect their duty to provide comfort and happiness for their offspring. The young form their own circle of friends, get amusements and find other sources of income. There is no tenderness or affection between parents and children, no attraction for home.

"The home has with some justification been likened to a filling station with parking space attached: it has been called the place where one goes when one has no other engagements. Of course this is a bit far-fetched, but it is a long cry today from the old family unit and unity."¹

The home, itself, in the old sense is disappearing. It is no longer a training ground for future citizens. Children are no longer the intimate and personal affairs of parents. The religious aspect of marriage is more and more disregarded. The modern marriage has no strong ties and that is why it is so unstable. "An alarming proportion of marriages survive for less than five years."²

Another most important and impressive cause of the family disorganization is an attitude of mind and a code of behavior which may be justly described as a pleasure

¹ Ibid., p. 276.

² Ibid., p. 478.

philosophy of life. This does not mean that in the past people did not like pleasure, but the pleasure philosophy of today provides ideals which are admired as well as followed. The old ideals that virtue is its own reward, that duties even if they require sacrifice of self must be unflinchingly fulfilled, are diametrically opposed to the new ideals which make the end of all effort the attaining of pleasure, the desire for earthly happiness.

This complete reversal in mankind's habit of thinking can be accounted for without difficulty. In the past the old ideals, duty, obligation, self-sacrifice, were engendered by the struggle necessary to survival; mere existence, except for a comparatively small number, required sturdy virtues of endurance and self-discipline. Science, with its broadened opportunity, eased existence for ever-increasing numbers who were able to turn their minds from duty to pleasure, and evolve a pleasure philosophy to take the place of the sterner philosophy. This following of a new pleasure ideal was most agreeable, as human nature always leans toward an easy code of living; and science, soon made to work for man's ease, left time for him to turn his thoughts from duty to indulgence.¹

This new philosophy has been applied to marriage

¹ E. R. Groves, The Marriage Crisis, p. 33.

and its principal ends. The question resolved is, What pleasure will this mode of life afford? If they find their existing single state apparently more pleasurable, the easiest solution, according to the new philosophy, is to remain in that more agreeable state. They have the same attitude in regard to having children. They question whether or not children would be an added pleasure; if they decide that this is unlikely, they control their progeny. This new philosophy makes life shallow and superfluous; it lessens its value by cheapening its aims. This life has no depth of love, no satisfaction of achievement after long strife.

The change in the status of women brings difficulties in marriage relationships. If one will, the man's, is dominant in the household, there can arise no conflict, but where the woman either demands control or expects equality the conflict arises. This situation is possible when woman has realized her ability to work outside the home and to achieve a status equal to that of her husband. She fails to recognize her ability to get respect and regard from her husband by loving him intensely. Men are always dependent upon women for their help and tender care, which engenders in them a certain deference and deep affection: this exchange of emotions and mutual consideration tends to equalize the relationship between the sexes.

Each sex thus comes to a proper consciousness of its value to the other; such consciousness has always been a component of masculine psychology.

Myerson believes that man is the kind of animal that has sex urge in every season. Sex is predominant in him and he wants its satisfaction. Man's tendency is to enjoy his visceral functions as pure pleasure without any interference. The use of contraceptives is not conducive to satisfaction in the sexual function, and causes disharmony in married life. Undoubtedly, the increasing rate of divorce is to some extent resultant from such a hidden psychological factor as the amount of sexual satisfaction in the married relation. Where this satisfaction exists, men and women forgive much else that is unsatisfactory. On the other hand, women who want a career and economic independence find children an obstacle; they avoid having children and this causes dissatisfaction in family life.

Critics of present-day society disagree in the reasons they advance for the maladjustment in the marriage institution and family. Some attribute this maladjustment to the failure to retain in marriage the tested ideals of the past. Others maintain that past ideals and institutions cannot serve their purpose today and family disorganization is the result. According to the first critics, the tested ideals upon which our institutions were based in the past

must not change. The ideals must remain the same in every age and people should, as in the past, aim to achieve these ideals. The second criticism is based upon the fact that social institutions have a tendency to change, but this changing process may not be in equal ratio to social evolution. Thus, there is liable to be disorganization and disharmony when some phases of society change according to the time and personal needs, and the social institutions which are related to them remain stagnant.

According to a materialistic point of view,

material culture changes readily in response to human inclination and curiosity through the process of invention and borrowing. The advantages of new tools, new methods of production, new vehicles of transportation, are more or less obvious, depending upon the multiplicity of social contacts, and are accepted with little or no resistance. Changes in material culture, however, necessitate related changes in non-material culture, in morals, in ethics, in religion, and in the whole frame-work of social institutions and relations.¹

However, people who believe that changes in family institutions are necessary, differ in opinion among themselves regarding the nature and extent of those changes. One group is optimistic; they say that the family will adjust itself to the society more perfectly and in a practical way: while the other group is pessimistic and predicts continual change in the future. To them "disorganization

¹ E. R. Mowrer, The Family, p. 254.

accordingly, makes way for reorganization, to give way again to disorganization, and thus prepare the way for reorganization, which will end in" infinity. Thus, the social changes are endless and bound to happen. It is difficult to control them, but some of them, which become prominent and stunt the growth of other changes, can be checked for the time being. In that way some relief can be given to society.¹

Effects of machinery

Coming to the point of the effect made by the industrial revolution, one can say that it played havoc with family life. It hit the very principles of the family and separated a man from his wife and children, and gradually set apart mother and children. Instead of getting mastery over a piece of work, by handling it from the beginning to the end, and enjoying a certain kind of satisfaction from his own creation, he involved himself in the sharp divisions of labor, got mastery over only a part of the work necessary to the finished product, became gloomy and mechanical on account of doing the same kind of monotonous work, and probably never saw the finished product which was at least in part the result of so much

¹ Ibid., p. 254.

of his labor. Machinery did not give him time to sit beside his wife and children, to talk with them and mold them according to his wish. He went out early in the morning when the children were still in bed and came home late in the evening when it was almost time for them to go to bed. Thus, through lack of contact with his wife and children, he lost his power and central position in the family.

This was not the only effect. Except in a few industries where bodily strength was essential, the new machinery was so easily operated that gradually children and women were drawn into the industrial world. Not that their labor was as effective as men's labor, but they could be hired more cheaply. Before the middle of the nineteenth century, the wives and children of the working men were actually taking the places of their husbands and fathers in the factories. In the half century, from 1841 to 1891, the number of women in the textile factories of England increased 221 per cent, while the increase of men during this period was only 53 per cent. Not only this, but whole families in many of the English mill towns were employed all day in the factories, from little children of four or five years old to mothers and fathers.¹

The family ceased to be an institution where mother,

¹ W. Goodsell, History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution, p. 423.

father, and children could stay together for a long time; could give the warmth of love which was a moral support and means of acquiring happiness, unity, and contentment. The absence of the mother from the home for the entire day brought still worse disasters upon family life. The home was ill-kept because nobody had time to look after it; there was no one to manage the family institution, to provide comforts and happiness for the family members and to sacrifice self in order to obtain love, sympathy, reverence and authority to rule in the family. Meals were hastily prepared and the mother did not realize the significance of this in causing illness. The mother lost her central place in the family life as a nurse and a good companion, and the children ceased to play their important role in the life of husband and wife, and so in the family.

Also the domestic circle was no more the center of social life and social entertainment. In ideal family life the members of each family and their immediate neighbors came in touch with each other through social functions and exchanged hospitality in their homes. It seems that the medieval inns and hospitals were not originally built for the use of local members of the community, but were only for strangers and wayfarers. On the contrary, today such institutions are chiefly used by the local members. The sick are no longer nursed in the home; no knowledge of

medical care for even slight illness is gained by any member of the family through caring for another.

Dwelling places have now become so small that there is no room to entertain friends at home, so restaurants, public places of entertainment, and hotels are substituted for the home: this has helped slowly and gradually to break home ties. In the past, there were small, separate dwelling places with all facilities to entertain friends. These homes were lived in by succeeding generations of the family. Now, large hotels and apartment buildings, which concentrate the population in the cities, divide the family into individual units.

Thus, the family lost its functions one by one and gave them to the community. It ceased to be an institution and lost its central place in the individual's life.

According to the rule of evolution, society is changing, and it will change until infinity. The industrial evolution stirred every phase of life, materially as well as culturally. The people achieved material civilization, which changed their ideas based upon past culture. In order to keep up with the age they must change their ideas. When society changes and becomes more complex, if members of society will not change their ideals, there is likely to be disorganization.

In the past, marriage was not the complex institution

that it is today. Today one should prepare himself for it quite as much as he prepares for a life of efficiency in the educational or industrial world.

A fertile source of trouble exists in the ignorance of both husband and wife concerning the nature and meaning of marriage. When we stop to consider the question impartially, is it not an amazing fact, in many instances, no instruction on the facts of sex life and sex relations is given to boys and girls, to young men and women, hereafter to be husbands and wives, fathers and mothers of the new generations? A modern writer indignantly protests "that we should leave our children to pick up their information about the most sacred, the most profound and vital of all human functions from the gutter, and learn to know it first from the lips of ignorance and vice, seems almost incredible, and certainly indicates the deeply-rooted unbelief and uncleanness of our own thoughts."¹

Parents fail to talk with their children, and urge them on into the marriage institution unprepared. They plunge the youths into marriage without warning, without preparation, inadequately informed, to sink or swim, and to make port as best they can. No wonder many of them fail to reach the harbor. It is needless to say that when marriage and family institutions are based upon personal, social, economical, and environmental factors, and when one factor plays a big role in that institution and others remain in the background, naturally, these two institutions will not be able to function appropriately.

The grave difficulty is that with the advancement of

¹ Ibid., pp. 468-69.

new civilization the standard of living was raised, consequently, the cost of living increased, which made the people helpless to establish homes at a comparatively early age. Machinery gave them attractive opportunities to earn a living, which caused intense competition, and which forced parents to train their children in other directions than the preparation for the marriage institution. In the dawn of democracy, when every individual thought it was possible to obtain anything desired, the ambition of people was diverted to material ends; each individual felt that his right to comforts and happiness was as great as his neighbors'. Other fields for securing happiness were neglected and the seeds of material ambition were sown in the minds of the people. Therefore, it is not strange that with these mundane ends in view, people find it difficult to marry in their twenties. Sex urge is strong in them at that time and they want its gratification. The postponement of marriage leads them into sex indulgence and, thus, many boys and girls get sex experiences before entering marriage, and sometimes invite illegitimate offspring. While, on the other hand, people take marriage very easily. In selecting their life partners they do not realize the significance of this choice. They find such a wide difference between their ambitions and real life that they become desperate and plunge into marriage.

To summarize this chapter:

Home is the flower of existence, satisfying biologically and humanly, giving peace and satisfaction to body and mind. This is ideal, the "happy ending" at which most romances, novels, plays, and all the day-dreams of youth leave us. Warm, cozy, intense domesticity, where passion is legitimate and love and friendship eternal; where children play around the hearth fire; of which death only is the ending.¹

This ideal is not realized, largely because there is no ideal.

A world in which great wars occur frequently, in which economic conflict is constant, in which sickness and disaster are never absent, where education is occasional, where reason has yet to rule in the larger policies and where folly occupies the high places-- why expect marriage to be more nearly perfect than the life of which it is a part? To be reasonably comfortable and happy in marriage is all we may expect.²

¹ A. Myerson, The Nervous Housewife, p. 129.

² Ibid., p. 129.

CHAPTER IV

INDIAN IDEALS OF MARRIAGE

Marriage for communal life

"A human being is not ordinarily self-sufficing. The God of Aristotle may enjoy his solitary existence, but not the men and women of the world. These are as a rule encouraged to enter the married life."¹ As in civilized societies all distinctive features and institutions attempt to compromise between their principles and men's need, the marriage system is a compromise between the biological purposes of Nature and the sociological motives of man. The marriage institution is perfect when these two purposes flow together in one direction. As society is a highly complex institution of relationships, it is difficult to fix the relations of individuals to each other.

It is a subject of great discussion among the Western people that Hindus do not bother using the word "thanks" for expressing gratitude; but the fact is that the Hindus consider the obligation of the helper greater than that of the recipient. For instance, students are not obligated to their teachers, but teachers are obligated to

¹ S. Radhakrishnan, The Hindu View of Life, p. 83.

the society and the community and they must fulfil their debt by offering their knowledge to the students. It is clear now that the Hindu society is not superficial, as it seems to the Westerners; one must go deep in order to get a correct perspective view of it.¹

The Aryans of India were living in the forest, but, gradually, as agriculture came into existence, they began to live near the rivers and plains, and so not far from other neighbors who were different in culture, which caused conflict in the Hindu society. A society can exist only when its members maintain peace by providing a scheme based on mutual adjustment of rights, and peace is maintained by self-sacrifice, which is cultivated in the individuals by the family. To the Hindus the family institution is not a place for personal enjoyments or comforts, but it is a place where they live communal life, and sacrifice themselves for others. As is natural, the Hindu family-- husband and wife, the husband's parents and their other children--live intimately and happily together, but it is supremely ideal when they allow their relatives and distant kinsmen to live with them, to share their income, and to enjoy rights equally as they do. To the Hindus there is no difference between near and distant relatives; all are

¹ H. A. Keyserling, The Book of Marriage, p. 99.

equal to them as members of their family. In this large home group individual selfishness is overcome, which gives rise to special qualities of heart. Thus, the Hindu home is not a place where only the immediate family can be masters of the whole house. They have to consider the rights of others; this induces them to spend money and time over their relatives, which they never count in terms of self-interest, but of social and spiritual welfare. Therefore, the household being an important element in the social structure, marriage, in Hindu society, is almost compulsory. According to Radhakrishnan, "He who runs back from marriage is in the same boat with one who runs away from battle. Failure in life avoids occasions for virtue."¹

The foregoing discussion shows clearly that the Indian society, having for its object the perfect communal life, is unable to allow people to choose life-mates according to their own will. In other words, the Hindu Shastras do not consider individual taste or inclination as important elements in marriage ideals. Though there is an indication of "Gandharva" marriage in the Hindu Shastras-- a marriage by mutual choice--which takes place between Sakuntala and Dushyanta in a forest hermitage.

Sakuntala's secret union with King Dushyanta. . . is not in harmony with the rest of society. So,

¹ S. Radhakrishnan, The Hindu View of Life, p. 83.

according to the poet, the curse comes upon her. She overlooks, in her self-absorption, the duty of hospitality; for when Nature is busy securing any special purpose, she throws all other purposes in the background. Society thereupon exacts its penalty and, in the King's audience hall, the inevitable thunderbolt of insult and rejection falls upon Sakuntala.¹

Marriage for spiritual advantage

To the Hindus, marriage is sacred, and the very gods are married. The gratification of sex life in marriage is never regarded as an abnormal expression of natural impulses. Marriage is an institution through which one obtains moral and intellectual development, and spiritual advancement. It is meant for the fulfilment of marriage ideals and the continuance of race. The Hindu ideal does not stop here; it advances further and emphasizes that the marriage institution and relation of the individuals are not only for getting happiness in this world, but they provide happiness in the other world also. The marriage institution furnishes an opportunity for the achievement of a higher ideal to which individual inclinations are subordinated. "Sensual love is sublimated into self-forgetful devotion. Marriage for the Hindu is a problem and not a datum."² They have all sorts of opinions, ideals

¹ H. A. Keyserling, The Book of Marriage, p. 109.

² S. Radhakrishnan, The Hindu View of Life, p. 84.

and ambitions, interests and achievements, but the marriage institution has to produce a harmonious life combining these different ends. As the man passes through his puberty period, he becomes matured and seeks the gratification of his sex life. Marriage is the only institution where he can obtain legitimate rights to give normal expression to his natural impulses. He finds a mate and makes her his life companion, but his strife does not end here. "Marriage is not the end of the struggle, it is but the beginning of a strenuous life where we attempt to realize a larger ideal by subordinating our private interests and inclinations."¹ From the forgetfulness of one's self for the sake of the other partner, there ensues a certain kind of satisfaction which gives a unique happiness.

According to the Hindu view, the ethical marriage is one which is monogamous, a marriage of Rama and Sita, Satyavan and Savitri, where the two stand by each other against the whole world. The main principle of monogamous marriage is to provide happiness for the life partners whose chief function is to beget children, who lead the parents into heaven by performing their duties towards the family as well as towards the nation.

¹Ibid., p. 85.

Eugenic point of view

The Hindu sometimes tolerated polygamy when there was no male child, who was considered a protector of race. They believe that only the son who has received the proper training and culture ensures for his parents the Lokas (the fruition of a completely successful social life). Thus, the Hindus have not neglected the importance of eugenics in marriage. According to them, people must choose partners for the sake of the progeny, and should not give way to emotion. Desire for progeny is the only biological, sociological, and spiritual justification for sexual intercourse; cultured children are the real fulfilment of marriage and love-life. The Hindu Shastras give illustrations of the significance of the children in hymns of blessing. "There I bind thee with auspicious bonds, that these twain, O, gracious Indra, may be rich in sons and rich in substance."¹ The priest says to the father of the bride, ". . . So now give thou this bride to her husband, and offspring besides."² On her arrival at her new home the bride is welcomed with these verses:

Here may delight be thine through wealth and progeny.
Give this home thy watchful care. Live with thy

¹ Z. A. Ragozin, Vedic India, p. 371.

² Ibid., p. 371.

husband, and in old age may you still rule your household. Here now remain, nor ever part; enjoy the full measure of your years; with sons and grandsons sporting, be glad in heart within your house.¹

And, again, the husband says, "Children and children's children may Prajapati give us."² Thus, children had a most important place in the family life.

The Hindus knew that as long as children cannot be shaken from heaven, but have to be built within their mothers' wombs, mothers should have some special functions and a high place in the family life. They clearly recognized that the mother, as she was the first, was also the most powerful of educators, and they believed that her influence in the nine months of pregnancy would make or mar the child's welfare in after life. She was considered the best person for training the children. Manu says that the spiritual teacher is ten times greater than an ordinary teacher in the claim to honour and in training the children: the father surpasses a hundred spiritual teachers; but the mother goes beyond a thousand fathers in the right to reverence and in the function of educator.

Describing the qualifications of a woman the Hindu Shastras say:

God took the rotundity of the moon, and the curves

¹ Ibid., p. 372.

² Ibid., p. 372.

of creepers, and the clinging of tendrils, and the trembling of grass, and the slenderness of the reed, and the bloom of flowers, and the lightness of leaves, . . . and the glances of deer, . . . and the joyous gaiety of sunbeams, . . . and the vanity of the peacock, and the softness of the parrot's bosom, . . . and the sweetness of honey, and the cruelty of the tiger, and the warm glow of fire, and the coldness of snow, . . . and the cooing of the Kokila (a bird), . . . and the fidelity of the Chakravaka (a bird), and compounding all these together he made woman and gave her to man.¹

Thus, woman has high status in the Hindu family. According to the Hindus, there is no tie to be compared in strength to that which binds together the mother and her child. A long babyhood creates a bond that nothing can break. The thoughts and feelings of womanhood are never considered ridiculous by the Indian man. Mothers are uneducated, but have enough wisdom; "wisdom lies in love and experience, having little to do with letters."²

Both husband and wife must set their faces towards the welfare of the family. For the woman, supreme love is a duty, but to the man his mother must stand always first. Ideally, the good breeding of the Hindu woman is so perfect that she becomes able to mold her family in a good direction. Even the joint family, where twenty-five to fifty people live together under the same roof, is an ideal arrangement to protect the relatives who are defective

¹ Will Durant, The Story of Civilization, p. 492.

² Margaret E. Nobel, The Web of Indian Life, p. 24.

and so are unable to earn their living. Sick, and mentally or physically defective persons receive more attention from the family on the ground "that the defenceless and unfortunate require a home, not a barrack."¹ Thus, the family life in India is singularly noble. "It is true that Indian men do not rise when a woman enters, and remain standing till she is seated. Nor do they hasten to open the door through which she is about to pass."² But it is not Hindu etiquette to do such things. It does not show that the Hindus have no regard for their wives; their way of expressing it is different.

The English expression "better half" has an equivalent in Sanskrit (ardhangini) which means only "one half of the body." The idea is probably based on Manu I, 32, in which it is said that Brahma, the creator, having divided his own body into two, became male by one half, and female by the other. So divided, a man and a woman only became a perfect person when again joined in wedlock.³

Thus, man and woman are equal and supplementary to each other.

The Sanskrit verse, describing the qualities of man and woman, reads:

. . . She is language, he is thought. She is prudence, he is law. He is reason, she is sense. She is duty, he is right. . . . He is patience, she is

¹ Ibid., p. 38.

² Ibid., p. 45.

³ Lajpat Rai, Unhappy India, p. 174.

peace. He is will, and she is wish. He is pity, she is gift. He is chant, and she is note. She is fuel, he is fire. She is motion, he is wind. He is ocean, she is shore. He is owner, she is wealth. . . . He is lamp, she is light. He is day, and she is night. He is tree, and she is vine. He is music, she is words. He is justice, she is truth. . . . She is body, he is soul.¹

It is clear now that woman is superior in certain respects, while man is in certain others. But both are inseparable and equally important in producing children and attending to their welfare, which are ideals of the Hindu marriage.

Thus,

the Hindus have looked upon marriage as a state of discipline, not intended for gaining individual happiness, but of which the method is the control of desire and the object to bring about the birth of the Slayer of Evil, the super-man who will make possible the achievement of heaven on earth.²

What part love plays in marriage

The Western people, whose marriage system is entirely different from that of the Hindus, jump to the conclusion that the Hindu marriage is loveless. They seem to take it for granted that where there is no regard for individual taste or inclination there can be no love in wedded life. Strictly speaking, these people do not understand the Hindu system of marriage. To believe that there

¹ Ibid., p. 173.

² H. A. Keyserling, The Book of Marriage, p. 111.

is no love without choice is a shallow conjecture. In India a husband transfers a chance partner into a life companion, and enjoys this life with her intellectually as well as spiritually. "Once married is married always" is a motto of the Hindus. They know that we do not choose our parents, children, our own body, language, or nation, and yet we have deep feelings for each of them. As we learn to like our parents, we must learn to like each other. Constancy and fidelity bring love in the Hindu marriage, which is not based only on sex life. The Hindus consider sex life as a gate to love-life, which makes the life deep and worth living. They do not have to build separate nests to love their mates, as the birds and the Westerners do. Love for life mates in the Hindu marriage is not floating on the sea, it is deep-rooted in the soil.

For the purpose of marriage, spontaneous love is unreliable; its proper cultivation should yield the best results . . . and this cultivation should begin before marriage. Therefore, from their earliest years, the husband as an idea is held up before our girls, in verse and story, through ceremonial and worship. When at length they get this husband, he is to them not a person but a principle, like loyalty, patriotism, or such other abstractions which owe their immense strength to the fact that the best part of them is our own creation and, therefore, part of our inner being.¹

And yet, to the Hindus, the perfect household is not an ultimate end. According to the Hindu Shastras, even

¹ Ibid., p. 113.

the home must be given up in due course in the quest of spiritual advancement. In fact, the household is an instrument, only to be set up to make this quest easy. The advancement of soul must find its way easy and clear in the marriage institution. "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world but lose his own soul?" A Sanskrit verse reads, "For the family sacrifice the individual; for the community, the family; for the country, the community; and for the soul, the whole world."¹

According to Tagore, woman has two duties to perform. In one she is the mother and in the other the beloved. As a mother she must not merely add to the number of the population by giving birth to children, but she must produce the best possible children who will have heroic souls and win the fight between the evil and good of their social life and natural circumstances. As the beloved she must fill her husband's life with inspiration and help him to advance spiritually.

In the past, the charm of woman was separated from the greed of man. Today he uses this "joy-giving power of woman" for "his individual enjoyment, corrupting it, confining it, like his property, within jealously guarded

¹ S. Radhakrishnan, The Hindu View of Life, p. 90.

limits."¹ Because man gives such ill treatment to woman, she feels insulted, and does not like to stay within a restricted area. When she finds that she has not a true place in the world, she becomes desperate and tries to follow man, neglecting her inner urge and duty. But she will never gain liberty outside the home. Only home can give her enough liberty and scope for her activity.

Man has already achieved the means of self-expression in public activity without giving up his individual concerns. When, likewise, any society shall be able to offer a larger field for the creative work of woman's special faculty, without detracting from her creative work in the home, then in such society will the true union of man and woman become possible.²

It can be seen from the earliest time till now that marriage is a barrier in such true union, and woman's joy-giving power is shamefully wasted and corrupted, and that is why marriage is a sort of trap for a woman, guarded by man, which renders her unable to contribute spiritual wealth to the society. Unfortunately, the sway of the spirit is unknown to the civilized man today, therefore, marriage brings unhappiness and disgrace to him.

¹ H. A. Keyserling, The Book of Marriage, p. 121.

² Ibid., p. 121.

CHAPTER V

COMPARATIVE DESCRIPTION OF MARRIAGE PATTERNS

In order to get a comparative view of the Indian and Western family patterns, the following comparison may be helpful. It gives a clear idea of some family patterns of India, which differ remarkably from the Western patterns, and may help us to recognize the Indian ideals of marriage in their true perspectives.

The control of reproduction

Indian

Pregnancy before marriage is shameful and often the woman is abandoned by the man, even though she yielded to him in the belief that marriage would follow.

After marriage, pregnancy is desirable and it is quite acceptable.

Western

All sexual intercourse before marriage, or after marriage with persons other than the married partners is considered immoral. Pregnancy before the marriage is shameful; after the marriage it is generally desirable. Deliberate control of fertility is immoral according to some conservative people, though among many people it

Indian

People do not know how to control fertility by the use of contraceptives.

Abortion is common, though it is illegal.

Western

is regarded as a personal affair and a matter of choice.¹

There are some methods by which people can prevent pregnancy, but contraceptives are a recent discovery, and have proved more effective. This means is approved by the educated people--a third to two-thirds of the population. To circulate information about contraceptives is illegal, though not immoral.²

Abortion is common, but is immoral and illegal. The law punishes for this crime with heavy penalties, but it is very difficult to discover and punish the

¹ J. K. Folsom, The Family, p. 6.

² Ibid., p. 6.

Indian

Children of both sexes are usually desired by both parents; often, however, male children are preferred, as male offspring are considered necessary to happiness in the next life.

Western

offenders officially because such crime is usually done secretly.¹

Generally, children of both sexes are desirable, and yet it depends upon the individuals. It seems that there is no emotional preference for either sex.²

The pattern of marital status

Marriage is monogamous, but men who have no children can marry again even though the first wife is living. Some people marry more than one wife when they find it necessary to acquire wealth in order to get power, or

Marriage is monogamous without exception. A married partner cannot marry again unless he or she ceases legally to be a partner; otherwise, the court takes steps under the criminal law and punishes them.³

¹ Ibid., p. 6.

² Ibid., p. 7.

³ Ibid., p. 7.

Indian

because of some political consideration.

People who are married according to the religious ceremony cannot get a divorce under any condition, except in some castes. Divorce through legal procedure is possible under civil marriage on the ground of adultery, and other causes which are the same for both man and woman. Among the lower classes of India the procedure of securing divorce is not controlled by law but by informal group judgment.

Western

"Divorce is permissible only through formal legal procedure, upon specific causes which are practically the same for both man and woman, which must be judicially proved, and which vary from one territorial government to another. Adultery is the most universally accepted ground for divorce." Desertion for a certain number of years, and physical cruelty are valid grounds for divorce, but not in all states. The question of the right to divorce rests upon legal technicalities and not upon any group judgment.¹

¹ Ibid., p. 8.

Indian

Usually no persons remain unmarried unless they are unattractive, or physically or mentally defective, and that is why, naturally, they have lower social status and less economic advantages.

Women gain no economic advantages by the means of marriage, but they gain social status and legal right to produce offspring.

Western

There is little or no difference in social status between married and unmarried people. It is estimated that ten per cent of the population never marry, and they are not condemned by the society. They have many personal reasons to remain unmarried, other than unattractiveness or defectiveness.¹

Generally, women get some economic advantages through marriage. Their primary motive is to satisfy their love with the approval of moral standards, and also to satisfy their desire for having legitimate children.²

¹ Ibid., p. 9.

² Ibid., p. 9.

Indian

Illegitimate children are socially condemned and in a helpless condition, because they have no parents to take care of them and love them, as those who bring them into the world abandon them.

Western

Illegitimate children have attributed to them socially a faulty character, but they have full legal rights, except of inheritance. The chief fault is attributed to the unmarried mother because she has crossed the socially important line of sex life. If it is possible to find the father, he is forced to support the mother and child.¹

Marital selection and the social structure

Marriage between two persons who have difference of degree in rank is usually disapproved, though legally not prohibited. Also marriages between different religions and castes are not socially

Marriage of persons of different ranks in the society is generally disapproved by the high-ranking family and the public from a practical viewpoint. The church authorities and some families

¹ Ibid., p. 10.

Indian

approved.

Marriage with any relative who is closer than fourth degree (first cousin) on the father's side, and seventh degree on the mother's side, is immoral (not in Mohammedanism).

The young are betrothed long before they have any power to choose their life companions, with the exception of a few children of the educated class, which is increasing its circle.

Western

do not approve the marriages which take place between those of different religions.¹

Marriage with any relative nearer than the fourth degree (first cousin) is not legal and valid. Marriage with first cousin is not even allowed in some laws.²

All young people have full freedom to choose their marriage partners. Families can approve and disapprove marriages. They have power to cut off social contacts and inheritance, but this is not usually done, even when there is disapproval. The

¹ Ibid., p. 10.

² Ibid., p. 10.

Indian

Marriage very seldom takes place by elopement.

There are no match-making agencies, but a family has some friends or relatives who, with certain motives, introduce one family to the other, and so the children of these families get acquainted with each other.

There is no entrance exam-

Western

family cannot prevent a marriage which is the choice of its both partners. Nevertheless, there is some influence of family on marriage on the side of the girl.¹

Occasionally, marriage takes place by elopement in order to avoid the interference of families.

There are no match-makers, but some people use newspaper advertisements.²

There is no test for marriage

¹ Ibid., p. 12.

² Ibid., p. 12.

Indian

ination which young people must pass before entering the threshold of the marriage institution.

Marriage is early, with the exception of a few educated families. "According to a very recent report nearly half the girls of India are married before 15."²

Defective persons generally cannot get married.

Western

fitness which young people must pass. However, the bridegroom is supposed to be an able man who can support his family.¹

"There are legal age limitations upon marriage, most typically 21 for men and 18 for girls without parental consent, and 18 for boys and 16 for girls with parental consent."³

In some states laws forbid the marriages of persons who are defective and diseased.⁴

¹ Ibid., p. 13.

² Ibid., p. 168.

³ Ibid., p. 13.

⁴ Ibid., p. 13.

IndianWesternSegregation pattern

The young man usually takes his wife with him to his paternal home town and they live with his family, under one roof. Sometimes, other relatives also live with them.

Boys and girls live together with their family, unless the occupations of boys and the marriages of girls keep them separate from their family.

As far as living and sleeping arrangements are concerned there is no classification

The new home of the newly married couple depends upon the husband's occupation. Generally, they do not live with their parents. They build their own nest where the husband and wife and their children--until they become mature--live together. Other relatives may come to live with them but usually for a short time as it is not considered desirable.¹

Both boys and girls remain in the family until they find occupations or get married.

After puberty, boys and girls sleep in separate rooms, except the married couples.

¹ Ibid., p. 16.

Indian

of the sexes. Both sleep in one large room. Contrary to the idea held by some Westerners, it is not shameful for a boy and girl to eat with each other outside the home. After marriage, there is no segregation unless it is necessary for certain work.

Small boys and girls play together or separately according to their wish, while adolescent boys and girls are found in two separate groups in public activities and functions, and during the day time. Not only that, there are certain ceremonies which are performed by only one

Western

It is not considered shameful or immoral for a boy and girl to eat together outside the home.¹

We see segregation between boys and girls aged 8 to 15. Boys and girls are together on public occasions and there are no ceremonies which are exclusively for one sex.

¹ Ibid., p. 17.

Indian

sex, and there are some fields in which both sexes may not work together.

Cooking, housekeeping, and child-rearing are supposed to be done exclusively by women, but sometimes both sexes work together; while men's fields, such as war, hunting, trade, business, are exclusively for them.

Western

Cooking, sewing, laundry, and the care of the children are exclusively women's occupations; while actual fighting in war, mining, lumbering, the metal industries, preaching and the law are fields only for men, though legally all occupations are open for both sexes. Usually women are restricted from entering highly masculine fields on the ground of chivalric attitude and for the protection of them from danger or hardship. The restriction is also made by male jealousy. Males' entry into highly feminine occupations is not restricted by the

Indian

The work of men is heavier and monotonous.

Women were excluded from political fields, but very recently there are quite a few women in political fields.

Nobody has the right to kill anyone under any circumstances, except in war, legal executions, and in certain

Western

women, but, somehow, it is regarded as shameful by both sexes.¹

The work of men is definitely heavier than that of women. Probably both sexes have to work equal hours.²

The political field was not open to women, but lately they have been admitted to it, and they are in charge of some high offices in government, though, comparatively, their number is small.³

One cannot kill anybody in any situation, unless one is forced to kill in war, or legal executions, or for

¹ Ibid., p. 18.

² Ibid., p. 18.

³ Ibid., p. 19.

Indian

self-defense situations.

Father and mother both take care of children. Especially the father takes care of many intimate duties, such as education, marriage, job. A young child is usually taken care of by its parents, but, sometimes, by relatives, older brothers or sisters, or servants.

Children are supposed to obey their parents and are trained that way.

Parents and children both have great affection for each other. Parents are dependent upon their children in old

Western

self-defense.¹

Usually the mother takes care of children at all ages. Sometimes, boys get special attention from the father. Relatives, older brothers and sisters, and the father take care of the young child, but their part is secondary to that of the mother. In some classes young children are taken care of by some special servants or institutions.

Children are trained and disciplined to obey their parents.

Both have affection for each other--usually parents want to fulfil their dreams through their children.

¹ Ibid., p. 20.

Indian

age, or to put this differently, children are their insurance in old age; this is why they love them so sincerely. All kinds and degrees of love are possible between parents and children. There is one group of people where the mother loves her sons, and the father his daughters, but it does not mean that the mother does not love her daughters; there is little difference between her attitude to each; while, sometimes, the father loves his sons more than his daughters, and in some families both love their boys and girls equally. There is no compulsory

Western

The mother's affection for her children is usually greater than the father's. There is strong affection between mother and son and between father and daughter. The boy is obedient to his father, but often he shows hatred, revolt, and jealousy toward him. He is tender toward his mother. Girls have small affection for their parents.¹

"All children from 7 to 14,

¹ Ibid., p. 21.

Indian

education. Ten per cent of the entire population get formal education. Other people learn customs, discipline and practical knowledge from their parents, relatives, and friends, and usually by observation.

Boys and girls cannot dance by couples. Usually they dance in separate groups.

Western

and some of those from 4 to 7, and from 14 to 25, are educated by a specialist class of adults in special buildings during the greater part of the day. About 24 per cent of the total population are young persons attending school."¹

Dancing is only by couples. It provides a certain kind of stimuli and gives slight physical satisfaction. It is a good excuse to put an arm around each other, which is otherwise not allowed, even in private, except for engaged and married couples. It also serves the social purpose of bringing boys and girls together to choose

¹ Ibid., p. 22.

Indian

It is considered very shameful for a man and wife to show love and affection for each other in public. The man may not hold his wife's arm while walking with her on the public roads, though it is not immoral.

Western

their life's partners.¹

Showing affectionate behavior in public by a married couple is not considered shameful, but it is rather superfluous.²

¹ Ibid., p. 28.

² Ibid., p. 29.

CHAPTER VI

AN ACCULTURATION IN MARRIAGE INSTITUTIONS IN INDIA

The following instances from the Hindu Shastras will give a real perspective view of marriage ideals among the Hindu people in the past. Later on the invaders from other countries came into India and they affected Indian culture by their contact.

There was absolutely no existence of child marriage in the days of Mahabharat. It is proved by the description of Droupadi, who was a princess and who rejected Karna as her husband in her Svayamvar (choice marriage), that she must have been no longer a young girl at the time of her marriage. When Arjun, a warrior, kidnapped Subhadra, she was not a child. The love affairs of two princesses, Damayanti and Savitri, show that they were matured girls and not children. There was no child marriage in this period. Boys spent twelve, twenty-four, or thirty-six years in the study of the Vedas, and it is written in the Hindu Shastras that the students must remain unmarried until they finished their studies. They used to begin these studies at the age of eight years, so, naturally, they could not get married until after they were at least twenty years of age.

Thus, a "Svayamvar" system is observed in this

period. We find many instances in which girls choose their husbands. Drovpati, Damayanti, and Sita married by this system. Savitri choose Satyavan as her husband against the wish of her parents. It is true that there is no direct method of ascertaining at what age they used to marry, but it is certain that this "Svayamvar" system cannot exist with the child marriage system.

The foregoing analysis shows that in the past history of Hindu marriage system, girls had liberty to choose their husbands. The Hindus of the real Hindu India married not as children, but as adults. It seems safe to say that child marriage was not common in India before the Muslim invasion. In the early Vedic times, women apparently enjoyed an equal status with men. There was no seclusion in zenana (veil), no sati (widow sacrifice), and no prohibition of the remarriage of widows. Women of culture composed hymns and performed sacrifices as men did. Some even remained unmarried and had their share of the paternal property. In one poem of old scripture, the Bhagvan Manu prescribed a positive punishment for parents who kept from school their boys after five years of age and girls after ten. Girls had a share in whatever education was available.

But with the Muslim conquest came the "parda" (veil) system for the protection of women. In order to protect their girls from kidnapping by Muslims, the Hindus pre-

ferred to marry them at an early age to suitable husbands, before the girls would be able to make a choice of their own. Thus, the women lost their position of the past. Society closed all the avenues for girls to acquire education and to mix with other people in order to find their life-mates. There is no denying the fact that the foreigners were administering India for their own benefit and not for India's. "Subjection to foreign yoke is one of the most potent causes of the decay of nations."¹ Political subjection is a fruitful source of social evils and degradation.

The Indian girls became the victims of their environment. In a country where the social and political position of men was, on the whole, that of slaves, the position of women could not be any better. That same position of men and women is still persisting at the present time. "The present position of women as compared with that of the Western women is as bad as that of the Indian men as compared with Western men."² The number of educated women is very small. Only ten per cent of Indian people get education, of which one per cent is women.

As the girls mature they get married. They have no voice in choosing their life partners. As wives they have

¹ Lajpat Rai, Unhappy India, p. xiii.

² Ibid., p. 175.

to stay with their husbands in their husbands' families. They have no voice in their household affairs. The older man or woman in the house sets the regulations for the family and they have to obey them. They are treated as machines in the household work. Even in the care and education of their children their opinion is not counted. They have to stay in the home for the greater part of their lives, which makes it impossible for them to enjoy any life outside the home. The cooperation which exists between Western men and women in public affairs is practically unknown in India. Public matters in India are almost entirely in the hands of men and the reason for this is not far to seek; the useful organizations for human welfare, in which women cooperate with men in the West, hardly exist in India, and where they do technically exist their influence is scarcely felt. Because of lack of opportunity and knowledge, women cannot take interest in the political and social activities. Their field of social life is very narrow. No wonder they revolt against this situation after having some education and knowledge of their rights and individuality: constant contact with Westerners and their literature gives them an idea of other women's freedom in married and family life.

When the Westerners first came to India they wanted to exploit her as much as they could, and later on they

decided to make their stay in India firm and permanent. In order to reach the great mass of the Indian people they began to learn Hindu languages, and they taught their language to the Hindus. With the transmission of language they began to transmit their ideas and culture. Thus, the Hindu ideas were affected by the contact of the Western people.

The Hindus began to learn English and they translated many English books into their mother tongue; these were welcomed by the many educated natives. They began to read the history of the last century, and of the Western women's suffragette movement, and to see in the movies Western women having much more freedom in their married life than Indian women, which upset the Hindu society and its ideals. This change is seen in their present literature. The literature of any age reflects the ideas of the people of that time. It is easy to understand from reading books, where the authors want to lead the people and society, and it can be known by the acceptance of those books whether the people want to follow the ideals contained therein.

The following instances from books on social philosophy, novels, dramas, and magazine stories, are well known and looked upon with favor by the Hindu people today. These books have been appreciated by the great majority of

the educated people, and their authors have received high honours. These books are the real witness of the Hindu society of today and they show perfectly an acculturation in marriage institutions in India at present.

Love marriage

The attention of the people to the failure of marriage was drawn by Goverdhanram Trepahi in the first part of his novel, "Sarasvatichandra," published in 1887. The people already were dissatisfied with the prevailing marriage customs, but lacked the courage to express their sincere opinion: they felt that this book was a reflection of their own ideas and welcomed it as a criticism of the existing customs, folkways, and mores.

The two principal characters in Trepahi's book are Sarasvatichandra and Kumud, whose betrothal had been arranged by their parents. In this instance, happily the young people were deeply in love with each other. Sarasvatichandra's step-mother resented the idea of his coming happiness and taunted him cruelly about the girl. Driven into an emotional frenzy, he disappeared from home and entirely out of the life of Kumud. Her parents, now, as was the Hindu custom, began to look about for another suitor; the girl was becoming mature and they wished to have her marriage arranged without delay. A very influential

family, who were their neighbors and friends, had a son. He seemed to them entirely desirable as a future son-in-law, although this boy, Pramaddhan, certainly seemed to lack qualities that should be expected in the son of this family; but no obstacle was permitted to interfere with their determination to marry off their daughter promptly. After marriage, Kumud found that she was wedded to a man mentally defective and to a person of her education and culture there was no possibility of any happiness in this union; besides, she was still in love with Sarasvatichandra. The author describes graphically her pathetic situation and stirs the feelings of his readers into protest against this custom of hurrying a daughter into marriage at her maturity.

By the introduction of two other characters, Trepathi points out another obstacle to married happiness; the mating of a very young girl with a man many years older. There can be no unity of interests or ideas when the difference in age is so great. He emphasizes the evil resulting from such a union--an evil well-known to the people, but one against which they hesitated to rebel openly.

Kusum, another character in "Sarasvatichandra," is portrayed in strong contrast to the expected type of Indian woman. She is the sister of Kumud, and so unusually able to make her own decisions that she has determined to remain single. Married life does not appeal to her and, regardless

of the fact that all Indian women are expected to marry, she intends to disregard any such obligation to society. Though a woman's right to make and adhere to any such decision was practically unknown, this Western idea immediately appealed to the people, and a gradual acculturation of Western thought in India became apparent. That the process would be slow was indicated, as--in the book-- after some years elapse Kusum marries. It seems that the author did not quite dare to leave her in a category so entirely outside the usual one.

Abolition of child marriage

Ranchhodbhai in his tragedy, "Lalita," written in 1866, shows his heroine, Lalita, a victim of the child marriage system. Married as a small girl to the illiterate and mentally perverted Nandankumar, her life was one of unmitigated misery. As customary, she went to live with her husband in his parents' home, but after a time she found it utterly impossible to continue living with him. She left his home and lived alone, and as it is most unusual for a woman in India to live by herself, she was subjected to many hardships and to much mental suffering, which resulted in her death.

A girl compelled to marry at a very early age has little chance of a normal happy life. She has been robbed

of her childhood, and unless she is able to accept whatever situation she finds herself in, life will be only a term of mental and physical suffering. Child marriage is an evil which has not been eliminated.

Nanalal Kavi, a poet and dramatist of the present day, makes a greater advance in advocating Western ideas than the earlier men. Most of the women he portrays are not willing to accept a mate of their parents' choice, and insist upon choosing for themselves and marrying for love. In his drama, "Indukumar," his heroine, Kantikumari, being questioned by her sister-in-law regarding her wish for marriage, replies that she feels that everyone should marry, as marriage is an essential factor in life, a step toward spiritualism, and a preparation for heaven hereafter: her opinion that "whoever remains unmarried withers" is an essentially Indian philosophy. Asked why, if these are her feelings, she has refused to marry the man chosen for her by her parents--one known to be quite worthy of her--she answered that when her heart would know a man, only that man would be her husband; otherwise, he would always be a stranger.

In the earlier stories cited above, the girls, though often dissatisfied and rebellious, were, without exception, obedient to the wishes of their parents. Kavi's heroine

shows a new spirit: her determination to choose her husband and to marry for love, is an idea that will quickly spread when Indian womanhood begins to realize its rights.

New ideals for life without marriage

In his second well known book, "Jaya and Jayant," Kavi goes farther in following Western ideas. His point is to show that marriage is not essential in life; that it is the right of either man or woman to remain unmarried if that mode of life appeals. Jaya, the daughter of a king, a woman of ideals, decides to remain single in order to carry out the greatest of her ideals, the establishment of a monastery for women. Jayant, a warrior in her father's household, is in love with Jaya, and her father looks with favor on this suitor. Her mother, whose ambitions for her daughter are far above a mere warrior, already plans to marry her to Kashiraj, the greatest king in all the country. Her mother knows that Jaya has decided not to marry; even Jayant, whom she loves, has not been able to change her decision. Without consulting her daughter, and entirely disregarding her known wishes, the mother arranges for the marriage with Kashiraj and invites him to the palace for the ceremony. Jaya learns of the arrangement only on the day of Kashiraj's arrival; she rejects the promised husband and disappears into the mountains. The king, her father,

sends out messengers to find his daughter; after a long search Jaya was found and brought to her home. She had been through many hardships, and when her mother saw the result of her efforts to rule her daughter's life, she realizes that many mothers, like herself, try to marry their daughters not to a worthy husband but to a throne. Jaya's father sorrowfully and wisely pointed out the fact that parents create difficulties in the lives of their children, with the result that both parents and children are unhappy.

Widow remarriage

Another writer, Ramanbhai, in his drama, "Raino Purvat," stresses the failure of marriage between youth and old age, but another point equally stressed shows further acculturation of Western ideas; that is, the necessity of permitting widows to remarry. Vinavati, a child widow who is unaware that she was ever married, falls in love with the prince, Jagadip. He also loves her, but does not know she is a widow. This knowledge came to him when he was threatened with the loss of his throne if he married Vinavati. Neither the knowledge of her widowhood, nor the loss of his princely rights alters his determination to marry her. The girl has a stepmother, who is also a widow, but who urges her to marry: as a widow bound by the old custom she knew its disadvantages and wanted her stepdaughter

to free herself from such unjust restrictions.

Sumati, a woman writer, died when she was twenty-one, but had already become well-known in the literary world. Her best female character, Madhuri, in the novel of the same name, takes an oath to marry only a man who is a great religious leader. She meets Madhukar and they fall in love, but she refuses to marry him as he does not fulfil the conditions of her oath. Madhukar, nothing daunted, determines that he will qualify for the position he desires; he becomes a religious leader and wins Madhuri.

It is to be remarked that this dedication of one's life to some ideal, such as the spiritual uplifting of mankind, is advocated by a woman of twenty. Youth is, indeed, thinking for itself.

Kanaiyalal Munshi, the most popular living historical novelist, always portrays his Indian women as rebelling against the old ideas. In his novel, "Patanani Prabhuta," Prasanna is in love with Tribhuvanpal. Her aunt, for diplomatic reasons, wants her to marry the king of Malva, but Prasanna refuses and marries the man of her choice, Tribhuvanpal.

Intercaste marriage

Rangitram Vavabhai, author of the short story, "Amad and Rupande," shows that the question of caste is

disregarded by young people who object to accepting partners chosen for them. Rupande's guardians want to marry her to a Rajput, that is a member of the warrior caste; but she refuses and marries Amad, a Mohammedan, who was a friend of her childhood and for whom she had long felt an attachment.

"My Marriage," a short story in autobiographical form by Pranalal Deshai, gives a picture of the consequences that may follow a child marriage arranged by parents. A young boy, still at school, is married to an illiterate girl. Several children are born, and the wife, ignorant and untrained, is unable to bear children and keep her health; she loses her physical attraction, and the husband, distracted from his studies, falls in love with a Christian and thinks of leaving his wife for this more desirable woman.

Other modern authors have illustrated the evils of marriage by purchase and by exchange. In the first of these, marriage by purchase, the parents offer their child, boy or girl, to the highest bidder. In the second, marriage by exchange, the parents offer a son or daughter to other parents who are also trying to arrange marriage for a child. Such marriages are not as common as formerly, and the emphasizing of the injustice done by such arrangements is helping to abolish the practice.

The short story, "Fire," tells of Rupa, who works

in her father's field, and of her love for the illegitimate Rudo, a farm worker on her father's land. The father refuses to permit the marriage and dismisses Rudo. The couple refuse to recognize any obstacle to their marriage and decide to run away. Rupa, to revenge herself against her father, sets fire to her home and then elopes with the man of her choice.

In this chapter it has been made apparent that new and revolutionary ideas are being constantly presented to the people by present-day writers. The question of marriage is, undoubtedly, the principal theme of the many novels and stories that engage the interest of the reading public. The writers advocate marriage at maturity, without parental interference, and marriage for love: they condemn all child marriages, which include marriage by purchase and marriage by exchange. The authors cited above are only a few of the many who have voiced their opinion under cover of a novel or story. The whole stream of literature shows an acculturation of Western marriage ideas which are gradually taking the place of the old ideas that led to so much misery.

CONCLUSION

As seen in the foregoing chapters of the thesis, today in the Western countries, as well as in India, the people are disturbed concerning marriage ideals, and about securing equal status and achieving economic independence. In this uncertainty, men and women neglect their duties, and, to the many well-wishers of society, the strain and stress of our time and the seeming ruthless disregard for the old ideals of marriage, seem to be true symptoms of national decay. Many see only a disappointing future, and have no hope of re-educating youth and making them understand that unless they change their course they are headed for disaster. Nevertheless, as long as man is aware of his ignorance, there is a possibility of leading him from ignorance to knowledge. The following comparison between a man and an animal, which shows where man differs from the animal, makes us confident that we will sometime see a bright future.

Biologists have compared a man to an animal in birth, growth, and death. They have also considered the nervous system, which plays an important role in physical and mental growth of both man and animal. But, somehow or other, students have failed to acknowledge a fact which is more subtle than the physical comparison of man and animal:

this fact is that man possesses a certain kind of ability arising from the power to think discriminatively of good and bad, moral and immoral things, and this particular ability is not possessed by animals. Animals respond to sexual excitement when they become excited; they give evidence of anger when they are crossed; they experience hunger and thirst when they are deprived of food and water. In this respect, there is not much difference between men and animals.

Nevertheless, this is especially characteristic of man: he is not only aware of his knowledge, but he apprehends, also, that he is ignorant. In other words, he is not only a witness of his knowledge, but he is a witness of his ignorance also. An animal gives evidence of an awareness of physical needs, but it is not aware of what it does not know. For instance, it sees water, knows it is water and drinks it, but it does not know what chemical constituents it has; not only that, but the animal is not aware of its ignorance. Man, on the contrary, may become conscious of his ignorance. The more he knows, the more he becomes conscious of his lack of knowledge. When an animal becomes sexually excited, it knows that and gets satisfaction for its excitement. But it has no idea what kind of normal mental condition it has when it is not excited. Here, man differs from the animal. He has very

distinct ideas about his normal condition of mind and body. By his discriminative power he knows the advantages and disadvantages of any given condition. This is considered an evolution of mind through which man progresses from ignorance to knowledge. Due to this power of progression it is possible to hope that the marriage trend under the current system will be diverted to one more desirable for society.

Men and women are different in physical endowments, and that is why their duties to the family and society must be different. Both are perfect in their own ways, but neither is able to produce children without the help of the other. A man and a woman are like the two pillars of a temple; when these two pillars are of equal height and standing on level ground they bear the burden of the whole temple. The collective powers of man and woman bring good results in bearing and rearing children. In marriage, woman must have equal status with her husband, not equal in man's field, but equal in her own field. From the very beginning, man has been physically the stronger and woman has usually been in his power. As a result he destroyed the maternal institutions and established paternal ones. He began to think of himself as superior and thought of woman as inferior: he gave much importance to his work and duties, and he minimized the importance of woman's duties.

Thus, man began to suffer from a superiority complex.

Man created an unfortunate condition in society when he was admitted to be superior to woman, and it reached its height when woman accepted the decree that she is inferior to man, and she began to suffer from an inferiority complex. Today she tries to get equality by competing with man in his field. Neglecting her duties, she attempts to obtain rights; she finds herself dependent upon man and economic dependency is unbearable to her. Thus, to get freedom she enters into man's field. She does not respect her own individuality and uniqueness, but pays an unconscious tribute to man by trying to imitate him. Because man and woman are biologically different, their duties, too, are naturally different. As long as children must grow within the mother's body, a mother has a specific function and place in the family; she must not compete with man in the hope of getting freedom and diminishing inferiority. This is not the correct way to achieve freedom and establish her status in the eyes of man. She must realize her superior position in bearing and rearing children, and perform her duties in the best possible way. Both man and woman have claim to superiority when respective duties are perfectly performed.

India is in the process of acculturation in marriage institutions. It is very likely that she will imitate her

Western sisters, but will not necessarily have to do all that the Westerners did in order to achieve marriage happiness: the Hindus can omit some of these experiments and divert their marriage trend into directions according to their needs, to the benefit of individuals as well as of the society. It is true, that the very basis of the Indian marriage system having been undermined, there is no longer harmony of adjustment between the underlying ideals and the facts of modern marriages. One section of the Hindu people earnestly wish for a return of the "Satya-Yuga" (Golden Age), but it seems that the Golden Age refuses to respond to their call. The time has come for the Hindu people to think out their problems from the very beginning, and to correlate their ideals and conclusions, so that the individuals and the society will accept and follow them.

DIGEST

This thesis discusses the problem of marriage in Western countries as well as in India, and shows that, under Western influence, an acculturation in marriage institutions has been taking place in India over a period of years and continues to develop. An attempt has been made by the author to point out the fact that marriage, as a social institution, is as important in the lives of parents as in the lives of their children. In the marriage union, men and women are given legal right to get satisfaction for their sex desires; they achieve happiness by loving each other; and, as the fulfilment of their love, they beget children.

Home is the best place for children to grow physically, mentally, and spiritually, under the care of parents. But, unfortunately, men began to think themselves superior to women, and forced this idea on them. As long as the women did not take it for granted that they were inferior to men, society interfered little with established marriage institutions. But, after some time, women began to doubt their power and superior place in rearing children; and they accepted the opinion that they are inferior to men. They, then, began to feel that economic dependence made them inferior in the eyes of men.

Gradually, society introduced machinery, which opened many avenues of work to both men and women. Men engaged themselves in factories instead of working at home. Women who were poor found an opportunity to earn money and support their families. Women who wanted to show their ability in men's fields accepted the jobs which machinery made available. Thus, women began to get economic independence. They left their homes and children. Men began to stay in the factory the greater part of the time and so lost, to some extent, their central position in the family. Some women changed their marriage ideals; they found children a hindrance. Disorganization in the marriage institutions was the consequence.

The Hindus have experienced similar changes of opinions, resulting in similar disorganization. Machinery has not been widely introduced and has not yet offered opportunities to women. The Hindu women, disturbed by the treatment they received from their men, wanted an opportunity to show their ability to men. The contact with the Western people served the purpose of the Hindu women. The Westerners introduced their culture through books and movies. The Hindu women revolted against their past and, now, they follow their Western sisters: as a result, they have maladjustment in marriage institutions. Now is the time for the Hindus to think seriously about their marriage

ideals and to adjust them according to the need of society and of individuals.

The solution of the problem of marriage in Western countries, as well as in India, is the realization by women of their high position in bearing and rearing children. Instead of competing with men in their fields, women should show their ability in their own sphere and, thereby, convince men of woman's superiority. Men and women are different in their physical endowments, and the work of each should be different. Men and women are complementary to each other, and they will remain so if neither asserts superiority.

The first part of the paper discusses the general theory of the...
 and the second part discusses the experimental results...
 The results show that the...
 The...
 The...
 The...
 The...

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

1. ...
 2. ...
 3. ...
 4. ...
 5. ...
 6. ...
 7. ...
 8. ...
 9. ...
 10. ...

BOOKS

- Bosanquet, Helen, The Family. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923.
- Durant, Will, The Story of Civilization. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1935.
- Folsom, Joseph K., The Family. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1934.
- Gillin, John L., Social Problems. New York: The Century Co., 1932.
- Goodsell, Willystine, A History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1915.
- Groves, Ernest R., Marriage. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933.
- _____, The Marriage Crisis. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928.
- _____, Wholesome Marriage. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927.
- Groves, Ernest R., and William F. Ogburn, American Marriage and Family Relationships. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1928.
- Keyserling, Hermann A., The Book of Marriage. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1928.
- Mowrer, Ernest R., The Family. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1932.
- Myerson, Abraham, The Nervous Housewife. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1920.
- Newitt, Hilary, Women Must Choose. London: Victor Gollancz, Ltd., 1937.
- Nobel, Margaret E., The Web of Indian Life. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1904.

Popenoe, Paul B., Modern Marriage. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Radhakrishnan, S., The Hindu View of Life. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.

Ragozin, Z. A., Vedic India. London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1895.

Rai, Lajpat, Unhappy India. Calcutta: Banna Publishing Co., 1928.

Reed, Ruth, The Modern Family. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1929.

Reuter, Edward B., and Jessie R. Runner, The Family. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc., 1931.

Sumner, William G., and Albert G. Keller, The Science of Society. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927.

Westermarck, Edward A., The Future of Marriage. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936.

GUJARATI BOOKS

Maheta, Sarojini, The Marriage System and Family Institutions of Gujarat. Ahmedabad: The Vernacular Society, 1934.

Patel, Narsinhbhai, Marriage as a Trap. Anand: Deshbandhu Printing Press, 1937.