

TOKOLOGY

A Book for Every Woman

BY

ALICE B. STOCKHAM, M. D.

ILLUSTRATED

Maternal love! Thou word that sums all bliss;
Gives and receives all bliss, fullest when most
Thou givest! —Pollock

REVISED EDITION

R. F. FENNO & COMPANY
18 EAST 17TH ST., NEW YORK

CHAPTER XI.

CHASTITY IN THE MARRIAGE RELATION.

“ So dear to heaven is saintly chastity,
That when a soul is found sincerely so,
A thousand liveried angels lackey her.”

—MILTON.

Many years ago during a visit to my cousin, a young married woman called with her four months old baby—a thin-necked, bloodless, blue looking child. After she left, cousin observed, “Is it not a shame that young people have so little knowledge? That poor child is suffering because the parents too frequently practice the privileges accorded in the marriage relation. The milk is deprived of its vitalizing and nutritious elements.” So little of such matters had come to my knowledge that all she meant was not comprehended. From what my instincts had taught me, and what had been seen in animal life, I had no thought that this relation ever was frequent, especially during child-bearing.

To this day the picture of that wan, pale baby is impressed upon my memory, its very emaciation making an eloquent plea for the rights of children. Soon after this, I heard H. C. Wright’s lecture upon “Marriage; its Duties and Responsibilities.” He urged men and women to transmit the best of themselves to their children, and to be certain that off-

spring were not deprived of vitality and strength by lustful indulgence. For the sake of the improvement and progress of posterity, the life of married people must be temperate. After this I read his "Marriage and Parentage," and "Unwelcome Child," with increased interest in this subject.

At that time the need of such lectures and books was not understood. In long years since, the agonizing cries of heart-broken, suffering women, the terrible death rate of little children have proven that in the marriage relation there is such a perversion of nature, such grievous wrongs committed that one needs a pen of fire to express the living, burning thoughts, and carry the conviction of truth into the very lives of men and women. Unless by some divine miracle, the eloquence of a thousand inspired pens cannot stay the floodtide of wrong and injustice now done to women and children under the cover of the marriage law.

Among animals, except in rare instance under domestication, the female admits the male in sexual embrace, only for procreation. Among some savage tribes this same rule has few exceptions. Is it not true that civilized people, boasting of their moral and religious codes, hold, teach and practice that sexual union shall occur in season and out of season, averring this to be the fulfillment of nature's law?

Briefly consider different views upon this subject.

First. Those who hold that sexual intercourse is a "physical necessity" to man but not to woman.

Second. Those who believe the act is a *love relation*, mutually demanded and enjoyed by both sexes, and serving other purposes besides that of procreation.

Third. Those who claim the relation should never be entered into save for procreation.

Physicians and physiologists teach, and most men and women believe:

That sexual union is a *necessity* to man, while it is not to woman.

That there is implanted in his being demands that cannot be restrained without injury to health.

That restraint is followed by absorption of the elements of generation, producing effects not unlike the absorption of a virulent foreign element.

That woman naturally has not so much passion as man, has not so much secretion, also has an outlet in menstruation, consequently has not the same demands nor the same injury if not gratified.

Are these claims based upon truth? What are the facts from which to infer what men and women *naturally* are?

When woman *only* is taught that virtue is the brightest jewel in her crown, when the popular verdict is that womanliness and modesty are synonyms for repression, when she lives in fear of maternity, and believes restraint on her part prevents vitality of life germs, when, too, erroneous habits pervert every function, how can we tell what is natural for her?

Then, on the other hand, when man is taught that virtue is *not* synonymous with manliness, when the passions are stimulated by unnatural habits of living, by impure conversation, thoughts, books and practices, can we say this strength of passion is purely natural and healthy?

A. E. Newton says: "They who have never carefully noted the effects of alcoholic stimulants, of

coffee, oysters, eggs, spices and animal food, as well as they who find pleasure in filthy conversations, can not surely, with any justness, charge *nature* with the exuberance of their amatory desires."

We teach the girl *repression*, the boy *expression*, not simply by word and book, but the lessons are graven into their very being by all the traditions, prejudices and customs of society.

What are some of the results of this theory?

Notably, in the first place, we have what is called the "social evil." Women, licensed by men, make a business of prostitution, selling their bodies that this demand—this *necessity*—of the male shall be supplied. In visiting these women, men simply yield to this supposed necessity of their nature; consequently commit no violation of law.

Women not having the same demands, by entering this life, or even permitting the act once, violate the laws of their being; according to the social codes, perpetrate the greatest crime in the calendar! They become outcasts. If they fill their lives with noble and philanthropic deeds, this one sin is so foul and rank, is such an offense, they have little hope of remission, even from a just and all-loving God.

Can the fact that men are upheld, their crime even condoned, while women, as partners in this terrible evil, are not only ostracised, but irretrievably lost, be explained in any other way?

Witness the effect of this same theory in the marriage relation! The man who has been accustomed to gratify his passions promiscuously, seeks and marries a lovely, virtuous girl. She is not supposed to have needs in this direction. Neither has she

learned that her body is her own and her soul is her Maker's. She gives up all *ownership* of herself to her husband, and what is the difference between her life and the life of the public woman? She is sold to one man, and is not half so well paid. Is it too strong language to say she is the one *prostitute* taking the place, for the man, of many, and not like her, having choice of time or conditions? In consequence she not only suffers physically, but feels disgraced and outraged to the depths of her soul.

She is liable to a chance maternity and the *unwelcome* child is deprived of physical vigor, and may be endowed with lustful passions and morbid appetites, if he does not indeed curse his own existence.

At the close of one of my health *conversations* after speaking upon this subject, a lady tremblingly, but touchingly, gave her experience. She said: "Ladies, when I was married two years I was the mother of a puny, sickly baby; it had required incessant care and watching to keep it alive. When it was only seven months old, to my surprise, astonishment and horror, I felt *quickenings*, and for the first time, I knew I was pregnant again. I was abased, humiliated. The sense of degradation that filled my soul, cannot be described. What had been done? The babe that was born and the babe that was unborn were robbed of their just inheritance. Remorsefully and tearfully I told my mother. She says: 'Why child, you should not grieve; don't you know your children are legitimate?' My whole being arose in protest; I stamped my foot and almost screamed; 'Although my husband is the father of my children, they are not legitimate. No man-made laws, nor priestly rites can ever make an

act legitimate that deprives innocent children of their right to life and health.' With sobs and moans, reaction came and I fainted in her arms. What was the sequel? Two years later both of these children after a brief existence lay in the 'city of the dead,' and until my husband and I learned *the law* we could not have children to live."

Parties holding the *second theory* claim:

That coition is a love act.

That it should never occur except when there is mutual participation on the part of both man and woman, and should be governed and guarded so as to control the creative power.

Thus this act is the emblem of love; by it there is a mutual exchange of subtle elements which gives health and vigor, and more firmly cements the union.

That if the lives of married people accorded to this theory, the demand of the man would be no more frequent than that of the woman.

That the husband cannot sustain this relation satisfactorily and without injury to himself unless there is reciprocation on the part of the wife.

That under this mutual relation there is *no loss* to either party, but a mutual compensation.

This theory has its arguments and certainly is more humane than the first.

A woman once consulted me who was the mother of five children, all born within ten years. These were puny, scrofulous, nervous, and irritable. She herself was a fit subject for doctors and drugs. Every organ in her body seemed diseased, and every function perverted. She was dragging out a miserable existence. Like other physicians, I had pre-

scribed in vain for her many maladies. One day she chanced to inquire how she could safely prevent conception. This led me to ask how great was the danger. She said: "Unless my husband is absent from home, few nights have been exempt since we were married, except it may be three or four immediately after confinement."

"And yet your husband loves you?"

"O, yes, he is kind and provides for his family. Perhaps I might love him but for this. While now—(will God forgive me?)—I *detest*, I *loathe* him, and if I knew how to support myself and children, would leave him."

"Can you talk with him upon this subject?"

"I think I can."

"Then there is hope, for many women cannot do that. Tell him I will give you treatment to improve your health, and if he will wait until you can respond, *take time for the act, have it entirely mutual from first to last*, the demand will not come so frequently."

"Do you think so?"

"The experience of many proves the truth of this statement."

Hopefully she went home, and in six months I had the satisfaction of knowing my patient was restored to health, and a single coition in a month gave the husband more satisfaction than the many had done previously, that the creative power was under control, and that my lady could proudly say "I love," where previously she said "I hate."

If husbands will listen, a few simple instructions will appeal to their *common sense*, and none can imagine the gain to themselves, to their wives, and

children and their children's children. Then it may not be said of the babes that their "Death borders on their birth, and their cradle stands in the grave."

The third theory, that the sexual relation should never be sustained, save for procreation, has many adherents. They teach that there are other uses for the procreative element than the generation of offspring—far better uses than its waste in momentary pleasure. This element, when retained in the system, the mental powers being properly directed, is in some way absorbed and diffused throughout the whole organism, replacing waste, and imparting a peculiar vivifying influence. It is taken up by the brain and may be coined into new thoughts—perhaps new inventions—grand conceptions of the true, the beautiful, the useful, or into fresh emotions of joy and impulses of kindness, and blessings to all around. It is a procreation on the mental and spiritual planes instead of the physical. *It is just as really a part of the generative function as is the begetting of physical offspring.*

They claim that men eminent for grand achievements in fields of science, philosophy, invention, religion and philanthropy, have been men whose lives accorded to this theory, referring us as illustrious examples to Plato, Newton, Lamb, our own Irving and Whittier, and always remembering the humble Nazarene

They also claim that to woman belongs the "creative power," that she must choose when a new life shall be evolved, and only by adhering to this law can she be protected in the highest function of her being—the function of maternity. Mrs. Chandler in

“Motherhood,” says: “Every mother from the hour when the new life commences, is overshadowed by the Most High. Could she understand her needs and powers, and secure to herself respect due to her sacred office, and, free from all polluting intrusion upon herself, bathe her spirit in the influxes which the life within attracts, very rapidly would disappear the loathesome deformities, the discordant spirits now blotting the fair proportions of humanity.”

She claims that in the Scripture statement in reference to the parents of the child Jesus, that Joseph “knew not” Mary from the hour when the announcement of the new life was made until the birth of the child, is involved a deeper and more important meaning than the Christian world or the medical profession have discovered. Thus this “undisturbed maternity, which was essential to the ushering in of the Prince of Peace, is equally in all cases a vital and indisputable necessity for the improvement of humanity. Motherhood should be a shrine unpoluted by selfishness. O woman! This would be thy recompense for all the sufferings and agonies which pertain to physical womanhood and motherhood.”

It is encouraging for those who believe this thought to know that not only woman but men standing high in learning and literature espouse and teach it. “The Science of a New Life,” by Dr. Cowan, gives what he terms the *law of continence* as a central thought. It is full of practical lessons for married people, and has had a large sale.

“The Better Way,” a pamphlet, by A. E. Newton, teaches that only through continent lives can we hope for progress.

“*Plain Facts*,” by Dr. Kellogg, has had an immense sale. He, too, teaches the same thought.

Note, all these books are written by *men*—not by women, with some fancied wrongs to redress; but by men strongly in sympathy with the needs of the race. They claim that a better and higher generation can only be attained through continent lives. This is a subject demanding the serious consideration, at least, of scientists, philosophers and philanthropists.

If the law of continence is not the law to govern one’s entire life, it is natural and reasonable that the mother should be exempt from the sexual relation during gestation. The husband should ever be ready to comfort and cheer with his sympathy. He should bear in mind that at this time his wife and child need the conservation of all forces, and consequently he should “observe all laws that will *let reason reign and passion serve*.”

The observance of the law of continence will do much to palliate the many nervous symptoms of pregnancy. I have known women so sensitive during gestation that even a touch or a kiss from the husband caused nausea and other distressing symptoms.

“The sexual relation at this time exhausts the mother and impairs the vitality of the child, inducing in its constitution precocious sexual development. The mind should be free from the subject, and every circumstance that has a tendency to promote desire should be studiously avoided. For this reason separate beds and even sleeping rooms for husband and wife are to be recommended.”

It is worth investigating, whether the cause of suffering in pregnancy and much of the pain at partu-

rition may not also be removed by the practice of continence during gestation.

Cannot those in charge of hospitals and charitable institutions make a study of the subject? A collection of statistics would help to establish or refute this theory. The influence of continence on offspring invites the serious thought of all who desire the progress of purity. Thoughtful parents will question whether by living during the mother's gestation on the low plane of physical love, they are not implanting in their child the seeds of sensuality. Keeping their lives in the higher spiritual love they may have offspring to whom a life of purity and self-control will be natural.

"In brief, the law seems to be that, such is the intimate connection between the mother and the embryo, the exercise of any faculty of her mind or soul, or of any organ of her brain or body, stimulates and develops in proportionate degree the corresponding faculty or organ in the incipient child."

Of what use is it to teach the young lessons of purity and morality, when by prenatal culture, they have graven in their very lives lessons of prostitution? Many men violate this law of reproduction through ignorance. Were they taught the results, and how to live lives of self-control, many would gladly accept the lesson.

To live continent lives, avoid food containing aphrodisiac stimulants, such as coffee, eggs, oysters, and animal food. *Omit the evening meal*; for the purpose desired this stands paramount to all other means. Let the life be temperate in every respect, and with a strong will the victory can be won. Remember that

it is the action of the *mind* chiefly, that stimulates excessive seminal secretion. The husband being the devoted lover, with similar untiring, delicate attentions, can attain the same self-control he practiced during courtship. The wife will more surely retain her health and youthful charms in bearing welcome children. Women will rejoice in a glad maternity, and a higher, nobler and more God-like posterity will people the earth.

A few years since I read a paper entitled, "The Hygiene of Pregnancy," before a Medical Association. In it were sentiments similar to the above. It was read hesitatingly, anticipating only adverse criticism from the men composing that body. Previous to the reading of my paper, the members had taken but little interest in the convention except to promulgate pet theories. The weather was warm, and groups were sitting on the piazza, smoking cigars, indifferent to subjects under discussion. The reading had not proceeded far, however, when cigars were thrown away, and the entire convention were listeners. Judge of my surprise when the thoughts expressed received a long and hearty applause. Most of those men used tobacco, some drank beer, and all ate animal food. They were not the class of men from whom recognition of such radical sentiments would be expected.

Let the justness of this subject be properly presented to them, and most men will be convinced of its truth. Men naturally reverence the maternal in woman, and if taught that *continence* serves the best interests of motherhood and posterity, will cheerfully accord their lives with it.

A principal of a high school in Iowa was a married man many years before he knew that the sexual relation was ever sustained during pregnancy. When he learned it, he asserted that his whole soul was filled with shame and disgust that his sex had no better knowledge of their protective duties relating to maternity.

Those desiring the best reproduction of themselves should learn:

That motherhood is the central fact of human life.

That the first right of a child is to be well born.

That every mother should be set apart during pregnancy for the ante-natal culture of her child.

That control of appetite is the first step in human culture.

That no man should become a father who can not and will not observe the demands of temperance in all things for the benefit of his child.