

Syracuse University

**SURFACE**

---

The Courier

Libraries

---

Fall 1993

## Breaching the "Wall of Partition Between the Male and the Female": John Humphrey Noyes and Free Love

Louis J. Kern  
*Hofstra University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://surface.syr.edu/libassoc>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kern, Louis J., "Breaching the "Wall of Partition Between the Male and the Female": John Humphrey Noyes and Free Love" (1993). *The Courier*. 296.

<https://surface.syr.edu/libassoc/296>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Libraries at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Courier by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact [surface@syr.edu](mailto:surface@syr.edu).

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY ASSOCIATES  
C O U R I E R



OUT OF THE FOLD.

"Oh, dreadful! They dwell in peace and harmony, and have no church scandals.  
They must be wiped out."

VOLUME XXVIII, NUMBER 2, FALL 1993

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY ASSOCIATES  
COURIER

VOLUME XXVIII

NUMBER TWO

FALL 1993

---

Foreword

By Robert Fogarty, Professor of History and Editor,  
*The Antioch Review*, Antioch College 3

Preface

By Mark F. Weimer, Curator of Special Collections,  
Syracuse University Library, and Guest Editor,  
*Syracuse University Library Associates Courier* 7

John Humphrey Noyes and Millennialism

By Michael Barkun, Professor of Political Science,  
Syracuse University 11

Building Perfection: The Relationship between Physical and Social Structures of the Oneida Community

By Janet White, Ph.D. Candidate in History of  
Architecture and Urbanism, Cornell University 23

Women, Family, and Utopia: The Oneida Community Experience and Its Implications for the Present

By Lawrence Foster, Associate Professor of American  
History, Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta 45

“Mingling the Sexes”: The Gendered Organization of Work in the Oneida Community

By Marlyn Klee-Hartzell, Associate Professor of  
Political Science, Adelphi University 61

Breaching the “Wall of Partition Between the Male and the Female”: John Humphrey Noyes and Free Love

By Louis J. Kern, Professor of History,  
Hofstra University 87

An Interview with Spencer Klaw

By Mary Beth Hinton, Editor,  
*Syracuse University Library Associates Courier* 117

From the Collections

129

# Breaching the “Wall of Partition Between the Male and the Female”: John Humphrey Noyes and Free Love

BY LOUIS J. KERN

Whoever has well studied the causes of human maladies will be sure that Christ, in undertaking to restore men to Paradise and immortality, will set up his kingdom first of all in the bed-chamber and the nursery.

John Humphrey Noyes<sup>1</sup>

ONEIDA, ITS CRITICS MAINTAINED, was a “seedbed of free love, the nursery of anarchic doctrines” that threatened “the total destruction of the marriage relation”.<sup>2</sup> This paper will examine the cultural and religious contexts within which John Humphrey Noyes developed and implemented his ideas about free love.

Although the Putney Community (1843–48) and the Oneida Community (1848–79) were both theocratic, socialistic communities, critics were most concerned about the social and moral implications of their ideas—especially their Perfectionist claims of having irreversibly transformed the “Man of Sin” into the “Spiritual Man”.<sup>3</sup> Apologists for traditional evangelical denominationalism and self-appointed conservators of public morals saw Perfec-

1. *Bible Communism: A Compilation from the Annual Reports and Other Publications of the Oneida Association and Its Other Branches; Presenting in Connection with Their History, a Summary View of Their Religious and Social Theories*, chap. 3, proposition 14, n. 1 (1853; reprint, Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1972), 40. The quoted phrase in the title is from Noyes's “Battle-Axe Letter” (see nn. 12 and 13).

2. John B. Ellis, *Free Love and its Votaries; or American Socialism Unmasked. Being an Historical and Descriptive Account of the Rise and Progress of the Various Free Love Associations in the United States, and of the Effects of Their Vicious Teachings Upon American Society* (1870; reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1971), 10.

3. The quoted phrases are from John Humphrey Noyes, *History of American Socialisms* (1870; reprint, New York: Hillary House, 1961), 621 and 620, respectively. Perfectionism was derived from holiness theology, which was in turn



tionism as the foremost example of decadence in contemporary American social and ethical life, with “a strong tendency to ultraisms—ultraisms not only in religion and politics, but in almost every department of moral and philanthropic enterprise”.<sup>4</sup> “Noyesism” was most dangerous because it had embraced the human passions in all their vigor and, through misguided “enthusiasm, or phrenzy, or from deliberate imposture”, had been led into “licentiousness and criminal intercourse between the sexes”.<sup>5</sup>

Noyesism’s opponents seem to have viewed its institutional expressions in much the same way that today’s Americans perceive such cults as the Branch Davidians. To Oneida’s enemies, this “singular sect” exhibited a “deeply laid scheme of personal aggrandizement—a scheme designed to sever the ties of consanguinity—under the social relations—subvert the present order of society—sap the foundations of civil government—and erect [its system] upon the ruins of republican institutions and the relics of morality”. It was claimed that the subversion of society would be accomplished through a process quite similar to what modern cults have called “individual programming”. This process, according to a contemporary critic of the Oneida Community, was one

they had so often repeated that they had become adepts in the business of *breaking-down*; and the whole phenomena [*sic*] was so perfectly familiar that they could “calculate results with precision”. And under the influence of the great “moral magnet of inconceivable strength”, which was among them, is it at all strange that each devoted victim should be drawn within the “*charmed circle*,” and doomed to irretrievable ruin?<sup>6</sup>

---

derived from New Light Calvinism as understood at the New Haven Theological Seminary, and it combined the theological perspectives of Nathaniel W. Taylor, Wesleyan Methodism, and the Edwardian tradition of evangelical revivalism.

4. Hubbard Eastman, *Noyesism Unveiled; A History of the Sect Self-Styled Perfectionists, with a Summary View of Their Leading Doctrines* (1849; reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1971), 402.

5. Eastman, *Noyesism Unveiled*, 400.

6. *Ibid.*, v, 179–80. The reference to a “singular sect” is found on p. 13.

To the “One-Love” party (as Noyes called the romantic advocates of strict monogamy), free love was a transcendently “dangerous Social Evil”, far worse than the petty vices that plagued Victorian social life. Other champions of conventional marriage, like John B. Ellis, recognized that some sexual deviations attend socially sanctioned marriage (and he even on occasion argued that prostitution was necessary to the preservation of monogamy). But he distinguished between these abuses and a system that, as he believed, sought to overthrow and replace the formalized institutionalization of sexual relationships:

Licentiousness is very different from Free Love. The former exists in secret and avoids publicity. The latter not only exists in defiance of the law, but seeks to destroy it, and to build up a system of its own, in which vice shall be made admirable and morality a reproach.<sup>7</sup>

Ellis claimed that “Free-Love experiments are failing when tried in organized communities”, but he thought the real issue was that the liberation of the affections threatened a broader social revolution, since “the principle is far more disastrous in society at large than at Oneida, Berlin Heights, or any of the other Free-Love hells of the country”.<sup>8</sup>

Noyes was not the first proponent of an antimarriage doctrine in the United States. He was preceded by the spiritual wifery movement, which smouldered amidst the embers of the great evangelical enthusiasms of the early nineteenth century, burst into flame upon contact with the spark of early Perfectionist controversies, and then scorched the burned-over district in the mid-1830s.<sup>9</sup> The movement sought to liberate those who were mismated from the toils of

7. Ellis, *Free Love*, 444.

8. *Ibid.*, 491, 492, respectively.

9. The idea of spiritual marriage, grounded in the purification of sexual relations through voluntary abstinence, had been part of the sexual tradition of early Christianity from the apostolic age to the sixteenth century. See Dyan Elliot, *Spiritual Marriage: Sexual Abstinence in Medieval Wedlock* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1993). See also William H. Dixon, *Spiritual Wives*, vol. 1, 2d ed. (London: Hurst & Blackett, 1868).

legal matrimony so they could seek their true “spiritual affinities”.

Spiritual wifism in practice led in two diametrically opposed directions: towards celibacy on the one hand and free divorce (or failing that, adultery) on the other. Lucina Umphreville, “Miss Anti-Marriage”, asserted that chastity must obtain between all who were under grace—“that females must not think of love; that the men must not woo them; that the church must not celebrate the marriage rite; and that those who had already passed beneath the yoke must live as though they had not”.<sup>10</sup> Those who were not so keen on mortifying the flesh, who wished not so much to bear the yoke in purity but to slip it altogether, found the position of Andrew Jackson Davis, the “Poughkeepsie Seer”, as expressed in his multivolume magnum opus, *The Great Harmonia* (1851–59), more congenial:

Should a man or a woman, after entering into the relation of husband and wife, become convinced, by various means, that each does not embody the other’s *ideal*, then they are not truly married—they are *divorced*; and both have a natural right to seek further for the embodiment of the heart’s *ideal* associate. Human legislation may not forbid them to marry again. In truth, men have no right to control arbitrarily the soul’s deepest, purest wants, the rights and elevations of true marriage.<sup>11</sup>

William H. Dixon, who considered spiritual marriage a libertine’s rationale for destroying monogamy, read Noyes’s “Battle-Axe Letter” of 15 January 1837 and concluded that he was preparing to launch his own theory of Spiritual Wifehood.<sup>12</sup> But Noyes, in his retrospective gloss on the letter, distinguished his “theory of absolute communism in love”, which “had never before been broached in

10. William H. Dixon, *Spiritual Wives* 2:12.

11. Quoted in Ellis, *Free Love*, 412.

12. Dixon, *Spiritual Wives* 2:51. The “Battle-Axe Letter” was a private epistle addressed to Noyes’s friend David Harrison. Though written “in the nakedness of privacy”, the letter quickly went the rounds of radical Perfectionists, and was published by Theophilus Gates in his antimarriage paper *Battle Axe and Weapons of War*. The letter is most readily available in Taylor Stoehr, *Free Love in America: A Documentary History* (New York: AMS Press, 1979), 498.

this world”, from “theories of limited affinityism or spiritual wifery, which is really marriage and nothing better”.<sup>13</sup>

In 1867, looking back with philosophical detachment on what he considered the excesses and “social irregularities” of the revivalism and reformism of the last three decades, Noyes observed that all “revivals breed social revolutions. . . . Religious love is very near neighbor to sexual love, and they always get mixed in the intimacies and social excitements of revivals”.<sup>14</sup> These upheavals of the affections resulted in gendered movements that sought to “revolutionize the relations of man and wife”, but in which men and women spun off in opposite directions. In such a divergence,

if women have the lead, the feminine idea that ordinary wedded love is carnal and unholy rises and becomes a ruling principle. Mating on the Spiritual plan, with all the heights and depths of sentimental love, becomes the order of the day. . . . On the other hand, if the leaders are men . . . polygamy in some form is the result. Thus Mormonism is the masculine form, as Shakerism is the feminine form, of the more morbid products of Revivals.<sup>15</sup>

Noyes rejected both conventional and revivalist sexuality. The latter, manifested in plurality of wives, liberalization of divorce, and marital abstinence, was indicative, for Noyes, of the sickly, unsound, and contaminated nature of contemporary American society. All of these practices represented attempts to address the symptomatology rather than the pathology of conventional marriage and monogamic sexuality. Americans suffered the effects of poor social hygiene, which found expression in emotional extremes—languishing affectivity on the one hand and febrile fleshiness on the other. But to the wise physician, these were merely superficial indications; the real source of the culture’s infirmity lay in the debilitation of the affections, especially the declining vigor of

13. Quoted in Stoehr, *Free Love in America*, 498.

14. Quoted in Dixon, *Spiritual Wives* 2:176–77.

15. *Ibid.*, 2:181–82.



romantic love and the weakening of its primary institutional support, monogamous marriage. For Noyes and the countercultural practitioners as well as for the more orthodox cultural homeopaths, appropriate therapy for society's sexual ills lay in purifying the affections and establishing a foundation for "true love" in "true marriage".

The conflict between the advocates of free love and the custodians of traditional marriage was played out in the context of the cult of sentimentality, which defined Victorian orthodoxy between 1830 and 1870. It allowed Americans to ignore or avoid unpleasant aspects of social reality and to reaffirm the status quo by holding fast to a romantic mythology—in which "true" women were apotheosized, children cherished, and all families harmonious—that obscured the fundamental crisis in social and emotional life: the loss of social confidence (at the height of the age of the "self-made man") occasioned by the too-frequent success of confidence men and tricksters. Lest he be duped by such characters (the unauthentic, delusory element of society) and led astray by their example, "the young American was told he must assume complete command of his own moral destiny for forming his own character from within".<sup>16</sup> In their preoccupation with personal authentication, the Victorians gave precedence to private experience over public life and gauged the value of private experience by its emotional intensity. Ideologically, evil came to be equated with the inauthentic, the superficial, the illegitimate.

Noyes's opponents cast him as a religious charlatan and a sexual confidence man. He was described as "the great *magician* of Putney", deceiving the credulous "with pretensions to wonderworking power"; "an impostor", manipulating the vulnerable "by *spiritual jugglery*", and using his "pretended miracles" "to humbug the people"—in short, as the arch-hypocrite and deceiver.<sup>17</sup>

16. Karen Halttunen, *Confidence Men and Painted Women: A Study of Middle-Class Culture in America, 1830–1870* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1982), 25. Other ideas in this paragraph are based on the discussion on pp. xiv–xv, 60–62, and 83–84.

17. These phrases are from Eastman, *Noyesism Unveiled*, 183, 185, and 219. Emphasis in text.

Commenting on “Noyes’s doctrine of ‘sexual morality’”, Hubbard Eastman maintained that he

has fairly outstripped Mahomet himself, and thrown the great Arabian Impostor far back into the shade! Mahomet promised *his* faithful followers a paradise of sensual pleasures *after this life*, or in a future state of existence; but Mr. Noyes has fitted up such a place *in this world*, and offers to *his* followers *in this life* what Mahomet promised *after* this life. Thus it appears that Noyesism is *an improved and enlarged edition of Mahometanism!*<sup>18</sup>

Seeking to shock and titillate his readers with a recitation of the more sensationalist details of social life at Oneida, John B. Ellis observed that

there is no marriage here, consequently there are no such things as husbands and wives . . . men and women are entirely unrestrained in their approaches to each other. Promiscuous intercourse is the rule. . . . The women are the common property of the men and *vice versa*. No woman being a wife can claim a husband’s protection against the advances of those who are personally repugnant to her. She must submit. She must love all alike.<sup>19</sup>

By virtue of the psychological projections that sustained these fantasies, Oneida sexual practices were believed to be degrading to women. The sentimental ideology constructed lubricity as male and, in denying sexual desire to women, had no alternative but to cast her as victim. For the female, the social theory of Bible Communism, “more than all others, degrades and debases her, and leaves her a defenseless prey to the passions and caprices of the stronger sex”.<sup>20</sup>

Though exercised by their anxieties over the social and moral threat of free love, contemporaries were unable to conceive of cohabitation absolutely devoid of any formalized conjugal relations.

18. Eastman, *Noyesism Unveiled*, 115–16.

19. Ellis, *Free Love*, 175.

20. Eastman, *Noyesism Unveiled*, 295.

Their language suggests that for all their concern over the subversive tendencies of free love, they saw it as an alternative, albeit an execrably beastly, form of marriage.

Underscoring the public nature of Victorian discourse on sexuality, an anonymous Christian woman noted that

“Free Love” is nothing new; but until lately such relations have been held in secret. . . . Its doctrines have been whispered in the ear, among private circles. But now they have found public advocates, and in the promulgation of the doctrines of Free Love I recognize only an attempt to render respectable such acts and principles as have hitherto been confined to the secret resorts devoted to the gratification of the senses.<sup>21</sup>

While many saw in free love a primarily legal and institutional problem, on a deeper level it represented a profound psychological and emotional challenge to the moral imperatives and the emotional complacency of the culture of sentimentality. The controversies that swirled around free love raised the following questions: What is the essence of love? Is it morally and physiologically desirable to separate love from sex? Is reproduction the only legitimate justification for intercourse?

“True” love, as a sentimental expression of romantic monogamy, was motivated by “a desire to possess exclusively the affections of the beloved”. It found its ultimate fulfillment in reproduction, for “from such love, and such alone, can the true relations of parentage arise, and on fidelity to such love rests our social safety”. By contrast, “the false theories veiled under the specious name of ‘Free Love’” are grounded solely in “*passional attraction*”.<sup>22</sup> Sex thus becomes the exclusive criterion of gratified desire. As a mid-century female defender of romantic exclusivity put it, free love’s

claim for “variety” is in other words a confession, that *sexual passion in some men is insatiable, and no one woman can fully*

21. Quoted in Stoehr, *Free Love in America*, 428.

22. *Ibid*, 427, 429, and 430, respectively.



**John Humphrey Noyes and Charlotte Miller Leonard  
in the North Tower of the New Mansion House.**



*satisfy it and live*. This, I grant, is true. But *sexual desire* is not love. And I would not have young or old taken captive by an appeal to the senses, under the impression that they are obeying the high behests of love.<sup>23</sup>

“But *Love*”, she concludes, “makes no such claims. It places the animal nature completely under subjection to the higher powers of the soul. While Free Love clamours for continual indulgence, true love asserts a firm, wise self-control.”<sup>24</sup>

John Humphrey Noyes, as an advocate of free love first at Putney and later at Oneida, would have agreed that the discrete function of the sexual relationship was to establish an emotionally fulfilling yet principled love. The problem with the institutional framework of worldly sexuality, however, was that it was bound to the letter of the law of matrimony, to the virtual exclusion of the spirit of love. The substitution of the form for the essence tended to frustrate any honest attempt to realize the essentially passionate and affective imperatives that had brought the sexes together in the first place. Conventional marriage, then, was an anomaly: it marginalized and frustrated the fulfillment of the emotional needs of husband and wife and repressed the expression of the natural instincts of love, thus alienating the affections and hindering the realization of the “true” ends of marriage. The institution had become an end in itself and had ignored the vital importance of process to the achievement of its own proper ends.

Noyes’s free love doctrines aimed initially at the redemption of marriage and the elevation of sexual relations as the means or process to accomplish its primary purpose—the expression of “true” love. In the *Spiritual Magazine* of 15 December 1846, he wrote that “love cannot be perfect while one fear remains that it will not always last”. Too often the experience of those linked in worldly marriage was one of love “without security. . . . Their union has not been an eternal marriage, where divorce is impossible.” But for Perfectionism, the relationship between the sexes

23. Stoehr, *Free Love in America*, 430.

24. *Ibid.*, 427.

would be more reliably covenanted by a “union which has the security—which is entered into like marriage, with irrevocable bonds”.<sup>25</sup>

The key to attaining emotional security was conscious and unremitting attention to the *process* of the physical relationship between the sexes. The practice that created and maintained love in Noyes’s system was male continence (discovered by Noyes in 1844), a form of *coitus reservatus* that made it practicable to separate sex from reproduction.<sup>26</sup> In an anonymous letter published in *The Circular* in 1866 as an endorsement for male continence, an adherent of the practice from outside the Community pointed out its critical role in promoting love:

A man of God, or a true gentleman . . . would never desire anything of a woman the granting of which would not make her happier. To all such men your mode is the only true and refined one. . . . How many a fond husband [in conventional marital practice], with a heart filled with passionate love, has at least found his life made stale, irritable,

25. Quoted in Eastman, *Noyesism Unveiled*, 395.

26. Speaking of the first eight years of his marriage to Harriet Holton (1838–46), Noyes explicitly said that “it was during this period . . . that I studied the subject of sexual intercourse in connection with my matrimonial experience, and discovered the principle of Male Continence” (*Male Continence* [Oneida Community, 1872], 10). Havelock Ellis, the great pioneer sexologist of the early twentieth century, supported Noyes’s claim to discovery: “Noyes believed”, he wrote, “that ‘male continence’ had never previously been a recognized practice based on theory, though there might have been occasional approximations to it. This is probably true if the coitus is *reservatus* in the full sense, with complete absence of emission” (*Sex in Relation to Society*, pt. 3 of *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* [New York: Random House, 1936], 2:554). Certainly, the postponement of ejaculation in order to heighten the sexual pleasure of both parties had been a central feature of India’s erotic practice for centuries before Noyes’s independent “discovery” of *coitus reservatus* and, indeed, had been formalized as a social expression of religious doctrine by sectarian Tantric Buddhism. For a fuller discussion of Tantric sexual practice, see Omar Garrison, *Tantra: The Yoga of Sex* (New York: The Julian Press, 1964). Also, George Noyes Miller, after his uncle’s death, referred to male continence as “Zugassent’s Discovery”. See his *After the Sex Struck; or Zugassent’s Discovery* (Boston: Arena Pub. Co., 1895).

and destitute of romance, in consequence of an unwise expression of his love.<sup>27</sup>

Indeed, Oneidans maintained that they had secured “true” love by purifying sexual relations and regenerating the romantic elements that alone guaranteed emotional satisfaction. “Free Love, in the Oneida sense of the term”, they maintained, “is much less free, in the gross, sensual way, than marriage”:

The theory of sexual interchange which governs all the general measures of the Community . . . is just that which in ordinary society governs the proceedings in *courtship*. . . . It is the theory that love *after* marriage and always and forever, should be what it is *before* marriage—a glowing attraction on both sides, and not the odious obligation of one partner and the sensual recklessness of the other.<sup>28</sup>

Ferocious resistance on the part of defenders of conventional sexuality led the Oneida Community to deny its links to that “class of socialists called ‘Free Lovers’”, and to discriminate its theory and practice from the broader movement. A policy statement by Noyes that appeared in *The Circular* early in 1865 laid out the foundation of the Community’s position:

This terrible combination of two very good ideas—freedom and love—was probably first used in our writings about fifteen years ago, and originated in the Oneida school of socialists. It was however soon taken up by an entirely different class of speculators scattered about the country, and has come to be the name of a form of socialism with which we have but little affinity.<sup>29</sup>

This admission of paternity coupled with denial of responsibility for the offspring allowed Noyes to take credit for inventing the generic term, while simultaneously dodging the tarbrush of ortho-

27. “Male Continence”, *The Circular* (1 October 1866), 229.

28. *The Circular* (21 March 1870), quoted in Constance Noyes Robertson, ed., *Oneida Community: An Autobiography, 1851–1876* (Syracuse: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1970), 283.

29. “Free Love”, *The Circular* (6 February 1865), 369.

doxy that awaited the more strident and ultraist of the antimarriage reformers.

The term required, to Noyes's mind, an antinomian stance towards the civil and criminal law. Those who stood in the resurrection state "constituted a kingdom by themselves, beyond the jurisdiction of human judgment, and amenable in conscience only to the spiritual authority which belongs to Christ". Those in the resurrection order, while apparently in docile conformity to social convention, should maintain, however, not "an atom of loyalty in their hearts for the institutions of the world, but . . . [give] all their devotion, both of conscience and affection, to the kingdom of Christ".<sup>30</sup>

Noyes encapsulated the Community's position on free love in the section of *Bible Communism* entitled "The Bible on Marriage". "We avow ourselves", he wrote, "strictly and entirely Bible men—disciples of the New Testament of Christ and Paul, in relation to the subject of marriage".<sup>31</sup> In practical terms, that discipleship combined strands of heretical Puritanism and New Light evangelicalism—Hutchinsonian antinomianism and Edwardsean conceptions of the relationship of the will to the affections.

The antinomian strain of Perfectionist belief was clear in a letter Noyes wrote in 1839, in which he maintained that "the outward act of sexual connection is as innocent and comely as any other act, or rather . . . is the most noble and comely of all". That belief, however,

covered with any covering but that of the Spirit, is licentiousness. The same is true of every principle of human action. "Whatever is not of faith is sin"; and to him that

30. *Bible Communism*, 95, 116, respectively.

31. *Bible Communism*, 82. The essential Biblical texts that provided a doctrinal foundation for the practice of "complex marriage" (pantagamy) were 1 Cor. 7:17–19 (the nullification of the ordinance of circumcision) and Matt. 22:23–30 (the Sadducees' conundrum about the effects of the levirate on a woman in the resurrection). The importance assigned to the Sadducees' challenge to the notion of bodily resurrection in the Gospels is attested by the inclusion of the episode in two other essentially identical accounts. See Mark 12:18–25, and Luke 21:27–36.



believeth, “*all things are lawful*” [1 Cor. 10:23]. God tells me that He does not care so much *what* I do, as *how* I do it, and by this word I walk in all things. I never inquire whether it is *right* to do this or *wrong* to do that, but whether God *leads* me to do it or not.<sup>32</sup>

He had made the antinomian foundations of what he called “complex marriage” even clearer in his statement of his credo in *The Witness* in 1838:

1. I believe, that marriage does not exist in heaven.
2. I believe, that the will of God will be done on earth, as it is done in heaven: consequently that a time will come when marriage will not exist on earth. . . .
4. I believe, that in the heavenly state . . . the Holy Spirit takes the place of written law, and arbitrary ceremonies, in regard to the intercourse of the sexes, and all other matters.<sup>33</sup>

Roundly attacked for his heretical beliefs by orthodox clerics, Noyes argued that they merely practiced an inferior kind of antinomianism. Those who “impede the true tendency of these doctrines by misrepresenting their nature and trusting in written laws”, he declared, merely extol the letter of the law while rejecting the higher standard of “gospel experience”.<sup>34</sup> Theirs was a carnal antinomianism, his a spiritual.

Another Perfectionist heresy was a tendency to Arminianism—the rejection of the belief in innate human depravity, which rejection validated individual choice (free will), thereby implying that salvation hinged on personal conduct and merit and on individual effort, rather than on the arbitrary visitation of divine grace. But since that had become standard evangelical doctrine by the 1830s,

32. Letter to Mr. [Alonzo?] Hollister, 2 July 1839, quoted in Eastman, *Noyesism Unveiled*, 86–87.

33. *The Witness*, vol. 1, no. 4 (21 November 1838): 26.

34. *Ibid.*; and “Two Kinds of Antinomianism”, in John Humphrey Noyes, *The Berean: A Manual for the Help of Those Who Seek the Faith of the Primitive Church* (Putney, Vt.: Office of the Spiritual Magazine, 1847), 223. For critiques of Noyes’s antinomianism, see: Ellis, *Free Love*, 61–64; and Eastman, *Noyesism Unveiled*, 64–66, 262–64, and 275–79.

religious conservatives could only assail Noyes obliquely on this issue. Thus, John B. Ellis referred to “the Perfectionist being free to follow his own impulses”, and Hubbard Eastman charged that “they glory in their freedom”.<sup>35</sup> In fact, Noyes held to doctrines on the will that derived from the New Divinity school, whose institutional stronghold was the Yale Divinity School, whence it dominated the pulpits of the Connecticut River Valley churches in the early nineteenth century.<sup>36</sup>

Through the New Divinity men, his ideas on freedom of the will ran directly back to Jonathan Edwards. Noyes’s most succinct expression of his own thinking on this question came in his colloquy on the “Divinity of the Will”. In man resided a “central divine principle” that manifested itself as will (the faculty of choice). “We must not think of suppressing it”, he asserted, “but endeavor to always surround it with such attractions that in the Perfection and even delirium of liberty it will act right”.<sup>37</sup>

Noyes followed Edwards in believing that perfect holiness was grounded in the religious affections and in the freedom of the will, the two doctrinal elements that form the theological basis for his system of free love. The “spiritual appetite after holiness” and the “increase of holy affections” led Noyes, as they had Edwards, to the realization that “true religion consists in the affections”.<sup>38</sup> As Ed-

35. Ellis, *Free Love*, 63. Eastman, *Noyesism Unveiled*, 65.

36. The New Divinity school sought to reconcile rational and emotional religion and focused on the relationship between man and sin. They made a distinction between original sin (the Calvinist doctrine of congenital human depravity) and the actual sin of individuals. Conversion lay in the free exercise of the will, which in the regenerated person led to positive holiness, or triumph over sin. Noyes’s Perfectionism similarly maintained that sin was voluntary and that those whose will has been regenerated had attained perfect sanctification or complete holiness, i.e., had moved beyond sin.

37. John Humphrey Noyes, *Home Talks* (Oneida, N.Y.: Oneida Community, 1875), 118.

38. Jonathan Edwards, *Religious Affections [Treatise Concerning Religious Affections]*, ed. John E. Smith (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1959), 377. Sydney E. Ahlstrom, in *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1972), clarifies Edwards’s doctrine on the affections. “The ‘affections’, to Edwards”, he notes, “are not simply the passions or even the ‘will’, but more

wards expressed it, “Love is not only one of the affections, but it is the chief of the affections, and the fountain of all the affections. . . . [and] from a fervent love to men will arise all other virtuous affections toward men”.<sup>39</sup>

Although frequently mistaken for an absolute Arminian, Noyes shared Edwards’s disdain for what was “vulgarly called liberty” and his belief that volition was truly free only when determined by the good. As Edwards wrote,

the liberty of moral agents does not consist in self-determining power; and . . . there is no need of any such liberty, in order to the nature of virtue . . . but that the state or act of the will may be the virtue of the subject, though it be not from self-determination, but the determination of an extrinsic cause. . . . God does decisively, in his providence, order all the volitions of moral agents.<sup>40</sup>

The religious affections reveal a God, who is “infinitely becoming and lovely”. They draw the human soul on to “perfect and glorious holiness and goodness”. The perfected will is free only insofar as it has been liberated from the tyranny of the lower, natural order of “present pleasure” and has become bound to determination by a higher order of the moral good that offers “greater advantage at a distance”. The will is free, then, only when it chooses the good. For Edwards, by definition, the regenerated will is only capable of choosing good; if evil is chosen, the will is unregenerate, and in its subordination to evil, unfree.<sup>41</sup>

As a Perfectionist, and like Edwards a practitioner of experiential religion, Noyes stood on the principle that “whoever commiteth

---

fundamentally, that which moves a person from neutrality or mere assent and inclines his heart to possess or reject something” (p. 303).

39. Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 107–8.

40. Jonathan Edwards, *Freedom of the Will [A Careful and Strict Enquiry into the Modern and Prevailing Notions of that Freedom of the Will, Which is Supposed to be Essential to Moral Agency, Virtue and Vice, Reward and Punishment, Praise and Blame]*, ed. Paul Ramsey (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1957), 433.

41. Phrases quoted are from: Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 255 ; and *Freedom of the Will*, 144, respectively.

sin is the servant of sin [John 8:34], and cannot be a freeman. Christ, as a Savior from sin, is the liberator and can make us free by setting us free from selfishness".<sup>42</sup> "True liberty" requires the death of "the liberty of *independence*" (the freedom of the will to choose evil), a false liberty that "proves in the end to be horrible bondage". No "man, governed by selfish passions deserves liberty". God must "restrain any tendency of that kind", "purge out . . . any remaining desire for that kind of liberty", and "force us, if need be into the liberty of heaven, the liberty of unity"—"the liberty of fellowship—liberty to approach one another and love one another—the liberty of Communism", issuing in "a genuine love feast—a flowing together of hearts".<sup>43</sup> "Perfect liberty", or redeemed free will, thus provided the theological foundation for the social intercourse of Bible Communism. For Noyes, the perfection of free will was a prerequisite to the practice of free love; it was essential for the spiritual man to achieve control of the flesh before he could safely undertake the practice of male continence, and before the community could begin "the experiment of a new state of society".

At the outset, Noyes was stating a resurrection theory of the relation of the sexes that could only come to prevail subsequent to the full spiritual integration of man. In the "Battle-Axe Letter" (1837), for example, he anticipated a resurrection state in which "there will be no marriage". "But", he warned, "woe to him who abolishes the law of apostasy before he stands in the holiness of the resurrection".<sup>44</sup> In *The Witness* in 1838 he declared categorically that "I do NOT believe that any have attained to that state [the heavenly state] that are now on earth".<sup>45</sup> It was not until 1846 that Noyes and his Putney followers had achieved (so they believed) the

42. Noyes, "Liberty", *Home Talks*, 348.

43. Phrases drawn from Noyes, "Liberty", *Home Talks*, 348, 346, 348, 350, and 346, respectively.

44. Stoehr, *Free Love in America*, 497. The state of "apostasy" that Noyes refers to here is the universal condition of the unregenerated human will. Those lacking the indwelling presence of divine grace are quite appropriately subject to all civil and ecclesiastical law—"the law of apostasy". This is essentially a restatement of the classic antinomian position.

45. *The Witness*, vol. 1, no. 4 (21 November 1838): 26.

necessary perfection for sanctification to sit at the table of “the marriage supper of the Lamb”, that feast at which “*every dish* is free to every guest”.<sup>46</sup>

Once having entered the practice of complex marriage, the Bible Communists sought to insulate as precisely as possible their social system from “bad men [who] might avail themselves of our sexual theories for licentious purposes”; to discriminate it from practices entailing infanticide, abortion, or “artificial tricks for frustrating the natural effects of propagation”.<sup>47</sup> They found it particularly galling to be linked, in the public mind, with the sexual doctrines of Robert Dale Owen and Fanny Wright, especially “their commendation of Onanism”.<sup>48</sup> Free love at Oneida was precisely the opposite of a “licentious state of freedom”, since, they boasted, “amativeness, the lion of the tribe of human passions, is conquered and civilized among us”.<sup>49</sup>

Oneida, under the social system of complex marriage, wished to be seen as closer to orthodox sexual practices than to licentious heterodoxy. By virtue of Bible Communism, they maintained, we

hold to freedom of love only within our own families. . . .

In respect to permanency, responsibility, and every essential point of difference between marriage and licentiousness, the Oneida Communists stand with marriage. Free Love with them does *not* mean freedom to love to-day and leave to-morrow; nor freedom to take a woman’s person and keep their property to themselves; nor freedom to freight a woman with offspring and send her downstream without care or help; nor freedom to beget children and leave them to the street and the poorhouse. Their communities are *families*, as distinctly bounded and separated from promiscuous society as ordered households. The tie that binds

46. “Battle-Axe Letter”, quoted in Stoehr, *Free Love in America*, 497

47. John Humphrey Noyes, *Male Continence*, 2d ed. (Oneida, N.Y.: Office of the American Socialist, 1877), 5, 7.

48. *The Witness*, vol. 1, no. 4 (21 November 1838): 26.

49. *Bible Communism*, 19.

them together is as permanent and sacred to say the least, as that of marriage, for it is their religion.<sup>50</sup>

Free love at Oneida can best be understood as a system of limitation; the nature of freedom lay in restriction and control. Complex marriage was uncompromisingly antiproprietorial in social relations and, in the spirit of “actual Communism”, renounced all selfish possession, “exclusiveness in regard to women and children”.<sup>51</sup> The “one-sided freedom” of marriage, the “liberty of the strong to oppress the weak [which] seems to be recognized and tolerated as inevitable and right in all popular forms of sexual relations”, they condemned, as well as “the liberty of marriage, as commonly understood and practiced . . . the liberty of a man to sleep habitually with a woman; liberty to please himself alone in his dealings with her; liberty to expose her to child-bearing, without care or consultation”.<sup>52</sup>

Paternalistic hegemony in the form of sexual proprietorship was abolished through the institutions of pantagamy and male continence. The combined impact of these “twin relics” of free love was powerfully subversive of the Victorian ideal of wedlock. The Oneidans inverted the romantic myth that monogamic marriage was the conservator of “true” love and that love was the primary *raison d'être* of matrimony by enlarging the sphere of the affections and locating it explicitly outside of normative marital relations. Sex was at once chained and loosed in this system, for it bound the heart with silken cords of sentiment, while simultaneously liberating the expression of physical desire by separating sex from reproduction.

The Oneida attack on romantic obsession and the cupidity of marriage found expression in the Community ideal of a “communism of hearts”, where all men strove collectively “to have the heart enlarged so as to cease to be a husband and become a univer-

50. “Special Notice”, *Oneida Circular* (21 August 1871), 265.

51. *Bible Communism*, 29. See also pp. 30–31, and Robertson, *Oneida Community*, 280.

52. “Free Love”, *The Circular* (7 March 1870), 401.



sal lover". The ultimate goal of Noyes's sexual system was to free love from fixation on isolated objects and from sexual dependence, and to make it general. "The Supreme affection", he maintained, demands that

amativeness must come in as the servant of catholic love. The present order of affections must be completely reversed. The acute love that the novels make so much of as being the primary affection, to which friendship is only an accessory, must itself subside into an accessory to friendship. Love that turns in all directions, toward God himself first, and then toward all mankind, must occupy the middle of the picture, and the specialities of amativeness must come in as accessories.<sup>53</sup>

Oneidans confessed that their purpose was the "civilization of the passions". Making love, they believed, was an art. "It is", one Community member said, "an attempt to express a sense of beauty and goodness. . . . It allows a person to express feelings that he cannot give any reason for, and to praise his sweetheart merely because it is a musical operation to himself and her."<sup>54</sup>

In the physical relationship between the sexes, the practice of male continence and of "ascending fellowship"<sup>55</sup> assured that *process* took priority over product, and made free love an art of fellowship rather than an impulsive expression of the exuberance of animal

53. Noyes, "The Superior Affection", *Home Talks*, 332–33. For other statements on the purification of love and its universalization, see Ellis, *Free Love*, 165; and Eastman, *Noyesism Unveiled*, 395.

54. *Mutual Criticism* (1867; reprint, Syracuse: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1975), 67. The prior phrase is from p. 42.

55. In every relationship, Noyes believed, one of the two partners was the natural spiritual superior to the other. From the point of view of the lower partner, the association would be considered "ascending fellowship"; from the point of view of the higher partner, it would be considered "descending fellowship". Since all social and spiritual relationships were seen in the light of this doctrine, those at the upper reaches of the associational hierarchy, it was argued, drew their strength from a more direct association with the divine spirit. Those who were most "advanced" in community doctrine were considered to be superior partners regardless of gender.

spirits. Free love became the antithesis of worldly licentiousness by virtue of “the real self-denial which it requires [that] cannot be adjusted to their [libertines’] schemes of pleasure seeking”. Complex marriage at Oneida was legitimized by male continence, which solved the “darkest of all problems”—“how to subject human propagation to the control of reason”.<sup>56</sup>

Solving this problem required that the propagative and erotic aspects of sexual intercourse be separated. Noyes’s discovery of a sexual technique to insure that separation was based on his division of the male role in the sex act into two parts—intromission and ejaculation. For the male, institutionalized sexual practice was nonorganic; sex became pure process, over which, ideally, the male had absolute control. The rational control of the male over the emotions and the physiological course of the sex act assured female liberation from the “suffering and miseries of involuntary propagation” and freed men to enjoy to the fullest “the sweetest and noblest period of intercourse with woman”.<sup>57</sup>

The language Noyes used in describing the benefits of his system underscores its freedom of choice. The whole process of intercourse up to emission is “voluntary”; only the final crisis is “involuntary” or “uncontrollable”. Men can “choose” to stop the progress of the act “at any point in the voluntary stages of it”. Indeed, the separation of propagation from the typical sex act insures the freedom of reproduction as well, for it “provides that impregnation and child-bearing shall be voluntary, and of course desired”. This freedom of reproduction is “a great deliverance” for both men and women, and insures the regeneration of love and sexuality.<sup>58</sup> “Our method”, Noyes concluded,

56. Noyes, *Male Continence*, 5, 7.

57. *Ibid.*, 4, 9.

58. *Ibid.*, 9, 10, and 13. Since female orgasm in absence of seminal emission was a nonreproductive act, women’s sexual climaxes were not restricted in Noyes’s theory, and in practice, women were encouraged to pursue erotic pleasure through intercourse. See discussion of female sexuality in my *An Ordered Love: Sex Roles and Sexuality in Victorian Utopias—the Shakers, the Mormons, and the Oneida Community* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981), 243–46.

simply proposes the subordination of the flesh to the spirit, teaching men to seek principally the elevated spiritual pleasures of sexual connection, and to be content with them in their general intercourse with women, restricting the more sensual part to its proper occasions. This is certainly natural and easy to spiritual men, however difficult it may be to the sensual.<sup>59</sup>

Male continence, then, the foundation for the practice of free love at Oneida, affirmed that “the social function of the sexual organs is their superior function, and that which gives man a position above the brutes”, and guaranteed that the amative function would remain “as superior to [the] reproductive as we have shown love to be to propagation”.<sup>60</sup>

The doctrine of ascending-descending fellowship provided the most succinct statement of the social and ideological effects of the practice of male continence. As Noyes put it,

while in ascending fellowship there is no self-limitation, because you are limited by your superior[,] in the descending fellowship you must be prepared to limit both yourself and those with whom you associate. Self-limitation is the principle which qualifies one for the descending fellowship. In the fellowship between man and woman, for instance, man is naturally the superior and his business is self-limitation. We hold that man is not only responsible for his own limitation but for that of the female.<sup>61</sup>

Free love at Oneida was thus oxymoronic; it was precisely the limitation on love that made it free. In the doctrinaire terms of Community belief and ritual, movement in the direction of free-

59. Noyes, *Male Continence*, 17. Male ejaculation was to be restricted to those occasions when the partners mutually agreed that the sex act should result in conception. After the initiation of “scientific propagation” at Oneida (1867), this effectively meant that male orgasm was restricted to those selected to father children under the eugenic breeding program (stirpiculture), although there seem to have always been some whose control was faulty.

60. Noyes, *Male Continence*, 15.

61. Noyes, “The Law of Fellowship”, *Home Talks*, 205.

dom (will) was ascending fellowship; movement in the direction of love (sex) was descending fellowship. Free love at Oneida was essentially a freedom of negation, a freedom *from* more than a freedom *for*, a liberation through empowerment over obstacles to an ethical emotional life rather than an expansion of erotic rights.

Antilegality and free will meant the abolition of “bacchanalian revelry” and licentiousness. Oneidans sedulously maintained that their kind of free love was neither “seditious” nor “unchaste”, and that those “imputing indecency to us, simply by inference from our free principles, only show that they have no confidence in their own virtue, except as it is secured by law”.<sup>62</sup> In other words, doctrinaire proponents of orthodox marriage were slaves to the law and bondsmen of sin.

The “law of marriage” was also unnatural; the “worldly system of sexual intercourse” perverse. Free love, on the contrary, was natural and salubrious. Noyes analogized “fleshly attractions” to the irresistible force that drew steel to the magnet. “If nothing intervenes”, he wrote,

and the tangent ends are plane surfaces, the steel advances to plane contact. If the tangent ends are ball and socket, or mortise and tenon, the steel, seeking by the law of attraction the closest possible unity, advances to interlocked contact. Attraction being the essence of love . . . man and woman are so adapted to each other by the differences of their natures, that attraction can attain a more perfect union between them.<sup>63</sup>

In “a state of unobstructed love”, a true union of “interlocked contact”, “variety . . . [became] in the nature of things, as beautiful and useful in love as in eating and drinking. . . . This is the law of nature, thrust out of sight, and condemned by common consent, and yet secretly known by all.”<sup>64</sup>

The secret history of the heart affirmed that free love was the most natural expression of the affections, and that it brought hu-

62. *The Circular* (7 March 1852), quoted in Robertson, *Oneida Community*, 273.

63. *Bible Communism*, 32.

64. *Ibid.*, 33, 35.

man emotional life and social institutions into agreement with the biological requirements of the natural order. Only the congruence of human behavior with natural law could make sex safe for society. Noyes argued that the unity of the sexes must be “according to the demands of nature”; “the only way to make it [the sexual instinct] safe and useful, is to give it a free and natural channel”.<sup>65</sup> Thus, free love, as a kind of universal moral reform, would restore the equilibrium of the natural world to human societies and thereby promote sexual hygiene and physical and psychological health.

In a culture as obsessed with the authenticity of experience as Victorian America, Noyes’s system of free love promised as well to reestablish the “true union of the sexes”. It would reconcile male and female by overcoming the gender alienation resulting from society’s false perception of the sinfulness of the sex act and the shame associated with the body and with sexual desire. His goal was society’s acceptance of the human sex drive as a natural, innocent biological urge. “True modesty”, as Noyes saw it, was

a sentiment which springs not from aversion or indifference to the sexual organs and offices, but from a delicate and reverent appreciation of their value and sacredness. . . . The shrinking of shame is produced by a feeling that the sexual nature is vile and shameful. Modesty and shame ought to be sundered, and shame ought to be banished from the company of virtue, though in the world it has stolen the very name of virtue. Any one who has true modesty . . . would sooner consent to the banishment of singing from heaven, than of sexual music.<sup>66</sup>

But at Oneida, the notes of the sexual score would be played not only *appassionata*, but by virtue of the practice of pantagamy, *ad libi-*

65. *Bible Communism*, 37. While the latitude of sexual choice was clearly more restricted than would have been the case under a more liberal construction of free love, it still provided Community members much more sexual latitude in selection of partners than conventional monogamy.

66. *Ibid.*, 41, 55.

*tum*, and by means of male continence, *sostenuto*. And the words of the song would come into perfect harmony with the music of sex.

Liberty of the will, expressed by institutionalized free love, would minister simultaneously to the personal and the communal. The individual would become one with his fellows and with the natural order of things. Sexual subjects would be discussed openly. As Noyes expressed it,

the sentiment of shame attempts a hopeless war with nature. Its policy is to prevent pruriency by keeping the mind in ignorance of sexual subjects; whilst nature is constantly thrusting those subjects upon the mind. Whoever would preserve the minds of the young in innocence by keeping them from “polluting images”, must first of all carry moral reform into the barn-yard and among the flies.<sup>67</sup>

Though the culture of shame thought only to despise the passions and to degrade sexual intercourse, Noyes had a visionary’s faith in the sanctification of sex. “Of all the pleasures of the senses”, he wrote, “sexual intercourse is intrinsically the most spiritual and refined; for it is intercourse of human life with human life, whereas in every other sensual enjoyment, human life has intercourse with inanimate matter, or life inferior to itself”.<sup>68</sup>

The practice of free love under institutionalized pantagamy and male continence at Oneida unbound the passions, privileged pleasure over reproduction, and licensed Community members to “love one another *fervently* . . . [or] *burningly*”. The liberation of pleasure in sex was a therapeutic innovation because it promoted physical and psychological health. “Amativeness”, Noyes said, “is eminently favorable to life”, whereas the “alienation of the sexes” only insured that the “source and distribution of life” would remain “deranged and obstructed”.<sup>69</sup>

67. *Ibid.*, 55.

68. *Ibid.*, 57.

69. *Ibid.*, 31 and 44, respectively. The sex act, for Noyes, was sacramental; it distributed the force of divine love. Therefore, in any sex act, the spiritually superior partner, while engaging in “descending fellowship” when

Oneidans believed that such a unified consciousness of emotional and sexual matters had the potential to transform society. This system of free love would promote intimate social cohesion by overcoming selfishness; would emancipate labor by breaking down the barriers that separated the sexes at work; and would, in the grand scheme of things, advance the moral and physical progress of the race. When the utopian day of jubilee dawns, under “freedom of love”, “the refining effects of sexual love . . . will be increased a thousand-fold, [and] when sexual intercourse becomes a method of ordinary conversation and each is married to all”, it “will at once raise the race to new vigor and beauty, moral and physical”.<sup>70</sup>

The genius of Noyes’s sexual discovery, male continence, was that it subsumed the ascetic sensibility towards intercourse under a romanticized physical technique. Separation of the amative from the propagative aspects of the sex act rendered it “a joyful act of friendship”, and the skill and precision required for the practice of male continence elevated intercourse to “a place among the ‘fine arts’”.<sup>71</sup> Noyes, then, in his practical system of intercourse, contributed materially to laying the foundations for a modern sexual sensibility. In lovemaking, refined technique and conscious attention to the details of the act came to comprise the essential skills of the ideal lover.

Although Noyes himself specifically rejected any use of artificial means of contraception, his separation of pleasure from reproduction and the superordination of pleasure over propagation pointed the way toward a modern sexual consciousness. His insistence on frank and open discussion of sexual questions and on matter-of-fact acceptance of sex as a natural biological function provided the basis for later public sex education programs—what, after all, was his treatise on *Male Continence* if not a sexual hygiene and sex educa-

---

the act is considered purely from a physical point of view, is engaging in “ascending fellowship” when the sex act is seen from a spiritual perspective. Sex thus became the medium for bridging physical and spiritual experience.

70. *Bible Communism*, 53. See also pp. 59–61.

71. *Ibid.*, 53.





John Humphrey Noyes.

tion pamphlet? He also pioneered in undertaking one of the earliest eugenics experiments in America and in institutionalizing birth control (though social contraception at Oneida did not employ what Noyes called “artificial means”). His influence can be traced to the widespread modern practice of contraception (although he most assuredly would have disapproved of most of the current methods), and by extension to such contemporary techniques of conception as *in vitro* fertilization and artificial insemination that rely on the separation of the physical sex act and male ejaculation from conception.

In social terms Noyes, despite an inveterate belief in female moral inferiority, provided a model for the emancipation of women as domestic chattels and their protection from the perils of childbirth by communizing marriage and terminating the proprietary control of the husband. Persons would no longer be defined as property solely on the basis of their gender. Ironically, by strengthening the moral hegemony of the male in complex marriage through the practice of normatively nonorgasmic sex for men, he also liberated sexual pleasure for women. Since women were defined as morally inferior and did not expend their vital energy in sexual climax to the same degree as men, they were expected to experience orgasms at Oneida. For the male, except under conditions of propagative intercourse, sex was pure process, whereas for the female, it integrated process and end. Noyes, then, was unable, finally, to transcend the sexual ethics of the double standard.

Noyes saw himself as a radical social reformer and evinced great impatience with gradualism, though his system of perfected sexuality was, he realized, potentially “incendiary and dangerous”. To the modern social critic, it is clear that Noyes’s system threatened—as his critics had charged from the beginning—the subversion of both the civil and ecclesiastical order because it was, quite self-consciously, revolutionary. Complex free love sought to “break up the social system of the world, and [to] establish true external order by the reconciliation of the sexes”. Following the principle that “holiness must go before free love”, the Oneida Perfectionists

believed they had achieved the spiritual grace to “revolutionize sexual morality”.<sup>72</sup>

That revolution did not come in their time, and the forces of conventional sexual morality reestablished social control. But John Humphrey Noyes had exposed the sentimental pieties and romantic myths of Victorian sexuality to the glaring light of reason. He was the most innovative sexologist of his age. Unlike most other free lovers, he went beyond ideological prescriptions for ideal gender behavior, or personal social rebellion, and developed a practical sexual science that established physical ground rules for the sex act itself. Though he repeatedly denied the label, Noyes was nonetheless one of the greatest practitioners as well as one of the chief proponents and theorists of free love in the nineteenth century. Through the subtleties and complexities of his free love system, Father Noyes of Oneida expressed a new sexual aesthetics and fostered a new erotic consciousness that made him a father, as well, of modern sexual attitudes and sensibilities.<sup>73</sup>

72. *Bible Communism*, 42. Phrases quoted earlier in the paragraph are from pp. 63, 34, and 41, respectively.

73. The connections between Noyes's ideas, including the practice of male continence, and modern sexual attitudes and behavior is recognized in a brief discussion of Oneidan sexual practices in Samuel and Cynthia Janus, *The Janus Report on Sexual Behavior* (New York: John Wiley, 1993), 173.