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“Liberty is the mother of virtue, and if women be, by their very constitution, slaves, and not allowed to breathe the sharp invigorating air of freedom, they must ever languish like exotics, and be reckoned beautiful flaws in nature.”
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Editor’s Introduction

Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797) was an English author who rose to prominence in radical circles with a very quick response to Burke’s *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790) in which she defended the idea of natural rights. She extended her analysis two years later to defend the idea of equal rights for women in one of the founding texts of modern feminism - *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Wollstonecraft lived in France during the Revolution and wrote an early history of that event. She also wrote travel letters and novels. In 1797 she married the radical political philosopher William Godwin. Her daughter Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin, later Mary Shelley, wrote the novel *Frankenstein* (1818).

This work is one of the founding documents of the modern feminist movement and came out of a spirited debate with conservatives like Edmund Burke who denounced the idea of natural rights and the corollary right to seek redress in a revolution if need be when the government refused to acknowledge those rights. Wollstonecraft joined other radicals such as Thomas Paine and William Godwin to defend the radical position.

What is intriguing about Wollstonecraft is that she continued the discussion in this later book in order to apply for the first time these ideas about individual liberty to women as well as men. Having established this to be the case to her satisfaction she then asked the further question why were women in the subordinate position they were in vis-à-vis men? Her answer was that they were held in this position by a combination of force (laws which discriminated against them in terms of property ownership, education, and marriage) and established opinion regarding the proper role of women in the home and in society. Her solution was to equalize women before the law and to encourage parents to devote the same effort in educating their daughters as they did their sons. Only when legal discrimination was ended and educational opportunities made available to young girls would women be able to find their true level in society.

Wollstonecraft also argued that traditional ideas about education and the proper roles for each gender handicapped young boys as much as it did young girls. Whereas young women were encouraged to be good wives and mothers, young men were encouraged to be heroic and obedient soldiers. Neither set of stereotypes encouraged individuals to find their own calling in life.

“if women are to be excluded, without having a voice, from a participation of the natural rights of mankind, prove first, to ward off the charge of injustice and inconsistency, that they want reason–else this flaw in your NEW CONSTITUTION will ever shew that man must, in some shape, act like a tyrant, and tyranny, in whatever part of society it rears its brazen front, will ever undermine morality”
Sir,

Having read with great pleasure a pamphlet which you have lately published I dedicate this volume to you; to induce you to reconsider the subject, and maturely weigh what I have advanced respecting the rights of woman and national education: and I call with the firm tone of humanity; for my arguments, Sir, are dictated by a disinterested spirit—I plead for my sex—not for myself. Independence I have long considered as the grand blessing of life, the basis of every virtue—and independence I will ever secure by contracting my wants, though I were to live on a barren heath.

It is then an affection for the whole human race that makes my pen dart rapidly along to support what I believe to be the cause of virtue: and the same motive leads me earnestly to wish to see woman placed in a station in which she would advance, instead of retarding, the progress of those glorious principles that give a substance to morality. My opinion, indeed, respecting the rights and duties of woman, seems to flow so naturally from these simple principles, that I think it scarcely possible, but that some of the enlarged minds who formed your admirable constitution, will coincide with me.

In France there is undoubtedly a more general diffusion of knowledge than in any part of the European world, and I attribute it, in a great measure, to the social intercourse which has long subsisted between the sexes. It is true, I utter my sentiments with freedom, that in France the very essence of sensuality has been extracted to regale the voluptuary, and a kind of sentimental lust has prevailed, which, together with the system of duplicity that the whole tenour of their political and civil government taught, have given a sinister sort of sagacity to the French character, properly termed finesse; from which naturally flow a polish of manners that injures the substance, by hunting sincerity out of society. And, modesty, the fairest garb of virtue! has been more grossly insulted in France than even in England, till their women have treated as prudish that attention to decency, which brutes instinctively observe.

Manners and morals are so nearly allied that they have often been confounded, but, though the former should only be the natural reflection of the latter, yet, when various causes have produced factitious and corrupt manners, which are very early caught, morality becomes an empty name. The personal reserve, and sacred respect for cleanliness and delicacy in domestic life, which French women almost despise, are the graceful pillars of modesty; but, far from despising them, if the pure flame of patriotism have reached their bosoms, they should labour to improve the morals of their fellow-citizens, by teaching men, not only to respect modesty in women, but to acquire it themselves, as the only way to merit their esteem.

“Contending for the rights of woman, my main argument is built on this simple principle, that if she be not prepared by education to become the companion of man, she will stop the progress of knowledge and virtue; for truth must be common to all, or it will be inefficacious with respect to its influence on general practice.”

Contending for the rights of woman, my main argument is built on this simple principle, that if she be not prepared by education to become the companion of man, she will stop the progress of knowledge and virtue; for truth must be common to all, or it will be inefficacious with respect to its influence on general practice. And how can woman be expected to cooperate unless she know why she ought to be virtuous? unless freedom strengthen her reason till she comprehend her duty, and see in what manner it is connected with her real good? If children are to be
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educated to understand the true principle of patriotism, their mother must be a patriot; and the love of mankind, from which an orderly train of virtues spring, can only be produced by considering the moral and civil interest of mankind; but the education and situation of woman, at present, shuts her out from such investigations.

In this work I have produced many arguments, which to me were conclusive, to prove that the prevailing notion respecting a sexual character was subversive of morality, and I have contended, that to render the human body and mind more perfect, chastity must more universally prevail, and that chastity will never be respected in the male world till the person of a woman is not, as it were, idolized, when little virtue or sense embellish it with the grand traces of mental beauty, or the interesting simplicity of affection.

Consider, Sir, dispassionately, these observations—for a glimpse of this truth seemed to open before you when you observed, ‘that to see one half of the human race excluded by the other from all participation of government, was a political phænomenon that, according to abstract principles, it was impossible to explain. If so, on what does your constitution rest? If the abstract rights of man will bear discussion and explanation, those of woman, by a parity of reasoning, will not shrink from the same test: though a different opinion prevails in this country, built on the very arguments which you use to justify the oppression of woman—prescription.

Consider, I address you as a legislator, whether, when men contend for their freedom, and to be allowed to judge for themselves respecting their own happiness, it be not inconsistent and unjust to subjugate women, even though you firmly believe that you are acting in the manner best calculated to promote their happiness? Who made man the exclusive judge, if woman partake with him the gift of reason?

In this style, argue tyrants of every denomination, from the weak king to the weak father of a family; they are all eager to crush reason; yet always assert that they usurp its throne only to be useful. Do you not act a similar part, when you force all women, by denying them civil and political rights, to remain immersed in their families grooping in the dark? for surely, Sir, you will not assert, that a duty can be binding which is not founded on reason? If indeed this be their destination, arguments may be drawn from reason: and thus augustly supported, the more understanding women acquire, the more they will be attached to their duty—comprehending it—for unless they comprehend it, unless their morals be fixed on the same immutable principle as those of man, no authority can make them discharge it in a virtuous manner. They may be convenient slaves, but slavery will have its constant effect, degrading the master and the abject dependent.

But, if women are to be excluded, without having a voice, from a participation of the natural rights of mankind, prove first, to ward off the charge of injustice and inconsistency, that they want reason—else this flaw in your NEW CONSTITUTION will ever shew that man must, in some shape, act like a tyrant, and tyranny, in whatever part of society it rears its brazen front, will ever undermine morality.

I have repeatedly asserted, and produced what appeared to me irrefragable arguments drawn from matters of fact, to prove my assertion, that women cannot, by force, be confined to domestic concerns; for they will, however ignorant, intermeddle with more weighty affairs, neglecting private duties only to disturb, by cunning tricks, the orderly plans of reason which rise above their comprehension.

Besides, whilst they are only made to acquire personal accomplishments, men will seek for pleasure in variety, and faithless husbands will make faithless wives, such ignorant beings, indeed, will be very excusable when, not taught to respect public good, nor allowed any civil rights, they attempt to do themselves justice by retaliation.

The box of mischief thus opened in society, what is to preserve private virtue, the only security of public freedom and universal happiness?

“Let there be then no coercion established in society, and the common law of gravity prevailing, the sexes will fall into their proper places.”

Let there be then no coercion established in society, and the common law of gravity prevailing, the sexes will fall into their proper places. And, now that more equitable laws are forming your citizens, marriage may become more sacred: your young men may choose wives from motives of affection, and your maidens allow love to root out vanity.
The father of a family will not then weaken his constitution and debase his sentiments, by visiting the harlot, nor forget, in obeying the call of appetite, the purpose for which it was implanted. And, the mother will not neglect her children to practise the arts of coquetry, when sense and modesty secure her the friendship of her husband.

But, till men become attentive to the duty of a father, it is vain to expect women to spend that time in their nursery which they, ‘wise in their generation,’ choose to spend at their glass; for this exertion of cunning is only an instinct of nature to enable them to obtain indirectly a little of that power of which they are unjustly denied a share: for, if women are not permitted to enjoy legitimate rights, they will render both men and themselves vicious, to obtain illicit privileges.

I wish, Sir, to set some investigations of this kind afloat in France; and should they lead to a confirmation of my principles, when your constitution is revised the Rights of Woman may be respected, if it be fully proved that reason calls for this respect, and loudly demands JUSTICE for one half of the human race.

I am, Sir,
Your’s respectfully,
M.W.

CHAPTER II. THE PREVAILING OPINION OF A SEXUAL CHARACTER DISCUSSED

To account for, and excuse the tyranny of man, many ingenious arguments have been brought forward to prove, that the two sexes, in the acquirement of virtue, ought to aim at attaining a very different character: or, to speak explicitly, women are not allowed to have sufficient strength of mind to acquire what really deserves the name of virtue. Yet it should seem, allowing them to have souls, that there is but one way appointed by Providence to lead mankind to either virtue or happiness.

If then women are not a swarm of ephemeron triflers, why should they be kept in ignorance under the specious name of innocence? Men complain, and with reason, of the follies and caprices of our sex, when they do not keenly satirize our head-strong passions and groveling vices. – Behold, I should answer, the natural effect of ignorance! The mind will ever be unstable that has only prejudices to rest on, and the current will run with destructive fury when there are no barriers to break its force. Women are told from their infancy, and taught by the example of their mothers, that a little knowledge of human weakness, justly termed cunning, softness or temper, outward obedience, and a scrupulous attention to a puerile kind of propriety, will obtain for them the protection of man; and should they be beautiful, every thing else is needless, for, at least, twenty years of their lives.

Thus Milton describes our first frail mother; though when he tells us that women are formed for softness and sweet attractive grace, I cannot comprehend his meaning, unless, in the true Mahometan strain, he meant to deprive us of souls, and insinuate that we were beings only designed by sweet attractive grace, and docile blind obedience, to gratify the senses of man when he can no longer soar on the wing of contemplation.

How grossly do they insult us who thus advise us only to render ourselves gentle, domestic brutes! For instance, the winning softness so warmly, and frequently, recommended, that governs by obeying. What childish expression, and how insignificant is the being – can it be an immortal one? who will condescend to govern by such sinister methods! ‘Certainly,’ says Lord Bacon, ‘man is of kin to the beasts by his body; and if he be not of kin to God by his spirit, he is a base and ignoble creature!’ Men, indeed, appear to me to act in a very unphilosophical manner when they try to secure the good conduct of women by attempting to keep them always in a state of childhood. Rousseau was more consistent when he wished to stop the progress of reason in both sexes, for if men eat of the tree of knowledge, women will come in for a taste; but, from the imperfect cultivation which their understandings now receive, they only attain a knowledge of evil.

Children, I grant, should be innocent; but when the epithet is applied to men, or women, it is but a civil term for weakness. For if it be allowed that women were destined by Providence to acquire human virtues, and by the exercise of their understandings, that stability of character which is the firmest ground to rest our future hopes upon, they must be permitted to turn to the fountain of light, and not forced to shape their course by the twinkling of a mere satellite. Milton, I grant, was of a very different opinion; for he only
bends to the indefeasible right of beauty, though it
would be difficult to render two passages which I now
mean to contrast, consistent. But into similar
inconsistencies are great men often led by their senses.

‘To whom thus Eve with perfect beauty adorn’d.
My Author and Disposer, what thou bidst
Unargued I obey; so God ordains;
God is thy law, thou mine: to know no more
Is Woman's happiest knowledge and her praise.’

These are exactly the arguments that I have used to
children; but I have added, your reason is now gaining
strength, and, till it arrives at some degree of maturity,
you must look up to me for advice – then you ought to
think, and only rely on God.

Yet in the following lines Milton seems to coincide
with me; when he makes Adam thus expostulate with
his Maker

‘Hast thou not made me here thy substitute,
And these inferior far beneath me set?
Among unequals what society
Can sort, what harmony or true delight?
Which must be mutual, in proportion due
Giv’n and receiv’d, but in disparity
The one intense, the other still remiss
Cannot well suit with either, but soon prove
Tedious alike of fellowship I speak
Such as I seek, fit to participate
All rational delight –’

In treating, therefore, of the manners of women, let
us, disregarding sensual arguments, trace what we
should endeavour to make them in order to co-operate,
if the expression be not too bold, with the supreme
Being.

By individual education, I mean, for the sense of
the word is not precisely defined, such an attention to a
child as will slowly sharpen the senses, form the temper,
regulate the passions as they begin to ferment, and set
the understanding to work before the body arrives at
maturity; so that the man may only have to proceed,
not to begin, the important task of learning to think
and reason.

To prevent any misconstruction, I must add, that I
do not believe that a private education can work the
wonders which some sanguine writers have attributed
to it. Men and women must be educated, in a great
degree, by the opinions and manners of the society
they live in. In every age there has been a stream of
popular opinion that has carried all before it, and given
a family character, as it were, to the century. It may
then fairly be inferred, that, till society be differently
constituted, much cannot be expected from education.
It is, however, sufficient for my present purpose to
assert, that, whatever effect circumstances have on the
abilities, every being may become virtuous by the
exercise of its own reason; for if but one being was
created with vicious inclinations, that is positively bad,
what can save us from atheism? or if we worship a
God, is not that God a devil?

“But for this epoch we must wait –
wait, perhaps, till kings and nobles,
enlightened by reason, and, preferring
the real dignity of man to childish
state, throw off their gaudy hereditary
trappings; and if then women do not
resign the arbitrary power of beauty –
they will prove that they have less mind
than man.”

Consequently, the most perfect education, in my
opinion, is such an exercise of the understanding as is
best calculated to strengthen the body and form the
heart. Or, in other words, to enable the individual to
attain such habits of virtue as will render it
independent. In fact, it is a farce to call any being
virtuous whose virtues do not result from the exercise of
its own reason. This was Rousseau's opinion respecting
men: I extend it to women, and confidently assert that
they have been drawn out of their sphere by false
refinement, and not by an endeavour to acquire
masculine qualities. Still the regal homage which they
receive is so intoxicating, that till the manners of the
times are changed, and formed on more reasonable
principles, it may be impossible to convince them that
the illegitimate power, which they obtain, by degrading
themselves, is a curse, and that they must return to
nature and equality, if they wish to secure the placid
satisfaction that unsophisticated affections impart. But
for this epoch we must wait – wait, perhaps, till kings
and nobles, enlightened by reason, and, preferring the
real dignity of man to childish state, throw off their
gaudy hereditary trappings; and if then women do not
resign the arbitrary power of beauty — they will prove that they have less mind than man.

I may be accused of arrogance; still I must declare what I firmly believe, that all the writers who have written on the subject of female education and manners from Rousseau to Dr Gregory, have contributed to render women more artificial, weak characters, than they would otherwise have been; and, consequently, more useless members of society. I might have expressed this conviction in a lower key; but I am afraid it would have been the whine of affectation, and not the faithful expression of my feelings, of the clear result, which experience and reflection have led me to draw. When I come to that division of the subject, I shall advert to the passages that I more particularly disapprove of, in the works of the authors I have just alluded to; but it is first necessary to observe, that my objection extends to the whole purport of those books, which tend, in my opinion, to degrade one half of the human species, and render women pleasing at the expense of every solid virtue.

Though, to reason on Rousseau's ground, if man did attain a degree of perfection of mind when his body arrived at maturity, it might be proper, in order to make a man and his wife one, that she should rely entirely on his understanding; and the graceful ivy, clasping the oak that supported it, would form a whole in which strength and beauty would be equally conspicuous. But, alas! husbands, as well as their helpmates, are often only overgrown children; nay, thanks to early debauchery, scarcely men in their outward form — and if the blind lead the blind, one need not come from heaven to tell us the consequence.

Many are the causes that, in the present corrupt state of society, contribute to enslave women by cramping their understandings and sharpening their senses. One, perhaps, that silently does more mischief than all the rest, is their disregard of order.

To do every thing in an orderly manner, is a most important precept, which women, who, generally speaking, receive only a disorderly kind of education, seldom attend to with that degree of exactness that men, who from their infancy are broken into method, observe. This negligent kind of guesswork, for what other epithet can be used to point out the random exertions of a sort of instinctive common sense, never brought to the test of reason? prevents their generalizing matters of fact — so they do to-day, what they did yesterday, merely because they did it yesterday.

This contempt of the understanding in early life has more baneful consequences than is commonly supposed; for the little knowledge which women of strong minds attain, is, from various circumstances, of a more desultory kind than the knowledge of men, and it is acquired more by sheer observations on real life, than from comparing what has been individually observed with the results of experience generalized by speculation. Led by their dependent situation and domestic employments more into society, what they learn is rather by snatches; and as learning is with them, in general, only a secondary thing, they do not pursue any one branch with that persevering ardour necessary to give vigour to the faculties, and clearness to the judgment. In the present state of society, a little learning is required to support the character of a gentleman; and boys are obliged to submit to a few years of discipline. But in the education of women, the cultivation of the understanding is always subordinate to the acquirement of some corporeal accomplishment; even while enervated by confinement and false notions of modesty, the body is prevented from attaining that grace and beauty which relaxed half-formed limbs never exhibit. Besides, in youth their faculties are not brought forward by emulation; and having no serious scientific study, if they have natural sagacity it is turned too soon on life and manners. They dwell on effects, and modifications, without tracing them back to causes; and complicated rules to adjust behaviour are a weak substitute for simple principles.

As a proof that education gives this appearance of weakness to females, we may instance the example of military men, who are, like them, sent into the world before their minds have been stored with knowledge or fortified by principles. The consequences are similar, soldiers acquire a little superficial knowledge, snatched from the muddy current of conversation, and, from continually mixing with society, they gain, what is termed a knowledge of the world, and this acquaintance with manners and customs has frequently been confounded with a knowledge of the human heart. But can the crude fruit of casual observation, never brought to the test of judgment, formed by comparing speculation and experience, deserve such a distinction? Soldiers, as well as women, practise the minor virtues with punctilious politeness. Where is then the sexual difference, when the education has been the same? All the difference that I can discern, arises from
the superior advantage of liberty, which enables the
former to see more of life.

It is wandering from my present subject, perhaps, to
make a political remark; but, as it was produced
naturally by the train of my reflections, I shall not pass
it silently over.

“Standing armies can never consist of
resolute, robust men; they may be well
disciplined machines, but they will
rarely contain men under the
influence of strong passions, or with
very vigorous faculties. And as for any
depth of understanding, I will venture
to affirm, that it is as rarely to be found
in the army as amongst women; and
the cause, I maintain, is the same.”

Standing armies can never consist of resolute,
robust men; they may be well disciplined machines, but
they will seldom contain men under the influence of
strong passions, or with very vigorous faculties. And as
for any depth of understanding, I will venture to
affirm, that it is as rarely to be found in the army as
amongst women; and the cause, I maintain, is the
same. It may be further observed, that officers are also
particularly attentive to their persons, fond of dancing,
crowded rooms, adventures, and ridicule. [1] Like the
fair sex, the business of their lives is gallantry. – They
were taught to please, and they only live to please. Yet
they do not lose their rank in the distinction of sexes,
for they are still reckoned superior to women, though
in what their superiority consists, beyond what I have
just mentioned, it is difficult to discover.

The great misfortune is this, that they both acquire
manners before morals, and a knowledge of life before
they have, from reflection, any acquaintance with the
grand ideal outline of human nature. The consequence
is natural; satisfied with common nature, they become
a prey to prejudices, and taking all their opinions on
credulity, they blindly submit to authority. So that if
they have any sense, it is a kind of instinctive glance,
that catches proportions, and decides with respect to
manners; but fails when arguments are to be pursued
below the surface, or opinions analyzed.

May not the same remark be applied to women?
Nay, the argument may be carried still further, for they
are both thrown out of a useful station by the
unnatural distinctions established in civilized life.
Riches and hereditary honours have made cyphers of
women to give consequence to the numerical figure;
and idleness has produced a mixture of gallantry and
despotism into society, which leads the very men who
are the slaves of their mistresses to tyrannize over their
sisters, wives, and daughters. This is only keeping them
in rank and file, it is true. Strengthen the female mind
by enlarging it, and there will be an end to blind
obedience; but, as blind obedience is ever sought for by
power, tyrants and sensualists are in the right when
they endeavour to keep women in the dark, because the
former only want slaves, and the latter a play-thing.
The sensualist, indeed, has been the most dangerous of
tyrians, and women have been duped by their lovers, as
princes by their ministers, whilst dreaming that they
reigned over them.

I now principally allude to Rousseau, for his
character of Sophia is, undoubtedly, a captivating one,
though it appears to me grossly unnatural; however it is
not the superstructure, but the foundation of her
character, the principles on which her education was
built, that I mean to attack; nay, warmly as I admire
the genius of that able writer, whose opinions I shall
often have occasion to cite, indignation always takes
place of admiration, and the rigid frown of insulted
virtue effaces the smile of complacency, which his
eloquent periods are wont to raise, when I read his
voluptuous reveries. Is this the man, who, in his ardour
for virtue, would banish all the soft arts of peace, and
almost carry us back to Spartan discipline? Is this the
man who delights to paint the useful struggles of
passion, the triumphs of good dispositions, and the
heroic flights which carry the glowing soul out of itself?
– How are these mighty sentiments lowered when he
describes the pretty foot and enticing airs of his little
favourite! But, for the present, I wave the subject, and,
instead of severely reprehending the transient effusions
of overweening sensibility, I shall only observe, that
whoever has cast a benevolent eye on society, must
often have been gratified by the sight of humble
mutual love, not dignified by sentiment, or
strengthened by a union in intellectual pursuits. The
domestic trifles of the day have afforded matters for
cheerful converse, and innocent caresses have softened toils which did not require great exercise of mind or stretch of thought; yet, has not the sight of this moderate felicity excited more tenderness than respect? An emotion similar to what we feel when children are playing, or animals sporting, whilst the contemplation of the noble struggles of suffering merit has raised admiration, and carried our thoughts to that world where sensation will give place to reason.

Women are, therefore, to be considered either as moral beings, or so weak that they must be entirely subjected to the superior faculties of men.

>“Women are, therefore, to be considered either as moral beings, or so weak that they must be entirely subjected to the superior faculties of men.”

Let us examine this question. Rousseau declares that a woman should never, for a moment, feel herself independent, that she should be governed by fear to exercise her natural cunning, and made a coquetish slave in order to render her a more alluring object of desire, a sweeter companion to man, whenever he chooses to relax himself. He carries the arguments, which he pretends to draw from the indications of nature, still further, and insinuates that truth and fortitude, the corner stones of all human virtue, should be cultivated with certain restrictions, because, with respect to the female character, obedience is the grand lesson which ought to be impressed with unrelenting rigour.

What nonsense! when will a great man arise with sufficient strength of mind to puff away the fumes which pride and sensuality have thus spread over the subject! If women are by nature inferior to men, their virtues must be the same in quality, if not in degree, or virtue is a relative idea; consequently, their conduct should be founded on the same principles, and have the same aim.

Connected with man as daughters, wives, and mothers, their moral character may be estimated by their manner of fulfilling those simple duties; but the end, the grand end of their exertions should be to unfold their own faculties and acquire the dignity of conscious virtue. They may try to render their road pleasant; but ought never to forget, in common with man, that life yields not the felicity which can satisfy an immortal soul. I do not mean to insinuate, that either sex should be so lost in abstract reflections or distant views, as to forget the affections and duties that lie before them, and are, in truth, the means appointed to produce the fruit of life; on the contrary, I would warmly recommend them, even while I assert, that they afford most satisfaction when they are considered in their true, sober light.

Probably the prevailing opinion, that woman was created for man, may have taken its rise from Moses’s poetical story; yet, as very few, it is presumed, who have bestowed any serious thought on the subject, ever supposed that Eve was, literally speaking, one of Adam’s ribs, the deduction must be allowed to fall to the ground; or, only be so far admitted as it proves that man, from the remotest antiquity, found it convenient to exert his strength to subjugate his companion, and his invention to shew that she ought to have her neck bent under the yoke, because the whole creation was only created for his convenience or pleasure.

Let it not be concluded that I wish to invert the order of things; I have already granted, that, from the constitution of their bodies, men seem to be designed by Providence to attain a greater degree of virtue. I speak collectively of the whole sex; but I see not the shadow of a reason to conclude that their virtues should differ in respect to their nature. In fact, how can they, if virtue has only one eternal standard? I must therefore, if I reason consequentially, as strenuously maintain that they have the same simple direction, as that there is a God.

It follows then that cunning should not be opposed to wisdom, little cares to great exertions, or insipid softness, varnished over with the name of gentleness, to that fortitude which grand views alone can inspire.

I shall be told that woman would then lose many of her peculiar graces, and the opinion of a well known poet might be quoted to refute my unqualified assertion. For Pope has said, in the name of the whole male sex,

>‘Yet ne’er so sure our passion to create,  
As when she touch’d the brink of all we hate.’

In what light this sally places men and women, I shall leave to the judicious to determine; meanwhile I shall content myself with observing, that I cannot discover why, unless they are mortal, females should
always be degraded by being made subservient to love or lust.

[we have cut the discussion about romantic love for reasons of space]

As a philosopher, I read with indignation the plausible epithets which men use to soften their insults; and, as a moralist, I ask what is meant by such heterogeneous associations, as fair defects, amiable weaknesses, etc.? If there be but one criterion of morals, but one archetype for man, women appear to be suspended by destiny, according to the vulgar tale of Mahomet’s coffin; they have neither the unerring instinct of brutes, nor are allowed to fix the eye of reason on a perfect model. They were made to be loved, and must not aim at respect, lest they should be hunted out of society as masculine.

“Do passive indolent women make the best wives? ... And have women, who have early imbibed notions of passive obedience, sufficient character to manage a family or educate children?”

But to view the subject in another point of view. Do passive indolent women make the best wives? Confining our discussion to the present moment of existence, let us see how such weak creatures perform their part? Do the women who, by the attainment of a few superficial accomplishments, have strengthened the prevailing prejudice, merely contribute to the happiness of their husbands? Do they display their charms merely to amuse them? And have women, who have early imbibed notions of passive obedience, sufficient character to manage a family or educate children? So far from it, that, after surveying the history of woman, I cannot help, agreeing with the severest satirist, considering the sex as the weakest as well as the most oppressed half of the species. What does history disclose but marks of inferiority, and how few women have emancipated themselves from the galling yoke of sovereign man? — So few, that the exceptions remind me of an ingenious conjecture respecting Newton: that he was probably a being of a superior order, accidently caged in a human body. Following the same train of thinking, I have been led to imagine that the few extraordinary women who have rushed in eccentric directions out of the orbit prescribed to their sex, were male spirits, confined by mistake in female frames. But if it be not philosophical to think of sex when the soul is mentioned, the inferiority must depend on the organs; or the heavenly fire, which is to ferment the clay, is not given in equal portions.

But avoiding, as I have hitherto done, any direct comparison of the two sexes collectively, or frankly acknowledging the inferiority of woman, according to the present appearance of things, I shall only insist that men have increased that inferiority till women are almost sunk below the standard of rational creatures. Let their faculties have room to unfold, and their virtues to gain strength, and then determine where the whole sex must stand in the intellectual scale. Yet let it be remembered, that for a small number of distinguished women I do not ask a place.

It is difficult for us purblind mortals to say to what height human discoveries and improvements may arrive when the gloom of despotism subsides, which makes us stumble at every step; but, when morality shall be settled on a more solid basis, then, without being gifted with a prophetic spirit, I will venture to predict that woman will be either the friend or slave of man. We shall not, as at present, doubt whether she is a moral agent, or the link which unites man with brutes. But, should it then appear, that like the brutes they were principally created for the use of man, he will let them patiently bite the bridle, and not mock them with empty praise; or, should their rationality be proved, he will not impede their improvement merely to gratify his sensual appetites. He will not, with all the graces of rhetoric, advise them to submit implicitly their understanding to the guidance of man. He will not, when he treats of the education of women, assert that they ought never to have the free use of reason, nor would he recommend cunning and dissimulation to beings who are acquiring, in like manner as himself, the virtues of humanity.

Surely there can be but one rule of right, if morality has an eternal foundation, and whoever sacrifices virtue, strictly so called, to present convenience, or whose duty it is to act in such a manner, lives only for the passing day, and cannot be an accountable creature.

The poet then should have dropped his sneer when he says,
‘If weak women go astray,
The stars are more in fault than they’

For that they are bound by the adamantine chain of
destiny is most certain, if it be proved that they are
never to exercise their own reason, never to be
independent, never to rise above opinion, or to feel
the dignity of a rational will that only bows to God, and
often forgets that the universe contains any being but
itself and the model of perfection to which its ardent
gaze is turned, to adore attributes that, softened into
virtues, may be imitated in kind, though the degree
overwhelms the enraptured mind.

If, I say, for I would not impress by declamation
when Reason offers her sober light, if they be really
capable of acting like rational creatures, let them not
be treated like slaves; or, like the brutes who are
dependent on the reason of man, when they associate
with him; but cultivate their minds, give them the
salutary, sublime curb of principle, and let them attain
conscious dignity by feeling themselves only dependent
on God. Teach them, in common with man, to submit
to necessity, instead of giving, to render them more
pleasing, a sex to morals.

Further, should experience prove that they cannot
attain the same degree of strength of mind, perseverence,
and fortitude, let their virtues be the
same in kind, though they may vainly struggle for the
same degree; and the superiority of man will be
equally clear, if not clearer; and truth, as it is a simple
principle, which admits of no modification, would be
common to both. Nay, the order of society as it is at
present regulated would not be inverted, for woman
would then only have the rank that reason assigned her,
and arts could not be practised to bring the balance
even, much less to turn it.

These may be termed utopian dreams. – Thanks to
that Being who impressed them on my soul, and gave
me sufficient strength of mind to dare to exert my own
reason, till, becoming dependent only on him for the
support of my virtue, I view, with indignation, the
mistaken notions that enslave my sex.

I love man as my fellow; but his scepter, real, or
usurped, extends not to me, unless the reason of an
individual demands my homage; and even then the
submission is to reason, and not to man. In fact, the
conduct of an accountable being must be regulated by
the operations of its own reason; or on what
foundation rests the throne of God?

“I love man as my fellow; but his
scepter, real, or usurped, extends not to
me, unless the reason of an individual
demands my homage; and even then
the submission is to reason, and not to
man.”

It appears to me necessary to dwell on these
obvious truths, because females have been insulated, as
it were; and, while they have been stripped of the
virtues that should clothe humanity, they have been
decked with artificial graces that enable them to
exercise a short-lived tyranny. Love, in their bosoms,
taking place of every nobler passion, their sole
ambition is to be fair, to raise emotion instead of
inspiring respect; and this ignoble desire, like the
servility in absolute monarchies, destroys all strength
of character Liberty is the mother of virtue, and if
women be, by their very constitution, slaves, and not
allowed to breathe the sharp invigorating air of
freedom, they must ever languish like exotics, and be
reckoned beautiful flaws in nature.

“Liberty is the mother of virtue, and if
women be, by their very constitution,
slaves, and not allowed to breathe the
sharp invigorating air of freedom, they
must ever languish like exotics, and be
reckoned beautiful flaws in nature.”

As to the argument respecting the subjection in
which the sex has ever been held, it retorts on man.
The many have always been enthralled by the few; and
monsters, who scarcely have shewn any discernment
of human excellence, have tyrannized over thousands
of their fellow-creatures. Why have men of superior
endowments submitted to such degradation? For, is it
not universally acknowledged that kings, viewed
collectively, have ever been inferior, in abilities and
virtue, to the same number of men taken from the
common mass of mankind – yet, have they not, and
are they not still treated with a degree of reverence that is an insult to reason? China is not the only country where a living man has been made a God. Men have submitted to superior strength to enjoy with impunity the pleasure of the moment – women have only done the same, and therefore till it is proved that the courtier, who servilely resigns the birthright of a man, is not a moral agent, it cannot be demonstrated that women is essentially inferior to man because she has always been subjugated.

“The many have always been enthralled by the few; and monsters, who scarcely have shewn any discernment of human excellence, have tyrannized over thousands of their fellow-creatures. Why have men of superior endowments submitted to such degradation? For, is it not universally acknowledged that kings, viewed collectively, have ever been inferior, in abilities and virtue, to the same number of men taken from the common mass of mankind – yet, have they not, and are they not still treated with a degree of reverence that is an insult to reason?”

Brutal force has hitherto governed the world, and that the science of politics is in its infancy, is evident from philosophers scrupling to give the knowledge most useful to man that determinate distinction.

I shall not pursue this argument any further than to establish an obvious inference, that as sound politics diffuse liberty, mankind, including woman, will become more wise and virtuous.

Notes

[1] Why should women be censured with petulant acrimony, because they seem to have a passion for a scarlet coat? Has not education placed them more on a level with soldiers than any other class of men?

[2] Similar feelings has Milton’s pleasing picture of paradisiacal happiness ever raised in my mind, yet, instead of envying the lovely pair, I have, with conscious dignity, or Satanic pride, turned to hell for sublimer objects. In the same style, when viewing some noble monument of human art, I have traced the emanation of the Deity in the order I admired, till, descending from that giddy height, I have caught myself contemplating the grandest of all human sights, – for fancy quickly placed, in some solitary recess, an outcast of fortune, rising superior to passion and discontent.
“The distinctive principle of Western social philosophy is individualism. It aims at the creation of a sphere in which the individual is free to think, to choose, and to act without being restrained by the interference of the social apparatus of coercion and oppression, the State.”

[Ludwig von Mises, “Liberty and Property” (1958)]
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