

MONEY, MATING & MARRIAGE

What You Absolutely Need to Know

Edited by

Jim Cogle

NOTE: This publication is designed to provide information and education. It is provided with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting or other professional advice. If financial advice, legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a licensed professional should be sought.

The publisher specifically disclaims any personal liability for loss or risk incurred as a consequence of the use and application, either directly or indirectly, of any opinion or information presented herein.

This document is intended for educational purposes only.

<i>Cover design</i>	Desktop X-Press Graphic Design
<i>Manuscript Preparation</i>	Dorothy Brislain
<i>Printed by</i>	6Colour Copy

Copyright © 2011 R. James Cogle

All rights reserved. No part of this work covered by the copyrights hereon may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means – graphic, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, taping or information storage and retrieval systems – without the prior written permission of the publisher, or, in case of photocopying or other reprographic copying, a licence from Access Copyright, the Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency, One Yonge Street, Suite 1900, Toronto, Ontario, M6B 3A9

ISBN 978-0-9694137-9-0

Printed in Canada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Road to a Better Marriage	page 5
The Mating Game - Then and Now.....	page 7
Sex at the Center	page 21
The Myths of Marriage.....	page 31
#1 Why People ‘Really’ Get Married	
# 2 How Most Married People Think	
# 3 What Is Really Needed for a Good Marriage	
#4 Marital Problems – The Shocking Truth	
#5 The Unfulfilled Marriage	
# 6 Married and Still Lonely	
# 7 Does Telling Your Spouse Off Indicate a Poor Marriage?	
When is it time?	page 93

THE ROAD TO A BETTER MARRIAGE

Dear Reader,

The reason that I have included this section regarding marriage is because money and marriage share a unique relationship. A happy marriage normally means more money. While this may not be scientifically provable, it is still true. The stress and negativity of an unhappy marriage robs energy that could be channelled toward wealth creation. Unhappy people tend to focus on their personal situation and not on their financial situation.

Many social scientists now agree that the cause of most marital problems is lack of knowledge. Most people, even if they have selected a suitable mate, simply do not know what to expect from marriage. How many couples do you know who have read very much, if anything, about marriage before jumping in? They are not among my friends. Most people spend very little time selecting a mate and less time exploring the ramifications of marriage. No wonder there is so much unhappiness and so many divorces.

Dr. William Lederer, Dr. Don Jackson, and Professors Jared Diamond and Helen Fisher were the major contributors to this guide. I have merely served as an editor of their work. These wise people present the case for “equality” in marriage and explore some of the common myths surrounding this venerable institution.

Their thesis is that “enduring human relationships depend on an interplay of behaviour which signals to each spouse that whatever she/he receives, has been forthcoming in response to something given”. This may at first sound clinical and crass but nonetheless, something for something is the basis of all human relationships. Once the novelty wears off, couples must negotiate an arrangement with respect to their behaviour and responsibilities, if they want to live in reasonable harmony. This is the fatal flaw in many marriages today. People get married with totally uninformed ideas of what marriage should be, could be and probably will be. According to the aforementioned writers, the negotiated marital arrangement may appear “selfish and unromantic” but yet it is, in their opinion, absolutely vital if we want a stable and enjoyable long-term marriage. Too many people believe that love and romance plus lots of material things will provide happiness. This delusion is at the core of our divorce epidemic. Happiness and thus a healthier financial situation come from a better understanding of modern marriage.

I hope that you enjoy reading *Money, Marriage and Mating* as much as I enjoyed putting it together for you. My only regret is that I didn't have these insights forty years ago. But as they say, “the next best time is now”. May our knowledge and our prosperity grow together.

R. J. (Jim) Cogle

THE MATING GAME – THEN AND NOW

I know that many people do not enjoy history. They find it boring, stodgy and irrelevant. This is usually because they have had a poor introduction to the subject through a less than enthusiastic high school teacher or a boring, old college professor. This is unfortunate, because history is essential for a clear understanding of most general topics. In particular, it is important for the understanding of societal institutions such as marriage and family. For this reason, I have been forced to include a few pages of history and can only hope that you won't be offended. You could skip these next several pages, but I believe they are vital to the understanding of the seven myths of marriage that we will be discussing in the latter part of this document. Please stay with me and I will try to be less boring than those who have preceded me in your life.

Now just sit back and enjoy a little read about how thousands of years of mating have led to our current situation. Women will get a chuckle about the marital arrangement that Julius Caesar encountered when he visited England in the first century A.D.

At the beginning of man's existence, several million years ago, it seems that members of the human race procreated in the same random manner as almost all other animals do. A female and a male met by chance, and if both had a strong sexual drive, they copulated. After a short period of intimacy, the male wandered off to continue his usual activities – hunting and fighting. Several months later, the female perhaps noticed that she was pregnant. It is probably true that for many millennia pregnancy was not associated with the sex act. Furthermore, in those ancient days, (as in some of the more impoverished rural nations today), the condition of pregnancy probably did not diminish the daily activities of the female until the point of actual delivery. When labour pains began, the female assumed as comfortable a position as possible – wherever she happened to be – and gave birth to the infant.

Perhaps within a day or two she was foraging for food as usual, with the additional burden of nursing and caring for the child. The father was totally uninvolved and didn't know his own child.

The First Communities

Probably the females eventually tended the gardens and built the shelters. Gradually these females must have gathered together in groups, clustering their temporary homes near one another, and the first community developed. The male still was the hunter and the warrior, probably roaming wherever game was most

plentiful during the spring and summer months, and, during his wanderings, copulating with any female he might happen to fancy. But the female, under the necessity of rearing children, accumulated the food to last through the winter, developed skills at turning animal hides into protective clothing, maintained fires and created shelters. It is probable, therefore, at least in the northern countries that itinerant males migrated toward the communities of females sometime in the late autumn.

With warm weather, the males wandered off again, stopping at the abodes of females in a random fashion. Finally, in some groups, the association between sex and childbirth became known. But still the human species continued the random sexual pattern. It is likely that the first human social group consisted of women who learned to help each other during labour and take turns at minding the children.

Under this social system there was no concern about paternity. Eventually, probably because of the invention of tools and the further development of agriculture, men began to spend more time around the camp and a simple social group evolved in which they played a fixed part.

A primitive law, or taboo, slowly formed, which forbade mating in directly ascending and descending lines of consanguinity – in other words, the incest taboo developed. We find this taboo among peoples and races all over the world; it is probably the first socio-marital regulation imposed by man upon himself.

It is not difficult, to see how an incest taboo would simplify and strengthen the social structure by allowing relatives to band together into a “clan”, whose members could trust each other and support each other in fights or other mutual endeavours. The ban against incest allowed males to avoid battles over their own sisters and mothers and to have a common link with other males (brothers-in-law). Since evidence indicates that polygamy and polyandry were common among primitive people, the early family units would have been different from those we know today, and would have consisted of several women with a relatively close tie to one another and a looser tie to one or more men. An exception may have been our ancient British ancestors.

When Julius Caesar visited ancient England in the first century, he described a peculiar family arrangement.

“Most of the tribes in the interior do not grow corn but live on milk and meat, and wear skins....They wear their hair long, and shave the whole of their bodies except the head and the upper lip. Wives are shared between groups of ten or twelve men especially between brothers and between fathers and sons; but the offspring of these unions are counted as the children of the man with whom a particular woman cohabitated first.”

Evidence derived from studies of the Bushmen in Australia indicates that a particular kind of social organization was probably necessary for the migration and survival of the human race in early times. The men had to forage for game and yet find a camp when the hunt was over, or women could not become impregnated and perpetuate the race. The long period of gestation in the human animal made possible the absence of men for considerable periods of time, without a resulting decline in the birth rate.

Since the life span of primitive man was probably less than thirty years, (man's life span was approximately thirty-seven years in Roman days), it was advantageous to mate indiscriminately. A man could thus be the father of many children by a number of women, instead of waiting as much as twelve to eighteen months for one woman to become fecund again. (Probably less than half of the children survived infancy). If twenty men went on hunting and foraging expeditions and only five returned, there were at least four women for each survivor to impregnate in the service of the tribe. Objects relating to fertility rites have been found by anthropologists among almost all primitive and nomadic people studied. Thus, it seems likely that man took great interest in the survival of the race at an early date in his history. (There is also evidence that early humans liked to copulate).

Today, we may see indiscriminate mating as immoral and crude, but it was necessary for the preservation of the species under primitive conditions of life.

At some point many thousands of years ago, changing atmospheric and soil conditions made possible the advent of tall grasses; shelter and food became more available within a given geographical area, and with the domestication of animals and especially with the acquisition of control over fire, a “camp” could be maintained for relatively long periods of time.

Woman, the Nurturer – Man, the Hunter

Consider now, in a speculative fashion, the kind of organization, which such circumstances might require. Women tied down by childbirth and child rearing would be likely to remain close to the camp. Men would hunt but return to the camp, either at nightfall, (for protection and warmth) or after longer periods of hunting. Individuals would begin to have, for their neighbours, though to a lesser extent, the kind of feeling that a mother has for her child. People would be regarded as belonging in one of two categories – those whom one knew and those whom one didn’t know. The latter probably were killed whenever possible, but gradually larger groups collected where the land would support them. And, as their numbers increased, people found it necessary to develop tolerance for one another.

As long as society remained primitive, the relationship between married male and female was a practical one; the family unit was a unit for physical survival. Almost everyone in it had to work, long and hard. A male and a female who became partners and had children, normally had greater chances for survival and

more advantages than they would have had if they had stayed alone. The first young children were a survival liability, but as they grew up the original “couple” became a group – with all of its members participating in the survival activities.

Love

‘Love’ was not important. In primitive vocabularies there was no word for love.

This may be due to the brutal and harsh conditions under which our early ancestors lived. They were forced to spend their every waking hour concerned with basic survival. In such conditions, love might be regarded as a luxury.

It was not until the Middle Ages, (1100-1500) that the word ‘love’ (in the sense in which it is used today) became current. Communities developed under the protection of the nobles in their great castles. The Lady of a castle assumed the same prestigious position as her husband, the Lord.

Other people did the work, but the Lady of the castle had leisure time to learn to read and practice the arts. Usually she was more educated than her husband, and, if she had duties, they were light and principally administrative. Having so much spare time, she often became egocentric, and she began to adorn herself. She also became bored.

When the Crusades began in the eleventh century, many of the nobles went off to war, leaving their wives at home. The men, who did not go on the Crusades, tried to amuse the ladies; they wooed them, usually with extramarital sex in mind.

During this period there arose the phenomenon of the troubadour, usually a noble, who went from castle to castle to entertain. These troubadours sang songs and ballads about “romance” to entertain the Lady of the castle.

There is much literature to suggest that sex, outside of marriage, became the fashion with these ladies. Probably these married women were the aggressors and initiators in these sex activities. The women were bored. They were intellectually and artistically superior to their husbands, and probably resented the inferior, non-productive position into which they had been forced by a male-dominated society.

They defined extramarital passion as “love”. These ladies of the Middle Ages, in their excessive leisure, gathered into groups called Courts of Love, which defined the current rules and traditions of “love”. The example, which follows, is a code of love agreed upon by a court of women under the leadership of the Countess of Champagne in May 1174.

CODE OF LOVE OF THE 12TH CENTURY

1. Marriage is no good excuse against loving.
2. Whoever cannot conceal a thing, cannot love.

3. No one can bind himself to two loves at once.
4. Love must always grow greater or grow less.
5. There is no savour in what a lover takes by force.
6. The male does not love until he has attained a complete manhood.
7. A widowhood of two years is prescribed to one lover for the other's death.
8. No one, without abundant reason, ought to be deprived of his own love.
9. No one can love unless urged thereto by the hope of being loved.
10. Love is always exiled from its dwelling by avarice.
11. It is not decent to love one whom one would be ashamed to marry.
12. The true lover does not desire embraces from any but the co-lover.
13. Love that is known publicly rarely lasts.
14. An easy conquest renders love despised, a difficult one makes it desired.
15. Every lover turns pale in the sight of the co-lover.
16. The lover's heart trembles, at the unexpected sight of the co-lover.
17. A new love makes one quit the old.
18. Probity, (high principle) alone makes a man worthy of love.
19. If love lessens, it dies speedily and rarely regains health.
20. The man prone to love is always prone to fear.
21. Real jealousy always increases the worth of love.
22. Suspicion and the jealousy it kindles, increase love's worth.
23. Who thought of love plagues, eats less and sleeps less.
24. Whatever a lover does ends with thinking of the co-lover.
25. The true lover thinks naught good but what he believes pleases the co-lover.

26. Love can deny love nothing.
27. The lover cannot be satiated by the delights of the co-lover.
28. The least presumption compels the lover to suspect evil of the co-lover.
29. He is not wont to love, whom too much abundance of plea sure annoys.
30. The true lover is haunted by the co-lover's image unceasingly.
31. Nothing prevents one woman from being loved by two men or one man by two women.

We pronounce and decree by the tenure of these presents, that love cannot extend its powers over two married persons; for lovers must grant everything, mutually and gratuitously, the one to the other, without being constrained there unto by any motive of necessity; while husband and wife are bound by duty to agree the one with the other and deny each other nothing. Let this judgement, which we have passed with extreme caution and with the advice of a great number of other ladies, be held by you as the truth, unquestionable and unalterable.

In the year 1174, the third day from the Calends of May 1st

Here we have the genesis of "romantic" love. Like most human beliefs, attitudes, and ways of behaving, it grew out of the social conditions and requirements of an era, and represented an adjustment to these conditions. In turn,

it influenced the conditions themselves, and triggered a series of changes which exert influence on attitudes and behaviour even today.

The phenomenon of “romance: grew even stronger when there were powerful female monarchs on the throne, e.g., Queen Elizabeth I and later, Queen Victoria in Great Britain. The male utilized the romantic environment during the courting of the female, but after marriage, the male became dominant, even tyrannical. Romantic love had nothing to do with married love, which was something else, and still is. (How grotesquely unfortunate).

This romance-before-marriage tradition was brought to the American Colonies from England. But in America its practice was not restricted to the elite. The romantic courtship became a common custom, largely because of the scarcity of women in the pioneer days. This early shortage had an enormous influence on American male/female relationships, an influence that still lingers. In pioneer days, males competed for the few females, using romantic-love behaviour as a persuader.

Also, the widespread belief (whether true or not) that the male was stronger, more vigorous, more courageous, and more aggressive than the female, placed emphasis, both directly and indirectly, on romantic love. The few females for whom the pioneers competed, appeared “small and helpless”. They had to be “protected” by the males. This view reinforced romantic attitudes before marriage.

The Modern Woman

During the periods of World War I and World War II, a revolution occurred in the relationship between men and women. Women learned that they could do almost anything men could do, as well as, in many instances, better. It was realized that women live longer, are healthier, have a higher threshold for pain than men, and can successfully compete with men scholastically.

This realization offered to women a new spectrum of satisfaction and opportunities, based, in large measure, on an improved self-image, which had long been denied them. For them, it indicated the end of the primarily male dominated and male structured society. The modern woman, in the first half of the twentieth century, desired equality in every way, beginning with sex and the vote.

At about the same time, contraceptive devices were perfected. Now, woman could be man's equal, not only in society, in business, and in scholarship, but also in sexual convenience; the sex act could be enjoyed by both, without the woman having to fear an unwanted pregnancy.

In past centuries, in Western society, it has been considered important for a bride to be a virgin, whereas this condition seldom was required of the male, or even considered desirable. Today, most people don't even pay lip service to the

idea of the virgin bride. It is not, generally, considered important. Evidence from research indicates that during the past fifty years, women have practiced premarital sexual relations at an increasing rate. This is true even among the evangelical community. According to Dr. Laureen Winner, a “born again” Christian writer, this promiscuity is just as prevalent in the Church, as it is in the general population.

Roughly 65% of all North American teenagers have sex by the time they graduate from high school. And about 75% have sex before getting married. These numbers are not appreciably different for Christians.

Sex and Promiscuity

Probably promiscuity has always been common in certain lower socio-economic groups, but in the upper class it was considered relatively rare until fifty years ago — at least it was not as obvious. The desire for extramarital intercourse has been increased by the advent of mass communication media, particularly television advertising and the internet. These have tended to make sex, both in and out of marriage, appear to be the most important thing in the lives of most North Americans.

The effect of the growing sex emphasis is shown, for example, in the fact that each year, thousands of babies are born to “child mothers”, twelve to eighteen years old. Thousands more are aborted.

Thousands of high school girls are getting pregnant annually, despite the proliferation of contraceptives. In California, one third of these are in the ninth and tenth grades. The frequency of premarital intercourse among high school students has considerable significance because it probably indicates a corresponding trend among adults — a trend less clearly reflected in statistics concerning adult women.

SEX AT THE CENTER

Two forces remain to be considered in this survey of the history of marriage. The first is religion. When the Holy Roman Empire was at its peak, the Church exerted control over all facets of human life in Western Europe by means of canonical law. The most stringent canonical laws concerned marriage. For many ages, marriage laws and customs had been civil, but then the Church moved in and took control. The first step was to make marriage a Holy Sacrament, for, in the New Testament, there is no proviso for this.

The hold of the Church for many centuries was so complete throughout Western Europe that almost everyone believed and accepted anything (religious or non-religious) which came from Rome. One breach occurred in the sixteenth century with the discoveries of Copernicus. His declaration that the planets, including the earth, revolve about the Sun, that the earth is not the centre of the universe, as the Church maintained, was heard throughout Europe. More and more, men of learning doubted some of the edicts that came from Rome. Also, with the emergence of the Protestant Churches, Roman Catholic control, over many aspects of life, was reduced. It became impossible for the elite to divorce without having the Pope's permission.

The growing disbelief in the Church's infallibility also resulted, in time, in the rejection of the Church's definition of male and female characteristics, including the evil nature of woman and the natural superiority of man. This ridiculous

proposition had grown out of a misreading of the creation story in Genesis and a misinterpretation of several other passages of scripture.

Economics and Marriage

Another force, which influences marriage, is economics. Until the nineteenth century, the European family was a unit of economic survival. Most people lived on the land or maintained family industries. The larger the family, the more hands there were to work at home. This arrangement may have been hard on the wife, but no one seemed to care about that in the male dominated society.

In 1769, the first great economic-technological explosion began. With the development of the modern steam engine by James Watt, an economic metamorphosis was initiated, which led to corresponding changes in family life and marriage. The steam engine made factories possible, and the factories took the husband out of the home, keeping him away all day and often into the night. The full burden of maintaining the home and family life fell upon the woman.

Hitherto, she had at least been able to depend on her husband to discipline the older children and to make major household decisions. In his absence, she was forced to assume almost all of the responsibility for the family.

The construction of factories also affected marriage in another way. It caused families to move from their rural homes, where they could always live off the land

in times of depression, into cities and slums, which provided no place to forage for food or to grow it. Workers, and their families, were crowded in the slum areas. Homes were small, (often consisting of one room) and unheated. Children had no place, either to work or to play, and they were exposed to more contagious illnesses. At the age of eight, they, too, went to work in the factories. Children longed for the day when they could leave their parents; shabby quarters, and the family was splintered in a fashion unheard of in rural communities.

The effects of slum living on family life were calamitous. The mother suffered the humiliation and despair of seeing her children grow hungry, ill, or quarrelsome. She was prevented from performing her usual nurturing role without a continuous, exhausting struggle.

The slums and factories also brought humiliation to the father. Pay was so low and depressions were so frequent, that he could not provide for his children or his wife. Unable to fulfill their traditional roles adequately, parents coped with hardship and disillusionment in the various ways that are common to human beings under stress. Some became lethargic and pretended not to care; some deserted the family, rather than face utter failure; some stayed and continued the struggle, often at the price of illness, bitterness, and chronic fear. Women began to work and seek more education so that they could help ensure adequate care for themselves and their children when their husbands could not. Men began to seek new ways to maintain their dominance and self-respect in the home.

At that time, English law, from which our own family law derives, gave the wife and mother no legal protection, let alone community property. Women, in such a legally helpless conditions, learned to distrust men and began to seek ways to look out for themselves. According to some authorities, many of these women moved to the United States as indentured wives, and subsequently influenced the development of American family structure along more egalitarian lines.

Changes in the Traditional Roles

During this era, which lasted approximately a hundred years, we find the disintegration of the traditional home. For centuries, in Western Europe, the traditional home was congruent with a particular form of marriage. With the fracturing of the customary roles in the home, the institution of marriage, inevitably, also came into serious question.

In Western culture, the male had always been dominant over the female. The “real man” was the individual who could use heavy tools, could hunt, and was a good physical fighter. Physical strength, having been the basis of survival, also placed men in the positions of power. They made the rules and decisions. But, after the Industrial Revolution, a man’s value began to be measured in terms of his technical skill and intellectual productiveness, as shown by the amount of money he made. And, as in the twentieth century moved on, the female was able to develop the same skills and intellectual powers, and make money almost as well as the man.

In the North America today, the women control and spend more money than do the men. In other words, as men's roles became less dependent upon physical strength and more related to skill and intellect, they also became more accessible to women. Birth control made it increasingly possible for both men and women to seek new avenues of expression.

To women, with their increased education in non-domestic areas, the new male role seemed attractive. By contrast, the traditional female roles often were regarded as unchallenging and servile, perhaps less because of their inherent nature, than because of their association with the concept of women as inferior beings, capable of filling only these roles and no others.

Drastic changes in family life were inevitable. One such major change has completely altered marital expectations and behaviour. Marriage has become more than a purely functional process. People today, seldom enter marriage because it will help them survive physically, or because it is generally more advantageous for a male and female to join in a collaborative partnership than to live alone.

The relationship problems evidenced in complex industrialized societies, have led some people to wish for the 'good old days' when social and sexual roles were rigidly defined by the society, and just as rigidly enforced. Also, one often hears, "if the young people had more real problems to worry about, they'd stay out of

trouble”. Both of these nostalgic sentiments are based on some truth, in more primitive societies - those social groupings in which sheer physical survival is the consciously understood central focus of communal living – active collaboration with others, and submergence of the individual interests to group interests becomes a necessity.

Quarrelling and separation, such as occur in divorce or desertion, are threats to individual survival, and are controlled by the group in its own interest. In these societies, the socialization process is such, that individual needs are adjusted to group needs. Indeed, this adjustment is the goal of socialization and education in all societies, but in modern civilizations, the variety of conflicting divergent groups makes it impossible for an individual to gear his needs and aims to those of all groups. The groups, which capture his allegiance, or the allegiance of his parents, generally determine his social behaviour.

In modern industrial society, couples facing a crisis affecting survival, often stick together, only to separate when the emergency has passed.

The Battle of the Sexes

The battle for survival in modern societies is usually a battle for emotional survival and the tools of war are correspondingly psychological, aimed at maiming the enemy’s self-esteem or causing him shame, rather than at killing him.

In such psychological warfare, e.g. the battle of the sexes between spouses, it is difficult to decide who the winner is and who the loser is. There may be other parties in the picture, operating unwittingly in subtle ways (the mother-in-law gets most of the blame) so that it is difficult to name the players without a program.

The institution of marriage has failed to adapt itself sufficiently to current requirements. The former battle of the sexes and the family turmoil raging today, are evidence of the haphazard efforts of individuals to reconcile their traditional role images with current realities. With little help from any social quarter, men and women are trying to find their place in the sun. Sometimes plagued by guilt and uncertainty, they struggle to discover their “identity”, yet are unable to accept themselves if they do catch a glimpse of their genuine needs, desires and goals.

For what they glimpse is not what they have been conditioned to believe is ‘good’ or ‘right’, according to age-old systems of beliefs developed on the basis of requirements which died at the time of the Industrial Revolution.

The man who, through education and training, has learned to find his greatest fulfillment in reading or art or hairstyling or general scholarship, rather than in athletic or business competition, must find ways to reconcile his preference with many age-old images regarding ‘masculinity’. The college educated woman, who finds happiness and self respect in professional achievement, has the task of

reconciling her learned needs and preferences with the 'feminine' image, which includes domestic and mothering abilities.

Today, both sexes can perform most social functions equally well, and the rigid social resistance to role diffusion, is becoming less of a frustration to those who seek self-expression in roles outside the boundaries of their defined sex roles.

Members of the younger generation can more easily break through traditional role designations. But it has been a major task of this and previous generations, to find concrete solutions to the sex role problems which their parents have left unresolved.

The extreme manifestations of what some parents see as sex role confusion, such as boys dressing more like girls, girls dressing more like boys, and the increase in homosexuality and promiscuity, frighten parents because they cannot imagine a future different from the past they have known.

The Industrial Revolution has, indeed, been accompanied by a trend toward the development of great similarity in the social roles of males and females. This does not mean that the biological differences between men and women have been destroyed or that homosexuality will be the eventual outcome.

Do We Still Need Marriage?

Some of the young people today, who are vehemently against marriage, are actually struggling to find new attitudes to match new social realities.

Accomplishment of this aim is involving vast changes in the marriage process and in family structure.

In summary, marriage used to be an institution for the physical survival and well-being of two people and their offspring. This function gave rise to a particular rule governed structure, suitable to the situation. Today, except in time of war or accident, the struggle for survival in industrialized societies does not require purely physical strength. Instead we have, primarily, the struggle for psychological and emotional survival. The family unit is the natural unit for human survival regardless of what the hazard is. But so far, the changes in the structure form and processes of marriage have been too few and too unsystematic to cope with the new psychological and emotional problems.

Marriage still is an anachronism from the days of the jungle, or at least from the days of small farms and home industries.

Divorce, marital strife, desertion and emotional and physical illness, are a few symptoms of this cultural lag in the institution of marriage, and they seem to be on the increase. We cannot return to the “simple” life of an agricultural or primitive

community in this atomic, industrial age. We must modify our outmoded attitudes, beliefs and institutions to accommodate current social realities.

Marriage is still a necessary institution. Men and women need a committed bond that is both public and private. But, marriage must be adjusted to new social and economic conditions. Above all, the new roles and relationships of men and women must be recognized. It is not surprising that an anachronistic social institution cannot function. Nevertheless, it is tragic that so many marriages fail and so little is being done about it. There is no substitute for a stable relationship, within some type of committed union.

THE MYTHS OF MARRIAGE

Both individual experience and statistical surveys make it clear that almost everyone suffers severe disappointment within a few months after marriage. A study conducted by the Mental Research Institute with couples married for an average of one year, indicated that they felt marriage was different from what they had expected.

One young woman said, "Marriage is not what I had assumed it would be. One premarital assumption after another has crashed down on my head. I am going to make my marriage work, but it's going to take a lot of hard work and readjusting. Marriage is like taking an airplane to Florida for a relaxing vacation in January, and when you get off the plane you find you're in the Swiss Alps. There is cold and snow instead of swimming and sunshine. Well, after you buy winter clothes and learn how to ski and learn how to talk a new foreign language, I guess you can have just as good a vacation in the Swiss Alps as you can in Florida. But I can tell you; it's one hell of a surprise when you get off that marital airplane and find that everything is far different from what one had assumed".

This realistic and candid young woman is now happy in her marriage. However, for her to reach this point, required two years of patient working and changing, and of expensive visits, by her and her husband, to a competent marriage counsellor for a one a month 'check-up'. She learned that the institution of modern marriage is based on many false assumptions and untrue beliefs.

Whenever a decision or a system is based on false assumptions, it is almost certain to be a failure — and marriage is no exception. We believe that if men and women were acquainted with the realities of marriage before they entered it and if they accepted these realities, the divorce rate would diminish markedly.

To understand the realities of the marital relationship, it is essential first to recognize the unrealities. What follows is a discussion of the myths of marriage.

MYTH# 1 - WHY PEOPLE 'REALLY' GET MARRIED

The first myth is the belief that people get married because they are 'in love'. It is extremely difficult to define love satisfactorily. Dictionaries disagree.

Psychiatrists and psychologists who specialize in marital problems usually are unable to define love. When they are asked the question by a client, they usually evade the issue by asking, "What do you think love is?"

The definition of perfect love, which is most cherished in the Western world is the one given by St. Paul in the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians. True, it is a Christian definition, but it is so universal, that its almost exact equivalent is used by Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists and Jews.

Love suffereth long, and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth
not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh
not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil;

Some versions use the word 'charity' instead of 'love'. But they mean the same thing. Both refer to the act of cherishing dearly and giving unstintingly without wishing anything in return.

Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; Beareth

all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth
all things. Love never faileth.

The authors have never met a person who is consistently loving, according to St. Paul's definition. We have known many decent people; people who have integrity and who are kind, most of the time; but they do not consistently love in this biblical sense. It is our opinion that it would be too difficult for spouses to practice this kind of relationship described by St. Paul unless both were saints.

The great American psychiatrist, Harry Stack Sullivan, has given a more practical definition of love. "When the satisfaction or the security of another person becomes as significant to one as is one's own satisfaction or security, then the state of love exists". The state of love, described by Sullivan, is possible in marriage, but few spouses are prepared for it or capable of experiencing it right after the wedding. Its coming, if it comes at all, is the result of luck or of years of hard work and patience, as we hope to demonstrate later.

Observation of hundreds of married couples shows that very few experience love. It is a false assumption that people marry for love. They like to think of themselves as being in love, but by and large, the emotion they interpret as love is, in reality, some other emotion – often a strong sex drive, fear, or a hunger for approval.

Why We Marry

If they are not in love then why are they impelled to marry? There are several reasons.

During courtship, individuals lose most of their judgement. People who believe themselves to be in love, describe their emotion as ecstasy. 'Ecstasy', from the Greek 'ekstasis', which means 'derange', is defined as the 'state of being beside oneself; state of being beyond all reason and self-control'. When an emotional courtship starts, the man and woman appear to relinquish whatever sense of balance and reality they ordinarily possess.

Helen Fisher writes that, "The love possessed person focuses almost all of his or her attention on the beloved, often to the detriment of everything and everyone around them, including work, family, and friends". Love is psychologically a type of insanity – fortunately for all, a temporary form of insanity.

Courtship – the time of ecstatic paralysis – has been cleverly designed by Nature to lure members of the species into reproducing themselves. Courtship is a powerful manifestation of sexual excitement. In Western culture, it has well-defined rituals. These are simple steps leading up to the ultimate goal – legal breeding. The man and the woman are in a trance. By the magic of Nature, they have become wonderfully attractive to each other.

It is marvellous to observe how ruthless and cunning Nature is in her effort to perpetuate the species. Individuals are in such a dizzy state that they become reckless. The problems of marriage are not noticed or considered. The frightful divorce statistics mean nothing. It seems obvious that bad marriages, like death, are for others only.

Frequently, the partners-to-be know that they are marrying the wrong persons, but they are in such a passion, (some call it romance) and are being driven so hard by their hormones, that they cannot help themselves. For example, they may realize that the man is unable, as yet, to earn a living or that the woman is incompetent to manage a home, or that each has radically different tastes and values from the other.

These, and many other obstacles to a workable marriage, usually have no significance to a couple in the courtship stage. The courting individuals are obsessed by one desire only – to mate. Every society ordains that a ceremony of some type should sanctify the mating.

Although in a majority of marriages, the magic and marvellous attractiveness of courtship diminishes (and often vanishes entirely) within a brief time after the honeymoon, it is obvious that the instinct to reproduce – the sex drive (which mistakenly is called love) – lures a great many individuals into marriage, (the greatest argument against sex too soon in the courtship stage).

People often marry because the family expects it of them. In our society, a single woman is sometimes regarded as an unattractive failure; and a middle-aged bachelor is suspected of being a homosexual, or of having a mother complex.

Society encourages marriage in many ways, and for many reasons. For example, marriage is, to put it crudely, good for business. It gives employment to ministers, justices of the peace, caterers, florists, dressmakers, printers, jewellers, furniture manufacturers, architects, landlords, obstetricians, etc., almost endlessly.

Whenever there is a wedding, a hundred cash registers tinkle. Therefore, members of the profit making multitude smile and applaud, frequently in honest approval. This approval adds to the myth that the very act of marriage is a good thing. It brings prestige, in society's eyes, to the young couple.

For the clergy and for officials, marriage is a source of power and control, a means of perpetuating loyalty to the Church through the children. Certain historical necessities, which in point of fact may no longer exist, are also reflected in the attitudes of society.

For example, in earlier days when mortality rates were high, a 'big family' meant more people in the community, and thus a greater chance for survival, and marriage was prerequisite for the existence of the big family. Though circumstances have now changed, the approbation of marriage has not. In short, almost all segments of society disapprove of the single state, but approve of

marriage. This universal attitude tends to cause people who think they are in love, to be impetuous, hurried and careless in getting married. Marriage, they have been taught, is a “good thing”, and although this has diminished somewhat, it is still there.

The pressures and the manoeuvrings of parents often push their children into premature and careless marriages. Parents manoeuvre, manipulate and meddle.

Fathers and mothers claim that they meddle for their children’s benefit. The truth is that parents often feel failure or disgrace if their children aren’t married at the conventional age. And, parents are seldom fully honest with their children about their own relationships. Therefore, most young adults believe that their parents are, or were, in love and that they must be emulated in this respect – again, to a lesser degree in the twenty-first century.

The Hollywood Influence

Romantic literature, tradition and television/Hollywood, have given marriage false values, which the excited male and female often accept as true. They enter wedlock expecting a high level of constant joy from that moment on. Although they take an oath to love and cherish each other, throughout all adversity, in fact, they do not expect any serious adversity. They have been persuaded that love, (which they cannot even define) automatically will make it possible to solve all problems.

Loneliness often drives people into marriage. Many individuals simply cannot bear to be alone. They get bored and restless, and they think that having somebody of the opposite sex in the house will stop them from being miserable.

Thus, they marry because of desperation, not love.

Many people are fearful concerning their economic future. Men may believe that the responsibility involved in supporting a wife and children will automatically motivate them to produce more than they would if they remained single. Women often feel they will find financial security through marriage, regardless of the current ability of their finances to provide for their needs.

Do Opposites Really Attract?

Some individuals marry because of an unconscious desire to improve themselves.

Almost all human beings have a mental image – called the ego ideal – of what they would like to be. In reality, an individual seldom develops into this ideal person. But, when he meets someone of the opposite sex who has the qualities that he desires, then up pops another false assumption.

The individual unconsciously concludes that if he marries, he will, without effort, acquire the missing desirable characteristics or talents. For this reason, a

drunk sometimes is attracted to an abstainer; an inherent liar may be drawn to a simple, naïve person; a man with poor physical coordination often marries a slender, athletic woman; a person who cannot carry a tune often marries one who can sing well, and so forth. After the marriage, the spouses learn that intimacy does not bring about the desired self-improvement. Each blames the other and the discord begins.

Many marriages are motivated by neuroses. Certain individuals pick as mates, those who make it possible for them to exercise their neuroses. These people do not wish to be happy in the normal sense. If they enjoy suffering, they unconsciously choose partners with whom they can fight, or who will abuse or degrade them. Some of these marriages endure for a considerable time, because the partners get pleasure from discord, but this type of perversion can hardly be called an expression of love.

Some people miss their father or mother, and cannot live without a parental symbol. Therefore, they find, and marry, a person of the opposite sex who will play the parental role.

In summary, then, it may be said that people generally enter matrimony thinking they are in love and believing that marriage will bring them 'instant happiness' which will solve all problems. Actually, in most instances they are swept into marriage on a tidal wave of romance, not love. Romance is usually ephemeral, (according to Helen Fisher, it cannot last more than eighteen months, and usually

far less). It is selfish. Romantic ‘lovers’ are distraught and miserable when separated and this misery is caused by selfishness of the most egocentric type.

The ‘lover’ is sorry for himself and is grieving over his loss of pleasure and intimacy. This state of mind is closely related to another selfish emotion – jealousy.

Romance is exciting but it is no relation to love, no kin to that generous concern for someone else, which Harry Stack Sullivan defines as love.

Most people believe they are marrying for love. This is a false assumption and a dangerous myth even though we all hate to hear it. We all want to believe in “and they lived happily ever after”.

MYTH # 2 - HOW MOST MARRIED PEOPLE THINK

Both our own research and a review of publications by many social scientists, have led us to the conclusion that spouses, who have been married for more than three or four years, rarely state spontaneously to an interviewer that they are in love with one another. They are more apt to speak in utilitarian terms, or to make unilateral statements like, “John is a good provider or Jane is a good mother to our children”. Yet, in many marriages, especially discordant ones, each partner tenaciously and stubbornly believes that he is a loving individual more loving than his spouse.

Each partner strongly feels that he is trying, with courage and self-sacrifice, to make the marriage work and that if there is friction the other partner is causing it.

Each may cite specific episodes which demonstrate that he is loving, patient and good, (and that the other is selfish, unkind, and unreasonable). In many cases, spouses, who believe their behaviour to be generous and loving, are unwittingly, lying to themselves. A large percentage of what they believe to be loving acts are, in truth, profoundly destructive acts — the expression of an unconscious hypocrisy. The spouses usually are not aware they are murdering their marriages and mangling their partners under the guise of love.

The pattern, in brief, is this – Spouse A believes, (consciously) that he is behaving in a loving, benevolent manner to spouse B. In reality, (unconsciously) A is behaving in a harmful manner. If B labels the behaviour as harmful rather than benevolent, A is hurt and replies, “I was only trying to be helpful”.

The accusations, misunderstandings and fights now begin. Here are three examples:

Example # 1

Michael Young, (who was a bachelor until he was thirty-two) is a marvellous cook and an efficient housekeeper. His wife, Martha, knows almost nothing about

domestic science. She has lived abroad most of her life. Her family had servants for all chores. Michael is unhappy over Martha's low-grade performance in cooking and home maintenance. "I will show you how to do it", says Michael. "I will teach you".

On weekends, Michael puts on a brilliant performance, cleaning the house with efficiency and speed, and concocting gourmet meals effortlessly. He repeats the act whenever there are guests present, "because that's when Martha needs help most", and frequently reminds her that he is helping her.

Actually he is showing her up, nagging her, and making her feel even more helpless and incompetent. He is making her afraid to try to learn, and is convincing her that, no matter what heroic efforts she makes, she will be a failure. He is unconsciously persuading her that she will never be able to equal his own performance and satisfy him. But he says, and believes, he is helping her and being loving.

Example # 2

Joan Dalrymple is a great cook. She majored in domestic science at a Women's school later studying cooking in Paris and Vienna. Preparing things to eat, the fancier the better, is the passion of her life. She bakes her own bread, makes her own mayonnaise, grows her own herbs, livens up vegetables and meats with rich egg and cream sauces. Her desserts are famous.

People are eager to be invited to the Dalrymple home. Joan is proud of her skill. She has elaborate dinner parties regularly, which she regards as per way of exhibiting her love for Howard and of helping him in his business. She forgets how much she enjoys receiving the praise of her guests, and their requests for recipes.

Howard is getting fatter by the month. His blood cholesterol is up. His physician wants him to lose weight. But Howard's health requirements do not take precedence over Joan's determination to nourish her own ego by impressing others with her skill as a cook and as a thoughtful loving wife, nor over her wish to advertise how much she is helping Howard, professionally.

Howard tries to follow his doctor's advice, but finds it hard to refuse eating in front of guests, or to appear difficult, after listening to Joan enthusiastically describe how she drove twenty miles to a farm to obtain absolutely fresh cream. Howard may, with tired despair, eat the food, and hope to reduce in other ways. Paradoxically, Howard believes he is being loving when he does so, because he doesn't wish to hurt Joan's feelings, especially in front of guests. In this way, he is compounding Joan's deceit and destructive behaviour. He is, not only, permitting Joan's "loving" actions and attitudes to destroy him, he is assisting her.

Example # 3

Joe, who has been married about three years, works hard in his advertising Office. He comes home at night extremely fatigued. At his moment of arrival, his wife, a teacher, greets him effusively and insists on “relaxing him and taking care of him”. During the summer, she always meets him at the garden gate, kisses him affectionately, puts her arm around him, and leads him to the chaise longue in the shade beneath the apple tree. There, waiting for him, are a glass of freshly made lemonade and two aspirins.

“But Marie, I don’t want to.....”

“Now, darling, you’re exhausted and nervous, and I know what’s good for you. That’s my sole function in life – to take care of you.....”

Observed objectively, this dialogue sounds like part of a comic opera, but variations of it occur daily in thousands of homes.

Joe may be flattered, but he is also irritated. What he would like to do is have a martini, a hot tub, and about a half hour of quiet. But Marie insists, and Joe usually gives in. Yet, each evening, driving home from work and thinking about the reception he’ll receive from Marie, he feels extremely angry. Some times he even wishes his wife would die. “If she were dead, I could get into the house without being molested”. This thought recurs so often that Joe finally feels he is losing his mind, and goes to a psychiatrist.

The psychiatrist interviews both Joe and Marie. Here is part of his private report. “Marie is a “sweet” person who has firm ideas about what a wife should do for her husband. When her determined benevolence violates her husband’s concepts, Joe resists and tells her to stop managing him. Marie responds by bursting into tears, clinging to Joe, and pathetically sobbing that he is rejecting her and does not love her”. And, indeed, after several years of Marie’s “benevolence”, Joe does reject her and dislike her. Marie has “loved” him into a nasty divorce.

Joe’s friends are shocked. How can he leave such a loving wife? Joe shakes his head with the unmistakable air of a man misunderstood. “Yes”, he is able to reply, after several months of seeing the psychiatrist. “Marie worked hard to make a good marriage. She worked so hard she forgot about me as an individual”.

There are many other examples of behaviour which appears to be loving, but is really selfish. Consider, for instance, the spouse who ‘loves’ the other so much that whenever they are separated he frets, phones, and e-mails his partner to distraction.

Or examine the behaviour of the individual who believes he wishes to make the other proud of him, but really desires to exhibit his fine intelligence and talents. In a group with the spouse, he will dominate all conversation, answer all questions

addressed to the spouse, and even steal all the punch lines, all with the air of being supportive and helpful of trying to make “both of us” look intelligent.

The husband who picks out a new car and gives it to his wife as a surprise birthday present is proud of his generosity and his loving behaviour. He looks ahead for the flash of joy which will light her face when she finds the car with her initials on it, waiting in the garage. But this desire for an enthusiastic response, a look of joyful surprise, is selfish. He is nourishing his own ego. Were his wife’s happiness and pride as significant to him as his own, he would have told her to pick out the automobile which she wanted, giving her the pleasure of choosing the make, model, colour, accessories, etc. Or, he would have suggested that they both go out and look at cars together.

We do not mean to imply, however, that the occasional, spontaneous acts of giving which occur in marriage are harmful.

The generalized recommendation to ‘be loving’, offered by counsellors, is too vague to be helpful and often simply makes the worried spouse feel guilty about being human, and occasionally unloving. And when giving is spontaneous, rather than forced, it brings joy to both the giver and the receiver. And when a so-called marriage counsellor recommends a ‘loving’ act, which one spouse performs independently (without discussion and mutual agreement), he is leading the spouse into debilitating behaviour. The ‘loving’ spouse is here, unilaterally

deciding the nature of the marriage relationship. This type of behaviour unequivocally leads to trouble.

Yet, just such behaviour which we call loving self-deception, is recommended by many writers on marriage in newspapers, magazines and books, and by many marriage counsellors some of whom have MDs or PhDs after their names.

The advice goes something like this: “If you want to make your wife happy, send her roses once a week”. But the wife may resent the spending money each week on flowers. She may prefer to spend the money at a beauty parlour or on new clothes.

Consider the following, (paraphrased) remarks of a nationally syndicated marriage counsellor, to a woman who seeks advice on how to behave toward her husband, whom she has just caught making love to another woman:

“Dear Upset: It is obvious that you have not been providing your spouse with sufficient stimulation (sic!) at home. How long has it been since you’ve had your hair restyled? Do you dress well? Present yourself well? I suggest you say nothing about the situation to your husband. Simply make it a practice to be a charming, attractive wife.

It is not obvious why the expert chose appearance as the focal point for his cure but, he is treating the situation as if it were solely the wife’s fault. There are many

reasons why his advice is unfortunate, if not actually harmful, including such obvious possibilities as the following:

1. The husband's fondness for his lover may indicate not sexual dissatisfaction, but a desire for intellectual companionship. He may already feel his wife is too vain and resent her lack of interest in intellectual activities. The columnist's advice, in this case, will only increase their problems.

2. If the wife is suddenly 'loving' and charming and the husband is feeling guilt for having behaved badly, what will he think of his wife's inappropriate behaviour? He may easily imagine that she is simply biding her time before letting the axe fall, by secretly making legal arrangements for separation or divorce. In the meantime, with no honest communication between them, his suspicions and guilt and her suspicions and anger will only drive them further apart. Like Tiger Woods, he may eventually be on the receiving end of a golf club.

3. Most important, how does this advice aid the couple to examine their total relationship, which is, after all, the key to the reasons for any form of infidelity? Sol Gordon, a noted social scientist, says he never lists adultery as a cause of marital breakdown. It is, according to Dr. Gordon, "a symptom".

Thus, behaviour that appears to be loving, may, in reality, be a form of one-upmanship, selfishness and lack of consideration. Deception of oneself and others is destructive and accelerates the disintegration of a marriage.

All human beings perform unilateral and selfish acts. To do so is not always bad. It sometimes can be wholesome if the individual knows what is happening. But under no circumstances can these acts be regarded as loving, and the first requirement for a workable marriage is to live and relate on a basis of reality, not of myths, obsolete and meaningless traditions and self-deceit.

MYTH # 3 - WHAT IS REALLY NEEDED FOR A GOOD MARRIAGE

Even though people are reluctant to admit it, most husbands and wives are disappointed in their marriages. There is overwhelming evidence to confirm this.

Almost two, out of every three, who get married, will be divorced within ten years. Many of these will indulge in legal polygamy, ie., they will marry and divorce several times. All told, the divorce rate in North America is about 45 percent.

Marriage is so turbulent an institution, that articles on how to patch up disintegrating marriages can be found in almost every issue of our family magazines and daily newspapers with titles such as “How to Keep Your Husband Happy”, “How to Make Your Wife Feel Loved”, “The Best Sex Ever”. Surveys show that this sort of article frequently attracts more readers than anything else in the publication. It appears because of public demand, a demand which must originate from millions of unhappy, confused and dissatisfied couples. Evidently, the dreamed-of happy marriage often does not materialize. There are unexpected shortcomings, bickering and misunderstandings. Most spouses, to varying degrees, are frustrated, confused, belligerent and disappointed.

Almost every expression of our culture, including advertisements, has something to say about how to improve female/male relationships. Movies, plays,

television, radio, feature the friction between wife and husband more than any other subject.

The offices of marriage counsellors, psychologists and psychiatrists are crowded with clients who are concerned over problems which mainly involve marriage, and who pay a lot of money for assistance. But these troubled people usually cannot identify their problems. Even worse, they usually do not sincerely seek solutions. What each one wants is confirmation that he is correct and good, and that his spouse is the one at fault.

One reason for this marital disenchantment is the prevalence of the mistaken belief that “love” is necessary for a satisfying and workable marriage. Usually when the word “love” is used, reference is actually being made to romance – that hypnotic, ecstatic condition enjoyed during courtship. Romance and love are different. Romance is based usually on minimum knowledge of the other person, (restricted frequently to the fact that being around him is a wonderful, stimulating experience). Romance is built on a foundation of quicksilver non-logic.

It consists of attributing to the other person, blindly, hopefully, but without much basis in fact, the qualities one wishes him to have, though they may not even be desirable, in actuality.

Most people, who select mates on the basis of imputed qualities, later find themselves disappointed, if the qualities are not present in fact, or discover that they are unable to tolerate the implication of the longed-for qualities in actual life.

For example: the man who is attracted by his fiancée's cuteness and sexiness, may spend tormented hours after they are married worrying about the effect of these very characteristics on other men. It is a dream relationship, an unrealistic relationship with a dream person imagined in terms of one's own needs.

Romance is essentially selfish, though it is expressed in terms of glittering sentiment and generous promises, which usually cannot be fulfilled. "I'll be the happiest man in the world for the rest of my life". "I'll make you the best wife any man ever had".

Romance, which most spouses mistake for love, is not necessary for a good marriage. The sparkle some couples manage to preserve in a satisfying marriage, based on genuine pleasure in one another's company, affection and sexual attraction for the spouse as he really is, can be called love.

If romance is different than love, then what is love? We do best to return to the definition of Harry Stack Sullivan. "When the satisfaction or the security of another person becomes as significant to one as is one's own satisfaction or security, then the state of love exists". In this sense, love consists of a devotion and respect for the spouse that is equal to one's own self-love.

We have already shown that people usually marry on a wave of romance, having nothing to do with love. When the average North American (not long from the altar) lives with the spouse in the intimacy of morning bad breath from too much smoking, of annoying habits previously not known, when he is hampered by the limitations of a small income, (compared with the lavishness of the honeymoon) or encounters the unexpected irritability of premenstrual tension or of business frustration and fatigue, a change in attitude begins to occur. The previously romantic person begins to have doubts about the wonderful attributes with which his spouse has been so blindly credited.

These doubts are particularly disturbing at the start. Not very long ago, after all, the spouse believed that “love” (romance) was heavenly, all-consuming immutable, and that beautiful relationship and behaviour were voluntary and spontaneous. Now, if doubts and criticism are permitted to intrude upon this perfect dream, the foundations begin to shake in a giddy manner. To the husband or wife, the doubts seem to be evidence that one of them is inadequate or not to be trusted. The doubts imply that the relationship is suffering from an unsuspected malignancy.

To live with another person in a state of love, (as defined by Sullivan) is a different experience from whirling around in a tornado of romance. A loving union is perhaps best seen in elderly couples who have been married for a long time. Their children have grown, the pressure of business has been relieved, and

the spectre of death is not far away. By now, they have achieved a set of realistic values. These elderly spouses respect each other's idiosyncrasies. They need and treasure companionship. Differences between them have been either accepted or worked out. They are no longer destructive elements. In such instances, each has as much interest in the well-being and security of the other as he has in himself.

Here is true symbiosis – a union where each admittedly feeds off the other. Those who give together, really live together.

But it is possible to have a productive and workable marriage without love, (although love is desirable) as well as without romance. One can have a functioning marriage which includes doubts and criticisms of the spouse and occasional inclinations toward divorce. The husband or wife may even think about how much fun it might be to flirt with an attractive neighbour. Such thoughts can occur without being disastrous to the marriage. In many workable marriages, both spouses get a good deal of mileage out of fantasy.

How then, can we describe this functional union which can bring reasonable satisfaction and well-being to both partners? It has four major elements – tolerance, respect, honesty, and the desire to stay together for mutual advantage.

One can prefer the spouse's company to all others, and even be lonely in his absence without experiencing either the wild passion inherent in romance, or the totally unselfish, unswerving devotion that is basic in true love.

In a workable marriage, both parties may be better off together than they would have been on their own. They may not be ecstatically happy because of their union, and they may not be 'in love', but they are not lonely and they have areas of shared contentment. They feel reasonably satisfied with their levels of personal interpersonal functioning. They can count their blessings and, like a sage, philosophically realize that nothing is perfect.

We must return, once again, to the meaning of the word 'love', for no other word in English carries more misleading connotations. The following is an actual example of how distorted the thinking of an individual may become when he believes he is in love.

A young woman and her fiancé, visiting a marriage counsellor, had completed an interpersonal test which told much about their behaviour and how they viewed each other. The counsellor, after studying the data, asked why the woman wished to marry this man who was an admitted alcoholic. She said she had sought the counsellor's help because she did have doubts. Her previous husband from whom she had recently been divorced was weak and passive. Now she was looking for a man strong enough to take care of her.

The marriage counsellor explained that he could not understand why she had picked an alcoholic – obviously a weak man who could not possibly look after her. She would have to look after him.

Her fiancé sat passively by and did not enter the conversation.

The counsellor asked again, “Why do you want to marry this man who appears to be just the opposite of the spouse you say you need”?

The young woman shrugged her shoulders, smiled happily and said, with dogmatic conviction, “Because I love him”.

Her fiancé smiled and nodded in support of her unsupportable statement.

It is obvious that this woman did not know what she meant by “I love him”. She did not even know how she felt about him. Because of her complex neurotic needs, she had a desire for this man, and it could probably be shown that this was a unilateral and totally selfish desire. Her choice of someone to “love” had nothing to do with her prospects for having a workable or satisfying marriage. The word “love” was a cover-up for an emotional mix-up, which she did not understand.

Often, “I love you” is an unconscious excuse for some form of emotional destructiveness. Sometimes it is a camouflage for a status struggle, which may continue even after a couple has separated. A spouse who has been deserted, (especially for another) may covertly or unconsciously wish to be identified and applauded as the good and loyal partner. The jilted spouse assumes a saintly,

pious behaviour, especially in public, and makes certain everyone knows he still “loves” the other, and will lovingly and patiently wait forever, until the other comes to his senses. This can be accomplished with operatic flamboyance, while the individual simultaneously has a well-hidden affair with someone else’s husband or wife, and the apparent inconsistency later can be rationalized away. “After John’s (or Mary’s) departure, there was such a hole in my life. I had to do something to stay on an even keel. If I had had a breakdown, it would have hurt the children. But my behaviour didn’t alter the fact that I love him”.

This type of “love” is especially likely to manifest itself when one spouse believes he received ill treatment from the other, for some years prior to the final desertion. The “injured” spouse, (as he regards himself no matter what he did to hurt and destroy the other) will loudly maintain with grief, “But I still love him”. It takes little clinical experience or psychological brilliance, to recognize that usually this person really is exhibiting hurt pride and rage at being the one who was left, rather than the one who did the leaving.

‘Love’ may also be used as an excuse for domination and control. The expression, “I love you” has such an immutable place in our traditions that it can serve as an excuse for anything, even for selfishness and evil. Who can protest against something done, “because I love you”, especially if the assertion is made with histrionic skill, and in a tone of sincerity? The victim (the one on the receiving end) may intuitively realize that he is being misused. Yet, he often finds it impossible to remonstrate.

Sullivan's definition of love is important. It describes, not a unilateral process, but a two-way street – a bilateral process in which two individuals function in relation to each other as equals. Their shared behaviour interlocks to form a framework that represents mutual respect and devotion. One spouse, alone, cannot achieve this relationship. Both must participate to the same degree. The necessity for both spouses to “give” equally is one of the reasons that a marriage built upon mutual love, is so rare.

People naturally wish to have a happy marriage to a loving spouse. But such a union is hard to come by, without knowledge of the anatomy of marriage, plus much patience, work, and luck. Many people fail to face the fact that if their parents' marriage was unhappy or their childhood was neurotic, they do not possess the prerequisite experience for choosing the correct mate. Where have they observed a good model for marriage? How can they possibly know what a loving marriage is like, and what elements must be put into it?

Most North Americans enter marriage expecting to have love without having asked themselves the question, “Am I lovable?” Following close behind is another question – “If I am not lovable, is it not likely that I have married an unloving person?”

There is another misuse of the word “love”. Some people believe that they can love generously, even if doing so requires behaving like a martyr. They believe

their rewards will come, not on earth, but in heaven, or, at least, in some mystical, unusual way. Therefore, they seem able to love unilaterally and want nothing for themselves. They suffer happily and enjoy making sacrifices, while pouring their love out on another. The more undeserving the other is, the more of this love there is to be poured.

This situation is deceptive. Martyrdom is actually one of the most blatant types of self-centeredness. No one can be more difficult to deal with than the one-way benevolent person who frantically, zealously and flamboyantly, tries to help someone else, and apparently seeks nothing for himself.

Those who have conducted research on couples who are content with their marriages and have reared, apparently healthy, successful children, agree that companionability and respect are the key words in the lexicon these couples use to describe their marriages. A husband interviewed in one study stated, "In love? Well, I guess so – haven't really thought about it. I suppose I would, though, if Martha and I were having troubles. The Chinese have a saying, 'One hand washes the other'. That sort of describes us, but I don't know if that's what you mean by love".

The happy, workable, productive marriage does not require love, as defined in this writing, or even the practice of the Golden Rule. To maintain continuously, a union based on love, is not feasible for most people. Nor is it possible to live in a permanent state of romance. Normal people should not be frustrated or

disappointed, if they are not in a constant state of love. If they experience the joy of love, (or imagine they do) for ten percent of the time they are married, attempt to treat each other with as much courtesy as they do distinguished strangers, and attempt to make the marriage a workable affair (one where there are some practical advantages and satisfactions for each), the chances are that the marriage will endure longer and with more strength than the so-called love matches. (The authors present a moot point here, and we can only hope that they are somewhat less than totally correct).

MYTH # 4 – MARITAL PROBLEMS: THE SHOCKING TRUTH

That Male/Female Differences Cause Most Marital Problems

Ever since history was first well recorded, (mostly by the male) men and women in civilized nations have based their behaviour on an improvable belief. Their relations to each other have been founded on the assumption that women and men are vastly different, emotionally, intellectually, and spiritually. They have considered each other almost as different species of homo sapiens.

That myth breaks down into many specific false assumptions, (some of which are embraced by men only, some by women only). Here are some examples:

1. Women are more emotional than men.
2. Men are better at abstract thinking than are women.

3. Women are more intuitive than men.
4. Men are more skilful with their hands (and in using tools) than women.
5. Women are more hypochondriacal than men, but men are little boys at heart especially when they're ill.
6. It is almost always the man who indulges in infidelity and breaks up the marriage.
7. Homosexuality is practiced more by men than by women.
8. The female usually snares the male.
9. Women are slier and more cunning than men.
10. Men are bolder, more physically vigorous, and more courageous, than women.
11. Women are more loving than men.

Believers in these myths often try to support their view by asking questions like the following:

Why have there been no famous women chess players?

Why so few great female mathematicians, composers, violinists, artists?

Why is the male such a beast of infidelity, while the woman is usually loyal and chaste?

Why do more men have ulcers than women?

Why do more men remain emotionally immature all their lives?

Why do men start all the wars?

It is supposed to be self-evident that these observations are explained by the inherent differences between the sexes.

Rousseau, the great French philosopher, wrote, “Woman is especially constituted to please men....to please them, to be useful to them, to make themselves loved and honoured by them, to educate them when young, to care for them when grown, to counsel them, to console them and to make life agreeable and sweet to them – these are the duties of women at all times, and what should be taught them from infancy”.

A woman author in nineteenth century England, who signed herself, “Lady of Distinction”, wrote, “The most perfect and implicit faith in the superiority of a husband’s judgement, and the most absolute obedience to his desires, is not only the conduct that will ensure the greatest success, but will give the most entire satisfaction....”.

Blackstone, the jurist, wrote, in his famous Commentaries, “.....the very being or legal existence of woman is incorporated and consolidated into that of the husband; under whose wing, protection and cover, she performs everything.....”.

Milton, the great English poet wrote, “It is no small glory to him (man), that a creature so like him should be made subject to him”.

Aristotle wrote, “The male is by nature superior, and the female inferior; and the one rules and the other is ruled. The male is, by nature, fitter for command than the female.....We must look to the female as being a sort of natural deficiency”.

Even the Christian church downgraded and stereotyped the female. “What is woman but an enemy to friendship, an unavoidable punishment, a necessary evil, a natural temptation – a wicked work of nature covered with shining varnish”, wrote St. John Chrysostom. A canonical decree prohibited women from approaching the altar or ministering to the priest. “A woman is incapable of true spiritual jurisdiction”, said a Pope.

All of these statements were made during the last 2,400 years, well into the era in which the male has been dominant in most civilized countries. During this period, he has had roles in society which make him appear stronger, wiser, superior.

There are several explanations for the present acceptance of the natural superiority of men.

First is the fact that, in the past, the members of the two sexes have found themselves in different social roles. These roles have given the impression that the type of work done by the individual, and his social position, indicate his character and talents. For a long time, man was, by necessity, the hunter. Therefore, he was believed to be more courageous and bold. Woman was

immobilized by pregnancy, child rearing, and home duties. Because she was, for biological reasons, assigned to a domiciliary role, it was assumed that she had a passive nature, and she was treated accordingly. This kind of reasoning is called the self-fulfilling prophecy. The individual believes a certain thing, then unconsciously arranges life so that what he believes becomes a fact.

Because laws and customs usually gave power, property and authority to the male, the female found that her only obvious avenue of survival was patience, cunning, sex allurements. So she began to exhibit these characteristics, even though, inherently, she possessed them to no greater degree than did the male.

Woman had almost no opportunities to exhibit her abilities in physical activity, intellectual creativity and invention – abilities usually regarded as being uniquely male. Therefore, woman has been considered lacking in these areas.

There is evidence that, in prehistoric days, (which lasted much longer than the historically recorded period) society was matriarchal – managed by the female. Agriculture, spinning, weaving, pottery, all activities, except war and hunting, were carried on by the female. In those days, women were the inventive ones, the abstract thinkers who, from necessity, created tools for turning plant fibre into yarn and yarn into cloth, discovered such complicated processes as baking and fabricating clay into pottery, and developed the crude instruments for sewing, erecting movable shelters, etc. The basic inventions, which allowed man to change from a half animal caveman into a civilized being, were made by females,

because technology was their area of concern. Some 'rednecks' have scoffed at the idea of a female being a political leader. Yet, when a woman takes on such a role, she often does well. Witness Queen Elizabeth I, Cleopatra, Katherine the Great, Queen Victoria, Margaret Thatcher, to name just a few.

It is mainly the pressure of society that determines what roles, attitudes and kinds of behaviour the members of each sex will embrace. These roles, attitudes and types of behaviour, have almost nothing to do with the sex of the individual, but many males refuse to accept this fact.

The way a person's role, in society, influences his status, can easily be illustrated. In Hawaii, for example, it used to be that an army-enlisted man generally treated as a socially inferior person, (except by the merchants who want his money). If a young woman goes out with an enlisted man, friends may raise eyebrows. It is assumed that the enlisted man usually drinks a lot and is not well educated, and that his only reason for dating a local girl is to sleep with her. The status of the navy-enlisted man in Norfolk, Virginia, is even worse.

But, observe Private John Smith closely. See how attractive he is? Even though he is the lowest of the enlisted men, Private Smith, like many other servicemen, is a college graduate, from a fine, loving family. He is a person of integrity, gentleness, ambition, and he has a clear, brilliant mind. Yet, regardless of his talents and fine character, when people see Private Smith, in his enlisted man's uniform, walking down Pleasant Avenue, they assume that he has the

undesirable behavioural tendencies, traditionally associated with enlisted men. And they treat him accordingly. However, if Private Smith is suddenly promoted and becomes Lieutenant John Smith, he, ipso facto, becomes socially acceptable, even to the elite.

His role in society has changed. People now assume he is more decent, has better manners, a better mind, than the John Smith who wore a different uniform, (and, hence, played a different role) only a few days before. At neither time do the observers have any information about John Smith. They estimate his worth from the role he is in, according to traditional, anachronistic values. Also, John Smith's opportunities, to exhibit his talents when he was an enlisted man, were limited, (although not insurmountable) by the social role in which he found himself. Even the wife he chooses will be influenced by whether or not he wears a silver bar.

The same method of assuming that the nature of a role reflects the inherent characteristics of the one playing it, has been employed in judgements about the qualities of the male and the female. People have assumed man and woman to be vastly different, simply because, historically, they have carried out different duties in society. It is not usually realized that, when the roles of male and female are reversed, each acquires many of the mannerisms and personality traits usually associated with the other.

In certain areas in Greece, during the Nazi invasion, there were no able-bodied men left. The Greek women fought the Germans ferociously and vigorously with rifles, swords, and hatchets. The old Greek men stayed home to take care of the children and assumed the women's role. In the same way, the effect of a reversal of roles is strikingly exemplified by young Israeli women who fought bravely in war, swore, cut their hair very short, and dug ditches alongside the men with whom they served. History supplies many instances of this kind.

Another factor, which has promoted the belief in rigid male/female differences, is the influence of publications by scientists – most of them men – who, unwittingly, biased their own experiments to conform to their preconceptions about female inferiority. Their bias created a distortion, similar to that which results when Black children are tested for intelligence by Southern examiners. The children evidence lower IQs than a similar group tested by Northern examiners. We have learned, only recently, that experiments are influenced by the natural bias of the experimenter and by the environment in which the experiment takes place. The experimenter, without knowing it, affects the behaviour of the person he is examining. Often, this influence is so great, that the response of the subject is almost entirely created by the already held beliefs of the experimenter. It is well established now, for example, that the hallucinations of subjects taking the drug LSD vary with the personality and beliefs of the experimenter, and with the environment in which the session is held.

Likewise, when a person has hallucinations as a result of sensory deprivation, (in experiments where the subject, with eyes and ears covered, is placed in a quiet, dark room, devoid of any form of external stimulus), the hallucinations vary according to what the subject has been told he may expect.

It is obvious, of course, that there are physical differences between men and women. There are also psychological differences, but it is difficult to estimate them, let alone measure them accurately. The slight hormonal differences between them, relate mainly to sexual functioning.

But, what happens when the sex hormones are altered? Does this change cause the individuals to be radically incompetent in their present social roles, or make it impossible for them to maintain their status in society, or change their sex patterns? It does not. It has been well demonstrated that both male and female castrations, (those having testicles or ovaries removed for medical reasons), can function adequately in their normal social roles, if they have internalized the roles before being castrated. They can even achieve sexual satisfaction and orgasms.

Perhaps, most convincing of all, is the work done by Hampton, Money and Money, in the studies they originated at Johns Hopkins University, concerning hermaphroditic children.

Hermaphrodites are physically closer to one sex than the other. But, it has been found the hermaphrodite child makes a better adjustment to the sex with which its parents have identified it than to the sex to which it is biologically closer.

For example, such a child may have functioning ovaries and only rudimentary testicles. In such a case, by hormonal and surgical treatment, a physician can, most easily, bring about a biologically, that is physically, female child. But, if the parents have been treating it like a boy, and wishing it to be a boy, there will be trouble. The child may turn out to be a homosexual. The psychological trend established by the parents in such cases, is more influential than the anatomical situation.

In an example like that of the hermaphroditic children, we are dealing with the extreme end of the continuum. Such drastic changes in the bio-psychological nature of human beings can be made only after years of hormone treatments, surgery and by psychological consultations.

The anthropologist, Margaret Mead, shows in her books, *Male and Female* and *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*, that masculine and feminine behaviour is conditioned by the attitude of society. In *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*, she discusses her observations of three tribes.

These three situations, in the three tribes, suggest then a very definite conclusion. If those temperamental attitudes, which we have traditionally

regarded as feminine, such as passivity, responsiveness and a willingness to cherish children, can so easily be set up as the masculine pattern in one tribe, and in another, the second tribe, be outlawed for the majority of men, we no longer have any basis for regarding such aspects of behaviour as sex-linked. And this conclusion becomes even stronger when we consider the actual reversal in Tchambuli, the third tribe, of the position of dominance of the two sexes, in spite of the existence of formal patrilineal institutions, in which children carry the name of the father.

Today, in our Western culture, we have our own tribal laws about sex roles. In early life, both parents, wittingly and unwittingly, transmit the cultural values to the child by indicating that “boys don’t cry”, “girls don’t fight”, etc. Mothers tell their daughters, “the trouble with men is.....”. Fathers implore sons, “For God’s sake, don’t let ‘em sucker you.....”.

Later on, when dating is culturally appropriate, mothers pass their attitudes toward the opposite sex on to their daughters, and fathers pass their attitudes on to their sons. Mothers seldom discuss dating with their sons, and fathers seldom discuss it with their daughters. In this manner, the parents help perpetuate the myth of the separation of the sexes.

In summary, it is debilitatingly erroneous to believe that there are vast differences between the male and the female, and that these differences cause most of the troubles in marriage. There are no vast, innate differences. The

behaviour patterns, attitudes, and temperaments of the male and the female are not inherently rigid. Despite the habits and cumulative forces of society, the man and woman can determine, for themselves, what role each will have in marriage. When they are unable to do this, then the marriage either will fail, or will be merely a numb, routine affair. Trouble is caused, not by vast differences, which don't exist, but by the inability to choose and activate the desirable or necessary role.

MYTH # 5 – THE UNFULFILLED MARRIAGE

This is a writing about marriage, not about families. Yet it would be an injustice to any description of the marital system to assume that the child plays no role in the making or breaking of the marriage. To have children is one of the explicit reasons for marrying. Indeed, in some religious groups, sexual intercourse between spouses is supposed to occur only for the purpose of procreation. It is easily observed that some spouses are totally child-oriented. They live for their children. In return, the children keep the marriage alive, by providing the parents *la raison d'être* for the marriage, and help fill the emotional and physical distance between the spouses, so that the expression of tension and friction between them is kept at a minimum.

When the children leave home, these marriages typically are in serious difficulty, unless the parents are fortunate enough to have developed outside interests, sufficient to maintain the protective distance between them.

Certain basic questions, propositions and observations concerning the effects of children on marriage, merit special discussion. Let us consider, first, whether childless marriages are less successful than marriages, which beget offspring.

This is a real yes and no proposition, despite the public's general belief that marriages, which result in children, are more successful. For example, spouses who marry relatively late in life, tend not to have children, and yet appear to have a higher average of functional marriages than couples marrying earlier. But it is the fact that they do not marry until later than their peers, that has most to do with how the marriages turn out. The fact that they do not have children is accessory.

Several studies also indicate that professional women, who marry later than their peers, and choose not to have children, have a better marital record than their undergraduate college classmates. Successful professional women, who marry later than their collegiate peers, tend to hold satisfying, well paying jobs, so they do not rush into marriage for financial reasons and feel they must have children, in part, to hold their husbands. In the lower classes, a father may desert his family when he staggers under the realization of how many mouths there are to feed. Here, the presence of children is, clearly, a liability.

Thus, one cannot generalize with certitude about the proposition that children help or hinder a marriage. Instead, the question becomes meaningful, only when

specific types of marital interaction, within varying ethnic and socio-economic groups are studied.

It is obvious, for example, that conventional middle class Midwesterners in agricultural areas are quite likely to marry, to stay married once they have said, I do”, and to have children because their values teach them to do so. Again, one cannot say that they have more successful marriages than other groups, because they usually have children. Having children is just part of their larger cultural context and value system.

Another observation often made is that it is desirable for married couples to wait a year or two before starting a family. This statement, for a number of reasons, deserves a nearly unequivocal “yes”. Now that we have ‘the pill’, family planning should be as frankly discussed as the budget, and it should be as forthrightly carried out as the inevitable purchase of a new computer.

Young people who marry, because the girl is pregnant, are very often doomed to find themselves parties to a divorce or an annulment. Marriages in which the wife becomes pregnant on the honeymoon, seem to be much less risky, than those beginning with a shotgun wedding.

However, though there is no convincing set of statistics to indicate that these couples divorce more frequently than couples who postpone pregnancy, marriage

experts agree that early pregnancy destroys, or at least maims, the important 'getting-to-know-you' period of the first year or so of marriage.

Often, serious problems result from the purely fiscal or physical aspects of early pregnancy. For example, the husband may have to quit school and get a job, because there is an unexpected mouth to feed. Correspondingly, if pregnancy forces the wife to leave a job from which she derives a great deal of satisfaction, she may have a good many negative feelings about her new role as a mother. Pregnancy may throw the couple's beginning sexual adjustment out of whack, because the girl is resentful of what he "did" to her, and the young husband may feel trapped because of what she "allowed to happen".

But, what about couples who have been married for a number of years? Can a correlation be found between their chances for marital success and the number of offspring? In Puerto Rico, India, and other countries, where devices preventing pregnancy have been in use for five or more years, statistics are becoming available. These indicate that most couples do not wish large families and that there are a higher percentage of happy, productive marriages among couples that have no children. Recent research suggests that the same situation exists in the United States and that the parents of five or more children, who so proudly point to their huge brood, may be putting on an act.

In countries where contraceptives are utilized, evidence is accumulating that even those who traditionally have large families, such as Catholics, Blacks and the

poor, don't necessarily want a great many children. In the United States, the difference in family size, between poor people and the well-to-do, used to be sizeable. Now it is diminishing rapidly.

Our picture of the large, happy family (the poor and shoeless), was based on myth. Instead, it appears that desertion rate among fathers diminishes when family size is controlled, when the very size of the family doesn't panic the father into leaving.

These facts do not mean that the presence of children reduces the chance for success of any particular marriage. However, it is clear, that the begetting of children is not a magic which will improve an already shaky marriage. Instead, it will help to destroy it ever further.

One aspect of the myth that children will automatically improve a marriage, stems from the parent's unconscious (sometimes even conscious) belief that he can experience through his child, the things he was denied or failed at as a child; or, perhaps from the belief that he can develop, in the younger, those desirable qualities lacking in the other spouse.

For example, a man who is secretly ashamed of his wife's dowdiness, may work extra hard to earn money to buy attractive outfits for his infant daughter. His wife may share his enthusiasm for their "cute little girl" and take pride in the neighbour's comments about the daughter's outfits, but she also understands,

often unconsciously, her husband's opinion that she is dowdy, even though he may not tell her so, directly.

Childless couples can sometimes reconcile their marital differences and disappointments by ignoring the discords, pretending they do not exist. They can seek compensating gratifications elsewhere, perhaps in their work. It is simple for both of them to have jobs. However, when there is a child, this shift of emphasis is impossible and the child becomes living evidence of the dissatisfaction in the marital relationship. Children, by their presence, may aggravate an already unhappy marriage by virtue of the role which they play in the relationship between spouses, which may be labelled the battle of the sexes.

The power struggle between the sexes often focuses upon the question of who, husband or wife, does the more important work. Should the husband have certain prerogatives because he earns the money if the mom chooses to stay at home? Should the wife who stays at home doing routine work and does not meet new people daily, as her husband does, have some compensating rewards? Should she be taken out often, or have several nights off to attend movies or to play bridge with the girls? By finding some chore which the father may, logically, be expected to do for the child, the wife may be indicating to the husband that he is neglecting an important part of his function, and that even if he earns the money and is important in his office, he is no better than she is. Conversely, the man who wishes to put his wife down can always find some instance of child neglect, particularly if the child becomes noisy or ill.

It is obvious that sacrificing or compromising one's personal desires in order to meet the needs and wishes of another, can create a sense of deprivation and become abrasive in any relationship. Children require a great deal of care and attention which often conflicts with their parents' own needs and desires. Yet, in our culture, fathers and mothers cannot often admit their sense of personal deprivation. Therefore, since they cannot feel guilty about having children, they end up blaming each other.

If, when a child is conceived, the parents hope the infant will mend a fractured marriage, the disappointment may be excruciatingly painful. The child's presence in a discordant union, therefore, may instigate new troubles and the marital relationship may deteriorate even more.

For example, a young woman feels that her amorously adventurous husband will be 'steadied' by becoming a father. Within a year, she gives birth to a baby girl. The husband is pleased and proud of the little girl. He pours the majority of his affection on her, thus rejecting the wife in a blatant manner. The mother begins disliking the child, almost to the point of hate. At first the wife thinks it cute when the little girl, at eighteen months of age, refuses to obey her and waits for Daddy to come home to arbitrate matters between her and her mother. It is not so funny when the little girl becomes an accomplished actress, to stage tearful scenes. If her mother appears adamant, the daughter, now four years old, dramatically tells other adults how bad Mommy is, and declares that she and

Daddy are going to live somewhere else. The father is usually flattered by this behaviour and rarely interferes. Occasionally, he becomes embarrassed and even frightened by the situation and, in a rage, punishes the child. The mother than attempts to protect her daughter and, again, the parents are caught up in mutually destructive behaviour.

In another situation, common in white, upper middle class, marriages, the wife uses the children to undermine the husband's authority and power. She manages this by unwittingly encouraging or assisting the children to break the rules, established by the father, when he is trying hard to be 'in charge'.

For example, as the father backs out of the garage on his way to work, he notices the children's toys in the driveway. He gets out, throws bicycles, skates, toys and baseball bats out of the way, then dashes to the kitchen and shouts, "Damn it, Martha, you tell the kids to put their stuff in the play shed and the next time anyone leaves anything out, he'll spend the day in his room".

That night, he is late for dinner. When he drives into the garage, he hears the crunch of wheels rolling over a skateboard and a bicycle. He storms into the house. His family has begun eating. Martha is looking fresh, clean and relaxed.

He screams, "Martha, who in the hell left the toys in the garage? This morning....." Martha replies, "Oh dear, that's probably my fault. I chased the twins in to get their baths and didn't think about the bicycle and toys. Dear, is

that such a terrible crime?” The husband turns on his heel and leaves, loudly slamming the back door. Another devastating battle has begun with the usual first act, “The Defeat of Dad”.

All these examples illustrate flaws in the basic myth that, when two people are about to be married, and there are potential problems, caused, for example, by little money, different racial backgrounds or different cultural levels, these major problems will be solved by the couple’s sheer joy in having a child. True, they may find pleasure in the youngster, but the presence of the child probably will not eliminate existing difficulties. The adults must find solutions on their own. And, unfortunately, the child may well aggravate the problems.

The truth of this observation becomes apparent when one considers that the family is a system, and that every person in a system is equally important in maintaining it. Just when Martha has forgiven John for one of his occasional temperamental outbursts, John junior puts on an act which Martha associates with his father, and she is angry at her husband all over again.

When John, senior, comes home that night seeking solace, his wife attacks him for being temperamental. He feels, “But I haven’t done anything”, and has a temper tantrum. John junior, watching this outburst, has his own temperamental behaviour reinforced. The three individuals are caught up in a system which will repeat itself, and Martha’s blaming John’s heredity for his being temperamental,

or John's blaming Martha's physiology for producing 'bad times' each month, will only obscure the nature of the system in which they are caught.

MYTH # 6 – MARRIED AND STILL LONELY

Once upon a time there was a well-received television drama, (it later became a motion picture) called 'Marty'. At the conclusion of the performance, the viewer experienced a feeling of satisfaction and general good feeling; the same sense of well-being and joy that a person has when he has read a fairy tale, such as Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs or Little Red Riding Hood.

The story of 'Marty' concerns a lonely, shy boy, who finds, or is found, by a lonely, shy girl. They supply each other's needs, decide to marry, presumably live happily ever after. It could be wonderful, if such events could take place frequently in the lives of lonely people. But the action in 'Marty' represents for most people, fantasies, not reality. Lonely people who marry each other to correct their situation usually discover that the most intense and excruciating loneliness is the loneliness that is shared with another.

There are several types of loneliness.

First is the loneliness of individuals who have a limited behavioural repertoire. The 'behavioural repertoire' is the accumulation of behavioural acts that have

been learned since birth and are at the individual's command. People afflicted with this type of loneliness find themselves to be strangers in a more than normal number of situations involving relationships. They yearn to be on a cheerful, or perhaps competitive, or perhaps collaborative action-interaction basis with other people. But they have difficulty because their behavioural repertoire is limited and therefore, in many cases, they do not understand other people and other people don't understand them. So they are strangers, and lonely.

When such lonely people marry each other, each has expectations of his spouse and neither realizes that the other is paralysed by a limited behavioural repertoire. Neither of these individuals has much to give to the other unless the behavioural repertoire is enlarged and developed. If lonely spouses recognize this problem, they may have a chance for a workable marriage. If they are cognizant of their limitations, perhaps they can form a team and slowly and painfully, increase the range of their behaviour.

Usually, however, each expects satisfying behaviour from the other – the land of action which is beyond the capability of his spouse. As a result, both of them end up lonelier than ever before. And, to this loneliness, bitterness frequently is added. For each of them is vulnerable and when he does not receive the behaviour he expects from the spouse, he believes he has been given a rebuff. Usually it is not a rebuff at all, but merely a reflection of social inadequacy. What happens next? The 'rebuffed' spouse draws back and then the other feels that

now he is being rebuffed and rejected, and thus the distance between the two quickly increases.

An extreme example of the result of limited behavioural range in marriage occurred many years ago with a couple known to the authors. The situation described here actually existed. A shy, young woman married a shy, young man. His mother and sister had reared him much as one would raise a hothouse plant. Several years after the marriage, the girl formed a close friendship with the young lady who lived next door. From her, she learned that sexual intercourse was supposed to take place in a normal marriage. She and her husband had been so ill-informed, that they had merely embraced. Neither of them had been brave enough to bring up the question of how babies were made.

When the young wife learned the facts about sex, she felt humiliated and cheated. Vituperatively, she scolded her surprised husband, and as a result they experienced so much turmoil that it became necessary for them to seek the help of a psychiatrist.

One of the mysteries of this situation is why the young woman did not recognize that she was just as uninformed as was her husband, and why he did not point this out to her.

A second type of loneliness, more prevalent among males than females, frequently characterizes the individual who lost his mother at a very early age. This type of person has been denied love as a child and, unconsciously, seeks

‘triumphs’ over others as a love substitute. He cannot get along with anyone over whom he cannot triumph in some way, or except in some rare instances, in which he collaborates with someone else to triumph against society.

Within this category we find many ‘successes’ in the arts, in industry and in business. These are the perfectionists – the people who are obsessed with becoming champions or innovators, or the top person in a field. Such people have limited emotional repertoires. Usually they can be loving and kind and considerate only to those who are useful to them. They define usefulness only in terms of their drive for perfection or success.

In the marriage of such a person, nothing which the spouse does is ever good enough. He is constantly critical of the spouse’s performance level. People of this sort trust no one to do anything well. They suspect that almost everyone will impede their gallop toward success. They require almost everything to revolve around themselves, and as this seldom happens in married life, these individuals drift from one marriage to another, always looking for the impossible and becoming more and more suspicious and lonelier and lonelier.

The third type of loneliness is perhaps the most painful of all. It is usually experienced by individuals who have had an intelligent, dominant mother and a passive father who behaved as if he were inferior. These people are obsessed with the desire to be popular and well thought of. They have bright personalities and well-developed social skills. Frequently, they are big talkers and good dancers,

and dress attractively. Often, they are excellent salesmen, advertising personnel and social leaders, and they tend to be gossips. By gossiping, (transmitting malicious information about somebody else) they bribe others to approve of them.

A high percentage of these people give the appearance of being flirtatious and 'sexy', but really are sexually unskilled and often frigid, even though they act passionate and may have had more than the normal number of affairs. This type of individual finds it difficult to be intimate and collaborative with anyone unless their mutual behaviour results in his being the center of attraction. This can happen only if he marries a passive person, probably his inferior. But the fact is that in marriage – and in relations with people in general – unless one can participate in behavioural interactions which are characterized by equality, one is lonely despite the appearance one may give of being very gregarious and a great mixer.

Loneliness cannot be cured by marriage. Those who live alone better tolerate loneliness. They have no expectations and thus, no disappointments. Lonely people who live together have about the same chance of realizing their expectations as the host who insists that everybody have a good time at his party.

MYTH # 7 – DOES TELLING YOUR SPOUSE OFF INDICATE A POOR MARRIAGE?

Most of us in this country are taught diplomacy, decorum and the art of self-restraint. Many husbands and wives believe that politeness, consideration and benevolence are important in a marriage and, not wishing to be rejected, they may attempt to practice these arts unremittingly.

If spouses are thoughtful of each other on all occasions, the likelihood is that they have a sick marriage. It is obvious that individuals have competing tendencies – different interests, different ways of using time, different biological rhythms, etc., and they cannot always have the same desires, needs, wishes or whatever, at the same time. The problem then is, ‘what do they do when conflicts arise’?

There are several possible answers, but the most important one is that the individual should do what he feels he has to do at this particular moment, and should believe enough in the durability of the marriage to withstand even a period of hate from the other spouse. When such conflicts do not ever arise, it must be concluded that either the spouses are peculiarly lucky in having chosen partners with exactly the same values, tastes, needs etc., or that somebody is sacrificing quietly and will unwittingly pay the other spouse back.

This may sound like explosive propaganda. But the alternative is a relationship in which one spouse thinks so little of his partner that he cannot permit an

independent act that happens to displease him, for the time being. How can spouses trust each other if they never have any disagreements? How does each know what the other really thinks and feels if he is accommodating and thoughtful all the time? For all anyone can tell, one spouse may secretly hate the other's guts.

Tom Henderson was a successful insurance executive with a mad passion for golf. He had been planning for some time, to attend a golf clinic being given in Concord, Massachusetts, by his favourite professional. Not only was he delighted to have the opportunity to work with his favourite pro, but knowing this geographical area, he realized that coming here would be very pleasant for his wife and two children. They could rent an attractive older home, swim in a nearby lake and engage in many of the pleasant activities of the city. Mary, his wife, was a bit reluctant, particularly because she was not well acquainted with the East and wasn't sure what she was getting into. However, Tom's enthusiasm overcame her reluctance and the boys were always eager for a vacation.

But over the next few months, a subtle campaign of propaganda was beamed toward Tom Henderson. It came from all directions. For example, Mrs. Smythe, Mary's mother, had taken an apartment in Honolulu, near the beach. She wrote to her daughter that she wished the whole family would visit her and described what a wonderful time the children would have. Thereafter, the advantages for the children formed the core of Mary's propaganda campaign.

Magazines with pictures of brown-skinned, lithe surfers, lay exposed on the coffee table and occasionally, at the writing desk. Also, knowing Tom's interest in golf, Mary, one morning, read him an article about a recent golfing match at the Waialae Country Club. She mentioned, with a shy smile, that her friend Nancy who lived in Honolulu had told her that golfers consider a round at the course of the Oahu Country Club one of the great golfing experiences of all time. While Mary spoke, Tom was hastily reading his e-mails and finishing his last mouthful of coffee. Not until he had nearly reached his office did it occur to him to wonder, "How come Mary's interested in golf, all of a sudden?"

"Oh, well". He turned to the tasks of the day. His errant thought lay untended and died. When Jane, their oldest daughter, celebrated her birthday in May, Mary presented her with a ukulele and a book of twelve easy lessons.

Now the propaganda had reached the stage where it became obvious even to Tom. One night he confronted his wife, "Darling", he said, "I thought we had agreed we were going to Concord this summer for our vacation? Now I get the impression that you're pushing for Honolulu".

Mary regarded him with her wide, startlingly blue eyes, much as she would a man from Mars suddenly appearing in her bedroom. "Why, Tom, whatever do you mean? I know how much you're counting on going to the golf clinic in Concord, and the children and I won't really mind". Tom absently nodded, and went into the bathroom to brush his teeth. He felt like a bit of a stinker for having

raised the question, but something was still tugging at his mind and he was not satisfied. When he got to bed, he went right to sleep with no thought of being amorous. Mary didn't rest well that night, for the hand that grasps for power is always a bit shaky.

As the days went by, Tom was reminded by both children, of what a wonderful place Hawaii is. He suspected that Mary was putting them up to this, but where was the evidence? Jane seemed to have a new-found interest in hula lessons and Tom junior spoke with wonder of the intricacies of surfing. Then one day, Mary brought Tom a somewhat pleading letter from her mother, describing her wish to see them and stating that a lovely apartment would become available close by during August – the very month that they were planning to spend in Concord.

Now Tom was no longer in doubt. He recognized the nature of the enemy, but almost as quickly as he turned to fight, he found his resistance fading. What father likes to deny his children? What husband wishes to keep his wife separated from her aged mother (whom she may never see alive again) and from school chums whom she hasn't seen in many years? Who can deny the beauty of Hawaii and the excellence of its golfing spots? And so, Tom succumbed and erected in place of the defeat in the Battle of Concord, an icon at which he daily worshipped – the image of Tom Henderson, Family Man.

Mary's mother was waiting for them at the airport in Honolulu. Although the Henderson family had been surfeited with food and drink, everyone accepted

grandma's gracious hospitality as she took them to lunch at the Outrigger Club. Leaning against the back of his chair and looking out at the sparkling Pacific,

Tom sipped his favourite beer hoping that some appetite would come so that he would not have the embarrassment of being the only one not eating. He half hastened to the cheery conversation as grandma told the children about the wonders they would soon behold. Mary interrupted, running in and out of the conversation like a track star with what Tom considered, wife-type questions – “Where can you get this?” “Where's the best place to buy that?”

Since first getting on the plane, Tom had been aware of a slow ball of dread forming in his stomach, and now it felt distended. He had been helped on the flight by two vodka martinis and half a bottle of Chablis, but the liquor hadn't dissolved the lump in his gut. It had only anaesthetized the surrounding area. Tom sat there and to his horror, he began to feel hate – not for the children – not for his mother-in-law, but for Mary. Suddenly, for the first time in the months of propaganda and the weeks of knowing that he had been hoodwinked, he experienced a surge of resoluteness. He sat straighter and gulped his beer instead of swishing it around like mouthwash.

Tom had a plan, but he said nothing about it. He allowed his mother-in-law to pay for the lunch and made arrangements for transporting their huge pile of baggage to the apartment. He worked hard helping the family get settled, and even went with Mary to the supermarket to lay in a stock of food. He had time for these things because his plane did not leave until midnight. Mrs. Smythe had

them over to supper. Tom went through the routine of replying to meaningless questions about his work and how his golf game was faring and played an All About Hawaii word game with the kids. Finally, the Hendersons left grandma's.

When they reached their own apartment, Tom called his family into the small living room and told them, as dispassionately and kindly as he could, that he was leaving on that midnight plane for San Francisco and had been lucky enough to secure a connecting flight to New York. When his wife, with her white stricken face, started to open her mouth, Tom held up his hand and said, in a tone stronger than he usually employed, "Let me finish." Talking to the children, so that Mary could listen without feeling so attacked, he explained that he was not leaving the family, but was doing something that he felt he had to do. He recognized that his decision was expensive, would upset the rest of the family, and would ruin him forever in his mother-in-law's eyes. He would like to rejoin them in two weeks, and would be very sad if they were so immutably angry about his decision, that he was no longer welcome. However, this was a chance he would have to take. He had counted on this golf vacation for a long time, and he reminded them without an air of martyrdom, that it had been many years since they had taken the vacation he wanted. He stated that, at times, it was necessary to do something drastic to break a pattern that was forming, and this one threatened to encrust not just the marriage, but the interrelationships of the entire family. Then he told them that he was not willing to discuss the matter since his decision was irrevocable. Here, he was wise, for there is nothing more useless than beating and bloodying a fait accompli with hopeless argumentation.

His wife's response was to run crying from the room. Tom had expected this and it did not curb his resolution. He kissed the children and, sad but erect, walked down the long stairs.

All this occurred ten years ago. The Hendersons are still married and enjoy a mutual respect that was missing. During her husband's absence, Mary recognized that she was something of a spoiled child. She recalled that her own father had rarely gotten his way, and did not fight for it. As a result, Mrs. Smythe had grown more and more into a skilful manipulator and dictator, often using the excuse that something was "best for Mary", to get her own way. The parallel was very obvious to Mary and she respected Tom for breaking the mould. They eventually agreed that for them, the only workable system would be to take turns in making decisions, since this would eliminate the need for covert manoeuvring and propagandizing through the children.

The Honolulu episode also proved useful in another way. During the two weeks Tom was in Concord, Mary performed superbly. To her own surprise, she found that her anger at him gave her the strength to enjoy the children in a manner she had not experienced before. The Henderson story came close to having a very different ending. But, great changes are built upon risk taking.

WHEN IS IT TIME?

Now, for the sake of your finances and your happiness, if there are problems in your marriage – fix them! Problems in a marriage seldom get better with time – usually, they get worse.

Part 3 of this section ‘The Myths of Marriage’ can be very helpful. If however, after reading this insightful little edition you feel there are serious problems in your marriage, please be sure to go for professional counselling. And above all, remember that kindness toward one another is the most important element in a happy marriage.

Needing outside help is nothing of which to be ashamed. Actually, it can be a source of consolation. There is a good chance that counseling will help if you both sincerely want the marriage to work. On the other hand, if counseling is of no benefit, you will at least know that you tried. Either way, it will have been worth the effort. Being trapped in an unsatisfactory marriage can be a long and painful sentence. Life is too short to suffer.