



Western Michigan University  
ScholarWorks at WMU

---

Honors Theses

Lee Honors College

---

Spring 4-1972

## New Forms of Heterosexual Marriage and Mating

Robert Lundy  
*Western Michigan University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/honors\\_theses](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/honors_theses)



Part of the Family, Life Course, and Society Commons

---

### Recommended Citation

Lundy, Robert, "New Forms of Heterosexual Marriage and Mating" (1972). *Honors Theses*. 464.  
[https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/honors\\_theses/464](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/honors_theses/464)

This Honors Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Lee Honors College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact [wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu](mailto:wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu).



New Forms of Heterosexual Marriage and Mating

Robert Lundy

Honors Senior Thesis

That The Way I've Always Heard It Should Be

By Carly Simon and Jacob Brackman

My father sits at night with no lights on;

His cigarette glows in the dark.

The living room is still;

I walk by, no remark.

I tiptoe past the master bedroom where

My mother reads her magazines.

I hear her call sweet dreams,

But I forget how to dream.

But you say it's time we moved in together

And raised a family of our own, you and me--

Well, that's the way I've always heard it should be;

You want to marry me, we'll marry.

My friends from college they're all married now;

They have their houses and their lawns.

They have their silent noons,

Tearful nights, angry dawns.

Their children hate them for the things they're not;

They hate themselves for what they are--

And yet' they drink, they laugh,

Close the wound, hide the scar.

But you say it's time we moved in together  
And raised a family of our own, you and me--  
Well, that's the way I've always heard it should be;  
You want to marry me, we'll marry.

You say that we can keep our love alive  
Babe, all I know is what I see--  
The couples cling and claw  
And drown in love's debris.  
You say we'll soar like two birds through the clouds,  
But soon you'll cage me on your shelf--  
I'll never learn to be just me first  
By myself.

Well O.K., it's time we moved in together  
And raised a family of our own, you and me--  
Well, that's the way I've always heard it should be,  
You want to marry me, we'll marry,  
We'll marry.

## New Forms of Heterosexual Marriage and Mating

This paper is about and dedicated to those persons who could not or would not fit the Procrustean bed.

"You have to accept reality" is a theme the young often espouse. In this regard marriage and mating laws must be rated in a tie for dead last in accepting that challenge. The Catholic Church is the other believer in unreality.

Herbert Otto in his introduction to The Family in Search of a Future brought both the law and reality into perspective. First, he noted that one-third to one-half of all marriages occurring now are destined to end in a divorce court. In the de jure system of sex-marriage-kinship orders, however, monogamous marriage is the only accepted form with sexual behavior limited thereto. Child legitimacy means that the parents were married before the child was registered. The nuclear family is the economic and residential unit.

The expectation is that the marriage should last for the lifetime of the spouses, although increasingly there are provisions for exceptional cases which are termed failures. The children belong to the parents and if the parents die they have the right to give their property to their children.

Other popular expectations based in the de jure system are that the woman will be the chief socializing agent and the male will be the economic agent. Between the lines of the legal, the ecclesiastical, and popular proscriptions, "there is an implication that in exchange for his support the man should secure monopolistic access to the wife sexually, and can as-

sume that children born to her are biologically his, while the wife receives support for herself and her children and a status position in the community based upon her husband's accomplishments."<sup>1</sup>

These high standards produce some rationalizations for non-achievement. Divorce in some cases gets minimum disapproval; some unmarried may be unchaste, such as the engaged or men in the service; and lastly, economic necessity may put mothers in the job market.

In the de facto, however, "pre-marital chastity is now probably honored more in the breach than in the observance; post marital infidelity is by no means rare." Also vast amounts of deception, collusion, and pretense are involved in divorce proceedings.<sup>2</sup>

"The system functions in a highly pluralistic set of alternative behavior modes while still under the umbrella of monolithic proscriptions."<sup>3</sup>

Historically considered three of our cultural heritages are amazingly similar. Those three cultures are the Ancient Hebrew, Greek, and Roman ones.

In all three the female had a lower status than the male although this is less extreme in Greek society. The Hebrews, on the other hand, thought women to be unclean and female infanticide was practiced until Ezekial's time.

Thus in all cultures the husband was the lord over both the wife and the children. Female remarriage after death of a spouse and inheritance laws stressed property continuity.

Polygyny or concubinage was practiced in all three cultures. Adultery, sodomy, and fornication were severely punished only if the offender was female. Often these acts were not even considered crimes for men. Divorce was mostly the right of the husband until the time of Christ. Prostitution, although sometimes disapproved of, was quite extensive. In fact, it was a means of worshipping Aphrodite in Greece. Greece also led the way in homosexuality while Rome was pre-eminent in abortion. The Hebrews were the most anti-celibate. Celibacy was a religious crime equal to murder, even for priests.

Practically all marriages in these cultures were arranged by parents, with love playing only a secondary role. Although the Hebrews had no civil or religious ceremony, they held marriage in the highest esteem.<sup>4</sup>

Thus the Christian Family was quite a change in our tradition. It stressed God's fatherhood and man's brotherhood, monogamy, marriage as a sacrament with ecclesiastical control, loyalty on the part of both spouses, spiritual equality, no divorce, condemnation of sex, disapproval of abortion, and the glorification of celibacy.<sup>5</sup>

The American family was significantly different from the normal Christian family. The pioneer conditions put a greater



value on women and gave freedom of mate selection. Young associations were permitted but courtship was expected to be short, and romantic love was discouraged because of the Puritan morality, fierce struggle for existence, and the stress on the economic aspect of the marriage contract. Marriage had become a civil rather than religious union.

"In other words, social and geographical mobility, resulting from the Protestant ethic, individualism, political democracy, and the frontier environment, led to the decline of patriarchy. Thus the individual replaced the family as the basic unit of society."<sup>6</sup>

For the young it was either complete subjugation or complete freedom. When a couple married they left home, never to return in many cases. But while at home they were part of a large family in which there was an extreme emphasis on discipline and strict religious training. This was partly due to the view that children were wicked by nature and should be treated as miniature adults. Rarely was a family separated by divorce.<sup>7</sup>

The size of families gradually declined due mostly to the emancipation of women but also to economic and budgetary considerations that arose out of the passing of the frontier, as well as the better known reasons of the twentieth century. The family not only lost members but also its economic, educational, religious, recreational, and protective tasks considerably.<sup>8</sup>

Winston Ehrmann, noted writer on sexual behavior, provides an accurate and concise anthropological comparison and twentieth century review.

"The human is the only animal in which sexual behavior is not integrally related to the cycle of fertility. . . .In fact, ours is one of the few [cultures] that has had, during certain periods in our history, a general prohibition of all sexual activities outside the marriage relation. . . .Even threats of disgrace and severe punishment, including death, however, have not been effective in preventing young people from engaging in pre-marital coitus."<sup>9</sup>

Ehrmann cites a study done by anthropologists Ford and Beech that showed only 16% of societies had formal restrictions to a single mate and only 5% wholly disapproved of both pre-marital and extra-marital liaisons. In contrast, 39% of the societies gave formal approval, although more so for men than women. Most societies control sexual behavior based on marriage, kinship, and reproductive reasons and not the prohibition of sexual expression itself.<sup>10,11</sup>

The most outstanding change of this century has been the shift to individual freedom of choice in many aspects of life. "Women became less dependent, economically speaking, upon men, and they achieved greater equality with men than had ever existed before in the history of the West. The opportunity for non-marital sexual expression contrary to the traditional mores

was made possible by the anonymity of the city and the use of the automobile and by 'the techniques' of conception control."<sup>12</sup>

The two primary inventions of the post-WWI young were dating and petting. Burchinal observed that these developed in urban areas and among college students "in response to the emancipation of women, increased leisure time, greater emancipation of youth, higher real incomes, commercialized recreation, and the extension of coeducational institutions. During the late 1930's and the 1940's, dating moved to the high school level."<sup>13</sup>

Petting allowed the couples to engage in the then expected and accepted pleasures of eroticism while maintaining the traditional female symbol of purity. Contraceptives permitted crossing the line for those who wished, but still the boy had to make the attempt to which the girl had to convey that her better judgement had been overwhelmed.

Off-campus, the drive was not so much for love and companionship but rather for status, prestige, and self-gratification. Therefore, there was more mutual sex exploitation. The male was out for sex gratification and the female for prestige and material gain. This helps explain the reason for the underlying antagonism to these male/female relationships.<sup>14</sup>

By the 50's marriage had changed to place more emphasis on companionship, affection, individualism, and egalitarianism instead of status, respect, obedience, authority, and duty.

The results were a greater drive for satisfaction and self-fulfillment and thus greater disillusionment, frustration, and divorce when the ideals were not met.<sup>15</sup>

The problem was that only marriage offered the independence of adulthood as well as the economic and social protection, so there was a great increase in teenage marriages.

Ehrmann points out the obvious factors that are causing this sexual crisis for youth. The increase of romantic love conflicted with the persistence of seeing eroticism as improper or indecent. Without ever getting to the cause of the conflict an elaborate system of social arrangements was developed. Even within marriage the two extremes were present. One group felt that love justified or made mandatory erotic expressions as an indispensable condition of marriage. The other tradition held that erotic satisfaction should occur only during intercourse which is solely for procreation.

Trends of the century seem to be the easing of taboos and reduction of sexual prohibitions among women, and a positive search for sexual satisfaction in marriage with greater concern on the husband's part for the wife's satisfaction. Among the unmarrieds, there has been a slight increase in pre-marital activity for men but a much greater one for women as we tend toward a single standard of behavior. Also there has been a marked decrease in the fear of pregnancy and venereal disease. Further, the longer period of dating has tended to converge the

sex attitudes and practices within the pair bond. Women after a time begin to express themselves sexually and men appreciate the need for respect more. Also, men tend to limit the number of involvements when they reach the stage of being in love.<sup>16</sup>

Writing in the early 1960's, William Kephart made a study of the status of marriage and divorce laws. Foremost in consideration is that the Constitution of the United States delegates the authority for these laws to the individual states. Therefore, the legal age for marriage without parental consent ranged from 12 to 21. For those marrying without consent, the most common legal age was 18 for women and 21 for men. For marrying with consent the most common was 16 for women and 18 for men. Even the minimum age of 16 for females is lowered in some states in case she is pregnant.<sup>17</sup>

Kephart noted that 11 states had higher age requirements for females (21) than the national average for first marriages (20). Leo Kanowitz in his book Women and the Law, which is more recent, notes that only four states have equal with-consent ages and only 11 have the same without-consent ages. According to him, the underlying assumptions are that the married status is the only proper one for women while men are encouraged in better pursuits. The differential recognizes that extra time is needed in order to be prepared for extra-family activities.<sup>18</sup> Neither one addresses himself to the coercion involved when

the female is pregnant, especially in the states that provide additional age deduction.

All fifty states prohibit incest. Many even prohibit filial relationships, marital ones, that do not include blood ties, simply to prevent familial jealousy. Until the middle 1960's thirty states had miscegenation laws.<sup>19</sup>

The marriage contract differs from other contracts in that it is not rescindable by mutual consent. Most states also require blood tests and a waiting period before a license will be certified. The licenses are invaluable for inheritance rights, social security, insurance and the like.<sup>20</sup>

Kanowitz also noted some other prohibitions that seem to be left over from common law days when a married woman had no rights of her own. Some states prohibit a married woman from changing her name or keeping her maiden name when she enters matrimony. Some states that do permit it, refuse to give the right to vote or the right to buy a car to such a woman. In Michigan a divorced woman may not revert to her maiden name if she has children by that marriage, even if she does not have custody. She may only change her name by becoming subservient to another man.<sup>21</sup>

In other carryovers the general rule still holds that a wife's legal domicile must follow that of her husband. So-called "unwritten laws" that excuse only the husband who shoots his spouse's paramour, but not vice versa, are even written into

the law in some states.<sup>22</sup>

Discrimination in mating laws is also evident in "statutory rape" laws. The same women who reach marriage rights before men somehow are mystically incapable of giving their assent to sexual relations, unlike their male counterparts.<sup>23</sup>

Prostitution, somewhat surprisingly, runs counter to other law trends. Under common law it was not a crime, but an ecclesiastical offense. In most cases, however, the patron is not tried and in fact has usually committed no crime unless he comes under a collateral offense.<sup>24</sup>

In summary of our legal tradition Margaret Mead, in Male and Female, puts it this way: "In our legal forms we are patrilineal, patrilineal, patrilocal, and legally for the most part, a patriarchal society. . . . we are also, of course, a monogamous society in which every form of polygamy, even the most casual, is frowned upon." That framework was profoundly changed by the existence of an American frontier and a shortage of women that worked against the unlimited power of the father and the husband.

Another carry-over from the old consciousness is guilt. Its foremost promulgator is the Catholic Church and the major cause is sex. The struggle between what is instilled into the child and what his instincts, intelligence and common sense tell him later on in life, usually culminates in a confusion of sexual guilts.

Much of the problem arises from the Church's attempt to divide the mind and the body, to elevate one and debase the other. This castration to the point of vindictiveness is not new. It has been the main problem of the Church since the fourth century.

Edward Di Lorenzo has written that Catholicism is based on the fear of sex. It (Catholicism) found that the easiest way to control a man's mind was through his groin. The faithful are told that only the Church can ease the guilt. The natural repetition of the sex urge keeps the person forever repentant in the confession booth like some self-flagellant.<sup>25</sup>

For many people the only way out of the conflict is illusion. Since only love can keep sex from being too dirty and ugly, a young woman pleads, "Tell me you love me." Only those words can free her mind and body, even if only fleetingly. Another illusion is the use of alcohol. The claim that one could not help one's self or could not remember the morning after, is another guilt salve.<sup>26</sup>

In 1949 Margaret Mead brought out Male and Female. Not only was it one of the most definitive works on the actual differences between the sexes, it also was terribly perceptive of the ways of a whole generation, that of our parents.

She cites the major problem of this culture as being an inability to recognize different types of femininity and masculinity. With our single standard, a little less hair on the



chin or a smaller bust line and one is almost placed in membership of the opposite sex. In other words, socially created social deviance. A person is left feeling less of a man or less of a woman. She feels that no child should be forced to deny his or her own sex membership.<sup>27</sup>

This hardship works the most on boys. The physiological rhythms of the female body constantly resolve any doubts about her sex membership. For her, puberty is dramatic and unmistakable, but for the boy it is a series of slow events. Thus, other cultures hold initiations in order to put some substance to growth and create certain tasks that are reserved for only the males.<sup>28</sup>

Another difference helps explain the origin of marriage. The female's need for continuity and planning, especially due to sexual matters, had to give order to the male's biological focus on immediate discharge.

On initiation into sexual adulthood Ms. Mead contrasted the United States and Samoa. In Samoa, life is rather easy going with sex viewed as a delightful experience, not something that will disrupt the social order. "The girls are chosen for first love affairs by older boys who have been initiated into full sex experience by older girls. In each sex partnership, one of the partners is expected to be sure and practiced."<sup>29</sup>

In contrast, dating in America occurs at an age when it has little to do with either sex or the body. Rather it is a

situation in which one is seen in public and from which satisfaction is derived from something quite contentless. "This continuous emphasis on the sexually relevant physical appearance is an outcome of using a heterosexual game as the prototype for success and popularity in adolescence."<sup>30</sup>

"We actually place our young people in a virtually intolerable situation, giving them the entire setting for behavior for which we then punish them whenever it occurs. . . . Petting is the answer to the dilemma. . . . The controls of this dangerous game . . . are placed in the hands of the girl. The boy is expected to ask for as much as possible, the girl to yield as little as possible.

The boy convinces the girl that he is so popular that he has the courage to ask for anything, and the girl convinces the boy that she is so popular that she has to give nothing. . . . From it comes the inability of many American women to make complete sexual surrenders, which foreigners find so confusing and frustrating, and from it also come the various compensations, the use of alcohol [among others]. . . The boy learns to value the situation in which he is checked, to devalue the situation in which he is not."<sup>31</sup>

Surprisingly the young play the game with good-sportsmanship. "The younger the boy and girl when they learn to play this game of partially incomplete, highly controlled indulgence of impulse, the more perfectly they can learn it. There are

fewer chances of the break-through deep emotion, to confuse the learning process." But when marriage comes, the definitions change. The male goal becomes a show of potency while for the female it is a happy sex life. Since climactic responses are not necessarily "natural" to the women, both persons resent return to petting as being regressive and to the man, it interferes with his show of potency.<sup>32</sup>

Until very recently the only persons who could live together without marriage were same-sex college students and spinsters. Thus if one is unmarried there are endless daily plans and initiatives for companionship. It is little wonder that companionship is the most desired value in a spouse. Moreover, Americans cannot stand being alone. If it occurs it must be softened with pets and by keeping the radio on.

In a more recent book, Ms. Mead got to the heart of the problem in America and other advanced countries. Among past societies and among the poor, when a boy left childhood he had no choice but to begin work. Adult sexual privileges were often tied to marrying and leaving the home. All this occurs during a very short period of time.

But today full privileges of adulthood are being denied until the early or middle twenties for those who continue schooling. The steadily increasing schooling demands have not been matched by steadily increasing privileges. Furthermore, in past societies it was the old who were the irresponsible

idealists. Now, the removal of the day to day worries and the extended schooling makes the young the idealists and the Devils' Advocates of the society.

With the falling of adult authority and so-called greater wisdom, the young have demanded full participation in life. But if this is translated into setting them to work in sober and confining tasks at an earlier age then it is a step back for society.<sup>33</sup>

Thus it is becoming quite clear that the problem with marriage today is pre-marriage. The lack of positive attitudes and a conscious effort to permit youth to become truly human must be foremost in any appraisal of future trends for resolving some of the on-going conflicts in present day marriage and mating.

Unfortunately, many of the writers of a Consciousness II position are more concerned with the problems that result from the system than with changing the system to free a new generation. These liberals do not call for a return to the old morality but say we should try to understand the deviances; yet implicitly they feel it would be better if we did return to the old morality.<sup>34</sup>

The statistics that are causing the hand-wringing are divorce rates and extra-marital experience rates. As noted earlier, divorce for current marriages is averaging between one-

third and one-half. To localize the problem more, even those couples married twenty years exhibit divorce rates twice as high when the men were under 22 or the women under 20. Also, having children in the first two years of marriage doubles the divorce rates.<sup>35</sup>

Dr. Gebhard, Kinsey's successor, gives his educated guess on the incidence of extra-marital experience as of 1968 as 60% for males and 35% for females.<sup>36</sup>

Here is a good example of the Consciousness I and II approach. Recently the California Social Welfare Board released their plans on how to lower illegitimacy rates. "A mother who bears a third illegitimate child should be deemed 'morally depraved' and required to hand the child over to the state. . . . The mother of an illegitimate child must name the child's father within six months after giving birth, or relinquish the child. . . . Girls 16 and under who bear an illegitimate child could be considered 'incapable of providing support' and lose the baby after a court hearing."<sup>37</sup>

Perhaps the best of the Consciousness II writers is Morton Hunt. His specialty is the middle-class middle-aged. He notices that there has been a steady increase among those who hark back to a historical minority tradition. He terms these persons the pagan-courtlies. Most prevalent today is Southern Europe; this tradition views marriage as a practical and functional arrangement but feels that sexuality could be directed

at someone other than a spouse. Due to the difficulty of divorce, there is an absolute distinction between wife and mistress which must be kept secret from the spouse. But unlike the Renaissance period, pagan-courtly love is now more courtly than loving. Thus it does not produce the tremendous amounts of guilt that affairs give the puritan-romantics nor is it as threatening to the marriage. However, these are traditions and not distinct personality types. They make our cultural heritage schizoid.<sup>38</sup>

Much of the increase in extra-marital affairs in the past two decades is correlated to a decrease in inner controls. Since the spouse is still the most effective enforcer of fidelity, most affairs are still kept secret from at least the spouse. Until recently psychologists viewed extra-marital sex as a presumption of pathology. Only recently have they noticed that more often it is a sign of health. The single most common reason given for searching for affairs is boredom. Given the right conditions, the desire overcomes the controls.<sup>39</sup>

Encouragement from the spouse makes temptation all but irresistible. It usually takes the form of separate dating, conjugal vacations (summer divorce), swinging, and double dating with the intent to start a group marriage. Mate-swapping "minimizes guilt by making the act legitimate and freely condoned, and at the same time overcomes lack of confidence by guaranteeing each participant a willing partner."<sup>40</sup>

Hunt also points out that the affair, besides being a remedy for boredom, is also everyone's answer to today's impersonality, disconnectedness, and gigantism of modern life. "We have lost our names and become numbers, lost touch with our friends and replaced them with people who merely live nearby, lost control of our destinies to governments, industries, and machines that ravish our earth and control our lives. If the individual feels powerless to remake or even salvage this world, he can at least comfort himself by making a world of his own through love. In each of its many forms, ranging from casual sexual encounters to the deepest emotional relationships, it gives him a sense of his own uniqueness, a vital connection with some other human being, an area of freedom within which he can manage a part of his destiny." Those who do not choose this course either live vicariously through fantasy and fiction or sublimate their desires into compulsive work and political activity.<sup>41</sup>

In 1969 Mr. Hunt said that the attitudes of the young were the only truly notable change occurring. Two years later he added group marriage and open homosexuality as other total breaks with Western tradition.<sup>42,43</sup>

In 1972 Playboy magazine published his "The Future of Marriage" using many of the same sources that are used in this paper. Although it was one of the most comprehensive in print, it ended being only a tract on the invincibility of monogamy.

For him, divorce is not a negation of marriage but a reratification since most divorcees remarry, and infidelity is merely a modification of monogamy. Both are no doubt true in part. He passes off the phenomenal increase in living-together arrangements as being monogamous, which they are, and very similar to married life, which they are not. Group marriage he associates with communes and intentional families, thus ignoring the vast majority of over-thirteen couples who are less conspicuous. Lastly, he sees any attempt at raising children communally to suffer from a lack of intense intimacy between parent and child, ignoring the fact that for most middle-class whites that does not even exist now. His only other perceptions are that divorce, living-together, and infidelity will increase while patriarchalism will decline.<sup>44</sup>

The reason for dwelling on Mr. Hunt's biases is that those biases are rampant in the social sciences today. They indict kibbutz life because parents only spend two hours a day with their children while thousands of East Coast children attend academies and do not even live at home. The examples are endless.

Little can be understood about Consciousness III persons without realizing that practically every single attitude of our society is being questioned and often rejected.

Single standard masculinity and femininity are being dis-



carded as Ms. Mead called for some twenty years ago. The old standards are viewed as perverted. This was dramatically brought home during the Vietnam war. For the Marines, homosexuality is not so much a sexual condition but a lack of the aggressiveness which comprises masculinity. When they received lectures about how Vietnamese men express friendship through physical contact, all the Marines could do was relate that to their own culture. All Vietnamese men are faggots.

One incident puts it more vividly. An American truck was forced to stop and take to a hospital an ARVN soldier who was lying by the side of the road with his leg shot off. An American took his crutches and grabbed him under the arm and got him in the truck. "The little slope grabbed me by the leg. And I had been in the country long enough to know that most of them are queer. They hold hands and stuff. And this sort of irks most marines and soldiers. And we're told that it's a Vietnamese custom, when you're really friendly you should hold hands. So they try to hold a lot of guy's hands. So they end up getting beat bloody. The guy grabbed my leg. So I got mad. I wasn't in a good mood that morning and I whacked him. And my buddies grabbed his crutches. . . . We threw his crutches in the rice paddy one time and and went another 150 yards and threw the other crutch and then out he went. He was screaming and crying and begging us. 'Out you go.' We all had a good laugh about that." That marine tradition merely re-enforced

the existing street corner one from which they came.<sup>45</sup>

The change in the definition of masculinity and femininity has also changed our standard of beauty. Now long hair can be beautiful on a guy and short hair can be beautiful on a girl. One eighteen year old male refers to standard of beauty as SOB. He stresses that today everyone is acceptable-looking. Further, the pleasure of looking at people is often taken away by SOB. SOB also starts a vicious cycle of self-fulfilling prophecies. When a guy is rejected by others because he doesn't meet the goal, he tends to reject himself. When it is reflected in his bearing and dress, it has come full cycle.<sup>46</sup>

This same student observed that males repress the showing of affection to members of the same sex. Instead they play a game he dubs "1002," which is the crazy ways in which they attempt to show their affection. Rather than saying, "I like you," they either slap a person hard on the back or say, "Hey, jerk." It appears that this occurs because of a fear of rejection; consequently, less affection is put forward. Moreover, emotion rarely expressed is hard to handle. One becomes suspicious of ulterior motives. Lastly, acting in pseudo-hostile ways, especially verbal, is constantly re-enforced by television through Don Rickles-type "humor."<sup>47</sup>

More and more, the façade put up for parents, the illicit back seat of a Dodge, the non-existent sex education and the unstructured attempt to discover love and sexuality are being

rejected. Here is how one student living with his girlfriend put it: "At home when you're in high school, you play out the Bonnie and Clyde back-seat bit." But at college when you are living together, "You close the door, strip off your clothes, and a lot more that you brought with you from home that you can't wait to get rid of . . . It's like an announcement. We're not going to do it in the bushes or on the back seat. But in the house--in the bed. Our own place, our own bunk. We're going to live together!" But given a chance to grow up without hangups and "We'd be breaking the doors down to dig each other instead of putting up doors to make like so-called consenting adults." That is what the Consciousness II persons have missed.<sup>48</sup>

The attempt to "break on through to the other side" is not easy. Here is a female student giving an update of the Margaret Mead analysis of dating. In high school when a large portion of the boys are having sex activity with a smaller percentage of the girls it puts greater pressure on the rest of the girls to avoid it, although there is a good chance that time will let the system self-destruct. "I felt that I was always on the defensive. . . It spoiled my enjoying practically every date. . . I used to feel that if I could go to sleep and wake up with it having happened, it would be like being released from prison. I think the worst part of it is the delay in having it happen. I think now that if it happened when

children are younger and it became more natural for boys and girls to be together, less nasty and secretive about nakedness and sex in general, it might be better for all concerned."<sup>49</sup>

The young today communicate through two media, music and print. Without analysing what they read and hear one is forced to merely read the entrails and have no ability to foresee the future. This is why Mr. Hunt could not even read two years into the future to see the rise of communes and the liberation of homosexuality.

Until recently there were only six songs. The introverted love song, the agony song, the sex song, the escape song, the rebellion song, and the extroverted love song. For a long time the basic gutsy, direct defiance that was inherent in rock and roll was either co-opted or released vicariously.

The basic change came in 1965 when extroverted love songs started to rival the introverted ones. Both were sexual, considered the world cold and tried to create a place of warmth, but one withdrew while the other tried to change the world. The introverted: "In this cold world you can love but one girl. Let me be that one girl. I'll be true to you." The logic of introverted love: "Don't you want somebody to love. Don't you need somebody to love. Wouldn't you love somebody to love. You've got to find somebody to love." This was bolstered by the sex songs which said there were only two types of each sex. There were girls that were your ideal and the kind you would

try to put the move on. Guys were either nice guy, shy guy, strong guy, or the guy that was only interested in a one night stand.

The escape (especially the drug ones) and the assertion songs bolstered this new community that wasn't based solely on sex as introverted love had been. This extroverted love is expressed in the liner notes of the MC5's first album. The MC5 and the revolution are "totally committed to driving people out of their separate shells and into each other's arms." From the Youngbloods: "Come on people now. Smile on your brother. Everybody get together. Try to love one another right now."<sup>43</sup>

Undoubtedly the most influential fiction writer in this area today is Robert H. Rimmer. For science fiction it is Robert A. Heinlein. The next two would probably be Aldous Huxley and B.F. Skinner. Rimmer burst on the scene with The Harrad Experiment, a book about kids that attend Harrad College with its four year course in human values and computer assigned roommates of the opposite sex. That was followed by The Rebellion of Yale Marrat which is about consensual bigamy. His next book, Proposition 31, is about the life of two families that led to a drive to permit corporate marriages of up to six adults if they are over thirty, by means of a public referendum.

In all of his works he has put forward the capacity of

man to live a joyous existence. This can be brought about by a conscious effort to give social support to creating a new moral order. Speaking of other writers he says, "For good or bad they are not proposing in concrete terms how to avoid where we are going. . . . There is very little concrete future planning. . . . We are at a time in the history of man where we can no longer hope or pray that the masses will democratically muddle through into a golden age . . . Most of us only respond to immediate disaster--future planning is the province of an entirely new type of leadership."<sup>51</sup> For him this means making laws that would permit all the proposals in his three best-known works.

Elsewhere he proposes that President Nixon's plan for a National Institute of Education include a Committee in Charge of Wednesday Night Human Value Programming. Every Wednesday between 8 p.m. and 11 p.m., all television stations would run a commercial free program of leaders and futurists for the purpose of involving people in the creation of National Goals.<sup>52</sup>

Three years ago he noted that the American Sunbathers Association got the Supreme Court to declare that the human body was not obscene. To implement at least the underlying assumptions he calls for a Spring Festival of Nakedness to be held annually on college campuses. It would be a bellylaugh on a neurotic establishment. Referring to television coverage, "Maybe they would be reduced to pleading with the peaceable

naked students to cover their breasts and genitals so they could record the event for the fine citizens of our country who still believe that man is conceived in sin."<sup>53</sup>

Heinlein, in contrast, is more futuristic. Stranger in a Strange Land is about a rich innocent who tries to bring people to their true potential by nine steps of awareness under a discipline that preaches "Thou art God." The Moon Is a Harsh Mistress presents a lunar community consisting of a variety of marriages: nuclear, clan, line polyandries, and groups. Theoretically eternal, the hero's line marriage was just a hundred years old. In I Will Fear No Evil the author presents the ultimate transplant, that of a brain, so that a male brain is in a female body. Rather than a unisex attitude the result is a fusion, a yin/yang.

The late Aldous Huxley not only gave the young his anti-utopia, Brave New World, but also his Utopian Island. His drug research gave him a slightly different insight and slant to what the young are looking for. B.F. Skinner, in Walden Two, despite his turgid style of novel writing, his seeming lack of joy, and his elaborate organization, presents a radical alternative to the economic and political system.

The question seems to form in this manner: does a change in beliefs of marriage mating, and sexuality lead only to a decline in patriarchy as Morton Hunt would suggest? Or is the authoritarian family "part and parcel," and at the same

time, prerequisite, of the authoritarian state and of authoritarian society" as William Reich suggested?<sup>54</sup> This helps explain the tremendous increase in enthusiasm for the works of A.S. Neill and his school, Summerhill.

If you believe, as I do, with Albert Ellis that virtually every living American "is completely muddled-, mixed-, and messed-up in his sex views, feelings, and acts" and is quite conscious that he no longer knows what is right sexually, then there is no limit to what a self-actualized individual, who is socially supported, could accomplish.<sup>55</sup>

The task of many authors is thus to understand the sex attitudes that got us here and to create new attitudes to help us cope with the future.

The foremost researcher on our sex attitudes was Dr. Kinsey. He found that the most common explanations adults gave the young for abstaining from sex were based on guilt. The actual reasons why they limited themselves were the American moral tradition and fear of the unfamiliar. Regretting the experiences if they occurred was most correlated with religiosity. The major argument for premarital intercourse was that it helped a person make emotional adjustments to other people and they are easiest to learn at an early age.<sup>56</sup>

A view of the underclass attitudes is provided by Paul Goodman. He believes that the aggressive masculinity noted



earlier in Vietnam veterans, the macho complex, comes from a systematic removal of self-worth of a man at the same time that he is being permitted sexual privileges. Sex becomes a contest of conquest, a continuation of the four-F approach to dating. The only alternative is to "be successful" which to the poor is translated into stealing. Those who cannot bear to tread either path usually withdraw into narcotics or gambling.<sup>57</sup>

Nathan Ackerman presents the indictment that most families are hollow and that they give to the young numbing attitudes. For him there is little genuine loving. "They fear and mistrust an open show of emotion, as if all emotion were bad, destructive, even violent. . . . The murderous competitiveness of the business ethic invades the private life of the family. The gain of one member is reckoned as the loss of another. . . . To admit the need of others or to show tenderness is a confession of weakness. . . . Everything in human intercourse is reduced to dress and cosmetics. Contact is skin-deep. From still another point of view, the adults lose the art of play."

In response the young must rebel, says Derek Miller, since they have no one else to get adjustment from. "The generation gap, whatever its other causes, is thus an inevitable result of the failure of society to provide the opportunity of forming attachment bonds to extramarital adults. . . . If there are no extra-marital adults with meaning in his life, an adolescent who is striving for autonomy must, of necessity, try

to weaken the existing bonds with his parents."<sup>58</sup>

The attitudes instilled in women are the fort  of Mirra Komarovsky. She finds that women are prevented from developing their inner resources while at the same time kept from accepting their feminine sexuality.<sup>59</sup> David Mace, looking into equality in the U.S.S.R., found that female comrades had to work the same number of hours as did their husbands, yet spend four hours more a day doing housework than did their mates.<sup>60</sup>

An either/or position on youthful sexuality is put forward by A.S. Neill in Summerhill: "I know of no argument against youth's love life that holds water. Nearly every argument is based on repressed emotion or hate of life--the religious, the moral, the expedient, the arbitrary, the pornographic. . . . The taboos and fears. . . . produce the perverts who rape and strangle small girls in parks, the perverts who torture Jews and Negroes . . . . Abolish sex repression and youth will be lost to authority. . . . For a parent there is no sitting on the fence, no neutrality. The choice is between guilty-secret sex or open-healthy-happy sex."<sup>61</sup>

Most views of those who advocate a new sexual attitude are well-known. However, Martin Zitter of the Sandstone Retreat, a sensual awareness center, caused quite a stir at the 1972 California State Psychological Association Annual Convention with his presentation on social sex. It is defined as non-reproductive sex with more than two people present or par-

ticipating. Social sex can either be "hot" as in swinging or "cool" as in open-ended sensuality. The latter is hardest for men because as boys they are told that being in touch with your feelings is sissyish.

"Social sex offers . . . an opportunity for anyone to regress back to the source of a possible problem, examine the situation that caused it, fulfill the fantasies that were left unfulfilled and build a new, more accepting attitude toward their sexuality. . . . When sex is kept behind closed doors, sex problems never get a chance to be honestly examined. Group feedback, however, provides a source of constant reevaluation for the sensitive person who is willing to change."<sup>62</sup>

What future attitudes will be was part of the concern of The Future of the Family, a book providing predictions and projections from four disciplines. Since by the turn of the century incomes will double, then work-oriented values will decline. Consequently, parents will not be so interested in imprinting diligence, punctuality, and deferred gratification into their children. Further, <sup>they</sup> will be rejected on moral grounds as a sell out to the establishment.

There will be a greater inner directedness with an increased interest in the mind, both psychopharmacologically and technologically. Fertility and reproduction will come under control, status orientations will diminish, socialization of the children will come more from peers, the economic function

will be underpinned by the government, social control of the behavior of both the spouses and the children will be increasingly lost by the family, and emotional satisfaction will be increasingly demanded and expected.<sup>63</sup>

Elsewhere in the book another author points out the four developments of the past three centuries. They are the acceleration of the population explosion, urbanization, population diversification, and the increased tempo of change. A detailed study can be found in Alvin Toffler's Future Shock. This means that primary relationships have given way to secondary ones. Rather than being persons and reacting emotionally they are roles with the relationship based on utility. Controls have gone from informal ones to less effective formal ones. At the same time traditional behavior with its automatic acceptance has given way to rational behavior based on inquiry and decision-making. This individuality is effectuated, though, by bureaucracies.

The family is no longer an extended one. The family is no longer a production unit, religious unit, educational unit, nor a strong affectional one. It has lost most of its role as a consumption unit, socialization unit, and protective unit. It is no longer monogamistic and is fast becoming a secondary rather than primary group.<sup>64</sup>

Philosophy, on the other hand, predicts that countertrends will develop and that one cannot exponentiate forever. Since

the Age of Faith is over we are standing naked in the midst of a value crisis; nothing is accepted without question. The Age of Ideology is declining also. The two great ideologies were Marxism and psychoanalysis. Marxism dealt with the problem of individualism versus collectivism but never developed a psychology of individual growth. Hence it was based on work. Psychoanalysis thought love and not work would yield the answer but never got around to social constructs. The task of the family and the community is to bring the two together.<sup>65</sup>

Behavioral science predicts that people will want both ends of the continuum--emotionality and serenity. Now there is little intimacy of shared feelings, but a fear of vulnerability. Soon people will allow themselves to be more irrational and infantile, but only in the family, which will be the one safe place in a hostile world. There will be a broader range of sexuality, both within and without the marriage.

More striking is the prediction that new educational means will be devised to bring the family back into the education process. Also, rather than needing others for economic reasons and learning to love them, the future will see that reversed. To that end networks of families will develop that will respond to each other's crises and joys.<sup>66</sup>

As we move toward new attitudes we must also move toward creating new forms with which to live. To describe some of the

attempts and suggestions so far, Herbert Otto edited The Family in Search of a Future. Although it is of mixed quality, it is important in that it is the first of its kind. Much of the following appeared in this work. Generally, it includes both ways of improving the nuclear marriage and family and also ways of adding to it other supportive persons.

Two of the former are serial polygamy and serial polygamy to the same person. Serial polygamy, also known as serial monogamy and progressive monogamy, is based on the belief that if a marriage is not working a person should have the chance to start over. Serial polygamy to the same person is known as reinventing marriage. Its purpose is to have a variety of cohabiting forms that a psychologist and a couple could form in order to reinvest the marriage with new meaning.<sup>67</sup>

Another proposal based on the nuclear couple is the non-legal voluntary association. It requires only one change in the law, redefining marriage in the tax laws from state registration to one of voluntary assumption. Otherwise paternity suits, child support, and independent agreements made before a breakup occurs in anticipation of the possibility of such an event, provide most of the advantages that marriage provides.<sup>68</sup>

Although not very much literature is available, another possibility is the intimate network. In short, it keeps the nuclear marriage but through intimacy with other families is

also an extended family of a lateral rather than vertical nature.

The most radical proposal, however, is Margaret Mead's "Marriage in Two Steps," written in 1966. Inherent in it is the difference pointed out in this paper between a marriage and a family. The first step, individual marriage, is an ethical, rather than binding, economic one, but would still be sanctified by law and religious ceremony. However, it would not be sanctioned for having children, and in case of dissolution would not involve alimony. The second step, parental marriage, would be like present marriage with the exception that an individual marriage with that spouse must exist for an unspecified period of time immediately prior. Somewhat unprecedented is her requirement that economic ability to support a child be shown for parental marriages.

Morton Hunt dismisses the proposal as being dated since the young have taken her up on the idea, without waiting for the law. That is assuming that only college students would enter individual marriage, when, in fact, it calls for everyone who wishes children to participate in an individual marriage no matter what their previous marital status or number of children. Further, it provides legal living together for persons of all ages, while today, cohabitation can get one sent to prison in some states. As an anthropologist, she believes that marriage is a solemn ritual that binds the generations in

a belief that what was true will continue to be true in the future. Therefore, it is more of a salve to the psyche of the old than is living together.

Besides her already stated belief in the delaying of parenthood in order to let children continue their education as well as be the idealists and conscience of the establishment, there are other reasons for making a distinction between marriage and parenthood. Among those marriages that occur at an early age, the couple does not bring cross-sex friendships into the marriage which are so essential to its continuation. Instead, they bring a child. If it did not actually precede the marriage, it comes in short order since we believe a child validates the marriage. Rather than being a person growing into the future, it is a symbol of an unreal past.

She also feels that individual marriages would place an emphasis on the whole relationship rather than seeking after the physical need as an end unto itself. "The present mode of sex among a wide range of partners casually, and then, inconsistently, of accepting marriage as a form of 'choice' arising from necessity is a deep denial of individuality and individual love." Individual marriage "would help them to grow into each other's life--and allow them to part without the burden of misunderstood intentions, bitter recriminations, and self-destructive guilt."

Parental marriage, on the other hand, would already have



a going union behind it. There would be no sudden surprises. A woman, having probably worked during the individual marriage, would bring to the marriage a skill that she could return to in time of need or by choice.<sup>69</sup>

There are four other forms that attack the nuclear couple/nuclear family concept. They are opposed to absolute sexual exclusivity and/or parental exclusivity.

One of the most curious is a plan for polygyny after age sixty. Its advantages, of course, are that it offers women an opportunity to reestablish a meaningful family group, gives all concerned a better diet, makes mealtime more of a social atmosphere, permits pooling of limited funds, solves the difficulty of care during illness, lightens the housework load, creates greater intimacy, encourages similar interests, helps eliminate loneliness and a feeling of uselessness common to the age group, and lastly, solves a number of sexual problems.<sup>70</sup> The problem is that polygyny's popularity is undermined by the values of the current aged. However, long strides have been made, with the possible exception of the sex. One Florida city's anti-hippie zoning ordinance, when used to prosecute a house of mostly unmarried persons over seventy, was appealed and declared unconstitutional. After the decision they said that it was a victory for those who refused to live separate and lonely existences. Another factor in the drive for co-ed living

for the aged is the presence of religious groups seeking such living arrangements, although most plan a celibate existence.

The kibbutz is a radical of child rearing. Bruno Bettelheim presented their case as well as responded to certain American critics. Success of the child-rearing he found correlated to the size of the group, the adult-child ratio, and the attitude of those in charge of the children. The most intimate contact between parent and child at this time is breast-feeding. Responding to Mr. Spiro's objections to the lack of privacy, he attributes the appraisal to the American bias. Bettelheim instead raises the point that privatization might be the cause of our feelings of isolation that the kibbutz was designed to counteract.

After leaving the nursery, a child joins seven others with whom to grow up. At kindergarten age, groups are joined to raise the number to sixteen, and later, when they are ready to start high school, the size is doubled again. Thus, the youth has a steady friendship system that grows with him and permits him to interact with his peers with little or no adult supervision.

The objectives of the kibbutz seem to have been met. Those objectives were to abolish parental and patriarchal authority, free the female, place value on communal living, and provide the children with a democratic education. As a by-product of this, the child does not need to rebel against his

parents since he was not so totally dependent on them such that he had no identity of his own.<sup>71</sup>

Communes, or tribal families, are the subject of a somewhat uncritical article by Joseph Downing. "The Tribal Family is a phenomenon of the new Society of Awakening that Hesse said was something encouraging and compelling, consoling and full of promise." Its benefits are therapeutic ones for the members. It allows them to reexamine socially-inculcated values through deep experience, escape unverified authority, and reinstitute a joy in living. Most are trying to reconstruct the loving, accepting, but undemanding family they never had. They also value the closer integration of work and living patterns.<sup>72</sup>

Group marriage is a topic that Dr. Albert Ellis has tackled. Time has shown that his definition, or lack of one, was his major failing. His analysis, though, is superb. Group marriages have trouble finding and selecting prospective members, difficulty of living together, love and sex problems, and an inconvenience due to the greater number of men over women who are interested in the idea. Its benefits, of course, are sexual varietism, wider love relationships, and social benefits from cooperative living.<sup>73</sup>

Two other writers who are trying to give substance and support to the same movement they analyze are Larry and Joan Constantine. They are almost alone in the field of multilateral

relations. Being more rigorous in their definitions than some, they draw sharp distinctions between communes and multilateral marriages. Communes are more centrally a living arrangement with fraternal/sororal relationships rather than marital ones. Sometimes, multilateral marriages are found within communes or intentional communities. Operationally, communes have a greater turnover of membership. Furthermore, "the primary contract in a commune is from the individual to the group rather than between individuals." Multilateral marriages differ from swinging in that there is "more of a total lifestyle commitment."<sup>74</sup>

Laws governing marriage and mating are hopelessly backward (See Appendix). Anyone with some optimism at all must direct his attention toward future laws. Michigan, however, has a chance of being a pioneer champion of least backwardness.

Public Act No. 75 for 1971 is commonly known as the no-fault divorce law. Modeled after similar laws in Iowa and Britain, it provides as sole grounds for divorce "a breakdown of the marriage relationship to the extent that the objects of matrimony have been destroyed and there remains no reasonable likelihood that the marriage can be preserved." All financial settlement statutes and interpretations were left intact. So far, the only observable trend has been a considerable increase in the number of divorce petitions being filed by men.

Another possible source of reform is the Revised Criminal Code. It would generally permit any voluntary sexual acts between spouses and also eliminate adultery. In the House-passed version, the legislators considered the anti-homosexuality too controversial to touch. One bright spot though is the intervention of the Lieutenant Governor on behalf of legalizing all consensual sex acts.

A bill for renewable marriage was introduced last year in the Maryland legislature but it did not pass. "It calls for making a marriage a three-year contract, with an option to renew every three years by mutual consent of both partners. Any disagreements over alimony, child custody and the like would be settled by a court as they are now."<sup>75</sup>

Realizing the problems before us one understands how pitiful these legal attempts have been. It is my belief that we are faced with a monstrous system that mounts unreality on unreality.

The myth of the absolute restriction of sex to marriage and the marital spouse must be the first to go. Even though we can produce mock indignation or snickering elbow-ribbing when we learn of a violation of the myth, it prevents us from creating new forms of premarital experiences. It prevents us from consciously choosing our future and instead forces us to accept the present and future course as inevitable.

This myth, in my opinion, is the main cause of the repression, sublimation, and concealment of youthful sexuality. This, in turn, blinds us to even the consideration of providing for the emotional development of adolescents.

An adjunct to the one-and-only-one-mate-who-must-be-a-spouse myth is the universal ideal myth. This means that everybody must crave for exactly the same thing--one spouse. Even in foreign countries we expect the persons we deal with to adopt our ways. Deviance is seen as a sign of pathology or inferiority.

Lastly, like Ms. Mead I must call for some concrete attempts to eliminate the singular type of masculinity and femininity that is constantly paraded before us. We must both accept and embrace diversity because it is no longer tolerated that a person can be made to feel less than human. We have reached a point in history when we can banish Procrustes and accept Aphrodite.

Notes

- 1 Herbert A. Otto, "Introduction," in The Family in Search of a Future, ed. H.A. Otto (New York, 1970), pp. 1; 13-14.
- 2 Ibid., p. 15.
- 3 Ibid., p. 16.
- 4 Panos D. Bardis, "Family Forms and Variations Historically Considered," in Handbook of Marriage and the Family, ed. H.T. Christensen (Chicago, 1964), pp. 412-40.
- 5 Ibid., p. 451.
- 6 Ibid., pp. 451-3.
- 7 Ibid., pp. 453-6.
- 8 Ibid., pp. 457-8.
- 9 Winston Ehrmann, "Marital and Non-Marital Sexual Behavior," in Handbook of Marriage and the Family, pp. 587-9.
- 10 Morton Hunt, The Affair (New York/Cleveland, 1969), p. 18.
- 11 Ehrman, p. 590.
- 12 Ibid., pp. 592-3.
- 13 Lee Burchinal, "The Premarital Dyad and Love Involvement," in Handbook of Marriage and the Family, p. 624.
- 14 Ehrmann, pp. 594-5.
- 15 Ibid., p. 595.
- 16 Ibid., pp. 595-612.
- 17 William Kephart, "Legal and Procedural Aspects of Marriage and Divorce," in Handbook of Marriage and the Family, p. 945.
- 18 Leo Kanowitz, Women and the Law: The Unfinished Revolution (Albuquerque, 1969), pp. 10-1.

- 19 Kephart, pp. 946-7.
- 20 Ibid., pp. 948-9.
- 21 Kanowitz, pp. 41-6.
- 22 Ibid., pp. 92-3.
- 23 Ibid., pp. 9, 18.
- 24 Ibid., p. 16.
- 25 Edward Di Lorenzo, "Guilt," in Forum: The International Journal of Human Relations, Volume I, Number 4 (January 1972), pp. 22-8.
- 26 Ibid., p. 28.
- 27 Margaret Mead, Male and Female (New York, 1949), pp. 130-42.
- 28 Ibid., pp. 159, 175.
- 29 Ibid., pp. 114-8.
- 30 Ibid., pp. 286-90.
- 31 Ibid., pp. 290-1.
- 32 Ibid., pp. 292-4.
- 33 Margaret Mead and Ken Heyman, Family (New York, 1965), pp. 189-92.
- 34 Herbert A. Otto, p. 16.
- 35 "The Marriage Game," Time, Vol. 99 No. 8 (February 21, 1972), p. 51.
- 36 Hunt, p. 11.
- 37 "An Immodest Proposal," Time, Vol 99 No. 15 (April 10, 1972), p. 12.
- 38 Hunt, pp. 19-22.
- 39 Ibid., pp. 45-54.
- 40 Ibid., pp. 79, 117-8.



- 41 Ibid., pp. 283-5.
- 42 Ibid., pp. 288.
- 43 Morton Hunt, "The Future of Marriage," Playboy, Vol. 18 No. 8 (August, 1971), p. 170.
- 44 Hunt, "The Future of Marriage," pp. 118, 168.
- 45 Charles J. Levy, "ARVN as Faggots: Inverted Warfare in Vietnam," Transaction, Vol. 8 no. 12 (October, 1971), pp. 18-21.
- 46 Robert H. Rimmer, You and I . . . Searching for Tomorrow (New York, 1971), pp. 393-4.
- 47 Ibid., pp. 394-5.
- 48 Roy Ald, Sex Off Campus (New York, 1970), pp. 52-8.
- 49 Ibid., pp. 167-70.
- 50 Richard Simon, "Do You Love Me, Now That I Can Dance?" (Public Lecture, Western Michigan University, 1970).
- 51 Rimmer, pp. 50-1.
- 52 Ibid., p. 52.
- 53 Ibid., p. 414.
- 54 William Reich, The Sexual Revolution (New York, 1969), p. 71.
- 55 Albert Ellis, "The Folklore of Sex" in The Family and the Sexual Revolution, ed. Edwin M. Schur (Bloomingdale, 1964), p. 83.
- 56 Alfred Kinsey, W. Pomeroy, C. Martin, and P. Gebhard, "Premarital Coitus: Some Arguments and Attitudes," in The Family and the Sexual Revolution, pp. 19-21.
- 57 Paul Goodman, "Growing Up Absurd," in The Family and the Sexual Revolution, pp. 53-8.
- 58 Derek Miller, "Parental Responsibility for Adolescent Maturity," in The Family and Its Future, ed. Katherine Elliot (london, 1970), p. 77.

- 59 Mirra Komarovsky, "Learning the Feminine Role," in The Family and the Sexual Revolution, p. 289.
- 60 David R. Mace, "The Employed Mother in the U.S.S.R.," in The Family and the Sexual Revolution, p. 289.
- 61 A.S. Neill, "Sex Attitudes," in The Family and the Sexual Revolution, pp. 169-76.
- 62 Tom Green, "Psychology Discovers Sex," Los Angeles Free Press, February 4, 1972, Part 1, p. 19.
- 63 Anthony J. Weiner, "Physical Science Predicts and Projects," in The Future of the Family by Farson, Hauser, Stroup, and Weiner (New York, 1969), pp. 8-19.
- 64 Philip M. Hauser, "Social Science Predicts and Projects," in The Future of the Family, pp. 21-36.
- 65 Herbert Stroup, "Philosophy Predicts and Projects," in The Future of the Family, pp. 40-6.
- 66 Richard E. Farson, "Behavioral Science Predicts and Projects," in The Future of the Family, pp. 57-74.
- 67 Sidney M. Jourard, "Reinventing Marriage: The Perspective of a Psychologist," in The Family in Search of a Future, p. 47.
- 68 Harold Greenwald, "Marriage as a Non-Legal Voluntary Association," in The Family in Search of a Future, pp. 53-4.
- 69 Margaret Mead, "Marriage in Two Steps," in The Family in Search of a Future, pp. 75-84.
- 70 Victor Kassel, "Polygyny after Sixty," in The Family in Search of a Future, pp. 138-43.
- 71 Bruno Bettelheim, "Does Communal Education Work? The Case of the Kibbutz," in The Family and the Sexual Revolution, pp. 294-304.
- 72 Joseph Downing, "The Tribal Family and the Society of Awakening," in The Family in Search of a Future, pp. 119-28.
- 73 Albert Ellis, "Group Marriage: A Possible Alternative?" pp. 85-95.

<sup>74</sup> Larry L. and Joan M. Constantine, "Group and Multilateral Marriage: Definitional Notes, Glossary, and Annotated Bibliography," in Family Process, Vol. 10, No. 2 (June, 1971), pp. 157-76.

<sup>75</sup> "Renewable Marriage," Time, Vol. 97, No. 11 (March 15, 1971), p. 43.



## Bibliography

### Books:

- Ald, Roy. Sex Off Campus. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1970.
- Christensen, H.T., editor. Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1964.
- Constantine, Lary L. and Joan M. "Group and Multilateral Marriage: Definitional Notes, Glossary, and Annotated Bibliography," in Family Process. Vol. 10, No. 2 (June, 1971), pp. 157-76.
- Farson, Richard E., Philip M. Hauser, Herbert Stroup, and Anthony J. Weiner. The Future of the Family. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1969.
- Greer, Germaine. Female Eunuch. New York: Bantam Books, 1970.
- Heinlein, Robert A. I Will Fear No Evil. New York: Berkeley Publishing, 1967.
- Heinlein, Robert A. The Moon is a Harsh Mistress. New York: Berkeley Publishing, 1967.
- Heinlein, Robert A. Stranger in a Strange Land. New York: Berkeley Publishing, 1961.
- Kanowitz, Leo. Women and the Law: The Unfinished Revolution. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1969.
- Mead, Margaret. Male and Female. New York: William Morrow and Co., 1949.
- Mead, Margaret and Ken Heyman. Family. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1965.
- Neubeck, Gerhard, editor. Extramartial Relations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Otto, Herbert A. The Family in Search of a Future. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.
- Rimmer, Robert H. The Harrad Experiment. New York: Bantam Books.
- Rimmer, Robert H. Proposition 31. New York: New American Library.

Rimmer, Robert H. The Rebellion of Yale Marrat. New York: New American Library.

Rimmer, Robert H. You and I . . . Searching for Tomorrow.

Schur, Edwin M., editor. The Family and the Sexual Revolution. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Thorp, Roderick and Robert Blake. The Music of Their Laughter: An American Album. San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1971.

Magazines and Newspapers:

Adams, Wesley. "Unsuccessful Attempt to Help Them." Family Law Quarterly. Vol. III, No. 1 (March, 1969), p. 15-

Constantine, Larry L. and Joan M. Excerpted from Forum as "Are Mary, Don, Betty, and Pete ready for group marriage? . . . And will their mothers attend the wedding?" Los Angeles Free Press, October 1, 1971, pp. 3, 7.

Di Lorenzo, Edward. "Guilt." Forum: The International Journal of Human Relations. Vol. I, No. 4 (January, 1972), pp. 22-28.

Green, Tom. "Psychology Discovers Sex." Los Angeles Free Press. February 4, 1972, Part 1, p. 19.

Greer, Germaine. "Playboy Interview." Playboy. Vol. 19, No. 1 (January, 1972), p. 61-82.

Hefner, Hugh M. "The Playboy Philosophy." Playboy. Part I, II, and III. 1963-64.

Hunt, Morton. "The Future of Marriage." Playboy. Vol. 18, No. 8 (August, 1971), pp. 117-8, 168-75.

"An Immodest Proposal." Time. Vol. 99, No. 15 (April 10, 1972), p. 12.

"An Intimate Revolution in Campus Life." Life. Vol. 69, No. 21 (November 20, 1970), pp. 32-41.

Knight, Jack. "3,000 Prostitution Cases in Year Use Up Police Time." Detroit Free Press. March 23, 1972, p. 12-13.

Levy, Charles J. "ARVN as Faggots: Inverted Warfare in Vietnam." Transaction. Vol. 8, No. 12 (October, 1971) pp. 18-27.

"The Marriage Game." Time. Vol. 99, No. 8 (February 21, 1972), p. 51.

Masters, William H. and Virginia E. Johnson. "Playboy Interview." Playboy. Vol. 15, No. 5 (May, 1968), pp. 67-82, 194-202.

Miller, Laura. "Prof denies existant of sex revolution." On Campus Today. March 9-17, 1972, p. 5.

Palson, Charles and Rebecca. "Swinging in Wedlock." Society (Transaction). Vol. 9, No. 4 (February, 1972), p. 28-37.

"Renewable Marriage." Time. Vol. 97, No. 11 (March 15, 1971), p. 43.

"Runaway Wives." Time. Vol. 98, No. 25 (December 20, 1971), p. 64.

"Sex and Change." Time. Vol. 99, No. 12 (March 20, 1972), p. 47.

Steinem, Gloria. "What It Would Be Like If Women Win." Time. Vol. 96, No. 9 (August 31, 1970), pp. 22-5.

"The Whispered Faith." Time. Vol. 98, No. 15 (October 11, 1971). p. 25.

Other:

Michigan House Bill No. 404 as passed the House, February 29, 1972.

Michigan Public Act No. 75 for 1971.

Simon, Richard. "Do You Love Me Now That I Can Dance?" Public Lecture, Western Michigan University, 1970.

# PENALTIES FOR SEX OFFENSES IN THE U.S. c. 1963

Maximum fine and/or imprisonment for first offense unless otherwise noted. When two numbers are given, they represent minimum and maximum penalties.

STATE	FORNICATION	ADULTERY	COHABITATION	SODOMY*
ALABAMA	\$100 to 7 or 6 mos.**	\$100 to 7 or 6 mos.**		2-10 yrs.
ALASKA	\$500 or 2 yrs. or both	\$200 or 3 mos.		1-10 yrs.
ARIZONA		3 yrs.	3 yrs.	5-20 yrs.
ARKANSAS			\$20-\$100***	1-21 yrs.
CALIFORNIA			\$1000 or 1 yr. or both	1 yr. to 7
COLORADO	\$200 or 6 mos.****	\$200 or 6 mos.****		1-14 yrs.
CONNECTICUT	\$100 or 6 mos. or both	5 yrs.		30 yrs.
DELAWARE		\$500 or 1 yr. or both		\$1000 and 3 yrs.
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	\$300 or 6 mos. or both	\$500 or 1 yr. or both		\$1000 or 10 yrs.
FLORIDA	\$30 or 3 mos.	\$500 or 2 yrs.	\$300 or 2 yrs.	20 yrs.
GEORGIA	\$1000 or 12 mos. or both	\$1000 or 12 mos. or both		1-10 yrs. 2nd conviction, 10-30 yrs.
HAWAII	\$15-\$50 or 1-3 mos.	\$30-\$100 or 3-12 mos. or both*****		\$1000 and 20 yrs.
IDAHO	\$300 or 6 mos. or both	\$100-\$1000 or 3 mos.-3 yrs.	\$300 or 6 mos. or both	5 yrs. to 7
ILLINOIS	\$200 or 6 mos. or both	\$500 or 1 yr. or both		\$100-\$1000 or 2-14 yrs. or both
INDIANA	\$500 or 6 mos. or both	\$500 or 6 mos. or both		10 yrs.
IOWA		\$300 and 1 yr. or 1-3 yrs.		10 yrs.
KANSAS	\$500 or 6 mos. or both	\$500 or 6 mos. or both		10 yrs.
KENTUCKY	\$20-\$50	\$20-\$50		2-5 yrs.
LOUISIANA			\$1000 or 1 yr. or both	\$2000 or 5 yrs. or both
MAINE	\$100 and 2 mos.	\$1000 or 5 yrs.	\$300 or 5 yrs.	1-10 yrs.
MARYLAND		\$10		1-10 yrs.
MASSACHUSETTS	\$30 or 3 mos.	\$500 or 3 yrs.	\$300 or 3 yrs.	20 yrs.
MICHIGAN	\$500 or 1 yr.	\$2000 or 4 yrs. or both	See below	15 yrs.
MINNESOTA	\$100 or 3 mos.	\$300 or 2 yrs.		20 yrs.
MISSISSIPPI	\$500 and 6 mos.	\$500 and 6 mos.		10 yrs.
MISSOURI	\$1000 or 1 yr. or both	\$1000 or 1 yr. or both		2 yrs. to 7
MONTANA	\$500 or 6 mos. or both	\$500 or 6 mos. or both		5 yrs. to 7
NEBRASKA	\$100 and 6 mos.	1 yr.		20 yrs.
NEVADA	\$500-\$1000 or 6 mos.-1 yr. or both	\$500-\$1000 or 6 mos.-1 yr. or both		1 yr.-life

\*Sodomy, often referred to as "the crime against nature," includes a wide variety of "unnatural" sexual activity, with animals or with another person of either sex, both within and outside of marriage.  
 \*\*\*\$300 to 7 or 1 year for second conviction; 2 years for third conviction.  
 \*\*\*\*\$100 to 7 or 1 year for second conviction; 1 to 3 years for third conviction.  
 \*\*\*\*\*Double first sentence imposed for second conviction and so on for subsequent convictions.  
 \*\*\*\*\*Penalty for male only; for female, penalty is less: \$10 to \$30 or 1 to 3 months' imprisonment.