

# *anchorage anarchy*

Issue #18

August 2011

\$1.00

## Queer Marriage—Threat or Menace?

Marriage is in the forefront of media coverage right now as same-sex marriage is being legalized in more and more states. In New York, like lambs to the slaughter, many same-sex couples were so eager to publicly surrender their self-sovereignty and independence that they entered a lottery to be among the first to be allowed to marry. While there is a lot of debate about whether expanding the “right” to marry is a good or bad thing, however, no one seems to be asking whether marriage itself, in whatever form it takes, is a good thing or not. Both sides of the gay marriage debate take it on faith that marriage is a worthwhile institution—that is, after all, why same-sex couples want in on it. And that is also why the bigots, who think that allowing queers to marry would lead to matrimony’s eventual demise, believe it so important to defend it from the homos.

But both the advocates and opponents of gay marriage are wrong. Marriage is a pernicious institution. At its worst it is a means whereby religion and government coerce people into forming personal relationships that replicate the authoritarian patterns of society. At its best, it is a ritual in which individuals unwilling to think and live for themselves seek out the approval of the community for their private sexual arrangements. In any of its manifestations, though, it is a tradition that has no place among free-thinking and free-living people.

### **Seven Brides for Seven Sisters?**

Marriage has a long history and has taken many forms. Although the one man/one woman state-sanctioned partnership prevalent in the United States is taken to be “traditional,” there are, and continue to be, many different types of

marriage. Partnerships including multiple spouses, although outlawed in America, continue to exist here and elsewhere and there are numerous instances of same-sex marriages in the historical record. Homosexual marriage really poses no threat to the institution, as has been demonstrated in Massachusetts, as well as in other countries where homosexual marriage is now legal.

Despite its obvious flaws, marriage is a remarkably resilient and attractive social institution that has managed to survive all sorts of challenges. Even as the institutional pressures to marry have lessened in western countries, most people believe the hype and marry at some point in their lives. The fact that people daily see the marriages of their parents, their friends, and even themselves, dissolve around them, does not dissuade them from flocking to the chapels and justices of the peace, in many cases time after time. People divorce and remarry, often changing their names again and again, in the hope that their next spouse will be “the one.” People promise the church, the state, and each other that they will stay together forever, for better or for worse, but later change their minds. And then they do it all over again with someone new.

There is no rational reason for the continuing appeal of marriage. There are benefits to marriage, of course, primarily the economic benefits that it entails. Married people gain access to their partners’ insurance and pension benefits and can extort payment from the partner when their relationship breaks down and ends in divorce. But this does not explain why most people marry. Gay marriage advocates, for instance, specifically reject civil partnerships that would essentially be marriage in everything but name and involve the same legal and financial

entanglements, simply because they are not “real” marriage. Those who marry, or desire to do so, apparently believe that the marriage ceremony itself somehow does something special to a relationship, despite the mountains of evidence to the contrary.

### **By the Authority Vested in Me...**

At bottom, most people need the approval of others, whether the state-approved authorities or simply their circle of friends and acquaintances, for their relationships. And marriage is the most obvious outward sign of this approval. Even if one’s family or friends don’t approve of one’s choice of spouse, the church and/or government can bestow their blessing on the partnership and it is therefore legitimate in the minds of the

participants. That is the real appeal to most of those who marry.


Such approval-seeking behavior is encouraged by the power-that-be in this world. The state, church, and most institutions desire conformity. They don’t want people to question authority, they don’t want individuals to think and act for themselves. They encourage people to see their community, their group, their religion, their government as the basic units of society. They discourage self-reliance and critical thinking.

Anarchists want to see a different world—one without authority, without a state, without coercion, and without marriage. That is why most anarchists oppose marriage. One need only read Emma Goldman or Voltairine de Cleyre (whose essay “They Who Marry Do III” follows this rant) to see that libertarians have long rejected the various arguments in favor of marriage. Anarchists support free thought, free sex, free love, free everything.

### **Unfree Love**

Unfortunately, we all live in an unfree world at present. A world that drives some people, hetero or homo, who would prefer to stay unencumbered by authoritarian rules into marriage, simply because that is the only way they can gain health insurance they can afford. Or have the ability to visit their loved ones in hospitals or prisons. Or share in parenting a partner’s children. Preventing queers from marrying thus denies them opportunities available to straights and is unjust.

Pushing for an expansion of marriage is not, however, the only—or best—approach to getting people access to things they want or need but are denied at present because they don’t want to or can’t get married. Instead of increasing the state’s involvement in folks’ personal lives by extending marriage rights to queers, the libertarian approach would be to oppose the government’s rules and regulations that put up the very barriers that drive people into the marriage trap. Many employers now offer insurance benefits to unmarried partners or family members, but these benefits are taxed, unlike those for spouses and children, making



## ***anchorage anarchy***

is a semi-annual publication of Bad Press,  
an anti-government anarchist project,  
and is edited by Joe Peacott.

Subscriptions are available for  
\$1 per issue.

**You can reach Bad Press at:**  
**PO Box 230332**  
**Anchorage, AK 99523-0332**  
**USA**

**[www.bad-press.net](http://www.bad-press.net)**  
**[bad\\_press@me.com](mailto:bad_press@me.com)**

them unaffordable for many. Abolishing income taxes, in addition to all its other obvious plusses, would therefore allow more unmarried people to purchase insurance for their loved ones. Schools and prisons that prohibit people who are not “related” from visiting or participating in the affairs of family members are creatures of the state. While I yearn for the day when both prisons and schools are eliminated, until then, the rules and regulations of these statist institutions that discriminate against unmarried partners should be eliminated.

Going a step beyond this, we should challenge the existence of the legal institution of marriage itself. Not only is it absurd that people who marry so readily promise to love someone else *forever*, marriage entails all sorts of legal traps most people do not think about when they enter into it. Unlike a conventional contract, simply saying “I do” involves the parties in a web of legal commitments to each other and puts them at significant financial liability, without these conditions appearing in any of the documents people sign when getting married. The rules are contained in the various state laws that regulate marriage, and thus the sexual behavior of individuals. The state holds people to the terms of a lifelong contract, the provisions of which they never see and seldom understand until they are explained during divorce proceedings. Marriage supporters need to remember that gay marriage has already created gay divorce, which is no less ugly than straight divorce.

### **Ain't Nobody's Business if I Do (or Don't)**

While I believe an anti-statist, anti-marriage approach would lead to more individual freedom than the gay marriage strategy, I recognize that it will be much easier to get gay marriage legalized everywhere in the United States, since it poses no threat to the basic structure or functions of authoritarian society. What I have suggested, instead, fundamentally challenges the state's right to control our behavior and steal and use our money as it chooses. Abolishing legal marriage



would allow people to couple and uncouple as they see fit and set the terms of their relationships between and among themselves. Whether opposite-sex, same-sex, couples, triads, or entire gangs of partners, people's sexual relationships and practices should be their business and that of no one else. People would be free to call their arrangement marriage if they like, and could even have a religious or secular “authority” figure mumble some nonsense over them to sanctify it. But without the state to enforce its unilaterally imposed terms on the participants, it would be an entirely different creature. If people feel the need to agree to a formal contract before they fuck, suck and/or breed, let them. But it should be left to them and them alone to draw up such an agreement.

The prospects for a free, anarchist society are not very bright at present, so marriage, for better or for worse, will clearly be around for a long time to come. While I hold matrimony, holy or otherwise, in complete contempt, allowing same-sex couples to marry is only fair. After all, why should they be denied the same opportunity to allow the government into their bedroom in exchange for cheaper health insurance and the right to alimony that is available to heteros? Until folks wise up and realize that the supposed benefits of marriage and other government institutions are not worth the price of surrendering one's freedom and self-respect, that is the best we can expect.

# They Who Marry Do Ill

Voltairine de Cleyre

*This essay was originally delivered as a lecture presenting the negative side of the question, whose positive was argued under the heading "They who marry do well," by Dr. Henrietta P. Westbrook. Both lectures were delivered before the Radical Liberal League, Philadelphia, April 28, 1907.*

Let me make myself understood on two points, now, so that when discussion arises later, words may not be wasted in considering things not in question:

First—How shall we measure doing well or doing ill;

Second—What I mean by marriage.

So much as I have been able to put together the pieces of the universe in my small head, there is no absolute right or wrong; there is only a relativity, depending on the consciously though very slowly altering condition of a social race in respect to the rest of the world. Right and wrong are social conceptions: mind, I do not say *human* conceptions. The names "right" and "wrong," truly, are of human invention only; but the conception "right" and "wrong," dimly or clearly, has been wrought out with more or less effectiveness by all intelligent social beings. And the definition of Right, as sealed and approved by the successful conduct of social beings, is: That mode of behavior which best serves the growing need of that society.

As to what that need is, certainly it has been in the past, and for the most part is now indicated by the unconscious response of the structure (social or individual) to the pressure of its environment. Up till a few years since I believed with Huxley, Von Hartman, and my teacher Lum, that it was wholly so determined; that consciousness might discern, and obey or oppose, but had no voice in deciding the course of social development: if it decided to oppose, it did so to its own ruin, not to the modification of the unconsciously determined ideal.

Of late years I have been approaching the conclusion that consciousness has a continuously

increasing part in the decision of social problems; that while it is a minor voice, and must be for a long time to come, it is, nevertheless, the dawning power which threatens to overhurl old processes and old laws, and supplant them by other powers and other ideals. I know no more fascinating speculation than this, of the role of consciousness in present and future evolution. However, it is not our present speculation. I speak of it only because in determining what constitutes well-being at present, I shall maintain that the old ideal has been considerably modified by conscious reaction against the superfluities produced by unconscious striving towards a certain end.



The question now becomes: What is the growing ideal of human society, unconsciously indicated and consciously discerned and illuminated?

By all the readings of progress, this indication appears to be the *free individual*; a society whose economic, political, social and sexual organization shall secure and constantly increase the scope of

being to its several units; whose solidarity and continuity depend upon the free attraction of its component parts, and in no wise upon compulsory forms. Unless we are agreed that this is the discernable goal of our present social striving, there is no hope that we shall agree in the rest of the argument. For it would be vastly easy to prove that if the maintenance of the old divisions of society into classes, each with specialized services to perform—the priesthood, the military, the wage earner, the capitalist, the domestic servant, the breeder, etc—is in accord with the growing force of society, then marriage is the thing, and they who marry do well.

But this is the point at which I stand, and from which I shall measure well and ill-doing; viz: that the aim of social striving now is the free individual, implying all the conditions necessary to that freedom.

Now the second thing: What shall we understand as marriage?

Some fifteen or eighteen years ago, when I had not been out of the convent long enough to forget its teachings, nor lived and experienced enough to work out my own definitions, I considered that marriage was “a sacrament of the Church” or it was “civil ceremony performed by the State,” by which a man and a woman were united for life, or until the divorce court separated them. With all the energy of a neophyte freethinker, I attacked religious marriage as an unwarranted interference on the part of the priest with the affairs of individuals, condemned the “until death do us part” promise as one of the immoralities which made a person a slave through all his future to his present feelings, and urged the miserable vulgarity of both the religious and civil ceremony, by which the intimate personal relations of two individuals are made topic of comment and jest by the public.

By all this I still hold. Nothing is more disgustingly vulgar to me than the so-called sacrament of marriage; outraging of all delicacy in the trumpeting of private matters in the general ear. Need I recall, for example, the unprinted and

unprintable floating literature concerning the marriage of Alice Roosevelt, when the so-called “American princess” was targeted by every lewd jester in the country, because, forsooth, the whole world had to be informed of her forthcoming union with Mr Longworth! But it is neither the religious nor the civil ceremony that I refer to now, when I say that “those who marry do ill.” The ceremony is only a form, a ghost, a meatless shell. By marriage I mean the real thing, the permanent relation of a man and a woman, sexual and economical, whereby the present home and family life is maintained. It is of no importance to me whether this is a polygamous, polyandric or monogamous marriage, nor whether it is blessed by a priest, permitted by a magistrate, contracted publicly or privately, or not contracted at all. It is the permanent dependent relationship which, I affirm, is detrimental to the growth of individual character, and to which I am unequivocally opposed. Now my opponents know where to find me.




In the old days to which I have alluded, I contended, warmly and sincerely, for the exclusive union of one man and one woman as long as they were held together by love, and for the dissolution of the arrangement upon the desire of either. We

talked in those days most enthusiastically about the bond of love, and it only. Nowadays I would say that I prefer to see a marriage based purely on business considerations, than a marriage based on love. That is not because I am in the least concerned with the success of the marriage, but because I am concerned with the success of love. And I believe that the easiest, surest and most applicable method of killing love is marriage—marriage as I have defined it. I believe that the only way to preserve love in anything like the ecstatic condition which renders it worthy of a distinctive name—otherwise it is either lust or simply friendship—is to maintain the distances. Never allow love to be vulgarized by the indecencies of continuous close communion. Better to be in familiar contempt of your enemy than the one you love.

I presume that some who are unacquainted with my opposition to legal and social forms, are ready to exclaim: “Do you want to do away with the relation of the sexes altogether, and cover the earth with monks and nuns?” By no means. While I am not over and above anxious about the repopulation of the earth, and should not shed any tears if I knew that the last man had already been born, I am not advocating sexual total abstinence. If the advocates of marriage had merely to prove the case against complete sexual abstinence, their task would be easy. The statistics of insanity, and in general all manner of aberrations, would alone constitute a big item in the charge. No: I do not believe that the highest human being is the unsexed one, or the one who extirpates his passions by violence, whether religious or scientific violence. I would have people regard all their normal instincts in a normal way, neither gluttonizing nor starving them, neither exalting them beyond their true service nor denouncing them as the servitors of evil, both of which mankind are wont to do in considering the sexual passion. In short, I would have men and women so arrange their lives that they shall always, at all times, be free beings in this regard as in all others. The limit of abstinence or indulgence can be fixed

by the individual alone, what is normal for one being excess for another, and what is excess at one period of life being normal at another. And as to the effects of such normal gratification of such normal appetite upon population, I would have them conscientiously controlled, as they can be, are to some extent now, and will be more and more through the progress of knowledge. The birth rate of France and of native-born Americans gives evidence of such conscious control.




“But,” say the advocates of marriage, “what is there in marriage to interfere with the free development of the individual? What does the free development of the individual mean, if not the expression of manhood and womanhood? And what is more essential to either than parentage and the rearing of young? And is not the fact that the latter requires a period of from fifteen to twenty years, the essential need which determines the permanent home?” It is the scientific advocate of marriage that talks this way. The religious man bases his talk on the will of God, or some other such metaphysical matter. I do not concern myself with him; I concern myself only with those who contend that as Man is the latest link in evolution, the same racial necessities which determine the

social and sexual relations of allied races will be found shaping and determining these relations in Man; and that, as we find among the higher animals that the period of rearing the young to the point of caring for themselves usually determines the period of conjugality, it must be concluded that the greater attainments of Man, which have so greatly lengthened the educational period of youth, must likewise have fixed the permanent family relation as the ideal condition for humanity. This is but the conscious extension of what unconsciousness, or perhaps semi-conscious adaptation, had already determined for the higher animals, and in savage races to an extent. If people are reasonable, sensible, self-controlled (as to other people they will keep themselves in trouble anyway, no matter how things are arranged), does not the marriage state secure this great fundamental purpose of the primal social function, which is at the same time an imperative demand of individual development, better than any other arrangement? With all its failures, is it not the best that has been tried, or with our present light has been conceived?

In endeavoring to prove the opposite of this contention, I shall not go to the failures to prove my point. It is not my purpose to show that a vast number of marriages do not succeed; the divorce court records do that. But as one swallow doesn't make a summer, nor a flock of swallows either, so divorces do not in themselves prove that marriage in itself is a bad thing, only that a goodly number of individuals make mistakes. This is, indeed, an unanswerable argument against the indissolubility of marriage, but not against marriage itself. I will go to the successful marriages—the marriages in which whatever the friction, man and wife have spent a great deal of agreeable time together; in which the family has been provided for by honest work decently paid (as the wage-system goes), of the father, and preserved within the home by the saving labor and attention of the mother;

the children given a reasonable education and started in life on their own account, and the old folks left to finish up life together, each resting secure in the knowledge that he has a tried friend until death severs the bond. This, I conceive, is the best form that marriage can present, and I opine it is oftener dreamed of than realized. But sometimes it is realized. Yet from the viewpoint that the object of life should be the development of individuality, such have lived less successfully than many who have not lived so happily.

And to the first great point—the point that physical parentage is one of the fundamental necessities of self-expression: here, I think, is where the factor of consciousness is in process of overturning the methods of life. Life, working unconsciously, blindly sought to preserve itself by generation, by manifold generation. The mind is simply staggered by the productivity of a single stalk of wheat, or of a fish, or of a queen bee, or of a man. One is smitten by the appalling waste of generative effort; numbed with helpless pity for the little things, the infinitude of little lives, that must come forth and suffer and die of starvation, of exposure, as a prey to other creatures, and all to no end but that out of the multitude a few may survive and continue the type! Man, at war with nature and not yet master of the situation, obeyed the same instinct, and by prolific parentage



maintained his war. To the Hebrew patriarch as to the American pioneer, a large family meant strength, the wealth of brawn and sinew to continue the conquest of forest and field. It was the only resource against annihilation. Therefore, the instinct towards physical creation was one of the most imperative determinants of action.

**AROUND THE WORLD  
EVERYWHERE YOU LOOK  
FREEDOM IS  
ALWAYS AGAINST  
THE LAW**

Drug Prohibition Laws / Age-of-Consent Laws / Property Laws / Trespassing Laws / Anti-Sodomy Laws / Tax Laws / Draft Laws / Censorship Laws / White Privilege Laws / Anti-Pornography Laws / Sedition Laws / Vagrancy Laws / Hitchhiking Laws / Indecency Laws / Obscenity Laws / Licensing Laws / Truancy Laws / Building Code and Zoning Laws / Anti-Skateboarding Laws / Loitering Laws / Patriarchal Privilege Laws / Marriage Laws / Child Vaccination Laws / Parade Permit Laws / Voting Laws / F.C.C. Laws / National Security Laws / National Emergency Laws / Anti-Strike Laws / Anti-Privacy Laws / Search and Seizure Laws / Anti-Graffiti Laws / Anti-Posting Laws / Anti-Abortion Laws / Anti-Riot Laws / Conspiracy Laws / Criminal Syndicalism Laws / Trade Laws / Vandalism Laws / Divorce Laws / Vice Laws / Bicycle Laws / Jaywalking Laws / Gun Laws / Heresy Laws /

Now the law of all instinct is, that it survives long after the necessity which created it has ceased to exist, and acts mischievously. The usual method of reckoning with such a survival is that since such and such a thing exists, it is an essential part of the structure, not obliged to account for itself and bound to be gratified. I am perfectly certain, however, that the more conscious consciousness becomes, or in other words, the more we become aware of the conditions of life and our relations therein, their new demands and

the best way of fulfilling them, the more speedily will instincts no longer demanded be dissolved from the structure.

How stands the war upon nature now? Why, so,—that short of a planetary catastrophe, we are certain of the conquest? Consciousness! The alert brain! The dominant will! Invention, discovery, mastery of hidden forces. We are no longer compelled to use the blind method of limitless propagation to equip the race with hunters and trappers and fishers and sheep-keepers and soil-tillers and breeders. Therefore, the original necessity which gave rise to the instinct of prolific parentage is gone; the instinct itself is bound to die, and is dying, but will die faster as men grasp more and more of the whole situation. In proportion as the parenthood of the brain becomes more and more prolific, as ideas spread, multiply, and conquer, the necessity for great physical production declines. This is my first contention. Hence the development of individuality does no longer *necessarily* imply numerous children, nor indeed, *necessarily* any children at all. That is not to say that no one will want children, nor to prophesy race suicide. It is simply to say that there will be fewer born, with better chances of surviving, developing, and achieving. Indeed, with all its clash of tendencies, the consciousness of our present society is having this driven home to it.

Supposing that the majority will still desire, or let me go further and say *do* still desire, this limited parentage, the question now becomes: Is this the overshadowing need in the development of the individual, or are there other needs equally imperative? If there are other needs equally imperative, must not these be taken equally into account in deciding the best manner of conducting one's life? If there are not other needs equally imperative, is it not still an open question whether the married state is the best means of securing it? In answering these questions, I think it will again be safe to separate into a majority and a minority. There will be a minority to whom the rearing of children will be the great dominant necessity of






their being, and a majority to whom this will be one of their necessities. Now what are the other necessities? The other physical and mental appetites! The desire for food and raiment and housing after the individual's own taste; the desire for sexual association, not for reproduction; the artistic desires; the desire to know, with its thousand ramifications, which may carry the soul from the depths of the concrete to the heights of the abstract; the desire to do, that is, to imprint one's will upon the social structure, whether as a mechanical contriver, a force harnesser, a combiner, a dream translator,—whatever may be the particular mode of the personal organization.

The desire for food, shelter, and raiment, it should at all times lie within the individual's power to furnish for himself. But the method of home-keeping is such that after the relation has been maintained for a few years, the interdependence of one on the other has become so great that each is somewhat helpless when circumstance destroys the combination, the man less so, the woman wretchedly so. She has done one thing in a secluded sphere, and while she may have learned to do that thing well (which is not certain, the method of training is not at all satisfactory), it is not a thing which has equipped her with the confidence necessary to go about making an independent living. She is timid above all, incompetent to deal with the conditions of struggle. The world of production has swept past her; she knows nothing of it. On the other hand,

what sort of an occupation is it for her to take domestic service under some other woman's rule? The conditions and pay of domestic service are such that every independent spirit would prefer to slave in a factory, where at least the slavery ends with the working hours. As for men, only a few days since a staunch free unionist told me, apparently without shame, that were it not for his wife he would be a tramp and a drunkard, simply because he is unable to keep a home; and in his eyes the chief merit of the arrangement is that his stomach is properly cared for. This is a degree of helplessness which I should have thought he would have shrunk from admitting, but is nevertheless probably true. Now this is one of the greatest objections to the married condition, as it is to any other condition which produces like results. In choosing one's economic position in society, one should always bear in mind that it should be such as should leave the individual uncrippled—an all-round person, with both productive and preservative capacities, a being pivoted within.

Concerning the sexual appetite, irrespective of reproduction, the advocates of marriage claim, and with some reason, that it tends to preserve normal appetite and satisfaction, and is both a physical and moral safeguard against excesses, with their attendant results, disease. That it does not do so entirely, we have ample and painful proof continuously before our eyes. As to what it may accomplish, it is almost impossible to find out the truth; for religious asceticism has so built the



THE QUESTION HUNG IN THE SILENCE FOR SEVERAL MOMENTS. WHEN I FINALLY FOUND WORDS TO ANSWER IT...

DENNIS --I-- I-- DON'T THINK--WE OUGHT TO RUSH INTO MARRIAGE-- JUST YET...

I THINK OF MARRIAGE AS AN INSTITUTION

I'M NOT SURE I'M READY TO BE INSTITUTIONALIZED



feeling of shame into the human mind, on the subject of sex, that the first instinct, when it is brought under discussion, seems to be to lie about it. This is especially the case with women. The majority of women usually wish to create the impression that they are devoid of sexual desires, and think they have paid the highest compliment to themselves when they say, "Personally, I am very cold; I have never experienced such an attraction." Sometimes this is true, but oftener it is a lie—a lie born of centuries of the pernicious teachings of the Church. A roundly developed person will understand that she pays no honor to herself by denying herself fullness of being, whether to herself or of herself; though, without doubt, where such a deficiency really exists, it may give room for an extra growth of some other qualities, perhaps of higher value. In general, however, notwithstanding women's lies, there is no such deficiency. In general, young, healthy beings of

both sexes desire such relations. What then? Is marriage the best answer to the need? Suppose they marry, say at twenty years, or thereabouts, which will be admitted as the time when sexual appetite is most active; the consequence is (I am just now leaving children out of account) that the two are thrown too much and too constantly in contact, and speedily exhaust the delight of each other's presence. Then irritations begin. The familiarities of life in common breed contempt. What was once a rare joy becomes a matter of course, and loses all its delicacy. Very often it becomes a physical torture to one (usually the woman), while it still retains some pleasure to the other, for the reason that bodies, like souls, do most seldom, almost never, parallel each other's development. And this lack of parallelism is the greatest argument to be produced against marriage. No matter how perfectly adapted to each other two people may be at any given time, it is not the slightest evidence that they will continue to be so. And no period of life is more deceptive as to what future development may be than the age I have just been speaking of, the age when physical desires and attractions being strongest, they obscure or hold in abeyance the other elements of being.

The terrible tragedies of sexual antipathy, mostly for shame's sake, will never be revealed. But they have filled the Earth with murder. And even in those homes where harmony has been maintained, and all is apparently peaceful, it is mainly so through the resignation and self-suppression of either the man or the woman. One has consented to be largely effaced, for the preservation of the family and social respect.

But awful as these things are, these physical degradations, they are not so terrible as the ruined souls. When the period of physical predominance is past, and soul-tendencies begin more and more strongly to assert themselves, how dreadful is the recognition that one is bound by the duties of common parentage and the necessities of home-keeping to remain in the constant company of one from whom one finds oneself going farther away in thought every day.—"Not a day," exclaim the

advocates of "free unions." I find such



YOUR PAPERS APPEAR TO BE IN ORDER. APPARENTLY YOU ARE A HETEROSEXUAL MARRIED COUPLE. SORRY, WE THOUGHT YOU MIGHT BE A COUPLA QUEERS.

exclamation worse folly than the talk of "holy matrimony" believers. The bonds are there, the bonds of life in common, the love of the home built by joint labor, the habit of association and dependence; they are very real chains, binding both, and not to be thrown off lightly. Not in a day or a month, but only after long hesitation, struggle, and grievous, grievous pain, can the wrench of separation come. Oftener it does not come at all.

A chapter from the lives of two men recently deceased will illustrate my meaning. Ernest Crosby, wedded, and I assume happily, to a lady of conservative thought and feeling, himself then conservative, came into his soul's own at the age of thirty-eight, while occupying the position of Judge of the International Court at Cairo. From then on, the whole radical world knows Ernest Crosby's work. Yet what a position was his compelled by honor to continue the functions of a social life which he disliked! To quote the words of his friend, Leonard Abbot, "a prisoner in his palatial home, waited on by servants and lackeys. Yet to the end he remained enslaved by his possessions." Had Crosby not been bound, had not union and family relations with one who holds very different views of life

in faith and honor held him, should we not have had a different life-sum? Like his great teacher, Tolstoy, likewise made absurd, his life contradicted by his works, because of his union with a woman who has not developed along parallel lines.

The second case, Hugh O. Pentecost. From the year 1887 on, whatever were his special tendencies, Pentecost was in the main a sympathizer with the struggle of labor, an opposer of oppression, persecution and prosecution in all forms. Yet through the influence of his family relations, because he felt in honor bound to provide greater material comfort and a better standing in society than the position of a radical speaker could give, he consented at one time to be the puppet of those he had most strenuously condemned, to become a district attorney, a prosecutor. And worse than that, to paint himself as a misled baby for having done the best act of his life, to protest against the execution of the Chicago Anarchists. That this influence was brought to bear upon him, I know from his own lips; a repetition, in a small way, of the treason of Benedict Arnold, who for his Tory wife's sake laid




"I told him it wouldn't kill him to try to be nice once in a while, but I was wrong."

everlasting infamy upon himself. I do not say there was no self-excusing in this, no Eve-did-tempt-me taint, but surely it had its influence. I speak of these two men because these instances are well known; but everyone knows of such instances among more obscure persons, and often where the woman is the one whose higher nature is degraded by the bond between herself and her husband.

And this is one side of the story. What of the other side? What of the conservative one who finds himself bound to one who outrages every principle of his or hers? People will not, and cannot, think and feel the same at the same moments, throughout any considerable period of life; and therefore, their moments of union should be rare and of no binding nature.

I return to the subject of children. Since this also is a normal desire, can it not be gratified without the sacrifice of individual freedom required by marriage? I see no reason why it cannot. I believe that children may be as well brought up in an individual home, or in a communal home, as in a dual home; and that impressions of life will be far pleasanter if received in an atmosphere of freedom and

independent strength than in an atmosphere of secret repression and discontent. I have no very satisfactory solutions to offer to the various questions presented by the child-problem; but neither do the advocates of marriage. Certain to me it is, that no one of the demands of life should ever be answered in a manner to preclude future free development. I have seen no great success from the old method of raising children under the indissoluble marriage yoke of the parents. (Our conservative parents probably consider their radical children great failures, though it probably does not occur to them that their system is in any way at fault.) Neither have I observed a gain in the child of the free union. Neither have I observed that the individually raised child is any more likely to be a success or a failure. Up to the present, no one has given a scientific answer to the child problem. Those papers which make a specialty of it, such as *Lucifer*, are full of guesses and theories and suggested experiments; but no infallible principles for the guidance of intentional or actual parents have as yet been worked out. Therefore, I see no reason why the rest of life should be sacrificed to an uncertainty.



That love and respect may last, I would have unions rare and impermanent. That life may grow, I would have men and women remain separate personalities. Have no common possessions with your lover more than you might freely have with one not your lover. Because I believe that marriage stales love, brings respect into contempt, outrages all the privacies and limits the growth of both parties, I believe that "they who marry do ill."

*"Once you have children, it forever changes the way you bore other people."*

