

What Men Should Know About Modern Marriage

To Help the Male of the Species Decide Whether He Should Wed Or Stay Single.

A Writer Who Keeps His or Her Identity Concealed Tells All About The Newest Standards in Women And Wickedness



AND now there's another big literary mystery to solve. It all concerns the authorship of one of the newest books of the season, "An Intelligent Man's Guide to Marriage and Celibacy." On the cover of the book, and in the preface, it is stated that this work is "By Juanita Tanner." But there isn't any such person as Juanita Tanner. Where does the name come from?

Well, in George Bernard Shaw's great play, "Man and Superman," the hero is named John Tanner. The heroine, Ann Whitefield, one of the go-getting females ever created on earth or in the brain of any author, decides that she will marry John Tanner. John flees, but Ann gets her man. And there Shaw's story ends.

Another writer, however, has taken up John and Ann Tanner's problem. This other writer, the real author of "The Intelligent Man's Guide to Marriage and Celibacy," has concealed his or her true identity by saying that this bold book was written by Juanita Tanner, the daughter of Shaw's characters, John Tanner and Ann Whitefield.

There is plenty of good reason why the real author should wish to keep his name and whereabouts a mystery, for the book is loaded with the frankest sort of an analysis of what modern marriage is all about. But the book presents its own argument best, and so here are some of the doctrines it presents in telling men all about why the old double standard of morality isn't double any more, and why men should or shouldn't marry. These excerpts are reprinted by permission of the publishers, the Bobbs Merrill Company, and by the mysterious author, who has even gone so far as to take out a 1929 copyright on the book under the name of Juanita Tanner.



IT is fashionable in these days to try to arrive by experimental methods which we call "nature's method of trial and error," and these methods seem especially popular in the field of morals.

But as no individual can possibly perform all the experiments in living it seems necessary to employ reason at least to the extent of deciding what experiments to undertake. They are often mutually exclusive. If, for example you decide upon the experiment of promiscuous living, you must definitely forego the experiment of chastity.

If you go in for romance you must eschew the practical, and vice versa.

And certainly before we experiment in marriage, a field in which the casualties run high, it would seem the better part of valor to weigh whatever data may be available, consider carefully the materials we have to work with, and choose, among various methods of procedure, that one which seems most likely to succeed.

For nature, in her trials, can afford mistakes. She can afford to waste millions of individuals and thousands of years. But we have neither so many lives nor so much time.

The materials you have to work with as a man are women and love.

As to methods of procedure the world acknowledges two: marriage and celibacy. These, however, seem to me to be again divisible into four; for there are at least two broadly differing views of marriage and as many of celibacy.

That is, there is marriage regarded as a practical undertaking to found a home and a family, the other party to the enterprise being any one of a number of suitable people of similar intentions, and there is marriage regarded as the romantic union of two persons destined in the eternal scheme of things to complement each other.

There is also celibacy regarded as a state of single blessedness permitting extra-legal intercourse without the bother of family responsibilities, and there is celibacy regarded as a state of devotional chastity.

AT the start you are facing a set of conditions—or we might as well call them frankly girls—that no man has ever faced before. You've gone to school with girls (unless you went to a private school), to college with them probably, and now you're going to have to work with them in business and the professions. Whatever you do and wherever you go, as long as you stay within the limits of Anglo-Saxon civilization, you'll be running into women and falling over them and finding them generally in your way.

The chances are that women won't really compete with you for the real jobs for at least another generation.

Too often, just when a girl is doing nicely, she will suddenly appear with the latest in plat-



Your marriage to a homely girl, though she be possessed of other sterling virtues, will be frowned upon.

inum settings on her third finger, and a disillusioned higher up will begin hunting another man to take her place.

One more example of feminine failure to stick to business? Not necessarily; she may have found a more profitable business opportunity. They may not have paid her quite as much as they would have paid a man for the same work. She may have concluded that it is better to command a man's salary even if it means promising to love, honor and obey the man.

Still you may consider this a mean trick. A girl goes into business, messes it up for men, and stays just long enough to find some boob who's willing to support her. Or, if she stays the demands as much salary as a man who has to think about supporting a wife and maybe a family. It's not fair, it seems, for a man to find himself married to the old-fashioned woman who demands support while he competes in business with the new-fashioned kind who demands equal pay.

WOMEN who try supporting themselves are now able to guess what a terrific undertaking it must be to support a family. If they have any fairness at all they are coming to see that while it is true men have had all the advantages in business, it is also true that they needed them.

But if you're a young man I think you're a bit foolish to give up your chance to see the world and tie yourself down to the support of a mere wife.

Don't mistake my meaning when I say I think you're foolish to undertake the support of a mere wife. If your wife is also your housekeeper and a nurse and governess, you owe her all you can pay her. But you are not paying her for being your wife; you are paying for a home and the privilege of being a father.

When you contemplate marriage these days you should be quite certain whether you contemplate marriage that merely includes a wife, or marriage that includes all that elastic word may cover. While the economic hazards of supporting a family and maintaining a home would seem sufficient to give any young man seriously to think, it cannot be concealed that the rewards of the undertaking have decreased rather than increased.

Now, we have abolished most of the distinctions between a home and bachelor's quarters. The unmarried man can have a small apartment with domestic service for less than it would cost him to maintain a slightly larger apartment and a wife, and otherwise there may be no great difference in the domestic arrangements. The comforts of home may turn out to consist of delicatessen food anyhow, as he can find out from his more candid married acquaintances; as for darning, that ancient wifely occupation, there isn't a respectable tailor or laundry that can't do a better job nowadays than most wives.

WOMEN are shedding few tears over the change.

Modern living conditions for people of ordinary income utterly annihilate the theory that two can live as cheaply as one.

Our grandfathers, who objected to girls riding bicycles and going to college and voting because the girls would become rough and wicked like men, were not off the track, though they may have been headed in the wrong direction. What they prophesied has come to pass, up to a certain point, and today observers of short skirts and drinking and swearing and petting inform us in no uncertain terms that the whole of the prophecy will soon be fulfilled. Women will soon be just as bad as men or know the reason why.

The Double Standard in its fullest expression gave women almost a monopoly of morals, and in its least a handicap in the golfing sense; men were allowed a few slices into the rough, so to speak, as part of their game.

You as an intelligent young man will see at once that this wasn't a compliment; quite the

contrary. The assumption was that men hadn't the moral stamina to play the game of monogamy according to the rules set down, and so they were allowed by common consent to cheat.

Now you at any rate don't have to be told that the pedestal days are over.

You know better than to think, I hope, that girls are naturally any better than you are. They may have been trained for generations to be better, so that even now when they try to cut loose from all restraint they don't quite make the down grade. But they are trying so hard to learn about everything that sometimes they not only believe the worst, they believe a worst actually worse than the real worst is. You've probably noticed it. Still, give them time—another generation or two—and they'll be right where they're determined to be, which is in on the ground floor.

Then you will have to search far and wide before you find a girl who can be worshiped as an angel or even revered as a saint, if this is what you want in exchange for your provision of food and clothes and shelter.

BUT the real question now is how is it going to be with you? Are you broad-minded enough to accept in a wife the variegated previous experience which women have so often accepted in men?

And can you as an intelligent man tell me any good reason why you should contract to devote a life's energy to the support of a woman you marry for her physical attraction, when she can not in reason promise that she will not cease to attract?

She will do her best to keep up her end of the bargain; the commerce in beauty-drugs, surgery, dress and all the other recognized aids to attraction—is sufficient guaranty of her ceaseless effort.

Nevertheless, the young girl you marry is probably better looking at marriage than she will be later; it is only reasonable to suppose that time must bring some diminution of her attraction; while your provision of a living presumably will improve as time goes on.

That is, as you contribute more, the wife who gives you only physical attraction must give you less. Though her charm may on the whole be well preserved it cannot possibly be promised for a long lifetime, but your promise is for life.

As a man you have no doubt been trained to a sincere reverence for beauty; you may also have come to find it an emotional stimulus.

Thus choice of a wife becomes for many men an esthetic adventure. To artistic considerations they will even sacrifice comfort, as evidenced by the popularity of beauty contest winners over domestic science experts.

Traditionally your selection of a beautiful woman, whatever her other qualifications, will

(Copyright, 1929, NEA Magazine—Printed in U. S. A.)

be approved and understood, while your marriage to a homely girl, though she be possessed of other sterling virtues, will be frowned upon.

But of course you, as an intelligent man, are very well aware that physical beauty is no guaranty of mental companionship. You may even feel some embarrassment about becoming the reward in a beauty contest.

PSYCHOLOGISTS these days are using a great deal of space in magazines and Sunday papers to warn women that all men prefer them to be dumb.

Being intelligent you must, I think, realize that adoption of even the most charming and beautiful child-wife is no way to gain a lifetime companion. You must see that only an intelligent woman could appreciate you.

I have throughout this discussion of choice been telling you that the decision in various matters rests with you. The reason is obvious: you are, still, traditionally, the person to propose marriage.

Not long ago a group of Young Women's Christian Association members agreed by a large majority that "Men and women should share equally in the initiative of finding and choosing mates." You see what it's coming to, and the chances are that as an intelligent young man you've already had to turn down half a dozen proposals.

Of course really popular or successful girls rarely go as far as a proposal; they don't have to. They know dozens of ways to put you in a position where you have to do it yourself. But you, on the other hand, have probably learned as many avenues of escape.

But while such tactics are still presumably fatal to their hopes, I trust you will treat gently all young ladies who make you offers of marriage.

Looking at practical marriage, ordained so that women could be comfortable, we discover that women no longer want motherhood and men do not find comfort in the plan. In short, practical marriage is close to being a failure in practice.

The most plausible theory of marriage seems to be that it will provide a best pal and severest critic safely to be counted upon for sympathy and understanding, a friend who will know all about us and love us just the same.

IT requires only an elementary ability to measure to prove that more love is required in the end if it is to be spread over a long period. Yet this necessary bread-and-butter of a permanent relationship is plainly the antithesis of sex attraction and of the possessive variety of love. Other ingredients than sex must be present, and in larger quantities.

In this necessity may lie the key to that problem so perplexing to sentimental Americans, of how it is that marriages based on property interests or social aims occasionally prove more

successful than our orthodox "love" matches. Common interests of even an economic sort seem a useful tie, more permanent and hardly more to be despised than physical charm.

For companionship to endure it must have a mutual interest in some work or play wholly separated from sex. No matter how well we may wish each other, we cannot be congenial traveling companions if we take different trains and encounter each other only at those junctions where we spend a night.

Moreover it seems fairly reasonable to suppose that if some companionship is good more is better; that is, the nearer perfection in marital friendship we can come the happier we shall be.

In reaching these conclusions about the necessity for a mutual outlook and intention and even employment, I am not forgetting our great-grandmothers. I know that the little lady who sits primly in the daguerreotype with great-grandfather standing beside her (or, as was the more frequent unchivalrous arrangement, standing with a mitted hand on his shoulder while he sits) is almost certain to be referred to as one who made a practical success of marriage, with no nonsense about equality or similarity.

GREAT-GRANDMOTHER was a womanly woman, great-grandfather was a manly man, and they went about the business of wedlock as nature intended. They celebrated their golden wedding with calm smiles and 24 grand-children.

Perhaps mental companionship in the sense in which we know it was not expected in the days when women were not supposed to have minds; women were required to be charming or useful, neither of which implies being companionable. But also as women were expected to think less, men did more thinking about household affairs than many of them do nowadays, and as their wives usually did accomplish a little celebration on the quiet there was probably more companionship in the community interests of providing wood and water, of managing garden and barnyard, than is generally supposed.

In pioneer days the practical objects were romantic objects demanding the best efforts of both husband and wife. The mere business of living was exciting and the physical results of marriage were of far more consequence.

The job on which the conquerors of the wilderness could unite was the job of raising offspring, which wasn't then merely a woman's work. Mutual interests? Look at those 12 and 16 and 20-children families! Small chance there for infidelities and complexes.

OUR pioneer civilization developed this sort of partnership, but it did not endure past the pioneer stage. With civilized security came a division of interests, and when the frontiers became back-country the too intensively cultivated soil began to yield a bumper crop of marital difficulties. The pioneer wife who kept a shotgun for stray Indians had a granddaughter who, retaining merely the ability to handle firearms, turned a revolver on a straying husband. The only danger common to the younger woman and her husband was boredom.

The promise of happiness is in a mutual job of keeping wolves from the door or coyotes out of the cabin.

Can we find no mutual jobs in present-day civilization?



Just when a girl is doing nicely . . . she suddenly appears at the office with the latest in platinum settings.



Women will soon be just as bad as men . . . or know the reason why.



I trust you will treat gently all young ladies who make you offers of marriage.