

# REALITY QUEST

---

Volume One

January 31, 1994

Issue XIV

---

## HUSBAND AND WIFE

My view of the relationship a man and woman should have is quite unorthodox. Many might accuse me of coming up with my own idea of these relationships to satisfy my own selfish needs. If this is the case, I hope my "selfish needs" will prove to be the best for more than just myself someday.

Human relationships are learned from birth and usually are as different as the many cultures which produce them. I was raised in a patriarchal family where the husband is the "head" and the woman is his wife. I had only the relationship my father and mother showed me while growing up to learn from. I very seldom was interested in any other husband/wife relationship, and therefore didn't take much notice of others. My father divorced my mother, Diane Jorgensen, when I was about three years old. I remember very little about their relationship and was too young to understand what one was. I vaguely remember an argument they had, where my mother threw a dish or something at my father who was standing in a doorway. This is the only interaction between the two which I can remember to this day.

My father married Gloria Harmon, a farm girl from Idaho. I never saw my dad and step-mother fight or argue at all. The reason they didn't was because what my father says, goes. I have never seen my step-mom stand up to my dad. She was a very submissive woman. There has always been a great love between the two, something I look back on as being very unique when compared to most relationships. It is not hard to have a relationship like they shared, if one of the two partners is submissive to the other. My mom loved my father so much that she would get sick when he was away for more than a couple days. My mother's agony of missing him and her extreme dependency on him is indicative of a relationship where one totally submits to the other.

I never saw the sexual side of my parent's relationship. The closest I ever got to their intimate moments was noticing the exchange of a quick kiss on the lips or cheek, the sexual innuendos my father would sometimes make, which would flush the face of my mom, and the squeaking bed I heard when I slept downstairs from them.

I obviously learned from my father the type of relationship I should have with my wife. However, I picked the wrong type of wife to compliment my desires. I married Paula Rae Blades on October 30, 1983. She came from a matriarchal family where her mother was the boss and her father was more submissive than any man I had ever known before. I thought he was a whimp. Paula's matriarchal grandmother was one of the most domineering women I have met to this day. I remember the first time I met her grandparents. We were playing some kind of board game around the kitchen table at Paula's parent's house. Her grandfather said very few words the whole night. The first thing this grandmother said to her husband was, "You stupid fool!" He took this kind of abuse the whole night as if he couldn't understand what she was saying. The fact is, he was so used to it, that it didn't bother him. Paula's mother, who I respect in her own way, was not quite as abusive to her husband, but was very much "in charge" of her marital relationship.

Well, I tried to show Paula that our relationship was going to be patriarchal--we were separated by May of 1986, and eventually divorced. I could almost guarantee that a man who comes from a patriarchal family will never last in marriage to a girl from a matriarchal one, if it so be that he continues in the pattern shown to him by his father. It wasn't long after my divorce that I found a woman with the same submissiveness as my mother (Gloria). I married Jackie Stoll in April of 1987. Like my parent's



relationship, Jackie and I never argued or fought. She was also very much in love with me and would miss me desperately if I was gone.

Some men would say that they would love to have a woman like my mother and Jackie. I did for about four years. As my religious views and philosophies changed, I began to realize the destructiveness that this kind of relationship had on a woman. Jackie and my mother were not only submissive, but naive and quite ignorant. Their love for their husband proved to be a great stumbling block in their personal growth. They were nothing more than the "ribs" of their husbands.

I took Marcee Kay Jaynes as a wife in April of 1992, and now had two submissive, "weak" wives. I took Vicky Prunty Batchelor as a wife in November of 1992. Though Vicky was ignorant, due to her involvement with a very "patriarchal" man, she was certainly not submissive. At this time, I was experimenting with the different relationships I was having with these women so I could determine what it was that I thought was best. (A more detailed account of this experience is described in *Reality Quest*, Volume One, Issue XI) From these relationships, I finally determined what I think is the right kind of relationship that a "husband" and "wife" should have.

I have determine that there shouldn't be marriage. The word "marriage" comes from a Latin word which means, "to own". Men created marriage to own their women; and now women use the same ritual to "own" their husbands. I have seen nothing but ignorant, naive women in a patriarchal relationship, and rude, overbearing women in a matriarchal one. I have found that both types of relationships are not conducive to the best interests of the human race. I have my own ideas on the proper relationship which I believe will better benefit man and womankind, and will share my views throughout the process of my newsletter, *Reality Quest*.

The following is a letter I wrote to Vicky in response to a note she sent me. It explains some of my views on the subject of husband/wife relationships:

January 1, 1994

Dearest Vicky,

Thanks for the card and the pictures of Rachael Alexandra. Like all new newborns at the time of birth, she has the face only a mother can love. However, if she turns out half as beautiful as her mother, she will be a "sight for sore eyes".

More than anything, I want to help you learn to express yourself and communicate the love that you possess for others. Therefore, here is your recent letter to me exactly as you wrote it along with my response:

December 28, 1993

Dear Chris,

*You certainly have the gift of persuasion! Whenever I get off the phone w/ you, (it usually takes a night's rest), I finally figure out why I disagree with you! I am certainly grateful for this angelic little babe, but the divine angels knew what they were doing when they introduced Jackie to you.*

*You are a wonderful person, I love you tons...but you confuse me!!! I know I can raise this little girl, and all of my six children by myself- without a husband. Many women do it, some men do it, homosexuals can even raise a child together, but I do believe there is a better way. I believe that family (a monogamous couple w/ children) is a small community that can be united with others. I believe we can all love each other, even though we may not have the same mother or father. But, I believe in a God of order. And, Chris, I believe as you step out of the bounds of your marriage (though you may say you're not Jackie's husband-you certainly give the illusion of such!) You will not find the peace that we all seek for. I find my greatest comfort in the love that God must have for us when we make mistakes, and he can use these experiences to teach us--and bless us! Little Rachael is my ensign of such mercy.*

*Chris, always be grateful for your wonderful wife, and the lessons of history.*

*Love, Vicky*



Yes, I can be very persuasive if I want. However, I feel it a weakness to have to persuade one of anything which you might believe to be true. When we argue, it is a sure sign that we are not sure of ourselves. One does not have to defend something one knows, or at least believes, to be true. Please don't waste your time trying to figure out if my beliefs are right or wrong. They are right for me; and I am truly the only one who really understands my beliefs. (Truthfully, sometimes I don't even understand why I believe the way I do.)

In one breath you express your love for me, and in the next you ridicule me in your own, kind way. Why bother trying to convince someone like me that I am wrong. You should well know that I do not understand right and wrong. For what is right for some is wrong for others. It is true that for you and Jackie, and I have recently learned, Marcee, the monogamous relationship wherein you can be assured the fidelity of one man by which you can raise children and form what you call a "community", is the best way to go. However, you also correctly state that, *"Many women do it, some men do it, homosexuals can even raise a child together..."*. Then you state that you believe in a "God of order". Now, is this a mormon god, a fundamentalist god, or a god you have envisioned for yourself? Knowing that you are intrigued once again by the mormon faith, I must assume that your god is a creation of all that you have associated with the name of "God" since your birth; and therefore, knowing Mormonism to have had the profoundest effect on your religious thinking, I must conclude that your god is Mormon. Hence, I must argue that your god can not be a god of order, if it so be that on one hand he justifies polygamy and then on the other sanctifies a monogamous marriage. To me, a "God of order" would teach the best way to his children and that this "best way" would bring the greatest amount of happiness to them.

You have advised me in the last part of your letter to, *"...be grateful for your wonderful wife, and the lessons of history."* If I am to use history for the basis of my conclusions on the proper relationship a man and a woman should have, I must conclude that monogamy has created much more misery than good, especially for women. At present, the divorce rate of marriages in the U.S. exceeds 50%. Now if one were to honestly look at the situation as "God" would, one would find that of the 50% that are still married, 49% are probably unfaithful to their spouse whether it be by the act of adultery or the thought thereof. Remember, it was Jesus who reportedly said, *"...whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."* (Matthew 5:28) You show me a man who has not committed adultery in the described manner and I will show you a liar. I think you will find, if you had the time to study, time which I know is very limited to a good temporal mother like yourself, that Jesus was never married himself. And if he was, he probably followed the example of the ancient biblical prophets and lived in polygamy.

Jackie is my wife because she considers herself as such. If she considers herself "my wife", then I consider myself her "husband". "Husband" and "wife" mean nothing to me. You could be my wife, if you considered yourself as such. However, I have concluded that you do not want to be the wife of a man who lives mostly with another woman and only visits you when it is convenient. You do not want to have sex with a man who is having sex with another woman. To you, a husband is a man with whom only you can have sex. A man who works in the world and earns money to take care of you and your children. A man with whom you can create your own little "community". To you, this is what a "God of order" would command of his children.

Please, do not take what I have written in the wrong way. You have every right to have the kind of "husband" you want. Most, if not all, women want what you want. Just because most women would agree with you, does that make it right for all? I do not think so. In a world where morality is based on the majority's idea of virtue, the minority live in a fascist, unloving world while the majority live in a bigoted, lovely place that would be lovelier if they could rid themselves of the minority. If that is what heaven is, and your god lives there, I will take my chances in hell.

The problem is sex. A human being has the illusion instilled inside that treats sex as something other than what it is, an emotional need. It is portrayed through television and society in general as something which "we crave", but something that is forbidden except in certain situations which society has determined proper. Sex has nothing to do with love. One can have sex with many people and love none. On the other hand, one can love someone immensely without having sex with them. You can not convince me that a couple who have been married for many years enjoys the same intensity of sex as young lovers or those who "cheat on their mates" (Why do you think they cheat on their mates?) However, those who have



only experienced sex with one person, know nothing else, and are completely satisfied with the type of sex they share with their mate.

Now, my philosophies may sound very lecherous, but I do have my own "order" to my perceptions of sexual relationships between a male and female. I believe that sex is a power which has been established to perpetuate the species of an organism. I do not believe, however, that animals in general, experience the act of sex quite like human's do. It appears that some sort of orgasm is reached in animals, but they seem to be totally oblivious to what it does for them. Humans, on the other hand, strive for the orgasm as the ultimate fulfillment of the sexual experience. Though sex can be enjoyed without a climax, it becomes much more fulfilling when one is reached. Without the orgasm, the man would fail in his attempt to fertilize a female's egg. The woman, on the other hand, does not need to experience any type of climax to become pregnant. This tells me that a man has been given a different role entirely by nature, (God), in the reproduction process. A woman has the potential of many organisms during the act of sex and these orgasms are much more intense than her male counterpart's. Her orgasms are much harder to reach, but seem to bring her much more satisfaction than the male's.

Understanding the above, I conclude that the sexual experience is not only for reproduction, but for the enjoyment of the organism. However, I feel that the two reasons described should not be separated. In other words, sex should be used for the creation of beings, but upon doing so, should be enjoyed to the extent that the organism attains the greatest amount of joy. This does not mean I think we should not use birth control. On the contrary, I believe that the woman has the right to choose for herself when to have a child since she will be the one mostly involved in the first years of its life. After having a child, she has the right to experience the joys of sex whenever and with whomever she wishes. Notice I underlined, "she wishes". You do not wish to have sex with me because you do not consider yourself my "wife". I do not fit your idea of what a husband should be and you have limited yourself to sex with only your husband. Jackie would not choose me to be her "husband" if I didn't fit her idea of what a husband should be. If she concludes that a "husband" is the same kind of man which you do, something I think she has concluded, then if I "take another wife", she wants nothing to do with me. That is her choice. I will not have sex with any woman unless it is to have children or give that woman the joy she deserves because she has had children.

If you accepted me as your "husband", knowing full well how I am, and Jackie does the same, I then have two "wives". Then why, one might ask, does the male think it is not proper for one of his "wives" to have sex with another male? For me, there is no reason to, because one man can serve not only the reproductive needs of more than one women, but the sexual needs also. What the man can not do in this situation, is fulfill the emotional needs that a woman possesses. A woman meets a lot of her emotional needs through being a mother. No man can love a woman like a child loves his or her mother. No man can be as devoted to a woman like a child to its mother. Women find a great amount of joy from the bonds formed during the infancy of the child. If a woman's child looked to someone else as their mother and carried on a filial relationship with them, the mother would feel the loss and her emotional needs would not be met. It is the same thing when their husband has a relationship with another woman.

The course of human relationships is set from the moment the child is born. How we treat our children will usually determine the type of relationships that will fulfill their needs when they are older. Because a mother is closer to the infant than the father, the woman develops motherly instincts which manifest themselves in the relationships she has with others, especially her husband. It's her motherly instinct that tells her that her husband should be sucking no one else's breasts. It's her motherly instinct that worries when he doesn't get home on time. And the same instinct, which is not really an instinct, but a learned behavior, tells the woman that her husband is "hers" and no one else's.

Vicky, I can not, and will not fault you for being a woman with motherly instincts. The women who have sex with lots of men do not have the "motherly instinct" and more than likely will never be mothers. I believe a woman does not have to be a mother if she doesn't want to be. However, if there is any kind of judgment which we receive from our actions on this earth, I would think it more than just to take the ability to enjoy sex from all human's who use it only for selfish purposes. You are one who uses your time on this earth to bless the lives of your children. If there are rewards for this, you will get a gold medal. Carry on with your search for truth. My advise, given ever so gently, is: do not be satisfied with man-made religions, for they were made by and for men. Search out the inner light that is abundant in you, and you will find the peace that only a woman can understand. Do not worry about my peace or my happiness. I create my own peace. I love you, Vicky, and always will.