

THE CAUSE OF LOVE/MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

The purpose of love is to augment the quality of one's life. This is the foundation of love/marriage. This principle shall be exemplified via the marriages of couples well known to the public.

The first couple shall be arbitrarily named William Jones and Cheryl Bromley. *Prior* to their initial contact on St.Bart's island in the Caribbean, the circumstances in their individual lives were as follows. William Jones had divorced his wife/manager.¹ A few months previously, Cheryl Bromley had broken up with a French racing car driver by the name of Olivier Chandon.² William Jones was her first romantic relationship since this break-up. *It is these circumstances which established the foundation of them falling in love and subsequently getting married.* The precise rationale behind this precept is as follows.

In life, when one experiences some type of factor which causes emotional pain, one method of alleviating the deleterious effect induced by this pain is to become "involved" with others who have experienced the same type of pain as yourself. The way this usually manifests itself is through support groups (i.e. victims of crime, or, for that matter, even alcoholics anonymous). "Involvement" with others who have experienced the same type of pain as yourself facilitates the alleviation of this pain as they are the only ones who will *truly comprehend* what you yourself are experiencing. The reason this concept is germane to love/marriage can be found via the first sentence of this paper. *The purpose of love is to augment the quality of one's life.* When one encounters a member of the opposite sex who has experienced the same type of pain that you have experienced in your life, (assuming you have actually experienced pain of sufficient magnitude in your life) this will be sufficient to induce love as this person *truly* comprehends what you yourself are experiencing.*

The reader may experience a certain degree of opposition to the stated tenet. The precise nature of the opposition would be as follows. If one is to overcome emotional pain via the specific "mechanism" of interacting with another who has experienced the same type of pain, the nature of the pain (and how to contend with it) must be *actively* discussed, analyzed and expounded upon. When one is dating, this is simply not implemented. Consequently the postulate which I have stated must be wrong. I am fully cognizant of this objection. However, it is absolutely imperative that the reader (*especially* the layman) incorporate the following into his thinking during the course of this paper.

In expounding upon the nature of love/marriage, this paper will (predominantly) *deal with the unconscious mind*. In a superficial attempt to illustrate why this is so critical, consider the following. In the entire history of human civilization, has anybody been capable of *truly* explaining why they love their spouse? In all probability one would state that one's spouse is nice, compassionate, intelligent (etc.), and therefore I love that person. However, does this list of adjectives elucidate and genuinely *explain* the nature of love? Certainly not. This paper *will* accomplish that goal. Consequently, in order to contest the reader's opposition (as outlined in the previous paragraph), the following will be stated.

Although the conventional way of contending with emotional pain (via interaction with others who have experienced the same type of emotional pain) is to "bring everything out into the open", the inducement of love is different. *On an unconscious level*, dating a member of the

* It is imperative that it be emphasized that what has been stated, as it pertains to *inducing* love, is simplistic. There are other factors of a secondary nature which will have bearing on whether you actually fall in love with this individual or not. These secondary factors will be expounded upon in subsequent parts of the paper.

opposite sex who has experienced the same type of emotional pain as yourself will serve to augment the quality of one's own life. This is the result of that person truly comprehending what you yourself are experiencing. Furthermore, via your romantic interaction with each other, this will serve to (unconsciously) alleviate the pain that both of you are experiencing, even if the nature of the pain is not "brought out into the open". As an example, let's take a couple who have been married for a period of three years. Prior to them dating, they had both been recently divorced. Although the respective pain that they've experienced would constitute the basis of their love, if we were to ask either one of them whether they were still experiencing any emotionally deleterious effects as a result of their respective divorces, would either one of them answer in the affirmative? Certainly not. Yet, in this scenario, the pain they experienced *is the reason* they fell in love and married each other. Consequently, when they both state that they have overcome the pain from their divorces, how can it be stated that this was the basis of their love/marriage? *Because the pain that they had experienced continued to exist on an unconscious level.*

We can now complete the explanation of the circumstances surrounding the marriage of William Jones and Cheryl Bromley. As previously stated, they initially met on St. Bart's island in the Caribbean. Although Cheryl Bromley's girlfriends suggested she should go out with him, she initially felt he wasn't her type.³ When they returned to New York, they were coincidentally residing close to each other. One day Jones picked up the newspaper and learned that Chandon (her previous boyfriend) had been killed. He was ambivalent about calling her. In relating this incident to a reporter, what he stated was the following. "I thought about it – 'Maybe this isn't a good time, but what she needs right now is a friend.' I was in a good position to be a friend at that point, *because I was feeling a certain amount of simpatico* (italics added)"⁴. "I called her up and said, 'Look, I know you're going through a hard time. If you just need someone to talk to, I'm here.'"⁵ They then proceeded to date and subsequently became married. (As previously stated, other secondary factors *must* be incorporated into this analysis in order to more fully explain the marital bond between them.)

One factor which induces love/marriage has just been presented. Specifically, *dating an individual who has experienced the same type of emotional pain which you have experienced.* A second factor which would induce love/marriage is of a very similar nature. However, it is not the *exact* same as there would be one primary difference between the nature of the two relationships *and* its subsequent ramifications on the relationships.

A second factor which would induce love (and differs from the first example provided) also pertains to the two individuals experiencing the same type of emotional pain. However, the differentiating factor is as follows. The *magnitude* of pain experienced by the two individuals is significantly lower than the magnitude of pain outlined in the first example. In an attempt to state this in slightly more succinct terms, one factor which induces love/marriage is both individuals experiencing similar emotional pain of a significant magnitude while a second factor entails both individuals experiencing similar emotional pain of a much smaller magnitude. In other words, when dealing with the second type of relationship, the experience in question is (somewhat) painful, yet reasonably easy to overcome over a relatively short period of time. It would be most judicious to exemplify this via Cheryl Bromley's next marriage.*

Shortly subsequent to her marriage to William Jones (the middle of '94), Cheryl was in Colorado for a ski trip. She was with another man (whom she was *not* dating) in a helicopter. However, there was an accident and the helicopter crashed. Although the man she was with

* I am fully cognizant of the fact that I have yet to explain the precise reason that William Jones and Cheryl Bromley became divorced. This will subsequently be addressed in the paper.

suffered a few broken bones, neither one of them was physically injured in a life threatening manner. Notwithstanding this fact, a helicopter crash has the potential to be life threatening. They both could have lost their lives in this crash. Consequently, the similar pain that they experienced was encountering a life threatening event. The fact that this was emotionally painful (to one extent or another) is unequivocally established in one particular interview that Cheryl conducted. When referring to this experience, she stated the following. “When you are about to die and you suddenly escape it, you are so grateful for the gift of life that it’s euphoria. I would wake up in the morning and look out at the mountains and think, I’ve never seen anything so beautiful. I felt like destiny was saying, ‘Wake up, this is where you’re supposed to be.’”⁶ Cheryl proceeded to visit him in the hospital as he was convalescing from his broken bones. It was then that they started to date. By virtue of the fact that they experienced the same type of emotional pain, this was sufficient to be the primary factor to induce love and subsequently, marriage.

The precise differentiating factor between emotional pain of this nature and the emotional pain that was initially outlined should be clarified. When contending with separation from an individual whom you once loved, it could potentially take a period of several years prior to you *completely* overcoming the emotionally deleterious effects induced by the pain of that separation. What this specifically refers to, is reaching the state where there isn’t even the tiniest scintilla of pain, even on an unconscious level. However, when dealing with a life threatening experience, the “dynamical nuances” are substantially different. It is within the realm of possibility that it would merely be a question of several months elapsing prior to overcoming the psychologically detrimental effects of this experience. At the most, it would be a few years prior to overcoming this experience. With this stated, we can now delve into the secondary factors required to induce love/marriage. Furthermore, the dynamical elements of divorce (as it pertains to these relationships) can be expounded upon.

One of the secondary factors required to induce love/marriage pertains to time. This specifically refers to the length of time required during the initial courtship prior to coming to the *conscious* (as opposed to unconscious) realization that you are in love. In relation to William Jones and Cheryl Bromley, they dated for two years prior to engaging in matrimony.⁷ Regarding Cheryl’s next marriage, they began to initially date in the middle of 1994. By December of that same year, they were married.⁸ When scrutinizing these two relationships, a natural question in the reader’s mind is, *why* is there such an inordinate chasm of time prior to them coming to the conscious realization that they were in love? The precise rationale is as follows.

In life, there are certain aspects pertaining to ourselves in which we would not encounter any difficulties sharing these nuances with others (in one respect or another). However, there are other elements which we would not wish to reveal to anybody but the closest of our friends. We can elucidate upon why the time that a couple spends courting each other is germane to them coming to the conscious realization that they are in love by extrapolating the previously stated concept to romantic relationships.

William Jones and Cheryl Bromley would not want to reveal the true depth of their emotion over their respective break-ups to just anybody. This is for the obvious reason that it would simply be too personal. However, over time, they would “reveal” the magnitude of their emotion to each other as they gradually become increasingly comfortable with each other. It is critical that the reader observe the fact that the word reveal has been placed in quotes. Their respective emotions (which are of a similar nature) will not be consciously revealed to each other (other than the fact that their break-ups would have been casually mentioned to each other at an early stage in the

relationship). It is only through various subtleties that they will come to the unconscious realization that they are sharing pain of a similar nature.

The dynamical situation with Cheryl Bromley and her next marriage was drastically different. Even though a life threatening experience is quite serious, one would not experience any difficulties in sharing the nature of that pain on an extraordinarily casual basis. This is clearly established by the previously cited quote pertaining to her emotional state shortly subsequent to the accident. She was fully cognizant of the fact that an inordinate number of complete strangers would be reading this interview in the magazine. Yet she experienced no difficulty in sharing this with utter strangers. A similar situation would have prevailed when she proceeded to date the man she was with in the helicopter. To “reveal” (once again, on an unconscious level) the nature of their (similar) pain to each other would have been devoid of difficulties given the fact that their pain was not of an intimate nature. Consequently, they would have come to the *conscious* realization that they were in love subsequent to a very brief courtship.

In relation to what has been presented, the following can now be stated. (It is absolutely imperative that the reader be fully cognizant of the fact that the following italicized statement is germane to what has been elucidated upon *thus far*. The statement *must* be developed further via an explanation of other types of marriages.)

There is an intermediate level of love and a low level of love.

It should be self evident that the intermediate level of love would pertain to the first marriage outlined whereas the low level of love pertains to the second marriage. With this stated, we can elucidate upon another factor (independent of the length of the courtship) which has bearing upon a couple falling in love.

This factor pertains to the physical appeal of each person. The following analysis will be initiated via the low level of love. What is the *precise* reason that a relationship of this nature falls within the parameters of a low level of love? It is for the simple reason that the emotional bond between the two individuals is *inherently* weak. Since the emotional bond is of such a weak nature, there must be some other factor present which would induce a sufficient level of attraction to cause both of them to feel that they are in love. This “other factor” would simply pertain to the physical appeal of each individual involved. In relation to the low level of love, both individuals would have to possess a degree of physical appeal which was above average. A physically appealing individual would suffice to “compensate” for the weakness of the emotional bond. This *combination* of a weak emotional attraction and a strong physical attraction would suffice to cause both of them to feel that they are in love. In relation to the intermediate level of love, the physical appeal of both individuals could be of an average nature in order to ensure the bond of love. In other words, although the emotional bond is *not* inherently weak, it is not, unto itself, sufficiently strong to induce love if there is not some degree of sexual interest. This degree of sexual interest could easily be achieved if the individuals were of average physical appeal.

Cheryl Bromley was one of the leading supermodels of the seventies (and has succeeded in maintaining a high level of physical appeal to this day). Therefore, for her marriage to the individual in the helicopter crash, she obviously would have possessed the requisite level of physical appeal to cause him to fall in love with her when he unconsciously came to the realization that they shared a similar level of pain. (I have not seen a sufficient number of pictures to enable

me to draw any sort of conclusion as to whether or not women would find him physically attractive. I can only state that I am confident about the accuracy of this paper and its underlying principles. Consequently, I can only presume that Cheryl Bromley found him attractive.) Presumably, women would find William Jones to be of average physical appeal if he were not a famous music star (almost any individual who is famous is “automatically” viewed as highly appealing by members of the opposite sex). Consequently, this would be commensurate with the theory outlined. (Some readers may be of the view that since Cheryl Bromley is highly appealing, this is *not* commensurate with the theory of an intermediate level of love requiring average physical appeal. However, this theory does not *prevent* an individual of high physical appeal from falling in love via the intermediate level of love. It merely states that, physically speaking, more is required with certain forms of marital love.)

Since the magnitude of an individual’s physical appeal has been presented within the context of this theory, it would be judicious to briefly delve into one other small aspect as it pertains to love and physical appeal even though it is irrelevant to fully comprehending the previously outlined relationships. For individuals to “reveal” themselves to each other (on an unconscious level) it is evident that they must be dating. For them to be dating, they had to agree to an initial date. To express all of this in succinct terms, *there must be an initial attraction* between the two individuals. Without initial attraction, they will not date and subsequently “reveal” themselves to each other. What criterion/criteria is predominantly utilized for an individual to gauge whether or not there is an initial attraction? In the West, the primary criterion is physical appeal. Although this precept does not necessarily apply to everybody, it is reasonable to state that it is predominantly applicable to the general population. In other words, there is no doubt in my mind that there have been an inordinate number of instances where two people who would have experienced true love with each other (if they had proceeded to date), failed to experience this as one individual was not sufficiently attractive to the other person to “justify” dating that individual when he/she asked them out. Consequently, they never dated, “revealed” their nature to each other, and subsequently experienced a life time of happiness via true love.

This completes the analysis of what induces two forms of love/marriage. However, the cause of divorce has yet to be outlined. If the reader is astute, he should have some rudimentary precept as to what causes divorce (as it pertains to the outlined relationships). The answer lies with the old ideal of, time heals all wounds. Since the foundation of their marriages (predominantly) entailed the experience of common emotional pain, what will transpire as time elapses? The reader should now fully comprehend why the marriages of both couples culminated in divorce. However, it is grossly simplistic to state, that upon each individual overcoming their respective pain, the marriage dissolved. Consequently, in order to ensure an appropriate level of analysis as to the cause of divorce, more needs to be stated.

We will proceed with William Jones and Cheryl Bromley. In order to successfully analyze their divorce, we will initiate the analysis from the very beginning of the relationship. It required approximately two years to fully “reveal” themselves to each other on an unconscious level and come to the conscious realization that they were in love. In my estimation, the emotional pain that two individuals experience over a significant break-up would last for approximately five years. The following should be kept in mind in relation to the last statement. Firstly, prior to there being even a remote chance of marital discord manifesting itself, the pain must be *completely* overcome. If there is even the tiniest scintilla of emotional pain, the marriage will remain perfectly healthy. Secondly, the pain that is experienced remains within the sphere of the unconscious mind. (The capacity in which emotional pain functions on an unconscious level during the course of marriage

was expounded upon towards the bottom of page one and the beginning of page two.) Therefore, on average, it would take approximately five years prior to *completely* overcoming (on an unconscious level) any emotional pain that they experienced over their respective break-ups. However, even at that stage, the marriage will be fine. If it required two years for them to come to the realization that they were in love, it will require another two years for them to come to the unconscious realization that there is no longer an emotional bond between them. It is at this stage that marital discord will commence. The reason for the marital discord is as follows. One cannot live in such close *emotional* proximity with another person unless a bond of love exists. This is for the simple reason that we all require a degree of privacy. You cannot spend as many hours together as an average couple does without the requisite emotional bond existing. If you live together without this bond, fights will commence. Initially, they will be sporadic and brief. As the months elapse, these fights will become exacerbated in both intensity and frequency. Finally, both of the individuals will come to the conscious realization that they are no longer in love. They may attempt therapy. However, in the end, they will divorce. In total, a marriage which is the result of an intermediate level of love should last for approximately eight years prior to divorce (five years to overcome their emotional pain, two years to come to the unconscious realization they are no longer in love, and several months of fighting as well as the possibility of marriage counseling). William and Cheryl's marriage lasted a total of nine years prior to divorce (the middle of 1985 to April 1994). In my opinion, the reason it took a little longer prior to the actual divorce pertained to William being on the road as a rock star. In the final years, they did not spend as much time together as an average couple would. Consequently, the inevitable friction that results from living with a person in which there is no emotional bond, was not as substantial as with an average couple.

Cheryl's next divorce is more difficult to effectively elucidate upon as it presents its own unique nuances. A marriage which is the result of common pain which is minimal should last for approximately two years, or slightly longer than that. The duration of Cheryl's was a mere seven months.⁹ When she and William Jones divorced, I am not cognizant of her speaking in ill terms of William or blaming him in any way for the divorce. However, with her next marriage, the situation was entirely different. She attributed the divorce to him. At one stage, she stated that he grossly overstated the magnitude of his wealth. The aspect of lacking money did not concern her. According to Cheryl, what did concern her was his lying to her. If he was lying about his wealth, what else was he not being forthright about? In another interview, she states that he was mentally abusive.¹⁰ Furthermore, on a tertiary level she was basically a "big city girl" and encountered difficulties in adjusting to country life (although this factor would have been virtually inconsequential in relevance to the difficulties she encountered because of him). Therefore, although a marriage of this nature (a low level of love) should have lasted a few years, this one did not because, according to Cheryl, he was too difficult to live with for more than one reason.

There is an alternative factor which would induce marital love which is completely independent of the two individuals experiencing some type of emotional pain prior to their courtship. Obviously, this would constitute a completely different marriage than the marriages already outlined as the nature of the emotional bond between the two individuals is completely different. Although the bond which induces marital love constitutes a departure from the bond previously elucidated upon, there are correlating factors with one of the previous marriages.

The following marriage will constitute a low level of love. Consequently, a marriage of this nature will conform to the following parameters.

1. There will be a reasonably short period of time prior to them coming to the realization that they are in love. This is in effect as the emotionally bonding factor is *not* of a highly personal nature and is reasonably easy to “reveal” (on an unconscious level) to the other person.
2. Since the emotional bond between them is *inherently* weak, there must be a high level of physical appeal on the part of both individuals in order to “compensate” for the weakness of the bond and subsequently induce love.
3. Given the overall weakness of the bond, the marriage will only be sustained for a period of a few years. An individual cannot live in such close *emotional* proximity to another individual unless there is a strong emotional bond between the two.

I choose to call the following type of marriage an idiosyncratic relationship. A rudimentary explanation of its nature is as follows. When a man and woman proceed to date, within a reasonably short period of time, they may discover that they have one (or more) qualities in common. Contingent upon the nature of this quality, it may suffice to induce a feeling of love between the two of them. By virtue of the fact that this explanation is reasonably nebulous, its meaning will be illuminated via the presentation of a tangible example of an idiosyncratic relationship.

The couple will be Sean Penn and Madonna. Their initial meeting transpired when Sean Penn visited the set during the shooting of her video *Material Girl*. This was February 1985.¹¹ In an interview published in March of 1985, this is what Madonna had to say about him. “We have so much in common - we were born one day apart - *and have such similar temperaments*. I feel like he is my brother or something (*italics added*).”¹² By August of that same year, they were married.¹³

Madonna did not state what caused their temperaments to be similar. However, based upon what is publicly known about these two, it would not be difficult to successfully infer as to why they had similar temperaments. Although they both may have changed in the intervening years, during the mid-'80s they both could have effectively been described as emotionally volatile. Sean Penn was known to physically attack photographers for doing nothing more than taking his picture. Although Madonna was not known to resort to physical violence, she could intensively lash out verbally if confronted with what she viewed as provocation. They were both head strong, independent, and would adamantly refuse to tolerate any opposition. As an example of this, in the same interview where she was describing their similarities, she had this to say about herself. “I’m tough, ambitious and I know exactly what I want.”¹⁴ Presumably, Sean Penn had the same characteristics (at that time period). Individuals like this would possess the previously stated qualities. (It should be emphasized that the fact they were born one day apart was immaterial towards the establishment of an idiosyncratic marriage.)

In the reader’s mind, there may be a degree of confusion. How does a relationship like this fulfill the function of love/marriage vis-a-vis the augmentation of the quality of one’s life? There are two things to state in responding to this particular query. Firstly, let’s scrutinize *some* of the friendships that we may establish in our own lives. What is the preliminary basis of attempting to forge a friendship? In one respect or another, you have something in common with this individual. If two individuals were radically different and had nothing in common with each other, they would never become friends. By fraternizing with an individual who has something (or more than one element) in common with you, the quality of your own life is marginally enhanced. By way of superficial analogy, an idiosyncratic marriage serves to augment the quality of your own life.

Although the following is simplistic, it will have to suffice in an attempt to answer the reader's (potential) question. In essence, you have found a "friend" whom you enjoy having sex with. This is simplistic as the factor you have in common with your spouse would not be the same type of factor that you would have in common with a "conventional" (someone who is not your spouse) friend. To be specific, two females with similar temperaments would not experience the requisite basis for a friendship. The second component in answering the reader's question would be the following. The reader should recognize that a marriage of this nature falls within the parameters of a low level of love. Consequently, its capacity to augment the quality of one's life is minimal and the marriage will break up within a reasonably short period of time.

Their marriage will now be analyzed in terms of the secondary factors which are required to induce love/marriage as well as a brief explanation of their divorce. The reader is already cognizant of the fact that they dated for merely a few months prior to their marriage. This is the result of the emotional factor not being the least bit personal and being easy to "reveal" to the other person. In fact, the bonding emotional factor is so impersonal, it is "on display" for the whole world to view. In light of the inherent weakness of the emotional bond, both individuals must be of above average physical appeal. Since they were both famous individuals, they would be viewed in this capacity by members of the opposite sex. Given the weakness of the bond, the marriage will break up relatively quickly as one cannot live in such close emotional proximity to another without a strong emotional bond. As a general rule of thumb, an idiosyncratic marriage would culminate in divorce within two to five years (there would be exceptions to this if various types of extenuating circumstances prevail). Sean Penn and Madonna initiated divorce proceedings by January of 1989.¹⁵

Readers who may be knowledgeable of Sean Penn and Madonna's marriage may be of the following view. Given the highly volatile nature of their relationship, their divorce was independent of a weak bond. Some examples of this volatility would be as follows. In December of 1988, Sean had assaulted Madonna.¹⁶ Furthermore, there were times in the marriage when Madonna was far "too cozy" with Sandra Bernhard for Sean's liking.¹⁷ The fact that their marriage was tenuous is clearly established by the fact that a year previously, their publicists had announced that they were divorcing (they reconciled shortly subsequent to the announcement).¹⁸ Although there is no question that their marriage was volatile, this volatility had no direct bearing on their divorce. The weakness of the initial bond was responsible for the divorce. The rationale behind this is as follows.

When dealing with true love (its nature will be momentarily outlined), most (but *not* all) differences can be overcome. This is for the simple reason that the bond between the two individuals is so strong that differences which would ordinarily constitute inordinate sources of friction can potentially be relegated to minor difficulties. Alternatively, even something as serious as a *singular* assault could be forgiven *if* true love prevailed (even in the case of Sean and Madonna, she dropped the charges that she initially pressed against him). An example to elucidate upon this is as follows.

Let's assume that a woman who was pro-abortion married a man who was anti-abortion. *If* there was a bond of true love between them, these differences would not necessarily prevent a blissful union. This is because the bond of true love is so strong, that differences of this nature would be overcome. This latter statement should not be misinterpreted. It does not mean that *all* differences can be overcome. To illustrate, let us assume that a man considered abortion tantamount to murder and abortionists tantamount to murderers. If this was the nature of his belief, he could not marry a woman who was a pro-abortionist as the chasm between the two of them is far

too substantial. To put it succinctly, although the bond of true love does not overcome *all* differences, it does overcome most differences.

It is for this reason, that Sean and Madonna's marriage did not break up as a *result* of the volatility of their relationship. It broke up because of the weakness of an idiosyncratic bond. If true love had prevailed between the two of them, some of the tribulations previously outlined would have created difficulties in the marriage. However, if there had been true love, the marriage would have prevailed.

The fourth marriage will be an example of true love. Although it is not absolutely guaranteed, in all probability the marriage will last for the duration of the couples' lives. The couple will be Sylvester and Sasha Stallone.*

True love is established as a direct consequence of the following emotional nuance. Everyone possesses a particular characteristic which comprises their innermost true nature. This characteristic is *only* "revealed" to one's spouse. In order to emphasize the importance of the last statement, it should be pointed out that even the individual is oblivious to their *own* innermost true nature. This innermost true nature constitutes a need. When we find an individual who fulfills this need, true love ensues. Obviously this preliminary explanation is even more nebulous than the initial explanation of an idiosyncratic relationship. Consequently, for its elucidation, we shall immediately proceed to an example.

Sasha's innermost true nature (and subsequently need) is to perpetually devote herself to someone (or possibly even something such as a worthy profession). This precept can easily be substantiated via a brief scrutiny of her life with Sylvester. They initially met when working together in a New York movie theatre. She had aspirations of becoming an actress. However, when they proceeded to reside together, she gave up those dreams and became a waitress in order to support him so that he could more effectively pursue his own writing/acting ambitions. Subsequent to returning home exhausted from work, she would very often spend her time typing his hand written scripts. In one particular interview, she stated the following. "From the very first, we were a working couple. *All my ambition, my energy, went into working with him.* I believed in him. I felt very involved with his work (italics added)."¹⁹ When he conceptualized *Rocky*, he wrote the script in eighty six continuous hours without taking a significant break. During this time, Sasha stayed up with him for the entire period typing his hand written pages. She engaged in this despite the fact that she was pregnant with their first child. When it came time to sell the screenplay for *Rocky*, the following transpired. The producers were vehemently opposed to him playing the starring role as he wasn't "bankable". They eventually offered him \$350,000 for the screenplay if he would relinquish his wish to play the starring role. He spoke to Sasha about it. The aspects of the conversation which are germane to this analysis are as follows. Sasha asked, "What does \$350,000 look like?" Sylvester said he didn't know. Her response was, "I don't know either, so I guess I wouldn't really miss it."

Sylvester then asked, "But if I *don't* sell it, how do you feel about having to go to the backyard and eat grass?"

"I'd sooner move to a trailer in the middle of a swamp than for you to sell *Rocky*."²⁰

She said this despite the fact that she was pregnant, and their financial situation was highly unstable (the landlord wanted them out). It was this final statement of Sasha's that imbued Sylvester with the requisite emotional fortitude to tell the producers that regardless of what they offered for the screenplay, they would not get it unless he played the starring role.

* Their divorce will be explained.

When Sylvester became a star, there were times when Sasha's life was still rather difficult. She states the following. "I enjoyed photography and wanted to become a professional photographer, but Sly did not want me to work. If I took on assignments, he knew that I would not always be available to him."²¹ When he worked on *Paradise Alley*, he proceeded to have an affair with his co-star Joyce Ingalls. When Sasha learned about it, they agreed to a partial separation (he did come home three or four days a week). During this period, despite the fact that he was romantically involved with Ingalls, Sasha states that he adopted the following position pertaining to the possibility of her seeing other men. "He came right out and said that he didn't want me to date anyone else. He couldn't handle it."²² The magnitude of her dedication is also exemplified via the following. "Before the separation, all my energy went into doing things for him. I put on fashion shows, danced, recited poetry. I made home movies of him and produced little films. I *auditioned* every day. To him it was a fantasy, and I really enjoyed it. Also his temperament required constant attention."²³ When he came to his senses and returned to her, she took him back. When Sasha briefly referred to their reunion with a reporter, she stated it was "too intimate to talk about. I don't want to share it."²⁴ The reader must recognize the significance of this statement. Their reunion was so emotional that Sasha simply assumed that his infidelity was a once in a life time aberration that would never transpire again. All the more devastating when he *did* cheat on her a second time subsequent to the release of *Rocky II*. What exacerbated Sasha's emotional pain even further, was that this time he physically left the house in order to move in with actress Susan Anton and continue his extramarital affair with her. Some time thereafter, Sasha filed for divorce. When he came to his senses and was able to provide her with adequate rationale as to why it would never transpire again, she cancelled the divorce proceedings and took him back again.

Substantiating Sylvester's innermost true nature/need will prove to be more formidable as the magnitude of the facts which substantiate this are not as substantial as the facts which pertain to Sasha. However, via the presentation of a few facts *and* a logical analysis, the reader should be capable of assessing the validity of my postulation.

From the time he was a child, Sylvester never believed in himself. This was a ramification of him being subjected to an abusive father. Two of the facts previously referred to pertain to two things (which I am cognizant of) that his father said to him. At one stage his father stated, "You weren't born with much of a brain, so you better develop your body."²⁵ At another time after proceeding with a rather foolish act, his father turned to his mother and, right in front of Sylvester stated the following. "This boy will never become President. You've given birth to an idiot."²⁶ When an individual is subjected to diatribe of this nature at a young age, it will almost inevitably culminate in that individual experiencing a complete lack of faith in himself. This is substantiated from two interviews. "I grew up with a pretty profound complex of inadequacy."²⁷ From another interview, we have the following. "Interviewer: You've indicated that you were an abused child. You once said, in fact, 'I know what it's like to be unwanted - an abused kid. I was taken to the hospital many times. I was totally subjugated by my father - pushed under.' Were you beaten as a child?" Sylvester initially responded by stating the nature of the physical discipline that his father subjected him to. During the course of this answer, he stated the following. "I felt my father didn't give me confidence...like, I always felt the guy down the street was better. I was never good."²⁸

The ramification of this lack of faith will be as follows. *The individual will be emotionally unstable.* It is this emotional instability which would have constituted Sylvester's innermost nature and functioned in the capacity of a need to be fulfilled.

In relation to Sylvester and Sasha, the following has been established. Sasha's innermost nature/need was to perpetually give of herself whereas Sylvester's innermost nature/need was one of emotional instability. At this stage, it would be most judicious if the reader stopped reading for a few minutes and intensely contemplated the following query. What would transpire when two individuals like this became romantically involved given the thesis that the purpose of love is to augment the quality of one's life?

With Sasha perpetually giving herself to Sylvester (predominantly on an emotional level), this would counter balance the intrinsic emotional instability which he was continuously experiencing. Emotional stability would have been induced in his own life. Consequently, both of their inner needs would have been fulfilled. This would constitute true love.

It will now be clarified as to *why* this constitutes true love. Firstly, *given the provision* that their innermost natures do not change, the marriage will last for the duration of the couples' lives. This is in contrast to the passage of time overcoming emotional pain. Secondly, unlike an idiosyncratic marriage, a bond of this nature is *inherently* strong. In light of the fact that this latter aspect adopts a certain level of importance, it would be most judicious to expound upon it with some degree of depth.

A marriage comparable to Sylvester and Sasha's (their innermost need being fulfilled) provides a level of gratification to one's life that is incomparable to anything else.* An analogy to elucidate upon the veracity of this is as follows. When two needs are compatible, this can be compared to two pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. The two pieces of the puzzle fit together so well, that the two can no longer be considered to be separate pieces. They are now viewed in the capacity of one cohesive piece. A marriage of this nature can be viewed in the same context. The two individuals fill each other's need so well, that the two, in essence, become one. The ramification of this bond is that they will experience a unique emotional connection which is incomparable to *any* other relationship in their lives. There will be a level of understanding between them which *cannot* be experienced with anyone else as the two merge into one cohesive unit. Given the nature of this bond, it is most probable that there is no other experience in the realm of human existence which is comparable to a matrimony which is the result of an innermost need being fulfilled.

Regarding the aspect of "two pieces of a jigsaw puzzle fitting together", at some psychological level, Sylvester seemed to superficially recognize the nature of his marriage to Sasha. Shortly subsequent to the release of *Rocky*, he wrote a book entitled *The Official Rocky Scrapbook*. Although it was predominantly about the making of *Rocky*, it was partially autobiographical. Although the following is not the final thing he wrote, it was the second last paragraph he wrote in the book. "And that is what the movie was *really* all about. *Two individuals-half people-two half people coming together making a whole person. Two individuals seeking love, seeking dignity, and finding courage along the way. The way my wife's love gave me strength (italics added beginning with the words two individuals).*"²⁹

The secondary factors which have bearing on love/marriage will now be addressed. Firstly, the magnitude of physical appeal will be dealt with. Given the inherent strength of the emotional bond, the physical appeal of both individuals can be extremely low without adversely affecting the possibility of love being established. I have seen pictures of Sylvester in his days prior to becoming a major star. His physical appeal was *significantly* below average. To be blunt, he was ugly. Women of the contemporary era who find him appealing may be incredulous as to the validity of this statement. Therefore, in an attempt to somewhat fortify my position, let me cite the initial impression of one of the co-producers of *Rocky*. "In comes this big lug who weighed two

* There is one exception to this which will subsequently be outlined.

hundred and twenty pounds, didn't talk well and acted slightly punch-drunk."³⁰ However, given the strength of the emotional bond, this was irrelevant towards the attainment of love. (I have been unable to find any pictures of Sasha during this time period. However, predicated upon pictures of her upon the attainment of her husband's stardom, she was a beautiful woman with above average physical appeal. This was *not* necessary for love to be established between the two of them.)

The amount of time required in the courtship phase prior to the individuals coming to the conscious realization that they are in love differs significantly from a low level of love, or for that matter, an intermediate level of love. The amount of time required to induce love is directly proportional to the intimacy of the emotional bond. In dealing with a low level of love, the emotional bonding element is "on display for the whole world to see". Consequently, love is rapidly induced. With an intermediate level of love, the intimacy of the pain that their break-up entails is not readily revealed. The chasm between true love and these other forms of love is truly inordinate. Unlike the first three marriages outlined in this paper, the two individuals are *completely oblivious* as to the nature of the emotional element which induces the bond of love/marriage. This is something which exists within the realm of the unconscious mind. The individuals are devoid of any conscious knowledge of it. Clearly, this is in sharp contrast with the first three marriages presented. Furthermore, despite the fact that the individuals are ignorant of their true inner nature, this doesn't alter the fact that it is something of an *extraordinarily* intimate nature. This is established by the fact that this need constitutes their innermost nature. Even though the individual is oblivious to this need, it, nevertheless, remains almost sacred. It will not be "revealed" (unconsciously speaking) to *anybody* with the exception of one's (future) spouse. This "revelation" will transpire over a period of years on an incremental basis via their interaction with each other. As the years elapse, they will come to the unconscious realization that this individual fulfills their inner need. Subsequently, they will consciously realize that they are in love and wish to spend the rest of their lives together.

Sylvester and Sasha met in 1970.³¹ They resided together and were married on December 28, 1974.³² It is interesting to note that despite the fact that they were living together (or to be more specific, they were *interacting* with each other to a much larger extent than they would have been had they merely been dating), it still required four years for them to get married. It is possible that if they had only been dating, it would have required longer (to be specific, more interaction with each other) for the relationship to culminate in matrimony.

A possible question on the reader's mind may be as follows. It has been stated that the purpose of love is to augment the quality of one's life. Given this postulation, how can Sylvester's extra marital affairs be explained given the fact that they certainly did not augment the quality of Sasha's life? The answer can be isolated by scrutinizing particular psychological implications as they pertain to an individual who does not believe in himself.

Although Sylvester's intrinsic emotional instability was largely counterbalanced via his marriage to Sasha, it was not completely eliminated (if it was completely eliminated, there wouldn't be a marriage). To one extent or another, the emotional instability continues to exert its influence on the individual. What this results in is the following. The individual goes in quest of some *external* factor(s) which he believes will provide him with the (permanent) *internal* quiescence which he so ardently yearns for. Consequently, he indulges in (what would be viewed by the majority of the population) as the "good" things in life, *if* he has the option to do so (and we can be certain that upon the attainment of stardom, Sylvester *did* have the option). What is specifically being referred to, are the materialistic trappings of wealth and sex. He certainly engaged in the former and engaged in extra marital affairs to indulge in the latter. Proof of the

accuracy of this concept can be found in one of his interviews. When he was discussing his affairs, this was the dialogue.

“Interviewer: Just what was it you were looking for anyway?

Sylvester: I was looking for...

Lengthy pause

Sylvester: Heaven! I really was. I was looking for heaven on earth. Nirvana. I was looking for what some individuals experience of NDE, near death experience. You know how you leave your body and float and everything seems so wonderful? I thought that success meant freedom from all responsibility, freedom from all fears, and that you could basically float through life with people patting you on the back saying, ‘Thank you. Thank you and keep up the good work.’”³³

Consequently, the fact that Sylvester engaged in extra marital affairs does not invalidate the postulate that the purpose of love is to augment the quality of one’s life.

Since the reader began reading this analysis of Sylvester and Sasha, there has been one primary question emblazoned on your mind. If this was an example of true love, why are they divorced? The answer to this question has (briefly) been alluded to previously. A marriage of this nature will last for the duration of the couples’ lives if the innermost nature/need of both individuals remains the same. If even one individual experiences an alteration of their innermost nature/need, the union will dissolve. This is what transpired with Sylvester and Sasha. Sylvester’s innermost nature/need of emotional instability (as a direct result of not believing in himself) vanished. The experience which precipitated this change will now be explained.

To begin, the following will be established. An individual who does not believe in himself, and a quest for some external utopia to provide internal quiescence are interdependent. To be precise, if one exists, the other automatically exists. Conversely, if one vanishes, the other will also vanish. Sylvester eventually experienced an epiphany. He came to the sudden realization that there *is* no form of external utopia which will induce internal contentment. Upon coming to this realization, knowledge was tacitly developed in his own mind. Some degree of internal quiescence can only be derived from within. With the acquisition of this knowledge (there is no form of external utopia which will induce internal contentment), he came to believe in himself. The fact that he came to comprehend that there is no external utopia to provide internal quiescence is substantiated from an interview. “I’m telling you, I made every conceivable mistake in the fame game. I even invented a few. But I’m glad I did it. Because there are no mysteries. *There is no answer.* So stop looking. Stop trying to find happiness, because there is no permanent form of happiness. I’m never gonna wake up every morning grinning from ear to ear. It just doesn’t work that way.” This was the result of a long and arduous emotional struggle in which he desperately strove to comprehend the meaning of success. This clearly substantiates that he came to the realization that was previously stated. The way he reconciled with Sasha was as follows. “I felt it was over. I was finished. This was it. This film would probably be my last. I just didn’t care anymore. The fame game had gotten to me. I had lost. I had hit basically emotional rock bottom. It was over. No more tie ball game. The finale. - I didn’t care anymore, period.” He phoned Sasha and asked her to halt the divorce proceedings. Come to Budapest (where he was shooting a film) so they could talk. He told her that he had solved the mystery of what he was searching for in life. He had become disillusioned with fame and success and knew that he had to return to his roots. Namely, Sasha and the boys. He told the interviewer, “Back to the simplistic, predictable,

stable, routine, wonderfully, tranquilizing effect of people that I'd known before this holocaust of success."³⁴

When Sylvester came to believe in himself he was no longer emotionally unstable. He no longer *needed* Sasha to continually give of herself. Sasha no longer had someone to perpetually devote herself to via the bonds of marital love. Therefore, Sylvester no longer had that particular need and Sasha couldn't fulfill her need. Consequently, the bonding factor between the two of them vanished. It was then a question of them coming to the unconscious realization that there was no longer a bond between the two of them. In my opinion, the time required for this is more or less proportional to the time required to fall in love. Once they come to this unconscious realization, marital discord will set in and the marriage will break up, on average within the course of several months. I would estimate that Sylvester experienced this epiphany (there is no external utopia) some time in 1979.* Sasha filed for divorce on November 29, 1984.³⁵~ (It would be interesting to note the following as it pertains to a marriage of this nature. When the person who does not believe in himself or herself happens to be affluent and/or famous, the break-up of this marriage is *inevitable*. The reason for this being that this individual will "overindulge" in the "good" things in life thereby causing this person to eventually realize that there is no such thing as external utopia to provide internal quiescence. This is what transpired with John and Cynthia Lennon whose marriage was *exactly* like Sylvester and Sasha's marriage.)

The next type of marriage will also fall within the parameters of a case of true love. However, there is a dichotomy between this marriage and Sylvester and Sasha's type of marriage despite the fact that both of them constitute examples of true love. Prior to proceeding any further, it is imperative that the following be emphasized. The analysis that will presently be implemented is simplistic. I am not certain as to the accuracy of the analysis *as it pertains* to the couple that I will be utilizing for my example. Consequently, the analysis will not be presented within the "primary" body of this paper, but instead, it will be presented in subsection I. This example of true love will be explained via the presentation of a hypothetical scenario.

Let's assume that Sasha were to meet a man who was like herself. Specifically, his innermost nature/need was to constantly give of himself to someone (or something like a profession). Subsequent to a sufficient courtship (a period of years) in which their innermost nature was "revealed" to each other, they would fall in love and get married, despite the fact that no need is being fulfilled. The reader may wonder why. The rationale is as follows. You have found someone whom (on an unconscious level) *truly* "comprehends" your innermost nature as no one else can in light of the fact that they share it with you. You have found someone who shares something exceptionally unique with you. You have found your psychological counterpart.

It must be pointed out that a relationship of this nature is not to be confused with an idiosyncratic marriage. The two are not even remotely similar. With an idiosyncratic marriage, we are dealing with an emotional bond which is on display for the whole world to see. By finding your psychological counterpart (or more specifically, finding someone who's innermost nature/need is the same as yours), we are dealing with the innermost nature. With the former marriage, love is induced subsequent to a few months of dating. With the latter, it would require years.

* If psychiatrists and psychoanalysts desire a more precise time frame in which this "metamorphosis" transpired, it was during the principal photography of his film *Victory* in Budapest.

~ Prior to completely leaving this marriage, it would be appropriate to state one final thing. There is one particular interview where some of this material is derived from. It is within the realm of possibility that psychiatrists and psychoanalysts may find this interview, *in its entirety*, somewhat illuminating from a psychological standpoint. The interview is from *Rolling Stone* July 8, 1982, *The Trouble with Sylvester Stallone*.

When Sylvester and Sasha's marriage was being elucidated upon, it was stated that a marriage of this nature provides a level of gratification to one's life which is incomparable to anything else. It was also stated that there would be one exception to this. This exception would be Sasha meeting a man like herself. This would constitute *the highest* form of love that could exist. If the reader is wondering why, re-read the first sentence of this paper. The purpose of love is to augment the quality of one's life. If Sasha married a man like herself, there would be two people who had nothing but a desire to give of themselves to the other person. Given the purpose of love, this would constitute the highest form of love. Conversely, if Sylvester had met a woman like himself (when he didn't believe in himself), they would have eventually married. However, the marriage would have resulted in divorce (even though *in principle* it would constitute a case of true love) as there are two selfish, self centred people who are exclusively concerned with their own gratification. Although I can't state for certain, this would presumably constitute the lowest form of love.*

The next marriage will be another example of a low level of love. If the reader has been "following along", then you should be cognizant of the fact that three factors will prevail as it pertains to a low level of love. Love will be induced subsequent to a brief courtship, there must be a high level of physical appeal with the individuals, and the duration of the marriage will be brief given the inherent weakness of the overall bond.

This marriage will once again pertain to overcoming emotional pain. However, it is slightly different than the first two marriages outlined. In this example, one individual will experience a high level (relatively speaking) of emotional pain, and the other will play a role in *partially* overcoming this pain. The couple who will exemplify this marriage is Sylvester Stallone and Brigitte Nielson.

The circumstances surrounding their initial meeting are as follows. Sylvester was in New York at the same time Nielson was. She learned of this and sent an inordinate number of messages to his hotel. He ignored all of them. She then sent him a composite photo displaying her in four different poses. As soon as he saw that, he phoned her. Over the phone he said to her, "Listen, you've heard the expression 'One picture is worth a thousand words'? Well, this picture is worth a Webster's dictionary."³⁶ This unequivocally substantiates that her physical appeal had bearing on the development of the relationship.

The emotional pain that Sylvester was experiencing is explained as follows. Sasha had filed for divorce towards the end of 1984. Although Sylvester no longer *needed* her (for the reasons previously outlined), the following should be kept in mind. During his adult life, Sasha was *always* there for him whenever he needed her. She loved him when *nobody* else did and stuck with him through thick and thin. When a man has experienced something of that nature for a period of almost fifteen years, her absence will obviously leave a *substantial* void, even if he no longer *needs* her on an emotional basis. It was Sylvester's *perception* (and that word must be emphasized) that Brigitte was just as dedicated to him as Sasha was. However, since this was nothing more than a perception, her ability in playing a role to overcome Sylvester's pain was minimal.

Firstly, it will be substantiated that Sylvester did view her in a similar capacity to Sasha. Here are some quotes from an interview. "She's very family oriented. And she's classically true to her man - I mean, really dedicated to the maintaining and prolonging of this relationship." In the same interview, we have the following. "'Cause she's single-minded about satisfying her man. To

* Once again, it must be pointed out that this analysis is simplistic. Subsection I will provide a more comprehensive analysis of a marriage of this nature.

her, emotion, love, supersedes everything, and I've never seen anyone that extraordinarily beautiful put all the trappings of wealth in a drawer and go for all the trappings of love."³⁷ The question is, *why* did he view her in this capacity. Once again, his own words will illuminate the answer to this question. "...she had been writing to me since she was eleven years old and first saw *Rocky* and had always wanted to meet me."³⁸ We also have the following.

"Interviewer: As fairy-tale-ish as your meeting was, it looked like a very premeditated move on her part.

Sylvester: It *was* premeditated. I tracked this down, talked to her parents. She had been writing letters to me since she was eleven years old. They have letters at her house that were dated ten years ago but were never mailed. So this was a fixation. She named her son Sylvester before she even met me. It was Sylvester until the husband said, 'Over my dead body.' So he got named Julian. [*Laughs*] I guess John Lennon ended up with all the glory. So her meeting wasn't like, 'Oh, he's got *Rambo* and *Rocky* coming and I want to meet him.' Oh, no, no, no. This was a real fulfilling moment for her. This was like the end of a quest."³⁹

Sylvester perceived her as comparable to Sasha merely because she had been writing to him since she was a pre-teen. What Sylvester overlooked was the following. Although she was dedicated to him, she was dedicated to Sylvester Stallone *the star*. Emphatically, she was not dedicated to Sylvester Stallone *the man*. However, he was incapable of recognizing this. Consequently, he *perceived* her as a dedicated woman. This was of assistance in filling the void left by Sasha's absence. However, since it was nothing more than a perception, she was incapable of completely overcoming his pain. Consequently, it was a low level of love.

The reader may be wondering about Nielson. What was the bond that she felt towards him? There was no bond. She was nothing more than his number one fan. Since she had such an intense interest in him for so many years, she misconstrued this as love as *any* "number one fan" would if they were to meet and date a star whom you may have been obsessed with for a number of years. Furthermore, for the readers who are of the view that Nielson *was* dedicated for having such an interest for so long, keep the following in mind. At the time she initially met him, she was married and had a child. She committed adultery and left her child in order to become involved with Stallone. This is something that a woman like Sasha would not even think about, let alone engage in.

They initially met in December 1984 and he proposed to her by July 1985.⁴⁰ During the course of their marriage, Nielson "revealed" that she was not the dedicated woman he originally perceived her to be. Subsequent to this realization, marital discord began. The marriage endured for nineteen months.

This covers almost all examples of the various factors which induce love/marriage. However, there is one type of marriage which has not been addressed. Its parameters are as follows. One individual experiences a low level of pain, and the other individual possesses the requisite capacities (in one respect or another) to facilitate their ability to *completely* overcome that pain. I do not possess an *actual* marriage at my disposal in order to elucidate upon this mechanism. Consequently, I am left with no alternative but to resort to a hypothetical scenario. Although the following is of a hypothetical nature, the reader can be assured it is *entirely* realistic. The scenario pertains to Sasha subsequent to her divorce from Sylvester.

The reader is fully cognizant of the fact that during the course of their marriage, Sylvester was abusive towards Sasha (abuse does not have to entail physical violence in order to constitute abuse). Compare and contrast this behaviour with his behaviour towards Nielson when they were dating. You are advised to go back a few pages and re-read some of the statements Stallone was making about Nielson. “She’s very family oriented...” There is also the following. “Cause she’s single-minded about satisfying her man. To her, emotion, love, supersedes everything, and I’ve *never* seen anyone that extraordinarily beautiful put all the trappings of wealth in a drawer and go for all the trappings of love (italics added).” He’s “never” seen anyone...? Sasha was there from the very beginning when he was ugly, impoverished, and without any type of foreseeable future. Yet despite all of this, she loved him and supported him *when nobody else did*. Without her, he would not be where he is today. Yet despite all of this, he completely ignored Sasha and “sang Nielson’s praises”. When Sasha was working as a waitress and typing his scripts, where exactly was Nielson? Furthermore, if, as an adult, Nielson had met Stallone as an usher, would she have been even remotely interested? Obviously not.

The way Sylvester was treating Nielson was obviously painful to Sasha. Although it was undoubtedly painful, I don’t believe she was completely devastated by it. This belief is predominantly predicated upon the following. For Sylvester’s initial affair, Sasha described her feelings as follows. “For a short time, I was frightened and distraught. I couldn’t comprehend the feeling of having someone and then not having him. Then I was furious. We had been on the bottom *together*, and when he made it to the top, he wanted to go it *alone*. But as I started to think more clearly, I realized that there was a part of me that wanted freedom, too. We needed the separation. I knew the only way we could really be together was to part for a while.”⁴¹ In this passage, is there anything to indicate a state of emotional *devastation*? There does not appear to be anything there. Furthermore, pain is exacerbated when an individual chooses not to “fight back”, but merely accept it. When Stallone and Nielson divorced, Nielson received six million dollars in the divorce settlement. Sasha had previously received twelve million dollars. Upon Sasha learning of this, she attempted legal action in an attempt to receive a higher settlement. She (justifiably) claimed that since she was the one who helped him reach his stature, she was entitled to more. (I am oblivious as to whether this bid succeeded or not.)

What if, at that particular stage in her life, Sasha met a specific type of man. One who told her how special she was; how she was the best thing that ever happened to Sylvester; how giving her up was the single biggest mistake of his life. Broadly speaking, showing her the depth of appreciation for the woman she was at that time. If this man was fairly good looking, then within a short period of time, she would have fallen in love with him. However, since the pain that Sylvester was inducing was not of a significant nature, that particular type of pain would have been overcome via time and the assistance of her (hypothetical) boyfriend. Subsequent to this, she would not have experienced feelings of love towards him.

To *briefly* recapitulate, a broad view of how two people fall in love is as follows. Firstly, there must be initial attraction (to be specific, they must agree to date). In the West, the primary criterion for this is physical appeal. If it is a low level of love (regardless of which *specific* type of low level it is), they will fall in love subsequent to a brief courtship since the bonding factor is easily “revealed”. The other additional “factor” as it pertains to a low level is a high degree of physical appeal with both individuals. If it is an intermediate level, it will take significantly longer (a few years) for the bonding factor to “reveal” itself, thereby inducing love (an intermediate level of physical appeal is required to ensure this). If it is true love, more than a few years of courtship

will be required for the bond to “reveal” itself and induce love. With true love, even if there is a low level of physical appeal, love will be induced.

Conclusions

The factors which induce love/marriage are as follows. (Regarding the following, the reader should keep in mind that whenever it is a case of a low level of love, there will be the common denominator of a reasonably short courtship prior to experiencing feelings of love and a reasonably high degree of physical appeal on the part of both individuals.)

1. IDIOSYNCRATIC MARRIAGE - The two individuals share one (possibly more) characteristic(s) which are readily and easily identifiable. Speaking in simplistic terms, the function of love is fulfilled as you have found “a friend” whom you enjoy having sex with.

2. OVERCOMING EMOTIONAL PAIN - This is divided into four separate sub-categories. The first three would conform to the parameters of a low level of love.

(i) The two individuals experience emotional pain which is *not* of a truly significant nature.

(ii) One individual experiences pain of a reasonably significant nature. The other’s “ability” to assist in overcoming this pain is partial.

(iii) One individual experiences pain which is not significant. The other’s emotional qualities assist in completely overcoming this pain.

(iv) Both individuals experience pain of a reasonably significant nature. To induce love/marriage, the courtship must be of a few years in duration and both individuals must possess average physical appeal.

In all of these cases, it should be self evident how the function of love is fulfilled.

3. YOUR INNERMOST NATURE/NEED BEING FULFILLED - We all have an innermost nature which simultaneously functions in the capacity of a need. When we meet an individual who fulfills this need, love will ensue. In order to ensure love/marriage there must be a lengthy courtship. It is also permissible for both individuals to possess physical appeal which is below average. The function of love is fulfilled as a need of yours is being fulfilled via your marriage to this person.

4. MARRYING AN INDIVIDUAL WHOSE INNERMOST NATURE/NEED IS THE SAME AS YOURS - You share something very unique with this person. They comprehend you (on an unconscious level) the way nobody else can. The function of love/marriage is fulfilled as you have found your psychological counterpart. The “secondary factors” are the same as above (a lengthy courtship, and permissible physical appeal below average). (This analysis is terribly simplistic and must be developed more fully in subsection I.)

The factors which induce divorce are as follows. (In all of these cases, divorce, in the *final* analysis, is a result of the inevitable friction when living in such close emotional proximity to another person. This cannot be engaged in unless a strong emotional bond exists between the two.)

1. IDIOSYNCRATIC MARRIAGE - The bond is *inherently* weak and simply will not sustain the marriage.

2. OVERCOMING EMOTIONAL PAIN

(i) Although this paper did not substantiate it, the two will overcome their pain within a brief period of time. Some time thereafter, marital discord will prevail and divorce will be imminent.

(ii) The individual experiencing the pain will come to the (unconscious) realization that this person cannot assist in *truly* overcoming the pain he/she is experiencing. Subsequent to this, there will be marital discord and divorce.

(iii) Since the pain that one individual was experiencing was not significant to begin with, the pain will be overcome within a reasonably short period of time. At that stage, the situation will be the same as the previous two cases.

(iv) The emotional pain which binds the two is of a significant nature. Therefore, it will be a period of years prior to the last scintilla of pain being *completely* overcome. There will then be a period of time which is proportional to the original courtship period prior to coming to the unconscious realization that there is no longer a bond between them. The marital discord will commence via sporadic and inconsequential fights. These fights will increase in intensity and frequency until they reach the stage they realize they can no longer live together as they no longer love each other.

3. YOUR INNERMOST NATURE/NEED BEING FULFILLED - This marriage will last for the duration of the couples' lives unless one of their needs changes. Generally speaking, this is improbable. However, if this does change, there will be a period of time proportional to the original courtship prior to marital discord prevailing.

4. MARRYING AN INDIVIDUAL WHOSE INNERMOST NATURE/NEED IS THE SAME AS YOURS - Same as above.

SUBSECTION I

The reason for not including this within the parameters of the main body of this paper has already been previously stated. I am not certain about the accuracy of the analysis as it pertains to the couple. In other words, have I successfully ascertained the nature of the bond between them? I'm not certain. Given this ambivalence, it is best to incorporate this particular analysis separately from the main body.

This subsection will continue with the development of a concept that was presented within the main body. It is an example of true love and pertains to marrying an individual whose innermost nature/need is the same as yours. What was stated within the context of the main body was not incorrect. *However*, more needs to be stated in order to ensure the accuracy of what was presented.

It is not merely a question of dating someone with the same innermost nature/need as yourself. If a person has "another critical factor" in common with you, this would also conform to the parameters of meeting your psychological counterpart. This "other factor" is (superficially) explained as follows. We may develop a *deeply held* precept at some stage in our life. If this precept is established, it is likely to be in our pre-teen years, or early teen years. This precept, on an unconscious level, plays a substantial role in the course of our lives. If we become romantically involved with another person who also formed this same type of deeply held precept, they will constitute our psychological counterpart and we will experience true love with them.

The (entirely real) couple who *might* elucidate upon this concept will be named Dennis Devin and Reanne Perron. Although what is about to be stated may be socially unacceptable, the reader should keep in mind that this paper is not being written with the intent of being socially diplomatic. Furthermore, in the name of scientific pursuit, there may be sporadic occasions where something rather unpleasant *must* be confronted regardless of how uncomfortable we may be with it. If these two individuals were not show business stars, they would have virtually no physical appeal to members of the opposite sex. They are simply plain and unattractive.* Furthermore, they are both quite short. Dennis Devin borders on being a midget. We will very briefly digress in order to briefly illustrate how important this can potentially be to women.

On a television news program, they once conducted a study. Five men were placed in a room. Four of them were of average height and the fifth was rather short, without bordering on being a midget. Furthermore, he was somewhat good looking (which is in contrast to Dennis Devin). Furthermore, the women who saw them were given fabrications about the short man. They were informed that he was a self made millionaire and possessed other desirable qualities. Despite this, none of the women expressed an interest in going out with him. When they were subsequently asked if there was *anything* that could be said which would induce them to want to go out with him instead of one of the other four, they responded with the following. If you said the other four were rapists or murderers, then we'd go out with him.

However, there is a bit more to be stated as it pertains to their complete lack of physical appeal. Sylvester Stallone was once in a somewhat similar situation. He too was completely devoid of physical appeal (although his height was normal). However, as time proceeded his

* For those of you who are cognizant of what couple is being referred to, there may be some fans of Reanne's sitcom who are of the view that this is not a meritorious statement with regards to her. For those of you who are of this view, I suggest you strive to see some of her guest appearances on her husband's sitcom and then assess if this statement is groundless.

appeal was enhanced and he eventually became very attractive to women. In other words, when he was lacking appeal, he would not necessarily have felt that he would have been that way for the rest of his life. The same is not necessarily true of Devin and Perron. As a small example, what is Devin capable of doing about his height? The reality remains that they were both unattractive (no doubt from a very young age). Furthermore, from a young age, they knew that it would remain this way and there was nothing they could do to alter it. Since the primary (preliminary) criterion that most Westerners utilize in assessing whether or not they will go out with someone is physical appeal, it is logical to assume that neither one of them would have experienced much dating when they were teenagers. Given the nature of teenagers, it is even possible that some people openly laughed at them when they asked someone out. If nobody went out with them, and they knew that their physical appeal would not drastically change in the future, what would be the psychological ramifications of coming to this realization?

They would feel a very deep sense of loneliness and isolation. They would wonder if they would ever find anybody to even date them, let alone find someone to spend the rest of their lives with. They may have consistently felt like outsiders as they watched others become romantically involved, and they remained forever alone.

If thoughts of this nature developed, they would have become deeply established on a psychological level. Furthermore, on an unconscious level, these feelings would have exerted their influence on their lives. This would constitute the deeply held precept referred to at the beginning of this section.

If Devin and Perron shared this same deeply held precept, during the course of a lengthy courtship, they would have unconsciously “revealed” this to each other. They would have unconsciously recognized that they had met someone who was very unique in that the other person was just like themselves. This was someone who truly comprehended something which played a substantial role in the course of their lives. As a direct result of this, they would have found their psychological counterpart.

Is this analysis of Devin and Perron correct? I don't know. I have no evidence to substantiate any of it since I am completely oblivious to any details pertaining to their childhood. My conclusions are predicated on their physical appeal and deductive analysis. I can only state that whatever the true nature of their relationship, it is true love. They are one of the few successful Hollywood marriages (more than twenty years thus far). Furthermore, in accordance with the principle of true love requiring a lengthy courtship, they resided together for several years prior to getting married.

Some readers may be wondering about the following. If I am so ambivalent as to the accuracy of my analysis, why did I present it at all, even if it was within a sub-section? There are two reasons for this. Firstly, although I may be completely wrong, it's also possible my analysis is entirely accurate. Secondly, and far more importantly, even if I am completely wrong, this analysis is still meritorious and illuminating.

Let's assume there were two teenagers who were completely devoid of physical appeal and they were fully cognizant of the fact that it would remain this way for the duration of their lives. Furthermore, let's assume that they developed the feelings of loneliness and isolation previously referred to. If these two individuals met as adults and proceeded to date, they would fall in love and get married since they each found their psychological counterpart. It would be true love. Therefore, even if this analysis is entirely irrelevant to Devin and Perron, it's still substantially insightful.

Towards the end of the main body of this paper, there was a brief review of what induced love/marriage. Under point four, the following should be stated.

4. (a) MARRYING AN INDIVIDUAL WHOSE INNERMOST NEED/NATURE IS THE SAME AS YOURS - The explanation remains the same as in the main body of the paper.

(b) MARRYING AN INDIVIDUAL WHO HAS THE SAME DEEPLY HELD PRECEPT THAT YOU HAVE - At some stage during the course of our life, we may develop a *deeply held* precept. If such a precept is developed, it is likely to be in our pre-teen, or early teen years. This precept will exist within the sphere of the unconscious mind and will, to one extent or another, exert its influence on one's life. If you find someone who also holds this deeply held precept, it will induce true love. One of the secondary factors required to induce love of this nature is a lengthy courtship. Furthermore, it is permissible for both individuals to possess a low level of physical appeal. The function of love is fulfilled as you have met someone who *truly* comprehends a deeply held precept which plays a substantial role in the course of your life. You have found your psychological counterpart.

My current theoretical perspective dictates the following. This analysis does *not* mean that we all have this deeply held precept. During the course of our lives, some type of deeply held precept may, or may not develop. (However, in science, theoretical perspectives are subject to possible change. In the future, my theoretical view on this point may change.)

An interesting question is now raised. There are two *different* factors which would induce true love. One is your innermost nature/need being fulfilled (i.e. the two pieces of the jigsaw puzzle fitting together). The other falls into two different components. Marrying someone who holds the same deeply held precept that you hold, or marrying an individual whose innermost nature/need is the same as yours. Since they both constitute true love, which form of love is higher?

With the exception of Sasha meeting a man like herself (which, as already stated is *the* highest form of love), your need being fulfilled would be the higher form of love. The fundamental rationale behind this entails this form of love augmenting the quality of your life to a much larger extent than the other form of true love. If the reader is wondering why, please re-read this section from the main body of the paper.

A marriage comparable to Sylvester and Sasha's (their innermost need being fulfilled) provides a level of gratification to one's life that is incomparable to anything else. An analogy to elucidate upon the veracity of this is as follows. When two needs are compatible, this can be compared to two pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. The two pieces of the puzzle fit together so well, that the two can no longer be considered to be separate pieces. They are now viewed in the capacity of one cohesive piece. A marriage of this nature can be viewed in the same context. The ramification of this bond is that they will experience a unique emotional connection which is incomparable to *any* other relationship in their lives. There will be a level of understanding between them which *cannot* be experienced with anyone else as the two merge into one cohesive unit. Given the nature of this bond, it is most probable that there is no other experience in the realm of human existence which is comparable to a matrimony which is the result of an innermost need being fulfilled.

SUBSECTION II

As the magnitude of love decreases, we find that the physical appeal of the individuals plays an increasingly prominent role in establishing the marital bond. On the basis of this, we can establish the following. If two people possess a *phenomenally high* level of physical appeal, this, *unto itself*, would suffice to induce love. Since this statement is overwhelmingly conducive to misinterpretation, its clarification should be implemented immediately.

When dealing with a phenomenally high level of physical appeal, the reader may feel that Tom Cruise or Kathy Ireland (as two examples) would fall within these parameters. However, they would not possess the requisite levels of physical appeal. An example of someone who would be sufficiently attractive would be Marilyn Monroe. What would differentiate Marilyn Monroe from the former two individuals? Marilyn Monroe was viewed as an international sex symbol whose fame was *predicated* upon her physical appeal. Although the physical appeal of Cruise and Ireland has had a prominent role to play in their popularity, they are still predominantly known as an actor or supermodel (respectively). Furthermore, most members of the opposite sex would not experience the same desire for Cruise or Ireland as men would for Marilyn Monroe. Consequently, for love of this nature to prevail, both individuals must be two of the world's *leading* sex symbols who have come to be *known* (i.e. famous) for their phenomenally high level of physical appeal. In my life time, there have only been two individuals who would conform to these parameters. They are Tom Selleck, and Farrah Fawcett. In order to illustrate how these two could have fallen in love and become married, we will present the following hypothetical (yet entirely realistic) scenario.

1. They are both at the epitome of their physical appeal *and* ardently yearned for by members of the opposite sex. Regarding Farrah Fawcett, this situation only prevailed for a brief period of time. She was only yearned for during the time that she was on *Charlie's Angels*. Shortly subsequent to this, she was no longer the world's most sought after female (which was the capacity she was viewed in during her time on the show). Tom Selleck was in a somewhat similar position. It was during the "run" of *Magnum P.I.* that he experienced his sex symbol status. Therefore, the first "condition" for establishing marital love between these two, is that *Charlie's Angels* and *Magnum P.I.* have both premiered simultaneously. This ensures that both of them would be viewed in the capacity of the most prominent sex symbols in the world.

2. Neither one of them experiences a "natural" fear of marriage (or more precisely, possible divorce). What this entails is as follows. The reader may be cognizant of the fact that Farrah Fawcett lived with actor Ryan O'Neal for almost two decades. They even had a child together. In other words, they were all *but* married. We can safely draw the conclusion that one (or both of them) were petrified of the possibility of divorce. Consequently, they never got married. If this same type of fear existed if Fawcett and Selleck had proceeded to date (while working within the hypothetical parameters of point one) a fear of possible divorce would have prevented them from marrying. Therefore, the second hypothetical point would be that neither one of them experiences a "natural" fear of marriage culminating in divorce.

3. They find each other to be emotionally compatible. This quality is *not* to be confused with an idiosyncratic relationship. They do not require some type of emotional factor in common with the other person as is the case with an idiosyncratic marriage. It simply means that there is not

some emotional quality which the other individual finds revolting. Hypothetically speaking, let's assume that one of them was completely devoid of intellect. This quality may be sufficient to prevent attraction. Consequently, emotional compatibility merely entails there not being some type of emotional quality which the other person finds to be revolting.

Let's assume that a hypothetical scenario existed in which these three elements were "in effect". If Tom Selleck and Farrah Fawcett had proceeded to date, within an exceedingly short period of time (days, or at the most, weeks) they would feel such a strong attraction to each other that each individual would misconstrue this feeling as one of love. Naturally, they would get married. However, given the fact that the bond is so phenomenally weak, it would merely be a period of anywhere from a few months to several months before they were divorced.

The precise reason for this attraction is as follows. The underlying basis of romantic relationships between men and women is sex. Since this sentence is even more strongly conducive to misinterpretation than the third sentence from the beginning of this subsection, there will be immediate clarification. This does not mean that romantic relationships are exclusively predicated upon sex. It merely means that sex constitutes an *underlying* basis for relationships.

The reader should strive to recall how he/she felt about the opposite sex in his/her prepubescent years. The opposite sex was always very "strange". One simply didn't want anything to do with them. It was only when we entered puberty that an interest in the opposite sex was initiated. What transpired during puberty? Our sex organs developed and we became physically capable of having sex. We were incapable of sex in our prepubescent years. It was this physical development which resulted in a psychological interest in the opposite sex. Consequently, it was the physical ability to engage in sex which initiated the transition from finding the opposite sex "strange", to developing an interest in them. Therefore, it is sex which constitutes the *underlying* basis for relationships. Furthermore, since sex does have a role to play in relationships, it illuminates two aspects of this paper. Firstly, it shows why Tom Selleck and Farrah Fawcett would have married if the hypothetical scenario illustrated had prevailed. Secondly, the data in this section further elucidates upon why the physical appeal of the individuals plays an increasingly important role as the magnitude of love decreases.

It must, once again, be emphasized that the reader must not misinterpret the position being advocated. This does not mean that relationships are *exclusively predicated* upon sex. It merely means that sex constitutes the underlying basis of relationships. The reader may feel that this postulate is inherently contradictory given the fact that it is the physical ability to engage in sex which induces the emotional transition from our prepubescent opposition to the opposite sex to our pubescent interest in them. There is no contradiction for the following reason. At some stage in our life, there should be some fundamental recognition that there is more to a relationship than mere sex. At some stage you must recognize that regardless of the magnitude of their physical appeal, great sex, unto itself, is insufficient to sustain a relationship. Even in the hypothetical scenario that was illustrated in this section, point three clearly states this. In other words, our intellect should, to one extent or another, be able to "tame" our innate biological drives as it pertains to finding a *life long* spouse. (Although with all too many people, when it comes to casual dating, these "liaisons" *are* exclusively predicated upon sex.)

What we've established *thus far* in this subsection is the following.

(i) Sex has a role to play in romance as it constitutes the underlying basis of relationships. This illustrates why, (a) it plays an increasingly prominent role in establishing the marital

bond as the magnitude of love decreases; and, (b) Tom Selleck and Farrah Fawcett would have been married if they proceeded to date under the circumstances previously outlined.

(ii) As a result of this, the reader should not draw the conclusion that relationships are *exclusively* predicated upon sex. At some stage, our intellect will, to one extent or another, dominate over our biological drives and cause us to realize that there is more to a life long relationship than sex.

There may be a question on the reader's mind. Why is the material in this subsection being presented at all, given the fact that the nature of the marital bond is *exclusively* germane to the most prominent of sex symbols? The data presented in this section *does* have bearing on another small aspect of love/marriage.

If the reader has truly comprehended this paper, then you should be fully cognizant of something. *There is no such thing as love at first sight*. This is for the simple reason that for love to prevail, there must be the (unconscious) "revelation" of certain emotional qualities. For this condition to prevail, there must be *interaction* between the two individuals. In relation to "love at first sight," the requisite interaction simply does not exist. In the reader's mind, this begs the following question. How does one explain the fact that there are people who claim to have experienced the phenomenon of love at first sight? The data presented in this subsection will illuminate the answer to that question.

To initiate the analysis, the reader will be reminded of the old cliché, "Beauty is in the eyes of the beholder." When an individual experiences love at first sight, the other individual is *perceived* as possessing a phenomenally high level of physical appeal. Given the postulate that a phenomenally high level of physical appeal would, unto itself, induce love, this would provide a reasonable explanation of the phenomenon of love at first sight.

The reader may experience opposition to this statement. Towards the commencement of this subsection, it was stated that neither Tom Cruise nor Kathy Ireland would possess the requisite level of physical appeal to induce love. To be more precise, *only* those who are *exclusively* known for being the world's most prominent sex symbols would meet these parameters. Given this fact, how could people who are not prominent sex symbols induce love at first sight, even if they were extraordinarily beautiful?

The cliché fully answers this question. *For the phenomenon of love at first sight*, the person does not have to *actually* possess a high level of physical appeal. Given the provision that the individual is initially *perceived* as being phenomenally beautiful, this (in conjunction with another small component) will suffice to induce love at first sight. However, if there is to be marital love which is exclusive of love at first sight, yet is (almost) exclusively predicated upon a phenomenal level of physical appeal, then the individuals must be the world's most prominent sex symbols.

The astute reader will observe that in the last paragraph, it was stated that another small component was required to induce love at first sight. This other component pertains to emotional compatibility. On the basis of extraordinarily abstract elements, there is the feeling that this individual who is perceived as phenomenally beautiful, is emotionally compatible. A hypothetical scenario will now be presented in order to illustrate the circumstances under which love at first sight may occur.

For this hypothetical scenario, we will present an unmarried scientific researcher who will be attending a scientific conference for the weekend. He is fully cognizant of who his colleagues

at this conference will be. He knows there are no women amongst them. Furthermore, the scientific problem to be discussed is enormously complex. To be succinct, romance is the furthest thing from his mind.

This latter sentence was presented for the following reason. The unexpected nature of seeing this other person has a role in establishing love at first sight. The rationale behind this is as follows. In life, the impact of certain experiences is magnified to the n^{th} degree if the experience is *completely* unexpected. Therefore, one of the facilitating factors in establishing love at first sight, is that the possibility of meeting this phenomenally beautiful person (as *perceived* by you) is completely unexpected.

In the middle of the conference, the guests are dining. During the course of dinner, this researcher is engaged in intensive contemplation as he and his colleagues have been incapable of making any headway in this problem. He then hears a female voice behind him asking if he would like any more coffee. He turns around to face the waitress (keep in mind that romance was the furthest thing from his mind). He then sees the most beautiful woman he has ever seen in his life (or, more precisely, a woman whom he *perceives* as being the most beautiful he's ever seen). At that stage, he will experience love at first sight as sex is the underlying basis of romantic relationships. However, there is still the question of emotional compatibility. How does he draw the conclusion that she is emotionally compatible with him? I myself am not certain as to the answer. I can only state what was previously stated. The person who falls in love experiences a very simple feeling of emotional compatibility which is rooted in exceedingly abstract elements.

We will return to our example for a (possible) illustration of this. Let's assume that the waitress articulated herself with some type of southern "drawl", wasn't particularly well groomed, and was chewing gum the way a cow chews cud. She then asked, "Hey Mistah, you want I should get ya some more coffee?" This would prevent the formation of a favourable initial impression and would probably cause him to feel that she is emotionally incompatible. In order to illustrate how he may perceive her as emotionally compatible, let's alter the scenario to the following. The woman is well groomed, well spoken, and is not chewing any gum (as in the case of our former example). She courteously asks, "Excuse me sir, but would you like some more coffee?" As a result of a favourable first impression, he may feel that she is emotionally compatible. A superficial analogy can be drawn with two different men. One is clean shaven, wearing a suit and tie, and his hair is properly combed. The other is wearing shorts, a ripped T-shirt, unshaven (without a full beard or moustache), and very long hair. On the basis of this, it is inevitable that most people would draw conclusions about what kind of person they are, regardless of whether those conclusions are accurate or not.

Consequently, for love at first sight to prevail, there will be the following conditions. Firstly, although it is not absolutely necessary, the possibility of seeing this person is completely unexpected. If an experience is unexpected, this greatly magnifies its impact. Secondly, the person one sees is perceived as possessing a phenomenally high level of physical appeal. Thirdly, on the basis of abstract elements, there will be the feeling that this person is emotionally compatible.

Some readers may be opposed to this for the following reason. It is being stated that there is no legitimate bond between the two individuals when it comes to love at first sight. However, either you yourself, or a couple you know have had a lengthy and wonderful marriage as a result of love at first sight. There will be two responses to this.

Firstly, you (or the couple you know) can be very grateful that you "lucked out". In other

words, be inordinately glad that there happened to be a *genuine* emotional bond of love that went above and beyond the realm of (perceived) physical appeal. Secondly, for every *one* couple you show me who have experienced a successful marriage subsequent to dating for a short period of time, I will show you an *inordinate* number of couples who have experienced marital disaster because they married too quickly (specifically, a brief courtship).

SUBSECTION III

This subsection will not expound upon anything new as it pertains to love/marriage and divorce. Its purpose is to *further* elucidate upon the various type of emotional factors which induce an idiosyncratic marriage. This will be accomplished via the provision of additional idiosyncratic relationships which culminated in love/marriage. The first two couples shall be given arbitrary names.

1. Danny Coleman and Jocelyn Smithers - The nature of the idiosyncrasy between these two can be stated very simply. They were both extraordinarily moral individuals with exceedingly high ethical standards. Although stating the idiosyncrasy is reasonably simple, *substantiating* it is slightly more labourious. It will be substantiated via some observations from interviewers, and some statements from Jocelyn.

In one particular interview, there was the statement that they refused to live together prior to their marriage. What was written was as follows. "And both govern their lives by rigid, traditional moral values, which precluded their becoming roommates."⁴² Another statement is as follows. "(Danny) shares (Jocelyn's) deep religious convictions and her almost puritanical aversion to alcohol, drugs, and vulgarities."⁴³ Furthermore, a few days prior to their wedding in New York (they both resided in Los Angeles at the time), they took separate hotel rooms in the same hotel.⁴⁴ Some direct statements from Jocelyn are as follows. "Family, religion and morality are what I'm all about."⁴⁵ "(Danny) is more old-fashioned than I am. I hear so many four-letter words on the set they've lost their meaning. Once in a while I let a vulgar word slip out at home and (Danny) goes crazy. He turns into an iceberg. He doesn't even like to hear me say 'dammit'. One day he said, 'I wish you wouldn't use that language. Your image is so sweet and pure, if people hear you cussing, I'll get blamed for it.'"⁴⁶ Clearly, this substantiates the nature of the idiosyncrasy.

This marriage was anomalous when compared to the theory of an idiosyncratic relationship. The two individuals should feel an attractive bond of love within a reasonably sort period of time (specifically, a few months) with matrimony following soon thereafter. However, their courtship lasted for nineteen months.⁴⁷ However, this anomaly does not invalidate the theory behind an idiosyncratic relationship as it is easily explained. Jocelyn "blindly rushed" into her first marriage. After only two dates, she was proposed to.⁴⁸ She accepted the proposal. Naturally, the marriage was a disaster and culminated in divorce. With this second marriage, she did not want to make the same mistake a second time. Consequently, although she probably felt a bond of love subsequent to a few months of dating, she took the precaution of waiting for a period of time which she deemed reasonable prior to marriage. Despite her "precaution", this marriage lasted for two and a half years.⁴⁹

As a point of interest, for readers who may continue to insist that it was the volatile nature of the relationship between Sean Penn and Madonna that was responsible for their divorce (as opposed to the inherently weak bond), the marriage between Danny and Jocelyn should clearly illustrate that it is the weakness of the bond which is responsible for divorce. There was no volatility in this marriage as a direct result of the fundamental nature of both individuals. Yet despite this fact, the marriage still culminated in divorce.

2. Lanceton Barton and Melissa Saxton – Both of these individuals are prominent magicians. Although they are not necessarily "superstars" (in the same vein as David Copperfield) Lanceton is

one of the most prominent magicians in Las Vegas (and the world), and Melissa was the world's most prominent *female* magician when she was still performing. This factor would suffice to establish an idiosyncratic marriage. Although this explains the nature of the marital bond, there is an exceedingly serious anomaly in relation to this marriage. It lasted for less than a year. Given the fact that an idiosyncratic bond was established, the question must be posed. Why did it last for such a brief period of time?

There is a paucity of data to enable me to draw an unequivocally accurate conclusion. However, given the data I am in possession of, I can make an inference to answer the question. A simplistic explanation is that they both came to the realization that their initial (unconscious) perceptions of each other were fundamentally fallacious. What this entails is the following.

In stating that they were both superstar magicians, there is more to be stated about Lanceton and, in essence, "less" to state about Melissa. Lanceton had been a magician since he was a boy. He experiences a *genuine* love and passion for magic. To be succinct, he was a passionate magician who happened to achieve fame and fortune in the pursuit of his passion. I don't believe the same can be stated about Melissa. Her background is as follows. She began as a dancer in the Siegfried and Roy magical spectacle. Subsequent to witnessing how well they were doing, it was her opinion that she may also be capable of doing reasonably well as a magician. In other words, she experienced no true passion for magic as Lanceton did (almost all leading magicians began their pursuit as children). She deemed magic to be nothing more than a viable means of attaining fame and fortune.

When they met, they perceived each other to be the same. Lanceton drew the unconscious conclusion that Melissa was a passionate magician who happened to be successful. Melissa drew the unconscious conclusion that Lanceton was nothing more than a rich and successful magician. Shortly into the marriage, the nature of their fallacious impressions was readily revealed. In order to elucidate as to how this revelation may have transpired, it is imperative that the reader be made cognizant of a certain point as it pertains to someone who truly loves magic. Since Lanceton is a true magician, he desired to devote every waking moment to magic. Namely, associating with other magicians, attending gatherings of magicians in Las Vegas, constantly conversing about magic, etc. The following is *not* a substantiated fact as to how their fallacious impressions were revealed, but merely an *example* of how this revelation *may* have transpired. Initially, she cooperated with his obsessive love of magic. However, subsequent to a brief period of time, she one day blurted out, "Does everything have to be about magic with you?!" From that point on, it was only a question of time (and a brief amount of time at that) that the marriage would have broken up. They would have both come to the unconscious realization that they were nothing alike. Lanceton would have unconsciously realized that she was nothing more than an individual who pursued magic as a means to an end. Melissa would have come to the unconscious realization that his true love in life was magic, not money and fame.

Therefore, the (probable) reason the marriage broke up so rapidly, was that they both came to the unconscious realization that their impressions of each other were entirely erroneous

3. Tom Arnold and Roseanne - The idiosyncrasy between the two of them can (generally) be explained via one primary characteristic. However, this primary characteristic is "subdivided" into three specific elements. The primary *general* characteristic is that they were both unappealing to members of the opposite sex. However, they were both unappealing for precisely the same three *specific* reasons. Those three reasons are as follows. (i) Although things have subsequently changed, they were both overweight at the time they met. For many people, an obese individual

can function in the capacity of inhibiting attraction. (ii) They were both of below average intellect. For some, this too can potentially constitute a romantic inhibitor. (iii) Notwithstanding these initial two reasons, they were both, to be blunt, devoid of physical appeal. As the reader can see, they were both unattractive for the exact same three reasons. It would be appropriate to emphasize that this marriage should *not* be compared with that of Dennis Devlin and Reanne Perron's marriage. Their lack of physical appeal was so substantial, it created the fear in their mind as they would ever find anybody to date, let alone marry. I don't believe the same situation existed with Tom Arnold and Roseanne.

In the reader's mind, there may be an anomaly with this analysis as contrasted with the three other idiosyncratic relationships thus far outlined. With the other three marriages, a *psychological* element was presented as it pertained to the individuals. Since this is not the case with this couple, how can this fall within the parameters of an idiosyncratic marriage?

The answer to this question lies with the following. In order to induce an idiosyncratic relationship, the correlating factor(s) between the two individuals is sufficiently strong in magnitude as to render them "birds of a feather". Although with the vast majority of couples, the factor(s) involved would be psychological, it is not imperative that the factor(s) be psychological in order to ensure the bond of love.

Another anomaly is as follows. It was clearly stated that for an idiosyncratic bond to exist, the physical appeal of the individuals must be above average in order to compensate for the weakness of the emotional bond. Yet these two are clearly lacking that component. The answer to this is found in the old cliché presented under subsection II. Beauty is in the eyes of the beholder. Although the majority of us would not have found them to be appealing, their view of each other would have differed from ours. On this last point, there should be the following word of caution. If either one of them are asked to confirm whether or not they found each other physically attractive at the time of their marriage, you can expect both of them to vehemently deny it. Their divorce was acrimonious and their resentment towards each other is rather substantial. *Any* attraction that they once felt for each other has been completely repressed.

4. Alec Baldwin and Kim Basinger - They were both actors of the *same stature* (to be specific, the magnitude of their stardom). It is reasonably important to stress this, as two individuals who are merely actors would not suffice to constitute an idiosyncrasy of sufficient "magnitude" to render them "birds of a feather". However, it should also be noted that two actors of the same stature is not, unto itself, sufficient to induce an idiosyncrasy between them (if it were, every major star in Hollywood would be falling in love with each other). There was a second characteristic which, *in conjunction* with being actors of the same magnitude induced an idiosyncratic bond of love. (As a point of clarification, the reader may now experience a degree of confusion as it pertains to the second couple outlined in this subsection. If two actors of the same stature is not sufficient to induce an idiosyncratic bond, what is the dichotomy as it pertains to two actors and two magicians? The chasm is as follows. *Superstar* magicians are exceptionally rare. Superstar actors are far more common. Given this fact, it is imperative that there be an additional bonding factor among actors of the same stature in order to render them "birds of a feather".)

They were both highly salacious, licentious individuals. This element was far more acute in them than with an average individual. They met when they were working on a film set together. Instead of one of them asking the other out to dinner, the following transpired. According to a member of the crew, Basinger was "coming on" to Baldwin right on the set. This crew member

reported that Basinger's sexual advances were as hot and heavy as you can imagine. Apparently, she showed no restraint whatsoever. Furthermore, this was not in privacy, but in full view of the film crew. Some men would have completely rebuffed her as there is more to a relationship than mere sex. At the very least, most men would have probably tried to dissuade her and asked her to save it for later when they had privacy. Baldwin never rebuffed her at all. Through it all, he was fully amenable to her advances and never attempted to even incrementally dissuade her.

Therefore, the idiosyncrasy between these two was as follows. They were both actors of the same stature *and* they were both highly salacious individuals. As in the latter marriages, there is an anomaly with this marriage. Instead of enduring for two to five years, it lasted for seven.

We can't be certain why the marriage endured this long as there have been few details pertaining to the divorce. However, I am under the following impression. Basinger did her best to maintain the union for the sake of their young daughter. In other words, she was determined that they seek counselling (and do whatever else was required) in the hopes of saving their marriage so that their daughter would not have to live with the pain of divorced parents. If it hadn't been for this factor, the marriage would have broken up considerably sooner.

5. Jane Fonda and her third husband - *One* factor which played a role in this idiosyncratic marriage, was that they were both quite affluent. However, like the former couple, this would not, unto itself, suffice to induce an idiosyncratic marriage. They were also elderly at the time they met. In other words, being old (or for that matter young) *would* constitute a characteristic. Therefore, it was the combination of affluence and old age which induced the idiosyncrasy. Although the following two characteristics would *not* constitute an idiosyncrasy, it would have served to incrementally strengthen the idiosyncratic bond between them. This was the third marriage for both of them, and they each had a parent who committed suicide. (Again it must be emphasized that these two factors do not constitute an idiosyncrasy unto themselves, but merely a strengthening of the idiosyncratic bond.)

As in the former marriage, an anomaly exists. Their marriage endured for seven years. The partial answer to this anomaly was presented in the last paragraph. Their bond was slightly stronger than the average idiosyncratic bond. However, there was another important factor involved. In my opinion, Fonda was desperate not to have the marriage end in divorce. Subsequent to her second divorce, she felt very lonely. She did not want to experience that ever again, especially at her age. The basis for stating that Fonda was desperate to save the marriage is as follows. From the time they were married, in my own mind I knew that, in all probability, it would culminate in divorce (this theory of love/marriage and divorce was developed when I was eighteen years old). When it went beyond six years, I became very curious. Then one day, he announced that he planned on running for President of the United States. As soon as I heard that, I knew what was transpiring (at least on an unconscious level in his mind). When they were happily married, Fonda stated that if he ever entered politics, she would leave him. When I heard of his announcement, I realized that the marriage was over, and he wanted out. He was attempting to "goad" her into leaving. In other words, she was desperate to save the marriage for the reason already stated and would not "allow" it to end by insisting on marriage counselling. Even for the press release of their separation, it was stated that they did remain committed to the long term success of their marriage. However, in the end, an idiosyncratic marriage cannot be saved.

6. Kaley Cuoco and her first marriage – This is being presented as Cuoco's first marriage was obviously idiosyncratic. However, the nature of the idiosyncrasy was rather unique. There were

two factors which rendered Cuoco and her first husband “birds of a feather”. Her husband was a tennis champion. When Cuoco was a teenager, she was a top amateur tennis player in California. Therefore, there was a mutual love of tennis. However, this would not suffice to establish an idiosyncratic bond. That’s where the second factor came into play. Specifically, financial affluence. Her husband had a net worth of two million dollars. However, Cuoco was worth tens of millions of dollars. Therefore, what rendered them “birds of a feather”? Tennis and financial affluence. *However*, they *counterbalanced* each other in these two respects. Cuoco had a love of tennis and reached a certain level of proficiency. However, this did not compare to her husband being a tennis champion. Conversely, a personal worth of two million dollars is not an infinitesimal amount of money. However, it did not begin to compare with the tens of millions of dollars that Cuoco was worth.

Therefore, what was the idiosyncratic bond with Kaley Cuoco and her first husband? Tennis and financial affluence. However, there was a need for a counterbalancing factor to prevail in order to ensure the bond.

The following should be pointed out. In all of these marriages, anomalies to the theory have been presented. However, they have all been explained. What the reader must realize is the following. Psychiatry is not like physics. It is not an exact science. This is because human beings are not like electrons, photons, or waves of sound. To be precise, human beings are different and simply do not exhibit the exact same behaviour (as do the subjects studied in physics). Consequently, when it comes to establishing theories in psychiatry, by virtue of the fact that we are dealing with human beings who are different, generally speaking, the theories will constitute sound guiding principles, not absolute and unequivocal laws.

Although the following has no bearing on the tenets outlined under subsection III, it would be judicious to present this material. There are four binding factors which would induce love/marriage (with two of them being further subdivided into other categories). It is theoretically possible that there could be more than one binding factor within a marriage. (This is why when Fonda married for the third time, I thought it was most probable that they would be divorced, but not guaranteed. This was for the simple reason that it was within the realm of possibility that there was a bond of true love as well as an idiosyncratic factor involved.) As an arbitrary example, one may be recently divorced (overcoming emotional pain) *and* experience a similar idiosyncrasy with another person. It is even possible (although phenomenally improbable) that all four binding factors could be in effect. Although it is possible that there is more than one binding factor, in all probability there will only be one binding factor with the overwhelming majority of couples.

REFERENCES

1. *People* April 8, 1985 *A Dreamboat Wedding* p.59
2. *Rolling Stone* November 6, 1986 *The Rolling Stone Interview (William Jones)* by Anthony DeCurtis p.49
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid. p.51
5. Ibid.
6. *Redbook* September 1999 (*Cheryl's Secret Strength*) by Jeanne Wolf p.108
7. *Rolling Stone* November 6, 1986 op.cit. p.51
8. *Us* January 22, 2001 p.31
9. Ibid.
10. *Redbook* September 1999 op.cit. p.108
11. *People* July 8, 1985 *Desperately Seeking Matrimony: Rock's Bad Girl and Her Lucky Star Sean Penn* by Carol Wallace p.24
12. *People* March 11, 1985 *Madonna* by Carl Arrington p.116
13. *People* September 2, 1985 *Madonna Lands Her Lucky Star* by Roger Wolmuth, p.23
14. *People* March 11, 1985 op.cit. p.113
15. *People* January 23, 1989 *It's Splits, Fits and Quits Again for Sean and Madonna* by James S. Kunen p.44-46
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. *Ladies Home Journal* August 1978 *My Rocky Marriage to Sylvester Stallone* by Marilyn Laron Funt p.66
20. Jeff Rovin *STALLONE! A Hero's Story* p.68
21. *Ladies Home Journal* August 1978 op.cit. p.66
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid. p.68
24. *People* May 8, 1978 *His Marriage and Ego Were Blowing Up until Sly Stallone Ended his Rocky Horror Show* by Lois Armstrong p.95
25. *Rolling Stone* July 8, 1982 *The Trouble With Sylvester Stallone* by Lewis Grossberger p.52
26. Jeff Rovin op.cit. p.20
27. *Esquire* December 1996 *The Masculine Mystique* by Susan Faludi p.91
28. *Rolling Stone* December 19, 1985 - January 2, 1986 *The Rolling Stone Interview Sylvester Stallone* by Nancy Collins p.132
29. Sylvester Stallone *The Official Rocky Scrapbook* p.58
30. *Time* June 14, 1982 *Winner and Still Champion* by J.D.Reed p.60
31. Jeff Rovin op.cit. p.43
32. Ibid. p.61
33. *Rolling Stone* July 8, 1982 op.cit. p.14
34. Ibid.
35. Jeff Rovin op.cit. p.207
36. Ibid. p.241
37. *Rolling Stone* December 19, 1985 - January 2, 1986 op.cit. p.128
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid.
40. Jeff Rovin op.cit. p.242, p.244
41. *Ladies Home Journal* August 1978 op.cit. p.66
42. *Ladies Home Journal* July 1979 (*Jocelyn Smithers*): *Wholesome Is Beautiful* by Stephen Decatur p.43
43. Ibid. p.44
44. Ibid. p.43
45. Ibid. p.44
46. Ibid.
47. *People* November 13, 1978 *Charlie's Last Available Angel, (Jocelyn Smithers) Says Yes to (Danny Coleman), No to a Hyphen* by Cheryl McCall p.48
48. *People* October 9, 1978 *With a Sizzling New Role, Angel (Jocelyn Smithers) Aims to Bring Her Image Down to Earth* by Lois Armstrong p.92
49. *People* October 19, 1981 *Acting the Part* by Lois Armstrong p.107