



How to cite this article:

Alberich Nistal, T. (2019). Polyamory, Free Love or in Freedom? Potentialities and Difficulties. *MLS Psychology Research* 2 (1), 99-116 doi: 10.33000/mlspr.v2i1.212

POLYAMORY, FREE LOVE OR IN FREEDOM? POTENTIALITIES AND DIFFICULTIES

Tomás Alberich Nistal

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

talberich@poli.uned.es · <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6129-1110>

Abstract. After a brief historical introduction of the multiple forms of sexual life and love relationships, this article studies the concept of polyamory, its different definitions and its differences with other close related terms such as the relational anarchy or free love, and responds to some critical voices that consider polyamory as characteristic of neoliberalism. Between the denominations used related to the subject would be the love in freedom, the polyamory (to love several people - the main one is the affections, the feelings) and the multiloving. Then, the article focuses on the main difficulties that hinder the development of polyamory and for to live the free love, according to different authors, such as time and space management, and legal obstacles, security, trust, consent and difficulties in open relationships. Analyzing in more detail jealousy and romantic love, in which you want to satisfy with one person, in the same couple, up to six different levels of relationship.

Keywords: Polyamory; Free love; Jealousy; Romantic love

¿POLIAMOR, AMOR LIBRE O EN LIBERTAD? POTENCIALIDADES Y DIFICULTADES

Resumen. Después de una breve introducción histórica sobre las muy diversas formas de vivir la sexualidad y las relaciones amorosas, en el artículo se plantea el concepto del poliamor, sus diferentes definiciones y otros conceptos próximos, como la anarquía relacional, diferenciándolo del amor libre y respondiendo a algunas de las críticas que lo consideran propio del neoliberalismo. Entre las denominaciones utilizadas relacionadas con el tema estaría el amor en libertad, el poliamor (querer a varias personas –lo principal son los afectos, los sentimientos) y el multiloving. Se pasa a continuación a describir las diferentes dificultades para el desarrollo del poliamor y para vivir el amor en libertad según diferentes autores, como son la gestión de los tiempos y las dificultades legales, la seguridad, la confianza, el consentimiento y las dificultades en las relaciones abiertas. Parándose finalmente con más detalle en el análisis de los celos y en el mito del amor romántico, en el que se quiere satisfacer con una sola persona, en la misma pareja, hasta seis planos diferentes de relación.

Palabras clave: Poliamor; Amor libre; Celos; Amor romántico.

Love is like Don Quixote: After just recovering its reason, it is about to die. Jacinto Benavente

Introduction

Love can build egalitarian relations but also oppressive. Love can contribute to settle existing social relations, help reproduce a patriarchal capitalist system, but it can also be the path toward a new way to relate, be a different anchor to build relationships more free and creative (Porta and Musante, 2016).

Yves-Alexandre Thalmann in *The virtues of the polyamory. The magic of the loves multiple*, surely the first book in Spanish about the polyamory (or the first known), affirms as a starting point that all people are by definition polyamorous.

We are permanently subjected to attractions, more or less strong, more or less numerous, according to our type of life. Sometimes, that empties into what one called love. But the love, large or small, with 'a' upper or lower case, whether the project for a night or a life, it does not prevent those attractions continue. Love does not prevent the love. (Thalmann, 2008, p.15).

From this postulate, arises a different debate, about how society organizes love and institutionalizes: if the basic organization of the socio-economic situation is the single-parent family or not.

What many thinkers suggest, since the ancient Greeks or psychology (from Freud at least), is that the desire, relationships do not repress, encourage multiple intimate relationships. From adolescence to old age, most people want to have loving relationships with others, not only with one. They can be more or less deep desires. "Intimate" does not mean just sex, nor of a single type. It may be only in some moments of life or on a regular or permanent.

If we set aside unscientific currents of thought and religious beliefs monogamous, in a life "normal" (the majority) is wanting to have relations with different people. This does not mean that, at certain times, such as when a person falls in love with another, think that with that person we can carry out completely. That will be enough to have relations with a single person, and that with it we will have the "total".

Michel Foucault, in his *History of Sexuality*, illustrates in detail the very diverse forms of sexual relations and loving at different times. To take distance from the institutionalized relations in our time, to quote one of his many examples:

...The love of boys is different from inclination toward women and superior to it ... (Plutarch, *Dialog about Love*). But the essence of his argument against the love for women is that it is nothing more than a natural inclination [...] we are pushed to procreate, as we are pushed to feed us. This same appetite we find in flies for milk, on bees for honey... all these

appetites Protógenes do not imagine giving the name of Love (Foucault, 2005, p. 229.230).

Giving a historic leap of vertigo, and after two millennia of Judeo-Christian orthodoxy, it is from the 19th century when multiplying the revolutionary proposals and radical about sexuality, at the same time that exponentially increases our knowledge of the vast and boundless diversity of types and forms of sexual relations.

Alexandra Kollontai (1872-1952), a militant feminist and Russian Communist, advocated free love as the basis for a new proletarian morality. "The notion of free love enables you to build egalitarian relations and put an end to the psychological subjection of women with respect to men" (War, 2011).

In the 1990s the past 1930s, Wilhelm Reich (1897-1957) write *The Function of the Orgasm* and, especially, *Sexuality in the Cultural Struggle*, published in multiple languages with the determinant title of *The Sexual Revolution* .

In the 1940-50 studies on sexuality of Alfred Kinsey in the United States shocked and revolutionize the sociological research. These works have influenced for decades, also in the later expansion of the hippy movement and in the thinking of the new social movements, from the 1968 revolutionary. Let us remember that precisely the Parisian May 68, of which we have just to celebrate half a century, began by "a minimum demand - the right of women to enter colleges of men- develops up to produce a questioning of all social codes" (Elorduy, 2018 , p. 4).

I only mention Kollontai, Reich and Kinsey because personally I remember how circulated photocopies of their articles and abstracts of them almost clandestinely in the 1990s, between 1970 a good part of the progressive youth¹ . Being a source of scandals and debates. The proposals of Reich began to become a reality shortly after his death in American prisons. These three revolutionary researchers, like many others, had been marginalized and vilified in life.

Kollontai had ruled that "the revolution will or will not be feminist", a phrase with which removed the principles of the traditional Left. Even in 2011, a banner with this slogan in the Camp Sun Of The 15M (Madrid) caused such controversy that was withdrawn. Kollontai argued that there can be no true love between a man and a woman is anchored in the past, so that defends free love as the only alternative (Torralba, 2018).

As of the 30s, the freudo-marxism of Wilhelm Reich and his *Sexual Revolution* advocated radical value of sexuality free: promoting the use of contraceptives and their distribution to prevent abortions, the facilitate young people's access to shelters for them to maintain sexual relations and an end to the repression of masturbation of children and adolescents.

For its part, Alfred Kinsey was the largest data collector related to sex:

¹ As a curiosity to cite the Spanish edition of "The young people's sexual struggle", the work of Reich written in 99 pages and duplicated, published in Spanish with the following literal end note: "This book is translated and duplicated by a group of young workers. Be the term for 'Print' clandestinely the 3 April 1973; date that has fallen killed by police, in defense of their legitimate rights along with 1,800 peers, the construction worker of Barcelona Manuel Fernández Márquez".

Together with its partners, interviewed in depth to thousands of people. The report on men's sexuality, published in 1948, has already led to scandal. In the, Kinsey stated that homosexuality is not a such an atypical behavior and that the homosexual feelings are widely extended and also among heterosexuals. In addition, addressed the theme of masturbation and even the excitement through sadomasochistic stories, who claimed to feel almost one out of every four. What about women? One in four was not exactly true, said Kinsey in his report of 1953, prepared on the basis of 6,000 interviews. In addition, almost half did not arrive to marriage (virgin Melzer, 2013).

In the social movements of the 1960s and 70s, the above-mentioned publications were very present, especially the *Sexual Revolution* of Reich. At the same time there had been another differential fact fundamental, the discovery of the female contraceptive pill. There is a relationship between the evolution of sexuality and contraceptive systems. In the liberation of women and in the "sexual revolution" started in the sixties of last century, was essential to the discovery of the birth control pill and, in a short time, its massive use. It was a revolution: women could begin to manage his or her own body and your sex, separating reproduction and sexuality safely.

Since the end of the century produces another significant social change: the separation of the relationships to marriage. It is increasingly socially assumed (in most countries) that the democratic minimally have a stable loving relationship, this does not necessarily mean that its institutional formalization.

What was previously considered a minority or clandestine or, at least, passenger and provisional, premarital relations", it becomes normal. Relationships (partner or not) are no longer pre nothing. In the current century is considered normal that people have loving relationships, and complete regardless of sexual marriage, although many decide to get married at some point in their life.

The main criticism to marriage, from the perspective of an anarchist, communist, a feminist, hippy, etc. It was not against love in a couple, it was against its institutionalization, which entailed loss of freedom and state control of a closed and patriarchal family institution. Times in which extramarital affairs and adultery could result in jail, but only for women. So, we see repeatedly in the critique of Kollontai and most of the historical feminist (Sylvia Pankhurst, Hildegart Rodríguez, etc.).

But, since the end of the century, we have entered a new era, the Information Society and the network society (Castells, 2010, p. 27). A society in which everything flows, everything changes and dissipates, and in which the rights, values and principles are diluted, we escape between his hands. There are no longer any solid rights. Is the liquid modernity (Bauman, 2005) also entails loving relationships are fluid and changing. The liquid love shows the "fragility of human ties" in the postmodernist society of globalization.

In 1990 the marriage Beck had explained that we lived in a time of social restructuring of the private, with a clash of interests between love, family and personal freedom. The traditional nuclear family, built around the sexual differentiation, with separate social roles and hierarchical, changes due to the approach of the emancipation and equality before the law, which, together with the increasing individualization and freedom idealized, generates a daily chaos in love (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2001).

When the official marriage becomes just one option from among the possible to maintain stable loving relationships, their social perception changes. In Spain, the number of marriages per year decreases from decades ago. Especially since 1980 decreases the number of marriages in which both are single, being already higher than civilians to the religious. In the meantime, the age of the spouses first-timers has not stopped increasing, reaching the 34 years in 2016 (INE, 2016).

The average age in which the Spanish population had had their first sexual intercourse was 18.3 years in 2008 the (CIS, 2009. National Survey of Sexual Health. 2780 study, Question 11). In fact, nearly 77% of the respondents that if they had sex, had begun before the 21 years (5.1% has never had relationships). And only 46% of men did it with his stable partner at that time, compared to 86% of women (idem, question 12).

Currently, the young men who have had sex, his first relationship has been around 15 years. That is to say that, in any case, between the age at which to start having sex and the first marriage there is a gap of more than 16 years; although the causes of the gap between the sexual debut and marriage have been the subject of disputes (Faus-Bertomeu and Gomez Redondo, 2016:6), and we would miss studies that delve into the topic. For the majority of the population the marriage is seen only as a possible future options for when you reach some stability and maturity.

Among the arguments that expose some defenders of the polyamory, is the increase in the number of divorces "70% of marriages end in separation or divorce" which would reflect, among other things, "the agony of monogamy" (Thalman, 2008:18). It has also been said since pro-collective polyamory, such as *golfs with principles* (Diaz, 2016), ensuring that in today's Spain the figure reaches 75%. Very debatable argument: a good part of the population at home precisely because there is a divorce and is easily practicable, not as in the past. If there is no gratuity and ease to divorce surely the number of new marriages would be even smaller than the current (although it is difficult to know with accuracy). What is clear is the irreversible separation of both facts: sex and marriage.

In the study of the CIS quoted above (2009) also we are interested in other answers. We shall quote only some that have more to do with this article. On if you disagree with the statement "I can only have sex with someone if I'm in love" (question 23) gender differences are bumpy: men who are very or somewhat agree are the 36%, but women the 73%.

In question 32, which if you have maintained relationships: how many people have you had sexual relations during the past 12 months? The men answered that "with only one person" the 76%, responding that the 6.7% with two and with more than two the rest, i.e. *21% of men have had sexual relations with two or more people in the last year* (3.1% NS/NC). While women just the 90% answer "with a single person", and with more people than the 8% (2.1 NC). Taking into account that, in the next question, 4.6% of men acknowledges that it has been "Person/s to the I/O that has paid", while it is 0.1 in women.

The Failure of Romantic Marriage

The fundamental problem of marriage is not that there are many divorces, it is for those who live in the widespread idea of romantic love, which leads to frustration to get the ideal love. To think that, with the same person in a single couple, we can meet happily five or six different aspirations, different levels of relationship that, if we look, you do not have to comply with our partner, I almost never meets and in fact it is practically impossible:

First playback, the offspring: with our partner want to have children, raise and educate them, agree on everything related to their upbringing. The coexistence in the same space gives rise to the domestic economy, are two levels: a unique home is cheaper than each on their own, and it is easier to parenting.

The domestic economy involves sharing, to help each other economically, in a society in which the two adults work but that one or both may have times when looking for work, unemployment rates for the care of children... The truth is that they have to live together and agree on many aspects, such as the fields of education, economy, housing, etc., and all this every day and for many years.

Third, the sexuality. The world of sex, the need for sexual relations that we all have. In the ideal of romantic love we assume and we want with our partner to be satisfied all our aspirations and fantasies.

Fourth, the affections, share feelings, hugs, caresses, secrets, pampering... All the sensitivity affective.

Fifth, the couple intellectual. Talk and share opinions, understand the world together, create a common vision, debating, discussing, interpreting and helping us to understand.

And sixth, the fun and free time. Share hobbies, hobbies, Leisure, Culture, Sports... Do I always have fun with my partner? Further, the times how long each person wants to be alone, enjoy the solitude? Free with others.

We want everything in one. If we try to make our partner meets these six planes of relationship, with all these aspects apparently possible when we fell in love with, what is to come will be the frustration.

Definition of Polyamory and Other Concepts

Thalman considers that "on a personal level, it attempts to transform the idea of exclusive love in an inclusive love, able to encompass more than two people" (p.31). Which, as well said, speaking of inclusiveness, remains as a positive and progressive present the polyamory:

The term *polyamory* is a neologism that first appeared in the 1960s, but whose popularization dates from the 1990s. Built from the Greek root *poly*, which means 'many', translated the idea of loves, i.e., with many people and many forms at the same time. This new concept stresses the polysemous nature of the word love. That is applied in a loving undifferentiated to

couples, parents, children, friends and even things (*italics in the original*, Thalmann, 2008, p. 33).

Understanding that the sentimental relations "include or not sexual relations, with all frankness and respecting each one".

For its part, according to the website of the Madrid Polyamory Association (2018)

Polyamory consists in loving to multiple people at once in a consensual manner, conscious and ethics. Those who defend we believe that love doesn't have to be restricted: if you love someone you want what is best for her, and that includes being able to extend your love life.

There are many other interesting definitions of polyamory. Already in 1997 the American activists and scholars Dossie Easton and Janet Hardy, had published *Promiscuous Ethics* (2013 Spanish edition), considered by his followers as "the Bible of the polyamory", where poses "a way to build relationships that go beyond what is socially established, which opens a wide range of freedom that is opposed to the conventional, the couple, monogamy, the so-called 'romantic love'," according to Vagalume, co-founder of (<http://www.golfxsconprincipios.com/>) (Diaz, 2016).

Giazu Enciso, psychologist, activist and researcher, in 2015 presented his doctoral thesis on *polyamorous practices*. In a simple way what define as "a relationship of more than two people at the same time. Of love and commitment, and not necessarily sexual. Where all the people involved know and agree to be in that relationship" (Enciso, 2015).

The set of revised definitions we conclude that the concept of polyamory is linked to the confidence, information, transparency, plurality, affective relations with mutual consent, ethics and honesty. At first, it seems that jealousy and insecurity may seem to be the most difficult to manage in the polyamory, but perhaps the loyalty and commitment the more complex aspects of the relationship, according to some of the debates raised by its practitioners.

It affects to differentiate it from what have been the traditional polygamous relationships, where a person (usually male) has relationships with others, they could be secret or consensual sex, but only one is the that hegemonizes relationships, in control of the situation and information, communicating what you want others with which it maintains relationships. These relationships are typical of patriarchy and have been assumed socially, standardized, in class societies, since, apart from a few exceptions, this type of relations are practiced exclusively by male members of the ruling classes, at least in a stable way.

The definition of theory and the concrete practice of the polyamory, also we infer that "the polyamory goes hand-in-hand with feminism, inseparably" (Roldán, 2018). It is not understood one without the other, since it assumes radically and as a starting point the equal rights of all people. From this perspective the approach of the polyamory is a feminist, but this does not mean that feminism is polyamorous.

Characteristics

In the defense of the polyamory emphasizes that relationships are not just sex. Love is much more. Jorge Roldán (2018) explains the amount of facts and relationship

types for which we are missing words, for which we do not have the appropriate names. Sometimes you are using and copying concepts and words of the English improperly, because it is very difficult to the literal translation, do not mean the same thing in each language, according to the context van loaded with intentionality, bias or cultural content.

The neologism "polyamory" itself is a poor translation of polyamory that in English does not mean exactly polyamory, which would be polilove. In the 1990s, when the concept begins to popularize in California, in its original version is impacted more on affective relationships and less on sexual, that is why in English popularize the strange term "polyamory" instead of polilove or multiloving. Experts as Felix Lopez (cited by Roldán, 2018) prefer to differentiate it from the term multiloving, since it would be more accurate to use two differentiated terms: polyamory, to want to several people (primary), are the affections and multiloving, to love several (not just wanting in the affective sense). In Spanish we have only one term, polyamory, such as sum of both.

Forms of Relationship

In the polyamory which different relationships are known to all participants does not mean a multiple coexistence, but it is not excluded. They can also be known or accepted in varying degrees, does not mean knowing everything, nor inform each step or activity. Consent does not mean to communicate aspects that belong to the intimacy of each person.

Polyamory may also arise as the assumption of a given reality, the fruit of a process. A couple may not be polyamorous when it has constituted and having to be when one of the two begins a new relationship with another and the three prefer to keep the relationship, once known the situation.

Hierarchy. It is called "polyamory hierarchical" when there is a primary relationship. It means that there is a more continuous or frequent relationship between two people and with another third is lower, for example because he lives outside, for employment reasons, etc. but equally the loyalty and information have to be to give to consider polyamory. And it can also be without hierarchy, when relationships flow in similar levels.

Number. The polyamory can be between three people but also among four or more. The number does not determine the consideration. Will determine, in practice, the times and intensities and forms of the different relationships.

Space. The polyamory can be granted or not in a group in coexistence. Several people who live together and with polyamory between them in a sanctioned by all. In this case, if the group is more than three people, you are closer to the so-called "communes", popularized by the hippy movement, who practiced the self-styled free love among them, and they began to be created in the years 60 and 70 of the last century.

But on the concept of "free love" usually is considered to be more open relations and flowing, without stability or with a high degree of variability, which is quite common in those decades among youth. Different case was the case of communes created in remote areas, such as some that began in abandoned villages in Spain, where, if you practiced stable relationships in the interior of a particular group.

Polyamory in a group in coexistence can be a *consensual relationship behind closed doors*, in which you don't admit that its participants may have relationships with other people outside of the group would be considered an infidelity (if there is no warning), or it may be open, that does not exclude other external relations, of a different type.

In conclusion, we can say that the concept of polyamory is characterized precisely by not defining a rigid structure or a universal framework (beyond the ethical principles cited above), nor can you specify in a model of relations:

There is not a typical structure of polyamorist relations. Someone can have two stable lovers who are not with anyone else, or three lovers who in turn have other lovers, or both lovers as primary relationship and another as a secondary relationship, or be bisexual and have lovers of two genera, or be in a trio that they may all be lovers of all and at the same time have sporadic relationships [...] Whatever the structure, what counts is that it works and that it would be agreed upon by all parties involved with sincerity and respect (Madrid Polyamory, 2008).

There is a pragmatic vision: what works and serves for the participants why reject it? The polyamory is based on mutual trust, respect and communication. These would be its ideological foundations minimum standards, rejecting stereotypes. Although the polyamory is defined more as a practice as an ideology, but with some minimum principles; it is more a cultural movement than a social movement with a defined ideology.

The flexibility in the delimitation of the relational forms is an interesting feature, "we could say that the polyamory and open relationships they share it with free love: there are no prefabricated structures, it is social bonds in construction, in constant mutation and resignification" (Porta and Musante, 2016, p.10) .

Polyamory Criticism from Defenders of Free Love

We have three main types of relationship on which we discussed in this article: *free love, polyamory and open relationships*. These three forms or "behaviors" also have in common that they reject any official institutionalization of love, call it marriage, registered domestic partner, polygamy, etc., would be three ways to live love in freedom. For these authors (Porta and Musante, 2016, p. 20)

Free love is revolutionary if you arrive to question the patriarchy, if it rises as a practice really novel, democratic, that breaks with the machismo and violence prevailing in today. And that's why we differentiate the polyamory or open relationships. These two are experiences that can be very "pleasant" and can be disruptive, but there is not a political proposal, do not look toward a horizon.

What is proposed on Free love is very attractive, but little concrete. From ideological anarchists and "revolutionaries", continues to advocate the free love as breaker position with the system, but not much concrete what it is and how it could live socially, beyond the theory and personal experiences. It is one of the differences with the polyamory, which if realized and lived in the present.

As well, for some the polyamory is one of the concrete ways to live free love (I prefer to say that it is one of the ways of love in freedom). But others have branded: how neoliberal approach that material consumption of love, consumerism. José Martínez García believes that "what is proposed in the polyamory is not free love, but neoliberal. The other does not interest me as a whole person, such as in free love, but only that which can be put in a contract". And repeat ad nauseam that the polyamory is neo-liberal, always contrasted with free love: "free love is a compromise between equals, based on respect, desire, and in the care, accepting the other as another that you cannot fully understand, nor can you submit, but in which delivery is total". But "in a patriarchal society and capitalist are not given the material conditions for this form of love" (Martínez, 2017).

To speak of "total surrender" reminds us more to the infatuation of love itself. If you counterpose to an ideal today impossible to achieve -free love- the arguments advanced by Martínez is weak. Rejects even the educational activities related to polyamory, how the workshops or seminars on jealousy, because its objective is only the improvement of a commercial contract: "The 'negative externalities' of the polyamory, like jealousy and insecurities, working in specialized workshops, in a business..." (Martínez, 2017). But their alternative to the practical reality of the polyamory is non-existent, since we live "in a patriarchal society". Rather it would seem that is speaking of the polyamory as if it were a commercial contract of sexual exchange.

The article was answered by Juan Carmona (2017), "the author caricatures to polyamory, accusing him of exactly what those who practice we try to avoid at all costs: the hedonistic instrumentalization of the companion". Replying to Martínez, provides detailed explanations, also of the educational activity: "Those who practice polyamory propose that jealousy addressing, among people who want to, as a natural feeling, that requires attention, patience, self-control and improvement of the character itself". Among its conclusions indicates that "The polyamory is free love precisely because it is accepted that there is that part of the person that can sometimes create insecurity" (Carmona, 2017).

Let us remember that anarchism and anarcho-communism, such as Kollontai, advocated free love how radical form of overcoming the love established, forced through marriage: the institution of marriage was part of the patriarchy, even more, it was considered to be one of the pillars of the patriarchal capitalist system. But, as we have argued, the marriage in the twenty-first century is no longer seen or experienced as a compulsory institution in order to establish relationships, supervised by the State. It is only one possibility among others. In the present pair without having the institutions can no longer be considered revolutionary, nor breaker with the patriarchy. If it is considered that there are other ways to live love in freedom, as the polyamory or open relationships. Assume that there are and respect them, in its multiple variants.

Relational Anarchy, Consent and Open Relationships

What is called "relational anarchy", would be a step further, more open and explicit what traditionally or *officially* is meant by polyamory.

Relational anarchists tend to believe in the natural consent and seek explicit consent in most of the areas of a new relationship. When they build a new relationship with someone, anarchists relational databases rely on the implicit consent, understanding that is revocable and renewed frequently with your partner [...] Consent may be explicit or implicit (Martin, 2015).

Consent is therefore the fundamental pillar of the anarchy relational database. We normally speak of partner and friendships, differentiating between people with which we have sex or not. polyamory, and more relational anarchy, they break with those tags.

A relationship that happens to be monogamous relationship to anarchy relational database is a covenant that could also lead to polyamory, free love or rupture of the couple.

Polyamory is different to the couple with liberal relations, in which two people assume by mutual agreement that each can have casual relationships with other people. Each party assumes that can relate intimately (at different levels) with other people, and not necessarily has to inform the other person of the couple. You do not have to report everything because it has agreed to do so. That is to say that we return to the importance of the consent, as previously agreed.

The social trend is an increase of couples who assume that their relations are open, in different degrees and for different situations or circumstances: personal, emotive, professionals (distant) work spaces, for rejecting monogamous relationships closed and exclusive, etc. This phenomenon can be part of a social process of growth of freedom, within couple relationships.

Once two people assume that phase of falling in love is temporary and rejects the romantic love, the *open relationship* may be the solution for precisely the search for stability.

It is a natural process consider having had various relationships before the current partner and that surely after we will also have other. If each pairing is only a part of a long sentimental life, we will assume naturally other relationships or its possibility, at least probing or explore other relationships. It is also the product of the increase in life expectancy and the quality of life. Only a century ago active love life "official" was on average 25 to 30 years, is now at least twice, more than half a century, we live in fact *several lives* (Alberich, 2015). Another thing is that, for ideological reasons or practical, we do not want to "complicate life" exploring other possibilities of relationships or dating.

Difficulties

In practice, any of the situations commented and the different types of relationship, polyamorists or open, are not easy. You have to know how to manage many things and to cope with different difficulties. The life of browser is complicated. Innovate as well. We are going to comment briefly on some of them.

Security. It is necessary to manage security and sexual relationships. Poorly developed aspect, little commented on web pages and articles on the polyamory but that

obviously concerned when speaking of the subject. Mutual trust has to include this aspect and it is necessary to communicate how it is being resolved, what protection measures being carried out.

Manage the times. It may happen that you start new relationships, one after another, but then cannot continue. A person assumes the polyamory and opens, begins a new relationship with other people, successive which also accept the polyamory. But in practice it occurs it is impossible its stability. Simply because we have a limited free time. One of the people you can continue to open new relationships, but others are not. In these cases, uneven relationship and, therefore, tensions and danger of hierarchies, breaking the equality required of the polyamory. The times are limited by the work, physical space, the care - family, offspring, etc.

Gender Differences

Women, to a greater extent than men, assume that model of love and romanticism that makes us sort our biography and our personal history around the achievement of love. Many women seek even the justification for its existence giving love a role of the same, giving him more time, more imaginary space and real, while men granted more time and space to be recognized and considered by society and peers (Porta and Musante, 2016).

Traditionally men have given more importance to relations and career women. Perception is changing in recent decades, especially with the addition to the labor market of women with highly qualified professions and in leadership positions.

To defend the polyamory (such as movement) a vision of strict equality in relationships, reach the polyamory is more appealing to women who defend their freedom that radically for men. It is easier, but find it more difficult to visualize it, to recognize it publicly, since there is still a lot of social rejection.

Our society is still patriarchal, but it must also be recognized that a part of the population walks in various ways to quit. Spaces have been created where one lives alternatively. One of these spaces is the fraternal relationships and non-patriarchal. But even today, the fact that a man recognizes that he lives in a polyamorous relationship may not be rejected because of ancestral form assumes the tendency to promiscuity of the man, but not woman. Without going into more explanation or reflection, think that it is man who has a relationship with several women and not vice versa. However, in the case of women, is rejected socially in all cases: whether it is a relationship of women with several men, as if she is part of a relationship of several women with one man, or if they are two and two.

One example that the active group of a well-known local collective of polyamories are six people, two men and four women (Roldán, 2018). But only men dare to go to the media and appear on the posters of conferences or discussions on the polyamory. Internally if all participate equally. Carry out activities such as discussions on "women's group", video forum, etc. The aim is to visualize the polyamory and create spaces of communication, discussion and training among people interested in issues related to polyamory, sexuality, jealousy, etc. In Spain there are groups known and

stable in Malaga, Valencia, Barcelona and Madrid at least. In other cities have existed but have dissolved or transformed.

Cultural Movement

Polyamory is not a proper social movement. Or, at least, its members are often not recognize themselves as forming part of one. These collective agreements do not proselytize, neither public advocacy of his ideas, although it can be considered as a cultural movement or a social movement of "short wave" (Alberich, 2017), which would form part of a wider social movement, within the framework of social movements in favor of sexual diversities.

Defend their ideas and way of life, but nor do they consider that their activity poliamorosa is the social objective to achieve. What they want is respect and be able to talk and discuss in freedom on the polyamory, not for society to be polyamorous. The collective respect for all the ways in which they can live sexuality and affectivity is scrupulous. In short, the respect for love.

Coexistence

Living in the same household, the children and the polyamory how is this possible? Really the aging in multiple coexistence has always existed. In many societies has lived extensively the upbringing in common, several generations in coexistence (grandparents, children, grandchildren...). The cousins were almost brothers that had a lot to do; in Spain they were officially referred to as carnal cousins or brotherly cousins, to differentiate them from "political" or first cousins and second cousins. This society was the majority until only a few generations. In the rural areas (and in some neighborhoods) is still very common family cohabitation extensive very close. The successive industrial revolutions have gone to impose the model of metropolitan urban society, where the place of residence is separate from the productive spaces and subjected to the economic logic. The extended family has been relocated dispersed into multiple spaces microfamilies.

After the second demographic transition, today, again, the cousins they acquire a new role: replace the brothers in the increasingly common families with an only child. In a multi-polyamorous family you can give this form of coexistence in a natural way. As also happens when separated parents begin a new coexistence with a partner who has offspring of previous connections. Siblings are more numerous. No one, or almost no one, he is surprised. Another issue is the legal recognition of polyamorist family and the difficulties involved.

Legality

When we talk about creating and playing in a polyamorous group is given the multiple profile, an aspect which is not covered in the current legislation. It is an issue

which coincides with demands of lesbians and other forms of sexual diversity. In this case, it raises the question of how to claim to recognize certain rights to more than two parents.

These difficulties are, for example, for legal permissions of absence from work due to illness of the spouse or children, which are only recognized for the family monogamous relationship, in marriage or de facto relationship -first-degree relatives. In general would have to recognize some rights to individuals of "home" in coexistence or, better, to legally recognize as the nucleus of family relationship of your loved ones to a maximum number of people who decide. So, if you recognize *family rights* to a few people, to "relatives", it could protect the rights of other types of families. How can be the LAT (*Living Apart Together*, couples "together but separated"), that is to say couples who do not live in the same house, people who have an intimate relationship stable but not officially live in the same house. And for other ways in which to recognize rights, when the family is made up of brothers with offspring of one (a nephew who is part of the family nucleus real), intimate friendships, etc.

In any case, the polyamorist collectives do not place much importance to the legal issues, at least for the moment. Their concerns will in other ways, such as the already raised. "They tend to give priority to other issues, such as the creation of spaces for meeting and mutual support or increase social visibility of the alternatives to monogamy" (Pérez Navarro, 2017). Which does not prevent "at least two-thirds would be assessed by means of a legal recognition if it were available," according to a study carried out in the US (idem). On the legal aspects is also advisable article of Martínez Thorium (2017).

Managing Jealousy

In one of the above-mentioned workshops of Polyamory Madrid, was used for the debate the proposals of Reid Mihalko (2008), who explains that there are 8 main reasons given jealousy. Some can be added to other and intermingling in each person. Are the eight arms of the "octopus" of jealousy: 1. Possession and control. How possessive I am with other people? If you do not control a situation how do I feel? The times do I consider that my love spends little time with me? 2. Insecurity How safe or unsafe feel the relationship? How likely are you to believe that the relationship will stagnate or break? How often do you think about the possible ruptures? 3. Loss. How easily I have the feeling of loss or abandonment do I have a fear of change? 4. Rejection. To what extent do you feel the rejection as an attack on the self-esteem? If a relationship ends and the other person leaves you what you feel you mean? 5. Loneliness Do you have any problem when, during a time not with another person? - There are who believes that the polyamory can only be assumed by people with great confidence in themselves and who enjoy solitude. 6. To what extent do you value the concepts of justice and equity? 7. Low self-esteem is possible by negative experiences of abandonment to what extent influenced by social comparison? 8. Envy what degree do you want things you don't or can't have?

The Limiting Myth: Romantic Love

The last difficulty that we will discuss to live a love in freedom is the cited and generalized ideal of romantic love. The love that everything can and forever. The love that is total or it is not. That love wonderful, perfect, total and absolute. That is to say, non-existent. And that, as is mission impossible, readily converts to the contrary, in hatred, in a dependency relationship to love-hate.

The monogamous romantic love and eternal is an idealization that lasts a moment. Delusional idealization that, when you live, it seems wonderful, how any illusion. It is normal for the *eternal love* lasts a moment or, at most, a few months ago. How Don Quixote, if he recovers reason at some point, will become moribund and fall harder the greater and higher the fantasies.

The average orange. In the romantic love one plus one is one, two people are merged into one. The idea is very nice, but then each operates as a person, are dependent and only a whole person when they are together,

"They love each other at the expense of their own person. In this way, each one is empty and depends on the love of the other; it has a reduced capacity for self-esteem... losing the other, who both depends, would be to lose itself. The 'arithmetic' of this kind of love is strange: one plus one is one if they stay together, but two less one is zero if you become separated" Lou Marinoff (2003, p. 157).

This does not mean that the polyamory or free love are against the "falling in love". Without falling in love there can hardly be complete love. Love is a delivery, is delivered to another person (or other) without requesting a reciprocity equivalent. Even if you ask for some kind of positive response to make it a "love".

Falling in love is a state, a situation. Transient. An exceptional process of madness transitory. When it recovers the reason is that it is about to die. It is the transition from temporary insanity of falling in love, stable. And this process

Supposed to meet real people, not perfect. Hold on to the myths leads to unhappiness. Often, the sense of happiness of everyone is defined in its own myths. If we are dominated by myths, such as the myths are not performed, the happiness never comes (Porta and Musante, 2016)

You may want to two or more people at the same time, but you cannot be in love with two people at the same time (as in the transient state of falling in love we are delivered/abducted a person).

The feelings are contradictory. There are those who considered a repetition of the notion of free love, as it can there be the idea of love without freedom? The same could be said that "there is no freedom without love", if we think of a humanist and spiritual sense of the very existence of the human community (Porta and Musante, 2016). On the contrary, he also wondered Is there someone more like a slave who is in love?

It is considered negative romantic love but you can be in favor of romanticism, as a concept that expresses that a person is romantic because it is "loving". People can defend the polyamorous romanticism, can be considered romantic precisely because they fall in love with ease, and want to express their feelings, are against to suppress his love for others. They are "in love of love".

Throughout history there have been many men, especially of the ruling classes, have had clear that different levels of human relationship the carried out and would enjoy with different women and men. The radical change is to get both the men and women have the same rights to relate to others, in relationships or not, or of other types.

In short, and as a final conclusion, let's say that the goal of generalization is not the polyamory as something desirable for all over the world. Nor does it have to be the positive goal to reach society in the future. The polyamory is one option among others. It is only one of the current forms of *free love* (in its broadest sense open) defended by revolutionary movements since the 19th century. At the same time, free love and open relationships are some of the possible ways to live love in freedom.

Where does polyamory head into the future, we do not know, but what we can imagine. The important thing is love in freedom. In this if we can agree, generalize and act accordingly.

References

- Alberich, T. (2015). [Relaciones familiares en tiempos de cambio: parejas, poliamor y mayores](http://pensamientostalberich2.blogspot.com/2015/09/relaciones-familiares-en-tiempos-de.html?view=flipcard). Retrieved from <http://pensamientostalberich2.blogspot.com/2015/09/relaciones-familiares-en-tiempos-de.html?view=flipcard>
- Alberich, T. (2017). Escenarios post15M: éxito, crisis y descendientes de los movimientos de indignados ¿hacia un nuevo ciclo de movilizaciones? In *IV Jornadas Internacionales de Sociología de la AMS*. Madrid.
- Bauman, Z. (2005). *Amor Líquido. Acerca de la fragilidad de los vínculos humanos*. Buenos Aires, Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Beck, U. y Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2001). *El normal caos del amor: las nuevas formas de relación amorosa*. Barcelona: Paidós Ibérica.
- Carmona, J. (2017). El poliamor no es neoliberalismo. *eldiario.es*. Retrieved from https://www.eldiario.es/tribunaabierta/poliamor-neoliberalismo_6_723787635.html
- Castells, M. (2010). *Comunicación y Poder*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Cerezo, B. (2018). ¿Cómo gestionar los celos? <https://www.indagora.es/es/como-gestionar-los-celos/>.
- CIS, Centro Investigaciones Sociológicas. (2009). *Encuesta Nacional de Salud Sexual*. Estudio 2780, 2008-2009. Retrieved from http://www.cis.es/cis/open/cm/ES/1_encuestas/estudios/ver.jsp?&estudio=9702

- Díaz, S. (2016). El poliamor o cómo romper con el modelo convencional en las relaciones sentimentales. *Cuarto Poder*. Retrieved from <https://www.cuartopoder.es/espana/2016/01/31/2410/2410/>
- Easton, D. y Hardy, J. W. (2013). *Ética promiscua: Una guía práctica para el poliamor, las relaciones abiertas y otras aventuras*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Melusina.
- Elorduy, P. (2018). Mayo del 68. Y la utopía cayó sobre nuestras cabezas. *El Salto*, 13.
- Enciso, G. (2015). *Una travesía de las emociones al afecto en las prácticas del poliamor. O lo que las palabras callaban sobre el cuerpo*. Universitat Autònoma Barcelona. Retrieved from <https://www.tesisenred.net/handle/10803/325694>
- Faus-Bertomeu, A. y Gómez-Redondo, R. (2016). El debut sexual: diferentes ritmos para géneros y generaciones. FES. Retrieved from <http://www.fes-sociologia.com/files/congress/12/papers/3407.pdf>
- Foucault, M. (2005). *Historia de la sexualidad 3. El cuidado de sí*. España: Siglo XXI de España Editores.
- Guerra, L. (2011). El amor libre: un problema político en el pensamiento de Alejandra Kollontai. In *VIII Jornadas de Investigación en Filosofía*. Citado por Porta Fernández, P. y Musante, F. (2016).
- INE, INEbase. (2016). Edad Media al Primer Matrimonio. Retrieved from <http://www.ine.es/jaxiT3/Datos.htm?t=1380>
- Marinoff, L. (2003). *Pregúntale a Platón. Cómo la filosofía puede cambiar tu vida*. Barcelona: Ediciones B.
- Martin, R. (2015). Anarquía relacional i consentiment. *A Medium*, [Relationship anarchy and consent](https://amorsplurals.cat/2016/08/29/anarquia-relacional-i-consentiment/), 28 d'octubre de 2015.
- Melzer, C. (2013). 60 años desde el informe que revolucionó la sexualidad". DPA. Emol.com. Retrieved from <http://www.emol.com/noticias/Tendencias/2013/09/13/739354/60-anos-desde-el-informe-que-revoluciono-la-sexualidad.html>
- Mihalko, R. (2008). Los celos: el pulpo de los ocho brazos. Consulta de 2016. Traducción propia. Retrieved from <https://amorsplurals.cat/2016/02/11/com-afrontar-els-8-bracos-del-pop-de-la-gelosia-part-i/>
- Martínez García, J. (2017 diciembre 28). Poliamor: ¿amor libre o neoliberal? *eldiario.es*. Retrieved from https://www.eldiario.es/zonacritica/Poliamor-amor-libre-neoliberal_6_723087694.html
- Martínez Torío, A. (2017). El poliamor a debate. *Revista Catalana de Dret Privat*, 17, 75-104.
- Pérez Navarro, P. (2017 enero). Poliamor y derechos. La ley de la monogamia. *Viento Sur*. Retrieved from <http://vientosur.info/spip.php?article12128>
- Poliamor Madrid. (2018). Poliamos Madrid. Retrieved from <https://poliamormadrid.org/>
- Porta Fernández, P. y Musante, F. (2016). Amor libre: ¿práctica revolucionaria o reproducción capitalista? Apuntes sobre experiencias y representaciones. In *IX*

Jornadas de Sociología de la UNLP, Ensenada, Argentina Retrieved from http://www.memoria.fahce.unlp.edu.ar/trab_eventos/ev.9141/ev.9141.pdf

Roldán Méndez, J. (2018, febrero 23). El poliamor a debate. In *Conferencia A.C. La Barraca* (Collado Villalba) (no publicada).

Saavedra, C. (2006). El Informe Kinsey. Colegio Universitario Cardenal Cisneros. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/28109731_El_Informe_Kinsey

Thalmann, Y. (2008). *Las virtudes del poliamor. La magia de los amores múltiples*. Barcelona: Plataforma Editorial.

Date Received: 28/03/2019

Date Review: 26/04/2019

Date Accepted: 28/06/2019