

ROUTLEDGE REVIVALS

**The Making of
Masculinities**
The New Men's Studies

Edited by
Harry Brod



Routledge Revivals

The Making of Masculinities

This book, first published in 1987, is both simple in conception and ambitious in intention. It aims at legitimating the relatively new interdisciplinary field of men's studies as one of the most significant and challenging intellectual and curricular developments in academia. The fourteen essays included here are drawn from such diverse disciplines as men's studies, philosophy, psychology, sociology, history, anthropology, Black studies, biology, English literature, and gay studies.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

The Making of Masculinities

The New Men's Studies

Edited by
Harry Brod



Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

First published in 1987
by Allen & Unwin, Inc

This edition first published in 2015 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN
and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 1987 Allen & Unwin, Inc

The right of Harry Brod to be identified as editor of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Publisher's Note

The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original copies may be apparent.

Disclaimer

The publisher has made every effort to trace copyright holders and welcomes correspondence from those they have been unable to contact.

A Library of Congress record exists under LC control number: 86028796

ISBN 13: 978-1-138-82829-2 (hbk)

ISBN 13: 978-1-315-73850-5 (ebk)

ISBN 13: 978-1-138-82833-9 (pbk)

THE MAKING OF MASCULINITIES

The New Men's Studies

Edited by
HARRY BROD

Boston
ALLEN & UNWIN
London Sydney Wellington

Copyright © 1987 by Allen & Unwin, Inc.
All rights reserved.

Allen & Unwin, Inc.
8 Winchester Place, Winchester, MA 01890, USA

The U.S. Company of
Unwin Hyman, Ltd

P.O. Box 18, Park Lane, Hemel Hempstead, Herts HP2 4TE, UK
40 Museum Street, London WC1A 1LU, UK
37/39 Queen Elizabeth Street, London SE1 2QB, UK

Allen & Unwin Australia Pty Ltd
8 Napier Street, North Sydney, NSW 2060, Australia

Allen & Unwin (New Zealand) Ltd, in association with
Port Nicholson Press Ltd
Private Bag, Wellington, New Zealand

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Making of masculinities.

Includes bibliographies and index.

1. Mens studies. 2. Men. 3. Masculinity (Psychology)
4. Sex role. I. Brod, Harry, 1951-
HQ1088.M35 1986 305.5'1 86-28796
ISBN 0-04-497035-8 (alk. paper)
ISBN 0-04-497036-6 (pbk. : alk. paper)

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

The Making of masculinities: the new men's
studies.

1. Men 2. Masculinity (Psychology)

I. Brod, Harry

305.3'1 HQ1067

ISBN 0-04-497035-8

ISBN 0-04-497036-6 Pbk

*In remembrance of the past,
appreciation of the present,
and anticipation of the future,
this book is dedicated to
Srulek Brod and Lieselotte Schüfftan,
my parents before they were my parents,
to Maria Papacostaki, with love and thanks,
and to our children, Artemis Leah and Alexandros Zev,
when they shall no longer be children.*



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Contents

Foreword	xi
CATHARINE R. STIMPSON	
Acknowledgments	xv
Introduction: Themes and Theses of Men's Studies	1
HARRY BROD	
I	
OVERVIEWS	19
1. The Theory of Male Sex-Role Identity: Its Rise and Fall, 1936 to the Present	21
JOSEPH H. PLECK	
2. The Case for Men's Studies	39
HARRY BROD	
3. Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity	63
TIM CARRIGAN, BOB CONNELL, AND JOHN LEE	
II	
HISTORY AND DANGER	101
	vii

4. The Secrets of Men's History	103
PETER FILENE	
5. The Contemporary "Crisis" of Masculinity in Historical Perspective	121
MICHAEL S. KIMMEL	
6. Surviving the Institutional Decimation of Black Males: Causes, Consequences, and Intervention	155
CLYDE W. FRANKLIN II	
III	
WORK AND PLAY	171
7. The Male Career Code and the Ideology of Role	173
RICHARD L. OCHBERG	
8. The Meaning of Success: The Athletic Experience and the Development of Male Identity	193
MICHAEL MESSNER	
IV	
SOCIAL AND BIOLOGICAL BONDING	211
9. The Bonds of Men: Problems and Possibilities in Close Male Relationships	213
DRURY SHERROD	
10. Gilgamesh and the Sundance Kid: The Myth of Male Friendship	241
DOROTHY HAMMOND AND ALTA JABLOW	
11. Biologic Influences on Masculinity	259
PERRY TREADWELL	
V	
LITERARY PASSIONS	287
12. Rereading American Literature from a Men's Studies Perspective: Some Implications	289
JAMES D. RIEMER	

Contents	ix
13. Howells, Stoddard, and Male Homosocial Attachment in Victorian America JOHN W. CROWLEY	301
14. Byron and Male Love: The Classical Tradition LOUIS CROMPTON	325
About the Contributors	333
Index	337



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Foreword

“Man”: the word seems as easy to define as “dog” or “stick.” Everyone can conjure up a picture of a man. He is an adult, human male. Everyone knows at least one man—at home, school, work, or in the mirror. However, we often do not know what we think we do. This is one of the lessons of the detective stories in which neighbors in a sleepy village suddenly discover a corpse in the church yard and a murderer next door. “Man” is complicated.

Signs of this complexity are pervasive. Look, to take only one example, at a standard reference work, *The Penguin Dictionary of Quotations*. Though it has no entries for “masculinity,” it has 18 entries for “mankind,” over 175 for “men,” and nearly 200 for “man.” The first of these is a ballad about a banished man who goes into the green-wood alone. The last is the famous, even notorious, paternal injunction from Kipling’s *Gunga Din*:

*If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds’ worth of distance run,
Yours is the Earth and everything that’s in it,
And—which is more—you’ll be a Man, my son!*

In part, the word “man” is perplexing because each historical period, every society, and each group within a society interprets the raw materials of existence in its own way. Its interpretative practices help to distinguish a period, a society, a group. A turkey for contemporary Boston is not the same bird as it was for the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The more anthropologists, sociologists, and historians explore the meanings of being “a man,” the more inconsistent, contradictory, and varied they become. A Harvard graduate in contemporary Cambridge is not the same “man” as he would

have been in a seventeenth-century American colony. Today, a Harvard graduate might even be a woman.

In part, the word “man” is manifold because of the work of a new intellectual enterprise, “men’s studies,” a complement to women’s studies. Taking shape in the 1960s, women’s studies is now a rich body of theory, ideas, and facts. Women’s studies argues that our narratives about “mankind” are exactly that, narratives about a kind of man. Deliberately or carelessly, they have excluded women. When we think about women, we realize that their experiences tend to be different, not only from each other, but from those of men. Odysseus has his story, Penelope hers. What, women’s studies asks, would Penelope say, about herself, about Odysseus, about ship-building, about Ithaca, if she were to speak by herself? For herself? Of herself? Yet, women’s studies goes on. Even if the stories of Odysseus and Penelope do flow through separate channels, they are a part of the same network of social relations, the same social landscape. That terrain has taught Odysseus how to be “manly,” Penelope how to be “womanly.”

As women’s studies brought women into history, men’s studies began to ask how men had experienced history *as men*, as carriers of masculinity. To be “masculine” is to have a particular psychological identity, social role, cultural script, place in the labor force, and sense of the sacred. In secular, modern industrial cultures, “real men” should define themselves in at least three ways. First, they earn money in the public labor force and support their families through that effort. Next, they have formal power over women and the children in those families. Being a man means being stronger than women and children. Finally, they are heterosexual. They sleep with the women whom they dominate and bully the homosexuals whose desires openly surge elsewhere.

Postindustrial cultures undercut such a definition of masculinity. They are heedlessly destructive of the industrial jobs that men have traditionally filled; heedlessly generative of the lower-paying service jobs that women frequently occupy. Less problematically, postindustrial cultures also tend to accept the values of egalitarianism within the family and sexual variety. One of the current tensions in the United States is between those who are fighting to retain the older pattern of masculinity and those who are struggling to permit newer forms to emerge.

Like women’s studies, men’s studies assumes that “masculinity” and “femininity” are the products, not of God, not of nature, but of historical processes. To be sure, both women’s studies and men’s studies have some practitioners who believe that nature demands that males become masculine; females feminine. For them, the wiring of the brain and the plugging away of the hormones, especially those old warhorses “testosterone” and

“estrogen,” carry out nature’s orders. However, most scholars in men’s studies have concluded that gender, our sense of being masculine or feminine, is as much a human construct as the pyramids or pewter. Like all human constructs, gender systems can change.

Believing in the possibilities of change, men’s studies wants the future to be more generous than the present. Explicitly or implicitly, men’s studies asks the future to embody certain values. One is that of fatherhood, in which men will nurture both sons and daughters with tender wisdom. Another is that of friendship, in which men will seek affectionate bonds with both other men and women. Still another is that of flexibility. Boys will grow up to be men, but no boy will think that being a man demands marching in lockstep with other men while women cheer them on from the sidelines.

The Making of Masculinities: The New Men’s Studies: its dogged, imaginative scholarship, sticking to its task, is rewriting that deceptively simple word, “man.”

CATHARINE R. STIMPSON



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Acknowledgments

I could not have formed the conception of men's studies this book embodies without the support of two particular groups of friends and colleagues. I would first like to thank my colleagues on the faculty of the Program for the Study of Women and Men in Society at the University of Southern California for ongoing intelligent, critical, and committed dialogue regarding the issues raised in this volume. In the chronological order in which I came to have the privilege of working with them, they are: Gloria Orenstein, Joelle Juillard, Judith Stiehm, Mark Kann, Lois Banner, Carol Jacklin, Walter Williams, and Helen Horowitz. I also had the great fortune to feel I had a support community spread out over the nation in the persons of the men and women of the National Organization for Changing Men (NOCM). I am particularly appreciative of the work of NOCM's Men's Studies Task Group, in which Joseph Pleck, Sam Femiano, Martin Acker, James Doyle, and Shepherd Bliss have played particularly important roles in creating and nurturing a community of scholars and activists that continues to nourish and challenge me. I have felt a special kinship in the men's movement with Tom Mosmiller, with whom I share a sense of the rightness of certain things.

Maria Papacostaki remains the first and foremost reader of all my writing. As the person who knows me best, she has on numerous occasions saved me from speaking against myself. She and our children, Artemis and Alexandros, have also immeasurably increased my understanding of men's issues related to fathering.

The contributors to this volume deserve special thanks. They committed themselves to this project before I could guarantee any rewards. The Introduction to the volume has been improved by comments several of

them made, and the brief introductions that precede each section are in most cases simply compiled and edited by me from abstracts written by the authors themselves.

The entire manuscript has benefited from comments by James Doyle, Martin Acker, and anonymous reviewers. The enthusiasm and support for the book shown by Lisa Freeman-Miller, my editor at Allen & Unwin, have also contributed greatly to what success I hope this volume may have, and certainly to my peace of mind in assembling it.

Introduction: Themes and Theses of Men's Studies

Harry Brod

DELINEATING THE FIELD

In the call for papers that led to this anthology, I described it as one “designed to analyze the depths of and exemplify the best of the deconstruction and reconstruction of masculinity emerging from the new men's studies.” This purpose has been achieved. The essays in this volume can legitimately claim to demonstrate the state of the art in men's studies. They are wide ranging in scope and finely nuanced in detail. They appropriate useful insights and methodologies from existing literature, as well as initiate innovative directions. Using the essays collected here as exemplars, in this introductory essay I articulate some of the principal characteristic themes and findings in men's studies. I do not summarize each article individually; instead, I highlight salient connections among them. Men's studies is a recent and, by comparison with more established fields, still relatively small addition to the academy. Nonetheless, it is a growing field, and it has matured sufficiently to allow for some evaluation.

Throughout the essays in this collection is a shared sense of the project of men's studies, a sense that men have been seen “through a glass darkly,” a sense that there is a need for men to be re-cognized in some fundamental way. James Riemer, in “Rereading American Literature from a Men's Studies Perspective: Some Implications,” writes: “To borrow a term from feminist criticism, the aim of a men's studies approach to American literature is re-vision: a revision of the way we read literature and a revision of the way we perceive men and manly ideals.” Peter Filene, in “The Secrets of Men's History,” writes that the distinctiveness of men's history “has to do with *how* more than with *what*,” and speaks of early men's historians as

“(literally) reconnaissance men.” One finds, throughout, a sensibility that combines two strains of thought: an acceptance of the obvious fact that most scholarship, in the conventional sense, has been about men, and the contention that such scholarship, in perhaps a more significant sense, has not really been about men at all. In my attempt to make “The Case for Men’s Studies,” I offer the following formulation:

While *seemingly* about men, traditional scholarship’s treatment of generic man as the human norm in fact systematically excludes from consideration what is unique to men *qua* men. The overgeneralization from male to generic human experience not only distorts our understanding of what, if anything, is truly generic to humanity but also precludes the study of masculinity as a *specific male* experience, rather than a universal paradigm for *human* experience. The most general definition of men’s studies is that it is the study of masculinities and male experiences as specific and varying social–historical–cultural formations. Such studies situate masculinities as objects of study on a par with femininities, instead of elevating them to universal norms.

Men’s studies questions assumptions that have passed beyond the horizons of usual scholarly inquiry to bring them back under critical purview. These assumptions about masculinity are so widely shared that they cease to appear as assumptions. Much of Joseph Pleck’s “The Theory of Male Sex-Role Identity,” for example, traces the historical processes by which the seemingly simple idea (but, as Pleck demonstrates, actually a complex conglomeration of distinct ideas) that a sense of masculinity is a positive desideratum of male personal identity entered into and came to dominate professional and popular discourse, thereby obscuring fundamental difficulties with this view and hiding its pernicious effects.

PROBLEMATICS OF SEX ROLES

Men’s studies scholars repeatedly face a problem in explaining their task. Many people find readily understandable and intuitively congenial the accurate claim that the necessity for women’s studies lies, in large part, in the need to rectify the injustices done to women in having been “written out of history” and systematically ignored by traditional scholarship. Women’s lives have been so privatized that they have been pushed outside the range of public discourse, outside the mainstream—some feminists call it the “male-stream”—tradition. Men’s studies has no such immediately appealing claim to make, since men have clearly been the subjects of scholarship. Yet, men’s studies has a task corollary to that of women’s studies. The nineteenth-century German philosopher Hegel wrote that what is familiar (*bekannt*) was often not really known (*erkannt*) precisely

because it was so seemingly familiar. One is reminded of Edgar Allan Poe's "The Purloined Letter," in which a particularly clever thief realizes that the best way to hide something is to keep it in plain view. Paradoxical as it may seem, some of the essays in this collection argue that men's public lives in an important sense represent a retreat and escape from their personal lives, a shrinkage rather than an enlargement of their spheres. More significantly, at least in terms of the potential influence of men's studies in the academy, they argue that the concepts and methodologies of traditional scholarship have perpetuated these misunderstandings of masculinity precisely because they share the same male biases. Filene argues that, in their criteria of significance, "the histories that men have written about themselves, then, contain the same bias as the histories they have written about one another." Public events and achievements, not personal feelings and experiences, are what count. Riemer cites criticism of Ernest Hemingway as an example of how a fundamental acceptance of patriarchal values can influence the interpretation of a text in which ideals of manhood are a central concern.

In much the same vein, Richard Ochberg, in "The Male Career Code and the Ideology of Role," demonstrates how the concept of sex roles, a core concept that "might serve as a shorthand description" of both women's and men's studies, can aid in denying the subjectivity of the experience ostensibly under study, a denial crucial to the pretensions to objectivity of the male construction of experience. Ochberg writes: "Men may attempt to escape their private troubles by migrating—like souls fleeing diseased bodies—from their private lives into public ones." He argues that in viewing and experiencing themselves as acting in a role, men lose the ability to experience *themselves* outside the role. He cautions: "Men's studies, which takes as part of its disciplinary mandate the critique of cultural forms that deprecate male subjectivity, should be careful not to find itself passively acquiescing in this deprecation by an uncritical acceptance of pure role theory."

Ochberg's point illustrates the finely nuanced character of many of the analyses presented here, and the enormous debt men's studies owes to the women's studies scholarship of the past two decades. While acknowledging the importance and centrality of sex roles, a concept introduced by Talcott Parsons and developed by women's studies, several essays take up criticisms of sex-role frameworks, criticisms also developed by women's studies scholars. Thus, in addition to Ochberg's criticism, we find Michael Kimmel, in "The Contemporary 'Crisis' of Masculinity in Historical Perspective," arguing that simplistic formulations of sex roles "posit masculinity as a fixed and definable set of behavioral norms, a static and universal box into which all men must fit." He writes:

Not only does the male sex-role paradigm ignore historical and cross-cultural dimensions to the social construction of masculinity, but it ignores how much of masculinity is a product of the interaction between men and women, that is, how much of the normative behaviors of both women and men has more to do with gender relations than either does with a fixed and isolated role to which individuals are socialized to adopt. Further, the focus on sex roles minimizes our analytic ability to specify the ways in which relations between men and women are derived from the power men as a group maintain over women as a group.¹

Kimmel's "interactionist" perspective, in which men and women "negotiate" changes in gender relations, emerges from recent trends in women's and men's studies toward deeper examinations of the social processes of engenderment, whereby gender dichotomies are first created, instead of simply assuming gender differentiation and then proceeding to analyze its ramifications on each gender in isolation. Such trends are historically situated and analyzed in my essay, which in this regard complements Pleck's historical account of the development of the theory of male sex role identity. Kimmel's essay attempts to rectify the deficiencies he perceives in the sex-role paradigm by comparative analysis of three periods during which a "crisis of masculinity" was discerned by contemporaries: England in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the present. Significant parallels emerge in "transformations in the social organization of work, the structure of social mobility, and changes in family and gender relations . . . in which the meaning of masculinity is itself brought into question." Significant parallels also emerge in male reactions to these changes, which Kimmel analyzes as falling into three categories: antifeminist backlash, promale backlash, and profeminist men. The most strident criticisms of the sex-role model are in Tim Carrigan, Bob Connell, and John Lee's "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity." They speak not of inadequacies or misdirections in the sex role model but of the "theoretical incoherence built into the 'sex role' paradigm," flatly stating that "the 'male sex role' does not exist." They criticize the ahistorical, conservative functionalism of sex-role theory and remind the reader that "we do not speak of 'race roles' or 'class roles' because the exercise of power in these areas of social relations is more immediately evident."

1. An extended version of Kimmel's argument may be found in his Introduction to the special issue he edited on Researching Male Roles, *American Behavioral Scientist* 29, no. 5 (May/June 1986): 517–529. For a similar criticism of the sex-role paradigm, see Liz Stanley and Sue Wise, *Breaking Out: Feminist Consciousness and Feminist Research* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983), pp 97–105.

Michael Messner's "The Meaning of Success: The Athletic Experience and the Development of Male Identity" also stresses the historical nature of questions about masculinity in its exploration of the rise and role of organized sports. Moreover, Messner attempts to answer a question he argues is not raised by a simplistic or mechanistic employment of socialization theory. The perspectives he criticizes consider solely the effects of sports on men, with some praising sports for their alleged character-building function and others condemning sports for their alleged character-debilitating function. Missing from such analyses, argues Messner, is the logically prior question: What is it about masculine identity that first attracts young males to sports? His answer meshes well with the analysis of male friendships given by Drury Sherrod in "The Bonds of Men: Problems and Possibilities in Close Male Relationships," as well as with Ochberg's analysis of the male career code. They point to a male need to construct relationships of intimacy and friendship bounded and defined by articulated rules. Examples would be what Ochberg refers to as the need to achieve a "detached collegiality" in relationships with coworkers in hierarchical settings, and what Messner refers to as the need to establish "work-related (or sports-related) positional identity" before "exploring close friendships and intimate relationships."

In their work, one sees emerging an important men's studies methodological strain that incorporates into studies of men critical examinations of the nascent gender identities with which men come to many traditional socializing institutions. This creates more dynamic, multidimensional frameworks for understanding the relationships between men's selves and men's roles than exists in much gender scholarship.

BEYOND ONE-DIMENSIONALITY

One finds repeated calls throughout this volume not simply to substitute one reductionist understanding of masculinity for another, as when Filene writes that the investigation of the personal dimensions (i.e., the "secrets") of men's lives is not a matter of "digging up skeletons in heroes' closets. . . . The point is not the secret but the interplay between the secret and the rest of his behavior and attitudes"; or when Riemer argues that the men's studies rereading of American literature he proposes does not commit one to the flaw of "reducing literature to sociological resource." One also finds a determination to listen to the voices of men themselves, whether they be friends (Sherrod), businessmen (Ochberg), or

athletes (Messner), to capture the “ephemeral side” (Sherrod), “subjectivity” (Ochberg), and “personal–existential level” (Messner) of masculinity. In inverse fashion to the struggle in women’s studies to establish the *objectivity* of women’s experiences and thereby validate the legitimacy of women’s experiences *as women*, much of men’s studies struggles to establish the *subjectivity* of men’s experiences and thereby validate the legitimacy of men’s experiences *as men*.

This difference follows logically from the differential and complementary effects of the public–private dichotomy on women and men. The commitment to take as one’s point of departure and legitimize men’s experiences as men leads in some cases to a critique of the use of female norms to categorize male experience, a critique analogous to the women’s studies critique of the generic use of male norms. For example, Sherrod questions the equation of intimacy and verbal self-revelation, arguing that although on this measure of intimacy men are judged to have less intimate relationships than women, this judgment may result from an inappropriate imposition of female norms on males. On this line of argument, perhaps men are not quantitatively less intimate but qualitatively differently intimate, in nonverbal ways.² Perhaps male intimacy is not face-to-face intimacy, but occurs side by side, as when engaged in some joint activity, or even back to back, as when backing each other up.³ Such a contention has mixed implications. Its validating attitude toward men’s experiences in their own terms may well be more effective in encouraging men to develop their own styles of intimacy than simply berating them for failing to meet female norms. But if one extends the idea to the point where it posits the existence of incommensurable modes of intimacy by gender, it suggests a kind of separatism that augurs poorly for the possibility of cross-gender intimacy. In other cases, the commitment to reexamine male experiences may lead to a call for greater attention to informally structured relationships, such as Dorothy Hammond and Alta Jablow’s examination of “Gilgamesh and the Sundance Kid: The Myth of Male Friendship.” Their argument suggests that in its inattention to the study of male friendships in our society, the tradition of male anthropology incorporates and is limited by the same male needs for clearly bounded relationships addressed by others in this volume.

2. In *Intimate Strangers: Men and Women Together* (New York: Harper & Row, 1984), Lillian Rubin differentiates intimacy from male bonding largely by this criterion. The explicit argument that intimacy requires self-disclosure is one of the virtues of her treatment; often this is simply assumed.

3. The imagery is from Shepherd Bliss, “Men Are Such Interesting Creatures,” *Twin Cities Men’s Center News* (Minneapolis) 10, no. 4 (August and September 1986): 13–15.

In the name of achieving a different kind of multidimensional understanding of masculinity, Perry Treadwell characterizes his “Biologic Influences on Masculinity” as “a plea that the biosociology of gender be an integral part of men’s studies,” in full awareness that many, if not most, scholars working in the area of gender might see such a plea as an argument for biological determinism, a position with which he takes care to say he does not align himself.

DIVERSITIES OF MEN’S LIVES

One of the criticisms of the early stage of men’s studies voiced in my and others’ articles in this volume is that, all too often, scholars have tended to write too simplistically of *the* male sex role, rather than the multiplicity of male roles. Steps in the right direction on this issue are taken by several contributors to this volume. Clyde Franklin’s “Surviving the Institutional Decimation of Black Males” looks at conflicting role pressures exerted on black men by multiple levels of the societies in which they live—their immediate male peer group, the wider subculture of the black community as a whole, and the larger white society—and concludes that the conflicts engendered in black men by competing prescriptions for masculinity issued by these groups are devastating and tragic. Pleck notes the misapplication of theories of masculinity from the dominant culture to shift the blame for the black community’s problems from white racism to “black men’s frustrated masculinity,” a theory that played an important role in the social policy formulated in the so-called Moynihan Report. Riemer studies “notions of manhood and masculinity that exist among southern rural blacks” in works by Ernest Gaines. But blacks are clearly not the only subgroup requiring greater attention. Filene notes the emergence of regional and generational studies in men’s history, as well as studies focused on differences relating to homosexuality and class. Riemer argues:

Through studies of works such as Henry Roth’s *Call It Sleep* and Pietro DiDonato’s *Christ in Concrete*, we could gain insight into how masculine roles and ideals from various ethnic backgrounds and the ability to achieve a sense of masculine identity were affected by the immigrant experience.⁴

4. The work of revisionist women historians on immigration will doubtless influence and refine our understanding of male immigrant experiences. See, for example, Elizabeth Ewen, *Immigrant Women in the Land of Dollars: Life and Culture on the Lower East Side, 1890–1925* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1985).

Sensitivity to diversity and an understanding of the interplay between dominant and marginalized modes of masculinity are well integrated in Louis Crompton's "Byron and Male Love: The Classical Tradition" and John Crowley's "Howells, Stoddard, and Male Homosocial Attachment in Victorian America." Crowley notes the historical genesis of the concept of homosexuality as a distinct type, as well as the existence of distinct homosexual-homosocial "styles," which vary by class and nationality. Crompton's analysis of divergent Greek and Latin classical models of male love and the effects of homophobia on Byron's life and work dispels myths of monolithic homosexual norms. Crowley invokes the concept of homosociality explored by Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick to analyze "the entire spectrum of same-sex bonds . . . reserving 'homosexual' for those parts of the homosocial spectrum that seem most marked by genital sexuality," while also acknowledging that the boundaries between homosociality and homosexuality are sometimes blurred.⁵ Much of the analytic originality and strength of Crowley's essay lies in his demonstration of how these boundaries are blurred in a case of literary fatherhood whereby male authority figures confer "something like the apostolic succession" on one another. Crowley argues that the family, usually conceived of as the locus par excellence of intimacy, has also served as a retreat and defense against a threatening kind of male homosociality. The contemporary analogue is visible in heterosexual men's use of the pictures of their children they carry in their wallets to project a secure identity.

THE POLITICS OF MEN'S STUDIES

Crowley's discussion of "the generation of male authority in a patriarchal culture" exemplifies a perspective I attempt to establish in my essay. I argue that a feminist men's studies perspective must go beyond simply demonstrating, for example, "how male role constraints on emotional display inhibit and repress men" to show "how male emotional restraint also confers power on men, in large part by effectively withholding information about oneself." The point is also implicit in the critiques of the male sex-role paradigm discussed earlier. In its explorations of the debilitating effects of various codes of masculinity on men's lives, men's studies must take care not to ignore or obscure the questions of power raised by feminism. Instead, men's studies, at least in its exemplary mode, demon-

5. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).

strates the connections between the pursuit of patriarchal power and various sorts of male self-denials.⁶

The question of the relationship between women's and men's studies, or, more generally, the question of the relationship between feminism and the critique of masculinity, is taken up most explicitly in my essay, but figures in others as well. Pleck credits feminism for certain advances in men's studies because it "challenged the traditional patterns of sex roles for which the theory of male identity provided ideological justification." My essay attempts to articulate and justify the component parts of men's studies' pro-feminist standpoint. The authors here seem to assume that their analyses are complementary rather than contradictory to essential tenets of feminist scholarship. The articles are critical of masculinity and at the same time sympathetic to men. One is reminded of Marx's characterization of his standpoint as one that, even as it condemns capitalists, "can less than any other make the individual responsible for relations whose creature he socially remains."⁷

Disagreements about other aspects of the politics of men's studies emerge in these pages. While my essay stresses the connections between men's studies and the men's movement, Filene writes that the results of men's political activism "hardly measured up to announcements of 'our own birth as a movement.' A network is closer to the truth." Carrigan, Connell, and Lee register their agreement with this verdict.⁸ Elsewhere, in what is more an issue of focus than disagreement, the difference between a sociological and a psychological orientation emerges in tracing the history of conceptualizations of masculinity in the 1950s, as Carrigan *et al.* emphasize the problem of social deviance, notably "juvenile delinquency and

6. For a skeptical analysis of men's studies' ability to retain this perspective, see Mark Kann, "The Costs of Being on Top," in a special issue on men's studies, *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors* 49, no. 4 (Summer 1986).

7. Karl Marx, Preface to the first German edition of *Capital*, in Robert C. Tucker, ed., *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2d ed. (New York: Norton, 1972), p. 297.

8. Though it can be inferred from the sections included here, the point is made most clearly in a section of the essay omitted from this volume. I would also argue that while the assertion that the men's movement ignored gay liberation arguments is correct when applied to "men's rights" groups, this cannot be said of the feminist men's movement. Robert Brannon has argued that the men's rights and feminist men's groups should not be conceptualized as different right and left wings of the same movement, but as opposing movements. See "Are the 'Free Men' a Faction of Our Movement?" *M.: Gentle Men for Gender Justice* 7 (Winter 1981–1982). The most recent comprehensive overview of the men's movement is in Anthony Astrachan's *How Men Feel: Their Responses to Women's Demands for Equality and Power* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor, 1986). A good earlier, but by now somewhat dated, account is Joe Interrante's "Dancing Along the Precipice: The Men's Movement in the 80's," *Radical America* 15, no. 5 (September–October 1981): 53–71.

educational underachievement,” while Pleck emphasizes the problems of postwar mainstream breadwinners as the underlying social motivations for scholarly research. Other disagreements in these pages perhaps center principally on the extent to which masculinity may be said to be socially constructed. Crowley and Treadwell would seem to be at odds over the social or biological construction of homosexuality. Although they take pains to show the malleability of men’s behavior as a function of cultural experience, many scholars and activists (myself among them) would be suspicious of Treadwell’s and Sherrod’s seeming flirtations with biological explanations of various aspects of masculinity, however qualified they are. Finally, several essays seem to invoke the sex-role paradigm criticized by others.

A MEN’S STUDIES CANON?

To speak of a men’s studies canon is premature. The field is still too new for such grandiose claims. Yet the collection of these essays in one volume makes clearly visible for the first time the initial components of what such a canon might look like.

The emergence of certain figures at the core of men’s studies was predictable. Two of the authors included here, Joseph Pleck and Peter Filene, have already emerged as key figures in the field. Pleck’s *The Myth of Masculinity* and the anthology he coedited with Elizabeth Pleck, *The American Man*, are repeatedly cited as having made definitive contributions to establishing the parameters of men’s studies. Filene’s *Him/Her/Self: Sex Roles in Modern America* has also established itself as a fundamental work, sometimes being cited in these pages in conjunction with another survey of American history, Joe L. Dubbert’s *A Man’s Place: Masculinity in Transition*. Several authors rely on Daniel Levinson’s *The Seasons of a Man’s Life*. Also somewhat predictably, what emerges from an examination of this volume is that the women feminist theorists who seem to have influenced most significantly the direction of men’s studies are Nancy Chodorow, Dorothy Dinnerstein, Barbara Ehrenreich, and Carol Gilligan.

What is more unexpected is the emergence of specific literary works as in some sense representative of contemporary dilemmas of masculinity. There has been no single book as influential in establishing a common frame of reference for men’s studies literary criticism as was Kate Millett’s *Sexual Politics* in the early stages of women’s studies. Yet more than one of the authors here turns to John Updike’s novel *Rabbit Run* and Sam Shepard’s play *True West* for insights on masculinity. In addition, Kimmel

writes: "Nowhere is the male antifeminist backlash [in the late-nineteenth-century United States] better expressed than in Henry James's novel *The Bostonians*," and I cite Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman* as "still the most eloquently profound single statement of mainstream contemporary American male dilemmas."

A consensus is emerging that, in American history, the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are particularly significant. In much the same way that a revision of our understanding of the Renaissance has become one of the paradigmatic examples of the fundamental historical reconceptualizations necessitated by new women's studies scholarship (influenced in large part by Joan Kelly-Gadol's classic essay, "Did Women Have a Renaissance?"), it appears that men's history's examination of this period may become paradigmatic of the necessity to incorporate men's studies perspectives into historical scholarship.⁹ Filene and Dubbert highlight this period in their books, it is one of the periods examined by Kimmel, and other essays in this volume also describe as pivotal such phenomena in this period as the rise of Teddy Roosevelt, organized sports, and organizations such as the Boy Scouts. There remain other areas where common references have yet to emerge. For example, Messner, Filene, and Treadwell all cite literature on sports and masculinity, yet even in the rare case where more than one author cites the same work, it is in a different context, as when the references are to different articles in Donald Sabo and Ross Runfola's anthology *Jock: Sports and Male Identity*.

What may well be the beginning of a trend to claim certain texts as precursors of men's studies is also discernible and of significance in these pages. In this regard, William Whyte's *Organization Man* and C. Wright Mills's *White Collar* are particularly noteworthy.¹⁰ Words written by Herbert Marcuse in 1964, not about men's studies but about analyses of advanced industrial civilizations, seem remarkably apropos and prescient if applied to men's studies:

I should like to emphasize the vital importance of the work of C. Wright Mills, and of studies which are frequently frowned upon because of simplification, overstatement, or journalistic ease — Vance Packard's *The Hidden Persuaders*, *The Status Seekers*, and *The Waste Makers*, William H. Whyte's *The Organization Man*, Fred J. Cook's *The Warfare State* belong in this category. To be sure, the lack of theoretical analysis in

9. Joan Kelly-Gadol, "Did Women Have a Renaissance?" in *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*, ed. Renate Bridenthal and Claudia Koonz (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977).

10. I criticize the omission of these books in my review of Eugene R. August's *Men's Studies: A Selected and Annotated Interdisciplinary Bibliography* (Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1985), in *Changing Men: Issues in Gender, Sex, and Politics* 16 (Summer 1986).

these works leaves the roots of the described conditions covered and protected, but left to speak for themselves, the conditions speak loudly enough. Perhaps the most telling evidence can be obtained by simply looking at television or listening to the AM radio for one consecutive hour for a couple of days, not shutting off the commercials, and now and then switching the station.¹¹

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In the concluding section of this introduction to men's studies, I am both descriptive and prescriptive. I also broaden my focus from the essays in this collection to the field as a whole. Without claiming to predict the future, I attempt to extrapolate new directions for men's studies from currently emerging trends, as well as argue for the need to forge new paths. I also take the opportunity to voice some criticisms of certain trends in men's studies.

The title of this volume was chosen to highlight the need for greater attention to two areas. The pluralized "Masculinities" is intended to call attention to the need for men's studies to move beyond race and class biases. Franklin's essay is the only sustained analysis of men of color in this collection, despite references to Third World men in several essays, and even Franklin deals only with black men. This deficiency reflects the general lack of such work in the field, which must move beyond its parochialism.¹² The privileging of U.S. white middle-class men's concerns, from which overgeneralizations are sometimes made, makes it impossible for men's studies to gain the needed critical distance on "hegemonic masculinity." This is Carrigan, Connell, and Lee's term for the institutionalized codes that embody these concerns, govern and restrict all men's lives, and give some men power over others.

The title phrase "The Making of" alludes to E. P. Thompson's seminal *The Making of the English Working Class*, and highlights my belief that we need more social constructionist accounts of masculinities.¹³ Many of the early writers on men, especially those who wrote for the popular press, tended to describe men as passive victims of impersonal socializing forces,

11. Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964), xvii.

12. Two collections partially filling the gap are Doris Y. Wilkinson and Ronald L. Taylor, eds., *The Black Male in America* (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1977); and Lawrence E. Gary, ed., *Black Men* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1981).

13. E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York: Random House, 1966). The same strategy of invocation by titular allusion is evident in Kenneth Plummer's *The Making of the Modern Homosexual* (Stroudsburg, Penn.: Hutchinson, 1981).

often in defensive reaction against overly voluntarist interpretations they found in some feminist writings. The male victimization thesis seemed to provide an escape from blaming men for the evils feminists identified. But with the denial of blameworthiness often went the denial of responsibility. Consequently, the political and scholarly aspirations of these writers remained unfulfilled. Politically, the image of men as victims too sharply contradicted the in-charge image men had of themselves and therefore led to popular criticisms of writers on men, as well as the “new men” themselves, as complaining “wimps.” Academically, lacking a complementary group to identify as victimizers, the analysis was vague and glossed over too many issues, particularly issues of power. What was and is needed are analyses that show how men both form and are formed by their conditions, or, as Marx put it, how men make their own history, but not in circumstances of their own choosing.

Valid social constructionist accounts of masculinities will most likely come from a conjunction of two specific intellectual traditions: socialist feminism and developmental psychology, most notably Freudian theory. I cite these not simply because they are my own intellectual affinities, and because much of the most innovative feminist theory in recent years has emerged from the synthesis of psychoanalysis and Marxism, but also because of the four women’s studies scholars already cited as currently being most influential in men’s studies—Chodorow, Dinnerstein, Ehrenreich, and Gilligan—the first three explicitly speak from psychoanalytic and socialist perspectives, while Gilligan works in the nonpsychoanalytic branch of developmental psychology.

Since my own background is in political theory rather than psychology, the potential impact of socialist feminism on men’s studies is clearer to me than that of psychoanalysis. I would like to begin a sketch of a distinctive men’s studies socialist feminist analysis of capitalist patriarchal masculinity.

The starting point for any socialist feminist conceptualization of masculinity lies in the distinction between precapitalist and capitalist patriarchy. A transfer of power from the hands of individual patriarchs to the institutions of capitalist patriarchy is an essential component of this shift. This transfer is part of the widening depersonalization and bureaucratization of human relationships in the development of capitalism, which individuals experience in and as various forms of alienation. Capitalism increasingly creates a gap between institutional and personal power.¹⁴ For men, this

14. See Carol Brown, “Mothers, Fathers, and Children: From Private to Public Patriarchy,” in *Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism*, ed. Lydia Sargent (Boston: South End Press, 1981).

creates a disjunction between the facts of public male power and the feelings of men's private powerlessness. Certain changes in male personality traits, for example from authoritarian to nurturing traits, can be increasingly tolerated by the system because interpersonal relations are no longer the locus of male power, especially when these changes concern men as fathers rather than bosses.¹⁵ Men may even be encouraged to draw personal rewards from fatherhood, and the market may respond in its own inimitable fashion to new demands for fathers' consumer goods (e.g., less frilly diapers and longer baby-carriage handles), but, in the final analysis, capitalist and patriarchal institutions retain their imperatives of power.

This public-private split in masculinity creates contradictory tensions within capitalist patriarchy. On the one hand, certain changes are encouraged by a system aiming to modernize masculinity, such as a more cooperative rather than competitive masculinity required by a more corporate rather than entrepreneurial capitalism. On the other hand, there is incentive to retain certain traditional aspects of masculinity insofar as they interact with the dynamics of advanced capitalist patriarchy in ways functional to the system. For example, persisting images of masculinity hold that "real men" are physically strong, aggressive, and in control of their work. Yet the structural dichotomy between manual and mental labor under capitalism means that no one's work fulfills all these conditions. Manual laborers work for others at the low end of the class spectrum, while management sits at a desk. Consequently, while the insecurities generated by these contradictions are personally dissatisfying to men, these insecurities also impel them to cling all the more tightly to sources of masculine identity validation offered by the system. This makes them all the more willing and efficient servants.¹⁶ Capitalism and patriarchy are at times complementary and at times contradictory for men.¹⁷ The interplay between psychological, economic, and political advantages and disadvantages is

15. See Ross Wetzsteon, "The Feminist Man?" in *The Women Say, The Men Say: Issues in Politics, Work, Family, Sexuality, and Power*, ed. Evelyn Shapiro and Barry M. Shapiro (New York: Dell, 1979), pp. 25–29.

16. See Cynthia Cockburn's *Brothers: Male Dominance and Technological Change* (London: Pluto Press, 1983), esp. chap. 5, "A Man among Men"; and *Machinery of Dominance: Women, Men, and Technical Know-How* (London: Pluto Press, 1985). As members of one of a vanishing breed of male craft industries, printers of the kind Cockburn investigates are particularly illustrative cases of occupationally related aspects of masculinity in transition. Studies that shed light on this but lack explicit focus on masculinity are Robert Blauner, *Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1964); and Theresa F. Rogers and Nathalie S. Friedman, *Printers Face Automation* (Lexington, Ky.: Heath, 1980).

17. This conceptualization is greatly indebted to Heidi Hartmann's "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards A More Progressive Union," in Sargent, ed., *Women and Revolution*.

fertile ground for the development of psychosociological analyses of masculinity. Consider the significance of delayed gratification in the work ethic of capitalism's early development and the Oedipal phase of male identity development, the common subordination of present desire to future power. Such structural analyses would complement in materialist, social historical terms analyses by intellectual historians of the isomorphism of values between patriarchal and capitalist masculinities broadly conceived, such as are evident in those traits marking Weber's ideal-typical puritan, or between instrumental masculine and scientific rationalities, evoked in feminist philosophy of science and ecofeminist writings.¹⁸

While the cliché that white middle-class men are less sexist than Third World or working-class men abounds in the culture, the perspective outlined here can be developed to suggest that these latter masculinities may instead be conceptualized as cultures of resistance, as counterweights to the leveling of differences essential to hegemonic masculinity. The cliché is perpetuated by a failure to distinguish personal from institutional power. Institutional power is camouflaged, so it does not appear to be exercised by any one individual. Thus men may appear more personally congenial farther up the economic ladder, even as they exercise the institutional power responsible for women's lower status. In contrast, men who have but their personal power are more conspicuous but actually less efficacious when exercising their power in patriarchy's service. Here the radical feminist emphasis on theories of difference can be applied in innovative ways as an important source of reconceptualizations of race, class, and ethnic differences in men's studies.¹⁹

Since one important source of current interest in men's studies is the belief that our present historical period is particularly tumultuous for men, it is understandable that much of men's studies currently focuses on crises and contradictions in men's lives. Part of the focus on changes was also motivated by a desire to demonstrate the untenability of naturalistic as-

18. On Weber, see David Morgan, "Men, Masculinity and the Process of Sociological Enquiry," in *Doing Feminist Research*, ed. Helen Roberts (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981). Important texts on gender and science include Evelyn Fox Keller, *Reflections on Gender and Science* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985); Carolyn Merchant, *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution* (New York: Harper & Row, 1980); Genevieve Lloyd, *The Man of Reason: "Male" and "Female" in Western Philosophy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984); Sandra Harding and Merrill B. Hintikka, eds., *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives in Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science* (Dordrecht: Riedel, 1983); and Sandra Harding, *The Science Question in Feminism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986). The most recent statement I have seen is Susan Bordo, "The Cartesian Masculinization of Thought," *Signs* 11, no. 3 (1986): 439–456.

19. See the chapter on "Men: Comrades in Struggle" in Bell Hooks, *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* (Boston: South End Press, 1984).

sumptions about masculinity. Despite the support given to such changes in most of the literature, such an approach nonetheless contains an important conservative strain. In emphasizing that such changes require explanation, it perpetuates the notion that the seemingly unremarkable daily transmission and perpetuation of masculinities through time and space is somehow less problematic. But unless one accepts deeply conservative assumptions, social and historical continuity requires analysis and explanation just as much as discontinuity does. As we learn more about the reproduction of masculinities, the focus of men's studies will inevitably shift from periods and situations of strain and conflict to the superficially unremarkable, mundane realities of most men's lives.

Men's studies would also benefit from a greater skepticism about current male role changes. Ehrenreich's work is one example of such skepticism. She asks the classic *cui bono* question of men's liberation, and concludes that much of it is inimical to women's interests. Invoked by name only in the conclusion, the feminization of poverty clearly underlies Ehrenreich's concerns about men fleeing from their commitments to support women and their families. Such skepticism could also be generated were cross-cultural comparisons made more central to men's studies. For example, there are numerous anthropological studies of the *couvade* phenomenon, where men in prestate societies ritually simulate bearing and giving birth to children, often including appropriate cramps and pains. There is considerable debate whether such rituals are supportive or subversive of women's procreative powers. From a comparative anthropological perspective, much of the "new fathers'" childbirth involvement, usually unquestioningly accepted as a benefit to women, appears suspiciously like a *couvade* ritual, down to the laborious panting and the counterfactual "we're pregnant" announcement.²⁰ It remains unclear how much of the "new fathering" ethos is an attempt to surrender or reestablish male power in the face of feminist gains for women.

Another line of investigation often appreciated on its own terms but not yet fully integrated with other areas in men's studies is the sort of life-cycle development research carried on by Daniel Levinson and his colleagues, among many others. For example, as one moves from soft to hardcore pornography, the average age of the male consumer increases from adolescence to midlife. Is this simply a case of overexposure leading to the need for greater doses to reach satiation, or are other factors involved,

20. I am indebted to Maria Papacostaki for this insight. She reminded me that while people say "we" are pregnant, they also say "she" had the miscarriage or Caesarean delivery. The question is also raised in Carol Tavris and Carole Wade, *The Longest War: Sex Differences in Perspective*, 2d ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1984), pp. 189–190.

relating to the waxing and waning of the power of both the physical and social self?

Carrigan, Connell, and Lee's "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity" is, as its title indicates, the essay in this volume most explicitly concerned with new directions for the field. Much of what I advocate is eloquently expressed in the latter sections of this piece, and I shall not repeat it here. A particular virtue of their analysis is the way the concept of "hegemonic masculinity" connects the themes of pluralities of masculinities and the power imbalance between men and women by understanding both as contested, interactive historical practices. In addition to mounting the strongest critique of the sex-role paradigm, they also make the strongest case for integrating gay and men's studies.

Toward the beginning of this introduction I used the Hegelian distinction between what is familiar and what is known to make a point about the present intentions of men's studies. Let me close these speculations on the future of men's studies by invoking another Hegelian metaphor, that "the owl of Minerva spreads its wings only with the falling of the dusk."²¹ The point here is that one can truly come to know something only after it has fully developed, philosophical knowledge being in some sense retrospective. It follows that if the field of men's studies has reached the point where it is possible fully to articulate and analyze its initial achievements and possibilities, both positive and negative, then this initial stage must now be over. I believe we are just now on the verge of an exciting second stage in the development of men's studies, I hope along lines outlined here. My greatest hope for this volume of essays in the new men's studies is that it be a stepping-stone for a newer men's studies.

21. G. W. F. Hegel, *Philosophy of Right*, trans. T. M. Knox (New York, Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 13.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>