

Copyright © Michael Kaufman, 1993, 2002

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise), without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

The author (copyright owner) grants permission for an individual to download and print one copy for reading purposes but not for further reproduction or sale.

Written permission is necessary for institutions and organizations (or individuals associated with institutions and organizations) to produce multiple copies for individual use, or to make it available in any electronic form. (This applies to all institutions and organizations, including educational, public sector, non-profit, corporate, and commercial enterprises.) Institutions and organizations who ask individuals (such as a students in a university or college course or attendees at a training seminar) to download this work as a required reading, are also required to obtain written permission. Normally this permission will be granted for a licensing fee of \$5 per copy or per user who will access this work, with the stipulation that these copies or electronic versions are not sold to generate revenues or profits above the price of reproduction plus licensing fee. Each copy (reproduced by any mechanical or electronic means) must include an author credit and this full copyright notice as it appears on this page.

Users do not have the right to alter, amend, or abridge this work in any way without the written approval of the copyright holder.

With written permission, up to two chapters may be photocopied or electronically reproduced for educational use in specific courses, without payment of a fee.

For permissions, contact: [mk@michaelkaufman.com](mailto:mk@michaelkaufman.com).

CHAPTERS 8, 9, 10 and sources

# CRACKING THE ARMOUR

POWER, PAIN  
AND THE LIVES  
OF MEN

MICHAEL  
KAUFMAN

Originally published by Viking (Penguin Books Canada) in 1993. The pagination and layout of this electronic version follows the 1993 book and thus can be cited as the original book.

# B U D D I E S I N P O W E R A N D P A I N

♦ *Men Relating to Men*

With the rise of patriarchal societies a few thousand years ago, men championed the idea that we were the more capable half of the human species. Perhaps a bit closer to God, a bit more rational, a bit more wild, a bit smarter, a bit braver, a bit more of this and that not displayed in the same generous proportions in females. We developed cultures and rituals that celebrated this difference. We came to see women as a weaker sex at the same moment that we placed them on pedestals. We gave ourselves the responsibility of leading countries, businesses, and religions. In doing so we repeatedly put ourselves in situations where our closest ties were with other men. We've celebrated male bonding and comradeship. We have pictures in our minds, if not on our walls, of male

sports heroes, leaders, thinkers, warriors or actors. Though some of these stereotypes and ideas about manhood have begun to break down, but they have been the dominant ideas for the past couple of millennia.

Relations among men, though, are the biggest paradox about men. In spite of all I've just said, the majority of men are not all that close to other men. Most heterosexual men find that the people who know their biggest secrets, their greatest desires, their foibles, their passions and their fears are women. When men ponder on who has seen them cry and who has given them comfort, most would list women before men. We're more likely to let ourselves be vulnerable with women than with other men. Of course men have male friends. And there's certainly nothing wrong with having women as close friends, lovers and life-long companions. The problem is that we tend to place limits on our male friendships. Part of this is a sexual boundary that the majority of men have no interest in crossing, or are fearful of crossing. That's fine; each to his own. More important, however, is the emotional boundary.

This is the paradox. Societies run by men seem to value men more highly than women, but we rarely let down our defences with other men; we remain distant and fearful. Men nurse a stack of conflicting feelings about men. Most of us have an intense, and usually buried, yearning for closeness, trust and intimacy with other men, our brothers, but in spite of our friendships

and elaborate rituals of male bonding, most men are isolated from other men. Scratch deeper, way deeper, and we find hatred, fear and suspicion of other men. When we dig under the surface, there is a lot of man-hating among men. I once heard a man compliment another by saying he was "a good shit." What does it tell us that his highest compliment for a friend and colleague was that he was a turd?

#### ◆ **Out of the Mouths of Babes**

I'm sitting on the floor with a group of boys, all about age nine and ten. We're talking and I'm watching them. They're tickling each other, making googly eyes, and one is reaming out his nose. Like these boys, when most of us were young, our best friends were other boys. We spent hours together, playing, hanging out and talking about the most intimate details of our bodies and our lives. When we were little, we slept together and bathed together. And, even though it wouldn't occur to most people to describe it this way, sometimes we were obviously in love—we giggled and whispered and just loved being together. One man says, "I look back at them, at the friendships of my childhood, and there was an incredible amount of emotionality tied up with them. When Kenny moved away in the middle of Grade 4, I remember walking to school crying. It was the first time I had lost someone I loved."

As youngsters and teens, our friendships with other boys had two aspects. One-on-one, we were able to establish real trust and intimacy. But then there was the pack side, what happened when we got into groups. There was the strength and magic of a group, the shared confidences and new identities. However, it was also where the ugliness began to creep in. Those outside the group were picked on. Group bonding and networks of friends became a critical means of affirming our own shaky masculinity. After all, look who was kept out of the group: girls, who obviously weren't men, and boys who didn't live up to group standards. Whatever the particular set of standards might be, the excluded guys couldn't meet our subgroup's definition of masculinity: the other guys were sissies, not cool, too caught up in how they looked, not athletic, too jocky; maybe they were the wrong colour, class or religion; maybe they were gay.

An ability to participate in the pack, to play by its rules and to observe its codes, pitted every boy against his own sensitivities. British writer David Jackson recounts his experiences in a boarding school in a scene that could be transplanted into the lives of most boys: "The dormitory is painted cream with brown institutional lino on the floor, and nine iron beds are crammed in around the walls. I stand at the centre of a grinning ring of faces. I've a hollow sinking feeling beginning to spread from the pit of my stomach. I look down at the polished brown lino,

knowing I mustn't cry but feeling my nose start to twitch with tears.

"For the second night running they've pinched my pajamas from under my pillow. My supposed friends, even Martin, have vanished into the anonymity of the grinning ring. They know that if they don't act with the mind of the pack it will be their turn next. Even Chris, who had his pajamas taken last week, is there now within the ring of faces, mocking and calling me. The pack hunts down any outsiders, and forces them to forget their own contradictory resistances, and teaches them to snarl, like the rest.

"The pack leader ambles up to me and pushes the stolen pajamas right under my nose. Steady now! Keep your cool! I know that I mustn't rise to the temptation of snatching. I know the pack want to goad me into chasing them. I look, mock-casually up at the plaster frieze on the ceiling, pretend to look away and then I suddenly lunge forward to grab the pajamas. At that very moment the pack leader whisks them away to another boy within the circle. I can't help myself now. I know I'm trapped within the rules of the game. I haven't got a choice anymore. I have to become part of the action. I flail this way, that way, arms outspread, trying to intercept the flung pajamas.

"I'm openly sobbing with anger now and with injured pride. They've got me on the run and they know it. I hear myself pleading with them to give my pajamas

back. Mucus and tears are dribbling down my chin. I half-intercept the flying bundle but two pack members land on top of me just as I am about to get my hands on the pajamas.

“The throwing gets more hysterical. I’m shrieking at them now. One of the pack makes a mistake and drops the pajamas. I get a hand to my pajama jacket sleeve while the pack seize hold of the other, and I tug with all my might. Two other boys drop on me from behind and try to pull me away. My jacket sleeve is ripped off. The pack stops in alarm.

“I hurl abuse at them between my sobs. I grab up the torn remnants and slam off to lock myself in the toilet for half an hour. For the next week I go around in hurt silence hoping the pack will forget my pajamas and move on to some other victim for next week. But they don’t. It’s always there in the banter, the incessant jibes and the repetitively brutalizing actions. I’ve shown the pack that ‘I can’t take a joke,’ that I’m easily hurt and offended and I’ve cried like a girl, and that’s the kind of person the pack likes to hunt. The barbaric system of male bonding is achieved at the expense of all those other forms and varieties of masculinity...that are choked off in their infancy without ever having a proper chance to develop and grow in a more gentle and openly emotional way.”

#### ◆ Yo! Big Guys

Adult male friendships emerge after fifteen or twenty

years of schooling in group adaptation. We learn to accept the demands of our male peers and identify them as our own. We assume this is the only way for men to relate for we see no alternative models. Details fill in the early impressions of childhood. Just as our bodies are filling out in adolescence, our psyches are filling out, firming up and becoming rigid. We discover the big stakes in joining the fraternity of men: join or be isolated, beaten up or teased; join or you won’t feel like a man. Our own unique versions of manhood are left behind. Qualities that don’t fit must be tossed aside or at least kept in the closet. The rigid ego boundaries of manhood are cemented by our friends. It is the greatest of all treacheries, for it is the demands of friendship and the ties of love that help us betray ourselves. Whatever you do, don’t let down your guard. Like David Jackson’s friends who joined the ring of taunting kids, no one can be trusted. If fathers were the first big male disappointments of our lives, then friends are a close second. We suppress our suspicion that this is even betrayal and accept that boys should stay at an emotional arm’s length. Gone are the intimacy and trust we once shared. Men might have close friends, but there is usually a lack of real intimacy: there are certain things most men just won’t talk about with their friends.

A thirty-eight-year-old, perhaps a bit more extreme than many men, told an interviewer: “I have three close

friends I have known since we were boys and they live here in the city. There are some things I wouldn't tell them. For example, I wouldn't tell them much about my work because we have always been highly competitive. I certainly wouldn't tell about my feelings, of any uncertainties with life or various things I do. And I wouldn't talk about any problems I have with my wife or in fact anything about my marriage and sex life. But other than that I would tell them anything."

It's hard to be intimate with someone you don't fully trust. How can you tell them about the desires that fly across your mind as you lie on a dock and watch the stars? How can you mention the fears that creep up your back when you're walking down a dark street? Any admission of weakness starts is like an announcement that you don't make it as a man. The bottom falls out of intimate friendships because we've become part of a pack, with each member trying to live up to the impossible demands of the others.

Strangely, though, there's also the opposite problem. In modern, Western societies, masculinity is also defined by an ability to stand alone. We don't see friendships as something needing nurturing, even though that's what keeps alive the bonds of intimacy and openness. "My pals," says one man, "well, they're just *there*. No, I don't do nothing to keep them there 'cause I don't have to. They wouldn't be friends if I did."

Friendships come to equal shared activities. Work, hobbies, TV, politics, service clubs and sports are the compass points of the relationship. We are brothers-in-arms and workmates, rather than soulmates. Michael Messner, researching men and sports, suggests that "the young male, who both seeks and fears attachment with others, thus finds the rulebound structure of games and sports to be a psychologically 'safe' place in which he can get [non-intimate] connection with others within a context that maintains clear boundaries, distance, and separation from others. At least for the boy who has some early successes in sports, some of these ambivalent needs can be met, for a time. But there is a catch....this attention [is] contingent on his being good—that narrow definition of success, based on performance and winning."

#### ◆ Violence Among Men

I drop in at a sports bar a few blocks from my place. It's a quiet and friendly spot, but today there's some nastiness in the air. A couple of guys, strangers to the place, are a bit drunk. They're arguing with someone at the adjoining table. It started with, "Hey, get your head out the way, I can't see the game," and quickly escalated to, "What the fuck is an asshole like you doing in here anyway?" Finally the man at the adjoining table swings out an arm and knocks a beer onto one of the guys. The two of them

are up in a flash and shove the man onto the floor. This isn't a place with a bouncer—we're talking about a neighbourhood pub that organizes bus trips to ball games—so one of the waitresses steps in and yells, "Sit down or get the hell out of here!" The three men, looking a bit stunned by a woman's voice in the midst of their little display of virility, sit down. One of the two guys says, "Let's get out of this shitbox," throws down some money and the two of them leave.

We're all a bit rattled, but the reaction in most corners is to laugh. The man who a moment before was an inch away from getting his face turned into cat chow, is laughing the loudest. Sure it's nerves, but it's also a display of bravado. Things return to normal, which, on this particular night, is the L.A.-Edmonton hockey game. Amidst dazzling displays of skating and puck control, bodies are getting smashed into the boards and players are flying. The shoves escalate into a brawl; as fists start flying the crowd goes wild. If you miss it now you can always catch it on the game highlights at 11 p.m.

As we grow up we see fighting everywhere. We're told it's just the way it is. Fish gotta swim, boys gotta fight. Boys, being boys, just got to let off a little steam now and again. The snap of a towel in the locker room. The threat to re-arrange your face if you stare too long at the guy at the bar. In fighting and in what Paul Willis calls "the ritualized display-violence" of teenagers and

some adult men, violence is openly present in its crisp, clean essence. Elsewhere, in sports such as hockey, football, boxing and professional wrestling, violence is incorporated into exercise and entertainment. Violence among men comes in subtle forms, such as the verbal putdown or the killer-instinct one is expected to cultivate in the business, political or even academic worlds. In its most grandiose form, violence has long been a preferred method of addressing conflicts among individuals or groups. The ever-present potential for violence among men reinforces the reality that relations between men, whether at the individual or the international level, are relations of power. The brotherhood of man is based on mutual distrust and insecurity.

Men feel the presence of violence from an early age. It's not that most of our dads were overtly brutal, although a lot of kids do experience corporal punishment; rather, it has to do with what is denied us. Our fragile need for love, physical connection and affection from our fathers or father figures was simply not met. And then among friends, we had experiences of being beaten up or picked on. We learned to fight or to run; we learned to pick on others, or we learned how to talk or joke our way out of a confrontation.

The anxiety and confusion produced by our early brushes with violence crystallize into an unspoken fear: other men are my potential enemies, my competitors.

This mutual hostility is rarely expressed. Men have formed elaborate institutions of male bonding and buddying: clubs, gangs, teams, fishing trips, card games, bars, gyms and political parties, not to mention that overarching fraternity of Man. Certainly, as many feminists have pointed out, male clubs are a subculture of male privilege. But they are also havens where men, by common consent, can find safety and security among other men. They are safe houses where our love and affection for other men can be expressed, even if indirectly or oh so subtly.

When I was in Grade Six this drama was constantly acted out. There was the challenge to fight and the punch in the stomach that knocked your wind out; there was the customary greeting of a slug on the shoulder. Before school, after school, during class change, at recess, whenever you came across another one of the boys, you'd punch each other on the shoulder. I remember walking from class to class in terror of meeting Ed in the hall. Ed, a hefty young football player a grade ahead of me, would leave a big bruise with one of his friendly hellos, and this was the interesting thing about the whole business. Most of the time his greeting was friendly and affectionate, even though I didn't realize it at the time. Long after the bruises have faded, I remember Ed's smile and the protective way he had of saying hello to me. But the slug on the shoulder was his way of expressing affection without breaking the domination of activity over

passivity. Active assault, the punch or the verbal putdown, becomes the means to express caring.

We all take our own pathway. Depending on that complex mixture of individual whim, opportunity, class and neighbourhood background, abilities and sheer luck, we incorporate violence into our lives in different ways. Many men end up displaying little or no violence, while others, like a nasty character described by Primo Levi, become "those guys who want to teach cats how to scratch."

I drop in at the Y with my son. We shoot some hoops, fool around on the weights and swim a few lengths. Afterwards in the dressing room I start talking with two guys. Two big guys. I'm no shrimp, but one of them at least matches my six foot two inches, and that's just across the shoulders. Both have tattoos over muscles that even my doctor probably wouldn't know about. They're nice enough guys and pretty articulate. I figure them for two weight room types, but soon find out that their most recent hangout was a maximum security penitentiary. We talk about this and that, I ask them about prison, and in the end, one of them—the little guy, the one under 200 pounds—says he learned one thing in there. "You can't let yourself be pushed around. Right from the start you got to show them you can't be pushed."

You don't have to be an inmate to know that violence can be a useful way to prove yourself. Feeling your masculinity is at stake—and how better to describe the

normal fare of male adolescence in our society?—a physical challenge to another man is a stirring confirmation of manhood. In one blow, you prove yourself to others and to yourself. When asked why he was into fighting, a young British soccer fan comments, “I mean it don’t matter if you lose a fight, so long as you don’t back down. I mean, you could end up in hospital but so long as you didn’t back down you’d made your case. I mean there’s a lot of this not wanting to be called a coward in it. When you’re sixteen or seventeen, before, say, you’re courting steady and that—that’s the time you don’t like being called a coward. And it’s one thing that hurts you more than anything else, you know.”

#### ◆ **Man Hating?**

I stop by the Glendale old-age home but I’ve forgotten to bring the flowers. Anyway, they would have made me a bit too self-conscious. This is the first time I’ve set foot in the place and I’m immediately filled with immense feelings of burden and sadness. There are my own fears of growing old and there’s my disgust of a society that doesn’t value or properly support the old.

It’s a Sunday afternoon and a lot of families are coming and going. I chat with a nurse who suggests I talk to Mr Ranston who doesn’t have a family. She goes off to explain to Mr Ranston that I’m doing research for a book and comes back, a minute later, with permission for a

visit.

Mr Ranston and I are awkward at first, but after a few minutes I feel comfortable asking questions about his friendships with other men. He’s an affable sort of man, not morose but definitely introspective. He talks about making friends through work, about losing some of those friends when he moved on to a new position, about his fifty-odd-year marriage and everything it meant to him. He is positive on the subject of friendships. “Men have got to have friends or you end up buckling under.... One time, he and I took on the whole company. And we won, you see.”

After a half an hour talking about friendships and this and that, I suddenly realize I’m hearing a narration about failure. With all his upbeat stories, I almost missed this. Every time he talks about friends there’s a bit of a “yes, but” quality that creeps in at the end: “Sure we were good friends, but you have to remember there wasn’t a lot of time for recreation in those days.” Or, “When he and his wife separated that was just about the last I saw of him. We had a lot in common, but if I remember, we only saw each other with our wives around.” Or, “I always wondered what happened to Jimmy, my best friend back in high school.” Did you ever try to track him down? I asked. “No, I can’t say I ever did, though I thought about it from time to time.”

Mr Ranston seems to realize this too, for he starts to

say that maybe he wasn't much good with friends. In the middle of a sentence he stops talking. A minute goes by. Aged by a decade, he looks at me and says he's had enough talking for now. I give him my phone number and say I'd enjoy coming back to talk again, about anything, it didn't have to be about this stuff. I suspect that it's not going to happen again.

I went to talk about friendships and I leave feeling guilty for upsetting Mr Ranston. I'm thinking about failure and the self-hatred that goes with it.

There is a link between self-hatred and the problems that straight and many gay men face in friendships. Fear of other men can get turned against ourselves. The extent of male self-hatred is probably the most surprising thing about patriarchal culture. It is something that has rarely, if ever, been acknowledged. It has little place in feminist thought and is not something that most men or women are aware of. Certainly we shouldn't be surprised that in cultures of male domination there are many forms of misogyny, of women hating. But man hating? Maybe we need a new word to complement misogyny, something like *misophally*. Isn't that what the crude stereotypes say that feminists are supposed to do? Aren't they the ones who are supposed to hate men? Maybe the occasional woman does hate men. But the biggest man haters around are men.

Some of these feelings of self-hate and hatred might be an offshoot of the fragility of masculinity: *Unlike me,*

*they are real men and hence a threat to me.* Without knowing it's happening, you hate yourself for not making the grade and you unconsciously hate other men for making it where you have failed.

Some of these feelings might result from the repression of desire for other men: *They are, like me, men, and hence not objects of affection and desire.* Some men will unconsciously hate themselves for still wanting affection and closeness from other men. Unable to go out there and get it, they will distrust men for not giving them what they silently need.

Man hating among men is a buried truth of many patriarchal cultures. It rarely exists in a pure, unadulterated form because it is combined with real respect, fear and admiration for other men. It is also hard to spot because many men turn their vilification towards women or distinct groups of men, such as gay men or members of particular racial or ethnic groups who seem different. However disguised, the dangerous chemistry of hate and self-hate emerges in self-destructive behaviour by men. It is seen in forms of addiction to work, alcohol and other drugs; it appears in the refusal to get support and help, to remain open for love and attention.

The thin veneer that covers self-destruction and man hating peels off in the stories of contemporary warrior heroes. In our hero stories, there is tight interplay between sadism and masochism: The athlete plays on

despite an injury—heroism and pleasure exist in pain. Rocky/Rambo—the white, working-class, Western archetype of manliness in the 1980s—was a character who moved wildly between the conquering hero, the guy who could dish out punishment, and the sufferer. Rambo's/Rocky's body, like that of many a good hero, is a body to be admired and envied, but you can't just admire a man's body; after all, what would that make you? So his body is forced to sustain inhuman levels of physical punishment. His physique is a potent and erotic symbol of power to so many teenagers and men; many men who can't stand what Rambo/Rocky stands for remain mesmerized by his body. But since it is male flesh, it must be punished. So Rocky's face is pulverized and Rambo's chest is criss-crossed with scars. The scars, the punishment, make the homoerotic nature of hero worship palatable. The scars give voice to the hatred and self-hatred that is one of the buried truths of men's lives.

No one actually orchestrates man hating. It isn't always expressed in open ways like woman hating, but is quietly passed from generation to generation in the rules for being men. The essential element is the need to be seen as a man by other men, for it's not just in women's eyes that we see confirmation of manhood. It's our own reflection in the eyes of other men. The group becomes the mirror, the pond of water, in which we see our image. That image is our armour.

### ◆ You're Not Queer, Are You?

Up at Hollywood Video I gaze at the shelves of movies. Tonight I'm not looking for an evening's entertainment but for the images of men in the Action Section. Here's the typical shot: One or two men are frozen in the midst of action. Their shirts are torn away. Their perfect, muscled chests gleam with sweat. Their chiselled faces are flawless. Power is in their eyes. Discreet slashes of red show where a wound has been suffered. They don't complain: for men like these a bullet wound is like a mosquito bite. Just a graze.

Men of all ages line up to see the Schwarzeneggers and Stallones of this world. Millions of us, including many who intellectually abhor these images, are fascinated by their bodies and by the vulnerability that hides behind their displays of ruthless power. Their pictures grace bedroom walls in college dorms. Down at the gym, men watch themselves and each other in the mirrored weight room to see how their bodies measure up against the bodies of *real* men. If you didn't know better, you'd think we lived in a society where homophilia was the norm, where the most valued form of sexual and love relationships was that between men. Instead, the norm is homophobia, and it's something that colours relations among all men perhaps more than anything else. Narrowly, homophobia means fear of homosexuality; but

more broadly, it translates for men into a fear of other men and fear of love between woman.

Why should men fear other men? We've already talked about the impact of violence from friends and how our need for love from our fathers was inadequately met. These experiences leave men unconsciously cautious in the company of men, even suspicious of them. And to the extent that men fear not making the masculine grade, it is other men who can best unmask our pretense: even if we can fake it with women, we certainly can't fake it around other men. Other men are the real judges of masculinity.

There is more that makes us fearful of other men. Something even stronger. It is the repression of homosexuality, and it affects both straight and gay men. Heterosexuality, which is part of our dominant conception of manhood, dictates that homosexual desire must be suppressed. A man might choose not to have sexual relations with other men – no problem with that. The problem is that as adults most men find the very possibility uncomfortable, even frightening or abhorrent. You may not like McDonald's hamburgers; you may be a vegetarian, and you may even think that no one should eat such a thing. But you don't get nervous sitting next to someone who likes them. You don't worry that they will force one down your throat, nor do you run amok in McDonald's beating up everyone who holds one of those

mealy little burgers to his lips. There's a big difference between choosing not to partake in something and having a mild or severe phobia of it. How do we explain the distaste or the fear of homosexuality that pervades so much male interaction, and why is this so virulent among teenagers?

We've seen how masculine power is associated with activity, femininity with passivity. A boy still wants to be nurtured and cared for, to be held in someone's arms and loved, but these impulses now get associated with femininity and vulnerability. Feeling those things makes you a sissy, a girl. It's not only kids who think this. The season after he made the All Star team, Blue Jay third baseman Kelly Gruber was having a hard time coping with a series of injuries; as a result, some of his teammates started calling him "Mrs Gruber." (Aside from the impact on boys, think of what an offence this is to women. To call a man inadequate, you say he's a woman.) Taunts of being a sissy aren't about homosexual sex. However, at puberty all sorts of thoughts and anxieties are connected with homosexuality per se. Love and affection for other men is equated with homosexuality, being a woman and losing power. Putdowns, verbal abuse and violence against other men are one way to disguise and redirect the affection we feel. One man tells me of his adolescent experiences: "I tried to be nice to these guys. One of them said, 'What are you, some type of faggot?' No, I

said. 'Well prove it,' he said, 'hit me.' I did and after that we could be friends."

For the majority of men in our culture, affection for other men gets expressed in a roundabout way: for instance, in sports, male comradeship at a business lunch or bar, muscle- building, religious rituals and war. In all these contexts men can safely enjoy the physical company of other men. Imagine being so frightened that it takes war or a violent sport to provide the necessary security to hug another man or give him a pat on the ass. We can still find ways to admire other men at a distance, in the worship of all manner of heroes—from successful businessmen to writers to movie stars.

Of course, many of the male activities on the sports field or the meeting room do not dispel eroticized relations with other men. These feelings may only be reawakened, given new energy. Nowhere has this been better captured than in the stunning wrestling scene in the perhaps mistitled book *Women in Love*, by D.H. Lawrence. It was late at night. Birkin had just come to Gerald's house after an unsuccessful marriage proposal. They talked of work, of love, of fighting, and in the end stripped off their clothes and began to wrestle in front of the blazing fire. As they wrestled, "they seemed to drive their white flesh deeper and deeper against each other, as if they would break into a oneness." They entwined, they wrestled, they pressed nearer and nearer. "A tense white

knot of flesh [was] gripped in silence." The thin Birkin "seemed to penetrate into Gerald's more solid, more diffuse bulk, to interfuse his body through the body of the other, as if to bring it subtly into subjection, always seizing with some rapid necromantic foreknowledge every motion of the other flesh, converting and counteracting it, playing upon the limbs and trunk of Gerald like some hard wind. . . . Now and again came a sharp gasp of breath, or a sound like a sigh, then the rapid thudding of movement on the thickly carpeted floor, then the strange sound of flesh escaping under flesh."

The very institutions of male bonding and patriarchal power force men to constantly re-experience their closeness and attraction to other men. But this is the very thing so many men are afraid of. Attraction runs smack into aversion. Longing piles up against horror. The outcome is homophobia. It is extreme only in some men, but few men, even those who are gay, escape homophobia altogether. Ultimately, homophobia isn't only about feelings towards other men. It is a way men try to cope with their anxiety over passive and receptive urges. For some men, particularly in adolescence when one's masculinity feels so tenuous, the anxieties are so great that only violence against other men or displays of sexual aggressiveness against women can dispel the fears.

Homophobia is not simply an individual problem. Unlike a fear of heights or darkness, this is a socially

constructed phobia, essential for the imposition and maintenance of our dominant forms of masculinity. As part of the package of masculinity, we're expected to deny our receptivity, nurturance and vulnerability in order to be men.

#### ◆ **Remaking Relations Among Men**

I stop by John's as he and Sarah are packing to move across the country. Several years ago, as he was nearing retirement from his years as a family doctor, his wife said that he was missing something. "You need to get yourself a close male friend," she said. John replied, "I've got friends." Sarah looked him in the eye and asked, "Do you ever tell them what makes you tick or do you hold them at arm's length?"

"She was right," John tells me. "There was always a certain sense of propriety to my friendships. I could express opinions on science. But anything personal was out of bounds. We liked one another, but there was a certain distance maintained." John, of a generation that believed that when you decide on something you just have to set out and work hard to achieve it, joined a men's support group he saw advertised in the paper. He wanted to look at his life and his friendships with other men. Maybe, he figured, he might even make a friend in the process.

The men's support group was like nothing he had experienced before. Each week seven men got together

for an evening of, well, just being together. They often had a theme for the evening: work, sports, fathers, mothers, experiences growing up, violence. The theme wasn't a topic for discussion; it was a focus for self-exploration. To ensure that no man dominated the discussion, they divided the time equally and so it became an exercise in good listening as well as good talking. The men encouraged each other to speak in the first person ("such and such happened to me," "I think that...") rather than in abstractions that allow us to stay removed from a problem ("men do this," "you feel that.") They took turns facilitating the discussion. To create a sense of safety, everyone agreed to complete confidentiality: whatever was said in that room did not leave the room. No one gave advice to the other men. They just listened and, when asked, commented on the experiences of the other.

John's support group, which hung together for sixteen months, was one of thousands of such groups that exist or have come and gone across North America, England, Australia and a growing number of cities in continental Europe, and recently in parts of the Third World. Some groups have a particular focus – perhaps a group of new fathers or new divorcees or men who come from violent backgrounds – but usually groups mix men from different experiences. In some cases these are groups that make use of a Robert Bly-type framework – complete with

drumming and talk of mytho-poetic images. More often, though, these are groups of men who simply want to talk. What's most important is that they are bringing men together to look at themselves and their lives.

What do we get out of these groups?

Another man, Gerry explained: "My relationship was falling apart and I had an intellectual sense I was in trouble and an instinctual sense I had to do something about it. I got involved in a men's group. For me, even a few hours once a week spent with men was a major change. For a little while I thought the men's group thing a little flaky, but I learned some valuable things about how intimacy for me comes from resolving conflict.

"Soon after getting involved in men's groups, my friendships really blossomed. We went from discussions around sports and women, conquest and victory, to virtually always checking out how you were feeling, always aware of the need to establish safe space, discuss fears and anxieties in relationships, joy and happy moments. It opened up a world of emotions."

I asked Gerry why it had taken him 25 years to get to that point? He quickly answered, "Nobody told me it was there." What did he wish he'd been told? "It's not so much told as what I didn't see lived. My father lived an emotionally closed life. I saw my adolescent friends shut down their childhood freedom around emotions as their childhood culminated and I got pulled into that." What

did he learn being in a men's group? "One thing I learned was the human capacity for feeling and spirituality. I discovered an ability to derive ecstasy from relationships with people and life far, far exceeding anything I knew possible."



I am sitting with a group of men who are talking about their experiences in men's groups. They're men from all walks of life, from different ethnic and racial groups, ranging in age from eighteen to their late sixties. I ask them what it meant to be in a men's group, how they felt about it, how it changed them and their lives.

Greg, a young man, jumps in with enthusiasm: "I felt frightened, elated. I felt scared to talk. What difference has it made? The way I was challenged and affirmed has been fantastic."

Richard says confidently, almost brashly, "Paranoia has been a mainstay of my life. How anxious I've been for years about my lovability and contribution. When I first came [to a men's group] I was like a turtle without a shell. I worked out a tremendous number of things, sometimes at the expense of other men in the group, usually with their help."

The next, a compact man, speaks succinctly: "What I got from it is feeling okay with myself as a man."

Wellesley speaks with a sort of quiet self-assurance.

"I've learned to love men, I've learned to love myself much more. I can't imagine my life without this now." As though replying, Mike says, it allowed him "a certain type of freedom."

Richard says his men's group helped him to start thinking about some of the ways he had hurt the women and men he most loved.

Meyer has a nice smile and speaks with eloquence. "It's the kind of acceptance I spent forty years searching for," he says. "I was longing for it. I got to talk and no one laughed or butted in. I didn't know what the ground rules were, but I was hooked. There was a courageous sharing in the groups I was in. There is a spandex quality to these groups: You get in and it fits you wherever your journey is. The response is, 'You're doing just fine, Meyer.' That's so different from the way the rest of the world has responded."

Ted, a young administrator, says he saw a sign on a bulletin board. "I was very isolated at that point. I was surprised that I could have close friendships with men because I hadn't had that for years, and that men could talk about anything at all, and could have deep emotional connections." An ad in a newspaper brought Chuck to a men's group. "It was a men against violence type of group, not particularly violent men, but men who wanted to do something to stop violence. For the first time I realized I wasn't alone."

For these men, men's support groups became their first real experience at dropping barriers with other men,

stretching beyond isolation to confront fears and search for new sources of strength and comradeship. For many, a men's group has an immediate impact on their relations with others. Phil decided, as he put it, to "teach my father how to hug. I was home once, talking to my mom and I think I said something about never hugging Dad. I think I said I wished he liked hugging. She looked at me and said, 'He loves hugging. He's just a regular teddy bear.' I couldn't believe it and so I went up to him and said, 'I hear you like hugging.' He kind of turned red and shifted from foot to foot, and then said, 'yeah.' And so we started hugging. I later tried to convince my brother that Dad liked hugging and he thought I was crazy."

My friend John, the retired doctor who was packing to move when I talked to him, did meet a man at a workshop and developed a strong and fast friendship. In this friendship he found unconditional acceptance of a type he didn't know was possible with other men. When they met, his friend was himself in the process of moving out west. Their friendship adapted and came to include visits, letter writing and phone calls. John wrote to his friend, "The fact of the matter is 'I love you' and it's scary for me to admit how much." There was, said John, a type of unconditional acceptance and intimacy that he had never experienced with another man.

The lessons and experiences of men's groups can be brought into our daily lives and areas of work. Many school boards and corporations are now organizing retreats and day-long and week-long workshops for male

staff that recreate a men's group atmosphere. In group after group I've seen men drop their resistance and undergo transformations in language and outlook, making them more responsive to the needs of both female and male colleagues and younger people.

Physicians or felons, students or farmers, accountants or athletes, our common experience in men's support groups is like an echo of the words of Aziz, from E.M. Forster's *Passage to India*. Forster, an astute observer of masculinity, writes, "Aziz winked at him slowly and said: 'There are many ways of being a man; mine is to express what is deepest in my heart.'"

## HARD TIMES AT THE OASIS

♦ *Relationships with Women*

We sat on the couch, holding hands, thinking back on the decade we had spent together, remembering the many things that had gone right, silently recalling the things that were pushing us apart. Maureen and I were splitting up. It had been a difficult couple of months, but with the decision made, the tension and hurt melted away for a moment and we were left with a deep reservoir of love and affection. Not so long ago, we figured it was going to last forever; in the end it resisted all of our careful attempts to keep it going.

Ours had been a life of security and pleasure, but also of many challenges and doubts. In its difficulties, both during our years together and in our moving apart, our

situation wasn't unusual. The forms of relationships between men and women that became the North American and European standard by the early twentieth century are on shaky grounds. Those lucky enough to have lifelong relationships where love and excitement are still intact and where their needs continue to mesh, have had to adjust to changing expectations and different ways of doing things. Over the past few decades the family has been shaken by the impact of the birth control pill, the hippy and youth movements, the women's liberation movement, increases in women in the work force, gay and lesbian liberation and the challenge to the dominant, often hypocritical sexual morality of white middle class society. These days, men and women alike have been working strenuously to remake our conceptions of sexual and love relations.

Our relationships with women aren't only crafted around marriage and its equivalent. Relationships between women and men can be built on any combination of sex, love, friendship, and work. The beguiling thing about relationships, though, is that they're not simply between two people. In a sense, we have relationships not just with another person but with the whole social, economic and psychological context of which we're both a part. The precepts of patriarchal society filter through all men's relationships with women. The outcome, though, is not like sunlight streaming

through a clear piece of glass, although every relationship has its rays of hope; it is also like water seeping through an aquarium filter that traps all the grunge of that undersea world. Our relationships are all of these things: the purity and mystery of the coloured fish illuminated by sunlight, the undulating plants and luminous water and the filter that can become clogged with sludge.

Let's say I am single and heterosexual, and I meet a woman at work. I find her attractive. She is a workmate, a colleague. What is it I really want? Sex, friendship, affection or a collegial relationship? If I relate to her with the expectation or hope of a sexual relationship, am I undermining our work relationship or our possible friendship? Will this be sexual harassment? Will it change how I think about her and act with her as a fellow worker? Even if we're both interested in each other, does it have to be me who makes the first move?

We are out together and are about to walk through a doorway. If I go first, it feels as if I am leading the way. If I hold back, it feels as if I am paternalistically allowing her go first. In a gendered society, even the simple act of walking through a doorway gets laden with the power categories of masculinity and femininity, with the split between activity and passivity, with men's prerogative and need to be in control. If all this happens because of a doorway, what can happen because of love and sex?

We are out on a date and each of us is deciding whether we want to have sex. Without being aware of it, I want to make love to establish intimacy. She hopes to establish intimacy in order to want to make love. The impact of our gendered psychological development is right there at the threshold of the bedroom. It is Janus-faced, one side inviting intimacy through sex, the other cautious about sex until there is intimacy.

We've decided to make love and up crops not only our desire, but the issues of safe sex and birth control. Who planned ahead? Who will take responsibility? What if she gets pregnant? Will our society allow her to have an abortion should she choose not to be a parent? Would our laws allow me to force her to have a child she doesn't want? Who will provide for the child she has?

We're sitting at the kitchen table trying to decide who is going to stay home with the child for the first year and who will keep going to work. If we're the average man and woman, my income will be one-and-a half times the size of hers; we can't afford for me to quit my job. The decision isn't just between the two of us. The wage structures and job ghettos of patriarchal society are there in the kitchen with us.

I'm going through a rough time, but if I'm like many men I have few men to turn to for emotional support. I am probably unaware of the depth of my feelings or am terrified of them overwhelming me. If ours is like most

relationships, she has learned to nurture me, to give me support, to monitor and protect my psychological needs and the needs of the relationship. I'm dependent on her, but maybe she resents that, or maybe the two of us are in conflict and I resent being dependent on someone who can't help me this time.

Let's look at some of the issues that arise in male-female relationships, especially as they relate to the way we've constructed masculinity. Let's see at how our dominant forms of masculinity interact with the dominant forms of femininity, for it is this interaction that produces the challenges, problems and some of the excitement of male-female relationships. After all, some men don't know how to be with women anymore, don't know where the new boundaries are drawn. These men walk around carrying useless bits of baggage – maybe it's a suitcase of guilt, maybe it's a duffle bag of awkwardness, maybe it's a backpack full of self-doubt and confusion. Other men walk boldly, dictating the terms of relationships, though sometimes that's because they are still blind to the power imbalances of sexism. These men continue to heap it onto women, often without knowing they're doing anything wrong. Such men are attractive to a decreasing number of women. And there are some men out there who have struggled through these issues and are starting to get it just right.

◆ **Ordinary Guys in an Ordinary World:  
The Social Context of Relationships**

Nelson stubs out another cigarette and looks at me through reddened eyes. "I feel desperate. I just want to find someone, I can't stand being single again. I want a family, someone who loves me, some quiet apartment, a kid, maybe two, just her and me forever." It's the stuff of teen pop songs. His is a longing born of heartbreak. Nelson feels incomplete, he feels he can't be whole without a woman who is "his." Like many men and women, he views a relationship as the creation of a whole from two, incomplete halves. People refer to "my other half" or "my better half." It's a view based on the idea of a natural gender split where men possess half of the characteristics of human beings and women the other half. It is not only a negative view of oneself, but it can create fierce forms of mutual dependency. You can't be whole, you can't be happy, you can't be satisfied in yourself and you can't love unless you are glued onto your missing half and thus become a full human being.

Stew looks at me confidently. "I was glad to get out of home when I was eighteen. My folks were okay, I guess, but for me in those days it was like being in prison. I couldn't breathe around that place. I was busting at the seams. Know what I did after I got out? I turned around and got engaged the same year and got married two years

later when we were juniors in college. I didn't even have a job and there I was back in that family. A different one, I mean, and I was happy as hell for the first years, but then things started sinking. I was like a guy in quicksand, I felt like a kid stuck with my folks again. I got out, I said goodbye and I was gone like that. I wouldn't do it like that now, but back then I couldn't even think straight, like I was about to explode."

Ramsey, on the other hand, is not a man to explode. He talks softly, picking out each sentence as if he's spent his lifetime finding just the right way to put it. "There were years when things were difficult. There were times when my every dream had come true. There were things about her that disturbed me, even annoyed me. I dare say the same thing was true for her. But I always knew I had her. Never for one moment did I doubt our love for each other. Not once. We had a family, they've long been on their own, but they're still part of my life. She's gone now, but she will never be gone. She really was mine forever. And I was hers."

These stories pivot around the centre of male-female relationships in our society: the family. Families exist in many different forms – gay or straight couples with or without kids, single-parent families, friends living together and extended families including grandparents, other relatives or friends. A family may not be where a relationship is taking place or even where we hope it is heading,

but the family has been the kettle in which personal aspirations and psychological needs have long brewed.

Many of men's needs – for security, for closeness, for care of ourselves and of children – are met within the family. But real families, as we all know, are more than a storybook description; they are a complex mix of support and oppression, love and violence. As Bruce Springsteen sings, *I met a girl and we ran away / I swore I'd make her happy every day / And how I made her cry*. There's a lot of crying that goes on in families, some from the pain of difficult-to-resolve differences in a relationship, some from the violence that mars far too many marriages, some just because it's a safe place to feel the pain that goes with living, and some from the inevitable hurt caused when two people split up. In these tight relationships with women, men might be able to let go a bit, but we nonetheless find it difficult to escape the expectations of our society. I can work hard to make my relationships better, to learn to be more responsive, thoughtful and caring, to be clearer about my needs and feelings. But families and all our personal relationships are not isolated and private affairs, cut off from the tawdry public world. In a thousand ways our personal relationships are inundated by the demands and conflicts of the patriarchal society as a whole. A hardrock miner, who works in an exhausting job where he feels powerless, says, "It makes me feel good to know she is at home waiting for me, like

there's a place where I'm a man. I think about that when I'm at work." His whole working life, and of course hers as well, impinges on their personal space, creating needs and expectations that are almost impossible to meet without conflict.

There is a vast landscape that forms the setting for our relationships. We live in a society in which romantic love – itself an invention of the European courts of the Middle Ages – is held out as an ideal. That ideal is one of exclusivity; love is for and from one person. If one person receives our love then there obviously isn't any left for someone else, at least not within the same category of love. In our consumer society we shop for relationships the way we shop for a new brand of detergent: What's the shape of its container? Its colour? Smell? How well does it perform? Is it within my income bracket or is it too expensive or too cheap? We live in an abundant society in which, paradoxically, the fear of scarcity rules every action and where we learn to compete for love and affection like anything else. We live in a society in which men dominate women, in which men have at various times seen women as their sexual property, in which women's autonomy has been denied by law, in which men have been allowed by law to rape their wives. We live in a society where governments, employers and, until recent decades, trade unions, have supported lower wage rates for women workers or for jobs that are associated

with women. This has added to women's dependency on male wage-earners and, conversely, on men's financial responsibilities for families. We live in a society where most of us earn our daily bread in alienated jobs performed for someone else. This alone creates a massive longing for human connection, a need that is beyond the capacity of one relationship to fulfil. We live in a society where we have learned shame for our bodies, but where the desires of our bodies are as great as ever. We live in a society where the avenues of physical contact, of emotional expression, of nurturing are for men usually limited to two narrow channels: sexual relationships and the family.

So I'm sitting at home, right there with my family. It might feel like "mine" but in a dozen ways it's "ours" – your's, mine and everyone else's. The family reflects social values and social divisions. It sparkles with idealism and sags under the numbing realities of daily life. Our private business couldn't be more public. The problems in our family and love relationships aren't just individual problems; it's not just a matter of something I've done wrong or the way she's screwing up. So many of the problems are social problems, caused by the demands, expectations, needs and impossible dilemmas placed on the two of us. We might be able to do a lot that is right, but a messy world out there often helps us do a lot that is wrong.

### ◆ Intimacy

I ask Ramsey about intimacy in his long and cherished marriage. "Oh, we were intimate. That was everything to us. But I think I know what you're getting at. At first I probably figured intimacy was only what went on in the bedroom. She was my first and only, well, you know. I thought we were intimate because we did things that neither of us had ever done with another living soul."

"And isn't that part of it?"

"Well it is, for sure. I think about those times, when you ask me about intimacy. What's foremost in my memories, though, is something a bit different. I don't know if I can find words for that one. It was sharing secrets. It was knowing that I knew more about her than anyone on earth, just like she knew about me. It was not having to pretend about anything when I was around her. That might be it, I could just let go and be myself. Just myself. I could say or do anything and knew she still loved me."

In a world where men have to perform and hustle, intimacy provides a respite and an oasis, a place where men can let down their guard, be cared for, care for someone else, be silly or be serious, share dreams, pass on secrets. All of this is part of the contract of love. It's like childhood with a dose of responsibility.

Finding intimacy and maintaining it are major

challenges for men. Their search for intimacy often goes unrecognized, even by themselves; they don't necessarily enter relationships consciously looking for intimacy. They might feel a tension between their own needs and those being expressed by women. In her book on relationships between men and women, Lillian Rubin observes that men often complain about demands for intimacy and emotional expression that don't seem to make sense to them, while women complain of men being shut down emotionally. One man she interviewed almost pleaded to her: "The whole goddamn business of what you're calling intimacy bugs the hell out of me. I never know what you women mean when you talk about it. Karen complains that I don't talk to her, but it's not talk she wants, it's some other damn thing, only I don't know what the hell it is."

"The problem," Rubin concludes, "lies not in what men don't say, however, but in what's not there - in what, quite simply, happens so far out of consciousness that it's not within their reach. For men have integrated all too well the lessons of their childhood - the experiences that taught them to repress and deny their inner thoughts, wishes, needs, and fears; indeed, not even to notice them. It's real, therefore, that the kind of inner thoughts and feelings that are readily accessible to a woman generally are unavailable to a man. When he says, 'I don't know

what I'm feeling,' he isn't necessarily being intransigent and withholding. More than likely, he speaks the truth."

Everything about the creation of masculinity is highlighted in our relations with women, because with women we're dealing with our gendered opposites. The relative absence of men from parenting, the primacy of women as parents, leaves men and women with a different sense of themselves and a different set of emotional needs. What happens if boys renounce their primary love and their original model of emotional attachment and if girls maintain this sense of oneness and identification? It means that men have learned to define themselves as separate from others, while women have learned to define themselves in relation to others. Dinah Forbes summarizes nicely: "Women are more likely to understand and experience ourselves in relation to the world. Our sense of 'me' incorporates our intimate relationships with others....We are more likely to experience and understand ourselves as daughter, wife, lover, mother - to literally lose our sense of autonomous identity within the relationships we form. So, as men have to work to achieve a less precarious sense of emotional connectedness, women have to work to achieve a less precarious sense of separateness. This difference between his sense of autonomy and our sense of relation haunts every aspect of our intimate relationships with

each other, and profoundly influences how power is acted out between men and women.”

#### ◆ Safety and Emotions

Men can bring a lot into relationships with women that can contribute to intimacy. There are the wild pleasures and sheer abandon of sex, which are part of the emotional repertoire of many men. There can also be a sense of protection and dedication to loved ones. There is the great longing for a corner of the world where he can find safety and quiet. Huge emotional needs that most heterosexual men find difficult to meet with other men can be brought into relationships with women and can contribute to their intensity and intimacy.

There are, though, many things that get in the way of intimacy. I think back to my early relationships with women: to my first college-age romances, to many relationships from the late 1960s through the 1970s, those golden years of sexual openness. There were good relationships and bad relationships; a couple I thought would last forever and others that were a nice way to pass a bit of time; some that were like a summer garden party, others that burned with intensity, passion, and love. It was a time of great expectations and dreams, when we felt we were prying open the doors of perception, a line from Aldous Huxley we were all fond of quoting. I learned a lot in those years, delved for the first time into

psychoanalytic theory, analyzed my dreams and fantasies, reworked the world over and over in my mind. But in all those years I never managed to learn the language of relationships, nor did I figure out that I had needs and fears of which I was not aware. My relationships really didn't work. I could love and wanted to be loved, but I felt like I was groping in the dark. I kept stumbling over a tangle of needs and feelings and emotions that were strewn along a thousand unknown pathways.

I wasn't unusual. Men not only tend to be weak on emotional skills, but are often suspicious and fearful of feelings. Harvard professor Carol Gilligan talks of men being “constricted in their emotional expression.” Victor Seidler, a British philosopher who writes about men, says, “We learn to treat emotions and feelings as signs of weakness....This can make it hard to identify emotional needs, for as we are less sensitive to ourselves so it is hard to be responsive to others.”

It's the problem that bedevilled Stew. He felt trapped in his family but turned around and recreated an oppressive family of his own. Lacking the skills to understand or express his feelings, he felt his only recourse was to bolt from his wife and set out on his own once again. This sense of something missing highlights our need for relationships that recreate the connectedness we have pushed aside in acquiring masculinity. There is

something out there we want and need. That's Nelson's story, the story of the man feeling not just sad about the end of his marriage, but desperate that he is now alone. If men often subdue their capacity for intimate connection, then intimacy is bound to be a place of conflict and confusion, made all the harder because true intimacy demands vulnerability and a penetration of our emotional defences. Such an invasion can be terrifying for it means giving up some of our detachment and autonomy. Since these traits are part of our psychic definition of masculinity, vulnerability and intimacy can make us feel as if our manhood and our sense of self are vanishing.

One way that some men find intimacy is in allowing themselves to be nurtured like children rather than in finding a mature form of connection based on interdependence and equality. They become emotionally dependent on women (though this can sometimes be disguised by dominating their spouses), but they are not necessarily nurturing in return. The paradox is apparent: men, whose identity is often bound up in separation, sometimes find intimacy through dependency. It becomes a problem for some men to physically and emotionally look after both himself and others.

I was talking about the tangle of my own relationships as a young adult, of living through the crescendo and quick fade of spectacular loves. It wasn't

until the end of my second major relationship, when I was twenty-eight, that I realized I had to sort out what was happening to me. I didn't have a choice. I felt crushed, rejected, and torn apart. Like Nelson, I felt as if life was nothing without her. I didn't understand why the relationship had ended, why it didn't work, but I knew I was drowning in my own tears. So I started doing some counselling and not long after got involved in my first men's support group. I eventually discovered – as we all do when we've had some time to recover from lost love – that I would survive and even prosper. More importantly, I began to understand that there are not only events and personalities in relationships, but that each relationship has its own emotional rhythms and demands. I began to uncover my own fears and needs; I discovered that I had been trying to meet all my needs in relation to one other person, something that required subsuming my partner's under my own needs. I started learning how to talk not just about what I *thought*, but what I *felt*. My next step was to go beyond talking about feelings and learning to find appropriate ways to express them.

Rediscovering a language of feelings is a hard task for men for it involves taking ourselves back to an early moment in our lives before we repressed all those feelings that we would soon equate with weakness. It is a process of rediscovery, of tapping into the immediacy of emotions that we knew as children. As children, however,

emotions flowed uncontrollably, or we used them to get the attention of parents. As adults, we have to develop skills that allow us to communicate our feelings in ways that are appropriate to the occasion. Danger lurks for those who use emotions to manipulate or to gain attention. An outburst of anger or jealousy or fear might be inappropriate or destructive to ourselves or to others.

As men, we need to learn how to listen to our hearts and the hearts of others with the same skill and precision we might apply to a technical problem, a strategy for a game or a problem at work. In doing so, we learn that emotions cannot be fully expressed in words. Words alone cannot help us address the immediacy and terror of rejection, the pain of jealousy, the sadness of separation, or the thrill of connection. Words require a distance from emotion, but as soon as we distance ourselves from that emotion, it can no longer be fully experienced or expressed. The emotion and its origins fade, sinking back into the buried depths of our hearts. Buried again, they fester. So a new language of the emotions doesn't just mean knowing what we are feeling; but it means learning new ways to experience and express the feelings. We learn that relationships require negotiation and work, including the development of safe avenues of emotional expression and release. We must find ways to express anger appropriately to a partner and listen to that person's anger in an atmosphere of openness and emotional support.

"You know what I did?" says Stew. "Well, I left my folks, got hitched up right away, and then split after a couple of years, right? You know what I did then? A year later I turned around and started the whole thing all over. This time it was a cosmic bad scene. We started arguing and cussing soon after the ink dried. I'm not stupid, but I didn't figure out what was happening. I didn't even figure out there was something to figure out. At work I got bothered by everything, sort of fidgety and not working well. One of the regular customers was this psychologist and I started talking to her one day. It was the end of the day and everyone was leaving, and I just start talking and she asks me some questions, like why did I get married so quickly and what did I miss about my parents and what was good with my current wife. She just listened and I went on for ages. It was the strangest thing. I don't remember ever having just sat thinking about how my past connected with my present and how I did things that worked against me."

"What happened then?"

"No instant changes. She suggested I start doing some counselling or therapy and I think I looked at her like she told me I was a psycho. I sort of said, yeah, good idea, and then dropped it for two years."

In the end Stew did start individual counselling, and he ended up in a men's group about the time I met him. Making the plunge into counselling was the first step in

allowing some vulnerability to enter his life, but it was also a first step in taking emotional responsibility for himself and equal responsibility for thinking about what was happening in his marriage.

The challenge isn't simply to men, but to men and women. Even if many women have developed a richer language of the emotions and somewhat better relational skills, both partners must struggle to understand the type of work and thought that must go into a relationship. Many things add to the lack of communication in relationships: not enough time, exhaustion and stress from work, pressures of parenting. These factors, however, are exacerbated by two basic problems. Many men don't adequately understand what they're feeling or how to think about their emotional needs or those of their partner. Most men *and* most women have no idea of, and no good models for, the process of discussion, negotiation and struggle necessary to make a relationship healthy.

#### ◆ Sex and Sexual Relationships

I was thirteen and she was fourteen, and we were sitting in front of the TV at the place where she was babysitting. I hate telling this story. We held hands and I had my arm around her. This had been going on for months and there still wasn't so much as a single kiss. The simple fact was that, although she had eons more experience than I, she

expected me to make the first move. She even started to tease me about not doing anything. In those days before really juicy kissing had made it to the silver screen, I wasn't exactly sure what to do. To be more precise, I wasn't sure which way to turn my head. I figured if I got it wrong, our noses would go smashing into each other and then she'd really have something to tease me about. My mind is blank about what happened next, but we finally kissed and in the end we had a hard time getting unstuck for the next few weeks.

If I could remake the world I'd make sure that sex was a place of sheer pleasure, a permanent vacationland, a tropical paradise of the senses.

Sexual relationships in what currently passes for reality are far from tranquil. One minute you're drifting down a river without a care in the world and then suddenly you're in rapids heading for a waterfall. That's because sexual relationships are where the problems and promises of men and women get focused with particular intensity. Sexual relationships, particularly those based on love and commitment, hold the promise of meeting needs unimaginable elsewhere, but they are also the place where we feel most vulnerable and exposed. Hidden needs, desires and fears rumble around and occasionally bubble to the surface. If our lives combine an experience of power and pain, it is no surprise that the potency of sex can bring the combination so quickly to the surface.

For many of us, sexual relationships are about the only corner of our lives where we feel truly and completely connected with another human being, where the prohibitions against touch and affection vanish, where we can feel wanted, needed and cherished, and where we can give love in return. Nelson says, "I said to her, couldn't have been more than five months ago, there'd never been a girl who made me feel like her. We were on this little vacation and were lying in this gigantic bed in the motel and had just had sex. I mean really great sex and she looks at me with this dreamy, 'You're just perfect you know' sort of look. I didn't feel I had to do or say anything."

Maybe that's what perfection is: those moments when we're completely relaxed with ourselves and another human being; it's a sense of oneness with oneself and the universe. For men, it's the subtle and glorious moment when we can stop pushing ourselves to succeed and perform, to make the grade as men, to experience power. Sometimes this perfection can be achieved in a moment of sexual intimacy, when there's complete acceptance of what we are, when our bodies and our desires are appreciated, when we feel mutuality and connection, when our mind and bodies are one, when the boundaries between ourselves and another human being dissolve away and we can fully let go.

Sex is this for men, but it's not only this. If relation-

ships are supercharged with a lifetime of unmet needs and a basketful of fears, if we're feeling pressure to perform and we fear our vulnerability, then there won't be much room left for those slow-mo images of two lovers running across a field.

As men, we learn to meet many different needs through sex. For most heterosexual adult men, certainly those in Anglo-Saxon cultures, just about the only time we get held, treated with affection and love, nurtured and listened to is in relationships with women where there is a sexual component. It is about the only time men are able to be uninhibited in their emotions. Shere Hite probably surprised herself and many readers when she found that most men answering her survey prized sex and intercourse for its sense of closeness. "It seems that sex and intercourse are almost the only times when many men feel free, or that they have the right, to be emotional and expressive. Similarly, many men feel that the only appropriate way for a man to ask for love and affection is by initiating sex and intercourse." Even language they chose to describe "how the vagina feels to your penis" used words that were as much emotional as tactile: "welcoming," "comforting," "loving, warm, and secure," "wet, soft, resilient, alive," "a feeling of being held closely and warmly."

Men and women tend to enter these encounters out of a different psychic reality, based in part on the different sense of autonomy and separation that we develop. So

while both men and women have intense feelings, we sometimes experience these in a different way. Dinah Forbes writes, "Women, by and large, need to feel an emotional connectedness before our erotic feelings can be aroused....Men can and often do use sex to summon up and express their feelings of connectedness. For many men, sex focuses these feelings and becomes the only manner of expressing them. Perhaps this is why, in many relationships, the man's desire for sex is more frequent than the woman's. The moments of self-abandonment become the only time he can lose his sense of separateness. Through intercourse he can meld again with woman and lose the sense of her as other. This can be both a relief for him, a renewal, and a painful assault on the boundaries of his sense of self. He can, if these feelings are too painful, reassert his separateness by dominating the woman."

If men and women often come into sexual relations with at least partially different needs and desires, then it requires good communication to bridge this gap. Our assumption should be that it takes discussion, negotiation and a lot of honesty to find what works between two people. Most of us barely attempt this.

One young man, who has been quite sexually active, says, "I just go on automatic pilot. I get into a groove and can sense where things will end up."

"What do you talk about, about sex, I mean?"

"Not a lot, really. Sometimes we'll talk about whether to do it, sometimes about condoms and that, but you just have to make things happen. Afterwards, we'll say how good it was, even if it wasn't."

"What can go wrong?"

"God, you want me to think about that?" He takes a drag from his cigarette. "Everything, I guess. It can be a disaster. She might want more than I want, she might want less. Maybe I'll get turned off and not get it up. Maybe I won't like how she'll do certain things."

"So why not talk about it?"

"Don't know. It's easier to have your head down there between her legs than to talk openly about what you like. It's plain embarrassing to say... I don't know, well you know."

I actually didn't know what he liked from sex. I didn't know what he felt insecure or awkward about. I doubted that his partners would know everything right away and figured that, even after a lot of trial and error, they would still be a bit uninformed. Too few men or women discuss their sexual preferences and desires. Few talk about their fears or the insecurities that get in the way of sexual intimacy. For men, the performance principle can rear its head and block meaningful communication. Of course you know what she (or he) wants; of course you'll get it up, and of course this will be good.

Meanwhile, many women are unable to be sexual

initiators. I guess that's what was happening back when I was thirteen. It's happened many times since. The whole progression, starting with asking someone out on a date, is so often the prerogative of men. It's an emotional burden on men and it's also a problem for those women who are caught on the opposite side of these relations of gender power. If power is unequal on the streets, in politics and at work, then it would be surprising if power were equal in bed. That's why the mutual exploration and expression of needs and feelings is so important in sexual relationships: it becomes a means to lessen these power differences by making what is usually unexpressed into part of the currency of our daily contact. Some of this exploration can best happen through words, although it also occurs through the explosion of differences and desires that takes place in the excitement of sex. Through body language and words, we learn to be vulnerable, we learn to exercise strength in ways that aren't harmful, we learn that desire can be mutual and is best satisfied if it is satisfied for both of us. Power relations can not only be learned or unlearned in sex; they are themselves part of the vibrancy of lovemaking. In different sexual positions, for example, we experience power and intimacy in different ways. Whether we acknowledge it or not, in sex we often fool around with desires about domination and submission. After all, that's one of the reasons why some people prefer

being on top or on the bottom, in being held down or holding someone down. Sex can be a safe place to mutually explore power relations without blame or guilt, so long as these explorations are consensual.

Part of that renegotiation of power relationships has to do with men taking more responsibility for the outcome of our sexual actions: not engaging in sexual intercourse without contraception and, in the case of all but long-term partners, not without a condom; sharing the cost of birth control and making those trips to the drugstore; knowing the effectiveness and side effects of different methods of birth control, particularly the risks of the pill or, worse, IUDs. It has to do with learning to listen to the needs of a lover – not only what she or he wants and doesn't want, but to listen for what *isn't* being said.

Men's sexual play isn't just a world of sun and cumulus clouds. For all that we celebrate sex, many of men's desires remain buried. We've seen how men's domination of women keeps men in the position of sexual "doer" and makes it hard for many men to lay back and let it happen to them. The repression of homoeroticism further de-eroticizes the male body. This has an odd effect on heterosexual relationships. Although we might admire the muscle power of other men, the sensuality of the male body isn't usually appreciated by heterosexual men or by the culture in general. As a result, many men are unable to explore the full range of our physical

potential, the desire and sensuality that can flow from every surface and crevice of our bodies. I remember one night when I was at a dance with a number of friends. A gay friend, who has had a long flirtation with me, tweaked my nipple through my T-shirt. If he hadn't been a good friend and if some degree of teasing wasn't part of our friendship, I would have found this objectionable and a clear case of sexual harassment. Instead I just gave him a mock grimace. Later that night with my female partner I set out to find exactly what feelings were there in my nipples. It didn't exactly revolutionize my sexual life, but it was one little bit in learning to more fully appreciate my body and to celebrate my full sexual potential, to be able, as Walt Whitman wrote, to "sing the body electric."

#### ◆ Friendship

Fifteen years ago Janet and I were the best of friends. Then we drifted apart and our paths crossed only occasionally until the past couple of years when we had grown close again. Now, suddenly, I felt ignored by her. She was madly in love and stuck in that stage where one minute without her beloved Sid was not worth living. "Michael!" Janet would say when I dared call her, "It's you!" as if I had been long dead and had miraculously reappeared in her life. I thought I was being silly, petty. Shouldn't I be thrilled for her? Why was I jealous? Why did I feel betrayed? It wasn't as if we were lovers.

Then I head down to the YMCA for a workout with my friend Roger. In the whirlpool he confesses to me that it's happened *again*. "What?" I ask innocently. He's infatuated with one of his wife's women friends who lives in the country. "She's, well, she's terrific and gorgeous beyond belief and she's like part of the family. I mean when she visits she stays with us and comes down for breakfast just in a T-shirt or she'll be in a towel going between the spare room and the shower and just smiles at me like, like she's, you know, smiling at me. It makes me croak of horniness. I'm happily married! She's one of her best friends! She's my friend! This is real sicko stuff. It never happens to you, does it?"

Right, Roger.

The reason these and many other dilemmas exist is that friendships between men and women carry many of the same dynamics and power relationships as sexual relationships. We've grown accustomed to think about our love relationships as being in some special world, which, if not exactly a dream world is at least a place of exclusive intimacy. So it can surprise men when intense feelings of love, jealousy or desire occur in friendships. In friendships between men and women, many of the same dynamics exist as in friendships with other men or in our sexual relationships. Just as good friendships bring us closer to someone else, they also bring us closer to our

own feelings and diverse needs. In the safety and warmth of a friendship we allow ourselves to feel things that we don't feel at other times. It's no wonder that I felt a bit betrayed when my friend Janet didn't talk to me for a month: the relationship was a place where I met certain needs and had an intense connection with a fellow human. Perhaps the intensity of my reaction was partly the result of letting my resentment simmer and stew. I didn't let her know how I was feeling, but the more I felt it, the more I expected her *just to know* what I was feeling.

Men's friendships with women may not require the same constant work and devotion to detail as marriages or other sexual relationships. But they do require concentration on our own feelings and needs as they come up, and on those of our friends. As in any other relationship, we have to struggle to break through barriers. Men sometimes rely on that friend for emotional support without giving the same in return – something that can also happen in reverse. Many men find it easier to dish out advice when all that's required is a sympathetic ear and shoulder. We might look at her problems through the eyes of someone who has resources and sources of power and privilege that many women in our society don't enjoy. "Just leave the jerk," we might think, without realizing her fear for her safety or her lack of financial resources. Or maybe we give a woman friend more support than we get in return, but we can't bring

ourselves to say, "Hey, I need some attention too."

It's also no wonder that many friendships stir up sexual feelings. We often feel attracted to those we love, even when that attraction wasn't the initial or primary basis of the friendship. When you care about someone, you often see them as beautiful and desirable. Sometimes this is fine and friendships can turn into long-term sexual relationships or just an occasional, friendly encounter. At other times it is inappropriate, but there's nothing wrong with the feelings, and even acknowledging them if they're mutual. Just because you feel something doesn't mean you have to do anything about it. Sometimes what feels like sexual desire is actually a desire for physical affection and closeness that can be met outside of a strictly sexual context through hugging, cuddling or holding hands. There are many ways to experience love and closeness that don't involve sex.

### ◆ **Transforming Men Transforms Relationships**

All of us have sometimes felt that relationships are just too hard, just too convoluted, just too crazy. Maybe the combination of commitment to another person, demands of an alienating job and the dream of lifelong fulfilment simply don't mesh most of the time. The stresses are real. Making everything more difficult are the challenges of

confronting gender inequalities in relationships, the need for equality in childcare and domestic work, and to rethink what it means to be men and women. In a century or two, humans may look back at our ideas about marriage and the ideal relationship and know we were hopelessly idealistic or hopelessly muddled in our blueprints for love.

Nevertheless, in the here and now, men can act to make our relationships with women more fulfilling. Our own process of transformation helps us open up more emotional space. Acknowledging our feelings and recognizing our needs are important steps towards greater intimacy. Learning to find support and intimacy in friendships with both women and men can take some of the pressure off our sexual relationships. Fighting for equality within relationships may require our sharing a greater domestic burden, but it can also build a relationship based on mutual trust and responsibility. It all must be part of an agenda for change.

## CRACKING THE ARMOUR

◆ *Remaking the  
World of Men*

There is a crisis in the lives of men.

The images and beliefs of many centuries of patriarchal power are collapsing. Some of the blows to patriarchy have come from within, from its own logic of development and change. As the power of men has been increasingly invested in economies and states beyond the control of individual men, and as the industry and science created by men have assumed their own relentless logic, the world we made in our own image has begun to undo itself. Our attempts to control nature have backfired in a way that would be laughable if the results were not so horrific. Our mighty economies have alienated us from the land and have turned us into extensions of machines.

Our great cities are like cancerous growths. Our old patriarchal gods are all but dead, sacrificed to the new patriarchal god of progress. And in the greatest of ironies, the very patriarchal science that sought to give men the power of life and death has allowed women to control their own reproduction to an extent never before possible. As a result, women have a new-found independence from the control of men.

Against this backdrop that modern feminism was developed. The first feminist wave came not in the late 1960s but more than a century earlier when women began to organize for the right to vote, own property, join trade unions, and receive decent pay for their labour. They challenged men's monopoly of social power and spoke out on issues concerning sexuality, birth control and violence.

With the privileges and powers enjoyed by men under attack, it is no surprise that most, but not all, men fiercely resisted this challenge. More surprising was that feminism awakened a new beast in men – the pain and alienation that had almost always been buried and perhaps was a small thing because of the privileges that men still. But with each victory of women, the rewards of manhood became shakier. Men's sense of alienation increased as their power to compensate for it decreased. With less power, we were less able to assert our well-rehearsed solutions to our pain. The balance

between men's power and men's pain had shifted irrevocably.

The whole issue has become even more confused as men, over the past few decades, have tried in piecemeal fashion to find our own ways of redefining manhood. We became confused about what it meant to be a man. Rigid dress codes and sexual mores broke down. Increasing numbers of men questioned their assumptions and roles. Men who embraced the ecology and peace movements, began asserting that you didn't have to be a warrior to be a man. A new attention to health and fitness helped us learn to value our bodies and to look after ourselves.

But none of these developments could check the crisis of masculinity. As we race towards the new millennium, the crisis of masculinity has only grown, with more confusion, more false solutions, more Messiahs on the loose, more attempts to reassert the old masculinity in a new wardrobe, or to run away from the problem and pretend we're not men. More attempts to run at the problem and shoot the messengers, especially when the messengers are women. The beast has pounced, and men have reacted with confusion, anger, self-doubt, pain and, sometimes, with hope.

The fact that the old ways no longer work can lead us to despair, or to grasp with desperation onto the fading images of power. But these old ways are no longer useful because we are facing a crisis different from any we have

confronted in the past. We are living in a time of unparalleled change, leaping like jack-rabbits from one technological innovation to the next. But the problems we stumble over are ones that defy technological solutions – the issues are ones of a culture, a way of life, a form of social organization, a type of thinking and feeling that are increasingly dysfunctional and destructive. It's a time when the trajectory of human social organization has brought us to a precipice, when the old ways of doing things are out of kilter with the complexities and problems of the world.

There's something I've heard so many times that it's entering the realm of cliché, but I still like it for it rings true. I'm told that the Chinese character for "crisis" is a combination of two figures: one representing danger and the other, opportunity. Danger and opportunity. We often think of the situation of men today as one of crisis, where problems and danger lurk like tigers in the jungle. Why not also see the crisis as a unique and wonderful opportunity held out to men to rethink our lives and to join with women in rethinking how we live on this planet?

We are living through something that is unique in human history. Great civilizations led by saints and madmen have come and gone. Religions and philosophies have had lives long and short. Discovery and invention have been constant features of all our

cultures. But for the first time since the rise of the first male-dominated societies thousands of years ago, there is a challenge to our most fundamental forms of social organization. Men's power is being challenged. The challenge is uneven from society to society; there will be advances and there will be setbacks. But I think it is safe to predict that unless a world war or ecological catastrophe casts us into barbarity, the way humans have organized their lives will never again be the same. We are at the beginning of the greatest conscious revolution in human history.

Sweeping changes in science, economic and social organization have brought us to this point, but more than anything it is feminism that holds out a new promise. Ray, a seventy-eight-year-old man living in a small town, said to me that "as a result of feminism I have made, well not exactly a deathbed conversion, but an affirmation of myself. Women have given men a wonderful new way of looking at humanity."

It may be wonderful, but it's never easy. And it is to men's varying responses to this changing world that our thoughts now turn.

#### ◆ "Oh yeah, I support equality"

Back in 1970 or 1971, a male friend and I signed up for the first women's studies course at my university. There were forty women and two men. The two of us were

brilliant. We eloquently defended women's liberation, offering idea after idea about how to struggle for change.

At the end of the first class the female professor came up to us and said, "Thanks very much for your support. Please don't come back." I was angry and humiliated. Here I was, sticking my neck out, courting beliefs that were heresy among the vast majority of my male peers, and I was told my presence wasn't wanted. It took me almost a decade to realize what the rejection was about. We might have been sympathetic, but we sat there reproducing all the stale patterns of male domination. The two of us talked more than the forty women combined. We knew feminism was about equality and liberation; we knew it meant there were a few things we shouldn't do or say. However, we had missed a fundamental point: feminism was about shifting the power relations between men and women. It was about women creating their own space and language. And along with just about everyone else, we missed the point that feminism would turn out to be as much about our lives as men as it was about women.

When the women's liberation movement got rolling in North America and Europe, the response of most men was scorn and derision, but as the years turned into decades, its impact grew. Message by message, issue by issue, it crept into the consciousness of men. Even though a lot of men wouldn't necessarily say "yes" if you asked them, "Are you pro-feminist?" if you go through the ideas

of feminism one by one, you find that the majority of men accept these ideas. Should your wife or daughter earn the same as men for work of equal value and have equal access to the professions and good union jobs? Of course. Should women have the right to choose to have abortions? Yes, says a solid majority of men in an increasing number of countries. Is violence against women a major social problem? For more and more men the answer again is a vehement yes.

In Toronto a couple of years ago, the city electrical workers were on strike. It was a predominantly male union, and for years the danger and difficulties of high-voltage line work had cultivated an extremely macho environment. Guys breaking beer bottles over their own heads, stuff like that. Women had entered the work force a few years earlier and the union was waging an ongoing educational campaign against sexism. Then came the strike and a city-wide union meeting. I walked one of the workers, a huge brawling sort of guy. In his arms was his baby. "The extraordinary thing," recalls the union president, "wasn't just that this guy brought his baby, but that no one teased him about it. Other guys offered to hold her and give him a hand. When she cried no one batted an eye. Tell me there hasn't been change among men."

Corporations and universities run by men have been forced to begin to institute affirmative action programs for hiring more women. Some political parties are scrambling

to find more women candidates. Unions and political parties, professional associations and private clubs are beginning to embrace many of the ideas of women's equality. Twenty years of struggle are being felt within the legal system. In many countries restrictive abortion laws are being thrown off the books by judges and legislatures. In the winter of 1991 a British court overturned a centuries-old law that a man could not be convicted of raping his wife. A week earlier a court in Brazil overturned the acquittal of a man who murdered his wife and her lover "in defence of his honour." In 1992, a conservative government in Canada passed the most progressive rape law in the world, stating not only that no means no, but that only a clear yes is a statement of consent. Corporations and governments are granting maternity leave, and some workers have won paternity leave. Equal pay legislation is on the books in some countries, although it is still far from being widely implemented. This isn't to say the feminist millennium has arrived, but simply that we're living in a time of unprecedented change.

The support of men for feminism and for a profound change in how we see manhood has led to the growth of new types of organizations among men. Chief among these have been men's support groups. Men's support groups are of many types – some explicitly anti-sexist, some simply talking about changing men. Some are influenced by ideas about peer counselling and therapy,

others by the mytho-poetic men's movement. Whatever their differences, they have in common the idea that men should meet together, discuss in a personal and confidential way their lives, their problems and their dreams. By creating a new form of brotherhood, we can pull down the barriers between men, collectively reassess what it means to be men, and directly or indirectly, positively influence relations between men and women in our society. Most men's support groups are small – usually five to nine men – and meet every week or two; some last for years, some just for six months or a year.

There has also been the growth of organizations with a focus on social action or providing services to men, men working publicly in support of women's reproductive rights, including abortion rights, in the childcare movement or within their unions, companies, schools and professional associations around equality issues. The most notable work has been by men's groups concerned with violence. In cities across North America, volunteer groups have sprung up to speak out publicly against men's violence. Men from these groups speak in schools and prisons and to community groups on issues such as rape, wife assault and sexual harassment. Some set up counselling groups for batterers (the best of these are accountable to the survivors), which occasionally evolve into professional social service organizations. One of the most impressive examples of this activity has been

Canada's White Ribbon Campaign, which I've been lucky to be part of. In the fall of 1991 a small group of us encouraged men to wear a white ribbon during the first week of December to commemorate the December 6, 1989 massacre of the fourteen women at the University of Montreal engineering school. The focus, though, was broader; the ribbon was a symbol of our opposition to all forms of violence against women and was a way for men to speak out in their workplaces and communities. Our first year was a huge success, generating support from leading male politicians, trade unionists, businessmen, actors, writers, native leaders and athletes. It is now developing as a grass-roots organization based on committees set up by men in their schools and offices, factories and neighbourhoods, places of worship and clubs, and in its second year involved one out of ten adult men in Canada as well as many boys.

While many men are sympathetic to the ideas of women's equality and watch with approval as the barriers fall, for most men there is little connection between these changes for women and their own lives. They support the idea of equality for women, but maybe they still don't take on half the domestic work, maybe they still find ways to dominate women around them, maybe they still find solace in sexist humour. They don't always understand that the changes women are seeking have a lot to do with our lives as men. They don't yet see that in

feminism we can find some of the answers to the crisis of masculinity.

For some men who support feminism, there is confusion about how they're supposed to act. Do we have to be nice guys all the time, agree with whatever women say? Should we be making jibes about what jerks men are and put women up on an ideological pedestal? These confusions will prevail so long as we only look at how patriarchy has negatively affected women and ignore what it has done to us as men.

Whatever the limits of this new-found consciousness among men, I see something important in these changes. Even if we have a long way to go, we are experiencing one of those rare times in human history when a social group with power has been forced to say it will recognize the equality of those it has dominated. Men are demonstrating a growing capacity to listen to the voice of women, to understand the anger and pain and to respond positively. There are tentative steps beyond equal sharing of power and towards a new definition of power. Whatever men have done to fit into the armour of masculinity, our decency as human beings is far from destroyed. In at least some of men's responses to feminism, there is compassion and a vision of equality.

#### ◆ **The Anti-Feminist Backlash**

That's all nice to know. It's great that a growing number

of men support the idea of women's equality, but a lot of men have been left behind. As Susan Faludi, Naomi Wolff and others have so persuasively argued, there has been a backlash against feminism, sometimes conscious and planned, more often not. The solution for these men to the crisis of masculinity is to turn back the clock. "Let's reassert men's power," they are telling us. "And let's assert the power of the conservative institutions that men have developed."

This backlash has been part of the inspiration of the right-wing revival in the United States since the 1970s. One of the central thrusts for the New Right has been against women's access to abortion, that is, to one aspect of their reproductive freedom. These movements have revealed a holy alliance between the Protestant right and the conservative wing of one of the world's most powerful patriarchal establishments, the Catholic Church (to the horror of many in the Church who are personally opposed to abortion but support a woman's right to choose, others who oppose abortion rights in most circumstances but are alienated by the harassment by anti-choice storm troopers against women seeking abortions, and still others in the Church who are clearly, even though quietly, pro-choice).

Similarly, the New Right prides itself as an anti-gay movement. It well understands that homophobia is one of the essential props of our dominant vision of

masculinity and our current patriarchal order. Homophobia is crucial for keeping men in line. Even the racism of the New Right has a strong gender element. Black men have long been portrayed as oversexed (hence white women need the protection of white men) and black women as there for the taking. "Black" has become a word describing gender as much as skin colour.

Not only are anti-feminism, homophobia and racism part of the gender staples of the New Right. This amorphous political current seems to recognize that the crisis of the patriarchal system isn't only a crisis of individual masculinity. It is expressed in national and international politics. Much of the imagery of the right centres on the idea of restoring national pride, not through, say, improvements in health care or education or a reduction in poverty. No, the project has been to flex military muscles, to show you can be the toughest kid on the block. This is the significance of the language of former presidents Ronald Reagan and George Bush. They projected tough images that coalesced around a national project. For Reagan, someone who had long played the tough cookie, his actions could be largely symbolic. Hand out billions to his friends in the military industry, perhaps invade a tiny place like Grenada. For Bush, stalked by the charge of being a "wimp," and with a clearer sense of the possibilities of U.S. power within a "new world order," the stakes were higher. He brought things to a crescendo

in early 1991 when, backed by the mightiest army in the world, he could be a rich kid playing the school-yard tough guy. He drew a line in the sand and challenged Iraqi President Saddam Hussein to cross it. The nation ate it up. There was no room for negotiation or sanctions. Might would be right. Machismo struck an ancient chord. And it wasn't only the right wing who got into it. In the midst of the war, one liberal man in England told me, "I'm not sure what's more frightening, the war, or my fascination with it."

The anti-feminist backlash has been expressed by others who are not necessarily political right-wingers, but who are angered by the gains made by women in recent years and what they see as reverse discrimination against men. Some of them have coalesced into a "men's rights movement" under names such as the Coalition of Free Men. One particular area of focus has been on men's custody rights and, in some cases, opposition to child support payments (which notoriously have been ignored by many men anyway). Some groups and individuals have gone so far as to set up defence funds for suspected rapists or to lobby against affirmative action for women.

#### ◆ Escaping to the Mythical Past

There have been anti-feminist and pro-feminist men. There have been new types of men's organizations, but the first to sweep into broad popular consciousness in

North America has been what is called the mytho-poetic men's movement. Robert Bly, only one of many proponents of this approach, has become its focus since the late 1980s following the publication of his book, *Iron John*. Bly is a decent storyteller, but more than that, he's touched a deep nerve. The nerve is the crisis of masculinity. His words strike a familiar chord for many men because they are about the experiences and concerns of men in crisis. His solutions are gripping for they seem to promise a world free of gender confusion and conflict. Bly has helped many men recognize for the first time that things they have been feeling for years have also been experienced by other men around them. He has joined the voices of many men who have talked about our isolation from one another and our distance from our fathers, and he has suggested a way out of the crisis. I do have concerns, however, about both his analysis of the problem and the solutions he gives. His stories and promises might help some men feel a lot better for a while, but I worry that in both analysis and action he is steering men and women in the wrong direction.

Bly's central idea is that as modern societies developed, men became increasingly estranged from manly pursuits and manly roles. We've been domesticized and feminized, brought up by mothers and left without links to fathers and male mentors. As a result, we've had to discover our masculinity only in relation to

women and not in relation to other men. This has buried our masculinity and created a breed of “soft” men, men who are passive, men who are not in touch with the essential self that he calls “the deep masculine” or “the wild man.” Such men are alienated men, are isolated men, are insecure men, are men prone to extremes of passivity or extremes of violence.

One or two of these points have been themes both of this book and my own work over the past decade, particularly the isolation and insecurity of many men and our distance from our fathers. Beyond that, Bly’s ideas are often diametrically opposed to mine. For Bly, there seems to be no distinction between sex and gender. There are essential male qualities that might be buried or even lost to individual men but that lie at our emotional core. These essential qualities of masculinity are biological givens, even though particular circumstances of time and society help give them shape. Such a view ignores the social construction of masculinity, the fact that there are no emotions or feelings intrinsic to manhood but rather that these are the product of our life experiences in a patriarchal society. Bly’s view ignores the fact there are many definitions of proper manhood. He rails against soft men, passive men, although, as far as I’m concerned, these men are no less real men than the hairy, grunting Iron John of his story. What’s more, as a book that hit the best seller list during that international male orgy of

bloodletting – the Gulf War, which Bly himself eloquently opposed – it was strange to read that “soft men” and “passive men” had apparently taken over the show.

In lumping together sex and gender Bly misses the point that masculinity exists neither as a core biological reality nor in the roles we play. The dominant forms of masculinity exist, not as timeless archetypes, but as power relationships with women, children, other men and our surrounding world. Bly suggests that the basic problem facing men is that we’ve been feminized and haven’t broken from the clutches of our mothers. Although he dwells on the relative absence of fathers in bringing up children, he misses the primary outcome of mother-led parenting: not that we’re all momma’s boys, but that boys *break* from their mothers at a very early age and do so within a social context that harms us. The problem is that we break from our initial, and perhaps only, experience of empathy and oneness with another human in order to identify with a male figure who simply isn’t there enough. The problem isn’t with grasping mothers (what a sad old male complaint that is!) but with men’s absence from the hard work and emotional intensity of care for infants and young children. The basic psychology associated with the dominant forms of masculinity is a product of the relationships in these early years, the break from the world of nurturing and emotional oneness and the development of the armour of masculinity.

In missing this, Bly gets confused around passivity. I agree with him that some men, confronted by the crisis of masculinity and the demands of feminism, risk falling into inaction. They start looking like awkward adolescents who no longer know what to do with their bodies. They try to lose their power to dominate and control without discovering new sources of inner power and strength. It is a sad picture, but I don't think it is an accurate description of most men these days. By focusing on this emotional paralysis and self-effacement, Bly misses the larger meaning of passivity: that the dominant images of manhood in our society and in our age revolve around the suppression of passivity and receptivity and the accentuation of activity and control.

Bly doesn't spot men's contradictory experiences of power. He doesn't recognize the existence of patriarchal societies, because he doesn't recognize that we live, and have lived, in societies controlled by men that give many forms of privilege and power to men. He eloquently recognizes men's pain, but is unable to link this to the way we have defined our power and to the basic social institutions of men's power. He leaves us in the murky world of mythic images and individual identity without recognizing that the problems of men are linked to the social structures that men have created over centuries to give us collective social power.

As a result of these weaknesses, his solutions come

up short. He lovingly points to a mythical past and the rituals and ideas of those years as bearing messages for our salvation. In doing so he misses the fact that the societies that sparked these myths and rituals of men—whether Greek or tribal, pioneer or post-feudal—were *patriarchal* societies. Virtually all of the rituals he celebrates were used by men to assert their collective power over women. For example, he cites approvingly the brilliance of old men initiators in many tribal cultures. He refers to boys being ritualistically kidnapped from their mothers, sometimes put in dark isolation for hours (in simulation of life in the womb of manhood), and, at the end, allowed to crawl through a man-made tunnel, a sort of vagina, into the arms of waiting men. It was precisely this type of ritual that men used to deny that women had the true power of bringing life into the world. To become a man meant breaking from the real flesh-and-blood birth relationship with women, and to concede that only men had the power to bestow life on other men. Such rituals were not neutral; they were used to create the great fraternity of Man, the bonding between men that denied women both their reproductive and social power.

In Bly's mythical past there was no oppression of women. It's a mythical past built on a sort of intellectual version of the Flintstones. He writes, "we know that for hundreds of thousands of years men have admired each other, and been admired by women, in particular for their

activity.” Other than his delightful imagination, I don’t know what time machine Bly employs, but *we* actually don’t know anything of the kind. Nor do most anthropologists now accept the version of reality that gives men sole franchise as hunters and protectors. “Men and women alike,” writes Bly, “called on men to pierce the dangerous places, carry handfuls of courage to the water-falls, dust the tails of the wild boars. All knew that if men did that well the women and children could sleep safely.” Early human existence was neither so simple nor so gender-defined. Anthropologists now look at early societies and see broad differences: some societies were dominated by men, others were based on equality. In some, men did the hunting, while in others, hunting and gathering tasks were shared. It wasn’t simply man the hunter and women the home-bound seeker of safety.

The reason these images are attractive to Robert Bly and many other men is that in this mythical past there was certainty about what it meant to be a man. Men were men and women were women. Projecting our own ideas and views into the distant past, it appears “obvious” that to be a man meant having qualities x, y and z. And of course, he says, these qualities were admired by men and women alike. No feminism there: everyone loved the boys of 50,000 BC.

This romance with a mythical past is nothing new. During the Industrial Revolution at the end of the

eighteenth century, as the march of industry and urbanization tore away the social fabric of pre-industrial life, intellectuals, artists and architects became fascinated with ancient Greece and Rome. A retreat into the mythical past of classical days was a balm on the frayed nerves of those dragged into the nasty realities of modernity and progress. As progress has progressed, as industry has marched ever deeper into the soul of our world, it appears that soothsayers have to retreat into an ever and more distant and mythical past to find solace.

To his credit, Bly highlights a very real problem: many a man no longer knows what it means to be a man. Men are confused. Wounded and bewildered, some strike out in violence and anger; others become ineffectual without any sense of personal power and worth. But we don’t need the balm of a mythical past. To be a man means only to have a penis and testicles. That’s all the certainty we really need. What makes it difficult to be a man is that most of what we associate with manhood is the collective hallucination of gender. Added to this, women and men alike are now rejecting the dominant ways we have defined manhood. It is these confusions that have fueled the crisis of masculinity.

By returning to a mythical past there is no sense of the need for struggle to change the structures of the economic, cultural, social and political world that have preserved a certain type of men’s power. There is a

completely individualistic solution: you get in touch with the “deep masculine,” you learn to bond with other men, you develop a new men’s subculture to collectively discover the “wild man” that lurks within, and you develop new rituals and new mentors who will walk with you into the new millennium.

Together we can do much better. We can find solutions that address the confusion between sex and gender. We can discover positive ways for men to embrace feminism, to understand that the empowerment of women will be part of a liberating experience for men. We can chart pathways of personal *and* social change. And we can do it now.

#### ◆ **Beyond the Crisis of Masculinity**

I am looking into a mirror. It’s not much of a mirror, just a little pocket thing I carry for emergencies when I go on canoe trips. It’s so small I can see only bits of my face at a time. There’s an eye and the bridge of my nose. There are my lips. Here is a good angle for shaving the left side of my neck. Anyhow, I’m looking into this mirror and although I can only see these bits and pieces, my brain puts it all together to give me a complete picture. The complete picture, of course, is still just a glimpse at the surface of a deeper reality that is buried underneath. When you look at someone, you do get clues about who the person really is from those bits and pieces: maybe it’s

the way the eyes hold yours, maybe it’s the shape of the smile or the turn of the head.

That inner world, my psychic landscape, is unique to me, but in those grooves of thought and action, there’s a lot I share with other men. I’ve spent many pages talking about what has happened to men, women, children and the planet as a result of the ways men have defined masculinity and set up societies with men at the helm. Starting shortly after birth, my brain took in that world of men and made out of it my own reality. Now my mental landscape maps the pushes and pulls of men’s power. The demands this society has made on me, the demands I quickly learned to make on myself, etched themselves onto the neural biways of my conscience, the expressways of my desires and fears, and dusty roads of memory. They are the pathways of male power that I have taken into my own personality. The power is not simply psychological; it is institutionalized and embedded in my world.

Men, though, are not just part of the problem. We are also part of the solution. We have within us the capacity and the capability to provide roughly 50 percent of the answers to the problems in the world today, including relations between the sexes. Exercising our capacity for change will start by recognizing that men can and must support women’s struggles for equality and liberation. We still have social privileges that benefit us but are often detrimental to the other half of humanity. It

is in our interests as caring individuals to support their struggles.

It is also in our interests because, as we have seen, the ways we have defined our own power and privileges exact an enormous cost on men. Our own experiences tell us that the ways we stacked the deck and dealt the cards have burned the dealer as well as those to whom we dealt. The price men pay shows us clearly that the changes envisioned by feminism are not a zero-sum game in which women will gain and men will lose. Whatever privileges and forms of power men stand to lose, there is a new world of connection, security, nurturance, eroticism, partnership and re-defined power that we have to gain.

The search to redefine masculinity doesn't mean a lifelong penance or a sentence to goody-goody land. We don't have to abandon many of the pleasures we've associated with being men – our physical and mental abilities, our strength and courage. We do, however, have to recognize these attributes in women, and we do have to stop being so obsessive about these things. We have to rethink our priorities, to wage an ongoing struggle at home and at work, on the streets and in our bedrooms, to put our money where our well-intentioned minds are.

I have suggested repeatedly that the problem is a social problem that becomes lodged within our minds. If the problem is both social and personal, then change has

to happen both out there and in here, in the outside world and behind the eyes of that person in the mirror.

There's been a long and sometimes tedious debate that seems to inform the political history of the twentieth century, although it goes way back to a lot of ancient religious and political philosophies. It's the one about how you change the world. Do you try to change yourself and figure that the coalition of thousands and millions of people changing themselves will have a critical impact on the structures and ideas of this world? After all, you'd argue, you need people with different ideas in order to make a different world. Or do you say that we can't significantly change ourselves so long as we live in a world full of oppressive structures that shape, limit, manipulate and define the human beings who you hope to change? It usually gets set up as a chicken-and-egg problem. It was one of the differences between the hippies and the political activists of the late 1960s. It's one of the differences today between men involved in men's growth movements and those involved in anti-sexist men's organizations. The former say their concern is in being better men, in getting in touch with their feelings, in exploring their full potential and in changing themselves. The latter say that's all fine and dandy, but there is daily injustice taking place. We can spend the rest of our lives trying to change ourselves without laying a finger on a rather nasty world that

surrounds us.

I've always had great respect for both ideas, and believe that you have to change both individual people and society. But it wasn't until I started trying to figure out what patriarchy has had to do with my own life that the relationship between personal and social change started getting clearer. Any problem lodged so firmly between our ears *and* set into the stonework of parliaments and football stadiums is going to require a lot of combined action if we want to shake its foundations.

Part of the reason we have to change ourselves is that we can't even identify the full extent of the problem until we're confronted with the way we're personally involved in it. But then again, we can't always understand the nature of the problem until we see how it has become a part of our everyday world. As an example, anyone can be aware there is a problem with inequality in parenting, but in a sense I can't fully understand the problem until I've had to struggle with being an equal parent and a fully nurturing father myself. After all, I live in a society that values just about everything else I do more than being a parent. It's also a society in which I spent many years working hard to lose the emotional skills necessary to being a good parent. That tells me that personal change and personal experience is critical. But, on the other hand, I can't fully know the depths and sources of the problem until I attempt to change the laws about parental

leave or women's reproductive rights, or change the way the economy is set up that makes it hard to be an equal or good parent. Those things tell me there's a world out there that has to be challenged and changed if I'm going to be a different person within it.

Any attempt to change myself happens not only in my head, but through my ties with the rest of the world. Any attempt to change the world in such a fundamental way has to happen as both social and individual change. Men can join in this process of change by supporting feminist causes at work and in government, in our neighbourhoods and schools. We can recognize that these aren't only "women's issues;" they are just as much our issues. We can join the process of change by sitting down with other men to start rethinking what it means to be men. There are different ways to do that, but there's no better start than in men's support groups. Men are beginning to develop an agenda for change .



We started with armour and end with a mirror. The mirror reflects the image of the person we try to project to the world, the armour hides the vulnerable bits that we don't want others to see. Armour projects a secure and robust manhood that is actually a lead weight around our bodies. The armour of old was worn by individuals but it was the creation of societies. Our individual armour is

much the same – it is personal stuff created by the smithies of the patriarchal order.

Now, mirrors are tricky things. They're symbols of vanity and of preoccupation with one's surface presentation. But let's give them a bit more credit. The tiny mirror in my emergency kit could signal a rescue plane from far away or with luck it could help me start a fire. Mirrors are used in telescopes that enable us to see billions of miles into space; maybe they can help us see a few obscure inches into ourselves.

This book, like the experiences of men in men's support groups, is like a mirror that allows us to reflect on our lives as men. In our reflections we see more than isolated, surface selves. We see the world of men and women and we see how we interact with each other. We see how our lives get geared into the workings of a patriarchal society. If we look hard enough, and especially if we look along with other men, we can start spotting bits of the armour. It's hard to see at first, almost impossible. We're just not trained to hold up a mirror and see our personal suit of armour. But it's there, covering our hearts and souls, protecting us against our own fear, separating us from our full and positive human power.

It was a game for me to visit the armour in the art museum when I was a kid in Cleveland. It was fun to run between the suits of armour in the room with the exotic

plants from Africa. Many years on, it's hard to pretend any longer that my armour is a game. I've hurt too many people with it. I've hurt myself trying to find a comfortable position under a metallic skin.

I wish I could just get rid of the armour by saying I don't need it any longer or by deciding this or that, but it's a struggle and it's going to take a long time. It's a process that takes me into groups of men and leads me into the streets beside my sisters and brothers. It's a process of rethinking and remaking myself and the world that surrounds me. It's a process that raises tremendous fear in some men. But for each bit of fear, it raises ever more hope and optimism; for each terrified man, there are a dozen more who are welcoming change with tentative but open arms.

My mind isn't as free or innocent as in the days when I played under the skylights of the museum. We can't go back. But we can go forward – if we do it together.

I think we can.

## SOURCES

In the following pages I have aimed to provide an informal and accessible resource for lay readers by departing from the usual bibliographical style and combining a list of specific sources for all references in the text, grouped according to chapter, with a review of notable current resources for further reading, grouped according to subject. In some cases, I've added a brief notation about the text. Finally, I have included a list of organizations and publications bearing on subjects addressed in this book.

### Chapter 1 ♦ From Flesh to Steel

Blye Frank made the comment, "masculinity is what we do." See his "Reflections on Men's Lives: Taking Responsibility," *Our Schools/Our Selves*, v. 2, n. 3 (September 1990).

### Sex differentiation

Some of the most accessible books are John Money and Anke A. Ehrhardt, *Man & Woman, Boy & Girl* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972) and works by

Robert J. Stoller--for example, his *Presentations of Gender* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985) and *Sex and Gender* (New York: Science House, 1968).

A very readable textbook on sex and gender is John Archer and Barbara Lloyd, *Sex and Gender* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985). And see Phillip Shaver and Clyde Hendrick, eds., *Sex and Gender* (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1987) and E.E. Maccoby and C.N. Jacklin, *The Psychology of Sex Differences* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975).

Critiques of sociobiology are to be found in Lynda Birke, *Women, Feminism and Biology* (Sussex: Wheatsheaf Books, 1986), Ruth Bleier, *Science and Gender* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1984); Ruth Hubbard, M. Henifin, and B. Fried, eds., *Biological Women: The Convenient Myth* (Cambridge: Schenkman, 1979); Carmen Schifellite, "Beyond Tarzan and Jane Genes," in M. Kaufman, ed., *Beyond Patriarchy* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1987); Janet Sayers, *Biological Politics* (London: Tavistock, 1982). And see Betty Rosoff and Ethel Tobash, series editors of the various volumes of *Genes and Gender* (New York: Feminist Press of the City University of New York).

### Different masculinities

Sources included Harry Brod, ed., *A Mensch Among Men* (Freedom, Ca.: The Crossing Press, 1988) on Jewish men; Richard Majors and Janet Mancini Billson, *Cool Pose: The*

*Dilemmas of Black Manhood in America*, (New York: Lexington Books, 1992); Robert Staples, *Black Masculinity* (San Francisco: Black Scholar Press, 1982); and Lawrence E. Gary, ed., *Black Men* (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1981); and the many fine books by bell hooks.

On working class masculinities: Paul Willis, *Learning to Labour* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977); David L. Collinson, "'Engineering Humor': Masculinity, Joking and Conflict in Shop-floor Relations," *Organization Studies* 9, (1988), pp. 181-199; and Stan Gray, "Sharing the Shop Floor," in M. Kaufman, ed., *Beyond Patriarchy*, op. cit. (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1987).

On Mexican-American men, see Manuel Peña, "Class, Gender and Machismo: The 'Treacherous Woman' Folklore of Mexican Male Workers," *Gender & Society* 5, (1991), pp. 30-46; Alfredo Mirandé, "Machismo: Rucas, Chingasos y Chagaderas," *De Colores: Journal of Chicano Expression and Thought* 6 (1982); and Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, "Overcoming Patriarchal Constraints: The Reconstruction of Gender Relations Among Mexican Immigrant Women and Men," *Gender and Society* (Fall 1992).

Analyses of white, middle class masculinities tend to be the staple of most US writings about men during the 1970s and 1980s. Influential "early" works included Joseph H. Pleck and Jack Sawyer, eds., *Men and Masculinity* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1974); Deborah S. David and Robert Brannon, eds., *The Forty-*

*Nine Percent Majority* (Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1976); Marc Feigen Fasteau, *The Male Machine* (New York: Dell, 1975); Jon Snodgrass, ed., *For Men Against Sexism* (Albion: Times Change Press, 1977); Robert A. Lewis, *Men in Difficult Times* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1981); Elizabeth Pleck and Joseph Pleck, *The American Man* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1980).

“Early” books from England, included Andrew Tolson, *The Limits of Masculinity* (London: Tavistock, 1977) and Paul Hoch, *White Hero, Black Beast: Racism, Sexism, and the Mask of Masculinity* (London: Pluto Press, 1979). From France, Emmanuel Reynaud, *Holy Virility* (London: Pluto Press, 1983).

On gay masculinities, in addition to the sources listed below, see, Gil Herdt, *Gay Culture in America* (Boston: Beacon, 1992); Marty Levine, *Gay Men* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976); Mark Thompson, ed. *Gay Spirit* (New York: St. Martin's, 1987); and Jonathan Katz, *Gay American History* (New York: Crowell, 1976).

Some more recent anthologies about men and masculinities are, Michael Kaufman, ed., *Beyond Patriarchy. Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1987); Michael S. Kimmel and Michael Messner, eds., *Men's Lives* (New York: Macmillan, 1992); Harry Brod, ed., *The Making of Masculinities* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1987); Rowena Chapman and Jonathan Rutherford, eds., *Male Order:*

*Unwrapping Masculinities* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1988); Victor J. Seidler, ed., *The Achilles Heel Reader* (London: Routledge, 1991); Alice Jardine and Paul Smith, eds., *Men in Feminism* (Methuen: New York, 1987) and Joseph A. Boone and Michael Cadden, *Engendering Men* (New York: Routledge, 1990) both of which involve literary analysis and the application of discourse theory; Franklin Abbott, *Men and Intimacy* (Freedom: The Crossing Press, 1990); Jeff Hearn and David H.J. Morgan, *Men, Masculinities, and Social Theory* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1990); Andy Metcalf and Martin Humphries, *The Sexuality of Men* (London: Pluto Press, 1985)--which should win the prize for the best cover of any of the anthologies: it's a picture of Clint Eastwood in bondage, fully clothed on a Western movie set, of course; and Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman, eds., *Theorizing Masculinities* (Newbury Park: Sage, late 1993).

As well as many other books mentioned below, see, Victor Seidler *Rediscovering Masculinity: Reason, Language, Sexuality* (New York: Routledge, 1989); Clyde Franklin, *Men and Society* (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1989); Arthur Brittan, *Masculinity and Power* (London: Basil Blackwell, 1989); John Stoltenberg, *Refusing to Be a Man* (Portland: Breitenbush, 1989); James A. Doyle, *The Male Experience* (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1989); Jeff Hearn, *The Gender of Oppression* (London: Harvester/Wheatsheaf, 1988); R.W. Connell, *Gender and Power* (Stanford: Stanford

University Press, 1988); Lynne Segal, *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men* (London: Virago, 1990); Kenneth Clatterbaugh for an analysis of various approaches to the study of masculinity, *Contemporary Perspectives on Masculinity* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1990). Books from a mythopoetic perspective are listed with the sources for Chapter Ten.

My thanks to Mark Rosenfeld for research on working class masculinities and to Chris Gabriel for research on the relation of gender and race.

### **Chapter 2 ♦ Pain Flows from the Source of Power**

R.W. Connell, *Gender and Power* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987), pp. 184-185, for the concept of hegemonic masculinity.

Dick Francis, *The Danger*, London: Michael Joseph, 1983, p. 188.

Klaus Theweleit, *Male Fantasies* v. 2, Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 1989, p.73.

Adrienne Rich, "Power," in *The Dream of a Common Language* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1978), p. 3.

See Jeff Hearn, *The Gender of Oppression* (Brighton: Wheatsheaf Books, 1987) for a discussion of masculinity as alienation.

My points on emotional release draw on the insights of co-counselling, a volunteer, peer-counselling network which I participated in for several years in the early 1980s.

### **Chapter 3 ♦ Dillinger's Equipment**

#### **Feminist and radical psychoanalysis**

Among the works of feminist psychoanalysis that most heavily influenced me were Nancy Chodorow, *The Reproduction of Mothering* (Berkeley: University of California, 1978); Dorothy Dinnerstein *The Mermaid and the Minotaur* (New York: Harper Colophon, 1977); Jessica Benjamin. *The Bonds of Love* (New York: Pantheon, 1988); as well as Juliet Mitchell, *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* (New York: Vintage, 1975).

Herbert Marcuse's *Eros and Civilization* (New York: Vintage Books, 1962) has influenced me in this area, as has Gad Horowitz's important but little-known book *Repression. Basic and Surplus Repression in Psychoanalytic Theory* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977). As a graduate student in the 1970s, I studied psychoanalytic theory with Gad Horowitz. Other influences include the early work of Erich Fromm and Wilhelm Reich in late 1920s and first few years of 1930's, some of the work Otto Fenichel and David Rapaport, and of course the writings of Freud himself.

My thanks to Eleanor MacDonald for her research assistance on object relations theory.

#### **Gender identity**

See Stoller's works mentioned above. See also Ethel S. Person and Lionel Ovesey, "Psychoanalytic Theories of

Gender Identity," *Journal of the Amer. Academy of Psychoanalysis*, V. 11, n.2:203-226 (1983); Ruth Fast, *Gender Identity* (Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Ass., 1984), p. 60. For a discussion of the phase of rapprochement and many other points, see Benjamin *op. cit.*, p. 34-36 and *passim*.

Dorothy Dinnerstein, *Mermaid and the Minotaur*, pp. 111-112. My intention in discussing rebellion from the mother is certainly not to reproach the mother. See Paula J. Caplan's *Don't Blame Mother* (New York: Harper and Row, 1989) for a critique from a social learning perspective.

#### **Infant relations with the father**

Among numerous sources, see, Michael E. Lamb, ed. *The Role of the Father in Child Development* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1981); Stanley H. Cath, Alan R. Gurwitt, John Munder Ross, *Father and Child* (Boston: Little Brown, 1982) including the article by Michael W. Yogman, "Observations on the Father-Infant Relationship," pp. 101-122. Also see Michael W. Yogman, James Cooley, Daniel Kindlon, "Fathers, Infants, Toddlers: Developing Relationship" and others in Phyllis Bronstein and Carolyn Pape Cowan, *Fatherhood Today* (New York: John Wiley & sons, 1988); and Kyle D. Pruett, "Infants of Primary Nurturing Fathers," in *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, v. 38, 1983. More generally on relations with

fathers see Samuel Osherson, *Finding our Fathers* (New York: Free Press, 1986).

#### **Chapter 4 ♦ Jekylls, Hydes and Hulks**

See Benjamin, *The Bonds of Love*, pp.104 and 166; also see pp. 76 and 170. See also Chodorow *Reproduction*, especially, Chapter 10. On disidentification see Robert Stoller, *Sex and Gender* (New York: Science House, 1968), pp. 263-265.

#### **Patriarchal rituals**

See Mary O'Brien, *The Politics of Reproduction* (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1981); On rituals associated with menstruation and birth, see, among numerous sources, Peggy Sanday's compilation of data from different tribal societies, *Female Power and Male Dominance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981) and Marilyn French's account in *Beyond Power* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1985), pp. 77-82. See also Gilbert Herdt's work, such as *Guardians of the Flutes* (New York: mcGraw-Hill, 1981) and David D. Gilmore, *Manhood in the Making*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990). On the medicalization of pregnancy and childbirth see Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English, *For Her Own Good* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1978).

There is a rich debate on the origins of patriarchy. In

addition to the above see Rae Lesser Blumberg, "A General Theory of Gender Stratification," in *Sociological Theory*, edited by Randall Collins (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984); Eleanor Leacock, *Myths of Male Dominance* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1981); Janet S. Chafetz, *Sex and Advantage* (Totowa: Rowman and Allanheld, 1984); Sherry Ortner and Harriet Whitehead, *Sexual Meanings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Michelle Z. Rosaldo, "The Use and Abuse of Anthropology," *Signs* v.5, 1980, pp. 389-417; Martin K. Whyte, *The Status of Women in Preindustrial Societies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978); and Rayna R. Reiter, ed., *Toward an Anthropology of Women* (New York: Monthly Review, 1975).

Timothy Findley rewrites the story of Noah and the ark in his stunning novel, *Not Wanted on the Voyage* (Toronto: Viking, 1984).

Tim Ryan, "The Roots of Masculinity," in A. Metcalf and M. Humphries, editors, *The Sexuality of Men* (London: Pluto Press, 1985), p. 26.

Alfred Adler is quoted by Bob Connell *op. cit.*, p. 199 from *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler* (New York: Basic Books, 1956), p. 56. Also see N. Chodorow *op. cit.*, p. 174. Freud took up Adler's concept in one of his last works, *Analysis Terminable and Interminable* (1937c).

Gerald I. Fogel, Frederick M. Lane, Robert S. Liebert, *The Psychology of Men* (New York: Basic Books 1986)

contains some useful and related articles.

My thanks to Dinah Forbes, Michael Kimmel, and Dan Leckie who each, independently, suggested that I use the term "mother wound" to describe some of the concepts I discuss in this chapter.

## Chapter 5 ♦ The Burden of Pleasure

### Sex and sexuality

Those familiar with some of the recent feminist and gay male writings on sex and sexuality will recognize an approach that tries to locate the conflicting and tension-ridden nature of women's sexuality. See, for example, Carol Vance, editor, *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality* (Boston: RKP, 1984); Ann Snitow, Christine Stansell, and Sharon Thompson, eds., *Powers of Desire* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1983.); Sue Cartledge and Joanna Ryan, eds., *Sex and Love: New Thoughts on Old Contradictions* (London: The Women's Press, 1983); Mariana Valverde, *Sex, Power, and Pleasure* (Toronto: The Women's Press, 1985)--p. 79 is the source of the reference to Queen Victoria and sex between women; Adrienne Rich, "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence," in Snitow, et al. *op. cit.*; and Varda Burstyn,

ed., *Women Against Censorship* (Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre, 1985).

See also Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, translated by Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1980); Jeffrey Weeks, *Sexuality and Its Discontents* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985); Jeffrey Weeks, *Sexuality* (London: Ellis Horwood and Tavistock, 1986); J.H. Gagnon and W. Simon, *Sexual Conduct: The Social Sources of Human Sexuality* (Chicago: Aldine, 1973); Gary Kinsman, *The Regulation of Desire* (Montreal: Black Rose, 1987); Andy Metcalf and Martin Humphries, eds. *The Sexuality of Men* (London: Pluto Press, 1985); Bernie Zilbegeld's *Male Sexuality* (Boston: Little Brown, 1978)--p. 24-25 is the source of the quote; Michael S. Kimmel, ed., *Men Confront Pornography* (New York: Crown, 1989)--p. 10 is the source of the quote; Shere Hite, *The Hite Report on Male Sexuality* (New York: Bantam, 1981)--pp. 398, 340 are the source of the quotes; Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Co., 1948); Emmanuel Reynaud, *Holy Virulity*, translated by Ros Schwartz, (London: Pluto Press, 1983); John D'Emilio and Estelle B. Freedman, *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988); Jonathan Ned Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac* (New York: Harper & Row, 1989); and various articles in my book *Beyond Patriarchy*.

Other specific sources in this chapter were Lynn Segal,

*Slow motion* (London: Virago Press, 1990), p.45; and P.D. James, *Devices and Desires* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1989), p. 136.

Several paragraphs of this chapter were adapted from an article I co-wrote with Gad Horowitz, "Male Sexuality: Towards a Theory of Liberation," printed in Michael Kaufman, *op. cit.* I thank Gad for permitting me to use this earlier work.

## Chapter 6 ♦ Leather Whips and Fragile Desires

There are many useful discussions on the pornography debates. For feminist anti-censorship perspectives see the articles collected by Varda Burstyn in *Women Against Censorship* (*op. cit.*) Particularly relevant to the issues addressed here were the essays by Sara Diamond, "Pornography: Image and Reality"; Myrna Kostash, "Second Thoughts"; Ann Snitow, "Retrenchment Versus Transformation: The Politics of the Antipornography Movement"; and Varda Burstyn, "Political Precedents and Moral Crusades: Women, Sex and the State" and "Beyond Despair: Positive Strategies." See also Shannon Bell's forthcoming work on prostitute discourse that includes an examination of what she calls prostitute performance art; and Ellen Willis, "Feminism, Moralism,

and Pornography," in A. Snitow, *et. al., op. cit.*

For feminist anti-porn writings that see pornography as hate literature and usually favor strict government controls see Andrea Dworkin, *Pornography: Men Possessing Women* (New York: Perigee, 1981); Andrea Dworkin and Catherine MacKinnon, *Pornography and Civil Rights: A New Day for Women's Equality* (Minneapolis: Organizing Against Pornography, 1985); Catherine MacKinnon, *Feminism Unmodified: Occasional Discourses on Life and Law* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987); Susan Griffin, *Pornography and Silence: Culture's Revenge against Nature* (New York: Harper & Row, 1981); Susan Cole, *Pornography and the Sex Crisis* (Toronto: Amanita Enterprises, 1989); those associated with Women Against Pornography, and men such as John Stoltenberg, *Refusing to Be a Man* (Portland: Breitenbush Books Inc., 1989).

Michael S. Kimmel has gathered a wide range of writings by men on pornography in his volume, *Men Confront Pornography* (New York: Crown, 1989). Thanks to Michael for the point about porn projecting onto women our own images of sexuality.

Other useful sources include Edward Donnerstein, Daniel Linz, and Steven Penrod, *The Question of Pornography: Research Findings and Policy Implications*, (New York: The Free Press, 1987) and N.M. Malamuth and Edward Donnerstein, eds., *Pornography and Sexual*

*Aggression* (Orlando: Academic Press, 1984);

Himani Baneerji, in the early 1980s, was the first person I heard talk about the feminist nature of Pauline Reage's, *The Story of O*. See also Kaja Silverman's "*Histoire d'O: The Construction of a Female Subject*," in Carole S. Vance, *op. cit.*

On gay and lesbian pornography there are articles in both the Burstyn and Kimmel collections.

Specific quotes from the above references, are:

Michael S. Kimmel, *op. cit.*, p.3, 314; Fred Small, "Pornography and Censorship," in Kimmel, p. 75-76; John Berger, *Ways of Seeing* (London: BBC, 1972), p. 131; Mariana Valverde, p. 126. (Valverde and Ann Snitow, *op. cit.*, also speak eloquently about the continuity between porn and mainstream culture.) 132, 140; Andy Moye, "Pornography," in Metcalf & Humphries, pp. 52, 53; Ann Snitow, in Burstyn, p. 115; Myrna Kostash in Burstyn, p. 36; Timothy Beneke, "Intrusive Images and Subjectified Bodies: Notes on Visual Heterosexual Porn," in Kimmel, pp. 181, 174; David Stienberg, "The Roots of Pornography," in Kimmel, p. 57; Sara Diamond, in Burstyn, p. 40; Phillip Leopate, "Renewing Sodom and Gomorrah," in Kimmel, p. 28; Dierdre English, "The Politics of Porn," *Mother Jones*, V.5 n.3 April 1980, p. 43; William Gibson, *Mona Lisa Overdrive* (New York: Bantam 1988), p.25; Harry Brod, "Eros Thanatized: Pornography

and Male Sexuality," in Kimmel, pp. 193-4, 198.

## Chapter 7 ♦ Pain Explodes in a World of Power

### Battering of women and children

Among many good sources, see Lenore E. Walker, *The Battered Woman* (New York: Harper Collins, 1979); Suzanne K. Steinmetz, *The Cycle of Violence* (New York: Praeger, 1977)--p. 90 is the source of the statistics on homicides); Margie Wolfe and Connie Guberman, eds., *No Safe Place* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1985) including the article by J. Drakich and Connie Guberman, "Violence in the Family--the source of statistics on hitting children, p. 244.); Elizabeth A. Stanko, *Intimate Intrusions* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985); M. Straus, R. Gelles, and S. Steinmetz, "The Marriage License as Hitting License," in A. Skolnick and J. Skolnick, *Family in Transition*, 6th Edition, (Boston: Scott, Foresman, 1989)--the source of the statistic on spousal violence in marriage, pp. 302-313. R. Emerson Dobash & Russell Dobash, *Violence Against Wives* (New York: Free Press, 1979) and see R. Emerson Dobash & Russell Dobash, *Women Violence and Social Change* (New York: Routledge, 1992).

### Rape

Diana E.H. Russell and Nicole Van de Ven, eds., *Crimes Against Women* (Millbrae: Les Femmes, 1976); Susan Brownmiller, *Against our Will* (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1975); Ann Wolbert Burgess, ed. *Rape and Sexual Assault II* (New York: Garland, 1988), including the articles by Ilsa L. Lottes, "Sexual Socialization and Attitudes Toward Rape" and Mary P. Koss, "Hidden Rape"--the source of campus rape statistics, and *Hidden Rape in University Campuses* (Rockville, Md: National Institute of Mental Health, 1981)--the source on the attitudes of men who rape); Jim Senter, "Male Rape: The Hidden Crime," *Changing Men* V. 19, Spring/Summer, 1988, for his account of being raped; M.R. Burt, "Cultural Myths and Supports for Rape," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 38, pp.217-30, 202, and FBI figures for rape in different countries, p.197.

Other sources on rape were Sylvia Levine and Joseph Koenig, eds., *Why Men Rape* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1980)-(which presents the testimonies collected on film by Douglas Jackson); Timothy Beneke, *Men on Rape* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982) and "Intrusive Images and Subjectified Bodies," in Kimmel *op. cit.*, p. 171, 172 are the sources of the quotations; Elizabeth A. Stanko, *Intimate Intrusions* (London: RKP, 1985); Julia R.

Schwendinger and Herman Schwendinger, *Rape and Inequality* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983); Diana Russell, *The Politics of Rape* (New York: Stein and Day, 1974) and her *Rape in Marriage* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990). Also see Peggy Reeves Sanday, *Fraternity Gang Rape* (New York: New York University Press, 1990); Diana Scully, *Understanding Sexual Violence* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1990).

Peggy Sanday's comparative figures from "The Socio-cultural context of rape: A Cross-cultural study," *The Journal of Social Issues* 37:5-27 and I.L. Weiss *Journey into sexuality: An Exploratory Voyage* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1986) both referred to by Ilsa L. Lottes, "Sexual Socialization and Attitudes," p. 196. Also see references in Peggy R. Sanday, *op. cit.*

Scott Coltrane has used anthropological data to compare men's behavior in different cultures in "The Micropolitics of Gender in Nonindustrial Societies," *Gender & Society* 6 (1992), pp. 86-107.

On the sexual abuse of children see, for example, Judith Lewis Herman, *Father-Daughter Incest* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981); articles in Wolfe and Guberman *op. cit.*; Sylvia Fraser, *My Fathers House* (New York: Harper & Row, 1989)--p. 19 is the source of the quotation. On male survivors of child abuse see Mike Lew, *Victims No Longer* (New York: Nevraumont

Publishing, 1988) and Mic Hunter, *Abused Boys: The Neglected Victims of Abuse* (New York: Ballantine Books 1990).

On the roots and impact of the abuse of children see the many books by Alice Miller, such as *For Your Own Good: Hidden Cruelty in Child-rearing and the Roots of Violence* (New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux, 1983) or *Banished Knowledge: Facing Childhood Injury* (New York: Doubleday, 1990)

### Men and the Military

Victor Mattei and the army drill sergeant are quoted by Helen Michalowski, "The Army will Make a 'Man' Out of You," WIN, March 1, 1980.

Wayne Eisenhart the *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* v.17 n.1, Winter 1977, p. 6 and *Journal of Social Issues*, v.31, No. 4, 1975, p. 16. Also see Robert J. Lifton, *Home From the War*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973 on some veterans' fears of intimacy.

Al and John quoted by Thomas Walkom, *The Globe and Mail*, February 27, 1986, p. A8. The Gulf war soldier quoted in *The Globe and Mail*, February, 1991, p. A2.

The institutionalization of rape in war has been documented at length by Susan Brownmiller in her pathbreaking 1975 book, *Against Our Will* (New York: Bantam, 1975).

Scott Key quoted in *The Globe and Mail*, Feb. 27, 1991, p. A2.

Two useful cinematic treatments of the military training process are Gwen Dyer's excellent *Anybody's Son Will Do*, from Canada's National Film Board's 1983 documentary series "War" and the first half of Stanley Kubrick's *Full Metal Jacket*.

Two good sources on the relationship of patriarchy, masculinity international politics, and war are Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases* (London: Pandora, 1989) and Jean Elshtain, *Women and War* (New York: Basic Books, 1988).

Other references for this chapter were: Russell Mokhiber, *Corporate Crime and Violence* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1988); Ken Kesey, *Sometimes a Great Notion* (Toronto: Bantam Books, 1964), p. 115; Meg Luxton, *More Than a Labor of Love* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1980), pp 65-66; Martin Amis, *Einstein's Monsters* (London: Penguin, 1988), p. 35.

On the expression of unwanted emotions in the family, see Michele Barrett and Mary MacIntosh, *The Anti-Social Family* (London: Verso, 1982), p. 23.

## Chapter 8 ♦ Buddies in Power and Pain

David Jackson, *Unmasking Masculinity* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1990), p. 177-9.

The 38 year old man talking about his friendships is quoted by R. Bell, *Worlds of Friendships*, (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1981), quoted by Drury Sherrod, in Harry Brod, *The Making of Masculinities*, (Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1987), p.217.

Michael Messner, "The Meaning of Success: The Athletic Experience and the Development of Male Identity," in Brod *op. cit.*, p. 198.

Otto Fenichel, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1945), p.212.

Primo Levi, *The Monkey's Wrench* (New York: Summit Books, 1978), p. 39.

The British soccer fan quoted by Peter Marsh and Reneé Paton, "Gender, Social Class and Conceptual Schemas of Aggression," in *Violent Transactions*, pp. 59-86, edited by Anne Campbell and John J. Gibbs (London: Basil Blackwell, 1986), p. 60.

See Robin Wood, "Raging Bull: The Homosexual Subtext in Film," in Kaufman, *op. cit.* for a discussion on sadism/masochism and the repression of homosexual desire in film.

Gad Horowitz, *op. cit.*, p. 99

D.H. Lawrence, *Women in Love*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics, 1960--first published in 1921), pp. 304-305.

E.M. Forster's *Passage to India* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985), p. 267.

Some material in this chapter is adapted from my article, "The Construction of Masculinity and the Triad of Men's Violence," in Kaufman, *op. cit.*, 1987.

Other references on sports as a gendered activity and as an important site for the construction of masculinity are: Michael A. Messner, *Power at Play: Sports and the Problem of Masculinity*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992); Varda Burstyn, *The Rites of Men* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, forthcoming); Brian Pronger, *The Arena of Masculinity* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), Bruce Kidd, "Sports and Masculinity," in Kaufman, *Beyond Patriarchy, op. cit.*

### Chapter 9 ♦ Hard Times at the Oasis

The miner, born in 1953, is quoted by Meg Luxton, *op. cit.*, p.66.

Dinah Forbes, "Difficult Loves," in *Who's on Top? The Politics of Heterosexuality*, by H. Buchbinder, V. Burstyn, D. Forbes, M. Steedman (Toronto: Garamond Press, 1987), quotations from pp.54 and 55.

Lillian B. Rubin, *Intimate Strangers* (New York: Harper Colophon, 1984), quotations from page 66, 71 and see also pp. 76-7, 102-3.

Victor Seidler, *Rediscovering Masculinity* (London: Routledge, 1989), p. 157.

Shere Hite, *op. cit.*, pp.344 and 336-346

On the family, also see, Bonnie Thorne and Marilyn Yalom, eds., *Rethinking the Family* (New York: Longman, 1982); Pat Armstrong and Hugh Armstrong, *The Double Ghetto* (Toronto: McLelland & Stewart, 1984); Michele Barrett and Mary McIntosh, *The Anti-Social Family* (London: Verso, 1982); Louise A. Tilly and Joan W. Scott, *Women, Work & Family* (New York: Methuen, 1987); Bonnie Fox, ed., *Family Bonds and Gender Divisions* (Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press, 1988); K. Anderson et. al., *Family Matters* (Toronto: Methuen, 1987); Eli Zaretsky, *Capitalism, The Family, & Personal Life* (New York: Harper, 1976); Bonnie Fox, ed., *Hidden in the Household* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1980).

On men, fatherhood, and domestic life, see, Arlie Hochschild, *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*, (New York: Viking, 1989); Rosanna Hertz, *More Equal Than Others: Women and Men in Dual Career Marriages*, (Berkeley: University of California, 1986); Ralph La Rossa, "Fatherhood and Social Change," *Family Relations* 37 (1988), pp. 451-457; C. Lewis, *Becoming a Father*, (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986); Graham Russel, *The Changing Role of Fathers* (London: University of Queensland, 1983), plus the sources listed under Chapter 3.

My thanks to Susan Prentice for research assistance and helpful comments during my research on the family, to Keith Murphy for tracking down some statistics on the

family, and to Ray Jones for his thoughts on developing a language of the emotions. The first time I heard a critique of the notion that women and men are incomplete halves until we're brought together was by Beth Steuver.

### Chapter 10 ♦ Cracking the Armour

In a remarkable and often surprising book, Michael Kimmel and Tom Mosmiller have collected documents and testimony by U.S. men who have publicly supported feminism over the past two centuries. *Against the Tide: Profeminist Men in the United States 1776-1990* (Boston: Beacon, 1992).

See Barbara Ehrenreich, *The Hearts of Men* (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1984) for resistance by men in the 1950s and on more recent resistance see, Susan Faludi, *Backlash* (New York: Crown, 1991). Also see, Naomi Wolff, *The Beauty Myth* (Mississauga: Random House, 1990); Cynthia Cockburn, *In the Way of Women: Men's Resistance to Sex Equality in Organizations* (Ithaca: ILR Press, 1991); Marilyn French, *The War Against Women* (New York: Summit, 1992), and Doris Anderson, *The Unfinished Revolution* (Toronto: Doubleday Canada, 1992).

For discussions on the patriarchal nature of modern science – only referred to in this book in passing – see Brian Easlea, *Fathering the Unthinkable* (London: Pluto

Press, 1983) and Brian Easlea “Patriarchy, Scientists, and Nuclear Warriors,” in M. Kaufman, *op. cit.*; Carolyn Merchant, *The Death of Nature* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980); Judith Plant, ed., *Healing the Wounds* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1989), as well as some of the texts cited in chapter one on gender and science.

Works written in the mytho-poetic framework include Robert Bly, *Iron John* (Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1990)--the quote is from page 60; Sam Keen, *Fire in the Belly* (New York: Bantam Books, 1991); Robert Moore and Douglas Gillette, *King, Warrior, Magician, Lover* (New York: Harper Collins, 1990). In a different vein, see John Rowan, *The Horned God* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987).

For a longer critique of Robert Bly and theoretical framework of the mythopoetic men's movement see Michael Kimmel and Michael Kaufman, “Weekend Warriors,” in Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman, ed., *Theorizing Masculinities* (Newbury Park: Sage, 1993).

Thanks to Michael Kimmel, Joseph Dunlop-Addley, Terry Boyd and many others who helped me develop my analysis of Robert Bly, and, again, to Michael for his thoughts on the historical antecedents of the contemporary crisis of masculinity. See his forthcoming book, *Manhood in America* (Harper Collins) for a fascinating discussion of this topic.

## Further Resources

### Canada

Those interested in finding out about local men's groups, groups working with violent men and other such efforts, or to have a list of resources from women's groups and selected articles should write for "The National Men's Directory. Support, Education, and Action," compiled and edited by Ken Fisher and David Nobbs. [2002 note: no longer available]

The White Ribbon Campaign, the world's largest initiative by men organizing against men's violence against women, is a community-based effort with a growing presence among men across the political and social spectrum. For more information, contact the WRC at 365 Bloor St. E., Suite 204, Toronto, Canada M4W 3L4, 416-920-6684, FAX: 416-920-1678, [www.whiteribbon.com](http://www.whiteribbon.com), [whiterib@idirect.com](mailto:whiterib@idirect.com).

The Men's Network for Change, an informal network of pro-feminist men's groups, publishes a very good newsletter *Men's Network News* (which includes a listing of member groups). To join and obtain a year of the newsletter write 17 Marley Place, London, N6C 3S9--\$26.75 or \$10.70 if you can't afford the full price. The Network helps sponsor an annual men's conference in the fall. [2002 note: this network has disbanded]

Most provinces and some local governments, trade

unions, schools boards, and corporations have offices that deal with gender issues. The focus of these women's directorates, equal opportunity offices, equity offices, is on women's rights but they have a lot of information that is be useful to men as well. The umbrella group of Canadian women's organizations is the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, 57 Mobile Dr., Toronto, M4A 1H5, (416) 759-5252, FAX: (416) 759-5370.

### United States

The National Organization for Men Against Sexism (NOMAS) and its precursors have been around for almost two decades. It has a number of working groups, including those relating to ending men's violence, gay rights, challenging homophobia, ending racism, on male-female relations, fathering, pornography, and concerning child custody issues. It sponsors an excellent annual conference in different parts of the United States. (P.O. Box 455, Louisville, CO, USA, 80027-0455. 303-666-7043, [www.nomas.org](http://www.nomas.org).)

NOMAS also sponsors the Men Studies Association, which has an annual conference, puts out a newsletter, and sponsors a research review published by Sage (see below.) For more information, write care off NOMAS.

*Changing Men* is an ever-improving magazine published twice a year (306 N. Brooks St., Madison, WI 53715). A two year subscription is \$24.

**Research on Men and Masculinities**

Several terrific academic book series on men and masculinities are now being published. For a list of current titles you can write the publisher or check an academic bookstore in your area.

On behalf of the Men's Studies Association, Michael Kimmel is the series editor of "Research Series on Men and Masculinities" published by Sage (write Michael Kimmel, c/o Sage Publications, 2455 Teller Rd. Newbury Park, Ca. 91320). [2002 note: this journal ceased publication. Michael Kimmel now edits *Men and Masculinity*, published by Sage.]

Michael Kimmel is also the series editor for a Beacon Press's "Men and Masculinity." (Beacon Press, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts, 02108-2892). [2002 Note: This series has been replaced by series Michael edits for University of California Press and for Zed Books.]

There are two efforts in England are published simultaneously in North America. Jeff Hearn is series editor for Unwin and Hyman's "Critical Studies in Men and Masculinities" (15/17 Broadwick Street, London, England W1V 1FP or 955 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02139.) Victor J. Seidler is series editor for Routledge's "Male Orders" (11 New Fetter Lane, London, England EC4P 4EE or 29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001).

**2002 Postscript on Sources**

The decade following the publication of *Cracking the Armour* has seen a phenomenal growth of books, research, and organizations that address issues of men and masculinities.

Three of the hundreds of sources are:

Michael Kaufman's website: [www.michaelkaufman.com](http://www.michaelkaufman.com)

White Ribbon Campaign website (which includes links to other organizations): [www.whiteribbon.com](http://www.whiteribbon.com)

The Men's Bibliography (A comprehensive bibliography of writing on men, masculinities and sexualities, compiled by Michael Flood): [www.xyonline.net/mensbiblio](http://www.xyonline.net/mensbiblio)