

The Double-Bind of the Middle Class Male: Men's Liberation and the Male Sex Role

MAUREEN BAKER AND J. I. HANS BAKKER

Within the past decade, traditional definitions of "masculinity" (eg. Ishwaran, 1971) have been increasingly challenged and even discredited. However, there has been little effort to clarify this concept within a heterosexual context. The great outpouring of feminist and gay liberation literature during the seventies has contributed to an increased awareness of options available to men and women. But while women who feel oppressed by the female sex role can turn to Greer, Millett, Friedan, and many others, men do not have a comparable body of theoretical and ideological literature to support a changing male identity. This is largely because men have not generally seen themselves as oppressed, but rather have emphasized their dominant economic and political status.

The woman who rejects the traditional definition of femininity becomes a "feminist," but there is no comparable term for a man who aims to redefine masculinity. The word "masculinist," if used at all, has a derogatory connotation, as in the work of Simone de Beauvoir. It has been used as a synonym for one who holds patriarchal or "male chauvinist" attitudes.

Men's liberation has recently developed in Britain and North America as a response by some middle class "liberal" men to the growth of feminist consciousness in women they knew. Many men felt excluded by women's solidarity and cohesiveness. The experimental relationships and political action by feminists inspired these men to examine their own relationships, attitudes, and priorities (Tolson, 1977:10).

The ideology of this nascent men's liberation movement claims that the traditional male sex role has placed great restrictions on men's behaviour, and actually grants them fewer choices in their lifestyle than women's experience. The traditional middle class male role allows men few options other than full-time employment, discourages them from expressing emotions and developing close relationships with other men, and leads to a high

From Maureen Baker and J. I. Hans Bakker, "The Double-Bind of the Middle Class Male: Men's Liberation and the Male Sex Role," *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 11 (1980), 547-61. Reprinted with permission.

rate of stress-related diseases. Men's liberation therefore encourages men to down-play occupational mobility and its related extrinsic rewards of money and power, and trade them off for more intrinsic satisfactions, such as "self-realization," expressiveness, and egalitarianism.

In this paper, we are arguing that those men who are interested in accepting this kind of ideology are potentially placed in a double-bind¹ situation. Although they may *personally* believe in equality between the sexes, egalitarian marriages, and the desirability of developing their potential outside of the work environment, other people—employers, wives, friends—may not necessarily support these changes. While the ideology of men's liberation encourages men to "androgynize" their behaviour, men's socialization, their employment situations, and many of our social institutions continue to reward more traditional masculine behaviour. If they accept men's liberation, they stand to lose the more tangible rewards offered to middle class men.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Our discussion of changes in the male sex role takes place within the context of role theory. We are making the assumption that there is some value consensus in society, and that for each sex category there are some accepted patterns of behaviour which are reinforced by societal structures such as the legal system, schools, occupational settings, and also primary groups. Sex roles are multi-dimensional, affected by the situational context, change over time, and include regional, cultural, and class differences. . . . In this paper, we are using the concept of "sex role" to refer to norms and expectations for behaviour related to one's biological sex, affecting both the areas of sexuality and reproduction, and non-sexual behaviour. Although several authors have made the distinction between "sex role" (referring to sexuality) and "gender role" (referring to non-sexual behaviour), we are using the concept of sex role in the broader sense to include both concepts, as have most authors quoted in the literature. . . .

The North American and British tradition of the traditional male sex role now includes a number of inter-related dimensions: strong achievement orientation, toughness, desire for power, willingness to give priority to occupational roles, repression of emotions, independence, heroism,² and emphasis on physical strength (David and Brannon, 1976; Goldberg, 1976; Tolson, 1977). However, throughout the past century there have been some changes in expectations of male behaviour. For example, industrialization and technological developments have led to a decreasing emphasis on the importance of physical strength and self-reliance. Married women's entry into the labour force has encouraged some men to place less importance on their bread-winning capacities.

In addition to historical changes in the male sex role, there are many variations with social class, age, race, and ethnicity. . . . We have decided to

concentrate our discussion on Anglo-Saxon, middle class men of working age, in the present time period.

In an attempt to focus our paper further, we have chosen not to deal with the *origin* of the traditional male role or sex roles in general (eg. Steven Goldberg, 1973). Although we are aware of the possibility of biological and psychoanalytic bases of sex role differences, we have assumed that sex roles are *largely* social, economic, and political products. We feel that the non-sociological issues are beyond the scope of this paper.³

Having clarified the boundaries of the discussion, one further qualification must be made. Several authors have linked sex roles to "relations of production." For example, Silverstein (1972:108) points out: ". . . the masculine personality, man's learned drive for inter-personal dominance, is the psychic engine for the capitalist society to function." Slater (1970:88-104) also argues that sex role differences exist because in a capitalist society, men must be motivated to work and strive for power.

We agree that aspects of capitalism may help to *perpetuate* the traditional male role, but emphasize that it is not a "sufficient cause." We are not saying in this analysis that there is something unique about capitalism which causes the development of specific forms of male behaviour. For one thing, we do not have adequate comparative evidence of the influence of other societal forms of male behaviour. For another, changes *within* capitalism may promote changes in the normative definition of masculine behaviour.

It is sufficient to begin with a better conceptualization of the male sex role emerging in contemporary northwestern European capitalist societies such as United States, Canada, Great Britain, and the Netherlands, since there may be significant differences in sex roles even between northwestern and southern European countries. . . . As stated, we are concentrating on the contemporary situation among white, Anglo-Saxon males in societies similar to English Canada. If we can provide a focused description of that particular strata of males, it will help to establish a basis for future comparative and historical analysis.

ERADICATING RIGID SEX ROLES?

Some writers have argued that women should *not* have to ". . . learn to evaluate their self-worth by their success in emotionally and materially supporting a man in his struggle for power" (Silverstein, 1972:108). Feminists have been especially strong in favouring this position. Socialist feminists have sought to destroy competition and power-seeking, but more reformist women's groups have attempted to provide women with equally competitive skills as men. Some women want to have the option of acting in the same manner men traditionally have acted. But an increasing number of men, especially gay men, have been disputing the validity of these goals and calling for the down-playing of power-seeking, competitiveness, and striving for higher incomes

(David and Brannon, 1976). These men have placed greater value on the traditionally "feminine" values of expressiveness and nurturance (Silverstein, 1972).

Many people of both sexes are now arguing for the eradication of rigid sex roles and the creation of an "androgynist" society, in which sex role will no longer be the basis of personality and ability differences (Tolson, 1977:134-46). These ideologies are often "anti-capitalist" in so far as they hold out the promise of a future post-capitalist or non-capitalist social order in which authority relations based on sex roles are neither necessary nor desirable, and self-esteem is not gained through interpersonal power (Tolson, 1977:134-46). However, many writers are more "reformist" in orientation (Farrell, 1975:127-45), and argue that sex roles will continue to exist, with some modifications.

Although the substance of liberation is "choice," men do not experience the same range of choice that women experience. Women have gained, for example, from the widespread acceptance of women's right to work. Social expectations as well as legal requirements of marriage channel men almost exclusively into work activities. This leaves men few acceptable alternatives compared to women. Women can still remain as housewives, can work part-time outside the home, or can be gainfully employed on a full-time basis, but men are heavily stigmatized if they move outside of full-time employment. For the middle class male, unemployment is an indication of his failure as a man. And the option of being a "househusband" does not really exist unless men have an alternative career, such as crafts or writing. The male sex role still remains oriented largely to work in the labour force and to related skills.

Hence, the middle class male interested in less rigid rather than traditionally-defined sex roles is caught in a peculiar double-bind situation. He is expected to be "successful" in terms of the old norms but he is also expected—at the same time—to remain somewhat aloof from the old set of expectations and explore new, emerging male sex roles.

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE ON THE MALE SEX ROLE

A survey of the literature on the male sex role reveals a notable paucity of material in comparison with that on women's roles. There are probably two main reasons for this:

1. Men have not generally viewed themselves as an oppressed group and have therefore not developed as extensive a theoretical basis for action as women and minority groups have; and
2. The pervasiveness of "patriarchal values" has obscured the effects of the rigid traditional male role, and encouraged social scientists to take its presence for granted.

However, the increasing amount of literature that does exist generally stresses the debilitating aspects of male socialization. Rigid male roles are said to lead to lack of expressiveness (Tolson, 1977; Bernard, 1968), difficulty in having close personal relationships, especially with other men, and the psychosomatic effects of competitiveness and the pursuit of "success" (Kaye, 1974; 198-200).

David and Brannon (1976) provide a lengthy analysis of the American male sex role by describing what they consider to be its four basic dimensions:

1. "*No Sissy Stuff*: the Stigma of Anything vaguely Feminine";
2. "*The Big Wheel*: Success, Status, and the Need to be Looked up to";
3. "*The Sturdy Oak*: a Manly Air of Toughness, Confidence and Self-Reliance"; and
4. "*Give 'Em Hell*: the Aura of Aggression, Violence, and Darling".

David and Brannon's main theme is that rigid sex roles for both sexes are damaging to individuals, but that the male sex role is particularly destructive to society. It encourages the kind of behaviour which leads to social violence, crime, and war. This theme is repeated by many writers (Stater, 1976:38-61; Kaye, 1974:8-11, 195-97).

Several authors have discussed the lack of a clear positive definition of the male sex role (Steinmann and Fox, 1974:69-93) and stress the absence of viable male role models because fathers spend much of their time away from home. The boy is consequently brought up by his mother or a female child-care worker, who conveys to him, verbally what *not* to be or do, rather than provide a positive model for his behaviour. This kind of socialization is common in the elementary school system, for the boy is likely to experience only women teachers in the lower grades (Sexon, 1969). He therefore learns the male role largely from peers (eg. through athletic activities) rather than from teachers, and because of this acquires a distorted picture which over-emphasizes physical prowess and bravado (ie. "Give 'Em Hell"). He soon fears that much that is womanly is threatening, yet he is under the jurisdiction of women for most of his day. Consequently, he may develop ambivalent attitudes towards women. He may "act out" in rebellion against the school system which expects him to be obedient and not "like a girl" at the same time it tells him "to be a man" (ie. "No Sissy Stuff").

Herb Goldberg (1976) emphasizes one significant negative aspect of the male sex role when he states that most men are "in harness" or locked into rigid behavioural expectations, but they do not realize it until they suffer the symptoms of stress-related diseases. After examining the high rates of accidents, suicides, heart attacks, and ulcers among men in comparison with women, Goldberg concludes that the male sex role is literally killing men. Jourard (1964) makes a similar argument when he hypothesizes that the inhibition of self-disclosure is one of the "lethal" aspects of the traditional

male sex role. Although the female sex role has restricted women from developing some of their personal potential, especially in the area of job skills, the male sex role is said to encourage men to kill themselves through competitive behaviour (Kaye, 1974).

Tolson (1977) analyses the experiences and limits of masculinity in the British setting, similar in many ways to English Canada, and discusses the ways in which the traditional male sex role is reinforced by social institutions, including the family and the work place. Without major changes in social institutions, he argues, men will not readily relinquish their social power. Tolson argues that there is little basis for action by powerful men against the system, as the system has worked to the advantage of such men. He also argues that "... a man's gender identity is interwoven with the ideology of 'free-individuality' which supports the system of capitalist wage-labour" (Tolson, 1977:146-47).

No existing work has clearly indicated the ramifications of extensive change in the male sex role, or the extent to which all available options seem to imply significant structural changes. One of the conclusions reached by many feminist writers is that comparable changes would have to take place in the socialization and values of men, as well as in the organizations run by men, before people could be "liberated" from rigid sex roles. But even for those men who are open to a change in values and roles, the norms of a traditional society may dampen their intentions. By pointing out the "double-bind" facing middle-class men, we wish to emphasize the complexity of the issues involved. Unlike many popular writers, we do not simply assume that all the traditional aspects of the male sex role can be easily changed without far-reaching changes in the social order.

MARRIAGE AND THE MALE DILEMMA

Within the context of the institution of marriage, we can illustrate how the double-bind operates. In the traditional situation, a husband took less responsibility for raising the children, caring for the home, keeping the marriage together, and maintaining ties with relatives (Bernard, 1972). The man's major responsibility has been to support the family financially, make major family decisions, and serve as disciplinarian for the children. But this traditional "complementary role" type of marriage has been challenged by the feminist movement, and claimed to be unequal in division of labour and power, especially as more married women enter the workforce; they have argued for a more egalitarian partnership.

Certainly a completely egalitarian situation is one theoretical option. But changes within personal relationships do not take place in a social vacuum. The priorities and values of other people affect even personal arrangements, and lack of institutional support makes such personal changes difficult.

Four theoretically possible options can be considered:

1. The Traditional Marriage

The man fills the traditional male role and the woman fills the traditional female role. The man is the "head of the household" and makes the crucial decisions (eg. decisions to move because of a job). The woman's career takes second place and must be sacrificed to the man's, whenever it is considered by the man to be in the long term best interests of the family unit. The woman takes most of the responsibility for maintenance of the home and raising of children (Ishwaran, 1971).

2. An Egalitarian Marriage

Man and woman both change their roles in order to accommodate to one another. The man does not attempt to excel in a career, if this will hurt his relationship with his wife. The woman also has a career, but her career does not necessarily take precedence over childrearing responsibilities. All household duties are divided equally between husband and wife.

3. A Reversal of the Traditional Marriage

The woman fills the traditional male role and the man becomes the "house-husband." The man does not attempt to earn a living or make a career; he takes full responsibility for raising the children while the wife earns an income sufficient to provide for the whole family. The wife's career takes priority. If the woman has to move for her job, then the man follows her.

4. An Egalitarian Relationship

This is a relationship between a man and a woman which is not defined as a marriage but as a companionate bond (O'Neill and O'Neill, 1972). It usually involves the decision to have few or no children. The man and woman may live separately, but if they live together they live fairly autonomous lives.

These four options are basic, although of course there can be variations on them. Also, people may change their role definitions at various stages of their relationship. A couple may begin with a traditional marriage, then have a completely egalitarian marriage, and eventually develop an egalitarian relationship that is regarded less as a marriage than as a companionship arrangement.

We might refer to these options as:

1. man and wife

2. husband and wife
3. woman and husband
4. man and woman

Naturally these roles are not limited to heterosexual relationships. A homosexual couple could also play out these four options.

On closer examination, all of the possibilities present problems for those interested in men's liberation. The "man and wife" alternative places all of the responsibility for earning money and decision-making on men. It means that men may have to take undesirable and low risk jobs to ensure that they can support their families. It also may mean that wives would be vicariously living through the husband's contact with the external world, and thus may put pressure on the man to perform by her standards. And fewer and fewer young educated women seem to be content to remain housewives; many are now beginning to prefer their own careers and interests outside the home. Middle class men who still want a traditional wife are often made to feel guilty about asking them to perform the kinds of domestic duties which wives were involved in twenty years ago.

In the "husband and wife" situation, the roles of husband and wife would theoretically be similar, and child-rearing and housework would be shared. However, as a general pattern, this would mean that children, regardless of sex, would have to be socialized to have similar ambitions, interests, and values, as well as skills. Girls would have to learn job skills, household repairs, and greater assertiveness. Boys would have to be taught household skills, such as cooking, sewing, nurturing, and decorating. Men would have to give up their legally sanctioned privileges such as "head of the household," deciding where the family should live, and expecting household services from his wife [*sic*] (Zucker and Callwood, 1971). Although the recent Canadian Law Reform Commission has recommended equalizing marriage and divorce law in terms of duties and obligations, men are still legally expected to support their wives and children. Employers still assume that the family will move with the husband's job requirements. Even when wives are gainfully employed their husbands are likely earning much higher salaries, especially if they are middle class. Wives themselves often accept the notion that their husband's job is more important, that they do not need to work until retirement, and that their husband *should* have a higher paying job than they have. It is very difficult for men to behave as though equality of the sexes exists when so much of our society assumes that it does not. Many socialist feminists have argued that equality within the family is not possible within a non-egalitarian society, as the power of husbands is reinforced by our value system and social institutions (Firestone, 1970; Millett, 1969).

The "woman and husband" alternative would probably be unacceptable to most people of both sexes, because it goes against the prevailing norms and values concerning desirable male behaviour. If men stayed at home and

cared for the children, they would probably begin to suffer from the "housewife syndrome," complaining of loneliness, boredom, and financial dependence. Wives would probably start to feel that their husbands had nothing to talk about, lived vicariously through them, and were too dependent on them. In other words, role reversal could lead to men being placed in the same position many women are in today.

But more realistically, men would not allow themselves to be placed in such a powerless situation. Few men voluntarily become househusbands, and when they do, it is usually a very temporary status. Middle class women generally are not attracted to "underachieving" men who have no career ambitions. They search for husbands who are slightly older (Larson, 1976:29), more occupationally established, and earning a high income (Bernard, 1972:146), which from the beginning leads to less egalitarian marriages. And many women still expect their men to pay their way, drive them places, and retain the chivalrous practices of a non-egalitarian era. For men who are trying to eradicate rigid sex roles, this could be very confusing.

In the "egalitarian relationship," both partners would have to develop independence and a wide variety of skills. It makes the assumption that both men and women have an equal opportunity to support themselves, which is often not true in our society. The presence of children would complicate the relationship, especially if the union was not legalized. Alternative forms of child care would have to be available to enable the woman to support herself. Either housework and child care would be shared by the man and woman (Someone might be hired to perform these duties if the couple could afford it.) This kind of relationship would imply widespread institutional changes, such as greater availability of child care facilities, equal pay for women, maternity and paternity benefits, legal changes in family law, and more available domestic help. But it would also imply behavioural changes by both men and women. Women would have to become more career-oriented and independent, but men would have to devote less time to their employment and more to their personal lives. A person who devotes more time to raising children and doing housework is less likely to achieve prominence in his career. Time spent at home is time spent away from the office. Particularly in a highly competitive job situation, the man who seriously attempts to live up to the egalitarian ethic at home may find that he is simply not able to compete at work (Miller, 1974). And there is no reason to believe that his colleagues would be sympathetic to his "liberated" values.

In other words, any of the new options imply broad changes either in marriage and the family as we know it, or in the wider society. Egalitarian marriages or relationships cannot be developed on a wide scale when men and women are not treated equally by the larger society. Men cannot be expected to weaken their commitment to competitiveness and work unless they are socially rewarded for their activities, if a man is expected to risk the respect of his colleagues and his own aspirations to attain an egalitarian

marriage, then he is likely to give only lip-service to egalitarianism.⁴ If he feels that women are attracted to him because of his occupational success and large salary, then he is unlikely to jeopardize this bargaining power on the marriage market (Collins, 1975).

It is becoming apparent that there cannot be two high-achievers in a dual-career family without "role strains," fatigue, and paid help (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971). Someone else can be paid for looking after the children, but such services are in short supply, are expensive, and are more readily available for children from two to five years old. Paid help for child care or housework not only requires a surplus of money, but someone to take responsibility for hiring and supervising the help. "Liberation" for men partially entails accepting some of the responsibility for work that wives formerly did. Some of the work can be done by working class women; but some middle class women find that they feel guilty about making poorer women do the work that they have defined as "drudgery."

The goals of the women's liberation movement cannot be achieved without a vast change in men's roles and attitudes. Although the husbands of working wives do more housework and child care than the husbands of housewives, several studies show that they do not do much more (Clark and Harvey, 1976; Meissner et al., 1975). Working wives essentially have two jobs, and men only one. If both sexes begin to be involved in careers and occupational striving, men will have to become more nurturant as well as start to de-emphasize occupational mobility, careerism, and high time investment in their jobs. If this does not happen, there will be greater strain on wives, a higher rate of marriage breakdown, and less time for children. With more women in the labour force and little change in the sex roles of men, we might evolve into an even more competitive and status-oriented society. (All of this assumes that paid help cannot fill the gap created by women leaving the home, and that women will not voluntarily return to their housewife role.)

But there are many reasons why we probably will not experience a liberation movement among men as extensive as the women's movement. Perhaps most significant is the fact, previously stated, that men have not perceived themselves as victimized. Since they have occupied the more prestigious and powerful positions in society, there has been little need for most men to be critical of the male role.

GROUPS CRITICAL OF MEN'S TRADITIONAL ROLES

However, there are some groups of people who are likely to emphasize the negative aspects of traditional male sex roles.

1. Wives of career-oriented men may be the ones who feel that the constant striving for occupational success leaves their husbands little time for family

activities. Bernard (1968) indicated that wives state that their husbands do not reveal their inner feelings to them, do not give them sufficient attention, and limit personal contact to sexual encounters. And an increasing number of middle-aged wives (as well as men) are concerned about the heart attack and early death rate statistics among middle-aged men.

2. There is also some indication that middle-aged men lessen their allegiance to the male sex role. What is sometimes called the "male menopause" may be caused by the realization that a man has reached middle-age, still is not "successful," and never will be. But it could also be caused by a feeling that he has done little with his life than "climb the ladder" and support a family. Some men break away from these expectations at this time, by having "affairs" with younger women.

Others plan for early retirement, so that they can pursue their own interests. However, when retirement actually comes, many men experience depression. Self-esteem has been closely tied to earning power and occupational status for many middle class men, and loss of a job not only means more spare time, but a loss of status and power in the outside community as well as at home.

3. Some of the "gay liberation" literature is also critical of the competitiveness and lack of emotional expressiveness of the traditional male role (Silverstein, 1972). It also advocates more flexibility and personal choice in lifestyles and relationships.

4. Another group of men who have spoken out against traditional male roles are those who have had some contact with the women's movement. The ideology and strategies of men's liberation borrows much from the feminist movement. Tolson (1977) mentions that some of the men involved in his men's group had been involved with or married to feminists, who felt that women's liberation was not possible without a wider involvement by men.

5. Some socialist groups have spoken out against sex roles in general, seeing the rigid division of labour in the family as a microcosm of the authority relations in society (Engels, 1884). In the socialist view, the perpetuation of the man's desire for work achievement and upward mobility is central to the maintenance of the capitalist system (Mitchell, 1966). Therefore some socialist men and women have tried to eradicate differences which are said to be due to the "relations of production" (Draper, 1970).

6. And finally, there has been a partial rejection of some elements of the male sex role by members of the "counter-culture." Although they have *not* rejected the traditional division of labour between the sexes, they have sought to escape from what they see as "alienated labour" and to increase control over their lives by becoming independent of bureaucratic organizations and rejecting the pursuit of upward mobility. Some of these groups

have also attempted to overcome the repression of emotions among men, by greater involvement with personal relationships than work.

LIMITATIONS ON MEN'S CONSCIOUSNESS

Those who have been critical of aspects of the male sex role have largely been outside of the occupational mobility system, or marginal to the system of values emphasizing achievement orientation. But the majority of middle class men benefit from those values and do not feel exploited or oppressed, and therefore have not had the same basis for group consciousness as women.

A second limitation on men's consciousness especially among middle class men is that they are less likely to disclose intimate feelings and vulnerabilities to other men in the same way that women have confided in other women (Booth, 1972; Goldberg, 1976). Silverstein (1972) claims that it is because men view each other as competitors for power and admitting weaknesses makes one appear all too human. But the main technique of the women's movement has been consciousness-raising. This involves sharing intimate concerns and information about personal relationships. Consciousness-raising and group therapy have been more difficult for men because of the socialized traits of hiding their true feelings and the pretense of self-reliance. "Anglo-Saxon" men especially have revealed themselves only to their close women friends, whom they see as outside the competition for male power.

Thirdly, the men's liberation movement would be impeded because middle class men to whom it is most likely to appeal are *caught up in becoming occupationally successful*, and do not have the time and energy to examine their personal situations. Both the early women's movement of the late nineteenth century and the recent movement of the nineteen sixties occurred among middle class educated women, who did not have the time restraints of having to earn a living. Men, on the other hand, have been encouraged to work hard during the day, and if they are married, to feel guilty if they are not home with their wives in the evening.

MASS MEDIA AND RESISTANCE TO CHANGE

Tuchman (1978) argues that changes in images of sex roles occur slowly because of a general "cultural" resistance to such changes. Using a structural functionalist framework, she argues that the main function of culture is to cultivate a resistance to change (Tuchman, 1978:47-48). If a particular cultural norm is accepted by most people, then changes will be slow. Tuchman applies this to sex role images of women in the mass media, but the theory is also applicable to normative views on male sex roles as well. The process of "discrediting" is used against men interested in changing some of the traditional male sex role patterns, for example. The media takes the more bizarre

aspects of changes in men's roles and presents men who do not conform to the John Wayne image as somehow "weak" or "lacking in courage." We can perhaps all think of newspaper articles or cartoons about "househusbands" in which negative aspects of the new expectations on men are exaggerated. The media discredits the women's liberation movement by presenting an image of the "women's libber," a hostile aggressive woman who refuses to listen to reason in any circumstance. The other tactics mentioned by Tuchman, such as "isolating" and "undercutting," are also used by the mass media, particularly television.^{2,3}

CONCLUSION

Women's liberation to some groups has meant a gain in power and money, as well as optimizing personal choice. Men's liberation involves the widening of choices for men, but also requires the devaluation of status, money, and personal power, all of which are highly valued in capitalist society. Men may gain better health, longer lives, more fulfilling leisure time, and greater intimacy in relationships with men, women, and children, but how many will choose these experiences at the expense of occupational achievement and status rewards, when their socialization has geared them towards these goals and their society requires them for its maintenance?

The middle class man is faced with a major dilemma. Should he remain in his traditional dominant position of breadwinner and decision-maker and be accused of being a "male chauvinist," or should he relinquish some of his traditional power to women in a society which still rewards men for male dominance? If he shares the housework with his wife, he must be prepared to get up to feed the baby in the middle of the night and appear at work tired the next day. He must be prepared to move with his wife's career at the risk of disadvantaging his own. He must be prepared to come home from a hard day at work, pick up the children from the day care centre, and cook a meal for his family (Miller, 1974).

The liberation of both sexes may require that certain privileges be given up by men. Can we expect to see men downgrading those values which are currently most highly rewarded in Canada, and in other societies?...

Notes

1. The concept of the "double bind" has been used extensively by Gregory Bateson (Bateson et al., 1963). It has been popularized as the Catch-22 situation so characteristic of large bureaucracies (see Heller, 1961).
2. "The very concept of heroism, as it has been defined by man appears to be

undergoing a serious re-evaluation these days, the medieval knight in shining armor is rusted and dank. . . ." (Susan Brownmiller, 1975:306-307).

3. None of this would need to be said to an academic audience of sociologists if it were not for the popularity that certain biological and psychoanalytical explanations have had recently, even within the discipline of sociology. In recent times there has been a renewed interest in studying the influence of biological factors on various aspects of social reality (eg. E. O. Wilson, 1975). Also, there has been much discussion of Freudian and Neo-Freudian theory (eg. Gad Horowitz, 1977). We do not feel these authors are monocausal determinists pleading for the exclusive priority of either biological or psychoanalytic factors; however, we do note a tendency for some sociologists to popularize such monocausal arguments (eg. Steven Goldberg, 1973).

Leaving aside the "hermeneutic" questions of whether sociobiologists and psychoanalytic theorists generally resort—in the final analysis—to the kinds of monocausal determinism they are sometimes regarded as upholding, we wish to disassociate ourselves from monocausal, biological, and psychoanalytic views. We basically accept therefore the position worked out in detail by Gerth and Mills (1964), at least for the purposes of this analysis.

4. A good example of lip service to fully egalitarian roles is provided by a recent popular book by Gail Sheehy (1967) called *Passages*. Sheehy's discussion of male life patterns based on an ideal of "integration" ignores some of the subtle mechanisms of the double-bind. Her "integrators" remain fairly traditional in their relationships with wives and bosses (Sheehy, 1976:177-78, 201-203).
5. "Isolating"—removing the problem to a safe, isolated place, like women's discussions in the kitchen; "undercutting"—undercutting the movement by exaggerating certain problem areas (eg. rape, exploitation of women as sex objects) and treating them as funny.

References

- Bateson, G., D. D. Jackson, J. Holey, and J. H. Weakland. 1963. "A Note on the Double Bind." *Family Process* 2: 154-61.
- Bernard, J. 1968. *The Sex Game*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- . 1972. *The Future of Marriage*. New York: World.
- Booth, A. 1972. "Sex and Social Participation." *American Sociological Review* 37 (April):183-92.
- Brinkerhoff, M. B. 1977. "Women Who Want to Work in a Man's World: A Study of the Influence of Structural Factors on Role Innovativeness." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 2 (3): 283-303.
- Brownmiller, S. 1975. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Clark, S., and A. S. Harvey. 1976. "The Sexual Division of Labour: The Use of Time." *Atlantis* 2 (1): 46-66.
- Collins, R. 1975. *Conflict Sociology*. Chapter Five. New York: Academic.

- David, D., and R. Brannon, eds. 1976. *The Forty-Nine Percent Majority*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Draper, H. 1970. "Marx and Engels on Women's Liberation." *International Socialism* 44 (July-August): 20-29.
- Engels, F. 1884. *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*.
- Farrell, W. 1975. *The Liberated Man*. New York: Random House.
- Firestone, S. 1970. *The Dialectic of Sex*. New York: Morrow.
- Gerth, H., and C. W. Mills. 1964. *Character and Social Structure: The Psychology of Institutions*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Goldberg, H. 1976. *The Hazards of Being Male: Surviving the Myth of Masculine Privilege*. New York: New American Library.
- Goldberg, S. 1973. *The Inevitability of Patriarchy*. New York: Morrow.
- Greer, G. 1970. *The Female Eunuch*. St. Alban's, Herts.: MacGibbon and Kee.
- Heller, J. 1961. *Catch-22*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Horowitz, G. 1977. *Repression, Basic and Surplus Repression in Psycho-Analytic Theory: Freud, Reich, and Marcuse*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ishwaran, K. 1971. "Calvinism and Social Behavior in a Dutch-Canadian Community." "Family and Community among the Dutch-Canadians." In *The Canadian Family*. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Jourard, S. 1964. *The Transparent Self: Self Disclosure and Well-Being*. Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand.
- Kaye, H. E. 1974. *Male Survival: Masculinity without Myth*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap.
- Komarovsky, M. 1946. "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles." *American Journal of Sociology* 52 (3): 184-89.
- Larson, L. 1976. *The Canadian Family in Comparative Perspective*. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall.
- Leacock, E. B. 1972. *Introduction to Engels*. New York: International Publishers.
- McCarthy, Barry. *What You (Still) Don't Know about Male Sexuality*.
- Meissner, M., E. W. Humphreys, S. M. Meis, and W. J. Sheu. 1975. "No Exit for Wives: Sexual Division of Labour and the Cumulation of Household Demands." *CRSA* 12 (4): 424-39.
- Miller, S. M. 1974. "The Making of a Confused Middle-Aged Husband." In *Men and Masculinity*, ed. J. H. Pleck and J. Sawyer. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Millett, K. 1969. *Sexual Politics*. New York: Avon.
- Mitchell, J. 1966. "Women: The Longest Revolution." *New Left Review* 40 (November-December): 11-37.
- O'Neill, N., and G. O'Neill. 1972. *Open Marriage*. New York: Avon.
- Pleck, J. H., and J. Sawyer, eds. 1974. *Men and Masculinity*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Rapoport, R., and R. Rapoport. 1971. *Dual-Career Families*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Sexton, P. 1969. *The Feminized Male*. New York: Random House.
- Sheehy, G. 1976. "Men's Life Passages." In *Passages: Predictable Crises of Adult Life*. New York: E. P. Dutton.
- Silverstein, M. 1972. "The History of a Short, Unsuccessful Academic Career." *Insurgent Sociologist* 3 (1): 4-19.
- Slater, P. 1970. *The Pursuit of Loneliness*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Steinmann, A., and D. J. Fox. 1974. *The Male Dilemma*. New York: Jason Aronson.

Tolson, A. 1977. *The Limits of Masculinity*. London: Tavistock.

Tuchman, G. 1978. *Hearth and Home*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, S. J. F. 1977. "The Relationship between Mass Media Content and Social Change in Canada: An Examination of the Image of Women in Mass Circulating Canadian Magazines 1930–1970." Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.

Zuker, M., and J. Callwood. 1971. *Canadian Women and the Law*. Toronto: Copp Clark.