

**An essay on the Present Difficulty with the Success of
Man-Woman Relationships in our Society**

by Stephen M. Golden
Copyright © 9 October 1989

Equality does not always manifest itself in “sameness.”

In any successful organization, there are leaders and there are followers; there are those who manage and there are those who are managed. Often, each individual is not given a choice as to whether he will be a leader or a follower, a manager or one who is managed.

It is important to realize that the followers, or the managed, are not in demeaning positions! Our society has unfortunately given a stigma to those positions by placing an ever present emphasis on the importance of being a leader. If you're not a leader, you're a loser!

This same principle applies to the family, and gives some insight perhaps, into why marriages do not work in our present society. There must be an established head in a family — the one who is responsible for making decisions. This is not to say that the other members of the family are to have no input into the decision making process, but as in a successful organization of any type, there must be the final decision maker. Now, this “head” of the family need not be the male, though it traditionally has been. This is the order established in the Christian New Testament, the same order established earlier in the Jewish Law, and is the pattern set up in most other cultures. The male is in the dominant position. In tribal cultures, there existed a large family, headed by the Chief of the tribe, usually a male, with sub-families headed by various men under the Chief. This traditional position of a woman in the family setting — that of being led or managed — is now looked upon by our society in the same light as the managed, or the follower: ‘It is demeaning!.’

One of the facets of the man-woman relationship throughout history has been woman's dependence upon man in order to have the necessities and comforts of life: food, shelter, clothing, protection, and more. Man was the provider of material goods and physical strength. But in our society, a career-minded woman can attain all of her needs on her own. Therefore the only need a woman might have for a relationship with a man would be for mutual friendship, intimate contact, and to produce young (although this procedure is no longer necessary, due to our current state of technology). All of these reasons, I will note, remain

completely subject to the will of the woman! The man has no real choice in the matter except to refuse — which is against the very essence of his nature.

Now, after young are produced, it is often desirable to have a two-adult household for purposes of child-care and help in raising the young, but this additional adult need not be a male!

This reduces the role of husband, male, or manhood to little more than a producer of deoxyribonucleic acid in convenient zygote packages, and places him in the position of a very real and severe threat. He must spend energy justifying his existence. This is essential to the issue because men have an innate desire and drive to touch a woman; to have female companionship. This drive in women, though it is said to be present, is not nearly as strong and is rarely evident. One seldom hears of women lusting after men as they pass by, or pursuing a man for an intimate encounter.

Our society today, by stressing career advancement, personal independence, and self-determined futures for women, places the woman in a position in which it is extremely difficult for her to be under a male's domination. At the same time, the society maintains that a man should exhibit many of the traditional traits and behaviors that are in direct conflict with the role that is being defined for the woman! While woman's role has been drastically re-defined, man's role has remained the same.

Social pressures require the man to be the leader; they require him to be strong; they require him to be the provider, and the head of his household. He should care for his wife (in spite of any unwillingness to be cared for). He must not be "hen-pecked." He must not be weak physically, socially, or emotionally. He is expected to maintain the same courtesies toward women as before; opening doors, helping her in and out of a car, allowing her to proceed first, and etc. A woman may choose to have a career, the man is required to do so. The woman, on the other hand may elect to marry someone who will support her. I know of no man who enjoys this option. Tradition and social pressures prohibit this type of behavior in men. In any dating situation, the man is required to pursue the woman, and "woo" her with flowers, candy, and other enticements.

The original bond between man and woman was based on the principle that man would desire woman, and woman would rely on man. This was a sort of enigmatic form of equality. Each member in the relationship fulfilled an important need of the other member. The roles were well defined, and understood

by both partners in the relationship. Though the roles were not the same, the two partners were equal in their need for the other. In a society where woman no longer relies on man, man has no equality in the relationship. Man still has the need and desire for woman, but in such, remains entirely at the mercy of woman! Our society has made women “equal” to man in all areas, including the work place (perhaps to the point of inadvertently making women dominant — or at least placing them in a position of great advantage over men, whether or not they realize it to their benefit).

In the area of general productivity and advancement, I cannot say this is bad. But in the area of personal relationships, I have come to the conclusion that the possibility for equality in a man-woman relationship, which has previously existed in the family environment, has been removed. There is no corresponding role definition for the man to balance the new role of the woman. Because of her new socially defined independence, the woman will always maintain the upper hand, and will have the choice of terminating the relationship. If a woman in a relationship does not have the upper hand, it is because she has, whether aware of it or not, forfeited or lost this position. In some cases this arises outside of her control, but most cases of forfeiture are within her control. Here are some examples:

1. Choosing not to pursue a career, or a lack of interest in providing for her own needs, thereby placing herself under the man’s care and domination,
2. Creation of an undesirable environment for the man in which he feels he might be better off without her, yet he remains for the time being,
3. A loss of original attractiveness to the man by a degeneration of her appearance through weight gain or other self neglect.

Aside from these, and similar circumstances, the woman is in complete domination. In recent years, women have been known to comment that men are either lacking in commitment, or are insecure. I propose this to be the reason: No security exists for a man in a relationship with a woman who does not truly rely on him.

This situation reduces to naught the likelihood that a man and a woman can live successfully together, or that they should live together. All that can result is frustration for the woman, if she subscribes

to the trends, and pain for the man, if he places himself in this unequal position. The time has come in American Culture that the family can no longer exist successfully, with one exception: that they both consent to remain under the so-called "outdated" traditional values and roles which establish order and meaning in the husband-wife-family relationship. Otherwise, each person is an equal and self-sustaining unit only as long as they remain independent. A man and a woman may choose to spend time together, but a permanent commitment without compatible role definition is impractical and will inevitably fail.