

Keynote Copy
for Alumni

PROSPECTS AND PATTERNS FOR MEN AND WOMEN
AT WORK:

Association
1973
Kresge

TO BE ABLE BOTH TO LOVE AND TO WORK

Thank you.

I have contemplated this speech with some misgivings. I have imagined you to be thinking: "Alas, an economics lecture at 10 in the morning. Besides, what evidence IS there in today's economy that economists know anything about the economy? The speaker isn't even an alumna. And what IS a woman economist?" By now you have all settled down to one of those speeches on the economy where non-economists go away bewildered and saddened, and the economists go away fighting among themselves. You remember, after all, that if all the economists in the world were placed end to end--they would still point in all directions.

I don't have a good excuse for not being an alumna, but I share your questions about what is a woman economist. We are still so few that when I was recently invited to a New England Conference of Women Economists I accepted with delight, full of curiosity. I thought: she and I will have a lovely

evening together. In the event I went, and there were forty-seven of us, all equally surprised to see anybody else. The next day at work I told a fellow economist about the forty-seven women and he said "I hadn't known it was to be a world conference."

In any case, my speech is on a kind of economics about which we are all experts-- that is, the organization of work lives for men and women in the ^{1970's and} 1980's. I have been asked to present the new vision of men and women at work, and I am here to talk about the joys and difficulties of androgyny in the world of work. For those here who don't know the term, androgyny, I want to be clear that this has nothing to do with the joys and difficulties of being a hermaphrodite--people who are physiologically both male and female. Not very much is known about them because they are so few. Hardly anyone advocates that everyone be a hermaphrodite.

Androgynous folk are spiritually both "masculine" and "feminine" to the degree they choose to be. Actually, not very much is known about them either because they are very few--because our society has made options in this area very difficult. However, lots of people are beginning to advocate androgyny for everyone. Androgyny means personal choice in the area of work. It means that what people do, in areas now sex-stereotyped, shall not be determined by sex-typing but by personal choice. It means permitting men to cry, to join the nurturant professions, to care for children and colleagues. It means permitting women to be assertive, and financially independent, and giving them wide career options.

things are done

You may ask - why does this funny subject come up now? Haven't we gotten along just fine? It's true that our women are supposed to be passive, adaptive, patient, responsive, receptive, unaggressive, and dependent--and that our men are supposed to be aggressive, competitive, hardworking, and powerful--masters of women, leaders of men. But haven't

we been doing just fine? Others may ask--even if we haven't gotten along very well on our stereotypes, what makes anyone think we will change?

I am reminded of a distinguished university administrator who was explaining affirmative action plans. It is, he said, like the mating of elephants: It takes place in high places. There is a lot of trumpeting - and Nothing happens for at least 4 years.

(Parenthetically, I should add that when my husband heard this story, he said - "that's a male chauvinist view of pregnancy!")

Nevertheless I think it may be said that things are changing.

What are the Forces Moving ^{Us} Toward Androgyny?

- 5 -

Once, on a farm, men and women were both working--more or less without a salary--side by side in a joint enterprise for survival. Their status was pretty equal in many families, certainly their friends thought so. Neither husband nor wife had many grownups to talk to but both had some. The woman had four or five pregnancies and nursed each baby for 10 to 15 months. She was more or less tied, by biology, to her home for at least five or ten years--but both parents raised and trained the children. Both parents worked more or less dawn to dark.

Then men left the home workplace. They earned money, they gained status; some gained power. They delegated the education of their children. They found more and more colleagues. The first pub was born. The women took on more responsibility for home and children. Little by little, in modern factories and offices, the paid employment of men became completely separate from home, excepting only business entertaining. Men got used

without any longer
directly taking care of others.
They

to being personally taken care of and delegated
new care-taking duties to a new female occupation:
office wife. Women got used to being supported.
For the first time in history we had some adult
females whose chief occupation was limited to
just one or two small children.

The right to salaries, to status, to power
remained predominantly with men. Little by little,
work, meaning paid work, became a male right.
Caring and nurturance and loving became a female
right. Objective processes; rational, scientific
thought became man's pride. Subjective, intuitional
processes became women's province. Unpaid work
was left predominantly to women, ^{And our} ~~in a~~ society which
came so to value money, that a full-time homemaker
with five children and all her husband's business
entertaining will say she "doesn't work."

But now things are changing again. I have of course in any case outlined only a stereotype - but that stereotype is falling. Many social changes have occurred simultaneously.

o There were ^{the} textile industries, and World Wars I and II, which drew women into paid work.

o The pill came along to make short the time when biology for women is destiny. The birth rate has dropped to fewer than two children per family; many men and women are not marrying and not having children. Day care has become more acceptable.

^{In the 1960's}
o A tremendous need for workers, in occupations now sex-typed for women, created a strong demand for women in the paid labor force.

*Make a
subfile
for Susans
copy?*

What do we find now, if we look at the lives
of men and women at work in 1973?

o Paid workweeks have changed dramatically for most workers. To begin with, the paid labor force has radically changed. The labor force participation rate for men over 16 has DROPPED from 95% in 1900 to 87% after World War II to 78% in 1973. The labor force participation rate for women has RISEN steadily--from 20% in 1900, when some of you were born, to 25% when I was born, to 45% today. Nine out of every ten young women in their teens--of our daughters and granddaughters--may be expected to be in paid employment.

The paid workweek for most men has dropped sharply since 1900; for women it has risen very sharply. Two out of every five persons in the labor force are women; women bring in nearly one third of family incomes and are the chief wage earner for one family in eight. The only major exception to this pattern is that all top professionals,

have been working longer and longer hours (probably most of you here have suspected this for some time).

o But why have these figures changed so remarkably? Have women been taking paid jobs from men, as we all asked after World War II? There is no reason, and there are no data, to believe that this is the case. Men, in general, stay longer in school, retire earlier, take longer vacations, work shorter hours. The demand for women, predominantly in jobs sex-stereotyped for women, has risen by leaps and bounds since World War II, at the same time that the birth rate has dropped and labor productivity in the home has risen.

Subfile
How are men and women now feeling about their lives at work?

We know that worker dissatisfaction is severe. Last week General Electric workers raised major questions about the quality of life at work. Automobile

companies all over the world are studying the conflict between producing goods, and providing work that is rewarding for its own sake. Universities are deeply concerned about clerical work; many major employers are concerned about overqualified workers. We read in WORK IN AMERICA, the Report of the President's Commission, that work

- o should not damage or degrade,
- o should interest and satisfy,
- o should use many skills and provide a chance to learn new skills,
- o should enhance other life roles, so that paid work enhances parenthood,
- o and should provide goods and services.

We know that satisfaction at work is linked to the prestige of the job, to control over one's work, to the cohesiveness and kind of work-group relations, and to the challenge and variety of the tasks. Yet industrialization has produced millions of jobs which, unlike the farm work of 1800, do not meet these criteria. And suddenly we hear many serious questions. Questions, this time, not from revolutionaries but from the responsible, caring, hardworking men and women among us.

Suddenly women have asked - why are we paid 60% of men's wages? Why is the wage gap still widening across most educational classifications? Why is our paid and unpaid workweek on the average ten hours a week longer than men's, in families where there are children? Why are we basically restricted to ten or twelve "women's" occupations out of the hundreds that exist? Why should so many of us be isolated in suburban homes?

Men: By the same token of course, men have some questions. Why should we fight the rat race? Why should we go to Southeast Asia? What did I spend my life for anyway, if my children don't know me or care for my values? Why should we die five or ten years sooner than our wives? What shall we do, as breadwinners, when our jobs disappear with recession?

Women are tired of being asked why they want a career.

Men, many of them, would like to be asked why they want a career.

Men are tired of being asked why they want to relax by cooking or why they want to play with children.

Women, many of them, would like to be asked.

Many women would like opportunities to be assertive, perseverant, ambitious, self-confident, creative, independent; to work with other adults; to receive equal pay for equal work.

Many men would like chances to be tender, nurturant, warm-hearted, sensitive, expressive. They would like to have their needs taken care of overtly rather than covertly, on the job. Men want equal satisfaction from hours lived.

How shall we provide these options?

We must break stereotypes in men's and women's thinking. For instance, in my new job here, one morning I went to the Sloan School of Management to ask them to accept more women as students. A professor there said to me, "a pity we can't find qualified women." I went back to my office to listen to several angry,

*substitute
in
other
copy*

frustrated secretaries and administrative assistants. Molly has a high honors degree in Math from Vassar. Joan is 38 and has a good college degree. She is well-motivated and had outstanding Graduate Record exam scores. Annette has been Assistant to a top professor for a decade. She administers his huge lab; she's taught herself calculus in evening school.* All were right here at MIT; all will go to Sloan or other graduate schools as a result of administrators who have been working hard to break stereotypes.

These stereotypes start early. I know a Ph.D. study of men watching their first-borns in a hospital nursery. The interviewer says "What do you think of your baby?" The replies are either "Look, how vigorous, how angry, how athletic, how active!" or "Look, how dainty, how cuddly, how cute!" And we can all guess which sex gets which comments-- even though the new father obviously doesn't have any objective knowledge of what his child is like.

* These are composite cases and do not describe real people.

So we must break stereotypes - in children's books, in movies, on TV, in the office, in our newspapers. We are beginning to get studies which indicate that the use of the generic "man" or "he" truly biases our thinking. For instance, in a new study, students were asked to select pictures they would use to illustrate a textbook. Half the students read chapters using the generic "man" to mean "person." Half were written without the generic use of "man,"--thus the title of one chapter was "Industrial Man"; of the other "Industrial Life." In a significant proportion of responses, the so-called generic "man" was not generically interpreted. Many more students brought in pictures of men to illustrate "Industrial Man" than "Industrial Life." Many similar studies show how systematically we bias and restrict our options for both men and women.

The androgynous life requires new options for work,--for instance, shared jobs in home and out of home. At a nearby college the first couple to share an academic appointment was really eyed askance.

No one was sure it would work. A year or two later - now - there are many shared appointments. Husband and wife work about 3/4 time each in 1 1/2 jobs and share homemaking and child care. One nice feature of this particular situation is that home and work are nearby - another aspect of work that needs to be reinstated.

Suppose we restructured work options between extended family structures that would include husbands and wives. Of course many families would want to continue just as they are. At present many husbands enjoy their paid employment; many wives enjoy homemaking. In millions of other families both parents already work, inside and outside the home. One third of our mothers with preschool children are already in paid employment. And at least a fifth of all the child care arrangements of such mothers are the programs to pay retired persons in child and grandfathers; men are already deeply re-engaging in the programs are among the most important re-engage lives of children. But suppose we assumed that both men and women were completely free to share financial responsibility, child custody, child care, homemaking? I believe that we would see many more

househusbands--not necessarily on a life-long basis, but happily for a year here and a summer there. I believe there would be many more 3/4 time workers, especially among young parents, if 3/4 employment were fostered and encouraged for both men and women.

o The androgynous life requires support of extended family structures that work. In 1900 many families lived with a grandparent or a servant. Only four or five percent of preschool children are now living in a home with an extra, available adult. This means we need small, child care centers in apartment buildings; child care centers at work; centers in high schools and in Foster Grandparents programs; near Veterans' Hospitals. Federal programs to pay retired persons in child and youth programs are among the most important re-integrations of age groups we can support. I believe that tax advantages should be available to new family styles which endure over time under a legal contract, and that public housing assistance should be available to stable, new-structure families of eligible income.

Subfile:

Structural Questions: Biology, the Law, Child Care

Of course the coming of androgyny takes time. To begin with, there are both structural problems and emotional problems built into a stronger move toward androgyny. Some people ask--what of biological differences? Are not men better adapted to paid employment and women to homemaking? I think this was, and in some ways still is, a fair question. Lots of people persist in the quaint belief that the sexes are biologically different! And there are many who for instance would protect the right of mothers to nurse, though not necessarily to the exclusion of part-time careers. But my own responses to the question of biological differences are three:

o First, I believe the structure of work has changed. For instance, a university president is not required to hunt buffalo; he or she is required to get along with everyone--the quintessentially traditionally feminine role (This is not by way of suggesting we need a new woman president immediately at MIT, Jerry. I hope you won't use this as an excuse to escape).

o Second, our knowledge of sex differences derives mainly from reports of observations which exclude the middle--which exclude the overlap where the sexes are similar. Dozens of studies of sex differences depend on item analyses which dropped the 80 or 90% overlap between the sexes, in order to report the 10 or 20% male/female differences. Androgyny does not require 50/50 distributions in every profession. It suggests that the 80 or 90% of men and women who share similar skills be in similar jobs with similar job ladders.

o Third, in the absence of a society which treats boys and girls the same, the Law of Parsimony suggests caution in our judgments. It is simplest, for the present, to assume that most reported sex differences in work behavior are socially determined, and to behave accordingly.

A second major structural problem is our legal system; we must work on the laws. You must all be tired of discussions of the Equal Rights Amendment so

instead I will try to illustrate the important principle of equal application of the laws with an apocryphal anecdote.

At a nameless educational institution a distinguished administrator was approached by a stuffy professor of science who complained about very pregnant women teaching in the classroom. "It is distracting for the men," he said, "most unseemly."

"Well," said the nameless administrator, "I suppose at an institution like this, there should be some objective criterion for when a woman is too pregnant?" "Oh, yes," said the professor. "Well," said the administrator, "I should tell you the personnel policies governing such rules," and he did, winding up with the affirmative action policy that all rules should affect both sexes alike. "Fine," said the professor. "Well," said the administrator, "we could ask the woman to leave when she could no longer stand next to the wall with her elbows touching it----- but I'm afraid we'd lose more men than women."

Actually, something must be done about the laws. Imagine with me that we want to promote equal opportunity for minorities and women. So we begin with four or five Federal offices and six or seven sets of rapidly changing legislation. In order not to damage the principle of academic freedom, we rightly insist on having each institution work out its own system for affirmative action, but then, because Federal administrators cannot easily handle diversity, we set guidelines--also rapidly changing--written by lawyers who never took Humanities. In an age when learning theory tells us that carrots work better than sticks, we design punitive legislation.

In addition, we are careful to provide only one or two levers for change. Thus a woman with a complaint often must completely polarize her issue by entering the courts, an adversary proceeding. If she loses, she may lose her job; if she wins, the job will be untenable. We are also careful to exclude from the law one of the most important issues in

sex discrimination--namely that whole occupations are sex-stereotyped for women only. That is, affirmative action legislation supports integration of traditionally male professions but generally ignores the reverse problem.

Finally, to be sure that the process is as punitive as the philosophy, we bury it all under masses of paperwork. I ask you--is this legislation as likely to be effective, as, say, oil depletion allowances? The only humorous thing that can be said about affirmative action legislation is that it inspires complete unanimity of feeling among men and women--everyone thinks it's badly designed. What we need is carrot legislation, not stick legislation--and we need more effective paternity leaves, a fostering of 1/2 and 3/4 time work, child care expenses treated as a business expense.

The final and most important structural question I will mention here has to do with children and family life. I recently participated in a careful review of dozens of studies on the effects of maternal paid employment. With Dr. Howell

of Harvard I believe there is little evidence that maternal employment by itself will help or hurt children and family life. Instead, what we learn-- (although from insufficient evidence)-- is that mothers who work in paid and unpaid employment, in accordance with their wishes to do so, have happier children and families. That is, it seems better for children and families, for parents to work where they are happiest-- a cliché, perhaps, but also a profound philosophy underlying the theory of androgyny.

But, obviously, as noted above, we need more adequate child care arrangements.⁽¹⁾ I believe that most women and men are really concerned about the welfare of our children. I also believe that many parents would prefer to share much of the child care themselves-- if they could find a way to do it.

Androgyny means that young parents, men and women, should be able to spend 30 or 40 hours a week with their families and 30 or 40 hours a week in paid employment out of the 112 waking hours allotted to

each of us.

1. Documentation of this need and possibilities for child care delivery may be found in Child Care in Massachusetts, the Public Responsibility, Richard R. Rowe et al, Mass. 10. Council on Edu 182 Tremont St Boston

1
for
office
copy →

Let us take an example of a family with young children. If, while the children were young, both husband and wife worked 3/4 in paid employment and, as a matter of course, 3/4 time at home in unpaid employment, we would introduce several improvements in work structure. Family finance would be more secure. There would be more jobs to go around in times of unemployment. Both men and women would have more variety in their work lives. Both would have at least one area of work, --at home--with considerable autonomy. Both would have two areas of work to acquire skills and self-esteem and a feeling of identity and purpose. Husband and wife would share a common purpose as on the old-time farm; children would grow up seeing both parents and would probably help more in home activities. Promotions would come more easily for women but not necessarily less easily for men; in most jobs promotion would just come a little later, ~~for both men and women.~~ Lifetime earnings for women would be much higher, for ^{most} men they would not be much lower, since life-time earnings depend more on years in the labor force than on ^{the} length of ^{the} work week for any given four or five-year period.

Both parents would have greater options to change jobs or get more training. People in tedious assembly-line work would spend less time there. Some jobs which demand 60 to 80 hours a week could productively be shared, either with a spouse or with a like-minded colleague.

Would the family be happier? Would men live longer? Would labor productivity rise, in both paid and unpaid employment? We do not know about happiness and longevity; ^{we} and should experiment and see. As for labor productivity, more high IQs would be available to employers; more patience and skills would be available to homelife and children. Might we see a rise in productivity? I think careful

research studies on the effects of androgyny might show that productivity vs happiness is a false issue.

[The Psychic Issues]

Up to now I have talked about the easy issues-- changing social structures. The difficult issues are psychic and in all of us. You all remember Pogo's famous First Law of Person-Dynamics? -- "I have searched and searched for the person who is in my way, and I have found her, and she is me."

I believe we are very resistant to changes in sex roles despite rational evidence supporting further movement toward androgyny. Why should this be? We do not know very much about the reasons but I will try to raise some hypotheses. Some reasons lie in the feelings women have toward themselves; some in their feelings about men. Some reasons lie in the feelings men have toward themselves; some in their feelings about women. Strangely and sadly, most of the hypotheses I will raise to you rest on a philosophy of competition and dissonance between ^{maleness and femaleness as} mutually exclusive goals. *conditions.*

For some reason, we believe men should suppress their nurturant selves; women their rational, instrumental selves. And this being so, there must be competition and striving between the sexes. As we continue, I would ask you to consider why and to what extent we would want to see nurturance and instrumentality as dissonant rather than complementary. I would agree that some kinds of competition are necessary. But - how much is necessary?

I believe that our understanding of maleness and femaleness and of the relations between the sexes is among the most primitive, potentially painful areas we can consider. Power, status, money, security, are at stake as we reorganize toward androgyny. All of us are at times deeply ambivalent, thoughtful, cautious, concerned, as we contemplate androgyny. Yet I believe we can learn to understand ourselves better and reduce our anxiety.

With respect to women's feelings, we know now, from many research studies, that we build inner conflict into women about success. My own generation was taught that success in paid employment meant difficulty in one's personal life. Indeed, women have been taught this so profoundly that a whole generation of modern feminists have taken the issues to be far more "all or nothing" than they need to be. If I say what I am about to say, it is with great respect and gratitude to many "all or nothing" feminists. Many of these women unfortunately found it easier to work for women's equality by assuming for a while

like
I feel too.

that they had to give up men, marriage, and children, if they were to gain equality. In making this assumption, however, they live out the old, wrong precept we were taught--that homemaking and nurturance required abandonment of a successful career.

And yet it is not easy to give up the wrong precepts and to work confidently for both career and family, on the same basis as one's husband. While I believe the future will show that many feminists accepted an old, wrong polarization of issues, I would not criticize any individual for the choices she felt she had to make. Androgyny is possible but getting there isn't easy.

Consider, for example, how most of us feel if a wife earns more than her husband. Yet these feelings are a last inheritance of an outdated polarization of interests between men and women. In the androgynous marriage, income is a family matter; paid and unpaid work equally earn the salaries

of both; paid and unpaid work are equally the choice of husband and wife.... a matter to be worked out and re-worked out, over time.

How does a woman learn to choose androgyny rather than polarization and militancy? How can we re-learn a commonality of family interests, rather than ^{the} (a) dichotomy of interests represented by Horner's "fear of success" and "the Battle of the Sexes"? We know a great deal from the research of Astin and Bailyn and others. For most women, having a true career choice depends on supportive males. Fathers have enormous influence on the careers of their daughters. Male peers at school, husbands and mentors are ^{crucial} critical to the career options of the women about them. Probably each man here could enormously influence the life of at least one niece or daughter or woman protégée. For we know that in this society an integrated and successful life, of paid work and unpaid work, is most likely a woman's inheritance from a man. Without male approval and encouragement, most

women in our society relapse into the "all or nothing" choice or make unsuccessful attempts at career and family.

Men's feelings about their own inner polarization have received less study. Only this year will we see extensive publication of autobiographies and studies on men. If many women have been made uneasy about success in paid employment, many men have been made [↓]actuely uneasy about nurturant professions including parenthood--and we are just beginning to learn about men's issues of this sort.

We are beginning to learn from the research of men like Fein and Pleck that men have an enormous interest in nurturance and in cooperative behaviour. Talking things out, expression of feelings, caring for children and being cared for by children-- cooperative rather than competitive situations are being shown to help men to thrive. Moreover, expressing these parts of themselves does not seem necessarily to lower labor productivity. Why have we trained men as well as women to dislike and suppress parts of themselves?

(Subtitle): Our Perceptions of Men and Women
At Work Together

Possibly some understanding may come from further exploration of our feelings about adult men and women working together. It is remarkable the extent to which we perceive such situations as competitive and threatening... or at least, unpleasant.

For instance, I was recently at a faculty meeting of a nearby university. A distinguished professor spoke--a man I admire and respect and a person with a remarkable reputation for his work on equal opportunity for all. This man gave a fine short speech on affirmative action--courageously working on the subject, as men need to do, with his own white male colleagues. At the very end, however, he said:

"In conclusion I want to leave this thought with you. The financial and personal costs of affirmative action are high--it costs money; it generates paperwork and a lot of trouble. But we must all force ourselves to do what is right, in bringing in women."

I felt very sad that I and my fellow women were such a bitter and costly pill. I wrote a note to the well-known Dean ^{who sat} beside me, saying: "Will no one get up and say that working with women can be productive and fun?" The Dean regarded me very gravely and wrote back: "Look around you. Do these men know what 'fun' is?"

Many hypotheses can be raised about why adult men and women working together is perceived as trouble. Caplow and others have suggested that modern males were raised almost exclusively by women. The idea of having to accept female collegueship and women managers revives the image of childhood impotence. Because we have permitted generations of children to be brought up by women, these children equate adulthood with escape from female influence. Chodorow further suggests that in this typically skewed, nurturance situation a boy learns to be a man in negative image. That is, (failing a present) ^{without an available} male role model, a boy can only learn that a man is a not-mother. Thus, not

only must he escape mother, to grow up--he must
also suppress his nurturant, mother-like parts
in order to gain male identity. The boy's only
other recourse is to identify with his mother, a
process which can be healthy but which brings
discomfort to many people. The more the father
and his work are apart from the family, the more
difficult for the son to become a whole human.
Where a father's work is better integrated with
his family and especially where children work with
both parents, the children have a ^{better} chance to learn
cooperation and work-productivity in a male/
female world.

And But there are other psychic problems. Many
people believe competition is very close to the
aggression of sexuality and that having women
colleagues will produce competition and therefore
promiscuity. My own research indeed leads me to
believe that both men and women often handle
competitive situations by sexualizing them. Thus a
man who perceives an able woman as a competitor may

seek to re-establish the customary dominance pattern by becoming attracted to her or seducing her. In the same way, a woman may find her perceptions of competition uncomfortable and begin to flirt.

I do not believe this pattern means that we need to avoid colleagues of the opposite sex. For one thing, one can learn to cooperate rather than compete; at least the attractions then can be based on equality and friendship rather than hostility and insecurity! Besides, men and women work together anyway--we are not about to fire the secretaries--and sexualize their relationships anyway. And finally, there are other ways to relate. The model of parent-child relations has ^{always} ever worked well for mentor and protege. Among equals a brother-sister model also works well if the men were brought up nurturant and the women self-reliant.

Some observers believe that the male desire for status and prestige has very primitive roots.

Men demonstrate virility; potency is directly linked to a man's ability to change appearance, to "show off"; virility is visible. Women therefore may not have exactly the same need to acquire visibile status in the world of paid work. If this hypothesis is true, then women would tend to be less interested in seeking status positions ^{for the sake of status}. Men, on the other hand, would be very much concerned to keep status positions for themselves; it is disconcerting to have a woman demonstrate "virility" by acquiring visibility in business. If a woman becomes highly visibile, she is inevitably assumed to be mimicking "male" sexual behavior and will often arouse very primitive feelings that "underneath she must be homosexual."

It is difficult to know what to do about deep-seated status problems. Possibly just knowing one's feelings will help.

But I have not finished the list. Some men are very uncomfortable about women in paid employment

because this thought raises the specter[?]_{re}_{er} of having no one left at home to "take care of me." I believe these men are still deeply dependent. Our society never gave them a chance to learn the healthy inter-dependence of working together and taking care of each other. Other men are profoundly threatened when a woman is more innovative, or produces more, or is paid more than a male colleague. This is especially true when a wife is more creative in the labor force and/or produces more or is paid more than her husband, a situation which women avoid like the plague and which automatically limits the extent to which they will innovate or seek well-paying jobs. I suggest that here again there is a very primitive energy source for these feelings.

Women are seen as creating life itself and as able to nurture life directly from their own beings. For many men the ability to invent, to "produce" in the process of proving virility, and to support a family, ^{are} is their unique gifts, and possibility^{ies} in life.

If women can reproduce and nurse and invent and produce and support a family, do they "need" men? Trained from childhood to repress emotions, I ~~believe that~~ a great many men find it difficult to believe and accept that they are of course really needed, interpersonally. If all the other demonstrations of "male achievement" can be performed by women, some men then feel they have lost their identities and have become obsolescent.

There is considerable research, and anecdotal evidence, that these problems I cite are not characteristic of secure and interdependent men. Many men easily outgrow their early discomforts as success, marriage and children bring them an identity and security.

We are ~~beginning~~ I hope that you will understand my conviction that men and women both need chances to grow on all these matters. Many women need to outgrow their dependence, ~~and~~ to take responsibility for themselves.

Many have lacked the opportunity to find themselves and to evaluate themselves in the outside world.

As unpaid housewives, they do not know what they are "worth" in our monetized world. As housewives consider entry into the paid labor force, they may feel their "opportunity cost" is zero, and they may undervalue themselves and their skills. The combination of isolation from the monetized economy and discomfort about success leads many women to low self-esteem and also to resentment against men.

All these factors have produced polarization between the sexes and inside us--between our nurturant selves and our instrumental selves. But I do not believe these polarizations are right or necessary in the world to come, and I believe we will move toward each other and ^{toward} our other halves. We are beginning to delve into our cultural heritage to pick up the strands of androgyny that have always been there--as Carolyn Heilbrun has gently shown in her new book. Our children are teaching us as well and many parents are listening.

Whatever the case of our erstwhile fears of the other sex and of its attributes, I believe that both men and women are finding they have much to gain from androgyny. Men who are deeply involved with their children learn that gestation, by itself, is not all that important - you love those you take care of--and children learn to love and take care of men who are involved with them. Men learn that their options to sing, to be angry, to decorate, to garden, to play, to cry--open up huge areas of self once blocked off. Their relations with women become much deeper, much less scary. And their women complain less, as they too see what financial responsibility and paid employment are like. Men, on the whole, gain options to love.

Women stand to gain equal pay for equal work, to gain enormously wider opportunities for work. They gain companions at home who know what measles, on top of diapers, on top of leaky plumbing, can mean. They gain sleep, that priceless, precious gift to young parents. They gain opportunities for independence and status and creativity. Women, on the whole, gain options for their work.

Wider opportunities to love and to work mean more variety, more interest, more companionship, more joy in the 24 hours of the day. Freud once said something like: "A mature adult is one who can love and can work." Androgyny means wider choices of both love and work for both men and women.

In closing, I will tell you another MIT story. On my new job I met a woman Corporation member at an evening meeting. I liked her enormously - the two of us instantly took off on dream castles of the ideal world for women at MIT. A vice-president nearby got more and more uneasy and said, finally, "Ladies - I hope you don't feel all of this is going to happen all at once."

My new friend turned to him gently and said - "Please don't worry too much about social upheaval. Those of us who have spent our lives as women know there is no chance that progress in this area will come too fast."

You may ask - but is not all this a foolish idealism?
I would answer that:

"An androgynist...insists that grief may be lessened or transformed through human energy and will. He or she may even go so far as to believe in prosperity, cooperation, and good. Androgyny does have a tragic vision: the picture of culture crushing personality; of power, too often assigned to one sex, running wild into war and corruption; of widespread loneliness and massive human waste. Yet the androgynist assents, silently or out loud, to the possibility that some tragedies may become obsolete."*

* Adapted from Catherine Stimpson