Amer. J. Orthopsychiat. 47(2), April 1977

THEORY AND REVIEW

"JOHNNY, I HARDLY KNEW YE:" Toward Revision of the Theory of Male Psychosexual Development

Kay M. Tooley, Ph.D.

The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

"The psychology of women," as it now exists, is a shadowy negative of the psychology of men, and can be successfully formulated only if male psychology is reassessed and considerably revised. Male theorists and practitioners have made virtues of the harsh facts of male socialization. These conditions, which have unhappy repercussions in the male ego and in the culture as a whole, are modifiable only if they are identified and understood.

"Johnny, I hardly Knew Ye," [11] *is an early Irish war-protest song sung by a woman to a mutilated returning soldier-husband.*

Theoretical discussions about psychosexual development and sexual identity have focused on male development as baseline and female development as a variation from that norm. This is a proper and inevitable history for the science/art of psychoanalysis, originating as it did in self-observation and self-report. Most of the selves observed and reported were male. The language, metaphor, and psychic history were male. Since Freud, and including him, there has been considerable dissatisfaction with the revised female editions of psychosexual development, which has led to complicated and almost impenetrable revisions of revisions of that original theory. Female consultants were admitted to the mysteries, coached in the language and metaphor, and invited to, now, please tell us, "What does a woman want?" Practicing therapists seem to be surprisingly unaware that female patients also coached in the historical male metaphor by interpreta-

Submitted to the Journal in November 1976.

tion (and under a heavy economic and emotional pressure not to "resist" such interpretations), are highly likely to speak the language that makes sense to the therapist—and thus to confirm his theoretical bias.

Fortunately, men and women have more common history as human beings than divergent history as sexual beings. Fortunately, metaphor is a strong cognitive tool, often translatable by the listener into something usefully applicable to her own situation. As a result, women patients are often helped considerably by the analytic method which, again fortunately, often leaves the theory far behind in its individual practical application. However, women patients are complaining more frequently that "often" and "oblique" are not enough, that they are tired of hand-me-down, theory-based interpretations; they are "resisting" by leaving treatment with male therapists in search of women practitioners—who may or may not represent an improvement. "The psychology of women," as it now exists, is a shadowy negative of the psychology of men, and can be successfully formulated only if male psychology is reassessed and considerably revised.

A problem in revision of theory is escaping the reification of ideas and language inevitable in any theory and technique with a history. One must find a different language, a different perspective, for both viewing and evaluating the familiar data of human experience upon which theory is based. This essay will employ a female perspective on male sexual development, and a conceptual framework more akin to developmental psychology than to psychoanalysis. An effort will be made to relate this perspective and language to common clinical truisms observed so widely for such a long period of time as to be generally accepted as knowledge gained from everyone's professional experience. The thesis to be defended is that male theorists and practitioners have made virtues of the harsh facts of male socialization; that these practices have unhappy repercussions in the male ego and in the culture as a whole; and that these harsh realities are modifiable only if they are identified and understood.

To begin with a metaphor, suppose we had studied two groups of males who had been divided into group A and group B at age eight on the basis of teacher observation and evaluation, test assessments, and developmental history. Group A boys walked earlier, talked earlier, made an easier adjustment to school, learned to read better and faster, and were relaxed and comfortable in the school environment. Group A boys also were rarely enuretic or assaultive or hyperkinetic. They contributed only about 20% of the group referred for psychotherapy. Group A boys had better interpersonal skills and a more highly developed capacity for empathy. Group B boys, conversely, showed significantly more immaturity, symptomatic behavior, and lack of capacity for adjusting to different environments. They contributed 80% of the child guidance population and the population of children referred for remedial education. Furthermore, group A and group B boys are known to be equal in number, to have the same cultural and socioeconomic background, and the same access to inherited capabilities.

On the basis of such differences, we would infer that group A had had a much more benign growth-inducing parenting in the important preschool years than did group B. Furthemore, we would be most interested in investigating further just how child-rearing practices differed from group A to group B. Observation and interviews with the parents would establish that corporal punishment and shaming were less often used with the group A boys, and that they were permitted much more physical closeness and cuddling than were those in group B—and until a later age. Group B boys were discouraged in their efforts to be close even when their siblings were not; they were encouraged to play at a considerable distance from mother, while group A mothers encouraged their children to play close by, particularly in strange and potentially frightening circumstances. Mothers talked more often and at greater length with their group A children from infancy than with their group B children. They also confessed they had felt closer, warmer, and more at ease with their group A children, usually on the basis of perceived similarity: "He looks like my side of the family." However, fathers also treated their group A children more gently and affectionately than their group B children. Both parents were less likely to stress performance with their group A children. In spite of this, group A children learned skills such as talking, feeding, and dressing themselves earlier, and generally had an earlier and easier toilet training. Their better school performance has been mentioned previously.

Of course, the group A children are girls and the group B children are boys.[1, 2, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 26] However, in converting these observations into theories of child development, we have stoutly resisted what seems an obvious conclusion: that girls are more intelligently, kindly, and gently reared than boys, and that this has positive effects that are readily observable in the latency period.* When other factors are held constant—socioeconomic background, genetic endowment, access to education—the child who performs better socially and intellectually (we would usually infer) has had a superior preschool home experience than his less well adjusted counterpart.

To examine the impact on little boys of this subtly disadvantageous handling, we must remember that most little boys have sisters. Those who do not have sisters receive just as much physical punishment and physical rejection (independence training) because that is what this society tends to prescribe for boys. Psychoanalytic theory acknowledges the presence of sisters in families to establish the basis for castration complex ("upon observing his little sister's penisless state . . .," etc.). From developmental psychology, we can infer that young boys have an opportunity to observe quite a lot more: their sisters are spanked much less, cuddled much more, spoken to more often and more gently, and praised more often whether older or younger. Boys' desires to cuddle and experience physical closeness are discouraged with varying degrees of harshness.

Physical rejection is evidenced quite

* That girls lose this developmental impetus in adolescence is another important social phenomenon but beyond the scope of this paper.

early in mother-son interactions.[19] One suspects that boys' early and obvious genital reaction to physical pleasure worries their mothers. It seems "sexual," and this tends to make mothers uneasy. Feeling guilty about stimulating "sexual" reactions in their sons, they may impose physical separation and isolation from their person both earlier and more drastically than they do with their daughters. (Which predisposes males to the depressive-aggressive world view that will be discussed later.) Maternal implementation of the separation-individuation task is also significantly different for boys and girls. A central aspect of the mothers' functioning in this task is supervision of the mindless motility of their toddlers: mothers make sure that toddlers do not learn about the physical environment too harshly and too early.[25] Little boys are more restless and more motile from birth;[18] they, more likely than their sisters, will climb fifteen times to the top of the table. Fatigue and resentment may lead mothers to allow boys, more often than girls, to learn about falls and bumps from experience. Boys learn about the hard and painful unyieldingness of the physical world at a time when their physical and mental development does not permit the lesson to be readily mastered. Little girls get hurt less and later, and so more easily learn to "be careful." Boys feel more pain, and consequently more anger at their physical environment—and this at a stage of development when "world" is insufficiently differentiated from mother. Thus, mother-son alienation receives another reinforcement. Little boys' anger is complementary to their mothers' sense of guilt, a complementarity resurrected in adult male-female relationships. (He blames her for what is unsatisfactory in his life, and she accepts the blame). If, on top of all this, sex-typing is enforced in their families, little boys (who, as yet, have no concept of their fathers' work) are made to feel ashamed of their wish to join mothers and sisters in the cooking, cleaning, and other household activities that make up the day.

As they move into latency, boys find that their sisters are permitted tomboyish activities to a much greater degree than boys are permitted girlish activities. Furthermore, any budding expertise their sisters show in male domains is likely to elicit parental satisfaction and compliments, often a simultaneous source of pain and shame for young boys: "She swims (or "plays baseball" or "fixes bicycles") better than he does!" It is no wonder that males often carry to adulthood a terror and hatred of competitive and competent females, and indeed feel "castrated" in observing their performance.

Now is the time, perhaps, for a slight digression. It is a clinical corollary that a fear which is excessively preoccupying and only remotely probable often indicates an unconscious wish. Thus, the wealthy man who spends his conscious hours in an anxious horror of poverty might well unconsciously wish to be rid of his money. A woman whose frequent fear of rape dominates her thinking and activity might be supposed to wish unconsciously to be raped. A man who worries all his life about losing his penis might be supposed unconsciously to wish for that state. Other writers have pointed out

that castration fear has all of the hallmarks of a reaction formation—a wish to be penisless, which is unacceptable to the conscious and rational mind.[10] Some have related it to womb envy, others have hypothesized a prehistoric past leaving a racial memory of matriarchy—a time in the history of the human race when it was decidedly more advantageous and pleasant to be a woman.[27] But a thesis pursued in this paper is that men have a personal past, repressed and distorted by adulthood, in which it must have seemed to them that it was much more pleasant and advantageous to be a girl. Like most childhood traumas, when the circumstances are known and interpreted the wish is much less shaming and irrational. Historically, the wish in the little boy to be penisless is sensible, a realistic judgment based on daily observation and experience. A castration wish is ego-alien to the adult male only because repression has obscured the excellent reasons for it. Instead, his ego translates the wish in currently reasonable terms: to wish to be castrated is to wish to be disfigured, maimed, unsexed.

The child's practical, although inaccurate, observation is that "no penis" equals "girl." The adult male has learned that castration does not equal woman but only non-man. (This point has occasioned much mysterious confusion in psychoanalytic theory.) Hence, the childish and conscious castration wish must be transmuted into postchildhood castration fear. The boy's wish to be female, based on a realistic perception of girls' favored treatment, is not supported by adult perceptions (women do not have a favored status in adult society) and is thus even more unacceptable to the man's conscious ego. "Penis envy" in adult women is much less at odds with current reality perceptions—seems much less "crazy" to the observing ego—because money, power, and freedom of choice are more available to adult men than to adult women. This represents a complete shift in the status quo of the sexes from their preschool days.

Zilboorg,[27] in a provocative essay, provided a vivid speculative picture of the little boy in a prehistoric matriarchal society:

> A number of facts cited by him [Ward] and other investigators seem definitely to point to man's very early hostility toward his primordial mother. She certainly had to wean him sooner or later and let him detach himself from her. [We have hypothesized that it is more like sooner than later.] The little females as they grow and mature might, most probably did find maternal consolation similar to the one their mothers seemed always to have. But the young male must have been a sorry sight indeed: he was young, inexperienced in getting food for himself, and not strong enough yet to be the object of choice by the fastidious, self-assured woman, who instinctively demanded the best and strongest the race could offer. Perhaps it is in this subsoil of early human life that the earliest and deepest veins of man's hostility toward woman, which is familiar on the basis of many clinical experiences, will sooner or later be found . . . "woman envy." (p. 281)

He is the prototype of the existential "outsider," excluded by sex from a cozy female society. This may indeed be a racial memory trait, but is likely as well to be a repressed and distorted memory from the boy's preoedipal, preverbal, personal past. One might hypothesize at this point in life a "critical period" for the enlargement of capacity for satisfying object relationships. The girl, with the experience of warm and successful

relationships within the home, steps into the school society with confidence. The little boy hesitates; the new situation seems to him to promise even less than the one he is leaving. He retreats and focuses his need for pleasure and self-approval on his body, specifically his penis. He has learned to cathect his whole body much less than girls do, because important others have seemed to cathect it less. It is the same body that was underprotected in the separation-individuation phase, the body that was the source of frequent pain at that time. Socialization practices in respect to the boy have emphasized that the expression of grief over pain is babyish and unmanly. Further, experiencing pain and inflicting it on others is presented as "fun" for the boy but not for the girl. This implements the retreat from the cathexis of the whole body to the cathexis of the penis, and a retreat from object relationships to a preference for part-object relationships.

The boy turns his interest away from the world of people to the world of objects and things (in which he shows an early competence, in contrast to the girl's early interpersonal and language competence). His already present anger and sense of rejection [24] is enlarged by his recognition that the new caretakers, teachers, are also put off by his fidgety action-oriented mode, his aggression, and his relative lack of interpersonal skills.[16] Masturbation becomes for him a dependable and always accessible source of reassurance and tension release. The latency expansion in his cognitive development consolidates his early predisposition for genital preoccupation and for the genitalization of his life experience. His competence in the world of things gains instinctual impetus from a focus on the "penis-like" aspect of things. Here we are indebted to the huge accumulation of psychoanalytic case descriptions that have unearthed the "penis perception" as the basis of the male cognitive experience: "tree-ness" is *trunk,* not leaf or fruit; "eye-ness" is orbs with a projection between, not a hollow receptacle of sensation; cars are powerful thrusting objects, not warm and relatively effortless means of being carried about; birds are erectile tissue, not free-moving nesting creatures; and the same with fish and dragons and tadpoles and dinosaurs and mosquitos, telephone poles and toothpicks, knives and feathers, toes and teeth, and everything that moves and is and does (and is threatened) on the face of the earth.

In this symbolic language, leaves are never separated offspring that wither and die. They are separated penises, so that even fear of death can be diluted to fear of castration. Concern with the penis substitutes for concern about all other threatening life relationships. This aids in averting anxiety and promoting autonomy, but while the advantages have been well publicized in the literature on male sexuality, the dangers and drawbacks to individual men and the civilization they control have gone unrecognized, unstated, and unconsidered.

In his lonely, angry state, the little boy feels that his penis is all he has; he will treasure it, worry about it, protect it all of his life, often distorting his entire life experience, his judgment of of the world, into a genital-endangering conspiracy of other men, women, even children who would emasculate him if he were off-guard for a moment. It is

at this point that we are indeed trapped by our male-evolved conceptual language, in which male attributes are implicitly good and healthy, female attributes the obverse.[4] ("Aggressive," in this conceptual language, conveys "assaultive" as well as "assertive;" "autonomous" connotes "unrelated" as well as "inner directed." As applied to women, "passive," means "inert" as well as "receptive;" "submissive" suggests "obedience" as well as the capacity for compromise and reconciliation.)

When research subjects are of late adolescent rather than of latency age, reports of findings are so dominated and so hopelessly confounded by stereotypical language that one must turn to the operational definition to understand what is in fact being measured. For example, if an adolescent is found to be easily mobilized by peer opinion to turn on a scapegoat, does this measure capacity for aggression or for group compliance? It is a truism among motivational researchers that their measures "work" for men but not for women. In other words, men know what motivates men, but not what motivates women. Back we go to, "What does a woman want?" Not such a puzzle; enough freedom of opportunity to test her head and heart, and enough money and power to insulate her from poverty and physical insult. Not so different from what a man wants. The deeper question, instead, concerns how a woman's strategy for achieving what she wants compares to a man's; the differences are great.

One study, which has taken the language of experimentation carefully into account, will be considered here in some detail. Goldstine [8] used projective measures (TAT) to examine the interpersonal modes and world views of male and female college students. Although her findings are familiar, the language of her summary—the processing of surplus meanings and surplus values of descriptive words—is unusual. It should be kept in mind that neither the young men nor the young women in this study had yet tested the outside world of work and hard reality, so that the views expressed had to be shaped largely by early socialization.

Goldstine found that the college men studied differed markedly from the women in their commitment to an "impersonal" rather than an "interpersonal" orientation. Males did not see the world they were about to enter as a place of potential satisfaction, and did not expect people to like them, protect them, and support them. These college men, again in contrast to the women, tended to define relationships in terms of their potential for hurt and frustration; they preferred to terminate relationships and withdraw, rather than work to improve them. Males conceptualized a dog-eat-dog world in which their own well-being must come at someone else's expense; conversely, the well-being of others was viewed as a source of personal chagrin and deprivation.

Here, it might be argued that these young men were merely expressing accurate reality testing. But the point is precisely that the dominant definition of "reality" is shaped largely by this masculine bias,[22] which holds that gratification of another invariably diminishes one's own possibility of being gratified —a depressive world view familiar to all clinicians, and characterized by the

absence of a clear concept of "enough" (enough guns, enough butter, enough money, enough possessions, enough power, enough motility).

Goldstine's male subjects expressed a need to preserve a sense of power by choosing to take rather than to be given to ("dominant" rather than "submissive," in the established terminology), to coerce rather than to convince; they preferred to leave rather than face their long-endured fear of being left. No wonder the civilized virtues of compromise, conciliation, and openness to the ideas, needs, and desires of others are, in practice, so often and so easily discarded; male psychology perceives these qualities as feminine "submissiveness" and "passivity"—as emasculation. Fear of emasculation, whether expressed as the boyhood fear of castration or the grownup male fear of impotence, remains the core organizer of adult male life experience, a natural outgrowth of the little boy's defensive phallocentrism. (One writer,[9] attempting to make a virtue of the harsh necessities of male socialization, pointed out the male's superior "self-boundary," in contrast to female "boundarylessness." To the present writer, a more apt comparison would be between two different kinds of boundaries: the Berlin Wall, for example, patrolled night and day, and the US-Canada border. The difference lies in the perception of the outsider as enemy.)

By adulthood, the penis carries such a heavy responsibility for the whole range of self-esteem and pleasure possibilities that its functioning is a source of great anxiety for the man. Any negative feedback from the environment may trigger impotence, and a typically male effort to externalize blame for this impotence. This disproportionate anger, evoked by small and inevitable life insults, constitutes a constant problem, even a danger for the man. Should a co-worker get his promotion (and even though other gratifying work possibilities remain), the man is not just momentarily discouraged, but is "emasculated" by a malevolent powerful male; the result is much greater fear, anger, and demoralization than the event warrants. If a neighbor runs the lawnmover over his daffodils, the man hasn't lost a few flowers that were going to fade in a week anyway; he has been "castrated." If another car cuts in front of him on the expressway, it is not a fleeting annoyance, not even a dangerous fleeting annoyance; it's a major operation—a castration. This exaggerated response to minor incidents is often justified to the conscious male ego by "the *principle* of the thing!"

Women have always been mystified by male willingness to bloody each other over incidents that seem trivial, while men have been incensed because women do not seem to give a comparable damn about the "principle of the thing" ("deficient superego"). Men's hearts—bruised, battered, strained through a lifetime of such daily anger and fear—break down in middle age at four times the rate of women's (even when the circumstances, such as life stress, are taken into account). Medical efforts have been made to salve those hearts with estrogen, as though one could confer belatedly some balm of female durability. I am suggesting that it is not the stressfulness of their lives but the surplus meaning of the daily small "castrations" and "emasculations," and the conse-

quent rage and fear, that wears out too many men too early.

Cultural pressures and socialization practices have, by adulthood, placed a heavy responsibility on the male genital, far heavier than nature ever intended. Successful sex therapy for impotence involves divesting the penis of a symbolic responsibility for all forms of pleasure, competence, and achievement. Such therapy frequently involves a phase in which men are specifically forbidden intercourse, and encouraged belatedly to explore the possibilities of the whole body's sensuality without the internal demand to prove himself in a sexual athletic competition. Unfortunately, as women become freer to express enthusiasm for intercourse, men are becoming more frequently impotent. Goldstine's work would indicate that it fits better with the masculine stereotype to "take" pleasure from a somewhat unwilling donor, rather than to cooperate in a pleasure-seeking enterprise. "Cooperation" is a rather alien concept. To the man, it seems instead a "competition" in which the evidence that he is "finished" is unconcealable, while her state remains a mystery. Stoller[23] has added another insight: much of male sexual arousal is at base vengeful, a retaliation against a depriving mother. Woman's past unwillingness to gratify is undone by each sexual encounter, and present unwillingness is itself a component of his satisfaction.

Inevitably, men turn the fear of emasculation and impotence on women, because historically and unconsciously it was women who devalued their penises to begin with. As mentioned above, women accept the projection of blame because of their own conflict over managing both the little boy's sexuality and his need for dependency gratification. It is also true that women are much safer targets for aggression than are other men. A case in point is the long submerged but widespread tradition of wife-beating, conceived as properly masculine and quite legal. Neither male nor female mental health experts would approve of wife-beating. However, male practitioners, along with the rest of the male world, do fear and distrust the active and independently achieving female, widely felt to be "castrating" and "unfeminine." I would suggest that a competent, competitive, female peer evokes a memory not of mother, daughter, or wife, but of *sister,* that formidable rival of old. Their barometer of self-esteem may indeed register alarm if men must deal with her again, and they will refuse to deal with her if they can—and they can and do.

The profession is guilty of promoting another pernicious myth that involves the same propaganda of inertness as the above; that is, the myth of motherhood as a passive experience—mother eternally rocking and breastfeeding her infants—a fantasy that provides sure and certain indication of a traumatic dependency weaning in the male professionals who, along with other men, prefer it. It is an attempt to rewrite developmental history to dethrone retrospectively the "giantess of the nursery"—that busy, absolute monarch of the preschool world who coerces and trains and forbids, as well as dispenses at will, naps and cookies and spankings and kisses.

DISCUSSION

This paper has proposed a need for a reordering of traditional hypotheses about male psychosexual socialization. It has been suggested that current theory represents a defensive effort to make virtues of the harsh realities of male socialization. In counterpoint, this essay reaffirms what other writers have suggested: "the psychology of women . . . represent[s] a deposit of the desires and disappointments of men" [10] (p. 326).

There are implications for clinical practice in a reformulation of the theory of male development—the same imperatives the mental health professions have always acknowledged: If there are practices and beliefs that poison human relationships, restrict human potential, and limit capacity for available enjoyment and pleasure, then we have an obligation to work to identify them, to counteract them, and to modify the practices and beliefs that gave rise to them.

Are the facts of male socialization modifiable? He *is* born with higher motility, and his genital difference *will* be grounds for lack of maternal empathic identification. Mothers have sensed that there is a lack in their capacity to understand and care for all of their children; as a result, they have invited a host of surrogates—Freuds and Spocks and Gesells—into the nursery to replace the missing expertise of a crucial, long-absent figure who does understand little boys, who does value motility, and who has a high investment in the welfare of his family. I am referring, of course, to fathers. It is time for fathers to come out of the closet where they have been half-ashamedly treasuring their pleasure, pride, and interest in their babies, and where their contributions have been classified as a kind of second-rate imitation of mothering. Fathers have, on occasion, been assigned the valuable function of "mothering" mothers in the demanding postnatal years.[5] This is an important and too often underestimated function. However, we need to confront a different question. What attitudes and services can fathers supply babies and small children that mothers cannot? I submit that the sad lacks in a small boy's life result from his father's exile, not from his mother's malevolence, although I can certainly understand why male analysts and analysands might have perceived this differently.[6]

Let us consider the question of male motility—a problem from the earliest days of life. A wakeful baby is often a crying baby, one more likely to arouse a sense of maternal ineffectiveness. A highly mobile toddler is more likely to need constant surveillance and pursuit, resulting in more maternal anxiety, fatigue, and resentment—as will a four-year-old who *must* crawl through the sewer under construction in the next block. Who, mother or father, is more likely to see this active exploration as muscular achievement, as brave mischief, as a valuable and not merely dangerous quality? If a two-and-half-year-old is still in diapers, although his sisters were "clean" by eighteen months, and if he grows into an eight-year-old who can't pass a mud puddle without giving in to a desire for total immersion, which of his parents will be better able to dredge up empathic memories of being

thought "messy?" Fathers can and will, if we permit and even teach them to be affectionate and sympathetic toward their own little-boy selves.

Most mothers, most of the time, are fond of fathers (having had in their own past considerable loving experience with the genre). If fathers are present when their sons are acting up, if they cope with these behaviors and process them as positive, mothers will come to see them as positive also. The inborn qualities of the little male may come to be a source of *parental* pride, rather than *maternal* concern.

Similarly, if an infant male's penile erection after a warm bath or after baby play is greeted by the amused appreciation of his father, it is not going to be viewed as a perversion by his mother—no matter what the experts say. (As a matter of fact, we must confront the possibility that mothers are simply going to be much less interested in experts if fathers are available to do fathering.) If it is true that women generally enjoy a wider sensual experience and a greater interpersonal tolerance, it is also true that men generally enjoy a greater freedom and ease about sexuality. If a woman alone feels guilty about a male infant's obvious sexual/sensual response, a woman with her husband at her elbow will feel secure with the world's finest chaperone. At the very least, that baby boy might be quickly shifted to the different lap of a different playmate rather than relegated with affective coolness to the floor or the playpen. (I can feel my male colleagues beginning to fret about homosexuality, and would remind them that there is no evidence that homosexuality results from warmly collaborative parenting. It is more likely to result from the separation and alienation of the sexes, which our own theories have done considerable to foster.)

If little boys had a less traumatic dependency weaning relative to little girls, they might be less aggressive, less distrustful, and certainly less hostile to women; they might have more highly developed interpersonal skills and verbal skills. As a consequence, elementary school would not compound the trauma of the preschool environment. The boys would not need to retreat into narcissistic reliance on the penis. They would have the skills and the affective "bank account" to develop confidence in their ability to obtain affection and earn approval.

And then would come the millennium. (One is due in only 23 years.) The long reign of terror of King Oedipus would be over at last. We could exorcise the fearful demon who insists that if good things are shared they are lost, and that "too much" is the only possible antidote to "too little." Man's ancient grievance against woman, whose insistence on her freedom to know and to choose caused his expulsion from the Garden of Eden, could be softened by an understanding that there are other gardens, other possibilities for peace and comfort; he would no longer need to restrict, punish, and coerce her in retaliation for his expulsion.

The physical environment might become something to be mutually tended and nurtured as the sum of all possible gardens, rather than an object that must be walled, defended, assaulted, and despoiled if needs are to be met. When we look back at a long life and say, "I've had enough!", it may be an ex-

pression of hopes fulfilled rather than an exclamation of angry despair.

"And they never will get our sons again, Johnny, I'm swearin' to ye!" [11]

REFERENCES

1. ANASTASI, A. AND FOLEY, J. 1949. Differential Psychology: Individual and Group Differences in Behavior (2nd Ed.). Crowell-Collier-Macmillan, New York.
2. BARDWICK, J. 1971. Dependency, passivity, and aggression. *In* Psychology of Women, J. Bardwick, ed. Harper and Row, New York.
3. BERMANN, E. 1973. Scapegoat: The Impact of Death-Fear on an American Family. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
4. BROVERMAN, I. ET AL. 1970. Sex role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. J. Consult. Clin. Psychol. 34: 1–7.
5. COHEN, M. 1966. Personal identity and sexual identity. Psychiatry 29:1–14.
6. EARLS, F. 1976. The fathers (not the mothers): their importance and influence with infants and young children. Psychiatry 39:209–226.
7. GOLDBERG, S. AND LEWIS, M. 1972. Play behavior in the year old infant: early sex differences. *In* Readings on the Psychology of Women, J. Bardwick, ed. Harper and Row, New York.
8. GOLDSTINE, T. 1974. Impersonal and interpersonal orientations in the concept of autonomy: a study of sex differences. Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
9. GUTMANN, D. 1965. Women and the conception of ego strength. Merrill Palmer Quart. 11:229–240.
10. HORNEY, K. 1926. The flight from womanhood. Inter. J. Psychoanal. 7:324–339.
11. *Johnny, I hardly knew ye.* Irish folk song (author unknown). *In* Songs of Mother Ireland. Associated Recordings Company, London, W.10.
12. KAGAN, J. 1964. Acquisition and significance of sex-typing and sex-role identity. *In* Review of Child Development Research, M. Hoffman and L. Hoffman, eds. Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
13. KAGAN, J. AND LEWIS, M. 1965. Studies of attention in the human infant. Merrill Palmer Quart. 11:95–127.
14. KELLY, F. AND BERRY, C. 1931. Special Education: The Handicapped and the Gifted. White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, Appleton, New York.
15. KOPEL, D. AND GEERDED, H. 1933. A survey of clinical services for poor readers. J. Ed. Psychol. Monogr. 13:209–224.
16. LIPPITT, R. AND GOLD, M. 1959. Classroom social structures as a mental health problem. J. Soc. Issues 15:40–50.
17. MACCOBY, E. 1966. Sex differences in intellectual functioning. *In* The Development of Sex Differences, E. Maccoby, ed. Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif.
18. MOSS, H. 1967. Sex, age, and state as determinants of mother infant interaction. Merrill Palmer Quart. 13:19–36.
19. SCHAEFER, E. AND BAYLEY, N. 1963. Maternal behavior, child behavior, and their intercorrelations from infancy through adolescence. Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Develpm. (28):3.
20. SCHUELL, H. 1947. Differences Which Matter: A Study of Boys and Girls. Bon Boeckman–Jones, Austin, Texas.
21. SEARS, R., RAN, L. AND ALPERT, R. 1965. Identification and Child Rearing. Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif.
22. SIMMEL, G. "Philosophische Kultor" (unavailable in English). See citation in, HORNEY, K., above.
23. STOLLER, R. 1976. Sexual excitement. Arch. Gen. Psychiat. 33:899–909.
24. TERMAN, L. AND TYLER, L. 1954. Psychological sex differences. *In* A Manual of Child Psychology, L. Carmichael, ed. John Wiley, New York.
25. TOOLEY, K. 1974. Words, actions and 'acting out': their role in the pathology of violent children. Inter. Rev. Psycho-Anal. 1:341–351.
26. WITKIN, H. ET AL. 1962. Psychological Differentiation. John Wiley, New York.
27. ZILBORG, G. 1944. Masculine and feminine: some biological and cultural aspects. Psychiatry 7:257–296.

For reprints: Dr. Kay M. Tooley, Children's Psychiatric Hospital, University of Michigan Medical Center, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48109