[mostly this is about Java, but with 2 pages on Amer Indians and with many comparisons to US culture]

Source: Walter L. Williams, “The Relationship Between Male-Male Friendship and Male-Female Marriage American Indian and Asian Comparisons” in *Men’s Friendships* edited by Peter Nardi.

Very often popular critics complain about problems of alienation resulting from men's inability to develop intimate friendships. Humans, like other social animals, need and want intimacy, yet many men feel an inability to express that part of their being freely. This lack of close friendships is decried by many (see, for example, Brod, 1987; Franklin, 1984; Kilgore, 1984; Kimmel & Messner, 1989; Miller, 1983; Pleck & Pleck, 1980). Yet suggestions for change are inevitably greeted with a chorus of disbelievers who dismiss such relationships among men as being Utopian, unrealistic, or even "unnatural." Given our observation of the way most American men act, we tend to think that this is the only way men can behave and still be "men." We might acknowledge, and even admire, the intense friendships that often exist among gay men, but this intensity itself seems to suggest that such friendships are not part of the standard masculine pattern. If men wish to retain their sense of being masculine, if they wish to be successful, if they wish to keep from being "emasculated," then close friendship seems to be the inevitable casualty.

Such a viewpoint is understandable, given our ignorance of other realistic alternatives. If the only point of reference is from within contemporary American culture, this viewpoint is easy to accept because so few "successful" white heterosexual men seem to challenge it. When examining men's friendships from the perspective of other cultures, however, it is the American style that seems strange.

Not enough research has been done on this subject to draw valid generalizations, but what investigation has been done on male friendships shows a quite different pattern from one culture to another. And within any particular culture, there is variation based on class, ethnic background, sexuality, and other differences. Masculinity, no less than other aspects of personality, is a socially constructed achieved status (Gilmore, 1990). The lack of intimacy and demonstrated affection among American men is quite unlike the situation in many other cultures. Many Americans may be aware, from newspaper photographs, that the acceptable style of formal greeting for men in France, Russia, and other European cultures is to embrace and kiss each other. Some of us may even be aware that Arab leaders often are seen walking arm in arm, or holding hands as they talk. Yet most of us are so ignorant of men's daily behavior in much of the non-Western world that we do not realize the peculiarity of men's interactions in the United States. In short, contemporary American mainstream masculinity is rather unique in its suppression of displays of affection, and of close and intimate friendships, between adult men.

Most of human history has occurred in small-scale societies where people know one another much more closely than in modern cities. For about 99% of our history as a species, humans existed in small hunter-gatherer bands. In more recent epochs, pastoral herdsmen or settled agricultural villages emerged. Only within the last century, and only in certain areas of the world, have urban populations surpassed rural ones. Perhaps it is time for us to examine the ways of life of these various social patterns and to see what lessons we might learn about how better to conduct our own social relations. This chapter focuses on male friendship patterns in other cultures, using select examples as a means of demonstrating not only that intimate relationships among men are realistic and possible but also that these kinds of relationships have indeed existed in many other times and places.

Friendship Across Cultures

To understand the differences between friendship in other cultures and friendship in contemporary America, it is necessary to look at some diverse examples; however, very little ethnographic data exist. While marriage patterns have been analyzed exhaustively by ethnographers, hardly any anthropological attention has been devoted to friendship— even though friendship is universal behavior. Friendships are often unstructured and spontaneous, thus fitting poorly with anthropologists' theories about the structures of society (Leyton, 1974). Gilmore (1990) has recently written the first cross-cultural study of manhood as an institutionalized social category; but despite the importance of his work, there is still a lack of cross-cultural focus on men's friendships.

The most extensive anthropological study of friendship remains *Friends and Lovers,* by Robert Brain (1976). Based largely on his fieldwork in Africa, Brain's book provides numerous examples where friendships are encouraged by being ceremonialized and formalized in society. In southern Ghana, for example, same-sex best friends go through a marriage ceremony similar to that performed for husbands and wives. This samesex marriage, for members of the noble class as well as commoners, includes the payment of "brideprice" to the parents of the younger friend. Among the Bangwa of Cameroon, where Brain did most of his research, social pressure is directed to every child to encourage him to pair up with a best friend, much in the same way that other societies pressure everyone to find a spouse. Cautionary myths are told about the misfortunes falling to a self-centered person who neglects to make a friend. A major theme of popular songs is the celebration of friendships, in contrast to Western pop music, which emphasizes heterosexual romance and sex. In fact, Bangway same-sex friendships are even more durable than male-female marriages. These friendships typically last from adolescence through old age, while marriages commonly split up when children reach adulthood.

Once a year, in the major Bangwa ceremony at the king's palace, men exchange gifts and formally proclaim their friendships as continuing for another year. When a man dies, his funeral ceremony is paid for by his best friend rather than his family. The friend's public mourning is treated even more seriously than the lament of the deceased's widow and children. Throughout the life course, friendship is publicly recognized and ceremonialized among the Bangwa in multiple ways that are not even verbalized among most American men (Brain, 1976).

The institution of "godparenthood," so often commented upon by anthropologists as a form of "fictive kinship" to give a child the advantage of an extra set of parents, is also often a means of formally recognizing friendships. Godparenthood institutionalizes the relationship between the parents of the child and their best friend. In some areas of Latin America, two men will perform a rite of baptism that makes them "godbrothers" (Brain, 1976). Such ceremonies formalize and give social and religious respect to friendship in a way that modern American society does not. Even though the mythic basis for such a ceremony in Judeo-Christian cultures exists in the Biblical story of Jonathan and David, there is a noticeable lack· of ritual in Protestant Christian churches that celebrates close friendships. The Catholic Church even warns its priests and seminary students against forming "particular friendships," thus depriving its unmarried clergy of any form of intimate relationship. On the sports field, probably the place most encouraging of same-sex camaraderie in modern America, the emphasis is on team loyalty, competition, and success—rather than on particular friendships.

North American Indian Friendships

How do other cultures manage to encourage these intense friendships among men? In order to understand the important role of such friendships, I turn to my own research with North American Indians. As with many other cultures, same-sex friendships among aboriginal North Americans were emotionally intense because marriages were not the center of a person's emotional life.

Marriage was primarily an economic arrangement between women and men to produce offspring and gather food. This arrangement had its basis in a division of labor by gender. Although wide ranges of activities were open for both women and men, in most pre-Columbian American societies there existed a basic division between masculine tasks and feminine tasks. While some individual males or females had the option of doing the tasks usually associated with the other sex, by taking on a highly respected berdache gender role that mixed the masculine and feminine aspects together, most people limited their skills to either masculine or feminine ones (Williams, 1986).

By dividing the necessary tasks of each family into "men's work" and "women's work," people only had to learn half of the necessary skills, and gained the expertise of their spouse in tasks that were different from their own skills. Because many Native American societies did not have social taboos against homosexual behavior, same-sex marriages were also recognized, just as long as one of the spouses took on a berdache role and agreed to do the labor of the other sex. The emphasis of the culture was to encourage marriage and parenthood (either by procreation or adoption), not to try to dictate what kind of sexual behavior a person should engage in. As a result, homosexually inclined individuals were not alienated, and family ties were quite strong. By marrying, a person could gain the assistance and support of the spouse's kin group, and thus could double the number of relatives to whom one could turn for support in time of need.

For American Indian societies, as with most societies in all of human history, marriage has primarily been an economic arrangement. Marriage partners in many of these situations might or might not be sexually attracted to each other, but they did expect to be able to depend on each other and their kinsmen for economic support. They had little expectation that they would be each other's best friend. Other than when they were engaging in sex, husbands and wives kept a certain respectful emotional distance from each other. They would bring their resources home to provide food for their spouse and children; they would eat at home and sleep there (at least some of the time). But American Indian men, like those in many other cultures, would not spend much of their leisure time at home. In some native societies husbands and wives did not even sleep together. Among groups as disparate as the Cherokees in the Southeast and the Yupik Eskimos of Alaska, males above age 10 regularly slept in the village "men's house," a sort of community center for males that doubled as the men's sleeping quarters, while the women and small children slept in their own individual houses.

Friendships in such sex-segregated societies followed the same pattern. For friendship, men's primary psychological needs would be met by their long-term friends from childhood. And those friendships were, of course, with persons of the same gender. Men usually had deep feelings of love for their mothers, aunts, grandmothers, and sisters, based on their intimacy in early childhood, but the only adult male who would experience continued close friendships with women was the androgynous berdache, who moved back and forth between the separated gender worlds of men and women. Because of their in-between gender status, berdaches (or their masculined female counterpart) often served as a gobetween to negotiate agreements or settle disputes between men and women. In some groups, like the Cheyenne Indians of the Plains, men were so shy around women that they would often ask berdaches to negotiate proposals of marriage.

In such a situation, where each sex felt such shyness in dealing with the other, they each turned to same-sex friends for primary intimacy needs. Early Western explorers often commented upon the especially warm friendships that existed between an Indian man and his "blood brother." A nineteenth-century United States Army officer, for example, reported about "brothers by adoption" that he observed from his years on the frontier. Speaking of Indian male pairs, he pointed out the contrast with more reserved friendships among white men. He said that Arapaho males "really seem to 'fall in love' with men; and I have known this affectionate interest to live for years." The union of

two men was often publicly recognized in a Friendship Dance that they would do together (Trumbull, 1894, pp. 71-72, 165-166).

One of these friendships among Lakotas was described by Francis Parkman, who met the two men during his journey on the Oregon Trail in 1846. They were, he wrote:

[I]nseparable; they ate, slept, and hunted together, and shared with one another almost all that they possessed. If there be anything that deserves to be called romantic in the Indian character, it is to be sought for in friendships such as this, which are common among many of the prairie tribes. (Parkman, 1969, pp. 280-283)

This is not to suggest that these special friendships should be equated with homosexuality. The emphasis for the Indian men was a close emotional bond, which might well be nonsexual in many or maybe most of these friendships. If two close friends engaged in sexual activity, that would be considered their own private business, which would not be publicly mentioned. Even if they were known to be sexual with each other, they would not be labeled as a distinct category like "homosexual." As long as they continued to follow a masculine lifestyle, they would not be socially defined as a berdache. And they certainly would not be stigmatized for their erotic acts. The socially recognized part of their relationship was their deep friendship; native communities honored that. What this meant is that Native American men were allowed to develop intense friendships, and even to be able to express their love for their blood brother friend, without worry that they would be stigmatized. Except for the berdache, any concept like "homosexual" was foreign to the thinking and social world of American Indians.

Friendship and Marriage: Andalusia and Java

The pattern of friendship that traditionally existed among Native Americans, where a man gets his intimate needs met more by his male friends than by his wife, is quite common in various areas of the world. When Brandes (1987) did his field research in rural areas of Andalusia, Spain, he found that both men and women feel more comfortable revealing their deeper thoughts to a same-sex friend than to their spouse. Brandes was told by his male informants that the home is basically women's space; for men it is "only for eating and sleeping." Men in Andalusia spend most of their leisure time with their male friends at the local tavern. When their teenaged sons become old enough to be brought into the men's friendship sphere, then the men take over the raising of the adolescent males; otherwise men are not much involved in the rearing of younger children. Except for harvest season, when adults are busy working long hours, a man is expected to spend several hours each day with his best friend. He goes home only in the evening for a late dinner just before bedtime. Since any association between an unrelated woman and man would arouse suspicion of adultery, men and women avoid close social interaction with the other sex.

It should be noted that these intense male-male friendships in Andalusia are not seen as a threat to the family in any way. Marriage is strong, but is kept within its bounds of economic co-dependence, food consumption, sex, and sleeping. Marriage relationships between husbands and wives are close, but are not expected to answer one's personal intimacy needs, which are met by one's same-sex friends. As a result of this system, people have two types of close bonds: the structured mixed-sex marriage-kinship system, and the unstructured same-sex friendships networks. These two bonds strengthen and complement each other, providing supportive allegiances and psychological outlets from the pressures of life. Rather than threaten each other, each of these two bonds has its restricted area and does not try to impose on the other. The two together work better than either marriage or friendship would by itself (Brandes, 1987).

My thinking on the complementary relationship between close friendships and marriage partnerships has also been influenced by my fieldwork on the island of Java, which is the most populous island in the archipelago of Indonesia. In 1987 and 19881 lived in the classical court city of Yogyakarta, where Javanese culture remains strong. Javanese people show a strong sense of reserve in terms of public interaction between women and men, even when they are married. A scandal would ensue if a husband and wife kissed in public, and except for younger urbanites, who have been influenced by American movies and television shows to adopt more Westernized lifestyles, it is rare even to see a Javanese man and woman holding hands in public. This reserve is part of a larger pattern of the limits placed on male-female intimacy. One reason that such reserve exists has to do with arranged marriages. Traditionally, there was no such thing as dating between proper young women and men in Java. Marriages were arranged by parents, with the bride and groom often meeting each other for the first time at their wedding ceremony. Before marriage, people spend most of their time with same-sex friends rather than in heterosexual dating.

Many Americans are shocked to hear of such a custom as arranged marriages, yet our shock is no greater than the shock felt by Javanese who observe American patterns of relationships. I have had several fascinating conversations with Indonesians on this topic. While they admire the material wealth of the United States, Indonesians often wonder "why Americans seem so intent on making themselves miserable." After watching American movies together, I noticed how often they expressed puzzlement about the way Americans experience so much stress by falling in and out of love. "Why," they asked me, "do Americans experience such fragile personal relationships?" One Indonesian spoke for many when he told me that he had the impression that "Americans don't seem to have a hold on anything. They don't seem committed—to their relationships, their friends, or to anything else." It is obvious to them that Western romanticism and traditional forms of family life are not working for many Americans.

In the United States, various groups have called for a "return to the traditional family" as a cure for society's ills. Yet, the nuclear family seems to be less and less able to deal with the realities of the stresses facing people in modern America. Progressive voices have not really articulated a vision for the future, beyond merely accepting the fact that divorce and singlehood are becoming more and more common. The question is, are there other alternatives to the patriarchal nuclear family that will help to prevent an increasing sense of alienation in the lifestyle of the twenty-first century? The extended family is long gone from the American scene, and the nuclear family seems likewise destined. One-to-one relationships continue to be made and broken in fairly similar patterns among both heterosexual couples and homosexual couples. Can people live comfortably with the uncertainty of not knowing how long their partnership will last? These are questions that terrify many, and people are pulled between their desires for the adventure of love and the security of a long-term relationship. Magazines are filled with articles telling worried spouses "how to keep your husband/wife in love with you."

No one seems to be asking the question that maybe it is precisely the romantic ideal of "being in love" that is itself the problem with contemporary marriages. It is in this regard that we might be able to learn something from Indonesian patterns. It became quite evident to me, during my time in Java, that Indonesian husbands and wives do not seem to feel the necessity of "being in love" all the time. In their view, such romantic ideals only lead to grief, because they promote so much longing that families are broken apart.

In Indonesia, under the influence of Westernization, younger people are beginning to choose their marriage partner by "falling in love," but the older generation questions the ideal of romantic love as the primary basis for one's emotional life. I interviewed elderly husbands and wives whose marriages had been arranged by their parents, asking them how they could have adjusted to life together without getting to know each other and falling in love beforehand. They told me it was

precisely because of their nonromantic approach that their marriage worked. They pointed out that even if two young people know each other intimately for several years, and think that they are completely right for each other, they are so inexperienced in human relationships that they cannot possibly know anything definite about the other person. Plus, individuals change so much over the life course that it does not matter much what kind of person the other one was at that moment. The important advantage of an arranged marriage, in the Javanese view, is that the two young people are not "in love," and therefore they are not disillusioned later when they fall out of love. (For interviews with elderly Javanese, where they detail their thoughts about arranged marriages and friendship patterns, see Williams, 1991).

Such non-emotional marriages work because they are complemented by people's emotional needs being met by same-sex friendships. The strong balance between marriage and friendship is most strikingly presented in the context of wedding ceremonies that I observed in Java. The most obvious difference from an American wedding was that all the men sat on one side of the room while the women sat together on the other side of the room. The seating pattern was consciously designed to reflect the separateness of women and men. Weddings are a big event in the villages, reflecting the importance of the family in Javanese culture.

In contrast to an American wedding, which focuses on the love between the bride and groom, a Javanese wedding ceremony emphasizes the economic and social obligations of the new couple to each other, to their future children, to their parents and other relatives, and to the community as a whole. The couple sits down together on the wedding seat, the bride on the women's side, and the groom on the men's, indicating that they retain their closeness to their same-sex friends, even while becoming husband and wife.

Throughout the ceremony, the major emphasis is the economic obligation of the bride and groom. Nowhere does "love," or any expression of emotion between the two partners, put in an appearance. After thinking about the meaning of this ceremony, and talking with Javanese people about the role of marriage, love, and friendship in their lives, I think that perhaps this deliberate deemphasis on love in a marriage is—ironically, to us—one of the reasons for its stability. Instead of an ideal of romantic love, Indonesians seem to have more realistic expectations for a marriage, keeping it more or less restricted to its economic and procreative functions. (For further elaboration of the Javanese wedding ceremony, see Williams, 1991).

In the Javanese view, marriage should not be too intimate. To them, a person's intimacies are best kept where they were already located before two people got married: with their same-sex friends. A man continues to have his relatives and male age-mates as his most intimate friends, and a woman does likewise with her female friends and relatives. They do not expect that their spouse will be either some knight in shining armor or a princess in perpetual beauty, and so they are not disappointed later. As in Andalusia, friendship is not antipathetic to the marriage bond, but they are complementary to each other. One's sexual partner is not expected to also be one's best friend. Given the economic importance of marriage in Javanese village life, the exaltation of friendship among one's same-sex friends serves as a balancing point.

As their separated seating at the Javanese wedding ceremony makes clear, women are not expected to separate themselves from other women and give all their emotional support to their husbands. Both they and their husbands are getting many of their emotional needs met by their same-sex friends. If husbands and wives do not sit together at a ceremony as symbolic as a wedding, why should it be expected for them to be together otherwise? In their workday, men and women are likewise often separated. Women spend much of their time at the market, selling their family's food produce to other women. Markets for food sales are primarily women's spaces, with men seldom involved. At their domestic work, women are either in the kitchen or at the riverbank, washing their

clothes in company with other women. Men are off plowing with the oxen, or working in all-male labor gangs in the fields or the irrigation canals.

During the evening hours in a typical Javanese village, after the day's work is completed, husbands and wives will each go their separate ways. Women will visit and chat with other women, while the men will gather among themselves. They may be involved with an arts organization or a dance group, and each of these groups is either all-male or all-female. Men may play musical instruments, or women may join a singing group, but there is little overlap between the sexes in many of their leisure activities.

The Future of Friendship

Strong extended family kinship networks have often not been able to survive the extensive geographical mobility characteristic of modern America. Relatives are separated as the capitalist job market has forced many people to migrate to other locations. Under these pressures, "the family" has been reduced from its original extended form (the most common type of family among humans) to a mere nuclear remnant of parents and children. In modern America, a person's "significant other" has now become practically the sole person with whom he or she can be intimate. For many couples, this is too much to ask of their relationships, as the significant other is expected simultaneously to be sexual playmate, economic partner, kinship system, best friend, and everything else. Because of the dictatorship of the romantic ideal, many Americans expect their spouse to meet all their emotional needs. That is doubly difficult to do while both partners are also holding down full-time employment outside the home.

As more American marriages become households where both spouses have jobs outside the home, there is less energy left for being emotionally supportive of one's partner. Even these rump nuclear family marriages are, therefore, in increasing numbers of cases, falling apart. The flip side of the American ideal of individual freedom and progress is thus often a legacy of individual alienation and loneliness.

In contrast, by not expecting the marriage relationship to fulfill all of a person's needs, many other cultures allow people more emotional closeness to same-sex friends. To take one example, in some cultures, families are not often broken up over the issue of homosexuality. In such a situation, in fact, there is not as much emotional need for homosexually inclined individuals to construct a separate homosexual identity. There will, of course, still be a certain percentage of people who erotically prefer a same-sex partner, but that inclination may be fulfilled within the friendship bond. There is no social pressure for persons to leave their marriage just because they desire same-sex erotic contacts. Sexual desires may have little to do with family bonding, because the marriage is not assumed to be sexually exclusive.

Same-sex friendships need not, of course, include a sexual component, but as far as the society is concerned, the important factor is the friendship rather than the sexual behavior. The person might be sexually involved with a same-sex friend while also being heterosexually married. Both forms of bonding occur, and a person does not have to choose one over the other. This flexibility resolves to the advantage of society and the individual. There is a looseness and an adaptiveness that allow for close intimate interaction with both sexes within the dual bonds of marriage and friendship.

In cultures that do not stigmatize same-sex eroticism, and do not divide up people into "homosexuals" and "heterosexuals," there is remarkable freedom from worry among males that others will perceive them to be members of a distinct "homosexual" category. This freedom from worry demonstrates that much of the inhibition that contemporary American men feel about their friendships is due to the fear that others might categorize them as homosexual. This can most

clearly be seen by contrasting the behavior of late twentieth-century Indian men with their nonhomophobic ancestors. As contemporary Indian people have absorbed more and more mainstream white American values, through Christian missionaries, government schools, off-reservation residence, and television, they have become more homophobic. On reservations today, friendships are not as intense as among past generations. American Indian men's alienation from each other is a "miner's canary" to warn us of the even more extreme alienation going on among mainstream Americans. Friendships among heterosexual men are one of the main casualties of homophobia.

Given all these pressures, which restrict men's expressions of their feelings and increase their stress levels, it will be valuable to get some concrete ideas as to how we can get beyond some of these dilemmas facing American men. A cross-cultural analysis is one possible source of knowledge regarding how men can conceptualize their intimacy needs.

First, it is necessary to move beyond the view that every person is either exclusively heterosexual or exclusively homosexual. Two facts emerge from the anthropological literature: (a) There is a diversity in individual sexual inclinations, with some persons clearly preferring the other sex and some clearly preferring the same sex, but many (probably a majority) having a mixture of erotic feelings for both sexes; and (b) for most people, healthy human operation requires the spreading around of intimacy to a wider circle of people. This is the most common pattern, in the extended family networks and the close friendships, of probably the majority of cultures, yet this is precisely what twentieth-century American culture has failed to do. Since our geographical mobility precludes the re-establishment of extended family kinship systems for most Americans, it behooves us to re-examine the cross-cultural data on friendships and to try to start building alternative forms of relationships on this basis.

Perhaps it is time for us to begin a more fundamental public discourse questioning the primacy of the male-female romantic ideal (i.e., "the traditional family") as sufficient for meeting human intimacy needs by itself. Many Americans know that something is wrong with their lives, but the only solution they hear is popular music's refrain that they should fall in love, and the allied heterosexist "pro-family" rhetoric. Perhaps a new rhetoric of friendship needs to be emphasized. It is not an exaggeration to say that there has been a denigration of friendship in the United States. The pro-heterosexual, pro-marriage discourse has almost obliterated intense same-sex friendships. This is not to suggest that people should abandon their sexual partners, but that they should expect less of such a partner than his or her total emotional support.

In the 1970s, radical feminist separatists' and gay men's friendship networks emerged as never before. New possibilities seemed to be emerging. By the 1980s, however, as a drive for social respectability set in, fueled by the AIDS crisis, gay men and lesbians tended to settle into same-sex couplehoods that mirror the American heterosexual marriage rather than the more widespread intimacy patterns of many other cultures.

As we prepare for a new century, a revitalization of the psychological and social importance of friendship should become a high priority. Ironically, the AIDS crisis has brought out the importance of friendship "buddy" networks, as well as domestic partners, as caregivers within the gay and lesbian community. In the non-gay community as well, more attention must be given to ceremonializing and ritualizing friendship relationships in the same way that romantic relationships and marriages have been. More serious respect can be given, from one's partner as well as by society at large, for the importance of friends. Since sexual attractions are often subject to change over the years, maybe more people will be living the slogan that "lovers come and go, but friends remain."

Certainly, these suggestions do not imply that all people will evolve new kinds of relationships, but it does imply the need for equal social respect being given for a variety of friendship types. It suggests that, rather than regretting the passing of a traditional form of marriage that has already disappeared for many people, Americans will be better served by paying more attention to our needs for close intimate friendships. The problem is not the breakdown of marriage as much as it is the need to develop wider distributions of individuals to whom we can express our intimacy. In this society, women are doing this much more successfully than are men. Before American men dismiss the possibility of anything different, they might educate themselves to the necessity of getting over barriers to intimacy with friends, whether this is due to homophobia or to a competitive ethos at the workplace. We already have, in the examples from other cultures, many functioning models that have well served the emotional needs of men for centuries. These models bear further investigation. Those who have highly developed friendships can recognize the power of these relationships to carry us forward into the future. For at least some of us, maybe this is a better place to focus our intimacies, rather than placing all our hopes on some romantic love that might later turn sour and then become so disruptive in our lives.

If our society is to survive, when traditional family patterns are evolving and geographical mobility strains the limits of intergenerational connections, it is up to innovative individuals to search out new forms for intimate relationships beyond sexual partnerships. We need to analyze and nurture our long-term close friendship networks as the best possible base on which to build an emotionally satisfying future.

REFERENCES

Brain, R. (1976). Friends and lovers. New York: Basic Books.

Brandes, S. (1987). Sex roles and anthropological research in rural Andalusia. Women's Studies, 13, 357-372.

Brod, H. (Ed.). (1987). The making of masculinities: The new men's studies. Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Franklin, C. (1984). The changing definition of masculinity.. New York: Plenum.

Gilmore, D. (1990). Manhood in the making: Cultural concepts of masculinity. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kilgore, J. (1984). The intimate man: Intimacy and masculinity in the 80s. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

Kimmel, M., & Messner, M. (Eds.). (1989). Men's lives. New York: Macmillan.

Leyton, E. (Ed.). (1974). The compact: Selected dimensions of friendship (Newfoundland Social and Economic Papers No. 3). Toronto: University of Toronto Press and Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Miller, S. (1983). Men and friendship. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Parkman, F. (1969). The Oregon Trail. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Pleck, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1980). The American man. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Trumbull, H. C. (1894). Friendship the master passion. Philadelphia: Wattles.

Williams, W. L. (1986). The spirit and the flesh: Sexual diversity in American Indian culture. Boston: Beacon.

Williams, W. L. (1991). Javanese lives: Women and men in modern Indonesian society. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.