
Michael Kimmel Manhood In America

*Michael Kimmel
Manhood In America*

*Downloaded from
everybodystreet.com by
Werner & Kenzie*

INTRODUCTION: UNDERSTANDING MICHAEL KIMMEL AND HIS SEMINAL WORK

Few scholars have shaped the conversation around masculinity in the United States as profoundly as sociologist Michael Kimmel. His landmark book, **Manhood in America: A Cultural History**, first published in

1996 and later updated, remains a cornerstone text for anyone seeking to understand the complex, often contradictory, definitions of American manhood. In this work, Kimmel does not simply describe what it means to be a man; he deconstructs the very idea of manhood as a historically shifting, socially constructed, and perpetually fragile identity. This article explores the core arguments, historical insights, and lasting relevance of **Michael Kimmel**

Manhood In America, offering a comprehensive guide for readers who want to grasp the evolution of masculine ideals and the pressures they place on men today.

THE CENTRAL THESIS: MANHOOD AS A RELENTLESS PERFORMANCE

At the heart of Kimmel's analysis is a deceptively simple claim: manhood in America is not a biological given but a cultural *achievement* that must be constantly proven. Unlike womanhood, which has historically been tied to biological milestones such as menstruation or childbirth, manhood is a status that can be lost. Kimmel argues that American men have historically been plagued by a deep-seated fear of being perceived as unmanly—a fear that

drives much of their behavior, from competition in the workplace to aggression in personal relationships. This performative dimension is the thread that links the Puritan patriarch of the 17th century to the "metrosexual" of the 1990s. Throughout **Manhood in America**, Kimmel demonstrates that each era redefines masculinity in response to economic shifts, social movements, and changing family structures.

THE HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF AMERICAN MANHOOD

Kimmel divides his historical narrative into distinct phases, each representing a dominant archetype of manhood. These are not rigid categories but overlapping ideals that emerge from specific

historical contexts.

The Genteel Patriarch (17th–18th Centuries)

In colonial America, manhood was rooted in land ownership, community standing, and patriarchal authority. A man was defined by his ability to provide for and govern his household. This ideal was largely static—once achieved, a man's status was secure. Kimmel notes that this version of manhood was intertwined with civic virtue; the "good man" was

also a good citizen.

The Self-Made Man (19th Century)

The industrial revolution shattered the static model. As men moved from farms to factories and offices, manhood became something to *earn* through competition, ambition, and economic success. Kimmel highlights the rise of the "self-made man" as the dominant masculine ideal: a rugged individualist who rises through sheer willpower. Yet this model also introduced anxiety. If manhood must be achieved, it can also

be lost through failure. The fear of "falling" into dependency or poverty became a central psychological burden. This era also saw the emergence of the "breadwinner" role, cementing a link between masculinity and financial provision that persists today.

The Masculine Primitive (Late 19th–Early 20th Centuries)

As women's suffrage and the closing of the frontier challenged traditional roles, men sought new ways to prove their

virility. Kimmel explores the rise of "muscular Christianity," outdoor camping movements like the Boy Scouts, and a fascination with "primitive" manhood. Figures like Theodore Roosevelt personified this ideal—a man who could combine civilized refinement with raw physical courage. This period also intensified homophobia, as any hint of effeminacy was viewed as a betrayal of masculine authenticity.

The Organization Man (Mid-20th

Century)

Following World War II, the ideal shifted again. The prosperous "organization man" was a loyal corporate employee who subordinated his own desires to the company. Manhood was measured by the size of one's house, the brand of one's car, and the ability to support a suburban family. However, Kimmel argues that this model produced a profound sense of emptiness. The conformist pressures of the 1950s led to a crisis of identity, famously captured in works like *The Lonely Crowd* and *Rebel Without a Cause*. Men felt trapped between the demands of breadwinning and the loss of individual agency.

The Modern Crisis of Masculinity (1970s–Present)

Kimmel devotes significant attention to the late 20th and early 21st centuries, arguing that each era's model of manhood has become increasingly fragile. The women's movement, deindustrialization, and the rise of a service economy have eroded traditional masculine roles. In response, we have seen a variety of reactions: the "New Age" sensitive man, the "angry white

male" backlash, the hyper-masculine action hero of Hollywood, and more recently, the online "manosphere" of pick-up artists and men's rights activists. In **Manhood in America**, Kimmel diagnoses this not as a single crisis but as a perpetual state of anxiety that has become the defining feature of American masculinity.

KIMMEL'S CORE CONCEPTS: THE GUY CODE AND HOMOSOCIALITY

Two concepts from Kimmel's work have become widely influential: the "Guy Code" and "homosociality."

The Guy Code

Borrowing from sociologist Erving Goffman, Kimmel outlines the unwritten rules of masculine behavior that boys and men are socialized to follow. These include: **no sissy stuff** (avoid anything feminine), **be a big wheel** (strive for power and status), **be a sturdy oak** (show no emotion), and **give 'em hell** (exude an aura of aggression and risk-taking). The Guy Code is not merely a set of stereotypes; it functions as a rigorous system of surveillance and judgment among men. Breaking the code—showing vulnerability, showing interest in "feminine" pursuits, failing at competition—can result in ridicule or social exclusion. This policing of

masculinity is, Kimmel argues, even more intense than external pressures from women or society at large.

Homosociality

Kimmel's concept of "homosociality" explains *why* men are so anxious about the Guy Code. He argues that men are primarily concerned with winning the approval of other men. Manhood, in this view, is a "homosocial enactment": men perform masculinity for the eyes of male peers. This explains why men take risks, engage in competitive behavior, and resist seeking help for emotional or physical problems. The ultimate fear is not failure itself, but being perceived as a failure by other men. This dynamic fuels everything from corporate

boardroom aggression to hazing rituals in fraternities and the military.

CONTEMPORARY RELEVANCE: WHY KIMMEL'S ANALYSIS MATTERS TODAY

Nearly three decades after its first publication, **Manhood in America** remains startlingly relevant. The #MeToo movement, the rise of political polarization, and the mental health crisis among men all echo Kimmel's central insights.

- **The "Angry White Male"**

Phenomenon: Kimmel anticipated the resentment felt by many men who believe they are losing their rightful place in society. His later work, including

Angry White Men, builds on this foundation, showing how economic anxiety and perceived threats to masculinity fuel populist and authoritarian politics.

- **Men's Mental Health:** The Guy Code's prohibition on emotional expression is directly linked to higher rates of suicide, substance abuse, and loneliness among men. Understanding this code is essential for developing interventions that encourage men to seek help.
- **Parenting and Relationships:** Kimmel's analysis helps explain why many men struggle with intimacy and egalitarian partnerships. The expectation to be a "breadwinner" can clash with

desires to be an involved father, leading to tension and guilt.

- **Diversity of Masculinities:** Kimmel emphasizes that there is no single "manhood" but many—shaped by race, class, sexuality, and region. For example, the manhood of a Black working-class man differs significantly from that of a white suburban executive. This intersectional approach has been crucial for later scholars studying masculinity.

CRITICISMS AND DEBATES AROUND KIMMEL'S FRAMEWORK

While widely respected, Kimmel's work is not without critics. Some argue that he focuses too heavily on white, middle-class men, underestimating the ways

CONCLUSION: RETHINKING

to the world of color and working-class men have resisted or redefined dominant masculine norms. Others contend that his analysis of "toxic masculinity" can be overly deterministic, portraying men as victims of social forces rather than agents capable of change. Additionally, some conservative critics view his work as pathologizing traditional masculinity, arguing that qualities like stoicism and competitiveness are natural and valuable. Kimmel himself has responded to these critiques by emphasizing that his goal is not to abolish manhood but to expand the possibilities for what men can be—to allow them to express a full range of human emotions without fear of ridicule.

MANHOOD FOR A NEW CENTURY

Michael Kimmel's **Manhood in America** is far more than a historical survey; it is a necessary diagnosis of the anxieties that shape American men's lives. By showing that the "crisis of masculinity" is not a recent phenomenon but a recurring theme in U.S. history, Kimmel provides a lens through which we can understand contemporary debates about gender roles, privilege, and identity. His work invites men to examine the hidden costs of the Guy Code—the loneliness, the competition, the fear—and to imagine a version of manhood rooted not in proving oneself but in being authentically human. For students, educators, therapists, and anyone

interested in gender, this book remains an indispensable guide to the past, present, and future of what it means to be a man in America.