Chapter 6

Anti-Monogamy: A Radical Challenge to Compulsory Heterosexuality?

Becky Rosa

Whilst lesbians and feminists have explored the dynamics of societies which push women into sexual relationships with men (e.g., Rich, 1980), and have theorized the revolutionary challenge of lesbianism (e.g., Leeds Revolutionary Feminist Group, 1981; Hoagland and Penelope, 1988; Jeffreys, 1990),[1] the form our relationships take has not been as carefully analyzed. Compulsory heterosexuality is not the complete package. All women, both heterosexual and lesbian, are expected to buy into a whole way of life that goes far beyond being involved in sexual relations with men. One of the most important parts of the package is monogamy.

In this chapter I propose that anti-monogamy provides a positive and profound challenge to the institution of compulsory heterosexuality. Lesbians and feminists have long engaged in intense discussions about monogamy and nonmonogamy, but thus far little has been committed to paper on the subject.

We have no adequate or positive language to describe our relationships that do not fall into the monogamous partner category nor are 'just' friends. Instead of there being a continuum of behaviour considered appropriate to different relationships, it confuses people if we hold hands walking down the street with a friend, slow dance with them at a disco or regularly share a bed — this is behaviour that signifies a sexual relationship, or an impending sexual relationship. Conversely, if we choose to go on holiday separate from our partner, or both go to a party with different people and do not talk to our partner most of the night, it is assumed that we have problems and may be in the process of splitting up.

There is a problem in defining monogamy purely in sexual terms. I would like to describe monogamy as the ideology that as adults we should primarily bond with one person, meeting most of our needs from

them (sexual, emotional, physical etc.). This is enforced by cultural products (the media), economic restraints (tax incentives, the high cost of single living), social factors (the provision of support and companionship, or social status and privilege) and by the notion that this is 'how it is', this is natural.

Theory of the family has generally included theory around child-rearing and motherhood, and the functions of the nuclear family in this process. Family theory has therefore often ignored childless women and lesbians.[2] A cursory examination of any sociology of the family textbook, for example Elliot (1986), will confirm this. Many women do not choose to have children yet still live and get their support predominantly in couple relationships. It is outside the scope and the intent of this paper to consider how child-rearing would be carried out in a nonmonogamous society.[3]

Women's monogamy has repercussions for their friends, for nonmonogamous women, and for feminism. Women living outside what have been recognized as families (or 'the family') have traditionally been ignored, so each woman trying to relate to people in a different way feels as if she is the first. Women have been controlled through our sexuality, and have been separated from each other through monogamous heterosexuality. Men have almost constant access to women through various mechanisms, marriage, harassment, violence, the organization of work and so on, which women do not necessarily have to each other. Women's friendship is vital for feminism and for an end to women's oppression, and the means by which we are divided from each other need to be examined as a prerequisite for women's liberation.

Falling in Love

Love is set up to be a highly individualized emotion free from the social determination of other aspects of our lives, to love or not to love is seen as a free choice, and the notion of 'arranged marriages' where the participants are not perceived to be given this choice is often looked down on by white Westerners. However, we are not free to make choices based on our (socially constructed or otherwise) feelings for other people. If we are in a couple it is assumed that we 'love' our partner, particularly if the couple is heterosexual. However, many people do not 'love', or even like, their partners. In the opposite direction, the love for our same-sex friends and colleagues is minimized. Like the word 'family' many

feminists seem to feel that the word 'love' is too highly loaded with meanings to be able to reclaim, and instead use terms such as Gyn/affection, passion, and female friendship (Daly, 1978, Raymond, 1986).

For monogamy to exist, there needs to be a division between sexual/romantic love and nonsexual love. Since our friendships are generally with people of the same sex as us (Nardi, 1992; Garrett, 1989), homophobia plays a part in keeping our friendships non-genitally-sexual. We believe that there is a distinction between the romantic/sexual love people feel for their partners, the love people feel for their friends and the love we feel for our biological families, yet this is not quantified nor qualified. The existence of such a large number of women survivors of childhood sexual assault shows that many men at least are unable to keep within the boundaries of family 'love'. It is not universally expected that family members will 'love' each other. Girls in modern Zambia are expected to confide in and seek advice from an older woman relative, not their mothers. Similarly, Cheyenne Indian girls of the last century had 'strained' relations with their mothers and instead received affection from their father's sisters (Collier *et al.*, 1982, p. 29).

Once this division has been established, different types of relationships with different roles and positions in our society are created as separate and distinct from one another. Romantic love is given precedence over platonic love. We are asked if we have a partner, but information about our friends (where we met them, how long they've been our friends) is not commonly solicited with such vigour. Even though society may not specifically dictate that we can only *love* one person, other social structures (such as emotional support, sex, levels of intimacy, passion, sharing of finances) are linked specifically with romantic love. Sex is seen as an intrinsic part of romantic love, and it is made inevitable that we will be in, or want to be in, a sexual relationship. Because norms exist about who we are allowed to have sex with, and because sex is linked with this superior form of love, the effect is that we are only really allowed to properly love one adult person (who is not part of our biological family).

It has not always been the case that passionate love and sex were congruous. Women's romantic friendships, Chinese marriage resisters and nuns are examples of this. British feminists around the turn of the century praised passionate non-genital love, perhaps an early recognition of the role of 'love' in women's oppression and an attempt to break out of the clearly defined notions of 'love' and redefine bonds of affection in a less oppressive way. Sex was viewed as something they avoided or were coerced into with men, or purely for reproduction, and the 'love' they felt

for their friends often may not have been associated with genital sex (Jeffreys, 1985; Faderman, 1981; Raymond, 1986).

The powerful link between sex and love seems to have emerged with the writings of the sexologists during the first half of the twentieth century. With greater economic choices for upper-class and middle-class women, a new way had to be found of enticing women into marriage. The link between love and sex, and the stigmatized categories of the lesbian and the frigid woman were created (Jeffreys, 1985; Faderman, 1981). Women were now expected to enjoy sex with men, and find the companionship, previously gained from other women, from their husbands.

Women were not just forced into compulsory heterosexuality, but also into compulsory *sexuality*. Women are expected to be in, or to want to be in, a sexual relationship. This pressure exists inside and outside of the lesbian community. Sex has become an important organizing principle of our society and we feel it is necessary to ascertain whether someone's relationship with someone else is sexual or not. If a woman does not have a sexual relationship, we want to know why, and how she intends to go about finding one. Physical affection for friends is expected to exist within certain boundaries, to be 'nonsexual'. This compulsory sexuality is maintained by ensuring that certain needs can only be met within a certain kind of relationship, the couple. Physical contact is equated with genital-sexual contact, and the orgasm seen as the goal. Firestone writes: 'Isolation from others makes people starved for physical affection; and if the only kind they can get is genital sex, that's soon what they crave' (1970, p. 140). It is also very difficult for people not in couple relationships to get the love and caring they want if other people are absorbed in their pair-bond.

Romance and love legitimize women's sexual relationships with men and with women, exonerating women from being called 'slags' and similar names, serving to keep women in unsatisfactory and even violent relationships ('But I love him/her') and allowing women to maintain their 'good girl' reputation (and thus reinforce the division between 'good' and 'bad' women) whilst participating in sexual activity. For lesbians, love can act to justify sex which is named as unnatural: if two women really love each other then their sexual relationship is justifiable. Lesbians can conform to the dominant belief (that love is inevitable, natural, and universal) to explain 'deviant' behaviour, reinforcing the dominant morality relating to love, and fitting into the 'feminine' stereotype of being governed by our emotions.

Conversely, there is also an expectation that if you are in a close relationship with someone of the appropriate gender and sexual orientation, it does or should involve a sexual element. Faderman says:

'[i]t is no doubt unlikely that many women born into a sex-conscious era can conduct a lesbian relationship today without some sexual exchange' (1981, pp. 328–9). Joyce Trebilcot writes that 'we need not assume that erotic feelings should lead to love making or that love making ought to occur only where there are erotic feelings' (quoted in Douglas, 1990, p. 166). It is the former of these links that is least challenged.

Monogamy is seen by women as a means of security, both economic and emotional. One lesbian in Johnson's study of long-term lesbian relationships says that in a nonmonogamous relationship, 'the security isn't there' (Johnson, 1990, p. 181). However, in nonmonogamous relationships, the security 'isn't there' only in the context of a society that pressures women into loving only one person at a time. A question that arises out of this is *how* exactly a monogamous relationship gives more security: do obligations of various kinds mean that people stay in relationships they do not really want to be in? Is this what 'security' means to women — staying in a relationship no matter what the quality of it is, and hiding the fragility of it? Lesbians and survivors of family rape know how 'unconditional love' from our biological families can disappear on coming out or confronting the attacker.

In a lesbian-hating world it is vital that heterosexual definitions of relationships, invented for the benefit of men, do not divide us; our relationships are too precious to fall out over the issue of 'sex'. We need to question each stage of our relationships, including the usefulness and the results of 'falling in love'.

When we meet a women to whom we are 'attracted', why does this indicate to us the start of a sexual relationship, rather than friendship? What if we already have a sexual relationship (remember we are only allowed to have one)? Within a monogamous framework, if we 'fall in love' with a woman and we already have a girlfriend[4] our choices are to finish with our current girlfriend and start a new relationship, to have 'an affair' or to openly continue two relationships with little or no support, and few models of how other lesbians may have made them work. Our energy is taken up trying to sort these out rather than in engagement with the wider lesbian community, and this often ultimately causes the break-up of relationships. However, since we can have an unlimited number of friends, it would serve us better if we did not separate off feelings of lust/attraction from feelings that we might like to get to know a woman better and be her friend.

Johnson says:

> during the early months of an infatuation, we almost completely misrepresent ourselves to our new love. . . . It isn't until we calm

> down a few weeks, months or years later that our true, sober selves emerge. . . . Falling passionately in love is about bonding; it is not about accurate self disclosure (Johnson, 1990, pp. 143–4).

But with what are we bonding, if we assume that our new lover is also not projecting her true self? This suggests that we know what roles we should play in sexual/romantic relationships, at least at the beginning, which is different from the more honest representations of self that occur in emergent friendships.

There is also evidence that sex is used as a short cut to making friendships (Becker, 1988; Nardi, 1992; Ramey, 1974). Perhaps this is because of the different patterns in becoming friends and becoming lovers with someone. When we become friends, this tends to happen over a longer period of time, perhaps at work or in a political group, without the same intense contact that is usually characteristic of a new lover relationship. Nonsexual friendships are likely to take longer to establish purely because of the lesser time and energy put into them over any period.[5] Raymond suggests that it is in friendships that women are most able to be themselves (1986, p. 227). Ti-Grace Atkinson explains: '"[f]riendship" is a rational relationship which requires the participation of two parties to the mutual satisfaction of both parties. "Love" can be felt by one party; it is unilateral in nature, and . . . is thus rendered contradictory and irrational' (1974, p. 44). Friendship is more compatible with autonomy, independence and freedom, and perhaps has more of a voluntary nature than the obligations of lover relationships.

Sexual monogamy has a double standard built into it. It is more acceptable for men than women to engage in extra-marital relationships (Buunk and van Driel, 1989, p. 97). As well as having affairs, many men also see prostitutes. The link between sex and exclusivity then is often broken, more often by men but also by women. It is reported that during the so-called 'sexual revolution' of the 1960s 'free love' was available, but it might be more aptly described as 'free sex'.[6]

Being sexually non-exclusive is not good enough to change society. With heterosexuality, the presence of a minority of lesbians does not prevent most women being coerced into relationships with men; there needs to be a strong enough challenge to overthrow the whole system. Many lesbians have assimilated into heterosexual culture, talking about their girlfriends as a personal sexual choice. Similarly, plenty of people (including many infamous Tory politicians who espouse values of *the* family) claim to be monogamous but are in fact nonmonogamous. However, they do not challenge the system which says that we ought to

be in couple relationships. It is anti-monogamy, perhaps analogous to political and radical lesbianism, which aims to break down this very system that dictates how we should conduct our relationships and that makes 'free choice' impossible.

Lesbian Monogamy

Lesbians are well placed to break down these false boundaries between love, sex and friendship. Nardi found that of lesbians who had lesbian best friends, 77 per cent were at least minimally attracted to them, 59 per cent had had sex with them at least once and 54 per cent had been 'in love' with their best friends (Nardi, 1992, pp. 110–11). Also, 45 per cent of lesbians said that their best friend was an ex-lover (Nardi, 1992, pp. 113–14). Weston in her interviews noted that 'both men and women featured early attractions to friends in their coming-out stories' (Weston, 1991, p. 121). The boundaries between sexual and nonsexual love are not as clear as we might believe when we examine our experiences as lesbians.

Although lesbians challenge the patriarchal rules that try to force us into heterosexuality, other aspects of the way in which we are supposed to conduct relationships, for example monogamy, remain largely unchallenged. Various studies bear this out. According to a 1978 study (reported in Johnson, 1990, p. 19), 60 per cent of the 'women-identified-women' who were part of this large research project said a permanent relationship is either 'very important' (25 per cent) or 'the most important thing in my life' (35 per cent). She also reports a study by Schwartz and Blumstein which documents a high break-up rate amongst lesbian couples: 48 per cent had broken up a year after the survey, compared with 14 per cent of the married couples, and 36 per cent of gay male couples. In a recent survey in *Lesbian London*, filled in by 250 lesbians, only eight women were attempting more than one relationship. Lesbians tend to fall into a pattern of (usually short-term) serial monogamy.

In Becker's book (1988) about lesbian ex-lovers, she writes that lesbians who were not in a new relationship at the time of the interview still expressed hope that they would be. Joani says she was 'developing friendships, maintaining my own interests and cultivating a sense of myself apart from being lovers with someone. Faith in some future lover relationship gave me the courage to do those things' (Becker, 1988, p. 180).

It is not as easy for lesbians as for heterosexuals to define what we mean by being in a couple. We cannot fall back on the well worn stereotypes and patterns of heterosexuality where engagement and marriage mark commitment, and there is more of a blurring for lesbians between lovers and friends. In her study of lesbian ex-lovers, Carol Becker shows that lesbians do not fall into exactly the same patterns of serial monogamy as heterosexuals, remaining in touch with ex-lovers and 'includ[ing] them in a family of friends that provides a reference point for personal continuity and growth' (Becker, 1988, pp. 18–19). Weston found that lesbian and gay families 'resembled networks . . . based on ties that radiated outward from individuals like spokes on a wheel' (1991, p. 109). Boundaries were fluid, and one 'family' could overlap with another — that of a lover or a friend. There were no easily identifiable units, which Weston (*ibid.*) comments 'might represent a nightmare to an anthropologist' but which make perfect sense to lesbians and gay men. She found that when lesbians and gay men were asked to list the members of their families, these mostly comprised other lesbians and gay men. With such loose, often unarticulated definitions of families there can be problems in who lesbians and gay men include in their families — and of reciprocity — 'do they include me?'

As lesbians individually and collectively we have to invent our own relationships — we are not shown how these should be as we grow up. However, heterosexism and homophobia serve to divide lesbians from each other, so it is very difficult for us to imagine and recreate different relationships. The heterosexual norms we learn are carried over into our community where it is made difficult for us to develop and communicate our own.

Lesbians face extra pressure to be monogamous because of anti-lesbianism. Many lesbians stay in monogamous relationships for the support they provide from an anti-lesbian world. Others stay with a lover simply because they do not know any other lesbians. Some lesbians feel the need to be in a relationship to maintain their lesbian identity in a world which wishes to invisiblize us. Many lesbians are disowned by their families or feel unable to be in contact with them because of their heterosexism. There is thus pressure on lesbians and gay men to create alternative 'family' structures, and monogamous relationships may be one of the easiest ways to gain this security that heterosexuals are more likely to be able to take for granted in their families of origin.

There is also a pressure on lesbians to be as 'normal' as possible. Many lesbians and (probably more) gay men take the line that we are just

like heterosexuals except for the sex of our lovers. The aim of lesbian and gay politics then becomes the assimilation of lesbians and gay men into the mainstream, so we have campaigns for lesbians and gay men to be able to get married just like heterosexuals.

Johnson found that lesbians in long-term couples emphasize the importance of having friends also in long-term couples (1990, p. 280). This reinforces the primacy of a woman's partner, and sees friends as a function of that partnership. Barrett and McIntosh point out that '[w]hen a marriage breaks up . . . the partners often find themselves friendless and isolated. A second marriage, replicating the first, is the easiest solution, and so a pattern of serial monogamy is set up' (1982, pp. 54–5). Women tend not to prioritize their own friendships and as a result leave themselves with fewer choices upon the break-up with their partners.

Friendship and Autonomy

It is not easy for women to live alone. Factors such as cost, fear for safety, social stigma and lack of emotional support all act against us. Yet studies show that single women achieve higher educational qualifications and are more highly qualified on average than women in couples and that single women are happier than married women. The reverse is true for men: single men tend to be 'uneducated' blue-collar workers, they do not live as long as married men, and married men are happier than single men (Houseknecht *et al.,* 1987: Buunk and van Driel, 1989; *Shocking Pink*, no date). It is in men's interests and to women's detriment that women are in monogamous heterosexual relationships, yet popular knowledge would have it the other way round, that men are 'nagged', 'tied down' etc. whilst women are lucky, do no work and spend all their partners' money. Houseknecht found that 'even highly dedicated professional women indicate that they limit their career strivings in deference to their husbands' careers' (1987, p. 335).

Single women, similarly to lesbians, dispel the myth that women should be dependent on a man, and are thus penalized for it. However, unlike single or coupled lesbians, heterosexual single women are not necessarily creating structures for women to bond with other women to provide real alternatives to heterosexual monogamy. Feminist writers have not generally challenged the stigma attached to the single woman, being concerned more with women's rights to be lesbians. For example,

when Valverde talks about heterosexual feminists talking about their relationships with men, she writes: [c]learly, *tact is needed so as not to make single women feel left out*' (1985, p. 63, emphasis added). She makes an assumption that single women *will* feel left out, thus reinforcing the idea that single women *are* missing out. She also does not ask heterosexual women to challenge a relationship form that leaves other women feeling 'left out' to the benefit of men. Turning this statement around to tell single women that tact is needed when talking about their singleness so as not to make women in heterosexual couples feel left out seems slightly ridiculous, because of course the stereotype contends that women in couples *choose* to live like that, whereas single women are out of control of their lack of a partner.

Female friendship has been given a bad press — when it is mentioned at all. Women and girls have always formed bonds of affection and necessity, but there is little sociological study on friendship. Stephanie Garrett (1989) suggests that the lack of non-Western research on friendship is because most research on relationships has focused on kinship ties, and the same may be true for the West. Feminist writing on radicalizing women's friendship, such as that by Mary Daly (1978) and Janice Raymond (1986) has also been largely marginalized, yet feminism is based in a fundamental way on women's friendships.

Our socialization as girls teaches us to accept the role of second best to our friends' boyfriends (Griffin, 1985; Lees, 1986). Does this conditioning carry over to lesbian communities where we accept that we are going to be second best to our friends' lovers? Friends are often used by people in relationships to support those relationships. For single people this most frequently means an unequal flow of energy. According to Becker '[f]riends were the greatest source of support for ex-lovers during their breakups' (1988, p. 69) as practical help, providing a place to stay, help with moving etc., and also a shoulder to cry on. Most women turned to their friends when they broke up with a lover as it 'left an empty hole in a formerly-full life'. So friends are turned to in a crisis, but who do single women turn to in their crises, when many of those same friends are with their partners? Pat says of her ex-lover Marcella: 'If I had a lover, I might have less energy for her. She has less energy for me, but that's fine because she has a husband and son' (Becker, 1988, p. 207). The energy that Pat is giving to Marcella is not being reciprocated, but being directed into her husband and son.

Conclusions

The individual needs that people meet in monogamous relationships are real needs, which may or may not be socially constructed. However, monogamous relationships then become not *a* way of meeting them, but *the* way. Because many of these needs (for affection, physical contact, someone to share things with) are considered 'natural', and a couple relationship is the main socially sanctioned way in which they are met, the couple itself is then considered to be a 'natural' method of structuring society.

The breaking down of the barriers between sexual and platonic love does not necessarily mean promiscuity or casual sex. In fact, with less pressure on individual relationships as a result of our needs being met by different people, relationships would be likely to be longer-term than at present. It would also mean a recognition that sex does not equal sexual intercourse, but a whole range of sensual experiences instead of the categories and rigid definitions currently forced upon us. At present, although we could describe women's sensual/sexual practice as being on a heterosexual-lesbian continuum, the lesbian exists as a social category *not* on a continuum but as a distinct identity with its own sub-culture, oppression and political significance. This means that women who identify as lesbians make choices and take risks which are different from those of a self-defined bisexual or heterosexual women. Misogyny and the oppression of lesbians makes identification as a lesbian important, a political act rather than purely classification of our sexual behaviour.

It has recently become difficult for lesbians/feminists to discuss lesbian sexuality. The debate has been simplistically polarized into 'pro-sex' and 'anti-sex', with lesbians who critique lesbian sexuality being subject to criticism similar in tone to the abuse lesbians suffer for refusing to service men, with non-SM sex often derogatorily referred to as 'vanilla' or 'bambi'.[7] In redefining women's sexuality it is important not to fall into the trap of starting from the premise that men have 'a sexuality', therefore women have to have one as well, separating this from other spheres of our lives. On the other hand, there is also a need not to theorize women's sexuality out of existence, reaffirming the stereotypes of the passive woman, victim to and defined by men's active sexuality.

If divisions were broken down between friends and lovers, it is improbable that compulsory heterosexuality could remain since women's friendships are at present predominantly with other women and there is no reason to expect that these close same-sex bonds are likely to

disappear. It seems very difficult to envisage how an anti-monogamous society would still retain its hetero-relational imperative. However the necessary destruction of society's homophobia and woman-hatred to enact more fluid relationships between women is an enormous task. The practicalities of a nonmonogamous lifestyle would require massive changes in society, necessitating a radical rethinking in social policy.

Advocating nonmonogamy does not mean that a lesbian's relationships must all be the same and equal. It is possible that women will still feel closer to a particular person at any point in time than they feel to others. However, it is also likely that women will choose different people to meet various needs (some people are good at cheering us up, others at providing a sympathetic ear, some enjoy going to the cinema, others prefer eating out and so on). A nonmonogamous society would not presume that because a woman felt closer to someone one day she would necessarily feel closest to them the next day, week, month or year, and it would not assume to know how that relationship was constructed nor would it elevate that relationship over all others.

It is important that lesbians do not replicate current oppressive heterosexual models. As Weston (1991, p. 208) says, 'major institutions . . . will find it easier to validate domestic partnerships, custody rights for lesbian and gay parents, and the right to jointly adopt children, than to recognise gay families that span several households or families that include friends'. Without the legal and social recognition of friends as 'family', the privileging of some family forms, including biological families, whilst others are subordinated, will reinforce the social order which oppresses lesbians.

Monogamy ultimately serves to keep women divided. Heterosexual women are divided from each other by being 'policed' by individual men. Lesbian energy is used in individual relationships instead of building our communities. Day-to-day anti-lesbianism is absorbed within the couple relationship instead of being transformed into movements to fight our oppression and reaching out to connect with other lesbians. Many lesbians struggle for their relationship to be accepted into heterosexist society, instead of creating a place where *all* lesbians are safe. This redirection of energy from a lesbian community to the individual ultimately benefits the patriarchy in its different forms.

It is not going to be easy to achieve, but the resolution for lesbians must be the creation of women's 'passionate friendship' (Raymond, 1986), where women act from a position of independence and autonomy, and 'sex', in a wider definition of what is 'sexual', becomes one way amongst many of demonstrating love.[8] 'For female-identified erotic love is not dichotomised from radical female friendship, but rather is one

important expression/manifestation of friendship' (Daly, 1978, p. 382), and as Firestone stated over twenty years ago, 'we demand . . . not the elimination of sexual joy and excitement but its rediffusion over . . . the spectrum of our lives' (1970, p. 147).

Notes

1 See Douglas (1990, pp. 137–84) for a review of feminist/lesbian writing on the politics of lesbianism and heterosexuality.
2 Lesbians may or may not have children, from previous heterosexual relationships, as co-mothers, or from artificial insemination. Lesbians are often ignored in 'family' policies and studies because we are assumed to be childless. However, a large proportion of lesbians do not have children, for political reasons, because it does not 'just happen' as it apparently does for heterosexual couples, and because lesbians choose to put our time and energy into other things.
3 However, Marge Piercy (1976), in her novel *Women on the Edge of Time*, provides one futuristic vision of how nonmonogamy and a child's need for stability may work.
4 I use 'girlfriend' as it is the word I use in my community of working-class dykes. Whilst being aware of its drawbacks, there is no other term I prefer, as 'girlfriend' emphasizes our lesbianism whereas gender-neutral terms such as 'partner' do not. I suspect that 'partner' is used more in middle-class circles than among working-class people.
5 Little research has been done around lesbian friendships; however, women's friendships in general are not encouraged and it could be that lesbians find it hard to make friends with other lesbians as we have few models as to how to do this. How do lesbians make friends? When does someone become a friend as opposed to an acquaintance/colleague/neighbour?
6 See Smith and Smith (1974) for a collection of articles on sexual behaviour during the 'sexual revolution'.
7 See Jeffreys (1990), particularly chapters 5 and 6 for further discussion of this.
8 This may or may not co-exist with relations with men. It is vitally important that men also have close emotional relationships with each other, and are able to be in close emotional relationships with women without expecting sexual intercourse. This chapter however, is not primarily concerned with this.

Refrences

ATKINSON, TI-GRACE (1974) *Amazon Odyssey*, New York, Link Books.
BARRETT, MICHÈLE and MCINTOSH, MARY (1982) *The Anti-Social Family*, London, Verso.
BECKER, CAROL S. (1988) *Unbroken Ties: Lesbian Ex-Lovers*, Alyson Publications.
BUUNK, BRAM P. and VAN DRIEL, BARRY (1989) *Variant Lifestyles and Relationships*, London, Sage.
COLLIER, J., ROSALDO, M.Z. and YANAGISAKO, S. (1982) 'Is There A Family? New Anthroplogical Views', in THORNE, BARRIE and YALOM, MARILYN (Eds) *Rethinking The Family*, New York and London, Longman.

DALY, MARY (1978) *Gyn/Ecology*, London, The Women's Press.
DOUGLAS, CAROL ANN (1990) *Love and Politics: Radical Feminist and Lesbian Theories*, in press.
ELLIOT, FAITH ROBERTSON (1986) *The Family: Change or Continuity*, Basingstoke, Macmillan.
FADERMAN, LILLIAN (1981) *Surpassing the Love of Men*, New York, Marrow (reprinted 1985, London, The Women's Press).
FIRESTONE, SHULAMITH (1970) *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution* (reprinted 1979, London, The Women's Press).
GARRETT, STEPHANIE (1989) 'Friendship and the Social Order', in PORTER, ROY and TOMASELLI, SYLVANA (Eds) *The Dialectics of Friendship*, London, Routledge.
GRIFFIN, CHRISTINE (1985) *Typical Girls? Young Women from School to the Job Market*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
HOAGLAND, SARAH LUCIA and PENELOPE, JULIA, (Eds) (1988) *For Lesbians Only: A Separatist Anthology*, London, Onlywomen Press.
HOUSEKNECHT, S.K., VAUGHAN, S. and STATHAM A. (1987) 'The Impact of Singlehood on the Career Patterns of Professional Women', in *Journal of Marriage and the Family,* 49(2), p. 353–66.
JEFFREYS, SHEILA (1985) *The Spinster and her Enemies: Feminism and Sexuality 1880–1930*, London, Pandora.
JEFFREYS, SHEILA (1990) *Anticlimax: A Feminist Perspective on the Sexual Revolution*, London, The Women's Press.
JOHNSON, SUSAN E. (1990) *Staying Power: Long Term Lesbian Couples,* Naiad Press.
KITZINGER, CELIA (1987) *The Social Construction of Lesbianism*, London, Sage.
LEEDS REVOLUTIONARY FEMINIST GROUP (1981) 'Political Lesbianism: The Case Against Heterosexuality', in ONLYWOMEN PRESS (Ed.) *Love Your Enemy? The Debate between Heterosexual Feminism and Political Lesbianism*, London, Onlywomen press.
LEES, SUE (1986) *Losing Out*, London, Hutchinson.
LESBIAN LONDON (1992) Issue 9 (September) and Issue 10 (October).
NARDI, PETER M. (1992) 'That's What Friends Are For: Friends as Family in the Gay and Lesbian Community', in PLUMMER, KEN (Ed.) *Modern Homosexualities*, London, Routledge.
PIERCY, MARGE (1976) *Woman on the Edge of Time*, New York, Knopf (reprinted 1979, London, The Women's Press).
RAMEY, JAMES (1974) 'Emerging Patterns of Innovative Marriage Behaviour' in SMITH, JAMES R. and SMITH, LYNN G. (Eds) *Beyond Monogamy*, Baltimore and London, Johns Hopkins University Press.
RAYMOND, JANICE (1986) *A Passion for Friends*, London, The Women's Press.
RICH, ADRIENNE (1980) 'Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence', in RICH, ADRIENNE *Blood, Bread and Poetry*, London, Virago; also reprinted as a pamphlet by Onlywomen Press (London, 1981).
SHOCKING PINK (no date) *Don't Get Married!*, Issue 11.
SMITH, JAMES R. and SMITH, LYNN, G. (Eds) (1974) *Beyond Monogamy*, Baltimore and London, Johns Hopkins University Press.
VALVERDE, MARIANA (1985) *Sex, Power and Pleasure*, Canada, Women's Press.
WESTON, KATH (1991) *Families We Choose: Lesbians, Gays, Kinship*, Columbia University Press.