

*Lust-Balance*, Entry of 2400 words in *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, edited by George Ritzer, Vol. VI. LE-M. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford: 2681-2685

Cas Wouters

The concept of the lust-balance refers to the social organization and accompanying social codes (ideals and practices) regarding the relationship between the longing for sexual gratification and the longing for enduring relational intimacy. It thus draws attention to the balance between emotive charges in the desires for sex and love, and to changes in this lust-balance. For, although the two types of longing are clearly interconnected, these connections change in both the biographies of individuals and the histories of peoples. Nor is the interconnectedness unproblematic. Moreover, the attempt to find a satisfying balance between the longing for sex and the longing for love may be complicated by many other longings; for instance by the longing for children or by the longing to raise one's social power and rank. Therefore, the lust-balance concept draws attention to relationships between sex and love that are polymorphous and multidimensional, just as Norbert Elias's (2000) concepts of a power balance and a tension balance. Thus, it offers a wider theoretical framework that opens the possibility to integrate many different threads of long-term developments as is demonstrated in *Sex and Manners: Female Emancipation in the West* (Wouters, 2004), a study pioneering with the lust-balance as a central concept. What follows next, leans on this study. Other studies into the connections and the tensions between sex and love are rare, and historical studies into this area are even harder to find. Studies of sexuality usually do not pay much attention, if any, to the kind of relationship in which it occurs; and vice versa, studies of loving relationships usually do not take a systematic interest in sex.

And yet, it is well-documented (common) knowledge that the nineteenth century's main stream of social change went in the direction of a romanticization and idealisation of love which implied a lust-dominated sexuality for men and a complementary (romantic) love or relationship-dominated sexuality for women. Statements such as 'the more spiritual love of a woman will refine and temper the more sensual love of a man' typify a Victorian ideal of love that was as passionate as it was exalted and desexualized (Stearns, 1994) with a rather depersonalized sexuality as a drawback and outlet for the man's 'raging hormones' and 'wild' sensuality behind the scenes of social life. This ideal of love as feeling mirrored the Victorian attempt 'to control the place of sex in marriage ... by urging the desexualization of love and the desensualization of sex' (Seidman, 1991: 7). It also implied that sexual intercourse was increasingly defined as *his* 'right' and *her* 'marital duty'.

The Victorian ideal of a highly elevated marital happiness was an ideal of the bourgeoisie. The rise of commercial groups and their world of business helps in particular to explain this idealization and also why 'ladies first' became a characteristic of all the commercializing nation states: deference to superiors was no longer the main ruling principle in nineteenth-century manners because business demanded, not deference, but trust and respect. In contrast to the aristocracy, the social existence of the bourgeoisie heavily depended upon contracts, which in turn depended upon a reputation of being financially solvent and morally solid. Moral solidity included the sexual sphere, and it seemed inconceivable how any bourgeois man could possibly create the solid impression of being able to live up to his contracts if he couldn't even keep his wife under control and his family in order. Therefore, in comparison with the aristocracy, the bourgeois control of the dangers of sexuality rested more strongly on the wife's obedience to her husband, and on (other kinds of) external social control such as chaperonage.

From the 1890s onwards, the processes of the 'desexualization of love and the desensualization of sex' seemed to go into reverse gear: there occurred instead a 'sexualization of love' and an 'eroticization of sex'. Throughout the twentieth century with accelerations in the 1920s, 1960s and 1970s, the Victorian examples of how to integrate the longing for sexual gratification and the longing for relational intimacy faded, but it was not before the spurt of informalization in the 1960s and 1970s that they disappeared. At that time, old 'marriage manuals' became suspect or hopelessly obsolete, mainly because they hardly acknowledged the sensual love and carnal desires of women, if they acknowledged them at all. Only since then have women themselves actively taken part in public discussions about their carnal desires and the achievement of a more satisfactory lust-balance – a spurt in the emancipation of sexuality.

From then on, increasingly large groups of people have been experimenting between the extremes of desexualized love (sexual longing subordinated to the continuation of a relationship) and depersonalized sexual contact, provoking new and more varied answers to what might be called the lust-balance question: when or within what kinds of relationship(s) are (what kinds of) eroticism and sexuality allowed *and* desired?

This question is first raised in puberty or adolescence when bodily and erotic impulses and emotions that were banned from interaction from early childhood onwards (except in cases of incest) are again explored and experimented with. The original need for bodily contact of small children and their subsequent frank and spontaneous explorations seem to be stopped and restricted when and where adults begin to experience them as sexual. Sexuality

*and* corporality are thus separated from other forms of contact. In puberty and adolescence, the taboo on touching and bodily contact has to be gradually dismantled, which for most people is a process of trial and error. In the twentieth century, especially since the 1960s, a similar process of trial and error has been going on collectively.

Around the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century, young people in most Western countries started to 'date', that is, to go out together, both with and without a chaperone. From then on, changes in courting regimes and in the related relationships between children and parents, women and men, have triggered many similar questions and discussions. The question concerning in what places young women and men could acceptably meet (private dances, clubs, skating rinks) and where not (a bachelor's apartment) more or less faded when acceptability came to include the street. Discussions about the necessity to be (properly) introduced ended with the acceptance of people simply introducing themselves. Questions regarding appropriate ways of meeting changed from focusing on how to ward off unwelcome advances to a broader focus including questions such as how to invite and respond to welcome advances. Increasingly open access to the opposite sex and easier, more comradely contacts between the sexes coincided with discussions and laments about the decline of courtesy towards women and the decline of poetry or romance in courting relationships, about the practice of kissing thoughtlessly and promiscuously, about girls as daredevils for whom running risks is a trump and ideal, about the public display of nudity and sex-appeal in clothing, and about the trend to disclose the 'secrets' or 'facts of life', a trend in which women were thought to lose their innocence and purity.

A major difference between European countries and the USA emerged in the early 1920s with the rise of a dating regime in the USA. From the 1920s onward, advice on dating, the 'line', necking and petting appears in American manners books only. This dating regime signified the escape of young people from under parental wings and the formation of a relatively autonomous courting regime of their own, leading to a head start in the emancipation of sexuality and to the rise of the first western youth culture – an international innovation restricted to the USA in contrast to the second youth culture, that of the 1960s, which was a western international one. This emancipation of young people in the USA also implied an emancipation of young women; it made young women less dependent upon their parents and chaperones. But in regard to their relationship to young men, the dating regime kept women rather dependent upon men and their 'treats'. Just as the competitive attitude was institutionalized in the dating regime and expressed in the words 'dating and rating', the uneven balance of power between the sexes was institutionalized in an attitude that linked

'petting and paying'. The younger generation had a common interest in breaking the taboo of the older generation, the no-sex-at-all taboo, thus creating for themselves a lust-balance with more sex. In the process of defining what sex, and on what conditions, boys and young men were clearly dominant.

In part, dating, necking and petting became a competitive 'quest of thrill' (Waller, 1937), pushing all participants towards further exploration of the path of lust, and yet, sexual exploration was to remain without sexual consummation. In that sense, the youth-culture dating code was oriented toward sex *and* love (marriage), maintaining the adult-code of abstinence of sex before and outside marriage. The responsibility for sufficiently restrained sexual emotion management was put in the hands of women. This double standard demanded that women developed increasing subtlety in the art of steering between yielding and rigidity, prudery and coquetry: a highly controlled indulgence of sexual impulses and emotions.

In the 1920s, liberation from the regime of older generations in the USA was not followed by a feminist movement attacking the uneven balance of power between the sexes. Thus, male dominance was formalized in the dating system, and subsequently more or less fossilized as part of American culture. This may help to explain why the female emancipation movements that followed the international youth culture met with tougher resistance in the USA than in many European countries.

In Europe, until the 1960s, the emancipation of the younger generations and their sexuality was relatively limited. It consisted of the development of a type of courtship relationship that was to some extent similar to 'going steady', a kind of 'trial' relationship that could transform into an 'engagement to be engaged'. In both, some sexual experimenting came to be increasingly accepted. After World War II, young people in the USA and in Europe started to 'go steady' and to go steady was to play marriage. The powerful longing of women for more equal and trusting relationships allowing for a lust-balance with more sex, more playful sex and more equal play and pleasure, seems to have been a major driving force of these changes.

In the 1960s, as the international Western youth culture and its Sexual Revolution surfaced and was soon followed by a strong wave of female emancipation, sex-for-the-sake-of-sex came to be discussed in all western countries. As a result, the *whole* lust-balance appeared on the public agenda. Moreover, both sexes came to participate in public discussions of lust-balance questions. Now, much stronger than in the first (USA) youth culture, changes in lust-balance definitions and practices resulted from changes in the balance of power between both the generations *and* the sexes.

The accepted code regarding the pace of getting closer and expressing further interest accelerated from a three times meeting before suggesting a 'spot of dinner', via a three times meeting before kissing and a three-date 'score', to the instant intimacy of a one-night stand. Masturbation was mentioned positively. These changes coincided with rising tensions between the longing for sexual gratification and for an intimate relationship. Topics and practices such as premarital sex, sexual variations, unmarried cohabitation, fornication, extramarital affairs, jealousy, homosexuality, pornography, teenage sex, abortion, exchange of partners, paedophilia, incest and so on, all part of a wider process of informalization, implied repeated up-rooting confrontations with the traditional lust-balance. Since the 1980s, the choir of voices expressing ideals of a lust-balance with more sex lost fervour, while those defending a more traditional lust-balance and attacking 'excessive permissiveness' became somewhat louder again. On the whole, however, these repeated confrontations accompanied and reinforced the trend towards a collective emancipation of sexuality, that is, a collective diminution in the fear of sexuality and its expression within increasingly less rigidly curtailed relationships. Sexual impulses and emotions were allowed (once again) into the centre of the personality – consciousness – and thus taken into account, whether acted upon or not. And the process of female emancipation was expressed in increasing acknowledgement of the principles of mutual attraction as well as mutual consent in courting. Surveying the twentieth-century development, women have come to feel like having sex more often, to allow more sexual incentives more easily and they have learned to discuss these matters more freely, whereas men have been learning to connect relational satisfaction and sexual gratification.

Discussions of issues like sexual harassment, pornography, rape in marriage and date-rape, can be understood as a common search for ways of becoming intimate and of keeping at a distance that are acceptable to both women and men (cf Vance, 1984). Precisely because of the sensitivity and caution needed to proceed in such a way, erotic and sexual consciousness and tensions have expanded and intensified, stimulating a further sexualization of love and eroticization of sex. This quest for an exciting and satisfying lust-balance, avoiding the extremes of emotional wildness and emotional numbness, has also stimulated the emotional tug-of-war to a higher tension-level. That is so, if only because the increased demands on emotion management will have intensified both the fantasies and the longing for (romantic) relationships characterized by greater intimacy, as well as the longing for easier (sexual) relationships in which the pressure of these demands is absent or negligible, as in one-night stands, 'buddy sex' or cybersex. This ambivalence, together with an increasingly more conscious (reflexive) and calculating (flexible) emotion management as a source of power,

respect and self-respect, is characteristic of processes of the decreasing segregation and increasing integration of the classes and the sexes (see Elias, 2000). And as long as such integration processes continue, these ambivalent emotions may be expected to accumulate and intensify, including both longings that make up the lust-balance.

Elias, Norbert (2000) *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*. Rev. ed., Oxford: Blackwell.

Seidman, Stephen (1991) *Romantic Longings: Love in America, 1830–1980*. New York: Routledge.

Stearns, Peter N. (1994) *American Cool: Constructing a Twentieth-Century Emotional Style*. New York University Press.

Vance, C.S. (Ed.)(1984) *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Waller, Willard (1937) 'The Rating and Dating Complex,' *American Sociological Review* 2: 727–34.

Wouters, Cas (2004) *Sex and Manners. Female Emancipation in the West 1890 – 2000*. London: Sage.

Possible cross references:

Civilizing Process, 210

Desire 369

Elias, Norbert 451

Sexuality Research - History 1428

Intimacy 797

Women and Sexuality 1756