



# The Gaze: The Male Need to Look vs the Female Need to Be Seen—An Evolutionary Perspective

Jennie Cummings-Knight

## A Visually Saturated Society

What human beings look at and what they see have always been of critical importance. However, the male and the female have tended to look at different things even from the moment of birth (e.g. Connellan et al. 2000). From early infancy, before verbal language gets started, boys on average respond more to toys that move and tend to be fascinated by the mechanics of how things work. Girls, on the other hand, tend on average to be more attracted firstly to faces and then more to dolls and cuddly toys (Connellan et al. 2000; Todd et al. 2017). These differences can be seen even more obviously during toddlerhood: “Sex-types play choices can be seen at about 2 years”. Boys generally “spend more time playing with blocks, transportation toys, guns, and manipulative objects; girls spend more time playing with dolls, stuffed animals, and art materials” (Fagot and Leve 1998).

Our increased emphasis within modern western society on the visual sensory domain began with television, first introduced from the 1920s, with colour TV starting in the USA as early as the 1960s. Alongside television, the development of the computer was taking place, beginning with the Telex Messaging Network in 1933. First computer designs began as early as the 1930s and by 1942 the Atanasoff-Berry Computer was completed. In 1946, a popular Science Fiction magazine story named “A Logic Named Joe”

---

J. Cummings-Knight (✉)  
Golden Leaf Counselling Services, Cromer, UK

predicted a worldwide network of computers. This was 50 years or so before the invention of the internet as we now know it. In the early 1990s, computer games began to be popular and by the present time it could be argued that a large proportion of the population has become addicted to visual computerised and computer aided experiences, with the mobile phone being by far the most popular.

## Male vs Female Points of Focus

Kafetsios (2004) using an emotional intelligence test (Mayer and Salovey 2007) in a sample of adults, found that females were on average better than males at emotional perception. It is an established fact of education that girls gain mastery over language faster than boys and this has a neurological basis (e.g. Burman et al. 2008). However, a crucial foundational element of emotional intelligence and emotional response is the “gaze”—in other words, what the infant looks at. Females from an early age show greater interest in social and facial stimuli, spend more time holding eye contact and are better at reading emotions from facial expressions (Wingenbach et al. 2018; Baron-Cohen et al. 1997). Greater levels of sociability on average have also been found amongst girls compared with age-matched boys even in samples where all subjects are on the autistic spectrum (Head et al. 2014).

These gender differences are also reflected in the significantly different life and career choices made by men and women. For example, the counselling profession, like other caring and therapy professions, “attracts” many more women than men. Recent figures from the BACP put the difference at 84% women compared to 16% men (Brown 2017). Similar gender ratios in psychology (80% women) and nursing (nearly 90% women) also support the hypothesis that there is a deeper-rooted sex difference at work: women are generally pre-disposed to be more interested in looking at the finely tuned nuances of human relationship. The domain of relationship, reading emotions, tuning into facial expressions, decoding non-verbal signals and listening to verbal language about emotion, significantly appeals more to females than males and is also a domain where on average women may be more skilled. Perhaps this is not surprising from an evolutionary perspective, given that females have been designed to bear and nurture infants. Reading and empathising with the emotional cues of infants has been vital to the survival of our species. It would be surprising if humans were the only mammalian species to have lost these evolutionary differences.

## Advertising

One of the by-products of the television and film age was that advertising became more visual, and with the increased interest in moving pictures of all sorts, ideals of female beauty became immortalised on “the big and small screen”. The female need to “be seen” and therefore to be attractive enough to be noticed began to take an even more important place in society than it had done before, as “ideals” were displayed in pictorial form everywhere the eye might roam. At the present time this bombardment of female imagery can be anywhere from an advert on a building to images on social media, punctuated by models in shop windows and the real-time viewing of females, dressed in contemporary fashions, on the street or in pubs and clubs.

The male’s need to “look” at the female is likewise fed by the media, by female images of all kinds that include media crafted “ideals”, and by erotic material that is often highly visual and imaginatively stimulating. The modern female of the western world tends to dress to accentuate every line and curve, no matter what her size or shape, assisted by modern technology. The suggestion of line and form becomes ever more explicit, with particular body parts emphasised over others. The proof of this is in the booming cosmetic surgery industry, with breast enhancement being the most popular procedure (Gallagher 2014).

## Ideals of Beauty

It is interesting to see how ideals of beauty have changed over time and how they differ between different cultures. For example, in the popular Middle Eastern folk tales known as the “Arabian Nights”, some of which are more than 1000 years old, the ideal woman is frequently referred to as having “*buttocks like sand dunes*” which are allegedly driving the male “out of his wits” with excitement. This preference for an ampler female figure contrasts strongly with our modern western obsession for a slim female form (with the obvious exception of breast size). European portrait paintings through the centuries also demonstrate how fashions in beauty and the expression of the ideal female form can change. However, what does *not* change, regardless of time or culture, is the universal use of female images or models to represent the archetypal ideal of feminine beauty. Each age and each culture has its image of the “diva” or divinely beautiful woman who is there to be admired, gazed upon and even worshipped.

The high cost of this emphasis on idealised beauty in a visual age can also be seen in the pre-occupation of an increasing number of young girls with their physical appearance and the subsequent rise in eating disorders like anorexia and bulimia nervosa. For this very reason the first female bishop in the Church of England, the Rt Rev Rachel Treweek, is attempting to raise awareness about the young female obsession with body image with a campaign to help young women accept their physical diversity (as reported in the Daily Telegraph by Sturgis 2016).

## The Evolutionary Male: Searching the Field for Prey

Whilst the female has always needed to “be seen”, the male has, in an evolutionary sense, always needed to do the “seeing” in terms of looking for a mate, looking for prey to hunt, and looking out for danger. Hunting and gathering is accepted to have been the primary mode of subsistence both for our earliest alleged hominid ancestors (“*homo erectus*” who may have lived as far back as 1.8 million years ago) and our own human species (“*homo sapiens*”) from its supposed origin about 200,000 years ago until the end of the Mesolithic period some 10,000 years ago.

A series of scientific investigations and reports by a range of researchers (e.g. Silverman and Eals 1992) have found strong evidence of sex differences in spatial ability between men and women, which they explain in terms of a differentiation of labour between males and females in hunter-gatherer societies. In such societies, males would hunt for prey and protect the social group, whilst females would gather plant food, tend to the home and care for the young. Gaulin and Fitzgerald (1986) have also found evidence that similar sex differences in spatial ability also apply to non-human species.

At this time of human existence, males required skills in navigation and orientation, hand-eye coordination skills, visuo-spatial perception skills and teamwork skills. These particular skills were essential for successful hunting and for survival itself (Dabbs et al. 1998). These sex differences can still be observed in our modern lives (e.g. map reading, car parking, risk-taking, team sport culture, nurturance, childcare, multi-tasking) but may often be mistaken for stereotypes or even misrepresented as sexism. Career choices and occupational preferences still to this day reflect these evolutionary differences. Females still *on average* tend to show more interest and aptitude

for caring roles and for the niceties of the domestic environment and have a good eye for what is close at hand (like finding lost objects in the home). So called “working class” men still to this day, like hunters of old, go outside the home and often work in teams to perform the most dangerous, dirty and laborious roles that provide the physical security and infrastructure for society to function (Fausto-Sterling 1985). According to statistics for the UK from the Health & Safety Executive, men accounted for 96% of workplace fatalities (HSE 2018). Women also excel in various tests of perceptual speed (Kimura 1999). These skills are also useful within the home where a sub-conscious eye can be kept on a number of things going on at the same time (“multi-tasking”).

## Parenting: Male and Female Focus

With regard to the traditional role of the female in looking after offspring, in spite of modern science and social reforms, the ancient physical differences between male and female which led to differentiated behavioural norms, still apply in terms of domestic life patterns, career choices, social attitudes and customs governing domestic and work life.

The obvious differences between traditional male and female “instinctual” parenting could be explained by the fact that the female carries the foetus “in utero” for 9 months before birth. She is therefore already prepared to “see the baby” in a different way to the father. He does not experience the changes in the mother’s body first hand, as she does, and neither has he had years of monthly changes in his body to prepare him for the eventual potential arrival of a baby. The woman in normal health is reminded that she is a potential mother for a number of days every single month of her reproductive life. If she takes a pill to prevent pregnancy, she is reminded of this possibility every single day and knows that if she does not pay attention to this, unplanned motherhood could well ensue.

The woman is therefore “looking” at herself, the male and the world outside through a different lens to the male with regard to her physical body. The male, on the other hand, is able to be more focussed outwardly on his work goals without regular cyclical physical changes potentially affecting his moods, his energy levels and his stamina. The male has a different “outlook”. He may not now literally be hunting prey in the fields, except for sport, perhaps—but his focus can be more external as he does not need to monitor regular internal physical changes, as the female does.

## The Biological vs the Sociological: Constructions of Gender

We have been looking so far at some of the biological differences between males and females in evolutionary terms, but at the time of writing, sociological approaches to gender are prevalent. The field of mainstream academic gender study is currently preoccupied with the “socialisation of gender” and biological and evolutionary factors within our species tend to be played down.

A social constructionist approach to gender is epitomised by the influential work of Judith Butler (1990, 1993) which posits the concept that the psychology of men and women is shaped primarily by their social and cultural context rather than by any biological sex differences within the human organism. According to such theories, for example, girls like the colour pink because they are socialised within the family unit to do so from birth (“pink for a girl, blue for a boy”) not because there are already underlying sex differences which these cultural practices have evolved to express. Likewise, it is proposed by social theorists of gender that if little girls tend to “play house” and little boys “play fight” this is because they are being taught or conditioned to do so without any major internal contribution from natural or evolved instincts or drives.

It is certainly true that social and cultural expectations shape the expression of gender in terms of etiquette, dress and fashion and it is also true that social beliefs, policies and laws governing what men and women are expected and allowed to do in the home, in the world of work and in public life, have changed considerably over history. At the same time, it is not at all clear that core sex differences in our species have been eroded by cultural changes. Gender differences in what baby boys and girls look at, attend to and how they respond to social stimuli and mechanical stimuli emerge pre-verbally and bear the hallmarks of instincts. As babies turn into toddlers and become more mobile and wilful, their motivations and choices in free play show remarkably consistent differences both over different generations and between cultures. In particular, it has to be accepted that boys *on average* are more motivated to play fighting games and girls *on average* are more motivated to play with dolls or toys aimed at little girls. These are important average motivational differences, but this does not mean that an individual girl who wishes to “play fight” or boy who wishes to play with a doll should be discouraged from doing so. At the same time, it would be equally damaging to force children away from their natural gendered impulses because of a mistaken belief that these are stereotypes imposed by society, rather than archetypal instincts.

Wright (1997) in his account of studies of twin behaviour noted the following: “*The field of psychology has been shaken by separated twin studies... suggesting that the development of an individual’s personality is guided by his genes*”. This also applied (p. 101) where a male twin was raised as a female from infancy after a botched circumcision operation and thankfully reclaimed his maleness as he reached maturity. Years of socialisation as a female had achieved no shift at all in his core gender identity.

Fagot (1994) and Fagot and Leve (1998) claim that a child’s gender identity emerges early in life and that once the identity is established, the nature of play changes: “*Children’s identification of whether they are boys or girls will result in playing more with other children of their own gender*”. This tendency to play more with others of the same gender also increases as the children grow older in the preschool years (Maccoby 1988).

Alexander and Wilcox (2012) refer to evidence from research on older children and adults which demonstrates the masculinising effects of pre-natal testosterone on social and cognitive behaviour. This includes qualities such as empathy, aggression, toy preferences and spatial abilities (Collyer and Hines 1995). Sex differences between male and female from childhood also persist into adulthood. This continuity in itself argues against a purely social constructionist approach to gender, which would predict more variability and scope for developmental reversals as the years go by. Sometimes also science ignores the instantly recognisable quirks and subtleties of everyday life experience. In my personal life, I have frequently observed how males switch tack rapidly from a “feelings type” conversation towards something more objective. One example is that when I am driving in the car with my husband as passenger, I may be engaged in an anecdote to do with my analysis of a personal issue. He will suddenly break the “emotional tone” by saying something like, “Oh look, that is a fine example of Norman (or Saxon) architecture!” This tendency to focus on external objects rather than to mull over the intricacies of personal relationships, is a robust male predisposition which many of my female clients speak about. Relationship therapist Perel (2007a, b) also comments on male and female difference in focus being relevant in developing understanding about the building of intimacy between couples.

## Women’s Rights: Changing Targets and What Is “Looked for”

Mary Wollstonecraft (1792) wrote a famous and groundbreaking paper called “Vindication of the Rights of Women” where she looked forward to the day when ‘honest independent women’ would be able to fill ‘respectable stations’



as physicians, farmers and shop keepers, “able to stand erect supported by their own industry rather than reduced to dependency”. Wollstonecraft pointed out the importance of equal opportunities for women to earn their own living and compete in the traditional domains of men. Her ideas about women’s rights represent very accurately what has become the default belief in the UK at the time of writing, more than 200 years later. It is a complete change from the traditional idea of “women’s rights” where a home with a family of her own was considered to be the primary right of every woman. In some parts of the world, this idea still holds sway but no longer in the majority of the Western world. Previously, when children were the woman’s primary focus, the man was expected to go out to work and provide for the woman to safeguard these rights. However, because of disregarded but persistent biological differences in our species, this social push for gender equality in more traditionally male career domains has, by default, left the female still predominantly in charge of the domains like “glamour”, home keeping and childcare—or still often literally “holding the baby”. Likewise, “working class” male domains that involve heavy manual work and high levels of physical risk are still dominated by men, who *tend* to be bigger and stronger physically.

This means that there is some danger of a societal imbalance where women may be feeling too much pressure “to do it all” and men may be feeling a corresponding loss of direction. Socio-political theories of gender equality, based purely on a notion of political rights but ignoring differential instincts based in evolutionary biology, can therefore unwittingly have some negative effects. Such an approach can become as detrimental as “patriarchy” has been claimed to be, in the Western world, in terms of devaluing the importance of the maternal function in society, whilst at the same time doing little to value the importance of fatherhood. My belief is that it is much more honest to accept that sex differences are still in place and are often positive. Equality does not mean sameness and unity comes best out of difference and diversity. Whilst there is great variation between *individual* men and women, both sexes have genuine power that derives *on average* from different domains of interest and expertise. These domains partly relate to instinctive, hard-wired, biological differences, but also partly relate to culture and environment. Likewise, Maguire (2004) states: “...*each sex has access to different forms of power and control which arouse intense envy in those who lack them*”.

The basic “dance” between male and female is a complementary one—it does not need to be framed as a play for power supremacy by either of the partners, although it often can be viewed as such.



## The “Gaze” of Different Sexualities and Gendered Identities

### Male Homosexuality

The process whereby an embryo is masculinised or feminised during foetal development is a matter of complex biology involving delicate interplay of genetics and hormones that can vary or be disrupted (e.g. Wu and Shah 2011). This means that there is potential scope biologically for individuals to develop differently in terms of their place on the sex and gender spectrum. The genital organs of the foetus are fully formed after about 4 months of gestation, whilst the brain and neural functions continue to develop for another 5 months after that. As we saw earlier, in 2016 in the UK, the vast majority (93.4%) of adults identified as heterosexual. This indicates that there is a natural process by which sex differences have evolved, but it also implies that this process can be potentially subject to variation to the extent that for about 6.6% of individuals, there may be more of a mixture of masculinity and femininity.

However, because of a mainstream sociological approach to gender and sexuality, the focus has been on the social and political “rights” of homosexual people and of others who present within a range of non-default heterosexual orientation, rather than on the natural and biological basis of their sexual orientation.

Sociological theories of gender not only persist, but occupy the mainstream in contemporary gender studies. Such theories have therefore inevitably led to similarly dangerous notions of “toxic masculinity” alongside “patriarchy” with the implication that masculinity itself, being seen as a social construct, a lifestyle choice or pathology rather than as a natural part of the human condition, can be reformed or reconstructed by social therapies (Seager et al. 2014; Barry and Seager 2019, in this volume).

If the default heterosexual male has a need to “look at the female”, then what is the homosexual male looking at and how does he want to be seen? Answers to such important questions are complex, but one simple observation is that homosexual men may often still be attracted to the female image as a “beautiful object” (one manifestation of this being homosexual fashion designers for women such as Christian Dior)—but framing this attraction more as something to admire rather than as a pure object of sexual desire. However, the evidence suggests that many homosexual men, unlike most heterosexual men but like most heterosexual women do experience an inner

desire to be “looked at” and admired as beautiful. This can be inferred from the popular use of and identification with female “gay icons” and “diva” images in the culture of homosexual men.

## Lesbian Women

The notion of the “diva” also raises an important question about women who are attracted to other women. If they are in some sense more “masculine”, do they have the same need to “look at” their objects of desire as heterosexual men? Does this mean they will use pornography more than heterosexual women? Do they share with heterosexual women a similar need to be “looked at” as a “desirable female”? Are homosexual partners, both gay and Lesbian, differentiated on the gender spectrum to enable attraction to occur or is the attraction based on complete mutual identification? Anecdotally and from clinical experience, it would appear that the Lesbian woman still needs to “be seen” but this also entails a female partner who is “doing the looking”. The evidence in terms of inter-partner violence statistics would also indicate that homosexual relationships for males and females are no less likely to become fraught, conflictual and violent than heterosexual relationships (Stiles-Shields and Carroll 2015).

## Transgender

In spite of the fact that we are being encouraged to believe that gender is a social construct, we operate with a double standard in society by accepting the desire and the potential need for someone to transition from one sex to another. What we understand about this desire is that, at some point, often in early puberty, a sense of intense *dysphoria* about being almost “imprisoned” in the “wrong body” can take hold. This suggests that gender dysphoria may potentially have a primarily biological origin, but there is also evidence that some individuals who transition regret doing so afterwards (Djordjevic et al. 2016). The fact that there are about three times more “male-female” (MTF) than “female-male” (FTM) transgender people is interesting and worthy of further research.

Transgender people, like all individuals, have a “self-image” based on a felt internal sense of their gender. But for many transgender people, how they feel inwardly clearly does not match how they look outwardly to others. Because of gender differences in the need to “look vs be looked at”, this will have very different implications for transgender men and transgender women.

## Pornography: What Is Being “Looked” at and “Looked for”?

Significant differences between male and female sexual preferences can be understood better in the context of the use of pornography.

Since the advent of computers in every household, the consumption of pornography is higher than it has ever been. As has been noted, “People spend more money on pornography in America in a year than...they do on all the performing arts combined. Sex sites are estimated to account for up to thirty percent of all Internet traffic” (Lehrer 2009).

The need for the male to look at the female is further illustrated in the much greater use of online porn by males in particular (e.g. Hald 2006). The evidence from pornography appears to support the theory that women on average have less need to “look at” and more need to be “looked at”. There is however, a growing market for pornography aimed at lesbian couples, as an internet search will reveal.

The general male preference for the use of “fetishes” also reflects the male pre-occupation with the visual in sexual encounters (Scorolli et al. 2007). Fetishes of a sexual nature have traditionally been associated with the male, and represent the development of associations of objects or specific parts of the body with sexual desire. They can form an important visual link between the brain and bodily sexual arousal (Foucault 1987; Foucault and Sennett 1981).

## The Celebration of Difference

### Yin and Yang

The ancient Chinese world believed that the interlocking building blocks of the universe were best understood by the terms “Yin” and “Yang”. The terms refer to complementary principles of Chinese philosophy, “yin” being negative, dark, moist and feminine, and “yang” being positive, bright, fiery and masculine. They can be thought of as opposite forces interacting in a complementary way, to form a dynamic system in which the whole is greater than the parts. The formation of the embryo begins with the fiery “yang” of the sperm penetrating the receptive but stationary form of the egg. The “yang” (symbolised by the sperm—whose DNA “packets” unlock the potential of the egg) is believed to be responsible for the formation of the spine

and skin and to enclose the embryo within its protection (Keown 2014). This concept shows us how the “masculine” is considered to be a protecting force for certain “feminine” aspects within ancient Chinese philosophy. The masculine therefore enables the full functioning of the female aspects of the personality.

Yin needs Yang and vice versa, and the two need to be in perfect balance for health and harmony in the body. This concept of interlocking, reciprocal and complementary aspects of the natural universe appears to offer a more promising model for gender studies than the sociopolitical theories that currently predominate in the Western world. The notion of Yin and Yang allows for an organic and natural integration of different and relating levels of human existence: body, mind, spirit and culture. The idea of Yin and Yang also strongly influenced Carl Jung’s (e.g. *Collected Works* 1991) well known theories of archetypes within a shared “collective unconscious” including universal interrelated elements of masculinity and femininity, so that even males had an “anima” within them and females an “animus”.

Natural philosophy theories such as these recognise that difference is essential to creativity and that opposite elements are also interdependent. Unity and diversity are essential to each other. These theories are better placed to explain sex gender differences as natural and related phenomena, rooted in our biology rather than sociologically constructed. Such theories also make it harder to justify concepts that view the genders comparatively as naturally in competition or conflict. Clearly, the natural state of gender relations is, on the contrary, systemic harmony.

## Complementary vs Conflicting Roles

There is of course the theory that “Women are from Venus and Men from Mars” (Gray 1992) but the important point is that they are both from the same solar system. Men and women do certainly have different outlooks based on evolutionary differences that *can* lead to conflict and misunderstanding, but primarily these differences have co-evolved to be complementary. In my work as a relationship therapist, I find time and again that I may need to explain to couples the differences in what men and women are *looking at*, to begin the process of better understanding between them, and that this often leads to a more harmonious outcome.

Put simply, sex difference can bring couples together or come between them. A woman feels more like an ongoing sexual relationship if she *feels* emotionally close to the male, whereas a man can often feel like a sexual

encounter purely on the grounds of being attracted by what he *sees*. This does not mean that a man is any the less capable of a faithful, longstanding relationship and very deep love for his partner. It just means that in evolutionary terms, he is “hard-wired” to be sexually attracted in the first instance to the woman primarily on the basis of what he can see.

Now, increasingly in the Western world and other communities also, the woman has changed her focus from inside the home to outside of it. Her career takes the first place, and the family, if indeed she chooses to have one, should ideally fit around her work needs. But this does not change the archetypal “beauty imperative” and the fact that essentially, the woman needs to be “seen” in just the same way that she has always desired to be seen. She needs to be seen to be attractive, to stay attractive as she ages, and she needs to have her emotional needs validated, or “seen” by her male partner rather than to be offered practical solutions (a common source of friction between couples where this is not understood). She needs to have her maternal instincts satisfied, (including within many lesbian relationships) and in many cases children still feature largely in her focus on “what she is looking at”.

It is interesting to remember that alongside the rise of feminism and some considerable progress in attaining “gender equality”, women are spending more than ever before on cosmetics and surgical enhancements, and at younger ages too (Gimlin 2002). Whilst complaining about the ongoing objectification of the female body by the male, most women take care to look as good as possible for as long as possible. This is because the drive for female beauty is not simply created by the male but is part of the female archetype.

Because of this unchanging archetype, a high proportion of women will still always feel the need to adorn their bodies according to cultural fashion to accentuate and emphasise their feminine shape and beauty. However, it is noteworthy that this powerful display of female sexuality is not frowned upon as potentially intrusive to the eyes of male onlookers in the same way that the gaze and attention of the male onlooker is often viewed with suspicion. However, whatever the social and cultural context (currently at the time of writing dominated by the #MeToo campaign), the female still needs to be “seen” by the male, and he responds as he always has done, and in the way that he has been biologically wired to react—by looking.

Some female writers such as Heather Heying have recently challenged the current fashion for pathologising the male gaze by coining the term *toxic femininity* to refer to the process whereby females use intense sexual display to evoke sexual hunger in men and then condemn the display by men of the

very hunger that they have “stoked up”. Psychologist Gad Saad (2018) also comments that in spite of the current western pre-occupation with “male dominance” women in fact are often “*attracted to ‘toxic masculine’ male phenotypes that correlate with testosterone, and they are desirous of men who are socially dominant, who are strategically risk-taking in their behaviours*”.

## Conclusion

We see in the natural world a continual cycle of death and re-birth, played out over the seasons and in the birth and ageing process of all organisms. Species that are at the top of the food chain would die out if the species lower down the food chain became extinct themselves.

If there were no animals to hunt, carnivores would all die out. The food chain exists because each part of it is inter-dependent on the rest of the chain for its survival.

Likewise, if men did not want to look at women, women would have much less reason to be concerned with their appearance. It could be argued that women vie with one another to be better dressed or more fashionable for reasons of status, but the roots of a desire to flaunt the body still originate in mating behaviour. This is discernible in animal life in display colours and rituals. Examples of this amongst the bird kingdom are the most obvious and numerous, although amongst the avian population it is usually the males that display their looks for the females.

The life force that we can see all around us, especially as spring returns each year as the leaves unfurl and mating begins once again, is sustained by the rhythm of need and response.

The basic instincts of reproduction are still present in the human species and represented in the majority of adult relationships. The attraction of opposites is what keeps the “dance” going on and what creates excitement and innovation in relationships.

The male feels that his manhood is affirmed as his need to “look” is responded to. Likewise, the female’s need to be looked at is fulfilled by the male’s need to look at her, and she feels a sense of completion when she is truly “seen” and appreciated. The joining of “Yin and Yang” in procreation, sexual intimacy and social intercourse results in a new surging up of the life force that sustains and inspires both male and female in all aspects of their lives.

**Acknowledgements** Bishop Woodford House Retreat Centre, Ely (where much of this chapter was written).

Geoff Cummings-Knight (proof reading).

## References

- Alexander, G. M., & Wilcox, T. (2012). Sex differences in early infancy. *Child Development Perspectives*, 6(4), 400–406. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2012.00247.x>.
- Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., & Jolliffe, A. (1997). Is there a “language of the eyes”? Evidence from normal adults, and adults with autism or Asperger syndrome. *Visual Cognition*, 4(3), 311–331.
- Brown, S. (2017). Is counselling women’s work? *Therapy Today*, 28(2).
- Burman, D., Bitan, T., & Booth, J. (2008). Sex differences in neural processing of language among children. *Neuropsychologia*, 46(5), 1349–1362.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble and the subversion of identity*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the limits of “sex”*. London: Routledge.
- Collyer, M., & Hines, M. (1995). Human behavioural sex differences: A role for gonadal hormones during early development? *Psychological Bulletin*, 118(1), 55.
- Connellan, J., Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Batki, A., & Ahluwalia, J. (2000). Sex differences in human neonatal social perception. *Infant Behaviour and Development*, 23(1), 113–118.
- Dabbs, J. M., Jr., Chang, E. L., Strong, R. A., & Milun, R. (1998). Spatial ability, navigation strategy, and geographic knowledge among men and women. *Evolution and Human Behaviour*, 19(2), 89–98.
- Djordjevic, M., Bizic, M., Duisin, D., Bouman, M., & Buncamper, M. (2016). Reversal surgery in regretful male-to-female transsexuals after sex reassignment surgery. *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 13(6), 1000–1007.
- Fagot, B. (1994). Peer relations and the development of competence in boys and girls. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 1994(65), 53–65.
- Fagot, B., & Leve, L. (1998). Teacher ratings of externalizing behaviour at school entry for boys and girls: Similar early predictors and different correlates. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 39(4), 555–566.
- Fausto-Sterling, A. (1985). *Myths of gender: Biological theories about women and men* (Revised ed.). New York: Basic Books.
- Foucault, M. (1987). *The use of pleasure: The history of sexuality* (Vol. 2). London: Penguin Books (translation copyright Random House 1985).
- Foucault, M., & Sennett, R. (1981). Sexuality and solitude. *London Review of Books*, 3(9), 3–7. Available from <http://www.lrb.co.uk/v03/n09/michel-foucault/sexuality-and-solitude>.



- Gallagher, J. (2014). *Plastic surgery booming in the UK* (BBC Health Report). Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-25986840>.
- Gaulin, S., & Fitzgerald, R. (1986). Sex differences in spatial ability: An evolutionary hypothesis and test. *The American Naturalist*, 127(1), 74–88.
- Gimlin, D. (2002). *Body work: Beauty and self-image in American culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gray, J. (1992). *Men are from Mars, women are from Venus*. New York: Thorsons / Harper Collins.
- Hald, G. (2006). Gender differences in pornography consumption among young heterosexual Danish adults. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 35(5), 577–585.
- Head, A., McGillivray, J., & Stokes, M. (2014). Gender differences in emotionality and sociability in children with autism spectrum disorders. *Molecular Autism*, 5(1), 19.
- Health & Safety Executive. (2018). Annual Statistics, published July 2018 (data up to March 2018) *workplace fatal injuries in Great Britain 2018*. Retrieved from <http://www.hse.gov.uk/Statistics/pdf/fatalinjuries.pdf>.
- Jung, C. G. (1991). *The archetypes and the collective unconscious* (Collected Works of C. G. Jung). London: Routledge.
- Kafetsios, K. (2004). Attachment and emotional intelligence abilities across the life course. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37(1), 129–145.
- Keown, D. (2014). *The spark in the machine*. Jessica Kingsley: Singing Dragon.
- Kimura, D. (1999). *Sex differences in the brain*. New York: Scientific American Incorporated.
- Lehrer, J. (2009). *The frontal cortex, porn and mirror neurons*. Retrieved from <http://scienceblogs.com/cortex/2009/08/24/porn-and-mirror-neurons/>.
- Maccoby, E. (1988). Gender as a social category. *Developmental Psychology*, 24(6), 755.
- Maguire, M. (2004). *Men, women, passion and power: Gender issues in psychotherapy*. London: Routledge.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (2007). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso emotional intelligence test*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems Incorporated.
- Office for National Statistics. (2017). *Sexual identity UK, 2016*. Retrieved from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/sexuality/bulletins/sexualidentityuk/2016#the-majority-of-the-uk-population-identifies-as-heterosexual-or-straight>.
- Perel, E. (2007a, July). Erotic intelligence. *Therapy Today*, 207, 27–32. BACP Leics.
- Perel, E. (2007b). *Mating in captivity: Sex, lies and domestic bliss*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Saad, G. (2018). *Is toxic masculinity a valid concept?* Retrieved from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/homo-consumericus/201803/is-toxic-masculinity-valid-concept>.
- Scorolli, C., Ghirlanda, S., Enquist, M., Zattoni, S., & Jannini, E. (2007). Relative prevalence of different fetishes. *International Journal of Impotence Research*, 19(4), 432.

- Seager, M., Sullivan, L., & Barry, J. (2014, October). Gender-related schemas and suicidality: Validation of the male and female traditional gender scripts questionnaires. *New Male Studies*, 3(3), 34. <http://newmalestudies.com/OJS/index.php/nms/article/view/151/154>.
- Silverman, I., & Eals, M. (1992). *Sex differences in spatial abilities: Evolutionary theory and data*. <http://psycnet.apa.org/record/1992-98504-014>.
- Stiles-Shields, C., & Carroll, R. (2015). Same-sex domestic violence: Prevalence, unique aspects, and clinical implications. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 41(6), 636–648.
- Sturgis, I. (2016, October 22). Britain's first female bishop on why she's leading the charge against negative body image. *Daily Telegraph, Lifestyle, Women*. Retrieved from <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/women/life/britains-first-female-bishop-on-why-shes-leading-the-charge-agai/>.
- Todd, B., Fischer, R., DiCosta, S., Roestorf, A., Harbour, K., & Barry, J. A. (2017). Sex differences in children's toy preferences: A systematic review, meta-regression and meta-analysis. *Infant and Child Development*. <http://www.citeulike.org/user/GI-Sci/article/14485720>.
- Wingenbach, T., Ashwin, C., & Brosnan, M. (2018). Sex differences in facial emotion recognition across varying expression intensity levels from videos. *PLoS ONE*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0190634>.
- Wollstonecraft, M. (1792). *A vindication of the rights of women* (Penguin Modern Classics Edition 2001). London: Penguin Random House.
- Wright, L. (1997). *Twins: Genes, environment and the mystery of identity*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Wu, M., & Shah, N. (2011). Control of masculinization of the brain and behaviour. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 21(1), 116–123.