

Margaret Mead Sex And Temperament In Three Primitive Societies

Margaret Mead Sex And Temperament In Three Primitive Societies

Downloaded from www2.lacavedespapilles.com by Potts & Carolyn

INTRODUCTION: RETHINKING GENDER THROUGH MARGARET MEAD’S PIONEERING WORK

In the early 20th century, the prevailing belief in Western societies held that men and women were born with distinct, biologically determined temperaments. Men were seen as naturally assertive, aggressive, and rational; women as nurturing, passive, and emotional. It was into this rigid landscape that the American anthropologist **Margaret Mead** stepped with a revolutionary question: Are these differences universal, or are they the products of culture? Her answer came in the form of a landmark study that would forever change the field of anthropology and our understanding of gender. In 1935, Mead published ***Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies***, a book that challenged the very foundations of biological determinism. Based on her fieldwork in New Guinea, Mead argued that the temperaments considered “masculine” or “feminine” in the West were not fixed by nature but were instead shaped by the social environments in which people lived. This article explores the key findings of this seminal work, the societies she studied, and the lasting impact of her conclusions on debates about gender, culture, and human potential.

THE CONTEXT OF MEAD’S RESEARCH

Margaret Mead (1901–1978) was a student of Franz Boas, the father of American anthropology. Boas championed the idea of **cultural relativism**—the view that a culture must be understood on its own terms, not judged by the standards of another. Mead set out to test this idea in the realm of gender. In 1931, she embarked on a five-year expedition to Papua New Guinea, then a remote colonial territory. She chose three distinct tribal groups: the Arapesh, the Mundugumor, and the Tchambuli (also spelled Chambri). Each group, she believed, offered a different model of how a society could assign roles and temperaments to men and women. Her goal was not simply to list differences, but to show that the entire concept of “male” and “female” personality was culturally constructed.

The Three Societies: A Comparative Lens

Mead’s comparative method was elegant in its simplicity. She lived among each tribe, observed daily life, conducted interviews, and recorded her observations. Her findings, published in ***Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies***, revealed a stunning diversity of gender norms.

THE ARAPESH: A SOCIETY OF GENTLE PEOPLE

The Arapesh were a mountain-dwelling people who lived in the Sepik region. Mead described them as a peaceful, cooperative, and non-competitive society. What struck her most was that both men and women exhibited what Westerners would typically label “feminine” traits: gentleness, emotional responsiveness, nurturance, and a strong focus on child-rearing. Arapesh men were expected to be kind, gentle, and cooperative—not aggressive or domineering. Both sexes participated equally in caring for infants, and the ideal temperament for all individuals was one of mutual support and tenderness. Mead emphasized that among the Arapesh, there was **no sharp distinction between male and female temperament**. Both genders were socialized to be passive and nurturing. This was a direct contradiction to the Western assumption that men are naturally more aggressive.

THE MUNDUGUMOR: A SOCIETY OF HEADHUNTERS

In stark contrast, the Mundugumor (or Mundugumor) were a fierce, warlike people who lived along the Yuat River. Mead reported that they valued aggression, jealousy, and competition. Here, both men and women were expected to be harsh, ruthless, and sexually assertive. Women were not seen as naturally nurturing; in fact, mothers often resented their children and showed little affection. Mead observed that Mundugumor women were as aggressive as the men, and they competed for status within the tribe. The ideal for both sexes was a kind of “masculine” temperament as defined in the West: assertiveness, independence, and a readiness to fight. Again, Mead found that **temperament was not biologically tied to sex**. Among the Mundugumor, women were socialized to be ruthless, proving that culture could override any supposed innate female tendencies toward gentleness.

THE TCHAMBULI: A REVERSAL OF WESTERN ROLES

The third society, the Tchambuli (Chambri), offered perhaps the most dramatic example for Mead’s thesis. Here, gender roles were almost completely reversed from those of 1930s America. Tchambuli women were the primary economic providers. They were pragmatic, efficient, and took charge of fishing, trade, and community decision-making. In contrast, Tchambuli men were more concerned with personal appearance, art, and gossip. They were described as emotionally expressive, vain, and dependent on women for validation. Mead noted that men were the ones who wore elaborate ornaments, spent hours discussing hairstyles, and engaged in theatrical performances. Women, on the other hand, were the “managers” of the society.

This reversal was not just about roles—it was about temperament. Tchambuli women exhibited the traits that Western societies reserved for men (rational, businesslike, unemotional), while Tchambuli men exhibited stereotypically “feminine” traits (coquettish, sensitive, preoccupied with beauty).

Mead used this example to argue that **what a culture considers “masculine” or “feminine” is arbitrary**. If one society treats men as the decorative sex and women as the providers, then clearly biology is not destiny.

KEY ARGUMENTS OF THE BOOK

Mead synthesized these three case studies into a powerful argument: Temperament is largely **socially conditioned**. She wrote that “human nature is almost unbelievably malleable” and that cultural patterns, not chromosomes, determine whether a person grows up to be gentle or aggressive, nurturing or competitive. Her work became a cornerstone of the **nature-versus-nurture debate**, strongly tilting the balance toward nurture. She claimed that the “natural” differences between men and women are actually the products of centuries of cultural training. By showing three cultures that each expressed very different “sex temperaments,” she demonstrated that the Western model was one among many possible arrangements.

Implications for Western Society

Mead’s findings had immediate implications for her home audience. In the 1930s, the Great Depression was reshaping family roles, and women were entering the workforce in greater numbers. Yet many still believed that women were by nature unsuited for leadership or competition. ***Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*** provided anthropological evidence that these assumptions were not universal truths. Mead argued that if the Arapesh could raise gentle people of both sexes, and the Mundugumor could raise aggressive people of both sexes, then Western educators and parents could also shape children to be whatever the society valued. She did not advocate for a single ideal, but she insisted that any rigid assignment of personality based on gender was wasteful of human talent.

CRITICISM AND CONTROVERSY

Despite its influence, Mead’s work has faced significant criticism over the decades. Some anthropologists later accused her of **overgeneralizing** and romanticizing the societies she studied. For instance, later research among the Arapesh found that they were not entirely without aggression, and that Mead may have emphasized certain traits to fit her thesis. Similarly, the Tchambuli reversal may have been more complex than she described. Some critics also pointed out that Mead spent only a few months in each group, raising questions about the depth of her observations.

Perhaps the most famous challenge came from Derek Freeman, who argued in the 1980s that Mead had been misled by informants and had ignored evidence of biological influences on behavior. Freeman’s critique sparked a fierce debate in anthropology, but most scholars today acknowledge that while some of Mead’s specific claims may have been exaggerated, her core insight—that culture profoundly shapes gender behavior—remains valid. She may have been wrong on details, but she was right about the principle of **cultural construction of gender**.

Legacy and Continued Relevance

More than 85 years after its publication, ***Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*** continues to be read and debated. It is a foundational text for feminist anthropology, gender studies, and anyone interested in the social construction of identity. Mead’s work helped pave the way for later scholars like Simone de Beauvoir, Judith Butler, and Joan Scott, who further dismantled the idea of innate male/female dichotomies. In the public sphere, the book remains a touchstone for arguments about gender equality, LGBTQ+ rights, and the fluidity of human roles.

Modern research in neuroscience and endocrinology has complicated the purely cultural explanation, showing that hormones and brain structure do play some role in behavior. However, Mead’s emphasis on the power of social environment is now widely accepted. We understand that culture can amplify or suppress biological tendencies. For example, the existence of many cultures where women are warriors or men are primary caregivers demonstrates that biology does not dictate fixed destinies.

PRACTICAL LESSONS FROM MEAD’S WORK

For contemporary readers, ***Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*** offers several takeaways:

- **Gender is not destiny.** The talents and temperaments of any individual are not limited by their sex.
- **Cultural expectations are powerful.** What a society expects of its members often becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.
- **Comparison reveals alternatives.** By looking at how other cultures organize gender, we can imagine new possibilities for our own.
- **Human nature is flexible.** The book is a reminder that we have the capacity to change, and that social progress is possible when we question inherited norms.

In many ways, the debates that Mead ignited are more relevant today than ever. Questions about transgender identities, non-binary genders, and the dismantling of traditional roles all echo her central thesis: that the link between biology and behavior is not fixed. While her methods were imperfect, her vision was clear.

CONCLUSION: A FOUNDATION FOR UNDERSTANDING HUMANITY

Margaret Mead's *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies* remains a landmark in the social sciences. It dared to ask whether the qualities we call “masculine” and “feminine” are universal truths or cultural inventions. By documenting three societies where the temperaments of

men and women were astonishingly different from Western norms, Mead provided compelling evidence that culture plays a decisive role in shaping human personality. Her work has been critiqued, refined, and built upon, but its core message endures: we are not prisoners of our biology. We have the power to create social arrangements that allow every person to develop their full potential, regardless of sex. In an age still wrestling with questions of gender equality, Mead’s study is a reminder that the answers lie not in nature alone, but in the societies we choose to build.