ARTICLES

CONFERENCE REPORT

OTHER

Instructions to Authors

Manuscript preparation. *Culture, Society & Masculinities* publishes regular articles (around 7,500 to 8,500 words) and brief reports (2,500 to 3,000 words). Authors should prepare manuscripts according to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed., 2009). Formatting instructions and instructions on the preparation of abstracts, text with designated headers (A-level through C-level), references, tables, and figures appear in the *Manual*. All copy must be double-spaced. **Abstract and keywords**. All manuscripts must include an abstract containing a maximum of 120 words typed on a separate page. After the abstract, supply up to five keywords or brief phrases. **References**. References should be listed in alphabetic order (also double-spaced). Each listed reference should be cited in the text and each text citation should be listed in the References. Basic formats are as follows:

Journal article:

Forth, C. E. (2009). Surviving our paradoxes? Masculinity, modernity, and the body. *Culture, Society & Masculinities, 1*(1), 6-32.

Book:

Janssen, D. F. (2008). *International guide to literature on masculinity: A bibliography*. MSP Bibliography Series No. 1. Harriman, TN: Men's Studies Press.

Edited book:

Armengol, J. M., & Carabí, À. (Eds.). (2009). *Debating masculinity*. Harriman, TN: Men's Studies Press.

Chapter in a book:

Gilmore, D. (2009). Cultures of masculinity. In Armengol, J. M., & Carabí, À. (Eds.), *Debating masculinity* (pp. 31-41). Harriman, TN: Men's Studies Press.

Article in an Internet-only journal:

Gordon, R. (2004, June 15). The men among us. Library Journal.com. Retrieved October 15, 2006, from http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA423789.html

Figures. High-quality printouts are needed for *all* figures. The minimum line weight for line art is 0.5 point for optimal printing.

Review Procedure. *Culture, Society & Masculinities* uses a masked review process. Authors are asked to include all identifying information in the cover letter, including the manuscript title, the authors' names, institutional affiliations, and e-mail addresses. The first page of the manuscript should include only the article's title, abstract, and keywords. Footnotes containing information that would reveal the authors' identity and/or affiliation should be removed. Every effort should be made to see that the manuscript itself contains no clues to the author's identity.

Permissions. When an article has been accepted, authors are required to obtain and provide to the editor all necessary permissions to reproduce in print and electronic form any copyrighted work, including, for example, photographs of people.

Publication Policy. Our policy prohibits an author from submitting the same manuscript for concurrent consideration by two or more publications. Our policy also prohibits publication of a manuscript that has already been published in whole or substantial part elsewhere. Authors of manuscripts describing research using human participants are required to comply with APA ethical standards in the treatment of human participants. Upon acceptance of a manuscript authors must sign and return a copyright agreement.

Submission. Submit manuscripts *only* as electronic files (.rtf or .doc file), via the editor's email: diederikjanssen@gmail.com

Hyeyurn Chung[a]

The Korean American Cowboy and the Fallacy of Regenerative Violence in Leonard Chang's *The Fruit 'N Food*

Abstract   This essay examines the incompatibility between violence deployed by Asian American male subjects and their pursuit of masculinity in Leonard Chang's novel, *The Fruit 'N Food*. According to Richard Slotkin, American history has evidenced that violence affords hegemonic men a venue by which to validate their masculinity and gain access to its cachet. Asian American men's appropriation of violence, however, effects the converse; even as they endeavor to tap into the regenerative quality of violence, they discover that their violence is delegitimized by their race and hence loses the capacity to restore their masculinity divested by the dominant discourse.

keywords   Leonard Chang, *The Fruit 'N Food* (book), Asian American masculinity, racialized violence, vigilante justice

> "In the United States, violence and heroism have been made synonymous
> except when it comes to blacks." —James Baldwin (1955 [1998, p. 320])

The lone figure of the cowboy, romantically roaming the mythical West, is perhaps the single most identifiable figure in the American imagination; capturing the American spirit of rugged individualism, the cowboy, alongside other archetypal figures as the hunter and the frontiersman, is the "founding father" in the American mythogenesis who "tore violently a nation from implacable and opulent wilderness." As such, these mythic founding fathers have continued to resurface throughout American history, conveying the "myth of regeneration through violence," which has become the "structuring metaphor of the American experience" (Slotkin, 1973, p. 5).

Although the mythic frontier of the Wild West now has become a thing of the past, a nation-state, observes eminent historian Richard Slotkin, constantly "invent[s] new forms of adversary [since] without an adversarial other, it begins to atrophy" (Christensen, 2008, p. 312). The urban riot wars and the attendant racial violence in the latter half of the twentieth century can thus be read as a "modernized and somewhat distorted version of the 'frontier myth'" (Slotkin, 1973, p. 125). Recast as Asian within the context of the 1992 L.A. Riots,

---

[a] Sungshin Women's University, Seoul, Korea.

All correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Sungshin Women's University, Department of English Language and Literature, Seoul, 136-742, Korea. Email: chunghy1@gmail.com.

---

arguably the worst urban civil unrest in American history, the Korean American cowboy, not unlike his predecessor who set out to tame indigenous enemies and the unruly wilderness in the struggle for nationhood, rode roughshod into the cataclysmic racial mayhem to reinstate law and order into the American megalopolis plummeting into a vortex of anarchy. Leonard Chang's *The Fruit 'N Food* (1996), which indubitably recalls the Riots, features Thomas Pak as the latest Korean American incarnation of the cowboy, waging war against the "renegade" minorities of the urban ghetto engaged in an illegitimate inner-city turf war.[1] Serving as a reminder of the incorrigible racial strife which connotes the violence embedded in the American landscape, Chang's novel elaborates on how violence becomes a Catch-22 for the ghettoized men of color as neither the Korean American cowboy nor his Black adversaries are able to tap into the regenerative quality of violence. In other words, Thomas Pak's association with a distinctly American icon like the cowboy bears little fruit as he is unable to achieve true selfhood, which remains the prestige of hegemonic men. As such, *The Fruit 'N Food*'s portrayal of violence as unfailingly degenerative for all men of color begs a consideration of the inextricable nexus between race, masculinity, and violence, as well as how Asian American (male) subjects in particular are reified time and again as victims even as they become agents of violence. Ultimately, I contend that Chang's novel, although praiseworthy in its attempt to re-conceive conventional archetypes in order to disassociate Asian American men from the dominant discourse which reinforces their emasculation and victimhood, envisions a rather grim and defeatist ending for Tom in that he seeks to embrace something ostensibly intangible to American men of color—masculinity—by means that further delegitimize their existence—violence.[2]

Though the coupling may initially appear tenuous, the iconic image of the cowboy was evoked more so than any other in the media coverage of the Korean American storeowners during the Riots. David Palumbo-Liu traces its emergence in the color photograph of a gun-toting Korean vigilante, which appeared in the May 1992 issue of *Newsweek* (p. 188).[3] The photo depicts a young

---

[1] Leonard Chang is a second-generation Korean American novelist. He has also written numerous short stories published in a variety of literary journals. His debut, *The Fruit 'N Food* (1996) received the Black Heron Press Award for Social Fiction in 1996. His next novel, *Dispatches from the Cold* (1998) won a "Goldie," awarded by the *San Francisco Bay Guardian* to outstanding local writers.

[2] As is discussed elsewhere in this essay, Chang's novel assumes a teleological structure leading to Tom's demise through an interspersion of his nightmares, in which he is engulfed by searing Whiteness which blinds and paralyzes him (p. 41).

[3] Palumbo-Liu notes how Elaine Kim, distinguished scholar of Asian American studies, was solicited by *Newsweek* to play up the violent faceoff between the "Korean American cowboy" and his Black adversary in her op-ed piece about the L.A. Riots. He also criticizes mainstream media's investment in perpetuating this image by recirculating simply in order to exploit its "excitement" factor (p. 190).

Korean American man "holding a semiautomatic handgun upright [and] wearing a Malcolm X t-shirt, with the image of a black man in a suit and tie holding an automatic rifle accompanied by the caption, 'By any means necessary'" ("Siege," 1992, p. 38). Palumbo-Liu discerns that the photograph illustrates the paradoxical positionality of the Asian American: on the one hand, he is situated as a stand-in for the legitimate (read: White) enforcers of law and order, upholders of the dominant ideology, the "frontline forces of the White bourgeoisie" whose counterviolence against the non-White "malefactors" is sanctioned, even prescribed by the state (p. 186). Along these lines, the Korean American cowboy, by "appropriating and inverting Malcolm X's maxim, 'By any means necessary,'" becomes the receptacle of the "pristine violent strain that America would euphemize in itself but exploit in others" (p. 185). On the other hand, the image of Malcolm X emblazoned on his chest aligns this Korean American cowboy with Black Power's war against the "intrusive violence of the state" perpetrated against racial minorities and the socially disenfranchised (p. 185). Palumbo-Liu's observation is paramount for two reasons: first, not only does it deconstruct the Black-White dichotomy in U.S. race relations by identifying Asian Americans as the "interstitial element" but it also installs Asian Americans' in-betweenness with respect to violence's vigilante/legitimate and violator/violated dualities (p. 183). Furthermore, Palumbo-Liu's reading of the Korean American cowboy allows us to see that the cowboy ethos was not necessarily crafted and then strategically deployed by the Korean American male subject but was yet another stereotype forced upon him by the mainstream's mediations. In the end, the designation of cowboy allows the Korean American male subject to align himself pro tempore to an American icon of power and masculinity but this, as Chang's novel demonstrates, relegates him to yet another metaphor which divests him of any agency.

Asian Americans' antipodal position as both the agent and victim of hegemony prompts an interrogation of the convoluted correlation between violence and inclusion into mainstream America and more specifically, how violence functions in the construction of Asian American masculinity.[4] Violence has long

---

[4] I recognize that there are divergent representations of Asian American masculinity; such variables as one's national origin, sexuality, class, and age determine how the Asian American male subject in question is perceived. On the one hand, he is "lascivious and predatory" and thus poses (sexual) threat to White womanhood. Along these lines, Asian American male sexuality was something to be contained with the purview of anti-miscegenation laws in late 19th and early 20th century. (In tandem, perceptions regarding hypermasculinity, typically associated with Black men, illustrate that being "too masculine" does not accrue them social and political cachet either.) On the other hand, he is asexual or homosexual, which fodders mainstream expectation of his effeminacy. Moreover, the contemporary "model minority" stereotype has exacerbated the preconception of Asian American men as passive and accommodating to White standards. Yen Le Espiritu (1997) maintains that the initial construction of Asian American masculinity as "hypermasculine" was later reversed to "asexual" or "homosexual"

been regarded as an acceptable means of accomplishing masculinity in American society, which has mythologized "the formative powers of violence" that begot and regenerated American manhood (Slotkin, 1973, p. 5); it is, in fact, the American (male) subject's monopoly on legitimate violence that sets him apart from racial and gendered others. Viet Thanh Nguyen (2002) explains that post-1960s Asian Americans recognized their body politic in terms of violence, as an ambient thematic presence they were determined to reconfigure, and which, in the past, had systematically demoralized and objectified their "Oriental" forefathers. Understanding violence as a part of their initiation process into the "complexities of American inclusion and exclusion, mobility and inequality" (p. 88), these young Asian Americans of "post-Yellow Power" movement reappropriated violence to garner agency and to stake out their place in America, with its long tradition of deploying violence to define itself (p. 63). In particular, they identified the male body as a "site for a series of activities and movements that will serve to regenerate [Asian America] through violence," and anticipated that the Asian American male subject, once recuperated in terms of his masculinity via a productive appropriation of violence, could then be "discursively transformed into a representative of the larger ethnic and national community" (p. 88).

While "phallic aggression," as Andrea Dworkin (1976) maintains, may be perceived as the "norm" of masculinity, not all acts of violence are treated equally; historically, only the violent exploits of hegemonic masculinity have been, for the most part, socially sanctioned. Violence enacted by unauthorized perpetrators simply reinforces the illegitimacy of the act and its doer. For instance, not only urban riots but all collective action undertaken by people of color (even the Civil Rights Movement) was portrayed as the irrational misbehavior of "troublemakers." Considering their continued tenure within the racial margins, one can reasonably conclude that Asian American male subjects' subscription to conventional methods of accomplishing masculinity, especially via violence, has failed to secure them access to American manhood.[5]

(p. 90), and American history details how Asian American men were systematically desexualized, thus emasculated, by the exclusion of Asian women in the initial stages of Asian immigration to the U.S. mainland, stringent anti-miscegenation laws, the establishment of bachelor societies, and so on.

[5] Even via legitimate venues, violence fails to remasculinize Asian American male subjects. One such example can be found in John Okada's *No-No Boy* (1957), which depicts marginalized men's centripetal move to a sanctioned site of violence, the military, which is considered among the most forceful institutions in constructing images of masculinity. The "young, well-muscled, and white" body of the soldier/warrior was believed to best embody the attitudes and behavior of traditional masculinity; a soldier's robust physique not only conveyed his strength but that of the "nation he represented" (Faludi, 1999, p. 16). However, Okada's *No-No Boy* illustrates how the discourse of war and its association with formative violence fails to recuperate the masculinity of Asian American men "deeply wounded by racial violence and discrimination" (Nguyen, 2002, p. 62).

Subsequently, even as Asian American cultural nationalists, including writer-activist Frank Chin, proposed that it behooves Asian American men to turn American violence against itself in order to reclaim their masculinity, Chang's Tom Pak evidences how an implementation of violence serves to mire him deeper into a state of physical and social emasculation and hastens the codification of his body as "savage, illegitimate, decrepit, and ineffective" (Nguyen, 2002, p. 96). Jeff Yang (2007) also indicates how more recent tragedies involving gun-wielding Asian American men have "conspired to swing [their image] away from the 'meek, passive, and mild' end of the spectrum and toward 'violent, bloodthirsty, and dangerous'" (para. 1) and how this transition from victim to agent of violence has had a deleterious effect on their already precarious social position. In lieu of securing their place in the fraternity of American masculinity, Asian American men's display of "phallic aggression" has rendered them more susceptible to the dominant group's discipline and punishment. Simply put, their acts of violence were racialized and subsequently disinvested of its regenerative value.

Circling back to Chang's novel, it begins and ends with the image of Tom—hospitalized, half-conscious, blind, apathetic, non-responsive to the world around him, wasting away to "nothing"—far removed from the masculine image of the cowboy and detained in a state which guarantees his protracted deposit on the fringes of American manhood (p. 218). *The Fruit 'N Food* illustrates that even as racialized masculinities continue to reconcile with the conventional registers of their hegemonic counterpart, accommodating and perpetuating the myth of American manhood ultimately works against those positioned beyond its purview.[6] The promise of legitimacy and regeneration, which White violence affords, is in effect a fallacious one for men marginalized by their race. Per my Baldwin epigraph, "in the United States, violence and heroism have been made synonymous except when it comes to blacks," *The Fruit 'N Food* elucidates how race matters in determining whether a violent act will be sanctioned as heroic or rendered criminal, and once colored by

---

[6] Chang's Tom invites us to reconsider the troublesome terminology of "masculinity." In *Disidentifications*, José Esteban Muñoz indicates that masculinity is a category that continues to prioritize a hegemonic rubric, which is cordoned off to those beyond the "norm" (1999, p. 58). In his book *Racial Castration*, David Eng (2001) also grapples with the viability of "masculinity" as a term to describe Asian American masculinity. Eng discusses how Asian Americans are subjected to multiple castrations by way of their race, gender, sexuality, history, and politics, suggesting that reading Asian American male bodies through the reductive lens of "masculinity" is what prostrates them sexually as well as divests them of all vestiges of sociopolitical power (pp. 14-17). Eng proposes an alternative (and perhaps a more apposite) term: subjectivity. Albeit the denotative proximity of the two terms, the latter, according to Eng and Keith Clark, is less inclined to evoke the linguistic baggage tied to the definition of the former, as "subjectivity" involves "degree of agency of exercises in self-definition and identity formation" (Clark, 2002, p. 2).

its doer, this racialized violence no longer restores but rather invalidates one's masculinity. Hence, for the men in the racial margins, violence becomes a bankrupt method to obtain their membership into the ultra-elite club of American manhood as it increasingly obscures the boundary between destruction and self-destruction, and further entrenches their locality on the outer edges of society.[7]

The Fruit 'N Food

Chang's novel begins with protagonist Tom's returns to his old neighborhood Kasdan, Queens—an itinerant loner, a return precipitated by nostalgia. To his dismay, Tom discovers that Kasdan is no longer as he remembers it but has now become a volatile site of racial friction. He is especially disheartened that Kasdan's Korean American community has all but disappeared; there is a small cluster of stores with Korean signs but the Korean church that Tom's father attended has been replaced by a dirty grey parking structure with "indecipherable graffiti" (p. 43). A "thin layer of grime" has descended on the neighborhood now populated by multiple generations of lower-class African Americans (p. 43). Tom goes to work for the Rhees, a Korean immigrant family who owns Fruit 'N Food, a local mom-and-pop grocery store that mostly caters to the neighborhood's Black clientele. Confined within the ghetto with no familial ties and no sense of an ethnic heritage, Tom considers himself an accidental Asian American and does not particularly ascribe his peripheral existence to his minority status; yet he is drawn to the Rhees who grant him "some inexplicable link to his past" (p. 13).[8]

---

[7] Sheila Smith McKoy adeptly observes that in the American context, "the violent and violating black bodies are the ultimate markers of racial difference;" lading Blackness with toxic violence is "the pattern of institutionalized racism" (2001, p. 5). According to Smith McKoy, even though racial violence is often enacted by "white bodies that represent the violent embrace of white racial domination, [it] is never read as a white phenomenon" (p. 5). It is important to note that in *The Fruit 'N Food*, Tom occupies a space that appears devoid of White (male) bodies and Tom's embrace of violence is depicted more or less as a personal vendetta against Black violence. Notwithstanding the "ostensible" absence of the hegemony in Chang's novel, the conflict between the two minority groups cannot fully be understood without examining their respective relationships with the dominant group, which is ever-present in its spectral or metonymic form (e.g., the media). For example, Tom's anxiety builds as he is exposed to incessant news reports about the mounting tension between the races. Mr. Rhee voices this concern about the presence of the media exacerbating the level of violence of the protestors (p. 133).

[8] Here, Tom undermines stereotypes of Asian Americans as the model minority: successful, intelligent, and tunnel-vision moneymakers, for whom assimilation into mainstream America takes precedence over all else. In a sense, Tom's divergence from a stereotypical Asian American initiates his destabilization of the dominant discourse,

When a confrontation breaks out between the Rhees and their Black customers, Tom taps into the "myth of regeneration through violence," which seemingly promises to "[purge] darkness from the hero and the [civilized] world" (Slotkin, 1973, p. 125). To a certain extent violence appears to be the only way for Tom to "take care of business" like a real man: homeless and broke with no physical prowess and no vocational expertise, the antiheroic Tom is hamstrung from gaining access to the cachet of hegemonic masculinity.[9] Though seminal in and of itself, violence nonetheless becomes devoid of its formative qualities in the ghetto, which the mainstream regards as a site of physical and moral degeneration. Tom's race implicates him as one of the "adversarial other," and the bravado and machismo of the mythic cowboy fails to transpose onto Tom's Asian body. Tom's racialized violence is thus rendered toxic; it not only "precipitate[s] chaos and ring[s] down the curtain on the American Dream" of the Kasdan community, but ends up exacerbating Tom's emasculation as he is circumscribed within the two invalidating positions of victim and enemy of the state (Baldwin, 1963, p. 337).

By all appearances, Tom, skinny, gaunt, and his long hair tied in a ponytail, is a far cry from the template of the mythic American hero who would wage battles by day and woo women by night (Chang, 1996, p. 10).[10] He is a loner, a drifter, a directionless college dropout with little prospects for the future. In his childhood, he was passed around from relative to relative after his

which is intent on inscribing his racialized body as a compliant model minority. Tom's minor stab at unsettling the hegemony is a trajectory that he tenaciously pursues by appropriating violence to reclaim his masculinity.

[9] Krienert (2003) examines Messerschmidt's claim that men with fewer acceptable outlets to assert masculinity tend to be involved in violent incidents. Messerschmidt postulates that violence can be "used as a resource when other resources are not available for accomplishing masculinity. For example, if a person does not have a steady, reliable job, a stable family life, or other traditional indicators of successful masculinity, violent behavior may be considered an acceptable way to convey the 'toughness' that is linked with masculine traits. […] It is when traditional means of demonstrating masculinity are stifled or do not exist, that violent behavior is most likely to occur" (Krienert, 2003, para. 11-12). The empirical testing of Messerschmidt's theory was inconclusive, which Krienert attributes to the limitation of the masculinity scales that were employed in the study as well as the use of an outdated operational definition of masculinity (para. 58).

[10] Controversial writer Frank Chin also stages the figure of the cowboy in his essay "Confessions of the Chinatown Cowboy." According to David Leiwei Li (1992, p. 324), Chin erects his ideal not as someone who "apes the Western hero" but belongs to both the "fighting tradition of ancient China" and the American frontier. In so doing, Chin appropriates the familiar figure of the cowboy and appoints him to spearhead the production of Asian (Chinese) American tradition, dislodging American Orientalism (p. 326). Chang's Tom, however, is distinguished from Chin's productive rendition of the cowboy as the latter banks solely on the cowboy's maverick quality and ends up underscoring his inability to embody this American icon.

mother's death. Because his father was unable to take care of him, Tom was even briefly sent to Korea but he knows very little, if anything, about Korea and being Korean. His father finally sent for Tom after several years but by then the two were too estranged to bridge the gap; father and son lived like "strangers," only speaking about the "most innocent and mundane" things (p. 13). In college, Tom became even more indifferent toward his father's attempts to communicate. His father's unread letters were discarded after searching the envelopes for checks. The irreconcilable difference between father and son culminates in Tom's refusal to attend his father's funeral. Not only is this Korean American cowboy deterritorialized from the mythic space of the western frontier and shuttled into the inner-cities, Tom is rendered ahistorical due to his disaffection from his cultural heritage, compounding his anxieties about his lack of identity, without which he ceases to exist; severed from constructive sites of identity formation, Tom's presence is marked by an absence of a sense of masculine self.

Tom's achievement of manhood is then forestalled, first and foremost, by his disconnect from a strong paternal presence. Not only was Tom estranged from his father but from the mild-mannered and affable Mr. Rhee, who becomes a surrogate father for Tom; the latter is also overshadowed by his brazen wife, whose dogged determination for success overwhelms Tom. Mr. Rhee's kindness is shown from the very beginning when he offers a gift of three grapefruits to Tom who has lost his wallet and cannot afford to pay. When Tom starts working at his store, Mr. Rhee invites Tom to share his meager lunch and shields Tom from Mrs. Rhee's unreasonable rants about coming in late or not keeping a close enough watch on the customers/shoplifters. Mr. Rhee also befriends Mr. Harris, an elderly African-American man whose wife had died two years earlier when an Asian *gang-peh*, hoodlum, attacked her. Mr. Harris, a regular at the store, also comes to support the Rhees, braving the taunts of boycotters. Their friendship proffers the promise of an "interethnic identifications and alliances" within the racial margins which can be used as "powerful weapons against white supremacy" (Lipsitz, 1998, p. 210).

Mr. Rhee owns a gun as his store has been held up four times in the past. Despite having a strong motive occasioning him to use deadly force to protect his family and property, Mr. Rhee recognizes the drawbacks of using violence to combat violence. Therefore, Mr. Rhee is adamantly against relying on a deadly weapon to shield himself and protect his family from being victimized; for Mr. Rhee, violence cannot be a means to even out his compromised manhood in America. In prioritizing the maintenance of peace in his family as well as in the larger community, Mr. Rhee encompasses an alternative Asian-American manhood that deviates from American national masculinity's self-definition through violence. Tom however criticizes Mr. Rhee for needlessly placing himself in a position of vulnerability, which Tom believes will invite future depredation. If Mr. Rhee offers Tom an alternative masculinity to adopt, his model is ultimately an unappealing one for Tom because Mr. Rhee's concilia-

tory demeanor implicates him as a "model minority," which post-1960s Asian Americans consider a feminized position marking their inferiority.

Tom's dissatisfaction with Mr. Rhee's alternate model of Asia-American masculinity leaves him to pursue a more conventional track of achieving manhood. In tandem, Tom struggles to negotiate his burgeoning ethnic allegiance to the Rhees and an antiracist discourse safeguarding all racialized subjects, two motives which have tended to mutual exclusion within inner cities. At first, Tom's dislocation from an Asian (American) frame of reference enables him to maintain distance and tolerance of both Asian Americans and African Americans. Despite his efforts to stay uninvolved, Tom finds himself unable to remain a bystander as the racial tension between the Rhees and their Black patrons escalates. Tom soon becomes over-sensitized to the issues of race and ethnicity as he is inundated with unrelenting reminders of the dangers of living and working in a neighborhood splintered by racial, cultural, and generational differences. Excessive media coverage and editorials about urban conflicts among people of color prompt Tom's undue fears that "Judgment is coming" to the "whole city [made] uneasy" by racial disturbances (pp. 104-105).

Overlapping the voyeuristic gaze of the media, which keeps surveillance over the inner cities, is Mrs. Rhee's scrutinizing gaze over Black bodies, which marginalizes them into criminality and Asian American ones into victimhood. The Rhees are constantly on guard for the Black "drug man" whose "many stealings" and "hold-ups" deprived them of "almost hundred dollars in past three months" (pp. 16-17). Mrs. Rhee, in particular, persists in conveying her contempt for and "irrational" suspicion of Blackness (p. 36). Despite her husband's admonition, she urges Tom to "watch for *gumdngee*," a "bad word, like nig … nigger [*sic*]," explains Mr. Rhee apologetically (pp. 16-17). In the beginning, Tom refuses to go along with Mrs. Rhee's hypervigilance toward her Black customers, whom she treats as latent criminals. Tom feels uncomfortable as she stares at a tall Black man with long dreadlocks with "her arms folded across her chest, feet apart, chin jutting forward, […] her body motionless" (pp. 34-35). Though Tom is initially surprised and offended by Mrs. Rhee's bigotry, Tom unwittingly finds himself replicating her paranoiac fears and hatred of Blacks, who come to embody violent persecution leveled against Asian Americans.

Tom nevertheless recognizes that, to a certain extent, Mrs. Rhee has been relegated to a henchman for hegemonic men; she is circumscribed within the racial margins, which she sentinels on their behalf at her peril. Like her neighbors, Mrs. Rhee must weather the harsh realities of racism, which are indiscriminatingly impinged on all minority subjects. Tom resists such a self-degrading position. Taking an oppositional position against Mrs. Rhee, who at once represents and takes the fall for hegemonic men, Tom retorts that he "wasn't a security guard [nor] a cop" (p. 55). Yet Tom, interned within the ghetto invoking a hypersensitivity to racial conflict and an attendant "us" ver-

sus "them" mentality, contracts the racist discourse of "Negrophobia" from Mrs. Rhee, and his antagonism toward other men of color intensifies accordingly (Knadler, 2002, p. 87).

Accompanying his irrational fear of Black customers is Tom's growing engrossment with the pistol that the Rhees keep under the counter. At first, Tom is disconcerted by its proximity, feeling "vaguely uncomfortable" as he believes there is "something menacing about having a gun within his reach" (p. 27) so he stares at it from afar, not wanting to touch nor disturb the gun. Tom's fascination with the gun increases as he becomes progressively mistrustful of other people of color who appear to him either as junkies or drunks, intent on abusing and undermining his sense of autonomy. In Tom's suspicious eyes, his customers appear "strung out" with their "harried, bloodshot eyes" (p. 25). In reiterating Mrs. Rhee's arbitrary fear of victimization, Tom ends up reinforcing the dominant discourse, which gratuitously packages threats to the hegemony in Black bodies.

Even as Tom succumbs to the osmosis of Mrs. Rhee's negrophobia, he rebukes Asian (American) women as unwitting agents of hegemony, which not only leads to their exclusion from participating in or benefitting from the process of reclaiming agency via violence but also provides justification for reinstating the gender hierarchy within Asian America as an oblique way for Asian-American men to subvert hegemonic authority. For instance, Tom remembers his Korean grandmother as a callous woman with "three front teeth missing [and] her wrinkled sunburnt face yelling at him [and making him cry] for breaking something" (p. 59). Just as Tom posits his grandmother as a source of his infantilization, Tom feels oppressed by Mrs. Rhee's covert insistence that he side with her against "their" prospective attackers.[11] Subsequently, it appears imperative that Asian-American women are relegated to and occupy the position of the quintessential victim (of racial and sexual violence) in order for their male counterparts to escape this categorization.

---

[11] There is a sharp gender divide in the characterization of Asian-American women in the context of urban conflicts. Whereas Chang's depiction of Mrs. Rhee renders her a consummate bigot, the three (female) documentary makers of *Sa-I-Gu* (which literally means "four-two-nine," for April 29, the date that the L.A. Riots began) endeavor to qualify the widespread portrayal of Asian American women as inarticulate and hysterical victims of racism, and to give voice to these women doubly "othered" by their race and gender. Poignant stories of the shattered dreams of Korean Americans comprise *Sa-I-Gu: From Korean Women's Perspective* (Cross Current Media, 1993), an attempt, also, to counter the one-dimensional media representation of Korean Americans as inarticulate, overwrought, or hypervigilant. Dai Sil Kim-Gibson and her co-producers, Elaine Kim and Christine Choy take issues with the fact that the Korean-American perspective was grossly neglected and misconstrued as Korean-American voices were persistently expunged from public discourse about the riots or were often rendered unintelligible and therefore un-American. In 2003, Kim-Gibson released *Wet Sand: Voices from L.A. Ten Years Later*, which revisits the tragic site to examine the fallout from the riots as suffered by multiethnic communities.

Two separate encounters offer sleep-deprived and often disoriented Tom peace and clarity: an illicit sexual relationship with the Rhee's rebellious and self-absorbed teenaged daughter June/Jung-Me and a violent exercise of vigilante justice.[12] Though troubled by June's age, Tom is comforted by her presence, which seems to dissipate the emptiness of his life. Tom is able to alleviate the stress of the daily grind by sexual and verbal exchanges with June. In June, Tom finds a confidante to whom he can unload his worries about the racial tension that he confronts with increasing frequency. Tom finds June's warm body reassuring in the austere atmosphere of his apartment and the Rhee's store.

Tom's sexual relationship with underage June, however, is unable to fully empower him due to its implications of legal and moral impropriety. Late one night when Tom is out on a date with June, the store is burglarized and Mrs. Rhee is badly hurt. Tom feels especially guilty because he and June were having sex during Mrs. Rhee's attack. His inability to protect Mrs. Rhee abates his sense of manhood even as it is being validated by a sexual encounter with June. The novel intersects scenes of intimacy between Tom and June with those of the break-in at the store; as parallels are drawn between Tom and the "black man with grey teeth [who] scream at Mrs. Rhee to give him the money" (p. 80), sexual intercourse is transformed into an act of violence against Asian-American women, whose position as the quintessential victim is upheld. Waving his gun back and forth in front of Mrs. Rhee's face, the intruder strikes Mrs. Rhee, grabs her breasts, and leaves her in a puddle of blood. At that same moment, as Tom lies next to June, he thinks that she might resemble a younger Mrs. Rhee. When the bruised and battered Mrs. Rhee returns to the store, Tom is surprised by how young she looks with her hair "falling [down] loosely" like June's (p. 94). The overlapping image of him and June in bed with that of Mrs. Rhee being held up at gunpoint is a frightening one for Tom as he inadvertently conflates himself with Mrs. Rhee's attacker (p. 89).

If Tom's gender approximates him to the Black armed gunman who assaults Mrs. Rhee, he and Asian-American women are yoked together by their race. During yet another confrontation with her Black customer, Mrs. Rhee cries out to Tom for help, and in this moment, all their prior dissensions are forgotten and the corporeal boundary between the two are erased by this language of fear and pain (p. 109). Tom's earlier vow to never let anyone hold him up, hurt, beat, or shoot him and how he'd "shoot before anyone would hit him" (pp. 86, 110) is extended to include Mrs. Rhee, whom he tries to save by aiming the gun at the would-be robbers. This juxtaposition across the gender line

---

[12] Perhaps to obviate the homosexual inscription of Asian-American male bodies, Chang validates Tom's heterosexuality very early on in the novel. Although his heterosexuality does little to restore Tom's masculinity, it keeps him from further marginalization as a "sexual deviant."

becomes even more palpable when one night, after he and June engage in sex, Tom finds his mid-section streaked with June's menstrual blood: "his groin and lower abdomen were smeared with circular patterns of red, and his still hard sex was covered with a mix of blood and semen." Thinking that the blood seems more like his, not hers, Tom stares at his bloodstained body, which looks like he had been in an accident and feels a "strange sadness" as he cleans June's blood off him (p. 128). Tom is reminded of this anointment by blood when he pulls the trigger on a crew of gang members harassing Mr. Harris, and suffers gunshot wounds which lead to his debility (p. 214).[13] Tom is thus situated as both aggressor and victim, two positions which, for Tom and other men of color, are not contradictory but coterminous.

As cowboy justice aggressively extracts respect, Tom begins to consider violence as the most effective way to recover his lost sense of manhood. Tom acts on a misguided belief that violently subverting the equations Asian = victim and Black = perpetrator will abet his transition from the feminized victim to the aggressive victimizer. Tom comes to see the gun and its promise of violence as the most conducive way of restoring his masculinity, which was compromised by the threats of racial violence against the passive and compliant Asian Americans. If sex with June offers Tom a momentary release from the agonizing state of mental and physical exhaustion, it is only when Tom uses violent measures to protect Mrs. Rhee from her attackers that he is able to "sink away instantly […] into a deep, quiet sleep," for the very first time since his arrival in Kasdan (p. 112).

As mentioned above, when Mrs. Rhee, unnerved by earlier attacks, cries out during a minor altercation with a Black couple at the store, Tom decides to take matters into his own hands and pulls a gun on Mrs. Rhee's alleged attackers. By disregarding Mrs. Rhee's plea to "push the alarm! Call police," Tom refuses to join sides with or rely on representatives of hegemonic masculinity whose delayed response time in the past disclosed their disinterest in coming to the Rhees' assistance (p. 110); in other words, Tom protests identification with the sanctioned enforcers of hegemonic violence who are intent on subduing racialized male bodies to docile ones. At the same time, Tom invokes an(other) iconic figure of White masculinity—the cowboy—by turning to a maverick form of violence; Tom forcibly seizes respect by pointing the gun at his perceived assailants and even after the incident, Tom does not relinquish the gun but puts it into his pants. The gun epitomizes Tom's phallic authority, by which he can reclaim his masculinity through enacting violence against destructive Black bodies. In so doing, Tom disarticulates the dominant discourse which inscribes Asian-American male bodies as effeminate and acquiescent.

---

[13] Interestingly enough, even as Tom appears partial to the outlaw mode of the cowboy and expresses aversion to allying with sanctioned enforcers of hegemonic violence, he seems equally unwilling to align himself to Asian *gang-peh* (gangsters), cowardly blackguards who would condescend to tormenting a feeble old man.

Tom's exterior also appears to reflect his heightened aggression: Tom is transformed from a "young Asian Christ" with his "gaunt face, deep set eyes, [and] long hair, tied in a ponytail in back" to a "big man with gun," whose physicality ostensibly manifests his increased militancy (pp. 10, 212).

Even as Tom aims to separate himself from the hegemony, he inadvertently consorts with its authority by employing cowboy justice. The outcome unanticipated by Tom is his demotion to a social menace. When Tom brandishes a gun, he is no longer the "big man" but attenuated to an out-of-control and unstable "crazy sucka," a threat to social order (p. 111). Tom's violence can only be read as illegitimate and the efficacy of Tom's strategy to reclaim his masculinity is severely limited from the get-go. Tom undertakes proactive measures to subvert the dominant discourse by asserting his masculinity of which he was deprived, but Tom remains an "unmanly" Asian American from a hegemonic perspective. Tom is still a "skinny, gaunt" Asian with long hair. Tom's endeavor to remasculinize himself via violence proves to be a miscarried attempt because he ultimately fails to destabilize stereotypes about Asian-American masculinity (p. 141).

Tom is further marginalized when his misappropriation of cowboy justice provokes a massive protest against the Rhee's store from the African American community, frustrated by racial discrimination. As the boycotters hurl racist slurs at Tom and the Rhees, Tom is taken back to his childhood, a time when he was defenseless against racial violence. At this moment, Tom prepares to combat these hateful words, which "blend together around him [trying to] sink him" with his tightened fist (p. 184). Tom's response derives from his mistaken belief that one can only counter violence with violence. The police momentarily thwarts a violent outbreak between the two warring factions but, police and media presence—hegemonic masculinity's gaze—escalates the intensity of the conflict, despite Mr. Rhee's desperate gestures of conciliation.

The tension between the Korean-American and African-American communities and between the Rhees and Tom reaches zero hour when the Rhees discover Tom's intimate relationship with June. Tom's guilt-ridden outburst coincides with an explosion of the boycott into a race riot, and Tom is again conflated with the violent and violating Black bodies of the rioters. Tom tries to escape from the store and to flee from his feelings of guilt for causing the boycott and for betraying the Rhee's trust by sleeping with June. Tom returns later only to discover that the store is ravaged beyond recognition. In a state of devastation and chaos, Tom witnesses Mr. Harris being mugged by members of an Asian street gang. Once again, Tom confronts violence with violence and once again, violence fails to reward Tom. Tom's intention in gunning down the gang members is noble in the sense that he is trying to protect Mr. Harris from harm; good intentions notwithstanding, his violence ends up being destructive both to self and others. Rather than restoring his agency, violence leaves Tom in dire straits as he falls blind and comatose after a gang member shoots back at him.

When he regains consciousness several months later, Tom finds himself in the hospital, paralyzed and enveloped in that "whiteness he had dreamed about" (p. 215). The Rhees, he learns, have lost the store, their daughter June's college fund, and the American Dream that both epitomized, and Tom is left only with the remnant of racial conflict, which remains unresolved by the end of the novel. Tom invokes the figure of the cowboy, and yet, his racialized and hence delegitimized violence leads to failure not only in his individual aspiration to reclaim his masculinity but also the communal aims to gain greater inclusion into American society. Ironically, Tom awakes to a world of Whiteness that erases all markers of difference but discovers that this Whiteness is "an ever-lasting blinding coldness like a cruel sun" coinciding with his paralysis (p. 215).

Detained in a hospital ward, Tom is overwhelmed by a sense of despair that he has not felt since he started to work for the Rhees. For a brief period, Tom manages to reinscribe the urban ghetto of Kasdan as a space of inclusion: home. As he lies half-conscious in a hospital bed, Tom nevertheless realizes that his experience at Fruit 'N Food was "meaningless, really" (p. 225). Though he aspired to belong to the Asian-American community, which the Rhees represented, Tom understands that he was mistaken to believe that he "belonged there, belonged somewhere" (p. 225).[14] Tom has fallen further into the margins of a segregated ghetto, which, in Chang's novel, shows no chance for a genuine reconciliation among its disconnected inhabitants. Cognizant that he has "nothing to come back to," Tom departs from the real world; he ignores his counselor's prompting to "react to the world around him," and increasingly withdraws into a dream world (p. 226). Tom's bedridden and emaciated body reduces him to "nothing," and Tom's earlier concern about the insignificance of his existence is confirmed in the end (p. 218). Alienation and emasculation are two interlocking forces that collude in the eradication of Tom and other racialized subjects from the fraternity of American manhood. Chang offers no closure as he leaves the blind and disabled Tom, indifferent to the things he could have done to "avoid what wasn't an inevitable conclusion of violence" — that is, a way to resolve interracial conflict that debilitates the marginalized by perpetuating racial fears and economic despair (p. 225).

Race coupled with violence always relegates subordinated men to a no-win situation; in this respect, perhaps the irresolution and the hopelessness that pervades the novel's end is to be expected. In Nguyen's (2002) estimation, those who succeed in reclaiming their masculinity are able to do so because

---

[14] Via the conflict between the Rhees and Tom, the novel suggests a deep-seated intergenerational discord within the Asian-American communities. When Mr. Rhee first meets Tom, he says that Tom is "no Korean. You *gyupo*" (p. 4). This division between Koreans and *gyupo* (or Korean Americans) is again addressed when Mrs. Rhee underscores and places blame on Tom's inauthentic Koreanness for bringing them to ruins (p. 207).

they learn to reinscribe the urban ghetto from a "space of exclusion" to a "space of inclusion" (p. 98); Tom's fall from grace is illustrated by his disaffection from the Asian-American community and the futility of his efforts to belong.

Moreover, Tom's misappropriation of violence devastates Kasdan and reinforces society's misconception of this multiracial neighborhood as a place of degradation. Tom's exercise of cowboy justice to reclaim his masculinity ultimately reiterates hegemonic anxiety of violent racialized bodies losing control and wreaking havoc on the social order. Tom inadvertently reinforces the dominance of hegemonic masculinity in that its sanctioned representatives, the police, are sent in to regulate the anarchy spawned by the unruly denizens of the racial margins and racial violence is, once again, used to subjugate people of color. Even as Chang signals a burgeoning camaraderie between Asian and African Americans and a possibility of their collective stand against disenfranchisement of racial others, Tom's deployment of violence seemingly stamps out any likelihood of recuperation. In the end, Tom's violence, delegitimized by his race, cannot rework the ghetto into a site of inclusion and reconciliation, wherein Asian and African Americans can converge. The urban landscape remains a demarcated ghetto in *The Fruit 'N Food*.

Albeit the conceivable merits of situating the Korean-American cowboy as a principal figure of American mythology, we would be amiss to elide that such positioning relegates him as a "perverse ventriloquist [dummy] of the White dominant ideology," to whom racialized subjects have a "tenuous and contingent relation" (Palumbo-Liu, 1999, p. 187). Ultimately, it is important to understand Tom's devastating turn to violence not necessarily as an unfortunate corollary of an individual's shortcomings but as a result of the propaganda of formative violence, which mythically regenerated American national manhood amid pandemonium. In this context, we can re-interpret the frustration that meets the readers at the end of Chang's novel and salvage its meaning as, perhaps, the author's tongue-in-cheek way of frustrating the dominant discourse that seeks yet another stereotype—the Asian-American cowboy—to delimit Asian-American subjectivity within its boundaries. Though truncated by the fallacious promise of regeneration through violence, Tom's resistance against hegemonic masculinity is significant for those endeavoring to locate their identity in the blended community that is America.

REFERENCES

Baldwin, J. (1963). *The fire next time*. New York: Dial Press.
Baldwin, J. (1998 [1955]). Down at the Cross. In T. Morrison (Ed.), *James Baldwin: Collected Essays* (pp. 63-84). New York: Library of America.
Chang, L. (1996). *The fruit 'n food*. Seattle: Black Heron Press.
Clark, K. (2002). *Black manhood in James Baldwin, Ernest J. Gaines, and August Wilson*. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
Christensen, P. (2008). The "wild west": The life and death of a myth. *Southwest Review*, *93*(3), 310-325.

Dworkin, A. (1976). *Our blood: Prophecies and discourses on sexual politics*. New York: Harper & Row.

Eng, D. (2001). *Racial castration: Managing masculinity in Asian America*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Espiritu, Y.L. (1997). *Asian American women and men: Labor, laws and love*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Faludi, S. (1999). *Stifled: The betrayal of the American man*. New York: W. Morrow & Co.

Knadler, S. (2002). *The fugitive race: Minority writers resisting whiteness*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press.

Krienert, J.L. (2003). Masculinity and crime: A quantitative exploration of Messerschmidt's hypothesis. *Electronic Journal of Sociology*. Retrieved November 29, 2009, from http://www.sociology.org/content/vol7.2/01_krienert.html

Li, D.L. (1992). The production of Chinese American tradition: Displaying American Orientalist discourse. In S.G. Lim & A. Ling (Eds.), *Reading the literatures of Asian America* (pp. 319-331). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lipsitz, G. (1998). *Possessive investment in whiteness*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Muñoz, J.E. (1999). *Disidentifications: Queer of color and the performance of politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Nguyen, V.T. (2002). *Race and resistance: Literature and politics in Asian America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Palumbo-Liu, D. (1999). *Asian/American: Historical crossings of a racial frontier*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Slotkin, R. (1973). *Regeneration through violence: The mythology of the American frontier, 1600-1860*. Middletown, CN: Wesleyan University Press.

Smith McKoy, S. (2001). *When Whites riot: Writing race and violence in American and South African cultures*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

The siege of L.A. (1992, May 11). *Newsweek*, 30-38.

Yang, J. (2007, May 8). Asian pop: Angry Asian men. SFGate.com. Retrieved February 23, 2009, from http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/g/a/2007/05/08/ apop.DTL

GABRIELA GONZALEZ VAILLANT[a]

"MIRROR MIRROR":
A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTERGENERATIONAL IMAGES OF MASCULINITIES IN URUGUAY

ABSTRACT While there have been many studies analyzing changes in gender roles for Latin American women, the impact of these changes on men, and on their gender identity, received relatively little analysis. This paper explores intergenerational changes and continuities in the conceptualization of gender roles within the realm of family life. This is accomplished through in-depth interviews with three generations of male Uruguayans; a grandfather, a father and a son in the same family. Interviews reveal a historical shift in the meaning of masculinity and in gender roles in Uruguayan society. Though the study draws on a small sample of 5 families (*n* = 15), data shed light in the day-to-day impact on men's lives of large structural shifts.

Gender identity is a social construction under constant renegotiation, contestation, and reinterpretation. The definition of "masculinity" varies between cultures, within cultures, and during the lifespan of an individual. Any study of masculinity, regardless of context, must contemplate its malleable and permuting nature (Kimmel, 1998). Many studies have shown how the idea of gender as a social construct accounts both for the preexisting social constraints that shape gender identities as well as for the resources individuals have for transforming and re-appropriating those identities (Connell, 1995; Hearn & Collinson, 1994). Even though the study of masculinity is a relatively recent endeavor in Latin America, "constructivism" has been the dominant theoretical discourse for studies on masculinity (Fuller, 2001; Gutmann & Vigoya, 2005). As Gutmann and Viveros point out, the predominant lens for understanding "man-as-man" in Latin America has been critical feminism emphasizing gender oppression and unequal power relationships, at times neglecting study of how prevailing images of manhood(s) in Latin America may be oppressive for men themselves. "Only in the late 1980s did research begin in Latin America that described men as having gender and producing gender. Until

---

[a] State University of New York at Stony Brook.

---

then, men were identified with humans in general, and male privilege made the problem of men as such invisible" (Vigoya, 2001, p. 237).

The present study incorporates a generational lens through which to view and study the shifts in gender perceptions that have taken place in Uruguay over the last several decades. This exploratory tri-generational research presents the changes and continuities in gender role conceptions of Uruguayan men of three successive generations (grandfathers, fathers, and sons) from five families.[1] The study offers no claim of representativeness of sample and cannot be generalized. Rather, it focuses on how a sample of men of different ages and generations have individually experienced radical changes in their immediate environments.

The utility of intergenerational studies lies in that it places its focus at C. Wright Mill's intersection of biography and history (Brannen & Nilsen, 2006). Mannheim has referred to differences in the relationships between generations in terms of the "tempo of change," and to intergenerational relations as a barometer of social change and transformation (Mannheim, 1993[1952], p. 384). In communities in which the pace of change is very slow, the break between generations is generally purely biological, and based on the identity of a numerical age. In communities that experience greater social change and profound transformation, the distinct historical consciousness of each generation is much more pronounced. There is always, however, a flow of culture ensuring transmission in both directions (with old generations usually preserving much of cultural heritage and new generations introducing new ideas and trends). While cross-sectional data and longitudinal studies have been used successfully to demonstrate continuity and ruptures in socialization processes across generations (see for example Bergtson, Furlong & Robert, 1974; Chen & Kaplan, 2001; Cunningham, 2001), this study makes the case for the need for more qualitative studies as might help uncover the subjectivity behind dynamic relations of different generations. Linking family histories has proven to be a useful method for understanding how people negotiate domestic socialization of values and shifts in their socio-historical environment (Attias-Donfut & Wolff, 2000; Brannen & Nilsen, 2006).

This study explores the degree in which individuals are embedded in specific *generational milieus* plays a role in how they decode the world and interpret gender roles. I begin by briefly conceptualizing the generational context and by making a case for its usefulness for studying shifting gender perceptions. I develop this context as that of changing familial arrangements and important economic, political, cultural, and ideological shifts in Latin America over the last decades. Though it is not the purpose of this article to carry out a comprehen-

---

[1] The interviews used in this paper were originally collected for a final project of a qualitative methods course in the Sociology Department at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of the Republic (Uruguay). This is the first time data from this collective research are published. The original research team was integrated by the author along with researchers Matias Damisa, Florencia Dansilio, and Luciana Scaraffuni.

sive analysis of the many changes that have taken place within the realm of domestic life, it is important to characterize the general trends of these changes in order to give historical context to the discourses which are analyzed in the following section. I then briefly contextualize some specificities and nuances regarding the Uruguayan case. The findings section is divided into three parts, each corresponding to a different historical generation. Within each generation, the paper focuses on men's attitudes toward (a) gender differences within the domestic sphere; (b) parenting and fatherhood; (c) socialization experiences, and (d) acknowledgment of one's own generation in relation to other generations of men. The last section presents some issues for discussion, and outlines possible directions of future research.

CHANGING TIMES, CHANGING MEN?
INTERGENERATIONAL MASCULINITIES WITHIN THE FAMILY

Generations, as understood by Mannheim, are seen as much more than statistical aggregates of individuals within the same age range. Rather, they are a group of people that have experienced a similar socio-historical era, and are by default endowed with certain *identitarian* inscriptions (Mannheim, 1993[1952]). Similar to economic classes, generational belongingness is linked to a standing within the social structure. While the notion of "class" has economic and financial power implications, generational location is indicated by the biological rhythm of birth and death. A same year of birth endows individuals with a common standing in the historical dimension of the social process with a common human experience of historical belongingness. In this subjective configuration of a specific generation, particular events appear as especially significant for its members (Strauss & Howe, 1991). At the same time, it is necessary to emphasize that generational identities are inexorably shaped by the presence of "significant other" generations. Intergenerational influences are always mutual, and usually operate in both directions simultaneously (Attias-Donfut & Wolff, 2005).

The traditional family, though it has significantly changed over time, appears as a microcosm particularly eligible for studying the morphology of generational relationships (Bawin-Legros, 2002). As Jelin (1994) has pointed out,

> The family unit is not an undifferentiated set of individuals who share activities linked to their livelihood. Rather, the family unit is a social organization and a microcosm of production relationships with a power structure and strong ideological and affective components that provide the foundation for its development and that support preservation and reproduction. However, this organization also has conflicts and struggles, and while there are common tasks and shared goals, each member has his or her own interests anchored in his or her position within the production and reproduction process, both internal and external to the household. (in Olvarría, 2006 p. 32)

Individuals engage both in intergenerational and intragenerational relationships, which can result in both conflict and harmony. Even though authors like Feuer have emphasized the need to incorporate "disillusionment with and opposition to older age groups" into the definition of generations (1969, p. 25), necessary conflict between older generations need not always be the case. Many studies have tried to debunk the "Oedipus myth" and show the importance of intergenerational transfers and relationships within families (Attias-Donfut & Wolff, 2000; Bergtson et al., 1974) . As life expectancy increases, "beanpole families," those composed by several living generations, become more commonplace (Brannen & Nilsen, 2006). A grandparent's presence in the household represents a powerful identity to grandchildren, although the nature of this representation changes with regard to context (Attias-Donfut & Segalen, 2002; Bengtson, 2001).

It is important to emphasize, however, that relationships between generations have been affected by recent transformations of the definition of the traditional family. There has been vast theorization about the conditions that have lead to the reversal of the "breadwinner system," and modification of the nuclear family through the emergence of new types of familial arrangements. The breadwinner system is characterized as a system in which men are the economic providers of their families (productive labor) and women are in charge of the domestic matters (reproductive and household labor). This form of division of labor is usually engrained in a patriarchal organization of the family (*paterfamilias*), and thus affects the way the social interactions ensue within the household. In urban areas of Latin America, this form of organization began to take place in the final decades of the 19th century, being further reinforced by state policies at the beginning of the 20th century reaffirming the responsibility of fathers as breadwinners (Jelin, 1994; Olvarría, 2006). Several factors have begun to challenge the hegemony of this model. It is possible to say that, by the mid-1970s, this model of family, and implied gender roles, experienced a severe crisis due to many factors. Some of the most salient have been an increasing feminization of labor as a consequence both of structural shifts and the struggle of social, political, and cultural movements toward equal rights. These movements acquired preponderance during the last decades of the 20th century, bringing about substantive changes in legislation and public perception of gender roles. The sudden "appearance" of women in the public sphere was further intensified as a consequence of macroeconomic transformations, changes being facilitated with more access to communication and the spread of globalization. The effects of globalization in the region, which have increasingly led to space/time contraction and a more interrelated world, to the *problematization* of the forms of masculinity previously conceived as hegemonic and to the recognition of a plurality of possible gender identities (Araujo & Rogers 2000; Moreno, 2002).

Statistics clearly demonstrate the emergence of these trends (Barker, 2006; Jelin, 1994; Olvarría, 2003). Between 1990 and 2008, women's participation in

the labor market increased from 32% to 53% in Latin America and the Caribbean. This percentage increases to 70% when considering women between 20 and 40 year of age (ILO-UNDP, 2009). Demographic changes, such as decreases in marriages and births, increase in divorces, children born out of wedlock and female-headed households, also suggest a change in the definition and prioritization of the nuclear patriarchal family (Olvarría, 2006).

The increasing passage of women from the private to the public sphere changed gender roles in the family household. As Olvarría states, "these developments are giving rise to changes in perceptions that men have about the sexual division of labor and also about their relationships with their partner and children" (2006 p. 349). Studies have shown, however, that this transition has not taken place without tension, as the breadwinner role is still strongly ingrained in the masculine identity of many men. Men's outward gestures of acceptance of the concept of a female head-of-house are often accompanied by inner psychic denial and resentment (Tolson, 1977; Wilkie, 1993). According to Giddens, "in social circumstances in which women are no longer complicit with the role of the phallus, the traumatic elements of maleness are thus exposed more plainly to view" (1994, p. 130). Viveros Vigoya emphasizes that among the literature on Latin American masculinities, the idea of the so-called crisis of masculinity is already a common place (2001). This crisis emerges, according to the author, due to a clash between the attributes culturally assigned to men in many countries and the subjective reactions of these men to many important social, economic, cultural, and ideological changes. Many qualitative studies have shown how shifts in gender identities are linked to the macro-social processes described in the preceding paragraph, and how these shifts create a disconnect between expectations and reality for many men across Latin America (Fuller, 1997; Gutmann, 1996; Henao, 1997). Several empirical qualitative studies focus on this disconnect:

> New studies illustrate the contradictions of contemporary fatherhood in Latin America, the impact of socioeconomic and political changes on interfamilial relations, the progressive deinstitutionalization of father's role—increasingly more independent of authority—and the growing importance of fatherhood for masculinity life projects. (Gutmann & Vigoya, 2005, p. 117)

However, not all members of the same generation interpret their life experiences or conceptualize their masculinities relative to a women's roles the same way. It is possible to differentiate, within a generation, many subgroups which Mannheim has referred to as generation units: "those groups within the same actual generation which work up the material of their common experiences in different specific ways" (1993[1928], p. 40). Many times, "Latin American manliness" is understood as an overarching concept that agglomerates a vast numbers of differentiated particular experiences. Gender obviously is not only determined by generational belongingness. Class, ethnicity, and place of

residence have all been shown to have effects on men's constructions of their own gendered identity (Fuller, 1997). Many studies in Latin America have provided ample proof of how the socio-economic, cultural, and political circumstance in which subjects are immersed shapes their understanding of masculine identities and, thus, one should expect to find variance within any given generation (Gutmann, 1996; Valdés & Olavarría, 1998; Viveros, 1998). Research has shown that higher social echelons present a stronger tendency to question, at least at the level of discourse, the hegemonic masculine model (Fuller, 2003; Olvarría, 2003; Valdés & Olavarría). In a study about masculinity in Chile, Valdés and Olvarría find that hegemonic models of gender differences are more ingrained in elderly men and men from lower segments more than others. Interestingly, some studies have shown that in practice, class may have a different effect upon distribution of roles within the domestic sphere. In his study of Mexican masculinities, Gutmann (1996) finds that ideas related to fatherhood are understood differently over a range of social classes. Men from lower classes with less education and economic resources tend to have greater responsibility for their children than men of higher social class. This suggests class bias in fulfillment of manly roles (Beattie, 2002).

Uruguayan Masculinities in Context

In order to contextualize the discourses that are presented in the following section, it is necessary to understand some particularities of gender perception in Uruguay in relation to other Latin American countries. Among some of the most salient differences between Uruguay and most of Latin America are the relatively early incorporation of women into the labor market, as well as early access to reproductive technologies for both women and men by the middle of the 20th century. The military dictatorship (1973-1985) and the neo-liberalization period which followed stand out as two important recent historical periods which influenced perceptions of gender relations in the country. As in other parts of Latin America, the socio-economic transformations that accompanied shifts in government policies had a huge impact on the relationship between genders (Connell, 1998).

Men constituted 48% of the total population by the end of the 1990s. Uruguay is a relatively homogeneous population ethnically and racially. African descendants comprise approximately 6% of the total Uruguayan population, or roughly 180,000 people, a particularly low number when compared to some of Uruguay's regional neighbors (Malvasio, 2004). Though largely disguised and seldom addressed in public, racial minorities are disproportionately affected by discrimination both in terms of gender and class. Half of all employed black women in Uruguay, for example, work in domestic service (Malvasio, 2004). Uruguay also has the most aged population in Latin America as a consequence of its early demographic transition, with very low fecundity rates and a recent increase of international emigration of youth (Amorín

et al., 2006). According to the National Institute of Statistics, in 2008 close to 94% of the population lived in urban areas.

Uruguay stands out in the region for its early legislation for equal gender rights. In 1932, after almost thirty years of collective action, women obtained the right to vote in Uruguay, making it the second country in the region to recognize this right. Additionally, women in Uruguay were the first to substantially modify their demographic characteristics. By 1950, the female population in Uruguay was mostly adult, urban, and had on average no more than three children (Batthyány, 2004). Women's participation in the labor force is among the highest in Latin America (Rivas & Rossi, 2000) and women are heads of the family in over one fifth of the Uruguayan households, an increased from 13.4% in 1963 to 22.9% in 1996 (Batthyány, 2004).

While marriage continues to be predominant, there has been a significant increase in the divorce rate and a simultaneous decrease in the nuptial rate (Batthyány, 2004). Even though women have, on average, more access to education than men (60% of university graduates are women), studies have shown that other, less visible ceilings have hindered more equal distributions of jobs and salaries. According to a recent study carried out by the Inter-American Development Bank, Uruguay has the second largest gender pay gap in Latin America, superseded only by Brazil. Uruguayan men earn, on average, 26.3% more than their female counterparts of the same age and with the same level of education (Atal, Ñopo, & Winder, 2009).

Twelve years of military dictatorship, from 1973 to 1985, also had influential impacts on the lives of many Uruguayan men and women. The authoritarian regimes in the countries of the Southern Cone (Argentina, Uruguay, and Chile) recognized "the defense of traditional family" as a principal platform of their moral campaign, and attempted to regulate all aspects of social interactions through harsh norms and rules. Among the many aspects of social control, sexuality and gender roles were closely monitored during military dictatorships. As countries in this region transitioned toward democratic regimes, the emergence of women's movements were visible and numerous, with gender politics appearing quickly on the political agenda (Alvarez, 1990). Additionally, many families experiences exile, which provided a mode of exposure to the values of other counties in which traditional gender roles were questioned (Corral & Paez, 1980).

Although statistics seem to suggest that perceptions of men's roles within the family have experienced substantial transformations, the implications of these transformations on their identities have not yet been fully grasped. Emphasis has largely been placed on women and the transformations they have experienced, whereas studies of masculinity in Uruguay are sparse. It is imperative to consider, therefore, how the changes described above have impacted the image that Uruguayan men have of their role as fathers and husbands within the family, and trace possible reassignments of their masculine identify.

Table 1

General Characteristics of Families (Income, Location) and Family Members (Age and Pseudonyms)

Family	Income	Location	Generation 1	Generation 2	Generation 3	Co-residential Generations
1	Low	Suburban area	Juan (82)	Alberto (51)	Andres (22)	2,3
2	Low	Urban area	Roberto (75)	Ignacio (46)	Martin (21)	1,2
3	Middle	Suburban area	Carlos (82)	Sebastian (48)	Agustin (24)	No
4	High	Urban area	Esteban (75)	Marcelo (49)	Jaime (21)	2,3
5	High	Urban area	Argelio (80)	Ricardo (53)	Leo (29)	No
Age range			75-82	46-53	22-29	

METHODS

PARTICIPANT SELECTION

The unit of observation included men from five different Uruguayan families and from three different generations from the same sets of families (son, father, and grandfather). Two prerequisites were set for considering families: 1) the "son" of each family had to be between 18 and 29 years of age, and 2) the three men had to share descent through a paternal line. This type of design is useful for exploring common patterns that arise in the discourse of same-generation men while controlling for specific idiosyncrasies of each family. In this way, the study was able to trace historical events that possibly shaped the subject's views of manhood and gender roles, as well as private events that shaped the particular histories of each family.

The method for selecting participants for interviews was stratified "purposive" (or theoretical) non-probabilistic sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994). When selecting the families, diversity was accounted for by selecting individuals from different socio-economic strata. A methodological decision was made to take the middle-generation men's self-reported monthly income as a proxy for socio-economic status of the family in the absence of other evidence. Though this may present theoretical and legitimacy issues, most of the participants from the first generation of men were retired, and most of the third generation participants were still in school and not yet formally employed. All of the families were residents of the Uruguayan metropolitan area. Families were selected from a list of families that volunteered to participate in the study through snowball recruitment taking into account the aforementioned socio-economic criteria, place of residence, and the interest of their particular family histories.

INSTRUMENTS

In-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted. They have been evaluated to be adequate for one-time interviews conducted by more than one re-

searcher (Kvale, 1996). They are justifiable instrument because this research sought to assess elements that cannot be directly observed, such as feelings, perceptions, meanings, past experiences, and intimate relationships (Patton, 1980 p. 196). A team of four trained social science researchers, both male and female from the Faculty of Social Sciences of Uruguay conducted the interviews and fieldwork. The interviews were conducted in Spanish in a location chosen by each interviewee. Time of interviews ranged between 50 minutes and 2 hours. Several instances of peer debriefing between researchers were carried out during all instances of the investigation in order to assure validity and trustworthiness of data. Researchers interviewed subjects alone. The structure of the interviews was based on a previously established set of general topics that served to guide the interactions and focus the conversation. Uniform questions helped provide reliable qualitative data comparable across interviews. The interviewer used a fairly open framework, which allowed for unexpected topics of conversation, permitting a flexibility to probe for further details or explanations. Field notes were collected in order to contextualize the interviews.

ANALYSIS

All interviews were tape-recorded, transcribed, and subjected to content analysis following Huberman and Miles's (1994) specifications for qualitative matrix data analysis. The first step consisted in the initial coding of the interviews, which was carried out using qualitative analysis software (MAXQDA) in order to make the "raw" data manageable and understandable in terms of the issues being studied. The interviews were coded following the relevant dimensions of the current study, though original codes were continuously revised in order to account for emergent phenomena. The second step consisted in organizing and compressing information into matrices, which allows for the observation of systematic patterns and interrelationships within same-generations, across and within families. Finally, conclusions were drawn by cross-checking, analyzing, and verifying the data collected in the light of emergent theoretical framework. For the presentation of findings, relevant extracts were selected that either condensed main beliefs expressed, or that were considered relevant for theoretical reasons.

RESULTS

Analyzing and comparing interviews across generational lines proved to be an indicative way of decoding certain common patterns and detecting general tendencies across discourses. A constant "game of mirrors" took place between generations by which self-identities were constructed by images of other generations. All the generations of men from this study viewed themselves as far more progressive and egalitarian than the preceding generations. Table 2

Table 2

Matrix Comparison of Key Dimensions across Generations

Respondent group	Domestic gender roles	Fatherhood
Generation 1 "Grandfather"	• Naturalization • Cognitively aware of changes • Innovations in terms of assisting their wives	• Easier to reflect upon life as children than as fathers • Identified the father with discipline and the mother with affectionate care
Generation 2 "Son"	• Disruptions of expectations • Discourses more elaborate than Generation 1 • Dialectic tension between practice and discourse	• Reflects greater participation on their part than the previous generation • From strict social scripts to more spontaneous scripts
Generation 3 "Grandson"	• Focused more on the problematic aspects of gender identification • Critical of the real extent of gender related transformation	• No direct experience • Discourse centered on the normative dimension and their own experiences as sons • Still observed gender division between their father and mothers

summarizes the main findings by considering the generational similarities and differences across the dimensions under study.

The interviews show how gender construction cannot be understood as an immutable task. It is necessary to contemplate a person's susceptibility to adapt to changing trends as a life process. Men from all generations are affected by transformations and this makes the nature and the forms of intergenerational relationships increasingly more complex. Though we saw "snapshots" of these men's lives, there was evidence of mutability regarding the topics raised concerning gender roles over the course of their life spans. Secondly, when questioned, individual tendencies seem to generally favor the adoption of egalitarian conceptions. Thirdly, we saw that these changes do not take place across all men in the same ways. Support was found for Mannheim's claim of the importance of "traumatic" events shaping the experiences of generations, such as the incorporation of women into the labor market and the second-wave of feminism, for the case of second generation men. It was more difficult to detect common patterns in the conceptualization of gender roles in the last generation partly due to the fact that it is always more difficult to unravel transformations of generations in process of formation.

Interwar Generation (Ages 75-82): Traditional Men in Post-Traditional Contexts

This group is especially interesting analytically as most studies about masculinities in Latin America have focused on the "transition generation" (the teenagers of the 1960s), and it is often assumed that elderly men, past a certain

age, are not impacted by or are simply immune to changes in their environment. According to a recent study carried out in Uruguay, irrespective of their particular life histories, men from this generation tend to have an idealized idea of familiar life, which coexists with a contradicting new reality that emerged in the second half of the century (Amorín et al., 2006).

Unsurprisingly, men from this generation expressed the most "traditional" ideas about gender roles, but they also recognized undeniable changes and progressions. It was very interesting to see how these men acknowledged a process of personal transformation regarding beliefs about gender norms throughout their life, "just like the skin-changing," in Esteban's metaphor. This conclusion was unanimous across interviews: there has to be a process of adaptation to an unmistakable "new reality" that imposes itself upon them. The intensity of this transformation, nevertheless, varied greatly from one case to the next. Roberto remembers how:

> Woman, before, had to be the man's companion.… I was the man of the house and I had to work. Then she started to work because we needed more money.… I think men should work and women take care of the house. When I got home I also helped. If she had piles of clothes to wash, I would help her, even though my hands were still covered in grease from the factory.

Esteban described a similar process but interpreted it in different terms:

> You have to understand that women in Uruguay have progressively been gaining more and more space. Imagine what it was for men of my generation to assume that their wives wanted to work!… I'm not saying we don't have cavemen among men of my generation, surely we do, but, as one becomes older, you question things that were natural before about what it means to be a man, a father, husband and even an-ex husband!

Sometimes interviewees refer to a specific process of reevaluation regarding their conceptions of fatherhood and marriage. Esteban's quote is interesting in that he distinguishes intragenerational differences between what he sees as antiquated men that have not been able to adapt to modern times (cavemen) and others who, like him, have experienced processes of deeper transformation. In all the interviews, women's incorporation into the labor market was highlighted as the most prevalent and recognizable change in gender role assignment. In some of the cases, this change marked their personal life history (with their wife's entry into the labor market) and, in others, it was something they witnessed happening to other couples around them.

The interviewees echo one another a lot in terms of pointing at the feminization of labor as a defining moment for shifts in their gender identities. However, the explanations for why woman began to work are not framed in the same way. The differences in explanations are suggestive of underlying gendered assumptions. In the case of Juan, Roberto, and Carlos (all of them be-

longing to the lower income families) the explanation for this shift was economic necessity. Women begin to work because they had to, rather that because they wanted to or liked to. The underlying logic appears to be: women do not belong in the workplace but material conditions have forced them into it, *ergo*, we were forced to adjust. Carlos explained:

> Before women were in the house. Now, unfortunately, due to the economic situation she has to go out and work. With the salary of the owner of the house, it is just simply not enough. Look … I was born in a time that was more sexist that today but I also think that in that time there was not so much need for money. It was the time of fat cows, women didn't need to work![2]

In Carlos's quote it is possible to see how women's participation in the labor market is seen as something unfortunate in the sense that work, one of the main pillars of prevailing models of masculinity, becomes a responsibility which is shared with their partners (Jelin, 1998; Valdés & Olavarría, 1998). According to Valdés and Olvarría, men in popular strata usually find themselves in a dilemma due to the fact that their material conditions (precarious living conditions, unemployment) compromise their ability to be sole providers of the household. Interestingly, these "undesired conditions" are seen as something external (e.g., an economic crisis), something they cannot control, and, as such, are not conceptualized in terms of crisis. In a study about child rearing and housekeeping in Chilean working-class fathers, Olavarría argues that these men describe their partner's financial collaboration as "assistance" and "leftovers" rather than as main contributions to the family economy (2003, p. 336). This appraisal of woman's work as collaboration rather than equal participation as "breadwinners" was very apparent throughout among the first generation of men interviewed here.

By contrast, in the case of Esteban and Argelio, the two men with university degrees, women's incorporation into the labor market is framed in terms of rights and as need for professional fulfillment. However, one must be careful with interpreting these differences: not only have studies shown that men tend to overestimate their participation in the domestic sphere (Kimmel, 2000), but it must also be considered that men from social sectors with more resources tend to have maids and nannies that usually assume the larger part of childcare and domestic chores (Beattie, 2002; Gutmann, 1996).

In the case of Argelio, even though he spoke of women's incorporation into the labor market as a turning point, his wife was mostly in charge of caring for five children, and they had a nanny and a maid to perform domestic chores and supervise children. As Argelio explains:

---

[2] "Epoca de las vacas gordas" is a common expression to refer to Uruguayan prosperity in the past.

> I would say that the most radical revolution for my generation was that we began to work alongside women and we had to assume that they too had both the right and a desire to work. Some women, like my wife, decided to stay at home. It was just the way things were because I spent most of the day in the hospital seeing patients. But I always helped when she asked and I took and picked up the kids to and from school … my daughter, who is now an adult, works—she has a profession and I have always encouraged her.

Independently of their socio-economic status, these men have always linked a woman's entry into the labor market to a reorganization of the division of roles within the family. These men acknowledged some type of responsibility in house chores but this was usually expressed in terms of *helping* women rather than in terms of an equal share of the housework. They participate and help when asked to, but gender roles are nonetheless strongly naturalized to leave household and domestic work to women. Innovation, for most men in this generation, lies in recognizing that men should help women when required. This delegation of responsibility was justified by a man's heavier workload, which forced them to spend longer periods of time away from home.

These findings are supported by research carried out in other countries in Latin America, though with different population groups. Fuller, for example, has stated for the case of urban Peruvian men:

> Men may, and should, carry out domestic chores, but when they do this, it is perceived as help or as an expression of personal taste, not associated to their gender, and not as the contribution that corresponds to them as males within the domestic order. (2003, p. 3)

Many authors have emphasized how men's conceptions about mothers' and fathers' division of childcare constitute a pivotal dimension of their masculinity within domestic life. The men in this generation also placed special emphasis on the changes they see in the conception of fatherhood, though these changes appear to be less grounded in their own experiences as fathers. While throughout their childhood the father was usually seen as the disciplinary figure, someone to fear and to respect unconditionally, emerging relationships between father and son are decidedly more flexible and less cohesive. The new paradigm of fatherhood, in the discourses of these men, appears as incarnated in their grandchildren. Some exemplified the disciplinary nature that regulated father-son intergenerational relationships when they were young by sharing anecdotes of punishment. Carlos recalls:

> Today things are expressed more frankly and openly. Before, we couldn't say certain things to our own father, we had a special respect towards the authority of the house. I was beaten once for not saying good afternoon to the neighbor. The mother would cover many things up in order to protect you. Now children express themselves, they talk to their parents about everything. I see it with my grandchildren.

The socialization process was airtight and left little room for any type of improvisation. The men of this generation refer to strict behavior roles that regulated the way they were expected to interact with their parents. Three of the grandfathers explained this attribute of the socialization process by referring to the widespread assumption that boys would follow their father footsteps: "you even had to be fan of the same soccer team," said Carlos. Aurelio refers to the pressure he felt throughout his childhood to follow his father's footsteps in terms of career decisions: "My father was a doctor and so I was expected to be a doctor. Of course I was expecting my own boys to follow my footsteps and … they all became social scientists! I wonder if it was a form of reaction …."

Though they see changes in parental roles as positive, three interviewees resented what they describe as a social deterioration of the family institution. They referred to increasing divorce rates, lack of respect across generations, and a lack of commitment between men and women as examples of this. Roberto expressed a longing for the "good old romantic times" when he says that "courtship was important back then, before, we were serious … a man had to visit his girlfriend and go to her house, meet her family, and you invited her out if you saw her as your possible wife.… Now young people are 'amigovios,'[3] and so men get bored and change girlfriends all the time."

Growing Up in the 1960s: Conceptual Redefinitions, Ambivalent Behaviors

As globalization spread, the influence of events and movements taking place in other regions of the world began to impact the subjectivities of Uruguayan men and women faster and more profoundly than ever before. These included the spread of second-wave feminism from the United States and Europe, the effervescence of the May revolution in 1968, the triumph of the Cuban Revolution, the massive incorporation of birth control and changes in politics of the body, among others. There is no doubt that the continent was shaken, with profound implications for some of the men of this generation. The question remains, how far-reaching these events were in terms of masculine subjectivity, and how entrenched previous ways of decoding the world. It is important to consider case studies of real men in order to fill in the gaps which many times emerge from exaggerated cliché images of a generation that has been shrouded by a romantic mystique.

As we will see, there were conflicts, but there was also much continuity with the previous generation. Marcelo reflects:

> We are a transitional generation. My father's generation had strict gender roles that had remained unchanged for generations. But they had to face the appearance of women on the labor market, which is not a minor development. When we got married our women were already working. We are the

---

[3] Compound word: *amigos* (friends) and *novios* (boyfriend/girlfriend).

generation that is in charge of transmitting these new roles. My son's generation will be the first to have been raised with these values that promote gender equality.

Additionally, these men's lives were also affected by twelve long years of military dictatorship, which imposed great levels of repression and control over cultural and political activities, as well as a diffusion of fear among the population and great control over the bodies and appearance of individuals. Some of the men interviewed were directly affected by the repression during these years. Alberto, for example, remembers that "during the late 1960s our classmates were wearing mini-skirts. This was something radical that our parents could not understand. Then the dictatorship came and women in schools had to wear their skirts below the knees again …."

Ricardo's account is particularly interesting given its strong emotional overtone. He refers to a process of great personal grievance and suffering as a consequence of the social reconfiguration of his masculine identity. The prime "threat" to his personal masculinity was the feminist revolution. He was a revolutionary activist in the years before the coup:

> In the sixties there was a cultural "Big Bang" in the world that radically affected all the spheres of everyday life. Many men in my generation got married in the pre-feminist world and then, suddenly, woke up in a world in which our women were demanding more equal relationships and empowerment. It was so dramatic, that many relationships didn't resist this. I was raised in a typical patriarchal family. Naturally, I also tried to reproduce this in my own marriage. This had an existential impact. It is not easy to construct relationships during structural changes.

According to these accounts the most important factor that caused their identities to shake was not so much economic but cultural. It was not so much that women were working, but that they were questioning some basic assumptions that up to that point were taken for granted. As Ricardo's quote illustrates, some of the premises upon which these men had built their gender identity, incorporated through a process of socialization in the home, came to be questioned by their co-generational partners.

It was possible to find certain levels of *problematization* regarding the real extent of the idea of "equal gender distribution" for the house chores. When asked to reflect on gender roles and norms, the mirroring generation (i.e., reference) always pointed to their parent's generation as "traditional" and "sexist" within the domestic sphere. Their discourse about this issue is replete with contradiction between what they think ought to be (*normative dimension*) and what is felt to be actual (*experiential dimension*). The "ought to" appears as much more ingrained and internalized in the case of these men than in the previous generation of men (their fathers). The main contradiction that these men appear to be experiencing is not so much that their wives are working and earning re-

spectable salaries (sometimes more than their husband), but rather that when the wife returns from work, they are also doing most of the housework.

Sebastian's account evokes this very concept:

> What happened to my generation was that, though most women were working, they were also doing most of the work within the house. I definitely do not reproduce my father's model, of not doing *anything* in the house and my mother also worked. But my wife does more ….

Hochschild and Machung (1989) discuss the "stalled revolution" in reference to this contradiction. Studies in neighboring Argentina have shown, for example, that even though many women are working outside the home, they are still doing the larger part of childcare and housework (Wainerman, 2007). Women have little choice but to take on what is known as a woman's double shift, or where income levels allow it, to seek domestic support of maids, replacing one woman for another (Olvarría, 2006). Here again it is possible to see what was seen in the previous generations; that the men from more affluent sectors reported to have maids at one point in their lives. This is consistent with research which found that the likelihood of a Uruguay family contracting domestic service is strongly and positively associated to income (Amarante & Espino, 2008).

Interestingly, however, the largest existential dilemmas emerged when these men were asked to reflect upon their parenting experiences. Most subjects said that they are not completely aware of how to fulfill the increasing expectations of what a father ought to be. These men recognize the importance of greater physical and emotional closeness, but they do not always know how exactly to provide it. "You don't get to go to an academy that teaches you how to become a father, so you inevitably make mistakes," said Ignacio. Marcelo explained that the gap between parenting expectations and reality has increased due to structural limitations: "We have important social constraints: those of poverty…. Fathers of newborns in Uruguay are given 3 days off work! How can you be supportive of your wife and become an available figure for your children like this?" The two men with lower socio-economic status referred to the fact that economic necessity has forced them to spend a lot of time out of the house, limiting the time they could spend with their children: "When you get home from work at 10 pm after going to two jobs, your kids are already in bed …" (Alberto).

In their study of the popular sectors of Medellín, Colombia, Dominique de Suremain and Acevedo (1999) examined the crisis that emerged with the new social and parenting demands on fathers. All of the men interviewed in this study described their fathering experiences as a constant exercise of "trial and error." While the previous generation referred to their parenting roles in very abstract terms, the behavioral repertoire of these men with respect to parenting reflects greater participation on their part than the previous generation.

These men refer to a vast number of discrete activities that account for their fatherhood experience and place emphasis on quality more than the quantity of the time shared with their children. Ricardo's account describes this idea:

If I compare my role as father with my father's, I would say that the communication with my children is much more explicit, verbal, and direct. I'm not saying my father didn't love us; he was the figure of moral authority, though my mother did most of the talking. This closeness, which is even physical, was not there. As a father, I was usually the one in charge of taking my children out to the park, playing with them, and telling bedtime stories. I became quite an expert at changing diapers. I am certainly more close to my children than I ever was with my father and I believe this to be a great privilege.

Here the prevalent discursive maneuver was comparing their experiences as father with their own experience as children. This is similar to what Olvarría (2003) found for the Chilean case. When speaking about the raising of their own children they depict a more positive relationship, one that is more egalitarian and emotionally intimate than the one they experienced as children.

THE FUTURE GENERATION: CRITICISM AND UNCERTAINTY

Donfut and Wolff (2005) state that in order for a generation to recognize itself as such, and be so recognized, it must be succeeded by an entire generation in order to allow for differentiation. Thus, it is impossible to refer to this group as a unique and definable generation, as they are still in the process of establishing themselves. These young men have grown up in a period of subverting gender roles with mothers that participate in the labor markets alongside with their fathers and female classmates that participate in the education system alongside them. While the previous generation of women was leading the struggle for equal rights, women in this generation are fighting battles of inclusion and more covert forms of gender discrimination. If the discourses of the previous generations reflects contradiction and crisis, those of this generation reflect criticism and skepticism. These men mostly showed a spontaneous and sincere critique of many aspects of their gender socialization and prevalent double standards regarding gender roles. They admitted that they themselves many times reproduce these contradictions but did not appear to live with this guilt. It is important to highlight that none of these men were fathers and therefore their reflection of parenting and gender only referred to their experiences as sons.

Upon arrival at Jaime's house, he was ironing shirts in his room. The interviewer asked him if ironing was something he was accustomed to doing: "It's the first time I do this and I am about to burn my father's shirts!!! He's flying tomorrow on a business trip. He paid me to do it (laughs)." When asked about whether this was a common distribution of roles he continued: "My fam-

ily is not a typical family. My father has no problem in cooking; he cooks when he wants or when my mother asks him to. Look: I'm ironing his shirts and not my mother. She would never iron his shirts, my father, who works more than my mother, wakes up at 8 o'clock to iron his shirts. In any other family it would be the mother."

This interaction summarizes some current contradictions which exist across many Uruguayan households. Though women work, their contribution is still viewed as "help," rather than an equal share of finances, and likewise a man's participation in house chores is still seen as exceptional by some of the third generation young men. For this generation it was clear that the egalitarian distribution of domestic work was not only necessary but desirable and positive. Some of these young men were very critical of the real extent of these transformations in their families. For example, although they would acknowledge that their fathers are doing chores, they placed special emphasis on the contradictory dimension of these acts. "Now every man knows what things ought to be like. My father knows perfectly well but maybe he doesn't do it in practice. In theory I am a genius but in practice … that is another thing" (Jaime).

Though the main area of concern of this study was how these men interpret and conceptualize their role as men within the family, the distance between theory and practice was brought up constantly by this generation. Interviews clarified how the expectations that many had about what it means to "share" household responsibilities has increased both quantitatively and qualitatively from generation to generation. Men across generations tended to overestimate their participation within the domestic sphere. It is very likely, nonetheless, that these men truly perceive themselves as far more egalitarian than previous generations of men. Further research is necessary in order to detect possible factors that may be operating to hinder changes in practices.

Conflicting perceptions are illustrated by this comparison of gender roles between a father and son of a same family:

Father: In all families I know, everyone helps the mother. Now we teach the children to make their own beds, and pick up the dishes. Before it was different, there were six brothers and I still can't understand how my mother managed.

Son: It is still very unfair. In all families I know it is the woman that keeps the house in order, cleans, and cooks. Even if she works. My mother works and she is the one that cleans, makes the beds!

Members of the third generation expressed ideas about gender norms and roles that had not appeared in previous generations. Though not ubiquitously expressed, we discuss them here as they depart from the gender discourses we anticipated to find in this generation. First, some subjects expressed that a tendency towards sexism was as much women's fault as it was men's, as they are often themselves culpable of perpetuating gender stereotypes. "When you

think about it," says Martin, "women are more sexist than men." This leads to what some men called *double double-standard* and a prevailing social hypocrisy with regards to gender normative behavior. Leo said dating scene framing was symptomatic of this: "Men are also oppressed currently. Women say they want equal treatment but when you go out on a date they are always expecting you to pay the bill and open the car door for them."

Two men stated that many times the "gender equality" talk taken to an extreme negates what, according to them, "are inherent differences among sexes" (Jaime). Some of these men were not afraid to say that, not only do they think that women and men are biologically and emotionally different ("I guess its natural, supra-social;" Andres) but that sameness is not even desirable. The absence of the guilt component present in their father's generation enabled these men to assume a more "critical" and sincere approach when discussing issues of gender. Additionally, this was the only generation that mentioned the effect of media in the reproduction of certain gender stereotypes.

> We have the same rights but this does not mean everyone should do the same. One will do some things and the other will do others. That is exemplified in having children, one is biologically apt for giving birth and the other is not! Also, I think we have to remember that mass media plays a very important role in shaping the images we have of what a women and men are. (Agustin).

When referring to their experiences as sons, the figure of the *father* was still mostly portrayed as more disciplinary in nature than the mother, and less present: "You still have the big threat: 'I'm going to tell your father when he gets home,'" says Alvaro. When asked to specify the differences between the tasks of their mother and father, most interviewees in this generation attributed affectionate care to their mothers, and punishment to their fathers. Nevertheless, these young men declare to communicate more and have a more affectionate relationship with their fathers than what they experienced between their fathers and grandfathers. They also sometimes recognized changes in their father's role: "I'm the oldest of three children and I see how my father has made great progress in being a dad … he hugs you and can say he loves you," says Leo. They stressed that many times they turned to their father's for advice on specific issues (e.g., "sexuality, politics") or before making important decisions. When thinking about the types of fathers they would like to become, most of them manifested a desire to play a more active role than their fathers did.

In three of the interviews the young man expressed discontent regarding the definition of a family's decreasing weight within Uruguayan society. Even though they welcome the less rigid structures of family life, they also view modernity as hindering the intimacy and unity that once characterized families in the past. Martin's description about the decreasing importance of "the family" in people's life has a tone of disappointment that echoes the melancholy of members of the eldest generation: "Sunday lunch with the family:

there's a tradition that we have lost. The mother works, the father works, so the children remain with the nanny or go to kindergarten. I miss that, Sundays with the extended family, with the big long tables; now everyone is in a hurry and there is no time for the family."

Discussion and Conclusion

Despite the fact that discourses can serve as opportune "windows," they prove not only plural but often contradictory. Further studies are still needed in order to assess what extent the shifts in men's discourses coincide with substantive shifts in practices. It was possible to see how men's notions of equality among the sexes are always relationally defined and that other acknowledged generations play an important role in this definition of the self.

Although this paper illustrates how women's entrance into the public sphere is often analyzed through the class lens, the influence of socio-economic status in perceptions of masculinity requires further exploration in a wider sample of cases. The present recruitment strategy and resource constraints impeded access to extremely vulnerable sectors of society. All except one of our interviewees from low income families attended high school.

The events which shape a man's identity vary from one generation and context to the other. Though national historical contexts are necessary to understand many of these men's discourses, many of the themes of generational differences seem to support a line of similar studies of intergenerational research carried out in Europe and the United States. Comparative studies are needed in order to further assess what, if anything, is distinct about the Latin American case, and what is distinct about these processes as taking place across nations.

References

Alvarez, S. (1990). *Engendering democracy in Brazil: Women's movements in transition politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Amarante, V., & Espino, A. (2008). Situación del servicio doméstico en Uruguay [Situation of the domestic service in Uruguay]. In: *Uruguay: Broadening the labor opportunity for women*. Montevideo: Montevideo INMUJER/World Bank.

Amorín, D., Berriel, F., Carril, E., Güida, C., Paredes, M., et al. (2006). *Proyecto género y generaciones: Reproducción biológica y social de la población uruguaya* [Gender and generations project: Biological and social reproduction of Uruguayan population]. Vol. 1. Montevideo: Trilce.

Atal, J. P., Ñopo, H., & Winder, N. (2009). *New century, old disparities: Gender and ethnic wage gaps in Latin America*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank, Department of Research and Chief Economist. Working Papers Series No. 109.

Attias-Donfut, C., & Segalen, M. (2002). The construction of grandparenthood. *Current Sociology, 50*(2), 281-294.

Attias-Donfut, C., & Wolff, F.-C. (2000). The redistributive effects of generational transfers. In S. Arber & C. Attias-Donfut (Eds.), *The myth of generational conflict: The family and state in ageing societies* (pp. 22-46). New York: Routledge.

Attias-Donfut, C., & Wolff, F.-C. (2005). Generational memory and family relationships. In M.L. Johnson (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of age and ageing* (pp. 443-454). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Barker, G. (2006). Men's participation as fathers in Latin America and the Caribbean: Critical literature review and policy options In I. Bannon & M.C. Correia (Eds.), *The other half of gender: Men's issues in development* (pp. 43-72). Washington, DC: World Bank.

Batthyány, K. (2004). Las mujeres en Uruguay: Breve descripción de la situación social y económica [Women in Uruguay: Brief description of the social and economic situation]. In: *Cuidado infantil y trabajo: ¿Un desafío exclusivamente femenino?; Una mirada desde el género y la ciudadanía social* (pp. 66-82). Montevideo: CINTERFOR.

Bawin-Legros, B. (2002). Introduction. Filiation and identity: Towards a sociology of intergenerational relations. *Current Sociology, 50*(2), 175-183.

Beattie, P.M. (2002). Beyond machismos: Recent examinations of masculinities in Latin America. *Men and Masculinities, 4*(3), 303-308.

Bengtson, V.L. (2001). The Burgess Award lecture: Beyond the nuclear family: The increasing importance of multigenerational bonds. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*(1), 1-16.

Bergtson, V.L., Furlong, M.J., & Robert, L.S. (1974). Time, aging, and the continuity of social structure: Themes and issues in generational analysis. *Journal of Social Issues, 30*(2), 1-31.

Brannen, J., & Nilsen, A. (2006). From fatherhood to fathering: Transmission and change among British fathers in four-generation families. *Sociology, 40*(2), 335-352.

Chen, Z.-y., & Kaplan, H.B. (2001). Intergenerational transmission of constructive parenting. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*(1), 17-31.

Connell, R.W. (1995). *The social organization of masculinity in Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California.

Connell, R.W. (1998). El imperialismo y el cuerpo de los hombres [Imperialism and men's bodies]. In T. Valdes & J. Olavarria (Eds.), *Masculinidades y equidad de género en América Latina* (pp. 76-89). Santiago: Flacso-Chile.

Corral, N., & Paez, O. (1980). *Crisis de las parejas en el exilio* [Crisis of couples in exile]. Lima: Comisión Evangélica Latinoamericana de Educación Cristiana.

Cunningham, M. (2001). The influence of parental attitudes and behaviors on children's attitudes toward gender and household labor in early adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*(1), 111-122.

Feuer, L.S. (1969). *The conflict of generations: The character and significance of student movements.* London: Heinemann.

Fuller, N. (1997). Fronteras y retos: Varones de clase media del Perú [Boarder and challenges: Middle class Peruvian men]. (S. Hernández & O. Jiménez, Trans.). In T. Valdes & J. Olavarria (Eds.), *Masculinidad/es: Poder y crisis* (pp. 139-152). Santiago: ISIS Internacional and FLACSO, Eds. De las Mujeres Nº24.

Fuller, N. (2001). The social constitution of gender identity among Peruvian men. *Men and Masculinities, 3*(3), 316-331.

Fuller, N. (2003). The social construction of gender identity among Peruvian males. In M.C. Gutmann (Ed.), *Changing men and Masculinities in Latin America* (pp. 134-152). Durham, NC: Duke Univeristy Press.

Giddens, A. (1994). *The transformation of intimacy. Sexuality, love and eroticism in modern societies*. London: Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gutmann, M.C. (1996). *The meaning of macho: Being a man in Mexico City.* . Berkeley & London: University of California Press.

Gutmann, M.C., & Vigoya, M.V. (2005). Masculinities in Latin America In M.S. Kimmel, J. Hearn & R.W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of studies on men and masculinities* (pp. 114-128). Thousand Oaks, Ca: SAGE.

Hearn, J., & Collinson, D.L. (1994). Theorizing unities and differences between men and between masculinities. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 97-118). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Henao, H. (1997). Un hombre en casa: La imagen del padre de hoy: Papeles y valores que destacan 400 encuestados en Medellín [Man in the house: Images of fatherhood today. Roles and values of 400 interviewees in Medellin]. *Nómadas*, *6*, 115-124.

Hochschild, A., & Machung, A. (1989). *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home*. New York: Viking-Penguin.

ILO-UNDP. (2009). *Work and family: Towards new forms of reconciliation with social co-responsibility*. Santiago: International Labour Organization and United Nations Development Programme.

Jelin, E. (1994). Las familias en América Latina [Families in Latin America]. In: *Familias siglo XXI,* Ediciones de las mujeres, No. 20. Santiago de Chile: ISIS Internacional.

Jelin, E. (1998). *The economies of gender*. 2nd ed. Malden: MA: Blackwell.

Kimmel, M. (1998). El desarrollo (de género) del subdesarrollo de género: La producción simultanea de masculinidades hegemónicas y dependientes en Europa y Estados Unidos [The development (of gender) of undevelopment (of gender). The simoultaneos production of hegemonic masculinities and dependents in Europe and the United States]. In T. Valdes & J. Olavarria (Eds.), *Masculinidades y equidad de género en América Latina* (pp. 207-217). Santiago de Chile: FLACSO.

Kimmel, M. (2000). *The gendered society*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Malvasio, G. (2004). Black women in Uruguay: Ethnic differences. *Women's Health Journal*, *1*, 54-61.

Mannheim, K. (1993[1952]). The problem of generations. In K.H. Wolff (Ed.), *From Karl Mannheim* (2nd ed., pp. 351-398). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Olvarría, J. (2003). Men at home? Childrearing and housekeeping among Chilean working-class fathers. In M.C. Gutmann (Ed.), *Changing men and masculinities in Latin America* (pp. 333-350). Durham, NC: Duke Univeristy Press.

Olvarría, J. (2006). Men's gender relations, identity and work/family balance in Latin America In I. Bannon & M.C. Correia (Eds.), *The other half of gender: Men's issues in development* (pp. 29-42). Washington, DC: World Bank.

Patton, M.Q. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods.* Beverly Hills, CA:: Sage Publications.

Rivas, F., & Rossi, M. (2000). *Wage Discrimination in Uruguay (1991-1997)*. Department of Economics, University of Uruguay.

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069.* New York: Morrow.

Suremain, M.D.D., & Acevedo, O.F. (1999). *Dónde están los padres ...?* [Where are the fathers …?]. Bogota: Red Mujer y Hábitat LAC, ENDA América Latina Programa Medellín.

Tolson, A. (1977). *The limits of masculinity*. London: Tavistock.

Valdés, T., & Olavarría, J. (1998). Ser hombre en Santiago de Chile: A pesar de todo, un mismo modelo [Being a man in Santiago de Chile: All in all, a same model]. In T. Valdes & J. Olavarria (Eds.), *Masculinidades y equidad de género en América Latina* (pp. 12-35). Santiago de Chile: FLACSO.

Vigoya, M.V. (2001). Contemporary Latin American perspectives on masculinity. *Men and Masculinities, 3*(3), 237-260.

Viveros, M. (1998). Quebrados y cumplidores: Bibliografías diversas de la masculinidad [Broken and reliable: Diverse bibliographies of masculinities]. In T. Valdes & J. Olavarria (Eds.), *Masculinidades y equidad de género en América Latina* (pp. 36-55). Santiago de Chile: FLACSO.

Wainerman, C. (2007). Conyugalidad y paternidad. ¿Una revolución estancada? [Married life and paternity. A stalled revolution?]. In M. Gutiérrez (Ed.), *Género, familias y trabajo: Rupturas y continuidades. Desafíos para la investigación política* (pp. 179-222). Buenos Aires: CLACSO, Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales

Wilkie, J.R. (1993). Changes in U.S. men's attitudes toward the family provider role, 1972-1989. *Gender and Society, 7*(2), 261-279.

Exhuming the History of Feminist Masculinity: Condorcet, 18th Century Radical Male Feminist

Abstract This work addresses bell hooks's call for the development of an alternative to patriarchal masculinity which she calls feminist masculinity. Patriarchal masculinity has convinced most men and women that the development of different forms of masculinity goes against our biological nature. Yet there exists a history of men's experiences that contradicts this perspective and amounts to, I argue, men's feminist history. In particular I argue that the life and work of French *philosophe* Condorcet constitutes a historical cornerstone for feminist masculinity. An important implication of this work is the understanding that gender dissolution is not the only strategy capable of rectifying gender inequality. Siding with a range of feminist perspectives, from ecofeminism and Black feminism, I contend that we can accomplish much through a critical reconstruction of men and masculinity, including the reevaluation of historic figures such as Condorcet.

keywords Nicolas de Condorcet (1743-1794), feminist masculinity, women's rights, enlightenment

In her work, *Feminism is for Everybody*, bell hooks writes that men need a "vision of masculinity where self-esteem and self-love of one's unique being forms the basis of identity" (2000, p. 70). Today, the dominant form of masculinity is formed in opposition to femininity (Adams & Coltrane, 2005), valorizes "acts and attitudes of independence, aggression, and sexuality" (Reed, 2005, p. 232), and "teaches men that [men's] sense of self and identity, their reason for being, resides in their capacity to dominate others" (hooks, 2000, p. 70). This patriarchal masculine identity promotes the domination "of the planet, of less powerful men, of women and children" (hooks, 2000, p. 70). To counteract this form of masculinity, hooks calls for the development of an identity which does not insist that men retreat from their maleness in order to become compassionate, humane, loving people. She calls for the development of a vision of "feminist masculinity" in order to challenge male domination of the planet, less powerful men, women, and children. Yet hooks laments that such

[a] Florida Atlantic University.

All correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Jeff Nall, doctoral candidate in Comparative Studies: Feminism, Gender, and Sexuality at Florida Atlantic University. Email: jnall2@fau.edu.

a "vision has yet to be made fully clear by feminist thinkers male or female" (2000, p. 70).

In response, below I make the case for the critical reclamation of masculinity by examining a marginalized model in history. Specifically, I assess the life and work of French *philosophe* Condorcet as a historic example of feminist masculinity as a significant refutation of the deeply seeded belief that masculinity and maleness are synonymous with domination and violence. I make the case that Condorcet's revolutionary contribution to anti-sexist thought and practice has not been thoroughly recognized. Moreover, I contend that his life and work provide an important link between men and the development of feminist thought, as well as an important historical model of feminist masculinity. Condorcet's case makes it clear that male feminism is not a contemporary anomaly and that the naturalized domination-based male identity is but one form of masculinity.

MASCULINITY AND MASTER CONSCIOUSNESS

I begin this work by addressing what I understand as the foundation upon which gender inequality is based. Placed in the broader context of feminist theory we should understand patriarchal masculinity as a component of a larger, "complex dominator identity" which environmental philosopher Val Plumwood calls *master consciousness* or *master identity* (Plumwood, 1993, p. 5). Starting from a fundamental confidence in the superiority of a select number of individuals who constitute the archetypes for humanity, master identity is "formed in the context of class, race species and gender domination," and proffers a naturalized ideal of humanity based on transcending nature, necessity, and femininity (pp. 5, 23). This worldview of mastery and colonization is legitimated by the master's logic of dualism.

Dualisms facilitate and justify the domination of one group over another by promoting the appropriation and incorporation of the objectified and subordinated "other" "into the selfhood and culture of the master, which forms their identity" (Plumwood, 1993, p. 41). The dualism male/female, for instance, is part of a number of interlocking dualisms including mind/body, reason/emotion, culture/nature, men/women, among others (Plumwood, p. 43). Patricia Hill Collins similarly identifies this intellectual schema as implying "relations of superiority and inferiority, hierarchical bonds that mesh with political economies of race, gender and class oppression" (2009, p. 78). Dualisms "systematically and pervasively" construct one identity as superior and another as necessarily inferior (Plumwood, p. 47). This directly speaks to the previously noted definition of masculinity as being formed through the exclusion or denial of femininity. "Dualism is the process by which contrasting concepts (for example, masculine and feminine gender identities) are formed by domination and subordination and constructed as oppositional and exclusive" (Plumwood, p. 31). Thus, master consciousness, which hooks calls "dominator culture," pro-

motes the formation of identity around manipulation, control, and violence (hooks, 2004, pp. 115-116). Particularly directed toward men, master consciousness (dominator culture) teaches us that men are "biologically hard-wired" "to dominate and control others," and that men are naturally predisposed to a predatory social existence (pp. 115-116).

Where poststructuralists emphasize the limits and oppressiveness in identitarian politics, feminist thinkers including Collins (2009), hooks (2004), and Plumwood (1993) argue that social identities are capable of bringing people together and empowering them in social struggles: "Social identities are also sources of empowerment and connection, of stability and continuity, which make it possible to draw on and contribute to wide social sources of meaning and practice" (Plumwood, p. 63). Plumwood acknowledges that social identities such as "woman" and "man" are problematic because of the way in which power relations form them. Yet she contends that such identities "are capable of liberatory or subversive reconstruction without total demolition and abandonment" (p. 63). The critical and qualified affirmation of subjugated categories of being "is essential to counter the logic of the master subject, who inferiorises women both individually and culturally, backgrounds and devalues their works, and defines them as peripheries to the master's centre" (p. 63).

Fundamental to the dismantling of a dualism is the "reconstruction of relationship and identity in terms of a non-hierarchical concept of difference" (Plumwood, 1993, p. 60). One of the specific strategies Plumwood mentions is that of thwarting incorporation or relational definition, a salient aspect of dualistic logic, through reclaiming "positive independent sources of identity and [affirming] resistance." Indeed, Connell and Messerschmidt contend that the concept of hegemonic masculinity acknowledges "the possibility of democratizing gender relations, of abolishing power differentials, not just of reproducing hierarchy" (2010, p. 224). Moreover, the concept recognizes the possibility and the desirability of "a version of masculinity open to equality with women" gaining ascendancy. Positioned within this theoretical context, the concept of feminist masculinity is used to recognize the aspects of masculinity exhibited by men past and present which cohere with a feminist vision of social being. Implicit in this recognition is the position that men and masculinity are categories which remain politically and socially powerful.

In line with Plumwood and Collins's recognition of the power and significance of social identities, hooks calls for a critical reclamation of masculinity and its liberation from the patriarchal definition. In hooks's view, the identification of masculinity and maleness with domination is a misguided reaction to patriarchal masculinity which fails to "separate maleness and manhood from all the identifying traits patriarchy has imposed on the self that has a penis" (2004, p. 115). The problem with men is not their maleness or masculinity. hooks writes that visionary feminism must "restore maleness and masculinity as an ethical biological category divorced from the dominator model" (p. 114). Feminist masculinity rejects patriarchal masculinity and its identification of

maleness with supremacy and domination. Rather, feminist masculinity defines "maleness as a state of being rather than as performance. Male being, maleness, masculinity must stand for the essential core goodness of the self, of the human body that has a penis" (p. 115). hooks further contends that we should replace the assumption that males are born inherently aggressive with the assumption that they "are born with the inherent will to connect" (p. 117). Men do not need to forsake maleness. Rather, men need to engage in an active transformation through resistance to the patriarchal, socially constructed identity of masculinity, and the creative formation of a masculine identity which is based on love rather than domination (p. 115). Such a feminist masculine identity would be based on a partnership model of being that "sees interbeing and interdependency as the organic relationship of all living beings. In the partnership model selfhood, whether one is female or male, is always at the core of one's identity" (p. 117).

Moreover, developing feminist masculinity requires more than abstract, theoretical contemplation. Part of envisioning feminist masculinity is reinterpreting the lives and works of male feminists. Collins writes that one method of undermining the logic of domination responsible for oppression is to explore and validate marginalized epistemological perspectives that fundamentally reject "dimensions of knowledge that perpetuate objectification, commodification, and exploitation" (2009, p. 308). Specific to her interest in Black feminist thought, she writes that bringing to light marginalized black women's thought requires "discovering, reinterpreting, and, in many cases, analyzing for the first time the works of individual U.S. Black women thinkers who were so extraordinary that they did manage to have their ideas preserved. In some cases this process involves locating unrecognized and unheralded works, scattered and long out of print" (Collins, p. 16). Similarly, recognizing and analyzing feminist masculine models furthers the project of exposing the ideological agenda inherent in monolithic portrayals of manhood as though one single model existed. "Just as theories, epistemologies, and facts produced by any group of individuals represent the standpoints and interests of their creators, the very definition of who is legitimated to do intellectual work is not only politically contested, but is changing (Mannheim, 1936; Gramsci, 1971)" (Collins, p. 19). Turning to history to consider the lives of men who have exhibited a kind of feminist masculine being provides men with what hooks describes as important "new models of self-assertion that do not require the construction of an enemy 'other,' be it a woman or the symbolic feminine, for them to define themselves against" (2004, p.114). As I will show, Condorcet's life and work provide an important alternative model of masculinity to patriarchal masculinity.

CONDORCET

On 17 September 1743, Condorcet was born into nobility and was bequeathed an ancient family name (Baker, 1976, p. vii). He would go on to be-

come a class-traitor by becoming France's "first figure of standing" to become an outright republican (McLean, 1994, pp. 20-21; Williams, 2004). Condorcet was "[f]iercely protected by his mother" and "remained exclusively under her influence for the first nine years of his life" (Williams, 2004, p. 10). Williams writes that Condorcet looked back on those years "with great affection." He was given a Jesuit education as a child only to become more fiercely critical of traditional, organized religion than Voltaire (McLean, 1994). Indeed, it was Condorcet's anonymously published anti-clerical work, *Letters of a Theologian* (1774) which initiated Condorcet's life-long commitment to political life and social reform (Baker, 1976).

Years after establishing himself as a mathematical genius in the French intellectual world, Condorcet began what would become a life-ending foray into France's revolutionary politics. In 1789 Condorcet was elected to the municipality of Paris, and participating in writing France's *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen*. Three years later he was elected to the new Legislative Assembly and became president of the assembly the following year. When the Legislative Assembly gave way to the National Convention, Condorcet, who identified with the Girondins, secured a spot in the new government. But Condorcet's opposition to the violent extremism of the Jacobins soon imperiled his life. When Condorcet spoke out against the Constitution proposed by Robespierre and the Jacobins, his arrest was called for on charges of conspiracy. Condorcet went into hiding fearing that he would share the fate of his guillotined associates. During this time he authored both his best-known work, *Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind* (posthumously published in 1795), and a letter to his young daughter, Eliza. He was eventually arrested, and found dead in his cell two days later, March 29th 1794 (Baker, 1976; McLean, 1994).

While aspects of Condorcet's contribution to the field of mathematics, the 18th-century notion of progress, and the French revolution are known among some scholars, his contributions to anti-sexist thought and practice and his example of feminist masculinity have not been widely recognized. If Condorcet is known among scholars of European history, he is almost nonexistent to everyday men globally. Why does this matter? As I will argue below, Condorcet, as a man, puts forward a very different kind of masculinity than the prevailing patriarchal masculinity most men know today as masculinity "as such." Condorcet's calls for equality among men and women were so daring that his works seem more likely to have been written during the 1970s than the 1790s. At a time when writers like Mary Wollstonecraft and other intellectuals were debating whether or not women deserved to be thoroughly educated, Condorcet made the then radical suggestion that women be given the right to vote and participate in their own governance. He even asserted that the main differences between men and women were a product of social conditioning, not innate capacities. Perhaps most importantly, Condorcet's political and public pronouncements were accompanied by the practical application of such

views and ideals in his personal life. In my view, it is imperative that legacy of men like Condorcet be given greater attention so that men may acquaint themselves an unheralded, empathy-driven, women-respecting model of masculinity.

<div align="center">Condorcet's Public Pronouncements on Women's Unequal Status</div>

Condorcet rejected as unfounded any notion of male intellectual superiority and argued that the only solution to women's unjust treatment was securing of their right to participate in the political process. Condorcet's first radical statement in support of women's rights came in 1787, a year after his marriage to Sophie de Grouchy. In the second letter of "Letters from a Freeman of New Haven," Condorcet argued that if all men were entitled to equal treatment on the premise that they are sentient beings who are "capable of reason and moral ideas," that is, natural rights, "then women should have precisely the same rights" (Condorcet, 1994, p. 298). Condorcet charged that "no true republic has ever yet existed" since "never in any so-called free constitution have women had the right of citizenship." He specifically criticized laws that disallowed women's eligibility for "public functions." The only people who should be excluded from public offices are "those people who had been tried and found guilty of certain crimes and those in domestic service." He declared that "no law should exclude women from any post." In what may have been his boldest and least popular political statement on behalf of women, Condorcet goes so far as to declare that women have the right to refuse to pay taxes levied by parliaments due to their being robbed of political representation. This statement alone places Condorcet firmly in the earliest feminist canon, and sets him apart from the majority of men of his day. As we will see below, Condorcet's uncommon position on women in society was premised on a disbelief in men's superiority over women.

Two years before Mary Wollstonecraft published *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, Condorcet wrote *On the Admission of Women to the Rights of Citizenship* (1790). Published on July 3, the work criticized "philosophers and legislators" among others for violating "the principle of equality of rights in calmly depriving half of the human race of the right of taking part in the formation of laws" (1976, p. 97). The work "aroused debates in the journals, the clubs and in the 'Cercle social'" (Aulard cited in Brookes, 1980, p. 338). Taking aim at even his fellow philosophers, Condorcet disparaged them all for failing to realize the hypocrisy of invoking the principle of equality to garner rights for a small group of men, while ignoring the plight of "half the human race" (1976, pp. 97-98). He blamed "custom" for making not only men but also women numb to the injustice of violating natural rights. Condorcet again argued that women are equally entitled to the rights of men based on the fact that they, too, "are sentient beings, capable of acquiring moral ideas and of reasoning concerning these ideas." The "rights of man" were firmly grounded in the principle that

men are in fact sentient beings capable of such thought and reasoning. So Condorcet reasoned that it made no sense to exclude one sex from this equation: "Either no individual of the human species has any true rights, or all have the same. And he who votes against the rights of another, of whatever religion, color, or sex, has thereby abjured his own." This statement immediately speaks to a rejection of patriarchal thought's formation of masculine identity through dualistic exclusions and othering.

In order to appreciate the uniqueness and poignancy of Condorcet's work on women, we must contrast his view of women with the dominant thinking and discourse among his intellectual contemporaries, some of whom were his friends and mentors. Roy Porter writes that the "*philosophes* did not generally commit themselves to the general emancipation of women as men's equals" (2001, pp. 45-46). According to Barbara Brookes, French philosophers including Montesquieu, Diderot, and d'Alembert "were tentative in their claims" and "did not present a coherent sustained argument to counter the prevailing ideas of woman's assumed biological, and therefore social, inferiority" (1980, p. 297).

One reason the Enlightenment's leading thinkers within and outside France were absolutely silent on women's enfranchisement is precisely their belief that women were in fact biologically inferior to men. In particular, enlightenment thinkers such as Montesquieu, Kant, and Rousseau upheld longstanding patriarchal beliefs that women were fundamentally inferior to men. Joan B. Landes writes that Montesquieu actively encouraged "the domestication of women" and that his ideas were implemented during and after the French Revolution: "Indeed, the new symbolic order of nineteenth-century bourgeois society was predicated on the silencing of public women" (1988, p. 38). This is apparent in Montesquieu's renowned work, *The Spirit of Laws*, published in 1748. In its seventh volume, Montesquieu explicitly states that it is "contrary to reason and nature that women should reign in families, as was customary among the Egyptians" (2002, p. 108). His conclusion is based on the premise that women's "natural weakness does not permit them to have the pre-eminence" necessary for the job. Whereas Condorcet views inequality as the bane of any society, including sex-based subjugation, Montesquieu explains that an overabundance of equality is harmful to the state. "The principle of democracy is corrupted not only when the spirit of equality is extinct," he writes, "but likewise when they fall into a spirit of extreme equality, and when each citizen would fain be upon a level with those whom he has chosen to command him" (p. 109). Writing very much from the mainstream of 18th-century intellectual thought, Montesquieu expressly defended the patriarchal world order. Too much equality would likely reduce respect for government leaders, old age, parents, while "deference to husbands will be likewise thrown off, and submission to masters." Speaking directly to the patriarchal thought model which continues to inform the prevailing form of masculinity today, Montesquieu warns that equality threatens male domination: "Wives, children, slaves will shake off all subjection. No longer will there be any such thing as manners, order, or virtue."

Perhaps influenced by the views of men like Montesquieu, both Kant and Rousseau also proffered outright misogynistic views of women. In his 1764 work, *Observations on Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime*, Kant rebukes calls for equal education for women, pointing to the female sex's natural inclination toward "all that is beautiful, elegant, and decorated" (1995, p. 581). Kant also warns that if women are educated like men they run the risk of destroying "the merits that are proper to her sex." According to Kant, Providence has instilled "kind and benevolent sensations, a fine feeling for propriety, and a compassionate soul" in the "fair sex," in place of principles which he thinks women are "hardly" capable of possessing (p. 583). In *Emile*, written two years prior, Rousseau concludes that women are predisposed to a life of indolent occupation, noting that boys generally like movement and noisy activities while girls are drawn to dolls and pretty things (1995, p. 577). Explaining his recommendation of instilling women with docility, Rousseau writes that such a quality will be needed during her life given that "she will always be in the subjection to a man, or to man's judgment, and she will never be free to set her own opinion above his" (pp. 578-579). In no uncertain terms, Rousseau joins Montesquieu in advocating the patriarchal subjugation of women.

Such sexist thinking was not limited to outright misogynists. Perhaps most significantly, even so-called pro-women intellectuals such as Paine, Holbach, and Diderot and most of his fellow *Encyclopedists* perpetuated the sexist interpretations of women upon which patriarchal control of women is based. While generally calling for greater concern for women's plight in society, these thinkers nevertheless agreed that women were biologically as well as socially disadvantaged to men. For instance, one finds Montesquieu's understanding of women replicated throughout the *Encyclopedia*, the first volume of which was published in 1751. Recognized as the "chief spokesmen of the *philosophes*" (Schwab, 1995, p. xxiv), the *Encyclopedists* considered man the peak of human potential against which all else should be compared. In her examination of the depiction of "woman" in the *Encyclopedia*, Terry Dock (1983, p. 72) explains that the *Encyclopedists* viewed women as necessarily weaker and frailer than men, leading them to believe it was their role to regulate the lives of women.

> [Woman] is not only classified with the defenseless young and the infirm aged,[1] but relegated to the ranks of the mentally inferior where she shares the opprobrium of imbeciles,[2] the common herd,[3] the gullible and the superstitious,[4] and the untutored. (Dock, pp. 83-84)

---

[1] Found in the *Encyclopédie* under the headings of ADVANTAGE, BOUCHES INUTILES, ENNEMI, LOUP, MORAVES.

[2] Found in the *Encyclopédie* under the headings of BAT, BATTOLOGIE, BUTUBATA; MELANCHOLIE; MARCOSIENS.

[3] Found in the *Encyclopédie* under the headings of IMAGINATION.

[4] Found in the *Encyclopédie* under the headings of AMULETE, HERCULE, SABBAT.

In his entries for the *Encyclopedia*, Diderot writes that woman is naturally weak and timid, and that her only recourse is to exert sporadic bursts of authority (Dock, 1983, p. 77). So it is no surprise that he refers to Socrates' principle that man is best suited to deal with "outdoor" matters while the wife is best suited to tend to "indoor" matters (Dock, p. 137). Elsewhere Diderot naturalizes the subjugation of women in society as a product of nature's malice. The "cruelty" of civil laws in "almost all countries," he writes, "is at one against women with the cruelty of nature" (Diderot, 1971, pp. 191-193). Diderot, like Aristotle, was informed by the belief that "woman's sex is nothing less than a defect or an imperfection of nature" (quoted in Dock, p. 10).

Again, we can fully recognize the significance of Condorcet's work by juxtaposing it with that of thinkers such as Thomas Paine. No stranger to French intellectual circles, Paine is often cited as a forerunner in male profeminist thinking, though some are reticent about such a view. Lynn Hunt writes: "The great proponent of 'the rights of man,' Thomas Paine, never even deigned to discuss the rights of women" (2005, p. 565). Rosemarie Zagarii goes even further complaining that while Paine "had argued for the right of all human beings to certain universal privileges," specific rights such as "the right to own property, to vote, to participate in government" were assumed to exclude women (2005, p. 669). "Typically for his time, Paine did not even consider whether women had rights or what those rights might be." Kimmel and Mosmiller contend that while Paine failed to advocate women's enfranchisement he nevertheless "recognized the paralyzing consequences of women's condition and lent his voice in support of reform at a time when virtually no other radical intellectual raised an eyebrow over any other issue than independence from the British" (1992, p. 57). Thus, Kimmel and Mosmiller include Paine's "An Occasional Letter on the Female Sex" (1775) in their collection of "pro-feminist" men's writing (1992).

Yet Paine's letter merely recapitulates the belief that women are subjugated by their biology as much as by society. Indeed, a close reading of Paine's only work expressly on the subject of women offers indication as to why he had not been given great consideration to women's rights: he viewed women as utterly other. While he pities women's place in society he, nevertheless, believes nature is to blame for their plight. He laments that nature, in "forming beings so susceptible and tender," was apparently more interested in giving women "charms" than "happiness" (1992, p. 63). Paine writes that women are continually "subjected to ills which are peculiarly their own," and blames nature for their disadvantaged position: "Over three-quarters of the globe nature has placed them between contempt and misery" (p. 65). While Paine's concern for women's well-being is certainly novel, his belief that women are biologically inferior to men merely perpetuates the dualistic logic justifying their subjugation.

Like Paine and Diderot, Holbach, also an *Encyclopedist,* lamented women's lot in life and complained about society's role in subjugating them, but never-

theless believed that nature was largely responsible for women's inferiority. Despite his desire to see women treated more fairly, Holbach adhered to the notion that nature had disadvantaged women by making them infirm and afflicted with sickness for at least one-forth of the year (Brookes, 1980, p. 311). In volume II of *The System of Nature*, Holbach writes that one should not be surprised that women have generally abstained from atheism since "their organization renders them fearful; their nervous system undergoes periodical variation." Not only does their education "dispose them to credulity," many women have a natural propensity for irrationality:

> Those among them who have a sound constitution, who have a well ordered imagination, have occasion for chimeras suitable to occupy their leisure; above all, when the world abandons them, then superstitious devotion, with its attractive ceremonies, becomes either a business or an amusement. (Holbach, 2006, pp. 226-227)

Taken together, these men's views on women form a coherent thesis: women are biologically predisposed to irrationality. Their silence on the subject of women's enfranchisement is a consequence of their deep-seeded distrust of women's intellectual capacity. The reason they said little to nothing on enfranchisement may have been because they believed women lacked complete competency to share with men the responsibilities of full citizenship.

Social Construction of Gender

In contrast, Condorcet argued that male-dominated society, not nature, was principally to blame for women's failings. If some opposed women's enfranchisement on the basis that they were politically inept and without knowledge of the public sphere, Condorcet made the case that education would solve the problem. Making a prophetic nod to the recognition of the social construction of gender, Condorcet plainly wrote: "I believe that all other differences between men and women are simply the result of education" (1994, p. 299). Condorcet directly contradicted Voltaire's contention that women lacked the talent of invention, arguing that woman's intellectual potential was largely unknown because she was deprived of the kind of education that would cultivate genius.

The importance of such analysis must be placed in the context of the long road to contemporary feminist theoretical thought. Judith Kegan Gardiner writes that 20th-century feminist theory's most significant accomplishment is the explication of gender as socially constructed and not necessarily "the natural, necessary, or ideal characteristics of people with similar genitals" (2005, p. 35). Judith Lorber explains that gender has been a means "to justify the exploitation of an identifiable group—women" (1994, p. 5). We can see in Condorcet's work recognition of the way in which gender can indeed be utilized to

subjugate women. In his essay, "On the Admission of Women to the Rights of Citizenship," we can find a direct rebuke to the disempowering conceptualization of women as thoroughly other, and therefore inferior, to men. Condorcet's essay adeptly rebukes common arguments against the enfranchisement of women in France. One by one, he proves the insipidity of various traditional ideas about women. He refutes the claim that pregnancy and menstruation will prevent women from exercising their rights by pointing out that men manage to carry out political obligations despite being prone to having "gout all winter" or catching "cold quickly" (1976, p. 98). In particular, this argument situates men in nature along with women and rejects the dualized view of women as imbedded in nature and men as part of transcendent culture. In dismissing the notion that women are naturally disposed to greater infirmity compared to men who are above such bestial connections to nature, Condorcet undermines the dualistic conceptual schema bolstering the patriarchal ideology, an ideology which many of Condorcet's intellectual contemporaries maintained.

Moreover, Condorcet challenged the notion that women were fundamentally different than men, an idea the church and thinkers such as Rousseau, Diderot, Montesquieu, and Paine subscribed to. Condorcet indicates that social convention and laws were in part responsible for molding women into their current form.

> [Women] are excluded from public affairs, from all that is decided according to rigorous ideas of justice or positive laws. The things with which they are occupied and upon which they act are precisely those which are regulated by natural propriety and sentiment. It is therefore unjust to allege, as an excuse for continuing to refuse women the enjoyment of their natural rights, grounds which only have a kind of reality because women do not exercise these rights. (1976, p. 100)

More than 150 years later, Simone de Beauvoir would write: "Legislators, priests, philosophers, writers, and scientists" have striven "to show that the subordinate position of woman is willed in heaven and advantageous on earth" (Beauvoir, 2006, p. 119). Thus we find in Condorcet's work not only the intellectual antecedent to contemporary male feminism, but also a precursor for 20th-century feminism more generally.

If women seem to be too concerned with matters such as beauty, appearances, and the like, Condorcet explains that this is a product of the ideas of propriety that society imbues in women from birth: "It is as reasonable for a woman to concern herself with her personal attractions as it was for Demosthenes to cultivate his voice and his gestures" (1976, p. 100). He further recognizes that it is foolish to overlook society's role in shaping the ideas and attitudes of men and women. It is not nature, "but education, and social existence" that causes the difference between the way men and women reason.

Since it is society that makes women obsess over aesthetic beauty and decorum rather than politics and philosophical matters, we cannot expect women to do otherwise; and we should not presume their behavior proves a deficiency of reason. Condorcet notes: "Women are not governed, it is true, by the reason of men. But they are governed by their own reason" (1976, p. 100). Conscious of the patriarchal social order to which women are forced to conform, Condorcet seems to acknowledge the way in which oppressed groups develop their own intellectual tools for survival.

In addition to recognizing that women are capable of achieving greatness of intellect, Condorcet also believes many women already have exhibited such mental prowess, though in different intellectual arenas such as imagination. First, consider that the *Encyclopedists* largely agree that women's capacity for rational thought was compromised by her imagination (Dock, 1983, p. 73). Yet Condorcet cites imagination as a tool used by women to produce great works. Specifically, he pointed to women authors such as mme de La Fayette and mme de Sevigne and their keen passion and sensibility as proof of genius as it related to the production of a dramatic work. Not only does Condorcet hold passion and sensibility in high regard, he even suggests that genius requires imagination and sensibility (Brookes, 1980, p. 329, n105). Such a stance once more deconstructs the fallacious dualisms which are used to bolster women's oppression. Condorcet mends the split between reason and imagination, between reason and passion, and recognizes in women's talents proof of her full humanity.

SEXUALITY

Another important aspect of Condorcet's work on women is his departure from the dominant male intellectual perspective on sexuality, particularly as it relates to women. As will become clear, the majority of the *Encyclopedists* were as concerned with chastity as the religious authorities they sought to dethrone. Jaucourt explains that women's supreme virtue is modesty, "a natural, wise, honest shame, a secret fear, a feeling for those things capable of effecting infamy" (Dock, 1983, p. 80). Dock explains that Jaucourt believes that "[t]he woman imbued with modesty is above reporting attacks on her honor—which would seem to deprive her of all recourse in the case of rape: 'She prefers to be silent about those who have outraged her, when she cannot talk about it without bringing to light actions and expressions which by themselves alarm her virtue'" (Dock, p. 80). Jaucourt's views complement those of Rousseau who writes that women must "learn to submit to injustice and to suffer the wrongs inflicted on her by her husband without complaints," that through her "gentleness" she will eventually be victorious over him, "unless he is a perfect monster" (1995, pp. 578-579). Contributors such as Holbach also put a premium on virginal purity. He is on record critiquing Japanese men for their tendency to marry former prostitutes, despite the fact many such women were forced into

prostitution by their families. Meanwhile Jaucourt lists the practice of taking non-virgins as wives among the various practices of a stupid nation (Dock, 1983, p. 135). In all, these thinkers remained committed promulgators of patriarchal masculinity and its systematic subordination of women through sexual control.

While their attitudes about religion, rationality, and scientific investigation may have radically departed from the Catholic and Protestant Christian worldview, most 18th century male intellectuals promoted and upheld the control of women's sexual and reproductive capacities, which cultural theorist Jane Caputi contends is "the core patriarchal practice" (2004, p. 393). In contrast, Condorcet disavowed such control and discounted sexist logic by highlighting the hypocrisy inherent in discussions of modesty and chastity. He rejected the idea that inadvisable sexual behavior constituted the root of all evil. "There is no virtue so easy to practice or appear to practice as chastity," he wrote; "it is compatible with the absence of real virtue and the presence of every vice. From the moment chastity is considered of great importance every scoundrel is sure of obtaining public esteem at little expense" (quoted in Schapiro, 1963, p. 194). In countries that have boasted of their supreme morality "every vice, every crime, and even debauchery were sure to be prevalent," writes Condorcet (in Schapiro, p. 194). Rather than clamoring for chastity and condemning feminine immodesty, Condorcet denounced police harassment of prostitutes and argued that women in the sex industry should be taught an occupation, not sent to prison (Schapiro, pp. 194-195).

While Montesquieu urged Europe to follow in the footsteps of the Romans in enacting laws purposed to "increase the number of marriages and children" (Kra, 1984, p. 283), Condorct promoted women's control of their reproductive powers. According to scholar David Williams, "Condorcet was an outspoken advocate of the right of women to plan their pregnancies prudently, illuminating the issue of birth control in a way that took him well beyond the horizons of his age (VI, 256-258)" (Williams, 2004, p. 168). Condorcet also sought to create "special hospitals for unmarried pregnant girls to which they could go without incurring the usual penalties for their condition, and he was concerned equally with the plight of their illegitimate children (VIII, 465-466)" (Williams, p. 169). Finally, Condorcet went so far as to assail the tyrannical policing of heteronormativity by repudiating murderous laws against homosexuality. Specifically, he criticized the practices of burning homosexuals alive, as was done in France, and subjecting them to mob violence, as in England (Schapiro, p. 195).

Condorcet's Practice of Compassion and Equality in his Personal Relationships

A salient feature of feminist epistemology is personal accountability (Collins, 2009, pp. 284-285). Personal experience is valued not only as a criterion

for knowledge (Collins; Krook, 2007), but also serves as an important site for verification of one's publicly pronounced statements. For instance, in her discussion of Black Feminst thought, Collins notes how her students "refused to evaluate the rationality of [an author's] written ideas without some indication of his personal credibility as an ethical human being" (Collins, p. 285). In short, one of the core features of feminist thinking is the recognition that one's public positions are valued only insofar as they reflect one's lived experience including one's personal interactions with others. For this reason, Condorcet's personal relationship with his wife and daughter are perhaps the most vital indications of his having embodied a truly "feminist" masculinity.

Unlike so many, past and present, Condorcet's personal life matched his publicly professed ideals. Condorcet shared a uniquely equitable relationship with his wife, Sophie. Not only did he marry, uncommon among male intellectuals who preferred to have mistresses without obligation, Condorcet found in his spouse an intellectual partner who probably had a tremendous impact on his intellectual and political thought (Schapiro, 1963). At a time when women were objectified and appreciated as little more than beautiful distractions, Condorcet was uniquely devoted to Sophie (Schapiro). We catch a glimpse of Sophie's love for Condorcet in a letter she wrote to him while he was in hiding during the Reign of Terror. With her husband deemed an enemy of the government, Sophie had no choice but to divorce Condorcet in order to be spared persecution (McLean, 1994): "I dare to believe that you know my heart well enough to feel that our mutual attachment is the bond uniting your life to mine. I cannot express how much this sacrifice is costing me.… It will leave a bitterness in my heart which only the justice of yours can soften" (Condorcet quoted in McLean, p. 30).

In my view, Condorcet's 1794 letter to his daughter Eliza stands as among the most significant manifestation of his feminist masculinity. Condorcet's letter offered sage advice to his then four-year-old on how best to live without worry for the constraints of codependence. He starts by stressing the importance of learning a skill so that she would be financially independent. He then urges her to realize the limited ability of wealth to bring about happiness (Condorcet, 1994, p. 284). Better to be poor and independent, he instructed her, than rich and dependent. The radical nature of such advice is realized when we consider that Condorcet is advising a girl to make her own way in the world during a time when women were seen as mere appendages to men and men's lives.

To fully appreciate the significance of Condorcet's advice to his daughter, it is instructive to consider Diderot's relationship with his daughter, Angelique. Condorcet's contemporary, Diderot had chosen his daughter Angelique's spouse before she reached the age of two-years-old (McLaughlin, 1984, p. 303). McLaughlin comments that despite Diderot's then professed derision of the institution of marriage and his support for alternatives to marriage, when it came to his own daughter he advanced the status quo in gender relations. The fact that Diderot's daughter was married off just one month before he authored

The Supplement au Voyage de Bougainville (in which he asserts that marriage is unnatural and contrary to individual dignity), is reason enough to call into question his commitment to his own ideas.

In discussing a letter written by Diderot to his daughter in advance of her marriage, McLaughlin writes: "His advice to her is not unlike that found in the most traditional marriage manuals of the day." Indeed, Diderot's letter to Angelique leaves no doubt that he believes a woman should submit to a man. In a letter dated September 13, 1772, Diderot tells Angelique that her new husband would now posses the authority he, as her father, had maintained over her (McLaughlin, 1984, p. 303). He advises Angelique that her "happiness is inseparable from that of your spouse…. Have for [him] all the condescension imaginable" (quoted in McLaughlin, 1984, p. 303). Diderot councils his daughter against the appearance of sexual impropriety, noting that "[o]ne has the right to judge women on appearances…." (p. 303). Diderot upholds the prejudice that the male sex is best suited to occupy the public sphere and the female sex is best suited to occupy the domestic sphere: "Exterior affairs are his; those of the interior are yours" (p. 304). Those women suffering from boredom and a sense of purposelessness should embrace household duties: "Rise early; give to your domestic occupations of all kinds the first hours of your morning; perhaps your entire morning. Fortify your soul" (pp. 303-304). McLaughlin summarizes Diderot's advice this way: "Her life must now revolve entirely around that of her husband; she must receive all those whom he desires her to meet, but her own associations must be restricted as much as possible" (p. 303).

In contrast, Condorcet's letter to his daughter expands upon his public statements on women. Rather than suggesting marriage as a means of social development, Condorcet recommends to Eliza the acquisition and application of "some skill in the arts and crafts or in exercising your mind" (Condorcet, 1994a, p. 285). Acquiring such a skill will succeed in not only staving off boredom, writes Condorcet, but may also secure independence:

> … do not forget that your aim must be the daily pleasure of being busy, of doing something which ensures your independence, protects you from boredom, and prevents the vague distaste for existence and unexplained depression which affect otherwise peaceful and successful lives. (1994a, p. 285)

In place of the assumption that she will exist to serve a husband, Condorcet's letter maintains the consistent assumption that Eliza has self-worth independent of others, and has or will have something to contribute to society. He urges his daughter to be benevolent, experience the pleasure of helping others in need not only by giving money but more importantly by giving time, "attention and enlightenment;" "Your benevolence will then be independent of your fortune and not limited by it; it will become an occupation and a source of pleasure" (p. 286). Absent from his advice is any notion that women belong to one particular sphere of existence. In contrast to the caged existence proffered by Diderot, Condorcet's letter presumes that the world is open to Eliza.

What makes Condorcet's letter unique has as much to do with what he does not say as what he does say. Condorcet does not deliver any platitudes about woman's work or place in society. Not once does he mention or recommend marriage to Eliza. This silence coupled with his clear advice to be both self-reliant and to seek happiness in her life forms a clear if unspoken message: embrace your autonomy and supersede the gendered limitations placed upon you by society; do not submit to the patriarchal, prejudicial yoke of the age. And whereas women of his age were socially educated to receive their esteem from others, Condorcet urged Eliza to find joy in her own person: "Enjoy the feelings of the people you love; but above all, enjoy your own" (1994, p. 286).

Evidence of Condorcet's embodiment of feminist masculinity is further apparent in his exaltation of the importance of emotional sensitivity and empathy for both human and nonhuman others. The weighty valuation of emotionality and empathy in both moral reasoning and validating knowledge is an important aspect of feminist thought. Carol Gilligan contends that the ethic of caring is manifest in women's refusal to engage in "detachment and depersonalization" which characterizes patriarchal, masculine thought. The ethic of caring among women is responsible for their "insistence on making connections that can lead to seeing the person killed in war or living in poverty as someone's son or father or brother or sister, or mother, or daughter, or friend" (2006, p. 209). Collins adds that "the ethic of caring suggests that personal expressiveness, emotions, and empathy are central to the knowledge validation process" (2009, pp. 281-282).

Condorcet understands empathy as a key aspect of leading what he understands as a good life. In the letter to Eliza he attributes "gentle sensitivity" or "humanity" to "the natural feeling which makes us share the sorrow of all sentient beings" (1994, p. 287). He goes on to write that this sensitivity, "which can be a source of happiness," should not be limited with regard to human relationships but should be extended "even to animals." One should be sensitive to the happiness and pain of anything that belongs to us. In addition to recognizing its contribution to human happiness, Condorcet also believed that empathy was the salient component of right moral reasoning:

> When I left college, I fell to reflecting on the moral ideas of justice and virtue. I felt that I saw that the interest we have in being just and virtuous arose from the pain one sensitive being must feel on becoming aware of the pain suffered by another. Since then … I have tried to preserve this sentiment in all its natural energy. I gave up hunting which I had enjoyed, and would not even kill an insect unless it was very harmful. (Condorcet quoted in Mclean, 1994, p. 7)

Feeling a genuine connection to the human and nonhuman lives around him, Condorcet held that self-respect is anchored in the treatment of others. To ensure that we do not treat another dishonorably, he instructed Eliza, we

must look to the golden rule, the ancient principle of empathy: "Think of the pain you have felt as a result of even minor injustices or mistakes, and imagine how it must feel to be the victim of serious injustices or truly shameful misconduct" (1994, p. 287).

Some wonder how Condorcet managed to maintain such progressive positions during a time when the cultural current overwhelmingly bolstered the notion that women were inferior to men. I believe we can understand Condorcet's feminist proclivity as a consequence of his emotional wholeness as a human being. Consider, first, the process by which a dominator or master subject deludes himself into thinking he is superior to another person. Citing Schwalbe, Connell and Messerschmidt (2010, p. 223) write that power is typically maintained through a strategy of dehumanizing the group of people one wishes to be in control of. This process of dehumanizing others succeeds insofar as the dominator suppresses empathy and achieves emotional distance from the group marked as "other." Plumwood describes this process as "radical exclusion" or "hyperseparation." Radical exclusion is one of five components of the logic of dualism or master consciousness (Plumwood, 1993, pp. 48-55). One engaged in radical exclusion often identifies the "other" as not only different but substantially inferior, thereby supporting the master subject's feeling of absolute superiority. Plumwood writes that this conceptual tool has been used to distinguish "between things sacred and things profane in religious thought" and, more specifically, "to mark out, protest and isolate a privileged group" (pp. 49-50). Rather than seeing himself as part of some inherently privileged group, Condorcet managed to recognize that men's privilege was a quite unnatural product of sexist oppression. Condorcet's refusal to see himself, as a man, as superior to women left both his empathy and emotional connection to the entirety of humanity in tact. As a result, he was able to see through the dehumanizing rhetoric around women's inferiority to men.

Conclusion

Today, Condorcet's example stands as proof that men are not limited to the patriarchal masculine model of selfhood. Condorcet's life and work project a form of manhood we can rightly describe as "feminist masculinity." Approximating that which hooks identifies as the partnership model of being, Condorcet's life was characterized by respect for human plurality, a valorization of equity and empathy, and a rejection of at least some of the central dualisms (reason/nature, reason/women and men/women) responsible for upholding inequality and patriarchal masculinity's definition of self through the objectification of others. Whereas Condorcet's contemporaries were beholden to a dualistic intellectual schema, informing their conceptualization of man as belonging to a fundamentally different realm of being than woman, Condorcet's analyses are informed by a basic recognition for the connectivity between things, including humans and animals. Thus, Condorcet argues that

men and women are more alike than they are different, and that which we identify as femininity is a product of education (culture), not nature.

Moreover, Condorcet lived a life which rejected the false distinction between public life and private life. His personal life is indistinguishable from his private life. As such, Condorcet lived a life that acknowledged the political character of one's personal interactions. His personal practices, including his communication with his daughter and his relationship with his wife, seemed to cohere with his publicly professed ideas about women. The life example of Condorcet begs a variety of questions: was he the only one? Were there others like him? And, perhaps most importantly, does Condorcet's example force us to be more critical of those whose prejudices and oppressive and contradictory behaviors we have excused as understandable errors of the age? Condorcet's example of masculinity stands as a refutation to the universality of patriarchal masculinity and is a testament to the viability of feminist masculinity. Condorcet's example provides men with precisely the kind of nondualistic and nonsexist model of self-assertion hooks (2004, p. 114) contends is necessary to reclaim maleness from dominator culture and violent, sexist, domineering model for masculinity.

References

Adams, M., & Coltrane, S. (2005). Boys and men in families: The domestic production of gender, power, and privilege. In M.S. Kimmel, J. Hearn & R.W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of studies on men and masculinities* (pp. 230-248). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Baker, K.M. (1976). Introduction. In *Condorcet: Selected writings*. Indianapolis, Indiana: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

Brookes, B. (1980). The feminism of Condorcet and Sophie de Grouchy. *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, *189*, 297-361.

Caputi, J. (2004). *Goddesses and monsters: Women, myth, power, and popular culture.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Clinton, K.B. (1975). Feeme et philosophe: Enlightenment origins of feminism. *Eighteenth-Century Studies, 8*(3), 283-299.

Collins, P.H. (2009). *Black feminist thought*. New York: Routledge.

Condorcet, A-N. de (1955/1793). *Sketch for a historical picture of the progress of the human mind* (J. Barraclough, Trans.). London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Condorcet, A-N. de (1976/1790). On the admission of women to the rights of citizenship. In *Condorcet: Selected writings*. Indianapolis, Indiana: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.

Condorcet, A-N. de (1994a). Condorcet's advice to his daughter. In I. McLean & F. Hewitt (Trans. & eds.), *Condorcet: Foundations of social choice and political theory* (pp. 284-290). Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar.

Condorcet, A-N. de (1994b [1787]). Letters from a Freeman of New Haven to a Citizen of Virginia on the Futility of Dividing the Legislative Power among Several Bodies. In I. McLean & F. Hewitt (Trans. & eds.), *Condorcet: Foundations of social choice and political theory* (pp. 292-334). Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar.

Connell, R.W., & Messerschmidt, J. (2010). Hegemonic masculinity. In J. Lorber (Ed.), *Gender inequality: Feminist theory and politics* (pp. 218-225). New York: Oxford University Press.

d'Holbach, P.H.T. (2006). *The system of nature*. Teddington, England: The Echo Library.

de Beauvoir, S. (2006). The second sex (Introduction). In E. Hackett & S. Haslanger (Eds.), *Theorizing feminisms: A reader* (pp. 114-123). New York: Oxford University Press.

de Montesquieu, C. (2002). *The spirit of laws*. New York: Prometheus.

Dock, T.S. (1983). *Woman in the Encyclopédie: A compendium*. Potomac, MD: Studia Humanitatis.

Gardiner, J.K. (2005). Men, masculinities, and feminist theory. In M.S. Kimmel, J. Hearn, & R.W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of studies on men and masculinities* (pp. 35-50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gilligan, C. (2006). Moral orientation and moral development. In E. Hackett & S. Haslanger (Eds.), *Theorizing feminisms: A reader* (pp. 200-210). New York: Oxford University Press.

hooks, b. (2000). *Feminism is for everybody*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

hooks, b. (2004). *The will to change: Men, masculinity, and love*. New York: Atria Books.

Hunt, L. (2005). Introduction to women and revolutionary citizenship: Enlightenment legacies? In S. Knott & B. Taylor (Eds.), *Women, gender and enlightenment* (pp. 565-569). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kant, I. (1995). The fair sex. In I. Kramnick (Ed.), *The portable enlightenment reader* (pp. 580-585). New York: Penguin Books.

Kimmel, M.S., & Mosmiller, T.E. (1992). Before Seneca Falls, 1775-1848. In M.S. Kimmel & T.E. Mosmiller (Eds.), *Against the tide: Pro-feminist men in the United States, 1776-1990: A documentary history* (pp. 55-61). Boston: Beacon Press.

Kra, P. (1984). Montesquieu and women. In S.I. Spencer (Ed.), *French women and the age of enlightenment* (pp. 272-284). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Krook, M.L. (2007). Are there feminist research methods? Paper presented at the Second Conference of the Association of Feminist Epistemologies, Methodologies, Metaphysics, and Science Studies, Women and Gender Studies Program, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, February 8-10, 2007. Available at http://krook.wustl.edu/pdf/Krook%20FEMMSS2%202007.pdf

Landes, J.B. (1988). *Women and the public sphere in the age of the French Revolution*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Lorber, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

McLaughlin, B.L. (1984). Diderot and women. In S.I. Spencer (Ed.), *French women and the age of enlightenment* (pp. 296-308). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

McLean, I., & Hewitt, F. (Trans. & Ed.). (1994). *Condorcet: Foundations of social choice and political theory*. Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Paine, T. (1992). An occasional letter on the female sex. In M.S. Kimmel & T.E. Mosmiller (Eds.), *Against the tide: Pro-feminist men in the United States, 1776-1990: A documentary history* (pp. 63-66). Boston: Beacon Press.

Plumwood, V. (1993). *Feminism and the mastery of nature*. New York: Routledge.

Porter, R. (2001). *The enlightenment*. New York: Palgrave.

Reed, R. (2005). *Birthing fathers: The transformation of men in American rites of birth*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Rousseau, J. (1995). Duties of women. In I. Kramnick (Ed.), *The portable enlightenment reader* (pp. 568-579). New York. Penguin.

Schiparo, J.S. (1963). *Condorcet and the rise of liberalism*. New York: Octagon Books.

Schwab, R.N. (1995). Introduction. In *Preliminary discourse to the encyclopedia of Diderot*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Williams, D. (2004). *Condorcet and modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zagarii, R. (2005). American women's rights before Seneca Falls. In S. Knott & B. Taylor (Eds.), *Women, gender and enlightenment* (pp. 667-691). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

CS&M   Jessica Eckstein[a]

Masculinity of Men Communicating Abuse Victimization

Abstract This study explored, through in-depth interviews, the experiences of men sexually, psychologically, and/or physically victimized by female romantic partners. Men's narratives were analyzed to determine how masculinity and construction of victim-identities were related. Results show that abused men construed victimization as precipitated internally through self-blame and externally via societal-blame. Gendered masculinity was demonstrated for most men in the form of hegemonic-striving via complicit rationalizations; however, a minority of men constructed victimization in terms of protest masculinity.

KEYWORDS MASCULINITY, MEN, HEGEMONY, INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE, VICTIMIZATION

Each year, 3.2 million men in the United States are victims of intimate partner violence (IPV) (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). Male IPV victimization, while not as common as female victimization, is a serious problem with its own set of identity issues for male victims. Unfortunately, men's victimization from female partners receives comparatively limited scholarly attention (George, 2003).

The goal of this study was to explore, through in-depth interviews, male IPV victims' communication of gender identities. I first present existing IPV literature to frame my approach to gendered victimization. I employ a theoretical lens of varying masculinities to discuss my findings in terms of heterosocial expectations for men.

Victimization

IPV may involve sexual (e.g., rape), physical (e.g., using objects or one's body to hit, kick, push, bite, shoot, stab, or strangle another person), and/or psychological (e.g., name calling; degradation; silent treatment; contingent affection; threats of destruction and/or death; social isolation; induced debility; relational obsessiveness or possessiveness) communication perpetrated by a romantic partner (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). The most extreme type of IPV relationship is known as *intimate terrorism* (Johnson, 2008). Believed to involve

[a] Department of Communication, Western Connecticut State University.

All correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Jessica Eckstein, Communication, Western Connecticut State University, 120 Berkhall Hall, 181 White St., Danbury, CT 06810. Email: jessica.eckstein@gmail.com.

primarily female victims, intimate terrorism is also experienced by men (Eckstein, 2009; Sarantakos, 1999). Victims of intimate terrorism are subjected to *coercive control*: support systems are weakened, distrust is cultivated, and humiliation is enforced through identity attacks (Romero, 1985). Often likened to being a prisoner of war, these IPV victims live through (a) *debilitation*, physical and psychological abuse to weaken mind and body; (b) *dread*, degradation and threats; and (c) *dependency*, controlled resources supplemented by kindness (Farber, Harlow, & West, 1957; Walker, 2000).

Strong societal perceptions exist that men rarely or never experience intimate terrorism from women (George, 2002, 2003; Migliaccio, 2001). As a result, men who do experience this type of victimization from female partners are viewed and treated differently from "normal" victims (Coney & Mackey, 1999). Without societal acknowledgement, male IPV victims may embrace dominant views of themselves as failures at masculinity. Social stigmatization of men as inappropriate victims not only affects males; viewing women as more suitable victims also may allow hegemonic norms to operate and keep women powerless (Dobash & Dobash, 1978). For men, who are discounted from expressing victimized identities, it may be difficult to articulate expected, dominant forms of masculinity.

All victims receive pressure to maintain silence about their experiences (Harris & Cook, 1994). However, in male-dominated societies like the U.S., men may receive further messages to suppress weakness or feelings associated with victimization (Kimmel, 2006). This denigration may cause men to strategize about communicating their victimization and enactment of their identities vis-à-vis others. The manner in which male IPV victims communicate gendered identities is unknown; men with similar experiences may embrace and/or react to victimization differently.

MASCULINE ENACTMENT

Masculine typologies are not static explanations; embodiment of particular masculinities changes over time and situations for different individuals. Three types of masculinity can be connected to IPV victimization of men: hegemonic masculinity, complicit masculinity, and protest masculinity.

Stereotypes of ideal men (e.g., strong, stoic, dominant) are conveyed by a *hegemonic* construct. Heterosexuality is intrinsic to hegemonic expectations. Men are expected to pursue sexual encounters only with women. Social encounters involving other men are valued to the extent that they uphold this hetero- or anti-homosexual orientation. To function heterosexually, men must appropriately behave homosocially. Men are supposed to be emotionally detached, to compete with one another for pride and resources (e.g., women, feats of strength, capitalistic success), and to sexually objectify women (Bird, 1996). Hegemonic masculinity is not the most common type of gender enactment; most men do not embody this type of masculinity. However, hegemony is still considered to be a preferred standard for men to acquire and is constantly reinforced by men and women (Connell, 1987, 1995).

One way continual hegemonic re-institution is carried out is through sub-ordination and stigmatization of non-compliant forms of masculinity (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Hegemonic masculinity is supported by compliant men and women, who need only to support, and not necessarily enact, dominant behaviors or belief systems in order to accrue the benefits themselves. *Complicit* or *accommodating* men benefit from patriarchy to the extent that all men receive advantages of masculine dominance. Women also may contribute to hegemony by complying in their own traditionally feminine roles (hooks, 1984). Thus, complicit masculinity is the controlling force societally sanction-ing heterosexuality/homosociality. Consent of dominant norms may occur ex-plicitly, but it also transpires through silence. Failure to challenge constrictive norms results in the dominant structure's success; consent is achieved implic-itly (Hearn, 2004; hooks, 1984). As a result, people not actually in power strengthen hegemonic ideals more than those who fulfill dominant roles. Com-plicit masculinity allows for governance without explicit defiance.

Sometimes referred to as *compulsive* (Majors & Billson, 1992) or *compensa-tory* (Pyke, 1996) masculinity, protest forms are exhibited by individuals who challenge dominant interpretations of their gendered identity roles and/or the oppression of other societal members. *Protest*, or *opposition*, masculinity is rarely culturally supported. Men who embody opposition or protest forms do so in spite of dominant norms (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Enactment of op-position masculinity may occur through protest speech or alternative enact-ment of gender roles (e.g., claiming to possess a masculine identity despite cultural expectations; Messerschmidt, 1994). Individuals who enact opposition masculinity may be stigmatized by hegemonic or complicit others. Any man who deviates from hegemonic norms risks reproach (Bem, 1993; Courtenay, 2000). Therefore, male IPV victims experience not only abuse, but they also en-counter stigma associated with deviant victimization and alternative mas-culinity (Migliaccio, 2001). The subordinated positions of women and children in a patriarchal culture also may be experienced by men who depart from pop-ular expectations of masculinity (Hearn, 2004).

If men victimized in IPV relationships submitted to expectations of failed masculinity, they would be expected to communicate victimization submis-sively in their narratives. However, one identity role (e.g., victim) may conflict with competing roles (e.g., privileged, powerful) for each man. If this is the case, men victimized by women may enact complicit identities to re-assert hegemonic norms and to avoid stigmatization. As a third option, men who are subordinated or marginalized in a given society may enact protest masculin-ity, and "claim" masculine identities in spite of what is societally expected of them (Messerschmidt, 1994). Any abused man may shape his experiences to fit within dominant frameworks. To explore that formative process, I asked the following research question: How do men abused in heterosexual, romantic relationships communicate gender in their victimization narratives?

Methods

Participants

The interviews reported here were derived from a larger study of male victimization (Eckstein, 2009). Men's specific victimization experiences, self-disclosure practices, and perceptions of social support were reported in that study and are not replicated here. In this report, I focus on constructions of victimization in terms of gendered masculinities. Twenty-eight heterosexual men, 28 to 58 years old (M = 45.8 years; SD = 8.72), participated in semi-structured interviews (*duration* = 29 minutes to 1.5 hours, M = 57.82 minutes, SD = 16.24). The majority of men were Caucasian (n = 26). However, racial differences, in terms of victimization construction and masculine enactment, were not apparent between these men and the two men who did not identify as White (i.e., one African American and one Asian American). Saturation was achieved by the third and fourth interviews. Responses were verified by a random subsample of the men who re-checked their completed transcriptions; all subsample data were confirmed as accurately documented.

All 28 men experienced intimate terrorism, as conceptualized by Johnson (2008), and encountered severe emotional/psychological abuse and threats. All men experienced tactics of domination/control from partners. Additionally, narratives often included severe physical injury (n = 23) and some cases of sexual abuse and rape (n = 4). The sample included men both currently in (n = 24) and out (n = 4) of abusive relationships. The majority of men (n = 26) stayed for years after victimization initially occurred. Among relationships ended at interview time, half (n = 12) were ended by the female perpetrators. Those still in relationships with their abusers mentioned desires to separate (n = 2), keep the relationship going and "work it out" (n = 1), or stay until children were grown (n = 1). There were no apparent differences in victimization or masculinity narratives between men currently out of or still in abusive relationships.

Procedure

After obtaining institutional approval for participants' protection, men were solicited for telephone interviews via Internet postings. The online call for research targeted heterosexual men self-identified as victims of an abusive relationship. The call was posted in chat groups and forums devoted to abused men and victims of family violence. Parameters were set to include English-speaking men residing in the United States. The final sample was comprised of men from 25 different states. To maximize participant safety, men had to, in an email, (a) initiate contact; (b) provide a safe, un-monitored telephone number; (c) set up a future appointment for the interview; and (d) agree to have their interview recorded.

Process of Analysis

Using a phenomenological approach similar to a constant comparative method, I employed a process of open, axial, and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Viewing communication as a symbolic process whereby individuals form and present identities, a phenomenological approach to studying that communication is particularly useful (Moustakas, 1994). To begin, I examined interview transcripts for emergent themes and noted *indicators* (e.g., words/phrases representing larger concepts). I coded these concept-indicators against one another within the same interview and with other interviews, constantly noting discrepant and convergent data (Strauss, 1987). For example, in one interview, I would look at the number (e.g., frequency representing prevalence) and types (e.g., as verb, noun, with different adjectives/adverbs, as received from different sources) of ways a term such as "victim" was used. Across interviews, I would pay particular attention to the ways these identified characteristics of "victim" were similar among diverse men's narratives and how the construct differed according to the individual experiences, demographics, and constructions of each man.

In the second step, I applied axial coding by evaluating indicators against existing theoretical conceptualizations of masculinity and IPV; I observed contexts and relationships where indicators existed. Again using the "victim" construct as an example, I would look for pairs or groupings of multiple constructs (e.g., "victim" emerging synchronously with discussions of "society" or "excuses for perpetrators"). I searched for themes/constructs that tended to hang together, within each interview and across all interviews, in such a way as to suggest rationale, cause/effect, or associative relationships. The *process* variables uncovered at this stage were examined to see how they fit with existing theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

Finally, I conducted selective coding to demonstrate congruent stories of masculinity narratives (LaRossa, 2005). By noting categories and relationships between constructs in the first two steps, I could now see a "storyline" begin to emerge. For example, victimization was often discussed along with societal roles but in different ways, depending on the man's perspective of his own role as "man," "protector," or "victim." Rather than viewing divergent themes/relationships in and among interviews as limiting, I viewed discrepancies as an opportunity to explore not only why each man differed, but how (i.e., the communication tools used) the contradictions (both within interviews and amongst all) served to reinforce particular or multiple masculine identities. Based on these methods, I report findings in terms of a critical understanding of gender and victimization.

Findings

All men demonstrated awareness of negative outcomes resulting from victimization and consistently emphasized a masculine interpretation of that

abuse. Never blaming the female perpetrator, men instead blamed themselves and/or society for permitting and perpetuating their victimization.

Masculine Internalization of Blame

All of the men mentioned feeling loss, or a diminishing sense of identity, from the abuse. One man exemplified responses along this line:

> During the time I'm going through this, often I saw myself as a victim. I see myself as a victim of something totally different now as opposed to then in describing it. I *realize* now I was a victim of more or less, *my own* ignorance, and *my* low expectations for myself. You know, it was my fault 'cause I had to own up to *my own selfishness* and my own guilt, selling myself short. So you know, yes, I saw myself as a victim then, but now I feel like I was a victim of *my own shortcomings*. (emphases added) ("*Ron," 39-year-old single electrician, 2½-year abusive dating relationship, out of IPV for 2 years*)

Embodying self-blame, Ron viewed his continued, albeit changed, victimization as internally precipitated. Other men also redirected victimization positions by making excuses for or noting a desire to protect their partners. They made blame intrapersonal instead of *extrapunitive*, as discussed by Miller and Porter (1983). The psychological shifts of this tactic were communicated by men concerned that others could see their identity failures. Representatively, Todd noted:

> I just didn't feel I was worthy. Of anything. I mean, it was, it made me really doubt. That my paradigm set was wrong. You know, everything I'd believed in was all of a sudden wrong. So yeah, it did affect me. My mother and family friends, who knew me prior to the marriage, said that I'd really changed. (*"Todd," 48-year-old single chemist, 5-year abusive marriage, out of IPV for 2 years*)

By acknowledging that members of their social network observed manifestations of their victimization, some men (*n* = 10) explicitly noted feeling stigma, an affect often exacerbated when seen by others (Flynn, 1990; Goffman, 1963). Knowing others' awareness of their abuse, these men may have internalized stigma with public perceptions of failed masculinity or relinquished relational control (Migliaccio, 2001). Possibly in an effort to re-assert control, some of the men discussed their relationships as progressing from self-imposed-victim to self-imposed-agent. These men could then discuss secondary consequences of having been formerly abused and no longer struggling with a victimized identity. Pete, still illustrating self-blame, discussed his relationship from a position away from his abuser, "Yeah, there was one day that I just sat down and said, 'Oh my God. She's nuts and I married her. What does that say about me?' It was a very disconcerting feeling" (*"Pete," 57-year-old single retired engineering supervisor, 4-month abusive marriage, out of IPV for 7 years*).

Some men could move to agentic positions. These men credited being able to convey the abuse in their own words with gaining control over how their identities were portrayed. These few men, representing exceptional cases (*n* = 4), tended to voice the perspective, "If it don't kill you, it can only make you stronger" (*"Dave," 28-year-old single mortgage broker/carpenter, 4-year abusive cohabiting relationship, out of IPV for 1 year*). In essence, as has been found in research on abused women (Peterson & Seligman, 1983), very few men emerged as agentic advocate survivors; more of them still internalized their blame.

Masculine Externalization of Blame

An internalization of blame did not preclude men from also turning culpability outward; many men blamed both themselves and others. However, it was through blame externalization that embodiment of masculine types clearly emerged. While most men embodied a hegemonically supportive complicit form, some men instead enacted protest masculinity. The communication of the men in this sample did not suggest overlapping (i.e., identifying in both categories) forms of masculinity for individual men.

Hegemonic/Complicit Masculinity. Most commonly, men in this sample felt both hurt and anger. However, these men's (*n* = 21) emotions were not directed at their abusers. Resentment was aimed at "systems" and a society allowing and perpetuating their victimization.

> In a politically correct way, yeah. But I mean, I don't know. Is it a victim? Of the circumstances? Isn't it the system? I would say I'm more a person that was exposed to an unfortunate situation, and the bias or the unfairness in the system perpetuated it to create a problem that really wasn't, or shouldn't have been there. (*"John," 57-year-old re-married financial planner, 1½-year abusive marriage, out of IPV for 16 years*)

> (laughs). I'm absolutely a victim. I mean, what she did was wrong and the abuse was wrong. But the problem is I feel I'm more a victim of the state, you know, than the victim of her. Because if it weren't for the state giving her the permission to be abusive, then there's no way she could have been. So yeah, I feel victimized by this country, allowing this to happen. (*"Kyle," 52-year-old engaged aerospace engineer, 16-year abusive marriage, out of IPV for 3 years*)

One man in particular, demonstrating internalization of hegemonic norms, discussed his victimization in terms of his own failure to uphold a masculine identity of power and control:

> Yes. Victim. I don't like to say that, because I hate that term. I don't like people saying they're victims, 'cause everyone can fight for themselves. But I've gone to the courts with the truth, and all the studies, all the proof in the world,

and it was just turned against me, and made me look like I was the perpetrator. In that case, yeah, I feel like a human rights victim, definitely. And my kids are suffering because of it. That really pisses me off. (*"Bob," 38-year-old single manager, 4-year abusive marriage, out of IPV for 6 years*)

Many of the men I interviewed felt they were victimized but refused to identify as victims solely of female perpetrators. In cases where abuse affected family members, such as children, these men also emphatically communicated hegemonic roles of provider and protector. Perhaps these roles entitled the men to "righteous" anger for injustice. As noted by Kimmel (2006), "fighting back" is the most endorsed form of aggression for American men. For the men in this sample who highlighted masculinity in their narratives, it may be that the societal system was a worthy (i.e., masculine, dominant, powerful) opponent to fight and against which to fail, but females and relationships were not. Ingrained notions of permitted societal roles for perpetrator/victim emerged in these narratives. Communicating masculinity against victimization, men illustrated understanding and internalization of hegemonic norms concerning power relations. Theoretically speaking, as IPV victims, these men could no longer claim a hegemonic identity status. As a result, in an effort to re-claim socially acceptable masculine identities through messages of strength, fighting against injustice, protection of the weak, and others, the identity that actually emerged in their narratives was one of complicit masculinity.

Individuals with subordinated identities may appeal to the same sources that dominate them to reinforce their self-worth. This form of identity-maintenance involves oppressed individuals playing up to dominant expectations. For example, Black men humiliated in early America (or similarly in colonial societies) could (a) act in stereotypically Euro-centric, hyper masculine ways and (b) re-direct their exploitation to Black women in an effort to maintain dominance over someone (Brownmiller, 1975). However, rather than raising the value of masculinity for Black men, appropriating (or merely mimicking, as do complicit forms) White hegemonic styles of masculinity through hyper-gendered enactment and dominance of others serves only to reinforce the subordination of the same men seeking to emulate it. This reproduction has been seen throughout history—in colonial societies where European values are perpetuated by native populations, particularly in gendered forms (Stoler, 1997); with poor and/or Black men in the post-Reconstructionist South who redirected their devaluation onto Black women (Hall, 1983); and with the men in this study who chose to embrace masculine, retaliatory attitudes toward anyone threatening their masculinity—but is an identity strategy that often backfires (e.g., further colonization, continued lynching, and further stigma of IPV victims, respectively). Basically, men who use a hierarchical structure to attempt increasing their own power, by upholding the system's masculine ideals, may be merely perpetuating their own oppression.

PROTEST MASCULINITY. Some of the men in this sample ($n = 6$) appeared to exhibit a form of protest masculinity in which they re-claimed masculine identities in spite of hegemonic norms. These men consistently asserted identities as "true men" resulting from better, softer fathering; improved interpersonal, emotional communication; and social activism on behalf of others (Connell, 1995). These men acknowledged that their victimization allowed them to re-perceive themselves as masculine, but in a different way than before their abuse. Now, they felt possessed of better humor, wisdom, and emotional responsiveness.

> How has it affected me? I've developed a much better sense of humor. I don't take everything with a grain of salt nowadays. I take it with a five pound bag. With a nice pretzel on the side with cheese. But see, that's what helps when you've got those heartbreaking instances. I've changed quite a bit over the years. I've gotten a little softer, I guess, you know, it's that old age setting in, huh? But it's taken a while. It's taken quite a while. (*"Ken," 54-year-old single unemployed laboratory assistant, 3-year abusive marriage, out of IPV for 9 years*)

Thus, these men constructed their victimization in terms of a "softening" of masculinity by protesting the idea that their identities were still fundamentally masculine: "Strangely enough, it [the abuse] had good side effects. I mean, I can cry watching movies. I can feel things emotionally that probably I never would've had I not been through this" (*Kyle*). These men, although not representing the majority, separated from hegemonic expectations to more gender-flexible forms of protest masculinity.

IMPLICATIONS

CONSEQUENCES FOR INDIVIDUAL MEN

Findings from this study are valuable in that they demonstrate gender and power operating for male IPV victims through their identity constructions. Awareness of these processes, sources of struggle for many victims, can aid practitioners working with male victims. For example, the institutional culpability discussed by men in this sample is not unfounded. Unique cultural repercussions for male IPV victims include denial of social services, blame for victimization, and verbal and physical abuse from members of their social networks (Muller, Desmarais, & Hamel, 2009; Sarantakos, 1999). Compared to female victims, male victims have difficulty obtaining governmental protection, legal aid, and social support for their abuse (Migliaccio, 2001; Taub, 1983). Alienation, denigration, and limitation of resources are culturally sanctioned for men who fail to uphold traditionally masculine identities (Carney et al., 2007; Courtenay, 2000). However, the findings from this study reveal that it is not only institutional, but also personal perceptions that influence men's likelihood of seeking help for their victimization. Further, many of the men demon-

strated their own support of dominant norms. The men's awareness *and* continued reinforcement of prevailing gender standards suggest that programs tailored to male victims not only need to provide typical victim-aid resources (e.g., tangible, informational, and emotional support), but programs also should address personal masculinity concepts for individual men.

THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

Debate exists surrounding the prevalence of violence perpetration by and victimization of individual men. Gender theories of violence and hegemonic masculinity associate the construct with men's dominance—violence is purported to be necessary for maintaining patriarchal culture (Anderson, 1997; Braithwaite & Daly, 1994). However, most men do not perpetrate violence (Katz, 1995; White & Kowalski, 1994). And whereas this fact has been attributed by some scholars to a lack of violent necessity on the part of individual men, who may rely on popular conceptions of violence to intimidate (e.g., women's vulnerability to sexual violence) (Brownmiller, 1975; MacKinnon, 1983), the lived experiences of individual, diverse men are less certain. More likely, as demonstrated in this study, the theoretical concepts of societal norms influencing victim identification also operate for subordinated men.

Theories of hegemonic dominance suggest that order may be maintained by framing women as appropriate, and thus powerless, victims of IPV (Dobash & Dobash, 1978). This understanding of hegemony may apply equally to men, particularly abused men who differ from dominant gender norms. Concepts of hegemonic dominance and violent enforcement operate for everyone in a society, including otherwise "dominant" (e.g., White, heterosexual, educated) men (Hearn, 2004). Results from this study indicate a need for theories/models of gender, masculinity, and violence to include diverse understandings of power operating for *all* people involved.

LIMITATIONS

The primary limitations of this study included a limited sample size and the recruitment and participation procedures. With fewer men than women victimized by IPV, it is possible that the men in this study represented unique cases. Internet recruitment and telephone participation limited the sample to men with those resources. Additionally, soliciting from primarily violence-focused resources may have resulted in recruitment of participants with particularly severe or impressionable experiences, representing extreme cases. Another result of soliciting from groups identified with IPV is that the sample may be self-selected by participants who have a predisposition to victimization tendencies. While the narratives in this sample suggest the men were more averse than receptive to viewing themselves as IPV "victims" in the purest sense (i.e., of female perpetrators), it is nonetheless a possibility that this sampling bias occurred. Each of these factors may affect the generalizability of findings.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research should continue to examine how currently existing understandings of violence, gender, and power can account for male victims. If anything, this line of research will augment and improve our understanding of dominant societal structures. It would be helpful to know more about male IPV victims' coping strategies and their constructions of the actual IPV experience. Specifically, micro-ethnographic data should be collected that would explicate harm, severity of injury, violence motives, perpetration attempts, help-seeking efforts, and social attributions for the violence. Knowing more about these factors can inform policy decisions which influence medical and psychological assistance available for victims (Goodyear-Smith & Laidlaw, 1999). This research also would shed light on the subjective and varying experiences of IPV victims.

CONCLUSION

Viewing men as perpetrators and women as victims discounts men subjected to abuse. These men are subjugated not only as abuse victims, but also as un-masculine men by society. Individual resistance to this stigma was shown here through hegemonic re-construction of who/what was to blame and by men enacting protest forms of masculinity. All men (and women) must position themselves in relation to hegemonic norms, whether through silence/acceptance/complicity or protest of all forms of victimization.

REFERENCES

Anderson, K.L. (1997). Gender, status, and domestic violence: An integration of feminist and family violence approaches. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 59,* 655-669.

Bem, S.L. (1993). *The lenses of gender.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Bird, S.R. (1996). Welcome to the men's club: Homosociality and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity. *Gender & Society, 10,* 120-132.

Braithwaite, J., & Daly, K. (1994). Masculinities, violence and communitarian control. In T. Newburn & E.A. Stanko (Eds.), *Just boys doing business?: Men, masculinities, and crime* (pp. 189-213). New York: Routledge.

Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men, women, and rape.* New York: Bantam.

Coney, N.S., & Mackey, W.C. (1999). The feminization of domestic violence in America: The woozle effect goes beyond rhetoric. *Journal of Men's Studies, 8,* 45-58.

Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and power.* Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Connell, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Connell, R.W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society, 19,* 829-859.

Courtenay, W.H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: A theory of gender and health. *Social Science and Medicine, 50,* 1385-1401.

Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (1978). Wives: The "appropriate" victims of marital violence. *Victimology, 2,* 426-442.

Eckstein, J.J. (2009). Exploring the communication of men revealing abuse from female romantic partners. In D.D. Cahn (Ed.), *Family violence: Communication processes* (pp. 89-111). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Farber, I.E., Harlow, H.F., & West, J.L. (1957). Brainwashing, conditioning and DDD (Debility, Dependency and Dread). *Sociometry, 20,* 271-283.

Flynn, C.P. (1990). Relationship violence by women: Issues and implications. *Family Relations, 39,* 194-198.

George, M.J. (2002). Skimmington revisited. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 10,* 111-126.

George, M.J. (2003). Invisible touch. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 8,* 23-60.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Goodyear-Smith, F.A., & Laidlaw, T.M. (1999). Aggressive acts and assaults in intimate relationships: Towards an understanding of the literature. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 17,* 285-304.

Hall, J.D. (1983). "The mind that burns in each body": Women, rape, and racial violence. In A. Snitow, C. Stansell, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Powers of desire: The politics of sexuality* (pp. 328-349). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Harris, R.J., & Cook, C.A. (1994). Attributions about spouse abuse: It matters who the batterers and victims are. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 30,* 553-565.

Hearn, J. (2004). From hegemonic masculinity to the hegemony of men. *Feminist Theory, 5,* 49-72.

hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Johnson, M.P. (2008). *A typology of domestic violence: Intimate terrorism, violent resistance, and situational couple violence*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Katz, J. (1995). Reconstructing masculinity in the locker room: The mentors in violence prevention project. *Harvard Educational Review, 65,* 163-174.

Kimmel, M.S. (2006). *Manhood in America: A cultural history* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

LaRossa, R. (2005). Grounded theory methods and qualitative family research. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67,* 837-857.

MacKinnon, C.A. (1983). Feminism, Marxism, method, and the state: Toward feminist jurisprudence. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8,* 635-658.

Majors, R., & Billson, J.M. (1992). *Cool pose: The dilemmas of Black manhood in America*. New York: Touchstone.

Messerschmidt, J.W. (1994). Schooling, masculinities, and youth crime by white boys. In T. Newburn & E.A. Stanko (Eds.), *Just boys doing business?: Men, masculinities, and crime* (pp. 81-99). New York: Routledge.

Migliaccio, T.A. (2001). Marginalizing the battered male. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 9,* 205-226.

Miller, D.T., & Porter, C.A. (1983). Self-blame in victims of violence. *Journal of Social Issues, 39,* 139-152.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Muller, H., Desmarais, S., & Hamel, J. (2009). Do judicial responses to restraining order requests discriminate against male victims of domestic violence? *Journal of Family Violence, 24*, 619-624.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M.E.P. (1983). Learned helplessness and victimization. *Journal of Social Issues, 39,* 103-116.

Pyke, K.D. (1996). Class-based masculinities: The interdependence of gender, class, and interpersonal power. *Gender and Society, 10,* 527-549.

Romero, M. (1985). A comparison between strategies used on prisoners of war and battered wives. *Sex Roles, 13,* 537-547.

Sarantakos, S. (1999). Husband abuse: Fact or fiction? *Australian Journal of Social Issues, 34,* 231-252.

Stoler, A.L. (1997). Making empire respectable: The politics of race and sexual morality in twentieth-century colonial cultures. In A. McClintock, A. Mufti, & E. Shohat (Eds.), *Dangerous liaisons: Gender, nation, and postcolonial perspectives* (pp. 344-373). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge Press.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Taub, N. (1983). Adult domestic violence: The law's response. *Victimology, 8,* 152-171.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the* National Violence against Women Survey (NCJ-183781). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Walker, L.E.A. (2000). *The battered woman syndrome* (2nd ed.). New York: Springer.

White, J.W., & Kowalski, R.M. (1994). Deconstructing the myth of the nonaggressive woman. *Psychology of Woman Quarterly, 18,* 487-508.

THE OBSCENITY OF GENDER THEORY: BAUDRILLARD'S MASCULINITIES

ABSTRACT   Jean Baudrillard's mid-oeuvre views on gender, especially his formulation of the Nietzschean-Derridean *catachrestical* notion of Woman, has evoked both angry rejections and nuanced appraisals. Commentary as yet provides little specific reference to implications for the research vista of masculinity/ies that followed on feminist heels. This article revisits the Baudrillardian provocation of established politics around gender with a focus on the rubric and research field of men/masculinity.

KEYWORDS   JEAN BAUDRILLARD (1929-2007), MASCULINITY, MEN'S STUDIES, FEMINISM, REVIEW

The work of French sociologist, "pataphysicist," and provocateur Jean Baudrillard (1929-2007) presents a controversial counterpoint to feminism, critical theory, and politicization more generally. His oeuvre sets out to detect a deep problematic at the heart of gender theory, illustrative of a more encompassing obituary of dissent concurring with the late capitalist predicament of sign culture. It offered an engagement not so much with gender as an ethical and representational challenge, as with the possibility of taking up that challenge against the backdrop of an ambient "catastrophe" compromising the modern aspiration to truthful and meaningful representation per se.

The implications of Baudrillard's work for gender become apparent in his early books including *La Société de Consommation* (1970, pp. 139-143, 214-217 [translated in 1998]), are most condensed in *De la Séduction* (1979 [1990]), and resurface throughout his later work, for instance in *Le Crime Parfait* (1995 [1996, pp. 111-123]).[1] Commentary, at first focusing primarily on implications for feminism, has been formulated by (among others) Luce Irigaray (1980), Louise Burchill (1984), Jane Gallop (1986/1987), Tania Modleski (1986/1991, ch. 2), Dou-

---

[1] Parts of *Seduction* were reprinted in *The Revenge of the Crystal* (Baudrillard, 1999, pp. 129-162) and *The Jean Baudrillard Reader* (Redhead, ed., 2008, pp. 49-56). Gerry Coulter's *Baudrillard Index* (2007), available from the *International Journal of Baudrillard Studies* website (http://www.ubishops.ca/baudrillardstudies), provides a comprehensive phrase-based index with entries for *male*, *masculine*, *feminine*, *gender*, and *women*.

[a] Independent researcher, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

All correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Diederik F. Janssen, Bergen-Dalseweg 209k60, Nijmegen 6522BK, The Netherlands. Email: diederikjanssen@gmail.com.

glas Kellner (1988, pp. 143-150, 181-185), Suzanne Moore (1988, pp. 180 et seq.), Mike Gane (1990, pp. 324-327/1991a, pp. 57-65; 1991b; 2000, pp. 65-76; 2001, pp. 83-88; 2003, pp. 184-186), Sadie Plant (1993), A. Keith Goshorn (1994), David Bell (1997), Michelle Ballif (2001, ch. 4; cf. 1992), Paul Hegarty (2004, pp. 69-74), and most extensively and sympathetically in Victoria Grace's "first systematic feminist reading" of Baudrillard (2000; also 2008).

Where in early commentary Baudrillard has been read as symptomatic of "male theory" and as programmatically antifeminist, recent appraisals have assessed responses as themselves symptomatic of historicizable feminist disengagements from *non grata*, because "masculine," philosophical qualifications. Yet whereas nuanced engagements are being offered, in work by, for instance, Diane Rubenstein (1991/2007, ch. 4), Deidre Pribram (1993), Jennifer Croissant (2006), Kim Toffoletti (2007), and Ingrid Hoofd (2010), Baudrillard's post-Marxism remains noticeably remote to the (neo-Marxist) mainstreams of gender theory, and a surprisingly marginal discussant in established clusters of debate where he could have become canonical: "French feminism," "post-feminism," "posthumanism," and feminist-socialist commentary[2] on "late capitalist" sexual identities. Though Baudrillard's work straightforwardly invites dialogue with a range of tropes consistently claimed as feminist concerns— *femme fatale*, Freudian/Lacanian *femininity as masquerade*, *feminine mimicry* (Irigaray), *parody/drag, cyborg* (Haraway), *transsexuality* (e.g., Felski, 1996, pp. 339-342/2006, pp. 567-569)—it partakes equally in the problem of intellectual mobility, alliance, and complicity informing the "men-in-feminism" debate as it gained some prominence in the latter half of the 1980s.

To an important degree this discussion would seem to extend to the issue of intellectual affordance as it pertains to the frameworks of "men's studies," profeminism, "critical studies of men," and most recently, "male studies," frameworks whose institutional histories may seem to have inherited the schismatic habitus of organized feminism (compare Diane Elam, one of many to take up this question in relation to feminism and deconstruction: 1994, pp. 89-104). Where in the 1980s a focal problem was male philosophers' "masculine" pinpointing of "Woman" (Lacan after Freud; Derrida and Baudrillard after Nietzsche), the 1990s saw booming ethnographic interest in mundane "masculinities" and their "crisis" before and after the feminist gaze. Crystallizing feminism's perpetual problematic—"how to engage with the cultural legacy of masculine influence" (Rainford, 2005, p. 2)—any "masculinity studies" will find itself preoccupied with reflection on this engagement as itself an influential legacy of forensic pinpointing.

Below I provide a very concise summary of the Baudrillardian provocation of established politics around gender, with attention to implications for the rubric of masculinity and its elevation to a field of study. Briefly, Baudrillard stages an encounter of second wave feminism with poststructuralism

---

[2] Remarkably so, for instance, in Hennessy (2000). See further Still (1997).

against the background of an encounter of Marx with poststructuralism.[3] This diffraction of one problematic through the lens of another is arguably the central event in any academic rubrification caught up in establishing its own urgency, competitive edge, and winning slogans. Raewyn Connell's macro-economic indictment of "hegemonic masculinity," articulated in such tropes as "patriarchal dividend," emerges from a similar diffraction, and considering the importance of Connell for adding masculinities to gender theory's mid-1980s portfolio, Baudrillard represents a contemporary moment of provocation worth revisiting.

BAUDRILLARD'S *GENRE*/GENDER

The early Baudrillard's anthropological gestures set out to capture precisely the discursive drift that upholds and seeks to ground econo-political rubrics, including gender. This was to take the familiar French form of a *mise en scène* of "an impossible dilemma between critique [and] *jouissance*" (Gane, 2008, p. 305, writing about the later Baudrillard; cf. Goshorn, 1994, p. 262). Baudrillard reworks the conventional idea of sex and gender as distinct but superimposed representational plateaus answering to the commodity form (and hence to alienation critique), and reappraises them as condensations and operations, respectively, within a sign-centered, frantically mediated Umwelt. This contextualization sets out to mourn a fatally progressive[4] entropy of gender—its demotion from *symbolic* vitality to *semiotic* obscenity—but also hints at a redeeming, inevitable reversibility of this late 20th century inferno. Emancipatory gender theory, to Baudrillard, is complicit with a general banalization and destruction of a radical alterity native to the symbolic realm. Critical theory is banal in that it accomplishes not the sensible dialectic or the more humane or more democratic Freudomarxism it promises, but a protracted "disappearance" of its meaning: not a politico-economic recalibration of the sexual or its due intellectual visibility, but a *fatal* saturation of the theme through an immoderate production of agency and identity. This is gender's *transpolitical* stage: every charm and mystery has become politically transparent, delivered to an indiscriminate culture of awareness-raising, fact-sheeting, and disclosure, and where issues are so preceded, premeditated, and deciphered by their intrusive political moment(um), this moment(um) becomes strictly self-referential, narcissistic, and cancerous. In its theoretical moment, its advertised *moment suprême*, the gendered situation is not clarified, democratized, and humanized, but overproduced and overextended. The radical re-

---

[3] While Baudrillard's complicated nostalgic-histrionic temperament may seem to co-inflect with a wider poststructural turn in gender/sexuality thinking of the past three decades, this impression is typically nuanced by Baudrillard connaisseurs, apart from himself.

[4] Compare Doel (1999, pp. 80-100), for implications of this spatial metaphor.

sponse is to rescue gender from theory and information—by calling forth its worst-case scenario.

Baudrillard's Hour

> Nous souffrons tout les jours
> A quoi ça sert
> Ces crimes d'illusions
> Nous trompent tous
> Maintenant je suis las
> C'est tout ce que je ressens
>   —Portishead, "Only You" (unreleased promotional track)

Baudrillard features in a "French Nietzschean" take on "Woman" (e.g., Herbold, 1995, pp. 83-85) of which Derrida's works, and the subsequent "deconstruction and feminism" debate, took center stage, in particular the latter's 1978 *Spurs/Eperons*—published in bilingual format in the same year as Baudrillard's *De la Séduction* (1979)—and his 1982 "Choreographies" interview.[5] Elaborating earlier drafts, Derrida's eventual reading of Nietzsche, valorizing "maverick feminism" as the "beyond" of phallogocentrism, shows extensive parallels with Baudrillard's ambient Nietzscheanism.[6] What Nietzsche was after was "a third (fluid) position, beyond good and evil, beyond male and female, beyond logocentric thought altogether ... a space of productive indecision" (Davis, 2000, pp. 173, 176). Male response to consecutive initial waves of feminism and eventually contributing to its "third wave," one sees a sustained interest in a "post-" or "beyond" of the battle of the sexes, the place where mod-

---

[5] For Nietzsche on the feminine, see for instance Burgard (1994); for a defense of Nietzsche as "*the* philosopher of manliness in modern times" see Mansfield (2006, pp. 110-121). For the Nietzsche-feminism encounter, see for instance Patton (ed., 1993), Oliver (1995), and Oliver and Pearsall (eds., 1998). For the Derrida-feminism encounter see for instance Feder, Rawlinson and Zakin (eds., 1997) and Holland (ed., 1997).

[6] Baudrillard's thematizing of gender is somewhat dissociated from his polemic engagements with contemporary writers. Foucault wrote little on gender but was later to provide extensive impetus to feminist/gender and queer theory. Colleague sociologist Bourdieu, whose 1990 essay and 1998 book on *Masculine Domination* (the latter translated in 2001) enjoyed considerable feminist attention, did not cite and was never cited by Baudrillard. Deleuze's, with Guattari's, substantial, if diffuse, significance for gender and queer theory, as judged from three edited collections (Colebrook & Buchanan, eds., 2000; Colebrook & Weinstein, eds., 2008; Nigianni & Storr, eds., 2009) is not recognized as being impacted by Baudrillard. Ivan Illich, whose 1982 work on *Gender* immediately attracted feminist scrutiny and in roughly the same historical window, is, again, not referenced in Baudrillard's (subsequent) work and does not refer to Baudrillard.

ern gender's gender, precisely gender's political template of combatant, schismatic, resentful (op)positionality, is reverted and surpassed.

Two variably polarized tendencies in appraising Baudrillard emerge from this, one that resists being seduced by his ontological proposals and remains within the anthropological purview of gender critique, and one that is seduced into the French-Nietzschean gesturing to a "post-gender" via a disallowing of an external, critical basis for gender politics (*dehors-genre*). Gravitating onto the first pole, Gane (2000, p. 76; 2001) suggests that Baudrillard belongs to the same tradition—at once messianic, reactionary, and utopian—as Auguste Comte, where he (Gane) observes a common longing for a stable hetero-patriarchal framework considered catastrophically eroded by a politicized, mass culture of dedifferentiation, victimological *ressentiment*, and desperate, "hysterical," and manneristic forms of excess. As most early and some subsequent commentators have agreed, Baudrillard can be read as the latest wave of re-totemization of "male theory" at the site of men claiming the high ground of a canonical irony vis-à-vis "the masculine."

As analyzed below, Baudrillard tries to qualify exactly such a principle of remasculinization, namely by its soft spot: the seducible core of all totemic systems that furtively allows, and seeks, the systemic event of being "led astray"—thus spoiling the progressive curvature of gender theory where it lays claims to critical positionality and aspires to a sophisticated, undeceived literary forensics of notions such as *mastery*. The latter emphasis we get, for instance, in the rhetorical reading by Ballif, who has Baudrillard join the male ranks of Gorgias of Leontini and Nietzsche as denigrated *sophists* undoing the tendentious work of *philosophers*, by "unthinking the representable … attempting to un-represent Woman … [resisting the] rethinking [of] Woman as merely the other that sustains the subjectivity of the selfsame" (2001, p. 6).[7]

Most of secondary literature understands well the unfruitfulness of reading Baudrillard along strict genealogies. Baudrillardian themes emanate from an historical epoch in which many French authors dealt with the same Gordian knots.[8] Later coeditor of *Men in Feminism* (1987) Alice Jardine's notion and critique of *gynesis*—"the putting into discourse of 'woman' as that process beyond the Cartesian Subject, the Dialectics of Representation, or Man's Truth" (1982, p. 58)—is broadly extendible to Baudrillard. Although mostly concentrated on the collateral "deconstruction and feminism" interface, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak is an equally useful commentator, first given her approach of this interface from a postcolonial perspective, an approach potentially con-

---

[7] Not cited by Ballif, Bell (1997, pp. 22-23) made the same connection, and reads Baudrillard as conversant with Stendhal's libertine characters; Hanlon (2002) asks whether one must suspect a Sadean eroticism at the root of Baudrilardian seduction.

[8] Victoria Burrus (2004, pp. 155-159) among others has suggested that Luce Irigaray anticipated Baudrillard's resistance against depth, the latter being the one failing to let himself be seduced.

versant with the "anthropological" spin of Baudrillard's early work, and second, where suggesting that the Derridean-Nietzschean-Baudrillardian Woman (as Derrida's *différance* and as Baudrillard's *primitive* or *child*[9]) constitutes an example of *catachresis*—"a metaphor without a literal referent standing in for a concept that is the condition of conceptuality ... [one name among others] of the non-truth of truth"—only ever a necessarily historical catachresis among catachreses, and to be deconstructed as such (Spivak, 1989, pp. 211, 219). "Woman" and "primitive" were catachrestical installments, nominalisms pitted against an ambient presence/power/attitude/gender/*virtus*. The fundamental task, feminist or not, was to escape complicity with its transcendental *virtues* (their mystique, office, prestige, referentiality) precisely where they tried to pinpoint, define, ground, and contain (for instance in an "opposite sex") their own point of opposition and dissolution: an ultra-feminism that proved beyond feminists (Baudrillard lamented repeatedly), and whose stakes lay forever somewhere else.

Though macro-historical, Baudrillard's work never aspired, nor directly responded, to the kind of historical analyses of modernity's gender offered by, for example, Rita Felski (1995, in turn only briefly touching upon his work). Baudrillard's conceptual apparatus relied rather on a rhetorical style distinct for its declarative, hyperbolic figures, the way theses are used to push to their limit the conceptual repertoire of contemporary intellectual movements and celebrities, and the radical assessment thus arrived at both of ambient conditions for historical and political eventuality ("the social," the subject, communication, critique), as well as of political playing fields such as sexuality and consumption. It is perhaps most productive to historicize Baudrillard as a provocateur of all the animated passions of the 1960s/70s—Freudo-Marxism, media theory, second wave feminism, sex therapy, minority and human rights, *anti-authoritäre Erziehung*: the "liberation" climate more generally, especially as seen through the prism of May 1968—but equally of the nascent stages of poststructuralism. Baudrillard announces the bankruptcy of nearly all critical thought in the occidental, late 20th century information age and its loud scenes (the ob-scenity) of political assertion—the promotional vortex of identity, difference, rights, and performance. Baudrillard's argument itself takes on explicitly temporal dimensions, seeking to secure a post-apocalyptic narrative position from which to look back on such treasured conceptual densities as reality, sociality, and gender: as "lost" facets of the good life, or else to anticipate their pending loss by extrapolating their centrifugal dispersion into the semio-informational void.

Baudrillard's Edge

> L'ampleur de notre guerre
> Ce n'est qu'un rêve

---

[9] For a critical note on Baudrillard's "primitive," see Lyotard (1974[1993, pp. 103-108]); on "child," consult Janssen (forthcoming a).

On a tout ecrasé
Ça je peux le voir égoïstement
Nous avons echoué
C'est tout ce que je ressens
    —Portishead, "Only You"

The translation of *De la Séduction* silently coincided with Butler's *Gender Trouble* (1990), which marked the American condensation of "queer theory." Grace (2000) is one of the few to offer a step in the direction of cross-theorizing Baudrillard and the queer vista, which should count as one of the more acutely interesting areas of engagement: on the one hand, we see a shared reconsideration of subjectivity, identity, and of agonistic political formulas such as liberation and legal codification, as ultimately naive and suspect. One observes a common allergic diathesis being triggered by the ennui of banal political arrival and by the "carceral" overtones of administrative consolidation. On the other hand, "queer" at times assumes the contours of gender's ultimate "fatal strategy" in Baudrillard's appraisal—a process that seeks the moment of its own exhaustion and saturation—or elsewhere, an answer to that symptomatic, rhetorical query, "what are you [theorists] doing after the orgy?"[10] The historical event of queer theory, as a statement of impatience with the preceding paradigm of rights and emancipation, may be rehearsing a similar nostalgic maneuver as feminism, seeking to reclaim for "gay presence" its now disowned privilege of intellectual marginality where it found itself facing its own sudden integration—the purgatory of political and academic arrival: an uncompromising push toward visibility, permission, (homo)normativity, legal representation, medical approval, curriculum, and (deadly) indulgence.

The route Baudrillard takes leads to rejection of critical theory in favor of a confrontational, "fatal" style of argument that seeks to escalate, before the mind's eye, the complicity of political theory with the regime it purports to challenge. While almost nowhere Baudrillard directly enters into dialogue with empirical or theoretical accomplishments from the edifice of gender theory (other than by interpreting the consolidation of such an edifice as symptomatic), he does directly, if briefly, address the French feminist scene as personified by psychoanalyst Luce Irigaray. While his work seeks alignment with a long tradition of comparative anthropological theory, and although well-travelled, Baudrillard seems equally irresponsive not only to contemporary anthropological work on the sex/gender/sexuality complex, but to mostly any disciplinary demarcation of that complex.

The Baudrillardian oeuvre derives its edge in part through the trans-Atlantic tension that drives especially the author's later work, as it renders America an oxymoronic "utopia achieved," the ground zero of simulation, excess

---

[10] Baudrillard is not immediately conversant with "queer" beyond a brief comment on the 1980s "gender benders" in *Amérique* (1986).

transparency, "integral reality," and progressive deterioration of the possibilities of dissent. The redemptive Other of this system of promiscuous semiotic hyphenation under high modernity is the precapitalist, "primitive" situation of symbolic exchange. This latter scene is supposed to break free from the strictures of value and the necessities of law: a challenge, epitomized by Marcel Mauss's gift (in ultimo the potlatch) or the aristocratic duel. Gender, to Baudrillard, is at stake in these events as anti-figures of economy's principle of generalized and limitless exchangeability—more than (in critical theory) as indexical to their participants as active stakeholders in an unproblematically material, socio-political predicament. In the gift we encounter not equity or representation but a wholly different "metabolism of exchange, prodigality, festival," now mobilized in a recuperation of sociality through a "radical negation" of the modern productivism that encodes, promotes, and escalates genders and sexualities as it does everything else, by the indiscretions and insinuations of total representation and fulfilled entitlements.

It is thus that the elaboration of Baudrillard's work points to, but then fails to engage with, Melanesianists such as Maurice Godelier and Majorie Strathern, both of whom look extensively both at the gift and at the "production of men" in precapitalist, gift-structured societies (Godelier, 1986; Godelier & Strathern, eds., 1991; Strathern, 1988).[11] Strathern, for instance, provides an ethnographic reading of gender as the fleeting after-image of a constant transfer of symbolic items and body fluids, counterpointing proprietary ideas of circumscribed gender identities.

But even this seemingly powerful ethnographic caveat of theory's resonance with capitalism can be said to collude with a deep logic of discovery and methodological realism which Baudrillard would have partake in a masculinity informing *all* will to theoretical excavation. Baudrillard rather gained notoriety by offsetting his polemics to established theory and emergent establishment of criticism, and from a mode of conceptual anthropology privileging inductive thinking over ethnographic nuance, rendering his ideas co-extensive, after Nietzsche, with Durkheim, Bataille, Caillois, Mauss, and Deleuze.

SEDUCTION

> On a choisi de prendre tout ce qu'on pouvait
> Ce teint d'automne a une fin amer
> Des années de frustration s'allongent côte à côte
> —Portishead, "Only You"

---

[11] The same argument has been made by Grace (2000, p. 5); see also Janssen (forthcoming b). Incidentally, Strathern also takes up distinctly Baudrillardian themes "at home" (2000).

Of all hot spots of radical alterity Baudrillard deploys against "production"—*symbolic violence, impossible exchange, the fatal, evil, radical illusion, singularity*—*seduction* is the most explicitly and consistently gendered, and in a way that sets up the two genders as "Manichean world processes" (Hegarty, 2004, p. 70). Baudrillard conceptualizes gender as symptom of, and a potent cipher for, a world order characterized by consumerism, the simulacrum, and mass mediation—a *post hoc* assessment of the progressive dissipation of revolution into ethics.

Baudrillard's interest is in gender, not sex. The latter, to the early, Marxist Baudrillard, lies fully in the realm of ideology and alienation: sex as an effect of semiological reduction, a dispersal of an irreducible reality into a "great distinctive structure ... into sexes that are full, distinct and opposed to one another" (1981, p. 99). Gender, to the later Baudrillard, partakes in a principle of duality more profound, more *ironic*, than that of banal complementarity or commensurability: a radical asymmetry that does not leave room for "difference" nor for a politics based on, and thus having to insist on, difference. Such non-commutability therefore acts as a counterpoint to gender theories that see gender as the production of difference, a scene of differential construction or performance amounting to an ethics of balance rather than an antidote to balanced in-difference.

Femininity, to mid-oeuvre Baudrillard, figures forth a capacity to radically revert, undo, or unwind masculinity as a totalizing order of production, subjectivity, functionality, law, certainty, and reality, and "reverse" it through discretion, ritual, charm—not *invert* it and reiterate structure, nor *subvert* it and *presuppose* structure, but *revert* so as to blur the very structuralist stamp of approval on itself as instantiation of law, nature, truth. Productivism finds itself confronted in a "parallel universe" properly understood in terms of "play, challenges, duels, the strategy of appearances" (1979 [1990, p. 7]): "an ironic alternative form, one that breaks the referentiality of sex, and provides a place, not of desire, but of play and defiance" (pp. 21, 38). Seduction denoted

> first, that reversible form in which both physiological sexes played out their identity, put themselves at play. What interested me was a kind of becoming-masculine and becoming-feminine of the masculine, against the prejudiced view that the masculine in itself is sexual identity. I understood the feminine as that which contradicts the masculine/feminine opposition, the value opposition between the two sexes. The feminine was that which transversalized these notions and, in a manner of speaking, abolished sexual identity. ... Seduction is not so much a play on desire as a playing with desire. It does not deny it, nor is it its opposite, but sets it in play. (Baudrillard, 2003, pp. 21-22)

This style of juxtaposition was intended to be controversial, and successfully attempted to move French philosophical concerns into the heartland of feminist strategizing, concerns that sought not so much to dismiss as to play-

fight, not so much to condemn as to stir up, not so much to colonize or reoccupy but to flirt with border patrollers, and not so much to disembody as to trick into red-faced indignation what had allowed itself to become a political routine. Seduction named a principle of indecision to be contrasted with the feminist-victimological reinvocation in the late 1970s and 1980s of Freud's 1897 "seduction hypothesis," as well as with Jean Laplanche's contemporary Lacanian suggestion to understand seduction as a "primal," "fundamental anthropological situation" (Fletcher, 1999, p. 12, cf. 130). Baudrillard's seduction partakes neither in the melodrama of an inescapable sexual destructivity, nor in the idea of an elementary "developmental" momentum. Rather, it amounts to an elusive pseudo-agonistic agency, or rather a principle of resilience, removed from, yet unraveling and defusing from within, the positive mode of infinite linear culminations—visibility, investment, materiality, depth, value, meaning, fitness, health, the market, and the law.

Simultaneously, seduction proper salvages "Man" from the disenchanted *fascinations* or "cold seduction" that characterize the conspiratorial semiosis and "new victim order" of late capitalism. Judith Butler's tropes of *doing* and *undoing*, in Baudrillard's perusal, become not acts of (in)(sub)ordination or direct sabotage, but incommutable orders that alternatively entrench and disembark the implied form of opposition. The feminine (as elsewhere in Baudrillard the Child and the Object) assumes but one shape of a cunning irony, a presentiment that "plays with the masculine, somewhere beyond sexual difference:" "an ironic, alternative form, one that breaks the referentiality of sex and provides a space, not of desire, but of play and defiance" (1996, p. 123; 1990, p. 21). It is consequently "of little import whether or not that [cunning] corresponds to real women." The idea of a distinctive dialectic or oppositional scheme itself *is* the masculine violence. Femininity names the principle of dissolution, corrosive irony, or implosion of polarity and of dialectics altogether: its unassimilability into feminist dialectics is exactly the point it is trying to make, the trick it is trying to pull. Baudrillard's Woman is nothing more and nothing less than the principle of challenge to the masculine as guarded and self-satisfied hegemony "true to itself" in its own mirror: contrary to the latter, she "has no anxious focalization on sex," her feminine cunning is properly *fatale*—"the object which plays out all the liquidities of desire" (1987, p. 96/1993, p. 111).

Gender Theory's Mirror of Production

> It's only you
> Who can tell me apart
> And it's only you
> Who can turn my wooden heart
> > —Portishead, "Only You"

The foregoing has implications for gender both as a theoretical ambit, and as a political cause or dimension in value-based statements. Seduction entails

privileging of a phenomenology of resistance that is neither cumulative nor assertive or confrontational, rather one that operates by decomposition and disarticulation: "Seduction does not make desire and sexual difference an issue except to reverse or play with it" (Baudrillard in Hunter 1991, p. 290).

Baudrillard's concept of gender is readily intelligible as contemporary and interdiscursive with Derrida but independently derives from his early assessment of the structural interweaving of political economy and signification, and the implied eligibility of addressing the common, productivist code dominating *axiological* (value-based) and *semiotic* (sign-based) processes. There are profound implications here for the relation between *object* and *subject*, whose juxtaposition underlies (pro)feminist and "men's" mobilization against the "object" status of women and concommitant pursuit of viable or workable subjectivities. What the French were after is the "ultrastructural" masculinism—the conceptual violence—of the subjectivism assumed and reinforced in the Anglo-American neo-Marxism of gender. The idea of an unalienated subjecthood further entrenches the "hegemony" and transcendent id-entity of *homo economicus*.

As argued, Baudrillard considers this entrenchment as exactly the working level of gender. We might venture that "the feminine" and "the masculine," if anything, only ever prove contrasts vital for a poetic dynamism; that both feminism and masculinism are organized efforts to revert an ever imminent endangerment of an only ever poetic polarity; but also that none of these self-conscious *isms* will survive their own success or transcendence; what both must overcome are inadvertent complicities not with the other side but with the final certitude of sidedness, which would mean the desiccation of their respective poetics. In their delicate anthropological presence, they cannot be reconciled, meet on the same level, or admit their parity. Rather than mirrored, genders "become each other's destiny," each other's imaginary and interlocutor. Man is vitalized by this interlocution, his seduction, a delicate situation undermined when seduction joins the real (the "feminist" nightmare), or when it turns "cool" (a generalized "debasement of play to the level of function") and engulfs Man altogether—when no longer poised on the brink between man and his void (the "cybernetic" nightmare). Both Sadie Plant (1993) and Mike Gane (1992/1993, ch.11) suggest Baudrillard, as read against Irigaray's *Amante Marine de Friedrich Nietzsche* (1980, translated 1991), articulates a general masculine predicament, an anxious maneuvering before the true threat of the feminine when the latter "takes control:" man's contorted valorizing of his projected beyond-value, his symptomatic attempt to define the point of his own indetermination, metaphorizing and conceptualizing his own horizon of representation, theorizing his phantasm. But was there not in second wave feminism a comparable dynamic and anxiety, where it staged its nemesis as a total and perennial conspiracy, and where its victimology has little in-house resources to moderate a habit of spindoctoring, deploying the very same "grooming" tactics it sought to expose in all varieties of "predators," intellectual "patriarchy," and queer-poststructural melodrama?

Baudrillard's work is of interest in tracing the historical conditionality of these vital anxieties. Baudrillard argues that the 1960/70s Zeitgeist of sexual

liberation created an uncertainty that forced gender to become a site of nostalgic, productivist overdrive, an ethnographic and theoretical frenzy symptomatic of the paradox of the disappearance of phenomenona placed under intense scrutiny—"once you are liberated you are forced to ask who you are." In this sense, feminism never liberated "women," it only ever produced "woman," and only ever found itself further integrated into the order of productivity that spelled out liberation as an imperative of self-enhancement. The prospect for women was that of the phallocratic apparatus: an ethic of imploding poles through their unreserved promotion as equivalent identity options and values, answering to a managerialist mantra of transparency, accountability, and sustainability. The assertive *ism* of equity feminism and such modes of academic posturing as "feminist anthropology," to Baudrillard, present "one of the most advanced forms of *ressentiment*," the collusive call for legitimation and legal recrimination rather than launching everything "back" into an orbit of symbolic exchange, of indetermination.

In Baudrillard's early anti-masculinism, rather than rescuing the (sexual) subject from objectification, the object, *the site of becoming-object*, of *becoming-Woman*, should be celebrated as reversing (as a reversal of) an otherwise boundless political exaltation of the (sexual) subject. Where as a state of operation this exaltation allows its being gender-coded (as masculine, or recently as demarking institutional or managerial "masculinities"), the unrestrained *demasqué* and disclosure of the masculine crime from a feminine victim position, trauma, or *écriture*, is only ever one of the most telling symptoms of a fundamental imbalance: an ambient bias of depth, grounding meaning, reality, and value. The modern mobilization against this bias risks a perverse effect: the very installation of what is lamented as hegemony, that is, the ideational order of consolidated (advertized, rationalized, ethically transparent, grounded) positions on the side of evidential and transparent truth. What results is a generalized predicament of restless motility under the hard light of fair proof, a tyranny of equity, parity, sustainability, representation, and inclusivity in which gender is forever emancipated, namely from symbolic vitality.

<div align="center">

A Stale Bitter End?
Baudrillard's Masculinities

</div>

Masculinity used to be the order of production, cumulation, assertion, ratiocination; the mode of capital, society, law, dominion, and rights. As such it invaginated feminism where the latter aspired to agonistic politics, to emulation, identification (a *getting even*) with the aggressor. During the late 1980s, however, Baudrillard begins to claim masculinity doesn't survive late capitalism (Goshorn, 1994, pp. 283-284): loss of virile mythologies as of feminine emblems, and the reign of the *transsexual*, the figure of an in-different, neutered excess of the sexual. Baudrillard would maintain in a 1988 interview that his "hypothesis is that masculinity does not exist, it is a gigantic story of simulation" (in Hunter, 1991, p. 290), its reign a "fable:" "but a residual, secondary and fragile formation, one that must be defended by retrenchments, institutions,

and artifices ... eccentric, paradoxical, paranoid and tiresome" (1990, p. 16). Moreover, it would be exactly the *hyper*masculine momentum of the informational scene (a drive toward hypervisibility and hyperfactuality) that brings about its reversal into a generalized indetermination (resisting both subjectivity and objectivity), epitomized by the indifferent, irresponsive masses.

If so, "All the endless commentaries on the sexual privilege of the masculine gender are thus mere foolishness" (1995 [1996, p. 117]) because privilege always lies elsewhere, in the situation of a critical excess, which is masculinity's ultimate, and indeed "perpetual," crisis. Theory is ambivalent. It lays claims to *revealing* a constitutive crisis at the heart of all masculine manifestations; equally, as the engine of an emancipatory drive, theory contributes to stasis resulting from pathological flux: both genders have succumbed to a generic narcissism under duress of a pervasive promiscuity of all sexual significations, and as such, neither centralized claims to power nor the decentral contestation of such claims remain truly eventful (2001, p. 136)—nor, ultimately, the twofoldness of gender.

As Derrida's politics of undecidability, Baudrillard wants to reinstate a radical responsibility lost first to a humanist metaphysics, and second to a hyperreal semiotic Umwelt. Neither a Nature nor a twittering of all opinions leads to accountable "Man." Yet Baudrillard's poetic sensibility (see Coulter, 2008) proves decidedly resistant to any integration into "gender theory," feminist pragmatics, or men's studies. Erickson and Thomson (2004) suggest, in a move resembling the American appropriation of *French thought* into *French theory*, that Baudrillard can be situated within the wider contours of "seduction theory," and that such theory can be productively deployed for precise political ends as a rhetorical stylistics that wrestles free from "ideology," elicits "desire in subjects," and delivers "liberation" and "empowerment" if only feminists could appropriate seduction's "interpretive value and heuristic merit."

A comparably pragmatic approach to Baudrillard is presented by Elizondo (2005) with reference to "men's studies." As argued, however, such programmatic deployments seem to be integrally discordant to Baudrillard's radical notion of seduction, which is pitted *exactly against* the transcendental merits of value, the heuristic moment, the desiring subject, its liberation, assertive power, its productive ethos and telos. Thus, as the authors note but for much more profound reasons than suggested, Baudrillard's gestures touch upon basic "unresolved tensions" (p. 314) between "seductive" and "productive" feminism, and (gender) theory more generally. "Integration," then, is no option: Baudrillard is "the model of an undisciplined thinker whose theorizing is undisciplinable" (Genosko, 1998, p. 6)—but precisely where he announces the bankruptcy of all positive models.[12]

A number of inferences can be made, and they will have to remain speculative. First, the current "theoretical" scene of gender if anything seems to be

---

[12] The same is true for the art world (Lotringer, 2001, pp. 150-153).

an ambivalent situation in which the critical position serves to keep in a state of poetic vitality that which it simultaneously wants to decipher, disclose, disrobe, and rob from its mystique. Early, and perhaps enduring, feminist resistance against the idea of men ("re")claiming a position of critical authority over masculinity, was possibly only the panicked reinvocation ("constitutive reiteration") of a gendered scene that had ceased to exist save that reiteration—the crime scene of gender whose investigation is forever kept in a state of irresolution, and where the theoretical gesture has come to inhabit the otherwise unarticulated, yet vital, space of gendered assertion: where "it" could have lingered as an idiosyncratic motif or mythic vector, but where now reigns an endless complaint against hegemony. Some commentators indeed follow Baudrillard in his assumption of a temporality after an intellectual orgy, of theory as perhaps only the epiphenomenon or echo of a disseminated irony, now having to deal with its own ubiquity, its own humorless victory. The current proclamation of "postfemininities" and "postfeminisms" (which features almost no reference to Baudrillard) seems to be evermore cautiously about dealing "productively" with a generalized situation of backlash; an engagement, then, with the Baudrillardian forensics and diagnostics of (hyper)assertive reality and rebound disappearance: a universal deregulation of all human relations as the paradoxical result of a total gender-coding, the ennui of a perfect gender-consciousness.

Masculinity, in the French reading and by its own unshakable definition, is that which delimits femininity to a derivative, supplemental, residual, or complementary function. This begs the familiar questions of coalition and public relations: whether Baudrillard, and by extension all possible intruders and "pimps of postmodernism" (Moore, 1988), represents another derivational ("male") tactic, or whether he can be allied to, or put to use in, a break with this tactical order. What Baudrillard may be suggesting, however, is that gender seeks evermore abstracted levels of strategizing as it becomes an evermore ironic posture, and mimics this situation by escalating the stakes to yet another level, at which "escape" proper must entail precisely the dissembling of guarded territorialism and strategic postures. Gender's level of operation, in other words, may be indefinitely deferred (a Baudrillardian reversibility: *what is masculine at one level becomes feminine where exhausted at the next level*), such that any progressivist politics can only ever sustain itself as a guarded delimitation of analytic scope, thus forfeiting its signature claim to a clever exteriority. Baudrillard's trope of "event horizon" disarms gender's *plan de campagne*: every linear tactic, followed through to its ultimate telos, will find itself having travelled on a Möbius strip, having gained a critical mass beyond which the stakes start to point to their own stakeness.

It would be too much to claim that feminism is only ever masculinity's most tragic hegemony embodied. Yet feminism's claim to Woman, duplicated since the late 1970s in the name of "the Child"—victims of total conspiracies (the masculine, sexuality, culture), their entitled sexualities forever misappropriated by faddish doctrines such as "queer theory"—has been only one of

many unfruitfully productivist litanies that overproduce the Child-Woman as the eternal dupe of a universe whose "sense of maleness" is, however, only too unproblematically embraced as women's prospectus. If "man" amounts to a witnessing of this situation from the alleged position of the hegemon, "men's studies" may have to recognize itself as the inevitable ground zero of late modernity's counterhegemonic surge. The question is whether to be disciplined or undisciplined: whether to co-produce a "New Man" or viable queeritude, reclaim some legal or biological justice, or instead lead astray all self-centered movements, alliances, fundaments, and entitlements.

REFERENCES

Ballif, M. (1992). Re/dressing histories; Or, on re/covering figures who have been laid bare by our gaze. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 22*(1), 91-98.

Ballif, M. (2001). *Seduction, sophistry, and the woman with the rhetorical figure*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Baudrillard, J. (1970). *La société de consommation*. Paris: Gallimard. Translated as *The consumer society: Myths and structures* (London/Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1998).

Baudrillard, J. (1979). *De la séduction*. Paris: Galilée. Translated as *Seduction* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990).

Baudrillard, J. (1981). *For a critique of the political economy of the sign*. St. Louis, MO: Telos Press. (Work originally published 1972)

Baudrillard, J. (1995). *Le crime parfait*. Paris: Galile͒e. Translated as *The perfect crime* (London/New York: Verso, 1996).

Baudrillard, J. (2003). *Passwords*. New York: Verso.

Baudrillard, J.; Gane M. (Ed.). (1993). *Baudrillard live: Selected interviews*. London; New York: Routledge.

Baudrillard, J.; Genosko, G. (Ed.). (2001). *The uncollected Baudrillard*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Baudrillard, J.; Lotringer, S. (Ed.). (1987). *Forget Foucault*. New York, NY: Semiotext(e).

Bell, D.F. (1997). Stendhal's legacy: Baudrillard on seduction. In D.D. Fisher & L.R. Schehr, (Eds.), *Articulations of difference: Gender studies and writing in French* (pp. 18-33). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). La domination masculine [Male domination]. *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales, 84*, 2-31.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *La domination masculine*. Paris: Seuil. Translated as *Masculine Domination* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001).

Burchill, L. (1984). Either/or: Peripeteia of an alternative on Jean Baudrillard's *De la Séduction*. In A. Frankovits (Ed.), *Seduced and abandoned: The Baudrillard scene* (pp. 28-44). Glebe, NSW, Australia & New York: Stonemoss Services & Semiotext(e).

Burgard, P.J. (1994). *Nietzsche and the feminine*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Burrus, V. (2004). *The sex lives of saints: An erotics of ancient hagiography*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Colebrook, C., & Buchanan, I. (Eds.) (2000). *Deleuze and feminist theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Colebrook, C., & Weinstein, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Deleuze and gender*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Coulter, G. (2008). Baudrillard and Holderlin and the poetic resolution of the world. *Nebula, 5*(4), 145-164.

Croissant, J.L. (2006). The new sexual technobody: Viagra in the hyperreal world. *Sexualities, 9*(3), 333-344.

Davis, D.D. (2000). *Breaking up (at) totality: A rhetoric of laughter*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Derrida, J., & McDonald, C.V. (1982). Choreographies. *Diacritics, 12*(2), 66-76.

Doel, M.A. (1999). *Poststructuralist geographies*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.

Elam, D. (1994). *Feminism and deconstruction*. New York: Routledge.

Elizondo, T.S. (2005). "The consumption of masculinity one object at a time": A sociological approach to understanding masculinity vis-à-vis Jean Baudrillard's system of objects. Ph.D. dissertation, Bowling Green State University.

Erickson, K.V. & Thomson, S. (2004). Seduction theory and the recovery of feminine aesthetics: Implications for rhetorical criticism. *Communication Quarterly*, *52*(3), 300-319.

Feder, E.K., Rawlinson, M.C., & Zakin, E. (Eds.). (1997). *Derrida and feminism: Recasting the question of woman.* New York: Routledge.

Felski, R. (1995). *The gender of modernity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Felski, R. (1996). Fin de siècle, fin de sexe: Transsexuality, postmodernism, and the death of history. *New Literary History, 27*(2), 337-349. Reprinted in S. Stryker & S. Whittle (Eds.), *The transgender studies reader* (pp. 565-573). New York: Routledge, 2006.

Fletcher, J. (1999). Introduction. In J. Laplanche, *Essays on Otherness*. London: Routledge.

Gallop, J. (1986). French theory and the seduction of feminism. *Paragraph, 8*, 19-24. Republished in A. Jardine & P. Smith (Eds.). (1987), *Men in feminism* (pp. 111-115). New York: Methuen.

Gane, M. (1990). Ironies of postmodernism: Fate of Baudrillard's fatalism. *Economy and Society, 19*(3), 314-331.

Gane, M. (1991a). French anti-feminism: The case of Jean Baudrillard. *Modern & Contemporary France, 44*, 19-25.

Gane, M. (1991b). *Baudrillard: Critical and fatal theory*. London/New York: Routledge.

Gane, M. (1992). Nietzsche's imaginary lovers. *Economy and Society, 21*(2), 173-191.

Gane, M. (1993). *Harmless lovers?: Gender, theory, and personal relationships*. London: Routledge.

Gane, M. (2000). *Jean Baudrillard: In radical uncertainty*. London/Sterling, Va.: Pluto Press.

Gane, M. (2001). Reading gender futures, from Comte to Baudrillard. *Social Epistemology, 15*(2), 77-89.

Gane, M. (2003). *French social theory.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gane, M. (2008). Cool memories: Baudrillard and the crisis of reading. *French Cultural Studies, 19*(3), 305-315.

Genosko, G. (1998). *Undisciplined theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Godelier, M. (1986). *The making of great men: Male domination and power among the New Guinea Baruya*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Godelier, M., & Strathern, M. (Eds.) (1991) *Big men and great men: Personifications of power in Melanesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goshorn, A.K. (1994). Valorizing "the feminine" while rejecting feminism? Baudrillard's feminist provocations. In D. Kellner (Eds.), *Baudrillard: A critical reader* (pp. 257-291). Oxford/Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Grace, V. (2000). *Baudrillard's challenge: A feminist reading*. London/NY: Routledge.

Grace, V. (2008). Baudrillard's illusions: The seduction of feminism. *French Cultural Studies, 19*(3), 347-361.

Hanlon, N. (2002). Is there a Sadean eroticism at the heart of Baudrillard? *Contemporary French and Francophone Studies, 6*(1), 213–226.

Hegarty, P. (2004). *Jean Baudrillard: Live theory*. London/New York: Continuum.

Hennessy, R. (2000). *Profit and pleasure: Sexual identities in late capitalism*. New York: Routledge.

Herbold, S. (1995). Well-placed reflections: (Post)modern woman as symptom of (post)modern man. *Signs, 21*(1), 83-115.

Holland, N.J. (Ed.). (1997). *Feminist interpretations of Jacques Derrida*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Hoofd, I.M. (2010). Between Baudrillard, Braidotti and Butler: Rethinking left-wing feminist theory in light of neoliberal acceleration. *International Journal of Baudrillard Studies, 7*(2).

Hunter, D. (1991). Interview with Jean Baudrillard. In D.B. Downing & S. Bazargan (Eds.), *Image and ideology in modern/postmodern discourse* (pp. 287-291). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Illich, I. (1982). *Gender*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Irigaray, L. (1980, March). La femme n'est rien et c'est là sa puissance [Woman is nothing and that is her power]. *Histoires d'Elles, 21*, 3.

Irigaray, L. (1991). *Marine lover of Friedrich Nietzsche*. New York: Columbia University Press. (Work originally published 1980)

Janssen, D.F. (forthcoming a). *To Catch a Predator*: American bestiary as fatal burlesque. *International Journal of Baudrillard Studies, 8*(1).

Janssen, D.F. (forthcoming b), Can the hegemon speak? Concluding masculinity with anthropology. In J.H. Arnold & Sean B. (Eds.), *What is masculinity? Historical dynamics from antiquity to the contemporary world*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Jardine, A. (1982). Gynesis. *Diacritics, 12*(2), 54-65.

Kellner, D. (1988). *Jean Baudrillard: From Marxism to post-modernism and beyond*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lotringer, S. (2001). Doing theory. In S. Lotringer & S. Cohen (Eds.), *French theory in America* (pp. 125-162). NY/London: Routledge.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1993). *Libidinal economy*. Trans. I.H. Grant. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. (Work originally published 1974)

Mansfield, H.C. (2006). *Manliness*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Modleski, T. (1986). Femininity as mas(s)querade: A feminist approach to mass culture. In C. McCabe (Ed.), *High theory/Low culture: Analysing popular television and film* (pp. 37-52). New York: St. Martin Press.

Modleski, T. (1991). *Feminism without women: Culture and criticism in a postfeminist age*. New York: Routledge.

Moore, S. (1988). Getting a bit of the other—The pimps of postmodernism. In R. Chapman & J. Rutherford (Eds.), *Male order. Unwrapping masculinity* (pp. 165-192). London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Nigianni, C., & Storr, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Deleuze and queer theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Oliver, K. (1995). *Womanizing Nietzsche: Philosophy's relation to the "feminine."* New York: Routledge.

Oliver, K., & Pearsall, M. (Eds.). (1998). *Feminist interpretations of Friedrich Nietzsche*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Patton, P. (Ed.). (1993). *Nietzsche, feminism, and political theory*. London: Routledge.

Plant, S. (1993). Baudrillard's woman: The eve of seduction. In C. Rojek & B.S. Turner (Eds.), *Forget Baudrillard?* (pp. 88-106). London/New York: Routledge.

Pribram, D.E. (1993). Seduction, control, and the search for authenticity. Madonna's "truth or dare." In C. Schwichtenberg (Ed.), *The Madonna connection* (pp. 189-212). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Rainford, L. (2005). *She changes by intrigue: Irony, femininity and feminism*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Redhead, S. (Ed.). (2008). *The Jean Baudrillard reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rubenstein, D. (1991). This is not a president: Baudrillard, Bush and enchanted simulation. In A. & M. Kroker (Eds.), *The hysterical male* (pp. 253-265). St. Martin's Press. Reprinted as chapter 4 in Rubenstein, D. (2007). *This is not a president: Sense and nonsense in the American political imaginary*. New York: New York University Press.

Spivak, G.C. (1989). Feminism and deconstruction, again: Negotiating with unacknowledged masculinism. In T. Brennan (Ed.), *Between feminism and psychoanalysis* (pp. 206-223). London: Routledge.

Still, J. (1997). *Feminine economies: Thinking against the market in the Enlightenment and the late twentieth century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Strathern, M. (1988). *The gender of the gift: Problems with women and problems with society in Melanesia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Strathern, M. (2000). The tyranny of transparency. *British Educational Research Journal, 26*(3), 309-321.

Toffoletti, K. (2007). *Cyborgs and Barbie dolls: Feminism, popular culture and the posthuman body*. London/New York: I.B. Tauris.

CS&M   Stefan Horlacher[a], Wieland Schwanebeck[a] and Peter Stear[b]

Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present: International Interdisciplinary Conference (Technical University of Dresden, June 17-20, 2009)[1]

Recently, it took the individual actions of a Scottish-born, 48-year-old Australian to once again question the legitimacy of the traditional gender dichotomies generally subscribed to by state legislatures and the wider public they are elected to represent. Norrie May-Welby of Sydney—born a man, before undergoing a sex change operation and eventually opting to become a "neuter"—"made headlines after […] receiving an official designation of gender neutrality in Australia" but was in next to no time confronted with the withdrawal of this document "over questions of whether the New South Wales registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages had the power to issue such a designation."[2]

The case of May-Welby resonates with a dramatic development in the contemporary relevance and problematic nature—*nature* of course being the operative word—of a number of issues raised during the international interdisciplinary conference "Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present," an event hosted by Prof. Dr. Stefan Horlacher at the Technical University of Dresden in June, 2009. Organized with

---

[1] For a German note on the conference see *Gender, 1*(2), 2009, pp. 133-138, available from http://budrich-journals.de/index.php/gender/article/view/718.

[2] "Norrie May-Welby: The world's first legally genderless person." *The Huffington Post*, March 19, 2010, accessed May 13, 2010, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/03/18/norrie-may-welby-the-worl_n_502851.html; "Briton is recognised as world's first officially genderless person." *The Telegraph*, March 15, 2010, accessed March 30, 2010, from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstopics/howaboutthat/7446850/Briton-is-recognised-as-worlds-first-officially-genderless-person.html.

[a] Technische Universität Dresden.
[b] Freie Universität Berlin

All correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Stefan Horlacher, Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Fakultät Sprach-, Literatur- und Kulturwissenschaften, Technische Universität Dresden 01062, Dresden. Email: stefan.horlacher@mailbox.tu-dresden.de.

the support of the *Fritz Thyssen Stiftung für Wissenschaft*, this conference was, as the title suggests, primarily devoted to a series of literary-historical case studies within the scope of surveying and comparing the conception, construction, and representation of masculinity in different historical periods. Beyond exercising the scholarly minds of presenters and participants from a wide range of academic fields in Europe and the U.S., it also attracted the attention of the media, with Germany's preeminent tabloid newspaper *Bild* as well as television channel MDR losing no time in reporting on the event. Media and public interest stems from the perception of contemporary masculinity as being in an (oxymoronic) state of perpetual crisis, the typical manifestations of which are the increasing gender divide in academic performance, male perpetrated violence in the home or workplace, and most dramatically the copycat massacres in schools and colleges.

It was thus fitting that, given the flurry of media interest in matters masculine, the conference opened with four papers that emphasized the growing cultural, social, and political significance of masculinity studies as an academic discipline. Stefan Horlacher's introductory paper addressed from a theoretical perspective the key questions of "Why Masculinities?" and "Why Literature?," thereby establishing the latter as the preeminent discursive resource for epistemological insights into the historical development and contemporary relevance of masculinities. By addressing key texts situated at the intersection of literature, literary studies, sociology, psychoanalysis, and other fields of research, Horlacher provided the necessary framework for examining the interplay of fictional constructions and of what is commonly perceived non-fictional, that is, "real-life" enactments of masculinities, emphasizing literature's potential to provide alternatives and offer solutions. Horlacher argued that while bearing a clear historical imprint, literary texts nevertheless transcend any narrow notion of mimesis that would reduce them to a mirror or straightforward representation of reality as "given." If one takes into account literature's ability (a) to constitute a discursive field in which even marginalized, aberrant voices can articulate themselves, (b) to give voice to something that could be called "the collective unconscious," and (c) to transcend its time of origin, literature (and literary studies), according to Horlacher, can be viewed as an extraordinarily privileged medium for the conception, reception, and analysis of historically changing phenomena linked to the construction and deconstruction of (not just) British masculinities (compare Horlacher, 2004, 2010).

In his keynote address, Harry Brod (Northern Iowa), one of the founders of masculinity studies in the U.S., traced the emergence of this field of enquiry into a fully-fledged discipline with its own key theoretical texts, debates, and concepts, identifying the desideratum of establishing a nexus between Eve Sedgwick's concept of homosociality and Raewyn Connell's research into hegemonic masculinity. In the course of his conceptual overview of the field, Brod also stressed the problematic status of a distinctive methodology as well as the

diverse relations between men's studies and feminism, women's studies, queer studies, and critical race theory. Despite the field's notable achievements so far (such as its impact in critiquing the popular notion that gender studies mainly address issues related to femininity), Brod finished on a relatively ambivalent note, and stressed two quite diverse aspects which were to prove relevant for the subsequent papers: on the one hand, some degree of saturation has been reached in the field of theory and publications (which may be read as a justifiably positive appraisal of the discipline and the way it has gradually established itself over the last few years), on the other hand, more satisfactory answers to the most burning issues within the field remain to be sought out.

Quite a different perspective was offered by the second keynote speaker, RICHARD COLLIER (Newcastle). Drawing on the field of legal studies, Collier's argument made it clear that one has to consider the role the law plays in the shaping of masculinity, serving not only as a focal point for political (or, indeed, public) disputes, but as an officially sanctioned discourse of its own that challenges the roles of men and their rights in various areas of social policy in the UK. Having been affected by the groundbreaking work of legal feminism (which focuses on women's representation within juridical practices and institutions), a "masculinities" perspective or position has been established as a burgeoning segment of legal discourse since the middle of the 1990s, with the problems of embodiment, autonomy, and legal policy providing the dominant recurring themes. In addition, Collier explored the changing public perceptions of male violence arising from the high-profile media interventions of paternity rights groups such as *Fathers4Justice*, who have polarized UK public opinion through a number of high-profile publicity stunts, including, for instance, protest occupations of Westminster by men dressed up as Batman and Spiderman—superhero personae with problematic and fragile identity issues—the implications of which deserve a thorough reading. It remains open to discussion whether public outrage has been indicative of a continued domination of established role model allocations in parenting cultures, or whether it is indicative of a developing awareness of and sympathy for fathers' rights activism. Clearly, the idea of "men who love and care" still has the potential to provoke unease among viewers who stick to notions of reckless hyper-masculinity.

The question of the field's current state of development and its future prospects in critical discourse raised earlier by Brod, was readdressed by KEVIN FLOYD (Kent State), who concluded the opening theoretical and interdisciplinary part of the conference with his paper on "Masculinity Studies and Queer Studies." Drawing on Judith Butler's analysis of heterosexual normativity, Floyd questioned the normalization of heterosexuality that has been a key issue ever since Butler's performative approach to gender, and her view of sex as culturally constructed. Although Butler's work has evidently become part of the canon of gender studies, masculinity is still discussed without critical reflection on the heterosexual norm. Here, the relatively recent fields of queer

and transgender studies may offer new perspectives on pre-twentieth century contexts, however deriving from a contemporary theoretical framework. By addressing the explanatory capacity as well as limitations of their key terms and paradigms, Floyd argued that transgender studies in particular have shown the potential to question both a number of entrenched academic assumptions about masculinity, as well as the outmoded divide between exclusively theoretical and historical approaches, and literary studies.

The main thematic section of the conference was devoted to analyses of exemplary, representative primary texts and the concomitant changes in the representation and construction of masculinity from the Middle Ages to the present. Two contributions on the medieval Romance genre opened this section, both offering readings "against the grain" of genre-specific masculinity formations.

Andrew James Johnston (FU Berlin), in "Robin, Gamelyn and Medieval Masculine Escapism," did away with the popular association of the purely violent ideal of masculinity with the Middle Ages, by pointing out the broad range of masculine identities that co-exist in many medieval texts. If the surface structure of the pseudo-Chaucerian romance *Gamelyn* seems to favor violence as a legitimate form of rebellious self-expression, with the aim of establishing "order" within homosocial contexts of adolescent males, Johnston elicited the transgressive potential of the *Gamelyn* text by drawing on popular cultural intertexts such as the *Robin Hood* narratives of that time, in order to show the complex web of contradictory ideological positions that question the role of violence depicted in *Gamelyn*: its eponymous hero is by no means flawless, but rather shows elements of clownish naiveté in addition to scenes that exhibit his brutish strength. Thus, there is a considerable residue of subversion beneath the conservative treatment of social pressures as depicted in *Gamelyn*, and Johnston's close reading both of the manifestations of the male body in *Gamelyn* as well as of the textual representation of a social order in transition, was able to discern contradictory images of masculine identity formation.

Christoph Houswitschka (Bamberg), in "Masculinity and Chivalric Prowess," showed how in Thomas Malory's *Morte Darthur*, one of the best-known and most influential Arthurian tales, it is once more the body which serves as a focal point for asserting and maintaining masculinity: the knight's physical and spiritual integrity comes under constant threat of physical violence and "fleshly lusts." In the course of the narrative, subtle traces of anxiety are often marginalized by scenes of demonstrative, hegemonic masculinity exhibiting male power: here Lancelot's impossible strength ultimately marks an exaggerated chivalric ideal and shows no hints of his downfall that usually features in the source material in Malory's time, as the author tellingly avoids the question whether Lancelot slept with the Queen, favoring instead the idealized extreme of his protagonist, as opposed to the moderate character of Gareth.

Early modern representations of masculinity were examined by Thomas Kühn (Dresden) and Gabriele Rippl (Bern). The former turned his attention to

John Milton's epic poem *Paradise Lost* (1667) and examined its stock of characters with regard to different forms of masculinity. Whilst Milton's settings—consisting of the discrete realms of hell, heaven, the earthly paradise as well as the spaces in between—feature inhabitants as diverse as Adam, the Father and the Son, the angels, and Satan and his followers, the creation of woman is rendered a side-issue that merely produced a "companion-piece" to man. Consequently, Eve appears as one of very few females in the text. However, Milton's world is by no means masculine in the traditional sense of the word. Focusing on Book VI of *Paradise Lost* (Raphael's account of the battle between Satan and the angels), Kühn demonstrated not only that virile masculinity is portrayed almost exclusively as the province of the fallen angels, but that "heaven's lack of masculinities" is only really overcome in battle situations, where even the archangel appears "[n]ot in his shape Celestial, but as Man / Clad to meet Man; over his lucid Armes / A militarie Vest of purple flowd" (*PL* XI, 238ff.).

GABRIELE RIPPL, on the other hand, offered an entirely different perspective in her paper "Images of Masculinity in Texts of Early Modern Women: Cavendish, Fanshawe and Bradstreet." As Rippl demonstrated, early modern autobiographical texts written by women are not only an excellent source of information for seventeenth-century notions of femininity, but also show the interrelatedness of gender roles and the functioning of gendered behavior codes. It became evident, how cultural, social, philosophical, and religious prescripts and traditions, that is, Renaissance ideas of ideal manhood, influenced the notion of masculinity and the self-fashioning of men in seventeenth-century England as well as in its New England colonies. As the chosen primary material made clear, early modern masculinity among the aristocracy and the gentry naturally implied amongst other things being a learned scholar, a talented horseman, an experienced soldier, and possibly also an art lover. Since the autobiographical material of the upper classes often served public goals, the literary presentation of masculinity is based on patterns that serve this purpose. Thus glimpses of the "real" men can only be caught by looking at the ironies, rifts, and gaps the texts produce. Obviously the outwardly-directed, or other-directed, "shame" culture of the court produced different masculinities than did the inwardly-directed "guilt" culture of the Puritans. Since our ideas of early modern masculinities always derive from discourses and representations of masculinity, it was the aim of Rippl's contribution to investigate different notions of masculinity as presented in Cavendish's, Fanshawe's, and Bradstreet's autobiographical texts which were critically read against the backdrop of religious, cultural, and literary prescripts and scrutinized for possible deviations from them.

Three contributions dealing with texts from the 18th century marked the transition from Renaissance and Augustan conceptions of masculinity to the modern era. ISABEL KARREMANN (Munich) compared the repression of the abject in the masculine ideals propagated by the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury with their satirical reprise in Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (1726). As Augustan masculinity is

clearly modeled on the heroes of Greek mythology and the Roman *civitas* under Augustus, the literary representations of the new Augustan age designate a masculine ideal based on rationality, absolute self-control, and emancipation from the desires and frailties of the body, as well as moral virtue (a word, as is worth pointing out, deriving from Lat. *vir* = man). The subsequent exclusion of irrationality, immorality, and any openly expressed sexuality—and their projection and abjection onto women, children, or dumb beasts—provided a discursive framework entirely conducive to the patriarchal order, yet, as various genre narratives of that era show, still produced its own anxieties. Karremann focused on Swift's renowned and exemplary novel and was able to show the way it subverts the key ideas of one of the era's most influential philosophers in Gulliver's voyage to Lilliput: the Herculean ideal of strength is subverted as the protagonist becomes subject to laughter, as his bizarre appearance is ridiculed by the locals. In addition, Gulliver's narrative ridicules the twelve labors of Hercules by reenacting them in a satirical form.

In "The Male Gaze vs. Sexual Ventriloquism," Laurenz Volkmann (Jena) examined the elusive nature of Daniel Defoe's fiction with regard to its gender politics. Focusing on the example of *Robinson Crusoe*, Volkmann discussed both the popular image of the protagonist as well as the significant amount of recent critical readings that emphasize homoerotic and colonial aspects. Defoe, argued Volkmann, largely modeled his eponymous hero on the ideal of muscular Christianity, though also including attributes from other gender concepts at the time. Consequently, Crusoe's sexuality has been subject to heated debate among several generations of academics, with many readings stressing the character's closeted homophilia as well as the aspect of the White, male colonizer who subjugates the savage islanders by virtue of his "male gaze," and who conquers nature in order to exploit it as a "perfect prostitute to industry." Similarly, quite a number of protagonists in Defoe's lesser books correspond to the image of the adventurous renegade whose personal relationships are dominated by comradeship and scenarios of male bonding, and who allows himself to cherish visions of idyllic all-male utopias. Often these turn out to be escapist fantasies emanating from the hardships of early capitalism. At the same time, Crusoe's character exhibits a number of male phobias (e.g., his refusal to go out naked) hinting at sublimation.

Rainer Emig (Hanover) considered the problematic issue of "Sentimental Masculinity," where the sentimental is traditionally viewed as an exclusively feminized form of narrative, as the famous examples of Samuel Richardson's heroines show (cf. *Pamela* or *Clarissa*). Against this popular notion, Emig addressed the effects of the Age of Sentimentality on new conceptualizations of masculinity, employing the example of Henry Mackenzie's *Man of Feeling* (1771). Mackenzie's protagonist, Harley, cannot reconcile contradictory expectations as he is torn between privilege and individual virtue, rationality and feeling, strength and weakness. The episodic structure of the book highlights Harley's failure to achieve worldly success, and by consequence eventually

sees his downfall. Thus, Mackenzie's short novel is not only indicative of the transition from Neoclassical via Romantic to bourgeois masculinity, which points in the direction of the 19th century, but even qualifies the protagonist as an early example of masculinity in crisis, which remains the preferred diagnosis throughout the following centuries.

Popular fiction of the 19th century was the focus of the next two presentations. RALF SCHNEIDER (Bielefeld) modeled his typology of Victorian masculinities on the basis of contemporary gender binaries that did not allow for a questioning of the masculine norm, though, paradoxically, the Victorians never explicitly formulated standard concepts of masculinity—unlike their emphasis on representing the feminine ideal, which was often reduced to the private sector, the public being an exclusively male affair. Still, Schneider argued that within these patriarchal, paternalist structures, there were ways of expressing anxieties and ambivalences about masculinity, especially in popular literary genres like the Gothic novel or early detective fiction, which both specialize in providing unsettling reading experiences. Schneider's typology classified the various forms of Victorian masculinity as either trivialized (as one can see in the hypochondriac uncle of the protagonist Laura in Collins' *Woman in White*), demonized (where, of course, Bram Stoker's Dracula or Stevenson's Mr. Hyde spring to mind), or utterly eccentric (such as Dickens' minor characters or Conan Doyle's celebrated Sherlock Holmes). Given that the majority of male protagonists are far from serving as flawless role models, a proper definition of the hegemonic, masculine ideal may only be found *ex negativo* in Victorian fiction, since not even a reliable *pater familias* tends to populate these books. Thus, the issue of masculinity appears in line with the general articulation of unease that often threatens domestic scenarios: in *Dracula*, for example, it is the polluted earth which is brought to England onboard the ship *Demeter*.

In their joint paper "The Props of Masculinity," SUSANNE SCHOLZ (Frankfurt/Main) and NICOLA DROPMANN (Kiel) examined the latent inferiority complex underpinning dominant male roles in the adventure novels of Henry Rider Haggard. To some degree providing the masculine ideal that Victorian genre fiction (as examined by Schneider) usually lacks, late Victorian adventure narratives present an all-male world of extremely exaggerated role modeling, that is, reckless ruffians fighting for the empire in swashbuckling scenarios. In the course of these narratives, imperial enterprises provide a potential playground for asserting virile, duty-bound, Christian manhood, and Haggard's famous hero, Allan Quatermain, not only regularly succeeds on his missions throughout Africa (he represents the great White hero who perceives his African servants as child-like creatures who must be educated), but also provides a model of masculine virility for adolescent readers of the time. Addressing the issue of the various phallic props (e.g. the rifle, which serves as a constant reminder of the protagonist's gun fetish) that usually accompany the hero on his mission (as exhibited in *King Solomon's Mines*), Scholz and Dropmann revealed the masculine ideal represented in this genre to be of a rather fragile nature. Against

this background of male anxiety in the contact zone between warriors and sages, British men and African women, fears about cultural degeneracy and contagion become apparent. By mapping the territory of Africa like the female body, the exploration of the "Dark Continent" is akin to the taking of a virgin site, allowing the hunter-hero to reassert his male identity. At the same time, this issue is also indicative of the imperialist mindset of the time: the crisis at home is acted out abroad in archaic trials of courage.

Opening the final section of the conference—the sessions on 20ᵗʰ and 21ˢᵗ century fiction—Silvia Mergenthal (Constance) examined the long shadow cast by the Great War and the way the experiences in the trenches led to a dramatic reconfiguration of gender relationships. Mergenthal referred to Pat Barker's *Regeneration* trilogy (*Regeneration*, 1991; *The Eye in the Door*, 1993; *The Ghost Road*, 1995) as well as to historical novels that include fictionalized renderings of the lives of the war poets Siegfried Sassoon and Wilfred Owen. With women at the home front steadily adjusting to jobs previously unavailable to them, it was the traumatized soldier who, having fostered emotional, sometimes latently homoerotic bonds during the war, suffered from the "nervous condition" of shell shock and thus showed behavior habitually associated with femininity: "The war that had promised so much in the way of 'manly' activity had actually delivered 'feminine' passivity," as Barker states in *Regeneration*. In the light of renewed discussions surrounding these texts, Mergenthal added a close reading of Robert Graves's autobiography, which stressed both the problem of homosexuality (since British military law prohibited "any act of gross indecency with another male person") as well as the traumatic implications of the war experience, a theme which also dominated the story of Sassoon's life.

Claudia Lainka (Mannheim/Dresden) introduced the now almost forgotten British author John Cowper Powys into the discussion. In his fourth novel, *Wolf Solent* (1929)—a bestseller at the time of publication, a success the author was never able to replicate—Cowper Powys developed a fluid construction of the notion of gender, which Lainka analyzed in a psychoanalytical reading of the text indebted to Jacques Lacan. Putting particular emphasis on the protagonist's conscious as well as unconscious thought-processes, Lainka demonstrated that Solent's masculine self-conception proves both highly idiosyncratic and rather unstable, thus doing away with the notion of a monolithic and predetermined conception of gender identity.

As far as post-war masculinities are concerned, Sebastian Müller (Mannheim) provided a starting point by presenting his research results on the problematic side of virile masculinity as portrayed in the Angry Young Man "movement" beyond its immediate 1950s context. While the character disposition of Jimmy Porter (the protagonist in John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger*) or Joe Lampton (in John Braine's *Room at the Top*) has usually been reduced to a class conflict brought about by the tension between upward mobility and the protagonists' respective working-class backgrounds, Müller emphasized the

inherent gender conflict: both Joe and Jimmy face challenges to their pride and masculinity and turn to alternate means of compensation, such as status symbols and rebellious gestures. The influence of these Angry Young Men and their tendency to idealize absent fathers can not only be traced in narratives of that era (like Sillitoe's *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*), but even in contemporary popular films of the post-modern age, such as David Fincher's adaption of Chuck Palahniuk's *Fight Club* (1999), or Martin Campbell's reboot of the James Bond franchise in *Casino Royale* (2006). Evidently, the working-class hero remains a simple but effectively reaffirming mode of male identity-formation, who still casts a long shadow in mass media representations of the 21st century.

The nexus of subversion, legalization and assimilation in the construction of gay masculinities was discussed in detail by BERTHOLD SCHOENE (Manchester), who referred to three English novels of the post-war period. Like Richard Collier before him, Schoene introduced legal aspects and their implications for male self-conception into the discussion. Having stressed the significance of the ideological split within the gay community between mainstream-cultural assimilationism and strategic cultivation of subversive extraneity that reached extreme heights in the aftermath of the 1980s AIDS crisis, Schoene explored three different literary examples of homosexuals. Whereas Alan Hollinghurst's *The Spell* (1998) features fantasies of promiscuous sex which hint at a subliminal "fear of domestication," Tom Wakefield's novel *Mates* (1983) portrays the domestic life of a gay couple and insists on ordinary forms of love, beyond mere mimicry of the heterosexual norm. Since all of the books in question—including even E.M. Forster's *Maurice* (1971; completed in 1914)—add to the debate of relationships among gay men, Schoene provocatively asked whether, despite their apparent differences and their apparent irreconcilability, both gay and queer ideologies do not in fact share at least some common denominators even when it comes to the alleged (il)legitimacy of promiscuity and sexual experimentalism on the one hand, and monogamous "coupledom" and the hotly contested desirability of gay marriage, on the other.

FATEMEH HOSSEINI (Dresden) charted the shift from patriarchal to "filiarchal" structures in the early novels of Ian McEwan, whose work has often raised controversy among feminists. The ambivalent quality of McEwan's prose becomes not only apparent if one considers its reception (whereas his early texts were denounced as misogynist, his third novel, *The Child in Time*, was suddenly embraced as a feminist text), but even more so if it is subjected to a close reading. Hosseini's argument focused both on man-woman as well as child-parent relationships in McEwan's novels, and noted a growing sophistication in the author's treatment of masculinities, culminating in the question raised in a recent oratory penned by the author of *Enduring Love*: "shall there be womanly times, or shall we die?" Novels like *The Innocent* or *The Cement Garden* (featuring the imitation and acquisition of a late father's phallic insignia) inevitably tie the perception of masculinity to death and violent sce-

narios, where both matriarchy and patriarchy have to be overcome by the figure of the son. Thus, the narratives point towards a post-patriarchal era of the son, for which Hosseini proposes the concept of *filiarchy*, a term originally derived from socioeconomic studies.

Andrea Ochsner (Basel) examined the comparatively recent phenomenon of British "Lad Lit." Now often identified with the publication of Nick Hornby's bestselling account of a football supporter, *Fever Pitch* (1992), and Hornby's subsequent novel *High Fidelity* (1995), the phenomenon of Laddism was addressed throughout the 1990s in self-help books and magazines, and came to evoke its own brand of literature. Lad lit turned into a publishing phenomenon, despite the feminist backlash against the kind of behavior advertised in these books. Ochsner rejected such superficial readings by proposing to read these narratives as a modern variant on the classic *Bildungsroman*, highlighting the problematic dispositions of masculinity that haunt the protagonists. They usually are urban men in their thirties who refuse to grow up, delay decisions, and overindulge their obsessions with personal possessions: Rob, the protagonist in *High Fidelity*, prefers sorting his record collection (in autobiographical order) over addressing personal problems; John O'Farrell's protagonist Michael (*The Best a Man Can Get*, 2000) is afraid of commitment in his relationship and favors prolonged adolescence, establishing for himself a persona as a daring bachelor; Tim Lott's *White City Blue* (1999) sees the collapse of a network of friends when one of them decides to tie the knot, the ongoing dedication among the latter's male friends also hinting at a homoerotic subtext. The central protagonists not only face a series of personal crises, but these are also very much viewed as coinciding with postmodern identity issues. The New Lad (as the quintessential 1990s Everyman) is simply overburdened with the sheer amount of male (media) scripts that he recognizes as potential role models.

The concluding panel discussion focused on two main aspects, emphasizing firstly—with reference to the opening theoretical contributions by Horlacher, Brod, Collier and Floyd—the centrality of divergent diachronic processes in constructions of the body as well as the importance of Butler's theory of performativity in any general definition of masculinity, especially with a view to how male (sexual/textual) identity is accorded a different meaning within different epochs and across different genres. The diachronic dimension of all literary works discussed during the conference also demonstrated how identity issues are negotiated on the levels of the psyche, of social practices, and of desire. A second major issue raised during the discussion was whether the perceived crisis of masculinity is largely a contemporary phenomenon or an inherent feature of male identity formation, as many of the textual analyses seemed to imply. In order to analyze the results of detailed literary interpretations on a more abstract level, explanatory models stemming from psychoanalytic object relations theories, which focus on psychosexual development during infancy and its impact on the "male script," may prove invaluable.

Plotting a literary history of British masculinities in terms of an ongoing succession of crises proved a controversial turning point in the discussion, suggesting the necessity of further research and a follow-up conference, which will take place at Dresden University of Technology in June 2010.[3] The projected publication date of a research anthology based on the contributions presented above but also including additional articles on Shakespeare (Mark Bracher), on the "crisis" of masculinity in seventeenth-century England (Michael S. Kimmel) and on Black British masculinity is 2011.

REFERENCES

Horlacher, S. (2004). *Daniel Martin, America, Faith in Fakes/Travels in Hyperreality* und das Verschwinden der Realität—Überlegungen zum antizipatorischen Potential von Literatur [*Daniel Martin, America, Faith in Fakes/Travels in Hyperreality* and the disappearance of reality—Considerations for literature's anticipatory potential]. In S. Horlacher & S. Glomb (Eds.), *Beyond extremes. Reflexion und Repräsentation von Modernisierungsprozessen im zeitgenössischen britischen Roman* (pp. 291-329). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Horlacher, S. (2010). Taboo, transgression, and literature: An introduction. In S. Horlacher, S. Glomb & L. Heiler (Eds.), *Taboo and transgression in British literature from the Renaissance to the present* (pp. 3-21). New York: Palgrave.

---

[3] International Workshop *Between the National and the Transnational, 1945-1980: Masculinities in British and American Literature between World War II and Thatcher/Reagan*, Dresden University of Technology, June 9-11, 2010.

Library Recommendation Form

I recommend the library subscribe to:

☐ **Journal of Men's Studies Press**
ISSN 0060–8265, e-ISSN 1933–8139, Tri-annual
Edited by James Doyle, PhD
Current Volume: 18

☐ **Culture, Society & Masculinities**
ISSN 1941–5583, e-ISSN 1941–5591, Semi-annual
Edited by Diederik Janssen, MD, The Men's Studies Press
Current Volume: 2

☐ **The International Journal of Men's Health**
ISSN 1532–6306, e-ISSN 1933–0278, Tri-annual
Edited by Jim Doyle, PhD
Current Volume: 9

☐ **Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers**
ISSN 1537–6680, e-ISSN 1933–026X, Tri-annual
Edited by Andrea Doucet, PhD (Carleton University)
Current Volume: 8

☐ **Thymos: Journal of Boyhood Studies**
ISSN 1931–9045, e-ISSN 1872–4329, Semi-annual
Edited by Diederik Janssen, MD, The Men's Studies Press
Current Volume: 4

All With Current Access

All current year print + electronic *or* electronic-only subscriptions will have e-access to their subscribed journal's previous volumes. Complete e-access to *all* volumes will continue as long as the subscriber maintains a current journal subscription.

Please visit **www.mensstudies.com** for current pricing, and publisher@messtudies.com for further information.

_____
PROFESSOR

_____
DEPARTMENT

_____
DATE

_____
SIGNATURE

Reason for acquisition:

☐ This journal will be an essential resource for myself and my colleagues
☐ I will refer my students to this journal
☐ I publish/intend to publish articles within this journal
☐ Other_____