

# Masculinities Journal

**7** February  
2017 ISSN: 2148-3841

ISSN 2148-3841

# MASCULINITIES

a journal of identity and culture

Issue 7

February 2017

**MASCULINITIES**  
a journal of identity and culture

Issue 7, February 2017  
ISSN 2148-3841

***CONTACT***

**e-mail**  
masculinitiesjournal@gmail.com

Atilla Barutçu  
Sociology Dept.  
Faculty of Arts and Sciences  
Bülent Ecevit University  
Zonguldak, Turkey

Masculinities, A Journal of Identity and Culture, is a peer international academic journal published biannually by Initiative for Critical Studies of Masculinity. The journal is published online and can be accessed via <http://masculinitiesjournal.org>. The whole content of the journal is free for public use and the authors possess the rights of their articles and they are responsible for the content. The texts in this journal can't be reproduced, stored, transmitted or quoted in any form or by any means without the prior permission of its author(s). To submit articles and reviews for future issues, please see the guidelines at the end of the journal. For further information and enquiries, please contact the editor(s).

Typesetting : Şenol Topçu  
Cover Design : Murat Göç

## EDITORIAL BOARD

---

### Chief Editor

Çimen Günay-Erkol  
(Özyegin University)

### Editorial Board

Murat Göç  
(Pamukkale University)

Ozlem Duva Kaya  
(Dokuz Eylül University)

Nurseli Yeşim Sünbülüoğlu  
(University of Sussex)

Selin Akyüz  
(Bilkent University)

Hasan Kürşat Akcan  
(Ankara University)

### Review Editors

Gülden Sayılan  
(ODTÜ)

Beril Türkoğlu  
(ODTÜ)

### Assistant Editors

Senol Topcu  
(Independent Researcher)

Naz Hıdır  
(Ankara University)

Atilla Barutçu  
(Bülent Ecevit University)

## Advisory Board

---

Adam Walton  
UCL Institute of Education

Daphna Hacker  
Tel Aviv University

Aksu Bora  
Hacettepe University

Dilek Cindođlu  
Abdullah Gül University

Alev Özkazanç  
Professor Emerita

Ebru Kılıç Bebek  
Özyegin University

Alp Biricik  
Independent Researcher

Eda Acara  
Queens University

Arda Arikan  
Akdeniz University

Emel BastürkAkca  
Kocaeli University

Aslıhan Dođan Topcu  
Mersin University

Esmâ Durugönül  
Akdeniz University

Ayse Erbora  
Okan University

Fatma Umut Beşpınar  
METU

Ayse L. Kirtunc  
Professor Emerita

Feryal Cubukcu  
Dokuz Eylul University

Berrin Koyuncu Lorasdađı  
Hacettepe University

Figen Uzar Özdemir  
Bülent Ecevit University

Burcu Alkan  
Bahçeşehir University

Funda Şenol Cantek  
Independent Researcher

Chris Haywood  
Newcastle University

Gamze Toksoy  
Mimar Sinan University

Cirus Rinaldi  
University of Palermo

Güncel Önkâl  
Maltepe University

Cüneyt Çakırlar  
Nottingham Trent University- Bilgi  
University

Hande Eslen-Ziya  
Glasgow Caledonian University

Hilal Onur-Ince  
Hacettepe Univerty

Jonathan Allan  
Brandon University

Jeff Hearn  
University of Hanken

Joseph Vandello  
University of South Florida

Maria Rashid  
SOAS

Melek Goregenli  
Independent Researcher

Mine Özyurt Kılıç  
Doğuş University  
Murat İri  
Istanbul University

Michael Kimmel  
SUNY

Nejat Ulusay  
Ankara University

Nevzat Kaya  
Dokuz Eylül University

Nil Mutluer  
Humboldt University zu Berlin

Nilgün Toker  
Independent Researcher

Orkun Kocabiyik  
Mugla University

Papatya Genca-Alkan  
Celal Bayar University

Raewyn Connell  
University of Sydney

Sandra Slater  
College of Charleston

Selcuk Candansayar  
Gazi University

Selim Sırı Kuru  
University of Washington

Serpil Sancar  
Ankara University

Simten Coşar  
Hacettepe University

Şahinde Yavuz  
Karadeniz Technical University

Seref Uluocak  
Onsekiz Mart University

Züleyha Çetiner Öktem  
Ege University

# Content

---

1-2 Introduction

## Articles/Makaleler

- 4-26 "And When I Arrived at Manhood...I Chewed My Father's Thumb": Working-Class Masculinity and the Folksongs of Larry Gorman - Ve erkeklige ulařtıđında... Babamın bařparmađını ıđnedim: Larry Gorman'ın halk řarkıları ve iřçi sınıfı erkekligi  
*Ian J. Jesse*
- 28-45 Scenes of Masochism and Male Homosocial Desire from Tobias Wolff's *In Pharaoh's Army* and Pat Barker's *Regeneration*. - Tobias Wolff'ün *Pharaoh's Army* ve Pat Barker'ın *Regeneration* isimli eserlerinde Mazořizm ve Homosoyal Arzu Sahneleri.  
*Justin Omar Johnston*
- 46-70 Queering Virility in F.T. Marinetti's Futurist Manifestos, 1909-1919 - F.T. Marinetti'nin Fütürist Manifestolarında Erkekligi Queerleřtirmek, 1909-1919  
*Janet Lee*
- 71-93 Vulnerable White Men and Sexual Citizenship: Charles Ray Sculptures - Savunmasız Beyaz Erkekler ve Cinsel Vatandaşlık: Charles Ray Heykelleri  
*Jerry D. Thomas*

## Translation Articles/Makaleler

- 95-117 Fiziksel Bereler, Duygusal Yara İzleri ve Ařk Isırıkları: Kadınların Erkek řiddeti Deneyimleri  
*Michelle Jones- Jeff Hearn*  
*Çev.: Murat Göç*

## Reviews/Kitap İncelemeleri

- 119-122 The History of Fatherhood in Norway, 1850-2012 by Jørgen Lorentzen  
*Selin Akyüz*
- 123-129 Hovarda Aleml Tařrada Eğlence ve Erkeklik by Osman Özarıslan  
*Beril Türkođlu*
- 130-135 Psychopolitics of the Oriental Father Between Omnipotence and Emasculation by Bülent Somay  
*Çimen Günay Erkol*
- 134-138 Contributors to this Issue
- 139-144 Guidelines

**W**e are proud to present you the 7<sup>th</sup> issue of Masculinities Journal under crushing and depressing circumstances. For the last couple of years, there has been an increasing pressure upon dissident intellectuals and academics, which peaked after the attempted coup last July. Since then, many of our friends, colleagues, and professors have been either dismissed with an emergency decree or forced to resign or retire. They haven't been allowed to attend academic meetings and their names have been removed from conference programs. Many departments, especially including gender studies graduate programs in Ankara University, literally collapsed due to losing a great majority of teaching staff. To make things worse, recently, academic journals in Turkey are "advised" to remove such names from their advisory boards by the governing bodies of the grand database of the scientific research council, which we will not consider under any circumstances no matter what. Such a violent isolation and defamation of a peaceful potential is also an attempt to silence an attempt to secure a world of equal opportunities and of peace for everyone, which, we think, is what masculinity studies is all about in the first place. Looking back in anger and frustration, we are still dedicated and adamant to continue inspiring people to question their gendered subjectivities and to struggle against all forms of patriarchy. Unlike William Butler Yeats who believed it is better "in times like these / A poet's mouth be silent", we feel that we have no other choice but to raise our voices however feeble and unavailing it might be, and that our humble endeavors by publishing this journal might help to ensure a peaceful and more equal world.

In this issue, we have compiled a wide array of articles from misogyny in futurist manifestos to emotional scars left by men's violence. Janet Lee from Oregon State University brilliantly discusses an Italian

futurist artist, Filippo Tomasso Marinetti, and focuses on a queer reading of his manifestos. Justin Omar Johnston from Stony Brook University conducts an inquiry into Gilles Deleuze's notion of "masochism" in Tobias Wolff's *In Pharaoh's Army* and Pat Barker's *Regeneration*. Ian Jesse from University of Maine takes the readers on a historical survey in his discussion of working-class masculinity in late 19<sup>th</sup> century and the folk songs of Larry Gorman in his " 'And When I Arrived at Manhood...I Chewed My Father's Thumb': Working-Class Masculinity and the Folksongs of Larry Gorman". Jerry D. Thomas from University of Wisconsin Oshkosh in his "Vulnerable White Men and Sexual Citizenship: Charles Ray Sculptures" discusses representations of white men in public art "that disrupted extant civil and legal models of citizenship" in Charles Ray's sculptures. This issue also includes remarkable and astounding reviews. Selin Akyüz reviewed Jørgen Lorentzen's "The History of Fatherhood in Norway, 1850-2012"; Çimen Günay-Erkol reviewed Bülent Somay's "Psychopolitics of the Oriental Father: Between Omnipotence and Emasculation". Beril Türkoğlu reviewed Osman Ozarslan's "Hovarda Alemi: Taşrada Eğlence Alemi ve Erkeklik". Murat Göç also translated a chapter "Physical Bruises, Emotional Scars and 'Love-Bites': Women's Experiences of Men's Violence" written by Michelle Jones and Jeff Hearn from *Sex, Violence, and the Body: Erotics of Wounding*.

**Murat Göç, PhD**

**On behalf of Editorial Board of the Masculinities Journal**

## **ARTICLES**

# **“And When I Arrived at Manhood...I Chewed My Father’s Thumb”: Working-Class Masculinity and the Folksongs of Larry Gorman**

Ian J. Jesse\*

University of Maine

## **Abstract:**

Larry Gorman was born on Prince Edward Island in 1846, and by the time he was eighteen years old began traveling for employment to either New Brunswick or northern New England. These travels continued throughout his lifetime and with them he brought a tradition of making songs. Gorman used his songs to critique and challenge the men around him and ultimately, this paper argues, to challenge the authority of his bosses, demonstrating that wage earners could assert power in the work place. While the late folklorist Edward D. Ives has already worked to document Gorman's life and songs, he did not interpret them through a gendered lens. Drawing on the oral histories collected by Ives, this paper's new perspective highlights working-class masculinity and shows that wage laborers in the last half of the nineteenth century did not have to remain silent about poor treatment from their bosses. While other historians have examined working-class masculinity, many of their studies only consider letters, diaries, and newspaper articles. While there is nothing wrong with these sources they leave out subjects who have not left such detailed historical paper trails. Some historians have examined connections between song and masculinity, but the canon of Larry Gorman has been omitted. This paper adds Gorman's songs to the historical discussion of masculinity to help create a more complete understanding of working-class masculinity during the second half of the nineteenth century.

**Key words:** Larry Gorman, working-class masculinity, history nineteenth century

---

\* MA student from the University of Maine  
[ian.jesse@maine.edu](mailto:ian.jesse@maine.edu)

## Ve erkeklığe ulaştığımda... Babamın başparmağını çığnedim: Larry Gorman'ın halk şarkıları ve işçi sınıfı erkeklığı

Ian J. Jesse\*

University of Maine

### Özet:

Larry Gorman 1846'da Prens Edward Adasında doğdu ve 18 yaşından itibaren gerek New Brunswick gerekse Kuzey New England'a çalışmak için gidip gelmeye başladı. Bu yolculuklar hayatı boyunca devam etti ve yolculuklarla beraber şarkı yazma geleneğini de beraberinde getirdi. Gorman şarkılarını etrafındaki erkekleri eleştirmek, meydan okumak ve en nihayetinde, bu çalışmanın da ele aldığı gibi, patronlarının otoritesini sarsmak, işçilerin de gücü olduğunu göstermek için yazdı. Güncel halkbilimcilerden Edward D. Ives, Gorman'ın hayatı ve şarkıları hakkında bir belgesel hazırlarken, Gorman'ın hayatını toplumsal cinsiyet perspektifinden yorumlamadı. Bu çalışmanın yeni perspektifi, Ives tarafından toplanan sözlü tarihlerden yararlanarak işçi sınıfı erkeklığını vurgulamakta ve 19. Yüzyılın son yarısında işçilerin patronlarından gördükleri muameleye sessiz kalmadıklarını göstermektedir. Diğer tarihçilerin çoğu işçi sınıfı erkeklığını incelemiş olsa da, bir çok çalışma yalnızca mektuplar, günlükler ve gazeteleri içermektedir. Her ne kadar bu kaynaklarla ilgili hiç bir yanlışlık olmasa da, bu çalışmalar ardında ayrıntılı tarihsel bir iz bırakmamış olan işçileri birer özne olarak çalışmaların dışında bırakmıştır. Bazı tarihçiler şarkı ve erkeklük arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemişler ancak Larry Gorman'ın kanonunu çalışmalarına dahil etmemişlerdir. Bu çalışma, 19. Yüzyılın ikinci yarısındaki işçi sınıfı erkeklığını daha bütüncül bir şekilde anlamaya yardımcı olabilmek adına, Gorman'ın şarkılarını erkeklığın tarihsel tartışma zeminine taşımaktadır.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Larry Gorman, işçi sınıfı erkeklığı, tarih, 19. yüzyıl

---

\* MA student from the University of Maine  
[ian.jesse@maine.edu](mailto:ian.jesse@maine.edu)

Surgeon Allaby (1957) of Passekeag, New Brunswick, recited several folksongs for the folklorist Edward "Sandy" Ives. Among these folksongs was the satirical, "The Gull Decoy," which was composed by the woods poet, Larry Gorman on Prince Edward Island some time during the last half of the nineteenth century. The song tells a story of a man named Patrick O'Reilly for whom Gorman had worked on a fishing boat. Gorman satirizes the way that O'Reilly raised his children and challenges the subject's respectability. In a humorous tone, the song lists some of O'Reilly's inappropriate actions such as exhuming a dead child to spite his brother, and setting "the dog on an orphan boy." This commentary highlights several negative male behaviors, a familiar theme throughout Gorman's canon.

Larry Gorman used "The Gull Decoy" and various other folksongs to comment on the behavior of the men around him; he lampoons several masculine behaviors and characteristics. Often times Gorman used song making to retaliate against men who he felt had wronged him and in several cases, "The Gull Decoy" being one of them, his songs were used against his employers. Gorman lived in a time when working-class men were increasingly dependent on others for wages as economic self-sufficiency was becoming more difficult to achieve; such self-sufficiency had previously been looked upon as a pillar of manhood (Glenn, 2006). Such dependency limited the authority working-class men had in the workplace (Stiles, 1998) but through song Gorman maintained and exerted some degree of power.

Numerous scholars have studied masculinity and identity formation, but many of their studies focus primarily on traditional written sources such as newspapers, letters, and journals. While there is nothing wrong with using these sources they only represent the experiences of those who have left a well documented record. This study does not use such sources and instead focuses on oral histories and folksong in which a new voice of masculinity is heard highlighting complexities of gender and identity formation.

Beginning in the 1980s historians began studying manhood and masculinity to understand the ways men formed gendered identities and how these identities were performed. The study of the formation of these constructs has been used to better understand historical events and experiences. Very few historians, however, have used folksong to understand masculinity and those who have omit Larry Gorman from their focus.

Steven Maynard's "Rough Work and Rugged Men: The Social Construction of Masculinity in Working-Class History," (1989) raises important questions for scholars studying masculinity and its connection to labor and the working-class. Maynard examines the ways capitalism was connected with gender and argues that "as industrial capitalism unfolded [at the turn into the twentieth century] it not only altered class relations, but also shifted gender relations precipitating a crisis in masculinity" (p. 160). Furthermore, Maynard suggests that a rise in "powerful tools" shifted manhood yet again by the twentieth century; working class claims of manhood based on skill were challenged. Definitions of manhood were in flux during this period and other historians have also noted these changes over time.

E. Anthony Rotundo (1993) also studied changes in the masculine identity in his work, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity From the Revolution to the Modern Era*, and it is considered one of the pioneering studies of masculinity in American history. Rotundo's work examines masculine identity throughout the nineteenth century and argues that American manhood passed through three phases (p. 2). The first of these phases was based on performance in the community which emerged in colonial New England, the second, connected to the rising market economy, appeared in the last years of the eighteenth century, and the third based on passion, strength, and self-expression rose at the end of the 1800s. It is clear that manhood is not a historical constant but evolves over time. While his study is well done it should be noted that it is limited, focusing only on the urban middle-class of New England and relies heavily on personal diaries and correspondence from educated men. He, therefore, only considers historical subjects who have left a

well-defined paper trail. A more complete picture of manhood is created when scholars consider working-class subjects and alternative sources such as oral history and folksong. These sources can give a voice to historical agents not heard before and expand the field by considering working-class subjects.

Deborah Stiles (1998) is one historian who has worked to understand working-class masculinity. In her study, "Martin Butler, Masculinity, and the North American Sole Leather Tanning Industry: 1871-1889," Stiles focuses on the northeast borderland and worksto understand how working-class manhood was negotiated in this region Stiles relies heavily on Martin Butler's journal and newspaper printings. Through Butler's writing Stiles finds that rural working-class masculinity could be found "in the contingencies *and* determinants of the North American sole leather tanning industry, and...located within the discourses Butler constructed about his and other men's experiences" (p. 92). Stiles concludes that the identity of men working in the northeast sole leather tanning industry was not entirely subject to the forces of industrial capitalism and that working-class individuals crafted their own identity (p.111). The real value in this study is the conclusion that these men exerted some amount of control over their identities. Historians should, therefore, discount the control men like Larry Gorman had in crafting identity although subject to the will of his employers.

Historians of masculinity have yet to recognize the discourse of masculinity within Larry Gorman's songs, but some scholars have recognized similar discourses in other song traditions. Stephen Nicholas Sanfilippo's (2010) doctoral dissertation, "Whalemen's Song: Lyrics and Masculinity in the Sag Harbor Whalefishery, 1840-1850," examines the ways Long Island whalemen of British ancestry, crafted and communicated a masculine identity. Sanfilippo addresses three concepts of masculinity in his study: "the Victorian bourgeois man," whose identity was based on economic success and social status, "the evangelical Christian man," whose identity focused on "fulfilling his Christian obligations as a family provider," and "the secular libertine," whose focus was on "immediate pleasure" (p. iii). To understand how

whalemen defined and performed masculine ideals Sanfilippo relies heavily on the songs Lewis Jones recorded while aboard whaling expeditions.

The strength in Sanfilippo's study is in his methodological approach which seeks to understand the cultural and social implications of Jones's songs. This merger of cultural and social history serves his study well as it seeks to make connections across multiple sources and strengthens the overall arguments. Placing cultural sources (i.e. folksong) in a social context is a promising methodology that should be considered by gender historians to derive new meanings from their sources. By understanding the cultural and social meanings of folksong, historians can include new voices into the discussion of masculinity.

Edward "Sandy" Ives (1964) published his study of Larry Gorman and the songs he wrote throughout his life. Ives traveled across Maine and the Maritime Provinces of Canada tracing Gorman's life and documenting his songs. Ives places Gorman in two central positions: the first as "the woods poet," and the second as part of a satirical "song tradition" (p. 2). As a woods poet Gorman shared his songs with his male coworkers in lumber camps but many of his songs were meant to attack those who wronged him. Ives believed no one ever took satirical song writing as far or as seriously as Gorman had; he was always making songs about the people and events around him (p. 187). It should be noted that Ives does not provide an in depth analysis of Gorman's songs except when attempting to determine how likely it is that a song may or may not have been written by the woods poet, or, when the song contains autobiographical information. Just a brief glance at some of the songs presented in his book, however, shows the prospects for deeper analysis. While a gendered analysis is lacking, Ives's work is still central to understanding Larry Gorman's life and songs. It places Gorman's life in perspective and provides important background information; a reexamination of Gorman's songs, therefore, must build on the work of Ives. Providing analysis through a gendered lens, as this study does, yields new insights into the importance of folksong and to notions of manhood and masculinity at the turn into the twentieth century.

Larry Gorman was born on Prince Edward Island around Trout River in 1846. His father, Thomas Gorman, an Irishman from County Kilkenny, had come to North America by 1825 and settled on one hundred acres on the north side of Trout River. To support himself and family Thomas Gorman worked in a shipyard and maintained a farm. He married Ann Donahue before 1834, also from Ireland. The couple had thirteen children in all while ten of them survived to become adults; Larry Gorman was the couple's second son (Ives, 1993: 9-11).

In 1874 Gorman's father passed away but his mother maintained a small store before opening another in Tyne Valley in 1880. Within the decade she closed shop and moved to her oldest son's farm in Glengarry, Prince Edward Island (Ives, 1993: 9-11). It is not known for certain when Larry Gorman began traveling between the island and the mainland, either New Brunswick or some part of the northeastern United States, for work but he most likely started by the time he was eighteen in 1864 (Ives, 1993: 54). It is believed that Gorman had a falling out with his brother James leaving him without a formal home on the Island. Because of this, by the time he was in his late thirties, he left Prince Edward Island permanently (Ives, 1993: 49-50).

Gorman spent a number of years working and traveling throughout New Brunswick before moving to Maine by the 1880s. In 1889 Gorman purchased a home in Ellsworth, Maine and in 1891, Gorman in his mid-forties, had married Mary Mahoney. Mahoney died five years later and Gorman was without a wife again (Ives, 1993: 80). After a year had passed Gorman was remarried to forty year old Julia Lynch. By the start of the 1900s the couple had sold the property in Ellsworth and moved to Brewer where Gorman lived for the remainder of his life (Ives, 1993: 110, 137). Throughout his life and travels Gorman brought with him a song making tradition and created a sizeable collection of songs.

Gorman and his songs present an interesting case study in masculinity for two reasons. For one, Gorman was married much later in life and never had any children; therefore, Gorman was unable to assert

his masculinity through fatherhood.<sup>1</sup> Secondly, many historians have examined masculinity through physical strength and occupational skills but Gorman was lacking in both areas.<sup>2</sup> William Bell (1956) of Brewer, Maine recalled that when in Brewer Gorman worked in a “wood and coal yard.” One of Gorman’s occupational duties was to carry coal up a set of stairs and Gorman almost quit because he could not handle this task. Bell also recalled that Gorman also worked in the wood yard of Eastern Fine Paper in Brewer but “wasn’t quite man enough for the work” (Bell, 1956). Without these abilities Gorman needed a different way to assert his manhood and he did so through his songs.

The period in which Gorman lived and worked was also one of transition. Working-class men, by the close of the nineteenth century, found it difficult to reach economic independency and were increasingly dependent upon other men for wages.<sup>3</sup> This transition of dependency is highlighted in one of Gorman's songs, “The Old Pod Auger Days” (n. d.). This song was printed and meant for sale during his time in Brewer. The broadsheet takes a more serious tone than many of his other songs, and the reason for this shift could be that this publication was meant to be sold; perhaps the author believed a more serious song would sell to a wider audience.

“The Old Pod Auger Days” bemoans the passing of an older time. During that time Gorman claims that, “You'd find all men more honest then, / Athletic, brave, and strong, / Their faces heavily bearded, / And their hair they wore it long.” The song’s composer believed that men in his time were lacking compared to the men of the past. The men discussed throughout Gorman’s canon do, in fact, appear to be lacking many of these traits. While he does present men who are strong in some of his songs, they are surely not honest or are lacking in other positive attributes. Gorman adds in the song that in these days, “the father trained the son, / He taught him to be useful, / How to use an axe and gun, / To clear the land and till it well, / A livelihood to raise.” It is interesting that Gorman laments the passing of these events because, as we know, he never had any children or maintained a farm of his own. The man spent his life dependent on others for wages. Countless

working-class men at this time were becoming increasingly dependent on wages from others for economic stability and these lines very much reflect this shift.<sup>4</sup>

The time in which Gorman lived and composed songs required new characteristics and behaviors of manhood; teaching sons to work the land to support themselves no longer defined the proper man. "The Old Pod Auger Days" is critical of the men that surrounded Gorman during his time and the song maker critically outlines several types of men throughout his canon. Covered in his songs are men defined by material possessions, men defined by physical strength, and men who are dishonest. Furthermore, many of the critiques in Gorman's songs were directed towards his bosses, allowing him to challenge the power of those above him and to exert his own authority in the workplace, therefore, allowing him to act out his own masculine identity.<sup>5</sup>

The first type of working-class manhood that appears in Gorman's songs is defined by material possessions. This description of man appears in two songs, "Bachelor's Hall" and "Michael O'Brian." In both songs the men are seeking a bride and believe that their belongings make them good men and attractive.

In "Bachelor's Hall," the song maker criticizes an anonymous man's motivation for seeking a wife and the method he chose to do so. This man's courtship was different, it was out of the ordinary, and that is what drew Gorman to crafting a song about it in a satirical style. The man in the song is seeking a wife because he desires someone to keep his house for little money. The song is not in Gorman's voice but that of the suitor, and states, "Folks boast of a life without any wife / They tell you it would be much cheaper / And they'll persuade great riches they made / By hiring a frugal housekeeper." But these people were wrong as he found a housekeeper to be more expensive than a wife. (McClellan, 1957: 5-6). Gorman portrays the man as seeking a wife for the wrong reasons and offered this song as a criticism of his motives. To Gorman, then, taking a wife involved more consideration than the cost of a housekeeper.

In the start of the song the man calls out to local women and asks them to take pity on him because "a bachelor's hall is no place at all" for a man to call home (McClellan, 1957: 5-6). Once this man is sure that he has the attention of the women he begins to extensively list all of his possessions to appear attractive. In one version of the song the list spans nine stanzas and boasts of fine mirrors, cups, and furniture. In the middle of the list, however, are also items used to clean and maintain a home. The singer includes "a box of white sand I keep always on hand / All packed away safe for the winter / I've a broom and a mop for to wipe every slop" but quickly switches back to his better possessions especially his "new chamber set" which he claims to be "the best yet" on the list (McClellan, 1957: 7). Clearly this man is simply not looking for a companion but someone to clean his home and who is attracted to his property. The song ends, as it began, with a call to all ladies to take pity, but the character now believes the list of possessions has entitled him to *his* choice of the women: "So now ladies all, come each when I call / Come Peggy, come Betsy, come Nancy / When I see you all, both short, fat and tall / I will surely see the one that I fancy" (McClellan, 1957: 9).

Gorman used this song to critique the way this man went about finding a wife. The man seeking a bride repeatedly calls to "Young ladies all both short, fat, and tall," as if any woman at all would do (McClellan, 1957: 5). Because this song is crafted in a satirical tradition Gorman did not believe that the purpose of finding a wife was to find an inexpensive housekeeper and that a man was not attractive because of his possessions. The topic and style of these verses reappear in his song, "Michael O'Brian."

"Michael O'Brian," is not in the voice of the composer but that of the title character and in the song O'Brian calls out to girls both short and tall. Once he has their attention he then begins to list all of his fine possessions. Included in this list are a "horse and wagon, two bobsleighs, / A harrow and a plow, / A fattening pig and two runabouts / With five calves and a cow." The focus of the list, however, makes a quick shift to the items needed to maintain a household. O'Brian adds, "I got a stove, a pot, pans, a strainer can / A bucket and a broom"(Doucette, 1957: 1-2).

This song is different from "Bachelor's Hall" as O'Brian claims to be "on the verge of thirty now / and...tired of a single life / It's time that I should make a vow / That I should have a wife" (Doucette, 1957: 3). This man now feels that it is the time in his life to take a wife, but his search has proved unsuccessful. The true comedy of "Michael O'Brian" comes at the end when the singer claims women will not give him attention because of bad breath. To resolve this problem he "takes a stroll for the good of my soul / and see my neighbor's wife." When his foul breath sends the girls away, he resorts to visiting his neighbor's wife, as he argues, for "the good of his soul." This man believed a physical connection with a woman was important and a factor in his decision to seek a wife (Doucette, 1957: 3).

These songs present men who had defined themselves in terms of their material possessions and believed that these belongings entitled them to their choice of companion. Through satire, however, Gorman makes it clear he did not agree with these opinions. Although these songs do not provide positive definitions for courtship, or what made a man, satire makes it clear that the characters of these songs were acting in an improper manner.

While the men in "Bachelor's Hall" and "Michael O'Brian" defined themselves in terms of possessions, some other characters in Gorman's songs defined themselves in terms of their physical abilities. These images of manhood appear in two of Gorman's songs, "The Champion of Moose Hill" and "Michael Riley" whose main characters are strong fighters, their manhood is directly challenged.

As Irving Frost (1957: 3) remembered it, "The Champion of Moose Hill" is about Emery Mace, who was quite the fighter. According to the song, which was composed in Mace's voice, Mace "licked the Amherst Champion" and "Fred Titus I nearly killed." At the end of this verse, however, Gorman delivers the punch line when in Mace's voice he sings: "But I almost lost the belt by a single welt / From a lady on Moose Hill." Emery Mace was able to fight and defeat other men but proved no match for this woman.

Frost (1957: 4) recalled that the song was made after Mace, who was "Always kickin' up a fuss" when he was drinking, "started...tryin' to kick up a fuss with [a woman's] husband." This woman had decided that she was not going to let Mace get away with this and so "she grabbed a stick of wood and she bated him right over the head with it, and knocked him cold." Frost added that this act surely "did not do his reputation any good." In this case a woman had beaten a strong man, and when she hit him, she directly challenged his manhood. This event, to Frost at the very least, would have soiled Mace's character and by commemorating this event in song Gorman shared the insult with a larger audience.

In "Michael Riley," Gorman presents another image of manhood defined by athleticism. The song is again not composed in Gorman's voice but that of the title character. In the song Riley boasts of defeating his father in a fight:

And when I arrived at manhood, I did him as proceeds:  
He took me to a raffle where he gave me too much rum-  
We got into a squabble and I chewed my father's thumb;  
And when I proved his champion how mighty proud I felt;  
Ever since that time I've worn the diamond belt  
(Pendergast, 1957: 9).

As the song continues Riley adds that "The Cape Wolfe pugilists I did beat them all/Like Samson with the Philistines, I slew them great and small" (Pendergast, 1957: 9). Clearly Riley was strong and able to display his masculinity through fighting, but as the song concludes Gorman delivers his true assessment of this man.

Riley is criticized as lacking control in the consumption of alcohol and in his emotions. Not only does this man fight his father when he is drunk at a raffle, he also subjects his wife and children to similar abuses. The final verse adds, "When I go to a tavern [I] like a foaming spout/When they get tired of me [it's] then they throw me out/I leave for home in anger to accomplish my desire /I take my wife and children and throw them on the fire" (O'Halleran, 1957: 3). Riley went too far when under the influence of alcohol, maltreating his father, wife, and children.

While at first it appeared that this song praised Michael Riley's masculine abilities, in actuality it presents a sharp critique of the man.

Several people, like Irving Frost, who recalled Gorman's songs also remembered some of the stories surrounding their creation and consequential effects. These histories provide insight into how Gorman's songs were interpreted by those around him as well as their social implications. There is a good chance that some of the histories that accompany Gorman's songs are not true; they might be exaggerated or plainly false, yet they highlight what these songs meant to those who heard them and provide an essential social context to assess Gorman's songs.

Another popular image that appears in the canon of Larry Gorman is that of the dishonest man. This imagery appears in the songs, "Myles Everett More" and "Donahue's Spree." While the precise events in the songs may have not actually occurred the remembrances of these two songs are critical for understanding their relation to Gorman's own masculine identity and how the song maker's contemporaries interpreted them.

In "Myles Everett More," the song maker presents a man who is dishonest. The man is portrayed without honor as it tells of his misdeeds. Here, More is not only credited with "mutilate[ing] a bull," but also tells of how he "loafed" and he "lunged" and "on [his] comrades [he] sponged," and "of [his] earning [he] spent every cent." The song adds that this man mistreated those who had treated him well and that he "meddled in folks' affairs" and in the song's conclusion, More admits to stealing a coat (Mace, 1957: 13). Alden Mace recalls that this song was composed after More had disrespected Gorman by calling him a "'bluenose," a term for someone from Nova Scotia (Mace, 1957: 13). The song maker was not going to let this insult pass and so he created a song against the man. Gorman was able to assert his own authority and power through this insulting song.

While Gorman was living in New Brunswick he composed the song "Donahue's Spree," about a man who finds love at a party and brags

to his companion about his dishonest doings. Everett Price recalled that the song was about Israel Brown and was quite insulting to this man. The character boasts, "Now I take a commodity under my jacket, / Steal out through the kitchen and make little racket, / And set it down easy in case I might crack it" (Ives, 1993: 73). Brown was remembered as "a big husky man" and Everett Price (1961: 1) added, "by God Israel Brown would a killed him if he'd a got a hold of him." Price adds that "Gorman had to get out of here, you see, to save his life" and moved to Maine. This reason for Gorman's move across the border may not be accurate, but it highlights how others perceived the song. Gorman's contemporaries understood the insults in the song and believed that Brown would have seriously hurt the composer for them.

Larry Gorman had outlined several masculine abilities and qualities in his songs: he discussed men who defined themselves through their material possessions, through physical strength, and men who were dishonest. While it is clear that Gorman articulated such character traits in his songs, he also used them to speak out against his employers. By vocalizing his opinions of his employers through songs he was able to assert some degree of authority when working-class men felt they had little power if any at all.

The position of working-class men is outlined in Gorman's song, "The Workman," (n. d.) which is another one of his printed broadsides, and takes more serious tone. The poem suggests a collective quality as its title is anonymous; "The Workman" could be any working-class man rather than an individual. Additionally, the song refers only to "he" and not a named person. The song calls, "Comrades, sit down and brush off your frown, / 'Til we'll talk of our sad situation." The men Gorman is attempting to reach with this broadside would have identified with the experience outlined in the song. While the song concludes that a working-man is unable to save his wages to provide for the well being of his family, a close reading of the second verse yields the working-man's perceptions of his position at work. The verse goes: "A Workman we know he is ground very low, / He is looked on as something inferior, / He is robbed and abused and badly used, / By those whom they call his

superior" (n. d.). The verse demonstrates that working-class men believed their position in society was low and that they are treated poorly from their bosses. Within the workplace the song claims that working-class men had little if any authority and were subject to their bosses will. For Gorman, however, making folksongs against his bosses allowed him to exercise authority.

For a period of time Gorman worked for Michael McElroy in Miminegash, Prince Edward Island. McElroy was not safe from Gorman's songs and found himself the subject of one with his name of the title. The song cautions those seeking work in the area and Gorman advises, "And if you should fish another year, / Or ever happen to come here, / Of one great bogus, pray keep clear, / He'll rob and starve you all I fear, / His name is McElroy." As the song continues it attacks McElroy's wife for taking pleasure in her husband's "swindling game" before concluding "This McElroy is quite a fop, / A proud, suspicious, naughty pup, / His head is tapering at the top, / Like some wild goose decoy" (Murphy, 1957: 28-29). McElroy's manhood is attacked as he is portrayed as a dishonest swindler, characteristics that Gorman's ideal man would not have possessed.

Mrs. Lawrence Murphy (1957: 31) believed that Gorman "didn't get a very good deal," or Gorman at least "thought he didn't," which inspired him to make up such a song. Rather than remain quiet about the injustices he felt he suffered as a working-class man, Gorman created and shared a song that belittled his boss. It is in this context that this song allowed Gorman to assert some degree of authority. McElroy, however, is not the only employer to have mistreated Gorman and had a song created about himself.

While living on Prince Edward Island Larry Gorman also fished for Patrick O'Reilly. It is uncertain what O'Reilly did to have a song made against him, but the insulting song brought his manhood to the forefront of the attack. "The Gull Decoy," like many of Gorman's other satirical songs, is not in own voice, but that of the title character and O'Reilly is given the nickname "the gull decoy." "The Gull Decoy" mentions how his

wife's parents were "so delighted / She fell in love with the Gull Decoy," and that he was well respected "by every man, woman, girl, or boy" (Allaby, 1957: 5-6). This had changed, however, for several reasons.

The song then moves to discuss how he chose to raise his children. He sings, "I bring my children to my own notions, / The oldest of them I called him Ike, / I always intend to give them tuition, / To drink and swear and to kick and fight" (Allaby, 1957: 5-6). Such methods of child rearing do not fit Gorman's proper notions of fatherhood in which men raised sons to work the land. Furthermore, the Gull Decoy was Michael Riley's father and this song also mentions the same fight as the song made after Riley.<sup>6</sup> After the father was defeated by his son he lost control over his household. As the song continues O'Reilly mentions how he no longer spends Sundays at home; he takes dinner from his son Pat and then leaves for his nephew's, home where he is read the news. Once his control had been challenged and overthrown he could no longer spend his time in his home. After this incident in the song O'Reilly's life spirals downward through his neglecting his Christian duties, exhuming a deceased child to spite his brother, and setting a dog on an orphan boy (Allaby, 1957: 2). The loss of control, coupled with these horrible incidents had changed the perceptions of this once respected man.

Irving Frost (1957: 8) explained that Gorman left Prince Edward Island after he "made up a song about somebody down there and they...was goin' to do away with him, you know? 'Cause he made this fella' mad, whoever he was, and he threatened Larry." This story is connected to his song "The Gull Decoy" and men like Frost felt that such an attack on Patrick O'Reilly would have carried serious repercussions. This story is similar to the one Alden Mace told regarding "Donahue's Spree" and Gorman's departure from New Brunswick. Such traditions demonstrate the amount of power Gorman's songs had, or at least, were perceived to have had. The notion of Gorman fleeing Prince Edward Island, and even New Brunswick, because he could not defend himself would not be considered a positive masculine characteristic. While it is not certain why he left Prince Edward Island, Everett Price recalled that there was more money to be made in the Pine Tree State than in the

Maritimes. If Gorman was seeking economic stability in the States, than surely this move could be considered a masculine action.

William Main Doerflinger (1990: 215) presents another song that was supposedly made against one of Larry Gorman's bosses, Natty Lamb from the lower St. Croix. Doerflinger notes that, "Tomah Stream," like the songs made against McElroy and O'Reilly, "is a classic example of the satirical lumberwoods song aimed at a boss who has treated the songmaker badly...A sly song like this was the worst possible revenge." The song places Natty Lamb within Gorman's theme of dishonest men. The song, in the composers voice, claims Lamb said, "the chance for lumbering was the best I ever did see. / ...'The provisions I'll provide for you, and if the very best kind!' / The cook will dish ' er up for you and have yer males on time." The crew, however, was "struck dumb" when they saw the provisions *they* needed to haul to camp and amongst the supplies were "three little loaves of bread as black as the Ace of Spades. / And a quarter of a pound of tea and an old bull's shoulder blade." Things only got worse as they reached the camp where they found "an old dead porcupine, full as large as me. / A piece of an old hemp carpet, 'twas more as thin as gauze, / This was the beddin' that Natty had for to keep out the frost." Lamb had been dishonest with his men and promised good provisions. Apparently, when Gorman found that the provisions were inadequate he made a song against his employer. The song maker was unwilling to remain quiet on the issue and voiced his opinion through verse.

Michael McElroy, Patrick O'Reilly, and Natty Lamb were three of Gorman's bosses who had been victim to his satirical songs but there is at least one more, Roderick McDonald, who was not safe. McDonald managed woods crews and river drivers along the Union River in Maine. He had a reputation for working his men hard, which most likely led Gorman to make a song with his name as the title. McDonald did not appreciate this honor.

In Gorman's song the river driver, who hired out men to help drive logs, is portrayed as dishonest; he keeps wages down by

"preaching up hard times" and when he first meets men he is kind, but once he and his employees are out of town, "his countenance is nothing but a frown." These criticisms do not appear too sharp, but Frost's story of Gorman's Christmas socks sheds light on how much power such a song was perceived to have had and how much their subjects disliked them.

Frost recalled that when Gorman was working along the Union River, his sister had sent the song maker a pair of red socks for Christmas. Shortly after sending the gift she sent her brother a letter asking if had received them. Having realized that he had not, he searched the camp and found them on the feet of Roderick McDonald. When confronted about the theft McDonald argued that the bright red socks were his own and would not hand them over. Once the song maker threatened to make another song about McDonald, however, he promptly sat down, removed the socks, and gave them to their rightful owner. This story highlights how men felt when Larry Gorman made songs about them. What Gorman lacked in social authority and physical abilities he made up in his song making abilities that allowed him to directly challenge other men and his bosses.

Not all of Gorman's songs about the men around him or his bosses were negative; Gorman's song, "It's a Wonder" (Ives, 1993: 130-31), praises one of his employers, Frederick Wellington Ayer of Eastern Manufacturing in Brewer. Not much of the song has survived but one verse praises Ayer for putting men to work: "A stranger comes along, he's soon put to work, / Be he Russian, Rumanian, Polander, or Turk; / There's no discrimination between Gentile or Jew, / It's really phenomenal what one man can do." Ayers's company put numerous men to work, and as Gorman's song makes it seem, treated them all fairly. While this was later in his life it appears that Gorman had finally found an employer who had not wronged or abused him.

Masculinity involves acting in a particular manner that both males and females can recognize as masculine. Through folksong Gorman created and displayed his own manhood; his songs not only

enabled him to comment on the behaviors of other men but to retaliate against his bosses who he had felt wronged him. Through this method, the song maker exerted some degree of authority in the workplace at a time when similar men endured poor treatment from their bosses to earn a wage. Gorman was unable to demonstrate authority through physical actions and so he used songs to display authority. The act of making songs about the behavior of other men, people who wronged him, and his bosses, allowed Larry Gorman to perform his own gender identity.

It is worth returning to Gorman's two broadsides, "The Old Pod Auger Days" and "The Workman." At the core of these two songs is the song maker's understanding of what the definition of manhood once was and where working-class men stood in his time. As already mentioned "The Old Pod Auger Days" claims that men had been "honest...athletic, brave, and strong" and these were qualities Gorman's modern man was lacking. Additionally, the song also highlights the transitional period away from a masculine goal of economic independence. Without this independence at the end of the nineteenth and into the twentieth century "The Workman" demonstrates that men were often mistreated and abused by their bosses. Larry Gorman could silently endure this treatment or speak out against his bosses; through folksong he chose the latter. By examining the masculine discourse and authority exerted in the folksongs of Larry Gorman, historians can work to better understand the complexities of working-class manhood at the turn into the twentieth century and include new voices into their discussions.

## Works Cited

- Allaby, Spurgeon. Interview by Edward D. Ives. Tape Recording. Passekeag, New Brunswick. June 7, 1957. Transcript located at the Maine Folklife Center, Orono, Me.
- Baron, Ava. "'An 'Other' Side of Gender Antagonism at Work: Men, Boys, and the Remasculization of Printers' Work, 1830-1920." *Work Engendered: Toward a New History of American Labor*. Ed. Ava Baron. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Bell, William. Interview by Edward D. Ives. Tape Recording. Brewer, Maine. December 13, 1956. Transcript located at the Maine Folklife Center, Orono, Me.
- Brittan, Arthur. *Masculinity and Power*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1989.
- Conrad, Margaret. "Chronicles of the Exodus: Myths and Realities of Maritime Canadians in the United States, 1870-1930." Eds. Stephen J. Hornsby Victor A. Konrad, and James J. Herlan. *The Northeastern Borderlands: Four Centuries of Interaction*. Fredericton, New Brunswick: Acadiensis Press, 1989. 97-119.
- Doerflinger, William Main. *Songs of the Sailor and Lumberman*. Glenwood: Meyerbook. 1990.
- Doucette, Edmund . Interview by Edward D. Ives. Tape Recording. Ebbsfleet, Prince Edward Island. June 25, 1957. Transcript located at the Maine Folklife Center, Orono, Me.
- Gorman, Lawrence. "The Old Pod Auger Days." South Brewer, Maine. No Date.
- Gorman, Lawrence. "The Workman." South Brewer, Maine. No Date.
- Gorn, Elliott J. "'Gouge and Bite, Pull Hair and Scratch': The Social Significance of Fighting in the Southern Backcountry." *The American Historical Review* 90, 1, February, 1985. 18-43.

- Glenn, Myra C. "Troubled Manhood in the Early Republic: The Life and Autobiography of Sailor Horace Lane." *Journal of the Early Republic* 42, Fall 1998. 59-93.
- Frost, Irving G. Interview by Edward D. Ives. Tape Recording. Bar Harbor, Maine. February 9, 1957. Transcriptlocated at the Maine Folklife Center, Orono, Me.
- Ives, Edward D. *Larry Gorman: The Man Who Made the Songs*. Fredericton: Goose Lane, 1993.
- Kaplan, Michael. "New York City Tavern Violence and the Creation of Working-Class Male Identity." *Journal of the Early Republic* 15, 4, Winter, 1995. 591-617.
- Mace, Alden. Interview by Edward D. Ives. Tape Recording. Southwest Harbor, Maine. February 22, 1957. Transcriptlocated at the Maine Folklife Center, Orono, Me.
- Maynard, Steven. "Rough Work and Rugged Men: The Social Construction of Masculinity in Working-Class History." *Labour/Le Travail* 23, Spring 1989. 159-169.
- McClellan, Cyrene. Interview by Edward D. Ives. Tape Recording. Charlettetown, Prince Edward Island. June 22, 1957. Transcriptlocated at the Maine Folklife Center, Orono, Me.
- O'Halleran, Frank. Interview by Edward D. Ives. Tape Recording. Bloomfield Station, Prince Edward Island. August 18, 1958. Transcriptlocated at the Maine Folklife Center, Orono, Me.
- Pendergast, James. Interview by Edward D. Ives. Tape Recording. Charlettetown, Prince Edward Island. June 15, 1957. Transcriptlocated at the Maine Folklife Center, Orono, Me.
- Price, Everett. Interview by Edward D. Ives. Tape Recording. Blackville, New Brunswick. July 11, 1961. Transcriptlocated at the Maine Folklife Center, Orono, Me.

Rotundo, E. Anthony. *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era*. New York: BasicBooks, 1993.

Sanfilippo, StephenNicholas. "Whalemen'sSong: LyricsandMasculinity in theSagHarborWhalefishery, 1840-1850." Doctoral Dissertation, Stony Brook University, 2010.

Stiles, Deborah. "Martin Butler, Masculinity, and the North American Sole Leather Tanning Industry: 1871-1889." *Labour/Le Travail* 42, Fall 1998. 85-114.

Tomczik, Adam. "'He-Men Could Talk to He-Men in He-Men Language': Lumberjack Culture in Maine and Minnesota." *Historian*70, 4, December, 2008. 697-715.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Arthur Brittan, *Masculinity and Power*, 97-98 for a discussion of masculinity and its relation to fatherhood.

<sup>2</sup> For discussions of physical abilities see: Elliott J. Gorn, "Gouge and Bite, Pull Hair and Scratch": The social Significance of Fighting in the Southern Backcountry," *The American Historical Review*, vol. 90, No. 1 (February 1985). 18-43, Michael Kaplan, "New York City Tavern Violence and the Creation of a Working-Class Male Identity," *Journal of the Early Republic*, vol. 15, no. 4 (Winter, 1995), 591-617. For discussions on masculinity and occupational skills see: Stiles, "Martin Butler," Adam Tomczik, "'He-Men Could Talk to He-Men in He-Men Language': Lumberjack Work Culture in Maine and Minnesota, 1840-1940," *Historian*, vol. 70 no. 4, (Dec. 2008) 697-715.

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of this transition see Ava Baron, "An 'Other' Side of Gender Antagonism at work: Men, Boys, and the Remasculization of Printers' Work, 1830-1920," in *Work Engendered: Toward a New History of American Labor*, ed. Ava Baron (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1991) 47-69;

<sup>4</sup> Margaret Conrad notes a shift in the economy "from wood, wind, and sail to iron, coal and rail" at the last half of the nineteenth century, which drove numerous peoples from the Maritime Provinces. This shift increasingly led to

wage dependency. See "Chronicles of the Exodus: Myths and Realities of Maritime Canadians in the United States, 1870-1930." Eds. Stephen J. Hornsby Victor A. Konrad, and James J. Herlan. *The Northeastern Borderlands: Four Centuries of Interaction*. Fredericton, New Brunswick: Acadiensis Press, 1989. 97-119.

<sup>5</sup> Authority as masculinity can best be understood in terms of competitiveness. Arthur Brittan notes that "Those who control and own the means of production are in a much better position to impose their competitive power than those who only have their labour and power to sell." Brittan, *Masculinity and Power* (Basil Blackwell; Oxford, 1989), 93.

<sup>6</sup> They are related, however, the last names are different. This could be caused because of the oral tradition of passing songs on or because Gorman changed it to make it rhyme in his songs.

# Scenes of Masochism and Male Homosocial Desire from Tobias Wolff's *In Pharaoh's Army* and Pat Barker's *Regeneration*.

Justin Omar Johnston\*  
Stony Brook University

## **Abstract:**

This article, "*Scenes of Masochism and Male Homosocial Desire from Tobias Wolff's In Pharaoh's Army and Pat Barker's Regeneration*," seeks to develop a historically contingent reading of the term "masculinity" as it is elaborated in relation to sexuality and discipline. More specifically, I am interested in looking at the layers of discursive meanings that construct or clothe the body as "masculine." My aim is not to undress this body of its prosthetic signifiers, but address this body, or to locate it in relation to its social surroundings, and disciplinary institutions. By examining a series of scenes, passages and arguments from Tobias Wolff's *In Pharaoh's Army* and Pat Barker's *Regeneration*, I will revise Gilles Deleuze's notion of "masochism" to highlight the political stakes in formulating a male homosocial masochistic scene.

**Key words:** Pharaoh's Army, Regeneration, masculinity, masochism

---

\* Phd, Assistant Professor, Stony Brook University, Department of English  
[Justin.johnston@stonybrook.edu](mailto:Justin.johnston@stonybrook.edu)

## **Tobias Wolff'ün *Pharaoh's Army* ve Pat Barker'ın *Regeneration* isimli eserlerinde Mazoşizm ve Homososyal Arzu Sahneleri.**

Justin Omar Johnston\*  
Stony Brook University

### **Özet:**

“Tobias Wolff'ün *Pharaoh's Army* ve Pat Barker'ın *Regeneration* isimli eserlerinde Mazoşizm ve Homososyal Arzu Sahneleri” isimli bu makale cinsellik ve disiplinle bağlantılı olarak ele alınan “erkeklik” teriminin tarihe bağlı bir okumasını yapmayı amaçlar. Özellikle, bedeni “erkeksi” olarak giydiren ya da inşa eden söylemsel anlam katmanlarıyla ilgiliyim. Amacım bu bedenin prostetik belirleyicilerini soymak değil, onu incelemek ve sosyal çevresi ve terbiye edici kurumları ile ilişki içerisinde yeniden konumlandırmaktır. Tobias Wolff'ün *Pharaoh's Army* ve Pat Barker'ın *Regeneration* isimli çalışmalarından bir dizi sahne, pasaj ve argümanı inceleyerek bir erkek homososyal mazoşistik sahenin oluşumundaki politik riskleri vurgulamak için Gilles Deleuze'ün “mazoşizm” kavramını gözden geçireceğim.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** *Pharaoh's Army*, erkeklik, mazoşizm

---

\* *Phd, Assistant Professor, Stony Brook University, Department of English*  
[Justin.johnston@stonybrook.edu](mailto:Justin.johnston@stonybrook.edu)

This essay draws on literary scenes of male masochism that subvert some of the gender norms that limit masochism in psychoanalytic theory. I am interested in exploring, therefore, how masochism, a concept firmly rooted within a sex-gender system, can both perpetuate and interrupt traditional notions of masculinity. My aim is not to undress masculine bodies of their prosthetic signifiers, but address such bodies, or to locate them in relation to their social surroundings and, in this case, their disciplinary surroundings. By examining a scene from Tobias Wolff's *In Pharaoh's Army* and several key passages from Pat Barker's *Regeneration*, I argue that the figure of the 'male mother,' despite his/her exclusion from psychoanalytic theories of masochism, opens male homosocial disciplinary settings to alternative and politically resistant forms of desire, pleasure and solidarity.

Before turning to Pat Barker and exploring the gendered forms of masochism represented in *Regeneration*, I want to set the stage for this analysis by first looking at a single crystalizing image from a different novel, Tobias Wolff's *In Pharaoh's Army*. This short scene, in particular, introduces the conceptual ties that bind discipline and masculinity to questions of cynicism and masochism. In the scene from Wolff's novel, then, the narrator describes his first encounter with his friend Huge Pierce.

This went on all night. Toward morning, wet, filthy, weaving on my feet as two drill sergeants took turns yelling in my face, I looked across the platoon bay at the morose rank of men waiting their ration of abuse, and saw in one mud-caked face a sudden lunatic flash of teeth. The guy was *grinning*. At me. In complicity, as if he knew me, had always known me, and knew exactly how to throw the switch that turned the most miserable luck, the worst degradations and prospects, into my choicest amusements. Like this endless night, this insane, ghastly scene. Wonderful! A scream! I grinned back at him. We were friends before we ever knew each other's names. (Wolfe, 1994, p. 50)

If we posit that this scene of “abuse” functions as a disciplinary practice within the military—as a method to train bodies—then how do Pierce’s grinning teeth interrupt this practice? Does this interruption constitute a perversion of military authority, where the supposedly docile body begins to resist “the worst degradations” of a disciplinary regime? Or is Pierce’s grin merely a fetishization of discipline, where the narrator and Pierce’s imagined “complicity” only makes their bodies more docile and accepting of punishment? These questions might broadly be categorized as “political,” in that they seek to locate the power of bodies (individual/collective) in relation to the power of the institution (state).

Likewise, a slightly different set of interconnected questions has to do with how sexuality or desire is functioning in this scene. In as much as this scene imagines *pleasure* as flowing from an act of discipline to an act of complicity, it raises at least three questions. Is Pierce’s pleasure in discipline “masochistic”? How does desire function in the formation of this friendship (a friendship without or before names)? And, finally, what is the relationship between masochism and male homosocial desire?

At one of the possible intersections between these lines of enquiry is a formation of a particular “masculine” subject. That is to say, “masculinity” must position itself in relation to a series of social forces, including an axis that run through questions of authority and sexuality. In order to unpack these relationships, I want to begin by elaborating a distinction between cynicism and masochism.

In SlavojŽizek’s essay, “How did Marx Invent the Symptom,” he argues for a notion of ideology that is rooted in material practices rather than imaginary or cognitive perceptions. He points out that “the cynical subject is quite aware of the distance between the ideological mask and social reality, but none the less insists upon the mask...one knows the falsehood very well...but still one does not renounce it” (1989, p. 29). This “cynical” subject is characterized by a disjunction between what they *know* and what they *do*. Despite the fact that the subject is aware of the ‘real social relations,’ they willfully act ‘as if’ they reject what they

know. Here Žižek deploys Marx's concept of "commodity fetishism" to explain the seeming breakdown between knowing and doing. A commodity fetish allows the subject to overcome or temporarily disavow their knowledge of social relations by obscuring the relationship between humans and things. While the subject might not subscribe to an illusory model of social relations, "*the things (commodities) themselves believe in [the subject's] place*" (1989, p. 34). In other words, the responsibility of acting in accordance with what you know is relieved by a fetishistic object who thinks in your place. For example, every Sunday, millions of spectators disavow the knowledge that they are not a professional athlete (or in anyway affiliated with a football team) when they put on the jersey of their favorite football team. Although the fan knows very well that their social relation to the team is fundamentally different than the athletes, *the jersey itself* disavows this knowledge; the jersey "believes" what and where the fan cannot. In this way, the fan, after three hours of sitting in front of a TV, nevertheless feels the thrill of victory along with the athletes.

This mode of fetishism, where the cynical subject acts according to the ideological imperatives through a process of disavowal offers us one reading of Pierce's grin. Here the grin would not figure as a perversion of or resistance to the disciplinary authority, but would, in fact, be the very sign of its cynical efficacy. The grin, therefore, suspends the reality of bodily punishment and it knows pleasure, enjoyment, and "amusement" in the place of the soldier. This reading of Pierce, however, is overly functionalist. It primarily focuses on the material outcome of Pierce's pleasure, namely, that he becomes a better, more docile soldier.

An alternative reading of the grin—a masochistic reading—would focus more on the interplay of psycho-sexual forces that give rise to pleasure. In Gilles Deleuze's work, *Masochism*, he points out that the "masochistic hero appears to be educated and fashioned by the authoritarian woman<sup>1</sup> whereas basically it is he who forms her, dresses her for the part and prompts the harsh words she addresses to him. It is the victim who speaks through the mouth of his torturer, without sparing himself" (1991, p. 22). The masochistic scenario, for Deleuze,

constitutes an inversion of the apparent power relations. The appearance of the disciplining authority dominating the docile body of the obedient masochist “conceals a criticism and a provocation” (1991, p. 88). The masochist “simply attacks the law on another flank. What we call humor...is a downward movement from the law to its consequences...By scrupulously applying the law we are able to demonstrate its absurdity and provoke the very disorder that it is intended to prevent or to conjure” (1991, p. 88). Indeed, by staging an extreme and literal enactment of the disciplinary rules, the masochist perverts the spirit of the law. That which the law seeks to prohibit not only becomes permissible but also logical, necessary and sanctioned. “By observing the very letter of the law, we refrain from questioning its ultimate or primary character; we then behave as if the supreme sovereignty of the law conferred upon it the enjoyment of all those pleasure that it denies us; hence by the closest adherence to it, and by zealously embracing it, we may hope to partake of its of its pleasures” (1991, p. 88).

In other words, Deleuze develops his argument about masochism along two lines. First of all, it is humorous and pleasurable to see the law’s intentions subverted through a “naïve” adherence to them, but secondly, the pain involved in punishment, as an enforcement of the laws, forms the “necessary precondition for achieving” pleasure. It is not so much that the masochist experiences pain as pleasure, but rather the “masochist regards the law as a punitive process and therefore begins by having the punishment inflicted upon himself; once he has undergone the punishment, he feels that he is allowed or indeed commanded to experience the pleasure that the law was supposed to forbid” (1991, p. 88). So long as one is already being punished for transgressing the law, the law necessitates that the transgression take place – the punishment seeks the crime, just as the pain gives sanction to the pleasure.

While the psychosexual dynamics of the masochistic subject can be elaborated in classical psychoanalytic terms, this sort of analysis relies on the structuring force of sex-gender differences. For instance, Deleuze posits that the apparent weakness of the masochist’s ego “is a

strategy by which the masochist manipulates the woman into the ideal state for the performance of the role he has assigned to her. If the masochist is lacking in anything, it would be the superego and not the ego at all" (1991, p. 124). The superego is instead externalized onto the figure of the beating woman, but this externalization is ultimately unstable. This instability arises, for Deleuze<sup>2</sup>, due to a recasting of the Oedipal drama, where the beating woman is figured as an "oral mother" on to whom a fetishistic "maternal phallus" is attached. Here "the process of disavowal is linked to castration not contingently but essentially and originally; the expression of fetishistic disavowal, 'No, the mother does not lack a phallus,' is not one particular form of disavowal among others, but formulates the very principle from which the other manifestations of disavowal derive" (1991, p. 127-128). At the root of the classic masochistic scene, according to Deleuze, is an attempt to suspend a gendered relation to phallic power from the point of view of the beaten subject.

Indeed, it is through this disavowal that Deleuze accomplishes a series of reversals. The "oral mother" can only be "allowed" to function as an externalization of the masochist superego because she is figured as retaining a "maternal phallus." In turn, however, this fetishistic appearance of a maternal phallus hides a more fundamental operation, in which the masochist's ego and the "oral mother" become complicit in the overthrowing of the father. Deleuze argues, "for in reality the superego is dead – not, however, as the result of an active negation but of a 'disavowal.' The beating woman represents the superego superficially and in the external world, and she also transforms the superego into the recipient of the beating, the essential victim. This explains the conspiracy of the mother-figure and the ego against the father's likeness. *The father's likeness represents both genital sexuality and the superego as an agent of repression: one is expelled with the other*" (1991, p. 125). That is to say, the superego is cut out of a scene that takes place between the mother and ego through a dialectical process whereby the masochist externalizes his superego onto the beating woman by disavowing her lack of a phallus, and, in return, it is supposedly the superego (the

(im)moral element) within the masochist that the woman punishes. In either case, the authority of the superego as a “father-image” is destabilized as it shuttles between the beating woman and masochistic subject, finding a home with neither.

An interpretation of Pierce’s grin as the sign of a masochistic subject is compelling, if imperfect. While a provisional reading of a masochistic Pierce might refigure his obsessive obedience as a humorous and pleasurable perversion of the disciplinary law, it could only do so by disavowing the lack of the woman-figure in this homosocial scene. This “lack of a lack,” to use Lacanian phraseology, already demonstrates the insufficiency of the Freud-Lacan-Deleuze description of masochism. To expose this insufficiency is to ask, *what are the psychosexual dynamics of a male-on-male masochism?*

According to Deleuze, Freud *rules out* this version of masochism because of the double-threat of castration and homosexuality: “Since, according to the theory, the masochist’s aim is to escape from the consequences of the transgression against the father, he proceeds to identity with the mother and offers himself to the father as a sexual object; however, since this would in turn renew the threat of castration which he is trying to avert, he chooses ‘being beaten’ both as a exorcism of ‘being castrated’ and as a regressive substitute of ‘being loved’; at the same time the mother takes on the role of the person who beats, as a result of repression of the homosexual choice<sup>3</sup>” (1991, p. 106). This formulation of the masochistic subject must be countered with at least two major objections<sup>4</sup>. On the one hand, “being beaten,” and the bodily threat entailed therein, seems just as likely to function as a regressive substitute for “being castrated” as for “being loved.” That is to say, “being beaten” seems to stand in an ambivalent relationship to castration and love, and certainly not as a straightforward “exorcism” of the possibility of castration. The second, and perhaps more damning objection has to do with the selection of the mother as a means to repress the homosexual choice. Since the choice of “being beaten” and the repression of homosexual desire are described as occurring “*at the same time*,” the possibility of homosexual or homosocial masochism is excluded from

this construction. In addition, the simultaneity of the two choices also implies that “being beaten” functions as a regressive substitute for “being loved” only because of the repression of homosexual desire. In this way the repression of homosexual desire not only forces the masochistic subject to displace the father with the mother, but also to substitute the possibility of “being loved” with the reality of “being beaten”. Suddenly, it becomes apparent, in this formulation, that homosexual desire is central to the formation of the masochistic subject.

Before proposing a theory of how a male homosocial masochism might work, I think it is important to review the two readings of Pierce’s grin that have already been offered. One must recall what is at stake in a theory of male homosocial masochism. If one reads Pierce’s grin as a cynical response to military authority, then it functions as the sign of his fetishistic acceptance of disciplinary power. Like the football jersey worn by spectators to disavow their ‘real’ relationship to the team, Pierce wears or performs his grin so as to suspend his knowledge about his ‘real’ relationship to the military. The implication of this reading is that Pierce allows his grin to think for him. That is to say, the materiality of the grin itself allows Pierce to enjoy his full and repeated acceptance of discipline, to act ‘as if’ he doesn’t know he is being psychically controlled. Such a reading figures Pierce as fully interpellated by a dominant ideological and disciplinary system. The alternative, psychosexual reading argues that Pierce’s grin is a symptom of a masochistic desire, where his full compliance with regulative norms (discipline) produces a humorous and pleasurable perversion of the disciplinary intensions. Such a reading focuses on Pierce’s ability to experience precisely the pleasure the law seeks to forbid, not by negating the law but by scrupulously following it. Indeed, by following the economic logic of the law connecting each pleasurable transgression to a painful punishment, Pierce is able to experience each punishment as a license or directive to pleasure. In this way, by reading Pierce as a masochist, one is able to open the possibility of a resistance to socially regulative regimes that seek to discipline the body.

The persuasiveness of this masochistic reading, however, is ultimately mitigated by the failure of psychoanalytic discourse to account for male homosocial masochism. Furthermore, while much is at stake in these two interpretations of Pierce's grin, neither of them explains the full complexity of the disciplinary scene. This grin does not occur in isolation, nor in a private encounter between the sergeant and Pierce. Indeed, the grin is directed "at *me*," at the narrator, at the reader. The sociality of "complicity" must be taken up at least as urgently as the psychology of the grin. Consequently, any theorization of male homosocial masochism needs to breakout of classical psychoanalytic discourse and situate itself in a socio-historical context. To make room for such an analytic shift, I would like to add a few more disciplinary scenes by way of comparison.

Pat Barker's novel *Regeneration* offers us a series of elaborations on the ideological and psychosexual questions under dispute. Additionally, with its focus on homosocial relationships, (both in the trenches and psychiatric ward) it lays out a diverse textual field for analyzing the social-sexual dynamics of male relationships. Before addressing these particular scenes, passages and relationships, it is worth pointing out that the very thematics of *Regeneration* rests on the question of male masochism. Doctor Rivers' conflict over the redeployment of Siegfried Sassoon is rooted in his inability to determine if Sassoon's desire to return is masochistic, and thus the humorous culmination of an anti-war resistance, or merely a disavowal of his 'real' relationship to his country/military/fellow soldiers. Put differently, it is a matter of determining if Sassoon and Rivers disavow their knowledge about the war and let their respective uniforms think for them or if they use their uniforms to make homosexuality—that which the uniform prohibits—the uniform's humorous and pleasurable mandate.

Consider the scene that immediately follows Prior's traumatic recollection depicting the onset of his mutism:

Rivers watched the play of emotions on Prior's face as he fitted the recovered memory into his past. He was unprepared for what happened next.

*'Is that all?'* Prior said.

He seemed to be beside himself with rage.

'I don't know about all,' Rivers said. 'I'd've thought that was a traumatic experience by any standards.'

Prior almost spat at him. *'It was nothing.'*

He put his head in his hands, at first, it seemed, in bewilderment, but then after a few moments he began to cry. Rivers waited a while, then walked round the desk and offered his handkerchief. Instead of taking it, Prior seized Rivers by the arms, and began butting him in the chest, hard enough to hurt. This was not an attack, Rivers realized, though it felt like one. It was the closest Prior could come to asking for physical contact. (1993, p. 104)

Since Prior cannot imagine himself as "the kind of person who breaks down," it is unlikely that he would find any traumatic memory a satisfactory excuse or account of his mutism (1993, p. 105). This prohibition against mutism is itself a symptom of a larger prohibition. Rivers, who suffers from a stammer, explains that mutism and stammering arise from the same "conflict between wanting to speak and knowing w-what you've got to say is not acceptable" (1993, p. 97). In this way, not speaking is to reveal a desire to transgress. Accordingly, in the excerpted scene, when Prior butts his head against River's chest, he is not only seeking "physical contact," but also an absolution through the medium of physical pain and punishment. Prior's relationship to Rivers is unstable because Rivers functions both as a "military doctor" (a sergeant of discipline) and as a fellow victim of the war<sup>5</sup> (a peer or friend). This confusion about Rivers role is dramatized by Prior's desire to externalize his superego in the figure of the disciplinarian, while simultaneously commiserate with him. Here, through the head butt, we can read the regressive substitution of "being loved" by the father with the reality of "being beaten." Only, of course, Rivers is a reluctant beater,

and has to be literally dragged into the masochistic scene by Prior. In this way Rivers is a weak superego, making him an excellent beater for a masochist. Remember, in the masochistic scene the point is merely to produce the simulacra of the father-image in the beating oral-mother. The masochist must disavow the mother's "lack of a phallus," just as Prior must disavow Rivers "lack of the phallus." This disavowal is readily accomplished because Rivers, as a military doctor, is *supposed* to wield the "phallic power" of the disciplinary institution—just as Yealand does. This question of Rivers functioning as the "beating woman" in the masochist scene will be explored more fully later, but first, it is necessary to address the glaring fact that this "physical contact" takes place between two men – it is seemingly not subject to the prohibition against homosexuality.

Eve Sedgwick's work *Between Men: English Literature and Homosocial Desire* (1985) offers us an socio-historical accounting of the prohibition against homosexuality. Sedgwick's study seems to follow from a now famous argument made by Foucault in *The History of Sexuality, Volume I*. Here Foucault states, "the nineteenth-century homosexual became a personage, a past, a case history, and a childhood, in addition to being an anatomy and possibly a mysterious physiology. Nothing that went into his total composition was unaffected by his sexuality...Homosexuality appeared as one of the forms of sexuality when it was transposed from the practice of sodomy onto a kind of interior androgyny, a hermaphroditism of the soul. The sodomite had been a temporary aberration; the homosexual was now a species" (1985, p. 43). This historically contingent appearance of the "homosexual subject" in the nineteenth-century had the effect of essentializing and pathologizing the love and desire between men. No sexual act or non-act was sufficient to identify the homosexual. Instead, what counted as male love or desire could only be determined by an analysis of the subject's interiority, through an investigation of their desire.

Exploring the larger consequences of this investigation is part of Sedgwick's project. She elaborates on Foucault's argument by pointing out that the distinction between "normal" homosocial behaviors and

“abnormal” homosocial desire is a gendered distinction. That is to say, it has become a cultural normative belief that homosocial friendships between women, where women seek to promote each other’s interests, is not radically different than homosexual desire between women. For Sedgwick “it seems at this moment to make an obvious kind of sense to say that women in our society who love women, women who teach, study, nurture, suckle, write about, march for, vote for, give jobs to, or otherwise promote the interests of women, are pursuing congruent and closely related activities. Thus the adjective ‘homosocial’ as applied to women’s bonds...need not be pointedly dichotomized as against ‘homosexual’; it can intelligibly denominate the entire continuum” (1985, p. 3). Indeed, the possibility of a continuum or spectrum of homosocial bonds, ranging from social interest to social desire, is precisely the social space that is obscured by the dichotomous distinction between hetero- and homosexuality. “To draw the ‘homosocial’ back into the orbit of ‘desire,’ of the potentially erotic, then, is to hypothesize the potential unbrokenness of a continuum between homosocial and homosexual”<sup>6</sup> (1985, p. 2).

At this historical moment, in contrast to the “obvious kind of sense” that a continuum exists between women’s homosocial and homosexual activities, men’s homosocial and homosexual activities are generally read as radically discontinuous. This separation of men’s social interests and sexual desires is a carefully monitored disciplinary distinction in contemporary western culture. Sedgwick is interested in the ways this constructed boundary works to control how male bodies are allowed to interrelate. For Sedgwick, “the importance—an importance—of the ‘homosexual’ ... comes not necessarily from its regulatory relation to a nascent or already-constituted minority of homosexual people or desires, but from its potential for giving whoever wields it a structuring definitional leverage over the whole range of male bodies that shape the social constitution” (1985, p. 86). The ability to detect, interpret and name homosexual desire becomes the power to legitimize or pathologize the male body in general. A whole symptomology of “homosexual” tendencies becomes the target and the

threat for *all men* who wish to avoid becoming pathologized as “homosexual.”

Accordingly, “what modern European-style homophobia delineates is thus a space, and perhaps a mechanism, of domination. So far as it is possible to do so without minimizing the specificity and gravity of European homosexual oppression and identity, it is analytically important to remember that the domination offered by this strategy is not only over a minority population, but over the bonds that structure all social form” (1985, p. 87). Thus, the conceptual construction the “homosexual” creates a new law within male social behavior. This law takes the form an invisible and interior distinction, at once Manichean and ubiquitous. The logic here is that “not only must homosexual men be unable to ascertain whether they are to be the objects of ‘random’ homophobic violence, *but no man must be able to ascertain that he is not (that his bonds are not) homosexual*”<sup>7</sup>(1985, p. 89). It is through this constant threat that certain forms of masculinity are formed, “for to be a man’s man is separated only by an invisible, carefully blurred, always-already-crossed line from being ‘interested in men.” (1985, p. 89).

The relationship between knowledge and the threat of violence in the construction of masculine homophobia is revealing in Prior’s relationship to Rivers, and the possibility of a male masochism more generally. During one their interviews Rivers pushes Prior to describe what he “felt” while walking in front of machine gun fire. Prior eventually replies that he felt “*Sexy,*” like one of “those men who lurk around in bushes waiting to jump out on unsuspecting ladies and – *er-um* – display their equipment?” (1993, p. 78). Prior’s vulnerability to the snipers undoubtedly accounts for his sense of nakedness or exposure, but it is precisely this undressing of the uniform—as the sign of disciplined masculinity—that also accounts for the sexual feeling on the homosocial battlefield. Although Prior attempts to reinscribe his feeling into a heterosexual scenario of exhibitionism, there are no “ladies” in the trenches, only men. The order for the soldier to walk “in a straight line...at normal walking speed” in front of machine gun fire takes the

form of “an *extremely* ridiculous event.” The soldier is being punished by a law intended to insure order (the straight line) and bravery (the normal walking speed). As a practice or exercise, the command functions to reinforce a notion of masculinity. The soldier is supposed to suspend their knowledge of the ‘real’ relationship between their bodies and bullets, and instead let the uniform think in their place. It is the uniform that believes in the order, in bravery and in a version of masculinity that prohibits homosocial desire. The humor, or “extreme ridiculousness” of the event arises as the faithful soldiers find themselves unprotected by the uniform. Indeed, by following the law of the uniform, they become undressed. The command, as a type of punishment, seeks its crime in the transgressive pleasure (of) following the order. It is precisely the homosocial desire prohibited by the uniform that now becomes its greatest demand. Speaking of a fellow soldier, Prior tells Rivers, “he had very blue eyes, you know, Towers” (1993, p. 106). The constructed division between homosocial camaraderie and homosocial desire is dismantled because there can be no more punishment – they are already, as it were, being punished for being gay. All that is left is the pleasure of transgressing the line between homosocial friendship and desire.

The novel makes male homosocial masochism available primarily through the character of Rivers, and the concept of a “male mother” (1993, p. 107). If Freud would have the masochist choose to be beaten by his mother due a prohibition against homosexuality, the category of the so-called “male mother” would interrupt this prohibition. Recall, in the Freud-Deleuze formulation, due to a disavowal of the mother’s “lack,” a type of “female father” ends up serving as the masochist’s disciplinarian. However, because the psychoanalytic discourse itself lacks a sense of its own historicity, it cannot see what Foucault and Sedgwick show to be historically contingent, namely, that the prohibition against “homosexuality” is a socially constructed method of controlling various bodies by forcing a continuum of libidinal energies into a binary division. Such a disciplinary regime, organized at the level of the superego or symbolic order, is precisely the law that the masochistic destabilizes. In other words, the choice of the “oral mother” as the masochist’s

disciplinarian has less to do with a historically contingent prohibition against homosexuality, and more to do with the need to create a “fake father” to stand in as an externalized and weak superego. Because Rivers’ project entails “redefining what it [means] to be a man,” using his supposed authority as a military doctor to deconstruct the division between male homosocial interest and desire, he is able to “allow” his patients “to understand that breakdown [is] nothing to be ashamed of, that horror and fear [are] inevitable responses to the trauma of war and [are] better acknowledged than suppressed, [and] that feelings for other men [are] natural and right” (1993, p. 48). Like the “female father,” the “male mother” is able to serve as the fetishistic simulacra of the father-image. Furthermore, by ordering his patients to “remember the traumatic events that had led to their being sent [to Craiglockhart], he [is], in effect, inflicting pain” (1993, p. 47). Put together, the fetishistic disavowal made possible by the ‘male mother’ and the infliction of pain through the command to recall traumatic events, signals the invention of a male homosocial masochism.

It is important, before concluding, to register Rivers complaint with the term ‘male mother.’ Rivers “distrusted the implication that nurturing, even when done by a man, remains female, as if the ability were in some way borrowed, or even stolen from women...If that were true, then there was really very little hope” (1993, p. 107). This distrust might be reformulated from the perspective of the “female father,” where there is an implication that punishment, even when done by a women, remain essentially male, essentially phallic. Such reservations seem to simultaneously miss the point and be the point. Masochism, as I have situated it, functions primarily as mode of resistance to already well-established societies of discipline. In the moment of disavowal, where the masochist acts ‘as if’ the mother is the father or the nurturer is the disciplinarian, this misrecognition depends precisely on a “borrowing” of one normative gender category by the other. In the process of this “borrowing,” however, the coercive forces of a disciplinary system cease to control the subject’s body or sexuality.

Another way to conceive of this dynamic is through the term “dressing down.” On the one hand “dressing down” refers to a state of being underdressed or dressed casually. The masochistic subject seeks to externalize his superego onto someone who functions as a “dressed down” father. Prior and Sassoon exchange their military uniforms for more casual uniforms, khakis, civilian clothing, even hospital gowns. Likewise, their superiors and those responsible for maintaining discipline also become “dressed down.” Rivers’ medical uniform is a relatively “dressed down” version of the high-ranking military uniforms of superiors in field. In this way, Rivers uniform is “dressed-up” just enough to be fetishized by his patients. Rivers uniform believes in Rivers’ authority for his patients, despite their knowledge of Rivers’ ‘real’ social relationship with them, which is generous and nurturing. On the other hand, within the military, to give someone a “dressing down” is to scold or discipline them. Each act of punishment is a type of “dressing down.” Thus, in the masochistic scene, a weak or “dressed down” superego “dresses down” or punishes the masochistic subject. As a result the masochist is metaphorically undressed or released from constraints of the superego. Indeed, in the male homosocial society of this novel, uniforms hide and discipline the male body. To be “dressed right” or “dressed left” is to describe on which side of the pant leg the penis rests, and on which side of the hetero/homo divide desire is curbed. If the masochistic scene does, in fact, allow the subject to escape the disciplinary enclosures of cultural norms, it will also free desire to pass through a continuum of possible social relations.

---

<sup>1</sup> The question of the torture's gender will be taken up later in this paper. For now, it is important to indicate that Deleuze—working from Sacher-Masoch's novels—figures the torturer as an “oral-mother” who works in alliance with the masochist's ego to dispel the image of the father and superego.

<sup>2</sup> Here Deleuze stages his argument within the basic constraints of the Oedipal drama as formulated by Freud.

<sup>3</sup> Although Deleuze goes on to reject this formulation by Freud, he does so for different reasons, what I would argue are the wrong reasons.

<sup>4</sup> An equally important objection, which is in great need of examination, is the apparent blindness of these theories to female-on-female masochism, and female masochists in general.

<sup>5</sup> Prior is always attempting to get Rivers to show his “personal” side. The suggestion that mutism and stammering flow from a similar transgression is merely one way in which Prior breaks down the barrier between patient and doctor. This leveling of power relations is accelerated when Rivers states: “I imagine most of us could [have broken down] if the pressure were bad enough. I know I could.” Prior takes this as moment of bonding between the two, asking, “Did the wallpaper speak?” (106).

<sup>6</sup> It is important to note that the sexualization of political relationships is not unproblematic. Depending on the specific circumstances, such a sexualization can function to help or hinder a group or individual's political aspirations. For example, the conflation of feminist activism with lesbian desires has been just one way in which women's sexuality has been used as a tool to marginalize and pathologize their political claims. The instrumentalization of sexuality in the political arena, however, has been predicated on a binary sexuality and not a continuum. In this way lesbianism is essentialized as the ‘true’ subject of feminism, whereas an understanding of sexuality along a historically changing spectrum of sexualities would allow women (and men) to acknowledge the role of desire in homosocial bonding and activism without that desire becoming the single and essential cause and goal of the political action.

<sup>7</sup> My emphasis

### Works Cited

Barker, Pat. *Regeneration*. New York: Plume, 1993.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Masochism: Coldness and Cruelty*. New York: Zone Books, 1991.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, Volume I*. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.

Sedgwick, Eve. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press. 1985

Wolff, Tobias. *In Pharaoh's Army: Memories of the Lost War*. New York: Vintage, 1994.

Zizek, Slavoj. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. New York: Verso, 1989.

# Queering Virility in F.T. Marinetti's Futurist Manifestos, 1909-1919

Janet Lee \*

Oregon State University

## Abstract:

This paper focuses on the bellicose founder of Italian futurism, Filippo Tommaso Marinetti. I employ a queer reading of his early manifestos (1909-1915) to question presumptions about sexual citizenship by interrogating hegemonic conventions linking gender and desire, bodies and performances. My goal is to disturb/extend traditional critiques of Marinetti's work and make the case that his manifestos are complicated by an erotics that tends not to stabilise around consistently gendered heterosexual/homosexual binaries. I suggest first that Marinetti's opportunistic misogyny, complicated by support for masculinised femininity and disclaim for effeminate men, reflects the impossibility of stable alignments of gender with particular sexed bodies. Second, Marinetti's anxieties about the borders between homosociability and desire are illustrated by an effusive and often violent homoeroticism, punctuated by heteronormative relief, and all encoded within belligerent assertions of hypermasculinity. I make the case that these are opportunistic narratives, produced during a decade at the *fin de siècle* when what we recognise as modern sexual categories were beginning to emerge and converge in oppositional logic, which defy classification in a coherent erotic regime.

**Key words:** F. T. Marinetti; Italian futurism; queer theory; masculinities

---

\* Professor of Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, Oregon State University  
[jlee@oregonstate.edu](mailto:jlee@oregonstate.edu)

## F.T. Marinetti'nin Fütürist Manifestolarında Erkeklği Queerleştirmek, 1909-1919

Janet Lee \*

Oregon State University

### Özet:

Bu makale İtalyan fütürizminin kavgacı kurucusu Filippo Tommaso Marinetti'ye odaklanmaktadır. Cinsel vatandaşlık hakkındaki önkabulleri sorgulamak amacıyla, toplumsal cinsiyet ve arzu, bedenler ve gösterimler gibi hegemonik konvansiyonları ele alarak erken manifestolarının (1909-1915) queer bir okumasını yapacağım. Amacım, Marinetti'nin yapıtına getirilen geleneksel eleştirileri yerinden oynatmak ve genişletmek; manifestolarının, tutarlı bir şekilde cinsiyetlendirilmiş bir heteroseksüel/homoseksüel ikiliğinin çevresinde sabitlenemeyen bir erotika tarafından karmaşıklaştırıldığını savunmaktır. İlk olarak, Marinetti'nin erkeksileşmiş kadınlığa verdiği destek ve kadınsılaştırılmış erkeklere yönelttiği ret ile karmaşık bir hale gelen fırsatçı kadın düşmanlığının, toplumsal cinsiyetin cinsiyetlendirilmiş bedenler üzerinden istikrarlı bir şekilde hizalanışının imkansızlığını yansıttığını iddia ediyorum. İkinci iddiam, Marinetti'nin homososyallik ve arzu arasındaki sınırlar konusunda hissettiği kaygıların, tümü hipermaskülinitenin çatışma halindeki savlarına kodlanmış, taşkın ve çoğunlukla şiddete meyyal bir homoerotizm ile örneklendiği ve heteronormatif rahatlama ile vurgulandığı. Bunların, yüzyıl dönümünde, modern cinsel kategorilerin ortaya çıkmaya başladığı ve uyumlu bir erotik rejim içinde sınıflandırmaya kafa tutan bir karşıtlık mantığı içerisinde birleştiği bir dönemde üretilmiş fırsatçı anlatılar olduğunu iddia ediyorum,

**Anahtar kelimeler:** F. T. Marinetti; İtalyan Fütürizmi, Queer teorisi, Erkeklikler

---

\* *Professor of Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, Oregon State University*  
[jlee@oregonstate.edu](mailto:jlee@oregonstate.edu)

## Introduction

In an airplane, sitting on the fuel tank, my belly warmed by the head of the pilot, I realized the utter folly of the antique syntax we have inherited from Homer (Marinetti, 'Technical Manifesto of Futurist Literature' [hereafter TM], 1912, p. 107).<sup>1</sup>

So begins this rather queer tale about the relationships between machines, masculinities, and modernism. Published in 1912 as a proto-Fascist utopian manifesto seeking to destroy history in the name of art, and in so doing consolidate modernist practice, it is predicated on 'the liquidation of the old rational, introspective, and sentimental "I" and on the hyperbolic expansion of the New Man's energy, intuition, [and] imagination' (Blum, 1996, p. viii). Such a vociferous will to power, what Cinzia Sartini Blum calls 'magical pragmatism' (p. 18) in its assertion that human will has the magical power to transform external things, is the voice of Filippo Tommaso Marinetti (1886-1944), founder and leader of Italian futurism. Known as the 'caffeine of Europe' because of his dauntless energy and strident bellicosity that valorised mechanised speed, technology, and violence (Flint, 1971, p. 6), Marinetti published a series of provocative texts in response to perceptions of the cultural malaise of *fin de siècle* Europe, a malaise rooted in anxieties about gender and sexual difference and influenced by 'lessons learned from Nietzsche, Sorel, and Bergson' (Berghaus, 2006, p. xx).

This article focuses on these categories of gender and sexual difference through interrogation of the homosocial spaces represented in Marinetti's Futurist manifestos about men and machines that were written between 1909 and 1919, the heyday of Italian futurism. These manifestos, representing a brilliant propaganda machine, 'transformed politics into a kind of lyric theatre', using the newly commercialised 'power of improvisation to outwit the reader' (Perloff, 1984, p. 77, p. 88). I employ a speculative queer reading of these manifestos to explore relationships between masculinity and modernity that play out across

contestable boundaries of manliness energised through homoerotic desire. In particular I mobilise a queer critique that investigates how gender and desire are structured in ways that unsettle hetero/homo/normativity as stable sets of unitary practices. As Lee Edelman (2004, p. 17) reminds us in a declaration about the need to move beyond identity politics: 'queerness can never define an identity; it can only ever disturb one'. I attempt here to disturb/extend traditional critiques of Marinetti's work and suggest his literary erotics emerge opportunistically, and are sustained as relatively unknowable, coalescing instead around ambiguous gender politics mobilised to proclaim a bellicose nationalist propaganda.

In this way my goal in this paper is not an attempt to recover Marinetti as a queer subject, nor does it imply revisiting his excessive macho swagger to better understand gendered relationships with women, or exploring his work as pertinent examples of modernist literary aesthetics, although I do touch on these aspects of Marinetti's *oeuvre*. Rather, my approach begins with Regina Kunzel's (2008, p. 237) notion that the 'homo/heterosexual binary [is] not only stunningly recent . . . [but] also remarkably uneven and considerably less hegemonic and less coherent than historians have often assumed'. I heed Laura Doan's (2013, p. xii) call for a queer critical history that moves beyond discovering queer subjects towards 'queerness as method' by stepping outside the logic of identity history and recognising the ways knowledge informed by modern organisations of gender and sexuality precedes and overdetermines what can be understood about the past. In other words, I seek to address the ways contemporary binaries shape our notions of the past. What might be learned, for example, if we shed our assumptions that subjects – like Marinetti – had bounded sexual identities to be investigated?

Known as a rising poet and creator of the literary magazine, *Poesia*, Marinetti founded the Futurist movement in 1909 with '*Fondazione e Manifesto del Futurismo*' ('The Foundation and Manifesto of Futurism' [hereafter FM]): a testament bridging poetic and theoretical discourse, and a persuasive political statement aimed at a mass

audience, or what Blum (1990) describes as a 'programmatic statement of aesthetic renovation, modernity, nationalism, and heroism' (p. 196). In this sense his manifestos transformed what had traditionally been a political template into a vehicle that would address a mass audience and represent a new literary genre (Lyon, 1999). This 'quasi-poetic construct' (Perloff, 1986,p. 82), which grafted the literary onto the political, produced a tight equation between art and society in its propagandist and mobilising opposition to the decadent and feminised sentimentalism associated with contemplative aestheticism. It also exclaimed a pugnacious affirmation for war as a means of individual and collective renewal, a source of revolutionary change, and a way to position futurism as a strategy 'beyond' socialism and communism (Re, 2009,p. 108-109).The following quote from Marinetti's founding manifesto speaks to this vision: 'We wish to glorify war – the sole cleanser of the world – militarism, patriotism, the destructive act of the libertarian, beautiful ideas worth dying for, and scorn for woman. We wish to destroy the museums, libraries, academies of any sort, and fight against moralism, feminism, and every kind of materialistic, self-serving cowardice' (FM, 1909,p. 14). During this period such cleansing notions of war were not, of course, unique to Marinetti, although he is distinct in affirming militarism as 'the basic law of life' (Blum, 2014,p. 95).

Marinetti's practical purpose was to move an audience to action and advance a programme of *arte-azione* (art-as action) that utilised war and appropriated new technologies like the airplane in the formulation of newly-virilised aesthetic practices. To create the new aesthetic of speed, exclaimed Marinetti, 'we have to destroy syntax, to scatter nouns at random' (TM,1912,p. 107), producing a chain of analogies like 'man-torpedo-boat and woman-bay' that 'connects objects that are distant in kind, seemingly different and hostile' (p. 108). Through this analogical style, what Marinetti described as 'the absolute master'of literary form (p. 109), he produced a 'lyric theatre' (Perloff, 1986,p. 84) casting the Futurist epistemological quest into a heroic gendered model and setting up a virile subject against a feminised reality to be conquered and penetrated/destroyed:'Only the poet who is detached from syntax and is

in command of Words-in-Freedom will know how to penetrate the essence of matter' (TM, 1912,p. 112), he declared. This authorial persona, whom R. W. Flint (1971,p. 5) dryly describes as 'someone [who] had to be the first to carry things to their ridiculous length and to do it with principle', put Italian futurism on the map as 'the most radical, dynamic and organised among the various modernist efforts to redeem modern life through culture' (Blum,2014,p. 90).

Through such innovations, Marinetti and Futurist comrades like Giacomo Balla, Umberto Boccioni, Carlo Carro, and Luigi Russolo sought the destruction of traditional arts and the implementation of dynamism not only through such formal disruptions in syntax and linguistic play, but also innovative visual representations of speed, sound, and movement. Futurism's optimistic geography of physical transcendence based upon complex invocations of speed and motion claimed to 'break down the divisions between positive and negative space, stasis and transcendence, object and environment' in quest of a disembodied virile sensibility (Merjian, 2012,p. 130). In this way the dynamism of mechanised speed, and flight in particular, provided Marinetti with artistic and cognitive possibilities, 'render[ing] "thinkable" [new] forms of literary expression' (Schnapp, 1994,p. 154).

The first section below traces Marinetti's responses to the Italian crisis in masculinity at the *fin de siècle* and makes the case that Marinetti's excessively virile gender polemics represent his response to modernity and to his anxiety about femininity as a set of social practices and erotic desires not only directed at women— a well-travelled terrain for scholars who have critiqued his 'scorn for woman' (Blum, 1990) -- but also at effeminate masculine subject positions. Shifting the lens from misogyny as the hatred, dislike, or prejudice against women to an equivalent relationship to femininity as the quality of being feminine: a set of social and cultural attitudes and practices performed by diverse bodies, provides insight not only into his appropriation of gender for opportunistic ends, but also into his acceptance of shifting subject positions embodying these categories. The next section explores Marinetti's little-studied (beyond assertions of homophobia) homoerotic

desires in the context of an impetus for grandiose homosocial schemes. It destabilises taken-for-granted notions of sexual difference, which I suggest are imported from contemporary notions of the sexual subject. Reflecting the incoherence and elasticity of sexual practices and desire that are not bounded and distinct, I suggest it is never possible to 'fix' the truth of Marinetti's erotic life as represented in his writings nor employ some template of normativity to make sense of his opportunistic texts aimed at promoting futurism as a political and literary movement. He produced an erotics shaped by gendered nationalist discourses where pleasure was ultimately both denied and celebrated in ways that draw attention to the impossibility and permeability of sexual classifications.

### **Virile masculinity and the defilement of the feminine**

**E**go-syntonic consolidation for a boy can come only in the form of masculinity . . . masculinity can be conferred only by men, and . . . femininity, in a person with a penis, can represent nothing but deficit and disaster (Sedgwick, 1993, p. 160).

Italian futurism flourished between 1909 and 1919, but continued into the 1940s, reinforced by new technologies and their application to industry, agriculture, and war alongside existential fears associated with loss of certainty and empire (Mosse, 1985; Perloff, 1986). Marinetti's modernist aesthetics are therefore rooted in an era of European modernity dominated by new means of transportation and communication arising from industrial and technical growth and by a growing military presence (Hemmings, 2015). For developing Italian fascism, the airplane in particular had 'symbolic implications that went far beyond its technical or utilitarian significance . . . Flight was a metaphor . . . for the urge to dominate, to master, to conquer' (Wohl, 1994, p. 288). Marinetti also responded to the belated industrialisation and relatively undeveloped economic situation in Italy at the time, which caused frustration and exacerbated political unrest (Hewitt, 1996). Such

unease was initiated by the *Risorgimento*, the movement for Italian unification that culminated in 1861 and helped rouse national consciousness (Fochessati, 2012). These complex social and economic forces facilitated a change in women's public roles and threatened traditional gender performances that sparked widespread anxiety and debate about national degeneracy as well as the *questione femminile* (woman question).

Out of this 'flux of irreconcilable social energies' (Lusty, 2014, p. 7) emerged the aggressive and belligerent patriotism that emboldened what Andrea Benedetti (2012, p. 227) has described as Marinetti's 'exclusive and elitist conception of nationalism' and his embrace of militarism. A strong, powerful nation needed virile rather than effeminate men as symbols of national regeneration, especially in the context of the Italo-Turkish and First World Wars (Brady, 2015; Spackman, 1994), in which Marinetti played a part. He worked as a war correspondent during the Italo-Turkish War and was severely wounded at the Gorizia front in World War I. These experiences served to increase his patriotic nationalism and exaltation of war: 'qualities' helping consolidate fascist polemics. In this sense Marinetti possessed a 'patriotic conviction and unshakable faith in the heroic "race" of the *Ardito*, the authentic Futurist soldier, moulded in forge of conflict' (Benedetti, 2012, p. 29). As Blum (2014, p. 97) notes, his was an 'exuberant display of masculine bravado' prompted by 'the masculinity crisis apparent in cultural and literary responses to the Great War'.

This 'masculinity crisis' that shaped Marinetti's work was also rooted in specific Italian cultural traditions associated with gender and masculine desire in flux at the *fin de siècle* (Mosse, 1985; Spackman, 1996). For example, among the diverse and publicly-accepted sexual practices surviving into the nineteenth century was the *cicisbeo* (an effeminate nobleman who acted as companion and/or lover of a married woman, attending her at public entertainments with knowledge and consent of the husband), *femminielli*, men with feminine gender expressions who had sexual relationships with other men and who were accepted in Neapolitan culture providing they took on the receptive,

'feminine' role (thus protecting dominant actors from scrutiny), and young Sicilian men's sexual practices with other men, which was regarded as adolescent phases of 'normal' manhood (Beccalossi, 2015). However with the advancement of new knowledge by 'experts' in medicine, eugenics, and sexology, racial and evolutionary theories provoked 'national shame' (Patriarca, 2010, p. 48) and diverse practices were increasingly disciplined into a newly-constructed 'normality' summoned to protect the 'race' and the nation (Benadusi, 2012; Foucault, 1985). Still, the legal decriminalisation of male same-sex practices on the southern Italian peninsula alongside ongoing perceptions of Italian men's willingness to act upon homoerotic desire (often explained in terms of a classical and 'natural' spontaneity), cast the region as a mecca for homoeroticism euphemistically called the 'Italian vice' (Beccalossi, 2015, p. 187).

Marinetti's literary response to these crises in masculinity mobilised art into a polemical aesthetic obsessed with the virility of the masculine subject and the denigration of the 'other', what Blum (1996, p. ix) describes as 'code for woman, nature, and reality' that would become a central distinction of fascist discourse (Mosse, 1985). As already mentioned, scholars have particularly focused on the potency of Marinetti's anti-woman polemics, even while he was well-known for his sexual exploits with women (Blum, 1990; Contarini, 2006; Spackman, 1996). 'Yes, our very sinews insist on war and scorn for women', writes Marinetti, 'for we fear their supplicating arms being wrapped around our legs, the morning of our setting forth!' ['Second Futurist Proclamation: Let's Kill Off the Moonlight' (hereafter KM), 1909, p. 23]). He offers tropes of castration ('[domesticity] stifles all vital energies' ['Against Sentimentalized Love and Parliamentarianism' [hereafter AL], 1911, p. 58]) and penetration ('Possessing a woman isn't rubbing yourself up against her but penetrating her' ['Down With the Tango and *Parsifal*' (hereafter DT) 1914, p. 132]) to defile women. Illustrating Kristeva's (1982) notion of the abject in terms of resistance to that which poses a threat, Marinetti uses violent images of rape to celebrate the 'furious coupling of war', imagined as an 'enormous vulva that splits wide open

to offer itself more easily in the terrible spasm of immanent victory!' (KM, 1909,p. 31).

At the same time, however, Marinetti, supported political and legal rights for women like suffrage and divorce, and advocated for key woman Futurists such as Valentine De Saint Point, BenedettaCappa Marinetti (his wife), and Maria Ginanni (Contarini, 2006). Subject women acting in masculinised ways in the public sphere was thus not necessarily a threat to Marinetti's gender scheme. 'We, Futurists, want to offer you (women): directly the vote: (the right to vote) Abolition of the marital authorization: Easy divorce: Devaluation and gradual abolition of the marriage: Devaluation of virginity ... I free love', wrote Marinetti in *Come siseducono le donne* (As the women are seduced) (quoted in Tesho, 2010, p. 14). As Contarini (2006, p. 877) emphasises, Marinetti's approach to women was 'ambivalent'. She describes his voice as perplexed or 'aporetic' when it came to women, and 'always opportunistic'. In terms of this opportunism, Marinetti's political advocacy must be understood in the context of his derision of the bourgeois family and its 'daily grind of domestic economic sweat and banal vulgarities' ('Against Marriage' [hereafter AM], 1919,p. 310). Freeing women from the family would aid the Futurist political agenda, which required women's participation (Benedetti, 2012). As ArtemidaTesho(2010, p. 16) notes, Marinetti's position on women's rights was opposed to fascist ideology, which resisted women's roles in economic and politic issues and stated that 'the most important role for women was a devotion to Mussolini and then to her husband and family'.

Alongside this ambiguous relationship to subject 'woman' is Marinetti's clear scorn of femininity: the root of his misogyny.<sup>2</sup> In his propagation of Italian nationalist masculinity with its 'cult of energy, aggressiveness, violence, and heroism' (Perloff, 1986,p. 89), Marinetti devalued its opposite: passéism and pacifism, and the soft, domestic and sentimental. In particular the virilities of speed were set against 'inert primitiveness and rancid romanticism [of] slowness' (Re, 2009,p. 110). Marinetti thus appropriated and celebrated the modernist aesthetic of speed by imagining hard, steely precisions that asserted a severe,

austere, and mechanical value system privileging tension and force and opposing the feminised soft and slow (Rabinbach, 1992). As Perloff (1984, p. 65) emphasises, 'violence and precision' were central aspects of Marinetti's lyrical form. For example, his 1914 manifesto employs phallic imagery to valorise speed and violent dynamism. His muse, the dreadnought battleship, 'radiated geometric and mechanical splendor . . . [with its] lyric initiative of electricity flowing through the sheaths of the quadruple turret guns, descending through sheathed pipes to the magazine, drawing up the turret guns out to the breeches, out to their final flights' (Marinetti, quoted in Flint, 1971, p. 98). For Marinetti, the rhythmic noise associated with such warfare asserts onomatopoeia as a literary device, 'enrich[ing] lyricism with brute reality' and propagating the numerical sensibility of words-in-freedom' (p. 103). In this way, the techno-warrior ethos, which relied upon militarised hyper-masculine excess and violent exuberance, derided the bourgeois masculine notion of self-control and moderation, scorned representations of femininity as sources of decadence and national degeneration, and encouraged educational models for boys of a 'lively, combative, muscular, and violently dynamic' nature (AM, 1919, p. 311).

A central aspect of Marinetti's defilement of femininity is his response to effeminacy. As he keenly recognised, one of the most lethal gender performances is that of effeminate masculinity, even though the feminised male 'invert' is essential to the construction of hegemonic masculinity (Halberstam, 1998). Effeminacy occurs as a product of policing the boundaries of hegemonic masculinities to ensure conformity and create hierarchies of subordinate masculinities (Connell, 2005; Dudink, Hagemann, and Tosh, 2004). And, indeed, Marinetti derides any masculine performances that deviate from his virile idea, especially those that epitomise the effete and leisured bourgeois dandy, an important social actor in elite European literary and social circles during this period (Katz, 1996; Linkoff, 2013). 'Our hearts are still attached to all this useless junk: peacocks' tails, strutting weathercocks, prissy perfumed kerchiefs!' he writes in 'Let's Kill Off the Moonlight' (1909, p. 25). Marinetti is particularly fearful of effeminising practices

'threatening to infect all races, turning them into jelly' (DT, 1914,p. 132). The latter quote is a derision of the 'effeminizing poisons of the Tango' (Marinetti, quoted in Flint, 1971,p. 69), an activity which still claims homoerotic currency (Kanai, 2015).

In this way Marinetti's goal of proclaiming both virile masculinity and masculinised femininity exemplifies his derision of femininity/effeminacy performed by multiple bodies and illustrates the impossibility of any stable alignment of gender with particular sexed bodies (Butler, 2004). This rupture between bodies and performances – or disconnect between bodily acts and identification -- thus illustrates the elasticity of these gender categories themselves.

### **The erotics of homosociability**

[I]t is . . . the most natural thing in the world that people of the same gender, people grouped together under the single most determinative diacritical mark of social organization, people whose economic, institutional, emotional, physical needs and knowledges may have so much in common, should bond together also on the axis of sexual desire (Sedgwick, 2008,p. 87).

Because conduits for male entitlement, especially in the nineteenth century, required intense male bonding, strong homosocial male cultures developed in exclusively masculine public spaces. In her discussion of homosociability Sedgwick (2008, p. 185) explains how strong bonds between men and the intense friendships they fostered was often indistinguishable from homosexual practices, which encouraged homophobia in response to the policing of these borders between homosociability and homoerotic desire. Indeed, a key aspect of Marinetti's Futurist vision is his prescription for homosociability: the desire for, and insistence upon, same-sex bonding. The first sentence of his founding manifesto begins with the camaraderie of the collective 'we': 'My friends and I had stayed up all night, sitting beneath the lamps

of a mosque, whose star-studded, filigreed brass domes resembled our souls, all aglow with the concentrated brilliance of an electric heart' (FM, 1909, p. 11). The narrative is established as a comradely journey shared by a band of friends, the 'young lions'. 'Come on! Let's go!' exclaims the narrator. 'Come on, my lads, let's get out of here!' (p. 12). Together, they declare a series of demands beginning with 'we' or using the possessive adjective 'our' to underscore their homosociability (pp. 13-14).

Such male bonding functions as definitive of masculinity rather than detrimental to it, with celebrations of comradely love not only aiding recruitment but also protecting this masculinised world from feminising principles. In order to retain power, men's bonds with women are inherently subordinate and pragmatic: they serve a purpose that ensures bonds with other men. In this sense women were used as intensifiers of the homosocial bond, taking on little currency except in terms of their circulation among men, as avenues for men's homosocial desire toward other men (Sedgwick, 1995). For example, Marinetti insists 'the young, modern male' must indulge in 'endless sexual amusement in rapid, casual encounters with women' in order to sustain a Futurist utopia ('Extended Man and the Kingdom of the Machine' [hereafter EM], 1915, p. 88).

Although for Marinetti men's desire for other men was tangled with fears about national degeneration, and certainly he used sexually abject metaphors in which homosexual acts were used as instruments to mock adversaries (Benadusi, 2012), still this contempt centered on what he considered unmanliness: an absence of virility exercised as courage and exuberance, rather than on homosexual desire itself. And, importantly, effeminate male 'inverts' were not yet rigidly cast as sexual subversives at this time. The modern male homosexual subject was not yet fully formed during this period and dandyism did not necessarily denote homosexual practices (Shorter, 2005; Sinfield, 1994). In addition, Benadusi (2012, p. 24) notes that in his everyday life Marinetti was decidedly 'less homophobic' than his Futurist contemporaries and writes about how one of these comrades, Aldo Palazzeschi, confessed a young male lover to Marinetti 'with the knowledge that he would find an

understanding listener'. Rather, Marinetti's ambiguous response to homosexual desire is again better understood as both opportunistic (in terms of what is best for Italian nationalism) and as a reflection of slippage across categories of gender and sexual desire characteristic of the period (Halperin, 1990).

Such erotic ambiguity and sexual opportunism is first illustrated in two examples. First, in a brazen speech given at the London Lyceum Club and published as the 'Lecture to the English on Futurism' (hereafter LE), Marinetti simultaneously insults and praises his perception of the English national character, including the 'absurd condemnation of Oscar Wilde', about which 'the intelligentsia of Europe will never forgive' (LE, 1911, p. 91). He tells his English audience that 'nearly all' their nation's young men indulge in homosexual practices 'at some time or other'. He insists that 'this perfectly respectable preference of theirs' stems from 'some sort of intensification of camaraderie and friendship, in the realm of athletic sports, before they reach the age of thirty – that age of work and order in which they suddenly return from Sodom to become engaged to some impudent young hussy, quickly registering their severe disapproval of the born invert, the false man, the half woman who makes no attempt to change' (p. 91). His diatribe condemns the English for their 'moral hypocrisy' and 'obsessive desire to keep up appearances at all costs' (p. 91). Bourgeois snobbery was the particular source of Marinetti's scorn: a snobbery he also condemned in his own nation: 'we have to hurl ourselves against the imbecility of fashion and head off this sheeplike current of snobbism' (DT, 1914, p. 132).

Against Marinetti's announcement of this particular sexual behaviour as a 'perfectly respectable preference' (LE, 1911, p. 91) and his 'support' for Oscar Wilde (or the opportunity to use this public national scandal to further the Futurist cause) is his derision of the 'obsession with lechery' that occurs closer to home on the canals of Venice, that 'putrescent city . . . magnificent carbuncle from the past' ('The Battles of Venice' [hereafter BV], 1911, p. 165). This ancient city, associated with ruin and decay, was a particular attraction for men seeking emotional and sexual relationships with men, especially among foreign tourists

(Aldrich, 1993). Venetian homosexual practices were grounded in cultures of masculinity among the gondoliers and facilitated by the Zanardelli Code of 1889, which decriminalised sex between men in private (Brady, 1915). 'We've had more than enough of amorous adventures, of lechery', Marinetti declared, 'you love to fawn on foreigners, and your servility is repulsive!' (BV, 1910, p. 166, p. 167).

How do we make sense of these two contrary takes on the potential anxieties between effeminacy and homoerotics: the support for Wilde, the poster child of the effete and leisured dandy and a lily-like apostle of aestheticism, and his disdain for the homoerotic practices of masculine Venetian subcultures? The question is further complicated by the fact that while Marinetti's contempt for femininity/effeminacy is clear, in the first case he offers support for the effeminate man and in the second, where this homoerotic subculture is not distinctly effete even if the tourists were, he unleashes contempt. An explanation rests again, not surprisingly, in Marinetti's opportunism and the insistence of a pragmatist nationalist politics that trumps all else. Oscar Wilde represented British decadence in such a way that it brought not only national shame to that country, but revealed its hypocrisy, snobbery, and prudery. Marinetti rejoiced in being able to elevate Italian national pride by insulting its British equivalent during his speech in London: 'That's how you carry out your obsessive desire . . . your meticulous, petty-minded mania for labels, masks, and all kinds of screens, the contrivances of prudishness and moral hypocrisy' (LE, 1911, p. 91). On the other hand, the widely-known Venetian tourist trade in homoeroticism represented Italy's own national 'shame'. Although these practices had a long cultural history and Marinetti most certainly was aware of these traditions, the need to demonstrate a virile polemic and literary aesthetic practice without hint of effeminacy was most pertinent for the movement (Contarini, 2006).

Alongside ambiguous opportunism in response to the sexual anxieties and gender uncertainties of modernity are Marinetti's own homoerotic representations of hypermasculinity associated with the Futurist man 'whose sleek shaft traverses the Earth' (FM, 1909, p. 13). As

Klaus Theweleit(1987) suggests in *Male Fantasies*, phallic representations of hypermasculinity were endemic to fascism because anxieties about the penetrability of the male body were tied to vulnerabilities of the nation state. And, indeed, it is exactly metaphors of penetration, ejaculation, and sadomasochism that Marinetti employs. In the founding manifesto, for example, Marinetti writes about the band of friends who ‘approached the three panting beasts to stroke their burning breasts’. The narrator declares: ‘I stretched myself out on my car like a corpse on its bier, but immediately I was revived as the steering wheel, like a guillotine blade, menaced my belly’ (FM, 1909, p. 12). Alive after an automobile accident, he has ‘a wonderful sense of [his] heart being pierced by the red-hot sword of joy!’ Then ‘[t]hey thought it was dead, that gorgeous shark of mine’, he explains, describing the car that survived the accident, ‘but a caress was all it needed to revive it, and there it was, back from the dead, darting along’ (p. 13). Similarly in ‘Let’s Kill Off the Moonlight’ the Futurist journey (imagined as ‘an awesome surge from a huge sluice gate’ [KM, 1909, p. 26]) involves an attempt to ‘tame the winds and keep them on a leash’ (p. 25). ‘The army of madness hurled itself from plain to plain’, writes Marinetti, like an ‘irresistible, free-flowing power of a liquid passing between enormous connecting vats’ (p. 26). He describes the journey, ‘tensed, twisted, and delirious . . . eddying with froth, that oozed ceaselessly from its gates, whose drawbridges had become pulsating, echoing funnels’. As they advanced they scattered the crowd like ‘sowers spreading seed’ until a man appeared, ‘very young with innocent eyes’ holding a flower ‘whose pistil wagged like a woman’s tongue’. Marinetti declares that ‘some wished to touch it, which would have been dreadful, since . . . a sighing foliage rose miraculously out of an earth rippling with unexpected waves’ (p. 27). As the excitement mounts ‘turbines transformed the rushing waters into electric pulses that clambered up along wires, up high poles, till they reached globes that were buzzing and glowing’ (28) when at the climax ‘great gouts of white foam that rolled and plunged, shower[ed] the backs of the lions’ (p. 29).

Alongside these representations of penetration and ejaculation are reproductive metaphors employed as strategies of mastery and control. Marinetti both appropriated and overpowered the geometries of nature by projecting homoerotic fantasies onto the hypermasculine symbol of the fused machine/man, the 'quite naturally [. . .] cruel, omniscient, and warlike' *superuomo* (EM, 1915, p. 86) who is born the product of male pathogenesis. As Marinetti exclaims, '[w]e've even dreamt of one day being able to create our own mechanical son, fruit of pure will, synthesis of all the laws the discovery of which science is about to hurl down upon us' (AL, 1911, p. 59).<sup>3</sup> Reborn in the form of an airplane (what Jeffrey Schapp [1994, p. 165] calls an 'aerial phallus'), 'he will possess the most unusual organs: organs adapted to the needs of an environment in which there are continual clashes. Even now we can predict a development of the external protrusion of the sternum, resembling a prow, which will have great significance, given that man, in the future, will become an increasingly better aviator' (EM, 1915, p. 86).

In this way homoeroticism is displaced onto a fetishised machine that becomes animated and fused as a masculine prosthetic. Such a mechanistic future, Marinetti declares, will be 'controlled from keyboards with a fertilizing abundance that throbs beneath the fingers of the engineers' (Marinetti, quoted in Flint, 1971, 104). Alongside love for the machine, writes Marinetti, is 'our growing love for matter [and] the will to penetrate it and know its vibrations' ('Geometrical and Mechanical Splendor and the Sensitivity Toward Numbers' [hereafter GM], 1914, p. 140). The hypermasculine machine sustains the erotic pleasures of mastering/penetrating effeminate (passively receptive) nature and illustrates the ways ambiguous eroticised virilities create an idealised notion of masculine strength elastic enough to contain physical prowess, nationalist strength, and sexual desire in one narrative. As Pursell (2008, p. 115) suggests, fascist regimes used body icons to defend dominant gendered nationalist norms and produce images that 'moved between aesthetics of domination and those of titillation'.

When such spectacular hypermasculinised homoerotic visual images collide with the fragmented and inchoate literary forms produced

in the manifestos, the result is an imaginative, but still relatively incoherent, narrative. Such modernist narrative highlighting ambiguities through oblique associations and characterisations provides resistance to realist literary traditions of the *fin de siècle* (Felski, 1995). Marinetti relied on such outrageous assertions to build his movement and to cultivate a public persona ready to feed a public hungry for patriotic nationalism at the very same time that he encouraged an innovative literary approach whose performative bent would foreshadow queer literary aesthetics. His authorial persona thrilled by asserting a mechanised precise logic that replaced outdated 'effeminate' language with the excesses of 'geometric and mechanical splendor' (GM, 1914, p. 142) even while this extravagant narrative, seething with internal contradictions, was irrational at base: 'a crazily naïve, exuberant paradox and divination' (Flint, 1971, p. 3). Such excessive and exaggerated ambiguity ultimately renders the author unknowable and prevents him from being fixed as a sexual subject. In other words, Marinetti's writing is inherently sexualised, but he resists binary oppositions and subverts coherent understandings of morality and transgression. Such queering of literary aesthetics to encourage a reading public to exercise power-over is cause for ponder, as also is the queering of fixed subjects and normative categories in the name of fascism.

## Conclusion

This paper has sought to contribute to knowledge about the fictive and insecure nature of homosexual/heterosexual binaries and the role of gender performances in the establishment of these categories. I make the case for a rupture between bodies and performances that disconnects bodily acts and identification. I also suggest that Marinetti's anxieties about the borders between homosociability and sexual desire are illustrated by an effusive and often violent homoeroticism, punctuated by occasional heteronormative relief, and all encoded within belligerent assertions of hypermasculinity associated with penetrative agency: a polyvalent narrative that marks a

refusal about the terminologies of desire. Importantly such narrative is contextualised in Marinetti's rabid nationalism and his seemingly 'natural' capacity for opportunism, all of which cumulate to defy attempts to place him within a coherent regime of erotic classification. In other words, while the narrative is animated by desire, exaggerated claim and counter claim renders Marinetti elusive and unknowable. However, although for Marinetti desire is articulated through multiple – and sometimes competing -- registers of the abject, the magical, and the pragmatic, it is always shaped by patriotic nationalism. Rather than a function of distinct sexual desires, Marinetti's opportunistic narrative reflects the ambiguous and sometimes contradictory socio-political practices associated with Italian futurism and encourages us to 'draw attention to the points of convergence between the social and the sexual', a methodology identified by Matt Houlbrook (2013) as 'essential' to queer historical analysis (p. 158). Such practice has implications for contemporary Italian queer theory in its refocus from queer subjects (somewhat of an oxymoron given queer theory's disruption of fixed identities) to queering as methodology (Pustianaz, 2010).

History has been faced with the difficulties of placing Marinetti's exaggerated rhetoric within coherent systems of classification. What I have tried to do here is problematise gender and sexual categories as distinct and bounded, hopefully revealing the fictive nature of these modes of categorisation and the impossibilities of classification beyond what we have come to understand as the modern sexual subject. Such an approach that attempts to problematise, defamiliarise, and destabilise what we think we know about the boundaries between gender and desire in Marinetti's work invariably accepts 'an irreducible dimension of opacity' regarding these categories (Kaplan, 2005, p. 270). Perhaps rather than understanding Marinetti in terms of his refusal to be aligned with a more or less fixed sexual subject, a situation that assumes there is a sexual subject with which to identify or align all along, his work can best be understood in response to contextualised cultural 'takes' on

sexual subjectivity (such as opportunism and the prerogatives of Italian nationalism).

What I have only begun to address here – and hopefully something other scholars will continue to pursue -- is the ways literary innovations of language and style in Marinetti's texts are specifically linked to non-normative sexual practices, or the similarities between his modernist syntax (or lack of it), ellipses, juxtapositions, and disjointed narratives, and queer theory's circumspection and strategic ambiguity. Both of course privilege transgression and the metaphorical language of substitution and digression; both can encode and decode homoerotic desire even while one is positioned to sustain fascism and the other seeks to interrogate power.

## References

- Aldrich, R. (1993). *The seduction of the Mediterranean: Writing, art, and homosexual fantasy*. New York: Routledge.
- Beccalossi, C. (2015). The Italian vice: Male homosexuality and British tourism in southern Italy. In V. P. Babini, C. Beccalossi, and L. Riall (Eds.), *Italian sexualities uncovered, 1789-1914* (pp. 185-206). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Benadusi, L. (2012). *The enemy of the new man: Homosexuality in fascist Italy*. Translated by S. Dungee and J. Pudney. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Benedetti, A. (2012). The war diaries of Filippo Tommasio Marinetti and Ernst Junger. *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies*, 2(1), 226-252.
- Berghaus, G. (2006). *F.T. Marinetti: Critical writings*. Translated by D. Thompson. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Blum, C. S. (1990). Rhetorical strategies and gender in Marinetti's Futurist Manifesto. *Italica*, 67(2), 196-211.

- Blum, C. S. (1996). *The other modernism: F.T. Marinetti's Futurist fiction of power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Blum, C. S. (2014). Marvellous masculinity: Futurist strategies of self-transfiguration through the maelstrom of modernity. In N. Lusty and J. Murphet (Eds.), *Modernism and masculinity* (pp. 87-102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brady, S. (2015). John Addington Symonds, Horatio Brown and Venice: Friendship, gondoliers. and homosexuality. In V. P. Babini, C. Beccalossi, and L. Riall (Eds.), *Italian sexualities uncovered, 1789-1914*(pp. 207-227). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. New York: Routledge.
- Connell R. W.(2005).*Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Contarini, S. (2006). *La femme Futuriste: Mythes, modèles et représentations de la femme dans la théorie et la littérature Futuristes (1909-1919)*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de Paris 10.
- Doan, L. (2013). *Disturbing practices: History, sexuality, and women's experiences of modern war*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dudink, S, Hagemann, K, and Tosh, J. (2004).*Masculinities in politics and war: Gendering modern history*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Edelman, L. (2004). *Queer theory and the death drive*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Felski, R. (1995). *The gender of modernity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Flint R. W. (Ed.). (1971). *Marinetti: Selected writings*. Translated by R. W. Flint and A. A. Coppotelli. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Fochessati, M. (2012).Broom and Futurist aristocracy: When the Futurist movement met the machineage. *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies*, 2(1), 69-103.

- Foucault, M. (1985). *History of sexuality, vol. 1*. New York: Vintage.
- Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Halperin, D. M. 1990. *One hundred years of sexuality and other essays on Greek love*. New York: Routledge.
- Hemmings, R. (2015). Modernity's object: The airplane, masculinity, and empire. *Criticism*, 57(2), 283-308.
- Hewitt, A. (1996). *Political inversions: Homosexuality, fascism and the modernist imagination*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Houlbrook, M. (2013). Thinking queer: The social and sexual in interwar Britain. In B. Lewis (Ed.), *British queer history: New approaches and perspectives* (pp.134-164). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Kanai, J. M. (2015). Buenos Aires beyond (homo)sexualized urban entrepreneurialism: The geographies of the queered tango. *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography*, 47(3), 652-670.
- Kaplan, M. (2005). *Sodom on the Thames: Sex, love and scandal in Wilde times*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Katz, J. N. (1996). *The invention of heterosexuality*. New York: Plume.
- Kristeva, J. (1982). Approaching abjection. *Oxford Literary Review*, 5 (1-2), 125-149.
- Kunzel, R. (2008). *Criminal intimacy: Prison and the uneven history of modern American sexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Linkoff, R. (2013). 'The young men who come down from Oxford and write gossip': Society gossip, homosexuality, and the logic of revelation in the interwar popular press. In B. Lewis (Ed.), *British queer history: New approaches and perspectives* (pp. 109-133). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Lusty, N. (2014). Introduction. In N. Lusty and J. Murphet (Eds.), *Modernism and masculinity* (pp. 1-18). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lyon, J. (1999). *Manifestoes: Provocations of the modern*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Marinetti, F. T. (1998 [1909]). *Mafarkathe Futurist: An African novel*. Translated by C. Diethel and S. Cox. London: Middlesex University Press.
- Merjian, A. H. (2012). A future by design: Giacomo Balla and the domestication of transcendence. *Oxford Art Journal*, 35(2), 121-146.
- Mosse, G. (1985). *Nationalism and sexuality: Respectability and abnormal sexuality in modern Europe*. New York: H. Fertig.
- Patriarca, S. (2010). *Italian vices: Nation and character from the Risorgimento to the Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perloff, M. (1984). Violence and precision: The manifesto as art form. *Chicago Review*, 34 (2), 65-101.
- Perloff, M. (1986). *The Futurist moment: Avant-garde, avant-guerre, and the language of rupture*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Pursell, T. (2008). Queer eyes and Wagnerian guys: Homoeroticism in the art of the Third Reich. *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 17(1), 110-137.
- Pustianaz, M. (2010). Qualchedomanda (sul) queer in Italia. *Italian Studies*, 65 (2), 263-277.
- Rabinbach, A. (1992). *The human motor: Energy, fatigue, and the origins of modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Re, L. (2009). Maria Ginanni vs. F. T. Marinetti: Women, speed, and war in Futurist Italy. *Annali di Italianistica* 27: 103-105.
- Schnapp, J. T. (1994). Propeller talk. *Modernism/Modernity*, 1(3), 153-178.
- Sedgwick, E. K. (1993). *Tendencies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Sedgwick, E. K. (1995). *Between men: English literature and male homosocial desire*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Sedgwick, E. K. (2008). *Epistemology of the closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Shorter, E. (2005). *Written in the flesh: A history of desire*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Silverman, K. (1992). *Male subjectivity at the margins*. New York: Routledge.
- Sinfield, A. (1994). *The Wilde century: Effeminacy, Oscar Wilde and the queer moment*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Spackman, B. (1994). Mafarka and son: Marinetti's homophobic economics. *Modernism/Modernity*, 1(3), 89-107.
- Spackman, B. (1996). *Fascist virilities: Rhetoric, ideology, and social fantasy in Italy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tesho, A. (2010). Italian Futurist women. *Forum on Public Policy: A Journal of the Oxford Round Table*, 1-18.
- Theweleit, K. (1987). *Male fantasies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wohl, R. (1994). *A passion for wings: Aviation and the Western imagination, 1908-1918*. Ithaca: Yale University Press.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup>Unless otherwise indicated, all page references to Marinetti's manifestos are from *F.T. Marinetti: Critical Writings* edited by Günter Berghaus (2006).

<sup>2</sup>Complicated, perhaps, by the politics of translation where the Italian adjective '*femminile*' can be translated into English as both woman/womanly/womanish and feminine.

<sup>3</sup> Marinetti's reproductive fantasy is best represented in his 1909 novel, *Mafarka*, a 'tale of rape, carnage, and Futurist declamation set in Africa' (Spackman 1994, 89), where he creates an Orientalised virile character, an African king who steals the gift of procreation from women and through imperial fantasies and male pathogenesis generates new machine/human life.

# Vulnerable White Men and Sexual Citizenship: Charles Ray Sculptures

Jerry D. Thomas \*

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

## **Abstract:**

This essay examines tensions in white men's public sexualities. Norms of sexual citizenship in the United States hide from public view vulnerable white men—naked and queer—especially in public art. In summer 2015, the Art Institute of Chicago showcased a major exhibit—Charles Ray Sculptures 1997–2014—that disrupted extant civil and legal models of citizenship that view white men as sexually unobjectified and impenetrable. The exhibit foreshadows queer nature—constructed and embodied—as a sexual citizenship model emphasizing diverse masculinities that crosscut ages, races, genders, and sexualities. Ray's work represents vulnerable naked and queer men as an integral part of American life from childhood to adulthood, including men in the classic American novel, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Ray presents vulnerable, embodied white men as both omnipresent and invisible. To disembody—disarticulate, erase, deny, shame into closets—the bodies of naked and queer men is to strip men of sexual citizenship. The disembodied sexual man compartmentalizes and severs his whole, despite representations that he is impenetrable, not vulnerable. Ray's exhibit—a queer nature, an indoor park—constructs part of what is missing in sexual citizenship.

**Key words:** Sexual citizenship, queer theory, Charles Ray, public art, male nude sculpture, *Huckleberry Finn*

---

\* Assistant Professor, Political Science, University of Wisconsin Oshkosh  
[thomasj@uwosh.edu](mailto:thomasj@uwosh.edu)

## Savunmasız Beyaz Erkekler ve Cinsel Vatandaşlık: Charles Ray Heykelleri

Jerry D. Thomas \*

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

### Özet:

Bu makale, beyaz erkeklerin kamusal cinselliklerindeki gerginlikleri incelemektedir. Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'ndeki cinsel vatandaşlık normları savunmasız beyaz erkekleri – çıplak ve kuir- özellikle kamusal sanatta saklı tutmaktadır. 2015 yazında, Chicago Sanat Enstitüsü beyaz erkekleri nesnelleştirilmemiş ve nüfuz edilemeyen olarak gören mevcut sivil ve yasal vatandaşlık modellerini bozan önemli bir sergiyi –Charles Ray Heykelleri 1997-2014- vitrine çıkardı. Sergi – inşa edilmiş ve somutlaştırılmış – kuir doğasını, yaşı, ırkları, toplumsal cinsiyetleri ve cinsellikleri çaprazlayan çeşitli erkeklikleri vurgulayan bir cinsel vatandaşlık modeli olarak öngörmektedir. Ray'in eserleri, klasik Amerikan romanı Huckleberry Finn'in Maceraları'ndaki erkekler de dahil olmak üzere, savunmasız çıplak ve kuir erkekleri çocukluktan yetişkinliğe Amerikan hayatının ayrılmaz bir parçası olarak temsil etmektedir. Ray, savunmasız ve somutlaştırılmış beyaz erkekleri hem her yerde var olan hem de görünmez olarak sunmaktadır. Çıplak ve kuir erkeklerin vücutlarını bedensellikten ayırmak, parçalamak, silmek, reddetmek veya gizli kalması için utandırmak erkekleri cinsel vatandaşlıklarından soymaktır. Bedensellikten ayrılmış cinsel erkek nüfuz edilemeyen ve savunmasız olmayan temsiline rağmen kendi bütünlüğünü bölümlere ayırır ve bütünlüğüne zarar verir. Ray'in sergisi – bir queer doğası, bir kapalı park- cinsel vatandaşlıkta eksik olan bir parçayı inşa etmektedir.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Cinsel vatandaşlık, kuir teori, Charles Ray, kamusal sanat, çıplak erkek heykel, Huckleberry Finn

---

\* Assistant Professor, Political Science, University of Wisconsin Oshkosh  
[thomasj@uwosh.edu](mailto:thomasj@uwosh.edu)

**N**orms of sexual citizenship in the United States hide from public view vulnerable white men—naked and queer—especially in public art. In summer 2015, the Art Institute of Chicago showcased a major exhibit—Charles Ray Sculptures 1997–2014—that disrupted extant civil and legal models of citizenship that view white men as sexually unobjectified and impenetrable. The exhibit foreshadows queer nature—constructed and embodied—as a sexual citizenship model emphasizing diverse masculinities that crosscut ages, races, genders, and sexualities. Ray’s work represents vulnerable naked and queer men as an integral part of American life from childhood to adulthood, including men in the classic American novel, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*.

Ray disrupts public/private binaries in sexual citizenship by constructing inside a building a park filled with vulnerable white men—queer and naked subject-objects rarely seen in the art world and more rarely seen in public spaces. With curator James Rondeau, Ray constructed a queer nature inside the Modern Wing. The cleared-out second floor, flanked by windows overlooking Millennium Park in downtown Chicago, left a large open space for about two dozen of Ray’s sculptures, all life-size or better. Museum visitors milled about the sculptures in a park-like setting, mimicking citizens in Millennium Park milling about benches, trees, art installations, and children splashing in a fountain/wading pool. The exhibit was queer nature—an artificial or counterfeit nature that replicates and passes as something else conceived as authentic. Queer nature disrupts the binary of conceptualizing queer and nature as co-constitutive opposites, like “landscape architecture”—a human-constructed nature—disrupts thinking that nature includes only elements not made by humans (see Schmidt 2014, analyzing the queer nature of waste in John Ashbery’s poetry). Just as landscape architecture exposes the permeable boundaries between nature and culture, Ray exposes the permeable boundaries between public and private sexualities in his indoor park of sculptures.

Ray's sculptures replicate common public parks: a boy plays with a car, a woman sleeps on a bench, an adolescent boy dressed as a Roman soldier performs in a play, a boy marvels at a frog he holds by its leg, a mime sleeps/performs on a cot, a man crouches to tie his shoelaces, a man hands his wife posies. There is a felled, decaying tree, Ray's version of a jungle gym (a tractor), and Mark Twain's characters, Huckleberry Finn and Jim.<sup>1</sup>

Ray's indoor park has a queer nature compared to traditional parks it replicates. Regardless of race and sex, people in Ray's park are monochromatic: polished versions of their silvery mediums (aluminum and stainless steel) or painted alabaster. Ray's park feels artificial and sterile, showing humans and nature without the spectrum of colors observed in outdoor parks. That Ray's park is inside the Institute emphasizes that seeing the queer park requires paying admission to a private museum, unlike Millennium Park, available to citizens at no cost. Only those who have the ability and desire to pay museum admission can see, and tacitly agree to see, Ray's naked men and boys; others are denied access.

This public/private distinction underscores legal and social norms that relegate men's sexualities to private spaces and prohibit public sexual expression. Sexual citizenship concerns the extent to which citizens receive liberties, equalities, autonomies, and dignities based on adherence to social and legal sexual norms (Eichner 2009). "Queer sexual citizenship" is seemingly paradoxical, since sexual citizenship is based on adherence to social norms and queerism is an ideological commitment to transgressing norms. Legally, queer sexualities are protected in private spaces. The U.S. Supreme Court in *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003) declared unconstitutional state proscriptions of consensual, adult sexual conduct in domestic spheres. The Court reasoned that states impermissible intrude on citizens' rights to privacy when they criminalize certain acts of sexual intimacy. Decriminalizing private intimate conduct was a leap forward in sexual citizenship jurisprudence, but it legitimated norms that expressions of sexuality are inherently private. Protecting private sexualities concomitantly constructs norms

that public sexualities are not protected. Queer sexual citizenship in public spaces remains controversial, and shifts in cultural norms do not always coincide with legal norms. For example, gender and sex hierarchies continue to exist despite laws prohibiting employment discrimination based on sex. The extant model of sexual citizenship is one that objectifies women's bodies and disembodies men. Concealing men's penises epitomizes this hegemonic norm and is reinforced by laws proscribing public indecency.

Shifts in public/private sexualities often occur through social movements supported by popular culture. This is where Charles Ray influences understandings of public sexuality. Ahead of social norms, he helps us envision possibilities for sexual citizenship in at least two ways. First, by making visible that which we do not often see (naked men and naked men interacting with one another), he reveals that most museum-goers are not offended seeing nude male bodies and to a lesser extent, queerness. Second, by making invisible what we take for granted in uncontroverted social life, he disrupts sexual citizenship assumptions.

### **Sexual Citizenship for Boys and Men**

Ray's men, ranging in age from five to sixty, shows the trajectory of sexual citizenship norms as men move from childhood into adolescence and into adulthood. The "accidental trilogy" is three sculptures of the same boy at three different ages. In *The New Beetle*, the boy is about five. Unaware of his nakedness, he attends to a toy car, a Volkswagen Beetle. In *Boy with Frog*, the boy is eight. Naked, he fixes his attention on a large frog he holds by one leg. In *School Play*, the adolescent boy performs as a Roman soldier; a t-shirt and toga conceal his body, and he holds a sword. The trilogy is accidental since Ray did not sculpt them to be seen together. *Boy with Frog* was a commissioned piece that stood alone outside the Punta della Dogana in Venice, Italy.

Ray hyper-details and hyper-texturizes certain parts of his sculptures; he deemphasizes other parts by smoothing them. In the

accidental trilogy, Ray sculpts in detail the stereotypically male objects the boy holds in every age—car, frog, and sword. In *Boy with Frog*, he smooths the boy's nipples and penis compared to the hyper-textured frog skin, as if to parody the attention we give to other things when a penis is visible. We divert our eyes and look at frogs and cars, anything to avoid looking at the penis. He blurs that which society tells us we should not see and hyper-texturizes what society validates as appropriate objects of our attention. When a person develops a larger penis and testicles and body hair, diverting our attentions toward other objects is more difficult. When men's genitals cannot be ignored, we cover them, as in *School Play* where the adolescent is not only dressed, but anachronistically overdressed. He wears a t-shirt under his toga so not even his shoulders are bare and so there is no glimpse of armpit hair. The accidental trilogy reflects sexual citizenship norms where it is acceptable to be a young boy playing naked with a toy car or a pre-pubescent boy trampling naked in nature looking for frogs. Once boys enter adolescence, they are expected to perform masculinities that involve covering their bodies and carrying swords. Boys' bodies become less visible as they age.

In the same exhibit, Ray offers a different view of public male sexuality for adult men. In two sculptures—*Young Man* and *Shoe Tie*—adult men are fully naked. Ray's subject-object in *Young Man* is one of his assistants: a man in his thirties holds a solemn expression as if he is aware of his own nakedness and aware that others (Ray) are seeing him and sexualizing him. Unlike the idealized image of a white man in Michelangelo's iconic, *David*, *Young Man* is an average white man: bulging sides, bearded, a medium-sized penis (circumcised), and thick pubic hair. Unlike the boys in the accidental trilogy, this man holds no toys or objects to distract our attention from his body. Ray hyper-details the young man's hair (head, facial, and pubic), inviting us to look intently at the man's body, including his genitals, in ways that do not feel perverse. In my experience, I was an average white man connecting with the likeness of another average white man. I wanted to touch him, but I was not allowed. The man does not touch himself. He stands upright with

his arms hanging freely at his sides. Ray constructs a sexualized naked man, without having him touch his own body, in contrast to the token woman in the exhibit (Aluminum Girl), whose hands rest on her thighs and who, by the way, has no pubic hair and visible, hyper-detailed labia minora and clitoris. Even if the man was not touching himself and if museum policies prevented me from touching him, my connection with Young Man was a moment I have experienced infrequently as a queer man—to be sexually aroused by and openly attentive to a naked man in the full light of day alongside women, men, children, and security guards. Looking at Young Man's full pubic bush, facial beard, and bulging mid-section, I overheard a woman say to another, "He looks like my husband." Young Man offers a different view of masculinity in sexual citizenship. Museum visitors were not only unalarmed by seeing a naked white man, but they seemed, as I did, to connect with his vulnerabilities and masculinities.

The second sculpture that disrupts normalized narratives that men should be clothed and desexualized in public spaces is Shoe Tie. Here, Ray's subject is his own body. In his early sixties, Ray crouches naked to tie his shoelaces. Neither the shoes nor the laces are there, so like Young Man, Ray includes nothing to divert our attention away from his naked body. Ray's inspiration for Shoe Tie comes from his routine mountain hikes before dawn, where mountain lions are common and where literature advises hikers not to bend over to tie shoes making themselves vulnerable to lion attacks (Catalogue 2014, 134). The crouched position is a vulnerable one not often seen in men's sexual citizenship, so I welcomed Ray depicting his vulnerabilities against lions, consciously transgressing common cautions. Ray exacerbates vulnerability by exposing his entire naked body in a bent-over, crouched position where arguably the armature of the sculpture is not the space between his fingers where one would expect to see shoelaces, but the space between his genitals and the earth: his scrotum, suspended from his groin, hovers over the ground. Both his genitals and the earth are nature even if we construct and conceptualize spaces and policies that view the two as separable. It is queer nature to acknowledge that socially

constructed sexualities and masculinities are as much part of nature as the non-human-made elements in the environment. Like the energy in the space between the eight-year-old boy's eyes and the frog's body, the armature of Shoe Tie is the mutable space between Ray's genitals and the mountain upon which he crouches—the spaces between men's natural bodies and natural otherness.

These sculptures are queer in part because the person experiencing them (me) is queer. Other perspectives, like the woman who said Young Man looked like her husband, are less queer in the sense of gay/straight binaries, but queer in the way one experiences sexuality in public spaces, regardless of gender. Each sculpture has certain queerness individually, but collectively displayed in an artificial park the monochromatic sculptures are decidedly queerer than contemporary sexual norms. One sculpture is obviously queer irrespective of the sexuality of the viewer. Huck and Jim is Ray's queerest piece and provides leverage for sexual citizenship analyses.

### **Huck and Jim: Homoeroticism and Patriarchy among Boys and Men**

One must read the wall placard to learn the subjects of the sculpture are Mark Twain's protagonists from *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Huck Finn is running away from an abusive father and an aunt hell-bent on reforming his vulgar ways. With his companion, Jim—a run-away slave owned by Huck's aunt—Huck flees his oppressors on a raft down the Mississippi River. Knowing the story taints how I view Ray's sculpture, but Ray's sculpture complicates Twain's story about American life, compelling me to read it differently. Of this sculpture, Ray asks whether the viewer can “negotiate the sexual politics” of a naked fourteen-year-old white boy and a naked twenty-eight-year-old black man (Catalogue 2014, 142). This negotiation depends in part on whether one is familiar with Twain's story.



[Insert Figure 1 about here]

Figure 1: Huck and Jim (2014), Author Photo

When I first viewed the sculpture, I was unaware the two men were Twain's characters. I immediately saw homoeroticism: one man bends over, the other stands upright. At 150% scale, the upright man's penis is at eye level. His penis is not circumcised, unlike the other men and boys in Ray's exhibit. My eyes are drawn to the bending man's hand, the object of his own attention as he scoops something unseen. Suspended in motion, Ray captures the instant just before the bending man must shift his footing to maintain balance. The hand of the upright man hovers over his back ready to steady him. While the bending man focuses on his own hand, the upright man focuses on something distant: his eyes are hollow with an introspective gaze. Both figures are painted white, but features other than skin color indicate they have different races. The upright man has curly hair, a broader nose, and fuller lips. Perhaps he is biracial; his facial features resemble black men and white men alike. The other man has straighter, wavy hair, much like a white man. I observed a sensual, sexual relationship between them. The armature of this piece—the greatest curiosity and energy—is the space where a hand hovers over a back. Why are they not touching?

There are no objects in the sculpture to distract us from looking at the men's bodies. Ray hyper-details the hair on the young man's head and the pubic hair of the upright man: holes leading inward provide depth. Ray also sculpts great details in their hands and feet—highly visible palm creases, toenails, and thumb wrinkles. One might look past the sculpture to see Millennium Park through the window, but one cannot avoid looking at the men's bodies.

It is not obvious that the man bending over is a boy. His bent body largely conceals tell-tale signs of age—genitals, face, and torso. One cannot see readily that these body parts are not fully developed. One can, however, crouch and contort to see the concealed body parts enough to discern that the man is a young one. His pubic hair is hardly developed and the penis length is shorter than the penis of the upright man. There are two folds of skin bunched at the head of his penis, but none covering the head, which is not small. Nor are his testicles small. More visible from the back of the sculpture, his testicles and scrotum suspend freely from a

central apex near his anus. But these genital details do not foreclose manhood based on age. Many adult men have shorter penises and shave their pubic hair. He is probably a younger man because he is slim with taut, unwrinkled skin. His face is boyish, but one almost has to lie on the floor and look upwards to see it. The upright man is unquestionably adult. His body is maturely formed with visible pectoral muscles, a full pubic bush, a longer penis, fuller testicles, and a squared face. His body parts are proportional and have no fatty areas characteristic in boys' faces, arms, legs, and abdomens. The point is not to extol a quintessential man's body, but to say that one can reasonably know the upright man is adult and the other is a younger man.

If one is uncertain about the age of the bending man, one can be certain there is sensitivity between the naked men, a bond. The obvious bond is a sexual one: a man bends over to be penetrated by another standing man. The image of a penetrated male conjures heteronormativity and constructs sexual hierarchies out of gender hierarchies where one man replicates the passive role of woman (Kemp 2013). Norms of sexual citizenship conceptualize sexually passive men as vulnerable, unlike Kemp, who views penetrations of the body as powerful, as when sound penetrates the ear (2013). We wonder whether Ray's penetrated man is powerful or vulnerably in need of patriarchal protection. The upright man reaches to touch the other in a fatherly way, but it is not obvious he is the boy's father, since they are different races. (Apologies to my own family: I am a white man, guardian of my biracial nephew, whose race is both white and black. I also note that Ray's *Two Boys*, a bas relief in the exhibit, depicts two brothers who have different racial characteristics.) The relationship Ray creates is sensitively patriarchal, protectionist, and nurturing, but one wonders whether the two are father and son; overt homoeroticism and different races suggest otherwise.

Reading the wall placard and learning that the subjects were Huck and Jim both validated and complicated these observations. Huck is a fourteen-year-old white adolescent; Jim is a twenty-eight-year-old black man. They are not father and son. I was familiar with Twain's story, but I

did not recall the overt homoeroticism I saw in Ray's representation. Had I ever even read the story? I bought the novel.

The novel contains intimate conversations between Huck and Jim, both naked on the raft, such as the one Ray uses as inspiration for his sculpture:

Soon as it was night, out we shoved; when we got her out to about the middle, we let her alone, and let her float wherever the current wanted her to; then we lit the pipes, and dangled our legs in the water and talked about all kinds of things—we was always naked, day and night, whenever the mosquitoes would let us—the new clothes Buck's folks made for me was too good to be comfortable, and besides I didn't go much on clothes, nohow . . .

It's lovely to live on a raft. We had the sky, up there, all speckled with stars, and we used to lay on our backs and look up at them, and discuss about whether they was made, or only just happened. Jim he allowed they was made, but I allowed they happened; I judged it would have took too long to make so many. Jim said the moon could a laid them; well, that looked kind of reasonable, so I didn't say nothing against it, because I've seen a frog lay most as many, so of course it could be done (Twain 2012 (1884), 123-24, emphasis in original).

Ray's representation of Huck and Jim is a moment when Huck is scooping frog eggs from the water; he originally conceived the sculpture as an outdoor fountain. Huck's embodied approach to understanding stars comes in his attempts to concretize what he can know with his own body—see, feel, scoop. Huck references a tangible framework for how the moon could have birthed the stars by connecting his natural body with other elements in nature.

Viewers familiar with Twain's story can similarly use the novel to concretize what we observe in Ray's sculpture, namely, the age and race

of the subjects; but knowing the story also complicates the experience because it does not align with the homoeroticism in Ray's sculpture. Jim's relationship to Huck in the novel is patriarchal: he takes longer shifts at night so Huck can rest, and he shields Huck from seeing his father's dead body. They are companions working, eating, and resting together on a raft down the tranquil and violent Mississippi River. Their relationship is, at once, patriarchal and homoerotic. One can imagine Huck and Jim being intimate with one another.

Suggesting homoeroticism between Jim (a man) and Huck (barely a man) broaches taboos surrounding children and sexual citizenship. Ray is important to sexual citizenship discourse because he forces us to consider how we negotiate the sexual politics between an adolescent white boy and an adult black man. When I discuss this sculpture with friends and colleagues, they raise concerns about power imbalances in sexual relationships among adults and children. They fixate on whether fourteen-year-old Huck can truly consent to sexual intimacy with twenty-eight-year-old Jim. The power imbalances associated with age become a litmus test for the legitimacy of sexual intimacy. Arguably, however, Huck has more power than Jim in this context. Despite Huck's resistance to his aunt's efforts to refine and educate him according to Christian values, he is more educated and socialized than his aunt's slave. Too, the white adolescent has a broader understanding of sexual citizenship norms. He is, after all, white and free. Jim is black and a slave. Age may be an indicator of sexual agency, but the cultural intersections surrounding race and education suggest the power imbalance does not tilt in Jim's favor. Huck is as likely as Jim to be aware of perceived social sexual transgressions related to age, race, and sex. Twain notes that Jim is married and has two children, which further complicates patriarchal and homoerotic narratives, but sexual citizenship norms are preoccupied with sexual power imbalances connected with age, not unlike power imbalances in Nabakov's *Lolita* (*Lolita* is twelve, Humbert around thirty-seven). Unlike *Lolita*, there are no explicit sexual relationships or desires described in *Huckleberry Finn*. The most explicit reference in the novel is the passage quoted above, which is not explicit; sexual references are

implied contextually in their nakedness, companionship, and conversational sensitivities. Yet, after seeing Ray's homoerotic representation of Huck and Jim, it is difficult to see Twain's characters as purely nonsexual.

Ray's sculpture challenges socially and legally constructed age lenses through which one sees young men (boys) as sexual citizens. By age fourteen, boys are aware of their sexual bodies—arousals from visual and physical stimuli, certain pleasures from stimulating the penis, bodily fluids that excrete in sleep. Sexual citizenship norms relegate these realities to private spaces, where young men exploring, for example, masturbation, do so only in bedrooms, bathrooms, or other private spaces. Despite these common experiences, young men learn that it is taboo to discuss their sexual bodies in public and more taboo to see or experience sexual bodies with others.

Consent is not the thrust of this essay; I do not argue that full sexual citizenship includes adults' unfettered sexual access to children. Instead, Ray's depiction of Huck and Jim compels reexamining age assumptions in sexuality when age is the language we use to describe white men's vulnerabilities. Fears of adult men sexually abusing vulnerable boys too often foreclose acknowledgements that boys have sexualities. Whether it is okay for a twenty-eight-year old man to have a sexual relationship with a fourteen-year-old man is different from asking whether the fourteen-year-old has sexuality or whether he is a sexual citizen. Huck is caught between boyhood and manhood, so are his genitals: more than a boy, not yet a fully formed man. This intermediate position disrupts the child/sex binary, even if we do not see the sexual boy in society with his naked body in the full light of day. Ray's sculpture acknowledges that sexual citizenship norms are constructed at early ages in ways that reinforce private sexualities and in ways that erase portions of men's sexualities. Society associates pathologies and maladies with childhood sexuality, such as the emerging porn "addiction" in a generation of young men who have ready access to sexual stimuli on the Internet that prevent them from having sexual relations with other people without pornography. Society views Internet

sexualities as problematic. This essay is not a treatise on the benefits of Internet pornography anymore than it is an essay that addresses the contours of consent, but these examples point to social constructions of sexualities in boys, which develop differently from what most people acknowledge as natural. But for Ray bringing childhood sexuality, with its taboos and constructions, into public discourse for critical analyses, boyhood sexuality remains missing in sexual citizenship discourse.

A characteristic of Ray's work is missing elements. In *Horse and Rider*—the only sculpture in the exhibit located in an adjacent courtyard open to the public, outside the Institute's Modern Wing—Ray sculpts his aging self, clothed in denim and a long sleeve shirt, sitting on an aging horse. The bridle connecting Ray's hands to the horse's bit is missing. In *Shoe Tie*, the laces are not there, nor are Ray's shoes or his clothes. Missing in many of Ray's sculptures is clothes, but also pubic hair on an adult woman (*Aluminum Girl*) or foreskin on the penises of white men. The only nude black man, Jim, has intact foreskin, not uncommon for a black slave. The powerful missing element in *Huck and Jim* is not their clothes or Huck's foreskin, but the touch between Huck and Jim. The space Ray sculpts between Jim's hand and Huck's back is a moment when we see no physical contact, but know that queerness exists. From Ray's representation, touching would have seemed as natural as their feet standing on the raft or water splashing on their legs. It would not alarm Huck or change his expression if Jim's hand touched his back. Neither would Jim's stature or expression change. What may have changed is public reaction to seeing the two men touching. It is one thing to know men have sexual, intimate relationships in private; one can accept it by not thinking about it. It is more difficult, obviously, to escape thinking about man-man intimacy when it confronts us in visible publics. The first time I saw two men holding hands in public was jarring, even if my reaction was ultimately positive. When I first saw *Huck and Jim*, it was equally jarring because it was uncommon, not because it was offensive. Omitting touch, Ray causes us to reflect upon the implications of seeing and not seeing man-man intimacy. The homoerotic energy that runs through the hand-back space symbolizes homoeroticism in Twain's

novel and men's public sexualities—touches and experiences are omnipresent even if we never actually see them.

Not only are we forbidden from seeing Jim touch Huck, we are also forbidden from touching the art. Touching was forbidden at the Ray exhibit, even *Horse and Rider* in the outdoor plaza. In the time it took to eat an apple, the security guard stationed at *Horse and Rider* said twenty or thirty times to passersby, “No touching. No touching. No touching.” People wanted to connect with the horse, even if it was queer-natured—solid stainless steel, monochromatic—like the polished stainless steel naked man with bulging sides. Inside the exhibit, the “no-touch” norm is even more symbolic. The five-year-old boy (*The New Beetle*) is protected by an electronic sensor that sounds when someone gets too close. Notwithstanding safety precautions associated with not noticing a small child sitting on a floor, it sounded repeatedly, even for cautious visitors fully aware of the sculpture's presence. They wanted to be closer to the boy than the Institute allowed. Ironically, the Institute sponsored a companion lecture series with Ray's exhibit entitled, *Connecting with the Contemporary*. Connections with art, it appears, are like men's public sexual citizenship: they must occur in ways that do not involve touching. In the outdoor plaza, people touched (men and women, parents and children). I saw no men together, except fathers and sons. I spied one man, who was there alone. I took his picture. He left. This public space, accessible to anyone, was not nearly as queer as inside the Modern Wing. It was not queer, except for me and Ray on his horse. There was no visible queerness.

### **Politics and Perspectives in Queer Sexual Citizenship and Public Art**

Ray's queerness has a fuller political story that complicates this analysis of men's public/private sexualities. Two sculptures in the exhibit are scaled larger than life—*Boy with Frog* and *Huck and Jim*—because Ray conceptualized them for outdoor spaces and both were ultimately rejected. *Boy with Frog* stood for several years in front

of the Punta della Dogana in Venice. The sculpture replaced a lamppost popular in wedding and visitor photographs. Ray notes:

The artfulness of my work was to find just the right scale. He's a boy and holds his ground in front of a constellation of art and architecture. He stands amid a sea of tourists, Venetians, and the daily activity of one of the world's most famous cities. I wanted him to become a citizen, but politics removed him. . . . [A] populist politician—propelled by social media—has the old green lamppost back, and Boy with Frog is without a permanent home (Catalogue 2014, 124).

The politics of a lamppost denied Boy with Frog sexual citizenship, a place visible to publics.

Similarly, Huck and Jim has no permanent home in visible publics. The Whitney Museum in New York City commissioned Ray to design a sculpture for the outdoor plaza of its new space in lower Manhattan, but ultimately rejected it for reasons stemming from the museum's "growing concern that this particular image of a naked African-American man and a naked white teen-ager in close proximity, presented in a public space with no other art works to provide context, might offend non-museumgoing visitors—thousands of whom pass through the area every day" (Tompkins 2015). As Calvin Tompkins described in *The New Yorker*, "It was the recurrent public-art problem: once you go into a museum, you have agreed (tacitly, anyway) to put up with all sorts of visual affronts, but, if you're just walking by outside, you haven't." The result is denying queer Huck and queer Jim sexual citizenship. When Ray asks whether the viewer can negotiate the sexual politics, the Whitney's response was not affirmative.

While I applaud the Art Institute for giving Huck and Jim a temporary home inside its queer-nature park, I would be remiss not to draw parallels to sexual citizenship in the decision not to display the sculpture in outdoor spaces. I have already discussed the problems of scale in the space where Huck and Jim stood in the exhibit—flanked by

three walls (the fourth a bank of windows overlooking Millennium Park) with two doors, one a glass door, the other an opening into a corridor beneath the stairs. The Institute curated Huck and Jim inside a closet, apart from the main exhibit spaces with the other sculptures. More symbolically, Huck and Jim was too large for its closet. Containment policies aimed at keeping queerness out of public view are as awkwardly constructed as the Institute's glass closet. At least we saw and felt that Huck and Jim were too confined and would be better positioned as an outdoor fountain. Until then, only the few of us who visited the Institute were privileged to see naked men and queerness in public spaces. Even if his queers were closeted in a corner by the exit—at the end after visitors had already been desensitized to seeing nude males—at least the closet was glass and at least it was part of the mainstream of the exhibit's traffic channel.

Queer normalization undergirds nonplused reactions of friends and colleagues with whom I have shared my experience with the Ray exhibit. Queer theorists' argue that normalizing queers will be the death of queers and queer theory. If sexual transgression becomes normal, sexual transgression ceases to be queer, by definition. I prefer queer extinction through visibility and normalization over extinction through erasure and closets. In some regards it is unremarkable that the Institute displayed nude male sculptures. We have seen Ron Mueck's hyperrealistic naked men and Ray's own body in early performance art (e.g., *Shelf* (1981), *Road Warrior* (1983), *Gangrene* (1981–85)). Ray's exhibit, however, is not only about nude men as subjects (it is surely that); it is also about queerness coming out and claiming public spaces. It is about Ray bringing vulnerable naked men and queer men into political discourses in democratic life, the touchstone of citizenship.

In the exhibit's closing lecture, Annie Morse of the Art Institute said Huck and Jim was virtually uncontroversial based upon visitor feedback, suggesting that queerness may shifting toward the new normal. The most controversial was *Sleeping Woman*; the subject is a black woman Ray spotted on a walk through Los Angeles. She was

sleeping on a bench at a busy corner, and Ray decided she would make a good sculpture, noting, “I was taken by the enormous size of her ass” (Catalogue 2014, 132). After taking hundreds of photographic images of her, he realized once he was home that he missed critical images for a sculpture. Forty-five minutes later, he returned to the woman still sleeping and took more pictures, which he used to sculpt her three-dimensional likeness in solid stainless steel. She never knew. If Ray’s exhibit heightens the visibility of naked and queer men, there remains a relative invisibility of racial diversity in art and sexual citizenship. In one visit to the exhibit, I observed the races of other visitors in one moment in one section. Of twenty-five people, four were people of color, of whom two were security guards. The comparison is the myriad of racial diversity in the adjacent Millennium Park.

Images of women’s sexual citizenship are also incomplete. The Guerrilla Girls for three decades have noted hierarchies in art and society related to men. Their poster depicts a nude woman wearing a gorilla mask and asks, “Do women have to be naked to get into the Met Museum?” The accompanying 1989 statistic reads, “Less than 5% of the artists in the Modern Art sections are women, but 85% of the nudes are female.” These numbers are relatively unchanged: 3% and 83% in 2005; 4% and 76% in 2012. Sexual citizenship discourses are necessarily incomplete when they exclude diverse perspectives, but Ray’s work challenges norms where only women are objectified and sexualized. The Guerrilla Girls might not view Ray’s exhibit as progress, since the political thrust is to increase works by women, not necessarily the number of male nudes. Still, Ray’s work disrupts power imbalance in gender hierarchies that make hegemonic the invisibility of vulnerable masculinities. He provides an overlooked perspective, even if it is a white man’s perspective. Everything said here and everything we know about the black man, Jim, is through the perspective of white men—this essay’s author (a white man) analyzes the sculpture of a white man (Ray) whose work is based on the novel of a white man (Twain) about a white man (Huck) telling his story about a black man (Jim). White men’s perspectives are limited. Still, I am a queer man struggling (always, it

seems) to navigate the politics of public queerness, never knowing the extent to which queerness may manifest permissibly.

Because of Ray's exhibit, I can imagine queer possibilities, even if others—at least one other white man—cannot. I witnessed the Art Institute turning away a young white man because he could not pay admission. The Institute's companion lectures cost \$12.00 if you attend on Thursday evenings when the Institute is open to Chicago residents at no charge. If one attends a lecture at other times, one must purchase an entry ticket (\$25.00) in addition to the lecture fee. On a Tuesday, I complained at having to buy an admission ticket to hear a public lecture. The woman assigned to deal with grumbling museum visitors reminded me that the Art Institute is not a public museum. "This is not a public lecture," she said, "we are a private institution." In my grumbings at being directed to the membership counter, I regret not offering to sponsor the commiserating young man who was denied admission. He left. I regret that he, like other citizens, was unable to see more clearly what is missing in sexual citizenship. I grew up poor in a fundamentalist Christian, rural, southern state. I know what it is like not to see yourself in society, or the inside of an art museum for that matter. I regret that economics along with race and sex and gender and age limit our knowledge and experiences of sexual citizenship.

What this young man missed by not seeing the exhibit or attending the lecture (titled "Art in Flux") is the queerness of Charles Ray. Contemporary art is in flux, departing from classical periods where paintings and sculptures are viewed best from one perspective. The classical Laocoön and His Sons in white marble is quintessential: viewers gain little from perspectives at the sides or rear of the three naked men intertwined with an accosting serpent; the "sweet spot" apparently is from the front, just right of center. Artists in the classical period manipulated and controlled viewers to see works through only one perspective, similar to sexual citizenship scholars such as Angela P. Harris (1990) who suggests the objective perspective of "We the people" forces us to presume there is only one correct, legal perspective. For Harris, these attitudes erase black women's perspectives. She favors the

phrase “multiple consciousness,” where legal and literary discourses are complex struggles and “unending dialogues” among voices and where multiple consciousness recognizes no essentialized self but “a welter of partial, sometimes contradictory, or even antithetical ‘selves’” (1990, 584). I understand contemporary art the way Harris understands sexual citizenship: individual and collective consciousnesses are not fixed but are “process[es] in which propositions are constantly put forth, challenged, and subverted”(584). Essentialism silences voices of black women and queer men. Conversely, diverse perspectives destabilize essentialist thinking that privileges whiteness and heteronormativity as universally “citizen.”

Contemporary art invites varying perspectives of distance and vantage-point. From the front, *School Play* (2014) shows an adolescent boy costumed as a Roman soldier in a make-shift toga holding a toy sword. Ray sculpted the boy with a sad facial expression. One can understand why a boy performing masculinity wearing a dress-like toga and carrying a sword might be less than enthusiastic, the rear perspective reveals other evidence of his sadness. The large indentation in his hair (“bed head”) indicates disinterest in preparing for a public performance. The tight toga knot at the boy’s left shoulder blade could have been tied only with two free hands. He, like other boys, was dressed by someone else and forced to perform his masculinity. Art in flux is an opening of perspectives, a departure from a fixed, often singular perspective of classical art. The young man whose museum admission I did not pay was denied these perspectives and his own, just like tourists and New Yorkers who are denied perspectives of Huck and Jim since the Whitney declined to accept Ray’s sculpture for its outdoor plaza.

Perspectives are constrained not only by what one sees and experiences, but also by what one does not see or experience. Being an active participant in constructing my experiences with Ray’s queer park is akin to queer theories emphasizing possibilities and fluidity in constructing sexual citizenship in contrast to classical views where “objective” perspectives disguised as science, medicine, religion, or philosophy manipulate participants by showing limited views.

Participants who look behind dominant norms to find different perspectives find none, because those who control the discourse—such as doctors who used science and medicine to pathologize homosexuality or art museums who use wealth to control who can and cannot be seen naked and sexualized. Contemporary art, like contemporary sexuality, provides space and opportunity for perspectives more complex than static, heteronormative, binaristic sexual expressions artists and experts of the past tell us are the only available (and valid) sexual expressions. All others are invisible, invalid, and erased. Sexual citizenship, like contemporary art, is in flux.

Queer theory tends to be constructivist, but avoids acknowledging that society constructs citizens' sexualities at early ages. I suspect this is out of fear that anti-queer citizens will use this knowledge to justify deconstructing sexualities in ex-gay therapies. This avoidance prevents us from understanding that sexual deconstruction is different from sexual construction. Michael O'Rourke, the Irish postman who works outside the academy, says the big secret about queer theory is that it does not like to talk about sex (2014). He is right. Queer theorists avoid talking about sex—its messiness, its embodiments, its constructions, its taboos. Society similarly avoids such conversations that disrupt traditional understandings of sexual power. Ultimately, this essay is about power: how we navigate, disrupt, and construct binaristic tensions in sexual citizenship—public/private, white/black, man/boy, clothed/naked, shamed/unabashed, rich/poor, queer/citizen.

Perspectives of sexual citizenship remain incomplete, but Ray exposes what is omnipresent and missing, namely vulnerable, embodied white men. To disembody—disarticulate, erase, deny, shame into closets—the bodies of naked and queer men is to strip men of sexual citizenship. The disembodied sexual man compartmentalizes and severs his whole, despite representations that he is impenetrable, not vulnerable. Ray's exhibit—a queer nature, an indoor park—constructs part of what is missing in sexual citizenship.

## Works Cited

- Catalogue. (2014). "Charles Ray: Sculpture 1997-2014." Kunstmuseum Basel and Art Institute of Chicago. Hatje Cantz.
- Eichner, Maxine. (2009). "Feminism, Queer Theory & Sexual Citizenship." In *Gender Equality: Dimensions of Women's Equal Citizenship*, ed. L. C. McClain and J. L. Grossman. New York: Cambridge.
- Harris, Angela P. (1990). "Race and Essentialism in Feminist Legal Theory." *Stanford Law Review* 42 (3):581-616.
- Kemp, Jonathan. (2013). *The Penetrated Male*. Brooklyn: Punctum.
- O'Rourke, Michael. (2014). "The Big Secret about Queer Theory..." *Inter Alia: A Journal of Queer Studies* (9):1-14.
- Schmidt, Christopher. (2014). *The Poetics of Waste: Queer Excess in Stein, Ashbery, Schuyler, and Goldsmith*: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Tompkins, Calvin. (2015). "Meaning Machines: The Sculptures of Charles Ray." *New Yorker*, May 11, 2015.
- Twain, Mark. 2012 (1884). *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. New York: Sterling Publishing.

---

<sup>1</sup> Images of all sculptures discussed in this essay are available at [www.charlesraysculpture.com](http://www.charlesraysculpture.com), except *Huck and Jim* (2014), which is shown in Figure

**TRANSLATION / ÇEVİRİ**

# Fiziksel Bereler, Duygusal Yara İzleri ve Aşk Isırıkları: Kadınların Erkek Şiddeti Deneyimleri

Michelle Jones- Jeff Hearn\*

Çev.: Murat Göç\*\*

İnsan bedenindeki izlerin teşhis edilebilen birçok toplumsal ve kamusal anlamı bulunur (Lingis, 1984: 22). Şiddeti de içerenler dahil olmak üzere, “bedene yazı yazmanın” ve toplumsal izlerin çeşitli şekilleri, birçok farklı kültürel bağlamda uygulanır. Bu bölüm, partneri ya da eski partneri olan erkekten şiddet gören kadın şiddet mağdurunun bedenini mercek altına almaktadır. Morarmalar ya da aşk ısırıkları gibi fiziksel izlerin ve bedenin içinde ve beden üzerinde kendini gösteren duygusal yaraların kişisel ve toplumsal anlamlarını analiz eder. Erkeklerin tanıdıkları kadınlara uyguladıkları şiddet, acil dikkat gerektiren bir toplumsal sorundur; kadınlar, erkek şiddeti mağdurlarının çok önemli bir kısmını oluşturmaktadırlar (Taft et al., 2001; Kimmel, 2002). Erkekler, özel ilişkilerinde, planlanmış, tekrarlanmış, ağır, fiziksel olarak zarar verici, kendini savunmaya dönük olmayan, önceden tasarlanmış, misilleme olarak düşünülmemiş ve cinsel şiddet olarak kabul edilebilecek her türlü şiddet eyleminin failidir. Bunun yanında, erkekler yine kişiler arası şiddet sayılabilecek bir çok ekonomik, kolektif, kurumsal, organize ve askeri şiddetin de baş sorumlusudur (Hearn and McKie, 2008).

Bryan Turner (1996: 233), bedenlerin kontrolüne ilişkin herhangi bir çalışmanın öncelikle kadın bedeninin kontrolünü ele aldığını öne sürer; bu nedenle, beden sosyolojisi aynı zamanda patriarkinin

---

\* *Sex, Violence, and The Body: The Erotics of Wounding*. Burr, V., Hearn, J. (Eds.). Palgrave. S. 53-70

\*\* Yrd. Doç.Dr., Pamukkale Üniv ersitesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü

incelendiği bir alandır. Biz de bu kapsamda, şiddet içeren heteroseksüel birlikteliklerde yaşanan şiddetin mağduru ya da hedefi olan kadın bedenindeki bedensel izlere odaklanıyoruz.

Elizabeth Grosz, “bedendeki izlerin, bir fiziksel anlam setini ortaya çıkaran” ve bu sebeple de bir derinlik ya da toplumsal anlam taşıyan “semptomlar, göstergeler ve ipuçları olarak okunabileceğini” ifade etmektedir (Grosz, 1994: 139). Grosz, “kapanan yaralar ve kesikler, bedeni, kamusal, kolektif, toplumsal bir kategori, bir toplumsal gruba dahil etme ya da üyeliğin izleri” olarak tanımlar; bu izler “toplumsal ihtiyaçlar, gereksinimler ve aşırılıklardan bir harita meydana getirirler” (Grosz, 1994: 140). Bu tür izler, “tüm özneleri, cinsiyet, sınıf, kültür ve yaş temelinde kodlamalara, toplumsal konularına ve ilişkilerine göre farklı farklı biçimlerde birbirine bağlar” (Grosz, 1994: 141). Bu süreçler fiziksel zararı ve daha da ötesini içerir; zira, bu izler kadınların zarar görmüş, şişmiş ve yaralanmış bedenlerinin ve hayatlarının hem içinde hem de dışındadır.

Şiddet dolu birlikteliklerde, kadınların bedenleri darbelere maruz kalır, ısırılır, yaralanır; saçları çekilir; elbiseleri yırtılır, bedenlerine vurulur, itilip kakılır, yumrukla, tekme ile vurulur, çimdirilir, boğazları sıkılır, kafa ile vurulur ve cinsellik ya da cinsel eylemler güç ve zor kullanarak yerine getirilir (Jones, 2004). Erkekler için, yaralar, izler, ve “aşk ısırıkları” keyif için yapılmış bir mücadelenin (Messner, 1990) ya da cinsel arzunun (Alapack, 2007) kahramanlık dolu imgeleri olarak görülebilir; kadınlar için bu izler daha çok bir mağdurluk halini veya hafifmeşrep cinsel ilişkileri işaret eder (Alapack, 2007; Alapack et al., 2005; Tea, 2002). Kadınların bedenlerindeki berelenmeler, fiziksel ve duygusal yaralar ve “aşk ısırıkları” onların ya hafifmeşrep/mağdur ya da fiilen direnc gösteren kişiler olduğunu gösterir; bu dirence kadınların kendilerine atfedilen bu rollere karşı direnci de dahildir.

Erkek şiddeti yüzünden oluşmuş kadın bedenindeki izlerin varlığı, kadınların şiddetin, tacizin ve yaralamanın “izlerini” nasıl deneyimlediği gibi özel toplumsal ve kültürel anlamları vardır.

Bu bölümün organizasyonu, Grosz'un (1994) "dışarıdaki içerisi (outside-in)" ve "içerideki dışarı (inside-out)" kavramları üzerine kuruludur. *Volatile Bodies* kitabında Grosz, özneyi oluşturan zihin (içerisi)/beden (dışarı) ve düşünsel/fiziksel ikili karşıtlığını bozar. Bedenin hem içinin hem de dışının değer gördüğü bir yeniden inşa fikrini ortaya koyar - "her zaman birbiri ile uyumlu bir şekilde bir araya gelmeyen ve birbirini desteklemeyen ve birbirine kaynaşmayan iki yüzey; iki yüzey arasındaki buluşma noktası, bu etkileşim her zaman bir iktidar sorunu olmuştur (Grosz, 1994: 189).

Dışarıdaki içerisi kavramı, beden yüzeyindeki toplumsal izlerin ve bu izlerin nasıl bir ruhsal içsellik ve derinlikle yaratıldığına odaklanır. Dışarıdaki içerisi, beden yüzeyindeki fiziksel güç kullanımından kaynaklanan gözle görülen fiziksel yaralanma izleri ve bu yaralanmanın kadın üzerindeki psikososyal etkileri bağlamında ele alınır. İçerideki dışarı kavramı ise, bireyin ruhsal dünyasının bedenin yüzeyinde, dışarısında, nasıl kendisi gösterdiğinin ifadesidir. İçerideki dışarı burada öncelikli olarak, sözlü ya da duygusal şiddet ve duygusal anlamda zedelenme gibi fiziksel olmayan şiddet deneyimlerine işaret eder. Bu tür yaralanmalarda, bedenin dışında görünür hiçbir fiziksel işaret ya da yaralanma yoksa da, en azından Batı kültüründe yaralanma bedenin içinde algılanır ya da deneyimlenir. Bu durum kadın şiddet mağdurunun, partnerlerinin sözlü ve psikolojik tacizlerinin bedenlerini nasıl etkilediği ve bedenin yüzeyinde görünür hale geldiğini kendi kendine değerlendirdiği bir psikosomatik hastalık vakası olarak ele alınabilir.

### **Fiziksel Zedelenmeler, Duygusal yaralar ve "Aşk Isırıkları"**

**A**şk ısırığı vakaları, bir başka kişinin dudakları ile uyguladığı, bazı durumlarda niteliği tam kestirilemeyen fiziksel/cinsel zor kullanma sonucu ortaya çıkar. Tendeki bu izler, farklı içsel anlamlar taşıyabilir ve durumun tanımlaması (daha önceleri gerçekleşmiş) cinsel birliktelikler ve şiddetin varlığı ile daha da karmaşık bir hale gelebilir. Bu türden içsel anlamlar, cinsel ilişkiler (ve cinsel ilişkinin yokluğu) ve şiddet (hatırlanan, gerçekleştirilmiş ya da

potansiyel şiddet de dahil) yolu ile beden ve ten üzerinde kendisini gösterebilir. Bu bağlamda, bu bölüm, bedenin yüzeyini mercek altına alır; içeriden gelen mesajların kadının bedeninin dışında kendisini nasıl gösterdiğinin, ve bu sürecin karmaşık ilişkiler ağının izini surer. Ama öncelikle, bu mesele hakkındaki birincil verilerin nasıl toplandığına ilişkin birkaç söz söylemek gerekir.

### Verilerin Toplanması

**B**u çalışmada benimsenen yöntemsel yaklaşım, feminist, post-yapısalcı ve diğer yorumsal yaklaşımların bir araya getirildiği çoklu paradigmatik yaklaşımdır (Reinharz, 1992; Neuman, 1997). Bu yöntem, bireylerin deneyimlerinin inşasında dilin etkisine odaklanarak (Gavey, 1989), anlam üretmek için yorumlamayı kullanarak (Neuman, 1997), bağlamın deneyimi anlamadaki önemi (Allen and Baber, 1992) ve niteliksel yöntemlerin değerini (Patton, 1980) göz önüne alarak kadınların erkek şiddeti deneyimlerini anlamayı gerektirmektedir.

Bu bölümün üzerine kurgulandığı mülakatlar, ev içi şiddetin failleri için oluşturulan erkekler programı grupları üzerine yürütülen bir değerlendirme araştırması kapsamında Michelle Jones tarafından gerçekleştirildi. Erkeklerin grup değerlendirmesi için etik onayların kapsamı doktora araştırma projesi (Jones, 2004) ve buradan çıkacak yayınlar için veri kullanımını da içeriyordu. Bu çalışma, şiddetin faili olarak erkeklerin kendi deneyimlerini (cf. Hearn, 1998) ve partnerleri olan kadınların da şiddetin mağduru olarak kendi deneyimlerini (cf. Hanmer, 1996) kayda geçirmesine olanak tanımıştır. 1996 yılında Avustralya'nın Metropolitan Adelaide'de (öfke yönetimi grubundan ziyade) "faillik sorumluluğu" modeli ile yürütülen ve sadece erkeklerden oluşan bu 11 grup çalışmada yer almayı kabul ettiler. Bu grupların dokuzu, katılımcılara hiçbir maddi yük getirmeyen toplum sağlığı merkezlerinde toplanıyordu; ikisi ise katılım için ücret isteyen bir tavsiye ve danışmanlık merkezi olan Relationships Australia merkezinde bir araya geliyordu. Tüm grup liderleri, katılımcı erkekleri değerlendirme çalışmasına katılmaları için güçlü bir şekilde teşvik

ettiler. Nihayetinde, erkekler mülakat yapıp yapmamaya kendileri karar verdiler. Erkek gruplarının ilk toplantısında erkeklerden (eski) partnerlerinin iletişim bilgileri istendi. Daha sonra, her kadına teker teker çalışmaya katılmak isteyip istemedikleri soruldu ve bu çalışmanın gönüllü, mahremiyete önem veren ve partnerlerinin müdahalesinden bağımsız bir çalışma olduğu aktarıldı.

Erkekler (failler) ve kadınlardan (mağdurlar-travma mağdurları) üç ayrı seferde hem anketi doldurmaları hem de yüz yüze görüşmeye katılmaları istendi. Bu şekilde çalışmaya 66 erkek ve 42 kadın katıldı. Çalışmaya katılan erkeklerin tümü, erkek gruplarında ilk gece toplantıya katılanlar kişilerdi. Erkek gruplarının ilk iki haftasında, 12 haftalık erkek çalışma grubunu tamamlamalarından iki hafta sonra ve grup çalışması bitiminden 18 ay sonra mülakatlar yapıldı. Mülakatlar yarı-yapılandırılmış mülakatlardı ve 15 dakika ile 2 saat arasında sürdü. Çalışma sonucunda, Nisan 1996 ile Mayıs 1998 arasında 259 mülakat gerçekleştirildi. Böylesi hassas konularda gerçekleştirilen uzun vadeli çalışmalarda çoğu zaman olduğu gibi, bir mülakattan diğerine önemli ölçüde yüksek bir çalışmayı bırakma oranı vardı.

Bu mülakatlarda, çalışmanın büyük oranda tanımlanmış genel özelliklerini en iyi temsil eden alıntılar seçildi. Eğer imkan varsa, mülakat yapılan kişinin kullandığı tam sözcük neyse o kullanıldı; bazı durumlarda, mahremiyeti korumak ya da söyleneni netleştirmek için kare parantez içinde bazı ilave kelimeler kullanıldı. Bu birinci veri, diğer benzer çalışmalardan elde edilen araştırma verileri ile desteklendi ve bir bağlama oturtuldu (örneğin, Hearn, 1998).

### **Dışarıdaki İçerisi: Fiziksel Zedelenme Deneyimleri ve Anlamları**

**F**iziksel şiddet, açık yaralar ve zedelenme gibi birçok farklı fiziksel zarar ile sonuçlanabilir. Zedelenmeler, kelimelere gerek olmadan şiddetin varlığını gözler önüne serer. Ten yüzeyindeki görünür işaretlerdir, açık toplumsal anlamları ve çıkarımları vardır; yaralanma,

zarar verme, ve yaralama sonucu meydana gelirler; kişinin kendi kendine yaptığı yaralanmalar da olabilir, kaza ile ya da bilerek yapılmış da olabilir.

Zedelenmeler “bölgesel kılcal damarların patlaması ve kırmızı kan hücrelerinin sızması ile sonuçlanan yumuşak dokunun travmatik yaralanması” olarak tanımlanırlar. Deri yüzeyinde, üzerine bastırıldığında rengi değişmeyen kırmızısı-mor renk değişikliği olarak gözlemlenebilir (MedicineNet.com, 1996). Zedelenmeler renkli de olabilir, kırmızı, siyah, mavi, mor, yeşil ve sarı renkli de olabilir. Günümüzde zedelenmelerle ilgili gittikçe gelişen ve zenginleşen bir adli tıp bilgi birikimi var (örneğin, Randeberg et al., 2007). Bu birikim, tıbbi personelin yaralanmanın ne kadar önce olduğunu tahmin etmelerine (zedelenmenin rengini inceleyerek), nasıl olduğuna dair tahminlerde bulunmalarına (iddia edilen suçun yara ile uyuşup uyuşmadığına bakarak) ve yaralanmanın ciddiyeti hakkında yargıya varmalarına yardımcı olur (Ohshima, 2000; Schwartz and Ricci, 1996). Adli tıp uzmanları, tecavüz mağdurlarını muayene ederken, kadının bedeninin yüzeyinin bir haritasını çıkarırlar. Tüm izler, zedelenmeler, yaralar ve yaralanmalar birer kanıt olarak kayıt altına alınır. Bedene verilen zararın tarihçesi belgelenir ve ihtiyaç duyulması halinde yasal süreçler boyunca birer delil olarak kullanılır. Kadının bedeni, zedelenmelerin ve yaralanmaların yazıldığı bir metin olarak düşünülür. Bu metnin yorumları farklı profesyonel, mesleki ve diğer söylemlere göre değişiklik gösterse bile, bu kadın bedeninin bir metin olduğu gerçeğini değiştirmez. Zedelenmeler farklı şekillerde okunabilir ve öz gözetimin farklı formlarını akla getirebilir. Bazıları, bir akrabanın, tanıdığın ya da yabancıların görmesini engelleyen giysilerin örtüsü altında gizlenmiştir. Bedensel izleri kapatmak için giysilerin bilinçli olarak giyilmesi, öz gözetimin bir aracıdır. Bazı zedelenmeler, örneğin, kolların parmaklarla sıkı bir şekilde kavrandığını gösteren izler – beden üzerinde zor kullanıldığını doğrudan gösteren izler olmasına rağmen- başkaları tarafından görüldüğünde sessizlikle karşılanabilir.

Morarmış bir göz gibi apaçık zedelenmelere maruz kalmış kadınlar ise nadiren dışarıya insan içine çıkarlar. Bu durumda hem kadınlar hem de erkekler, dışarı çıkmamak ve insanlara görünmemek için kendilerine has nedenler uydurabilirler. Rosa, partnerinin şiddet dolu bir saldırısı sonrası insanların bakışlarından kaçınmak için davranışlarını değiştirmenin ve evde kalmanın gerekli olduğunu hissetmiştir. O günleri şöyle hatırlıyor:

Bana koridorda kafa attı ve burnumu kırdı, yere düştüm...  
İşe gidemedim, burnum bu şekilde iken gidemezdim. Enkaz  
gibi görünüyordum. İş yerini aradım ve “İşe gelemiyorum”  
dedim.

Rosa utanmıştı ve mahçup olmuştu: iş arkadaşları ile yüzyüze gelmek, sorgulanmak ve didik didik edilmek istemiyordu. Bu durumun nasıl oluştuğunu açıklayacak konumda olmak ya da ne olduğu ile ilgili yalan söylemek istemiyordu. Rosa öz gözetim yapıyor ve partnerini korumak için davranışlarını kısıtlıyordu. Görüşülen kadınlardan başka bir tanesi, Jan, partneri gözünü morarttığına çocuğunu okula bırakmak istemediğini ve insanların gözünden uzak, evde oturmayı tercih ettiğini hatırlıyor.

Foucault (1991: 212) ‘disiplin süreçlerinin yalnızca kapalı kurumlarda değil aynı zamanda toplumun her yanına dağılmış izleme merkezleri tarafından oluşturulduğunu’ söylemektedir. Jan’ın durumunda, Jan “izleme merkezlerinin”, çocuk istismarı konusunda bildirim yapmaları gereken ama kadına yönelik ev içi şiddet konusunda herhangi bir şüpheli durumu gözlemlemeyen okuldaki öğretmenlere ve diğer velilere kadar uzandığını hissetmişti. Bazı kadınlar için zedelenmeler, boğazın sıkılmasının bıraktığı izler ya da morarmış gözler, erkeğin şiddetini ve daha da özelde ilişkiyi sonlandırmakla ilgili bir şey yapmak için uyarı sinyalleridir. Jessica, “tartışmalar çok artmıştı, itip kakmalar çok artmıştı. Sanırım, gözümün morarması son noktayı koydu” demektedir. Emma da “boğazımı sıktığı için izler kalmıştı ve bu yaptığı son şey oldu” diye anımsıyor o anı. Bu her iki kadın için de, zedelenme, şiddetin çok ileri gittiğinin ve ilişkilerinin bitim noktasının yakın

olduğunun işaretiydi. Birçok kadın, bedenlerinin zedelenmiş olmasının onlara sağladığı, şiddetin var olduğunu ve gerçek olduğunu onlara söyleyen bir meşruiyet hissinden bahsederler. Bazı kadınlar, eşlerine ya da partnerlerine neden oldukları zedelenmelerin şiddetini gösterir ve onlardan buna bir son vermelerini isterler. Böylelikle, sıklıkla uyguladıkları şiddeti reddeden erkekler, uyguladıkları muamelenin sonuçlarını ve derecesini görebilirler. İlk mülakatında Olivia şunları söylemişti:

Yine devam ediyordu yaptığına ve ona durmasını söyledim ve bana vurdu ve “canımı yakıyorsun” dedim. Ağlıyordum ve gidiyordu “aptal olma, sana zarar vermiyorum”. Benim canımı her yaktığında, kollarımda daha önceden olmuş zedelenmeler vardı ve “bunu ben yapmadım” derdi. Bana vururdu, ben de orada yatardım, bir bebek gibi kıvrılır yatardım ve ağlardım – hiç inanamıyorum. Yüzümde nabzımın attığını hissedirdim gerçekten de. Bunun için onu asla affetmeyeceğim. Ve gider aynada kendime bakardım. [üzgün bir şekilde] bunu yapabildiğine inanamıyordum. Sonra ona gidip “bak ne yaptın bana” derdim ve bana bakar ve ağlardı. Benim canımı yaktığını düşünmüyordu, sonra bana gelir ve “bu kadar, artık bitti” derdi ve ağlardı ve bana bir daha asla vurmayacağını söylerdi. Ah, bana sonradan yine vurdu ama o zamanki gibi değil. Yine de ondan korkarım.

Olivia'nın, partnerine vücudundaki zedelenmelerini göstermesi, utanma, suçluluk duygusu ve partnerinin tekrar şiddet davranışını tekrarlamayacağına ilişkin söz vermesi ile sonuçlandı. Partneri olan erkek, şiddetli davranışının bu sefer çok ileri gittiğini fark etmişti; ne yazık ki, tekrar vurmayacağına ilişkin verdiği söz tutulmadı, ama Olivia bir daha bu kadar şiddetli vurmadığını ifade etmişti. Olivia'nın benimle yaptığı üçüncü ve son mülakatta Olivia, bedenindeki bu zedelenmelerin nasıl ona, ilişkinin dışında bir destek aramak ve bir uzaklaştırma emri çıkarttırmak için bir meşruiyet duygusu verdiğini anlattı.

Kolumdaki zedelenmeler olmuştu. Yaptığını inkar etti. Kolumu öyle kavradıktan bir saat sonra ortaya çıktılar. Ben de onun için bir uzaklaştırma emir çıkarttırdım.

Kadınlara yönelik şiddet uygulayan erkeklerle Birleşik Krallık'ta yapılan bir çalışmada, bir erkek, kadının yüzüne nasıl zarar verdiğini ve kadının yüzünü gördüğünde, durumun kendisi için uygunsuz olduğunu düşündüğü için, bir hafta evde kalması gerektiğine karar verdiğini söylemiştir:

İki koca morarmış göz ve kırık bir burun. İnanamıyordum. İki hafta izin aldım. Kapıya birisi gelirse, kapıya gidip bakmak zorundaydım. Kimseyi içeri alamazdım. Çünkü yaptığımdan utanıyordum. Çocuk yardımı çekini almaya bile gidemedi. Ben gitmek zorunda kaldım. Onu eve kilitlemek zorunda kaldım ve anahtarları yanıma aldım. Birisi gelir diye onu eve kilitledim.

Erkeğin bakış açısından, erkek şiddet konusunda “çok ileri” gitmişti veya çok dikkatsiz davranmıştı. Belli bir noktada, bu durum, onu ev dışındaki kişilerle temas kurmaya ve bu kişilerle çatışmalar yaşamaya zorlamış ve onun için ilave sorunlar yaratmıştı (Hearn, 1998: 211). Bu açıdan bakıldığında, erkeğe göre şiddet, erkeğin gerekli gördüğünden daha çok fark edilebilir bir zarar vermeden uygulanabilir. Cheryl'in yüzünde izlerin, o ve partneri açısından toplumsal sonuçları da vardı. Kocası Doug'un uyguladığı şiddeti yakın erkek arkadaşı ile paylaşmaya mecbur kaldı. İzlerin sebebi sorulduğunda anlatmak zorunda kalmıştı ve arkadaşının tepkisini şöyle özetliyordu: “Bana, bunu yaptığını bildikten sonra onunla birlikte çalışabilecek miyim bilmiyorum...Yüzünde izleri gördükten sonra”. Arkadaşı “Onu öldüreceğim” demişti. Bu yorum, arkadaşının Doug'un uyguladığı şiddeti öğrendikten sonra birlikte çalışabilme ve vakit geçirebilme imkanlarını sorguladığını gösterir. Başka bir deyişle, Cheryl'in bedenindeki izlerin varlığı, çiftin diğer insanlarla etkileşimlerini ve ilişkilerini de değiştirmiştir.

Foucault için beden, iktidarın, bilginin ve direnişin oyunlarının oynandığı bir sahadır. Bu bağlamda, kadının bedeni, kadınların kendi bedenleri ve kadın bedeni üzerindeki tıbbi ve yasal bilginin arasındaki etkileşimin gerçekleştiği bir alandır. Bedenindeki zedelenme izleri, Chloe'nin tıbbi yardım alma isteğini cesaretlendirmiştir:

Beni o gece duvara çarptığında, ve [çocuklar] çılgık çılgılla bağıryorken, tek hissettiğim “buna daha fazla katlanamayacağım” olmuştu. Katlanamazdım. Bir yere tutunmak ve bir şeyler yapmak zorundaydım. Bir doktoru aradım çünkü çok kötü yaralanmışım ve kalçam zedelenmişti ve doktor bana “şimdi bir şey yapman gerek. Bir şey yapmasan bile, gidip nerede durduğunu bir düşünmen gerekiyor” dedi. Doktorla yaptığı konuşma, kocasından ayrılırsa olabilecekler ve daha sonra da erkek danışma grupları hakkında toplumsal güvenlik kurumundan bilgi alması için Chloe'yi güçlendirdi ve harekete geçirdi. Francine gibi diğer kadınlar için şiddetin şoku ve ciddiyeti onları hareketsiz kılmıştı, onları herhangi bir tıbbi yardım arayışından uzaklaştırmıştı. Francine olanları şöyle anlatıyordu:

Mutfak masasından bir sandalye çaktı ve üzerime sandalye ile yürüdü, sandalyenin dört ayağını yüzüme vurdu. Ellerim başımın üstünde kendimi koruyordum, ama başıma vurdu ve başımda, parmaklarımda ve parmak eklemlerinde çok büyük yaralar açıldı, kollarımda, bacaklarımda ve kalçamda kocaman ezikler oldu. Doktora gitmem gerekiyordu; çünkü, başımın tam arkasına ağır bir darbe almışım, neredeyse tam ortasına. Bu beni biraz endişelendirdi çünkü sersemlemişim ve başım dönüyordu ve bir kanama olmadığını umuyordum, çünkü... yani işte tam başının arkasına beyin köküne aldığın yaraların tehlikeli olabileceğini biliyordum ve kaygılanmışım. Ama donmuş gibi, felç olmuş gibiydim.

Francine “donmuş ve felç olmuş gibi” iken, Rosa da “çok zorlukla hareket ediyordu”. Hareketsizlik hissi, hem yaralanma

hikayelerinin bir parçasıdır, kadınların geçirdikleri fiziksel yaralanmaları tarif etmesine yardımcı olur, hem de yardım isteyememelerine sebep olur.

Bedensel zedelenmeler gibi fiziksel yara izleri de kadın bedenlerine şiddet “mağduru” damgasını vurur. Bedeninde taşıdığı yaralanma izleri, o/partneri ve çocuklar için şiddetin birer hatırlatıcısı gibidirler. Kadınların (ve erkeklerin) iş ya da toplumsal bağlarını sınırlar. Bedensel zedelenmeler ayrıca fiziksel şiddetin meydana geldiğinin de kanıtıdır. Beden yüzeyindeki zedelenmeler hem tıbbi hem de öz gözetim gerektirirler. Ciddi fiziksel istismarı takiben, kadınlar tıbbi yardım almak için acil servislere ya da aile hekimlerine başvurabilirler. Bu durumlarda, doktor, kadının bedenindeki zedelenmelerin ve yaraların tespiti için kadının bedenini inceleyebilir. Doktorlar, yaralanmaların nasıl olduğu konusunda kadının beyanını esas alır. Bir kadın bedenindeki yaralanmaların nasıl oluştuğunu bazen açıklayabilir bazen de açıklamayabilir. Kadının yaralanmanın kaynağını açıklamayı reddetme davranışı, kendisine mağdur rolü biçecek doktora ya da bedeninde yapılmasını istemediği herhangi bir tıbbi müdahaleye karşı bir direnç olarak anlaşılabilir. Kadın bedenindeki zedelenmeler ve yaralanmalar tıp mesleği açısından kadını bir mağdur olarak tanımlar.

Şiddet dolu bir ilişki içerisinde, kadının bedeni, erkek partnerinin yumrukları, ayakları, dizleri, başı ya da bedenin diğer kısımları ile kadın bedenine şiddetin dilini nakşettiği bir metindir ve böylelikle erkek bu bedensel metni yeniden yazar. Erkek partner şiddetinden kaynaklanan kadın bedeni yüzeyindeki zedelenmelerin belirli anlamları ve göstergeleri vardır. Fiziksel şiddetin görünür hatırlatıcılarıdır, öz gözetimi harekete geçirirler, toplumsal etkileşimi sınırlarlar, bir ilişkiyi sona erdirmeye kararını cesaretlendirmek için sembolik birer anahtardır, kadınları yardım istemek için harekete geçirirler ya da yardım isteme arzularının önüne geçerek onları hareketsiz kılar ve onları mağdur pozisyonuna sokarlar. Bundan sonraki bölüm, kadınların

bedenlerinin içindeki duygusal yara izlerini ve fiziksel olmayan bu şiddetin kadın bedeninin dış yüzeyinde ortaya çıkışını ele alır.

### **İçerideki Dışarısı: Duygusal Yaralanma Deneyimleri ve Anlamları**

**Y**ukarıda anlatılan kadın deneyimleri, bedensel zedelenmelerin yaralanmanın ciddiyeti konusunda birer kanıt sunduğunu ve şiddetin meydana geldiğini ortaya koyduğunu ifade eder. Bir zedelenme var ise, rıza sorgulanır ve bir zor kullanımının işaretleri vardır. Bedensel zedelenme, mağdura öznellik sağlayan değerli bir varlık haline dönüşebilir. Ancak tam tersine, Jackie duygusal örselenme deneyimini aktarırken, bedensel zedelenmelerin getirdiği meşruiyet duygusu olmadığı için mağdur konumunda olamayacağına inanmaktadır.

İşte gördüğünüz gibi, durumum net değil ve en çok da bundan nefret ediyorum. Sanırım eğer çok bariz bir şey olmuş olsaydı – yaralanmış olsaydım mesela – o zaman diyebilirdim ki ‘bak, işte olan bu’ ama sahip olduğum tek rehberim hislerim. Bedenimde hiç zedelenme yok ama içimde aynı şeyleri hissediyorum, içimde bir yerde kendimi çok yabancı gibi hissediyordum.

Jackie’nin ifadeleri, bedensel zedelenmelerin varlığının duygusal incinmenin temsiline olanak sağladığını ancak bedensel hasarın yokluğu ile meşru bir şekilde “mağdur” statüsü elde edemeyeceğini hissettiğini göstermektedir. Kadın bedeni yüzeyindeki zedelenmelerin herkes tarafından görülebilen izleri, kadın da isterse, ona bir mağdur statüsü sağlayacaktır. Jackie gibi bedenlerinde görünür zedelenme olmayan kadınlar, mağdurlaşma deneyimlerini sorgulayabilirler.

Bir yara izi, bedensel ya da duygusal veya her iki şekilde de kendini gösterebilir. Bu, hem deri yüzeyinde, iyileşmiş de olsa, bir yara, bir yanık, ya da bir hassasiyet sonrası bir yara izi hem de kişinin zihninde kişisel bir talihsizlik ya da nahoş bir deneyimin süregelen etkisi şeklinde olabilir. Fiziksel yara izleri, bir olayın kalıcı bir hatırasıdır. Yine de, belki

de şaşırtıcı bir şekilde, mülakatta görüşülen hiçbir kadın, bedenlerindeki fiziksel yara izlerinden hiç bahsetmediler, neredeyse hepsi fiziksel olarak yaralanmış olmaktan ötürü oluşmuş duygusal yara izlerinden bahsettiler. Ev içi şiddetten kaynaklanan yaralanmalar birçok farklı şekilde meydana gelebilir, yalnızca fiziksel şiddet değil, duygusal, sözel, toplumsal ve cinsel şiddet de bu kapsama girer. Fiziksel yara izleri, bedensel zararın oluştuğunun görünür kanıtlarıdır, beden dış yüzeyindedirler ama bir derinlikleri de vardır. Bedenin etten kemikten derinliklerine doğru delip geçerek ilerleyen bir müdahaleyi sembolize ederler. Bununla birlikte, duygusal yara izleri bedenin içindedir, çıplak gözle görünmez. Fiziksel ve duygusal yaraların bir ortak noktası, bedensel yaralanma ya da hasarın bedenin yüzeyinde ya da içinde kalıcı varlığıdır. Richard'ın sözlü şiddeti, Helen'i duygusal açıdan incitmişti. Helen partnerinin sözlü şiddetinin etkilerini şöyle tarif etmektedir: "Sinirleniyordum çünkü onu sevdiğimi söyleyemiyordum. Söyleyemiyordum çünkü böyle davranan birisini sevmezdim. Sürekli heyecanlı ve hareketli ve sonra kötü bir ruh halinde sürekli sessiz. Ben, onun gibi, ruh halimi bir düğme ile açıp kapatamıyordum. Sinirleniyordum çünkü "seni seviyorum, seni seviyorum" diyordu ve ben söyleyemeyince 'altı aydan beri-ya da işte 12 aydan beri, işte her neyse- seni seviyorum demedin ve bu benim canımı yakıyor' diyordu. 'Yani üzgünüm. Benim için çok önemlisin ama hissetmediğim bir şeyi söyleyemiyordum, çünkü beni çocukların önünde dövdükten ve bana 'orospu' dedikten ya da başka şekilde hakaretler ettikten sonra dönüp seni seviyorum diyemiyordum' derdim. 'Senden nefret ediyorum, Richard, böyle olduğunda senden gerçekten nefret ediyorum' derdim. Helen, ruhu incindiği ve Richard'ın sözlü şiddeti ve saldırganlığı ile yaralandığı için Richard'a 'seni seviyorum' diyemiyordu. Richard'ın davranışı, Helen'in ona olan sevgisini sorguladığı anlamına geliyordu. Helen ailesine olan bağlılığını sorgulamamıştı.

Bir çok kadın partnerlerinin şiddet dolu ve saldırgan davranışları sonrası onlarla sevişirken zorluk yaşadıklarını ifade etmişlerdir. Bu tavır, Birleşik Krallık'ta yapılan bir araştırmada, tanıdıkları kadınlara yönelik şiddet uygulayan erkeklerin, şiddet dolu davranışları ile cinsellik ve

cinsel hayatları arasında bağlantıya ilişkin konuşmadaki isteksizlikleri ile zıtlık gösterir (Hearn, 1998: ch. 8). Bu çalışma kapsamında görüşülen kadınlar için, partnerlerinin şiddet dolu ve saldırgan davranışlarının hatırası, cinsellik de dahil olmak üzere ilişkilerinin tüm yönlerine yayılmıştır. Cheryl, özellikle de cinsel ilişkiye girerken ve duygusal olarak yaklaşmışken, kocasının ona gösterdiği iki yüzü arasında paramparça bölündüğünden bahseder. Henüz, kocasının “acı veren dokunuşları” onun için hala gerçekliğini koruyorken, kocası ile yaklaşmayı ve istek dolu dokunuşların keyfini çıkarmayı zor ya da imkansız buluyordu:

Cheryl: Doug’a açıklamakta oldukça zorlandığım bir şey var. Doug’la işin cinsellik yönü oldukça zorlaşıyor çünkü bazen sadece ızdırap ve acı gibi geliyor. Bana neler yaptığını hatırlıyorum ve ‘yapamayacağım’ diye düşünüyorum ve hiç o ruh halinde olmuyorum.

Michelle: Duygusal açıdan yakınlık peki?

Cheryl: Evet, [duraklıyor] ‘Eğer beni çok kereler incitirsen Doug ve bana çok kereler öfke ile dokunursan, nasıl benimle duygusal yakınlık kurmak isteyebilirsin? Ve ben de artık seninle bu şekilde bir yakınlık kurmak istemiyorum. Sana, canımın yanacağından korkmadan ‘hayır’ diyebilmeyi istiyorum’. Bu durumu kabul edebilmiş değil.

Cheryl’in dile getirdiği uyumsuzluk, hem kocası hem de şiddetin faili olan Doug’u, hem “normal” hem de şiddet dolu karakteri de içinde barındıran parçalanmış bir özne olarak görmesinden kaynaklanıyordu. Bu, bazı erkeklerin kendi şiddet dolu geçmişleri ve şimdiki şiddetten uzaklaşmış benliklerini birbirinden nasıl birbirinden ayırdığını anımsatır (Hearn, 1998: 106-7).

Liz Eckermann (1997), modern sosyoloji kuramının bireyin inançları, tavırları, değerleri, ve eylemlerini birbiri ile entegre etmeye yönelik evrensel bir arayış içinde olduğunu ifade eder. Foucault, “içsel tutarlılık” arayışını yadsıyarak bunun yerine parçalı özne konumlarının geçerliliğini savunur. Foucault, bireysel kimlik ve toplumsal formasyonlara yönelik merkezsizleştirilmiş bir yaklaşım önerir.

Eckerman, Foucault ile hemfikir olmanın “herhangi bir birey ve herhangi bir toplumun, çok parçalı, sürekli değişen ve çoğu zaman da kendi ile çatışan kimliklere sahip olabileceği” anlamına geldiğini düşünür (Eckermann, 1997: 153).

Bedenin dışındaki fiziksel hasar, yaralanmalar ve zedelenmeler gibi örneğin, bedenin içinde ve insanın ruhunda da duygusal yara izleri bırakabildiği gibi, duygusal yaralanmalar da bedenin dışında, psikosomatik şikayetler şeklinde, kendilerini gösterebilirler. Deri hastalıklarını inceleyen Jay Prosser (2001: 54) “ruhsal dalgalanmaların, bilinçdışının histerik semptomlarına bağlı olarak cilt yüzeyinde travmatik hatıralar bırakabileceğini” not etmiştir. Bu açıdan bakıldığında, bilinçdışı, yaralarını bedenin üstüne naksetme kapasitesine sahiptir. Yapılan görüşmelerde, Kate, Sam’in fiziksel olmayan şiddetinin bedenindeki yansımalarını nasıl deneyimlediğini aktarmıştır. Sam, Kate’i fiziksel olarak istismar etmemiştir, onun istismarı daha çok sözlü, duygusal ve toplumsaldı. Sam ve Kate, önceki ilişkilerinden olan çocuklarının ebeveynliği de dahil bir çok konuda karşı karşıya gelecekti. İki yıllık bir dönem boyunca Kate ile üç kez mülakat yapıldı. İşyerinden uzun süreler uzaklaşmak zorunda kalması ve özel bir psikiyatri hastanesine yatması sebebi ile Kate ile buluşup görüşmek için bir kaç deneme yaptık. İkinci görüşmede, bir yürüme yardımcısı kullanıyordu. Bu ikinci toplantıda, Kate rahatsızlığını şöyle açıklıyordu:

Yine hastaneye yattım - aslında [kızımın] bir süreliğine [evi] terk etmesinin ardından hastanedeydim zaten, çünkü uzun ve aşırı stres yüzünden doktorların panik bozukluk dediği rahatsızlık olmuş bende. Artritim de vardı, psoriatic artrit, çok stresli olduğumda çirkin başını köşeden gösteren fibromiyaljim de vardı, bu sebeple bir de bunlarla uğraşıyordum.

Evet, evde bakım hizmetlerine gittim, bana yürümem için yardımcıları ve başka şeyler de verdiler. Hastaneden çıktım ama bugün doktorumu aradım çünkü dün gece bir panik atak geçirdim, epey ciddi bir ataktı, intihar düşüncesi ile

ilgili sorunlarım var, halbuki böyle olmak böyle düşünmek normalde benim yapacağım bir şey değil”.

Bu mülakatta Kate, bir dizi hastalığını –fiziksel ve ruhsal sorunlarını- anlatıyor ve sonuç olarak, bu düşünce ve davranışların onun için “normal” ya da olağan olmadığını söylüyor. Üçüncü ve son mülakat tarihi geldiğinde, Kate ve Sam ilişkilerini noktalamıştı ve Kate görüşmeye gelmek konusunda tereddütlüydü. Fiziksel olarak değişmişti, yeni saç rengi ve kesimi dışında, selam vermek için kapıya kadar kendi başına yürümüştü. Son mülakat boyunca Kate, çok kökten fiziksel değişimlerden bahsediyordu:

[İlişki de bittiğine göre] kararımı o anda vermiştim, her gün bir milimetre bile olsa ileri doğru ilerleyecektim. Ve her gün yürümeye başladım. Tepenin başına kadar yürüdüm. Tepenin en başında “Durmak Yasaktır” levhası vardı bir tane. Levhada bir göçük olması lazım artık, çünkü her gittiğimde “Bu senin için Sam” deyip bir tane vuruyordum levhaya. Çünkü Sam bana hiçbir işe yaramadığımı söylüyordu; daha başka bir sürü şey de söylüyordu. Ve onu terk ettiğimde yürüyemiyordum ve tepenin başına kadar tek başıma yürüdüm, kendimi tepenin o başına kadar yürümek için zorladım, “Durmak Yasaktır” levhasına vurdum ve kendi kendime “yürüyeceğim” diye düşündüm. Yürüme yardımcısından kurtuldum, her şeyden kurtuldum. Baş ağrıları çekmekten kurtuldum. Sonra kendi kendime düşündüm “Bir iş bulacağım”. Eski patronlarımı aradım. Bana “referansları boşver. Geri gelip bizim için çalışacak mısın?” dediler. Şimdi de o günden beridir orada çalışıyorum. Migren krizlerim geçtiğinde dedim ki “iki aydan beri migren krizi geçirmiyorum. Ne komik. Tam da Sam’den ayrıldığım zamandan beri. Şimdi yürüyebilirim. Ne komik...Beni artık bağlayacak kimse yok.

Kate bedensel ve psikolojik iyileşmesini, onu duygusal açıdan istismar eden ilişkisinin bitimi ile ilişkilendiriyor. Yaşadıkları üzerine düşündükten sonra Kate, bedensel ve ruhsal rahatsızlıklarını, Sam’ın

istismar ve şiddet dolu davranışlarının bir yansıması olarak görüyordu. Kate için, duygusal yaralanmaları ve yara izleri, ruhsal rahatsızlıklar olarak kendini gösteriyordu. Ruhsal ve fiziksel işlevsel bozukluklarının, partnerinin sözlü istismarı ve şiddeti olmasa, hiç yaşanmayacağına inanıyor. Bunun en çarpıcı kanıtı, Kate'in yeniden kavuştuğu sağlığının, fiziksel ve duygusal iyilik halinin zamanlamasını şiddet dolu ilişkisinin bitişi ile ilişkilendirmesidir.

Duygusal yaralar, erkek şiddeti deneyimi sonrası kadınların bedeninde var olur ve varlıklarını sürdürürler. Duygusal yaralar görünmezler ve bu sebeple de bedenin dış yüzünde görünür olan fiziksel yaralar ve zedelenmeler gibi tıbbi ve yasal alınmasını gerektirecek bir meşruiyetleri yok gibi kabul edilir. Kadınlar kendilerini elden ayaktan düşmüş gibi tanımlarlar, tamamen olmasa da, kısmen bunun sebebi, uğradıkları zararın ve yaralarının hiçbir fiziksel kanıtı olmaması sebebi ile kendilerini şiddet mağduru olarak görüp göremeyeceklerini sorgulamalarıdır. İlişkinin bitiminin hemen akabinde, Kate geçirdiği bir dizi ruhsal ve fiziksel rahatsızlıkların şiddet dolu bir ilişki yaşamının sonucu olduğunu düşünüyordu. Kate, Sam'in sürekli tekrar eden sözlü, duygusal ve toplumsal şiddet davranışlarının hedefiydi. Kate, bu şiddeti içsel olarak özümsemiş görünüyordu ve bu şiddet de kendisini psoriatic artrit ve fibromiyalji gibi fiziksel rahatsızlıklar olarak gösteriyordu.

### **“Aşk ısırtıkları deneyimleri ve anlamları: karmaşık bir cinsellik ve şiddet vakası**

Şiddet konusunu ve şiddetin kadınlar için ne anlama geldiğini konuşurken, bazı kadınlar “aşk ısırtıklarından” “aşk berelerinden” veya “öpücük izlerinden” bahsettiler. Bu çalışmada, kadın ve erkeklere aşk ısırtıkları ile ilgili hiçbir şey sorulmamıştı. Aşk ısırtıkları hakkında yapılan yorumlar, kadınların erkek şiddeti deneyimleri ile ilgili bir tartışma bağlamında kadınlar tarafından kendiliğinden ifade edilmişlerdi. Mülakata alınan erkeklerin hiçbiri verdikleri ya da aldıkları öpücüklerin bıraktığı izleri uyguladıkları şiddetin bir parçası olarak algılamamışlardır. Bu durum, erkeklerin, kadınların öpücük izlerini bir

şiddet eylemi olarak gördüklerinin farkında olmadığını göstermektedir. Hem fiziksel zedelenmeler hem de duygusal yaralarla karşılaştırıldığında, “aşk ısırıkları” çok daha fazla karmaşık bir durumdur. Bir aşk ısırlığının varlığı, ister cinsel istek kaynaklı olarak tanımlansın ister tanımlanmasın, içerideki dışarıya ve dışarıdaki içerisinin kesişme noktası olarak anlaşılabilir. Bu olası iki bileşenli yapıyı sorunsallaştırır; beden yüzeyine uygulanan güçten beden içinde uygulanan güce, cinsel temastan şiddete, içsel hafızadan dışsal işaretlere kadar kadar sahip oldukları anlamlar değişebilir.

Sert aşk ısırıkları ya da öpücük izleri bedenin her yerinde bulunabilir, varlıkları yalnızca elbisenin örtmediği görünebilir yerlerde, örneğin kadının boynunda ise başkaları tarafından bilinecek ve cinsel birliktelik ve hatta seks düşkünlüğü iması yapacaktır. “Aşk ısırlığının” anlamı bağlamına göre değişir, çoğu zaman belirsizdir, başka bir bağlam yoksa, aşk ısırlığının rıza ile olduğu varsayılır ve keyif alındığı düşünülür. Aşk ısırlığı tek başına şiddet dolu bir ilişkiyi göstermez, bir şiddet mağduru kimliği de üretmez. Diğer şiddet izleri olmadan, “aşk ısırlığının” erotik olduğu, en azından olabileceği varsayılır. Aşk ısırıkları veya öpücük izleri de, gören kişilere cinsel “rahatlık” veya öpücüğün “çok ileri gittiğini” düşündürür (Alapack, 2007; Alapack et al., 2005; Tea, 2002). Kimin gördüğüne bağlı olarak, kişi için bu izler hem bir gurur hem de utanma kaynağı olabilir – bir “nişan” olarak gösterilir ve taşınabilir veya utanç içinde gizlenebilir.

Norveçli ve Danimarkalı psikologlardan oluşan ekibi ile Alapack (2005) 52 ergen yaştaki öğrenciden bazı bedensel deneyimleri (ilk öpücük, ciddi kıskançlık krizi, partnerle bir araya gelindiğinde yüzün kızarması, sevgi ile ya da hafif sertçe dokunulma ya da öpücük izi bırakacak şekilde öpmek ya da öpülme gibi) tanımlamalarını istedi. Bu öğrencilerden 11'i, kadınlar ve erkekler için değişen anlamları ile, öpücük izi bırakacak şekilde öpme ya da öpülme deneyimlerini aktardı. Görüşmenin yapıldığı tarihte, görüşülen kişiler şiddet içeren bir ilişki içinde oldukları konusunda bir bildirim yapmamışlardı. Şiddet içermeyen bir ilişkideki öpücük izi anlatımları, cinsel arzu, zevk ve yeni cinsel düşüncelerin uyanışı anlamına geliyordu. Bazı görüşmeciler,

öpücük izlerinin kimsenin göremeyeği daha özel bölgelerde, mesela erkeğin iç baldır kısmı, olduğunu söylediler. Bir görüşmeci, çiftin özel bölgelerdeki öpücük izlerinin nasıl saklandığını aktarmıştı: “cinsel organlarımızın yanında, ilk sevişmemizin hemen sonrasında...birbirimize adanmışlığımızın birer ifadesi olarak...sanki bedenlerimizden yapılma nişan yüzükleri gibi.. (Alapack et al., 2005: 57).

Bu çalışmadaki görüşmeler sırasında, istek mağdur olsun ister fail, öpücük izinin yerinin önemli olduğu ve çoğu zaman sahiplenme ya da mührünü basma izleri olarak herkes tarafından görünür olduğu kayda geçirildi. Mülakatlardan birinde, Jodie, istemediği halde oluşan öpücük izi ile ilgili şunları söyledi: “dışarı çıkmadan önce öpmeye devam ediyordu ve boynuma zorla bir öpücük izi bıraktı, bu ondan daha çok iğrenmeme sebep oldu”. Jodie için, bu hiçbir duygusal yönü olmayan ve herkesin göreceği şekilde “zorla” kondurulan öpücük izinin tam dışarı çıkmadan önce gelmesi önemliydi. Utanmıştı ve bu öpücük izini dışarıda herkes içinde bir beden aksesuarı olarak taşımaya zorlanmıştı. Bu öpücük izi partnerine karşı duyduğu iğrenme izinin bir hatırlatıcısıydı.

Bu vakada, öpücük izi, Jodie'nin dışarı çıktığında başkaları ile toplumsalleşmesinin önüne geçmekti ve bu hali ile bir tür toplumsal kontrol ve toplumsal şiddetin farklı bir türüydü sadece (Hanmer, 1996). Bu sebeple, tüm aşk ısırıklarının bir şiddet hali olduğunu söylemek zor olsa da, şiddetli bir şekilde ya da bir şiddet davranışı bağlamında meydana geldiğinde, aşk ısırığının şiddet davranışının bir parçası olduğu tespiti daha olasıdır. Şiddet içeren bir ilişkide aşk ısırıkları, erotik duygulara yönelik bir hareketten ziyade, bir kontrol aracı ve (cinsel) sahiplenmenin bir aracı olarak kullanılırlar. Sally, partnerinin aşk ısırıklarını bir kontrol yöntemi olarak kullandığından bahsetmişti. Erkek arkadaşı, üniversitede yeni bir kursa bağlayacağı günden bir gece önce boynuna öpücük izleri bırakmıştı. Bu durumda, Sally'nin boynunda yeni oluşmuş öpücük izlerinin varlığı, diğer erkek ve kadınlara Sally'nin cinsel olarak başkaları için uygun olmadığını ve halihazırda bir ilişkide olduğunu gösteren bir semboldü. Evli değıllerdi ve cinsel olarak başkaları için uygun olmadığını olağan işareti olan bir yüzük takmıyorlardı. Bu durumda, öpücük iziğinin varlığı bir sahiplik ya da

mülkiyeti gösteren bir sembol olarak yorumlanabilir. Bir ilişki içinde öpücük izinin kendisi de bir ilişkinin kanıtı olarak görülebilir. Chloe “Aramızdaki ilişki çok iyi gidiyordu ve şimdi bu oldu. Çok komikti çünkü iki gün öncesinden boynunda bir iz görmüştüm ve nasıl da denizaltında bir şeyin ona çarptığını söylemişti ve ‘çarpmak için ne garip bir yer, tam da boynunda’ diye düşünmüştüm ve iki ile ikiyi toplamaya başlamıştım” diye anlatıyor durumu. Chloe için, kocasının bir ilişkisi olduğuna ilişkin bir tartışmaya götüren bir dizi şüpheli olay olmuştu. Bu olaydan sonra bile, kocasının boynundaki (öpücük izi olduğunu düşündüğü) izin kaynağı ile söyledikleri yüzünen bir ilişkisi olup olmadığından tam emin olamıyordu. Chloe şöyle anlatıyor:

[A]ma bugüne kadar hala bu konu ile ilgili hakikati bilmiyorum çünkü boynunda bir iz vardı ve bunun onu korkutup korkutmadığını bilmiyordum, yani bu kanıt yüzünden, ya da işyerinde ona birşeyin çarpıp çarpmadığını ya da birisinin ona saldırıp saldırmadığından emin değildim.

Chloe'nin kocasının boynundaki ize ilişkin aşk ısırığı olabileceği yönündeki yorumu ona bir ilişkinin görünür kanıtını sunuyordu; ama kocasının inkarı, onun daha fazla bilgiye ihtiyacı olduğu anlamına da geliyordu, çünkü boynundaki bu iz birçok başka şekilde de açıklanabilirdi. Şiddet içerikli ilişkiler bağlamında, aşık ısırıkları, cinsellik, şiddet, beden üzerindeki izler ve Dışarıdaki İçerisi ve İçerideki Dışarısı kavramlarının karmaşık bir bir aradalığına işaret eder. Aşk ısırıkları, kimin bedeninde ve bedenin neresinde olduğunda bağlı olarak erkekler ve kadınlar için de farklı anlamlar taşır. Özellikle de, aşk ısırığının şiddet ile (öncesinde, sırasında, ve sonrasında) ilişkisi, kimin aşk ısırığını verdiği, ne zaman, hangi cinsel, şiddet içerikli, cinsel şiddet içerikli ya da başka bağlamlarda bu ısırığın oluştuğu gibi kilit sorulara yanıt aranır. Bu tür durumlarda, aşk ısırıklarının, cinsel ilişkini varlığının başkaları tarafından da tahmin edilebileceği evlilik, sevgililik, ya da diğer yakın birlikteliklerde tecavüz ya da cinsel saldırı belirtisi olarak değil de cinsel sahiplenmenin izleri olarak düşünülmesi daha uygundur. Dahası, aşk ısırıklarının belirsiz doğası, hem aşk ısırıklarının varlığı hem

de özel ya da varsayılan nedenleri bağlamında, iktidar ve baskının vücut bulmuş hallerine başka bir katman daha ekler. “aşk” ve “ısırıkları” kelimelerini bir araya getiren terimin kendisi bu belirsizliği dile getirir ve bu sebeple şiddeti ve yaralanmayı bir adım öteye taşır: eylem halindeki cinselliğin şiddetleştirilmesi (Hearn, 1998: 158).

## Sonuç

**G**rosz’ın İçerideki Dışarı ve Dışarıdaki İçerisi modeli, evlilik ve benzeri ilişkilerde erkek şiddetinin hedefi olarak kadın bedenini analiz etmek için güçlü bir yol ortaya koyar. Şiddetin hem fiziksel hem de fiziksel olmayan şekilleri ve etkilerinin incelenmesinin gerekliliğine işaret eder zira şiddet dolu bir ilişki bağlamında kadın bedeninin içinde ve dışında etkileri apaçık görülür. Kadın bedeninin dış yüzündeki berelenmeler gibi şiddet izlerinin, görünür olduklarında, şiddet sonucu oluştuğu var sayılır. Fiziksel olmayan şiddet izleri, duygusal yaralar gibi, doğrudan ve açık bir şekilde beden dış yüzeyinde bir iz bırakmaz ama bedenin içinde, insanın ruhunda, iç yaşamda izlerini bırakırlar; kolayca görülebilir değildirler ve kodlarının çözümlenmesi gerekir. Aşk ısırıkları, çoğu zaman başkaları tarafından görülebilecek şekilde bedenin dış yüzeyine bırakılmış izlerdir; ancak cinsellik ve şiddetin karmaşık kesişim noktaları yine de özel bir bağlamsal çözümlenme gerektirir. Kadının bedeni üzerindeki zedelenme izleri, ev içi mahremiyeti aşar ve genelde gizli ve mahrem olan şiddeti kamusal alana taşır. Kadının bedenindeki zedelenmeler, kadını ev içi şiddetin mağduru olarak tanımlama kapasitesine sahiptir. Şiddet eylemine ilişkin kamusal bir soruşturma ya da mağdurun zorla itirafının alınması ile sonuçlanabilir. Zedelenmeler, kadının -bedenin görünen yerlerini kapatmak ve kendilerini ve erkek faili başkalarının bakışlarından korumak için davranışlarını değiştirmek gibi – özgözetim davranışlarına yönelmesine de sebep olabilir. Kadın bedenindeki “ev içi şiddetten” kaynaklanan zedelenmeler ve yaralar, kadının bedenine “mağdur” konumunu nakşeder. Bu durum, erkeklerin bedeninde spor mücadelesi ya da yaralanma sonucu oluşan kahramansı, muzafferlik simgesi izler

olarak okunan yara izleri ile tezatlık gösterir. Grosz (1994) bu türden bedene kazınmış izlerin, yeniden yazılma ve dönüşüm kapasitesi olduğunu ve kadına özgürlük ve otonomi kazandırabilecek birçok farklı bağlamda yaşanabileceği ve sergilenebileceğini ileri sürer.

Bunun ilginç bir örneği, feminist literatürde ve sağlık ve toplum sağlığı çalışanları arasında (“mağdur” yerine) hayatta kalan – survivor kavramının kullanılmasıdır (Kelly et al., 1996; Dunn, 2005). Avustralyalı bir hemşire ve akademisyen olan Charmaine Power (1998) mağdur/hayatta kalan ikiliğini çözümler ve “güçlü kadını” erkek şiddeti deneyimi olan kadınlar için alternative bir kimlik olarak tanımlar. Bireysel bir seviyede, tıp mesleği kadın bedeninde, kadın bedenini ev içi şiddetin bir mağduru olarak simgeleştirecek ve damgalayacak izler arar. Yaralanmanın derecesine bağlı olarak, kadın bu izlerin herkes tarafından görülüp görülmeyeceğine ya da tıbbi yardım alıp almayacağına karar verebilir, mağdur etiketini riske atar ve kendisini “hayatta kalan” veya “güçlü kadın” olarak yeniden tanımlayabilir.

Kadınların bedenindeki zedelenme izleri olmadan, bazı kadınlar şiddet dolu bir ilişki içinde oldukları iddiasını haklı çıkartamayacaklarını hissedebilirler. Onlara göre, duygusal incinme, acı, izler ve yaralanmalar yasal ve tıbbi müdahale ile yardım ve destek istemek için yeterli değildir. Bir kadın, Kate, bedensel fiziki ve mental rahatsızlık belirtileri olduğunu ve bunların partnerinin fiziksel olmayan istismarının psikosomatik sonuçları olduğunu aktarmıştır. Bu sebeple, sözlü, duygusal, ya da toplumsal istismarlar ve yaralanmalar gibi fiziksel olmayan şiddet türlerinin de somatik sonuçları olabilir. Bedenin yüzeyindeki zarar veya yaralanmalar, Kate’in yürüme güçlüğünde görüldüğü gibi görünmeyen yaralardan farklı bir etkiye sahiptir. İlk vakada, şiddet(in bir türü) ile ilgili net bir mesaj verilir: ikinci vakada ise mesaj farklı bir seviyededir ve farklı yorumlara açıktır. Burada önemli nokta, bu bağlamda, izlerin görünebilirlik derecesi (dış görünüşte, kıyafet altında, dikkatli bakıldığında görülebilir olması), farklı şekillerde uygulanan şiddetten kaynaklanan fiziksel ya da diğer türlü zararlar ve bu izlerin, özellikle de aşk ısırıklarının, bazen belirsiz, anlamları arasındaki etkileşimdir. Bu anlamlar, deri yüzeyinde bir zor kullanmadan beden içinde bir zor

kullanmaya, cinsel temastan şiddet dolu bir temasa, içsel hafızadan beden dışındaki bir ize kadar değişiklik gösterir. Bedenin herkes tarafından görülecek bir yerine bırakılacak bir aşk ısırtığı, yönlendirici olabilir, toplum gözünde kadının sahipli ya da cinsel olarak başkaları için müsait olmadığını gösterebilir. Daha da önemlisi, aşk ısırtıkları, tek başlarına bir anlam taşımazlar, ilişki içindeki şiddetin simgesi olabilirler. Bedendeki izin doğasını belirleyen ilişkinin bağlamının – başka bir deyişle, duygusal olmayan, zorla yapılmış ve yaralanmaya sebep olan bir temas bağlamının olup olmadığının -bilinmesine ihtiyaç vardır. İlişki bağlamını bilmeden, aşk ısırtığı da cinsel olarak başkaları için müsait olunmadığını gösteren, ve potansiyel olarak erotik bir anlam içeren, bir iz olarak anlaşılacaktır. Bazı cinsel, aşk ve şefkat dolu bağlamlarda gururla yaşanacak bir temas başka bir bağlamda daha fazla acı ve utanç anlamına gelinebilir. Böyle bir potansiyel belirsizlik, bu izlerin deneyimsel gücünden kaynaklanmaktadır. Bir aşk, adanmışlık ve bağlılık izi olabilecek olan bir iz, mülkiyet, sahiplik ve şiddet izine dönüşebilir ve bu sebeple de çok daha fazla yaralayıcıdır. Bazı durumlarda, aşk ısırtıkları, Dışarıdaki İçerisi ve İçerideki Dışarısının kesişme noktasında yer alır ve bu sebeple de zaten problemlili olan ikilikleri daha da fazla problemlili bir hale dönüştürebilir.

## **BOOK REVIEWS**

**Jørgen Lorentzen,**

***The History of Fatherhood in Norway, 1850-2012***

Palgrave Macmillan, 2013, 190 pp.

ISBN 978-1-137-34337-6

In line with the increasing interest in examining masculinities, the field of men's history is emerging among the students of masculinity. *The History of Fatherhood in Norway, 1850-2012* delivers the task of writing men's history with a specific focus on fatherhood. Jørgen Lorentzen, former Professor at the Center for Gender Research at University of Oslo and current Director of Hedda Foundation, offers a comprehensive work on fatherhood from the mid-nineteenth century up to the present. Requiring a multi-dimensional and multi-disciplinary lens, analyzing the history of fatherhood is important not only as a contribution to the growing body of literature on 'new world order masculinity and fatherhood' but also as a hinge for ethnographic researches. As Lorentzen clearly points out, the aim of the book is not to offer a comprehensive review but "(...) to find a starting point in history that would offer (...) enough source material from which to gain insight into fatherhood, before the effects of modernization and industrialization took hold in Norway toward the end of the 1800s." (p.2). Considering the scholarly interest in the effects of industrialization and urbanization on gender by the early theory of modernization, Lorentzen's aim is valid as it scrutinizes whether Norwegian father has been present in the family before its counterparts. Therefore, having asked the main question of "what is the real history of fatherhood?" (p.1), he tries to shape a historical perspective on understanding of fatherhood. To have such framework, on the basis of how fatherhood is depicted and what are the father's position in the family and society, he uses fictional and non-fictional writings that enabled him to have a comprehensive picture.

The book is organized in four chapters, including introduction. Introductory part draws the aim, scope and content of the book. Alongside the historical sources, the author cites three literary works, “*The Wild Duck*, a play by Henrik Ibsen; *A Day in October*, a novel by Sigurd Hoel; and *My Struggle*, the extensive documentary-novel by Karl Ove Knausgård, published recently” (p.7) and argues that different type of works required different analytical approaches and offered diversity of ideas. This part also briefly reviews the literature on fathers and fatherhood.

Part I covers the period between 1850 and 1927. This part introduces Lorentzen’s identifications of father *in* and *for* the family (emphasis added). In line with the highly cited theory of the literature on gender studies, in general, masculinities, in particular, he discusses the limits of father’s involvement in domestic sphere vis a vis public sphere. Taking the relationship between home and work as a demarcation line, he argues that fathers were involved in the family and a working partnership between the spouses was the norm until early 1900s, especially among farming communities. He also discusses how home represented “man’s refuge” and analyzes the importance of family life in the construction of masculinities. Especially, Lorentzen’s analysis on duality between “(...) role *outside* the home as provider *for* the family, and another *in* the family” (emphasis in original) is very important with reference to father’s construction of manliness (p. 36-37).

The author’s analysis on the gradual weakening of the father’s place within the family in the 1900s marked by the growth of modernization, urbanization and professionalization is also significant. In the context of major transformations in the society at macro, within the family at micro level, father’s presence decreased as examples from the literary works and socio-political contexts throughout Nordic countries confirmed. Father’s lessening role in the family was accompanied by the gradual dominance of women over domestic affairs and Lorentzen highlights the importance of home that was on decline as well (p. 70).

Based on the understanding that gender is a relational construct, Lorentzen's focus on motherhood is also significant so as to analyze the history of fatherhood in Norway. Part II covers the period between 1927 and 1970. This part discusses, first, the glorification of motherhood. Giving the socio-political context, emphasizing progress of modernity, heteronormativity and policy shifts such as the Marriage Act of 1927 that brought greater equality in marriage, the author analyzes how the role of father for the family was glorified. He also touches some incidents from his personal life and mentions "my father's role was *for* the family, and not, on the whole, *in* the family. His participation was neither expected, nor even considered a possibility." (emphasis in original) (p. 71). On the other hand, while father's provider role was institutionalized, a new tone following the end of World War II dominated the country accompanied by economic growth and technological development. Lorentzen offers examples from the literary texts on how a new form of 'democratic family' was glorified that hinted a reinstatement of father's place in the family.

Part III analyzes the period starting from 1970, marking the establishment of the 'feminist project' in Norway. In line with the literature, analysing 'new fatherhood' with reference to transformation and de-legitimation of hegemonic masculinity and also as a response to increase of women's participation in the labor market, the author examines such new model in the framework of "democratization of intimacy" (p.107). To read "new terrains of childcare and housework" (p.111), Lorentzen traces discourses of fatherhood in literary, non-literary and also visual data. For instance, the part analyzes Knausgård's writing project, entitled *My Struggle* in detail. Especially, with a lens focusing on critical studies of masculinities, Lorentzen highlights the importance of the relation between the subjective construction of masculinities and fatherhood. His emphasis is important as it stands at the intersection of the 'philosophy of gender duality'.

This final part also examines the political context and initiatives to support father's nurturing role. The author examines the boundaries of being a 'good father' especially after the introduction of paternity leave

in 1993 and effects of the politics of fatherhood. However, in line with a research that analyzes 'childlessness' in Norway, Lorentzen points out a paradoxical development. While the post-1990 era can be described as a glorification of fatherly intimacy, the data offered by the author shows time of living with their own children is very limited for men (p. 140-141). Lorentzen highlights the rise in divorce rates and the tendency of men to have their first child at a relatively older age and tries to juxtapose the dynamics behind this 'paradox of fatherhood'. It would have been interesting to read more on this paradox and its footprints in the construction of masculinities with an emphasis on 'politics of fatherhood'

To conclude, *The History of Fatherhood in Norway, 1850-2012* is a valuable contribution to the literature on men's history and fatherhood. Written for students of masculinities, historians and general audience, the book offers an account of historical developments to frame a general understanding of how fatherhood is depicted. Lorentzen's conceptualizations of father *in* the family and father *for* the family are also significant especially for the newly emerging field of inquiry on 'new fatherhood'. It significantly erupts the understanding of newness intrinsic to modernity, industrialization and urbanization. The author's analysis of fatherhood scrutinizes not only local dynamics but also broader contexts and ideological transformations. Therefore, the manuscript provides an important source for researchers aiming to conduct ethnographical work on Norwegian masculinities and also contributes to the knowledge on men's lives and experiences.

**Selin Akyüz**  
**Bilkent University**

**Osman Özarşlan**

***Hovarda Alemi: Taşrada Eğlence ve Erkeklik***

İletişim Yayıncılık, 2016, 176 sayfa

ISBN 978-975-05-1972-7

Türkiye’de erkeklik her geçen gün üzerine daha fazla söz söylenen ve hatta söz söyleme ihtiyacını doğuran bir olgu haline geliyor. Bugüne kadar kaleme alınmış gerek akademik gerek gündelik dildeki kitapların neredeyse hiçbirinin değinmediği bir konunun kapılarını aralıyor Osman Özarşlan: Gazinolarda kazanılan ve şekillenen erkeklikler.

Özarşlan Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Sosyoloji bölümünde tamamladığı “Masculinities at Night in the Provinces ” isimli yüksek lisans tez çalışmasını, takibi oldukça kolay ve keyifli bir kitap haline dönüştürmüş. Kitap bugüne kadar özellikle tez çalışmalarından oluşturulan kitaplardan okuyucuyu içine alan bir hikayeleme tarzıyla oldukça farklı bir çizgide duruyor. Özarşlan kitabında kentlerden hem coğrafi hem de psikolojik olarak uzaklaştırılmış taşrayı ve taşradaki gazinoların erkeklik performansı için vazgeçilmez mekanlar olduğunu anlatıyor. Özarşlan tez araştırmasını Burdur’un bir ilçesi olan Çavdır’da yürütmüş. Çavdır, Antalya gibi modern eğlence hayatının doruklarda yaşandığı kentlerin periferinde duran, kentlerin taşralaştırdığı bir mekan olması açısından oldukça önemli. “7 Türkiyeli, 1 Dağıstanlı ve 3 Gürcü konsomatris” ile beraber “7 erkek garson, 3 işletmeci ve 7 erkek müdavi” (s. 20) olmak üzere toplamda 38 kişi ile yapılan yüz yüze görüşmeler kitabın ana hattını oluşturuyor. Çalışmasında yarı yapılandırılmış yüz yüze görüşmeler ve etnografik gözlem gibi nitel araştırma metotlarından faydalanan Özarşlan, aynı zamanda Burdur’un yerlisi ve esnafı olmanın verdiği güven ve samimiyetin araştırmasının ilerlemesinde ne kadar önemli olduğunun da altını çiziyor.

Kitap temel olarak beş bölümden oluşuyor: Teorik satır, taşra, erkeklik, konsomatris kadınlar ve sonuç. Bu bölümler birbirlerinden

ayrık değil aksine birbirini tamamlayıcı ve yumuşak geçişler sunan bölümler. Kitabın genel yapısına bakacak olursak da, yazarın teorik arka planı ve saha araştırmasının sonuçlarını beraber ve tamamlayıcı şekilde sunduğunu görüyoruz. Ancak yine de kitabın ilk üç bölümünde literatürün taşra, sıkıntı ve erkeklik meselesine hangi açılardan yaklaştığı ve yazarın bu perspektifleri ne ölçüde benimsediğini okurken; saha araştırmasına dair alıntılar ancak kitabın ilk yarısından sonra görünür olmaya başlıyor ve ağırlıklı olarak üçüncü ve dördüncü bölümlerde karşımıza çıkıyor.

Kitabın birinci bölümü araştırmanın teorik alt yapısı ve saha araştırmasına dair derinlemesine bilgiler sunuyor. Buna ek olarak yazar, Çavdır'ın 90'lardan sonra geçirdiği kültürel değişimi ve meyhane kültürünün konsomatris kadınların taşraya gelmesi ile nasıl şekillendiğini ele alıyor. Buna göre, sohbet ve muhabbetin hüküm sürdüğü meyhane hayatı, yüksek sesli müzik ve kadınların eşlik ettiği yarış mekanları haline geliyor. Yazar taşra ve taşra sıkıntısını neoliberal dönüşümlerin bir yan etkisi olarak okuyor. Ancak bunu yaparken taşranın sıkıntısını gidermek üzere şekillenen eğlence kültürünün de erkekliğin yarış alanı olarak hizmet ettiğine dikkat çekiyor. Özarslan daha sonraki bölümlerde ayrıntılı açıkladığı üç tip erkekliğin taşra sıkıntısını nasıl şekillendirdiğini ve taşraya nasıl dinamizm kattığını saha araştırmasından çeşitli örneklerle ortaya koyuyor.

İkinci bölüm, "taşra"nın taşıdığı coğrafi ve kültürel anlamları sorguluyor. Başka bir deyişle "taşra nedir ve neresidir?" sorularına açıklık getiriyor. Bu soruları net bir şekilde yanıtlamak önemli çünkü Antalya gibi hareketli bir eğlence merkezinin Burdur, Çavdır gibi daha küçük bir yerleşim merkezini nasıl taşralaştırdığını görmeden, taşradaki erkekliği ve kadınlığı anlamak pek mümkün değil. Özarslan taşrayı "merkezle ilişki içerisinde, tarihsel, sosyal ve coğrafi olarak üretilmiş bir çevre" (s. 27) olarak ele alıyor. Bu bölümün iki amacından biri, taşra ve taşralılığa dair politik ve gündelik temsillerin üretildiği, hem sosyal hem tarihi bağlamları tartışmak. Diğeri ise, devletin bir idari birim olarak ayrıştırdığı taşrayı değil, insanların özellikle sıkıntı ile özdeşleştirdikleri kendi taşralarını sorgulamak. Bunun için Özarslan, taşranın Tanzimat'tan

bugüne kadar Türkiye tarihindeki yerini araştırmış. Ayrıca, etimolojik olarak “dışarı” anlamına gelen taşranın merkezden uzaklığının insanların hayatlarını ve hayallerini ne kadar yalnızlaştırdığından bahsetmiş. Buna ek olarak, taşranın tekabül ettiği içsel sıkıntının edebiyatta ve sinemadaki farklı tezahürlerini de örnekleyerek taşranın nasıl bir dışlanmışlık ve sıkıntıya işaret ettiğine de değinmiş. Öyle ki bu sıkıntı, kitaba konu olan gazino müdavimlerini ve gece hayatını harekete geçiren en büyük etken haline geliyor. Bu bölümün en büyük katkısı şüphesiz ki cumhuriyet döneminden sonra çeşitli politikalarla şekillenen kent hayatı ve eğlencesinin kentli ve taşralı ayrımını nasıl keskinleştirdiği ve bu ayrımın taşra eğlencesini nasıl şekillendirdiğine yönelik yaptığı tartışmadır.

Kitabın üçüncü bölümü “erkeklik” konusunu inceliyor. Bölüm boyunca yazar, dünyada ve Türkiye’de erkeklik çalışmalarına kısaca değinerek kendi araştırmasının da var olan literatüre nasıl eklendiğinden bahsediyor. Buna göre, erkekliği verili ve değişmez değil; tarihe, döneme ve duruma göre değişebilen ve toplumsal olarak kurgulanan kimlikler bütünü olarak ele alıyor. Çavdır’ın yerel erkekliklerini de bu perspektiften yorumluyor. Özarıslan’a göre erkekler dindar ve mutaassıp hallerini ezandan sonra gerek dükkanda, gerek evde, gerekse de kahvelerde bırakıp geceye yelken açıyorlar. Yazarın şu cümlesi aslında Çavdır’ın erkekliklerini oldukça iyi özetliyor: “...caminin yeri ayrı, meyhanenin yeri ayrıdır. Kul hakkı yemedikten sonra kimseye değil Allah’a hesap verirler...Üçkağıtçı bir dindar olmaktansa dürüst bir ayyaş olmak iyidir, yeter ki niyet salih olsun” (s. 67). Çavdır’da erkeklerin gece performansları akşam kahvehanelerde gazinolara yeni gelen veya hali hazırda müdavimi oldukları kadınların sohbetiyle başlıyor ve gazinolarda son buluyor. Ancak Özarıslan, buradaki erkekliği, erkeklerin sosyal statüsü, dindarlığı, sınıfsal konumu veya ailevi dinamikleri açısından değil, kimliklerini gece hayatında yeniden kurgulama ve sürdürme biçimleri üzerinden inceliyor.

Üçüncü bölümün devamında yazar erkeklikleri “paralı”, “belalı” ve “yakışıklı” olarak üçe ayırıyor. Bu iç tip erkekliği de konsomatris kadınlarla, gece hayatındaki diğer erkekliklerle ve aileleriyle olan

ilişkileri üzerinden okumaya çalışıyor. “Paralı” erkek, para harcama gücü ve rahatlığıyla gazinolardaki garsonlar ve işletmeciler üzerinde hegemonya kuruyor ve bu şekilde hem konsomatris kadınların gözüne giriyor hem de gece hayatında diğer erkeklikleri ezerek öne çıkıyor. “Belalı” denen erkek sermaye olarak hayatını ortaya koyuyor ve yaşam boyu bir kadın için çile çekmeyi göze alıyor. Ancak, belalı statüsünü kazanmak için çektiği çileleri bir kahramanlık anlatısına dönüştürerek gece dünyasında bir isim elde ediyor, kendinden bahsettiriyor. Bir diğer deyişle, önce mekânın ağır abisi olmayı hak ediyor, sonra kazandığı bu statü üzerinden racon keserek bitmeyen bir tiyatronun daimi oyuncusu oluyor. Kısacası belalı “yalan dünyayı bir dava uğruna harcayan kişidir” (s. 112) ve etrafa nam salıp isim yapmak için oynamayacağı oyun yoktur. “Yakışıklı” ise temelde gece hayatının içerisinde var olmayan ancak konsomatris kadınların özelini, sevgisini ve cinselliğini paylaştığı genç ve deneyimsiz erkeklerin performansına tekabül ediyor. Özarслан, yakışıklıyı gerçekten yakışıklı olduğu için değil, parasını ve hayatını ortaya koyan diğer erkekliklerin erişemediği “kadın cinselliğine” erişebilmenin verdiği imtiyazdan dolayı bu şekilde adlandırıyor. Paralı ve belalı denen erkeklikler, kadının şov dünyasına sunduğu fakat kimsenin sahip olamadığı erotik bedeni üzerinden şekillenirken; yakışıklı denen erkeklik kadının saf sevgisini sunduğu cinsel bedeni üzerinden şekilleniyor. Özarслан, hayatta silik bir tip olan yakışıklının üzerinde fazlalık gibi duran bu imtiyazın, iki amaca hizmet ettiğini söylüyor. İlki diğer erkekliklerin kurgulanmasında hayati bir rol oynaması; ikincisi ise toy bir erkekten, kadını maddi ve psikolojik olarak sömüren bir erkeğe dönüşerek kadının hayatında yıkıcı bir rol oynaması.

Kitabın dördüncü bölümü, erkekliklerin kurgusunda en temel role sahip olan konsomatris kadınlara odaklanıyor. Özarслан’a göre konsomatris kadınlar gece hayatının nesnesi olmanın aksine öznesi olarak rol alıyor. Ailevi yoksulluğun yanında bireysel borçlanmanın da getirdiği yoksulluk mağduriyeti, kadınları güzelliklerini ve yeteneklerini kullanarak zamanı paraya çevirebilecekleri bir hayatın öznesi yapıyor. Konsomatris kadınların aileleri ise ahlaki açıdan gözü kapalı reddedecekleri bu mesleği, kazancından nemalandıkları ve hayatlarını

kızlarının yolladığı parayla idame ettirdikleri için kabul ediyorlar. Hatta, uzaktaki kızlarının iyi yürekli patronlarla çalıştıklarına ikna oluyorlar. Bu açıdan yazarın yaptığı yoksulluk tartışması, bu mesleğin girişi kolay ama çıkması zor bir labirente nasıl dönüştüğüne dair iyi bir zemin sağlıyor.

Gece hayatında “hem para kazanabilmek hem de hayatta kalabilmek” (s. 132) için çeşitli taktikler uygulayan kadınlar, yoksul hayatlarında sahip olmadıkları ekonomik özgürlüğe sahip olabiliyorlar. Buna ek olarak Özarlan, yaptığı görüşmelere dayanarak kadınların kendilerini önceki hayatlarına kıyasla daha kıymetli hissettiklerini söylüyor. Ancak ekonomik özgürlük ve kıymet görme üzerinden kurulan kadınlık pratikleri, günün birinde terk etmek için girdikleri bu sektörde hapsolmalarına da neden oluyor.

Özarlan, konsomatris kadınların hayatını ve yaptığı işin devamlılığını riske sokan belli başlı durumları da ele alıyor. Örneğin, sarhoş olmak ve müşteriye karşı bir şeyler hissetmek bu durumlardan bazıları. Bu gibi durumlar da cinsel gerginliği olan fakat hiçbir zaman cinsel birliktelikle sonuçlanmayan sohbetleri riske sokuyor. Başka bir deyişle, sarhoş veya aşık olmak kadınların güzellikleri, sohbet yetenekleri ve erotik bedenleriyle özenle işlediği bu diskur savaşını kaybetmek anlamına geliyor. Kadınların bunlara çözüm olarak geliştirdiği temel yollardan biri ısmarlanan içkileri hızlıca içip boğazına parmak atarak çıkarmak; diğeri de masadaki adama aşık olmamak için daha önce yaşadığı acıları sürekli canlı tutmak oluyor.

Özarlan’ın çalışmasını diğerlerinden farklı ve özgün kılan şey erkeklige alışlagelmiş kalıplarla değil, taşra dinamiğinin içinden doğan yerel bir gözle bakıyor olması. Erkeklikleri gece hayatına katılım ve orada gösterilen performans üzerinden yorumlamak aslında hem erkeklikler içerisinde hem de kadınlıklar karşısında performansın nasıl şekillendiğini gösteriyor. Erkeklerin gazinoya girdikten sonra elde edecekleri isim/nam, gece hayatında kadınları elde etmek için sundukları bireysel sermayelere dönüşüyor. Gazino içerisinde farklı kimlikler üzerinden süren yarış, gece hayatında “itibar” kazandıran bir hiyerarşiye dönüşüyor. Kitabı güzel kılan bir diğer şey ise araştırmada

elde edilen verilerin literatürdeki belli kalıplara göre değil zıtlıklardan doğan dinamiklere göre okunması. Kitabın çatısını oluşturan erkeklik ve kadınlıklar özellikle eğlence-sıkıntı, kentli-taşralı, paralı-yoksul gerginlikleri arasına sıkışmış ve bu dar alanda kendini var etmeye çalışan kimlikler olarak karşımıza çıkıyor.

Kitabın bu artılarına rağmen bazı eksiklikleri de bulunuyor. İlk olarak, Özarслан'ın kendisinin de belirttiği gibi, gazino müdavimlerinin eşleri veya yakınlarıyla görüşmeler yapılması araştırmayı daha güçlü kılabilirdi. Pavyonlarda bir gövde gösterisine dönüşen erkeklik, evde eş ve çocuklar nezdinde nasıl karşılanıyor? Dışarıdaki performansı evdeki sorumluluklarını yerine getirmesi için göz yumulan bir anlaşmaya mı dahil ediliyor? Eşleri bu durumu nasıl rasyonelleştiriyor ve kendi çevresinde bu gerçeği nasıl bir söylemle/ performansla taşıyor veya örtbas ediyor? Aslında tüm bu sorular gazinolardaki lambalar altında pırıldayan erkeklik pratiğinin, kamusal alanda ve evde kadınlık pratiğini de etkileyebileceğinin bir göstergesi olabilir. İkinci olarak, yazar yoksulluğu sadece kadınların öznelliklerini şekillendiren bir olgu olarak ele alıyor, fakat yoksulluk paralı dışında belalı ve yakışıklı tipolojilerinin de kurulmasında etkili bir olgu. Bu nedenle yoksulluğun hem teorik hem de pratik anlamda kitabın en başından itibaren tartışılması bahsi geçen erkeklik tipolojilerini açıklama ve anlamada faydalı olabilirdi.

Son olarak, giriş, taşra ve erkeklik bölümlerinde modernlik ve taşranın birbirini dışlaması üzerine kurulan bu ilişkide erkekliklerin pratikleri oldukça acı anlatılıyor ve temel argümanı destekliyor. Ancak, kitabın bazı yerlerinde de vurgulandığı gibi taşradaki modern eğlence illüzyonunu yaratmadaki en temel araç konsomatris kadınların güzelliği ve alımlılığı olmasına rağmen, kitabın son bölümünde ele alınan konsomatris kadınların modern eğlencenin vitrini olan güzelliklerini nasıl kurdukları, kurguladıkları ve bunun için ödedikleri bedeller arka planda kalıyor. Kadınların günlerinin yarısını harcadıkları kuaförler ile yapılacak görüşmeler araştırmanın temel argümanını destekleyecek çok güçlü veriler sunabilirdi. Bu konunun eksiklik olarak ön plana çıkması, benzer güzellik pratiklerinin hemen her meslekte kadın için yansıması olmasındandır. Modern dünyanın güzellik/bakım maskesi altında

sunduđu bu kadınlık deneyimlerinin erkeklikleri nasıl kurguladıđı ve şekillendirdiđini incelemek gelecek alıřmalarda odaklanılması gereken bir konu.

Kitabın bir yüksek lisans tez alıřmasına dayandıđını tekrar hatırlarsak, zarslan teori ve pratikte hissedilen kk eksikliklerin silemeyeceđi, bařarılı ve dil kullanımı aısından da olduka keyifli bir kitaba imzasını atmıř. “Hovarda Alemi” eđlencenin bile artık modernlikle anıldıđı gnmz Trkiye’sinde, yoksulluđun nasıl bir eđlence anlayıřını yarattıđı ve yoksulluđu beslemeye nasıl devam ettiđi konusunda dřnmeye teřvik ediyor. Bu tartıřma temel olarak kentin tařrayı ve tařra sıkıntısını nasıl yarattıđı ve bu sıkıntıdan nasıl nemalandıđını da olduka yalın bir dille ortaya koyuyor.

**Beril Trkođlu**  
**Orta Dođu Teknik niversitesi**

**Bülent Somay**

***Psychopolitics of the Oriental Father: Between Omnipotence and Emasculation***

Palgrave, 2014, 243 pp.  
ISBN 978-1-137-46265-7

*Psychopolitics of the Oriental Father* is a Freudian analysis of the image of the “Oriental father,” and an intriguing look at how the Oriental subject imagined itself. Somay’s aim, in his words, is to make “an inquiry into the cultural/historical unconscious of non-colonial Oriental spaces, into how the so-called Oriental subject was structured and split in the passage to capitalism” (6).

The main argument, the uniqueness of the Turkish (post-Ottoman) nation-state experience, is built around the recurring (primordial) father image, and its striking contrast to the West, in which a certain type of “brotherhood” triumphed over the father and led to democratic citizenship. Although the book makes a gripping read and opens up interesting questions about the “authoritarianism” of Turkish modernism, this “Oedipal” argument and the extensive and indefinite “Orient” rhetoric fails at large to explain the gendered aspects of Turkish modernization in its complexity.

The book is arranged into seven chapters. In the “Introduction,” Somay discusses the asymmetry between “the Occident” and “the Orient” and underlines that what is often discussed under terms such as “Westernization,” “Europeanization,” or “development” etc. are in fact the advent of capitalism in the Orient, which helps maintain the Occident/Orient dualism to function properly. The first chapter, “Is East East and West West?” builds on the asymmetry, but ends up questioning it. Somay articulates how the East/West dichotomy was accepted as self-evident and “essential” by focusing on racial characteristics as defined in

the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and discusses how white domination became the hegemonic narrative in a way that served the imperialistic agenda of the Europe. With references to Michel Foucault, he exemplifies the dualisms produced and maintained by the Western ratio such as sane/insane, criminal/lawful, infirm/healthy (24). According to Somay, the subaltern positions in these dualisms also uphold the dualistic ratio with the expectancy of a future reversal of roles (25). To transcend the dualism, Somay suggests a “not-only-but-also look” (which he differentiates from “both”) earlier examples of which can be found in Bertolt Brecht, Ernst Bloch, and implicitly in Mikhail Bakhtin’s concept of “dialogy”.

In the second chapter, Somay mentions the use of extensive slave labor in material production in Greco-Roman civilization as a major difference between the Orient and the Occident, which as a result, contributed to the formation of a leisure class, and narrative of freedom, the leisure class forming the present-day intelligentsia. The idea that “father function” therefore assumes different forms in the West and the East, follows rather speculatively. Somay then develops his theses on the father image, returning to Freud and his *Totem and Taboo*. He says that the brothers’ revolt against the primordial father figure and patricide are not central metaphors “as a starting point for civilization” in the Orient. Generally there is fratricide instead. It is often the father who succeeds to suppress and even when a son kills the father, the “position of absolute domination remains,” and is filled by the son later (53). With the exclusively Oriental tradition of circumcision, Somay argues that “the permanent supervision of the castrating father” is maintained (54). The failure to kill the primordial father also means his “jouissance” of freely mating with all women available continues as a rule, while in the Occident the brothers declined the father’s prior position, declared each other’s wives taboo and therefore made monogamy a strict law for both genders. A reference, in passing, to Stalinist and Kemalist top-to-bottom regimes ends the second chapter, suggesting “the despot,” “the totalitarian leader” as “the father” of the communities.

In the third chapter, Somay delves into the problematic aspects of the Oriental intellectual, taking his lead from India under British rule, as in the works of Homi Bhabha. Somay argues that “new body images” modeled on the West (73) appeared as a result and he calls the transgression across cultures as “transvestity”. Following Bhabha’s line of thought, with Jacques Lacan’s theory of hysteria and René Girard’s theory of triangular desire, Somay articulates the Oriental Oedipal bargain, which he argues to be fundamentally different from the Western Oedipal bargain, as the father continues to be “an external entity” (77) in the Orient. The colonial invader kills or emasculates the father: For example, in the case of India, it replaces the father first with a company and then Queen Victoria, a woman, eventually causing the loss of the ego-ideal for the Orient. Somay articulates on how transvestitism is different from mimicry: in mimicry, the mimic strives to look like the other, while transvestite strives to fit into the image of desire in the gaze of the other (87).

The fourth chapter revolves around the birth of modern/secular Turkish intelligentsia at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in “the translation chamber,” an office made of Muslim Turkish youth who were previously sent abroad for education and who, after their return, are given the task of translating significant works of Western philosophy and literature. Somay punctuates the “belated” efforts to catch up with Western civilization with references to Gregory Jusdanis, and Daryush Shayegan etc., and he shows how Europe becomes an object of desire, and with the defeat of 1878 (the Russo Turkish war) he argues that a new bargain, a Hamletesque bargain, takes place as Ottoman intellectuals face Western cultural and political hegemony, with the loss of their the sultans (their fathers). The concept of the West is “masculine” in war, Somay argues, but “feminine” in the good, new ideas, and since Ottoman intellectuals desired to “rejuvenate” the father rather than killing him as suggested by Jale Parla, Somay argues that they seek for “a marriage” of their civilization with the West. Western ideas thus became “trophy wives” for Ottoman intellectuals.

To acquire the European object of desire, the Ottoman intellectual had to look European. Hence, the fifth chapter deals with the Empire's urge to modernize via vestimentary reforms, which continued into the premature Turkish Republic in the form of a "Hat Revolution". Somay focuses on the masculine ideal of the new nation-state and discusses how the reforms tried to shape it physically. The sixth chapter elaborates on Mustafa Kemal's emergence as a father figure, who later takes the name Atatürk –the father of Turks-, having abolished the Sultanate on 1 November 1922 and the Caliphate on 3 March 1924, and leaving the brand-new nation state fatherless. With the introduction of Mustafa Kemal, Somay critically turns against his theses about the termination of the father figure in the West, and refers to the "temporary" rebirth of the father figure in several European countries in the process of nation building, such as Napoleon for France, Bismarck for Germany and Garibaldi for Italy, adding hastily that these are "discredited (even discarded) afterwards" (141). Mustafa Kemal's idealization as a figure of "serene wisdom and paternal compassion" and the extensive mourning after his death are indicators, according to Somay, of how the image of the primordial father is kept alive. Somay shows the continuity of the father image with references to more contemporary images such as the late Prime Minister Süleyman Demirel, who was also referred to as "baba" (father), and his famous hat.

The seventh chapter marks the uniqueness of the Turkish case among several other nation-building processes in Europe (or the Third World) with its giving rebirth to the primordial father image, and diverts the focus from men on the status of women rather unexpectedly. In this chapter, Somay articulates how being a woman became a complex issue in "modernizing" Turkey because of the Islamic tradition of veil. With references to scholars such as Deniz Kandiyoti, Nilüfer Göle, Meyda Yeğenoğlu, Yeşim Arat etc., Somay problematizes female visibility in the Kemalist reforms, and elaborates on the position of the veiled women, who campaigned for their rights in post 1980s.

Having traversed a wide range of historical periods with the Orient/Occident rhetoric and the resurrecting father image, the

conclusion leaves us in June 2013, when an uprising to protest the replacement of Gezi Park, the only green area in the greater Taksim district, with the replica of the historical Gunnery Barracks grew into a bigger protest. Demonstrations spread over the country, caused the occupation of the park, and gave birth to the Gezi Commune. Somay sees the commune that also included Islamic youth and several veiled young women, and the peaceful protests, as a revolt of brothers and sisters, a reminder of the “possibility of another modernity” (188). The book ends with this positive impulse of revolt and peaceful protest in the Orient “finally” targeting the father image not to replace him, but to challenge the whole system.

In *Psychopolitics of the Oriental Father*, there are examples derived from a wide period of Turkish history to support the everlasting image of the castrating “Oriental father,” which range from the tales of nomadic Turkish tribes (Dede Korkut) to political figures of contemporary times such as Süleyman Demirel but in the end of the book, we find ourselves, as readers, with the possibility (of dreaming) of a Western style democracy in “the Orient” without much explanation. How was Gezi possible in the Orient, if the primordial father has never been “really” dead? How could the participants of Gezi adopt “a castrating role” in their already “castrated” positions? The problem in this book’s “not-only-but-also” look is that it promises a transgression of boundaries and dualities only at the very end, and because of the Freudian exegesis, it brings too few “also”s to the table theoretically to explain the complex relationships between the fathers and sons (the oppressors and the oppressed) in the Orient. The figure of the all-able-castrating father is only one questionable face of a complex image, which needs to be reconsidered and critically examined.

The idea of “the Orient,” which is the main pillar of this book, needs a more detailed analysis to escape being a trope and serve as an analytical tool to understand Turkey. Starting from the first chapter entitled “Is East East and West West?” Somay puts a question mark on what are often accepted as “common sense” dualities, but he leaves the suspicion in the air. In addition to Gezi, the Arab oppositional

movements (the Arab Spring) in Tunisia and Egypt could have been very well included as examples in the problem of “killing” the Oriental father. That the trigger of the movements in Tunisia, which became a catalyst for the Tunisian Revolution and the wider Arab Spring was Mohammed Bouazizi’s setting himself to fire in December 2010 after being publicly humiliated by a female municipal official, Faïda Hamdi (Bouazizi’s family claims that she slapped him in the face, spat at him, confiscated his scale, and tossed his cart aside) brings other complexities to the table, which reminds us that “the Oriental father” can also be female. Hence, if we need to move from the Freudian Oedipal triangle to the Orient’s political authoritarianism, and to Turkey’s political struggles with its Oriental father, and finally to the “position of absolute domination,” which remains although the father gets killed, we seem to rest on several preconditions, assumptions, conventions etc., which make a large-scale transformation impossible. Somay’s willingness to confront fantasies and projections of the Orient is challenging but *Psychopolitics of the Oriental Father* dangerously derails the discussion to an impasse, while working through the complexities of the subjectivities in the Orient.

**Çimen Günay Erkol**  
**Özyeğin University**

**Beril Türkoğlu**

She was born in Izmir in 1987 and graduated from Middle East Technical University (METU) after completing her primary and secondary school in Izmir. She had her master degree with the thesis titled "VIOLENCE AS A WAY OF RECONSTRUCTING MANHOOD: THE ROLE OF THREATENED MANHOOD AND MASCULINE IDEOLOGY ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN" in METU Social Psychology in 2013. She won the first prize in Sabancı University Dicle Koğacıoğlu Article Award in December 2012 before her master's degree with the article "*Manhood on the fault line: Examining manhood under the frame of working and unemployment.*" Her fields of interests are masculinity, violence, discrimination, prejudice, and gender. She is still in METU Social Psychology doctoral programme and work in Psychology department as a research assistant.

**Çimen Günay-Erkol**

Çimen Günay-Erkol graduated from METU Department of Mining Engineering, but never worked as an engineer except during her summer internships. She obtained her master's degree from Department of Turkish Literature at Bilkent University in 2001, upon completing a dissertation on socialist realist writer Suat Derviş. Between 2002-2008 she conducted PhD research in the Netherlands at Leiden University's Department of Literary Studies, and earned her PhD degree from Leiden University with a thesis on post-coup novels of 1970s, the so-called March 12 Novels. Since 2008, she is assistant professor of Turkish Literature at Özyeğin University in Istanbul and since 2009 she is the mother of Ali Liber. Her fields of interest include gender and masculinity studies, disability studies, biography, and topics such as testimony in coup periods and fictionalization of history.

### **Ian J. Jesse**

Ian J. Jesse is an MA student from the University of Maine. He is currently completing his thesis which examines definitions of positive and negative masculine identities in lumbercamps in the Northeast during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

### **Janet Lee**

Janet Lee is professor of women, gender, and sexuality studies at Oregon State University, USA. Her scholarship includes gender and literary histories, especially early-twentieth century feminist and queer British historical geographies, and the cultural histories of the U.S. Progressive Era. Current projects involve a history of emotions focus on relationships between militarism and modernity that explores the ways imperialism and forces of modernity shape embodied emotional performances of military masculinities among World War I airmen.

### **Justin Omar Johnston**

Justin Omar Johnston is an Assistant Professor in the English Department at Stony Brook University. He received his Ph.D. (2012) in Literary Studies from the University of Wisconsin - Madison. His current research examines how biotechnology and climate change have affected representations of “the human” in contemporary novels. Johnston’s book project, *The Prosthetic Novel*, examines how clones, animal-human hybrids, and toxic bodies have proliferated across a variety of internationally acclaimed literary texts during the 21st century. These bodies are weighted down by the history of 20th century biopolitics, even as they anticipate still emergent forms of subjectivity. This area of work has fueled a sustained passion for the fields of feminist body theory, postcolonial criticism, animal studies, and eco-criticism. Johnston teaches courses on Anglophone and Postcolonial literature, Science and Literature, 20th Century Literature, and various other courses.

### **Jerry Thomas**

Jerry Thomas, JD, PhD

Assistant Professor, University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

### **Murat Göç**

Murat Goc received his PhD degree from Ege University American Culture and Literature Dept. He is currently teaching at Pamukkale University, Turkey. His main areas of interest are contemporary literature, cultural theory, gender studies, in particular masculinity studies.

### **Selin Akyüz**

Selin Akyüz obtained her Bachelor's degree from the Department of Political Science and Public Administration at Bilkent University and her Master's degree from the Department of Political Science and Public Administration at Hacettepe University. She completed her doctoral studies in 2012 in the Department of Political Science at Bilkent University. In her dissertation she developed a typology of political manhood in Turkey and discussed the construction of masculinities in Turkish politics with a specific focus on political parties. During her doctoral studies, Akyüz got a research fellowship from the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK) and completed her research at University of Oslo, Centre for Gender Studies as a visiting researcher. She also worked in research projects on gender, democratization, local politics and human rights. Her major research interests are critical studies on men and masculinities, gender studies, Turkish politics, migration and contemporary social theory. She worked as an Assistant Professor at Zirve University between 2012-2014. Akyüz is currently conducting her post-doctoral research on gendered perceptions of migration at University of Oxford, International Gender Studies Centre at Lady Margaret Hall.

Masculinities is an online biannual journal of interdisciplinary and critical studies of gender and masculinity. It aims to enable researchers and scholar to discuss issues in an independent and inspiring forum related to the representations of gender, particularly masculinity, formations of gendered identities, cultural, social, and aesthetic reflections of masculinity in culture and literature.

Masculinities primarily offers interdisciplinary and pioneering research in the field of gender and masculinity, necessarily outreaching into arts, literature, history, sociology, philosophy, communications, linguistics, and medicine. The editor(s) welcome scholarly and critical contributions, including articles, book and film reviews, reviews of the published articles as well as Announcements of forthcoming events, conference reports, and information on other matters of interest to gender studies and/or masculinity studies. The submissions are accepted after a double blind peer review process of evaluation and main criteria of admission are originality, theoretical and methodological sophistication, scholarly significance, and clarity. The editors reserve the right to accept or reject submissions for publication. Any changes to the text submitted will be clarified with the author before publication.

The submission of articles accepted for publication indicates a clear understanding of the following rules.

1. The opinions expressed in *Masculinities* by the editors and contributors are their own responsibility.
2. The language of the journal is English and Turkish and Access to the published articles is free of charge.
3. The contributor grants *Masculinities* exclusive rights to publish his/her contribution in electronic form (as freely downloadable PDF file from the website). The contribution is understood to include all material submitted for publication and all supplementary material accompanying the contribution.
4. The author may share copies of the manuscript with colleagues in personal compilations or other publications of his/her own work for educational or research purposes.

5. Any request to reproduce the original material first published in *Masculinities* will be forwarded to the original author and *Masculinities* will raise no objection as long as the author agrees to reproduction and the original publication is properly acknowledged.
6. With each submission, the author assures that the text is an original work and has not been published or not being considered for publication elsewhere. It must be carefully noted that in the case of a multi-authored contribution, the person who submits the paper is authorized to answer on behalf of all the co-authors.
7. Manuscripts should be in accordance with the parenthetical format in the current MLA Style Manual.
8. Manuscripts should not exceed 7,000 words. You are kindly advised to provide a short bio note, an abstract of 150-200 words, keywords and a postal address for further contact on a separate sheet of paper.
9. The authors will be informed about the decision of reviewers within 60 days at the latest. The texts will be published in the closest issue once approved for publication.
10. You can also submit **reviews** of books, articles, conferences and academic meetings, films, performances, MA thesis and dissertations to be published in the journal. Reviews of any kind must generally conform to the guidelines above mentioned. They must include such information in the heading like author, title, place of publication/organization, publisher/organizers, date of publication/organization. number of pages, length, language, price, etc. where possible. The review itself is expected to provide accurate information about the content of the publication/event as well as a very brief introduction of the authors/organizers. The review should also emphasize the significance and the impact of the work/event in its field besides sometimes a critical assessment of its weaknesses and potential failures in addressing certain topics. The finished paper should be limited with 1200-1500 words at most.
11. You must submit your papers and reviews to both masculinitiesjournal@gmail.com. You will get a confirmation mail in return once the editors have received your e-mails.

## Stylesheet

All submissions to be considered for publication should be sent by email to the editors as a .doc file and a pdf version. Please make sure that

- Your text includes a title page on which the title of article, name and affiliation of the author(s), and contact information are provided. Page numbers should start on the first page of the text consecutively in the heading outer corner. In line with the policy of blind submission, the author's name and institution should appear only on the title page to ensure strict anonymity for both authors and referees.
- The paragraphs should be properly indented (1,5 cm)
- Notes and explanations must be inserted as end notes (if any).
- The text must be justified, except titles and headings which should be ranged left.
- Word-breaks should be certainly avoided.
- The text should be double-spaced including end notes and references.
- Any images or graphs should be supplied as separate .jpg files.
- The recommended font is Times New Roman (11 pt; end notes 9 pt).
- For quotations longer than 2-3 lines, you should leave an empty line before and after the quotation and increase the left margin by 1 cm.
- Highlighted words or words in languages other than English should be written in italics.
- For in-text referencing and bibliography, all essays should conform to the current APA Style Manual.
- Please avoid using abbreviations unless very necessary, except conventionally used 'etc.', 'i.e.', 'e.g.'. 'et al'.

Please do not hesitate to contact the editors should you have any further queries via provided [contact](#) information

Masculinities toplumsal cinsiyet ve erkeklik çalışmalarına eleştirel bir yaklaşımı benimseyen ve yılda iki kez yayınlanan disiplinler arası bir akademik dergidir. Araştırmacıları ve akademisyenleri, toplumsal cinsiyet, ve özellikle de erkeklik temsilleri, toplumsal cinsiyet kimliklerinin oluşumu, erkekliğin kültür ve edebiyatta kültürel, sosyal ve estetik yansımalarına ilişkin bağımsız ve ilham verici tartışmaları yürütecekleri bir platform sunmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Erkeklikler, öncelikle toplumsal cinsiyet ve erkeklik alanında ama aynı zamanda kaçınılmaz olarak sanat, edebiyat, tarih, sosyoloji, felsefe, iletişim ve dilbilim alanlarını da kapsayacak disiplinler arası ve öncü çalışmalara yer vermeyi hedeflemektedir. Dergi editörleri, her türden bilimsel ve eleştirel katılımı, makaleleri, kitap ve film incelemelerini, yayınlanmış makale incelemelerini, gerçekleştirecek etkinlik duyurularını, konferans raporlarını, ve toplumsal cinsiyet çalışmaları ve/veya erkeklik çalışmalarına herhangi bir çalışmayı dergide görmeyi arzu etmektedirler. Gönderilen metinler, ikili kör hakemlik değerlendirmesinden sonra yayınlanırlar ve ana yayın ölçütleri orijinallik, kuramsal ve yöntemsel olgunluk, bilimsel öneme sahip olmak ve netliktir. Editörler, gönderilen metinleri yayınlamak üzere kabul ya da red etme hakkına sahiptir. Metinde yapılacak herhangi bir değişiklik yayından önce yazara bildirilecek ve onayı alınacaktır.

Yayınlanmak üzere gönderilen makalelerin dergiye gönderilmesi şu hususların net bir şekilde anlaşıldığını ve kabul edildiğini gösterir:

1. Masculinities dergisinde editörlerin ve katkıda bulunan yazarlarının ifade ettiği fikirlerin sorumluluğu kendilerine aittir.
2. Derginin dili İngilizce ve Türkçedir ve dergiye erişim ücretsizdir.
3. Yazarlar yazılarının elektronik ortamda (ücretsiz bir şekilde edinilebilen PDF kopya) yayınlanma hakkını editörlere vermiştir. Gönderilen yazıların içeriği tüm metin içeriğini ve buna eşlik eden yazılı ve görsel tüm materyali de içerir.
4. Yazar, yazısının kopyasını eğitim ve araştırma amaçları doğrultusunda meslektaşları ile derlemeler ya da diğer yayın türlerinde paylaşabilir.
5. Orijinal metnin herhangi bir şekilde çoğaltılması izni için yazara yönlendirme yapılacak, yazarın yeniden basım için izin vermesi ve

- metnin ilk basıldığı yer olarak Masculinities dergisine atf verilmesi koşulu ile, Masculinities dergisi herhangi bir itiraz dile getirmeyecektir
6. Yazar, yayınlanmak üzere gönderdiği metnin orijinal bir çalışma olduğunu ve daha önce başka bir yerde yayınlanmadığını ya da yayınlanmak üzere değerlendirmeye alınmadığını taahhüt eder. Çok yazarlı metinlerde, metni dergiye ileten kişinin tüm yazarlar adına söz hakkını kullandığı varsayılacaktır.
  7. Dergide basılacak metinler, güncel MLA formatında yazılarak gönderilmelidir.
  8. Metinler, 7000 kelimeyi geçmemelidir. Metne ek olarak, kısa bir özgeçmiş, 150-200 kelimelik Türkçe, 500-600 kelimelik bir İngilizce özet, anahtar kelimeler ve iletişim adreslerini ayrı bir metin dosyasında gönderilmesi istenmektedir.
  9. Yazarlar hakemlerin kararı ile ilgili olarak en geç 60 gün içinde bilgilendirilecektir. Metinler, yayınlanacak ilk sayıda değerlendirilecektir.
  10. Makaleler dışında, kitap, makale, konferans, akademik toplantı, film, performans, yüksek lisans ve doktora tezi incelemelerini de yayınlanmak üzere gönderebilirsiniz. Bu türden her inceleme genel itibarı ile yukarıda bahsi geçen hususlara tabidir. Ayrıca, her bir inceleme, (eğer mümkünse) yazar, başlık, basım/ düzenleme yeri, basım/düzenleme tarihi, sayfa sayısı/uzunluğu, dili, fiyatı vb. bilgileri başlığın hemen altında sağlamalıdır. İncelemenin basılı metin/düzenlenen etkinliğin içeriğine dair net bir bilgi sunması ve yazar/düzenleyenler hakkında kısa bir bilgilendirme yapması beklenmektedir. İnceleme metni çalışmanın/olayın kendi alanında önemini ve etkisini olduğu kadar belli konulara değinme konusundaki yetersizliklerini de içermelidir. İnceleme metni 1200-1500 kelime ile sınırlanmalıdır.
  11. Makalelerinizi ve incelemelerinizi bu metnin sonunda verilen iletişim adresine gönderebilirsiniz. Metnin editörlerin eline geçtiğinde bir doğrulama mesajı alacaksınız.

## Yazım Kuralları

Yayınlanmak üzere gönderilecek tüm metinler .doc ve PDF formatında e-mail ile gönderilmelidir. Metinlerin şu hususları taşıdığına emin olunuz:

- Metin, ayrı bir kapak sayfasında makale başlığı, yazar(lar)ın ismi ve kurumsal bağlantıları, ve iletişim bilgileri yer almalıdır. Sayfa numaraları metnin ilk sayfasından itibaren üst dış kenarda yer almalıdır. Kör hakem değerlendirmesi politikası uyarınca, yazarın ismi ve kurumu yalnızca kapak sayfasında yer almalıdır.
- Paragrafların ilk satır girintisi düzgün bir şekilde verilmelidir (1,5 cm).
- Notlar ve açıklamalar (varsa eğer) son not olarak verilmelidir.
- Metin iki yana yaslanmalı, başlık ve alt başlıklar sola hizalanmalıdır.
- Satır sonunda kelimenin bölünmesinden kesinlikle kaçınmalıdır.
- Son notlar ve referanslar kısmı dahil metin çift aralıkla yazılmalıdır.
- Resimler ve grafikler ayrı bir klasörde .jpg dosyası olarak gönderilmelidir
- Tavsiye edilen yazı karakteri Times New Roman'dır (11 pt; sonnotlar9 pt).
- 2-3 satırı geçen alıntılar için ayrı bir paragraf açmalı, öncesinde ve sonrasında bir satır boşluk bırakarak soldan girintiyi 1 cm artırmalısınız.
- İngilizce/Türkçe olmayan önemli kelimeler/terimler italik olarak verilmelidir.
- Metin içi referans ve kaynakça için, tüm metinler APA formatına uygun olmalıdır.
- Lütfen, çok gerekli olmadıkça kısaltmalardan kaçının, kısaltma verilmesinin gerekli olduğu durumlarda, ilk kullanımda kısaltmanın açılımını da veriniz.

Herhangi bir sorunuz olduğunda lütfen aşağıda verilen iletişim bilgileri üzerinden editörlerle temasa geçiniz.

Atilla Barutçu

Sosyoloji bölümü

Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi

Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi, Zonguldak, Türkiye

masculinitiesjournal@gmail.com