

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

2011

Hegemonic masculinity: Identity construction and consequences for men

Bill Joseph Clemon

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Clemon, Bill Joseph, "Hegemonic masculinity: Identity construction and consequences for men" (2011). *Theses Digitization Project*. 3599.
<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/3599>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY: IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION AND
CONSEQUENCES FOR MEN

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in Social Sciences

by
Bill Joseph Clemon

June 2011

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY: IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION AND
CONSEQUENCES FOR MEN

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Bill Joseph Clemon

June 2011


Approved by:



Patricia Little, Chair, Sociology



Marcia Marx, Sociology



Timothy Pytell, History

3/16/2011
Date

ABSTRACT

This is an examination of the actual development and role of hegemonic masculinity as it relates to the conditioning of males and the effects on themselves and those with who they are in contact. The writer has delved into societal institutions such as economics and politics as they relate to gender roles and expectations that have been attributed to those deemed as hegemonic males. The historical evolution of hegemonic masculinity is examined as well as its aftermath. The latter part of the project is devoted to offering alternative perspectives and proposed solutions, taking into consideration the various agendas and structures of the gender and sexually oriented groups that are most concerned.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is with profound gratitude and appreciation that I thank my wife - Carla for her never ending support of my work. The countless hours of discussion, proofreading and care she has given to this writer is priceless. I would also like to thank my reading committee: Dr. Little (my much valued advisor, whom without none of this could have been possible), Dr. Marx for her candid appraisals which has provided much insight and challenge, and Dr. Pytell who has provided much in the way of encouragement and support. I also do not want to forget any of my professors in the behavioral sciences department, with a special mention to Dr. Toruno and Dr. Jennings, who have been of inestimable value in sharpening my focus and supporting my efforts. I would also like to thank Dr. Texeira, and Dr. Heeren who weathered the fluxes of this writer's thought in its embryonic stage and showed great patience and insight that was invaluable to this project. Thank you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY	4
CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS	7
Review Current Discourse	7
History	10
Cultural Manifestations	34
Effects on the Hegemonic Male	48
Emotional Lives	60
CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION	76
Challenging the Status Quo	76
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	92
REFERENCES	95

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Masculinity was once an identifier that united all biological males, serving as a defining characteristic in determining male behavior and identity. Today it is a divisive element in gender relations. The way masculinity is viewed is determined by which side of the fence you are viewing it from. At its most generic, Merriam - Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (2007) defines masculinity in part with one word - "MALE" set apart as one entity. However, this definition does not begin to address the intricacy and complexity that this term holds today.

As an example, in *Men's Lives*, written in 2004, Kimmel and Messner outline three main approaches regarding masculinity in social scientific research: biological, anthropological and sociological. The biological approach stresses innate differences which program social behavior. Anthropological studies are cross cultural and sociological studies emphasizes how children are socialized into gender roles relating to their biological sex (*Men's Lives*: Kimmel & Messner, p.xi 2004). All of these approaches contribute

something to our understanding of how masculinity is perceived and discussed, but there is still so much more.

There is a pull between competing viewpoints - traditional vs. non-traditional. This project explores the concept of the traditional - hegemonic masculinity, which emphasizes the dominance of a particular class of men whose main aim is to remain in power.

It is this writer's belief that personal power stems from a strong identity. But what exactly is identity? Social Psychology gives us identity theory to further our understanding identity formation. The text *Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives*, written by Rohall, Milkie and Lucas, asserts: "Identity refers to our internalized, stable sense of who we are, including role identities, social categories and personal characteristics (Burke 2003)." Our concept of identity is then based on an understanding of how we see ourselves and what roles we must fulfill (Rohall, Milkie & Lucas, 2007 p.120). A strong identity is connected to a concept of worth and is usually dependent on the quality of relationships in a person's life. This is the problem.

Many hegemonically trained males do not have a strong identity that satisfies their sense of personal power, even

if they wield power. Their quality of relationships has lessened and so has their sense of worth.

Another complication, although hegemonic masculinity has a racial bias, men of other races have also been conditioned to the concept of male privilege and superiority that is adherent in the hegemonic class. Thus, a murky picture of male identity ensues with a strong hegemonic influence even to those who are not considered hegemonic.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

I will include an exploration of current discourse and cultural influences.

In addition, a historical and structural examination will emphasize how hegemonic masculinity came to be such a powerful influence on American men. I will explore the repercussions on the individual men, their families, and the sociological, psychological, economic, and political status of men as a group.

Next, an in - depth look at cinema (especially in the period of 1940 - 1960) and how it personified masculinity with hidden subtexts of gender that were not always visible, but had a strong effect on how hegemonic masculinity was perceived.

I will then discuss labor and consumerism (especially post-WWII) and how they affected returning veterans who were supposed to fulfill societal expectations as heads of families and 'breadwinners', in an artificially induced economy and family structure. I will trace Kennedy's "New Frontier" and the development of the Aerospace industry,

along with the growing profitability and burgeoning corporate regime and how it relates to today.

Next we will examine the effects on male identity, analyzing the paradox of power vs. no power, depending on what level of existence - micro or macro, is emphasized.

We will then explore how gender groups vary in expressing similar concerns, by examining the actual structure and operation of these groups, taking account of the multi-level of subgroups, factions and agenda, and using this information as a base of understanding.

I will conclude with an overall critique of how this project will contribute to our current picture. That there are limits to what is done here and its value is obvious. However, I hope that this writing serves as a springboard for further exploration of what is needed in men's studies, to bring a more cohesive front to gender discourse.

I started with feminist writings, as the feminists appeared to contribute the most attention and information regarding the destructive effects of hegemonic masculinity on women.

This was important, as the conflict between hegemonic males and the women who had suffered so much at the hands of these men, is what makes up the core of the descriptive

efforts currently in vogue in dealing with hegemonic masculinity.

Other gender groups have voiced their concerns; however, most have received a lot of guidance from the feminist perspective, which has acted in strong opposition to the idea and practice of hegemonic masculinity. After reading feminist literature, I then turned to the issues described by the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender (GLBT) community.

I noted both similarities and differences in how each group perceived the situation regarding hegemonic males, which in turn established this writer's curiosity about the underlying sociological and psychological aspects, and how these in turn related to economics and politics in the forming of hegemonic masculinity. Media also drew my attention as an influential cultural artifact that has had great bearing on gender roles and perspectives.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Review Current Discourse

Just what is hegemonic masculinity? Borrowing from Connell, Carrigan and Lee: Steven Cohen in *Masked Men* gives us: "It is... a question of how particular groups of men inhabit positions of power and wealth and how they legitimate and reproduce the social relationships that generate their dominance" (Cohan, 1997, p.35).

Hegemonic masculinity is a social construct of gender that is based on racial and economic preference (white, middle-class and up) and is dependent on the subjugation of women, and other racially or sexually oriented groups. It is the traditional socialization of males with the expectation that men must be heterosexual, dominant, and emotionally unavailable. It is based on gender inequality and accords privilege to hegemonically trained men.

Hegemonic masculinity is homophobic in nature. This means not only does it engender disapproval for other sexually oriented groups such as gay and lesbian; it also states that men must be afraid of them as well. With fear and hegemonic male privilege, this group is perceived as

the oppressing element in society and therefore a threat to all other gender groups.

Hegemonic masculinity is one of a group of masculinities, which also include complicit and subordinate (Kimmel, 2000). Complicit masculinity is defined by R.W. Connell as: "those organized around the complicit acceptance of what has come to be termed a patriarchal dividend". Complicity is defined by *The Merriam Webster Collegiate Dictionary* (2007), as "association or participation in or as if in a wrongful act".

Those in this group are 'free riders' of the hegemonic system. Connell gives gay masculinities as an example of subordinate masculinity, in which he differentiates from marginalized masculinities - those of ethnic minorities (Doucet, 2004).

This idea forms a major change. Masculinity must be discussed in its separate forms that are indicative of each group. The masculinity of a gay, Asian, twenty seven year old male is going to be different than that of a fifty year old straight black male - or, which designates another change in discussion - female. Masculinity is no longer seen as irrevocably attached to the biological male and

this has had a major impact on all gender populations (Halberstam, 1998).

Today, deconstruction is the perspective is prevalent in gender studies. Since masculinity is a gender-based set of behavioral traits that can be attributed to both biological sexes and its variants, it does not appear as a viable index for men only.

Traditional masculinity is considered hegemonic, mainly because it is invisible in its structure. It is the standard by which all other groups are measured. White, educated, middle class, heterosexual and misogynist are some of the prerequisites that are necessary to those of this group, yet these characteristics are taken for granted as dominant. Connell in Gender and power shows how hegemonic masculinity is conveyed in an intricate balance of power regarding the subordination of alternative masculinities and women (Connell, 1987 pp. 183 - 187).

Defining these characteristics as dominant results from a history of imperialism and domination from Western European countries around the world, rather than any inherent worth or value to these traits. However, when discussing gender privilege and inequality, they are the deciding factors in our society.

Hegemonic masculinity is a major contributor to most of the violence and aggression in men. This is where we get the argument that men are at heart oppressors, and rapists, that early separatist feminist voices such as Andrea Dworkin, Susan Brownmiller or Catherine McKinnon have asserted when discussing domestic violence, date rape, gay bashing and other gender related crimes.

There has been a visible gap in the interest and studies between men and women. I recently saw this evidenced by a visit to a local Barnes and Noble bookstore. There I found sections of women's studies, gay and lesbian studies, cultural studies, but no men's studies. I do find this interesting in an academic climate where men are of primary concern to other gender groups. As oppressed groups become more empowered, they often turn the lens of examination toward the dominant group. I expect to see more studies of masculinity in the future.

History

Male identity has a long and colorful narration. Depending on where you want to start, whether in ancient Rome, the Renaissance or the Depression era, men have played an influential part in the formation of our cultural

identity, both good and bad. For this study, I touch primarily on the turn of the century, focusing on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

There was an identifiable parallel between this period and the issues of today regarding the masculine role and its effects on society. By examining this relationship between these two periods, it is clear that the general instability of the male role and identity has had a longevity that is staggering.

Michael Kimmel's: *Manhood in America*, illuminates a structural pattern that stems from the economic status of men and how it related to the economic expectations of society. In general, a man's identity was his work. Kimmel specifies three basic archetypes for male roles: 1. The Heroic Artisan. 2. The Genteel Patriarch. 3. The Self-Made Man (Kimmel, 2006).

The Heroic Artisan is the quintessential laborer. He is physically strong and a skilled craftsman. Think of a cabinetmaker. He is respected for the cabinets he builds and provides for his community. He works with his hands in a highly skilled endeavor. He and the demands of his customers, whom he in all probability, knows personally, control his work' pace. He may own a shop and train his

neighbor's children to work for him. This man may belong to a guild, which is a fraternal order of skilled workers such as him. The guild operates as a benevolent organization that looks after its members (Kimmel, 2006).

According to Kimmel (2006), the Heroic artisan is in direct competition with the Genteel Patriarch. This fellow is an aristocrat, European in manner, sophisticated, and landed gentry. At worst, he is an 'idealized fop.' Both the Heroic Artisan and the Genteel Patriarch are subjected to the next category - the Self-Made Man.

Kimmel (2006) says that the Self-Made Man, is the one who won, but not without a price. What he gained in upward mobility, he lost in his psychological and sociological well-being, exhibiting "anxiety, restlessness and loneliness". His status was less secure as it now had to be constantly earned and proven through financial success (Kimmel, 2006).

He was the capitalist, the Robber Baron, whose only concern was his profit. This is the man who dictated the fate of the other two. Spawn of the Industrial age, what he said, went. He wanted wageworkers for his factories; thus the artisan is transformed and so is the fate of the aristocrat - as agriculture must now share the spotlight

with industry - to their detriment and his profit (Kimmel, 2006).

The wageworker faced a different set of circumstances than the artisan. Here is an illustration and example of Karl Marx's 1890 (as cited in Lemert, 2010). alienated worker. Whether as a factory worker or an office clerk, he was now accountable to the machine age, which dictated his schedule, work pace, status and compensation. He was also told, that it was his Christian and manly duty to become rich (Max Weber, 1905, as cited in Lemert, 2010).

Inspirational literature such as the Horatio Alger stories inundates him with accounts of poor boys that made good with 'luck and pluck'. One example would be Alger's: "Ragged Dick," which is about an orphan who acquires adult benefactors through his courage, intelligence and tenacity (as cited in Kimmel, 2006).

Along with societal expectations for financial success, the wageworker was reminded that he was also the head of his family and responsible for their upkeep and guidance. What made this more difficult was that he was also taught not to trust his wife, as women were becoming more of a threat to the masculine role of dominance (mainly due to more women seeking education and jobs, and even the

vote). This was made easier by the separation of spheres in the labor organization of the home, between men and women (Kimmel, 2006).

As industrial technology became more advanced, men worked longer hours and farther away from home, leaving the women at home to take care of the housekeeping and raising the children. Frightened men tried to keep women out of the job market, schools, and the voting booths. The top writers of the day were saying in unison that women were too feeble minded, to be educated and given business opportunities. At the same time, they were given the status of 'keepers of the moral virtue' and the sacred responsibility of civilizing the children (Kimmel, 2006)

Men said that business was a dirty job - amoral, corrupt, and full of misdeeds. They were trying to spare women the disgrace inherent in this dishonorable endeavor. It was not about status and privilege, men were just doing their job... white men that is. Black people had a different sense of what the job they needed to accomplish entailed.

White Women joined black Americans in the fight for their rights, which stemmed from the abolitionist coalitions formed in the days of slavery. This is what

provided women the opportunity to organize and extend to a stronger political platform.

Harriet Tubman, who established the Underground Railroad and Sojourner Truth, made famous by her "Ain't I a Woman?" speech were two of the better known black abolitionists. Sarah Mapp Douglass, who was not as well known, set up the Female Anti-Slavery Society in 1833 along with Lucretia Mott, a white abolitionist. They helped set a precedent for further collaboration (Watkins, Rueda & Rodriguez, 1992).

The specific rights in question were in the areas of labor, suffrage and education, with the same struggle for legitimate status politically and economically. Immigrants came next, the Irish, Germans, Italians and other groups that were non-European such as the Chinese, which made the job market crowded and less secure for white men. White-only labor groups and vigilante organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan represented the insecurity of the white man's position in relation to his environment and his aspirations for success (Kimmel, 2006).

But success wasn't coming to the majority of white men, in spite of all the efforts to indoctrinate them, including the banning of masturbation and excessive sexual

activity, as the expenditure of semen was seen as a waste of energies that were better directed toward commerce (Kimmel, 2006). A significant number of men were failing in the business world, which took a toll on their health; as stress levels increased, health levels decreased. Men were becoming pale and sickly, with less energy and diminishing vigor. It was clear that this had come to public notice due to the number of articles written on the subject. Something had to be done and quickly, and it was. Horace Greely and others told men to go west (Kimmel, 2006).

The frontier with its physical challenges was seen as a tonic and cure-all for the White American male, especially so for the younger man. Teddy Roosevelt was one of the boys who answered this call. He embraced enthusiastically all that the West had to offer, including physical hardship and war. He was able to change from a sickly youth to a robust man with "red blood in his veins". Roosevelt became a skilled woodsman and healthy specimen of what a man should be.

The west was also seen as an opportunity to begin again. It did not matter what you did in the East, you could succeed in the West with the right fortitude.

Other remedies were tried during this period (1840 to the turn of the century), one of which resonates strongly today: the fitness craze (Kimmel, 2006). Men were encouraged to build their bodies, if they could not build their bank accounts. Strength and virility were considered compensation for lack of financial success. Physical fitness was also touted as the ideal representation of the successful businessman. Gymnasiums and tonics did a booming business; unfortunately so did bars.

Male alcohol consumption was at an all time high and this permeated in all economic classes. Articles were written and Temperance Leagues were formed, primarily led by women (Kimmel, 2006). Religion became a women's domain, as it was considered too pious and 'goody-goody' a prospect for the self-respecting male. Ministers were considered 'namby-pamby' and poor excuses for men (Kimmel, 2006,).

An interesting dilemma evolved from this: although men were touted as the head of the house and women were assigned the domestic sphere, what was not considered, was that women also became domesticators. This was a position with a certain power (Kimmel, 2006).

Women had more authority and control in how the home was run; the result was that men were becoming more and

more uncomfortable in their own homes. This led to minimal contact with their children, which led to a fear that boys who spend too much time with mama will become "mama's boys." Men were afraid of this because three main influences in a boy's life, family, religion and education, were controlled by women. Thus there were stronger efforts to assimilate men back in their own homes. This was accomplished with two main thrusts.

First, marriages needed fixing. According to the critics of the day "companionate marriage" is the model to be used. This means that the love bond between husband and wife needed strengthening. The increase of faltering marriages caused such an alarm that the psychologist John B. Watson thought that marriage itself would disappear in the next 50 years (Kimmel, 2006) .

Next, men needed to be better fathers. Men were encouraged by the current writers of the day such as Harriet Beecher Stowe (Kimmel 2006), who said to men that the children need you and you need to spend more time helping out at home.

There arose another complication for the hegemonic male. Gay subculture was becoming more established in the turn of the century. This was the era of Walt Whitman, who

created a sensation by his rendering of the Calamus poems in *Leaves of Grass*, which were considered homoerotic. However, during the 1870s there was a degree of ambiguity between romantic friendship and expressions more erotic between two men. Whitman's work reflects this aspect eloquently (Miller, 1995).

It was also the time of Oscar Wilde (who was a friend of Whitman) with his 'green carnation' and subsequent trial regarding his homosexuality (Miller, 1995). It began in the 1850s and "by the end of the century, gay men had 'resorts in every large city'..." (Kimmel, 2006, p.68).

The increased openness of gay male culture increased the anxiety of the main-stream male population, which set the precedent for further actions of repression against homosexuals - as hetero-sexual men sought psychological distance from gay men, lest they be thought the same. This was considered devastating to heterosexual men, since gay men were perceived as having a total lack of masculinity. Men were deemed gay if they had demonstrated "an abnormal dread of dust and dirt" (Kimmel, 2006). According to historian George Chauncey, the effeminacy demonstrated in gay culture during this time was in the main, a probable

way to identify and signal that they were gay to available men (as cited in Kimmel, 2006).

These trends continued, as the other groups became more powerful. The flapper era of the twenties was considered to be a revolution in the norms concerning women. This was the precursor of the sentiment "drugs, sex, and rock and roll", as these women were considered at this time to be immoral libertines, who smoked, drank, and caroused to all hours. In addition, the flapper image is androgynous, since the ideal body for this image was that of a young boy, with breasts bound down and boyish hairstyles that minimized the feminine attributes of the female body (Kimmel, 2006).

Then came the Depression. Now, except only at the very top economic class, there was no financial success to aspire to: there weren't even jobs! This had a crippling effect on male identity, which was based on the idea that real men made money and dominated women. Men were again encouraged to spend more time at home with their children (especially their sons). This was in part, to give men a sense of positive involvement and success at something (Kimmel, 2006).

With the advent of Franklin Roosevelt's "New Deal" and the shoring up of the economy, came war. WWII was a major component in the formation of a strong hegemonic male identity, with an unexpected impact. The military also served as a coalescing agent for gay identity. Historian John D'Emilio described it so: "a substantially new 'erotic situation' conducive both to the articulation of homosexual identity and to the more rapid evolution of a gay subculture" (Miller, 1995, p.231).

Before WWII, and in spite of Walt Whitman and Oscar Wilde, gay people perceived themselves to be isolated as well as ostracized. There was no official recognition of homosexuality by the U.S. military, although there were penalties for specific sexual acts such as sodomy between males, which often resulted in lengthy prison sentences for those convicted. If gay men were rejected for service, other reasons were given; sex perversion was the closest they came to alluding to sexual orientation (Miller, 1995, p. 231).

This practice changed partially due to the increased psychiatric attention given to homosexuality in the advent of the war. The military became more concerned and saw the homosexual (according to Alan Berube who wrote *Coming Out*

Under Fire, which is about homosexual soldiers who served in WWII) as "...a personality type unfit for military service and combat" (Miller, 1995, p.232). In spite of the military efforts to screen them out, the gay population who went into service, found out just how many of them there were (millions). What had contributed to this was an incredible demand for personnel and the screening process was lax (Miller, 1995).

The laxity in the screening was primarily due to the criteria used for spotting homosexuals, which reflected the hegemonic view that all gay men are effeminate and can be easily identified by watching for feminine characteristics, as well as physiological attributes such as expanded rectums (Miller, 1995, p.232). The American military had no choice except to accept the existence of gay soldiers, even though they fought hard against it.

One reason for this acceptance was related to the military practice of farming out homosexual soldiers - both men and women - to stereotypical but essential functions. Lesbian soldiers (the ones identified as masculine) were made into mechanics. Gay men were given duties such as "...clerks, medics, hospital corpsmen, chaplain's assistants

and female impersonators in musical revues and morale boosting shows (Miller, 1995, p.233).

Newsweek, (1947) stated in an article that gay servicemen were above average in "intelligence, education and rating...law abiding and hard working. In spite of nervous, unstable and often hysterical temperaments..." (as cited in Miller, 1995).

There is an interesting anecdote regarding a lesbian sergeant working under General Eisenhower. One day she was called into the general's office and received the order to find and get rid of all lesbians in the battalion. Her response was that she would do this, but the general needed to know that her name would top the list. She then told the general that the list would also include some of the top performers in the unit. The general's response was to tell her to forget the order. Her unit was in fact ninety-seven percent lesbian (Kaiser, 1997).

The tolerance for lesbians in the armed forces was broader than for gay men (at least during the earlier years of the Second World War). For homosexual men, the army came up with the blue discharge program, which was deemed an undesirable (not classified honorable or dishonorable).

These were considered kinder, since the previous alternative had been prison (Miller, 1995).

The discharge program affected approximately nine thousand soldiers and sailors who were kicked out of service - mostly gay men. They were subjected to much humiliation before being actually released. They were locked into 'gay stockades' and made to march past soldiers who ridiculed them. Lesbians were asked intimate sexual details in trial hearings (Miller, 1995).

The U.S. military continued to struggle with the growing presence of gays within their ranks. Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson in 1943 "provided an exception for a soldier who had a homosexual experience but was not a confirmed pervert" (Kaiser, 1997, p.). This meant that after psychological rehabilitation, the soldier could return to his unit. In 1944 those who were seen as homosexuals were to be hospitalized, which made it easier to process them and have them removed from service (Kaiser, 1997).

However, this trend contradicted other military practices such as the army's sponsorship of drag shows. Not every performer was gay, but it gave a point of contact to those who were. These shows were enthusiastically endorsed by General Eisenhower (Kaiser, 1997).

According to Berube, there was a significant amount of homosexual activity during combat conditions. Part of this was due to a closer emotional bonding between soldiers (Kaiser, 1997). Another factor was the lack of opportunity for heterosexual sex during combat. The military position here was, it was not too bad, as long as the soldier felt really bad afterward (Cohan, 1997).

In support of this premise, Cohan mentions a 1943 army manual entitled "Psychology for the Fighting Man," which was a culmination of the findings that both represented military and academic points of view. Although not officially endorsed, it did give an idea of what the current trend of discourse during that time was touting, concerning sexual identity (Cohan, 1997).

Gay culture was firmly set in the military structure. There were even whole units that were mostly gay - as in Seventh Army Headquarters in Deauville, France (Kaiser, 1997, p.32). Military psychiatric research concluded that in spite of a tendency to be high strung, gay soldiers could perform exceptionally, which paralleled the *Newsweek* article (Miller, 1995).

Another issue derived from this war, is that not all soldiers were able to adhere to the ideal masculine

behavior as prescribed by the hegemonic model. Kimmel describes it: "Many soldiers in the Second World War, it turned out, could not fire their weapons and return enemy fire, and about 75 percent of all infantrymen rarely fired their weapons at all" (Kimmel, 2006 p.148). He also mentions that there were problems with incontinence and men who faked emotional disorders to get out of combat (Kimmel, 2006).

The phenomenon of 'shell shock', in which panic and disorientation in combat resulted in the inability for some men to wage war became recognized. This was during a time period where men who were soldiers were touted as real men. The intensity and hardship of war was considered a given, so there was not a lot of therapeutic intervention available for these men. They were basically expected to "get over it" because terror was natural and expected in combat: suck it up and deal (Kimmel, 2006). General Patton slapping the soldier who was afflicted with this malady best illustrated this attitude. Patton did not recognize it as a legitimate condition that warranted hospitalization; rather he saw it as a weakness of character (Kimmel 2006).

The aftermath of WWII presented problems in the area of family reconciliation. The separation in families and

the returning soldier's psychological issues were disruptive to the status quo of peacetime activity. *Good Housekeeping*, magazine told wives "He's head man again" and gave them the task of restructuring their home to meet this demand, regardless of what they would have preferred (Kimmel, 2006). Also, if the women did well in this task, their husbands "should have stopped their 'oppressive remembering' in about two or three weeks." They were wrong, since the post-traumatic dysfunctions of war proved to have a longer shelf life than predicted (Kimmel, 1995, p.148).

Women had been employed during WWII at a level that was unprecedented, but were now told to quit their jobs, resume their roles as housewives and mothers, and welcome their men home. Douglas Aircraft (who later became McDonnell Douglas) was a prime example of this, according to Susan Faludi (1999) in *Stiffed: the Betrayal of the American Man*. The plant in Long Beach, California "with a total of 175,000 workers, became the first in the world to build over \$1 billion worth of aircraft over the course of the war".

Eighty-seven percent of the workers at Douglas Aircraft during WWII were women. They were all fired and the company then replaced them with returning male

veterans, who were given the G.I. Bill, and had vocational certificates or college degrees. They were then moved to Lakewood, California, which was a "federally subsidized suburb next door." Male veterans could buy a house without a down payment with a mortgage payment of fifty dollars a month (Faludi, 1999).

Female veterans were not given the same treatment. The G.I. Bill favored mostly men, who also received unemployment pay along with educational allowances and home loans. Women were not as able to receive benefits. They had less access to benefit counseling, which was mostly done in male-dominated organizations such as Veterans of Foreign Wars. There was also discrimination in qualification criteria, which led to some women feeling that their wartime contribution was somehow worth less than their male counterparts. The status of women veterans served as a bar to employment (Cohen, 2003).

There was a rushed and artificial quality that permeated this time. Families were swiftly re-connected when possible, although some divorced. Suburbs were hastily constructed and so were many marriages to fill them. A bargain was struck between husband and wife many times, with little emotional investment. Wives gave affection and

loyalty, according to the tenets of the day, in exchange for financial security (Faludi, 1999).

In appearance, this was the stable nuclear family and considered the ideal. Television reinforced this ideal in the 1950's with programs such as "Father knows Best" and "Leave it to Beaver", which depicted happy homes with dads cheerfully in charge, with good jobs (not clear what they were, though), and devoted wives and children. This was not always reality.

The aerospace industry was designed in part, to serve the needs of employment for returning veterans as well as to provide Kennedy's "New Frontier" for the economy. It also helped to change the corporate structure in America.

Enter a new era of bureaucracy, middle management and hierarchical insecurity for the male employee. Jobs were created that were superfluous, with a complex infrastructure of managers managing managers with inflated job titles and 'perks'. McDonnell Douglas again is a prime example (Faludi, 1999).

Here was a place where almost all white-collar workers were "engineers", whether they had engineering skills or not. This too, had a serious effect on the men who worked there. It was difficult for them to maintain a semblance of

self-respect, when they knew they were not really earning their bread in any substantial way. Men were doing jobs that were for the most part meaningless, in a 'grey flannel' uniform that made all performance the same - inconsequential. This element eroded most of the positive feeling associated with work, considering they had little to no idea of what their work was suppose to accomplish. (They knew it was 'make work.')

Women at home felt this sense of lack also. Enter Betty Friedan's "problem with no name" (1963). While a magazine journalist, she researched, mainly through personal interviews for fifteen years, wives that were middle class and above. These were the women who supposedly had it all. They were mainly white, college educated, and successfully married to husbands with good jobs and a house in the suburbs.

These were the women who were told that being a housewife and mother was more fulfilling and the perfect capstone to the achievement of their degrees. Not all women expressed discontent, but there were enough who did. Friedan's (1963) book: *The Feminine Mystique*, chronicled the feeling and experience of the women who did experience

melancholy, a lack of purpose, and alienation from husband and children.

The feminine mystique is described by the following: "...says that the highest value and the only commitment for women is the fulfillment of their own femininity..." This translates into "...occupation housewife" (Friedan, 1963, p.43). The housewife - mother now becomes the sole model for women to follow.

So, with identity issues on both sides of the spectrum, we pass through the turbulent sixties. This was the time for serious revolution. It all happened in one decade: the generation gap, "black power", women's liberation, the Stonewall Rebellion and Viet Nam.

Hegemonic men continued to be knocked off balance with other groups wanting equality, as well as the erosion of their faith in government and its military. Now add the job market and economic instability of the seventies and eighties, with the breakdown of the manufacturing industry and the transformation to a service industry still pending; this meant that it was truer than ever, that those men were no longer identified by what they produced. Instead, they were measured by how much and at what quality they spent. This is not a new development, as the shift from

manufacturer to consumer had its seeds planted early in our history.

Thorstein Veblen in his treatise: *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, wrote ably on this developing trend. In his fourth chapter titled "Conspicuous Consumption," he observes: "Unproductive consumption of goods is honorable, primarily as a mark of prowess and a perquisite of human dignity..." (Veblen, 1899, p.69). This phenomenon became more intense as consumerism was more related to sex appeal, power, status, pleasure, and identity.

Consumerism was considered a patriotic duty in the fifties and sixties, as the amalgamation of products sold was considered the cornerstone of a growing economy. Retail analyst Victor Lebow in 1950 stated: "Our productive economy... demands that we make consumption our way of life that we convert the buying and use of goods into rituals..." Also it was noted, "We need things consumed, burned up, worn out, replaced and discarded at an ever-increasing rate" (Schor & Holt, 2000, p.463).

This was another reason why white male veterans were given such cushy, high paying jobs, in order to make them economically viable enough to keep spending. In the

fifties, this was an easy thing to do, with everyone so welcoming and life so full of promise.

Job security then was considered a given, and so was the steady climb up the corporate ladder to riches, power and status. However, more recently (eighties on up), with corporate downsizing, broken-down manufacturing plants, and the rapid deterioration of much of what was considered valuable, it becomes harder to see the point of consumerism when the demand is there, but the means of fulfilling it are becoming scarcer. Today, average Americans spend beyond their means, regardless of the lifestyle, resulting in an upward spiral of increasing debt and where applicable, both partners are working. However, hegemonic men still expect women to do the majority of the domestic chores as described in Arlie Hochschild's *Second Shift*.

The effect of social change upon hegemonic masculinity is cyclical. The same issues keep rising up with the same male reactions - fear, confusion, and aggression. Defining oneself as a man in terms of productivity or protection of one's family is a social construction that the economy no longer supports.

Levels of consumerism now define "providing for one's family". Refraining from domestic chores to accentuate

gender differences in the family now backfires as women, beleaguered by the need to work outside the home, resent and resist taking on all of the domestic work as well.

What had been considered to be core knowledge of what makes a man is constantly challenged as economic and social developments bring these once standard ideas to the dock. Groups have formed who articulate these challenges and new ideas, and they have gained political clout in the arena of gender relations, making the situation more tenuous and unstable for the traditionally trained hegemonic male. With current studies continuing to shed more complexity on gender issues, he becomes more entangled in ineffective strategies in his relationships, since he is not as able to articulate his role identities as he had in the past.

Cultural Manifestations

Gender and Sexual Identity in American Cinema

Culture can be defined as a reflection of the motivating influences in a specific population. Media representation is one of the strongest facets of that reflection. When it comes to cultural reflection in gender, we see that the dichotomy of dominant and submissive is continuously present among the sexes. It is the byplay of

this dichotomy that gives structure to our gender relations. This is especially true in media representation.

Advertisements, books, periodicals, television, radio, and film contribute a great deal to gender reference. We in society pick up on both, the denotation and the connotation of the messages that depict gender and sexuality. The more gender conscious we are; the more validity we attribute to these messages. The more aware we are of our sexuality and its repercussions, the more impact sexual messages will have on our perception of identity. Think about Erving Goffman's idea that gender is merely a portrayal and ritualized as described in his book *Gender Advertisements*. As ritual becomes more repetitive, the ideas encased in it become stronger in our consciousness and the more we are aware of them. (Goffman, as cited in Adams & Sydie, 2001, p.515).

Visual impact is more immediate in most cases than cognitive impact. If this is true, then visual combined with auditory and the impact of motion would be even more powerful as a cultural influence. It is along this line of thought, that I chose film as a unit of analysis.

A film is similar to a painting. Both are at the onset, original canvasses of artistic expression, opinion,

emotional rhetoric, or a combination of these and other elements. Also, what the artist is attempting to convey is not always the same as what the viewer receives. Both forms of art have been and continue to be, used to send messages that run the gamut of political, cultural, religious, and relational issues.

Hegemonic masculinity, being the predominant gender ideology, has become a core element of gender depiction in film. However, it is not the only representation. The subtext of these other portrayals is often in conflict with the hegemonic ideal. At no time was this more prevalent in American film history than in the period circa 1940 - 1960.

In order to understand this phenomenon and its significance to male identity, we must first go back to the origin of film in America. One of the earliest films extant (1895) was of two men dancing together. "The Gay Brothers" directed by William Dickson for Thomas Edison Studios (Russo, 1987).

It is important to note that what this represents to a particular viewer today is not the same as what it represented to a viewer back then. One reason is that we are further along in a process of assimilation of a more varied gender experience, which was just developing at the

turn of the century. Even though there was knowledge of a homosexual population, attitudes and actions had not coalesced into what we currently see. Two men dancing may have been a homosexual representation, or it may just mean that these were the performers that were the most convenient and there weren't any women around. I say this to emphasize that the examination of cultural context, requires more effort than a cursory observation. Even the term "gay" had a different message than it does now.

The specter of feminization in men haunts the hegemonic male. It is made clearer when it is considered how many films actually featured men in drag. Fatty Arbuckle's "Miss Fatty's Seaside Lovers" (1915) and Wallace Beery's "Sweedie" series (1913) (he plays a Swedish maid) are examples. "A Florida Enchantment" (1919) represents another facet in gender transformation - that of sex role reversal. The plot is based on a man who eats magic seeds and turns into a woman; however, this was not a permanent condition (Russo, 1987). This was the social and cultural dynamic that gave impetus to the longstanding tradition of feminized and gay portrayals of men in film.

One of the earliest traditions in this genre is that of the "sissy". Vito Russo stated in his book *Celluloid*

Closet, that the sissy was characterized by tiny stature, pale skin, mincing walk and feminine type expressions and actions. He was often used in film in order to secure the masculine status of the mainstream masculine actor. By comparison, he could make any man look manlier. Russo said, "Early sissies were yardsticks for measuring the virility of men around them" (Russo, 1987, p.16).

An example is in the film "Sailor Made Man" (1921) where Harold Lloyd was aboard a ship where men were dancing together. His dance partner kept slapping him while they danced. In essence he was being punished as the scapegoat for the ambiguous behavior of all the men present, as the identified sissy. According to Russo, "The spectre of the real underlying fear of homosexuality arose in several Harold Lloyd's comedies always by farcical chance" (Russo, 1987, pp.17, 18) His heyday was in the twenties and thirties and was followed by the "pansy".

The pansy was gay - exaggerated, flamboyant gay. This was the first cinematic recognition of the gay population. He was seen as ridiculous, but not considered dangerous to the moral sense of the heterosexual moviegoer. "The Spoilers" (1923), a Laurel and Hardy parody of the western "The Spoilers", depicted an obviously gay cowboy as he

showed romantic infatuation with Laurel's character, who then rejected him, so the cowboy dropped a flower pot on Laurel's head (Russo, 1987).

The pansy ushered in a more tangible consciousness of homosexuality that was comedic exaggeration, to an audience, who probably would not have been able to handle it otherwise. Other examples are as follows: "Just Imagine" (1930) and "The Warrior's Husband" (1933) were two films that showed the men as feminine, weak and silly, while the women were strong and intelligent. In 1934, "Wonder Bar" had a scene where two men were dancing together looking deeply into each other's eyes. Al Jolson as the host commented wryly 'boys will be boys ...woooo' (Russo, 1987, pp. 39, 40).

This may have been the extent of sophistication in the cinematic image of gay people, except for one thing - the gay population in actuality. I am referring to the members of the audience who were gay, albeit not advertising the fact, the gay performers, directors, scriptwriters, and producers, who permeated the industry against common knowledge (Russo, 1987). They had a significant influence on how male gender was personified. Montgomery Clift, Chuck

Connors, Tennessee Williams, and Howard Hawks were considered major players in Hollywood, and all were gay.

A significant change in gender and sexual orientation in the movies was marked from 1940 to 1960. This is because of the intervention of the Hays Commission as a censorial board (also known as the Breen Commission). During pre-code Hollywood, movies were continuing to push the envelope of morality.

Nudity and adult themes were becoming more common and there was no governing board setting limits. Religious groups (especially the Catholic Church) protested and finally William Hays - a former postmaster general, was chosen to head Motion Pictures and Directors of America, which created the Motion Picture Production Code in 1930, an in-house censorship board for the motion picture industry. It was done in order to ensure enforced morality on the motion picture industry (Russo, 1987).

The Hays Commission attempted to crack down especially on gay representations. This did not eliminate them; they simply slipped in to a deeper level of audience awareness, through more subtle depictions and clever subtext.

Some portrayals were not that subtle. "The Maltese Falcon" with Humphrey Bogart, Peter Lorre played an example

of this subtlety in his character. Although it was never mentioned directly, he was coded homosexual by the system of props and mannerisms that existed for that purpose. He smelled of gardenias, used a perfumed calling card, and carried a cane, which he stroked (like a penis?) There was even a scene where he put it in his mouth - suggesting fellatio. His manner was effeminate (this was considered by the straight population as a dead give away in spotting homosexuals), and he went down after one punch from Bogart after bracing Bogart with a gun.

There was a more subtle depiction in the character of Sidney Greenstreet's gunsel, a young man who also played as boyish and effeminate in spite of the fact that he was a killer.

Bogart himself is a study in contradiction. Known to favor tough macho roles, he was also the quintessential misogynist. When Lauren Bacall was his wife, she revealed his 'woman in his pocket' concept as a 'joke dream' depicting the ideal woman. The idea was that a man should be able to pull a woman out of his pocket when he wanted and put her away at other times, with the exception of those times at night when he would want her 'life-sized' (Cohan, 1997, p.100).

However, the contradiction lies in the complexity of the roles he plays. His roles are angry and alienated with almost a desperate desire to affirm himself as a 'real man' in spite of evidence of ambivalence in his motives. "Dead Reckoning (1947) - Bogart portrays a WWII war veteran who avenges the framing and subsequent death of his wartime buddy by going after his treacherous and murderous girlfriend. He romances her and sets her up for a fall. At one point the girl - Coral asks Rip (Bogart): "Don't you love me?" [Bogart responds] "That's the tough part of it, but it will pass.... These things do in time.... Then there's one other thing: I loved him more" (Cohan, 1997, p.89).

The nature of that love is not clearly defined. There was a scene in the same film where Rip (Bogart) is alone with his buddy Johnny and Johnny takes off his shirt to wash up. Although Rip does change his position, he keeps his eyes on Johnny's body in a way Cohan concludes as homoerotic (Cohan, 1997). It is easier to see how in even the most hegemonically represented portrayal of men, there can always be a lingering question that has not been cinematically resolved.

Gender representations of men became more ambiguous as time went on. "Anchors Aweigh" (1945) with Frank Sinatra

and Gene Kelly, illustrates this theme, when both actors playing sailors who are also best friends, gave perceivable mixed messages in their portrayals. Frank Sinatra played a softer kind of man who seemed more interested in being with Kelly, even though their main interest was supposed to be finding women. Grady Sutton (a gay actor) played Kelly's rival for his love interest - easily bested by the more macho Kelly. Russo (1987) had described this movie in this way. I saw it and have to agree that the gender ambiguity is visibly present.

"Rope" (1948), Alfred Hitchcock's thriller, went a step further in depicting a real life murder involving a gay male couple who murdered one of their classmates, giving us a sense of the tension between homosexual portrayals restrained by the censorship of the times. Although the couple was gay (including the actors who played them), at no time was it directly stated. Yet, the intimate connection between the two was palpable (Russo, 1987).

Lesbians too had their representations in movies such as "Queen Christina" and "Dracula's Daughter", which both had visible lesbian undertones. Then along came a more direct representation with "Young Man with a Horn" (1950)

where Kirk Douglas' wife leaves him for another woman and "Caged" (1950) depicting lesbian culture in prison. Hope Emerson played a sadistic lesbian prison matron.

There was another exception to the ban on homosexuality, which became more prevalent in the fifties. You can openly portray gay people in film, if you made sure that they had tragic endings. One example is the film "Children of Loneliness". This movie was originally released in 1939, but was banned because it was considered immoral. It was re-released in the fifties. One episode has a lesbian girl attempting to seduce the heroine. After consultation with a psychiatrist, she rejects the lesbian girl, who responds by trying to throw acid in the other girl's face. She throws it back, hitting the target and the lesbian girl, half-crazed with pain, runs out into the street and gets run over by a truck (Russo, 1985).

"Rebel without a cause" with Sal Mineo (another gay actor) who played a sensitive, effeminate boy who had Alan Ladd as a pin-up photo in his school locker. His relation to James Dean was considered ambiguously suspect, and he was beaten up and finally killed by police.. This was the norm for this genre until the late sixties (Cohan, 1997).

Rock Hudson was the conundrum of gay persona in the sixties, gay himself; he mainly played straight hyper - masculine roles: soldier, lover, man in charge. He had the looks that many women went for and took advantage of this to advance his career. In one movie however, "Pillow Talk" with Doris Day (another gender ambiguous performer in Calamity Jane), Rock actually played a straight man who pretended to be gay in order to woo Doris. To those in the know, this was the ultimate insider joke - a gay man playing a straight man pretending to be gay. This symbolizes the complexity of gender personification as the decade progressed (Cohan, 1997).

Sexually oriented and gender representations, reflected the issues and turbulence of the sixties, seventies, and eighties. There was the Stone Wall Rebellion (1969), where the clients of a gay bar in New York fought against police for three days and became a clarion call for the initiation of the Gay Rights movement and similar organizations (Miller, 1995). The reason this particular event had such an impact is because it told the gay population that it had muscle. Gay people could organize and fight back against the oppression that they endured. The result was electrifying for the gay community and this

was reflected in not only a more visible presence openly in cinema, but a more varied one as well.

The personas became more powerful and at times darker. There were negative portrayals of gay or transsexual psychopaths; however, there were also comedies such as "Norman is That You?" (1970), which showcased not only a male gay relationship, but also an interracial one.

Up to and throughout the nineties this trend continues. One of the ground breaking films in the eighties that was gay oriented was "Making Love", for the first time two men, young, attractive, white, and successful were shown in an actual erotic scene and both of them lived. This was unprecedented and brought forth a new level in this genre.

Al Pacino's film of the nineties "Cruising" was not well received by the gay community. There were various protests including picket lines deploring this dark projection of gay life. Pacino was a cop assigned to go under cover and penetrate the sado-masochistic gay bar scene in New York (featuring real gay leather bars such as the Anvil and the Mineshaft), in order to catch a gay murderer. The film focused on the leather bars and emphasized the dehumanization of gay culture as men prowled

the streets looking for sexual liaisons that were completed on the street, in bars, parks, or anywhere that was available.

The men were depicted as cold and impersonal in their contact (men again, emotionally unavailable), the lighting was dark and oppressive, and the twist in the plot is that the film had an ambiguous ending, leaving you to wonder if Pacino's character had crossed the line and was a murderer himself who was discovering his own gay tendencies. Not exactly a balanced picture of gay culture (Russo, 1985).

Films then, gave a multi-level look at different aspects of gender that would not have been processed, if not for the implementation of these gender cues and symbols. The ideal of hegemonic masculinity for the mainstream moviegoers was in direct conflict with the variety of gender and sexual orientation that was actually displayed.

It would be impossible to measure the contribution that these gender and sexually varied additions have made in the formation of male identity. All of these factors had to have been recorded and processed at different levels of awareness; yet, much of this was not obvious to the average viewer.

This would mean that most people, who saw these films, might have been influenced in their perception of gender, in ways they were not aware. This could have had a significant impact on gender perspective - not just on men but also on women as they had experienced their men.

Effects on the Hegemonic Male

Male identity is no longer, for the hegemonically trained male, a secure place. The identifiable signposts that were instrumental in developing his perspective of himself and other men, no longer serve any of his purposes as effectively as he had come to expect. He still retains dominance in societal spheres (and still has a per capita higher salary than women overall), but only in the broadest sense.

As he attempts to use this dominance for personal betterment, he is finding out that the formula for success has only been beneficial to a few. Yet he is considered to have received a uniform benefit package, with little to no downside, by other groups, who perceive him to be a threat. This is, in a way, shocking to him, since he always saw other groups as the threat and he was only trying to preserve what he supposed was his.

Kimmel and Messner in *"Men's Lives"* tell us that "Men construct masculinity in accord with their position in social structures and therefore the access to power" (Kimmel & Messner, 2004, p.3). If this is true, what happens if the social structures break down? Then what men perceive as masculinity will also break down.

Masculinity then can be seen as a reflection of gender security for the hegemonic male. It is a locus of identifiable traits that tells him not only who he is, but also who he is supposed to be. If a man's masculinity is not verified by evidence of strength, stability, and integrity proven by life experiences, then the masculinity is turned inside out and loses its focus.

Adaptive strategies used by hegemonically trained males are translated into male identity concepts related to their areas of influence and control. Some of these concepts have resulted in destructive behavior by hegemonic men. Some men have lashed out violently to those who are not in their circle of friends; these reactions have extended to close family members, which are attested to, by the levels of spousal and child abuse that have been perpetrated.

Victor Seidler in *Rethinking Masculinity: Philosophical Explorations in Light of Feminism*, tells us regarding the violent responses of men about a partial incentive, "Sometimes we can retain control in our relationships through the very sanction of our tempers" (May, Strikwerda & Hopkins, 1996, p.71). This would mean that violence does not have to be present, as long as the potential is seen as probable. Hegemonic masculinity would have a certain utility in promoting a violent persona even if men were not violent in nature.

Other men turn on themselves, through alcoholism, drug abuse, alienation from friends and family, depression and suicide. Still others just muddle through, nothing dramatic - they function in job, home life, hobbies and personal interests, but there is no sense of ambition or goal-oriented behavior.

Then there is the group that rebels. These are the ones, according to feminists that are guilty of "backlash". This is one interpretation of this term, Christina Hoff Summers, author of: *Who Stole Feminism: How Women Have Betrayed Women*, referring to the concept promoted by Faludi and Wolf, deemed 'backlash', as more of an intangible oppositional force, regarded by feminists as a major

threat, due to its ability to undermine the feminist cause not only through men but also through women who support, directly or indirectly, patriarchy (Sommers, 1994). The men assigned this term are the tangible evidence of male oppression. They are the 'dyed in the wool' misogynists that unfortunately are the most visible in their reaction and general behavior.

There was a time when men and masculinity were singularly tied together. Now men who have depended on this as an axiom of life are now in a process of identity diffusion. Authors such as Judith Halberstam and Judith Butler will tell you in no uncertain terms that masculinity no longer belongs to biological males and it never did. Halberstam is especially emphatic in her book *Female Masculinity* (1998).

Even the title is a declaration that men have false claims on this particular gender trait and the inherent privileges thereof. In a historical treatise regarding masculine women in the nineteenth century, Halberstam is adamant that we must view female masculinity as separate from lesbianism. The two components may often occur concurrently, but are not the same.

To describe the archetype of 'female husband', she tells us of Anne Lister (1791-1840), an Englishwoman who kept a set of diaries describing her intimate relationships with other women. She was fairly wealthy, having inherited an estate that protected her from much of the criticism and censure she would have had to endure due to her masculine persona. She took pains to separate herself from identification with "Sapphic artifices" versus her "natural tendencies".

Her masculinity was apparent even though she still wore women's clothing. She specialized in married women who were abandoned or mistreated by their husbands. In sexual activities there was no reciprocity, as she did to her partners, yet did not allow them to do to her, because it would feminize her.

Halberstam emphasizes that Anne Lister was not trying to imitate men and that her masculinity emanates from her being and complemented the woman she was. She was a masculine woman, who seduced married women into lesbian relationships, yet she was not a lesbian herself and her boundaries reflected it. (Halberstam, 1998).

Masculinity does not belong solely to men. This premise would beg the question: how do men then define

masculinity? It is because so many men have not found the answer to this question, that men are experiencing an overall shift in their identity and where will it take them. This shift is for some is frightening.

Even the subject of sexual orientation for the hegemonic male is a more complicated picture than otherwise assumed. They are for the most part heterosexual reportedly; however, for a significant number of men, this is not a fixed criterion. There have been visible shifts or anomalies on the sexual identity continuum. How else can we explain the phenomenon of identified straight males embracing gay culture, nightlife and entertainment for the companionship and job prospects; or what about the appeal for television shows such as "Queer Eye for the Straight Guy"? This element points to a relaxing of the restrictive aspects governing what constitutes a heterosexual male. There was a time when if a man were identified straight, he would go to great lengths to avoid proximity to those who were not.

Another example of this shifting is the phenomenon of "the down low" that established in the culture of black identified straight men. Keith Boykin's: *Beyond the Down Low: Sex, Lies, and Denial in Black America*, gave a

stunning picture of what was said and what had actually transpired regarding this trend. According to Boykin, one problem that exists, in even discussing this subject, is the inconsistency in the definition of the term - 'down low'. What did it actually mean and whom does it include? Boykin asks the reader to compare brief summaries on seven people; some are identified as gay, while some are identified as straight, in varying degrees of homosexual involvement and representing different nationalities, both men and women.

Then he asks the question: which one is on the down low? He goes on to say, "In the years since the media began to hype the down low, no one has ever really defined it". It is seen at the end of the chapter, after consulting with several 'experts', Boykin makes the qualified statement that the down low is about secrecy in sexual behavior. It is not race-related or whether you are HIV positive, as the media had portrayed (Boykin, 2005).

This issue had achieved notoriety due to the belief that black men who engaged in gay sex were responsible for an increase of the incidence of AIDS in black women. This is where these men seek out homosexual liaisons, but do not want the name for it. Here is complexity in itself. Some in

this group simply object to being identified as "gay" which they consider racially inappropriate. They would use other terms such as 'same sex love'. They are aware that they are homosexual and accept it to varying degrees.

The varying degrees part is where the picture gets more enigmatic. Now we are getting to the group that live predominantly heterosexual lifestyles including sleeping with women and occasionally seek out sexual contact with men. These men do not identify as homosexual and have come up with various rationalizations to support their claims to varying effectiveness. One example is of a man who had taken into consideration how much time he spent as a heterosexual, compared to the time he spent as a homosexual and concluded that because his homosexual activity came up to only one - two hours per week, it was inconsequential (Boykin,2005).

To make the dilemma in attaining an accurate picture of heterosexual male identity more problematic, we have not yet considered the issue of straight men who have not acted in homosexual ways, yet have fantasized about it frequently. Would they be considered purely heterosexual, or heterosexual with gay leanings - and if this is accurate, what exactly does this mean?

Now let us take heterosexuals with gender variation such as transvestites and transsexuals. How do these categories contribute to hegemonic male sexual identity? What do we say about the white middle-aged husband who is straight, but likes to wear his wife's lingerie - known only to his wife; or the same man secretly discontent and contemplating a sex change in relation to male identity?

These factors of sexual ideation are more significant to the identities of hegemonic males than most would assume. Kimmel informs us "*Transvestites and cross-dressers reveal the artifice of gender*" (Kimmel, 2000, p.110). The term artifice suggests skilled deception and is apt to the discussion of gender performance as it encompasses the role of costume and mindset that goes hand in hand with gender ideation.

Hegemonically trained men have been told at different times, different things, which at times overlapped - adding to their confusion. For the most part, they are told that they are on top and must remain that way, and the way to remain on top is to be stoic, and put women, homosexuals, racially and economically inferior males in their place and keep them there.

They were also told they must be breadwinners, fathers, husbands, and must be sensitive to the needs of their significant others. This is interesting because in order to accomplish the latter, they must tap into an emotionality and vulnerability that they have no training in dealing with, and are not supposed to have, (remember they were trained to be unemotional) and yet, to remain on top they must succeed in all that is expected of them.

This is not to say that there isn't anyone who is willing to help them; the problem is that men, who are hegemonically conditioned, are trained to be suspicious of anyone who requires them to acknowledge that they need help. Trust and vulnerability are the issues here. Hugh LaFollette in his essay *Real Men* said, "The influences of our sexist culture make trust difficult for most men" (May, Strikwerda & Hopkins, 1996, p.121). They are trained not to seek help even when they need it.

This aspect increases the alienation and isolation that a lot of these men feel, and thereby reduces their effectiveness in taking advantage of any assistance, or in dealing with any emotional aspect of their lives, which they cannot escape, since emotion is part and parcel of

human existence. Anger seems to be the only acceptable emotional outlet.

The social conditioning in education and politicization of the hegemonically trained male is inconsistent. Yet from the time they were boys, they tried to absorb whatever they were told and for the most part, be what they were supposed to be - according to who was guiding them at the time. The result of this has been, although they are powerful from a macro perspective; they are losing power, status, continuity, self-confidence and personal effectiveness in living well, from a micro perspective. How can this be?

Macro Benefits of Hegemonic Masculinity

As mentioned earlier, men are still holding on to the majority of power in government and business, making higher salaries, retaining more of the top positions in their fields of endeavor, According to Kimmel in: *The Gendered Society*, This form of inequality not only relates to per capita income discrepancy between men and women, but also to how sex segregation classifies 'male and female professions' and pay those occupations designated female less (Kimmel, 2004).

An example given was that of clerical work, which originally was male dominated, and paid reasonably well until the middle of the twentieth century, when it was seen by the U.S. and Great Britain as less valuable, because during that time most of the workers in the field were women.

Another example that worked in the opposite way was computer programmers. Kimmel states that in the forties, women worked as keypunch operators, "...the precursor to computer programmer", because to the employer, this looked like clerical work. However, when it was discovered that programming demanded proficiency in "abstract logic, mathematics, electrical circuitry and machinery", even though women were handling it with little difficulty, men wanted in; subsequently, wages were substantially raised (Kimmel, 2004, p.191).

Regarding per capita income, there is a definite wage gap. Women earn seventy-seven cents to a man's dollar. In 1996, women lost approximately 100 million dollars due to income discrimination. Although there is some differentiation due to education and age, the gap is still very much in favor of men (Kimmel, 2004).

Micro Costs to Men

A reasonable question now comes to mind: given this financial superiority in a land of choices, just how are men losing out? In order to answer it effectively, we will have to look closer at how income translates into actual quality of life for the hegemonic male.

Utilitarianism is a concept that emphasizes desire. *The Blackwell Dictionary of Sociology* defines it: "utilitarianism views the core of the ideal human existence as the individual who is motivated by rational self interest, seeking pleasure and happiness and avoiding pain and unhappiness" (Johnson, 2000, p.338). Satisfaction of desires and urges, either psychological or sociological as manifested by physical acquisition becomes the main goal of the consumer.

The problem for hegemonically conditioned men is that it is this very goal that is consistently thwarted by their own choices. They are not doing very well in avoiding pain and unhappiness, and that is directly related to their hegemonically driven identity.

Emotional Lives

Relationships to Wives and Children

One of the most common themes in Susan Faludi's *Stiffed* is the alienation of boys from their fathers and the negative repercussions that occurred. This trend was seen whether she discussed Viet Nam veterans, juvenile delinquents, porn stars, gang members or the sexualized hazing at the Citadel.

Billy Shehan of the Spur Posse, a group notorious in the nineties for initiating a 'sex for points' game, while seeking celebrity on the talk show circuit was discussing Little League baseball. He had stated that the problem was that it was a "dad's game", meaning that fathers treated their son's participation in sports as if it was their own and subsequently brought a great deal of pressure and guilt to their sons.

Billy had said "My dad, he was living through me with sports... Sports are what our dads embedded in us. It was like a disease and it contaminated the whole town" (Faludi, 1999, p.123). Faludi goes on to say that fathers were probably just trying to pass on a legacy of accomplishment; however the reality is, kids like Billy who were white, middle class and college educated, just weren't buying it.

Hegemonically conditioned males are known to be alienated from their children. Their sons, required to grow

up in their father's shadow, which includes a burgeoning hegemonic identity, are uniquely affected. Dan Kindlon and Michael Thompson's: *Raising Cain*, in a chapter entitled "Fathers and Sons: A Legacy of Desire and Distance" points out an "emotional gulf separates most sons from their fathers.... For too many sons, this emotional breach between them and their fathers remains a lifelong source of sadness, anger, bitterness, or shame" (Kindlon & Thompson, 2000, p.95).

If this is true, then since many of these men are also fathers, the quality of the relationships between hegemonically conditioned men and their sons, is consistently being eroded by the choices these men have been trained to make, regarding interaction style and content concerning their sons (after all isn't this the only way to raise a son to be a man?). This construct affects the family structure as a whole by the emotional interplay or lack of same, as the emotionally spontaneous boy is transformed into the emotionally distant and repressed angry man.

Hegemonic males are prone to negative outcomes in their intimate relationships due to their emotional unavailability and lack of skill in social interaction. We

did cover in brief father and son, but this trend extends to spouse, friends and relatives as well.

Take marriage: the irony here is that marriage is as a rule, more advantageous to men than women. Married men live longer and healthier lives, earn more, and are generally happier than unmarried men; yet, a significant number of men do not embrace their marriages in a way that enhances or even sustains them and therefore they lose them.

A telling point is that originally in this country, it was unhappy women who sought divorce as an alternative. Kimmel cites "a recent study found that three of four women listed pathological behaviors by male partners (adultery, violence, substance abuse, abandonment) as their reason for divorce" (Kimmel, 2004).

If this is accurate, then these male partners chose actions that moved away from their own best interests, given that to be married is considered a more desirable condition for men than to be unmarried. Benefits include regular and safe sex; domestic needs met (meals, house cleaning etc.); affection and nurturing with a compatible partner; and a family structure that allows him free access to his children.

Why would this be? Men are getting married, then sabotaging their marriages. This does not sound rational or in their best interests, and yet it is prevalent as almost half of all marriages end in divorce (Kimmel, 2004). It would be naïve and inaccurate to say that divorces are solely caused through the negative participation of men; however, it does suggest that a significant number of men have not figured out an effective strategy in preserving their marriages.

The interaction problems that hegemonic males face can be linked to their allocation and acquisition of resources. Resources such as time, money, energy and emotional availability are the determining factors of success in any relationship, be it commercial or intimate. If hegemonic males are distributing their resources away from their significant others and instead moving toward isolation, alienation or escape, then the return for their investment will in terms of utility be summarily low. Just what are these men trying to escape?

It is the pressure of not knowing where they stand or how to win. Hegemonic males must win. It is in the societal mandate. Yet how can they win, if they do not know how to play? The rules are beyond them, as they do not match the

game that these men are in, and in fact some rules even are contradictory, as is the mandate; being emotionally distant prevents him from also being there for his family and only being trained to win prevents him from knowing how to survive losing, or teaching that to his son; what happens when he loses?

These are the actual concepts that are in place regarding building effective relationships with others: such as, effective communication must be given and received, or that intimacy is built on mutual trust and respect. Not all hegemonic males are ignorant of these ideas, but who to apply them to and when, does not seem to include those in their more intimate circles.

Instead these ideas appear to be mainly applicable to those, who like themselves, are in the same state of bewilderment. It is reasonable to see this 'as the blind leading the blind'. Susan Faludi's description of the Christian men's group, The Promise Keepers, which in essence was a network of support groups for men under Christian doctrine, describes this effect.

The emphasis here was on men who were experiencing marriage failure to one degree or another, encouraging each other to take back the leadership role that was biblically

mandated in their homes. What Faludi saw was the overall ineffectiveness of this group at the cell level. This was in spite of rousing pep rallies and marketable consumer items reflecting the organization.

Although the men in these groups attempted to be supportive of each other, they did not know how to translate their willingness into tangible guidelines, outside of Biblical platitudes. They lacked real leadership. As a result, these cell groups actually reinforced the helplessness of each member. Eventually at the time of her writing, Promise Keepers gradually disbanded, partly from leadership issues, but at the cell group level, faith was lost in the group's ability to sustain itself.

A typical example from an actual meeting is as follows on pages 287 - 288 of chapter 5 in Faludi's *Stiffed*. One member questioned why no member of the group had called or asked about a member who was in crisis (and who was currently present) and had been absent for 4 weeks. The outspoken member had directly stated "...do we care...? After a guilty silence and a round of shifting blame, group members started to address the member who was in crisis with verbal reassurances that they loved him. Jeremy Foote, the

outspoken member, added after the group's "We love you Frank" chant, "even though we never call you". Jeremy never returned (Faludi, 1999,).

Clearly, just because men band together, does not mean that they know how to support each other or solve problems. Without solutions to their problems, they can't win. What the experiences of Promise Keepers teach us is that men will stumble and fall without a functional plan. To help solve intimate problems of its members, a group must know and practice intimacy themselves. Therefore planning must stem from this intimate structure. Obviously Promise Keepers and groups like them do not do this well - if at all.

Alcohol

Those who are experiencing pain and dissatisfaction in their lives tend to seek various forms of escape. For hegemonically trained men, this is no different. One of the foremost preferences for escape is the consumption of alcohol.

Drinking has been consistently linked with hegemonic masculinity. A real man, one who can 'hold his liquor' is powerful, attractive and virile (which goes against the current findings linking impotence to alcohol). Lance

Strate's essay: "*Beer Commercials: A Manual on Masculinity*" tells us about the "Jocks, rock stars and pick-up artists..." who inundate the advertising for beer, while more 'sensitive types' are excluded (Kimmel & Messner, 2004, p.533).

Current studies suggest that excessive alcohol consumption is becoming more and more prevalent with younger men by way of fraternities and sports events. Boswell & Spade's essay: "*Fraternities and Collegiate Rape Culture*", stated "...drinking dominated high-risk fraternity parties.... A rape culture is strengthened by rules that permit alcohol only at fraternity parties" (Kimmel & Messner), 2004, p.187).

Add one more factor, Jean Kilbourne's: *Can't Buy My Love: How Advertising Changes the Way We Think and Feel*, said: "Alcohol is also linked with over half of violent crimes, domestic violence, rape, and child abuse" (Kilbourne, 1999, p.156). Kilbourne also tells us that the alcohol industry itself has a stake in not only increasing alcohol consumption, but also to actively encourage alcoholism, and start people thinking about and drinking alcohol at a younger age. This is because the main support

of the alcohol industry can be classified as heavy drinkers.

This is an alarming situation in regard to male identity. The alcohol industry rakes in billions a year and much of this is fueled by hegemonically trained men who are not told to drink in moderation, but to drink as much as they can, since this is what will enhance them as men.

Rocco L. Capraro wrote in his treatise *"Why College Men Drink"* that drinking is "male domain...male dominated, male identified and male centered". He goes on to say, "Men outnumber women in virtually every category of drinking behavior used in research for comparison..." (Kimmel and Messner, p.191). Part of the twenty seven percent of the surplus derived from the wage gap is spent here.

This is not to say that every man who drinks will fit a negative profile; however, every male is subjected to the same messages and will respond to them according to the degree of emotional security and personal autonomy each possesses. If the degree of security and autonomy is low in a particular man, he will in all probability be more susceptible to the messages of toxic excessive consumption that are being bandied about in his environment. Hegemonic

masculinity does not promote either emotional security or personal autonomy.

Poor and Working Class Men as Producers

"Men as consumers" is not an image that sits well with hegemonic males. They were trained to be producers (or at least be seen as one), and became accustomed to the benefits and status that adhered to this role.

An illustration of this dilemma comes from Faludi's description of Kerwin Scott, brother of the notorious Crip gang member "Monster Cody" author of "Monster," an autobiography about his experience as a Crip. Faludi informs us that "...he kept hoping to discover some passage through the consumer economy that would lead to a useful manhood, grounded in work and care" (Faludi, 1999, p.489).

This is a primary issue: producer versus consumer is the locus of conflict in the hegemonic male. In a study of poor and working class white males, Michelle Fine, Lois Weiss, Judi Addelston and Julia Marusza Hall found that "The poor and working-class white boys and men in this [study] belong to a continuum of white working-class men who up until recently in U.S. history have been relatively privileged. These men, however, do not articulate

themselves inside that history" (as cited in Kimmel & Messner, 2004, p.67).

This is the irony; we as a society, see hegemonic males as a privileged class with little to no down side in their existence, since they have the power. Yet, more and more of these men fail to 'articulate' into this perspective. The existence of poor and working class hegemonically trained males speaks in opposition to the societal premise that they hold all the power, not to mention those that are unemployed.

What we fail to see at this time in the social sciences is that the classification of macro versus micro is both illusory and interdependent. They are mainly perception devices that provide a certain facility in ordering our observations regarding the environment and phenomenon we choose to study. The interdependent aspect is what makes things less clear in studying people. Men in a general group are considered a macro unit of analysis, while men as individuals are considered micro.

The actuality is that men operate simultaneously as group members and as individuals. This is in conjunction with a multi-tiered interactive process that is governed by a man's perception of himself and his world order. This

world order is linked in varying connections to the 'others' occupying that world with him.

Men are then privileged in this society. But whether the privilege he possesses translates to a privileged position in his life can only be seen by the criteria used in judging 'privileged position'. The indices used to classify utility in an individual's existence must align with said criteria. When this is done, the picture takes on more depth.

When traditionally trained men have made some efforts in resolving their concerns, such as the Men's Rights movement initiated in the seventies (that was immediately seen as evidence of backlash by some feminist groups), their communication was clumsy and ineffective. The spirit of these organizations was defensive, to the point that it overshadowed the potential effectiveness of resolving the group's more legitimate concerns. Many of the responses were emotional and immature, and this led to the movement's demise at the time. Kimmel refers to "angry white males... felt besieged by frenzied 'feminazis' and a culture of entitlements, affirmative action, and special interests...sick and tired of being oppressed by women and dominated by impersonal bureaucracies...and they were not

going to take it any more" This was given in the spirit 'you are not the victims, we are' (Kimmel, 2006, pp.197-198).

However, the existence of these groups also signified a genuine need to be heard on the same forum as other groups, and a willingness to communicate on the same level. This was an important development as men were trying to speak of their pain and were experimenting with their emotions as a viable form of expression. They were not very good at it; I would say the main reason for this is that they did not have a lot of practice.

One of *The Men's Rights Movement and the Nurturing Agenda (versus) the Toxic Triad: Chivalry, Machismo, and Homophobia*, the more well-spoken advocates of men's rights is found in Francis Baumli. His although it appears angry, it does lend a unique and articulate balance to the argument for men's rights. Baumli's (1999) initial premise is that a men's rights group should be primarily concerned with men and their concerns; however, this does not make a men's rights group automatically oppositional to the aims of other gender organizations.

As an example, he tells us that "The men's rights movement does not support feminism because feminism

indulges a habitual misandry and sexism toward men; but the men's rights movement does support women's liberation because it believes that women's liberation is supportive of men's liberation, e.g., a woman earning a just wage relieves a man of the burden of being a family's main provider" (Baumli, 1989, p.3).

Baumli also challenges the belief that men have all the power. Instead, there are arenas of power that men and women possess: "male power: political, economic and sexual - on the streets; and arenas of female power: domestic, emotional and sexual - in the home." He goes on to say that by only implementing a holistic change in society are the negative aspects of conflicting arenas of power lessened (Baumli, 1989, p.4). Baumli, although in obvious bias, offers an alter-native cognitive path in exploring the ramifications of power and advocacy in gender organizations.

Hegemonic males are still responding to what they are told, while watching the foundations for what they are told (and tell themselves) continue to erode. Without a practical blueprint for identity reformation, they have no other recourse except further disorientation and gradual

self-destruction while continuing to have a toxic effect on today's society.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

Challenging the Status Quo

Although it is clear that the subject of this thesis is hegemonic masculinity, what is not as clear in popular contention, is that men are distinctly separate from hegemonic masculinity. When various groups discuss traditional men, the assumption appears to be that hegemonic masculinity is engrained in the male psyche.

Take the statement "men are the oppressors"; this is a common saying among certain feminist groups. As we take a closer look at this statement, it is easy to see that if taken at face value, it would mean that all men are oppressors and only oppressors. It also implies that they all oppress by designation and entitlement.

Also, the most common usage connotes that those that are oppressed are only women. In addition to these factors, what has also manifested in some arguments is that because men are the oppressors, there is no need to be concerned about the concerns of men. Let us examine - men the oppressors more closely from a different angle.

That there have been women who have been oppressed by men, there is no doubt. There are men who have been abusive and cruel to women, children, gay and lesbian people, transsexuals, and others deemed unacceptable or inferior in their view of society.

However, in order to make this statement more accurate and precise, you must include at least one other word - some. Some men are oppressing women. The use of the word some in discourse calls for an ability to distinguish and use discernment in how the statement is targeted. Some implies not all.

Although this is an obvious concept, I found it to be missing in the positions taken regarding oppressive men and their victims. The word 'some' opens some important doors.

For example, if not all men are oppressing, then the oppressing cannot be essentially inherent to the male sex. This would mean that oppressive behavior is learned and a product of social conditioning.

If this premise were more utilized in discourse, we would hear more statements such as - "there are some men who are hegemonically conditioned that have oppressed women". This approach would lend more incentive to explore

the complexity of what does constitute the experience of men in this society and also the nature of the oppression.

Another aspect rarely entertained, is that men oppress other men. This is evidenced by the need for labor unions, the Civil Rights movement as well as gang units in police forces. A more accurate statement would be as follows: men who have the temperament, latitude and means, oppress those who do not. If this is true, that men oppress other men, then the subject of male oppression is not totally and cannot be limited to men oppressing women.

The common denominator of both types of oppression is fear. Hegemonic masculinity is a fear reaction that stems from a perceived lack of security in self and environment - the core of which is economic. When the economic status of men is perceived to be in danger, male reaction has turned to oppressive behavior in order to preserve status, privilege, wealth, esteem, or relational control, just as a drowning person may pull down those around him.

On a grander scale, R.W. Connell in his essay: *Masculinities, Change and Conflict in Global Society: Thinking about the Future of Men's Studies*, is attempting to coordinate a geo-political perspective regarding the study of masculinity in men. One of his reasons for this

is, "Recent research has documented different forms of masculinity, but has not succeeded well in showing how they are distributed across populations" (Connell, 2003, p.7). Connell goes on to discuss the connection between "ethnic differences in masculinity" and the importance to social conflict. On page nine of the same essay Connell ties in "commodification, neoliberalism, and market society", which he ties into the concept of 'world gender order'.

Another revelation that is noteworthy occurs on page 11, "The movement of populations and the interaction of cultures, under colonialism and post globalization have linked the making of masculinity with the construction of racial and ethnic hierarchies" (Connell, 2003 pp.9, 11).

What this suggests is that hegemonic masculinity, as part of a study of masculinity in general, will be seen as more active in a geo-politico-economic system of inquiry. When you analyze the influence of national conflicts and how goods are distributed within a specific populace, if there are men involved (and there usually are), then the form of masculinity that is manifested will play a part in the decision-making regardless of the stakes or scale involved.

Of course this is more of a macro perspective; however, the premise of fear related to economic status holds true in micro as well, if viewed from the perspective of the individual relationships of which hegemonically conditioned men have been a part.

The historical record reflects that men were hostile to women when women wanted to work, which would give men competition and reduce the number of available jobs, as well as giving women more independence. This is not to say that threat of economic status was the only reason for a hostile male reaction; however it was a consistent factor that continues to this day. Not that prior to women seeking enhanced economic status, there were not incidents of cruelty towards women by men, who possessed that temperament, but it took a threat to economic status to make it official, and pervasive in the major social institutions, and culture.

Another common statement is that "men are violent." This again is a general statement that leaves out some important points. The first point is that violence is not totally restricted to men, although it is noted that the majority of incidents are committed by men. Kimmel informs us that men commit eighty to ninety-nine percent of violent

crimes in this society (Kimmel, 2000, p.265). He goes on to state probable factors contributing to the high rate of male violence. He rejects biological origin and promotes gender inequality as the element with the most impact (Kimmel, 2000, p.267).

However, women have been and can be violent with enough provocation and motivation. Women do engage in violence, in varying degrees and for similar reasons as men. A historical example would be that of Apache women who would at times torture and kill enemy captives. In her rare treatise, *Apache Women Warriors*, Kimberly Moore Buchannan on page 23 gives us a detailed image of one of these times:

Some Chiricahua Apache women were asked to kill and torture captives... They say they used to bind Mexicans with hands behind their backs. Then they turned the women loose with axes and knives to kill the Mexican prisoner. The man could hardly run and the women would chase him around until they killed him... When a brave warrior was killed, the men go out for about three Mexicans. They bring them back for the women to kill in revenge. The women ride at them on horseback with spears.

Buchanan makes it clear throughout her book that her aim is not to vilify Apache women, but instead to give an accurate portrayal of the empowerment and status that the women had which reached farther than the popular westernized image of domestic squaw. She tells us first that in Apache society, the women were esteemed. Husbands married into the wife's family. Like the Spartans, women were trained from the time they were children in survival and warrior skills such as horsemanship, shooting a bow and arrow and to be able to fight and run fast. There were women who actually went on raiding parties with the men, including a famous one named Lozen who was highly esteemed by Geronimo. Survival and revenge for dead husbands or relatives were the principle motivation for violent acts. (Buchanan, 1986).

A more current example of women who resort to violence would be female serial killers or women who physically retaliate against a physical attack. This is why it is important when discussing violence whether perpetrated by women or men that we understand something about the motivation for it, because violence is purposeful even when the purpose is not readily visible.

There appears to be a trend that as women have adopted more masculine mannerisms and traits, their mode of purporting violence is becoming more similar to men (e.g. women in street gangs). The degree of incidence may be significantly less than that of men, but it is also important to note that not all crime is reported (many men would rather die than tell the police that their wives beat them up) and this too for various reasons.

Social norms support violence while deploring it. There are situations when violence is not only tolerated, but also expected. The most common justification is defense of life, either yours or someone else's. Another is in defense of country: war. However, as we know, violence is perpetrated for many different reasons, some more justifiable than others. Violence or the threat of violence is also utilized as a tool of control for many in society.

There are people out there who are predatory in nature and need little provocation. There is one aspect directly observed by this writer: if a person possesses the combination of being physically intimidating and is predatory in nature, he or she is more apt to use directly violent methods to secure what they want or retaliate for perceived insult or damage.

If he or she does not possess these characteristics to the degree that it would be effective, then any violent measures would be more indirect. They would more likely set traps for their victim that would lead to injury, or hire someone to do it for them.

Are there definable differences in violence committed by men as opposed to women? Outside of common assumptions regarding method, for example it is a truism that women would be more apt to use poison to murder someone - than a man, who would prefer a gun, knife or bludgeon; there also appears to be a difference in the mode of violence. Men appear to be more explosive and spontaneous, while women are more calculating.

Also according to Kimmel, women engage in violence from a more defensive than offensive position in the main, and focus on someone who is known (Kimmel, 2000, pp.270-272). However, we must be careful with statements such as these, because without an in depth knowledge of the individual and environment, related to the victim, any conclusions made about any particular case would be spurious at best.

What we do know is that violence in today's culture is gendered masculine. For the hegemonically trained man,

violence is the most direct way of controlling the situation; and control of the situation is what he has been trained to have. Therefore, while both men and women use violence, and use it differently, it is no accident that the vast majority of reported violence is perpetrated by men. It is part of the training as a hegemonic male.

Another assumption to be challenged is the implication that men move as a coordinated organizational unit when they are oppressing. Just as in any group - for example, feminists, there is a general organizational structure with various multi-tiered divisions, which manifest as cliques, subgroups, factions, sects and partisan groups.

Kathy Rudy in her essay: *Radical Feminism, Lesbian Separatism and Queer Theory*, in discussing her personal experiences in Durham North Carolina, which was a lesbian community in the seventies and eighties, clarified some of the individual partisan groups of that community "Radical feminism, essentialism, woman-identified-woman, lesbian separatism, cultural feminism - these are all terms that share borders around the territory of a similar set of lived political experiences" (Rudy, Spring 2001, p.3).

She describes the struggle for unity and the obstacles that came when issues were discussed. Each contributes to

diversity in agenda, methodology, and motivation. With the feminists, there were broad divisions such as liberal, radical, and socialist, which in turn broke into subgroups that spanned the human condition, as in Rudy's adopted community, taking into consideration race, sexual orientation, gender variation, the geo-political scene. Currently they are working to resolve a significant number of positions which only add to the complexity of voice that characterized the feminist movement.

If we are to look at men as an organized group, then it does appear that it is necessary to regard them with similar features of diversity. Regarding hegemonic masculinity, you will find that there are men who wholeheartedly support it, those who are against it, those who are indifferent and just along for the ride, meaning they may have benefited from the hegemonic system, but are not that invested, and those who are so far from the mainstream that it hardly touches them.

There are strong voices and weak voices. There are men who are trying to redress grievances of men (example: father's rights advocates), and there are men who are trying to address grievances of women (male feminists), and sometimes they overlap. There are male bullies and there

are male victims. These are the men who people would commonly refer to as 'wimps', 'doormats', the person that Rodney Dangerfield personified ("gets no respect.") There are domestic spousal abusers and henpecked husbands. There are gay bashers and those who respect and support what they perceive as simply alternative lifestyles.

There are varying degrees of religious or spiritual belief, along with political and social ideologies that different men adhere to. There are men who like and respect women and those who don't. These are just a few of the parameters when it comes to male diversity.

Also, in regard to the popular position that there are distinct masculinities, this writer is not thoroughly convinced. There is support for this position. Harry Brod (1994) gives us the insight that "one result of pluralization is that men's studies then becomes less about men, more about the important challenges of diversity, and effectively less invested in countering hegemonic forms of masculinity (Brod, 1994, as cited in Justad, 2000 p. 5).

The idea of multiple masculinities appears to me, to dilute the focus in finding a solution, to the degree that masculinity is not taken as a whole, to what Justad characterizes as "hegemonic forms".

The core element of masculinity in each case is that of instrumentality and effective action in achieving one's objective. This does not change in any gender or sexually oriented treatment in masculinity. What appears to be more true, is that the same masculinity and its attributes are apportioned unequally according to who is dominant, and is on a continuum with masculine and feminine polarities.

Alternative Perspectives

The original parameter of discussing male social development was that of manhood - maturation from boys to men. Kimmel discussed this parameter as it was seen during the time of the American Revolution in this way, "Being a man meant also not being a boy. A man was independent, self controlled, responsible; a boy was dependent, irresponsible and lacked control" (Kimmel, 2006, p.14).

This then, was the ideal that they strove for. It was only relatively recent in our history where this parameter shifted to discourse of masculinity vs. femininity as we are more familiar with it today. In this writer's opinion, this shift in parameter illustrated a shift in context in male training from one that was complementary to community, to one that is oppositional.

This development had huge repercussions that resonated in our society. The maturation process called manhood was predicated on societal need. Men were taught to be strong, protective, and productive, with a moral code that encompassed honor, respect and consideration to others.

The noted historian E. Anthony Rotundo said "that men of the colonial and Revolutionary eras 'especially were judged by their contribution to the larger community. Before 1800...close link between manhood and social usefulness" (as cited in Faludi, 1999, p.11).

It was necessary, as the exigencies of survival required a certain type of response to the hostile or destructive elements that lambasted men's and women's existence. These elements included the physical challenges of hardship, wild animal attacks, food threatening conditions such as inclement weather, agricultural blight and insects, and lastly and perhaps more telling, dealing with the criminal element in humanity, in the form of men (and sometimes women) who preyed on families and considered innocents.

The problem was not in the manhood training process. Men trained in such a manner were held to a high expectation of behavior by the rest of the community. The

Men in order to be viable members of society need a strong identity and perspective that emphasizes the message that they still have a contribution to make to society in themselves and for themselves that is and will be respected by those they cross paths with. It is important to listen to the concerns and grievances of hegemonic men, just as it has been important to listen to the concerns and grievances of all other groups we have given voice to.

This is true, if for no other reason, than it is historically reflected, that we have inherited most of our societal difficulties by refusing to do just that. Groups who are not heard become more isolated in society. With isolation, comes fear on both sides of the social spectrum, hostility, militancy and aggression. With no position of redress, we have revolutions with the subsequent destructive aftermath on a small or large scale.

If the reader takes nothing else from this writing, it is my hope that one thing is retained. You may disagree or disapprove of some or all of the positions evident, if this is the case, use your disapproval to seek out a deeper level of awareness than before, a more viable construction that satisfies your sense of correctness.

The main thing that I am interested in is to shed light on some dark corners of our comprehension, by contributing to the enhancement of the discourse and methodology adhered to by those representatives in the appropriate fields. This is because if any who read this thesis are active members of a group that has influence in the discussed areas of this project, it will be your voices that will carry the day.

In conclusion, with all that has been said in the areas of discourse, history, cultural manifestation, effects and challenges concerning the plight and fate of the hegemonic male; it is important to remember, that just like all other humans on this planet, he is not a sociological abstract; he is a man who lives, succeeds and fails, like any other person, and must be dealt with in the same vein.

Hegemonic masculinity is a social construct and fear response that is separate from the man who was trained in it. It is only with genuine support and alternative training from boy to man, that we as a society can reap the benefits of a more proactive, socially responsible group of men. Not all would respond favorably; however, the key word to practical resolution is some - some can always lead to more.

problem was that due to the diversity in men, men adhered to the training in varying degrees and those that violated it became the abusive element and the predators and miscreants in the community.

This was seen also in how women were traditionally viewed. Although regarded as the 'weaker sex', in that they were not regarded as physically strong and needed male protection, the point here was by training, they were to be protected. Women were placed in a position of perceived value, especially due to the scarcity in some areas. Women were companions who shared the work, hardships and all of the rest of what made life difficult. Women were also instrumental in providing what made life more pleasant and palatable. Men well trained in the code of manhood knew this and appreciated it.

There is more recent work regarding this theme. Ian M. Harris wrote an essay: *Men as Standard Bearers*, that after reviewing the current literature of the time of his writing, had this to say: "After an exhaustive empirical study...I discovered that the aspect of male gender norms most valued by men in the United States is what I call 'standard bearing behavior,' an aspect of masculinity that has been left out of presentations about male behavior"

(Harris, 1994, p4.). He then goes on to describe four categories of cultural messages given to men: "scholar, nature lover, do the best you can, and good Samaritan" (Harris, 1994).

What changed is that as technology and commerce progressed and communities were grounded in the industrial age and the exigencies of business and manufacturing, separation of spheres led to the perception of women being a suspected hostile other (Kimmel, 2006). This factor had, in effect, changed the discourse and perception of women as a duality to men, both a temptation and a threat - hence the dichotomy of masculinity vs. femininity with the latter as undesirable. What led to more disruption is that the term manhood itself became more obscured and was used synonymously with masculinity in the discourse of the time, with no one the wiser regarding its original distinction.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I have attempted to bring forth for the reader's consideration, the importance of taking a second and deeper look at hegemonic masculinity and how it relates to men, with a more detailed account of their existence. Hegemonic masculinity is not desirable in this society because it is a fear driven social construct that is driven by what men are not(not effeminate, not homosexual)instead of what they are.

It is my hope that this writing, will initiate different roads of research and study that will take into consideration how the needs of men complement the needs of others, and this need does not go away because the man is declared a hegemonic male.

Whether the hegemonic male approves or not, gender and sexual diversity are the main pillars of not only our history, but also the subsequent development and growth of everyone who identifies with any group of distinction - including the more familiar divisions of race, religion and economic class.

REFERENCES

- Baumli, F. (1989). The men's rights movement and the nurturing agenda (versus) the toxic triad: Chivalry, Machismo, and homophobia. *Transitions*. Manhasset: October 30, 1989. Vol.9, Iss.5; pg.11. Retrieved from Gender Watch database. January 15, 2006.
- Bodroghkozy, A. (2004). Where have you gone Mary Richards? Feminism's rise and fall in primetime television. *Iris*. Charlottesville; Fall 2004. Iss. 49; pg. 12. Retrieved from Gender Watch database. February 3, 2006
- Boon, K. A. (2005). Heroes, metanarratives, and the paradox of masculinity in contemporary western culture. *Journal of Men's Studies*. Harriman: Spring 2005, Vol.13, Iss. 3; pg. 301. Retrieved from Gender Watch database. January 15, 2006.
- Boykin, K. (2005). *Beyond the down low: Sex, lies and denial in black America*. New York: Carroll and Graf.
- Buford, H. (2005). The gay market goes mainstream. *The Gay and Lesbian Review*. Worldwide. Boston: February 28, 2005. Vol. XII, Iss. 1. pg. 22. Retrieved from Gender Watch database. February 3, 2006.

- Cohan, S. (1997). *Masked men: masculinity and the movies in the fifties*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Connell, R.W. (2003). Masculinities, change and conflict in global society: Thinking About the future of Men's Studies. *Journal of Men's Studies*. Harriman: Spring 2003. Vol. 11, Iss. 3 pg. 249. Retrieved from Gender Watch database. January 15, 2006.
- Cornish, P.A. (1999). Men engaging feminism: A model of personal change and social transformation. *Journal of Men's Studies*. Harriman: January 31, 1999. Vol.7 Iss. 2; pg. 173. Retrieved from Gender Watch database. January 15, 2006.
- Cossman, B. & Danielson, D. & Halley, J. & Higgins, T. (2003). Gender, sexuality, and power: Is Feminist theory enough? *Columbia Journal of Gender and the Law*. New York: December 31, 2003. Vol. 12, Iss. 3; pg. 601. Retrieved from Gender Watch database. February 3, 2006.
- Croteau, D. & Hoynes, W. (2003). *Media society: industries, images and audiences*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.

- Dines, G. & Humez, J. M. (1995). *Gender, race and class in media: a text reader*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Doucet, A. (2004). "Its almost like I have a job, but I don't get paid: Fathers at home re-configuring work, care and masculinity. *Fathering*. Harriman: Fall 2004, Vol.2 Iss. 3; pg. 277. Retrieved from Gender Watch database. January 15, 2006.
- Epstein, B. (2002). The successes and failures of feminism. *Journal of Women's History*. Bloomington: Summer 2002. Vol. 14, Iss. 3; pg. 601. retrieved from GenderWatch database. February 3, 2006.
- Faludi, S. (1999). *Stiffed: The betrayal of the American Man*. New York: Harper and Collins.
- Finkbeiner, K.R. (2004). *The F word: Feminism in jeopardy*. Emeryville CA.: Seal Press.
- Foerisch, J. (2004). The trials of trialoguing in gay, lesbian and feminist studies. *Critical Matrix*. Princeton: Summer 2004. Vol. 15, pg. 75. Retrieved from Gender Watch Database. February 3, 2006.
- Frankel, L. (2004). An appeal for additional research about the development of hetero-sexual male sexual identity. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality*.

- Binghamton: December 31, 2004, Vol. 16, Iss. 4; pg.1.
Retrieved from Gender Watch database. January 15,
2006.
- Friedan, B. (1963). *The feminine mystique*. New York:
Norton.
- Goddard, K. (2000). "Looks maketh the man"; The female gaze
and the construction of Masculinity. *Journal of Men's
Studies*. Harriman: October 31, 2000 Vol.9, Iss. 1;pg.
23. Retrieved from Gender Watch database, January 15,
2006.
- Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female masculinity*. Durham & London:
Duke University Press.
- Harris, I. M. (1994). Men as standard bearers. *Journal of
Men's Studies*. Harriman: November 30, 1994. Vol.3,
Iss. 2; pg. 103. Retrieved from Gender Watch database.
January 15, 2006.
- Hoff-Summers, C. (1994). *Who stole feminism: How women have
betrayed women*.
New York: Touchstone.
- Jagose, A. (1996). *Queer theory: An introduction*. New York:
New York University Press.
- Justad, M. J. (2000). Women's studies and men's studies:
Friends or foes? *Journal of Men's Studies*. Harriman:

- April 30, 2000. Vol.8, Iss.3; pg. 401. Retrieved from Gender Watch database. January 15, 2006.
- Kaiser, C. (1997). *The gay metropolis: The landmark history of gay life in America since World War II*. San Diego: Harcourt, Brace & Company.
- Kimmel, M.S. (2006). *Manhood in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kimmel, M.S. (2004). *The gendered society*: 2nd edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kimmel, M. S. & Messner, M. A.. (2004). *Men's lives*. Boston: Pearson and Company.
- Kinser, A. E. (2003). Multivoiced feminism is messy and vibrant. *Women and Language Urbana*: Spring 2003. Vol.26, Iss.1; pg. 110. Retrieved from Gender Watch data-base. February 3, 2006.
- Lemert, C. (2010). *Social theory*, 4th edition. Philadelphia: Westview Press.
- Levy, D. P. (2005). Hegemonic complicity, friendship, and comradeship: Validation and Causal processes among white, middle class, middle aged men. *Journal of Men's Studies*. Harriman: Winter 2005. Vol.13, Iss. 2; pg. 199. Retrieved from Gender Watch database. January 15, 2006.

- May, L. & Strikwerda, R. & Hopkins, P. (edit. 1996).
*Rethinking masculinity: philosophical explorations in
 light of feminism*, 2nd edition. London: Rowman &
 Littlefield Publications.
- Miller, N. (1995). *Out of the past: gay and lesbian history
 from 1869 to the present*. New York: Random House,
 Vintage Books.
- Palahniuk, C. (1996). *Fight Club*. New York: Henry Holt &
 Company.
- Parish, J. R. (1993). *Guys and lesbians in mainstream
 cinema: Plots, critiques, casts and credits for 272
 theatrical and made for television Hollywood releases*.
 Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Company.
- Rinehart, R. E. (1998). *Players all*. Bloomington &
 Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Rudy, K. (2001). Radical feminism, lesbian separatism, and
 queer theory. *Feminist Studies*. College Park: Spring
 2001. Vol. 27, Iss. 1; pg. 190. Retrieved from Gender
 Watch database. January 15, 2006.
- Shackleton, D. (2004). Women's power over men. *Everyman*.
 Ottawa: July-September 2004. Iss. 65; pg. 10.
 Retrieved from Gender Watch database. January 15,
 2006.

- Stephens, E. M. (2004). Doing psychotherapy with men; Have feminist ideas blinded us to men's needs? *Everyman*. Ottawa: June- March 2004. Iss. 63; pg.40. Retrieved from Gender Watch database. January 15, 2006.
- Walter, L.(2003). "Bridges, chasms, and common ground: Multicultural and transnational feminism. *Feminist Collections*. Madison: Fall 2003. Vol. 25, Iss. 1; pg. 7. Retrieved from Gender Watch database. February 3, 2006.
- Watkins, A.W. & Rueda M. & Rodriguez, M. (1999). *Introducing Feminism*. Cambridge: Icon Books.