

**CONSTRUYENDO NUEVAS
MASCULINIDADES: LA REPRESENTACIÓN
DE LA MASCULINIDAD
EN LA LITERATURA Y EL CINE DE LOS
ESTADOS UNIDOS
(1980-2003)**

MEMORIA DEL PROYECTO DE INVESTIGACIÓN

Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales, Instituto de la Mujer
EXP. 62/03

ÀNGELS CARABÍ (IP)

ÍNDICE

1. INTRODUCCIÓN TEÓRICA	3
1.1 Orígenes y desarrollo de los estudios de la masculinidad	3
1.2 Temas	13
1.2.1 Masculinidad y conflicto bélico – Cristina Alsina	13
1.2.2 Masculinidad y etnicidad	14
1.2.2.1 Masculinidades afroamericanas -Àngels Carabí	15
1.2.2.2 Masculinidades asiático-americanas -Isabel Seguro	16
1.2.2.3 Masculinidades nativo-americanas -Àngels Carabí	18
1.2.2.4 Masculinidades árabo-americanas -Marta Bosch	20
1.2.2.5 Masculinidades chicanas -Bárbara Ozieblo	21
1.2.3 Relecturas y reescrituras de los clásicos -Rodrigo Andrés	22
1.2.4 Masculinidades y novela negra -Bill Phillips	24
2. OBJETIVOS	26
3. METODOLOGÍA	27
3.1 Hipótesis de trabajo	27
3.2 Selección del corpus	27
3.3 Desarrollo de la metodología	28
3.4 Temas y distribución de tareas	29

4. RESULTADOS	31
4.1 Publicaciones	32
4.1.1 DVD <i>Debating Masculinity</i> (2005)	33
4.1.2 <i>La masculinidad a debate</i> (2007)	34
4.1.3 <i>Hombres soñados por escritoras de hoy. Figuras masculinas en la literatura norteamericana</i> (2007)	35
4.1.4 <i>Multiculturalism and American Women Writers: Early Testimonies</i> (2007)	37
4.1.5 <i>Herman Melville: el poder subversivo del amor entre hombres</i> (2007)	38
4.2 Presentaciones en congresos y seminarios	39
5. CONCLUSIONES	118
6. ACTIVIDADES REALIZADAS	129
6.1 Seminarios y conferencias	130
6.2 Jornadas y congresos	133
6.3 Tesis doctorales y trabajos de investigación	138
7. BIBLIOGRAFÍA	140

1. INTRODUCCIÓN TEÓRICA

1.1 ORÍGENES Y DESARROLLO DE LOS ESTUDIOS DE LA MASCULINIDAD

Los estudios de la masculinidad se iniciaron en los Estados Unidos inspirados por el movimiento feminista y el movimiento de liberación gay de los años 60 y 70. Estos dos movimientos, que se habían nutrido del lenguaje liberador del movimiento de los Derechos Civiles, lucharon por dar visibilidad a las mujeres y al colectivo homosexual. Este proceso de afirmación implicaba, de manera indirecta, cuestionar la hegemonía del hombre heterosexual. Por tanto, en los países occidentales el sistema patriarcal, basado en el predominio del varón heterosexual y cuya ideología ha sido transmitida por la filosofía, la literatura, la arquitectura, el cine, la historia, la medicina, la política, los medios de comunicación, etc., fue puesto en tela de juicio por los movimientos sociales de los años sesenta y sus valores, dichos universales, sujetos a revisión (Carabí).

El primero de estos movimientos sociales, el feminista, ayudó a las mujeres a repensarse a sí mismas. En este sentido, el feminismo no sólo ayudó a las mujeres a cuestionar conceptos tradicionales de feminidad, sino la misma división sexual. Al reclamar cambios políticos y sociales, las mujeres pusieron en cuestión la mayoría de asunciones patriarcales, lo que finalmente contribuiría al desarrollo de una crítica de las normas de género hegemónicas. De manera similar, el nacimiento en 1969 del movimiento gay empezó a cuestionar la heterosexualidad normativa. Habiendo sido discriminados por largo tiempo, hombres gays y lesbianas se unieron para luchar por su causa, reclamando la libertad de orientación sexual como un derecho inalienable. El colectivo gay se manifestó espontáneamente en Stone Wall para defender la libertad de opción sexual y con su acto invalidó la exclusividad del modelo heterosexual normativo. Como el movimiento feminista, el movimiento homosexual prepararía así el terreno en los próximos años para el desarrollo del análisis de la masculinidad hegemónica/heterosexual.

Además de estos dos movimientos sociales fundamentales, el interés actual por los hombres y las masculinidades deriva del movimiento de los Derechos Civiles, que se forjó en los Estados Unidos a finales de los años 50 y se tornó extremadamente activo en la siguiente década en los EE.UU. y en otros países. Los participantes en el

Movimiento denunciaron el racismo y reclamaron la igualdad racial entre blancos y no-blancos. Como varios académicos han argumentado (Thomas DiPiero), la masculinidad y la raza blanca no son sólo interdependientes, sino que están articuladas de tal manera que cada una de estas categorías deviene más compleja por asociación con la otra. Al defender lo no-blanco, el movimiento de los Derechos Civiles estaba plantando también, por tanto, las semillas para la crítica de la masculinidad hegemónica/blanca.

Además de estos orígenes sociales, el interés contemporáneo en la masculinidad tiene también raíces académicas (Harry Brod). Desde finales de los años sesenta y principios de los setenta, los estudios de la mujer en los Estados Unidos han estado revisando los currículos académicos tradicionales incorporando el estudio del género en la mayoría de facultades y universidades. Los estudios de las mujeres han creado, pues, gran parte del vocabulario para discusiones académicas sobre la desigualdad y la construcción del género –a saber, las construcciones culturales de la femineidad pero también la masculinidad. Inspirados por la teoría feminista, los estudios de la masculinidad expanden y enfatizan, pues, el análisis de la masculinidad dentro de los estudios de género.

Los estudios de la masculinidad en los EE.UU. están también relacionados con los estudios gays/lésbicos/queer, tanto metodológica como sustancialmente (Brod). De una forma similar a la de los estudios de la mujer descritos antes, los estudios gays han pasado de proporcionar información simplemente a/sobre las personas homosexuales a cuestionar la naturaleza del binarismo heterosexual/homosexual. Por tanto, es cada vez más difícil distinguir entre estudios gays y estudios de la masculinidad en los EE.UU. De hecho, ambos comparten una serie de intereses comunes, como los efectos de la homofobia sobre la población general. Además, los estudios gays han resultado muy útiles, como Harry Brod ha indicado, para corregir la tendencia desafortunada de los estudios de la masculinidad en los EE.UU. de asumir demasiada similitud entre hombres.

Gran parte del reciente trabajo sobre masculinidades está incorporando cada vez más la raza al análisis del género. Ligando los estudios de la masculinidad y los estudios étnicos, académicos como Michael Awkward, Robyn Wiegman, David Eng, Alfredo Mirandé y Mrinalini Sinha, entre otros, han argumentado que la masculinidad está influida por la etnicidad de maneras muy importantes. En este sentido, la teoría de las masculinidades deriva también de los estudios críticos sobre etnicidad, que surgieron en

los EE.UU. en los años 70 y han mostrado cómo la raza es un componente esencial de nuestras vidas sociales y políticas.

Aunque los estudios norteamericanos sobre masculinidades han surgido gracias, especialmente, a (las intersecciones entre) los estudios feministas, gays y étnicos, todos los cuales tienen una historia de como mínimo tres décadas, el estudio de la masculinidad es, especialmente comparado con campos más establecidos como los estudios de la mujer, una incorporación reciente a la academia (Brod). Si bien es cierto que algunas de las instituciones más liberales de los EE.UU., como la Universidad de California en Berkeley, empezaron a ofrecer algunos cursos sobre masculinidades a mediados de los años 70, los estudios de la masculinidad no surgieron como un campo académico hasta los años 90. Desde entonces, han contribuido al desarrollo de una teoría crítica que es profeminista, pro-gay y dedicada a la mejora de la vida de mujeres y hombres (Judith Newton).

Desde principios de los años 90, pues, el estudio de la masculinidad se ha convertido progresivamente en el foco de revistas, programas y cursos universitarios. Diversos antiguos departamentos de estudios de la mujer en los EE.UU. (como los departamentos de la Universidad de Indiana, Rutgers o UCLA) han sido re-bautizados como departamentos de estudios de género a lo largo de la última década, pues han incluido tanto los estudios gays como de la masculinidad en sus currícula. Asimismo, muchos departamentos de sociología, psicología, antropología, historia, filosofía, filología inglesa, etc. han empezado a incorporar el análisis de la masculinidad en sus cursos y programas. Por tanto, el tema de la masculinidad no está ni debería estar limitado a (departamentos de) estudios de género, sino que se está convirtiendo cada vez más en un objeto de estudio interdepartamental e interdisciplinario.

Estudios multidisciplinares de la masculinidad

Históricamente, el análisis de la masculinidad se ha constituido, así pues, como un campo de estudio interdisciplinario, que se ha nutrido de las aportaciones teóricas de diversas disciplinas académicas, especialmente la biología, la antropología, la psicología y la sociología. El proyecto que hemos desarrollado durante estos últimos tres años se ha basado también, por tanto, en un enfoque interdisciplinario, pero intentando mantener una actitud crítica ante las diferentes contribuciones a la masculinidad por parte de diversas disciplinas. Aunque todas las disciplinas nos ayudan a comprender

mejor el significado y la construcción del género masculino, cada una de ellas resulta también limitada por sí sola, como han argumentado Michael Kimmel y Michael Messner, para explicar plenamente el funcionamiento de las masculinidades en nuestras sociedades. Por ejemplo, en biología, el reduccionismo genético, que relaciona directamente diferentes comportamientos de género a diferentes factores genéticos, ha sido cuestionado por la teoría genética más reciente en los EE.UU. que, desde los años 90, rechaza completamente antiguas asunciones según las cuales los genes determinaban la compleja acción humana de una manera estable o directa. Como Lynne Segal argumenta en el volumen *La masculinidad a debate* (Carabí y Armengol, 2007), no hay genes para todo, y mucho menos para explicar características de la conducta humana, social e históricamente construidas, tan complejas como el deseo sexual o la violencia. Nacemos machos o hembras, pero siempre nos convertimos en hombres y mujeres en un contexto socio-cultural e histórico específico. Las diferencias biológicas entre hombres y mujeres parecen influir en algunas diferencias de la vida social, pero no determinan los comportamientos de hombres y mujeres directamente (Kimmel y Messner).

Aunque algunas obras antropológicas como *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies* (1935) de Margaret Mead han mostrado la variación de los roles de género entre culturas diferentes, subrayando la fluidez del género y la primacía de la organización cultural, muchos estudios antropológicos norteamericanos, como *Hacerse hombre* (1990) de David Gilmore, insisten en la universalidad de las diferencias de género, que atribuyen a adaptaciones culturales específicas al entorno. Dichos argumentos revelan un obvio conservadurismo, pues sostienen que las diferencias entre hombres y mujeres son las que la naturaleza y la evolución cultural determinó, y no deben por tanto ser cuestionadas (Kimmel y Messner).

Si bien los modelos psicológicos han hecho contribuciones decisivas a los estudios de las masculinidades en los EE.UU., explicando muchos de los conflictos internos y frágiles identidades sexuales que conforman las psiques masculinas, el poder y los significados de la masculinidad derivan no sólo de la mente o interacción familiar, sino de más amplias relaciones de género sociales y políticas. Como Lynne Segal ha explicado, es la dificultad de superar el individualismo metodológico reinante en todo el pensamiento psicológico (la dificultad de superar la idea de que todas las explicaciones de los fenómenos personales y sociales pueden ser reducidas a hechos sobre individuos)

lo que hace tan difícil comprender por qué el cambio del varón es tan lento y tan contradictorio.

Asimismo, los estudios psicológicos sobre el género en los EE.UU. han descrito secuencias de desarrollo específicas para hombres y mujeres, aunque dichos modelos han sido cuestionados también por psicoanalistas feministas norteamericanas como Nancy Chodorow y Carol Gilligan. Estas estudiosas han mostrado, por ejemplo, cómo ciertas ideologías patriarcales hacen de la masculinidad el estándar y la norma para medir el desarrollo psicológico tanto de hombres como de mujeres. Inevitablemente, pues, la feminidad deviene problemática y menos desarrollada. Chodorow, por ejemplo, insiste que las diferencias “esenciales” entre los sexos son socialmente construidas y, por tanto, sujetas a crítica y al cambio.

Pese a sus contribuciones, esenciales al estudio de la masculinidad, muchos modelos sociológicos todavía se basan en la “teoría de los roles sexuales”. Diversos sociólogos siguen hablando de “roles sexuales” –a saber, el conjunto de actitudes, atributos y comportamientos que es visto como apropiado para hombres y apropiado para mujeres (Kimmel y Messner). Así, la masculinidad se relaciona a menudo con el dominio de la tecnología, la agresión, la competitividad, etc., mientras que la feminidad se asocia a la empatía emocional, la sociabilidad y la pasividad. La teoría americana de los roles sexuales informó una gran variedad de manuales de auto-ayuda que instruían a los padres sobre lo que debían hacer si querían que sus hijos/as crecieran como hombres o mujeres saludables. Sin embargo, diversas estudiosas feministas han empezado también a cuestionar la teoría de los roles sexuales, mostrando cómo las asunciones ideológicas sobre madurez y salud convertían la masculinidad en la norma para medir a ambos sexos (Kimmel y Messner).

Con lo apuntado hasta aquí, parece evidente, así pues, que los estudios de la masculinidad podrían enriquecerse de una metodología interdisciplinaria, que analizara diferentes cuestiones desde perspectivas diferentes (a veces incluso contradictorias) y, de esta manera, pudiera mantener un enfoque crítico sobre cada una de ellas. Usando una metodología interdisciplinaria, el proyecto “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades” se ha centrado, pues, en analizar la masculinidad desde perspectivas teóricas diferentes, incluido algunas de las contribuciones más recientes a los estudios norteamericanos sobre masculinidades por parte de áreas como la sociología, la psicología y el psicoanálisis, la antropología y la biología. Dicho enfoque interdisciplinar nos ha

ayudado a mantener una postura crítica ante los diferentes modelos explicativos de la masculinidad procedentes de diferentes disciplinas académicas. Si muchos proyectos sobre masculinidades se inscriben en una disciplina concreta, nuestro proyecto se ha centrado, pues, en un novedoso análisis interdisciplinar de la masculinidad.

La aportación original de nuestro trabajo ha sido la inclusión de la literatura. De hecho, durante la última década, se ha publicado un gran número de estudios sobre representaciones de la masculinidad, muchos de ellos en los Estados Unidos. Este interés creciente por explorar las imágenes del género masculino en la literatura, el cine, los anuncios publicitarios, los medios de comunicación, etc. podría reportar importantes beneficios sociales, pues el análisis de las representaciones culturales de la masculinidad nos ayuda a entender mejor su construcción social. De hecho, numerosas teóricas feministas han mostrado cómo “el género es (una) representación” y cómo “la representación del género *es* su construcción” (Teresa De Lauretis). De ello se concluye, así pues, que los estudios de las representaciones culturales del género (masculino) pueden resultar particularmente relevantes para el análisis de la construcción social de la masculinidad. En este sentido, el teórico de la masculinidad Michael Kimmel ha comentado que mientras que los primeros estudios de las masculinidades -publicados en América en los años setenta y ochenta del siglo XX- surgieron de los campos de la psicología y la sociología, desde los años noventa se está haciendo especial hincapié en las representaciones culturales y literarias de la masculinidad (Carabí y Armengol, *La masculinidad a debate*, 2005).

El proyecto “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades” ha ahondado en el novedoso campo de estudio de las representaciones literarias de la masculinidad. Además de explorar la genealogía y desarrollo de los estudios de las masculinidades literarias en los EE.UU., nuestra investigación se ha centrado en explorar las aplicaciones prácticas de los estudios de las masculinidades a la crítica de la literatura estadounidense. A lo largo de estos tres años, hemos constatado que dichos estudios podrían contribuir a una interesante relectura y revisión de las letras norteamericanas. Por un lado, los estudios de las masculinidades ayudan a cuestionar imágenes tradicionales patriarcales de la masculinidad en la literatura. Por otro lado, estimulan la búsqueda de nuevos modelos de masculinidad en la literatura estadounidense, menos sexistas, racistas y homófobos. Dichos modelos alternativos de masculinidad se vienen formulando con frecuencia en la literatura de escritoras estadounidenses, quienes están no sólo cuestionando valores

masculinos patriarcales como el individualismo y la competitividad, sino “soñando” también con nuevos modelos literarios de masculinidad, con atractivos hombres “de ficción”, más sensibles y menos competitivos, menos individualistas y más relacionales. Así pues, el proyecto “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades” ha prestado especial atención a los modelos masculinos en la literatura de escritoras estadounidenses actuales, cuyas obras nos invitan a reflexionar sobre la necesidad -y la posibilidad- del cambio social del varón y de las relaciones de género tradicionales.

Estudios de las masculinidades literarias en los EE.UU.: orígenes y desarrollo

Uno de los primeros y principales estudios críticos sobre masculinidades en la literatura norteamericana fue *Manhood and the American Renaissance* (1989), de David Leverenz. Basándose en varios discursos teóricos y críticos como el feminismo, el nuevo historicismo, el psicoanálisis (y, hasta cierto punto, la deconstrucción), Leverenz analiza las representaciones de la masculinidad en la literatura de cinco autores americanos canónicos que escribieron alrededor de 1850: Emerson, Hawthorne, Melville, Thoreau y Whitman. Según Leverenz, todos estos escritores sintieron, conscientemente, que no encajaban dentro de las normas dominantes de la masculinidad de su época, y la mayoría de ellos se sintieron feminizados por su “sensibilidad” artística y por su vocación como escritores en la esfera doméstica, lejos de la esfera pública/masculina. Además, Leverenz esboza tres ideologías de la masculinidad en el noreste americano antes de la Guerra Civil: patricia, artesana y emprendedora, sugiriendo que en la América anterior a la Guerra Civil las ideologías más antiguas del patriarca gentil y de la independencia artesanal fueron cuestionadas por la nueva ideología, de clase media, del individualismo competitivo. Así pues, este académico establece interesantes vínculos entre conflictos de género y clase, sobre todo el conflicto de clase fundamental en el noreste americano desde 1820 hasta 1850: la batalla por el poder entre la antigua elite de terratenientes y la nueva clase media de emprendedores hombres de negocios. Leverenz concluye: “la clase media ganó, y su ideología de la masculinidad como individualismo competitivo todavía domina la vida americana” (1989, p. 3). Otro aspecto del trabajo de Leverenz es su atención a las representaciones de las masculinidades en la literatura de mujeres escritoras americanas del siglo XIX como Caroline Kirkland, Sarah Hale, Susan Warner y Harriet Beecher Stowe, quienes, como Leverenz sostiene, “iluminan conflictos de clase y género en la vida americana

con excepcional claridad, incluso dureza” (p. 4). Finalmente, el estudio de Leverenz de textos como *La cabaña del tío Tom* (1851-2) de Harriet Beecher Stowe añade la raza al género y a la clase como categorías analíticas, y establece una serie de interesantes vínculos entre los tres conceptos. Sin embargo, *Manhood and the American Renaissance* presenta también una serie de problemas, sobre todo referentes a la homofobia. Leverenz establece a lo largo de su obra una asociación explícita entre la homosexualidad, la pasividad masoquista y la humillación (Rodrigo Andrés). Fundado en el miedo y en el odio a la homosexualidad, el trabajo crítico de Leverenz acaba promoviendo ideas y estereotipos tradicionales del homosexual y, por consiguiente, deviene anticuado y alienante, como Rodrigo Andrés ha concluido, para la mayoría de lectores contemporáneos.

Aunque el trabajo de Leverenz es generalmente considerado como fundacional del estudio de las masculinidades literarias, la investigación contemporánea sobre el tema está proporcionando nuevas e interesantes perspectivas, la mayoría de ellas de índole más progresista. Resulta imposible hacer referencia aquí a todos los nuevos resultados de la investigación actual en este campo. Subrayaremos, sin embargo, algunos de los que han sido descritos como particularmente relevantes e innovadores (Murphy, *Fictions of Masculinity*, 1994). Por ejemplo, la obra *Gender, Fantasy, and Realism in American Literature* (1982) de Alfred Habegger conforma un interesante estudio sobre las representaciones de la masculinidad en las novelas de Henry James y William Dean Howells. *Phallic Critiques: Masculinity and Twentieth-Century Literature* (1984) de Peter Schwenger analiza la masculinidad en la ficción de Mailer y Hemingway. En este texto, Schwenger también explora la interacción entre la sexualidad y el estilo literario, argumentando que “*existe en efecto un estilo masculino*” (1984, p. 12). Dos textos relativamente recientes e importantes son *Double Talk: The Erotics of Male Literary Collaboration* (1989) de Wayne Koestenbaum y *Engendering Men: The Question of Male Feminist Criticism* (1990) de Joseph A. Boone y Michael Cadden. El primero se ocupa de la colaboración literaria entre autores varones. Por otro lado, el volumen *Engendering Men* señala, en palabras de sus editores, “diferentes posibilidades” para una práctica feminista de hombres (1990, p. 4). Boone y Cadden apuntan que los hombres norteamericanos han empezado ya a redefinirse a sí mismos como hombres y, por tanto, como críticos de los textos literarios y culturales que han heredado y que están en proceso de recrear. “Al sexuarnos a nosotros mismos, al hacer

visible nuestros cuerpos textuales/sexuales”, comentan, “reconocemos nuestro papel en un movimiento [feminista de hombres] cuyo momento, confiamos, ya ha llegado” (Boone y Cadden, 1990, p. 7).

La mayoría de estos estudios críticos exploran representaciones culturales y literarias de la masculinidad *blanca*. Sin embargo, no debemos olvidar que en los últimos años han aparecido también numerosas e interesantes obras sobre masculinidades no-blancas. Merece la pena, por tanto, mencionar algunas de las más recientes y relevantes publicaciones sobre representaciones literarias de las masculinidades afro-americana (Awkward, 1989 y 1995), asiático-americana (Eng, 2001), chicana (Mirande, 1997; Ozieblo, 2004), judía (Rosenberg, 2001) e india (Sinha, 1995).

Nuevas masculinidades escritas por mujeres

Si aceptamos la tesis de Franz Fanon (1952) según la cual el oprimido puede tener un punto de vista privilegiado sobre los mecanismos de opresión, entonces no es de extrañar que las mujeres, largamente oprimidas por el patriarcado, hayan revisitado y reescrito la masculinidad desde perspectivas particularmente reveladoras e innovadoras. Además de cuestionar los valores patriarcales tradicionales, las mujeres escritoras a menudo “sueñan” también en sus obras con nuevos modelos alternativos de masculinidad. Así pues, el proyecto “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades” ha prestado especial atención a los modelos masculinos creados por escritoras norteamericanas, con el doble objetivo de explorar su deconstrucción de la masculinidad y su creación de nuevas formas de ser hombre, más igualitarias, ricas y plurales.

Es cierto que las antologías y la crítica literarias han obviado con frecuencia las percepciones femeninas de las virtudes, dilemas y luchas por la felicidad de los varones. Sin embargo, las mujeres en general, y las escritoras norteamericanas en particular, han hablado siempre de los hombres. Lo que ocurre, sin embargo, es que, a diferencia de los pronunciamientos masculinos sobre las mujeres, las afirmaciones femeninas sobre los varones han sido por lo general (y al menos hasta las últimas décadas) “más tranquilas, más reflexivas, más especulativas –y bastante penetrantes” (Daly). Pese a ello, o quizás precisamente por ello, las visiones femeninas de la masculinidad han sido habitualmente relegadas a un segundo plano por la crítica literaria. Además, los pocos estudios críticos que han analizado, directa o indirectamente, la representación del varón en la literatura

escrita por mujeres norteamericanas han centrado su atención, casi exclusivamente, en la denuncia por parte de estas escritoras de modelos negativos y patriarcales de masculinidad, basados en el sexismo, el racismo y/o la homofobia.

Con el fin de invertir estas tendencias críticas, el proyecto “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades” llevado a cabo durante estos últimos tres años se ha propuesto, por un lado, comenzar a explorar los modelos masculinos en la literatura norteamericana escrita por mujeres y, por otro, mostrar la irreducible complejidad y pluralidad de dichos modelos. Además de denunciar la masculinidad patriarcal, el proyecto ha pretendido hacer hincapié en los nuevos modelos de masculinidad alternativos creados por escritoras norteamericanas, mostrando “no sólo lo que muchas mujeres escritoras norteamericanas parecen valorar en los hombres, sino también lo que ven como posibles caminos hacia la felicidad para sus hermanos” (Daly).

1.2 TEMAS

1.2.1 MASCULINIDAD Y CONFLICTO BÉLICO – Cristina Alsina

Tal y como expone Michael Bibby en su ensayo de 1996 *Hearts and Minds. Bodies, Poetry, and Resistance in the Vietnam Era*, el cuerpo del veterano de guerra —y, en particular, del veterano herido o incapacitado por la guerra— funcionaba como una efectiva metáfora de la fragmentación social y política de los Estados Unidos post-Vietnam y dificultaba el proceso de restablecimiento del consenso ideológico hegemónico. Los veteranos de guerra, en el mejor de los casos, sobrellevaban la frustración por haber regresado vencidos de la guerra y por no haber completado el tránsito ritual a una masculinidad adulta y victoriosa que se supone es el resultado del paso por el ejército; en el peor de los casos, soportaban cicatrices físicas y psicológicas que les incapacitaban para una reinserción plena como miembros útiles de la sociedad. Una generación de hombres efectuaba, pues, su entrada en la vida adulta con un fuerte sentimiento de extemporaneidad; sus cuerpos, que “no longer function[ed] as the potent sign of masculine soldiery offered by dominant ideology” se habían convertido en “a contradictory, fractured, dis-membered sign revealing the incoherence of this ideology itself” (Bibby, 1996, p. 155). De ahí que numerosos analistas coincidan con Milton Bates cuando escribe, en su libro de 1996 *The Wars We Took to Vietnam: Cultural Conflict and Storytelling*: “America [...] was castrated on the sexualized battlefield of Vietnam” (Bates, 1996, p. 143). Tal y como argumenta Linda Boose en su artículo “Techno-Muscularity and the ‘Boy Eternal’. From the Quagmire to the Gulf”, incluido en una colección de ensayos, editada por Amy Kaplan y Donal E. Pease, titulada *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, esta coyuntura histórica —“the debacle of America’s masculinized, militarized policies on both fronts of the Vietnam War” (Boose, 1993, p. 585)— hubiera podido desembocar en “an alternative to the mythology of a national self born in and valorized by a history of conquest and domination” (1993, p. 585). Sin embargo, durante la década de los ochenta, el modelo de masculinidad tradicional, alentado por las reaccionarias y revisionistas prácticas institucionales de las administraciones Reagan y Bush, se retira a posiciones defensivas y tal y como Susan Jeffords analiza brillantemente en su libro de 1989 *The Remasculinization of America*.

Gender and the Vietnam War, se reinscribe como hegemónica en el tejido cultural estadounidense.

La narrativa sobre la guerra en Vietnam escrita por mujeres estadounidenses presenta una interesante novedad con respecto a los textos escritos por excombatientes, objeto de análisis en las obras críticas mencionadas en el párrafo anterior —y en el estudio de dicha novedad radica precisamente la originalidad de nuestra aportación al campo de estudio. Novelistas como Bobbie Ann Mason —*In Country* (1985)— o Jayne Anne Phillips —*Machine Dreams* (1984)— crean personajes masculinos cuya debilidad no se considera una aberración con respecto al modelo tradicional de masculinidad, sino una ocasión para la reflexión sobre las nociones hegemónicas de identidad nacional y subjetividad masculina que generaron la mencionada debilidad. Las novelas de Mason y Phillips cuestionan los discursos hegemónicos que establecen el estándar de perfección masculina en comparación con el cual cada individuo masculino debe negociar su identidad individual, a veces a muy alto precio. Ambas novelistas establecen lazos de empatía con sus personajes masculinos y se proponen la revisión de esos discursos hegemónicos a fin de buscar espacios para la formación de la subjetividad masculina que permitan generar un modelo más equitativo y dialogante que no suponga una carga tan onerosa para el sujeto masculino.

1.2.2 MASCULINIDAD Y ETNICIDAD

Los estudios que vinculan masculinidad, raza y etnicidad son un campo de análisis que se ha ido consolidando a medida que los estudios de las masculinidades se han asentado en los programas de estudios de género. Si bien la investigación sobre masculinidades afroamericanas es la que cuenta con mayor número de publicaciones —seguidas de los estudios sobre las hispanas— las masculinidades asiáticas, nativo americanas, y, en los últimos tiempos, de forma significativa, las masculinidades americanas de ascendencia árabe están recibiendo una atención cada vez mayor.

Esta temática conforma una parte muy substancial de nuestra investigación dado que, en la creciente naturaleza multicultural de nuestras sociedades, debida, en gran parte, a la inmigración, los aspectos de raza resultan fundamentales para determinar el comportamiento de varones procedentes de culturas distintas. En nuestro trabajo, abordamos el estudio de masculinidades étnicas, prestando atención tanto a los

estereotipos creados por la cultura occidental, como a las nuevas representaciones formuladas por autoras procedentes de ámbitos culturales diferentes. Nuestro análisis del multiculturalismo y las representaciones de género tiene como base y punto de partida la publicación prevista del libro *Multiculturalism and American Women Writers. Early Testimonies* (Carabí) que contiene entrevistas llevadas a cabo en los Estados Unidos a trece escritoras procedentes de la cultura afroamericana, asiática (china, japonesa, filipina), hispana (chicana, cubana, dominicana) y nativa americana.

1.2.2.1 Masculinidades afroamericanas – Ángels Carabí

En lo que hace referencia a la cultura afroamericana, los estudios de Franz Fanon, Lynne Segal, James Baldwin y Toni Morrison señalan que, desde el comercio de esclavos en el siglo XVI, el hombre blanco ha tenido una visión colonizadora del varón negro y le ha atribuido una masculinidad subordinada, cuya función es reafirmar la del hombre blanco. La colonización y la esclavitud devaluaron la naturaleza del hombre negro, lo des-humanizaron con el fin de equiparlo a una propiedad material, y lo convirtieron en el chivo expiatorio de los temores y fantasías del hombre blanco. De este modo, se podía hablar de dos imágenes de hombre negro que han perdurado en la ficción blanca: una es la del hombre negro feminizado, miembro de una raza “probada” menos humana por las teorías darvinistas, y la otra es la del varón negro hipermasculino cuya potencia sexual ha representado una amenaza para el varón blanco. A este respecto, tanto Baldwin como Fanon y Segal sostienen que la hipersexualización de los varones negros es el resultado de proyectar los propios impulsos (reprimidos) del varón blanco en el cuerpo incontrolable del varón de color. Este factor ha conducido a crear el estereotipo del violador negro y a justificar la protección de la mujer blanca con la represión y el maltrato del varón negro.

Ante esta realidad que sujeta a los varones negros a la ética del racismo, la labor de las escritoras afroamericanas que hemos estudiado ha sido compleja en lo que se refiere a sus propias representaciones de la masculinidad afroamericana. La comunidad negra es objeto de actitudes racistas pero es asimismo patriarcal y sexista. El hombre negro, dice Baldwin, ha asumido una relación de dominio sobre la mujer afroamericana para paliar la relación de dependencia que genera la estructura racista. Como mujeres negras, las autoras objeto de nuestro estudio denuncian la opresión de la mujer de color en manos de sus compañeros de raza y, de este modo, luchan contra el poder

androcéntrico. Las obras de Alice Walker, un ejemplo entre muchos, reflejan un descontento claro con los miembros varones de la comunidad afroamericana. *El Color Púrpura*, novela de Walker que fue premio Pulitzer, retrata la creciente crueldad hacia las mujeres negras por parte del padre de familia, sólo albergando un tenue rayo de esperanza hacia un nuevo hombre, al final de la novela. Algunas autoras afroamericana han optado, tal como indica Audre Lorde, por pensar que “deberíamos (hombres y mujeres negros) trabajar juntos, ciertamente”. Toni Morrison ya hizo patente, en una entrevista que nos concedió, que “los hombres (afroamericanos) tienen mucho más que aprender que las mujeres”. Así lo demuestran muchas de sus novelas en las que sus personajes masculinos aprenden a ser libres cuando se desprenden del pesado legado del patriarcado que presupone demostrar que, para ser viril, es necesario oprimir a otra persona. Lo interesante de Morrison es que establece un encadenamiento de relaciones humanas entre mujeres y hombres. Un varón es capaz de ayudar a una mujer porque éste ha sido ayudado por otro varón quien, a su vez, ha sido enseñado por una mujer. Esto está en la línea con la percepción de Michael Awkward de los hombres como aliados potenciales de las mujeres negras en sus esfuerzos para desestabilizar el poder que ostenta el patriarcado. Se trata, dice Awkward, de que los varones consigan alcanzar un equilibrio entre el trabajo de búsqueda personal, como personas marcadas por el género, y la aplicación de las críticas contra el patriarcado. Es mediante este proceso que los hombres feministas pueden contribuir a ampliar el alcance de la crítica feminista y explorar otras aplicaciones. En este contexto de diálogos entre hombres y mujeres afroamericanos, hemos analizado la obra de autoras como Alice Walker y Toni Morrison, antes mencionadas, así como la obra de Gloria Naylor, June Jordan y Maya Angelou. También hemos investigado la obra de Zora Neale Hurston, de los años treinta, por considerarla una brillante precursora del análisis de la masculinidad afroamericana que sus sucesoras desarrollarían cuarenta años más tarde.

1.2.2.2 Masculinidades asiático-americanas – Isabel Seguro

El estudio de la masculinidad asiático-americana se ha basado, sobre todo, en el análisis de las representaciones de Asia y de los asiático-americanos en textos dramáticos y teatrales. El enfoque se ha centrado en la forma en que artistas y dramaturgos asiático-americanos se contemplan a sí mismos en contraposición al tipo de representaciones y construcciones del “otro” asiático creadas por la cultura dominante (blanca) de los

Estados Unidos. Asimismo hemos analizado cómo esas representaciones han afectado a las diversas comunidades asiático-americanas, tanto en el espacio público (por ejemplo, a través de la promulgación de legislación discriminatoria) como en el privado (a través de la influencia de los estereotipos en la psique del individuo) y cómo las generaciones más jóvenes las desmantelan al proporcionar sus propias imágenes alternativas. Por ello, hemos concedido especial atención a las imágenes del hombre asiático-americano feminizado y emasculado y en las diversas estrategias utilizadas por un número de dramaturgos/as para desconstruir dichas imágenes como parte de la crítica a la cultura dominante norteamericana, y a su política imperialista.

El análisis de la representación de las masculinidades asiático-americanas se ha centrado en textos dramáticos y teatrales desde los años ochenta hasta la época presente. Dicha elección se basa en la naturaleza inminentemente pública del teatro y ejemplifica cómo las comunidades asiáticas han ganado visibilidad en la sociedad y en la cultura dominante de los Estados Unidos. El teatro también es un género literario que, en comparación con otros, no ha sido objeto de trabajos extensos analíticos dentro del campo de los estudios asiático-americanos.

En su etapa inicial, la crítica literaria de textos asiático-americanos tomó como punto de referencia el contexto socio-histórico en el que éstos fueron producidos, enfatizando cuestiones de raza y etnicidad: la asimilación cultural, la discriminación racial y sus consecuencias materiales, así como las repercusiones psicológicas en el individuo. Los primeros estudios en torno a la producción literaria asiático-americana se centraron, pues, en valoraciones sobre la asimilación cultural versus la resistencia a los discursos dominantes de la sociedad (blanca) estadounidense. Un ejemplo claro de esta aproximación es el reconocido trabajo de Elaine H. Kim *Asian American Literature: An Introduction to the Writings and Their Social Context* (1982). Desde esta perspectiva, los textos se valoraban positivamente si mostraban resistencia a los discursos dominantes de la sociedad norteamericana, criticando la asimilación cultural tradicionalmente asociada con la inmigración asiática y los asiático-americanos. Estos primeros estudios, asimismo, se concentraban en los géneros literarios de la poesía, el relato corto y la narrativa. El hecho de proporcionar mayor protagonismo a la producción teatral de por sí ya es una innovación que, en los Estados Unidos, ha tenido lugar en tiempos muy recientes.

Los textos dramáticos y teatrales seleccionados sirven para analizar, desde nuevas perspectivas teórico-literarias dentro de los estudios asiático-americanos, cuestiones de la construcción y representación del sujeto según la raza y el género. De ahí que se tenga en cuenta en nuestro análisis las perspectivas de los estudios postcoloniales, de género, queer, y de cuestiones relacionadas con la diáspora debido al gran impacto social de la inmigración. Aunque recientemente se han publicado trabajos específicos sobre el teatro asiático-americano, éstos no se centran en los estudios de la masculinidad y en las interrelaciones y paralelismos entre los varios discursos que contribuyen a la creación del sujeto. De este modo la obra de Josephine Lee, *Performing Asian America* (1997), se concentra, básicamente, en cuestiones de raza y etnicidad en las obras de dramaturgos asiático-americanos. Por su parte, Karen Shimakawa, en el libro *National Abjection* (2002), parte del concepto de la “abyección”, desarrollado por Julia Kristeva, para demostrar cómo la América asiática ha sido construida como el “abyecto” del sujeto americano no marcado. Ciertamente es que la obra de David L. Eng *Racial Castration: Managing Masculinity in Asian America* (2001) realiza un profundo análisis de las imágenes de la masculinidad asiático-americana en la literatura y el cine, pero sólo lleva a cabo un estudio de una obra teatral, *M. Butterfly* (1988) de David Henry Hwang, de gran éxito en Broadway. Sin embargo desde entonces, el teatro asiático-americano se ha caracterizado por su dinamismo y gran capacidad productiva y, es precisamente este corpus el que resulta interesante analizar para comprobar los cambios en las representaciones del sujeto asiático-americano desde su propia perspectiva.

1.2.2.3 Masculinidades nativo-americanas –Àngels Carabí

Durante años, las imágenes de los indios norteamericanos se han transmitido principalmente por la industria de Hollywood y han configurado nuestra visión de los primeros pobladores de los Estados Unidos como hombre salvajes, con un comportamiento más propio del mundo animal que del humano. Este estereotipo degradante ha sido atribuido a la gran mayoría de las tribus —sin distinguir entre la pluralidad de las comunidades ni de sus miembros— y su función ha sido aglutinar los miedos y las limitaciones del sujeto de la mirada, mostrando a este último como superior. De este modo, cuando más deshumanizados y crueles se presentaba a los indígenas, más nobles y valientes eran los nuevos invasores. La demonización del

indígena fue utilizada, pues, para justificar la colonización y presentarla como un camino hacia el progreso donde la presencia del nativo salvaje era un obstáculo a eliminar (Coltelli).

Para entender la literatura indio-americana y sus representaciones de la masculinidad resulta necesario acercarnos a su concepción del mundo. Para los indios el mundo es una unidad cósmica donde todas las cosas, personas, animales, plantas, espíritus están interrelacionados. Una imagen muy gráfica de los indios Pueblo que ilustra esta visión es la tela de araña. El entramado de la tela es tan sensible que cuando un hilo se rompe, toda la tela se resiente. De la misma manera, cuando la armonía de la tribu, o de la naturaleza, o de un miembro se altera y se desequilibra, la totalidad cósmica se ve alterada. Otro principio fundamental de la cultura indio-americana es la identificación con la tierra. La crítica Paula Gunn Allen establece la diferencia entre el indio y el europeo a través de su relación con la tierra. Cuando los indios se refieren a la tierra, indica Allen, dicen: “Nosotros somos la tierra.” No existe una separación entre las personas y la tierra puesto que todo está interrelacionado. En cambio, el pensamiento occidental es antropocéntrico y el hombre, especialmente la construcción de la masculinidad tradicional, establece una relación de separación y de dominio sobre su entorno. Otro aspecto significativo de la cultura india es el hecho que su legado cultural ha sido transmitido oralmente. La figura del “storyteller”, que puede ser un hombre o una mujer, es la encargada de mantener viva la tradición. Los indios Pueblo la representan con la imagen de una mujer sólida, sentada con la boca plenamente abierta, con niños encaramados por todo su cuerpo que escuchan las historias sobre su tribu. La interacción con la audiencia, característica de la transmisión oral, permite que las leyendas, mitologías y tradiciones evolucionen con los cambios sociales.

La situación actual de los indios norteamericanos es difícil. Si bien la población ha aumentado desde principios de siglo hasta llegar casi a los dos millones de personas, la realidad es que la media de esperanza de vida es de cuarenta y nueve años. El profundo sentimiento de pérdida que proviene de haber perdido su lengua, sus tierras, sus derechos, su cultura y sus dioses lleva al indio americano a sentirse objeto y no sujeto de su propia historia (Allen). La falta de oportunidades laborales y el racismo lleva a jóvenes y a adultos, de forma muy preocupante, a buscar refugio en el alcohol. Existe un elevado índice de suicidios entre la población adolescente y adulta como

consecuencia de los numerosos conflictos personales y comunitarios, de modo que el indio americano ve en peligro la continuidad de su cultura y de su propia vida.

Dadas estas circunstancias, tanto el varón nativo americano como la mujer india están en busca de una identidad cultural que les afirme como individuos. Sin embargo, existen diferencias entre ellos para llegar a este objetivo. En las obras que hemos analizado de Louise Erdrich, Joy Harjo, Leslie Silko y Chris Eyre, las mujeres, como indica Chavkin, suelen partir de un sentimiento de fortaleza y de sentirse necesarias para la comunidad. Los hombres, sin embargo, se sienten muy inseguros e inciertos con respecto al lugar que ocupan dado que no pueden realizar actividades que les garanticen un respeto hacia sí mismos (Wong). Las mujeres suelen ser autónomas y se mantienen a sí mismas y a sus familias, pero la mayoría de los varones tienen problemas en cuidar de sí mismos. Las formas de afirmación identitaria del varón suelen ser la violencia en contra de las mujeres, la agresividad hacia sí mismos o en contra de otros hombres, así como la huida y el abandono del cuidado de los hijos y de su familia. Conscientes de esta realidad, las escritoras contemporáneas crean personajes masculinos genuinos que, en algunos casos, y mediante narrativas “curativas” (healing narratives), recuperan el principio relacional que ha caracterizado su cultura al tiempo que se ocupan de temas como la amistad entre varones, las relaciones paterno-filiales, la violencia en la reserva y la relación con la naturaleza y la comunidad.

1.2.2.4 Masculinidades árabo-americanas – Marta Bosch

El análisis crítico de la literatura árabo-americana se ha empezado a desarrollar muy recientemente y básicamente en forma de antologías como *Post Gibran: Anthology of New Arab American Writing* (2000) de Munir Akash and Khaled Mattawa, o *Dinarzad's Children: An Anthology Of Contemporary Arab American Fiction* (2004) de Pauline Kaldas y Khaled Mattawa. La literatura árabo-americana empezó a desarrollarse a principios de siglo, cuando hombres de origen árabe inmigrantes a los Estados Unidos empezaron a escribir poesía y novelas, mayoritariamente dentro de lo que se llamó la Pen League, que tuvo como fundador el escritor Khalil Gibran. Este grupo desapareció en los años cuarenta, momento en que hubo un descenso en cuanto a la producción de literatura árabo-americana. Sin embargo, en los años ochenta hubo un resurgimiento que concentró mayoritariamente voces femeninas, que a través de poesía, en primer lugar, y de la narrativa, después, ofrecieron nuevas visiones de la experiencia árabo-americana.

Es por ello que el estudio de la ficción árabo-americana contemporánea está aún poco desarrollado, y no existen análisis críticos que, desde una perspectiva de género, examinen las visiones de la masculinidad que las escritoras árabo-americanas ponen de manifiesto.

Sí existen estudios sobre la masculinidad árabe que como *Gender and Difference in the Middle Ages* (2003) de Sharon Farmer y Carol Braun Pasternack y *Imagined Masculinities: Male Identities and Culture in the Modern Middle East* (2000) de Mai Ghassoub y Emma Sinclair exploran la masculinidad en países de Oriente Próximo desde sus raíces en la edad media hasta la actualidad. También existen análisis de la imagen de los árabes que circula en los Estados Unidos, es decir, de los estereotipos sobre el hombre árabe, que son ambivalentes, al mezclar nociones de feminidad, relacionada al orientalismo, con ideas de hipermasculinidad, relacionadas con el terrorismo o la guerra santa. Este es el caso que abordan libros como el de Norman Daniel *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image* (1993), o los libros de Jack G. Shaheen *Arab and Muslim Stereotyping in American Popular Culture* (1999) o *Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Villifies a People* (2001).

Se han utilizado estos estudios para contrastar sus ideas con las imágenes del hombre árabe que escritoras árabo-americanas aportan en sus textos de ficción. Es decir, se ha aplicado la teoría sobre las masculinidades árabes y sobre los estereotipos de hombre árabe que circulan en los Estados Unidos, al análisis de la construcción de la masculinidad en la literatura árabo-americana contemporánea escrita por mujeres como Diana Abu-Jaber, Elmaz Abinader, Etel Adnan o Mona Simpson, escritoras que proyectan modelos alternativos de hombre árabe y árabo-americano, se alejan de los estereotipos que circulan por occidente y ofrecen una negociación de los ideales masculinos del hombre árabe y del hombre norteamericano.

1.2.2.5 Masculinidades chicanas – Bárbara Ozieblo

Los estudios de la masculinidad han desarrollado sus definiciones y conceptos teóricos a partir de los estudios de la mujer y del feminismo. Recientemente críticos como Carla McDonough, David Savran y Robert Vorlicky los han aplicado a los estudios teatrales, produciendo interesantes trabajos que nos han conducido al análisis de la crisis de la identidad masculina en las obras de tres dramaturgas pertenecientes a diferentes grupos étnicos: Suzan-Lori Parks (afro-americana), Paula Vogel (anglo-americana) y Cherríe

Moraga (chicana). Nuestro análisis nos ha llevado a constatar cómo estas dramaturgas llegan a conclusiones muy similares en cuanto a las problemáticas en torno a la masculinidad.

Si bien es verdad que, en palabras de Octavio Paz, "[l]a mujer vive presa en la imagen que la sociedad masculina le impone", no es menos cierto que los hombres también son prisioneros de las imágenes que han creado de sí mismos. Es decir, la "crisis de la masculinidad" de finales del siglo XX tiene sus raíces en una sociedad patriarcal que nos ha impuesto a todos, hombres y mujeres, unos modelos y pautas de comportamiento, asimilados en mayor o menor medida, y que entran en conflicto con nuestro propio bienestar. En sus obras teatrales, Parks, Vogel y Moraga, no se apropian de la experiencia masculina para crear al hombre ideal, como tantas veces han hecho los hombres al escribir sobre las mujeres. Por el contrario, intentan buscar las razones que conducen a sus personajes masculinos a modelos inadmisibles de comportamiento humano. Sin embargo, para estas autoras, la comprensión de dichos actos no equivale a su justificación. El tratar de entender por qué los hombres actúan de cierta manera en circunstancias concretas es una manera de acelerar su erradicación.

Las obras analizadas son *Topdog/Underdog* (2001) de Suzan-Lori Parks, que ganó el premio Pulitzer en el 2002; *How I Learned to Drive* (1997) de Paula Vogel; y *Shadow of a Man* (1990) de Cherríe Moraga. En *Topdog/Underdog* Parks lleva a cabo un análisis de la realidad de dos hermanos afro-americanos oprimidos por razón de raza y sexualidad. En *How I Learned to Drive* Vogel, que es una mujer blanca lesbiana, nos presenta una historia de acoso sexual a través de la cual obliga al espectador/lector a repensar el discurso patriarcal "asimilado" que condena ciertos comportamientos sin entrar a explorar las razones que conducen a ellos. Por su parte, Moraga, en su obra *Shadow of a Man*, indaga sobre el concepto de masculinidad en la cultura chicana y cómo éste afecta las relaciones entre hombres y mujeres. Las tres dramaturgas aportan a su teatro el afán de raigambre brechtiano y artaudiano de conseguir que el público/lector reaccione ante los modelos de comportamiento hegemónicos para poder llegar a un entendimiento sobre cómo erradicarlos de nuestra realidad social.

1.2.3 RELECTURAS Y REESCRITURAS DE LOS CLÁSICOS - Rodrigo Andrés

Una de las aportaciones del pensamiento político y teórico feminista al mundo de las humanidades en general y al de los estudios literarios en concreto consiste en un nuevo

paradigma y en una nueva metodología para releer las obras clásicas que configuran el canon literario occidental.

A lo largo de las últimas tres décadas, numerosas obras de teóricas feministas, ya desde la pionera *Sexual Politics* (1970) de Kate Millet, han examinado las distorsiones en la presentación de los personajes femeninos creados por escritores varones para servir sus intereses. Más reciente, sin embargo, ha sido la exploración de las distorsiones en la presentación de la masculinidad en el canon literario occidental. En el marco del Proyecto, Rodrigo Andrés centró su trabajo en el análisis de los resultados de esta nueva línea de estudios de género aplicados a la literatura.

Para ello, optó por organizar su trabajo en tres etapas, coincidiendo con los tres años del proyecto. En una primera fase, revisaría las mejores aportaciones de los estudios de la masculinidad aplicada al canon literario americano. Fruto de este estudio es su participación en el congreso AEDEAN celebrado en Salamanca en 2003, en el que Andrés subrayó la homofobia inherente a la obra de los principales teóricos varones de las masculinidades literarias americanas. Como caso concreto, escogió analizar el clásico de David Leverenz, *Manhood and the American Renaissance* (1989) dada su difusión tanto entre los estudiosos del s. XIX como entre los estudiosos de temas de género, psicoanálisis y sexualidad.

En una segunda fase, Rodrigo Andrés analizaría cómo algunas escritoras norteamericanas han optado por incorporar la crítica de los estudios de la masculinidad a su obra creativa para proceder a escribir obras literarias que re-examinan la masculinidad de personajes clásicos. Un ejemplo brillante de esta estrategia literaria es la novela *Ahab's Wife* (1999), cuya autora, Sena Jeter Naslund reescribe el personaje del capitán Ahab perteneciente a la novela de Herman Melville *Moby Dick* (1851) analizándolo desde la perspectiva de su esposa quien, capaz de ver al ser humano debajo de la máscara social del frío capitán de barco, discierne entre la masculinidad social de su marido y la humanidad genuina de Ahab, oprimida por las pautas de comportamiento exigidas por ese patrón social de masculinidad. Rodrigo Andrés presentó su análisis de la novela en el congreso AEDEAN celebrado en Valencia en diciembre de 2004.

En una tercera fase, Rodrigo Andrés exploró cómo la lectura de este tipo de re-escrituras de clásicos literarios desde la perspectiva de los nuevos estudios de la masculinidad pueden aportar una re-evaluación de las condiciones socioculturales que impulsaron a los escritores de esos clásicos a presentar unos modelos de masculinidad

determinados, ya sea con el fin de perpetuarlos o, en ocasiones, de denunciarlos. En este sentido, la participación de Rodrigo Andrés en el congreso AEDEAN 2005, celebrado en Jaén, consistió en documentar cómo su propia lectura de la relectura que Sena Jeter Naslund realiza de la obra de Herman Melville ha conducido a este investigador a releer la correlación entre el tipo de masculinidad que los biógrafos más celebrados de Melville (Hershell Parker, Laurie Robertson-Lorant) sostienen caracterizó al escritor y su denuncia de la masculinidad imperante a mediados del siglo diecinueve en la América nortea y blanca y que acabaría siendo tan influyente en todo el mundo occidental en el siglo siguiente.

Las conclusiones del trabajo de Rodrigo Andrés sobre las relecturas de los clásicos efectuadas a raíz de los estudios de la masculinidad de finales del s. XX y principios del s. XXI apuntan a la fertilidad de la interacción entre teorías de género y canon literario para conseguir un doble motivo: subrayar las distorsiones detrás de la construcción hegemónica de la masculinidad occidental y apuntar hacia nuevas masculinidades que, al ser más dialogantes y atentas a “el Otro” sexual, de género, clase o raza pueden llegar a suponer una amenaza a las jerarquías sociales de occidente.

1.2.4 MASCULINIDADES Y NOVELA NEGRA – Bill Phillips

Desde hace unos años la novela negra ha sido reconocida como género literario merecedor de investigación académica. Sin embargo, aunque la novela negra se caracteriza por ofrecer un modelo de masculinidad muy convencional, no se ha realizado ningún análisis dentro del marco de los estudios de género hasta hace muy poco. En el año 2000 se publicó *Murdering Masculinities* de Greg Forster, un estudio de la novela negra clásica de los años 30, 40 y 50 del siglo pasado, que analiza la figura del detective como modelo de masculinidad. En los Estados Unidos se ha prestado mucha atención, en los últimos años, a la novela negra escrita y protagonizada por mujeres. La mujer detective cuestiona la masculinidad tanto del modelo literario como del sexual. Ello abre la posibilidad de que una detective pueda tener un comportamiento masculino o femenino, o una combinación de los dos. Un libro importante en el estudio de la mujer detective es *Detective Agency* de Priscilla L. Walton y Manina Jones.

La aportación original de esta área del proyecto es el estudio específico del sexismo, racismo y la homofobia en la novela negra clásica, y el seguimiento de los

cambios importantes experimentados por el género literario desde los años setenta. Además de que desde entonces se han escrito novelas negras protagonizadas (y escritas) por mujeres y hombres de diferentes procedencias étnicas y de diferentes orientaciones sexuales, se ha estudiado los modelos de masculinidad alternativos propuestos por estas novelas contemporáneas. Autores norteamericanos como Walter Mosley, James Sallis y George Pelecanos son importantes por su desconstrucción del modelo tradicional, mientras autoras como Paula L. Woods destacan por ofrecer un modelo nuevo, alternativo, de la masculinidad que rechaza el sexismo, racismo y homofobia y comparte con los personajes femeninos de la obra el deseo de crear un mundo sin prejuicios, injusticias y desigualdades.

2. OBJETIVOS

El objetivo global de nuestro proyecto de investigación ha sido profundizar en el análisis de las masculinidades occidentales centrándonos en las representaciones masculinas en producción literaria actual de los Estados Unidos (1980-2003) y, especialmente, en la obra de creación de autoras norteamericanas. La hipótesis de la cual partimos es que los textos literarios, y también los filmicos, son dos de los campos simbólicos que más influyen en la construcción de los modelos de género y, por ello, campos idóneos de análisis.

Hemos llevado a cabo el análisis de la representaciones de la masculinidad mediante la aplicación de una metodología teórica interdisciplinar al corpus seleccionado. Este análisis se ha centrado en, por un lado, desconstruir la masculinidad hegemónica y, por otro, en explorar formas alternativas y dialogantes de masculinidad. De este modo, los objetivos concretos de nuestro estudio se han centrado en:

- visibilizar la masculinidad como un constructo cultural basado en estructuras jerárquicas de poder relacionadas con el género, la raza y la orientación sexual
- incorporar las aportaciones teóricas más recientes al tema por parte de la psicología, la sociología, los estudios de género, raza y sexualidad que abordan el análisis de la masculinidad
- aplicar este corpus teórico al análisis de la representación de la masculinidad en textos literarios (y filmicos) estadounidenses producidos especialmente por mujeres en las dos últimas décadas.
- aportar el aparato crítico necesario para desconstruir la masculinidad hegemónica como agente de desigualdades sociales y, asimismo, dar a conocer formas alternativas de masculinidad que, afortunadamente, se están formulando en la literatura estadounidense.
- ampliar los estudios de género incorporando el creciente diálogo entre la teoría feminista y los estudios de la masculinidad.

3. METODOLOGÍA

3.1 Hipótesis de trabajo

Partimos de la hipótesis que la masculinidad es una construcción cultural que se define por oposición: "ser hombre" significa *no* ser mujer, *no* ser étnico y *no* ser homosexual (Segal, 1990). Por consiguiente, la masculinidad hegemónica se fundamenta y autoafirma a través del sexismo, el racismo y la homofobia. Analizar las representaciones de la masculinidad puede contribuir a que los modelos tradicionales de masculinidad jerárquica sean vistos de manera crítica y, por ello, cuestionados. Sostenemos que, debido a su naturaleza cultural, la masculinidad puede ser también socialmente desconstruida.

3.2 Selección del corpus

- Delimitación temática: hemos escogido una selección de **temas** que reconocidos teóricos de la masculinidad como Michael Kimmel, Lynne Segal, Harry Brod, Bob Connell, y Victoria Sau entre otros, consideran fundamentales en el campo de los estudios de la masculinidad y que se especifican en el apartado 3.4: "Temas" .
- Delimitación espacial: dada la formación en la filología anglo-americana de los miembros del proyecto, hemos acotado el ámbito de estudio a las **escritoras norteamericanas** actuales que, educadas en el feminismo, son en extremo críticas de los valores patriarcales que discriminan en función del género, la raza y la sexualidad. Los testimonios de estas creadoras que proceden de ámbitos culturales distintos resultan clave para el análisis de la masculinidad en sociedades cada vez más multiculturales.
- Delimitación cronológica: nos hemos centrado en las **dos últimas décadas** de la producción literaria norteamericana ya que es una época idónea para explicar nuestro momento presente y, además, como hemos indicado, es a partir de los años ochenta cuando los/las analistas de la masculinidad comienzan a articular un discurso, inspirado en el feminismo, que revisa los patrones normativos de la masculinidad hegemónica. De hecho, la consolidación de los estudios de la masculinidad responde a un período en el que la redefinición de roles de género se perfila como una de las grandes revoluciones sociales del siglo que iniciamos.

3.3 Desarrollo de la metodología

En lo que concierne a la metodología seguida, partimos de la hipótesis que la masculinidad es una construcción cultural que se define por oposición: "ser hombre" significa *no* ser mujer, *no* ser étnico y *no* ser homosexual (Segal, 1990). Por consiguiente, la masculinidad hegemónica se fundamenta y autoafirma a través del sexismo, el racismo y la homofobia. Sin embargo, sostenemos que, debido a su naturaleza cultural, la masculinidad puede ser también socialmente desconstruida. Con el fin de analizar este proceso, hemos utilizado las aproximaciones de perspectivas críticas de ámbitos diversos. El enfoque metodológico de sociólogos especialistas en esta temática nos ha permitido comprobar que la masculinidad no es un concepto fijo e inamovible, sino que varía según el período histórico, la clase social, la edad, la orientación sexual, la etnicidad, etc. El enfoque antropológico utilizado nos ha permitido observar cómo diferentes culturas de los Estados Unidos -la cultura blanca y las culturas de las minorías étnicas- construyen distintos códigos de masculinidad; además hemos constatado que el culto a la masculinidad tradicional incluye en todas ellas elementos de dominación patriarcal. Desde el punto de vista de la psicología, hemos analizado cómo los parámetros de la masculinidad hegemónica determinan el comportamiento masculino y las relaciones entre los hombres -con respecto a la amistad, la paternidad, la violencia- y también condicionan las relaciones entre los hombres y las mujeres, generando frecuentemente estructuras de dominación y, en última instancia, de violencia de género.

En relación a estas fuentes metodológicas, nos han sido de gran utilidad las entrevistas llevadas a cabo en Nueva York a cinco teóricos especialistas en el campo de los estudios de las masculinidades. Las conversaciones mantenidas con Michael Kimmel, sociólogo y director del Center for the Study of Men and Masculinities (SUNY), David Gilmore, antropólogo (SUNY), Krin Gabbard, teórico de estudios de cine (SUNY), David Eng, especialista en estudios de raza y masculinidad (Rutgers Univ) y Carolyn Dinshaw, directora del "Center for the Study of Gender and Sexualities" de la New York University, han resultado ser de absoluta referencia en nuestra investigación. El resultado de estas entrevistas se ha materializado en la publicación de una selección de las conversaciones en formato DVD *La masculinidad a debate* (Carabí y Armengol) y está en preparación el volumen del mismo título (Icaria editorial) que contiene la totalidad del contenido de las entrevistas.

3.4 Temas y distribución de tareas

El trabajo de investigación ha consistido, por un lado, en una parte que ha aportado las bases teóricas multidisciplinares de este estudio y que ha estado a cargo del Dr. Michael Kimmel (sociólogo), Dra. Victoria Sau (psicóloga), Dr. Josep M. Armengol (teoría literaria y masculinidades). Por otro lado, esta parte teórica ha sido aplicada al análisis del corpus textual seleccionado. Tras establecer las bases teóricas comunes, las tareas fueron repartidas de la siguiente manera:

- masculinidad y conflicto bélico (Dra. Cristina Alsina): este tema ha sido analizado en relación a las obras de autoras sureñas, centrándonos en la obra de Bobbie Ann Mason y Jayne Anne Phillips.

- masculinidad y etnicidad (Dra. Àngels Carabí, Dra. Bárbara Ozieblo, Dr. Bill Phillips, Isabel Seguro, Marta Bosch): esta temática se aborda a través del estudio de autoras étnicas que analizan la manera en la que conceptos de raza, clase y sexualidad se interrelacionan para configurar diferentes modelos de masculinidad. Se han explorado las obras de escritoras afro-americanas (Toni Morrison, Gloria Naylor), indio-americanas (Louise Erdrich, Leslie Silko), árabo-americanas (Diana Abu-Jaber, Elmaz Abinader), asiático-americanas (Fae Myenne Ng, Velina Hasu Houston, Wakako Yamauchi) e hispanas (Sandra Cisneros, Cherrie Moraga, Maria Irene Fornes)

- masculinidad y relectura de los clásicos (Dr. Rodrigo Andrés): Esta línea apunta a la fertilidad de la interacción entre teorías de género y la re-lectura del canon literario estadounidense para conseguir un doble motivo: subrayar las distorsiones detrás de la construcción hegemónica de la masculinidad occidental y apuntar hacia nuevas masculinidades que, al ser más dialogantes y atentas a “el Otro” sexual, de género, clase o raza pueden llegar a suponer una amenaza a las jerarquías sociales de occidente. esta temática ha sido desarrollada por el Dr. Rodrigo Andrés a través del estudio de la obra de Sena Meter Naslund que reescribe el personaje del capitán Ahab en Moby Dick de Herman Melville

-masculinidad y novela negra (Dr. Bill Phillips): Este tema se ha analizado prestando especial atención a autoras como Sue Grafton, Paula L. Woods y Sara Paretsky, teniendo en cuenta que, tradicionalmente, la novela negra se ha asociado con un mundo e imágenes de lo masculino muy convencional. En los últimos años, han surgido

escritoras que publican novela negra con mujeres como protagonistas. De ahí que se haya prestado atención al estudio de la mujer detective como medio de atacar el sexismo, el racismo y la homofobia de la novela negra clásica a partir de estudios como el de Priscilla L. Walton y Manina Jones, *Detective Agency*.

4. RESULTADOS

4.1. PUBLICACIONES: DVD y libros

4.1.1. DVD *Debating masculinity / La masculinidad a debate*

4.1.2. *La masculinidad a debate*

4.1.3. *Hombres soñados por escritoras de hoy: figuras masculinas en la literatura norteamericana*

4.1.4. *Multiculturalism and American Women Writers: Early Testimonies*

4.1.5. *El potencial subversivo del amor entre hombres en la tradición literaria occidental. Billy Budd, Sailor, de Herman Melville*

4.2. PRESENTACIONES EN CONGRESOS Y SEMINARIOS

4.1. PUBLICACIONES: DVD y libros

4.1.1. **DVD *Debating Masculinity / La masculinidad a debate***

(Se adjunta DVD)

Autores: Àngels Carabí y Josep M. Armengol

Editores: Publicacions UB, 2005.

Duración: 35 minutos

El DVD recoge una selección de 35 minutos de las entrevistas llevadas a cabo en Nueva York a reconocidos especialistas en los estudios de masculinidades que proceden de ámbitos de estudio diversos. Desde la sociología, la antropología, los estudios literarios y cinematográficos, los estudios de raza y de la sexualidad, Michael Kimmel (SUNY), David Gilmore (SUNY), Krin Gabbard (SUNY), David Eng (Rutgers University) y Carolyn Dinshaw (NYU) ofrecen sus innovadoras reflexiones sobre ésta temática.

4.1.2. *La masculinidad a debate*, Àngels Carabí y Josep M. Armengol (eds.)
Icària editorial, 2007

ÍNDICE

Agradecimientos

Prólogo

- I. **Los estudios de la masculinidad: una introducción**
Michael Kimmel, sociólogo
- II. **Culturas de la masculinidad**
David Gilmore, antropólogo
- III. **Hombres de película**
Krin Gabbard, estudios de cine
- IV. **Varones de novela**
David Leverenz, crítica literaria
- V. **Perspectivas queer**
Carolyn Dinshaw, estudios de sexualidad
- VI. **Raza y masculinidad**
David Eng, estudios de raza y etnicidad
- VII. **Masculinidades del Islam**
Linda Jones, estudios árabes e islámicos
- VIII. **Biología y género(s)**
Patricia Adair Gowaty, bióloga evolucionista
- IX. **Los hombres tras el feminismo: ¿Qué queda por decir?**
Lynne Segal, psicóloga

Epílogo

La masculinidad a debate

Lynne Segal en diálogo con el grupo de investigación "Construyendo nuevas masculinidades", Universitat de Barcelona:

Cristina Alsina, Rodrigo Andrés, José María Armengol, Marta Bosch, Àngels Carabí, William Phillips, Isabel Seguro.

Autor@s

4.1.3. *Hombres soñados por escritoras de hoy: figuras masculinas en la literatura norteamericana*, Cristina Alsina, Rodrigo Andrés, Àngels Carabí (eds), Colección Atenea, Universidad de Málaga, 2007.

(Se adjunta el índice del libro y los artículos de Bárbara Ozieblo, Josep M. Armengol y Carmen Manuel)

El volumen que proponemos es una colección de artículos que exploran las representaciones de la masculinidad en la obra de escritoras norteamericanas de los últimos veinte años. Estas autoras revisan la masculinidad tradicional que discrimina en función del género, la raza, la clase social, la sexualidad, la edad, la nacionalidad, etc. Las autoras que estudiamos deconstruyen estos conceptos y, en muchos casos, reescriben la masculinidad hegemónica, aportando formas alternativas y más humanas de ser hombre.

De este modo, a través de la obra de Bobbie Ann Mason y Jayne Ann Phillips se explora la violencia masculina que encuentra su máximo exponente en los conflictos bélicos como, por ejemplo, la guerra de Vietnam. Autoras como Tillie Olsen y Grace Paley investigan la manera en que diferentes clases sociales determinan distintos comportamientos masculinos, y ofrecen una visión comprensiva de los hombres de clase trabajadora como co-víctimas de la injusticia social y como potenciales compañeros, tanto a nivel de compromiso personal como de compromiso político.

En el marco del creciente multiculturalismo de la sociedad norteamericana y de las sociedades en general, las autoras que hemos escogido investigan la manera en que los conceptos de raza, género y clase se interrelacionan en el pluralismo cultural. En este contexto, exploran temas como la amistad entre varones, las relaciones de paternidad, violencia y sexualidad masculinas, y proponen formas alternativas de ser hombre que trascienden las fronteras de los conceptos de género y etnicidad. Las autoras seleccionadas provienen de un amplio abanico cultural en el contexto de la sociedad norteamericana como Toni Morrison, Alice Walker, Gloria Taylor, Sapphire, Suzan Lori-Parks (afro-americanas), Louise Erdrich (nativo americana), Cherrie Moraga (chicana), Momoko Iko, Wakako Yamauchi y Velina Hasu Houston (asiático-americanas) y Diana Abu-Jaber y Elmz Abiander (árabo-americanas).

En el género de la novela negra, exploraremos cómo autoras como Sue Grafton, Paula L. Woods y Sara Paretsky interrogan el comportamiento tradicional masculino del héroe urbano —el detective— con respecto al uso de la violencia (que adquiere carácter negativo), en sus relaciones personales, y en los casos en que la figura del detective no es un varón, sino una mujer.

El volumen es el resultado de tres años de estudio llevados a cabo por los miembros del proyecto de investigación “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades: la representación de la masculinidad en la literatura y el cine de los Estados Unidos (1980-2003)”, Instituto de la Mujer, Ref., no: 62/03.

Autores: Cristina Alsina (UB), Rodrigo Andrés (UB), Josep M Armengol (UB), Marta Bosch (UB), Àngels Carabí (UB), María del Mar Gallego (UHuelva), Carmen Manuel (UV), Bárbara Ozieblo (UM), William Phillips (UB), Isabel Seguro (UB)

4.1.4. *Multiculturalism and American Women Writers: Early Testimonies,*

Àngels Carabí (ed), Biblioteca Javier Coy, 2007.

(Se adjunta el índice del libro)

INDEX

Prologue

I. AFRICAN AMERICAN

- Toni Morrison:
 - *Song of Solomon, Sula, Tar Baby*
 - *Beloved*
 - *Jazz*
- Gloria Naylor
- June Jordan

II. ASIAN AMERICAN

- Maxine Hong Kingston
- Amy Tan
- Janice Mirikitani
- Bharati Mukherjee
- Jessica Hagedorn

III. CHICANO

- Sandra Cisneros
- Cristina García
- Lucha Corpi
- Julia Álvarez

IV. NATIVE AMERICAN

- Joy Harjo
- Leslie Silko

4.1.5. *El potencial subversivo del amor entre hombres en la tradición literaria occidental. Billy Budd, Sailor, de Herman Melville*, Rodrigo Andrés, Biblioteca Javier Coy, 2007.

El Dr. Andrés argumenta que el escritor estadounidense Herman Melville (1819-1891) se inscribe en una tradición literaria de amor entre hombres que cuestiona los valores patriarcales y, potencialmente, actúa como vehiculadora para la creación de sociedades más igualitarias. Así, investiga la manera en que el amor entre hombres puede tener un carácter subversivo en la literatura y en las relaciones sociales.

4.2. PRESENTACIONES EN CONGRESOS Y SEMINARIOS

XXVII Congreso de AEDEAN, Salamanca – diciembre, 2003

Mesa Redonda: “A Men’s Studies Approach to American Literatura: Theory into Practice”

Panel: “Feminist and Gender Studies”

Participan: Dra. Àngels Carabí, Dr. Rodrigo Andrés y Sr. Josep M^a Armengol

Resultados:

"Masculinity Studies: an Overview"

Àngels Carabí

Universitat de Barcelona

This brief overview aims to trace the emergence of masculinity studies since its origins (1970s) and to highlight some of its current theoretical inquiries.

In the past decade, masculinity studies have consolidated as a field of critical analysis which seeks to rethink the meanings of masculinity. Men’s studies scholarship emerged in the United States in the 1970s as a response to second wave feminism and to the questioning of traditional male behaviors stimulated primarily by World War II, its aftermath, and the Vietnam war (Jeffords). First wave men’s studies scholarship (1970s-1980s) centered its attention on the experience of white, middle class men, giving birth to movements like the profeminist movement which sought gender equality by deconstructing male privileges and by changing men. Other types of movement were the mythopoetic movement (Bly) and the Promise Keepers who wanted to reconstruct masculinity from an essentialist perspective. However, notions of unified identities were challenged by the emergence of postmodernism and poststructuralism in the 1980s and 1990s which brought new research perspectives on masculinity studies. Just as feminism had initially interrogated fundamental concepts such as woman, femininity, women’s experiences, and patriarchy and the sex/gender division, current studies of masculinity are exploring how men are constituted as gendered social subjects. To move away from the universalized notion of man, second-wave masculinity studies has shown

that masculinity has multiple meanings which vary over time and across cultures (Rotundo, Petersen). Moreover masculinities, rather than fixed identities, are open to produce new configurations in changing intercultural contexts (Petersen). Recent investigation has been focusing on the socially constructed differences existing between men, a position which undermines previous notions that differences only exist between men and women; this analysis sustains that men's realities are plural, that men create their identities with the perception of other men and that hierarchies have been determining men's relationships (Brod, Kaufman, Kimmel). One of the most radical advances in studies of masculinities comes from the feminisms of the 1980s-1990s and by queer studies which have transformed the critical inquiry by not only fostering alternative masculinities but by seeking wide rearticulations of masculinity. Eve Kossofsky Sedgwick's interrogations into male sexuality have turned gay studies into one of the most significant analytical fields of masculinity studies. The contributions of Judith Butler and Judith Halberstam have helped to relocate the notions of masculinity and identification which defy patriarchal constructions of men (and women) (Wiegman).

Since the late 1990s masculinity studies has also been paying attention to issues of ethnicity. Race masculinity studies emerged out of the concerns raised by men of color who feel absent from the emerging body of criticism on this field. These male critics (Awkward, Eng, Mirande) as well as female critics (Anzaldúa, hooks) claim that masculinities are not exclusively constructed within men's power over women but in structures of exclusion based on hierarchies which subordinate racialized men (Robinson). The insights of race studies are stimulating an innovative field of analysis which focuses on the need to explore white masculinities as racialized identities as well as to reflect on the concept of whiteness as a political construction (S. Robinson). As scholarly masculinity studies is progressively being influenced by a wide range of feminisms, queer studies and race studies, there is a growing need to advance new dialogues between masculinity studies and these other disciplines.

The aim of the panel "Man's Approach to American Literature: Theory into Practice" is to show how a rereading of American literature from the perspective of masculinity studies can enrich the interpretation of the text.

Rodrigo Andrés argues that men's studies have only recently incorporated an analysis of male homosexualities. Whereas some women critics have considered gay

men as pioneers in the creation of new attitudes amongst men and between men and women, most heterosexual men doing men's studies still show a strong homophobic bias in their analysis and even appropriation of the historical experience of gay men.

Josep M^a Armengol's article argues that analyzing literary texts of different social and historical periods can show how American society's dominant ideals of masculinity have changed over the past two centuries. He also contends that masculinity studies shift the focus of criticism from universal and abstract dilemmas to men's intimate and personal concerns, especially those related to their perceptions of masculinity.

Works/Critics Cited

- Anzaldúa, Gloria 1987: *Borderlands. La Frontera. The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.
- Awkward, Michael 1995: *Negotiating Difference: Race, Gender and the Politics of Positionality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bly, Robert 1990: *Iron John*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Brod, Harry, ed. 1987: *The Making of Masculinities: the New Men's Studies*. Boston: Allen and Unwin.
- Butler, Judith 1990: *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York and London: Routledge.
- DiPiero, Thomas 2002: *Why Men Aren't*. Durham and London, Duke UP.
- Halberstam, Judith 1998: *Female Masculinity*. Durham, Duke University Press.
- hooks, bell 1995: *Killing Rage. Ending Racism*. New York: Henri Holt.
- Jeffords, Susan 1989: *The Remasculinization of America: Gender and the Vietnam War*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Kaufman, Michael and Harry Brod eds. 1994: *Theorizing Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kimmel, Michael, ed. 2000: *The Gendered Society*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mirande, Alfredo 1997: *Hombres y Machos: Masculinity and Latino Culture*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Petersen, Alan 2003: "Research on Men and Masculinities. Some Implications of Recent Theory for the Future". *Men and Masculinities* 6: 54-69.

Robinson, Phil 2004. 03. 05:

<http://europrofem.org/02.info/22contri/2.04.enmasc/46enmas.htm>

Robinson, Sally 2000: *Marked Men: White Masculinity in Crisis*. New York: Columbia.

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

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

Wiegman, Robyn 1995. "Unmaking: Men and Masculinity in Feminist Theory". *Masculinity Studies and Feminist Theory. New Directions*. Ed. Judith Kegan Gardiner. New York: Columbia University Press. 30-59.

Rodrigo Andrés

Universitat de Barcelona

Over the last two centuries, Western cultures have worked hard to undo the figure of the homosexual man with power, creating instead the figure of the effeminate homosexual, understanding as "feminine" aspects such as weakness and passivity, both at the physical and at the emotional level. The intention behind this strategy has been to neutralize an important threat to the hierarchies of gender, based on the correlation of the binary pair "masculine"/"feminine" with that of "active"/"passive". The figure of the homosexual male has been excluded from the realm of masculinity and included instead in the non-privileged component in the category of knowledge of gender. In this way, masculine heterosexuality has eliminated from its midst a type of masculinity that can be interpreted as being more flexible because, among other things, it accepts a relational, and therefore, non-essentialist sexuality which challenges "active" and "passive" roles, and which dares explore the power, the agency and the pleasure that exist in so-called masculine "passivity". Institutional discourses have been crucial in the de-masculinization of the gay man. According to Lynne Segal,

For over a hundred years now scientific and popular belief has held that male homosexuality derives from and expresses something 'feminine' in men - the absence of appropriate levels of masculinity... - The connection made between gender inversion and homosexuality served not only to control and

punish homosexual behaviour, but also to define and maintain appropriate definitions of masculine and feminine behaviour (Segal, 1990, pp. 135-38).

Towards the end of the twentieth century, the media and some academics have begun to discuss an incipient “crisis of masculinity”. Men’s studies all over the Western hemisphere have even begun to present “man” as a *new* victim of patriarchy who, lost in a new cultural order and without clear role models to follow, should start thinking of himself, like women, as co-victims of patriarchy.

This new debate about the epistemological crisis of masculinity makes us consider the following questions: Are we going to keep using the term “masculinity” as an equivalent of “heterosexuality”? If we do, chances are we are condemning masculine homosexuality, once again, to the space in between that we have not yet been able to fully define. A second question could be: are we going to ask the “new man” (heterosexual by definition) to undergo a profound revision and renegotiation of the values historically and culturally ascribed to the “masculine” and the “feminine” without contemplating in this analysis the experience of those men who historically have been forced to negotiate - both at the personal level and as a community - between those two concepts, given the pressures of a society that is both patriarchal and heterosexist? And, finally, can we start any analysis of the culture of men and of its interaction with the culture of women without incorporating an analysis of the culture of gay men?

We have to admit that over the last few years, the field of men’s studies has begun to incorporate male homosexuality as an intrinsic component of any analysis of masculinities, given that, according to Lynne Segal:

From the point of view of understanding and changing masculinity, however, the really important thing is that gay men have once again had to pioneer new attitudes amongst men - this time, the idea of more open, imaginative and responsible attitudes to sex, and of men nursing and caring for each other (Segal, 1990, p. 164).

This openness in some female critics of masculinities needs to be contrasted with the much more ambiguous attitude in the writings of heterosexual men who theorize about the new masculinities. In the following pages, we will try to argue that

the writings of some men in men's studies can, in some cases, show decades of delay in their assimilation of concepts that have long been debated by the different feminist movements. It is revealing how only as late as 1994 Michael S. Kimmel concluded that "manhood is socially constructed" (Kimmel, 1994, p.120). This conclusion led both M. Kimmel and M. Kaufman to assume that, if the traditional notion of masculinity had been socially constructed, it can now be socially deconstructed. This, in its turn, becomes an invitation to social activism and a celebration of the agency of the citizens of today in bringing about a major social change. The two critics, however, never consider that the notion of traditional masculinity could be not only a social construction but a category of knowledge or a parameter *through* which we understand gender and gender binary oppositions. The fact that neither M. Kimmel nor M. Kaufman contemplates this possibility even if it is just to reject it leaves these critics and their writings in the margins of some of the most interesting questions in the contemporary debate on gender in the academia.

In some cases, the writings of men in men's studies show not only a reluctance to fully engage in contemporary debates but also an attitude that may strike us as homophobic. As an example, let us read closely these fragments of an article written by M. Kimmel, paradoxically, on homophobia:

"The lives of most American men are bounded, and their interests daily curtailed by the constant necessity to prove to their fellows, and to themselves, that they are not sissies, not homosexuals," writes psychoanalytic historian Geoffrey Gorer (1964). "Any interest or pursuit which is identified as feminine interest or pursuit becomes deeply suspect for men" (p. 129)... Our real fear "is not fear of women but of being ashamed or humiliated in front of other men, or being dominated by stronger men" (Leverenz, 1986, p. 451)... Homophobia is a central organizing principle of our cultural definition of manhood. Homophobia is more than the irrational fear of gay men, more than the fear that we might be perceived as gay. "The word 'faggot' has nothing to do with homosexual experience or even with fears of homosexuals," writes David Leverenz (1986). "It comes out of the depths of manhood: a label of ultimate contempt for anyone who seems sissy, untough, uncool" (p. 455). Homophobia is the fear that other men will unmask us, emasculate us, reveal to us and the world that we do not measure up, that we are not real men. We are afraid to let other men see that fear...

The fear of being seen as a sissy dominated the cultural definitions of manhood. As adolescents, we learn that our peers are a kind of gender police, constantly threatening to unmask us as feminine, as sissies. The stakes of perceived sissydom are enormous - sometimes matters of life and death. We take enormous risks to prove our manhood, exposing ourselves disproportionately to health risks, workplace hazards, and stress-related illnesses. Men commit suicide three times as often as women (Kimmel, 1994, pp. 130-33).

These fragments show a tendency of heterosexual men in men's studies to appropriating for their own purposes the experience of being a victim of homophobia. They do it in such a way that the suffering of gay men becomes, actually, the experience of all men, thus universalizing a reality and, interestingly enough, eliminating from their analysis the subjectivity of the victimizers. Whereas it would be impossible for any critic to state without difficulties that racism makes white people suffer and that domestic violence makes men the victims of that violence, both M. Kimmel and M. Kauffman seem to get away with the idea of making straight men the victims of homophobia.

One more aspect that needs examination is how the voice of men doing men's studies is becoming more and more heteronormative in their equation of "Aus" with "Amen" and, one more time, with "heterosexuals". This is evident in the writings of M. Kimmel:

The fear - sometimes conscious, sometimes not - that others might perceive us as homosexual propels men to enact all manner of exaggerated masculine behaviours and attitudes to make sure that no one could possibly get the wrong idea about us... How many of us have translated those ideas and those words into actions, by physically attacking gay men...?... This perspective may help clarify a paradox in men's lives, a paradox in which men have virtually all the power and yet do not feel powerful (see Kaufman, 1993) (Kimmel, 1994, p. 135).

The argument in this quotation seems to be based on two important premises: The first one is that *we* men are not gay men, and the second one is that we *attack* gay men. My personal difficulties in following Kimmel's argument (who seems to move back and forth between his identifications with the victims of homophobia and with the attackers

of gay men) become even more serious when, in a footnote to his article on homophobia, Kimmel suggests the privileges inherent in being gay and powerless:

Such are the ironies of sexism: The powerful have a narrower range of options than the powerless, because the powerless can *also* imitate the powerful and get away with it. It may even enhance status, if done with charm and grace - that is, is not threatening. For the powerful, any hint of behaving like the powerless is a fall from grace (Kimmel, 1994, p. 139).

A brief glimpse at the literature written on homosexual masculinity by some of the most prestigious theoreticians of men's studies in the English speaking academia leads us to conclude that the absolutely necessary incorporation of gay masculinities in the analysis of masculinities is not necessarily exempt from a still strong and not so subtle homophobic bias.

Works Cited:

- Kimmel, Michael S. 1994: "Masculinity as Homophobia. Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity". *Theorizing Masculinities*. Ed. Harry Brod & Michael Kauffman. Thousand Oaks: Sage. 119-41.
- Segal, Lynne 1990: *Slow Motion. Changing Masculinities, Changing Men*. New Brunswick: Rutgers.

"A Men's Studies Rereading of American Literature"

Josep M. Armengol

Universitat de Barcelona

While gender has long been related to women (and, more recently, to gay men), gender studies has only recently begun to explore heterosexual masculinity. However, gendering the heterosexual man remains one of the main challenges of this new century. Hence the need for Men's Studies, which Harry Brod defines as "the study of masculinities and male experiences as specific and varying social-historical-cultural formations". Men's Studies is a small, though growing, and recent field of study, which analyzes masculinities as socially

constructed (and so as liable to be socially de-constructed and changed), context-specific, and culture-bound. Even though the first masculinity studies in the late 1970s and early 1980s were mostly written by psychologists and sociologists, from the 1990s there has been a dramatic increase in the analysis of literary representations of masculinity. Following the work of scholars like James D. Riemer, this study will show how a Men's Studies rereading of American literature can prove beneficial for several reasons.

Traditionally, gender studies have been associated with women. Politically, this is as should be. It was women who underwent -and still undergo- the most detrimental effects of patriarchy and so it was women who had to make gender visible for the first time (Kimmel).

However, gender does not only affect women. For example, the growing body of gay studies has shown how patriarchy also oppresses homosexual men. While gender has long been related to women (and, more recently, to gay masculinities), gender studies has only recently begun to explore heterosexual masculinity. And yet gendering the heterosexual man remains one of the main challenges of this new century.

In this sense, American sociologist Michael Kimmel suggests that (heterosexual) "American men have no history", as they remain largely invisible from a gender studies perspective. In his own words, "American men have no history of themselves *as men*" (Kimmel, 1996, pp. 1-2).

It is already common knowledge that *invisibility* is a precondition for the perpetuation of male dominance. In this respect, Sally Robinson reminds us that "one cannot question, let alone dismantle, what remains hidden from view" (Robinson, 2000, p. 1), while Judith Butler (1990) and Donna Haraway (1991) also talk about the privilege of inhabiting an unmarked body that has been the patrimony of white Western man.

It seems, then, that in order to question the privileges of unmarkedness, one needs to make the normative visible as a category in gender terms. In other words, in order to do away with universalizing notions of (heterosexual) masculinity, one needs, first of all, to gender it and to render it visible. Hence the need for Men's Studies, which Harry Brod defines as

The study of masculinities and male experiences as specific and varying

social-historical-cultural formations. Such studies situate masculinities as objects of study on a par with femininities, instead of elevating them to universal norms. (Brod, 1987, p. 40)

In fact, Men's Studies is a small, though growing, and relatively recent field of study, which analyzes masculinities as socially constructed (and so as liable to be socially de-constructed and changed), context-specific, and culture-bound. So Men's Studies no longer treats masculinity as the universal and unchangeable "referent against which standards are assessed but as a problematic gender construct" itself (Kimmel, 1987, p. 10).

Even though the first masculinity studies in the late 1970s and early 1980s were mainly written by psychologists and sociologists, from the 1990s there has been a dramatic increase in the number of works on literary representations of masculinity. As James D. Riemer (1987) suggests, a Men's Studies rereading of American literature can prove beneficial for several reasons. First, just as the erroneous assumption that male experience equals human experience affected literary criticism's treatment of women as characters and authors, so has it limited our perceptions about men in literature. Therefore, Men's Studies can help transform "supposedly universal human experiences into ones that are distinctly masculine" (Riemer, 1987, p. 289).

A second implication of rereading American literature from a Men's Studies perspective is the "possibility of viewing a significant portion of American literature Y as social documents reflecting our society's ideals of masculinity" (Riemer, 1987, p. 290). In this way, these studies show how "there exists a multiplicity of ideals of American manhood, some of which at times conflict with one another, and how" American "society's predominant ideals of masculinity have changed over the past two centuries" (1987, p. 290).

Sociologically, one should also avoid restricting the analysis of American manhood to literary texts that focus on the values of the white middle class, which Riemer identifies as a common "limitation characteristic of a majority of the research and scholarship in men's studies" (Riemer, 1987, p. 291). By studying literary works that depict men's lives beyond the bourgeois experience, we could see how masculinity may vary according to a man's social, economic and/or racial-ethnic environment. Moreover, we could also analyze how these environments have created or influenced those ideals (1987, p. 291).

Despite the undeniable value of literature as a social document reflecting our masculine ideals, one should insist that such literary analyses cannot be taken as sociological, psychological, or anthropological studies on American masculinity. As Riemer insists, they

cannot be expected to give the whole “truth” about manhood in relation to a particular social, economic, racial-ethnic environment, but they can offer valuable insights into areas for further, potentially corroborating research by sociologists, psychologists, and social anthropologists. (Riemer, 1987, p. 291)

It seems, then, that the relationship between literary studies on masculinity and the larger field of Men’s Studies is “a reciprocal one” (Riemer, 1987, p. 291). Just as rereading American literature for what it says about social conceptions of masculinity widens the base of men's studies knowledge, information gathered from other fields, such as sociology or psychology, “can illuminate our rereading of American literature in new and meaningful ways by affecting the nature of literary criticism itself” (1987, p. 291). While, traditionally, literary criticism by males has viewed the dilemmas of male characters from an abstract perspective, a Men’s Studies approach to American literature shifts “the focus of criticism from the manner in which men’s lives reflect universal concerns or dilemmas to a more intimate, personal concern with how cultural values, particularly those connected with ideals of masculinity, affect the lives of men on a personal Y level” (1987, pp. 293- 294). Since a Men’s Studies approach to American literature focuses on the personal, it can reveal, for instance, “the central role that women play in developing the male sense of masculinity” (1987, pp. 295-296).

Finally, one should not forget that a Men’s Studies approach to American literature starts off from a feminist agenda. In other words, “attitude and ideological approach, not the sex of characters, authors, or critics, delineate the men’s studies perspective” (Riemer, 1987, p. 289). So one could conclude, borrowing a term from feminist literary criticism, that the aim of a Men’s Studies approach to American literature is “re-vision: a revision of the way we read literature and a revision of the way we perceive men and manly ideals” (1987, p. 298). It is a revision that seeks to analyze traditional but also new alternative models of masculinity. As James D. Riemer puts it:

to change men's lives [one needs] more than recognition of the limitations and negative effects of our present ideals of manhood. There also must be a recognition and reinforcement of positive alternatives to traditional masculine ideals and behaviors. (Riemer, 1987, p. 298)

Riemer complains about the “astonishing infrequency with which such alternative images occur” (Riemer, 1987, p. 299). However, a number of writers -especially, though not exclusively, ethnic American women writers such as Toni Morrison, Leslie Silko or Louise Erdrich- have begun to redefine masculinity through their fiction (Carabí, 2003, pp. 99-114). Of course, the positive images of masculinity in these fictional works should be taken as models for reflection, not as a recipe. As Nobel-Prize-winning-novelist Toni Morrison has rightly suggested, fiction

should have something in it that enlightens; something in it that opens the door and points the way. Something in it that suggests what the conflicts are, what the problems are. But it need not solve those problems because it is not a case study, it is not a recipe. (Evans, 1984, p. 341)

Works Cited

- Brod, Harry 1987: “The Case for Men's Studies”. *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Ed. Harry Brod. Boston: Allen and Unwin. 39-62.
- Butler, Judith 1990: *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Carabí, Àngels 2003: “Algunos hombres buenos: escritoras norteamericanas”. *Hombres escritos por mujeres*. Ed. Àngels Carabí and Marta Segarra. Barcelona: Icaria. 99-114.
- Evans, Mari, ed. 1984: *Black Women Writers (1950-1980): A Critical Evaluation*. New York: Anchor.
- Haraway, Donna 1991: *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Kimmel, Michael, ed. 1987: *Changing Men. New Directions on Research on Men and Masculinity*. Newsbury Park: Sage.
- 1996: *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. New York: The Free Press.

Riemer, James D. 1987: "Rereading American Literature from a Men's Studies Perspective: Some Implications". *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Ed. Harry Brod. Boston: Allen and Unwin. 289-299.

Robinson, Sally 2000: *Marked Men: White Masculinity in Crisis*. New York: Columbia University Press

Congreso EAAS Praga – abril 2004

Panel: "Representations of Masculinity in 20th century American literature"

Participan: Dra. Àngels Carabí, Dr. Bob Vorlicky, Dra. Barbara Ozieblo, Dr.

William Dow, Sr. Josep M^a Armengol

Resultados:

"Introduction to the Studies of Masculinities"

Àngels Carabí

Universitat de Barcelona

Today's panel, entitled "Re-presentations of Masculinity in twentieth-century American Literature", attempts to explore the current theoretical inquiries of masculinity studies and its applicability to the analysis of literary works.

In the past decade, masculinity studies have been consolidated as a field of critical analysis which seeks to rethink the meanings of masculinity. Men's studies scholarship emerged in the United States in the 1970s as a response to the second wave feminism and to the questioning of traditional male behaviors.

First wave men's studies scholarship which took place in the 1970s and 1980s centered its attention on the experience of white, middle class men, giving birth to movements like the profeminist movement which sought gender equality by deconstructing male privileges. Parallel to this movement, other movements emerged, such as the mythopoetic movement (Bly) and the Promise Keepers who wanted to reconstruct masculinity from an essentialist perspective.

Yet, notions of unified identities were challenged by the emergence of postmodernism and poststructuralism in the 1980s and 1990s which brought new

research perspectives on masculinity studies. These studies have shown that masculinity has multiple meanings which vary over time and across cultures (Rotundo, Petersen) and rather than fixed identities, masculinities are open to produce new configurations in changing intercultural contexts (Petersen).

Recent investigation has been focusing on the socially constructed differences existing between men, a position which undermines previous notions that differences only exist between men and women; this analysis sustains that men's realities are plural, that men create their identities with the perception of other men and that hierarchies have been determining men's relationships (Brod, Kaufman, Kimmel).

Just as feminism had initially interrogated fundamental concepts as woman, femininity, women's experiences, patriarchy and the sex/gender division, current studies of masculinity are exploring how men are constituted as gendered social subjects.

One of the most radical advances in the studies of masculinities comes from the feminisms of the 1980s-1990s and by queer studies which have transformed the critical inquiry by not only fostering alternative masculinities but by seeking wide rearticulations of masculinity which defy patriarchal constructions of men. Gay studies, for instance, have turned into one of the most significant analytical fields of masculinity studies.

Since the late 1990s masculinity studies has also been paying attention to issues of ethnicity. Race masculinity studies emerged out of the concerns raised by men of color who feel absent from the emerging body of criticism on this field. These male critics (Awkward, Eng, Mirande) as well as female critics (Anzaldúa, hooks) claim that masculinities are not exclusively constructed within men's power over women but in structures of exclusion based on hierarchies which subordinate racialized men (Robinson).

The insights of race studies are stimulating an innovative field of analysis which focuses on the need to explore white masculinities as racialized identities as well as to reflect on the concept of whiteness as a political construction (S. Robinson).

As scholarly masculinity studies is progressively being influenced by a wide range of feminisms, queer studies and race studies, there is a growing need to advance new dialogues between masculinity studies and these other disciplines.

Today's panel offers an interesting variety of perspectives on the issues of masculinity. The first presentation centers its attention on masculinity studies' current theoretical foundations and the other presentations focus on the application of theory to the analysis of three literary texts, two of them written by men and one by a woman.

Jose M^a Armengol interrogates principal elements of identification of masculinity, such as whiteness, maleness and heterosexuality from a theoretical point of view.

William Dow analyzes Jack London's work *People in the Abyss*, published in 1902. Dow will show how, in London's work it is the body that recreates and contains the prescribed and proscribed range of social behaviors in relation to masculinity.

Bob Vorlicky analyses Richard Greenberg's play *Take Me Out*, 2003. Vorlicky shows how Greenberg queers the male space by exploring the complex relationships of men among themselves – actually baseball players- in a multiracial and sexually diverse scenario.

Finally, Barbara Ozieblo will explore the point of view of a woman dramatist, Cherrie Moraga's who, in her play, *A Shadow of a Man*, 1994, inverts the specular gaze and focuses on Manuel and his family *as a woman*.

I wish to thank the participation of all the panelists in this debate and the audience for accompanying us in this beautiful city.

Works Cited

- Anzaldúa, Gloria 1987: *Borderlands. La Frontera. The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.
- Awkward, Michael 1995: *Negotiating Difference: Race, Gender and the Politics of Positionality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bly, Robert 1990: *Iron John*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Brod, Harry, ed. 1987: *The Making of Masculinities: the New Men's Studies*. Boston: Allen and Unwin.
- Butler, Judith 1990: *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York and London: Routledge.
- DiPiero, Thomas 2002: *Why Men Aren't*. Durham and London, Duke UP.
- Halberstam, Judith 1998: *Female Masculinity*. Durham, Duke University Press.
- hooks, bell 1995: *Killing Rage. Ending Racism*. New York: Henri Holt.

- Jeffords, Susan 1989: *The Remasculinization of America: Gender and the Vietnam War*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Kaufman, Michael and Harry Brod eds. 1994: *Theorizing Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kimmel, Michael, ed. 2000: *The Gendered Society*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mirande, Alfredo 1997: *Hombres y Machos: Masculinity and Latino Culture*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Petersen, Alan 2003: "Research on Men and Masculinities. Some Implications of Recent Theory for the Future". *Men and Masculinities* 6: 54-69.
- Robinson, Phil 2004. 03. 05:
http://europofem.org/02.info/22contri/2.04.enmasc/46en_mas.htm
- Robinson, Sally 2000: *Marked Men: White Masculinity in Crisis*. New York: Columbia.
- Rotundo, Anthony E. 1993: *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky 1985: *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wiegman, Robyn 1995. "Unmaking: Men and Masculinity in Feminist Theory". *Masculinity Studies and Feminist Theory. New Directions*. Ed. Judith Kegan Gardiner. New York: Columbia University Press. 30-59.

“Men’s Studies: Theoretical Foundations and Applicability to Literary Theory”

Josep M. Armengol

University of Barcelona

As more and more work is being done in the name of men’s studies, it seems necessary to analyze some of its theoretical foundations as well as its applicability to literary theory. It is already common knowledge that women’s studies focuses on women’s experiences, while gay/lesbian/queer studies concentrate on the lives of homosexual men and women. Though men’s studies analyze both gay and heterosexual masculinities and, more recently, masculinities from different social and ethnic backgrounds, it is a fact that, traditionally, its focus has been on white, heterosexual masculinity. Thus, men’s studies seems grounded in a doubtful object of study. In his landmark *White Men Aren’t*, Thomas DiPiero argues, for example, that his research on white masculinity suggests that the principal elements of identification - whiteness, maleness- are impossible ones, since according to the cultural structure that has defined them, “no one could ever be completely white and/or completely male.” In other words, the ideal white man “is not simply a fiction, [...] but a fiction constructed to prohibit comprehensive identification” (DiPiero 4). Insisting further, DiPiero contends that if nobody has ever really been completely white or completely male, then we have a split between our structures of meaning and our sociopolitical practices, which implies that “we have a designation of human identity -white male- that apparently has no real referent in the world in which we live.” “It seems particularly ironic,” DiPiero concludes, “that the standard by which all others have traditionally been measured and through which all are made into fictionalized others is itself an impossible and nonexistent model” (DiPiero, 2002, p. 9).

DiPiero provides two convincing examples to support his argument. First of all, he refers to the well-known “one drop of blood” rule, which developed in the eighteenth century in the American south and has survived up to the present. According to this rule, “no person with any identifiable nonwhite heritage whatsoever [...] can be identified as properly white” (DiPiero, 2002, p. 9). DiPiero wittingly concludes that since no one can account for the sexual dalliances of ancestors

long dead, “a great deal of racial consternation and hysteria arises in the people for whom such pedigree matters” (2002, pp. 9-10).

Second, DiPiero also suggests that the concept of “whiteness” is culture-specific and context-bound (DiPiero, 2002, pp. 10-11). Following Winthrop Jordan, DiPiero argues that the term *white* began to be commonly used as a term to describe/classify human beings toward the end of the seventeenth century. As Jordan himself explains:

There seems to have been something of a shift during the seventeenth century in the terminology which Englishmen in the colonies applied to themselves. From the initially most common term *Christian*, at mid-century there was a marked drift toward *English* and *free*. After about 1680, taking the colonies as a whole, a new term appeared -*white*. (Jordan qtd. in DiPiero, 2002, p. 240)

It appears, then, that white masculinity has been “historically variable -in some cases quite radically” (DiPiero, 2002, p. 10). For example, at the beginning of the twentieth century, Irish and Italian immigrants were not usually regarded as white, although both groups today would most likely be regarded as white by nearly everyone (2002, p.10). Therefore, it becomes very difficult to identify who white males are. As DiPiero exemplifies:

it took a Supreme Court decision to determine whether Bhagat Singh Thind, a native of India who was applying for American citizenship, was white. He wasn't. The Supreme Court held that “the words ‘free white persons’ are words of common speech, to be interpreted in accordance with the understanding of the common man.” (DiPiero, 2002, p. 10)

Indeed, white masculinity appears to be determined at least as much by people's beliefs and opinions on the subject as it is by the physical characteristics that seem to define it (DiPiero, 2002, p. 10). As DiPiero concludes in this respect:

if it were simply the case that any person who appeared to be a white male simply *was* a white male, the identity would have no problematic political or ideological dimension since there would be no question of a legitimacy to which some people were not entitled. That is why we cannot simply and unproblematically point to the person who seems both white and male: you have to

know what he looks like before you can actually see him. (DiPiero, 2002, pp. 10-11)

If the existence of “whiteness” appears, at least, open to questioning, the concept of “heterosexuality” can also be interrogated in a number of ways. Probably, the most radical challenge to the presumed unity and stability of heterosexuality has come from Judith Butler. In her classical *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Butler suggests, for instance, that the “unity” of gender is the effect of a regulatory practice that tries to render gender identity uniform through a compulsory heterosexuality: “The force of this practice is, through an exclusionary apparatus of production, to restrict the relative meanings of ‘heterosexuality,’ ‘homosexuality,’ and ‘bisexuality’ as well as the subversive sites of their convergence and resignification” (Butler, 1990, pp. 31-32). While Monique Wittig establishes a radical division between heterosexuality and homosexuality, Butler argues against (mis)conceptions of heterosexuality as a coherent model. In this sense, then, Butler coincides with other queer theorists like Carolyn Dinshaw, who also insists on the inextricability of “the normative” and “the deviant,” claiming that sometimes they even become indistinguishable. As Butler concludes in this respect, the ideal of a coherent heterosexuality, which Wittig describes as the norm and standard of the heterosexual matrix, is “an impossible ideal.”

A psychoanalytic elaboration might contend that this impossibility is exposed in virtue of the complexity and resistance of an unconscious sexuality that is not always already heterosexual. In this sense, heterosexuality offers normative sexual positions that are intrinsically impossible to embody, and the persistent failure to identify fully and without incoherence with these positions reveals heterosexuality itself not only as a compulsory law, but as an inevitable comedy. (Butler, 1990, p. 122)

Like Butler, other scholars have also set out to challenge the presumed “unity” and “coherence” of heterosexuality. For example, in his well-known *Gay New York*, George Chauncey explains that the opposition between homosexuals and heterosexuals is very recent, and that it is only after the Second World War that homosexuality and heterosexuality appear as mutually exclusive options. Until that

time, many people shifted from a female to a male lover and heterosexual men could have sex with gay men, without fear of feminization, as long as they played the so-called “masculine” role in the relationship. Indeed, Mason Stokes (Stokes, 2001, pp. 14-15) reminds us that the very concept of heterosexuality has a discrete history. According to Jonathan Ned Katz, the term *heterosexuality* was first used in the American medical context in 1892 in an article by Dr. James G. Kiernan (Katz, 1995, p. 19). In Kiernan’s view, *heterosexuality* had perverse connotations, as it referred to non-reproductive male-female erotic desire. Like Kiernan’s work, Richard von Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia Sexualis* also described the term *heterosexuality* as a non-reproductive, pleasure-centered pathology. However, Krafft-Ebing, unlike Kiernan, begins to refer to heterosexuality as the “normal,” different-sex erotic standard. The reason for this semantic change is obvious: “Because Krafft-Ebing discusses heterosexuality alongside case studies of men troubled by homosexual desire, heterosexuality begins to assume its shape as a cure for deviance, as a thing to strive for” (Stokes, 2001, p. 15). Finally, Freud’s “Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality” helped to consolidate the power of heterosexuality as modern society’s dominant norm. It seems, then, that *heterosexuality* is not a stable, eternal, and immutable referent, since its meanings have radically changed over the years. As Spanish sociologist Òscar Guasch notes in this respect, in reality there are very few heterosexual people, as it is very difficult to fulfill all the requirements of the model: monogamy, vaginal intercourse, erections and orgasms, capacity for reproduction, etc. (Guasch, 2001, pp. 41-42).

If, as it seems, the concept of “heterosexuality” has been radically challenged, the notion of *maleness* (and *femaleness*) has also been put into question. One of the first (and most influential) challenges to the traditional biological distinction between the sexes came from the work of Michel Foucault. In the last chapter of *The History of Sexuality*, Volume I, Foucault suggests that we should give up looking at “sex” as both univocal and causal, and that we should begin treating it as an *effect*, rather than an origin. Indeed, Foucault argues that “sex” is nothing but an effect of the hegemonic discourse of (hetero)sexuality. In his own words:

The notion of “sex” made it possible to group together, in an artificial unity, anatomical elements, biological functions, conducts, sensations, and pleasures, and it enabled one to make use of this fictitious unity as a causal

principle, an omnipresent meaning: sex was thus able to function as a unique signifier and as a universal signified. (Foucault, 1984, p. 154)

So Foucault seems to consider that morphology itself is a direct consequence of a hegemonic epistemology and that power constructs what it claims simply to represent. As Butler explains in this respect, “for Foucault, the body is not ‘sexed’ in any significant sense prior to its determination within a discourse through which it becomes invested with an ‘idea’ of natural or essential sex” (Butler, 1990, p. 92). It seems, then, that the body is only meaningful(l) in the context of power relations:

Sexuality is an historically specific organization of power, discourse, bodies, and affectivity. As such, sexuality is understood by Foucault to produce “sex” as an artificial concept which effectively extends and disguises the power relations responsible for its genesis. (Butler, 1990, p. 92)

Last but not least, it should be added that since most definitions of masculinity rely on the concept of maleness, the concept of masculinity (studies) is itself put under pressure. For instance, Harry Brod’s seminal definition of masculinity studies refers to “the study of masculinities and *male* experiences as specific and varying social-historical-cultural formations” (Brod, 1987, p. 40; emphasis added). From what has been suggested, it appears, then, that the widespread belief in the (fixed) identity of the white heterosexual male is anything but unproblematical. Does it follow, therefore, that we should give up beforehand masculinity studies as well as any attempt to analyze white heterosexual masculinity? Inevitably, the question leads us back to the current debate between identity politics, on the one hand, and postmodernism, on the other.

That the discussion is (also/especially) relevant to masculinity studies will become clear by looking at a number of obviously opposite views on the subject. Many men’s studies scholars advocate a postmodern dissolution of (sexual) identity. Thus, Patrick Grim has argued that sex differences are not so important as is usually assumed. In his own words:

let us suppose that in some case we do have firm and unambiguous empirical evidence of differences between the sexes; let us suppose that we can *prove* that men are characteristically more aggressive, that women are generally

more “communicative,” and the like. What follows from suitably hard data revealing suitably fundamental differences even if we have it? Not as much, I think, as is often assumed. (Grim, 1992, p. 2)

Indeed, relying on a binary model of sexual difference for feminist and masculinity studies can reinforce, rather than deconstruct, patriarchal divisions, even if undesired. As Pierre Bourdieu and Michael Kimmel insist, gender inequality creates gender differences, not the other way around.

Nevertheless, some critics still rely on identity politics and suspect most attempts to dissolve (sexual) difference. For example, Sally Robinson suggests that her work on white masculinity is not worried about “unfairly generalizing about an obviously heterogeneous category,” insisting that “white men in post-liberationist culture *have*, in fact, been lumped into one category.” As she explains:

In fact, I take a certain delight in imagining one possible response to my arguments here. How can we lump *all* white men, regardless of their differences, into one, seemingly monolithic category? The delight comes both from the irony of this question -what feminist woman wouldn't laugh at this? What victim of racial profiling wouldn't snicker at this payback?- and from the fact that anyone who articulates it will be further confirming the arguments I am making. (Robinson, 2000, pp. 20-21)

Rather than choose between fixed notions of sexual identity and the dissolution of sexual difference, a number of scholars have started to rethink the debate in an interesting number of ways. One of the most interesting challenges to the dichotomous debate between identity politics and postmodernism has come from the work of Asian-American queer scholar David L. Eng. In the introduction to *Q & A: Queer in Asian America*, for instance, he argues that most epistemologies are addressed to unacknowledged and universal subjects. For example, he identifies the white, European, middle-class gay man “as the unacknowledged universal subject of lesbian/gay and queer studies” (Eng, 1998, p. 12), just as he sees the white, European, middle-class, heterosexual man as the unacknowledged universal subject of masculinity studies.

However, the assumption of a universal subject for gay and masculinity studies should be questioned for (at least) two different reasons. First, conceptions of

masculinity vary historically and psychically according to the particularities of race, ethnicity, national origin, sexuality, gender, class, and age (Eng, 2001, p. 4), among others. Second, no masculine identity is stable and coherent (2001, pp. 25-34). In Eng's own words, masculine subjectivity is "the hybrid result of internalized ideals and lived material contradictions that were once external" (2001, pp. 25-27). "Even the most orthodox of" masculine "subject positions, finally, are ambivalent and porous" (2001, p. 26).

In order to move beyond these reductionist (mis)conceptions of our gendered identities, Eng advocates the notion of masculinity studies as a "subjectless critique," which has two main implications. First, it acknowledges that masculinity varies historically and culturally by the particularities of race, class, gender, sexuality, and age, among others. Second, it allows for heterogeneity, multiplicity, and contradiction within supposedly stable and unitary male subjectivities, thus moving beyond liberal humanist conceptions of identity as pure and coherent.

Even though Eng advocates a new definition of masculinity studies as "subjectless," his redefinition does not entail doing away with the subject. Indeed, he simply defends a view of the subject as problematic. In this sense, Judith Butler reminds us that there is a key difference between the poststructuralist view whereby the subject never existed and the postmodern argument that sees the subject as heterogeneous and contradictory. "It is in this latter respect that feminism and postmodernism come together. They both view the idea of the subject as problematic, which [...] is not the same as doing away with the subject" (Oliver, 2000, p. 65). Indeed, Eng sees no irreducible contradiction between the view of the subject as problematic and identitarian claims, or between postmodern theory and political practice. After all, the political efficacy of a coalitional gathering under a strategic "we," Eng insists, "in no way requires the ossification of either the label [...] or its contents" (Eng, 1998, p. 9).

From what has been suggested, one could conclude, then, that categories like masculinity and gender continue to be relevant in spite of the postmodern insistence on their indeterminacy and instability. However, this paper contends that (white, heterosexual) masculinity is not unitary and monolithic, but heterogeneous, multiple, and contradictory. Therefore, men's studies should not try to "solve" (were it possible) masculinity's internal contradictions, but, rather, to explore and focus on them. As Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick suggests in her seminal *Epistemology of the Closet*, "the more

promising project would seem to be a study of the incoherent dispensation itself, the indis severable girdle of incongruities under whose discomfoting span, for most of a century, have unfolded both the most generative and the most murderous plots of our culture” (Sedwick, 1990, p. 90). After all, these incongruities are the condition, not the failure, of historical analyses, community-building, and political practice (Dinshaw).

Finally, we will make some reference to men’s studies applicability to literary theory. More specifically, we will attempt to challenge the common claim that there is no relationship between social and literary studies of masculinities, or that literature is of little or no social relevance to the analysis of masculinities. In this sense, Terry Eagleton has proposed a “revolutionary” and “political” criticism that “would dismantle the ruling concepts of ‘literature’, reinserting ‘literary’ texts into the whole field of cultural practices. It would strive to relate such ‘cultural’ practices to other forms of social activity” (Eagleton, quoted in Oliver, 2000, p. 16). In other words, critics like Eagleton attempt to undermine the distinction between the literary and the non-literary, or “the division of art and society whereby art and aesthetic values are confined to the fringes of our lives and are separated from society” (Oliver, 2000, p. 16). As Oliver concludes in this respect, we should try to transgress the “limits between the world and the text” (2000, p. 24), learning to view

the text as a social phenomenon and an ideological act that participated of life through language. Although we cannot assume a direct correspondence between reality and the way it is represented by the text, we can certainly argue that *there is a relation between the text and the socio-historical reality in which it is being produced, reproduced and read*. It is in the ways texts interpret, problematize and/or mediate reality that their political and ideological function may be discerned. (Oliver, 2000, p. 12; emphasis added)

Works Cited

- Bourdieu, Pierre. *La domination masculine*. Paris: Seuil, 1998.
- Brod, Harry. “The Case for Men’s Studies.” *The Making of Masculinities. The New Men’s Studies*. Ed. Harry Brod. Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1987.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

- Dinshaw, Carolyn. *Getting Medieval: Sexualities and Communities, Pre- and Postmodern*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1999.
- DiPiero, Thomas. *White Men Aren't*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Eng, David L. *Racial Castration: Managing Masculinity in Asian America*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2001.
- et al. "Introduction. Q & A: Notes on a Queer Asian America." *Q & A: Queer in Asian America*. Ed. David L. Eng and Alice Y. Hom. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998.
- Foucault, Michel. *History of Sexuality. Vol. I*. Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1984.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality." 1905. Trans. James Strachey. Vol. 14. London: Hogarth, 1957. 73-102.
- Grim, Patrick. "Sex and Social Roles: How to Deal with the Data." *Rethinking Masculinity: Philosophical Explorations in Light of Feminism*. Ed. Larry May and Robert Strikwerda. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1992.
- Guasch, Òscar. "L'heterosexualitat com a problema social. Envers un model obert de sexualitat." *Sociologia de la sexualitat*. Barcelona: Pòrtic, 2001. 35-44.
- Katz, Jonathan Ned. *The Invention of Heterosexuality*. New York: Penguin, 1995.
- Kimmel, Michael. *The Gendered Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Krafft-Ebing, Richard von. *Psychopathia Sexualis, with Special Reference to Contrary Sexual Instinct*. Trans. Charles Gilbert Chaddock. 7th ed. Philadelphia: Davis, 1893.
- Oliver, Maria Antònia. "Crossroads and Battlegrounds: The Borderlands as Social and Imaginary Space in Contemporary Writings by Chicanas." Diss. Barcelona: Departament de Filologia Anglesa i Alemanya de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2000.
- Robinson, Sally. *Marked Men: White Masculinity in Crisis*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Stokes, Mason. *The Color of Sex: Whiteness, Heterosexuality, and the Fictions of White Supremacy*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2001.

“A Man and His Shadow as seen by a woman: Cherríe Moraga’s

***Shadow of a Man*”**

Barbara Ozieblo

Universidad de Málaga

One of the tasks of Women’s Studies has been to wrest control of our selves from the patriarchy, from those myriad male writers bent on creating and re-creating us in their image. Remember how amazed Virginia Woolf was at the number of men who had written about women when she turned to us with the question: “Are you aware, perhaps, that you are the most discussed animal in the universe?” (Woolf, 1985, p. 27) In the second half of the twentieth century women began to write and theorize about ourselves and, for Jane Flax, “The single most important advance in feminist theory is that the existence of gender relations has been problematized” (Flax, 1990, pp. 43-44). Looking at ourselves we have been obliged to look also at those around us and at the social relations so created; this inevitably led us to focus on the oppressor, that is, on the patriarchal system, and so, on men as its representatives. Our opinions and demands caused a little stir and some men, such as Robert Bly, Michael Kimmel and many others responded to the challenge. So, masculinity studies, or men’s studies, has gradually developed its definitions and theories in the footsteps of feminism, and recently has been applied to theater studies by a number of critics, such as Carla McDonough, David Savran and Bob Vorlicky.

Victoria Robinson, among many others, has queried and discussed women’s participation in masculinity studies just as men’s participation in women’s studies has been, and still is, under discussion. What I hope to show today, through an analysis of Chicano dramatist Cherríe Moraga’s early play *Shadow of a Man* (1990), is that women do not attempt to appropriate and create male experience in the same way that men have done when writing about women. As Kate Millet formulated it: “The image of women as we know it is an image created by men and fashioned to suit their needs” (Millet, 1985, p. 46). Or, as Octavio Paz put it: “La mujer vive presa en la imagen que la sociedad masculina le impone” (Paz, 345), that is: women are prisoners of the image that male society imposes on them. Both Millett and Paz could have added that men too are prisoners of the image they have thus created for themselves; Moraga’s *Shadow of a Man* deals with this double imprisonment. Cherríe Moraga presents a truly horrific

situation caused by Manuel's uncertain sense of identity and his need to prove himself as a man. He suffers the consequences as much—if not more than his wife and children. Moraga adopts the impassive stance of observer and refrains from making accusations. By inverting the specular gaze and focusing on Manuel and his family *as a woman*, she attempts to penetrate the situation and the character and so rouses the spectator to pity Manuel and admire his wife Hortensia. Such a positive presentation of men's lack of self-knowledge and identity can only deepen and enrich our understanding of the male predicament, and thus of our own.

Recently, Judith Kegan Gardiner formulated a definition of masculinity and feminism which I would like to quote here: "Masculinity is a nostalgic formation, always missing, lost, or about to be lost, its ideal form located in a past that advances with each generation in order to recede just beyond its grasp. Feminism, in contrast, is a utopian discourse of an ideal future, never yet attained, whose myth celebrates alliances that manage conflicts within comprehensive metanarratives and narratives of comprehension" (Gardiner, 2002, p. 10). Applying this definition to the characters under scrutiny, we could argue that Cherríe Moraga, in *Shadow of a Man*, engages both masculinity and femininity and shows how the male is absorbed in looking back while the women are intent on moving forward.

Shadow of a Man was first performed on 10 November 1990 by Brava! For Women in the Arts and the Eureka Theatre Company in San Francisco. It was directed and the set was designed by María Irene Fornés. Moraga developed the play during her residence at INTAR's 1985 Hispanic Playwrights-in-Residence Laboratory in New York City, so that early versions of the play were presented at readings and performed as a "play in progress." The structural device Moraga uses here is that of the mystery or detective play; the principal action, or crime, has already occurred and the characters have to face the consequences of this crime; there is no moment of crisis or revelation—Manuel's death is a death foreseen—as Moraga guides us through the complicated relationships of this Chicana family. The setting, as given in the stage directions, is indicative of Moraga's rejection of patriarchal models of behavior; the play is performed in "places chiefly inhabited by mothers and daughters" (Moraga, 1994, p. 40), that is, the kitchen, the bathroom, and the daughters' bedroom, but also in the garden behind the kitchen, in which "multiple plant life abounds" (1994, p. 41), thus linking the women to the soil and to the nurture that nature provides. Moraga's meaning

is clear: the home is the women's sphere, and the male, as Hortensia says "stays a stranger in his own home" (1994, p. 83).

The acting space is not presented realistically; rooms are divided by "representative walls that rise about sixteen inches from the floor" (1994, p. 41). This rejection of theatrical conventions, of the traditional *suspension of disbelief*, reminds us constantly that we are watching a play and not a *slice of life* that has somehow appeared in front of us. Realism has been criticized and rejected by many feminist theater critics who see it as a form appropriated by the patriarchy to perpetuate its structures, and although Moraga presents a family and a situation that follow realistic models, the setting shows she was aware of the discussions surrounding realism, and also points in the direction her more recent plays have taken, such as *A Mexican Medea*. The backdrop is a "Mexican painting of a Los Angeles sunset," which Moraga uses to emphasize the Chicano origins of the players and the play and their "otherness" within their own land. This is also indicated by the mixing of Spanish and English, a device frequently used by Chicano writers in order to highlight the struggle between assimilation and otherness.

Manuel's family is caught up in the struggle for assimilation of the younger generation, born and educated in California; for Manuel, the concept of assimilation is not clear-cut but tainted by a disturbing ambiguity. On the one hand, it implies the loss of roots, and thus of identity, and on the other, it relates to the "American success story" and thus becomes a reinforcement of identity. Manuel's son Rigo is about to marry a "gringuita" (Moraga, 1994, p. 46) and although nobody approves, they have all accepted Rigo's decision, except for Manuel who refuses to go to the wedding believing his son has betrayed him. Manuel does not appear till scene three, by which time we already know from the women that his behavior is a source of tension within the family; he regularly comes home late at night, in a drunken stupor, talking to himself. His son's impending wedding is destroying his peace; it symbolizes a rite of passage from ethnic isolationism to assimilation in the majority culture but also from boyhood to manhood. And for Manuel it is a goad to consider his own marriage and the trial of friendship between men he so disastrously submitted himself to. Manuel is much attached to his son and, remembering their closeness and conversations, he moans: "I know they [your eyes] saw lo que sabía mi compadre, that I am a weak man, but they did not judge me. Why do you judge me now, hijo?" (1994, p. 49)

Manuel's private sense of guilt is a secret he cannot bring out into the open; he cannot discuss it, especially with his wife, who participated unwillingly in an act that has destroyed their marriage. Hortensia had always, even before their wedding, felt attracted to Conrado, Manuel's friend and *compadre*. It was a mutual attraction, but one that, out of respect for Manuel, neither was prepared to recognize. Manuel had always looked up to Conrado, seeing in him a model of Mexican masculinity and, at the same time, an example of the American Dream come true, and thus of assimilation. Manuel creates his identity, his vision of himself, by modeling his behavior and attire on Conrado's example. We can assume that there is also a healthy masculine rivalry between the two men, and perhaps more; Carla McDonough points to the fragility of male identity and friendships, indicating that men fear "tenderness or affection for other men" because affection can so easily be interpreted as effeminacy—even in a culture such as the Chicano that is less afraid of demonstrative physical acts than the Anglo (McDonough, 1997, p. 7). The ties between the two men are strengthened when Conrado becomes the godfather of Manuel's first-born, Rigo, who is now about to marry. The relationship of *compadres* is highly significant in Mexican culture; as Moraga informs us in a prefatory note, it is "a very special bond, akin to that of blood ties, sometimes stronger" (Moraga, 1994, p. 41). When Conrado decides to leave Los Angeles—we assume he finds being close to Hortensia without being able to express his desire, painful—Manuel is desperate and prepared to sacrifice all he has to keep his *compadre* near him. So he gives him Hortensia, virtually pushing Conrado into her bed. She resists this man who had always excited her, by his mere presence making "los vellitos on my arm . . . stand straight up" (1994, p. 64); but their mutual desire, and his assurances that "Manuel knows. This is what he wants" (1994, p. 81) overcome her sense of right and wrong.

So it is Manuel that pushes the couple together, and Conrado is sufficiently self-seeking to take advantage of his *compadre*. As Manuel says to his friend: "I loved you, man. I gave you hasta mi propia mujer, but that didn't mean nothing to you. You just went and left. I gave you my fucking wife, cabrón. What does that make me?" (Moraga, 1994, p. 81) Conrado's duplicity is revealed when he returns after many years without a cent, an utter failure in Manuel's eyes —Lupe, the daughter he fathered that fateful night is now a difficult teenager. Manuel blames his *compadre* for destroying his marriage; he complains that after that night, Hortensia had treated him as if he did not

exist and, unable to see his reflection in her eyes, he is reduced to a shadow. As Carla McDonough has pointed out, “Masculine dependency upon the complicity of women, on women’s participation in its fantasy, insure that masculinity is much more dependent, more fractured and precarious, than it wishes to appear” (McDonough, 1997, p. 7).

Manuel had constructed his sense of male identity on the pillars of his reflection in his wife’s eyes, his relationship with Conrado, and his love for his son. According to Octavio Paz, the Mexican word for “male,” *macho*, even before it acquired the negative connotations it has today, meant *chingar*, a complex term for Paz, but one which my Oxford Dictionary translates simply as “to fuck” or “to screw”; “el ‘Macho’ es el Gran Chingón,” affirmed Paz (Paz, 219). Thus Manuel’s sense of identity is linked to his sexual prowess with Hortensia, incarnated in their son Rigo, and in his unspoken rivalry with and desire for Conrado. Having literally given his wife to his *compadre*, assuming, through this act, the submissive role in his relationship with Conrado, Manuel is rendered impotent. Now that Rigo is marrying an Anglo, linking manhood with assimilation, Manuel’s sense of identity totters. He sends for Conrado, begging him to return and ordering Hortensia to treat him with the honor and respect traditionally accorded a *compadre*. He insists that she is nothing to both of them; they will not even talk of her. She will be their servant and their cook, directing all her actions at ensuring that their material needs are satisfied.

The full import of Manuel’s need to submit to his friend’s desire is revealed in the scene when Conrado returns. Moraga achieves this by brief flashbacks, in which her characters momentarily re-enact the past. These moments, or flashes, are marked by Glen Miller’s “Sunrise Serenade” and by the lighting that “*assumes a dreamlike, surreal quality*” (Moraga, 1994, p. 78). Manuel interrupts the reunion between Conrado and Hortensia and, knowing now that his *compadre* is not a living example of the “American success story” (1994, p. 69), and that he is still interested in his wife, Manuel cannot endure his deception and takes an overdose.

Although Manuel does have a physical stage presence, we are constantly aware of him through Hortensia’s eyes, and also those of her sister Rosario, and the two daughters, Lupe and Leticia. Hortensia, talking about her marriage with her sister and daughters just before the funeral, comments: “Funny, when a man is asleep, that’s when you really get to know him. You see the child’s look on his face, before he wakes up

and remembers he's a man again" (1994, p. 83). Moraga has fully reversed the "customary specular relation of subject and object between a male gaze and a female body," a reversal to which Gardiner attributes the "ambivalent dependency and antagonism toward feminism" (Gardiner, 2002, p. 9) that masculinity studies frequently expresses. In *Shadow of a Man*, our gaze and that of the women characters is directed on a man who has been deprived of his role models and his manhood not by others, but by his unpardonable sin against the humanity of his wife. However, he does not recognize this as a sin against Hortensia but as an offense, instigated by him, against his property, his wife. He has exposed himself, shown his fragility as a man and, knowing himself observed, believes that everybody knows his secret and that "they're all laughing at what they see inside my head" (Moraga, 1994, p. 65). Although the women's gaze prevails in the play, Moraga does allow Manuel to express his fears and his horror at the loss of his identity, with the result that we can sympathize with his predicament and are less willing to lay all the responsibility on his shoulders. Such self-expression and introspection would of course be shunned by a "truly" masculine man.

Hortensia's comment on a man appearing like a child in his sleep is part of the symbolic structure of the play that divides the family into the male and female spheres and presents her, and her sister Rosario, as nurturing mother figures. Manuel is reduced to a baby when he returns home drunk and Hortensia has to undress him; when, later, he is about to meet Conrado, he dresses, and although he does this by himself, he does it in the presence of the women who observe him, "*their eyes never leaving him*" (Moraga, 1994, p. 75). He thus becomes the little boy who can now dress himself, but still needs the supervision of the mother, until, once dressed, the clothes give him his manly identity and "*He imagines himself a different man, in Conrado's image*" (1994, p. 75).

Shadow of a Man attempts to understand the predicament of a man who has lost his sense of self, and who, having mortally offended the one woman who could reaffirm him, cannot find himself. Although I have focused on this aspect of the play, Moraga has stated that *Shadow of a Man* is a "family" play in which she "tried to expose the secrets and silences affecting both men and women in the traditional Chicano household" (Moraga, qtd. in Ramírez, 2000, p. 119). As Alicia Arrizón has indicated, the early Chicano movement—at the time of which the play is set—emphasized the value of the family and of patriarchal power, and she describes the Chicana family as being "saturated with sexism, homophobia, and internal oppression" (Arrizón, 1999. p.

8) in which women's participation is reduced to what Moraga has called the three f's "feeding, fighting and fucking." (Moraga, qtd. in Arrizón, 1999, p. 8). In order to examine these functions of women, Moraga has placed the women in the subject position, thus establishing Manuel as the "other." Moraga can then deal with domestic violence, with mother-daughter relationships, and with a lesbian awakening. The domestic violence is an obvious result of Manuel's loss of identity; he drinks in order to forget that he is nothing but a shadow, and, unable to assume the responsibility for his act, blames Hortensia, frequently resorting to violence. It is the daughters, Lupe and Leticia, who have to care for her at such moments, and their response to the scenes they witness is poles apart. Seventeen-year old Leticia, determined not to be the submissive woman her mother is, decides to give away her virginity because she has already learnt, observing the males in her life, that sex "is not about love. It's power. . . . Power they drop into our hands, so fragile the slightest pressure makes them weak with pain" (Moraga, 1994, p. 78). She explains to her mother that she had "opened [her] legs . . . [n]ot for me to be worthless, but to know that my worth had nothing to do with it" (1994, p. 78). Just as Hortensia is Leticia's confidant, so Rosario, the divorced aunt, is the person that twelve-year old Lupe chooses to confide the lesbian desires that torment her. By the end of the play, Lupe freely acknowledges her attraction for a schoolgirl friend.

In *Shadow of a Man* Moraga has not followed the example of male writers who have only two types of women in their repertoire: the temptress or the angel; she has, instead, shown how the need to enact the gender roles imposed by society is destructive and oppressive not only for women, but also for men. Manuel is unable to cope with the role he believes he should play in his family and before his *compadre*; as Susan Faludi, in an unusual application of female flower imagery to men, has affirmed, "masculinity [is] a fragile flower—a hothouse orchid in constant need of trellising and nourishment" (Faludi, 1992, p. 83). Unfortunately, Manuel is no wilting orchid; floundering in the vacuum created by the loss of self-esteem, he has recourse to physical and psychological violence in order to reassert himself. Rather than create Manuel in her own image as male writers have done for centuries with their women characters, Moraga has created a true-to-life protagonist we can pity.

Works Cited

- Arrizón, Alicia. *Latina Performance: Traversing the Stage* Bloomington; Indiana University Press, 1999.
- Faludi, Susan. *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against Women* London: Chatto & Windus, 1992.
- Flax, Jane. "Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory." Ed. Linda J. Nicholson. *Feminism/Postmodernism* New York: Routledge, 1990. 39-62.
- McDonough, Carla J. *Staging Masculinity: Male Identity in Contemporary American Drama* Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 1997.
- Gardiner, Judith Kegan. Introduction. Ed Gardiner. *Masculinity Studies and Feminist Theory* New York: Columbia University Press, 2002. 1-30.
- Millett, Kate. *Sexual Politics* (1969) London: Virago, 1985.
- Moraga, Cherríe. *Shadow of a Man* in *Heroes and Saints and Other Plays* Albuquerque, NM: West End Press, 1994. 37-84.
- Ramírez, Elizabeth C. *Chicanas/Latinas in American Theatre: A History of Performance* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2000.
- Robinson, Victoria. "Radical Revisionings?: The Theorizing of Masculinity and (Radical) Feminist Theory." *Women's Studies International Forum* 26:2 (March-April 2003): 129-137.
- Vorlicky, Robert. *Act Like a Man: Challenging Masculinities in American Drama* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.
- Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. (1929) Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.

XXVIII Congreso de AEDEAN, Valencia – diciembre 2004

Mesa Redonda: “‘Men by Women’: Contemporary American Women Writing about Men. Re-visiting Grand Narratives of Hegemonic Masculinity”

Panel: “Feminist and Gender Studies”

Participan: Dra. Àngels Carabí, Dr. Rodrigo Andrés, Dr. William C. Phillips y Sra. Cristina Alsina Rísquez

Resultados:

“Studies of Masculinities and Women’s Literature”

Àngels Carabí

University of Barcelona

Traditionally, gender studies have focused on women. Since the 1960s, feminism has made significant contributions to the analysis of gender as a cultural and political construction. In making gender visible, they have not only questioned cultural concepts of femininity but have stimulated the analysis of masculinity as a gendered construction. This has, in turn, given rise to the so-called *studies of masculinities*, which, inspired by feminist insights, have started to explore “men and masculinities as specific and varying social-cultural-historical formations” (Brod, 1987), rather than as universal paradigms. Masculinity studies have thus shown how masculinity varies from culture to culture and over historical time. In terms of academic disciplines, the focus of masculinity studies, as American sociologist Michael Kimmel indicates, seems to have moved from psychology to sociology to history. Today, much masculinity scholarship seems to be centered on the analysis of filmic and literary representations of masculinity.

Therefore, this panel, attempts to explore representations of masculinity in contemporary American women’s fiction. Given women’s long awareness and analysis of gender as a cultural and political category, fiction by women offers some of the most innovative and subversive representations of masculinity and gender relations in contemporary American culture. Rodrigo Andrés explores how Sena Jeter Naslund rereads and revisits issues of the American nineteenth century offering a historical critique of traditional masculinity. Cristina Alsina analyzes how two writers of the “Vietnam Generation”, Bobbie Ann Mason and Jayne Anne Phillips create fictional

worlds which explore changes in the definitions of male gender. William Phillips looks at representations of masculinity in the crime novels of Sara Paretsky, Sue Grafton and Patricia Cornwell.

“*Ahab’s Wife*. Contemporary Rewritings of Melvillean Masculinities”

Rodrigo Andrés

Universitat de Barcelona

Sena Jeter Naslund’s novel *Ahab’s Wife* (1999) pays homage to the great American classic *Moby Dick* (1851). Unlike Melville’s all-male novel, however, the protagonist of Naslund’s text is a woman, Una Spenser, whose relation to one of the characters in *Moby Dick* is explicit both in the title of the novel, and in its very attractive first line: “Captain Ahab was neither my first husband nor my last” (Naslund, 2000, p. 1). Una is a strong, sensual, and intellectually independent who, looking for knowledge and experiences goes out to sea disguised as a cabin boy. Naslund, however, makes it a point to show that Una’s character is not an anachronistic projection with no correspondence in mid nineteenth Century American womanhood. To prove her point, Naslund introduces in her narrative two historical women, Margaret Fuller, who stated “Let them be sea-captains - if they will!”, and Maria Mitchell, the first woman to discover a comet using a telescope. The psychological fortitude of Una, her pragmatic spirit of survival, and her realistic flexibility in front of moral dilemmas are moreover, counterbalanced by the much weaker personalities of most male characters around her, whose shortcomings and weaknesses often derive from obsessions motivated by either fear of, or actual acknowledgements of, personal failure. Thus, when after having been stove by a whale and being left stranded in an open boat, Una and the rest of the crew start eating human flesh, she can actually do it there and then but, most importantly, can justify herself later on for having done so. In contrast to her, her co-survivor and future husband Kit goes mad and becomes violent against her, others, and himself, in his inability to accept having become a cannibal. Their common friend Giles, another survivor of the tragedy, ends up killing himself so as not to have to live with the remembrance of the taste of human blood. Unwilling to expiate religious guilt with either death or madness, Una accepts that “It is an imperfect world, love” (2000, p. 281), and cannot condemn herself because “human beings are morally complex, women

as well as men, and I must live with that” (2000, p. 387). In the same way, when later on in the novel Una is confronted with a man who cannot forgive himself because he has practiced incest with his own sister, Una empowers him to forgive himself by showing she has forgiven her own cannibalism.

The dichotomy between the maturity of Una, who states “I liked myself” (Naslund, 2000, p. 462) and the Manichaeian vision of life of the male characters in the novel, which tends to paralyze them and / or remove them from the midst of the social fabric, reminds us of Nina Baym’s analysis of Nathaniel Hawthorne’s characters: “he created male protagonists who suffer from isolation, alienation, and self-absorption; women offer sociality, self-forgetfulness, connection...” (Byam, 1982, p. 58). Richly made of interconnections between fictitious and historical characters, Naslund’s novel actually forces a meeting between Nathaniel Hawthorne and Una Spenser, after which, the reader is invited to deduce, Hawthorne feels inspired to create the character of Hester Prynne and also to name his own daughter Una. The binary opposition between woman as flexible, sensual, and even hedonistic versus man as alienated from himself and tragic with the world is best embodied in both Una and Captain Ahab. When he states “In no corner of the earth have I found a happiness that lasts” she swiftly responds “Nor an unhappiness!” (Naslund, 2000, p. 478)

If Nina Baym had attributed the flexibility of Hawthorne’s female characters to the surprising profeminism of the writer, in this paper we would like to connect the flexibility of Naslund’s protagonist to Herman Melville’s needs and abilities to question some of the major preoccupations which informed mid-nineteenth century American masculinity.

The first of these preoccupations is the Transcendentalist approach to life, which tended to deny the ambiguities of human nature and of the universe attempting to smooth them up in a narrative of radical optimism to which, as we know, Herman Melville screamed “No! In Thunder!” As a matter of fact, in his writings, Melville celebrates the joys of life but, at the same time, he also embraces the contradictions and complexities of human psyche exploring what he celebrated in Hawthorne as “blackness, ten times black” (Melville, 1994, p. 2617).

A second issue is the Christian dogmatism of the first half of the nineteenth century expressed in *Ahab’s Wife* in the discourse of guilt and of fear of God in the Quaker tradition best represented by Una’s father: “*If thy hand offend thee... cut it off!*”

(Naslund, 2000, p. 569). In her rejection of such morbid religiosity, Una's spiritual curiosity is better pleased first with the Universalist church in their belief that one is saved, but later on, even more so, by the Unitarians, who grant her freedom of thought, do not dictate her actions, and celebrate nature and the most physical aspects of the human experience.

The third concern is what both Leslie Fiedler and Toni Morrison have labeled fear or even horror of no civilization, of boundarilessness, of powerlessness, of freedom in front of the unknown and the uncivilized, i.e. of nature itself. In Naslund's novel, it is true that Una does once look at Captain Ahab and asks herself in fear: "Who was this captain? A male version of myself?" (Naslund, 2000, p. 291). But the novel emphasizes that the major difference between the two characters is that she can, and does, surrender to nature whereas his inability to do the same leads to his self-destructive obsession to conquer nature in the shape of a white whale. As opposed to the masculinist dreams of control through "civilization" behind the discourses of Manifest Destiny or of nineteenth-century American capitalism that so much did upset Melville, in Naslund's novel the fictionalized Margaret Fuller comfortably writes: "And it is the way of women. We allow each other our individuality. We do not insist that we dominate or control" (2000, p. 592).

Ahab's Wife offers, thus, a critique of nineteenth-century traditional white American masculinity. Sena Jeter Naslund presents masculine emotional and psychological shortcomings with much understanding and with great awareness of the major discourses which shaped the received notion of what it was to be male in Captain Ahab's times. We believe that the spirit of the well-informed and contextualized critique of masculinity in Sena Jeter Naslund's *Ahab's Wife* is only facilitated by the same spirit in the critique of masculinity evidenced in Melville's original text. We believe that *Moby Dick* explored some of the discourse of American nineteenth-Century masculinity within the master narratives in philosophy, religion, patriotism, and entrepreneurship, in order to analyze and diagnose the major shortcomings in the construction of nineteenth-Century American masculinity which so much determined the construction of the nation and affected the lives of American women and men.

Works cited

- Baym, Nina 1982: "Thwarted Nature: Nathaniel Hawthorne as Feminist". *American Novelists Revisited: Essays in Feminist Criticism*. Ed. Fritz Fleishman. Boston: Hall. 58-77.
- Fiedler, Leslie 1982: *Love and Death in the American Novel*. New York: Penguin.
- Melville, Herman 1994: "Hawthorne and his Mosses". *The Heath Anthology of American Literature. Vol.1*. Ed. Paul Lauter. MA: Heath. 2613-25.
- Melville, Herman 1988: *Moby Dick*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morrison, Toni 1992: *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. New York: Vintage.
- Naslund, Sena Jeter 2000: *Ahab's Wife*. New York: Perennial.

"The Demystification of 'Techno-muscular' Masculinity in Bobbie Ann Mason's *In Country* and Jayne Anne Phillips' *Machine Dreams*"

Cristina Alsina Rísquez

Universitat de Barcelona

Both Jayne Anne Phillips and Bobbie Ann Mason have been considered members of the Vietnam Generation and, along with most of the baby boomers, came of age during the Vietnam War. This historical circumstance has branded at least two of the fictional worlds they have created—the worlds of *Machine Dreams* in the case of the former and that of *In Country* in the case of the latter. One of the most recurrent symbols in Mason's *In Country* is Bruce Springsteen's *Born in the U.S.A.* On its front cover, the singer is seen "facing the flag, as though studying it, trying to figure out its meaning" (Mason, 1987, p. 236). In the same fashion, both Mason and Phillips scrutinize the nation in an attempt to make sense of the traumatic event that had left a toll of 58,000 U.S. soldiers dead, some 120,000 of those who returned having committed suicide by 1990 (Boose, 1993, p. 603), and the socially complicated and politically expensive problem of having to tackle the problems of adjustment suffered by a majority of the veterans. The aforementioned novels, written in 1984 and 1985 respectively, offer a panoramic vista of U.S. society from the end of WWII to the aftermath of the Vietnam War. While Phillips describes the hegemonic discourses that lead the U.S. into the imperial war in Vietnam, Mason concentrates on the devastating effects of those

discourses on the generation that fought the war. Both writers highlight the way in which the crisis of the discourse of technological progress, on the one hand, and the social and personal dissatisfaction brought about by the imposition of a hegemonic normative family during the 1950s, on the other, problematized the process of subject formation for a generation of American men. They also aimed at redefining the traditional notions of self and nation, which had come to be regarded as having led to the atrocities witnessed and committed in Vietnam.

In both novels, the conditions for trauma are identified precisely in the discourses that equate a certain prototype of masculinity with the normative national identity. Thus, both novels put the blame for such terrible toll on the belief which establishes that American boys make their transition into male adulthood through the rite of initiation of participating in the war of their generation: ‘I don’t get it,’ Sam said. ‘If there wasn’t a war for fifty years and two whole generations didn’t have to fight, do you mean there should have been a war for them? Is that why we have wars —so guys won’t miss out?’” (Mason, 1987, pp. 86-87). The inadequacy of such discourse was most forcefully felt when the continuous line of victories and triumphal masculinity was unexpectedly and against all odds interrupted in Vietnam, depriving the males of the baby boom generation of their symbolic transition into hegemonic maturity, and therefore leaving them “unfinished”: as Sam’s mother would say in *In Country*, veterans—and by extension the soldier understood as the most effective symbol of hegemonic masculine potency— became a “case of arrested development” (1987, p. 234).

The felt incompleteness of the males in the novels analyzed translates into their failure when faced with the social duty of fulfilling their roles as fathers and providers within the traditional family unit. The disruption of the line of normative masculinity problematizes the process of subject formation for the men of the Vietnam Generation. But far from criticizing men for their “shortcomings”, Mason and Phillips empathize with those men and, instead, their novels question the hegemonic discourses which set up the standard of masculine perfection in comparison to which men define their individual identities, sometimes at a great personal cost. The novels at hand articulate their criticism around the way the U.S. society tends to accept unquestioningly the fact that technology brings human progress and that the only sound social organization is the nuclear family. Such a narrative of national identity envisages men as the able users and

creators of the technology which brings about the well-being he, as head of family, is in charge of providing to the members of the family unit.

According to Slotkin, the frontier experience had inscribed in the American imagination the moral truth that “violence and savage war were the necessary instruments of American progress” (Slotkin, 1993, p. 171). Thus, violence on the racially and / or culturally “Other”, under the appearance of a morally acceptable civilizing—or democratizing— effort, was inscribed as one of the principles that defines the national identity from its origins. For that project, the United States counted on the most sophisticated technology ever displayed by an army, a technology that was the result of an unbroken line of progress that gave unquestionable evidence to the fact that the founding of the United States had served as harbinger of a new World Order it was their destiny to promote and defend. Mason and Phillips denounce the failure of the model of national identity based on the blind belief in progress as a source of well being and civilization by both voicing their fear that technology, more than the specialized knowledge possessed by men, had become the subterfuge used by men to avoid confronting more complex aspects of their existence and by presenting technology as ultimately inefficient and destructive and, in this fashion, questioning the principle that equates technology and human progress.

The second belief, central to the construction both of the national and the masculine identity, these novels question is the one which identifies the normative family as the only possible organizational unit in society. Both Phillips and Mason identify the hegemonic nuclear family as the perpetuator of destructive national convictions and discourses. The family is portrayed, thus, and as one of the originators of the conditions for trauma. By doing this Mason and Phillips establish links with the 1970s belief that “the typical American family ought to be considered one of contributing factors in the war and, perhaps, western militarism in general” (Berg & Rowe, 1991, p. 3), instead of echoing the belief, common in the 80s, when their work was published, that the national failure in Vietnam would not have taken place had the nuclear family not been under attack from the New Left activists.

Works Cited

- Berg Rick and John Carlos Rowe 1991: "The Vietnam War and American Memory". *The Vietnam War and American Culture*. Eds. John Carlos Rowe and Rick Berg. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Boose, Lynda 1993: "Techno-Muscularity and the 'Boy Eternal'. From the Quagmire to the Gulf". *Cultures of United States Imperialism*. Eds. Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease. Durham and London: Duke University Press. 581-616.
- Mason, Bobbie Ann 1987 (1985): *In Country*. London: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Phillips, Jayne Anne 1984: *Machine Dreams*. New York: Washington Square Press.
- Slotkin, Richard 1993: "Buffalo Bill's 'Wild West' and the Mythologization of the American Empire". *Cultures of United States Imperialism*. Eds. Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease. Durham and London: Duke University Press. 581-616.

"Representations of Masculinity in American Detective Novels"

Bill Phillips

Universitat de Barcelona

For many, the hardboiled American detective novel begins with Dashiell Hammett's *The Maltese Falcon* in 1930, and is consolidated with the publication of Chandler's first Philip Marlowe novel, *The Big Sleep*, in 1939. In "The Simple Art of Murder," published in 1944, Chandler explains what the hardboiled private detective should be like:

... down these mean streets a man must go who is not himself mean, who is neither tarnished nor afraid. The detective in this kind of story must be such a man. He is the hero, he is everything. He must be a complete man and a common man and yet an unusual man. He must be, to use a rather weathered phrase, a man of honour, by instinct, by inevitability, without thought of it, and certainly without saying it. He must be the best man in his world and a good enough man for any world (Chandler, 1954, p. 198).

As Chandler himself implies, this model is basically that of the medieval knight of courtly romance, a twentieth century, rather bedraggled and besmirched, raincoat clad

St George. He is required to be brave, strong, skilled with weapons, loyal, clever and silent. He must also, of course, protect the weak and vulnerable, especially women, assuming they deserve it. As Chandler's novels make clear, there are all too often women who do not deserve consideration, just as witches and gossips were shunned in earlier times. A woman must be a virginal and pure, or she is beneath contempt.

Although this model of masculinity might seem acceptable to some, it should not be forgotten that it is a model based, primarily, on violence and, secondly, on a binary opposition. Woman is the 'other.' The masculine model can only exist in opposition to the supposedly feminine characteristics of cowardice, weakness, lack of dexterity, disloyalty, stupidity, evil cunning, and garrulity.

As well as reinforcing traditional misogynistic representations of femininity, the hard-boiled detective, in his need to construct himself in opposition to the 'other' is also racist and homophobic. The black population of Los Angeles, where Philip Marlowe lives and works is beneath his interest. In *Farewell, My Lovely* Marlowe witnesses the murder of a black bar manager by a white man. Far from attempting to detain the murderer, Marlowe's investigations lead him to the true villain of the novel, a woman. It emerges that the murderer is merely another victim of womanly wiles. The murdered black man is forgotten. Joel Cairo, meanwhile, one of the villains in Dashiell Hammett's *The Maltese Falcon* is characterised as effeminate:

Effie Perine rose and went into the outer office. Spade took off his hat and sat in his chair. The girl returned with an engraved card – MR JOEL CAIRO.
 'This guy is queer,' she said.
 'In with him, then, darling,' said Spade. (Hammett, 1982)

Not surprisingly some of the later generation of American detective fiction took Hammett's and Chandler's model to its logical extreme. Mickey Spillane's Mike Hammer and Tiger Mann novels are unashamedly sexist, racist and homophobic, as well as being among the most violent of the genre. Spillane, unlike Hammett and Chandler who were politically on the left, is an extreme right-wing reactionary obsessed with preventing the infiltration of his beloved United States by communists, criminals and perverts, against whom any means are justified. Other authors, such as Ross MacDonald, though less extreme than Spillane, undeviatingly follow Chandler's definition of what a hero should be.

In 1973 Robert B. Parker published the first of a long series of detective novels featuring Spenser, a character closely modelled on Philip Marlowe, his name being, like Marlowe's, that of a sixteenth century English poet. Despite Parker's enthusiasm for Chandler – he finished the latter's uncompleted novel *Poodle Springs* and wrote a sequel to *The Big Sleep* – he very quickly introduces modifications to the now conventional model of masculinity epitomised by the private detective. The second Spenser novel, *God Save the Child*, published in 1974, introduces the woman who is to become Spenser's life-long partner, Susan Silverman. A professional, independent psycho-therapist, Susan Silverman is neither virginal and pure, nor beneath the contempt of the ardent Spenser. She becomes invaluable, both for his peace of mind, and as an ally in solving crime. In 1976, *Promised Land* introduces Hawk, a black version of Spenser, who becomes his closest friend and invaluable side-kick in times of crisis. Many years later, in *Paper Doll*, published in 1993, Lee Farrell, a gay police detective, joins the company of barmen, lawmen, lawyers, tycoons and criminals who make up Spenser's growing army of friends and acquaintances on whom he can call in times of trouble.

Despite this, Spenser remains true to a traditional model of masculinity: he idolises Susan Silverman, but lives alone, being incapable of sharing a flat with anyone else, he drinks a lot, he enjoys violence and uses it to resolve problems, he is faithful to his personal code requiring him to be brave, strong, skilled with weapons, loyal, clever, a man of his word, and largely silent. Part of the problem lies in the genre itself which requires that there be an all-powerful protagonist to whom all other characters are necessarily subordinate. The fact that the most important secondary characters are a woman and a black man ironically underlines their subordinate positions.

The problem, then, lies not only in the model of masculinity represented by the hard-boiled detective, but in the genre itself. More recent writers such as Walter Mosley, James Sallis and George P. Pelecanos have pushed the literary model to its limits in order to examine the gender model. All three writers have created detectives who are not really detectives at all, and are also either black or from minority communities. Walter Mosley's Easy Rawlins holds various jobs, from being a school caretaker to clandestinely owning a block of flats in a white neighbourhood. He is asked to investigate simply because he gains a reputation for being able to help out. James Sallis's Lew Griffin holds down many jobs, from debt collector to university lecturer,

but spends his time hunting for a variety of missing persons. George P. Pelecanos's Nick Stefanos is of Greek origin who earns a living as a barman, and like Rawlins, is an investigator at the request of friends and acquaintances. All three drink far too much but, unlike Spenser or Marlowe, they know it. Indeed, their alcoholism is recognised for the illness it is. They almost never solve their cases, turning the genre, which relies on the satisfactory resolution of the mystery, upside down. None of them are capable of sustaining lasting close relationships, particularly with women and all three consider themselves to be failures.

This more recent model of masculinity provided by Mosely, Sallis and Pelecanos is not concerned with offering a particularly useful alternative to Chandler's. Nevertheless it represents an important step forward. The hard-boiled detective of Hammett, Chandler, Spillane, MacDonald and Parker is revealed as empty, contradictory and unbelievable. The first step that the hard-boiled detective must make if he is to redeem himself is to recognise the error of his ways. His hard drinking is not tough, it is a sickness. He is not, and cannot, be a superman, nor is it to be expected that he will always succeed in solving his cases. He has a problem with the way he relates to the rest of society, particularly women, and he needs to do something about it. Rawlins, Griffin and Stefanos know this. It is a beginning.

Works Cited

- Chandler, Raymond 1964: "The Simple Art of Murder". *Pearls are a Nuisance*.
Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hammett, Dashiell 1982 (1930): *The Maltese Falcon*. In *The Four Great Novels*.
London: Pan.

VII Congreso de SAAS, Jaen – 16-18 March 2005

Panel: "Masculinities and Gender Relations in Contemporary US Women's Literature"

Participan: Dra. Àngels Carabí, Dr. Rodrigo Andrés, Dra. Leonor Acosta, Dr. Jeroen Lievens

Resultados:

**“Masculinities deconstructed: Rikki Ducornet’s reinvention of the male
Bildungsroman”**

Leonor Acosta

Universidad de Cádiz

In some cases, the narrative genre of the Bildungsroman proves to be the perfect frame for the confrontation between the sexes and the diverse workings of power inherent in it. This is the case of Rikki Ducornet who creates significant male characters who must engage themselves in a difficult process of acquiring their proper identities in confrontation with the roles imposed over them. Ducornet explores the issue of masculinity and relates its codification to the concepts of civilization, progress, discovery and territorial expansion in her novel *Phosphor in Dreamland* (1995). By means of a juxtaposition of texts placed on different ontological levels this novel entails a profound critique of the Spanish colonization and devastation of a fictional Caribbean island (Birdland).

“De-ethnicizing ethnic masculinities? : the case of Fae Myenne Ng”

Rodrigo Andrés

Universitat de Barcelona

The decades following the Civil Rights Movement in the United States witnessed an outpouring of excellent literary works written from within different ethnic communities, such as the African-American, Chicano, Asian-American, and Native American ones. Those literary texts often had an agenda that included political aspects such as self-dignifying, more social visibility, internal cohesion and, above all, the contestation of stereotypes widely circulated by and among mainstream society. Contemporary women-of-color writers, often authors of texts that sold better than those of their fellow male writers, were crucial agents in this process of self-affirmation. One of the aspects women writers chose to explore in their novels, plays, and poems, is the role of men

within their communities. This perspective has often proved necessary, given the consistency with which White American society has traditionally distorted all masculinities other than white. As a matter of fact, both popular and highbrow White-American representations have treated those masculinities exclusively as an “ethnic” phenomenon. Distortions have been particularly acute with the case of Asian and Asian-American masculinities, time and again stereotyped as “feminized” and set in opposition to Anglo-American notions of hegemonic virility. Over the last four decades, Chinese-American literature in general, and the one written by women in particular, has offered radically new perspectives on masculinity from within different Chinese communities in the United States. But given the identity-politics emphasis of the first generation of Chinese-American writers to “make” it in the American literary scene in the decades of the 1970s and 1980s those representations have still analyzed male characters as determined by their ethnicity. The decade of the 1990s, however, produced a new paradigm of thought which led to the recognition that no American identity is non-ethnic. Along the line of this perception, a new generation of writers has proceeded to analyze the masculinity of some male characters within the frame of their individuality and not emphasizing racial, ethnic or social overdeterminations. This paper explores how, in her 1993 masterpiece *Bone*, by now already a classic of contemporary American literature, writer Fae Myenne Ng presents some Chinese and Chinese-American male characters. Our hypothesis is that Ng’s impressive first work offers not only a transition between two worlds, the Asian-American and the American one, but also a transition between literary depictions of male characters as ethnically marked to one that moves beyond racial definitions.

“Key Spaces? Gender and Closure in Lynne Tillman’s *No Lease on Life*”

Jeroen Lievens

Ghent University

Neither space nor gender belong to a realm of pre-given essences; rather, both are socially and culturally construed artifacts. Space produces, performs, and perpetuates the codes of culturally dominant masculinities and femininities, while at the same time the individual body is constantly shifting or affirming, that is, *negotiating* its position

within and towards the spatial relations that locate and define it. Lynne Tillman is a contemporary U.S. writer who invites us to consider the many ways in which space involves itself in the many forms of thought, action and speech that represent the abundance of human culture.

XXIX Congreso de AEDEAN, Jaen – diciembre, 2005**Mesa Redonda: “Re-reading Masculinities and Sexualities in American Culture and Literatura”****Panel: “US Studies”****Participan: Dra. Àngels Carabí, Sr. Josep M^a Armengol, Sra. Isabel Seguro****Resultados:**

Since the late 1960s and early 1970s, feminist scholars have tried to show the relevance of gender -namely, the cultural meanings attached to one's biological sex- to social and political life. Together with other factors such as race, class, sexuality, age, etc., gender has thus come to be understood as one of the most significant organizing principles of our social lives. Traditionally, gender studies have concentrated on women, which is politically correct. After all, it is women who have long undergone the worst effects of patriarchal power, and so it was women who had to make gender visible as a political category for the first time.

Nevertheless, since the early 1980s several feminist scholars, male and female, have begun to argue how gender describes both women and men. These scholars have shown how masculinity, like femininity, is not a natural given but rather a cultural and historical construct that varies from culture to culture and across time. The study of the social and cultural construction of masculinity has thus given rise to the so-called studies of masculinities, which Harry Brod has defined as “the study of masculinities and male experiences as specific and varying social-cultural-historical formations” (Brod, 1987, p. 40). Challenging traditional (mis)conceptions of masculinity as eternal and universal, masculinity studies has shown how masculinity, like femininity, is a specific gendered construction that was culturally constructed and can, therefore, be culturally de-constructed and questioned as well.

In order to illustrate the cultural construction of masculinity as well as its effects on men's lives, much masculinity scholarship has focused on the analysis of male sexuality. Masculinity scholars (see, for example, Segal; Kimmel; Beneke) have indeed shown how male sexuality, like female sexuality, is a gendered construction. As masculinity anthropologist David Gilmore has noted, sexuality is used as a means of proving masculinity in most cultures around the globe. In many cultures worldwide,

men appear to seek sex as a form of asserting their manhood and virility, rather than as a form of achieving reciprocal pleasure and intimacy (Gilmore, 1990). This also seems to apply to contemporary American culture. As one American boy told feminist researcher Lillian Rubin, part of the attraction of sex is “the conquest...and what you...tell the guys at school the next day” (Rubin, qtd. in Kimmel, 2000, p. 222). As in many other cultures, then, sexuality seems to remain a clearly gendered behavior in contemporary American culture as well.

Questioning the widespread cultural (mis)conception of male sexuality as a test of manhood, however, several masculinity scholars (see, for example, Segal; Kimmel; Beneke) have shown how it is both possible and desirable to rethink dominant gendered notions of sexuality. Since ideas about male (hetero)sexuality remain inseparable from cultural concepts of masculinity, rethinking men’s sexualities will require questioning masculinities. However difficult, change in the gendered meanings surrounding male sexuality seems both feasible and advisable. And (American) culture and literature might contribute to it. As Teresa De Lauretis (De Lauretis, 1987, p. 1) has argued, both gender and sexuality are constructed through representations. It follows, therefore, that literature, as (a) representation, may contribute to rethinking both masculinity and (male) (hetero)sexuality.

In line with these main arguments, then, the round table “Rereading Masculinities and Sexualities in American Culture and Literature” aimed to explore the construction, as well as the possible de-construction, of masculinities and (male) sexualities in American culture and literature. The first contribution to the table, by Josep Maria Armengol, focused on the analysis of the re-presentation of masculinity and male sexuality in “Winterkill,” one of the short stories in the collection *Rock Springs* (1987) by the contemporary American writer Richard Ford. Armengol showed how Ford’s “Winterkill” seems to explore and subvert from innovative perspectives the conventional view of sexuality as a symbol of virility and manhood. The story is told by Les Snow, a thirty-seven-year-old narrator. A lower-class man, Les has lost his job and spends most of his time watching T.V. at home or drinking in bars with his wheelchair-constrained friend Troy Burnham, who is sexually disabled. It is precisely while Les and Troy are having a drink together in a bar that they meet Nola Foster, a widow who is described as “not a bad-looking woman at all” (Ford, 1987, p. 150). After having a

few drinks together, Nola and the two men decide to go together on a late-night fishing excursion by a river.

Ford's story, then, concerns itself with a male-male-female (erotic) triangle. And, predictably, the triangle involves two men engaged in a homosocial relation of rivalry over a woman. As has been argued, male (hetero)sexuality usually acts as a form of male homosociality, a way to prove one's masculinity, especially before and against other males. In this sense, then, male sexuality often becomes extremely competitive, as men use sexuality to prove not only that they are manly, but also that they are *manlier* than other men. In "Winterkill," Troy and Les also compete against each other to have sex with Nola and thus prove their superior masculinity.

Troy resorts to violence and stereotypical male behavior to try to seduce Nola, showing off his aggressive fishing skills. In particular, Troy tries to catch Nola's attention effecting quick, jerky movements with his fishing rod, which suggests a phallic symbol. Nevertheless, Nola, like most women in *Rock Springs*, is not keen on violent sports like fishing and pays, therefore, no attention to Troy. Troy's phallic rod fails not only to catch Nola's attention, who thus moves away from the traditional passive role of woman as sexual trophy for the phallic male, but also to retrieve any fish from the water. In a "typical Ford twist on male adventure," Troy ends up catching not fish but a dead deer, which seems to symbolize the defeated, hapless man (Leder, 2000, p. 111). In effect, the dead deer seems to stand for Troy himself, who, given the irony of his catch, finds himself the object of ridicule from both Les and Nola. Disappointed and ridiculed, then, Troy can do nothing but burst into tears as though "it was him who had washed up there and was finished" (Ford, 1987, p. 166).

Les, on the other hand, tries to diminish the masculinity of his sexual competitor by insisting on his sexual disability. As has been argued, sexuality has traditionally been used as a proof of masculinity. Because males often see sexuality as a primary means of proving masculinity, men, as masculinity scholar Harry Brod (Brod, 1992, p. 153) has argued, tend to feel pressured to perform adequately in sex. Failure to do so inevitably threatens masculine identity. Thus, men focus on sexual performance, particularly erection and penetration, as the main features of sex, which leads to a phallicentric conception of male sexuality. Trying to diminish the virility of his friend, then, Les introduces Troy to Nola as an impotent man who "can't do very much" (Ford, 1987, p. 151). Troy suffers a paralysis below his waist and so cannot have erections. Thus, Les

explains to Nola that Troy “does not look exactly like a whole man” and that, probably, he has not been with a woman for fifteen years (1987, pp. 156-157).

Nevertheless, Richard Ford’s story seems to question conventional phallicentric conceptions of sexuality, especially the traditional view of sex as a proof of masculinity. After all, Troy ends up seducing Nola despite his sexual disability. Although Troy is physically disabled, Les himself acknowledges that Troy is “both frail and strong at once,” since he had been “an excellent wrestler” and could still break “his spinning rod into two pieces with only his hands.” Even more important is the fact that Troy “always has enthusiasm” and “a good heart” (Ford, 1987, pp. 151, 167 and 152). Because of these positive attributes, then, Troy ends up seducing Nola.

Troy’s final sexual intercourse with Nola is not explicitly described, as it takes place off-stage. At story’s end, we only see Nola enter Troy’s bedroom and “close the door behind” (Ford, 1987, p. 168). The end of the story thus seems particularly subversive as well. Instead of describing *the* sexual scene explicitly, Richard Ford asks the reader to imagine *different* possibilities for alternative, non-phallic forms of sexuality. Rather than simply provide the representation of Troy’s sexual relationship with Nola, then, Ford asks the reader to play an active role in envisioning possible re-writings of heterosexuality beyond the traditionally phallic terms. In Ford’s story, the phallicentric conception of sexuality, like Troy’s phallic rod, is thus broken into pieces. Ford’s text, then, seems to prove particularly subversive. After all, male sexuality, as has been argued, is closely related to gender and masculinity. It follows, therefore, that innovative re-visions of male sexuality like Richard Ford’s could contribute as well to questioning dominant patriarchal notions of masculinity.

While Armengol focused on the analysis of white masculinities and sexualities, the other two contributions to the round table, by Dr. Àngels Carabí and Isabel Seguro, explored the connections between masculinities and sexualities, on the one hand, and race and ethnicity, on the other. Focusing on African-American and Asian-American literature, respectively, Carabí and Seguro showed how both masculinity and sexuality are inflected by ethnicity in American culture and literature. Carabí explored the ways in which African-American author Toni Morrison rewrites traditional constructions of black masculinity and how, in this process, Morrison questions and contributes to redefining the ideologies that sustain social power structures marked by unequal notions of gender and sexuality. Carabí’s presentation centered on the analysis of two male

characters in the works of Toni Morrison: Milkman Dead in *Song of Solomon* (1977) and Paul D in *Beloved* (1988). Both men, Carabí argued, undergo successful trips to free themselves from individualistic and self-centered patriarchal notions of traditional masculinity. If Milkman's search ends with a promising and individual liberating flight, in *Beloved* Morrison suggests alternative ways of acting manly through non-normative and nurturing heterosexual love relationships.

In *Song of Solomon*, freedom, for the “young” and immature Milkman, is linked to individualistic practices and to materialistic aims. Before his trip South, Milkman, Carabí indicated, is a selfish man, unconcerned about the people who love him and the pain he might cause onto them, especially onto the women of his life. When faced by the shocking complexity of his mother's personal story, he non-empathically, dreams her dead; he interferes with the love-life of his sister First Corinthians, assuming the traditional role of the man in the house to “protect” his family's reputation; he, too, betrays his loving aunt Pilate by breaking into her house to steal a sack which he believes contains gold; he ends his twelve-year relationship with his girlfriend Hagar with a simple note of “thank you and good bye”. Protected by the immunity provided by his upper-middle class social status, he remains ignorant of the racism that affects the lives of the black people of the Blood Bank. When his childhood friend Guitar gives signs of radical activism to counteract white attacks against blacks, Milkman's reaction shows an absolute lack of interest.

Like Macon Dead, his assimilated father, Milkman tries to be a “white” black, an emblem of (white) America's patriarchy. Milkman, at this stage, Carabí suggested, embodies the characteristics of (white) traditional masculinity stated by psychologists Brannon and David in their book, *The Forty-nine Percent Majority*: 1) men cannot be passive, nor vulnerable and must not take care of others; 2) men must be important, have power and be superior to others; 3) they must be tough, self-sufficient and hide their emotions; 4) men must be aggressive, face risk situations and use violence. If the characteristics of normative masculinity are demanding for white men, they are even more problematic to be accomplished by black men. According to critics like Franz Fanon, James Baldwin and Toni Morrison, black men's masculinity is a subordinated masculinity, constructed to reinforce white males' superiority. As a consequence, Milkman, like his father, has to counteract the notions of non-identity enforced by racism to prove he is the subject of patriarchy, to prove he is a man.

This he will try to achieve in his trip south in search for the gold which, he believes, will lead to his independence and freedom. Yet his journey will provide a different vision of himself and of his male gendered construction. His encounter with the members of the Southern community who knew his father brings him a dignified vision of the silenced history of his paternal family. Nurtured by these new learnt community values and by the information of his genealogy revealed in the song of Solomon sung by the children in the streets of Shalimar, Milkman questions his previous non-relational masculine behavior. Aware of his cultural legacy, he is ready to reclaim the dignity of the past of African American slaves, especially the legacy of his ancestor Solomon, a wise man who could fly back to Africa. But, when men “fly”, as Morrison has stated, “somebody is left behind”. Moved by Ryna’s painful lament echoed by the mountains -the woman abandoned by Solomon in his flight to Africa- Milkman acknowledges the cruel way in which he left his girlfriend Hagar. Taking responsibility over his wrongdoings and feeling reborn as a member of the African American community, he is mature enough to abandon his selfish and masculine ego. It is in his love-making with Sweet, a very tender and smiling prostitute, that Milkman experiences the pleasure of giving. Once Milkman frees himself from the individualistic and hierarchical codes of patriarchy, he feels light. So light that, when jumping off a hill to give his body –now his only possession- to his killing friend Guitar, he is able to fly.

Milkman’s evolution towards freedom anticipates Paul D’s more complex journey towards the creation of alternative masculinities. In *Beloved*, Morrison offers highly suggestive nurturing forms of manhood articulated in non-normative heterosexual relationships. By doing so, the author contributes to redefining fundamental social patriarchal structures -like marriage, family and sexuality- which have been severely marked by gender inequalities.

Beloved’s story is framed during slavery, a time where notions of manhood were denied to black males. Colored men (and women) were robbed of any form of ownership over their bodies, their desires, their will, and of the possibility to build up family structures. It was white culture that defined notions of family and of manhood. A man, in white culture, was supposed to be the head of the house, the protector and the provider. Yet black men were not entitled to such foundations since black masculinities were, as it has been indicated, second-hand male identities, constructed to insure white men’s superiority. As a result of this, Paul D’ sense of manhood is a damaged one. His

distorted nonidentity and the unmanly vision that he has of himself are rooted in the violations, the sexual abuses that he suffered in prison and, especially, in Schoolteacher's perverse humiliations which made him feel "something less than a chicken sitting in the sun on a tub" (Morrison, 1988, p. 72).

First a runaway slave and, like many post-war black men, a wanderer, his re-encounter with Sethe (the woman who he was fond of in the Sweet Home plantation) awakens in him the desire to settle down and create a family. When Paul D enters Sethe's house, he assumes, erroneously, that he can live his manhood by acting as protector-provider, the roles that white patriarchy has denied him. His first act or protection is to violently chase the strange presence of a ghost which he believes haunts the house. Ignoring Sethe's and her daughter's desires, Paul D takes command. Yet what he misses (and does not ask) is that, in Sethe's household, both the mother and her daughter feel comforted by the presence of the baby's spirit. Annoyed by the fact that Sethe has done it all by herself, "No man? You were here by yourself?" (Morrison, 1988, p. 10) -including giving birth to Denver while escaping from slavery- Paul D feels not needed. It is his hunger to inscribe his masculine discourse of ownership what makes him tell Sethe: "I want you pregnant. Would you do that for me?" (1988, p.129). But Sethe ignores his request and her decision makes Paul feel diminished and vulnerable in his maleness: "There was a family somehow and he was not the head of it" (1988, p.132). Terrified of Sethe's power after learning about her killing of her two-year old daughter to save her from being taken back to slavery, Paul D leaves the house.

To change Paul D's traditional codes of masculinity requires moving "on a slow motion" (to borrow sociologist Lynne Segal's title of her book). His evolution towards a non-normative and non-hierarchical heterosexual relationship is beautifully narrated by Morrison. Paul D modifies his traditional notions of maleness when he is able to meditate over and assimilate the intimacies he shared with a magnificent man, Sixo, a slave he met at the plantation.

Sixo, who ends his life being burned up by the whites, was a "wild man" who showed respect for the living and for the dead, for the natural and the supernatural, who "went among trees at night for dancing to keep his bloodlines open" (Morrison, 1988, p. 25). A man who "stopped speaking English because there was no future in it"; who told stories to the men that "made them cry-laugh" (1988, p. 25), and who walked for thirty miles back and forth to the plantation to see the woman he loved for an hour because, as

he tells Paul D, “The pieces I am she gather them and give them back to me in all the right order” (1988, p. 272).

It is Paul D’s reflecting on Sixo’s notions of manliness, a manhood uncolonized by the dominant culture of the white slaveholder and in tune with ideals of African maleness, what makes Paul D look at himself through Sixo’s eyes. He then feels profoundly ashamed of not having understood Sethe’s painful deed. His awareness to the fact that Mr. Garner’s “modelic” manhood is made superior at the expense of the *quality* of his ownership over black people, as Deborah Ayer Sitter indicates, makes Paul D ready to free himself from white hierarchical notions of manhood and to incorporate alternative ways of acting as a man in relations of marriage and family. He, then, is able to help Sethe to re-member herself, having been guided by a man (Sixo) who learned to re-piece himself with the help of a woman. Paul D’s return to 124 coincides with the end of Sethe’s personal cleansing ritual. Sethe has relived the past of slavery and can now re-find her “best self” in the healing hands of a masculine and loving man.

Finally, Isabel Seguro’s presentation on Asian-American masculinities began by emphasizing the coalitional nature of the term “Asian American,” traditionally equated to Americans of Chinese and Japanese descent for being, originally, the most numerous Asian groups to migrate to the United States. Seguro’s contribution concentrated, therefore, upon the representations of Chinese American literature and culture, since these were later applied to the rest of the Asian communities in the country.

The other point which was underlined is the interconnections between gender and sexual discourses, on the one hand, and racial discourses, on the other, working together hand in hand in the formation of images of Asian American men and women. The images that are formed out of these interconnections are, furthermore, related to the history of Asian immigration to the United States, together with Western colonial and imperial enterprises in the East, as noted by scholars such as Elaine H. Kim.

Consequently, the East has been personified as effeminate and submissive which is, in turn, reflected in the ways Asian peoples have been depicted. As a result, Asian men have been constructed as emasculated whereas the women have been hyper-feminized. The East, overall, is subordinated to the West, embodied in the figure of the white, middle-class, heterosexual male.

However, the Orient and, therefore, Asian men, have been seen also as a menace. At this point, Seguro made reference to Shirley Geok-lin Lim's concept of the "Ambivalent American." The term refers to the existence of simultaneous stereotypes, which may even contradict each other, around a particular (ethnic) group. According to the socio-political conditions at a given time, one of these may be enforced whilst the other(s) remain(s) latent. Thus, as long as Chinese coolies provided the necessary labor force for constructing the infrastructure of the country (railroads, fisheries, etc.), they would be considered as unthreatening. The menacing images of Chinese emerged when their presence was interpreted as endangering jobs for whites.

This was reflected in legislation. First, with the Page Act (1875), which aimed specifically at preventing the entrance of Chinese women into the United States. The effect was an unbalance between male and female members in the Chinatowns formed in major American cities, as exemplified by what came to be known as bachelor communities. Furthermore, Asians, and Chinese in particular, were relegated to certain types of jobs so as to prevent competition for white workers. Chinese Americans, thus, became associated with the feminine, the domestic sphere due to the services they were providing: restaurants, servants, and above all, laundries. The highlight of such discriminatory legislation arrived with the Chinese Exclusion Act (1882).

Asian American men were disempowered by being emasculated in the public sphere. An example of how the "Ambivalent American" functions is seen with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor (Dec. 7, 1941), turning the Japanese American population into the enemy of the people versus the Chinese American population. Officially, the "Yellow Peril" was dissipated with the end of World War II and the conversion of Japan from an enemy into an important ally in the Pacific basin. From there on, another stereotype was created: the model minority.

According to this image, Asian Americans are portrayed as hard-working (establishing links with the mainstream American work ethic), straight A students, law-abiding and meek. This kind of stereotype reflects the Asian American attempts to assimilate within mainstream society, following the rules by which to accomplish the American Dream. It is also a stereotype that, due to its assimilationist nature, does not question the system and therefore serves as a means of constraining the Asian American community by dominant culture.

One of the ways Asian men attempt to integrate and/or assimilate is depicted in their relationships with Caucasian women. To get involved with a white woman, a representative of dominant culture, is a means by which to recover their manhood. However, according to a racial discourse, the Asian man is subordinated to the white woman. These kinds of tensions and the constraints of the model minority concept are explored in two plays chosen by the participant: *Bondage* (1992) by David Henry Hwang and *Wonderland* (1999) by Chay Yew.

Bondage is a one-act play that takes place in an S&M parlor in California sometime in the 1990s. There are only two characters, Terri, the dominatrix, and Mark, the client. Both characters wear hoods so that the audience is unaware of their ethnicity. Terri's method of controlling Mark is by ordering him to play subordinate roles in relation to the ones she assumes during their S&M session. First, she puts on a blond wig and tells Mark that he is a Chinese man. The friction between racial and gender discourses is reflected in Mark's initial reaction whilst performing this first role game: "But—you're blonde. I'm—Chinese. It's not easy to know whether it's OK for me to love you" (Hwang, 1992, p. 253).

Along the play both keep changing roles—a fact that emphasizes the performative nature of gender *and* ethnic images. When Terri becomes a black woman and Mark a white man, their role game reveals white men's prejudices concerning the sexuality of black women as tremendously alluring. In another role game Terri becomes a Chinese woman and Mark, once more, a Chinese man whose position is again undermined. As a Chinese American woman, Terri proclaims that she is "not attracted to Asian men" (Hwang, 1992, p. 267) and that "[e]very successful Asian woman walks in on the arm of a white man" (1992, p. 268). The assimilated, model minority Asian man cannot compete with whiteness—the norm to which he will be unable to adjust.

What the play reveals is that Terri chooses the roles with particular care, fantasizing that she has power over men, whereas Mark's demands, as a client, for Terri to play and ask him to play certain ethnic representations is an attempt to overcome his fear of women. Eventually, when both characters take off their hoods and reveal themselves as a white woman and an Asian man, we realize that they have tried to come to terms with the expectations imposed on them by mainstream society according to gender and racial discourses. Along the play they have become aware of the

commonalties between racial and gender discourses and that makes them come together to an understanding, deconstructing the ideology of white America.

Chay Yew belongs to the younger generation of Asian American authors concerned with queer writing, “queer” understood, in David Eng’s and Alice Hom’s words, as “a political practice based on transgression of the normal and normativity rather than a straight/gay binary of the heterosexual/homosexual identity” (Eng et al., 203). These writers are more concerned with deconstructing patriarchal values that work as forces of oppression both in Asian American and mainstream American culture. They are not so much concerned with re/constructing or re/presenting Asian American womanhood/manhood, but with representing diversity within Asian America.

In his 1999 play *Wonderland*, Yew examines the constraining effects of the model minority image by depicting an Asian American family (consisting of father, mother and son), especially through the father figure. The father is an architect who dreams of designing skyscrapers—a symbol of American progress and modernity, as well as a phallic image of American success. However, his supervisors keep assigning him mall designs —flat buildings which symbolize his subordinate position versus mainstream society and his symbolic emasculation. He follows word by word his supervisors’ instructions concerning the use of building materials, ultimately unquestioning their decisions in order to achieve their approval. When the roof of his work of art, the Wonderland mall, collapses due to the poor quality of the materials used causing the death of sixteen people, he is the one taken responsible for the catastrophe, the scapegoat of the company. The image of the good, model, Asian American citizen changes to that of an untrustworthy element for the security of society.

This Asian American father is further emasculated, not only by the fact that his architectural license is revoked and therefore he is unable to support his family, but also because his only son turns out to be gay. That means that the family’s line dies with this son who will not form a conventional family and who does not desire to pursue a “successful” career such as an engineer or doctor. Instead, he wants to become an actor. Finally, the son ends up working in gay porno films. The final question becomes: “Is that what you got/after all these years/for playing by the book/by the rules?” (Yew, 2002, p. 403).

Both *Bondage* and *Wonderland*, therefore, reflect how certain stereotypes around Asian American masculinity still linger.

Works Cited

- Baldwin, James. *The Fire Next Time*. Middlesex: Penguin, 1963.
- Beneke, Timothy. *Proving Manhood: Reflections on Men and Sexism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Brannon, R. y D.David, *The Forty-nine percent majority*, Washington: Wesley Press, 1976.
- Brod, Harry. "The Case for Men's Studies." *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Ed. Harry Brod. Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1987. 39-62.
- . "Pornography and the Alienation of Male Sexuality." *Rethinking Masculinity: Philosophical Explorations in Light of Feminism*. Ed. Larry May and Robert Strikwerda. Lanham: Littlefield Adams Quality Papers, 1992. 149-65.
- De Lauretis, Teresa. *Technologies of Gender*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.
- Fanon, Frantz 1952. *Black Skins, White Masks*. New York: Grove Weindfeld, 1967.
- Ford, Richard. *Rock Springs*. 1987. New York: Vintage, 1988.
- Gilmore, David. *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Hwang, David Henry. *Trying to Find Chinatown. The Selected Plays*. New York: Theatre Communications Group, 2000.
- Kimmel, Michael. *The Gendered Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Leder, Priscilla. "Men with Women: Gender Relations in Richard Ford's *Rock Springs*." *Perspectives on Richard Ford*. Ed. Huey Guagliardo. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2000. 97-120.
- Lim, Shirley Geok-lin. "The Ambivalent American: Asian American Literature in the Cusp". *Reading the Literatures of Asian America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992.
- Morrison, Toni. *Beloved*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1988.
- Sau-ling Wong and Jeffrey J. Santa Ana. "Gender and Sexuality in Asian American Literature." *Signs* 25:1 (1999): 171-226.

Segal, Lynne. *Slow Motion. Changing Men, Changing Masculinities*. New Brunswick: N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

Sitter, Deborah Ayer. *African American Review* 26:1, Women Writers Issue (Spring, 1992): 17-29.

Yew, Chay. *The Hyphenated American. Four Plays by Chay Yew*. New York: Grove Press, 2002.

XXIX Congreso de AEDEAN, Jaen – diciembre, 2005

Mesa Redonda: “Masculinity Studies in Practice: Bringing Masculinity Studies into the Classroom”

Panel: “Feminist and Gender Studies”

Participan: Dra. Barbara Ozieblo, Dr. Rodrigo Andrés, Dr. William C. Phillips, Sra. Cristina Alsina Rísquez

Resultados:

“Reading masculinity as privilege in Herman Melville’s stories about the material conditions of writing”

Rodrigo Andrés

Universitat de Barcelona

A copyist was no problem. Helen served as his copyist. (Parker 1, 1996, p. 651).

These are not natural silences, that necessary time for renewal, lying fallow, gestation, in the natural cycle of creation. The silences I speak of here are unnatural; the unnatural thwarting of what struggles to come into being, but cannot. In the old, the obvious parallels: when the seed strikes stone; the soil will not sustain; the spring is false; the time is drought or blight or infestation; the frost comes premature (Olsen, 1989).

Melville [...] was groping past the simplicity of Hawthorne's doctrine of art for artist's sake. Indeed, what had pleased him in 1850 was shockingly inadequate in early 1856. Hawthorne had been wrong in "the Artist of the Beautiful": what counted was not, for instance, Shakespeare's having "thought" of *Macbeth* but his having written it and its having survived. What counted was having *Moby-Dick* published, not Melville's having glorified himself by experiencing *Moby-Dick* as a bright conception or as a work that did not need to survive - and to survive in a sufficient number of printed copies "perceptible to mortal senses" (Parker 2, 2002, p. 273).

Herman Melville's short story "Bartleby, the Scrivener" (1853) is often taught as a Biblical allegory, as an analysis of the ethics of capitalism, or as an extended metaphor of Herman Melville's own prerogative as a writer. In this contribution I would like to suggest that it is also possible to approach the text from a masculinity studies perspective. "Bartleby" may then be read and taught as a story that indirectly explores the gendered dimension of the job of the scrivener, i.e., the copyist, and which is informed by Herman Melville's considerations about the gendered dimension of what it was to be a writer in his own immediate context.

In my reading and teaching of the story I actually happen to disagree with David Leverenz, for whom the American Renaissance male writers suffered severe psychological hardships because they saw themselves as deviating from the gender expectations of the type of activity male Brahmins from New England should devote themselves to. According to those expectations, white middle class men should be building America and its institutions, and leaving the profession of literature to a market already taken by what Hawthorne contemptuously referred to as a "mob of scribbling women". In my reading of "Bartleby", Melville shows his uncomfortable awareness that maleness was - even in the America of the early 1850s - a definite privilege if one wanted to become a writer.

Ever since he came back from his long voyage in the Pacific, literature was such a passion for Herman Melville that he could only understand his life and his personal growth as concomitant with writing:

My development has been all within a few years past. I am like one of those seeds taken out of the Egyptian Pyramids, which after being three thousand years a seed and nothing but a seed, being planted in English soil, it developed itself, grew to greenness, and then fell to mould. So I. Until I was twenty-five, I had no development at all. From my twenty-fifth year I date my life. Three weeks have scarcely passed, at any time between then and now, that I have not unfolded within myself. But I feel that I am now come to the inmost leaf of the bulb, and that shortly the flower must fall to the mould (Melville, in Horth, 1993, p. 193).

This passion required full self, since, according to biographer Hershel Parker, “He could not think of doing anything else with his life besides writing” (Parker 2, 2002, p. 120). For a few years - too few for us Melville lovers - Melville was granted the circumstances of full self for writing. And it was mostly the women around him who made those circumstances possible, as has historically happened around many male writers. Tillie Olsen’s comments about female sacrifice in the enabling of loved male husbands or relatives is pertinent. This denial often happened at the expense of the potential talent of women, which went unexplored and was therefore lost to humanity:

And not only wives: mothers, sisters, daughters, lovers, helper women, secretaries, housekeepers, watchers and warders. Not here the place to list the myriad women whose contribution was significant, sometimes decisive, to the development and productivity of writers [...] Remember the young women writers, their aspirant lives clogged in Love’s ambuscade - those who let their work go (his gifts are more important than mine - their sense of their own potentialities, their self-confidence already so robbed: not recognizing everyday enabling differences in circumstances for males, let alone superior advantages since birth) in the belief that they would become of the tradition-hallowed “inspirer-beloved”; and those who had every intention of going on writing - and tried; but usually subsumed into the server-enablers [...] Think too of the helper women, the famous enablers [...] who - if only in [...] occasional pieces - disclosed a writing capacity [...] Nearly every one, in their own distinguished way, evidencing quality, vision, capacity to contribute to literature, greater or as great as that of their men - but with marked contrast in productivity, influence, recognition (Olsen, 1989, p. 218)

Four of Herman's seven siblings were women. One, Helen, slightly older than him. Three, Augusta, Kate, and Fanny, younger. Only two of them married (Helen and Kate) and only very late in life. Augusta and Fanny remained single. All of them moved around Herman Melville's rhythms as a writer. Parker tells us about their daily life in 1847:

American dinnertime was at two, but the Melvilles dined late, at four, to accommodate Herman's need to concentrate on his manuscript for one sustained stretch of hours. (The normal time for tea in America was six, a "massive" meal, in effect, supper, according to the British observer Mrs. Felton, but for the Melvilles tea was delayed, and less substantial.) (Parker 1, 1996, p. 563).

This daily routine, which resembles so much Nathaniel Hawthorne's accounts of his own beginnings as a writer, can only be understood with the gender specificity of the writer being male and the caring people female, with the noted exception of an Emily Dickinson.

In a long letter to Evert Duyckinck, Melville gives him an account of how he "passes his time":

My own breakfast over, I go to my work-room & light my fire - then spread my M.S.S. on the table - take one business squint at it, & fall to with a will. At 2 1/2 P.M. I hear a preconcerted knock at my door, which (by request) continues till I rise & go to the door, which serves to wean me effectively from my writing, however interested I may be... My evenings I spend in a sort of mesmeric state in my room - not being able to read - only now & then skimming over some large-printed book (Parker 1, 1996, p. 799).

During the 1840s and early 50s, while Melville was writing *Typee* (1846), *Omoo* (1847), *Mardi* (1849), *Redburn* (1849), *White-Jacket* (1850), *Moby-Dick* (1851), *Pierre* (1852), and "Bartleby" (1853) among many other short stories, those four women would do all the revising and preparation for printing. It was especially Helen and Augusta who would be responsible for the immense task, the chore, of copying. Their time was organized around Melville's writing, as the following fragments from Parker's biography indicate:

By 21 December 1850 Melville was still not writing at anything like top speed. That day Augusta wrote Helen (now in Lansingburgh) not to rush home to take over the copying duties: ‘As to Herman’s M.S.S. you need not hurry your return on that account, he gets on very slowly with it. As soon as he is ready for you, I will let you know’ (Parker 1, 1996, p. 800).

On January 1849 Melville accompanied his [...] wife [...] leaving the proofs of *Mardi* in the hands of Augusta. She struggled with them through the month, with some tardy help from the author. In an interval Augusta entered into her commonplace book, *Orient Pearls at Random Strung*, a poem, “The Rights of Women,” by Mrs. E. Little, that sufficiently conveyed her sense of the question being agitated in the aftermath of the Seneca Falls convention in 1848 (Parker 1, 1996, p. 612).

Interestingly enough, Melville’s *Mardi* is dedicated to one of his siblings, but not Augusta. The inscription reads: “Dedicated to my brother, Allan Melville”.

Hershell Parker’s two-volume biography reveals how for a number of years, the entire family was devoted to Herman’s writing: “As the member of the family who had first encouraged Herman to write down his adventures in the Marquesas, Augusta retained a special concern for his career, but everyone in the Fourth Avenue house was caught up in the process of bookmaking as well as babymaking” (Parker 1, 1996, p. 613). August, therefore, seems to be particularly busy with Herman’s texts: “In a letter to Lizzie on 27 January 1849 who was then pregnant with her first child: ‘- *Malcolm Melville!* [...] How I long to press him to my heart. There, I can write no more. The last proof sheets are through. “Mardi’s” a book! -. “Ah my own Kostanza! child of many prayers.” Oro’s blessing on thee.’” (1996, p. 613).

So very busy that Helen actually realized that the bonds of sisterly love could, or had, become actual chains of quasi-enslavement: “now Augusta in her way was a slave, yoked to him. Helen, the only one who knew what her sister was enduring, assured her in late June, “I can sympathise in your state of entire employment” - effectively a form of enslavement” (Parker 2, 2002, pp. 220-221).

Echoing Virginia Woolf’s fantasy of a Judith Shakespeare born to William’s parents, one wonders whether any one of Herman’s sisters may have had the same creative gifts, the same talents, the same yearnings and the same literary aspirations as her brother. Augusta’s letter to her very dear friend Mary Blatchford may be pertinent

here: "I really believe that I could at this moment indite a sonnet." (Letter from Augusta Melville to Mary Blatchford. 17 October 1850. Quoted in Parker 1, 1996, p. 786).

Was Herman Melville himself unaware of that potential in his sister(s)? Was he not conscious that both Helen and Augusta had to sacrifice that potential talent by becoming mechanical copyists? Melville knew for sure that the only way of copying is by not introducing yourself, by taking to the extreme the alienating labor of a scrivener. This possible awareness invites a reading / teaching of the story by which Herman Melville may not be only identifying with the scrivener of the story "Bartleby", but also - uncomfortably - with the lawyer. The entries for the year 1853 in Parker's biography serve to illustrate the parallelisms: "Melville apparently wrote "Bartleby, the Scrivener" between mid-August and the week of Kate's wedding in mid-September. Augusta recorded no letters written between 6 and 24 August, a possible indicating that she was copying furiously..." (Parker 2, 2002, p. 176). Our reading of the story therefore looks at masculinity not in the light that Leverenz does, that is, as traumatic for a male writer in a moment when writing was considered a feminine activity, but as a privileged position over that of the silenced voices in Melville's own family. This reading serves us to teach "Bartleby" in the light of another Melville story, "The Tartarus of Maids" (1855) - part of a diptych with "The Paradise of Bachelors"- in which Melville analyzes the material conditions of writing. In his visit to remote paper mills, the narrator of the story realizes how women are the victims of the social division of labor which condemns them to produce paper - as women - and prevents them from writing on paper - as women - too.

Melville's texts therefore show how writing may often come at the expense of the non-writing of other people, whose yearning to say will go silenced and whose identities disappears in the generation of the materiality of texts written by other people. Gender is here an issue at stake, and in my reading / teaching of "Bartleby" Herman Melville did not see his masculinity with anxiety because of the deviance of gender expectations in the America of the 1840s and 50s, but rather on the contrary, with the anxiety of seeing his gender the bearer of undeniable privileges for writers of his times.

People mentioned:

Helen Maria Melville (Helen) 1817-1888 Helen Griggs

Herman Melville (Herman) 1819-1891

Augusta Melville (Guss) 1821-1876

Catherine Melville (Kate) 1825-1905 Kate Hoadley

Frances Priscilla Melville (Fanny) 1827-1885

Works Cited:

Coultrap-McQuin, Susan. *Doing Literary Business. American women Writers in the Nineteenth Century*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press 1990.

Creech, James. *Closet Writing / Gay Reading. The Case of Melville's Pierre*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Horth, Lynn. *Correspondence*. Evanston and Chicago: The Northwestern-Newberry Edition, 1993.

Leverenz, David. *Manhood and the American Renaissance*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1989.

Melville, Herman. "Bartleby, the Scrivener" (1853). *The Complete Shorter Fiction*. London: Everyman's Library, 1997. 18-51.

---. *Billy Budd Sailor (An Inside Narrative. Billy Budd, Sailor and Other Stories*. Ed. Harold Beaver. New York: Penguin, 1985. 319-409.

---. *Correspondence (The Writings of Herman Melville, Vol. 14)*. Horth, Lynn, ed. Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University Press and The Newberry Library, 1993.

---. *Mardi and a Voyage Thither* (1849). Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1998.

---. "The Paradise of Bachelors and the Tartarus of Maids" (1855). *The Complete Shorter Fiction*. London: Everyman's Library, 1997. 313-332.

---. *White-Jacket* (1850). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Olsen, Tillie. "Wives, Mothers, Enablers". *Silences*. New York: Delta, 1989 218-23.

Olsen-Smith, Steven. "Herman Melville's Planned Work on Remorse". *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, vol. 50, No. 4 (Mar., 1996), 489-500.

Parker, Hershel. *Herman Melville. A Biography. Volume 1, 1819-1851*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

---. *Herman Melville. A Biography. Volume 2, 1851-1891*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Robertson-Lorant, Laurie. *Melville. A Biography*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996.

“The Romantic Poet as Model of Masculinity”

Bill Phillips

Universitat de Barcelona

One of Romanticism's greatest problems is that it has been taught and written about for many years, not from an honest academic standpoint; not from a rigorous, disinterested, inquiring standpoint, but from a quasi-religious standpoint. Critics and teachers of Romanticism have all too often been Romanticism's evangelists. The student, unable to recognise anything sublime in the poetry of Wordsworth is deemed by herself, and by her teacher, an insensitive failure. The teacher of course, like the priest, conceals, meanwhile, his own inability to transcend the material world. Fortunately, cultural and literary criticism since the 1980s has looked on Romanticism with a more sceptical eye. Equally, poets and writers of the Romantic period, such as John Clare, once considered very minor indeed for not living up to the aesthetic and philosophical standards of Wordsworth and Coleridge, are now central to our understanding of early nineteenth century poetry. Wordsworth, it will be remembered, became disillusioned with the French Revolution, and with progressive politics in general. Dismayed by events in France, it is argued, he turned his attention inwards and upwards, in search of spiritual rather than material transformation. "Between 1793 and 1798 Wordsworth lost the world merely to gain his own immortal soul" (McGann, 1985, p. 88) says Jerome McGann. Not everyone took the same route. William Blake, for example, a man for whom the material and spiritual worlds were indistinguishable, never lost faith in revolution. Neither did Shelley nor Byron, though their early deaths may have been helpful in this respect. English Romanticism, then, as constructed by Wordsworth and Coleridge, was basically a rather superficial, a rather wishy-washy kind of religion. It was a rejection of the material world, the here and now, the struggle for equal rights, improved living standards, health, parliamentary representation, the abolition of slavery, the fair distribution of land, education, childcare – all of these things, for an indeterminate and ungraspable sense of spiritual superiority.

So far, so good. But why was the club so exclusive? Why were women not allowed to become Romantic poets: there were plenty of women writing at the time. And why was Romanticism so class-obsessed? It is no new discovery to say that Romanticism is masculine. Or to say that the Romantic Poet is a powerful model of masculinity. But this is not an area that is usually considered at much length, particularly in the classroom. As a model of masculinity it is evidently difficult (though not necessarily impossible) for a woman to become a Romantic Poet; there are a number of often unsurpassable obstacles to be overcome. Firstly, the question of nature: the Romantic Poet must "wander lonely as a cloud", but for women, this was effectively impossible. As Stephen Hunt points out: "There remained the rarely mentioned but ever-present possibility that the Arcadian countryside was peopled by potential rapists." (Hunt, 2000, p. 53). Secondly, at least as far as women are concerned, there is an "identification of the 'lunatic' with nature..." (2000, p. 58). The Bluestockings, with their literary salons and their preference for sensibility and the domestic, constructed not only a model of femininity, in which the woman is expected to remain at home, caring for her family and making the world a better place by attention to the tiniest domestic detail, but also a model of masculinity. If women were confined to the hearth, then masculinity, all too often constructed in opposition to femininity, must find its place elsewhere, wheeling and dealing, travelling, observing and studying the wider world.. The masculine Romantic Poet is, in part, merely *not* a Bluestocking.

Being out in the countryside is also a question of class. People do not walk, unless they have to. Romanticism changed this, at least for men. Women were chided should they venture out alone, as Jane Austen demonstrates in *Pride and Prejudice* when Elizabeth Bennet muddies herself disgracefully by walking cross-country to her sister's sickbed. Anne Yearsley, the so-called Milk Maid Poet, who was "consistently described as 'wild', 'simple', 'natural'" (Waldron, p. 118), did not write about nature at all. In her poem "Lines, composed in a Carriage, on seeing an Half-blown Primrose in the Mouth of a Peasant; the Author being on the Road to Bath" the title plainly describes the poet as being safely enclosed in a carriage, cut off from the natural world, unlike the 'Peasant' walking along with a flower in his mouth. What chance does a woman have of being a Romantic Poet if this is the closest she can get to the natural world? Not, it should be added, that Anne Yearsley wanted to be a nature poet; her interests lay elsewhere.

Wordsworth, meanwhile, in 1793, was able to walk across Salisbury Plain for his own pleasure. On his journey, at least according to the poetry he subsequently produced, he met a female vagrant, a woman brought to poverty by enclosure, war, and widowhood. The theme of the female vagrant became popular, and appears in later poetry by Wordsworth himself, Robert Southey, the Scots poet Robert Tannahil, and Amelia Opie, among others. She is an object both of pity and of horror. She has passed beyond the pale of acceptable society and cannot return; indeed her only escape is through death. The male vagrant however, is rarely, if ever, mentioned. Indeed, as David Chandler comments, "on his first Wye visit Wordsworth probably looked more like a common tramp than a gentleman on holiday." But men, unlike women, are allowed out on their own, even if they do risk being mistaken for a labourer or tramp. How, then, can a woman write nature poetry? How can she experience the transformation described by Wordsworth in "Lines, Written a few miles above Tintern Abbey, On Revisiting the Banks of the Wye During a Tour. July 13, 1798"? Well she can, of course, like Dorothy, accompany a man, but sadly, women's brains are just not up to fully appreciating the experience: "...in thy voice I catch / The language of my former heart, and read / My former pleasures in the shooting lights / Of thy wild eyes" Wordsworth tells his sister, reminding us that she still has a long way to go on her spiritual journey if she is to be as uplifted as he is. Charlotte Smith, it is true, sneaked out into rural Sussex, but she kept her head down. Her nature poetry, like John Clare's, focuses on the minute, the hidden and the local. Like Clare, she catalogues flowers, and confines herself to sunken lanes, never surveying, in Romantic picturesque style, the panorama of nature from a lofty viewpoint, as Wordsworth does in Tintern Abbey.

Ironically, it is Charlotte Smith's long poem "The Emigrants" which is now widely recognised as having inspired the opening lines of "Tintern Abbey". But Smith does not recognise the healing, spiritual properties of nature that Wordsworth does: she is too familiar with the poverty of the country dwellers. Here, then, is another aspect of Romantic masculinity: men are spiritual, women are material. This neo-Platonist duality has been recognised by ecofeminists as a convention of gender. Women are closer to nature than men because, like the land, they are fertile and life-giving. Being close to nature they are, following the neo-Platonist tradition so deeply entrenched in our culture, material and inferior. Men, being to a certain extent divorced from the actual function of child birth are less material, more spiritual. This is the far from original

assumption made by Wordsworth and later critics of Romanticism. It is again ironic that women, supposedly closer to nature than men, are denied access to it. Nevertheless, the refusal to allow women to join the Romantic Poets' club, to aspire to the Sublime, does not silence them. The extraordinary events in France, on which Wordsworth and Coleridge turned their backs, were faithfully recorded by Helen Maria Williams, who remained in Paris for most of the revolutionary and Napoleonic years. The campaign for the abolition of slavery, which was largely ignored by Wordsworth, and was openly opposed by radicals such as William Cobbett, may well not have succeeded when it did were it not for the support given it by women. The much-derided Bluestockings, women such as Hannah More and Anna Laetitia Barbauld, campaigned tirelessly for abolition, recognising that the enslavement of Africans bore similarities to the subjugation of women. Such issues no longer concerned the High Romantics. In common with the priesthood of any patriarchal religion, the prophets of Romanticism remained loyal to their gender, and chose not to rock the boat.

Those men who did choose to rock the boat, the so-called Cockney school of poets, were attacked for, among other things, being feminine. Ayumi Mizukoshi argues that Leigh Hunt, who was imprisoned for his opposition to the monarchy, "is without exception grouped with the feminine or effeminate. It is taken for granted that while Keats was manfully striding into the epic quest, Hunt had been left behind in the realm of the pastoral goddess Flora. In referring to his lack of intellectual and theoretical power, modern academics are implicitly criticising Hunt for his effeminacy." Keats was also a member of the Cockney school, and a close friend of Hunt's. Having been accepted into the canon as a major Romantic Poet, critics needed to confirm his masculinity: "[f]rom F. R. Leavis to Harold Bloom," continues Mizukoshi, "twentieth-century critics have made every effort to masculinise and hence canonise Keats. Meanwhile, Hunt was increasingly dismissed as minor, effeminate and Cockney."

When considering the Romantic Poet, then, or at least the model provided by Wordsworth, we should be aware that it is a model of masculinity, a model which deliberately excludes women, and which reaffirms male domination of the literary world at a time when the novel, increasingly produced and read by women, was becoming dangerously powerful. Romanticism restores poetry to the position of dominant genre, while at the same time reaffirming the literary and spiritual pre-eminence of the masculine gender. So powerful is this model, that while poetry has

(relatively) recently escaped masculine dominance, the figure of the masculine Romantic Poet remains as potent as ever. The extremely high status awarded Romantic poetry by the canon – at least at a level with Shakespeare – is also a confirmation of the status of the masculine in traditional literary judgement. The argument is rather circular, as such arguments usually are: the true Romantic Poet is a man – Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Byron and Keats are the examples which prove this to be the case, hence, since only these five men are true Romantic Poets (though Keats, Shelley and Byron are neither quite as masculine nor quite as great as Wordsworth and Coleridge), only men can be true Romantic Poets. And what is Romanticism? It is about nature and the countryside – a space denied to women; and it is about matters of the spirit, a condition denied to women who are, by nature, earthy and material. Ultimately the conclusion must be reached that women, and male poets who do not satisfy the strict masculine requirements of Romanticism, are better off remaining outside the club. By concerning themselves with this world, the material world, which is the only world we have, their poetry is both more interesting and far, far more meaningful.

Works Cited

- Chandler, David. "Vagrancy Smoked Out: Wordsworth 'betwixt Severn and Wye'" *Romanticism On the Net* 11. August 1998. Access: 22.03.01. <<http://users.ox.ac.uk/~scat0385/hermit.html>>
- Hunt, Stephen "Wandering Lonely" in *Reading Under the Sign of Nature*. Eds. John Tallmadge and Henry Harrington. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2000.*
- McGann, Jerome J. "Wordsworth and the Ideology of Romantic Poems" *The Romantic Ideology: A Critical Investigation*. 1983. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Mizukoshi, Ayumi. "The Cockney Politics of Gender - the Cases of Hunt and Keats." *Romanticism On the Net* 14. May 1999. Date of access: 27.3.01. <<http://users.ox.ac.uk/~scat0385/cockneygender.html>>

Universitat de Barcelona

The U.S.A., in the period ranging from 1890 to 1940, was, to use David Minter's turn of phrase, torn between "conflicting alliances" (Minter, 1996). On the one hand, the country witnessed the emergence of the "New Woman" and of what was perceived as the progressive feminization of society. At the same time that middle-class women were accessing the job market in significant numbers -mainly as secretaries and receptionists- and depriving men who occupied white-collar jobs of what had traditionally been a "male-only" space, working-class women engaged actively in the socialist, anarchist and unionist movements and achieved unprecedented visibility in them. Both these aspects were tangible signs of a re-organization of the world of labor, which involved the active participation of women. On top of that, an ever-growing group of feminists and "liberated women" got involved in two campaigns which had a profound impact on society: one to fight for the elective franchise, which, in its attempt to include the values of the domestic sphere into what was perceived as the too violent public space and political arena, threatened to bring about a re-definition of the national identity; the other one, to legalize the use of contraceptive measures, which, if freely used, would make motherhood optional and would, therefore, imply a redefinition of the social role allotted to women who would be not only fit to mother men but fit to live in equality with them. The growing participation of women in public, social and even political affairs was met with an equally growing skepticism and even resentment by men who understood their presence in those affairs as debilitating. The language of male anxiety crystallized into the expression of their fear of "social displacement and impugning of their besieged masculinity" (Minter, 1996, p. 121) and was translated into a cultural and ideological defense of the traditional masculine values, baptized as the "cult of the masculine" or the "cult of the strenuous life".

This confrontation between the reformist push of the "new woman" and the resistance to change of the hegemonic male discourse is reflected in the tension between the appeal of the socialist and unionist ideas that were gaining strength in the U.S. of the turn of the century, and the reactionary combination of individualism and social Darwinism exemplified by Teddy Roosevelt's 1898 speech "The cult of the Strenuous Life":

In speaking to you, men of the greatest city of the West, men of the State which gave to the country Lincoln and Grant, men who preeminently and distinctly

embody all that is most American in the American character I wish to preach, not the doctrine of ignoble ease, but the doctrine of the strenuous life; the life of toil and effort, of labor and strife; to preach that highest form of success which comes, not to the man who desires mere easy peace, but to the man who does not shrink from danger, from hardship or from bitter toil, and who out of these wins the splendid ultimate triumph. A life of slothful ease, a life of that peace which springs merely from lack either of desire or of power to strive after great things, is as little worthy of a nation as of an individual

In this context, London's work proves particularly appropriate to illustrate the complexity of this ideological struggle. Considered by many a spokesperson for the "cult of masculinity" in novels such as *White Fang*, *The Call of the Wild* or *The Game*, and by others as a propagandist for socialist ideas in novels such as *The People of the Abyss*, he tries to bring together these two apparently irreconcilable extremes by defining himself as a defender of "Individualist Socialism", a self-imposed label which hints at the contradictions inherent to his work. These contradictions come to one of their more elaborate expressions in *Martin Eden*.

The sympathies of the novel are undoubtedly with the working-class, whose members are depicted as victims of the "vampirism" of the bourgeoisie, which keeps itself alive at the expense of the strength, vitality and life of the working class. In fact, Martin's own healthy body and still uncorrupted mind are put to the service of the bourgeoisie when he first meets Ruth Morse and "becomes clay in her hands immediately, as passionately desirous of being moulded by her as she was desirous of shaping him into the image of her ideal man" (London, 1982, p. 632). Ruth's parents shamelessly instrumentalize Martin in their desire to wake Ruth's somehow dormant nature to the realities of life:

He is the first man that ever drew a passing notice from Ruth," she told her husband. "She has been so singularly backward where men are concerned that I have been worried greatly."

Mr. Morse looked at his wife curiously.

"You mean to use this young sailor to wake her up?" he questioned.

"I mean that she is not to die an old maid if I can help it," was the answer. "If this young Eden can arouse her interest in mankind in general, it will be a good thing."

“A very good thing,” he commented. “But suppose, —and we must suppose, sometimes, my dear, —suppose he arouses her interest too particularly in him?”
 “Impossible,” Mrs. Morse laughed. “She is three years older than he, and, besides, it is impossible. Nothing will ever come of it. Trust that to me” (London, 1982, p. 633)

Martin Eden, after having escaped what London calls “the social Pit” and submerged himself in the decadent, conservative, and conventional life style of the middle-class reality of the Morses, finally understands, when it is too late for him, the beauty and moral superiority of the working class:

Realism is imperative to my nature, and the bourgeois spirit hates realism. The bourgeoisie is cowardly. It is afraid of life. And all your effort was to make me afraid of life. You would have formalized me. You would have compressed me into a two-by-four pigeonhole of life, where all life’s values are unreal, and false, and vulgar. [...] Vulgarly —a hearty vulgarity, I’ll admit— is the basis of bourgeois refinement and culture. (London, 1982, p. 915)

But this ode to the superiority of the working class is undermined by the celebration of masculinity and manly beauty incarnated by Martin Eden, the white supremacist version of the noble savage, the uneducated natural force that excels all other characters —more educated and civilized— in strength, vitality, health and generosity of heart and mind.

Works Cited

- LONDON, Jack (1982), *Novels and Social Writings*, New York Literary Classics, New York.
- MINTER, David (1996), *A Cultural History of the American Novel*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

XXX Congreso de AEDEAN, Huelva – diciembre, 2006

Mesa Redonda: "Gender, Race and Class: Ethnic Masculinities in Contemporary American Literature Written by Women" (I)

Panel: "Feminist and Gender Studies"

Participan: Dra. Àngels Carabí, Dr. Josep M. Armengol, Dra. Cristina Alsina, Sra. Isabel Seguro

Resumen:

Since the 1980s, the study of masculinity -namely, the cultural prescriptions that each society attaches to one's biological sex at a particular time (MacIntosh)- has increasingly become an academic object of analysis. Along with feminist and gay studies, masculinity studies has thus explored the meanings of "being a man" from multiple and innovative methodological and disciplinary perspectives. As more and more work is being done in the name of masculinity studies, increasing attention is being paid to the intersections between different factors such as masculinity, race, and class. In line with the latest trends of masculinity studies, then, the members of the research project "Construyendo nuevas masculinidades" (Instituto de la Mujer, Exp. N° 62/03), as a result of their three-year research work, propose two round tables on the analysis of how gender, race and class combine in the construction of ethnic masculinities. While most studies of literary masculinities have focused on the analysis of male-authored texts, the tables that we propose will explore a plurality of representations of ethnic men from women whose work challenges hegemonic patriarchal values.

Round Table I

Although ethnic studies have traditionally focused on the analysis of non-white cultures and races, **Josep M. Armengol** will explore whiteness as an ethnic construct. Borrowing from the latest work of whiteness studies, Armengol will analyze the "white race" as a social, historical, and political invention. Armengol will point as well to the intersections between whiteness studies, which focuses on the cultural construction of

whiteness, and masculinity studies, which approaches masculinity as a specific gendered construct.

The hegemonic definition of masculinity underwent a serious process of revision during the 60s and 70s. The Vietnam War had emasculating effects both on those who fought it and came out of the experience having suffered extreme changes in their bodies and their psyche, and on those who didn't fight it and were, thus, deprived of one of the most generally accepted rites of passage to mature masculinity: soldiering. This crisis of masculinity is also marked by a growing consciousness of how issues of class bear on one's perception of what "being a man" means. **Cristina Alsina** will analyze how women writers -writing in the 80s- represent these changes in their work of fiction.

Isabel Seguro will explore Asian American masculinities and other ethnic masculinities from the viewpoint of Asian women immigrants in the United States, particularly those who entered the country as "war brides" after the Second World War. Most of them, being women married to American military men, had to deal with issues of racism as well as with different notions of manhood and gender relations in their new lives in the United States.

Àngels Carabí will carry out a comparative analysis of the representations of masculinity in the writings of women authors from different ethnic backgrounds to explore how different cultural backgrounds produce different ways of acting masculine. The purpose of Carabí's analysis is twofold. On the one hand, Carabí aims to analyze how gender, race and class play a central role in the construction of ethnic masculinities. On the other hand, her intention is to point to the complexity of the interrelations which are forged when different ethnic masculinities are in contact in multicultural societies. For her analysis, Carabí will investigate masculine constructs in the works of Native American, African American and Asian American women writers. References will be also be made to the recent film *Crash* (2006), directed by Paul Haggis.

XXX Congreso de AEDEAN, Huelva – diciembre, 2006

Mesa Redonda: "Gender, Race and Class: Ethnic Masculinities in Contemporary American Literature Written by Women" (II)

Panel: “Feminist and Gender Studies”

Participan: Dra. Bárbara Ozieblo, Sra. Marta Bosch, Dr. Rodrigo Andrés, Dr. William C. Phillips

Resumen:

Rodrigo Andrés will explore how in the works of Jewish American writers Tillie Olsen (1912-) and Grace Paley (1922-) male characters are presented as co-victims of an oppressive class system, rather than as patriarchal victimizers. Both writers –celebrated icons of feminist literature in the United States- pay homage to women of the working classes and also dignify their men as potential partners at the level of both personal and political commitments.

Marta Bosch will explore the extent to which the writings of contemporary Arab-American women authors such as Diana Abu-Jaber, Elmaz Abinader, Eden Adnan, Mona Simpson, or Naomi Shihab Nye reproduce or depart from traditional representations of Arab masculinity. Taking into account their gender, class, and ethnicity, Bosch’s contribution will examine the ways in which these writers articulate representations of Western masculinity alongside their Arab cultural heritage and the stereotypes of Arab men circulating in Western societies. As will be argued, such stereotypes are characterized by ambivalence, showing traits of effeminacy (related to colonialism and Orientalism) in contrast with features of hypermasculinity (related to violence and patriarchy).

Bill Phillips will analyze how the traditional fictional American detective powerfully reinforced an already existing model of white, middle class, heterosexual masculinity. Nevertheless, alternative models, such as Joseph Hansen’s 1970 gay detective novel *Fadeout*, Jame Lee Burke’s Dave Robicheaux series or Paula L. Wood’s more recent Charlotte Justice novels have challenged the gender, race and class bias associated with the genre.

Bárbara Ozieblo will explore the intersections between masculinity and ethnicity in Chicana literature. Ozieblo will investigate the works of Chicana writers,

such as Cherríe Moraga, to try to illustrate how Chicano masculinity is also marked by the specificities of race and class.

5. CONCLUSIONES

5. CONCLUSIONES

Los estudios de las masculinidades y sus aplicaciones a la crítica literaria

A pesar del creciente número de textos sobre masculinidades literarias, este campo de estudio continúa siendo ampliamente desconocido en el mundo académico. Mientras que el análisis de las mujeres y la feminidad en la literatura es ya una materia habitual dentro de los estudios literarios, y generalmente resulta familiar tanto a alumnas como a alumnos, el análisis feminista de las masculinidades literarias sigue, por lo general, poco difundido. Como el crítico literario Berthold Schoene (2000) ha comentado al respecto, pidan a cualquier alumno perceptivo que escriba un ensayo sobre la representación de las mujeres de Jane Austen, o sobre el asfixiante impacto de las políticas de género patriarcales en las mujeres de las comedias de Shakespeare, y el resultado es a menudo argumentado clara y coherentemente. Sin embargo, pídanles que comenten la representación de los hombres y la respuesta es frecuentemente una mezcla de incomodidad, agitación nerviosa y silencio.

Existen diversas razones para ello. Por un lado, el análisis de las imágenes de las mujeres en la literatura tiene una historia considerablemente larga dentro de la crítica literaria feminista, mientras que el estudio feminista de las masculinidades literarias constituye una incorporación relativamente reciente al mundo académico. Exceptuando a unos pocos críticos literarios como Leverenz (1989), los hombres acaban de empezar a analizar la masculinidad en la cultura y literatura estadounidenses. Además, hay muy pocos textos que sugieran cómo llevar a cabo un análisis de las masculinidades literarias, y dicho análisis no puede basarse simplemente en la imitación de las perspectivas, objetivos y resoluciones de la crítica literaria feminista. Para tratar el tema específico de la condición masculina, estos estudios deben desarrollar su propio discurso contra el patriarcado, lo cual no es fácil y requiere su tiempo. Por todos estos motivos, los estudios de las masculinidades en la literatura no están aún tan extendidos como los estudios de mujeres.

Sin embargo, el proyecto “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades” ha intentado mostrar cómo una re-visión de la literatura norteamericana desde la perspectiva de la masculinidad podría resultar altamente beneficiosa por varios motivos. En primer lugar, si la asunción errónea que la experiencia masculina equivale a la experiencia humana distorsionó las imágenes de las mujeres como personajes literarios y como autoras, dicha asunción ha limitado también nuestras percepciones de los hombres en la literatura. Los estudios de las masculinidades proponen una completa relectura de las imágenes de la masculinidad y de los ideales masculinos en la literatura norteamericana. Como James D. Riemer apunta, “en los últimos diez o quince años, los estudios de los hombres han examinado nuestros ideales culturales de masculinidad y cómo afectan las vidas de los varones, transformando experiencias humanas universales en unas que son específicamente masculinas”. El enfoque a la literatura estadounidense desde el prisma de la masculinidad se desmarca, por tanto, del análisis de temas supuestamente universales y poco tangibles, explorando el efecto concreto de los ideales culturales de la masculinidad sobre la vida personal y cotidiana de los hombres (Riemer). Releer, por ejemplo, temas aparentemente universales y no marcados por el género como las emociones y la violencia desde el ángulo de la masculinidad puede ayudarnos a comprender cómo los ideales masculinos afectan, y con frecuencia limitan y complican, las vidas de los hombres en la cultura y literatura de los Estados Unidos.

Otra implicación de visitar la literatura norteamericana a través de los estudios de las masculinidades es la posibilidad de analizar una parte significativa de las obras literarias como documentos sociales que reflejan las nociones de virilidad de la cultura estadounidense. Puesto que toda sociedad es plural, no monolítica, los estudios de las masculinidades intentan mostrar también las múltiples visiones y representaciones del varón en la literatura. Si los conceptos de masculinidad de un escritor pueden variar de los de sus propios contemporáneos, la variación tiende a ser aún mayor cuando contrastamos representaciones de la masculinidad de momentos históricos dispares. Al igual que los conceptos sociales de masculinidad, las ideas literarias sobre el género masculino cambian, pues, según el contexto histórico y sociocultural. Además, los cambios de los significados culturales de la masculinidad a menudo derivan en, y reflejan, cambios de las representaciones literarias de la masculinidad. Por tanto, la relación entre los estudios de las masculinidades en la literatura y el campo más amplio de los estudios de las masculinidades en general puede describirse como “recíproca”

(Riemer). Si releer la masculinidad en la literatura norteamericana nos ayuda a entender mejor los conceptos sociales del género masculino, la información procedente de otros campos como la sociología y la psicología puede iluminar nuestra relectura de la literatura estadounidense de formas altamente innovadoras, como hemos comprobado a lo largo de nuestra investigación en el marco del proyecto “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades”. Asimismo, vincular campos generalmente separados como la sociología y la crítica literaria puede ayudarnos a transgredir y subvertir los límites disciplinarios tradicionales, modificando asimismo el formato habitual de la crítica literaria. Pese al indudable valor de la literatura como documento social que refleja nuestros ideales culturales de masculinidad, los estudios literarios del género masculino no deberían ser interpretados, sin embargo, como investigaciones literalmente sociológicas, psicológicas o antropológicas de las masculinidades en los Estados Unidos. Como James D. Riemer ha comentado, no podemos esperar que los estudios de las masculinidades literarias “proporcionen toda la ‘verdad’ sobre la masculinidad en relación con un entorno social, económico y racial-étnico particular”, aunque “pueden ofrecer valiosas aportaciones para futuras investigaciones, potencialmente corroborativas, por parte de sociólogos, psicólogos y antropólogos sociales”. Con lo dicho hasta aquí, podríamos concluir que el objetivo principal de un enfoque a la literatura norteamericana desde el prisma de la masculinidad es la “Re-visión”, que la escritora y ensayista Adrienne Rich definió como “el acto de mirar atrás, de ver con ojos frescos, de entrar en un texto antiguo desde una nueva dirección crítica”. Dicha revisión implica el análisis de modelos tradicionales pero también alternativos de masculinidad en la literatura. Como indica Riemer, para cambiar las vidas de los hombres [es necesario] más que el reconocimiento de las limitaciones y efectos negativos de nuestros ideales de masculinidad actuales. Debe haber también un reconocimiento y refuerzo de alternativas positivas a los ideales y comportamientos masculinos tradicionales. La crítica de los modelos tradicionales de masculinidad y la búsqueda de nuevas formas de ser hombre han constituido, por tanto, los dos objetivos principales de nuestro proyecto a lo largo de estos tres últimos años.

Con el doble objetivo de subvertir los valores tradicionales patriarcales y contribuir a la búsqueda de nuevos modelos alternativos de masculinidad, el proyecto ha contado con dos partes diferentes aunque complementarias. La primera ha explorado personajes masculinos que no consiguen desprenderse de valores masculinos

patriarcales como el sexismo, el individualismo, la competitividad o la represión y el desarraigo emocionales. Por otro lado, la segunda parte ha celebrado las subversivas imágenes en la literatura de escritoras norteamericanas de personajes masculinos que “luchan por alcanzar estadios de mayor felicidad...siguiendo escalas de valores feministas” (Daly).

Según teóric@s de la masculinidad como Victor J. Seidler, Lillian Rubin, Carol Gilligan y Nancy Chodorow, entre otr@s, la construcción de la masculinidad patriarcal se ha basado tradicionalmente en aspectos como la obsesión por el éxito profesional y el trabajo, la racionalidad y la represión emocional, así como el individualismo y la falta de actitudes relacionales hacia los demás. Como indica Seidler (1989), “la masculinidad es una identidad esencialmente negativa aprendida definiéndose a sí misma como la antítesis de las emociones y los afectos”. Desafiando las normas de la masculinidad tradicional, varios protagonistas masculinos creados por escritoras norteamericanas como Toni Morrison o Sandra Cisneros aspiran, sin embargo, a sentir la calidez de un hogar; a experimentar emociones y pasiones, especialmente el amor; y, en definitiva, a establecer relaciones y vínculos afectivos sólidos y duraderos. Los varones de estas historias adoptan, pues, una nueva conciencia relacional, contextual, integradora y vital, descubriendo el valor de la experiencia de continuidad y de relación con los demás.

Como sostiene Carol Gilligan en su ya clásica obra *In a Different Voice* (1982), esta actitud relacional ante la vida ha sido tradicionalmente más valorada (y encarnada) por mujeres que por hombres. A diferencia del énfasis masculino en la competitividad y el individualismo, las mujeres han considerado las relaciones y los vínculos afectivos como componentes vitales prioritarios. Por tanto, las mujeres acostumbran a ver la moralidad como íntimamente relacionada con el cuidado del otro, valorando la interdependencia sobre el individualismo y la rígida independencia. Como explica la propia Gilligan, este “ideal del cuidado es...una actividad de relación, es ver y responder a la necesidad, cuidando del mundo conservando la red de conexión de modo que nadie se quede solo” (1982). Si bien el cuidado del otro y todas estas actitudes relacionales han sido, como ha mostrado Gilligan, tradicionalmente femeninas, diversos textos literarios analizados en el proyecto “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades” dibujan a menudo personajes masculinos que sufren transformaciones positivas, abandonando su individualismo inicial a favor de actitudes más abiertas, menos individualistas y más

relacionales. El análisis de estos innovadores modelos masculinos, que alcanzan una mayor felicidad propia ofreciéndose al otro, podrían contribuir a una redefinición feminista de la masculinidad. Como Riemer nos recuerda, seguramente será más fácil que los varones cambien sus vidas si les ayudamos a percatarse de lo que podrían llegar a ser. En este sentido, el proyecto “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades” ha intentado contribuir a abrir un proceso de reflexión sobre la construcción y posible deconstrucción de la masculinidad a partir de la literatura norteamericana escrita por mujeres, quienes han hablado a menudo sobre las dificultades pero también la promesa del cambio del varón. A lo largo de estos últimos años, los diferentes investigadores del proyecto “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades” han compartido, así pues, el doble objetivo de cuestionar los modelos tradicionales de masculinidad y contribuir a la búsqueda de nuevas formas alternativas de ser hombre a través de la literatura norteamericana escrita por mujeres.

En relación al apartado sobre **masculinidad y conflicto bélico** la Dra. Cristina Alsina ha analizado cómo la narrativa sobre la guerra de Vietnam escrita por escritoras norteamericanas ha subvertido el modelo de masculinidad tradicional alentado por las políticas del período de los presidentes Reagan y Bush. Los personajes de dos escritoras sureñas, Bobbie Ann Mason y Jayne Ann Phillips, son seres humanos cuya vulnerabilidad no significa un menoscabo a su masculinidad, sino una ocasión excelente para reflexionar sobre los conceptos de hegemonía de identidad nacional y sobre la complejidad de la subjetividad masculina. Los varones de Mason y Phillips cuestionan, con su comportamiento, los discursos hegemónicos que determinan lo que se supone significa “ser un hombre”. Las dos escritoras revisan las tradicionales formas de subjetividad masculina y ofrecen perfiles de masculinidades alternativas más equitativas y dialogantes que liberan al varón de las nociones imperantes asociadas a la virilidad tradicional.

El tema de **masculinidad y etnicidad** está siendo un área de estudio que los análisis de la masculinidad van incorporando cada vez más. Si bien la realidad multicultural de los Estados Unidos invita, por motivos obvios, a explorar las

masculinidades étnicas, lo cierto es que este análisis se perfila como ineludible en las sociedades europeas de naturaleza crecientemente multicultural. Las reflexiones de críticos de la masculinidad y la etnicidad como Michael Awkward, Robyn Wiegman, bell hooks, David Gilmore, David Eng, Lynne Segal, Alfredo Mirande y Mrinalini Sinha, entre otros, han sido fundamentales para nuestro estudio en torno al modo en que los factores de raza y etnicidad influyen en el comportamiento masculino y en las relaciones entre culturas.

De este modo, la Dra. Àngels Carabí, en su estudio de las **masculinidades afroamericanas**, ha explorado la manera en que el discurso colonizador, desde los tiempos de la esclavitud, construyó unos estereotipos del hombre negro que todavía perduran en la cultura contemporánea, y cuya finalidad ha sido controlar en lo posible unas fuerzas de naturaleza salvaje que desbordaban al varón blanco. Los estudios sobre la masculinidad negra revelan que uno de los estereotipos más temidos en lo que respecta a los varones de color -el hombre negro hipersexualizado- no es más que la proyección de las represiones del varón blanco en el cuerpo “incontrolable” del hombre de color. Si “el sujeto del sueño es el soñador mismo”, como dice Toni Morrison, el hombre blanco se ha soñado a sí mismo en un “Otro” inferior que ha aglutinado sus deseos más oscuros y por ello lo ha demonizado. El trabajo de las escritoras que hemos estudiado, como Toni Morrison, Gloria Naylor y June Jordan ha sido desmenuzar la construcción de estos estereotipos y dotar a sus compañeros de una textura humana y de una subjetividad propia. De todas maneras, si bien este proceso empático las ha llevado a crear varones increíblemente generosos que nos sorprenden gratamente por su reescritura de la masculinidad, lo cierto es que estos modelos alternativos masculinos son producto de un proceso evolutivo en el que una o varias mujeres y, a veces, algún otro hombre “diferente” han intervenido positivamente. Así en algunos casos, los textos de Morrison y de Alice Walker perfilan varones libres que han aprendido a despojarse de los códigos tradicionales de masculinidad. En otros, los varones siguen ateniéndose a la rigidez de sus códigos sexistas pero, de la mano de las escritoras, podemos aproximarnos a ellos y entender el proceso que les ha conducido a ser como son, aunque sin dejar de ser críticos de sus actos.

Isabel Seguro ha centrado el análisis de las representaciones de la **masculinidad asiático-americana** en explorar la manera en que los dramaturgos asiático-americanos se contemplan a sí mismos y se fijan el objetivo de desconstruir los estereotipos de género proporcionados por la cultura popular en los Estados Unidos a lo largo de la historia de la inmigración asiática al país. En su afán desconstruccionista, los dramaturgos asiático-americanos han investigado cuáles son las políticas encargadas de la producción de, por una parte, las imágenes del hombre asiático emasculado y, en su versión más amenazadora, decadente —sexual y culturalmente— y, por la otra, de la mujer asiática o bien como sumisa y ávida de complacer al hombre (especialmente si es blanco) — la *Lotus Blossom*— o bien como la mujer vengativa e hipersexualizada encarnada por la *Dragon Lady*. Los artistas asiático-americanos se han encargado, no sólo de demostrar los efectos nefastos de dichas imágenes en la realidad material y psicológica de los miembros de sus comunidades, sino también de proporcionar nuevas imágenes de sí mismos que están de acorde con su realidad cotidiana. De este modo, representan a personajes asiático-americanos en el quehacer diario dentro de la sociedad norteamericana, enfatizando la contribución de dichas comunidades en la construcción y desarrollo de los Estados Unidos.

Las representaciones de los **indios norteamericanos** que, tradicionalmente, han sido transmitidas —y desvirtuadas— por la literatura de la cultura dominante y, principalmente por la industria de Hollywood han sido exploradas por la Dra. Àngels Carabí. A pesar de que en las últimas décadas ha habido una voluntad de aportar una imagen más positiva de la población indígena, por ejemplo en el film, dirigido por Kevin Costner, *Bailando con lobos* (1990), lo cierto es que la película ha seguido reproduciendo valores tradicionales, especialmente en lo que concierne a las relaciones de género y a las relaciones entre mujeres y hombres de diferentes razas. Para analizar la cultura india resulta necesario comprender su visión del mundo. Conceptos como la unidad cósmica donde todo está interrelacionado, la noción de armonía con el entorno, la identificación con la tierra —y no el control sobre ella— así como el legado oral de la cultura son básicos para explicar la producción literaria y las representaciones de los varones indio-americanos. Àngels Carabí ha estudiado las escritoras indias que empiezan a publicar a partir de los años sesenta como consecuencia de los Movimientos de los Derechos Civiles y del feminismo. A partir de entonces se consolida una

literatura nativo-americana, producida por escritoras, que da voz a las mujeres y también a los varones de la comunidad india. Conocedoras de la validez de su cultura, escritoras como Leslie Silko, Louise Erdrich y Joy Harjo, entre otras, ven con profunda pena cómo los jóvenes indios de su comunidad se sienten desplazados en una América que, o bien los margina por ser indios, o bien los aculturiza para que dejen de serlo. Mestizos, discriminados por prácticas racistas y sin un punto de referencia, los sentimientos básicos de equilibrio y armonía han desaparecido y el resultado suele ser el refugio del alcohol, o las peleas entre indios, el abandono de las familias, e incluso el suicidio. En un acto de responsabilidad hacia su comunidad, las escritoras exploran en sus novelas las vidas de los jóvenes varones analizando temas como la amistad entre varones, las relaciones paterno-filiales, la violencia entre varones y contra las mujeres, con el objetivo, en algunos casos factible, de restablecer las relaciones armónicas entre personas y también con el entorno.

Marta Bosch ha estudiado las representaciones de la **masculinidad en la literatura árabo-americana**. De este modo, se ha centrado en explorar la literatura producida por escritoras estadounidenses contemporáneas inmigrantes de primera o segunda generación originarias de países árabes, como Diana Abu-Jaber, Elmaz Abinader, Etel Adnan o Mona Simpson, y su negociación de las nociones de masculinidad provenientes tanto de la cultura árabe como de la cultura norteamericana. También han sido objeto de su análisis los estereotipos del hombre árabe que predominan en los Estados Unidos. Se ha concluido que estas escritoras proyectan modelos alternativos de ser hombre; proponen figuras masculinas que se alejan de los estereotipos y de las nociones de masculinidad tradicionales de las culturas árabe y americana y que establecen relaciones afectivas más sanas. En su trabajo, estas escritoras ponen de manifiesto la complejidad de las relaciones entre culturas y los valores positivos que se pueden derivar de éstas.

Por su parte, la Dra. Bárbara Ozieblo aplica los **estudios sobre las masculinidades en el teatro** de críticos como Carla McDonough, David Savran y Robert Vorlicky, entre otros, a la obra de varias dramaturgas contemporáneas. Ozieblo demuestra como en el teatro de mujeres, las dramaturgas no se apropian del espacio de la mirada masculina para crear imágenes de un hombre ideal, sino que representan a

hombres en situaciones extremas —como en la comisión de un parricidio y el acoso sexual en el seno de la familia— con el objetivo no tan sólo analizar, sino también de incitar al espectador/lector a replantearse los roles que, según el género, la cultura hegemónica nos conduce a desempeñar. El aspecto innovador del análisis llevado a cabo por Ozieblo radica en la selección de dramaturgas de diferentes orígenes cuyas obras llegan a conclusiones muy similares en cuanto a los efectos nocivos del concepto hegemónico y patriarcal de la masculinidad. Así, Suzan-Lori Parks hace lo propio en la comunidad afro-americana, Paula Vogel en la anglo-americana y Cherríe Moraga en la chicana.

El Dr. Rodrigo Andrés ha revisado las mejores aportaciones de los estudios de la masculinidad aplicadas a la **relectura de los clásicos del canon literario americano**, subrayando la homofobia inherente a la obra de los principales teóricos varones, como el clásico de David Leverenz, *Manhood and the American Renaissance* (1989) de enorme difusión tanto entre los estudiosos del diecinueve como entre los estudiosos de temas de género, psicoanálisis y sexualidad. En una segunda fase, Andrés analizó cómo algunas escritoras norteamericanas han incorporado la crítica de los estudios de la masculinidad a su obra creativa, produciendo obras literarias que re-examinan la masculinidad de personajes clásicos, como la novela *Ahab's Wife* (1999), cuya autora, Sena Jeter Naslund reescribe el personaje del capitán Ahab perteneciente a la novela de Herman Melville *Moby Dick* (1851) discerniendo entre la masculinidad social del personaje y su humanidad genuina, oprimida por las pautas de comportamiento exigidas por ese patrón social de masculinidad. Finalmente, Andrés exploró cómo la lectura de este tipo de re-escrituras de clásicos literarios desde la perspectiva de los nuevos estudios de la masculinidad supone una re-evaluación de las condiciones socioculturales que impulsaron a los escritores de esos clásicos a presentar unos modelos de masculinidad determinados, ya fuera con el fin de perpetuarlos o, en ocasiones, de denunciarlos. Andrés ha documentado que la relectura que Sena Jeter Naslund realiza de la obra de Herman Melville apunta a la fertilidad de la interacción entre teorías de género y canon literario para conseguir un doble motivo: subrayar las distorsiones detrás de la construcción hegemónica de la masculinidad occidental y apuntar hacia nuevas masculinidades que, al ser más dialogantes y atentas a “el Otro” sexual, de

género, clase o raza pueden llegar a suponer una amenaza a las jerarquías sociales de occidente.

Finalmente, el Dr. Bill Phillips ha analizado los cambios de la **novela negra norteamericana** a lo largo de la historia del género. Al principio, la figura del detective estaba asociada a la de un hombre honrado pero con los prejuicios típicos de su época. Concretamente, las novelas de Dashiell Hammet, Raymond Chandler, Mickey Spillane y otros representan a las mujeres, a las personas de diferentes etnias y de diferente orientación sexual como personas inferiores, ridículas e inmorales. Sin embargo, desde los años sesenta los autores y las autoras de novela negra han introducido muchísimas modificaciones al modelo de masculinidad que representa el detective, hasta hacerlo casi (o a veces totalmente) irreconocible. Este proceso ha llevado a crear unos modelos alternativos de roles de género (no siempre encarnados por el propio detective) que nos pueden ayudar a plantear la posibilidad de una sociedad diferente, más justa, igualitaria y tolerante.

6. ACTIVIDADES REALIZADAS

6.1 SEMINARIOS Y CONFERENCIAS

6.2 JORNADAS Y CONGRESOS

6.3 TESIS DOCTORALES Y TRABAJOS DE INVESTIGACIÓN

6.1 SEMINARIOS Y CONFERENCIAS

- **Victoria Sau**

Seminario “La masculinidad como incógnita”.

Universitat de Barcelona, 22 octubre 2004.

La psicóloga feminista Victoria Sau impartió el seminario en el que abordó temas de reflexión sobre cuestiones de violencia, agresividad y miedo en relación a la construcción tradicional de la masculinidad. Asimismo exploró los conceptos de paternidad, la naturaleza de las relaciones entre padres varones e hijos/as y la incidencia de la masculinidad hegemónica en la educación infantil del varón.

- **Dr. Matthew Roudané**

“Public Issues: Private Tensions. Contemporary American Drama”.

Jueves 13 de Enero de 2005 de 11:30h a 13:30h. Aula: Sala de profesores / as de Edificio Josep Carner (C/ Aribau) en la Facultat de Filologia de la Universitat de Barcelona.

El Dr. Matthew Roudané, professor of English and Chair, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GE. USA, y actualmente profesor Fulbright en el Departamento de Filología Inglesa de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid, impartió el seminario “Public Issues: Private Tensions. Contemporary American Drama”.

El seminario es una actividad del proyecto “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades”, Centre Dona i literatura/Càtedra UNESCO “Dones, desenvolupament i cultures”. En él, se efectuó una crítica de la cultura americana a través del análisis de las masculinidades en el teatro estadounidense. El Dr.Roudané ha publicado una historia crítica del teatro americano desde 1960 hasta el momento presente además de numerosos libros y ensayos sobre Sam Shepard, Edward Albee y David Mamet entre otros dramaturgos.

- **Dra. Linda G. Jones**

"Textual Representations of Gender and Masculinity in Medieval Islamic Society: Al-Andalus and the Magreb".

Martes, 1 de Febrero de 2005 de 10h a 12h. Aula: Sala de Profesores, Edifici Josep Carner (C/ Aribau), Facultat de Filologia de la Universitat de Barcelona.

La Dra. Linda G. Jones (Departamento de Filología Inglesa de la Universidad de Barcelona) empezó hablando de los estudios de género, que parten de la base de que "los hombres y mujeres no nacen, se hacen," y resulta ser apropiada para explicar el género y la masculinidad en la sociedad islámica medieval y moderna. Aunque el

término "género" es una construcción moderna occidental, el concepto de "virilidad ideal" (Ar. *Kamal al-rijjaliyya*) tiene sus orígenes en la sociedad árabe pre-islámica. Los ideales de la masculinidad están "textualizados" en una variedad de discursos culturales que son modelos a emular por los varones musulmanes. Estos discursos son la poesía pre-islámica; el Qur'an y el Hadith (dichos y hazañas del profeta Muhammad); diccionarios biográficos y hagiografías de hombres ilustres; y crónicas dinásticas. Tras una breve panorámica de las virtudes emblemáticas de la masculinidad en la Arabia pre-islámica, se analizó como el Islam reinterpretó estas construcciones de género para producir varias tipologías de "virilidad ideal", a veces compitiendo entre sí, y que aún están vigentes. Inspirándonos en la observación de Hayden White, que "toda narrativa histórica tiene como propósito latente o manifiesto el deseo de *moralizar* los hechos que trata," los mencionados discursos culturales son utilizados para trazar los ideales competitivos de la "virilidad ideal" en los contextos sociales específicos del siglo XII y XIII del al-Andalus y el Magreb. Se exploró la construcción de género en el Irán post-revolucionario y en el Afganistán de finales del siglo XX, con el fin de resaltar las continuidades de las definiciones de la "masculinidad ideal" en las sociedades musulmanas contemporáneas.

- Bobbie Ann Mason

Conferencia de la escritora norteamericana Bobbie Ann Mason

Marzo de 2005, en colaboración con el Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Alemana (UB) y el Consulado de Estados Unidos.

Bobbie Ann Mason, es profesora de la Universidad de Kentucky y reconocida escritora estadounidense, con novelas como *In Country* (1985) o *An Atomic Romance* (2005). La conferencia se dividió en dos partes: Mason hizo una breve lectura de su obra y después habló de la tradición literaria del Sur, de la construcción de la masculinidad, de sus propias influencias literarias y del acto de creación literaria.

- Dra. Tiffany Ana Lopez

"His Ear in My Hand: Gender and Violence in Chicana Feminist Writing".

Miércoles, 20 de abril de 2005 10h a 12h. Sala de Juntas, Facultat de Filologia de la Universitat de Barcelona.

La Dra. Tiffany Ana Lopez es editora de la antología *Growing Up Chicana/o* (William Morrow & Co.) y autora de *The Alchemy of Blood: Violence as Critical Discourse in U.S Latina/o Writing* (Duke UP, de próxima publicación).

The seminar presented an overview of the ways foundational voices in Chicana feminism, from Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldua to Mary Pat Brady and Eden Torres, have engaged with matters of gender and violence as an intrinsic part of their theorizations about identity and culture. Lopez writes, "If autobiographical narratives form the very foundation of Chicana feminist writing, the Chicana feminist is charged to consider entering that conversation through the terrain of autobiography." Her talk addresses her efforts to work from the intersections of critical theory and personal

practice as part of developing a wide ranging matrix for thinking about the ways violence shapes Chicana identity.

- Dra. Cynthia Stretch
"Teaching American Literature."

Miércoles, 23 de noviembre de 11h a 13h. Aula: Sala de profesores, Edifici Josep Carner (C/ Aribau), Facultat de Filologia, Universidad de Barcelona.

La Dra. Cynthia Stretch es profesora de la Southern Connecticut University y profesora Fulbright en el Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Alemana de la Universidad de Barcelona, y especializada en masculinidades y clase.

El seminario de la Dra. Stretch trató sobre la metodología de la enseñanza de la literatura norteamericana en los Estados Unidos y, especialmente, sobre los contenidos de las asignaturas que ha estado impartiendo en los últimos años en la Southern Connecticut University.

- Evelyn C. White
"Vida y escritura de mujeres afro-americanas"

Jueves 23 de marzo de 2006 de 10h a 11:30h. Aula 2.1 Edifici Josep Carner (C/ Aribau) en la Facultat de Filologia de la Universitat de Barcelona.

Evelyn C. White, biógrafa oficial de Alice Walker (autora de la novela *El color púrpura*), habló de los vínculos entre vida y escritura en las mujeres negras americanas, especialmente en el caso de Alice Walker. E. White, que tiene masteres en periodismo y administración pública de las universidades de Columbia y Harvard, ha sido galardonada con premios por su trabajo sobre mujeres afro-americanas, en el que analiza como el género, la raza y la clase social determinan la vida y la escritura de las mujeres negras. Exploró asimismo la manera en que Alice Walter cuestiona los parámetros patriarcales de la masculinidad afro-americana.

6.2 JORNADAS Y CONGRESOS

- XXVII Congreso de AEDEAN

Salamanca – diciembre, 2003

Mesa Redonda: “A Men’s Studies Approach to American Literatura: Theory into Practice”

Panel: “Feminist and Gender Studies”

Participan: Dra. Àngels Carabí, Dr. Rodrigo Andrés y Sr. Josep M^a Armengol

- Panel "Re-Presentations of Masculinity in Twentieth-Century American Literature". Congreso internacional de la European Association for American Studies (EAAS)

Praga, 2-5 abril 2004.

Título: “America in the Course of Human Events: Presentations and Interpretations”.

El panel nos permitió reflexionar sobre la obra de teóricos y teóricas de la masculinidad como Brod, Gilmore, Eng, Segal, Dinshaw, así como sobre las representaciones de la masculinidad étnica en la obra de la dramaturga Chicana, Cherrie Moraga. Participantes: Àngels Carabí, B. Ozieblo, José M. Armengol

- Jornada “¿Hacia dónde van los hombres? La masculinidad a debate”

4 noviembre 2004, organizada por la Regidoria de Dona i Drets Civils del Ayuntamiento de Barcelona

Mesa redonda: “Líneas académicas actuales sobre masculinidades”. Partipan: Victoria Sau “La masculinidad como enigma”, José M Armengol “¿Existe la masculinidad?”, Bill Phillips. “Representaciones de la masculinidad en la novela negra”. Modera: Àngels Carabí. Presentación del video “La masculinidad a debate” realizado por Àngels Carabí y Josep M. Armengol.

- Mesa redonda: “Men by Women. Contemporary American Women Writing About Men”- Congreso internacional AEDEAN

Valencia, diciembre 2004.

Esta mesa redonda analizó, desde una perspectiva feminista, las representaciones de la masculinidad y de las relaciones entre géneros en la literatura contemporánea escrita por mujeres y proporcionó una aproximación crítica a los valores tradicionales del patriarcado que han determinado las relaciones de opresión tanto de los hombres hacia

las mujeres como de algunos hombres hacia otros hombres. Participantes: Rodrigo Andrés, Àngels Carabí, Bill Phillips y Cristina Alsina.

- Panel: "Masculinities and Gender Relations in Contemporary American Women's Literature" Coord: Àngels Carabí. *Masculinities, Femininities and Hybridities*. Spanish Association for American Studies

Jaén 16-18 marzo, 2005.

- II Congreso sobre masculinidades.

Organiza: Ajuntament de Barcelona, Regidoria de la Dona i Drets Civils. Barcelona, 2-4 de junio, 2005. Institut d'Estudis Catalans, C/ Carme, 47, Barcelona.

Actividades organizadas por el equipo de investigación del Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales - Instituto de la Mujer Exp. 62/03:

Conferencia inaugural a cargo de la Dra. Tanya Dalziell, profesora del Departamento de "English, Communication, and Cultural Studies" de la Universidad de Western Australia. Especialista en el análisis de la construcción de la raza blanca con relación a los estudios postcoloniales y de masculinidad.

Mesas redondas:

"Representaciones literarias y filmicas de la masculinidad". Participan: Josep M. Armengol, Cristina Alsina y Bill Phillips.

"Hombres escritos por mujeres". Participan: Àngels Carabí, Bárbara Ozieblo (Universidad de Málaga) y Victoria Sau.

Presentación del video "La masculinidad a debate" que incluye entrevistas a reconocidos teóricos en el campo de los estudios de las masculinidades procedentes de diversas disciplinas. Las entrevistas fueron realizadas en Nueva York por Àngels Carabí y Josep M. Armengol.

- Mesas redondas AEDEAN

Jaén - diciembre, 2005

“Re-reading masculinities and sexualities in American Culture and Literature” (Josep M. Armengol, Àngels Carabí, Maria Isabel Seguro), **“Masculinity Studies in Practice: Bringing Masculinity Studies into the Literature Classroom”** (Cristina Alsina, Rodrigo Andrés, Bárbara Ozieblo, Bill Phillips)

- Lynne Segal

“Men After Feminism?: What’s Left to Say?”

Conferencia: 9 de mayo de 2006, 10 de la mañana, aula 2.1. Acto abierto al público en general. Seminario restringido: 8 de mayo de 2006, 17-19h de la tarde, Sala de profesores – Edificio Josep Carner (C/ Aribau) en la Facultat de Filologia de la Universitat de Barcelona.

Lynne Segal, psicóloga especialista en estudios de género y masculinidades y profesora de la Universidad de Londres, impartió una conferencia y un seminario sobre la construcción del género masculino. Los estudios de la Dra. Segal se centran en el análisis del género y la masculinidad desde una perspectiva feminista e interdisciplinaria. Entre sus trabajos más relevantes, destacan *Slow Motion. Changing Masculinities, Changing Men* (1990), *Straight Sex: The Politics of Pleasure* (1994), y *Why Feminism?* (1998).

- Congreso “Estudios de Género: La Literatura en femenino/masculino”

Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 13-15 julio de 2006.

Proyección del DVD *Debating Masculinity/La masculinidad a debate*. Àngels Carabí (UB) y Josep M. Armengol (UB), eds. Publicacions UB, 2005. El DVD recoge las entrevistas llevadas a cabo en Nueva York a reconocidos especialistas en la materia que proceden de ámbitos de estudio diversos. Desde la sociología, la antropología, los estudios literarios y cinematográficos, los estudios de raza y de la sexualidad, Michael Kimmel (SUNY), David Gilmore (SUNY), Krin Gabbard (SUNY), David Eng (Rutgers University) y Carolyn Dinshaw (NYU) nos ofrecen sus innovadoras reflexiones sobre ésta temática.

- Jornada “Las masculinidades: un reto de futuro”: presentación del proyecto “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades”, y seminario y conferencia a cargo de Michael Kimmel

16 y 17 de octubre 2006

Facultad de Filología - Universitat de Barcelona

El *Centre Dona i Literatura* de la Universitat de Barcelona, en el marco del proyecto de investigación “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades” dirigido por la Dra. Àngels Carabí (Instituto de la Mujer, Exp. nº 62/03), organizó la jornada “Las masculinidades: un reto de futuro”, en colaboración con la Regidoria de Dona i Drets Civils del Ayuntamiento de Barcelona. El Dr. Michael Kimmel, uno de los teóricos más emblemáticos del mundo en el campo de los estudios de las masculinidades, es el invitado principal.

Michael Kimmel es director del *Center for the Study of Men and Masculinities* (State University of New York at Stony Brook) y es autor de libros tan reconocidos como *Against the Tide: Profeminist Men in the United States* (1992), *Manhood in America: A*

Cultural History (1996), *The Gendered Society* (2000) y *Men and Masculinities: A Social, Cultural and Historical Encyclopedia* (2003). Dirige también la revista internacional *Men and Masculinities* (Sage). Michael Kimmel es miembro del proyecto de investigación “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades”.

Programa

Lugar: Facultad de Filología, Universitat de Barcelona, C/ Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes, 585

16 octubre:

17h – 19h

sala de profesores, aulario Josep Carner, c/ Aribau 2, planta 5ª

- Seminario sobre género y masculinidades a cargo de Michael Kimmel

Coordina: Rodrigo Andrés (UB)

(inscripción previa en cdona@ub.edu)

El acto será en inglés

17 octubre: entrada libre

10h – 11.00h

Aula Magna

- Presentación del proyecto “Construyendo nuevas masculinidades” a cargo de los miembros del proyecto

Presenta el acto: Bill Phillips. Intervienen: Àngels Carabí, Cristina Alsina, Rodrigo Andrés, Josep M. Armengol, Bill Phillips, Isabel Seguro, Marta Bosch (UB)

- Proyección del DVD *Debating Masculinity* editado por Àngels Carabí y Josep M. Armengol con el apoyo de la Regidoria de Dona i Drets Civils del Ayuntamiento de Barcelona (Unidad de Audiovisuales, UB)

DVD subtítulo en catalán

11.00h – 11.30h refrigerio

11.30h – 13.00h

Aula Magna

- Conferencia “The Future of Masculinities” a cargo de Michael Kimmel

Preside el acto: Ilma. Sra. Pilar Vallugera, Regidora de Dona i Drets Civils del Ayuntamiento de Barcelona

Presenta: Josep M. Armengol (UB)

La conferencia será en inglés

- Mesas redondas AEDEAN

Huelva, 13-16 diciembre, 2006

Las dos mesas redondas analizarán como el género, la raza y la clase se combinan en la construcción de masculinidades étnicas.

“Gender, Race and Class: Masculinities and Multiculturalism in American Literature Written by Women (I)” (Àngels Carabí (moderadora), Josep M. Armengol, Cristina Alsina, Maria Isabel Seguro)

Josep M. Armengol explorará la blancura como construcción étnica, es decir, como invención social, histórica y política, y su relación con los estudios de masculinidades.

Cristina Alsina analizará como las escritoras de los años ochenta representan la Guerra de Vietnam, con efectos castradores tanto para los que lucharon en la guerra y experimentaron cambios extremos en sus cuerpos y su psique, como para los que no lucharon y fueron privados de un muy aceptado rito de iniciación hacia la masculinidad madura: hacer de soldado.

Maria Isabel Seguro explorará las masculinidades asiático-americanas desde el punto de vista de las mujeres asiáticas inmigrantes a los Estados Unidos, que tuvieron que soportar problemas de racismo y también diferentes nociones de masculinidad y relaciones de género.

Àngels Carabí hará un análisis comparativo de las representaciones de la masculinidad en los textos de escritoras de diferentes orígenes étnicos para explorar como los diferentes orígenes culturales producen diferentes maneras de actuar de forma masculina.

“Gender, Race and Class: Masculinities and Multiculturalism in American Literature Written by Women (II)” (Bárbara Ozieblo (moderadora), Rodrigo Andrés, Marta Bosch, Bill Phillips).

Rodrigo Andrés explorará como en los trabajos de autoras judío-americanas como Tillie Olsen (1912-) y Grace Paley (1922-) los personajes masculinos se presentan como co-víctimas de un sistema opresivo de clase, más que como victimizadores patriarcales.

Marta Bosch tendrá en cuenta nociones de género, clase y etnicidad para examinar las formas en que escritoras árabo-americanas contemporáneas como Diana Abu-Jaber, Elmaz Abinader, Etel Adnan o Mona Simpson, articulan representaciones de masculinidad occidental y árabe, en relación a su herencia cultural árabe y a los estereotipos de hombre árabe que circulan en los Estados Unidos.

Bill Phillips analizará como la tradición norteamericana de novela de detectives ha reforzado los modelos existentes de masculinidad blanca, heterosexual y de clase media, pero como, por otro lado, han aparecido también modelos alternativos de hombre.

Bárbara Ozieblo explorará las intersecciones entre masculinidad y etnicidad en la literatura chicana, e investigará las obras de escritoras chicanas como Cherrie Moraga para intentar ilustrar como la masculinidad chicana también está marcada por especificidades de raza y clase.

6.3 TESIS DOCTORALES Y TRABAJOS DE INVESTIGACIÓN

Tesis doctorales

- Autor: **Rodrigo Andrés**

Título: **"El potencial subversivo del amor entre hombres en la tradición literaria occidental. *Billy Budd, Sailor*, de Herman Melville"**

Directora: Àngels Carabí

La tesis argumenta que el escritor estadounidense Herman Melville (1819-1891) se inscribe en una tradición literaria de amor entre hombres que cuestiona los valores patriarcales y, potencialmente, actúa como vehiculadora para la creación de sociedades más igualitarias.

Fecha de lectura: Marzo 2004

Calificación: Sobresaliente "cum laude" por unanimidad.

- Autor: **Josep M. Armengol**

Título: **"Gendering Men: Theorizing Masculinities in American Culture and Literature"**.

Directora: Àngels Carabí

Introducción a las teorías de la masculinidad actuales y análisis de las representaciones de la masculinidad en la literatura estadounidense.

Fecha de lectura: 29 Junio 2006

Calificación: Sobresaliente "cum laude".

- Autora: **Cristina Alsina**

Título: **"‘This is just a story’: la ficción como verdad en la obra de Tim O’Brien"**

Codirectores: Àngels Carabí y Francisco Amella Vela

La tesis analiza la obra de Tim O'Brien y su exploración de los modelos alternativos de identidad masculina que se presentan en abierta oposición a la masculinidad violenta e imperialista hegemónica.

Fecha de lectura: 26 Septiembre 2006

Calificación: Sobresaliente "cum laude".

Trabajos de investigación

-Autora: **Maria Isabel Seguro**

Título DEA: “**Cloud Nine: A Practice on Intersectionality**”

Directora: Dra. Pilar Zozaya

Análisis de la obra de Caryl Churchill *Cloud Nine* desde las perspectivas de los estudios postcoloniales, queer, y de los estudios de género (estudios feministas y estudios de la masculinidad), y como las premisas de estos estudios se reflejan en el lenguaje teatral (la semiótica del teatro).

Fecha de lectura: Septiembre 2005

Calificación: Excelente.

7. BIBLIOGRAFÍA

7. BIBLIOGRAFÍA

A continuación indicamos los trabajos más recientes sobre masculinidades a partir de los cuales hemos realizado nuestra investigación:

- Adams, Rachel y David Savran (eds.). (2002). *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Allister, Mark. (2004). *Eco-man: New Perspectives on Masculinity and Nature (Under the Sign of Nature: Explorations in Ecocriticism)*. University of Virginia Press.
- Anderson, Margaret and Patricia Collins Hill, eds. (1992). *Race, Class, and Gender: An Anthology*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Awkward, Michael. (1989). *Inspiriting Influences. Tradition, Revision and Afro-American Women's Novels*. Nueva York: Columbia University Press.
- Babb, Valerie Melissa (1998). *Whiteness Visible: The Meaning of Whiteness in American Literature and Culture*. NY: New York University Press.
- Badinter, Elisabeth. (1995) *XY: On Masculine Identity*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Blount, Marcellus (ed). (1995) *Representing Black Men*. Routledge.
- Boone, Joseph A. y Michael Cadden (eds.). (1990). *Engendering Men: The Question of Male Feminist Criticism*. Nueva York y Londres: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1998) *Masculine Domination*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Breu, Christopher. (2005) *Hard-boiled Masculinities*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Brod, Harry (ed.). (1987). *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Boston: Allen and Unwin.
- Brod, Harry y Michael Kaufman (eds.). (1994). *Theorizing Masculinities*. Londres: Sage.
- Brod, Harry, and Michael Kaufman, eds. (1994). *Theorizing Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Chan, Jachinson W. (2001). *Chinese American Masculinities: From Fu Manchu to Bruce Lee*. New York: Routledge.
- Chapman, Rowena y Jonathan Rutherford. (1988). *Male Order -Unwrapping Masculinity*. Londres: Lawrence and Wishart.

- Cheung, King-Kok (ed.) (1996) *An Interethnic Companion to Asian American Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, Suzanne. (2000) *Cold Warriors: Manliness on Trial in the Rhetoric of the West*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Clum, John M. (2002). *He's All Man: Male Homosexuality and Myths of Masculinity in American Drama and Film*. Palgrave.
- Cohan, Steven y I. R. Hark. (1993). *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in the Hollywood Cinema*. Londres: Routledge.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Connell, R. W. (1989). *Masculinities*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Connell, R. W. (1987) *Gender and Power*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Cornwall, Andrea, and Nancy Lindisfarne, eds. (1993). *Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies*. London: Routledge.
- Creighton, Margaret S. (1999). *Rites and Passages. The Experience of American Whaling 1830-1870*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cunningham, John Christopher. (1999). *Literary Intersections of Masculinity*. Nueva York: Garland.
- Cunningham, John Christopher. (2002). *Race-ing Masculinity: Identity in Contemporary U. S. Men's Writing*. Nueva York: Routledge.
- Davidson, Michael. (2004) [Guys Like Us: Citing Masculinity in Cold War Poetics](#). The University of Chicago Press.
- Digby, Tom (ed.). (1998). *Men Doing Feminism*. Nueva York: Routledge.
- Dreese, Donelle N. (2002) *Ecocriticism: Creating Self and Place in Environmental and American Indian Literatures (American Indian Studies, V. 15)* Peter Lang Pub Inc.
- Edwards, Tim. (1993). *Erotics and Politics: Gay Male Sexuality, Masculinity, and Feminism*. Nueva York: Routledge.
- Elaasar, Aladdin. (2004) *Silent Victims: The Plight of Arab & Muslim Americans in Post 9/11 America*. AuthorHouse
- Eng, David. (2001). *Racial Castration: Managing Masculinity in Asian America*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

- Ferberm Abby L. (1998). *White Man Falling: Race, Gender and White Supremacy*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Frankenberg, Ruth, ed. (1997). *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Fulford, Tim. (1999) *Romanticism and Masculinity: Gender, Politics and Poetics in the Writing of Burke, Coleridge, Cobbett, Wordsworth, De Quincey and Hazlitt (Romanticism in Perspective)*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Furman, Jan. (2003). *Toni Morrison's "Song of Solomon": A Casebook (Casebooks in Criticism)*. Oxford University Press Inc, USA.
- Gabbard, Krin. (2004). *Black Magic: White Hollywood and African American Culture*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Gardiner, Judith Kegan (ed.). (2002). *Masculinity Studies and Feminist Theory: New Directions*. Nueva York: Columbia University Press.
- Gerzon, Mark. (1982). *A Choice of Heroes: The Changing Faces of American Manhood*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Gilmore, David. (1990). *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Goldberg, David Theo (Editor). (1994). *Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader (Blackwell Critical Readers)*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Gregson, Ian. (1999) *The Male Image: Representations of Masculinity in Postwar Poetry*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hagedorn, Jessica Tarahata (ed.). (2004). *Charlie Chan Is Dead II: At Home in the World. A New Anthology of Contemporary American Fiction*. New York: Penguin.
- Hearn, Jeff y David H. J. Morgan (eds.). (1990). *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory*. Londres: Unwin Hyman.
- Herdt, Gilbert (Ed.). (1996). *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*. Zone Books, New York, NY.
- Herdt, Gilbert H. (1981) *Guardians of the Flutes: Idioms of Masculinity*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hertha D. Sweet Wong. (1999). *Louise Erdrich's Love Medicine*. Oxford University Press Inc, USA.

- Holmlund, Christine. (2002). *Impossible Bodies: Femininity and Masculinity at the Movies*. Londres, Nueva York: Routledge.
- Izenberg, Gerald. (2000) *Modernism and Masculinity: Mann, Wedekind, Kandinsky through World War I*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jacobson, Matthew Frye. (1998). *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Jardine, Alice y Paul Smith. (1987). *Men in Feminism*. Londres y Nueva York: Methuen.
- Jeffords, Susan. (1993). *The Big Switch: Hollywood Masculinity in the Nineties*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Jeffords, Susan. (1994) *Hard Bodies: Hollywood Masculinity in the Reagan Era*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Kaufman, Michael (ed.). (1987). *Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power and Change*. Nueva York: Oxford University Press.
- Kiberd, Declan. (1985). *Men and Feminism in Modern Literature*. Londres: Macmillan.
- Kim, Klaine and Jessica Tarahata Hagedorn (eds.). (1993). *Charlie Chan Is Dead: An Anthology of Contemporary Asian American Fiction*. New York: Penguin.
- Kimmel, Michael (ed.). (1987). *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity*. Nueva York: Sage.
- Kimmel, Michael y Michael Messner. (1998). *Men's Lives*. Nueva York/Toronto: Macmillan/Maxwell (4ª edición).
- Kimmel, Michael, and Thomas Mossmiller, eds. (1992). *Against the Tide: Profeminist Men in the United States, 1776-1990: A Documentary History*. Boston: Beacon.
- Kimmel, Michael. (1996). *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. Nueva York: Faber.
- Kimmel, Michael. (2000). *The Gendered Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kimmel, Michael. (1996). *Manhood in America*. New York: Free Press.
- Kimmel, Michael. (2000). *The Gendered Society and The Gendered Society Reader*. Oxford: OUP.
- Labbe, Jacqueline M. (1998). *Romantic Visualities: Landscape, Gender and Romanticism*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lahoucine Ouzgane. (2006). *Islamic Masculinities (Global Masculinities)*. Zed Books Ltd.

- Lee, Robert. (2003). *Multicultural American Literature. Comparative Black, Native, Latinoa and Asian American Fictions* University Press of Mississippi.
- Lehman, Peter. (ed.). (2000). *Masculinity: Bodies, Movies, Culture*. Nueva York: Routledge.
- Leverenz, David. (1989). *Manhood and the American Renaissance*. Cornell: Cornell University Press.
- Louise Archer. (2003). *Race, Masculinity and Schooling: Muslim Boys and Education (Educating Boys, Learning Gender)*. Open University Press
- Lowe, Lisa. (1996). *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mai Ghousoub and Emma Sinclair-Webb. (2000). *Imagined Masculinities: Changing Patterns of Identity for Middle Eastern Men*. Saqi Books.
- Mai Ghousoub and Emma Sinclair-Webb. (2006). *Imagined Masculinities: Male Identity and Culture in the Modern Middle East*. Saqi Books.
- May, Larry y Robert Strikwerda. (eds.). (1992). *Rethinking Masculinity: Philosophical Explorations in Light of Feminism*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Messner, Michael A. (1997). *Politics of Masculinities: Men in Movements*. University of Southern California: Sage.
- Mirande, Alfredo. (1997). *Hombres y machos: Masculinity in Latino Cultures*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Mitchell, Lee Clark. (1998). *Westerns: Making the Man in Fiction and Film*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mosse, George. (1996) *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Muñoz, José Estebán. (1999). *Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Murphy, Peter (ed.). (1994). *The Fiction of Masculinity: Literary Constructions of Man*. Nueva York: New York University Press.
- Ned Katz, Jonathan. (2001) *Love Stories: Sex Between Men Before Homosexuality*. University of Chicago Press.
- Nguyen, Viet Thanh. (2002). *Race and Resistance: Literature and Politics in Asian America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Nissen, Axel. (2003). *The Romantic Friendship Reader: Love Stories Between Men in Victorian America*. University of British Columbia Press.
- Peach, Linden. (1998). *Toni Morrison: Contemporary Critical Essays (New Casebooks)*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Pepper, Andrew. (2001) *The Contemporary American Crime Novel: Race, Ethnicity, Gender, Class*. Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Pfeil, Fred. (1995) *White Guys: Studies in Poststructuralist Domination and Difference*. New York and London: Verso.
- Phillips, Kathy J. (2006). *Manipulating Masculinity: War and Gender in Modern British and American Literature*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Plain, Gill. (2001). *Twentieth Century Crime Fiction: Gender, Sexuality and the Body*. Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Robinson, Sally. (2000). *Marked Men: White Masculinity in Crisis*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Russo, V. (1987). *The Celluloid Closet: Homosexuality in the Movies*. Nueva York: Harper and Row.
- Sau-ling Cynthia Wong. (1998). *Maxine Hong Kingston's The Woman Warrior. A Casebook*. Oxford University Press Inc, USA
- Segal, Lynne. (1990). *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men*. Londres: Virago.
- Segal, Lynne. (1999) *Why Feminism?* Londres: Virago.
- Smith, Terry (ed.). (1998). *In Visible Touch: Modernism and Masculinity*. University of Chicago Press.
- Stecopoulos, Harry, and Michael Uebel, eds. (1997). *Race and the Subject of Masculinities*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Tasker, Yvonne. (1997). "Fists of Fury: Discourses of Race and Masculinity in the Martial Arts Cinema." In Stecopoulos, Harry and Michael Uebel (eds.). *Race and the Subject of Masculinities*, Duke University Press.
- Taylor-Guthrie, Danille (Editor). (1994). *Conversations with Toni Morrison (Literary Conversations)*. University Press of Mississippi.
- Thompson, C., E. Schaefer, and H. Brod, eds. (2003). *White Men Challenging Racism: 35 Personal Stories*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

- Wallace, Lee. (2003). *Sexual Encounters: Pacific Texts, Modern Sexualities*. Cornell University Press.
- Wolfson, Susan J. (2006). *Borderlines: The Shiftings of Gender in British Romanticism*. Stanford University Press.

También señalamos los siguientes estudios publicados en España y/o por estudiosos españoles:

- Amorós, Celia. (1991). *Hacia una crítica de la razón patriarcal*. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- Andrés, Rodrigo. “La homosexualidad masculina, el espacio cultural entre masculinidad y feminidad, y preguntas ante una ‘crisis’”. *Nuevas masculinidades*. Barcelona: Icaria, 2000. 121-132.
- Andrés, Rodrigo. “Gay Nostalgia in Nick Carraway’s Mythopoesis of the American Dream”. *Travelling Across Cultures/Viajes Interculturales. The Twentieth-Century American Experience*. Eds. Constante González Groba et al. Santiago: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 2000. 147-156.
- Armengol, Josep M. (2003). "Travestismos literarios: identidad, autoría y representación de la masculinidad en la literatura escrita por mujeres". *Hombres escritos por mujeres*. Eds. Àngels Carabí y Marta Segarra (eds.). Barcelona, Icaria, 2003. 81-98.
- Armengol, Josep M. (2003). “Richard Ford”. *Men and Masculinities: A Social, Cultural, and Historical Encyclopedia* (en prensa).
Estudio sobre la representación de la masculinidad en la literatura de Richard Ford.
- Barragán, Fernando. (1998). “Ampliar los horizontes masculinos y femeninos: las expresiones de las masculinidades en la adolescencia.” Informe inédito.
- Bonino, Luis. (1995). “Los varones y el cambio de las mujeres”. *Materiales de trabajo* nº 27. Madrid: Ministerio de Asuntos Sociales. Dirección General del Menor y la Familia.

- Bonino, Luis. (1996). "Grupos de Reflexión de Varones". Rev. *Modelos Grupales de Psicoterapia*. Madrid: SEGPA.
Estudio sobre los grupos de hombres profeministas en España.
- Bonino, Luis. (1998). "Micromachismos". Bruselas: City & Shelter (Euro PRO-Fem, www.menprofeminist.org).
- Callirgos, Juan Carlos. (1998). *Sobre héroes y batallas: los caminos de la identidad masculina*. Perú: Escuela para el desarrollo.
- Carabí, Àngels y Marta Segarra (eds.). (2000). *Nuevas masculinidades*. Barcelona: Icaria.
- Carabí, Àngels y Marta Segarra (eds.). (2000). *Reescrituras de la masculinidad*. Barcelona: PPU.
- Carabí, Àngels y Marta Segarra (eds.). (2003). *Hombres escritos por mujeres*. Barcelona: Icaria (en prensa).
- Corsi, J. (1995). *Violencia masculina en la pareja*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Fernández, J. y otr@s. (1996). *Varones y mujeres: desarrollo de la doble realidad del sexo y del género*. Madrid: Pirámide col. Psicología.
- Freixa, Carme. (1998). *Ellos y nosotras*. Barcelona: Icaria.
- Gil Calvo, Enrique. (1997). *El nuevo sexo débil: Los dilemas del varón posmoderno*. Madrid: Temas de Hoy.
- Hombres por la igualdad*. Delegación de Salud y Género del Ayuntamiento de Jerez de la Frontera. Página web: www.hombresigualdad.com
- Lectora. Revista de dones i textualitat*, nº 4 (1998), dossier "Hombres y feminismo". (Centre Dona i Literatura).
- Lorente, Miguel. (2001). *Mi marido me pega lo normal: agresión a la mujer, realidades y mitos*. Barcelona: Crítica.
- Marqués, Josep-Vicent. (1991). *Curso elemental para varones sensibles y machistas recuperables*. Madrid: Temas de Hoy.
- Montoya, O. (1998). *Nadando contra corriente: Buscando pistas para prevenir la violencia masculina en las relaciones de pareja*. Managua: Fundación puntos de encuentro.
- Ozieblo, Bárbara. (2000). *Susan Glaspell: A Critical Biography*. North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.

- Pescador, Erick. (1997). "La masculinidad y la vivencia del placer". México: *Archivos latinoamericanos*. Vol. II, 2; 173-181.
- Pescador, Erick. (1998). "Talleres sobre sexualidad y masculinidades". México: IX CLASES.
- Phillips, William Charles. (1995). "The Perils of Political Correctness in Robert B. Parker's Spenser Novels". *Actas del XXI Congreso de la Asociación Española de Estudios Anglonorteamericanos*. Nº 19. Vigo.
- Phillips, William Charles. (2002). "When Ploughs Destroy'd the Green". *John Clare Society Journal* nº 21. Nottingham Trent University.
- Roma, Pepa. (1998). *Hablan ellos*. Barcelona: Plaza y Janés.
Libro en que varios hombres reflexionan sobre su propia masculinidad.
- Sau, Victoria. (1996). *Psicología diferencial del sexo y del género*. Barcelona: Icaria.
- Sau, Victoria. (2003). "Paternidad(es)". *Actas de la Primera Convención Catalana sobre masculinidades, diversidad y diferencia* (Publicación de la Regiduría de Derechos Civiles del Ayuntamiento de Barcelona, en prensa).
- Vílchez, Joan. (1989). *Grupos de hombres: reflexiones sobre la masculinidad*. Madrid: FESS (Federación Española de Sociedades de Sexología).
- Villadongos, Fernando. "Grupos de hombres y movimiento feminista: una lucha compartida." En *Revista del Colegio Oficial de Psicólogos del País Vasco, Berri Orriak*, nº 64 (junio 1996).