

A Man's World?
Political Masculinities in Literature and Culture

A Man's World?
Political Masculinities in Literature and Culture

Edited by

Kathleen Starck and Birgit Sauer

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

A Man's World?
Political Masculinities in Literature and Culture,
Edited by Kathleen Starck and Birgit Sauer

This book first published 2014

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2014 by Kathleen Starck, Birgit Sauer and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-5982-6, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-5982-0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I. Political Masculinities: Introduction and Theoretical Considerations

Political Masculinities: Introduction
Kathleen Starck and Birgit Sauer 3

Masculinity as an Analytical Category: Work in Progress
Eva Kreisky 11

Part II. Nineteenth-Century Citizenship

Rational and Respectable Beings: The Chartist Conception of the Citizen
as Masculine
Jutta Schwarzkopf 27

La Voix du Pays: Masculinity, Vocal Authority and the Disembodied
Citizen in Nineteenth-Century Belgium
Josephine Hoegaerts 39

Part III. Military and Neoliberal Masculinities

Ethnicity, Military Service and Male Civic In/Exclusion in Finland,
1918–1928
Anders Ahlbäck 53

Gun Rights as Privileges of Free Men: Chronology of a Powerful
Political Myth of Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Germany
Dagmar Ellerbrock 67

“Speedy Cars, Perky Women, Champagne and Striptease Bars”:
Neoliberal Masculinity in Crisis?
Birgit Sauer 81

Part IV. Literary Representations

| | |
|--|----|
| “A Traitor, an Adulterer!”: Political and Private Masculinities in James Joyce’s <i>A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man</i> Dominik Wallerius | 97 |
|--|----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| The Ideal of a Masculinist State in Thomas Mann’s Novella <i>Mario and the Magician</i> Marion Löffler | 111 |
|---|-----|

Part V. Filmic Representations

| | |
|--|-----|
| “Don’t Say Penis in this House.” (De)Constructing the Male Body Politic in Oliver Stone’s <i>Born on the Fourth of July</i> Jan D. Kucharzewski | 127 |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| “Lovers, not Fighters”: The Body Politic and Its Restrained Libido Wieland Schwanebeck | 141 |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| “Join Our Band of Brothers”: Screening 1980s Nationalism and Masculinity in <i>This is England</i> Kathleen Starck | 155 |
|---|-----|

Part VI. Framing Political Masculinities in the Media

| | |
|--|-----|
| Political Masculinities Then and Now: Bully Gordon and Miss Westerwelle Rainer Emig | 169 |
|--|-----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Playboys and Politicians: Men’s Magazines as Political Counterpublics Laura Saarenmaa | 181 |
|--|-----|

| | |
|--------------------|-----|
| Contributors | 195 |
|--------------------|-----|

| | |
|------------------|-----|
| Name Index | 201 |
|------------------|-----|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Subject Index | 203 |
|---------------------|-----|

PART I

POLITICAL MASCULINITIES: INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

POLITICAL MASCULINITIES: INTRODUCTION

KATHLEEN STARCK AND BIRGIT SAUER

Over the last twenty years, the field of masculinity studies has found its way into numerous academic disciplines. Thus, the social sciences as well as medical and psychological research have investigated many phenomena around the issue of masculinity. From this research emerged a consensus that masculinity has remained invisible in many contexts. Due to the assumed normativity and normality of the masculine, thus defining and marking the feminine as the Other, masculinity has remained an unmarked gender. Michael Kimmel writes already in 1990: “That which privileges us is rendered invisible by the very process that constructs this privilege” (Kimmel 1990, 93). Moreover, “[m]arginality is visible, and painfully visceral. Privilege is invisible, and painlessly pleasant” (ibid., 94). Kimmel, referencing Teresa de Lauretis (De Lauretis 1987), establishes an analogy between masculinity/gender and ideology because it hides its inherent power relations.

“That which is *normative*—begins to appear as *normal*, designed by nature acting through culture. But this is a sleight of hand: the normative is not normal, but the result of a long and complex set of social conflicts among groups” (Kimmel 1990, 95; Kimmel’s emphasis).

Twenty years later, Todd Reeser, in his comprehensive introduction to the theorising of masculinity, confirms the validity of this approach. He sees parallels between the genesis, maintenance and functioning of masculinity and ideology as resulting from masculinities’ traditional link to power, the fact that no single group can be seen as responsible for the construction of masculinity, the fact that in a two-way manner institutions create masculinity but masculinity likewise contributes to the creating of institutions, as well as the resulting “natural” appearance of masculinity (Reeser 2010, 19–20), “that it appears so natural within a given cultural and historical context that it is not questioned” (ibid., 20).

This invisibility of masculinity, it has been argued, holds particularly true for public spheres such as politics. Political institutions, norms and

practices such as the state, parliament, citizenship and nationality, the vote, the military, policy making and the implementation of laws and many others have traditionally been treated as if they were un-gendered and guided exclusively by objective reasoning and rationality. Ironically, rationality and reason have themselves been historically and habitually ascribed to masculinity. Yet, with regard to the realm of politics this truth has often been ignored in modern democracies in favour of an apparent gender-inclusiveness of political institutions and structures. However, negated masculinity of political institutions and norms has contributed to the exclusion of women from politics—or better: to an inclusion of women in modern democracies that is merely paradoxical.

Thus, in the light of the increasing acceptance and endorsement of masculinity studies in the scientific community of humanities and social sciences, it is not surprising that for approximately two decades now researchers have been producing an ever-expanding body of literature on masculinities in the political arena. These studies explore the interdependence of the construction of masculinities on the one hand and the emerging, maintenance, and modification of concepts such as the state, citizenship, nationality, democracy, militarism and policing on the other. As a result, masculinity has been made visible in the domain of politics and is now open to critique and questioning.

This understanding of the emergence, development and transformation of modern politics and states as masculine arenas has been advanced particularly by political scientists and (cultural) historians. Their theoretical and empirical research has identified different representations of political masculinities with respect to time, space and state form. Valuable contributions from the disciplines of history and political science have been made, for example, by international relations scholars Marysia Zalewski and Jane Parpart's influential 1998 book *The 'Man' Question in International Relations* and its 2008 follow-up *Rethinking the Man Question. Sex, Gender and Violence in International Relations*, examining the theories and practices of war and masculinity and analysing white male privilege within the discipline of international relations; by Ann J. Tickner's many analyses of the role of gender in international relations, e.g. in her 2001 book *Gendering World Politics*; by Charlotte Hooper's 2001 book *Manly States. Masculinities, International Relations, and Gender Politics*; by Cynthia Enloe's numerous feminist analyses of the interdependencies between politics, militarisation, globalised economics and gender, e.g. in her 1989 book *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*; by Terrell Carver's 2004 book *Men in Political Theory*, in which he re-reads classic texts in political

philosophy with regard to gender; by Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann and John Tosh's 2004 collection of essays by social, political and cultural historians, *Masculinities in Politics and War. Gendering Modern History*, which traces the origins of politics as a masculine sphere and points out the role of masculinity in the waging of wars, the building of nations and the making of revolutions; by Dudink, Hagemann and Anna Clark's 2012 collection of essays *Representing Masculinity. Male Citizenship in Modern Western Cultures*, which focuses on the mechanisms of constructions of citizenship over time and across continents; by historian K.A. Cuordileone's 2005 analysis of masculinity in American Cold War politics, *Manhood and American Political Culture in the Cold War*; by Robert D. Dean's 2003 book dealing with similar issues, *Imperial Brotherhood. Gender and the Making of Cold War Foreign Policy*; by Ben Griffin's 2012 book *The Politics of Gender in Victorian Britain: Masculinity, Political Culture and the Struggle for Women's Rights*, in which he argues that, among other factors, changing ideas of masculinity contributed significantly to the nineteenth-century reforms of women's legal position in the UK; by historian J.A. Mangan's 2012 study of the links between sport, education and the making of "imperial masculinities" in Britain, *'Manufactured' Masculinity. Making Imperial Manliness, Morality and Militarism*; and by the 1997 collection of essays edited by Eva Kreisky and Birgit Sauer, which studies the hidden gender politics of political science as an academic discipline, *Das geheime Glossar der Politikwissenschaft. Geschlechtskritische Inspektion der Kategorien einer Disziplin*.

Cultural and literary research, on the other hand, focuses on the representation of political masculinities in cultural artefacts and texts. Thus, concentrating on adventure stories, cultural historian Graham Dawson in his 1994 book *Soldier Heroes. British Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities* explores the interconnectedness of ideas/ideals of military heroes, masculinity and British national identity. Psychologist Stephen J. Ducat, in his 2004 book *The Wimp Factor. Gender Gaps, Holy Wars, and the Anxious Politics of Masculinity*, on the other hand, looks at the importance of a convincing performance of masculinity for male candidates in American presidential election campaigns and the damaging effects a similar performance might have for female politicians. In a similar vein, writer-educator and anti-sexist male activist Jackson Katz published his book *Leading Men: Presidential Campaigns and the Politics of Manhood* in 2012 and James W. Messerschmidt in 2010 published *Hegemonic Masculinities and Camouflaged Politics: Unmasking the Bush Dynasty and Its War Against Iraq*. Links between fascism and masculinity

in Italy are at the centre of John Champagne's 2012 book *Aesthetic Modernism and Masculinity in Fascist Italy*, in which he analyses a large variety of cultural artefacts such as literature, music, films and painting, whereas film scholar Raz Yosef explores the link between homosexual masculinity and nationalism in Israeli cinema in his 2004 book *Beyond Flesh: Queer Masculinities and Nationalism in Israeli Cinema*. Scrutinising the American literary canon, Suzanne Clark in her 2000 book *Cold Warriors: Manliness on Trial in the Rhetoric of the West*, looks at exclusion mechanisms in the defence of ideas of white male identity within the context of the Cold War. The equation of (black) masculinity with political radicalism within the Black Power Movement is Rolland Murray's concern in his 2006 book *Our Living Manhood: Literature, Black Power, and Masculine Ideology*. Susan Jeffords draws attention to the relation between ideas of manhood and nationalism, as portrayed in action films during Ronald Reagan's presidency, and the success of the political New Right in her 1994 book *Hard Bodies: Hollywood Masculinity in the Reagan Era*.

This list is by no means complete. However, we hope it illustrates the amount of research activity in the field of political masculinities as well as the range of topics and perspectives that are being investigated. Most of the above literature, though, focuses on either political science, historical or cultural perspectives. Yet, we feel that it would be tremendously beneficial to the study of political masculinities to integrate some of the findings from different academic disciplines. Thus, we want to shed light on different modes of representing and (de-)constructing political masculinities across time and space, encourage interdisciplinary debate and introduce scholars from various subjects to individual disciplines' distinct ways of inquiry. The book wants to demonstrate, how many of the concepts and developments of political masculinities that are evident in the contributions speak to each other across centuries and (Western) cultures and scientific disciplines. In spite of the multitude of historical, social and political contexts which are introduced, it is possible to identify continuities and similarities. And furthermore, the different disciplines which refer to rather different notions of both, masculinity and politics, are able to speak to and with each other. For this purpose, our definition of "political masculinity" encompasses any kind of masculinity that is constructed around, ascribed to and/or claimed by "political players". These shall be individuals or groups of persons who are part of or associated with the "political domain", i.e. professional politicians, party members, members of the military as well as citizens and members of political movements claiming or gaining political rights.

Political scientist Eva Kreisky's inquiry into the merits of masculinity as an analytical category is the starting point for the book's theoretical considerations. She draws attention to the question whether the concept of masculinity has been theorised enough with regard to gendered institutional arrangements as well as transformations and diversities of masculinities. Chapter two continues with articles by historians Jutta Schwarzkopf and Josephine Hoegaerts. Schwarzkopf presents an unusual gendered take on the Chartist movement of mid-century Britain. She identifies the Chartists' construction of (male) citizenship as rational, self-controlled, self-disciplined and respectable with economic independence being the key factor. This kind of masculinity, she contends, is a reaction to the degradation of working-class living conditions and the anxiety of male heads of households over their position. Staying in the nineteenth century, Hoegaerts deals with the very specific subject matter of voices in the nineteenth-century Belgian parliament. Analysing the proceedings between 1833 and 1905, she deconstructs the idea of the disembodied citizen and illustrates the vital role that the male politicians' corporeality played in their political career.

Chapter three addresses the issue of the military, militarised masculinities and neoliberal transformations of masculinities. Historian Anders Ahlbäck examines the re-negotiation of male citizenship in Finland after national independence came about in 1917–1918 and universal conscription was introduced. He discusses how within this context, officers and conscripts of the Swedish-speaking language minority constructed themselves as particularly virtuous and law-abiding and thereby contributed to the masculinisation and militarisation of Swedish nationality in Finland. Dagmar Ellerbrock, likewise a historian, explores gun rights as privileges of free men in Germany. She traces the construction of “political male maturity” during the revolutionary years of 1848/49 through the legal merging of the right to bear firearms with the participation in military service and thus masculinity. Political scientist Birgit Sauer examines the transformation of hegemonic masculinity in Western post-industrial societies since the 1990s. She argues that global neoliberal restructuring created an arena for re-negotiation of political masculinity. However, forms of global governance and governmentalisation of states resulted in the reconstruction of a “neoliberal masculinity” and an unequal gender order.

Chapter four introduces literary representations of political masculinities. Literary scholar Dominik Wallerius takes us to Ireland at the beginning of the twentieth century. His reading of James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* revolves around the historical figure of Charles Stewart

Parnell, leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party. Wallerius illustrates the parallels between the gendered nature of Parnell's political downfall and Stephen Dedalus' dilemma of having to choose between muscular virility and sexual bravado, on the one hand, and Catholic piety and intellectualism, on the other. Thereby he explores Irish men's "double-bind" in their attempts to construct a stable masculine identity. Marion Löffler, who is a political scientist, analyses the ideal of a masculinist state in Thomas Mann's novella *Mario and the Magician*. Contrary to prevailing political interpretations, Löffler concentrates on the first part of the novella. She identifies the embeddedness of the critique of the fascist Italian state in a narrative of feminised political structures. In contrast to this criticism, a kind of state is promoted that is reminiscent of Weber's rational bureaucracy, which, in turn, is masculinist. As a result, Löffler is able to define the Cipolla of the second part as a failed charismatic leader.

Chapter five puts forth three examples of filmic representations of political masculinity. American studies scholar Jan D. Kucharzewski discusses Oliver Stone's films from the 1980s and their depiction of individual men's bodies (e.g. Vietnam veterans) as a site of American politics and "national discourses of power, hegemony, and crisis." Wieland Schwanebeck, a scholar of English literature, offers a gendered interpretation of the contemporary British television programme *The Thick of It*. He singles out the satire's trademark character, spin doctor Malcolm Tucker, and demonstrates how Tucker's phallic rhetoric and hypermasculine behaviour, instead of rational decision-making, lead to political success. This, Schwanebeck argues, is the show's comment on "the rules of the political game." Kathleen Starck's reading of Shane Meadows's *This is England* shows how the white nationalist masculinity of the protagonist Combo is paralleled with the national masculinity of Thatcher's Falklands victory and at the same time is depicted as empty and meaningless.

The sixth chapter provides two samples of the depiction of political masculinity in the media. Cultural and literary studies scholar Rainer Emig shows how the contemporary British and German political systems "thrive on short-circuiting masculinity, heterosexuality and power." For this purpose, he looks at the two case studies of the former openly gay German Foreign Minister, Guido Westerwelle, and former British Prime Minister, Gordon Brown and their media and popular echo. Laura Saarenmaa, who works in the field of media studies, analyses the construction of masculinity of Finnish politicians, who, during the 1970s, were routinely portrayed in sex magazines modelled on the American *Playboy* Magazine. She claims that the current homosocial order of Finnish "national public

and political cultures” was also forged with the help of these magazines’ impact.

We would like to thank those who helped to realise this project: the German Science Foundation (DFG) and the University of Koblenz-Landau, who funded the conference where the contributions to this volume were discussed. Thanks also to Petra Schäfer for carefully copy-editing the book.

References

- Carver, Terrell. 2004. *Men in Political Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Champagne, John. 2012. *Aesthetic Modernism and Masculinity in Fascist Italy*. New York: Routledge.
- Clark, Suzanne. 2000. *Cold Warriors: Manliness on Trial in the Rhetoric of the West*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Cuordileone, Kyle A. 2005. *Manhood and American Political Culture in the Cold War*. New York: Routledge.
- Dawson, Graham. 1994. *Soldier Heroes. British Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities*. London: Routledge.
- Dean, Robert D. 2003. *Imperial Brotherhood. Gender and the Making of Cold War Foreign Policy*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- De Lauretis, Teresa. 1987. *Technologies of Gender. Essays on Theory, Film, and Fiction*. London: Macmillan.
- Ducat, Stephen. 2004. *The Wimp Factor. Gender Gaps, Holy Wars and the Politics of Anxious Masculinity*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Dudink, Stefan, Karen Hagemann and John Tosh. Eds. 2004. *Masculinities in Politics and War. Gendering Modern History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . Karen Hagemann and Anna Clark. Eds. 2012. *Representing Masculinity. Male Citizenship in Modern Western Cultures*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Enloe, Cynthia H. 1989. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. London: Pandora.
- Griffin, Ben. 2012. *The Politics of Gender in Victorian Britain: Masculinity, Political Culture and the Struggle for Women’s Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hooper, Charlotte. 2001. *Manly States. Masculinities, International Relations, and Gender Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Jeffords, Susan. 1994. *Hard Bodies: Hollywood Masculinity in the Reagan Era*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Katz, Jackson. 2012. *Leading Men: Presidential Campaigns and the Politics of Manhood*. New York: Interlink.
- Kimmel, Michael. 1990. "After fifteen Years: the Impact of the Sociology of Masculinity on the Masculinity of Sociology." In: Jeff Hearn and David Morgan. Eds. *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory*, 93–109. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Kreisky, Eva, and Birgit Sauer. Eds. 1997. *Das geheime Glossar der Politikwissenschaft. Geschlechtskritische Inspektion der Kategorien einer Disziplin*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.
- Mangan, J.A. 2012. *'Manufactured' Masculinity. Making Imperial Manliness, Morality and Militarism*. Routledge.
- Messerschmidt, James. 2010. *Hegemonic Masculinities and Camouflaged Politics: Unmasking the Bush Dynasty and Its War Against Iraq*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Murray, Rolland. 2006. *Our Living Manhood: Literature, Black Power, and Masculine Ideology*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Reeser, Todd W. 2010. *Masculinities in Theory. An Introduction*. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Tickner, Ann. 2001. *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Yosef, Raz. 2004. *Beyond Flesh: Queer Masculinities and Nationalism in Israeli Cinema*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Zalewski, Marysia, and Jane Parpart. Eds. 1998. *The "Man" Question in International Relations*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- . Eds. 2008. *Rethinking the Man Question. Sex, Gender and Violence in International Relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

MASCULINITY AS AN ANALYTICAL CATEGORY: WORK IN PROGRESS¹

EVA KREISKY

Introduction

With my contribution, I would like to draw attention to the relevance and specifics of the concept of masculinities in the context of political science and political theory. In these fields, masculinities have been crucial for illuminating gendered structural and institutional arrangements and thereby contributed immensely to our understanding of the gendering of politics, bureaucracy, and the state. The concepts of “Männerbund” and masculinism have been particularly fruitful for exploring the ways in which gender shapes the political process and organises the political exclusion of women and other feminised groups. However, it took quite some time until masculinity, “Männerbund”, and masculinism could unfold this analytical potential, which required their transformation from political to analytical categories—a process that was profoundly shaped by historical events and experiences. The article traces these developments to appreciate the historical roots of these concepts, the conditions for their emergence and transformation, and their reformulations as important tools for critical political analysis.

“Männerbund” as Political Ideology and Polemical Term

The process of conceptualising masculinity and making it an issue in social science debate has been shaped by historical contexts. In the German-speaking world, affirmative and critical discourses on the “Männerbund” (a concept which can only vaguely be translated into “male bond”) have provided a particularly important reference point:

The genesis of “Männerbund” ideology is closely connected to the development of the bourgeois (and proletarian) feminist movement at the end of the nineteenth century, which increasingly threatened patriarchal

and authoritarian power relations in public and private domains and justified masculinist strategies of exclusion. A further element in its emergence was the downfall of the old political order. Struggles for the emancipation of women and democratisation initiated the transition to a new political regime. In this context, the “Männerbund” was imagined as a space separated from women and their alleged maternal instincts.

Theorists such as Heinrich Schurtz (1902), Hans Blüher (1916; 1921), Alfred Rosenberg (1930), or Alfred Baeumler (1934) idealised the “Männerbund” as an exclusively male social space (Kreisky 1995, 143). In a pseudo-scientific manner, they claimed a natural male drive toward fraternisation and community building, which they simultaneously declared as the root of political organisation. The “Männerbund” was to represent an alternative to family life. As a model for the organisation of social and political order, it was also an antonym to the feminised masses. Women’s infiltration of men’s circles, it was argued, would devalue these communities, feminise men and jeopardise the social power balance. This fear also applied (and still applies) to demands for political participation made by women and justified the historical exclusion of women from the state, bureaucracy as well as the military and war. The historical “Männerbund” was a (conservative) community, which glorified equality, friendship, fraternalism and camaraderie. Internally however, they were structured extremely hierarchically, developed ritualised forms of communication, defined themselves in opposition to stereotypes of imaginary “enemies”, and shielded themselves from the outside world through loyal secrecy (Kreisky 1994a, 201). They also served as a means to construct male identity(-ies) and to deal with male experiences of fear and powerlessness.

The perceived loss of male power during and after the First World War required fundamental revision of social modernisation and fuelled “Männerbund” ideologies: Women’s equality brought on by the war was proclaimed to be over and remasculinisation demanded. The shaken masculinity of the First World War and glorified memories of masculine camaraderie on the battlefield (“Schützengrabengemeinschaft”) supported this process. In fictional literature and scientific texts, desires for male comradeship in the “Männerbund” were spreading. The idea of this bond could, as was believed at that time, legitimise the further exclusion of women and preserve masculine power under new conditions. With the development of new democracies, the “Männerbund” looked like an ideal counterpoint, as a—no doubt backwards turned—future space for male socialisation in the new political era. As many traditional masculine values as possible were to be rescued and maintained in the democratic societies,

which were now being formed. Sexism and androcentrism were united in the political programme of “antifeminism”. The philosophy of the “Männerbund”, which was extremely popular at the time, was to prolong the exclusion of women and ensure save spaces for men within the new structures of power.

Only a short time later, as early as the late 1920s, but more openly in the 1930s, an authoritarian, militarised as well as socio-economically crisis-laden political and social development began, which reinforced these regressive processes. The authoritarian political regimes of the pre-fascist and fascist era fell in line with “Männerbund” thinking. In many cases these regimes, particularly the National Socialist one, were regarded as the pinnacle of “Männerbund” practices. Masculinity as a system experienced its extreme totalitarian form. The references of National Socialism to the ideology of the “Männerbund” discredited the concept so significantly that it did not reappear in debates on gender in the post-fascist era. Although social and political institutions kept operating as “Männerbund” for the most part, they did so without declaring themselves as such. It was the new feminist movement that came back to the “Männerbund” as a structural type, to criticise the on-going resistance to reform of political and social structures. The “Männerbund” served as a feminist political term. However, it did not yet have any relevance as an analytical category.

Social Science Theories on Masculinity

Parallel to the transformation of “Männerbund” from an affirmative to a critical concept, two variants of social science theorising on masculinity developed in the course of the first half of the twentieth century:

Sigmund Freud’s classic psychoanalytic theory, which in addition to its clinical significance also contained great potential for critical social and cultural analysis, mainly concentrated on male development. Therefore, his work can be considered the origin of modern thinking about masculinity. However, he did not systematically discuss masculinity and also did not seek any structural perspective on gender. For the most part, the issue of power remained unaddressed. Interestingly, the first dissent within the psychoanalytic school (Alfred Adler, Carl G. Jung, Wilhelm Reich) arose regarding the problem of masculinity.

The second movement concerned with masculinity developed in the USA in the historical context of the Great Depression in the 1930s. It emerged from socio-psychological research and was centred around (male and female) gender roles (“structural functionalism”). At that time, the

male identity of the family provider (corresponding to the role of the housewife) found itself in a crisis and the stability of patriarchal gender regimes appeared to be somewhat jeopardised. Conforming to gender roles was however considered prerequisite for upholding patriarchal capitalism. The focus was on the role and not the individual and his/her agency. This concept remained hegemonic until the 1950s and 1960s. For the most part, it also left out issues of power and dominance and was therefore repeatedly criticised, particularly by the developing new women's movement.

Since the 1970s, research on men and masculinities in the Anglo-Saxon context became increasingly critical of patriarchy. Approximately since the beginning of the 1990s, masculinities have also been addressed in German-speaking debates by feminist gender scholars. Two variants of studying masculinities developed: On the one hand, research on men, which mainly resembles the descriptive research on women, gradually gained ground. This research cannot be regarded as research on masculinity and hardly deals with ideological constructs of masculinity. Its deficit was and continues to be its ahistorical and decontextualised perspective on structures of power. This type of research addresses male mental states or crises of manhood, without elaborating on social causes, which is why women and above all feminism are often blamed for these "crises". On the other hand, a form of masculinity studies evolved which was based on feminist theory and social science critique of patriarchy and capitalism. In this context, a paradigmatic change in perspective occurred from women to gender relations as well as a connection between gender studies and social theory. This was essential for making masculinities useful for feminist social analyses.

Gender Relations as a Political Science Category

This paradigm shift enabled the social organisation of gender relations to become the central analytical problem and ultimately made masculinities relevant for political analysis. This approach starts from the acknowledgement that class or ethnicities, for example, also have influence on the formation of gender hierarchies, leading to different configurations, which is why we should talk about gender relations plural (Scott 1986, 1054).

These relations are not only based on "(fixed) conscious ideas of masculine or feminine", but also on a conflict between a person's "need for the appearance of wholeness and the imprecision of terminology, its relative meaning (and) its dependence on repression." (ibid., 1063–4).

Hence, interaction and rivalries between the genders are more complex and more contradictory than other social conflicts. For this purpose, Regina Becker-Schmidt (1987) introduced the term “double socialisation” of women, with which the simultaneous and conflicting involvement of women in private as well as public environments is addressed. Therefore, women need a “double” consciousness: Material and economic interests as well as sexual and emotional demands are articulated in the context of gender relations. Raewyn Connell (1999, 94ff.) also detected a particular organisational structure of social practice in gender, which integrates power, production, and emotional relationships.

The post-structuralist conceptualisation of gender by the American historian Joan W. Scott (1986) should have a significant influence on the development of gender research in political science, which converted the idea of historically constructed gender difference into an analytical category. Scott (*ibid.*, 1067ff.) defines gender as a “constitutive element of social relationships”, which “is (based) on perceived differences between the genders.” With her concept of gender, she emphasises the significance of power relations and names gender as one of the central social power struggles. Her approach explicitly refers to politics as well as social institutions and organisations, symbols, types of representation, normative concepts and the idea of “subjective identities”, which altogether expands gender to a political science category and therefore makes it useful beyond the private sphere (*ibid.*).

Hegemonic Masculinity and Masculinism

The reconceptualisation of gender as a relational category and gender studies’ stronger engagement with feminist concerns with power paved the way for masculinity to become a useful tool for analysing political institutions, structures, and processes.

The question of gender-specific power relations in modern societies highlighted that there is neither everlasting masculinity nor masculinity as such. Masculinity is neither homogeneous nor unchangeable. Furthermore, analysing male power and dominance cannot only dwell on the micro-perspective on individual men but must also take a meso- as well as macro-perspective on masculinities. Therefore, the following analytical levels must be distinguished (Kreisky 2004):

- Individual men or men as a social group,
- Social and political constructions of different masculinities,
- Social production of hegemonic masculinity,

- The male bond (“Männerbund”) as a structural sedimentation of masculinity and institutional standard form of politics, state, economy, and warfare,
- Masculinism as an ideological expression of excessive masculine values, symbolisation of masculine hegemony, and male-centred view of social relationships.

With these clarifications and expansions of the category masculinities, the culturally specific ways of how (male) children and adolescents acquire a male identity through socialisation—a central field of study in sociological, pedagogic, psychological and ethnological masculinity research—attained meaning for political analysis. The correct doing of gender —i.e. the acquisition of body language and emotionality, which enables social recognition of an individual as man or woman—, became interesting for political science, because the social construction of gender identity takes place in public and political institutions. Consequently, school, family, military but also bureaucracy and administration are regarded as relevant social spaces and methods for the creation of gendered subjects. These processes of gendered identification which are necessary for the formation of subjectivities gain relevance for the theorisation of power because of their modes of operation: True masculinity, as Bourdieu puts it, is acquired in the “serious games of the competition [...] played among men”, which is ultimately about domination and subordination (Bourdieu 1997, 203 quoted in Bereswill and Neuber 2011, 77).

Social acquisition of masculinity is based on ideological and practical exclusion of femininity and furthermore, on hierarchies between men and masculinities. Therefore, Connell (1995) emphasises that there is not one masculinity, but always masculinities plural. Using the concept of hegemonic masculinity, different hierarchies between masculinities can be analysed. Hegemonic masculinity does not define a norm because it is not normal in a statistical sense. Actually, only a minority of men embody this hegemonic ideal, although the majority of men enjoy the advantages of patriarchy derived from it (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005, 832). Hegemonic masculinity provides a model for identification and orientation for non-hegemonic masculinities. Given that most men benefit from the advantages of the patriarchal gender order, they do not question hegemonic masculinity. Connell (1995, 79) refers to this masculinity/these masculinities as *complicit*. Consequently, normal men embody *complicit* masculinity, they lead a normal family life, fulfil their social obligations, are more or less successful in their professional lives, can even act supportive of women but leave the principles of patriarchal relations

untouched. They do not only benefit from a patriarchal dividend “in terms of honour, prestige and the right to command” (ibid.) but also from a material dividend in the form of an average income, which is significantly higher than that of women.

Subordinate masculinity on the other hand cannot live in peaceful harmony with its environment or even hold socially important positions, as is characteristic of complicit masculinity. This is due to the fact that it functions as a constitutive other in the construction of hegemonic masculinity, similar to femininity. As a typical case for subordinate masculinity in modern society, Connell observed homosexual men in the 1990s.² Central to their delegitimation was “the symbolic blurring with femininity” (ibid., 79). The association of men (also heterosexual) with allegedly feminine characteristics excludes them from the protection of legitimate masculinity, which is defined by hegemonic masculinity. They symbolically become women in the patriarchal matrix. “Hegemonic masculinity” builds on the patriarchal gender order and ideology and can practically legitimise it:

“Hegemonic masculinity can be defined as the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women” (ibid., 77).

In addition to the new approach to gender relations enabled by the concept of hegemonic masculinity, masculinism was introduced as a term to make sense of the endurance of male dominance, despite changing variants of masculinity. Masculinity is a social construct, which is subject to constant changes by being reinterpreted culturally, historically and individually. The rapid changes, which were observed between the 1950s and the 1980s, made it seem like the patriarchal gender order had been fundamentally challenged. However, “[w]hat has changed is not male power as such, but its form, its presentation, its packaging. In other words, while it is apparent that styles of masculinity may alter in relatively short time spans, the substance of male power does not” (Brittan 2001, 52). In order to explain this contradiction between a change in masculinities on the one hand and the continuity of male power on the other, Arthur Brittan introduced the term masculinism. In Brittan’s understanding, masculinity refers to those aspects of male behaviour and male gender practices, which change relatively easily in the course of time; masculinism on the other hand defines the ideology, which justifies and supports male patriarchal dominance and at the same time, is relatively resistant to change:

“Masculinism is the ideology that justifies and naturalises male dominance. As such, it is the ideology of patriarchy. Masculinism takes it for granted that there is a fundamental difference between men and women, it assumes that heterosexuality is normal, it accepts without question the sexual division of labour, and it sanctions the political and dominant role of men in the public and private spheres” (ibid., 53).

Masculinism—just like “Männerbund”—has both a political and an analytical meaning, which overlap and interact. As a self-labelling for antifeminist men’s movements and politics, it acts as a conceptual counterpart to political feminism. As exemplified in the discussion of “Männerbund” ideologies, it forms an anti-modern reaction to the perceived endangerment of masculinity, which usually appears when there is a tendency towards the modernisation of traditional-hierarchical gender orders in favour of women. Therefore, the objective of every masculinist ideology is the relegitimisation of traditional gender relations, upholding the unquestioned privilege of male positions (Meuser 1998, 154–5; Kreisky 2001, 156). The restructuring of patriarchal gender relations and masculinist institutions is exaggerated to a crisis of masculinity. From this perspective, masculinity appears as an endangered identity, which no longer has a secure and stable position in today’s society (Kreisky 2001, 53). Idealisation of male values and symbol systems ultimately creates reconstructed, readjusted hegemonic masculinity (ibid., 156).

Masculinism as an analytical concept is intended to highlight this process and its modes of operation and serves the gender critical analysis of social and political relations: In this conceptual sense, masculinism is to be understood as a political-ideological as well as symbolic exaggeration and idealisation of socially created masculinities as well as excessive and exclusively male values. Masculinism is the standardised and comprehensive form of socialisation, which goes far beyond male-dominated institutions and which can lastingly structure conventional social discourses and political orders. Therefore, naming and highlighting masculinism pursues an analytical goal, which is critical of ideology and patriarchy and can also be applied to recent social and political developments, such as neoliberalisation and the economic globalisation of societies in late modernity.

“Männerbund” as an Analytical Category

With these refined understandings of masculinity(-ies) as intertwined with power and gender relations and masculinism as the ideology of male dominance, “Männerbund” could finally step out of its specific historical

context and become a tool for analysing contemporary political arrangements. The historical context of hegemonic masculinity in the nineteenth century was provided by homosocial communities, i.e. exclusively male places of socialisation, which were characterised by a general exclusion of women (e.g. universities, churches, the military, political institutions) and were therefore seen as “Männerbund”. At the beginning of the twentieth century, partly as a reaction to the first women’s movement, the idea of “Männerbund” experienced a programmatic, antidemocratic and antifeminist turn. During the second women’s movement, “Männerbund” became a popular expression and a political concept to point out male dominance in government and bureaucracy.

“Männerbund” as an analytical concept combines both understandings and at the same time overcomes them. It serves as a concept which enables us to capture the historical sedimentation of (hegemonic) masculinity in political institutions (Kreisky 1992, 1994a). A feminist archaeology of institutions can make the masculinist foundation of state and politics visible (Kreisky 1994b, 28). Ultimately, “Männerbund” defines masculinity as a system (Kreisky 1994a, 192), which is embedded in the organisational culture (e.g. professional ethics, ritualised work patterns, modes of discrimination and exclusion) of political institutions. It is their standard form and independent of specific men or masculinities.

The historical form of the “Männerbund”, which represented an institution for the creation and the mediation of hegemonic masculinity, has become rare since the Second World War and has been replaced by numerous, more casual male bonds. Nevertheless, it has left its mark on political institutions and organisations. The enormous ability of the “Männerbund” to fortify and consolidate its position is based on informal networks, relationships and career cultures. Many specific forms and arrangements of male bonding take place as supposedly private recreational activities, which is why they are not considered relevant for economic and political analysis. Connell quotes a CEO, who, asked about career barriers for women, answered as follows:

“Male bonding through hunting, fishing and sports talk is irrelevant to business. Too much so-called ‘strategic planning’ takes place after the bars close—that kind of male fellowship ritual is irrelevant to business” (Connell 2002, 100).

The ignorance towards institutionalised masculinity formulated here also characterises political science concepts, its abstract and allegedly gender-neutral discourses as well as formal political institutions (Kreisky 1997,

163). The concept of “Männerbund” therefore also works as a tool for criticising male-dominated academic disciplines such as political science.

Conclusions: Masculinity in the Context of a Theory of Gender Relations

The paradigmatic break with gender role theory marked the beginning of completely new theorisations of masculinity. Although these newer theoretical approaches developed in different fields of the social sciences, they feature a common basis: a focus on diverse and transformational masculinities, a concern with power, and a relational approach to gender. Political science has contributed to these debates an institutional and structural perspective, which highlights the relevance of socioeconomic structures and institutional practices for the (trans)formation of gender hierarchies. It emphasises that, even though there are multiple masculinities, the social construction and ideological conceptualisations of masculinities are systematic processes embedded in the manifold layers of social change. Concepts such as “Männerbund” and masculinism proved useful for grasping these systematic aspects of masculinities and their significance in shaping the political process. From their specific historical and political contexts, they have been developed into analytical categories, even though the distinction between political and analytical is by no means clear-cut and rigid.

This applies to the concepts of gender and masculinity more generally, which are now established social and political science terminology. Still, their conceptualisation is not a completed process and never will be; they keep transforming in the context of current debates and developments. In view of booming socio-, neuro- and microbiology, for example, the category gender no longer works as formerly envisioned. With the search for “genetic explanations” for social relations and inequalities, the feminist hypothesis of social constructivism has been faced with serious resistance (Scott 2001, 30). At the same time, the concept of gender itself, initially intended as feminist resistance to biological determinism, is transforming. While gaining greater acceptance from the mainstream, the inflationary use of the “gender label” led to a “containment of the subversive possibilities of gender” and diminished its political significance (ibid., 33). Demands for reactivating the feminist impetus of gender studies have therefore accompanied their development as an academic discipline. Because the intersections between political and analytical concepts are fluid, unstable, and subject to constant renegotiations, the theoretical work must continue.

Notes

1 The author would like to thank Saskia Stachowitsch for revising, restructuring, and translating earlier drafts of this article as well as Kathrin Glösel for getting the manuscript in shape.

2 Since Connell's study, there have been individual cases, in which homosexuals have broken through the *glass ceiling* and became visible in public institutions. However, this has not changed the power dynamics and differences between masculinity(-ies).

References

- Baeumler, Alfred. 1934. *Männerbund und Wissenschaft*. Berlin: no publisher.
- Becker-Schmidt, Regina. 1987. "Die doppelte Vergesellschaftung—die doppelte Unterdrückung." In *Die andere Hälfte der Gesellschaft*. Edited by Lilo Unterkirchner and Ina Wagner, 10–27. Vienna: Österreichischer Soziologentag.
- Bereswill, Mechthild, and Anke Neuger. 2011. "Marginalised Masculinity, Precarisation and the Gender Order." In *Debates on a Multi-Faceted Concept*. Edited by Helma Lutz et al., 69–89. Burlington/Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.
- Blüher, Hans. 1916. *Der bürgerliche und der geistige Antifeminismus*. Berlin: no publisher.
- . 1921. *Die Rolle der Erotik in der männlichen Gesellschaft. eine Theorie der menschlichen Staatsbildung nach Wesen und Wert*, 2 Volumes. Jena: no publisher.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1997. "Die männliche Herrschaft." In *Ein alltägliches Spiel. Geschlechterkonstruktion in der sozialen Praxis*. Edited by Irene Dölling and Beate Krais, 153–217. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. Quoted in Mechthild Bereswill and Anke Neuger. 2011. "Marginalised Masculinity, Precarisation and the Gender Order." In *Debates on a Multi-Faceted Concept*. Edited by Helma Lutz et al., 69–89. Burlington/Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.
- Brittan, Arthur. 2001. "Masculinities and Masculinism." In *The Masculinities Reader*. Edited by Stephen M. Whitehead and Frank J. Barret, 51–55. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, Raewyn. 1985. "Theorising Gender." *Sociology* 2: 260–72.
- . 1986. "Zur Theorie der Geschlechterverhältnisse." *Das Argument* 157: 330–44.

- 1995. *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 1999. *Der gemachte Mann: Konstruktion und Krise von Männlichkeiten*. Opladen: Leske & Budrich.
- 2002. *Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, Raewyn, and James Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society* 19(6): 829–59.
- Kreisky, Eva. 1992. "Der Staat als Männerbund. Der Versuch einer feministischen Staatssicht." In *Staat aus feministischer Sicht*. Edited by Elke Biester, Brigitte Geißel, Sabine Lang, Petra Schäfer and Brigitte Young, 56–62. Berlin: Eigenverlag der Freien Universität Berlin.
- 1994a. "Das ewig Männerbündische? Zur Standardform von Staat und Politik." In *Wozu Politikwissenschaft? Über das Neue in der Politik*. Edited by Claus Leggewie, 191–208. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- 1994b. "Aspekte der Dialektik von Politik und Geschlecht. Plädoyer gegen 'geschlechtshalbierte Wahrheiten und Blickrichtungen' in der Politikwissenschaft." In *Feministische Politikwissenschaft*. Edited by Erna Appelt and Gerda Neyer, 13–35. Wien: Verlag für Gesellschaftskritik.
- 1995. "Das Geschlecht politischer Institutionen." In *Politische Theorie und Ideengeschichte im Gespräch*. Edited by Helmut Kramer, 134–63. Wien: WUV Verlag.
- 1997. "Diskreter Maskulinismus. Über geschlechtsneutralen Schein politischer Idole, politischer Ideale und politischer Institutionen." In *Das geheime Glossar der Politikwissenschaft. Geschlechtskritische Inspektion der Kategorien einer Disziplin*. Edited by Eva Kreisky and Birgit Sauer, 161–213. Frankfurt am Main/New York: Campus Verlag.
- 2001. "Weltwirtschaft als Kampffeld: Aspekte des Zusammenspiels von Globalismus und Maskulinismus." *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 2: 137–59.
- 2004. "Geschlecht als politische und politikwissenschaftliche Kategorie." In *Politikwissenschaft und Geschlecht. Konzepte—Verknüpfungen—Perspektiven*. Edited by Sieglinde Rosenberger and Birgit Sauer, 23–43. Wien: WUV.
- Meuser, Michael. 1998. *Geschlecht und Männlichkeit. Soziologische Theorie und kulturelle Deutungsmuster*. Opladen: Leske & Budrich.
- Rosenberg, Alfred. 1930. *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts. Eine Wertung der seelisch-geistigen Gestaltenkämpfe unserer Zeit*. Berlin: no publisher.
- Schurtz, Heinrich. 1902. *Altersklassen und Männerbünde. Eine Darstellung der Grundformen der Gesellschaft*. Berlin: no publisher.

- Scott, Joan Wallach. 1986. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *American Historical Review* 5: 1053–75.
- . 2001. "Millennial Fantasies. The Future of 'Gender' in the 21st Century." In *Gender. Die Tücken einer Kategorie: Joan W. Scott. Geschichte und Politik*. Edited by Claudia Honegger and Caroline Arni, 19–37. Zurich: Chronos.

