

Chapter 1: Introduction

Moving homophobia research from ‘sexuality’ to ‘gender’

In 1868 Karol Maria Benkert coined the term ‘homosexual’ (Edwards 2005; Fone 2001), and thus assisted in creating a discourse based on sexual behaviour. Nearly a century later, clinical psychologist George Weinberg (1972) wrote of ‘homophobia’ which originally meant a fear of homosexuality, but has since come to take on broader sociological meanings. Since the naming of these two concepts, there has been a flurry of activity as researchers from variety of disciplines have tried to understand what these concepts mean to their areas of expertise. Initial examinations of homosexuality considered it from medical and mental health viewpoints; understanding homophobia moved from psychiatric discourses to those of human rights, and the original examination of sexuality has more recently expanded to incorporate gender (Fone 2001).

This thesis takes that expansion of theoretical focus one more step in that direction. While theorising sexuality now includes an examination of gender, I am expanding the examination of homophobia’s impact from gay men to men in general. This acts to continue the theoretical direction taken by Plummer (1999) who discussed how homophobia was more closely related to gender betrayal than sexual difference: the current work examines the *impact* of homophobia in Australian masculinity. Under examination are the policing capacities of homophobia, and the ways in which it restricts men’s social, physical and emotional interactions, and how these have lessened in some ways for many of the men who participated in this research. Just as sexuality is not a singular, stable binary, neither is gender. How cultures consider ideals of masculinity and femininity varies, and how cultures understand, and incorporate or punish same-sex sex depends on diverse factors such as stability of population, available resources and tradition. These three factors, particularly their fragility in the lives of nomadic desert tribes of the Old Testament, were vital in proscriptive attitudes developing within the three dominant monotheistic religions: Judaism, Christianity and Islam (Naphy 2004). Different cultures show variety in the ways in which they incorporate same-sex sex relationships within the broader social

and sexual realms, from Samurai lovers of medieval Japan (Rupp 2001) to Thailand's ladyboys (Totman 2003), from Quentin Crisp's (1977) fairy culture of 1940s London to John Rechy's (1964; 1977) hyper-male American clone in the 1970s. In the West, homosexuality has largely been conflated with effeminacy (Connell 1995), and thus positioned as a subordinate form of masculinity. Although Freud (1970) saw a bisexual potential in all people and Jung (1968) saw an *anima*, or reflection for the other gender contained in each of us, there has been in different cultures at different times (including most of the Modern West) a drive to equate masculinity with a specific set of performances. These are frequently measured against femininity as if 'male' and 'female' are distinct species. Part of that 'measuring' has been the equation of same-sex sex with femininity, and both women and homosexuals become the monstrous 'other' that men attempt to avoid. In Chapter 2, I will address the links between misogyny and homophobia, and show how there is a second layer of power underpinning homophobia that sexism alone does not explain.

However, as masculinity has been shown to be something learned and not an inherent quality that all males equally possess, tensions exist: in the learning of masculinity, where boys must absorb a set of ill-defined characteristics; and also because not all boys will be able to perform some of the masculine scripts. Gender is in part a performance that is mediated by the body, and yet few males possess the lean, muscular body which is valorised in contemporary culture. Similarly, those who do not enact the acceptable social aspects of masculinity – autonomy, fearlessness, peer-group orientation (see Kimmel 1996; Plummer 1999) – are regarded as lesser males. Again these are not inherent qualities but must be learnt by trial and error – and are constantly under review in a changing society. Masculinity becomes a difficult chimera to embody.

Connell (1989) refers to *masculinities* in the plural, a related series of ways of being male which incorporate a hierarchy ranging from preferred to derided presentations. In the West, same-sex sex has come to be a powerful mediator regarding men's behaviour as it has come to embody the antithesis of hegemonic masculinity. Despite the fact that there is nothing inherently feminine about two men having sex, homosexual activity has come to be equated with both femininity and emasculation, as if being penetrated has the capacity to 'unman' one (and this of course ignores the

lack of penetration of a great deal of same-sex sex, and the potential for male penetration in heterosexual unions: see Kinsey, Pomeroy & Martin 1949; Hite 1981).

But somehow, this aspect of male sexuality has come to be wrapped with negative attitudes which seem to encapsulate all of the fears that men have about themselves and their roles in relations to each other and to women. These fears restrict men's behaviour, limiting the ways in which they allow their erotic drives to be channelled. They also restrict the ways men will behave in a variety of contexts based on the assumption that some activities are not the domain of 'real' men, but rather those of the feared, emasculating 'other'. Any activity which comes to be seen as suspect gets policed. Homophobia becomes a powerful mediating force that polices not only transgressions from heterosexual behaviour – thus controlling sexuality – but also transgressions from acceptable gender performance. Activities seen either as feminising, or as not displaying the 'right sort' of masculinity risk attracting homophobic names. It is this policing of gender of all men, not the sexual behaviour of gay men, that this thesis aims to examine.

In-depth interviews and focus groups were utilised to ascertain men's ideas about what desirable masculinity meant to them, and how and where they learned these ideas. Transcripts of the interviews were then analysed to find patterns and meanings embedded in the discourses of gender. These were compared to ideas of other researchers that had been enunciated in the literature on gender, sexuality and homophobia.

Overview of chapters

Chapter 2 will present a literature review on two related ideas. First, I will present a brief examination of the social constructionism and essentialism debates. Secondly, I will discuss how these two theories attempt to explain the ideas of how sexuality and gender. The relatively new term 'homophobia' has diversified from its original psychological meaning to incorporate sociological meaning, and this chapter will also look at that development. By incorporating the theoretical perspective of social constructionism, homophobia will be shown to be a learned attitude, not an inherent aspect of masculinity.

Chapter 3 will outline the epistemological framework of the study, and provide an overview of the methods used to gather and interpret the data. This research operates from an interpretivist, social science perspective, and aims to uncover in the words of the participants what these experiences shaped them. As such, the research started with a very broad research question: How does homophobia impact on Australian men?

A grounded theory approach allows both the research question and the sample to be further refined in response to incoming information (Glaser and Strauss 1967). In interpretivist research, the researcher should not presume to know the area under investigation, but rather remain open to incoming information, and shape the research in response to this and the theoretical sensitivity produced by a careful literature review. Analysis of the early transcripts showed that language and embodied experience had major influences on how boys constructed their own sense of masculinity, and in opposition to what they saw as failed masculinity. Language patrolled the borders, and was central to ‘othering’ males; the use of the body, especially through sport, was foregrounded in publicly displaying characteristics of desired masculinity.

The research questions thus developed into the following:

- What are the pressures which shape boys, and what are the attitudes and actions which are seen as acceptable for boys?
- When and where do these attitudes become acculturated?
- How does language related to sexuality shape the gender presentation of boys?
- What is the role of sport in shaping male’s ideas of preferred body shape?
- What impact does sport have in the socialising of boys?
- Can homophobic attitudes be unlearned? If so, by whom, under what circumstances and to what purpose?

The results of the thesis are divided into four chapters. These are presented as chronology of a man’s life. Taking a social constructionist viewpoint that sees sexuality and gender as learnt potentialities, I examine how and where these are acculturated. Chapter 4, *Learning masculinity by distancing “difference”* looks at

where attitudes to gender are learned, and how homosexuality comes to represent failed masculinity. Plummer (1999; 2001) notes that homophobic attitudes and language start to develop before there is an awareness of sexuality indicating that there is more to homophobia than the control of sexuality. Aspects of behaviour not related to homosexual activity can attract such words, and so it appears that it is *difference* which is being regulated. Specific mechanisms about how these ideas are transmitted are the focus of the next two results chapters.

Chapter 5, *Boy's talk: The roles of language and humour in shaping male identity* examines how words like 'poofter', 'homo', 'pansy' and 'faggot' are used in different areas of male socialisation. This chapter opens with a brief, contextualising literature review pertaining to the use of language and humour as systems of communication, and the power dynamics which underlie it. Homophobic language arose in different contexts during the participant interviews: it was directed at most men at some stage in their lives, and induced by a range of prompts from having the wrong body to being academic to rejecting peer-group interactions. Some men spoke of campaigns of humiliation that accompanied the use of such language; some had the words directed at them sporadically and felt no specific humiliation beyond the actual occurrence. Other men spoke glibly of using these words in the context of jokes and that no harm was meant. Comments about the use of jokes between peers then allowed a broadening of discussion to examine the role of humour in shaping male behaviour. Boys and men who were seen to take themselves too seriously lost social capital and had a social distance created around them, although the data will show that what some men wrote off as 'just a joke' was often a series of ritualised humiliations. The discussion then expanded beyond interpersonal interactions, and examined how humour is involved in creating male identities at a national level.

Although gender is constructed in a social environment, it is based on a physical, sexed body. Chapter 6, *Sport and the creation of Australian masculinity*, looks at what meanings are attached to the body and how specific body types have come to represent idealised masculinity. As with Chapter 5, this section opens with a contextualising literature review, which gives an overview of the development of sport in the West. This sets out a theoretical and historical framework on which the empirical data related to sport and embodiment will rest.

Kimmel (1994; 1996) notes that a common belief regarding gender is that boys are physical and external and girls are intellectual and internal. Following the literature review, this chapter develops two main themes:

- As sport is central in how boys' experience school, I examine it as a technique where boys learn how their body socially positions them. As with language, sport becomes a system of communication wherein boys learn what sort of body they should aspire to possess. Lean muscularity is desired, but this shape does not come naturally to all: training can increase the strength and size of the body, and as clear social benefits are enunciated by both peers and superiors, there is pressure on boys to try and attain this shape. Those who cannot play sport, have a body which does not allow them to play well or who refuse to play are sidelined. Homophobic labels are often directed at them to coerce them into joining in this lauded activity.
- Sport also communicated concepts of acceptable social interaction for boys by elevating some performances (team-based activities) and problematising others (individual interests). Boys are taught to see the team as a vital part of their existence, and those who will be part of the team are marginalised.

As the interviews were designed to cover a rough chronology of men's lives, some participants talked about how their ideas of masculinity and attitudes to sexuality changed over time. This became the basis for Chapter 7, *Changing opinions*. Here, I discuss the possibility of unlearning homophobic attitudes. Men describe a series of re-socialising processes that occur, and the contexts which allow them. Pressure to 'perform' masculinity within the narrow range of scripts was described by some men as reducing, particularly when masculinity has been 'proven' through ritualised performances of having a girlfriend, marrying or fathering children. Mono-cultural or single-sex environments such as boys' schools or the armed forces held boys and men within a narrow range of gender presentations, and these were also tightly enforced by those institutions. Those who conformed to valorised masculine scripts had their status as the 'right' kind of male validated; those who failed were frequently forced out, and they became the measuring stick against which 'real' males considered themselves. This then became a self-reinforcing cycle where only those who embodied the hegemony fully were allowed positions of power, allowing them to

perpetuate the same environment repeatedly. Men who fitted the hegemony and did not see the negative impacts that this had on those outside of the hegemony felt no desire to challenge their opinions, which from their sequestered worldview, was working well. However, those men who encountered diversity, either by chance, or through active rejection of the hegemony, were able to re-evaluate their ideas about what their masculinity meant to them.

The majority of the men were reflexive and expressed liberal attitudes, and yet within these men were still areas in which their attitudes were still constrained. Of this group, the majority had held restrictive attitudes to homosexuality or gender transgression at some point in their lives. A significant minority continued to express hostile attitudes, sometimes through condescending humour, sometimes through espousal of violence. The policing capacities of homophobia were evident when this occurred in focus groups: even when these attitudes were expressed by a minority of participants, other men – whose attitudes were more liberal – frequently failed to challenge the homophobe.

Homophobia is shown to be a learned construct which impacts on all men. The thesis discusses where these attitudes are learnt, and what impacts and constraints they have on men. Some men describe unlearning these attitudes, and go on to describe how this has influenced their ideas on other areas of their lives. Although vocally homophobic men constituted a small section of the sample, their voice was loud and carried the imprimatur of a presumed social sanction. The disproportionate impact of this minority is discussed in chapter 8, *Conclusion*.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Male and female, and straight. It seems so easy, a world consisting of tidy opposites attracting each other and nothing more confusing to consider. At least until recently, this was the predominant Western view of masculinity, femininity and sexuality. Other sexualities were hidden from view to the point that they did not appear to exist, and genders conformed to rigidly enforced, restricted standards. The discussion of sex was so closely controlled by discourses of morality, shame and medicalisation that any variation from the scripted performances could literally be seen as mad or able to send you to hell. Sexology as a discipline dates back to the late nineteenth century and from that time arguments abounded as to what sex was normal and what was pathological. Perhaps the most detailed scientific examination of human sexuality was that of Kinsey.

The work that Alfred Kinsey started his career on, the study of gall wasps, prepared him for researching human sexuality in an important, surprising way: with a collection of over one million individual specimens, he found no two wasps exactly the same. This realisation sensitised Kinsey to the potential for variation in human sexual response (Gathorne-Hardy 1998). On the surface, sexual behaviour and gender appeared to be immutable but Kinsey found that variation was the natural state, not conformity. However because the discourses on sexuality were so tightly regulated, no variation was discussed or presented. What Kinsey and a range of anthropologists, sexologists and psychologists who pre-dated and followed his work found was variation as nuanced and individual as there are individuals to consider.

This chapter presents reviews of two separate areas of the literature. The first section looks at how sexuality has been considered since the nineteenth century, how during that period discourses have come to understand sexuality through their own prisms, and subsequently shape it into a form that their discipline authorises. The second section looks at how same-sex behaviour has been considered in the West and other cultures, the social and political transformations leading to the formation of the

modern identity of 'gay', and the impact that this has had on cultural ideas about gender and sexuality.

Social constructionism, essentialism and sexuality

A major development in the social sciences in the late twentieth century was the emergence of social constructionism, and debates about which perspective better enunciates human behaviour have reverberated through the academy ever since. These debates are comprehensively covered elsewhere (see Beasley 2005; Halwani 1991; Kimmel 1996; McIntosh 1992; Plummer 1975; Weeks 2003), and it is beyond the scope of this thesis to revisit them. Apart from the following short section outlining my position I will not delve further into this debate except as necessary to contextualise other aspects of the literature review. As well as social constructionism, I will also examine the concepts of 'Othering', hierarchies, ritual and contagion as systems through which ideas about gender, sexuality and homophobia are disseminated.

To ascribe all social behaviour to genetic programming is biologically reductionist, a position shown to be untenable due to the inherent problems in experiments designed to 'prove' why some people behave in certain ways. These problems include a lack of replication of experiments (Byne 1997; Taylor 1996), difficulty in interpreting results or controlling all external variables, dubious reliability and a reliance on a binary model of sexuality (Byne 1997; Edwards 2005). This style of research also ignores the findings of cross-cultural (see Kenny 1991; Malinowski 1934; Mead 2000) and historical examinations of sexual practices (see Chauncey 1995; Daniel 1991; Dover 1978; Greenberg 1988). These research methodologies found differing ways in which same-sex sex is incorporated into non-Western or non-Modern lifestyles. Differing meanings and rituals surround sexual behaviour (see Chauncey 1995; Foucault 1990), which biological examinations fail to account for. Not only this, 'Biological reductionism, in essence, is two or three million years out of date' (Connell 1987: 72).

At the other end of the debate is the belief that we are social beings for whom all understanding of the world is learnt, socially constructed and contingent upon

historical confluences. In Mouffe's (1992: 372) words, 'The identity of such a multiple and contradictory subject is therefore always contingent and precarious' and the subject is continually shaped and re-shaped by competing discourses. In this viewpoint, gender has no basis in the body but is a learnt performance that marks out social divisions and power dynamics of a given society (Butler 1990; 1993). Butler is not writing that bodies do not exist – or matter – but Worth (2002: 40) writes that 'while, for Butler, there may be such a thing as anatomy, it is somehow strangely bracketed', indicating that biology risks being rendered an insignificant side-issue to pure constructionists. Between these viewpoints are other social constructionists such as Bordo (1999), Turner (1999), Vance (1989) and Weeks (1985; 2003) who see that the social world is indeed constructed, but that it is layered upon a physical body – one which is sexed, has an evolutionary background, is subject to desires and informed by the historical/political milieu.

Tensions between the two camps exist, and in categories such as gender and sexuality the debates become heated and overlaid with political imperatives. Each side seeks to prove its position in the 'nature vs. nurture debate', and to ascribe moral neutrality or degeneracy inherent in different enactments of sexuality or gender. Vance (1989: 14) writes that despite the influence that social constructionism has had on the social sciences, sexuality and gender are the last bastions of essentialism. They are:

...the very last domains to have their biologized status called into question. For all of us, essentialism was our first way of thinking about sexuality and still remains the hegemonic one in the culture.

Something that seems so self-apparent as gender – men and women are physically different, therefore they must be socially different – creates particular hostility. So too does sexuality which we come to see as linked to 'proper' gender performance and having acceptable or problematic variations. 'We prefer clear-cut categories to ambiguity', writes Weeks (2003: 49): as limited versions of gender and sexuality are presented to us as acceptable, it becomes challenging to discover that there are variances in these categories. These categories have been so ubiquitously presented to us as that they appear to be inherent qualities (Butler 1990), and so when this paradigm is questioned, it calls to account many assumptions that we have about our gendered society. The challenges that this presents to our understanding of acceptable

masculinity, femininity or sexuality, which we had been lead to believe were core components of our makeup, are profound and unsettling: encountering someone who lives beyond the gender/sexuality binaries leaves open the possibility that these taken-for-granted constituencies may be open to change or uncertainty for anyone.

Evolutionary explanations of gender and sexuality do offer tidy simplicity, ‘certainty where others recognize only contingency’ (Weeks 2003: 47), but this scientific reductionism does not allow for complex nuance in human sexuality and gender. Gender constructs, when reduced to a binary, become an easily understood schema that do not require one to grapple with nuance and malleability (Ross 1985a). This simplification ignores the input of socialisation in an attempt to present quantitative explanations to complex issues with broad aetiologies (Sapolsky 2000). ‘Difference’ in any form risks problematisation, and although Crosby (1992: 131) wrote that ‘difference’ was ‘*the* project of women’s studies today’ (original emphasis), she noted that the academy had been slow to utilise difference as a tool to investigate gender. I propose that difference is still an under-utilised means of examining both categories between and within genders, which still suffer from an over-reliance on binaries. ‘[I]n practice, the binary remains a fundamental principal of social and psychic ordering’ writes Dollimore (1991: 255), a simplifying categorisation that demands either/or clarity and pays no heed to historical, personal or cultural variance. Taking social constructionism as the basis for the current research, I will now examine some of the techniques that are used to create categorisations of people and social groups.

Othering

Goffman (1973) writes that we consider people by regarding obvious categories, such as having a specific sexuality, disability, or mental illness, and we then ‘read’ the person through our understanding of a stereotype which then encapsulates their entire personality. Through this technique we can measure our own sense of self in a process which Goffman (1959: 4) describes as ‘self-other differentiation’. We come to know who we are by reading how different we are from the ‘other’, and find a bond with people who exhibit characteristics which are seen as similar to our own (Link & Phelan 2001). Stigma thus can be seen to have both a social bonding effect by marking out inter-groups differences and also has a role in constraining people’s

presentation through a technique which Scambler (2006: 289) calls the 'maintenance of face'. According to Scambler, people present a consistently positive self-image which is enacted within the consensus-agreed definitions of that role.

However, the creation of the 'other' instigates problems when a narrow range of acceptable behaviour allows the formation of prejudice as described by Allport (1954: 42): 'Hostility toward out-groups help strengthen our sense of belonging [...] the familiar is preferred. What is alien is regarded as somehow inferior.' This become a system of circular reinforcement: those seen as dissimilar are held at an increasing difference, we thus bond more tightly to peers, and the chances of breaking the divisions between the two groups becomes evermore entrenched. This phenomenon has been examined by Tarrant (2002), Tajfel (1982) and Sherif (1961) who noted how forcing a bonded group to work co-operatively with an out-group could dissipate inter-group hostilities.

While the majority of social scientists rely on social constructionist reading of sexuality, it is not universal. Halwani (1989) points to John Boswell's rejection of social constructionism, and Halwani himself argues more strongly in favour of essentialism. The fact that the term 'homosexual' did not come into existence until the late nineteenth century does not mean that there was no homosexual activity, simply that that there was no categorisation based on the nominator. However Halwani presents this as proof of social constructionism's failure. Coining the term simply presented a theoretical technique with which to consider it. Halwani's argument is therefore semantic, an attempt to present sexuality as an unchanging, core constituency, which underplays the malleability of this drive across an individual's life. The behaviour has long existed but the categorisation of it less so. While the activity is found across human society and the animal world, the constructs of 'homosexual', and to a greater extent 'gay' have cultural contingencies that Halwani's ontological hair-splitting does nothing to illuminate.

Hierarchies

When social systems are reduced to binaries, taboos function to mark out the boundaries between the authorised and the prohibited (van Gennep 1960; Weeks

2003). In this process, hierarchies of status levels develop and operate across a broad range of social institutions. The following brief list illustrates some of the areas of research into gender and sexuality which have discussed the role of hierarchies in delineating social power:

- Rubin (1984) reports hierarchies of sexualities, with monogamous, married heterosexuality being dominant. Unmarried monogamy has less status; non-monogamy less still. Homosexuality ranks below this, with more status for monogamy than non-monogamy, and the lowest status being afforded to paedophiles.
- Bersani (1987) criticises Altman's (1982: 79) view that a 'Whitmanesque democracy' exists in gay bathhouses. To Bersani, bathhouses are hierarchical, with status predicated upon looks, genital size, muscularity and age.
- Donaldson (2001) and Kupers (2001) identify hierarchies of status in prison, with different status afforded, depending on whether one was penetrator or penetrated.
- In the same volume, Anonymous (2001) also describes status of sex role, with penetration being equated with emasculation. As well as sexual hierarchies, Anonymous also described co-occurring hierarchies of ethnicity, with power imbalances between different groups. However, Hensley and Tewkesbury (2002) caution against over-emphasising coercive or violent same-sex sex in prison, noting both the amount of consensual sexual activity, and also the fact that this is a far less researched area of penology.
- Within the concept of discrimination, Pallotta-Chiarolli (1995) found that schools reinforce narrow gender presentations by allowing homophobic language to go unchallenged, while reacting quickly to racism: there is apparently a hierarchy of forms of discrimination.

Fone (2001: 12) concurs. Homophobes will feel that discrimination is allowable as they see themselves as bastions of morality protecting their society: 'they can indeed proudly embrace their homophobia.' This allows heterosexuality to be positioned above homosexuality, and shows the potential for the use of social or physical violence to mark out the hierarchy. Speaking in a documentary about his life, English writer Quentin Crisp (*Mavis Catches up with Quentin Crisp*, 1998) said:

[Homophobic violence] is due to the fact that everybody during the course of a lifetime piles up a great deal of indignation: there's your wife who no longer loves you, there are your children who no longer obey you, there is your employer who never gives you any advancement. And one day you see someone *who nobody can blame you for attacking*, and it all pours out (emphasis added).

Masculinity is in most instances privileged above femininity, and within masculinity, there are a series of competing and at times contradictory hierarchies:

- Keddie (2003: 291) refers to the need for boys to jostle for dominance within 'pecking orders'.
- Courtney (2000) ranks urban, heterosexual and wealthy masculinities above rural, gay or poor masculinities.
- Messerschmidt (2000), Messner (1992) and Stanko (1994) describe the benefits of the 'right' body and the capacity to use it violently, and be seen to be able to take violence as means to elevate one's masculinity status.
- Kimmel (1990; 1996), and Kimmel and Kaufmann (1994) describe status being attached to such externalities as being non-emotive, autonomous and sporting. Men who are emotional, dependent, or not as physically competent receive lower rankings on the hierarchies.
- Plummer (1999; 2001, 2005) writes that attentiveness to education in childhood brings negative status and yet is closely correlated with earning potential – and its attendant high status – in adulthood. This indicates how status indicators are malleable over time.
- Connell (1995: 78) describes gay men as being 'at the bottom of a gender hierarchy among men'. They are the 'subordinated masculinities' (1995: 79; 2000: 30) against which dominant forms are measured.

While men in general are elevated, very few actually feel that they have access to power as it is controlled by a small number of men in a very limited category (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005; Kimmel 1994).

Ritual

In the absence of an essential way to be human, the constructed nature of society requires markers to delineate how society understands itself and telegraph ideas of acceptable behaviour. Ritual functions to convey these ideas, and acts as markers

between hierarchies as described above. Fitzclarence and Hickey (2001), Hardin (2000) and Plummer (1999; 2006) describe similar roles of ritual in delineating successful enactment of gender and transition to adulthood through sporting ritual.

Ritual is discussed in a variety of other contexts, such as:

- Having an input into the allowable displays of emotion at times of mourning (Metcalf & Huntington 1991);
- Life-stage transitions, which are marked out by progression through school (Lewis 1985);
- The learning of acceptable sexuality through ritualised sex-talk (Mac an Ghail 1994);
- And ritualised homophobic violence showing adherence to peer-group expectation as a rite of passage (van der Meer 2003).

The presentation of gender in media becomes solidified into ritualised performances, and deviations from these scripts risks punishment (Goffman 1987). We 'read' people, attaching meaning to the signs of sexuality, class, age, employment, based on what society tells us that these signs mean (Saco 1992). Ritual functions as a bonding mechanism, allowing shared norms to delimit group identity (Muir & Seitz 2003) and their utility at both structural levels and in micro-enactments:

...can be seen as a dynamic process that at once reproduced the structure and cultural ethos of a community and, at the same time, enables the community to enmesh itself in its own identity (Sabo & Panepinto 1990: 116).

Contagion

As positions on hierarchies can move, status can be gained or lost through risky choices. One of these can be placing yourself in proximity to those with lower status. In *Stigma*, Goffman (1963: 30) writes 'the tendency for a stigma to spread from a stigmatised individual to his [sic] close connections provides a reason why such relations tend to be either avoided or terminated.' Weinberg (1972) speaks of the contagion effect that a stigmatised category like 'homosexual' can attain: it becomes socially dangerous to affiliate with anyone known or suspected to be gay, as this may cast a pall of suspicion over you (Herek 2004). Contagion has literal meanings in

health contexts, where people will avoid those with infectious diseases, although the level of the response is often out of proportion to the risk of infection (Herek, Capitanio & Widaman 2002).

In non-medical contexts, contact with stigmatised groups has the potential to break down social barriers. Allport's (1954) contact theory shows that increased contact with outgroups can dissolve stigma. However, this may fail if entrenched ideas dominate and are acted upon before social contact can challenge the stereotypes. Despite social contact in a bar, Matthew Shephard was killed when the contagion threat of his sexuality was seen as a justifiable cause for murder in order to create distance from that threat (Corrigan & Matthews 2003). Tomsen (1993; 1994) found that 25% of all stranger murders in New South Wales were gay-hate crimes, and while murder is an extreme example, lesser examples of social rejection exist. Tomsen and Mason (2001) found similar motivations for gay bashings in Australia, as men who were seen to betray gender norms were considered to be fair game for assault, regardless of the sexuality of the victim. In the Netherlands, van der Meer (2003) found that gay bashings functioned to broadcast adherence to the hegemonic, heterosexual masculinity of the bashers. Despite the fact the bashers were generally strangers, there was an apparent need to violently perform hegemonic adherence for this short-lived peer group.

Plummer (1999; 2001) cites the failure to embody hegemonic masculinity as the prime cause of homophobia, noting how any softness in males may be symbolically and literally expunged through homophobic violence. The public enactment of violence shows peers how tightly bound to gender ideals one was. Less physically violent, but still psychologically damaging is the social exclusion predicted by Goffman's (1973) stigma model. From shunning to insulting to hitting to murdering, these are mere steps on the hierarchy of exclusion and escalating violence which underpins homophobia.

Taking these considerations – the input of the social world, the creation of the 'other' to shape a sense of self or group identity, social hierarchies, ritualised policing of boundaries, and the threat of contagion – I will now look at three overlapping constructs that are central to the formation of individual identity and integration into

society: the development of ideas about gender, sexuality and the practise of homophobia.

Gender

Knowledge of the body has shifted over time as different discourses have dominated different cultures and epochs. The Biblical view, which still influences Jewish, Christian and Islamic cultures, held that God created man and woman in His [*sic*] own image (Gen. 1.27 Authorized King James Version). As Adam was created first, and Eve taken from his rib, (Gen. 2.7; 2.21), a binary of gender with male superiority has permeated these cultures and others that have been colonised by them. A pervasive fear and misunderstanding of sexuality permeated pre-modern societies, and as women were seen as responsible for the Fall from grace, femininity and female sexuality in particular became something monstrous and consuming (Turner 1999; Wood 2000).

This view was reformulated later as science came to control knowledge of the body (Lacquer 1990). This resulted in the differences between the genders emphasised by science, rather than religion, despite the view that the similarities between genders outweigh the differences. Reproductive systems have come to enunciate and 'prove' the differences between the genders (Plummer 2005; Weeks 2003), and the female was considered to be an incomplete male featuring inverted, undeveloped genitals (Turner 1999). Beyond Modernity's view of science is the realm of shifting, malleable boundaries and categories that constitutes postmodernity. In its rejection of simple categorisation and causality, postmodernity sees that knowledge is rarely black and white. Sexuality or gender are not binaries with rational, provable causes but are more likely products of multiple inputs, a blurred line between genetics and biological programming, overwritten with socially-learnt concepts about appropriate behaviour.

Despite the variations of gender shown in schoolyards and the difficulties for children who do not fit in with the majority, the general tendency not to question gender norms persists. From this we can deduce that the behaviour of all children is constrained by the social norms of gender, and in the absence of an essential core, gender must be continually enacted in line with Butler's (1995) concept of the performativity of

gender. Connell (1989: 291) writes that boys use 'getting into trouble' as a method of learning their sense of masculinity: gender construction is not done in isolation, but is a collective process, 'the social dynamic in which masculinities are formed'.

Nonetheless, the attraction of having the complex social world explained in simple terms means there is an ongoing reliance on simplistic explanations. Essentialist readings of gender abound, ascribing evolutionary and biological determinations to the differences between the sexes. However as the existence of variations such as intersex people attest, there is more to masculinity and femininity than chromosomes, or levels of testosterone or oestrogen. Fausto-Sterling (2000) refers to gender, like sexuality, as a continuum, and she includes conditions such as Turner's syndrome and Klinefelter syndrome in her claim that 1.7% of the population can be considered intersex – a broad categorisation which she terms 'non-dimorphic sexual development' (2000: 52). Sax (2002) notes that few clinicians consider these syndromes as embodying intersex, and proposes the much lower figure of 0.018%. Regardless of which figure is closer, masculinity and femininity are complex states that involve more than a binary instigated by hormones, and the broader thesis of Fausto-Sterling is that the binary fails as it is a reductive understanding of a nuanced, often shrouded category system.

Simply viewing all men as 'masculine' and all women as 'feminine' with no variance risks becoming a self-reinforcing cycle as described by Butler (1995) wherein she writes that a binary of gender becomes so ubiquitous that it is retroactively interpreted as being an essential aspect of the body. Gender, so deeply integrated into how we perceive our identities, then becomes a fraught terrain when we see other enactments that differ from what we assumed to be the 'real' way to be male or female.

The impact of the social world on ideas of masculinity are enunciated by Kimmel (1994: 121) when he writes that:

...manhood is neither static nor timeless; it is historical. Manhood is not the manifestations of an inner essence; it is socially constructed [...] we tend to search for the timeless and eternal during moments of crisis, those points of transition when old definitions no longer work and new definitions are yet to be firmly established.

Connell (1987) also discusses the impact that unstable times have on people's ideas of gender, describing the reaction to second wave feminism and gay rights by conservative American Protestantism. This idea is also examined by Beal (1997) who links reaction to non-traditional gender relations with a changing economy. Founder of the American fundamentalist Christian men's movement, the Promise Keepers, Tony Evans, is a former football coach. He claims that:

...the primary cause of this national crisis is the feminization of the American male. When I say feminization, I am not talking about sexual preference. I am trying to describe a misunderstanding of manhood that has produced a nation of sissified men (in Beal 1997: 277).

Homophobia is not solely related to sexual behaviour, but rather the transgression of hegemonic gender norms, functioning as the 'dragon at the gates of an alternative masculinity' (Flood 1995 online). Evans explicates the link to gender transgression, while sidestepping accusations of homophobia.

'Crisis' is again cited as a motivator towards traditional gender roles in several instances in recent years:

- The Cold War was a period of uncertainty, where difference was feared and policed. Homosexuality was linked to effeminated males and spreading communism and gender norms were strictly enforced (Abelove 2003; Weeks 2003).
- The contemporary collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the rise of the Taliban are both cited by Connell (2005) as responsible for ushering in the return to traditional gender roles in Afghanistan.
- In a local context, Connell (2005) describes how the collapse of the fishing industry in the Torres Strait left the gendered world in a state of flux, which was counteracted by the reintroduction of initiation rituals to properly school boys into acceptable, traditional masculinity.

Organisations such as Promise Keepers seeks to reinstate an aggressive, dominant form of masculinity which Evans sees as men's natural state, but there seems to be a blindspot which countermands the 'essence' of masculinity. David and Brannon (1976: 13-27) detail four aspects of successful masculinity that boys must learn to embody:

- Avoid ‘sissy stuff’ so no-one questions your masculinity and sexuality;
- Be a ‘Big Wheel’ to demonstrate your status;
- Be ‘Sturdy Oaks’ by suppressing any emotion which may cause you to look weak;
- Display ‘Give ‘em Hell’ aggression in business or sporting interactions.

And yet if masculinity were a stable, core component to manhood, why would we need to learn such attributes?

Creating gender by ‘othering’

The role of ‘othering’ in gender allows masculinity to be taught by showing boys and men what they are supposed to be – by learning to fear the unauthorized masculinities (Renold 2004). Goffman (1963: 153) neatly summarises what masculinity should encapsulate:

...there is only one complete unblushing male in America: a young, married, white, urban, northern, heterosexual Protestant father of college education, fully employed, of good complexion, weight and height and a recent record of sports. Every American male tends to look out from the world from this perspective.

The continual presentation of this hegemonic version of masculinity has the effect of drumming it into our consciousness, ‘the sedimentation in the body of an infinitely repeated discourse’ (Foucault 1988: 97). By taking white, middle class heterosexual masculinity as the benchmark, all other masculinities can be compared and ranked on hierarchies of power: this is the reference point ‘from which everything else remains a falling away’ (Weeks 2003: 4). From this perspective gender can be learnt – but one of the aspects that is eventually learned is that gender is amorphous, changing and unable to be attained fully. It is a series of ‘ideals that are never quite inhabited by anyone’ (Butler 1995: 32). It has frequently been described as being in crisis, for example:

- Badinter (1995) sees the crisis developing in the 1600s in Britain.
- Kimmel (1996), Messner (1987), and White (1993) describe a crisis in reaction to the closing of the American frontier in the late nineteenth century and the development of urbanisation.

- Mac an Ghaill (1994) links urbanisation and the attendant changes on work practices of the Industrial Revolution across the West.
- Both Kimmel (1990) and Messner (1992) point out that the ‘crisis’ was not the same for all men, but was in fact a crisis in *hegemonic* masculinity most acutely felt in white, middle class Protestants.
- Overlaying all of these views is that of Buchbinder (1994) who states that masculinity has *never* been a stable constant and can thus be seen to be in a permanent flux.

These statements refer to masculinity at a macro, societal level: as Plummer (1999) shows, ideas of what are considered to be successful masculinity vary across a man’s life, from physical domination in youth to wealth as denoting power in later life. Thus masculinity is not only unstable across time and societies, it is also unstable within societies and across the lives of individual men. It is, to use the term coined by Durkheim (1933; 1952) a state of anomie, that is, a state of normlessness.

So we can perhaps lay the ghost of essential, core masculinity aside. We will now examine how masculinity has been enacted in different populations at different times, and how they have caused the West to re-think ideas of what manhood is for us now.

Masculinity over time

From the Age of Reason, the ownership of knowledge that the Church maintained from the early Christian period came under challenge. Darwin’s (1989) 1831-1836 travels on the *Beagle* presented perhaps the most serious challenge to Church doctrines since Copernicus in the fifteen century, that of the theory of evolution. Major reevaluations of a range of phenomena followed as the Industrial Revolution made the scientific examination of natural world more accessible though technology. Advances in travel technology opened the social world of other continents and oceans to anthropologists. While ideas of a ‘third sex’ were not unknown in the West, (see Rictor, 1991; 1992 for a discussion on London’s ‘Molly houses’), this was a subculture that was reviled and liable to prosecution in Europe. Anthropological evidence found a wide range of enactments of gender beyond the hegemonic binary, and with varying degrees of social acceptance. In the Cheyenne nation, roles of men

and women overlapped with some men taking on the role of *berdache*; the Omani had the *xanith*, in Islamic cultures, the *khanith*, in India the *hijra*, and Polynesia had *mahu* (Bordo 1999; Gilmore 1990; Kenny 1992; Rupp 2001). Jacobs, Thomas & Lang (1997) and Pilling (1997) reject the European-based term *berdache*, with its implications of lower, penetrable status, preferring instead *two-spirit* people. A modern example of existence between the gender binaries is that of the *travesti* in Portugal and Brazil (Bordo 1999; Rupp 2001): non-castrated transvestite prostitutes who develop breasts through hormonal treatment and silicone injections. In this example, the changing technologies of endocrinology and plastic surgery combine to re-create gender.

The challenges that the blurred gender roles presented to the hegemonic gender order of invading cultures was too great, and the Christian missionaries attempted to eliminate such variations as they advanced. In the early colonial period, Connell (2005) describes how new populations were gendered according to the standards of the colonisers' homelands, by a small, unrepresentative group of men: soldiers, cowboys, conquistadors, and in the Australian version, the outback man. This homogenising of culture continues in a globalised world, with pervasive electronic media imagery presenting gender ideals of the West across the developed and developing societies (Connell 2005) – although the majority of people in developing nations have little access to electronic media. Also of note is the fact that the West is not monolithic in its gender representations, and beyond its traditional imagery and media forms can be found a world of diversity: in alternate media, particularly the borderless Internet.

Valourised masculinity in the West is largely performed in a limited range of scripts as described by Kimmel (1996): autonomous, strong and emotionally restrained. In Australia, perhaps the highest enactment of masculinity is found in sport, and the rougher the sport, the more successfully communicated is a sense of masculinity. Rugby, particularly in the eastern states, with its bone-jarring physicality, aggression and homophobic codes of male interaction (Hutchins & Mikosza 1998) portrays a physically powerful, aggressive dominant masculinity that boys and men are expected to aspire to.

The construction of gender: A summary

We are left with an unstable way of experiencing gender, liable to influences from merging cultures and riven with power dynamics. Gender is not a singular way of being, but one that is shaped by the geographical, urban, economic, and political environments. Fear of change, or perceived weakness, force it into narrow enactments when other factors of the society and the polity are in flux. So entrenched is the hegemony that it is difficult to individually resist it: Skelton (1996) gives the example of teachers, most of whom treat boys and girls differently. Those who attempt to interact with students beyond the confines of the gender hegemony find that they are competing with entrenched attitudes from other teachers and parents – and that the students have already absorbed many traditional ideas of gender by the time they get to school.

The possibility of being the wrong sort of man is a powerful moderator of men's behaviours. The desire for simple categorisations of 'acceptable' and 'unacceptable' give simplistic divisions like 'male' and 'female' a potency that overwhelms the similarities between the sexes, and maximises and problematises the differences. As such, masculinity becomes the 'relentless repudiation of the feminine' (Kimmel 1994: 25). Masculinity is a continuum on which men – and particularly boys who are trying to establish their masculine identities – jockey for dominance. At one end are aggressive, physically dominant boys who maintain their superior social position through violence and humiliation (Thorne 1993), which is seen as an acceptable enactment of boys 'doing boy' (Epstein et al 2001: 163). This is authorised by teachers (see Gilchrist, Howarth & Sullivan 2003; Keddie 2003) and sport's coaches (Fitzclarence & Hickey 2001). The role of homophobia in shaping boys behaviour into the aggressive, hegemonic forms is shown when homophobic harassment goes unchallenged by teachers (Meyer 2005; Pallotta-Chiarolli 1995) and even used as a negative motivator by coaches which acts to keep sport as a heterosexual domain (Griffin 1995).

Opposing aggressive, hegemonic enactments are the subordinated masculinities described by Connell (1987; 1995) and Connell and Messerschmidt (2005): the sissy boys whose experiences of isolation and humiliation Rofes (1995) records. These are

the monstrous 'others' against which the hegemonic boys perform their sense of superiority.

With this in mind, we now turn to sexuality. One of the things that the sexed body can do is to relate to other people sexually, and this section of the discussion will look at the role of sexuality in how gender is created, and how those ideas have been considered over time.

Sexuality

As in the discussion on gender, sexuality risks being reduced to simplistic categories. This is problematic in three areas:

- It assumes a binary between heterosexual and homosexual;
- It does not fully engage with the possibility of change across the course of a person's life and;
- It uses a modern concept – that of identity-based sexuality to describe a phenomenon that exists in very different enactments elsewhere, and without the benefit/constriction of categories.

This section will examine how sexuality has been and continues to be enacted in a range of forms across and within cultures. It examines the emergence in the late nineteenth century of our current categories of 'heterosexual' and 'homosexual'. This requires us to set aside the modern way of thinking of sex, and look without the lenses of taxonomy and science at the variety of ways of performing sex. As with gender, the way we see sexuality modeled around us is so all-consuming that it can appear to be the only way for it to exist. Edwards (2005: 52) writes that same-sex desire and activity exists 'in all likelihood across time and space' before being corralled into discursive categories, and Plummer (2005) argues that as bodies are different and reduced to binaries, sexuality also risks oversimplification. To do so ignores malleability and subtlety in sexuality, and only considers it from a post-Stonewall perspective based on identity politics.

Therefore an Ancient Greek, a 17th century Londoner or contemporary Melanesian, would find the term 'homosexual' is meaningless. In the late nineteenth century

sexuality began to take on identities and power dynamics contingent upon the society in which it is enacted – and, in the West, it was the emergence of discourses which created a framework for this re-conceptualisation (Foucault 1988). If there is no category which conceptualizes identity, then sexual behaviour remains simply a behaviour.

An anthropological examination of pre-Modern enactments of sexuality

Before the Modern West, other cultures had a range of sexualities, involving same- or opposite-sex object choice, but without names or identities like ‘heterosexual’ or ‘homosexual’. Perhaps the best-known form of same-sex sex is that of the *erastes* and the *eromenos* in Ancient Greece. In the Ancient world, concern around sexuality related to improper sexual drives such as being immoderate or appearing feminised. It was not the gender of the person you were having sex with which was problematic: it was having the wrong kind of sex. An adult male (*erastes*) who was penetrated either by his younger lover (*eromenos*) or his slave was seen to lose masculine status (De Cecco 1983; Dover 1989). Daniel (1991) describes same-sex sex occurring in ancient cultures in Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia, and in the early Muslim world. Christianity and Judaism were far more condemnatory of all sexual expression, in contrast to Islam which authorised sex between males – although again in regimented forms where the older man was only allowed to penetrate the younger (Rowson 1991). As Christianity spread, homosexuality in particular was increasingly problematised (Suchar 1978) although Boswell (1995) found evidence of some acceptance of same-sex relationships in the early Christian Church. In an earlier article Boswell (1982) also wrote of acceptance of same-sex sexuality in medieval Islam, although passive sexuality, again linked to fear of penetration and feminisation, was considered to devalue a man.

Like gender, there are a broad range of ways in which sexuality can be enacted outside of the binary of homosexual-heterosexual, and without the moral impediment that various religions attach to it. The West appears to be more homophobic than other cultures (Fone 2001), and as Western influence spreads, so too does homophobia. Rupp (2001) details the sexual variety which existed in pre-modern Japan, as does Taga (2005) who expands his commentary to Asia as a wider

geographical area. However as 'other' genders became problematised as the West's influence spread, so too did 'other' sexualities, and were retrospectively erased from public consciousness. The history of same sex-sex in Japan was retrospectively excised from public consciousness as 'The Western vice that we Japanese have never known' (Watanabe & Iwata 1989: 12), although the authors note that this was not simply caused by the arrival of Westerners or Christianity in the fifteenth century, but a complex of factors including the de-eroticisation of the male, and a polarisation of gender roles in the move to modern capitalism.

In discussing the absence of a recorded presence of same-sex lifestyles in American history, Chauncey (2004) makes the claim that American gay and lesbian culture prior to the 1960s was purposely erased from history. Likewise in modern Holland, the history of pre-modern homosexuality in Islam is denied as young Muslim men define their cultural identity by performing violent homophobic assaults (van der Meer 2003). Tensions around culture, gender and sexuality become dangerously interwoven as proper gender performance becomes identified with 'us' and homosexuality becomes a vice of the ethnic 'other' (Mac an Ghail 1994; Weeks 1985). The superiority of one's own group becomes entrenched by conceiving the in-group as properly masculine, and the out-group as 'othered'. The ultimate 'othering' for men was relegation to the category (regardless of sexuality) of homosexual. As Chauncey and van der Meer note, this can be at the expense of part of your cultural history which featured a now-suppressed enactment of same-sex sex.

Twentieth century anthropological research shows diverse forms of sexuality beyond the binary. Gilmore (1990), Herdt (1981; 1984), and van Gennep (1960) all detail same-sex sexual activity in Melanesia that does not have a grounding in Western constructs of homosexuality. These authors depict coming-of-age rituals, and so we see more diverse ways in which sexuality is incorporated into other cultures, beyond reproduction. Although we can consider the activities as homosexual, the identity of the actors is not. There is a same-sex erotic focus, but the activity is ritualised and these cultures do not have an understanding of concepts of 'heterosexual' or 'homosexual'. These accounts also provide 'a salutary jolt to our ethnocentricity' (Weeks 2003: 8) by forcing us to confront variability in sexuality and accept that diverse forms exist in other cultures.

The Ancient Greek, Medieval Islam and current Melanesian enactments of same-sex sex (how you had sex, not who you had it with) continued into the West until the early 20th century. Chauncey (1995) and Cleminson (2004) discuss how sexual behaviour was considered in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in New York and Spain respectively: a man could have sex with another man but not consider himself homosexual (as this category had not yet escaped the discourses of medicine to be part of the daily argot) but not have his *masculinity* challenged as long as he was not penetrated. This attitude became untenable as ideas of sexuality became linked to the *object* of the sexual interaction rather than the *activity* itself over the twentieth century.

Within the modern West, but outside of the Northern European/American/Australasian spheres, this attitude continues in what Garber (1995: 30) terms 'Latin bisexuality.' Again it is gender, not sexuality that is considered: as long as a man takes the approved male role of dominator and penetrator, his masculine status is not questioned, and by allocating the stigma of same-sex sex onto the *cochon*, or receptive partner, this allows heterosexually-identified men to have sex with other men (Altman 2001). This gender/sexuality blurring also underpins the role of the *travesti* of Brazil and Portugal (Bordo 1999; Rupp 2001). Although biologically still male, their appearance is female and the status of the men who they have sex with is not challenged as long as the *travesti* is penetrated, not the penetrator. Worth (2000; 2002) describes a confluence of factors impacting on gender liminality in New Zealand and Pacific Islands, including globalisation, migration and black American drag culture, illustrating how gender continues to be reshaped from within and without of its immediate culture. Totman (2003) adds a further consideration to this equation in his description of the 'ladyboy' culture in Thailand: effeminate males, some who can be considered transgender, some of whom – but not all – are gay, show how blurred, culturally contingent and differently enacted from our ideas gender and sexuality can become. In considering the liminal states of gender, Altman (2001: 88) warns against viewing them with a post-colonial romanticism which ascribes a simplistic label of 'gay' to a range of sexual and gender subcultures using 'the language of (West) Hollywood rather than indigenous culture'. Altman also notes that it is simplistic to assume that all traditional societies conflate 'homosexual' with

‘third sex’, and that the term entered Western sexology through Ulrichs and Krafft-Ebbing ‘as part of an apologia for homosexuality’ (2001: 89).

In the gender section of this chapter, I discussed how gender performance can come to appear self-evident and thus mutually reinforcing. So too the Thai performance of effeminised homosexuality can appear to be a self-reinforcing world, far removed from what Connell (1987: 37) terms the ‘gay machismo’ of the post-Stonewall world. However the indications of gender presentation being enacted differently in response to the social world’s perceptions of homosexuality can be found in Vito Russo’s (1987) *The Celluloid Closet*. This work details different performances of gender in American cinema in the twentieth century, showing how homosexuality has variously been presented through fey queens, pitiable neurotics, sexual psychopaths, AIDS victims and later, non-stereotype men in response to (or perhaps formative of) cultural understandings of sexuality. Quentin Crisp (1977) describes a homosexual milieu far different to the twenty-first century version. Homosexual men flaunted their effeminacy and sought sexual partners who were considered ‘real’ men – but would not consider themselves as ‘fairies’ – the category Crisp was in.

Grellert, Newcomb and Bentler (1982) found significant differences in gender-role incongruity between heterosexual and homosexual children, although the authors note weak internal consistency in their results and vastly different results compared to earlier research in this area. Overlaying this research are four disturbing aspects:

- Firstly, the uncritical use of the work of psychotherapist, Irving Bieber, notable for his homophobic approach to psychotherapy (Abelove 2003) as a key feature to their literature review and results;
- Secondly, the authors cite the 1936 Attitude-Interest Analysis Test of Terman and Miles, which Kimmel (1996) sees as problematic in its reductionist approach;
- Thirdly, they conflate homosexuality, transvestism and transgenderism into one category (Grellert et al 1982);
- Finally, their disturbing conclusion that when children exhibit non-traditional gender play, that ‘intervention be used’ albeit ‘only in exceptional cases’ (Grellert et al 1982: 477).

This approach is contrasted with a possible social basis for gender presentation as described by Connell (1987). She writes that if there is an effeminacy to gay men it is likely to be a socially learnt behaviour, a point underscored by the range of culturally contingent masculinities from pre-Stonewall fairies to post-Stonewall 'clones'. Ross (1985b) suggests that gender incongruity is correlated with levels of homophobia and gender norms in different cultures. Societies such as Scandinavian countries, which have lower levels of homophobia and less rigidly enforced gender roles, were more likely to have gender-congruent homosexuals than countries like Australia, which has traditionally been extremely homophobic and enforced strict gender roles.

Ross (1985a) notes the importance of conceptualising gender and sexuality as different aspects of personality, thus questioning the validity of Grellert et al's analysis. Adding to this perspective is the view of McIntosh (1992) who wrote the Modern West's conceptualisation of male homosexuality as effeminate arose only in the 18th century, lending more weight to the role of society in shaping behaviour of sexual subcultures. This can be seen, as with the 'ladyboys', as a culturally-allowable expression of sexual and gender diversity, or enacted to challenge the zeitgeist as Crisp proclaimed when he said that he was setting out to be as outrageously feminine as possible to educate people to the fact of his existence.

Development of homosexual communities and identities in the West

The move from homosexuality being equated with effeminacy to being equated with masculinity (or hyper-masculinity) occurred in the late twentieth century as the male body was commodified and sexualised. The response to this in the gay male community was to fetishise *masculine* masculinity, as opposed to *effete* masculinity (Flood 1993; Shilts 1987). But the groundwork for this development originated in the Industrial Revolution, and later World War II, the civil rights movements and feminism.

The impact of urbanisation caused by the Industrial Revolution allowed the formation of gay subcultures as cities rapidly expanded. These nascent communities rising in the 19th century did not provide much security beyond their walls (Greenberg 1988),

but rather a space at the edge of the mainstream, which did allow room for the subculture to develop its own signifiers away from the majority's gaze. Following the demobilisation of troops at the end of World War II, gay communities that had been developing from the late 1800s in New York and San Francisco began to explode. Young gay men from across America, who had been forced into all-male environments of the army, chose to stay in the cities rather than return to the towns of their birth (Chauncey 1995; D'Emilio 1997, Shilts 1982).

'Crisis' was earlier described as being productive of fears about gender identity. Moral panics have also risen in changing times, linking to increasing urbanisation, a destabilised rural idyll, and 'other' sexualities.

- Aldrich (2004) describes how homosexuality became conflated with burgeoning cities in the Renaissance.
- Weeks (1977) details the interplay of 'crisis' and moral decline, in which changing moral standards were ascribed as causing the French Revolution.
- Weeks (1977; 2003) notes the increasing concerns about prostitution in late nineteenth century Britain as the Industrial Revolution and urbanisation rapidly reconfigured the social geography.
- Increasing visibility of gay communities in the politically fraught Cold War engendered strong responses, as again homosexuality was aligned with 'otherness'. The fear of spreading communism was successfully linked by senator Joe McCarthy with the masculinity-sapping potential of homosexuality (Kimmel 1996).

The impact of President Eisenhower's 1953 Executive Order 10450, supposedly to protect America from homosexuality/communism, was to have thousands of men and women fired from the government jobs, and government contractors on the basis of their sexuality (Abelove 2003; Chauncey 2004). The entire McCarthy witch-hunt exemplifies Goffman's theory of stigma and contagion: to defend a communist meant you risked being called a communist, and to defend a homosexual meant your sexuality, masculinity and patriotism came under scrutiny. Although the threat of communism dissipated, fears generated around sexuality proved to be powerful recruiters for political conservatism, as the sexual revolution and emergence of AIDS

inflamed the Religious Right and saw a deepening of political conservatism in the West (Weeks 2003). 'Other' sexualities had proved to be an effective whipping boy around which to garner fear and political leverage and continue to do so as the politicisation of same-sex marriage debates illustrate in recent elections in both Australia and the United States show.

Changes in gender presentation for gay men

As gay communities grew numerically and politically, the sexual aesthetic moved from images of femininity to sexualised masculinity as the drag balls of the early twentieth century were replaced by bar and club culture (Chauncey 1995; Shilts 1982). The Black civil rights movement had provided tools of protest that were taken up by early homophile movements and lobbying for social change increased. In the United Kingdom, the Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution, generally referred to as the Wolfenden Commission (The Home Office 1957) led to legislative change in 1967. In the United States, the Stonewall riots brought a swift acceleration to the push for homosexual emancipation (Duberman 1993). The development of gay pride movements following these events lead to an upsurge in people arriving in gay ghettos, but also in self-disclosure – coming out – and a reclaiming masculine identities. This created the potential for what Rotello (1997: 61) called 'dropping the fairy-trade "role-playing" ' in favour of more democratic expressions of sexuality. Such a change in self-perception challenged the older stereotypes of gay men being effete (Connell 1987; Greenberg 1988), and a change was observed in the dress style of San Francisco's Castro district in favour of iconically masculine dress. Shilts (1987: 86) writes that the trend was caused by impoverished young men moving to San Francisco to escape oppressive home life, and buying second hand Levi's, sportswear and flannel shirts. As well as being cheap and a rejection of middle class ideas about dress, it communicated an usurping of 'working-class machismo, not the gentle bourgeois effetism of generations past'.

Hooven (1993) describes the impact of artist 'Tom of Finland' in re-creating the gay aesthetic, originally in Europe but later exporting his art and an accompanying sexual ethos to the rest of the West. While heterosexual imagery had previously been appropriated by the gay community, 'Tom' took this further by sexualising and

exaggerating imagery of soldiers from World War II, motorcyclists, and workmen of his native Finland. What originated as artistic fantasies became reality, as men in the post-Stonewall era re-formed Western ideas about homosexuality into *über-butch* three-dimensional versions of Tom's drawings, creating a simultaneous emphasis on male power and the usurping of it (Lahti 1998).

The role of discourses in shaping ideas about sexuality

Foucault (1980; 1988; 1990) describes how ideas about the social world are transmitted, restrained and shaped by what he terms discourses: authorised statements that convey information about how one is expected to behave. Discourses are not static phenomena, but adapt as the social world changes and agencies of power shift. It is power that appears to fascinate Foucault, as it permeates his work over many years.

Although I have earlier written that the Church's ownership of knowledge was challenged in *The Age of Reason*, Foucault (1980: 85) dates this earlier. He wrote that 'the West since Medieval times has attributed to science and has reserved for those engaged in scientific discourse' a reservoir of power over and to the exclusion of local, discontinuous or folk knowledge. Science became, like the Church which preceded it, a grand narrative which subsumed other knowledges as it bolstered its own position. This is not to say that science took knowledge from the Church and the power balance shifted totally. Power and discourses are always vying for dominance over other versions of power systems.

Within the Church, Protestantism and the counter-reformation stripped away the power of the confessional, and over the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, knowledge of sexuality moved to educators, jurists and the medical profession, and these competing discourses had the effect of 'passing everything to do with sex through the endless mill of speech' (Foucault 1990: 21). 1846 is seen as the defining moment when medical discourses took control of sexuality with the publication of Heinrich Kaan's *Psychopathia Sexualis*, placing non-reproductive sexuality under the rubric of pathology rather than sin as a set of medical technologies arose at this point to control sexuality in the name of public health. Although Foucault claimed that the

power systems examining homosexuality 'did not aim to suppress it, but rather to give it analytical, visible and permanent reality', the original effects of such analysis was indeed control and repression. Between Kaan's writing and the late-twentieth century removal of homosexuality as a mental disorder, there was a flurry of persecution, misinformation and political machinations.

It was in the late nineteenth century that the examination of the world undertaken by science began to turn its lens to sexuality. Early writers such as Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, Magnus Hirschfeld and Havelock Ellis began to treat sexuality as any other topic of scientific endeavour: by stripping away moralism and looking from a rational viewpoint. Ulrichs and Hirschfeld both felt that homosexuality was a form of a third sex (Abelove 2003), but not all of these attempts managed to remain value-free, as Krafft-Ebbing considered homosexuality to be an hereditary degeneracy (Marshall 1981). Regardless of any researcher's moral viewpoints, the rise of discourses altered the world. Foucault's (1990: 42) famous dictum, 'the sodomite had been a temporary aberration; the homosexual was now a species' described how discourses create categories, which then go on to shape people into behaving in the way that the category has pre-determined.

As the discourses of science and taxonomy developed in the twentieth century, ideas of gender and sexuality were categorised, and an uneasy struggle for power existed between guardians of morality and proponents of rationality. Images of sexuality and gender were tightly controlled in the media (Fejes 1992; Kimmel 1996), however, below the veneer of monoculture different lives existed, and curiosity about them prompted researchers to explore further. An epidemic of sexually transmitted infections was sweeping America in the 1920s, and it was in this environment that Alfred Kinsey began to question why sexual behaviour was so tightly controlled by morality, and what people were actually doing sexually (Gathorne-Hardy 1998). The knowledge that Kinsey uncovered about sex had the effect of opening discourses to the public, but also allowing the fear of 'others' to be effectively utilised by conservative traditionalists such as McCarthy.

Freud's liberal attitudes to homosexuality predate Kinsey. In 1935, Freud wrote that 'Homosexuality is assuredly no advantage, but it is nothing to be ashamed of, no vice,

no degradation' (in Abelove 2003: 1). While Freud (1970) rejected Ulrich's suggestion of a third sex, he did not waver in his refusal to pathologise homosexuality. Freud and Kinsey helped to re-shape ideas about sexuality in the West, but Freud was misinterpreted (at best; hijacked at worst) in the hands of early American psychoanalysts such as James Putman and Smith Jelliffe. Psychoanalysis, overlaid with American puritanical morality, came to view homosexuality as a mental illness (Abelove 2003). This was the environment in which Kinsey and his team began their research. Competing discourses attacked, parried and re-attacked each other with the powerful forces of morality squared off against a growing body of scientific knowledge. Despite Freud's writings, psychoanalysis's assaults on homosexuality became more vociferous, and as a science in its own right provided its own research to counter Kinsey and other researchers such as the psychologist Evelyn Hooker (1957). Still, psychoanalysis maintained its position that homosexuality was caused by arrested psychosexual development under the tutelage of Sandor Rado, Irving Bieber and Charles Socarides, each more strident than the last in their denunciations of any sexuality but heterosexuality (Abelove 2003).

Running parallel to the medical investigations of sexuality were the anthropological examinations of gender in non-Western cultures by Malinowski (1932) and Mead (2000) in the first half of the twentieth century, and later examinations of sexuality by van Gennep (1960) and Herdt (1981). None of these disciplines on their own were sufficient to explain the complexity of sexual attraction and behaviour, but all added to an opus of knowledge far more detailed than the morality-based proscriptions of early periods. A contested ground emerged wherein various disciplines jostled for supremacy in the knowledge and control of sexuality. This was not simply an occurrence which began with anthropologists, sexologists or Benkert himself, but rather had been in progress for millennia, as Weeks (2003: 3) describes:

...what was mooted in the debates of late antiquity, codified by the early Christian disquisitions on the flesh and personalized in the procedures of the Catholic confessional and Protestant witness before God, reached an apotheosis in the nineteenth century as medicine and psychology, sexology and pedagogy, took on a role, alongside the Churches, of establishing moral and social standards.

Discourses shaping behaviour

Kinsey, Pomeroy & Martin's (1949) *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* found that approximately one in ten American men thought of themselves as exclusively homosexual, and that 37% had sex to the point of orgasm with another male. Although the Kinsey methodology has been criticised, the original findings were replicated once the original data had been re-examined to remove the statistical bias of over-representation of incarcerated men (Gebhard & Johnson 1979). Other researchers have found differing rates of same-sex attraction may equally be shaped by discourses or interpretations of the research question. Michael et al (1994) estimated 1-3% of the American adult male population had same-sex attraction: these authors note that the figures vary depending upon whether questionnaires ask about sexual behaviour or identity. As not all same-sex attracted men will admit to this still taboo activity, under-reporting must be considered. Smith et al (2003) note how different methodologies and research questions will elicit differing responses to questions about sexual behaviour. In their random-sample survey of Australian sexual behaviour, Grulich et al (2003) cite variability in international research findings, with 1.1% of English and French men having same-sex sexual experience in the past year compared to 6.3% of men in the Netherlands. Grulich et al found 5.9% of Australian men had had same-sex sex over their lifetime, and 1.1% in the past year: commenting on this same research, Smith et al (2003) also note that this sample's over-representation of participants with higher-status employment and education attainment may predispose respondents to more liberal attitudes – although the authors do not indicate whether this will correlate with higher or lower levels of same-sex sex. This research is in sharp contrast to both the Kinsey research, and previous Australian research by Ross (1988), who conducted face-to-face interviews regarding HIV risk categories. Within this study, participants were also asked to privately complete a short written survey and send it back by reply-paid post. This found that 11.2% of men had same-sex sex across their lifetime and 6.1% in the past 12 months. Smith et al queries the 40% refusal rate for these questions, but as this part of Ross's investigation required additional motivation on behalf of participants (filling in the survey and posting it back), the refusal rate can perhaps be attributed to lack of motivation rather than embarrassment about the questions.

Kinsey, Pomeroy & Martin (1949) express caution in ascribing concrete categories to sexual behaviour, noting the variability of behaviour and identity over time, and in specific locations. An important fact to note, however, is that if there was a higher rate of same-sex activity reported in the Kinsey study due to otherwise-heterosexual men being deprived of female sexual companions and only having access to male sexual companions in prison, this illustrates Kinsey's belief in the mutability and contingency of sexual behaviour. Men placed in a gender-specific environment adapted their sexual behaviour to fit the available sexual marketplace of the prison. These men did not become 'gay'; they simply adopted same-sex behaviour for the duration of their incarceration. This is directly comparable to non-Western enactments of sexuality, such as the Melanesian examples cited by Gilmore, Herdt and van Gennep: sexual object choice is fluid and informed by social contingencies which shape and restrict choices to suit the philosophy and morality of the group. Similarly, Hensley and Tewkesbury (2002) present a meta-analysis of rates of same-sex sex in prisons, indicating that sexual object choice is indeed fluid and malleable, with up to 65% of men having sex. Although this section is discussing the input of discourses on sexuality, and these citations refer to the social constructedness of sexuality, it illustrates the overlaps between ideas of discourse and social construction wherein they influence each other symbiotically. To Kinsey, sexuality was not a binary, but a continuum, and men's positions on the continuum changed over time. Because of this, Kinsey was cautious about readers putting too much emphasis on categorisation which he saw as limiting (Stein 1992). In effect, this work simply found, in a Western context, a similar degree of sexual variety which anthropologists had already observed in other societies. However, once the men left prison and its liminal environment, they were again controlled by discourses which would consider any same-sex contact as deviant.

This idea of fluid sexual object choice is continued in the most contentious data on the Kinsey report (1949: 176-180): tables 31 to 34 discussing pre-pubescent sexual response. These data back up Freud's (1970) theory of infant sexuality, and the non-gendered direction that sexual response can take. The boys were reacting to stimulation, not specifically heterosexual or homosexual, as some of them were too young to have understandings of ideas of gender in regards to acceptable sexual

object choice. It is only later, as the boys grow and become aware of discourses of gender, sexuality, sex, 'otherness' etc, that such sexual behaviour becomes problematised. Freud's ideas of the latent period of childhood sexuality therefore may be seen to be induced discursively by parental and societal disapproval of sex in general. Later, erotic choice is focused by society towards the opposite sex, and prohibitions against homosexuality create an atmosphere in which these desires must be suppressed. Similar data is found in the diaries of Australian pedophile Clarence Osbourne (Wilson 1981). This data set, which lists sexual contact with 2500 boys and adolescents show how responsive males are to sexual stimulation, not stimulation that is specifically characterised as heterosexual or homosexual. Thus, as boys grow, and learn the social ideals of sexual behaviour, their erotic choices and behaviour come to be shaped by those discourses.

The diversity that Kinsey discovered brought the discourses of diversity into the public domain, and these were expanded further by Klein (1993). While Kinsey's continuum is based on behaviour, Klein also examined attraction, fantasy, emotional preference, social preference, and whether one had a heterosexual or homosexual lifestyle. Rather than one continuum, Klein proposed a grid of scales which were not always congruent. One could be gay on behaviour but straight on identity, or have different positions on attraction compared to emotional preference. As people's identities and attractions change over time, Klein also suggested that a temporal scale would assist in illustrating the mutability in sexual responses that people experience. Schmidt et al (1994) give an example of discourses shaping behaviour by replicating a 1970 survey of sexual behaviour with young German males in 1990: although the cohort was matched for age, educational level and socio-economic status, there was a dramatic decline in same-sex sex occurring in 1990. It was proposed that this occurred for three reasons:

- There was more social prohibition against young women having casual sex in 1970, therefore boys who wanted recreational sex would find this in each other's company. By 1990, sexual emancipation had allowed young women to partake in recreational sex.
- Between 1970 and 1990, the notion of 'gay' had become known to the extent that any same-sex sex was seen as gay, rather than simply boys having sexual

fun. Prior to the gay rights movement, same-sex sex, while still considered to be sinful, was not seen as gay.

- By 1990, 'gay' had become an identity unto itself, and any same-sex sex would involve boys psychically adopting an identity that did not relate to other aspects of their sexual personas. The discourses of gay liberation had now reduced the range of sexual behaviour for young men.

Tables 31-34 of Kinsey, the Osbourne diaries, historical documentation by Dover and Boswell, the anthropological evidence of Mead, Malinowski, van Gennep and Herdt, and the recent historical examinations of Chauncey all show that sexual response is flexible, and although Kinsey's one-in-ten shocked America in the 1940s, if anything it underestimates the potential level of same-sex contact of men. Schmidt's study gives a clear indication that attitudes to sexuality and actual behaviour are shaped by changing discourses: the categorisation of sexuality in the nineteenth century, and the co-opting of knowledge about homosexuality by medical, psychiatric and legal discourses. Discourses moved to those of human rights following the sexual revolution, and the discourse of pathology began to shift: it was no longer the homosexual who was sick and needed changing, but the society and its homophobic responses to sexual differences (Reynolds 2002).

The construction of sexuality: A summary

This section began by looking at how sexuality is widely assumed – like gender – to be a core characteristic of our personality: unchanging, determinate on our self-concept and gender identity, and if not heterosexual then problematic. However, as the variety of ways in which sexual activity occurs across the world, and the changing meanings that same- or opposite-sex sex have had even in the twentieth century show, sexuality is fluid and open to re-negotiation. This conflict between what we are taught to believe sexuality is, and how we may actually experience it, creates states of confusion and tension. If we are not who we think we are, or may not always be this way forever, what does this say about who we are as sexed, sexual beings? It is the policing of these fears that we now look at, in the final section of this literature review: the development of homophobia.

Homophobia

The sources of homosexual oppression are a chain of many historical processes, according to Plummer (1975). Ecclesiastical law become secular law, and chance factors not directly related to homosexuality itself nevertheless had an effect on it. An example of this is the 1533 anti-sodomy law introduced by Henry VIII, which was intended to create leverage for the king against the Church. Although these were to prevent non-procreative sex between men and women, and sexual contact between men or between men and animals, they were largely enacted against same-sex sex. In 1885, the Labouchere Amendment was a last-minute addition to legislation aimed at protecting women and children from prostitution but which effectively criminalised homosexuality (Fogarty 1992; Marshall 1981; Plummer 1975; Weeks 1977; 1981). For such legislation to be written, a conceptualisation of ‘wrong’ sexuality was required and, unsurprisingly, the category of homosexual was named the following year. This is an example of changing power dynamics and a shift in the ownership of knowledge, as the discourses of religion and canon law moved to discourses of science and secular law (Plummer 1975). Foucault (1990) saw that discourses were both an instrument and an effect of power. They simultaneously transmit power but also allow for the formation of opposition as power is codified into a comprehensible whole that people may submit to or revolt against. In effect, ‘reprimand does not merely repress or control the subject but forms a crucial part of the juridical and social *formation* of the subject’ (Butler 1993: 123, original emphasis). Thus the formation of medical or juridical discourses around homophobia shape and are shaped by the society, and homophobia itself becomes a discourse.

As medicine created the category of the homosexual, a reaction to this category was the development of homophobia. Weeks (1977: 21) highlights the libel and indecency trials of Oscar Wilde as a temporal fulcrum: from that moment on homosexuality was defined as a fearful ‘other’, written into the public consciousness through courtroom proceedings and newspaper converge.

The Wilde trials were not only the most dramatic, but also the most significant events, for they created a public image for the homosexual, and a terrifying moral tale of the dangers that trailed close behind deviant behaviour. They were labelling processes of the most explicit kind, drawing an impassable border between acceptable and abhorrent behaviour.

The term 'homophobia' did not emerge for another 77 years, but as homosexual behaviour had existed before it was named (Foucault 1988), homophobic attitudes had likewise been in operation. The vitriol with which Wilde was denounced, and his imprisonment, show the danger of transgressing social norms. Weinberg simply created a new discourse with which these attitudes and their impact on the social landscape could be understood. However, the term homophobia was not without problems, as it does not describe a phobia in the classic, psychological sense.

The differences between 'phobia' and homophobia are discussed by Bowers (2002), Davies (2002), Johnson, Brems and Alford-Keating (1997), Logan (1996) and Plummer (1999) and are represented on six axes in which homophobia appear incongruent to the DSM-IV (APA 2000) definitions:

- Phobias are motivated by fear; homophobia is motivated by hatred;
- Phobias are unjustified; a homophobe will feel that his/her beliefs are justified and socially sanctioned;
- Phobias feature avoidance whereas a homophobe may actively seek out homosexuals upon whom to exercise harm;
- Phobias have no political overlay; homophobia has socio-political dimensions; People with phobias recognize that they are dysfunctional and may seek treatment; homophobes do not see any need to change;
- There is a gendered dimension to homophobia. Heterosexual men report higher male-directed homophobia but do not have the same attitude to lesbians. Heterosexual women are more lesbo-phobic but more tolerant of male homosexuality – although the degree of their female-directed homophobia is not as intense as that of heterosexual men.

This latter point is an important reminder that homophobia is more closely concerned with monitoring gender presentation than sexual behaviour. Rissel et al (2003: 119) give the following statistics for Australia: 21.4% of Australian men think sex between women is always wrong, compared to 25.1% of Australian women; 36.9% of Australian men think sex between men is always wrong, compared to 26.6% of

women. Plummer (1999; 2001; 2006) adds further examples of this gendered effect. Homophobia is likely to be triggered by:

- Childlike behaviour;
- Being slow to develop or lacking physical competency;
- Being timid or afraid to fight;
- Showing emotions, particularly crying;
- Being meticulous in self-presentation;
- Being academically inclined, and being teacher's pet;
- Being a loner and rejecting peer-group approval;
- Refusing to participate in team sport, and;
- Respecting authority.

These factors are rejections or failure to comply with the group-affiliated, non-emotional, physical and aggressive models of masculinity which are valorised in our society. As Plummer (1999) notes, the use of homophobic language was shown to predate children's knowledge of sexuality and sexual difference, reinforcing his view that it is gender which is under interrogation. Boys began to use homophobic terms to police the gender-nonconforming behaviour of peers. This was not necessarily about the sexual behaviour of any of them and as this language began well before puberty and therefore according to Plummer before understandings of heterosexuality and homosexuality. Although Epstein and Johnson (1998) would argue that comprehension of sexualities was present in children well before puberty, Plummer's point is more concerned with the use of these terms being intimately involved in the control of gender – which boys understand well from an early age, rather than the more amorphous concepts of sexualities.

'Respecting authority' is an idea which contains contradictions for masculinity: in the class, it can show that a boy is academically inclined and thus separated from the peer group; but in sporting or military contexts, adherence to authority is vital for peer bonding.

Further indications of the social, as opposed to psychological, underpinnings of homophobia are in the different ways in which genders regard sexuality: right-wing

attitudes and a belief that men should be tough (Davies 2004) and religiosity Altermeyer (2001) have all been shown to predict homophobic attitudes. Hopwood and Connors (2002) ascribe this to a lessening of a social role of the Church in Australia, which causes its members to tightly bond over an agreed, despised outgroup. Three other major findings by these authors include:

- Negative attitudes towards homosexuality could also be predicted by the choice of academic major in university students at a rural Australian university, with business studies majors more homophobic (regardless of gender) than humanities students;
- Masculinity in rural areas was so highly prized that some males felt the need to ‘raise the barriers between themselves and gay men’ (2002: 89) which manifested in friendship bonds being stridently monitored by homophobic sentiment to demarcate homosocial from homosexual, with the example cited being that of interactions during physical contact sports;
- And on-going positive contact with other sexualities reduced mistrust over time, a position which is congruent with Allport’s (1965) contact theory.

A report on HIV/AIDS in South Africa by Petros et al (2006) notes how fear of transmission of the virus instigates the ‘othering’ of a series of personal attributes, including gender, race, culture and sexuality. The authors note that this occurs not only in individual interactions, but at a social level allowing some social groups to feel insulated from, in the case of the South African HIV pandemic, risk of infection: in the context of the current research, gender insecurities are projected onto an ‘othered’ sexuality.

In the earlier sections of this chapter we looked at how the fears of difference and a preference for simple binaries created a tendency to over-simplify complex categories. Men and women are supposed to ‘fit’ particular enactments of their gender, and heterosexuals and homosexuals expected to ‘fit’ particular activities and stereotypes. Any attitudes or performances that are contrary to social expectations become suppressed. Homophobia acts to restrain gender presentation and sexual behaviour, monitoring anything that is seen as either feminine or a lesser form of masculinity, suppressing Jung’s (1968) ‘anima’. Echoes of this suppression are found

in the research of Connell (1987; 1995) and Kimmel (1994; 1996), which describes interplay between misogyny and homophobia – a psychic need to drive any indication of femininity out of men. Distance from femininity is also seen as the cause of men adopting *hyper*-masculine behaviour (Flood 1993; Mosher & Tomkins 1988): however, this argument does not fully explain homophobia. Although homophobic language (poofter, faggot) and emasculating language (sissy, girl) are often drawn up in the same breath, there is, according to Plummer (1999; 2001), another layer to homophobia. The feminist model sees a continuum from masculinity to femininity being policed, but Plummer argues that this is overlaid with a related but distinct continuum – that of ordained masculinity to failed masculinity. There is nothing inherently feminine about choosing French over mathematics at school or excelling in diving rather than rugby, and yet the former of these paired examples has less status, and can be seen either as feminising (a girl's subject or a sissy's sport) or as failed masculinity. If we only consider the a continuum from masculinity to femininity, we risk forcing the examination of gender back into a binary, and as Plummer (2001; 2006) notes, it is not simply feminised masculinity being compared to hegemonic masculinity which is being policed: it is lesser, non-hegemonic or 'failed' forms of masculinity.

Further proof of the relationship between gender and homophobia, and the internal inconsistencies in the term itself, can be found in prison studies. Homophobia is not uniformly enacted upon men who have sex with each other, but only on those who have it the wrong way, i.e. passively (Donaldson 2001; Heilpern 1998; Kupers 2001; Sabo & Panepinto 2001), reminiscent of the attitudes discussed around same-sex sex in Ancient Greece, Medieval Islam, Latin bisexuality etc. I have previously addressed the overlaps between gender, sexuality and homophobia, and how social constructionism is an effective theoretical tool to examine how each of these symbiotically supports the others (McCann 2004).

The practical effects of homophobia are to monitor relationships between men. While homosociality is authorised, any closer interactions are presented as dangerous to a man's autonomy. Thus the entire population has its behaviour modified through 'a mechanism for regulating the behaviour of the many by the specific oppression of a few' (Sedgwick 1985: 88). A problem with Sedgwick's view, though, is that it

implies that only gay men ('oppression of a few') are oppressed, and yet it is the sexual behaviour and gender performance of all men which is oppressed.

- If we take Freud's polymorphous perversity as a *fait accompli*, the bisexual potential of all men is crushed by homophobia.
- As crying induced homophobia, all men learn that to express emotions publicly risks inducing emasculating homophobic names.
- Artistic interests are frequently considered by young men to be 'poofy', thus restraining any interest that young men may have in these pursuits.

If power can be exercised over the body, the person can be controlled, and if power is exercised over a social body as the above examples show, the people who make up that social body can equally be controlled. Thus the gay world can be controlled through legislation and opprobrium, and this has a macro effect on the behaviour of all men (Turner 1999). Sedgwick's position therefore features a blindspot as it is in fact the majority who are oppressed by the *highly visible* oppression of the few.

And as with narrow gender presentations or ranges of sexual behaviour, homophobia becomes sedimented into social attitudes. Homophobia reaches beyond the control of gay men, acting in Kimmel's (1994: 131) words as 'the main organising principle of our cultural definition of manhood'.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined the abilities and shortcomings of essentialism and social constructionism to examine the related fields of gender and sexuality, and looked at how homophobia is an effective technique to police transgressions from the valued performances of either.

Essentialism has been shown to be biologically reductive, and research which valorises this approach utilises faulty methodologies. Social constructionism, in its pure form, ignores the biological basis that sexed bodies are located in, ascribing to the social world an almost unrestrained capacity to create gender. Diverse disciplines, from biology and sexology to history and anthropology, indicate that both of these positions have influence on how we become adult, gendered, sexual beings.

Gender has been discussed in terms where a 'majority rules' atmosphere comes to dominate: with the world largely being made up of two sexes, a gender binary dominates. Variations from the dominant forms were incorporated into ritual, ceremonial roles in some societies, and demonised and hidden in others. Techniques of 'othering' have been effective in silencing variations in gender presentation. This occurs within cultures where those who exist between the binaries may be seen as transgressors, sinners or ill; and also between societies, where those cultures which utilise gender-liminal roles are positioned by the dominant West as primitive or godless.

Similarly, sexuality has existed in a diverse range of forms cross-culturally and historically, and yet has also been constrained at times by religion and more recently by science. Freud and Kinsey both describe a broad range of sexual expressions as the natural state, and yet procreative sex has attained dominance over other forms. As Foucault's descriptions of discourses show, human sexuality is able to be shaped and constrained by authorised or prohibited social attitudes to sex that eventually come to be part of the culture and its definition of itself through its accepted sexual practices.

In both the constructs of gender and sexuality, hierarchies operate to create more status for some categories, allowing less powerful or smaller categories to be controlled. The lack of concreteness of categories means that one's position in them is constantly under review, and so fear of being associated with a problematised 'other' acts as a powerful force to keep different groups or individuals apart. This has the effect of maximising and artificially reinforcing differences. Homophobia is a powerful social control, related to sexual behaviour, but also to gender performance. The lack of stability in both of these systems requires that they be continually performed for an audience, and performed in opposition to the 'othered' sexualities and genders.

The majority of research into homophobia to date has focussed on sexuality and the negative impacts on gay men and lesbians (Bowers et al 2006; Hillier et al 2005). More recently, gender transgressions have been examined, although gay men have still been the locus of examination (Plummer 2001; Ridge, Plummer & Peasley 2006).

The function of this research is two-fold: firstly, to examine the impact of homophobia on masculinity. This will move the focus from sexuality to gender, looking at how it has the ability to constrain a broad range of aspects of male life. Secondly, as the thesis specifically examines the impact of homophobia on Australian men, it will allow an examination of homophobia's role in shaping the national male identity. The aim is to expand on the existing work on homophobia and gay male sexuality, to allow it to be used as a broader theoretical tool in the examination of gender. While the empirical data is drawn from an Australian sample, it is contextualised within international masculinities literature from Australasian, North American and European researchers. It is hoped that the findings of this thesis can be equally applied by researchers in other countries to examine how homophobia impacts on their populations.

The 'crisis of masculinity', whether originating in the Industrial Revolution, third wave feminism, or collapsing international boundaries in a globalised world, leaves men unsure of how they are expected to behave. The tendency to rely on stereotypes and to 'other' those who appear as different from us leads to inter-group hostility. Apart from sexuality-related 'othering' in Australia over the past century, in- and out-group hostility manifested in the 'othering' of Chinese labourers in the gold rush, then of Irish Catholics, post-war Mediterranean migrants, Asian crime gangs in the early 1990s and currently in Islamophobia. This thesis aims to provide an understanding of just one of the aspects through which we 'other' the social world. Differences between men and women appear so self-evident through the manifestation of physical bodies, and yet the similarities between the sexes are underplayed. Within men, hierarchies of desired and derided masculinity force men into behaviours and attitudes which allow them to side with what they see as acceptable masculinity. This would not be problematic except that this holds many men outside of much of the male social world; leaves many other men feeling insecure about their role in the social world based on a narrow range of attributes; and authorises some very destructive practises which men perform to 'prove' that they are the 'right sort of man'. This study aims to interpret what these pressures are, how men acquiesce to or resist them, and to illustrate what discourses men are already using to position themselves in a changing gendered landscape.

When compared to women, men still have higher rates of suicide, imprisonment, substance abuse and premature and violent death. For all the social power that is ascribed to men, it is not uniformly available (Connell 1995), and masculinity appears to be failing a great number of men. This thesis aims to provide an understanding how and why men perform within the narrow range of acceptable gender scripts. It aims to enlarge the focus of homophobia beyond sexuality and onto gender more broadly, and also contribute an Australian perspective to the existing literature on masculinities. Homophobia has been shown to have major, negative impacts on how all men behave. It is my hope to provide a theoretical framework to underpin policies that impact on how boys and men are taught, socialised and employed. As well as having the potential to improve the lives of men, a greater understanding of homophobia and its role in gender also has the capacity to improve the relationships between men and the women in their lives. Finally, by highlighting homophobia as a technique through which *difference* is policed, and in- and out-group tension created, this theoretical framework could then be applied to broader social 'othering', between communities and nations, the results of which we see daily in the world news.