

UNiversitas: Journal of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Volume 2
Issue 2 *Volume 2, Issue 2 (Fall 2006)*

Article 15

9-2006

The Enfleshment of Masculinity(s): The Maintenance of Hegemonic Masculinity

Brett N. Billman
Bowling Green State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/universitas>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2006 Brett N. Billman

Recommended Citation

Billman, Brett N. (2006) "The Enfleshment of Masculinity(s): The Maintenance of Hegemonic Masculinity," *UNiversitas: Journal of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity*. Vol. 2 : Iss. 2 , Article 15.
Available at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/universitas/vol2/iss2/15>

This Forum Theme 1 is brought to you for free and open access by UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNiversitas: Journal of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity by an authorized editor of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.



**The Enfleshment of Masculinity(s):
The Maintenance of Hegemonic Masculinity**

Brett N. Billman

Abstract:

With the proliferation of the term “masculinities” over the past two decades men’s subjective experiences have come to light in an attempt to destabilize the patriarchy. However, in this time it seems that hegemonic masculinity has in fact been attempting, quite successfully, to maintain itself through the proliferation of multiple patriarchies. Examination of the enfleshment of masculinity through the physicality of the masculine body presents us with a more articulated version of hegemonic masculinity. This more articulate view begins to highlight the politics of difference present in a discussion of *Brokeback Mountain* and the wide spread deployment and growth of the term metrosexual.

The Enfleshment of Masculinity(s): The Maintenance of Hegemonic Masculinity

Brett N. Billman

Men's Studies and the study of multiple masculinities have created a parallel space near Women's Studies. The object of Men's Studies is to interrogate the patriarchy from an inside position. Our knowledge of the patriarchal system has grown thanks to these inquiries. Given this expanding knowledge I believe it is time for Men's Studies' scholars to reflexively rethink current trajectories in Men's Studies and the study of multiple masculinities. I make this call for renewed reflexivity the same way that Third World feminists did to their Western sisters. This is that in our endeavors to understand contradictory positions in the patriarchy, which are often our own, we are neglecting to question our privilege. It is paramount that we not only elevate the inequalities and contradictory positions but also the positions of privilege as well.

Men's Studies was created to provide a way for men to interrogate the patriarchy through establishing men's subjective experiences, thereby displacing the supposed objective experiences that have universalized and empowered men (Brod, 1994). By interrogating and sharing the nuances of men's experiences we have begun to destabilize what has been presented as universal objective knowledge. However, by uncovering men's subjectivity and placing it at the loci of inquiry it appears that hegemonic masculinity is attempting to maintain itself and through this maintenance, negative attitudes towards effeminate men, gay men and women are once again growing.

The study of masculinities has enlightened us to the experience and lives of men. By acknowledging and studying multiple masculinities we have learned that the power endowed by the patriarchal system not only oppresses women but men too. We have learned that not all men hold the same amount of power and that power can be stripped if men do not conform to their proscribed roles. The patriarchy is a system not only to place women at a lower level but it is also a vertically moving system to arrange men. The American patriarchy has been constructed by defining what an ideal man is. Erving Goffman (1963) wrote about this ideal over four decades ago in his book *Stigma*, "The young, married, white, urban, northern, heterosexual Protestant father of college education, fully employed, of good complexion, weight, and height, and a recent record in sports," (p. 128). This is the description that every American male has used to view the world and measure his successes and/or failures. In other words this is the marker from which all other masculinities have been measured (Goffman, 1963). Goffman's description represents the ideal which men try to achieve, but very few, if any succeed. In an attempt to achieve this ideal, masculinity fractures forming an attainable version, this form of masculinity has acquired the name Robert Hanke (1992) offers us, "hegemonic masculinity:"

Hegemonic masculinity originates within recent work in the sociology of gender. Carrigan, Connell, and Lee (1987) argue that hegemonic masculinity should not be understood as the "male role" but as a particular variety of masculinity to which women and others (young, effeminate, or homosexual men) are subordinated (p. 190).

This particular variety of masculinity maintains power, privilege, and dominance by defining what it means to be a real man and by articulating subordinate relational subjectivities. This agency occurs not only through coercion and violence but through cultural processes as well. Even since Harry Brod thrust the term "masculinities" into mainstream academic discourse by

titling his edited book, *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies* (1987), there still appears to be only one true real man and he is still constructed by the ideal that Goffman wrote about in 1963.

I want it to be clear that as a middle class, white appearing, able bodied, college educated, gay male I enter into the discussion of masculinities from a position outside hegemonic masculinity. My positioning in the patriarchy is important to note because although my goal is to disrupt the power of the patriarchy and maleness I am also bound to both by my enfleshment. It is for these reasons that I find it ethically necessary to not only locate myself within the larger social system but within these pages as well. The underlying premise of this essay has to do with this notion of the enfleshment of masculinities and how it maintains the power and privilege of hegemonic masculinity.

When talking about the enfleshment of masculinities I mean a few different things. On one hand I am talking about the physical body that is discursively marked. The masculine body conjures images of muscles, toughness and power. This very phallic vision of the masculine body also produces specters of tradition, authenticity and naturalness. The matter of masculinity is at once physical and metaphysical much like Judith Butler (1993) writes:

The body posited as prior to the sign, is always *posited* or *signified* as *prior*. The signification produces as an *effect* of its own procedure the very body that it nevertheless and simultaneously claims to discover as that which *precedes* its own action. If the body signified as prior to signification is an effect of signification, then the mimetic or representational status of language, which claims that signs follow bodies as their necessary mirrors, is not mimetic at all. On the contrary, it is productive, constitutive, one might even argue *performative*, inasmuch as this signifying act delimits and contours the body that it then claims to find prior to any and all signification (p. 30).

By destabilizing the materiality of the body Butler has pushed us to think of the importance and even the creation of the body in a different light. Through this destabilization we are able to break the bonds of manifest destiny because the very materiality of our bodies no longer dictates the course of our life. In this sense the relationship between nature and culture has been reversed. The body is no longer a site that creates culture but rather the site on which culture is applied. This application of culture to the body, in particular the male body, serves as a second layer of enfleshment. Here it becomes clear why I chose the term enfleshment to describe the enactment of masculinity. There is something very public about flesh even when we are trying to keep as much of it covered as possible. Perhaps this is why the performance of masculinities is the most obvious in public. When we sit in class and look around we know masculinity when we see it. We most definitely notice masculinity when working out at the gym, and masculinity becomes even more obvious in the locker room. Masculinity is constructed through interactions, it does not exist alone there must be something to measure itself against and react to. This interaction between the flesh of being and other beings brings us to an interesting crossroads, which is that masculinity can never wipe off the stain of the patriarchy. The system of the patriarchy continually constructs us no matter what subjective positions we hold.

Now, in the 21st century men are spending more time in the gym, tanning, grooming, and even undergoing cosmetic surgeries. This newfound male vanity, fueled by a visually stimulated culture has created a man obsessed with being seen. This obsession epitomizes Foucault's (1979) description of the panopticon, "The panoptical mechanism arranges spatial unities that make it possible to see constantly and to recognize immediately" (p. 200). This constant surveillance forces a state of self-policing that assures the automatic functioning of power. For men society

becomes a cell with no walls or doors, but which restricts us by the enfleshment of masculinity because we know that it is always being read.

The mainstreaming of images of gay men also plays a part of this newfound heterosexual male vanity. The desire of gay men to pass and not to disrupt the cultural status quo has reinvigorated the drive to obtain a masculine worked out body. These bodies that are muscular and lean suggest a level of masculinity that reflects confidence, virility and power. Ironically it was homophobia that was the driving force behind these worked out bodies.

In the 60's and 70's gay men were often times characterized as being slight and effeminate in appearance, not muscular or toned, but thin to average. Then in the 1980's the AIDS epidemic hit and those that suffered from the lethal disease were prone to its physical characteristics, those of being thin and frail, the same characteristics that used to be the gay males ideal. In a response to the disease's physical characteristics gay men began going to the gym and pumping up trying to separate themselves from the diseased and soon to be dead (Barker, 2001).

In the 90's this toning and going to the gym continued but not necessarily as a reaction to the AIDS epidemic but as a way of conforming to the mainstream. Gay men were trying to be accepted into mainstream society by their ability to pass. The best way for a gay male to pass in a hetero-normative society is to be masculine, or not disrupting predefined gender roles. This act of passing changed the ideal image of the gay male for gay men and possible partners. Gay men no longer wanted to be associated with the effeminate fairy or sissy; they wanted to be "real men," and wanted to associate with "real men" who were gay. Their bodies became a way of wearing their masculinity so that others could see them. Now personals ads and gay internet chat communities are littered with the words: "masculine," "athletic," "fit," "worked out," as well as what seem to be large pectoral sizes accompanied by narrowing waist lines. Don't forget these ads also state that they do not want any "fats," "femmes," or "trolls" (Barker, 2002). The new community ideals, queering everything has once again segregated the gay male into acceptable and unacceptable categories.

The assumption here is that men are striving for a certain body image that will not only make them desirable but privilege them as well. This does not suggest that the flesh of masculinity is becoming more important than the performance of masculinity rather the flesh is another site for performance. Men are now maintaining their masculine status through the repetition of building and maintaining this masculine body image. By becoming self aware of our subjective experiences the masculine body now has a phallic discursive image that was previously relegated to the nether regions. This bodily discourse must be interrogated and fleshed out in order to disrupt the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity.

If the physicality of our bodies is no longer the beginning but rather an effect of a discourse of power, the reiteration of that discourse through performativity creates a gap in which we can begin to interrogate masculinity.

Performativity is thus not a singular "act," for it is always a reiteration of a norm or set of norms, and to the extent that it requires an act-like status in the present, it conceals or dissimulates the conventions of which it is a repetition. Moreover, this act is not primarily theatrical; indeed, its apparent theatricality is produced to the extent that its historicity remains dissimulated (and, conversely, its theatricality gains a certain inevitability given the impossibility of a full disclosure of its historicity) (Butler, 1993, p. 12).

By deploying performativity we can begin to see how the repetitive nature of discourse constructs our realities. These repetitions are discursively created fences that maintain and contain us by

limiting our possibilities. They repeat cultural norms and values while restraining and regulating the non-normative.

Though I find Butler's work inspiring and useful when interrogating gender and the feminine it proves to be almost dysfunctional when applying it to masculinities. To me Butler does not push performativity far enough because although we engage in the performative we do not all engage it in the same way. The performativity of masculinities especially that of hegemonic masculinity resembles more closely to what Halberstam (1998) theorizes it as; "kinging,' or performing nonperformativity" (p. 259). Halberstam (1998) goes on to say, "To "king" a role can involve a number of different modes, including understatement, hyperbole, and layering" (p. 259).

Understatement as a mode describes a performers attempt to minimize performativity. Halberstam uses the example of when a drag king performs his reluctance to perform. The performance of shyness and the non-theatrical are in effect a performance of masculinity and a strategy to naturalize it. Hyperbole, is finding the exact form of masculinity that is already exaggerated and duplicating it. Halberstam (1998) uses Drag King Murray Hill's performance of the older fatter Elvis Presley to describe hyperbole; in essence Murray is performing, "Elvis playing Elvis" (p. 259). The naturalized performance of masculinity lends itself nicely to the masculine hyperbole because it imitates itself and its naturalness making the constructedness and artificiality visible through its own design. Layering is the final mode that Halberstam offers us. Layering is when a drag king performs a recognizable persona like Elvis but the drag king's femaleness is also apparent. This layering of the theatrical and the real reveals both the performer's queerness and again the constructedness of conventional gender roles (Halberstam, 1998).

By viewing masculinities through the drag king's eyes and that of her/his audience we can begin to interrogate masculinities from a performative stand point thus enabling us to see that masculinities are in fact constructed for the purposes of social control and power maintenance. Now that part of the enfleshment of masculinities is visible we can begin to critically interrogate them because though I think it is important to understand that there are multiple masculinities, there are also multiple patriarchies in which all of these masculinities operate and answer to the hegemonic form. It is the operation of these patriarchies that I am concerned with. I am concerned because much of the scholarship on men and masculinities focuses on those men's contradictory experiences to power and never mention that even though they are marginalized they still benefit, maybe only a little, but none the less still benefit for simply being men living in a patriarchal society.

Arthur Flannigan-Saint-Aubin (1994) suggests that masculinity differs from femininity because masculinity is achieved rather than developed naturally. Taking this supposition at its face value we are all feminine in the beginning and through growing up we either become masculine or we stay feminine. For men, those of us who become masculine have achieved some goal, and for those men who stay feminine they fail their gender and are less than men, they are essentially feminized or female. The worked out body is one way to achieve this masculine goal, by appearing to be masculine. Gay men have often been criticized as being woman like or at least less than male, a traitor to their sex due to their gender. But body image in the image of the athletic, muscular male in some ways constitutes a type of a "gender fuck," someone who is labeled less than male can perform and be accepted as completely male. To further complicate matters David S. Gutterman (1994) states;

The fluidity and instability of the discourses of sexuality and gender (as well as the relationship between these discourses) can also be seen in what Weeks (1985) calls, “the macho-style amongst gay men” (p. 191). The emphasis on physical strength, blue jeans, muscle shirts, tank tops, motorcycles, and other conventional characteristics of normative male gender identity is frequent in gay culture . . . [Moreover] a weight room, spa, or other physically-oriented environment often serves as a place for men to meet in gay male pornography. The adoption of such characteristics can be read as an effort at destabilizing predominant cultural constructions of masculinity (p. 228).

Gutterman argues that by utilizing traditional male heterosexual spaces and archetypes for erotic play gay men are creating a gap between the interplay of normative masculinity and nonnormative sexuality which can give way to the possibility of multiple masculinities. The problem is that Gutterman is arguing that gay men are transforming heterosexual spaces and performances. This suggests that heterosexual masculinity was in place before gay masculinity which cannot be the case because heterosexuality can not exist without homosexuality.

The attempt here is to disentangle gender and sexuality. However, masculinity and sexuality are interdependent. For men the notion of masculinity constructs our sexuality and it is through our sexualities that we confirm the successful construction of our gender identity (Fracher and Kimmel, 1995). The appearance and use of the body serves as a hierarchical gauge, which ranges from the masculine, the very strong, to the feminine, the very weak. The image of the sexual male has influenced masculinity, sexuality, and male body image. A definite conclusion can be made that striving for gay liberation has brought to surface the male’s sexual body. In doing so the heterosexual male’s body has also become sexualized and recentered as the authentic, more desired and powerful. This enfleshment enacts the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity which is always linked to heterosexuality.

Philosopher and Men’s Studies scholar Harry Brod (1995) writes that there are multiple masculinities and that often times men who are effeminate adopt a masquerade in order to pass as “real men.” These men are thereby enacting their masculinity by adopting traditional masculine qualities in order to secure a position in the patriarchy and avoiding censure at the same time.

This enfleshment of masculinity is most visible in the recent discussions of the film *Brokeback Mountain*. The Journal of Men’s Studies (2006) included four short essays centered on the film. The authors of the essays explore various meanings the film has to offer to the study of masculinities. Harry Brod (2006) suggests that the film often dubbed as the gay cowboy film be interrogated through the eyes of bisexuality in an attempt to destabilize the cultural definitions and the vertical hierarchy of heterosexual and homosexual. Richard Pitt (2006) further blurs the lines of bisexuality by comparing Jack and Ennis’s relationship to that of men on the downlow. This sharply contrasts the intersections of masculinity, sexuality and race. In the final two essays, one explores love (Rose & Urschel, 2006), and the other desire (Tuss, 2006). The fascinating dilemmas in interpreting this film are highlighted in each of these four essays not simply within each essay itself but also between the four as a whole. Are they gay or bisexual? How does race play a part in the interpretation of sexuality, masculinity and validity? Is it love or desire? All these questions point to the enfleshment of masculinities because each interpretation places the characters in a specific location relative to hegemonic masculinity.

The hypermasculine nature of Jack and Ennis’s relationship including the aggressive and rough sex scenes is what complicates their placement in the hierarchical order. Their enfleshment is that of cowboys who both get married but as spectators we cannot ignore the sexual side of their relationship. We are forced to value different aspects of each character differently. Is the fact that these two men have sporadic sexual relations with one another constitutive of their

being gay or is the fact that they both get married a sign that they are bisexual? Do we consider their happiness, love and desires to be more telling? These complications are symptoms of the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity. Because though the authors and even I are trying to reinvision new ways to interpret masculinities and other identity formations we are still swimming in the murky waters of the politics of difference. As spectators and consumers of culture we read cultural texts but not all texts are clearly made sense of. In the case of the film the text of sexuality is never clearly articulated, we are forced to make our own judgments about Jack and Ennis's sexualities. It is this urge to read and interpret that fuels the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity by creating multiple patriarchies. These patriarchies are the byproducts of multiple masculinities and the dialectic relationships between them.

Another example of the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity is the "metrosexual". The term, metrosexual, was thrust onto the public by British journalist Mark Simpson in 1994. Simpson defined the metrosexual as, "the single young man with a high disposable income, living or working in the city (because that's where all the best shops are)" furthermore, "Metrosexual man is a commodity fetishist, a collector of fantasies about the male sold to him by advertising" (1994). The metrosexual according to Simpson really had no sexuality he could be gay, bisexual or heterosexual. However, times have changed and the metrosexual is now definitely equated with heterosexuality.

The proliferation of the metrosexual was compounded exponentially by Bravo's *QueerEye for the Straight Guy* makeover series. The *Queer Eye* guys are five gay men who specialize in various aspects of life. There is Carson Kressley "fashion," Jai Rodriguez "culture," Ted Allen "food and wine," Kyan Douglas "grooming," and Thom Filicia "interior design." These five gay men enter a straight man's life and make it and him over in order to make him a metrosexual. I say to make him a metrosexual because the reasons for these makeovers are usually based on romance or professional advancement through proper consumerism. The *Queer Eye* guys help to remake the straight guy's life and in the process help to propose to a fiancé, to make a girlfriend or wife happy, or to advance in their careers. These reasons are not to be marked as a crisis of masculinity but rather as a benefit from a visit from the *Queer Eye* guys. Katherine Sender (2006) posits, "In *Queer Eye* the crisis of masculinity is framed not in terms of financial, professional, or relational pressures on men, but as a failure to grow up, to see the self as others do, and to have a positive self-regard" (p. 144). Sender (2006) argues that the show is teaching men how to participate in culture through consumerism and alerting men to the fact that they are being looked at and evaluated. This really proves that success in love and work are heavily predicated on the presentation of self. This does not mean that hegemonic masculinity is changing but rather it is articulating the need for a particular variety of self-presentation that was assumed but not overtly stated. Goffman's (1963) definition of the ideal man was, "The young, married, white, urban, northern, heterosexual, Protestant father of college education, fully employed, of good complexion, weight, and height, and a recent record in sports," (p. 128) should be read as well groomed, adept consumer, and culturally engaged.

The mainstreaming of the metrosexual has induced some interesting developments in the categories of masculinities. Now, men who exercise, shop for clothes, get facials, manicures and pedicures are no longer considered effeminate or queer if they identify themselves as metrosexual. Metrosexual is a label that is self-applied. I say this because by declaring yourself a metrosexual you are also declaring your heterosexuality. The metrosexual label, permits these men to participate in a consumer culture that was once identified as womanly or queer, and reiterate their heterosexuality. The problem is that this version of masculinity allows the heterosexual male a type of upward mobility by protecting their masculinity and sexuality by declaring it.

This is not something that a gay man can do because once he declares his sexuality by rejecting the metrosexual label that is only accorded to heterosexual men he is censured because of the interplay between masculinity and sexuality. I would also add a word of caution, the metrosexual label is also inherently racist. Men of color who might fit into the category of the metrosexual could find themselves in an unstable position. The consumer culture that powers the metrosexual is white appearing in that those of color who participate in it are often accused of trying to be white. This most closely relates to the young urban white men who adopt a rapper persona and are called wiggers. It now seems obvious that the adoption of the metrosexual label by heterosexual men has in fact maintained hegemonic masculinity by forcing gay men back into the closet or else moving them to yet another lower and unstable category.

Metrosexual practices as well as the label provide a literal interpretation of the enfleshment of masculinity and how that enfleshment is maintaining the power structure of hegemonic masculinity. The most devastating effect of the enfleshment of the metrosexual is not that it allows the heterosexual matrix to define the “good” and the “bad” gay man, but that gay culture has adopted the same value system. Gay men can be seen searching for the masculine, jock like, straight-acting boyfriend. These men ridicule the effeminate and dismiss them as part of their culture. This infighting is part of the patriarchy’s strategy to maintain hegemonic masculinity, because this infighting creates multiple patriarchies, all of which answer to hegemonic masculinity.

The metrosexual and *Brokeback Mountain* both illustrate the enfleshment of masculinities by showing how multiple identity constructions as well as cultural signification encase our readings of masculinities and our experiences. The rough cowboy exterior of the characters in *Brokeback Mountain* juxtaposed with the intimate same sex sexual relationship shared between Jack and Ennis complicated the reading of sexuality and in the end the reading of masculinity. The audience’s need to define their relationship and/or their sexualities is a blatant reminder of the patriarchal social structure in which we live. The metrosexual is caught in a similar predicament because he must be a competent consumer and stylish citizen while maintaining his masculinity and heterosexual standing. Furthermore, wide spread acceptance of the metrosexual has caused gay culture to adopt heterosexual masculine ideals and to enforce those ideals in the same way that heterosexual culture did and still does. It must not be forgotten that we are bound to the patriarchy in one way or another, and we must acknowledge those bonds in order to completely break free. The previous inquiries show that by theorizing multiple masculinities we have also created multiple patriarchies. These patriarchies have been going unexamined and in return hegemonic masculinity has been maintaining itself.

The discussion to this point does reflect an intersection between masculinity and male body. The male body is becoming more of an object or erotic zone than it had been considered in the past. So in this time of postmodernism the gender gap has proliferated in one sense, the sense that when it comes to identifying masculinity everyone is looking. This constant surveillance forces men back inline with the patriarchy for fear of again not measuring up. This realization should be investigated with vigor in order to better understand masculinities’ hegemonic power and to derail the promotion of negative attitudes towards femininity, feminine men, and women through the proliferation of the hyper masculine and fear of the feminine.

The study of masculinities needs to continue to investigate how hegemonic masculinity continues to maintain itself. We can learn a lot from third world feminism because they have been calling to their otherwise white Western sisters to be critical not only of their oppressions but also of their privileges. Men like women should not be categorized by common oppressions because oppression is individualized and experienced singularly. For this reason I am making

a call to arms to not only investigate the oppressive regime of the patriarchy but also to begin to theorize masculinities in a way that reveals the multiple patriarchies that form splinter cells with the same objective, which is to maintain the dominance of hegemonic masculinity. I offer a starting point, that the current nature of our language supports the dialectic tensions between masculinities and multiple patriarchies. The knowledge we gain from our individual subject experiences will aid us in this endeavor. By recognizing that we are not just within the patriarchy but within the hierarchical order of patriarchies we can begin to combat the terrorist like tactics that plague men's and women's lives.

Brett Billman is a Doctoral Student at Bowling Green State University

REFERENCES

- Barker, A. (September/October, 2001). Gay health: Beyond HIV prevention and the pec deck. *Living +*, 14.
- Brod, H., (Ed.). (1987). The case for Men's Studies. In *The making of masculinities: The new Men's Studies*. (pp.39-62). Boston: Allen & Unwin.
- Brod, H., (1994). Some thoughts on some histories of some masculinities: Jews and other others. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 82-96). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.
- Brod, H., (1995). Masculinity as masquerade. In Andrew Perchuk and Helaine Posner (Eds.), *The masculine masquerade: Masculinity and representations*. (pp. 13-19). Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Brod, H., (2006). "They're bi Shepherd, not gay cowboys": The misframing of *Brokeback Mountain*. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 14(2), 252-253.
- Butler, J. P. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. New York: Routledge.
- Dotson, W.E. (1999). Is he cute? Gay male culture. In, *Behold the man: The hype and selling of male beauty in media and culture* (pp. 125-141). New York: The Hawthorn Press.
- Flanigan-Saint-Aubin. A. (1994). The male body and literary metaphors for masculinity. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 239-258). London: Sage Publications Inc.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage.
- Fracher, J., & Kimmel, M. (1995). Hard issues and soft spots: Counseling men about sexuality. In M. Kimmel & M. Messner (Eds.), *Men's lives* (3rd ed., pp. 365-374). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York: Doubleday.
- Gutterman, S.D. (1994). Postmodernism and the interrogation of masculinity. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 219-238). London: Sage Publications Inc.
- Halberstam, J., (1998). *Female masculinity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hanke, R., (1992). Redesigning men: hegemonic masculinity in transition. In Steve Craig (Ed.), *Men, masculinity, and the media*. (pp. 185-198). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Pitt, R. N. Jr., (2006). Downlow mountain?: De/stigmatizing bisexuality through pitying and pejorative discourses in media. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 14(2), 254-258.

Rohlinger, D. A. (2002). Eroticizing men: Cultural influences on advertising and male objectification. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, Feb. 2002, p. 61 (14). Retrieved October 9, 2002, from Infotrac database.

Rose, J., & Urschel, J., (2006). Understanding the complexity of love in *Brokeback Mountain*: An analysis of the film and short story. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 14(2), 247-251.

Seidman, S., (1993). *Identity politics in a "postmodern" gay cultures: Some historical and conceptual notes*. In M. Warner (Ed.), *Fear of a queer planet: Queer politics and social theory* (pp. 105-142). Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.

Sender, K., (2006). Queens for a day: *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy* and the neoliberal project. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 23(2), 131-151.

Simpson, M., (1994, November 15). Here come the mirror men. *The Independent*, p. 22.

Tuss, A. J., (2006). *Brokeback Mountain* and the geography of desire. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 14(2), 243-246.