

2003

Affectation: “Masculinity” and Mass Culture

JP Baertson

Grand Valley State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mcnair>

Recommended Citation

Baertson, JP (2003) "Affectation: “Masculinity” and Mass Culture," *McNair Scholars Journal*: Vol. 7: Iss. 1, Article 2.

Available at: <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mcnair/vol7/iss1/2>

Affectation: “Masculinity” and Mass Culture



JP Baertson
McNair Scholar

ABSTRACT

*In response to the claim that there has been insufficient substantial critique of “masculinity’s” archaic and ambiguous perceptions, this project aims at establishing awareness of society’s processes and mechanisms, allowing for dissection of the attributes, understandings, and implications of the universal and particular denotations and the prescriptive descriptions of “masculinity” by mass culture. By contrasting while combining various theories and identifications of “masculinity” through the film *Fight Club*, this examination outlines the various crossroads negotiated in cultural ambivalence, where innate and essential parameters are inappropriate. Elimination of “the natural” in non-identity is a potential catalyst for revolutionizing the epistemological and ontological structures of the human person.*

I

I will be investigating the notion, identity, and assumptions of masculinity through its relation to contemporary mass culture. The necessity for this investigation reveals itself in light of two developments in theoretical dialectic: firstly, the cultivation of the age of sexual difference, where sex/gender entails consequence in philosophical discourse, and secondly, the various thinkers who have put “nature” and the identification with “the natural” into question, most significantly the challenges to the idea of “human nature.” The concern will be “what is ‘masculinity?’” accounting for existence in and as the age of Guy Debord’s *Society of the Spectacle*, of capitalist consumerism, and of the domination of the image, resulting in a detachment of masculinity from its former anchoring in the “natural”. That is, what are the implications and visceral consequences of identity that is no longer comprised of “essential” qualities that dictate necessary characteristics for *being*? This is even more the case with gender identities that harbour no indispensable conditions or traits for the existence of men or women, such as the archaic notions of male providers to female nurturers and sexual intercourse strictly as a heterosexual activity for the purposes of procreation.

With the Frankfurt School’s central contention that identity is passively formed in and through the encounter with mass culture, the existential recital of gender prescriptions leads to the enquiry of the mechanisms of masculinity’s construction and manufacture as performance and the implications of such development. That is, whilst in the present age of the grand illusion, how does “masculinity” exist and perpetuate with relation to its past and future? For this enquiry, I will consult and coalesce the works of third wave feminist philosophers, namely Judith Butler, as well as social and



John Drabinski, Ph.D.
Faculty Mentor

political theorists, including the works of those in the Frankfurt School, and French philosophers such as Theodor Adorno, Guy Debord, and Louis Althusser. With an amalgamation of these theories, I will illustrate the methods through which masculinity has become a cultural performance, a portrayal, and not the fulfilment of any sort of “intrinsic” function or impulse.

In response to the claim that there has been insufficient substantial critique of the archaic and ambiguous perceptions of “masculinity,” I aim to establish awareness of the processes and mechanisms that govern, manipulate, and comprise society. More specifically, through dissecting the attributes, understandings, and implications of the universal and particular denotations and the prescriptive descriptions of “masculinity” ascribed by mass culture, I wish to undo contrived attitudes towards gender identities. What this verbose goal signifies is the manner and methodology that structures and perpetuates the “acceptable” understandings of “masculine” gender. One could say that the history of thought in the West, authored by men, is itself a history of writing about masculinity. This version of history has credibility, however, only if one assumes a fixed “nature” for sex and gender. If no such assumption exists, then the issues are more complex and subsequently need reconsideration. This article contemplates what it means to examine masculinity as a product of culture and as a certain performance.

The essay will contrast and combine various theories and identifications of “masculinity” as they are rendered through the screen of popular culture. Then, the film *Fight Club* will be used to cite specific examples in mainstream media of the examination that outlines the various crossroads in cultural and existential ambivalence, where innate and essential parameters of identity are

inappropriate. The film *Fight Club*, with the novel as its basis, is the centre point of commencement because it expresses modern society’s ambivalence regarding the status of “masculinity.” It contends with these questions: What is it? What is required of men in relation to themselves and to other men? What sort of political, economic, and moral issues are at stake in this “requirement”? How do political and economic schematic processes construct, out of a kind of necessity, images of masculinity? How does this construction perpetuate patriarchy? What does this construction offer for paths of overcoming patriarchal oppression through rethinking masculinity? To divest and respond to these questions, I shall draw upon the postmodern, para-Marxist, and feminist thinkers and theories mentioned earlier to contend with the issues of anti-humanism, artistic intention, and gender assembly and interpretation. The aim of the project is to analyse these negotiated crossroads to illuminate both the necessity and possibilities of thinking about “masculinity.” This thinking is crucial if we are to become aware of and eventually overcome the violence and injustice of patriarchal oppression. I seek to eliminate “the natural” in the Frankfurt School’s understanding of “non-identity” I as a potential catalyst for revolutionising the epistemological and ontological structures of the human person.

II

Fight Club has implications beyond that of box office earnings and merchandising, making it more than a film. It is a symptom of a fundamental ambivalence in contemporary life about the meaning of *masculinity*. To underscore these tensions in the scope of a larger and much graver crisis, we can understand them as indicators of an elemental flaw in placebo of civilisation. Let us begin with an

examination of the symptoms of this ambivalence in the film’s conflicts, after which we will draw out the theoretical context and consequences of these ambivalences. Before that, however, we shall establish the contextual atmosphere surrounding and leading up to *Fight Club* to better grasp the relevance of the film.

To appreciate the impact and relevance of *Fight Club*, we first need to reminisce and review the developments and overall ambience of mass culture during recent history, spanning the past thirty years, to explore the three most prominent and dominant media of music, cinema, and television. It is in these arenas of cultural manipulation that the most dramatic challenges to and subsequent responses of society and its multifaceted agenda occur, making *Fight Club* exemplary of where masculinity now stands: in crisis.

To begin with music, more accurately the genre of rock ‘n’ roll in which the importance of rock music’s development into sub-genres of ultra-masculine edged heavy metal, the short-lived but highly important glitter rock, and the over-the-top jollity of the glam rock movement of the mid-1980s serves to amplify the necessity of performance and to eliminate challenges to the “masculine” ideal that it perpetuates. The “metal” sub-genres stand out as unique in their presentation and interpretation of “masculinity” by both performers and audience, ultimately dwelling in an ambiguity that goes unquestioned by many rock patrons and personnel. Key to this ambiguity that adds the “glam” to the “metal” is the appropriation of traditionally feminine elements of style by rock bands on stage, in music videos, and in all public appearances. Stan Denski and David Scholle (*Men, Masculinity, and the Media*, 51) comment on the ambiguity built into the excessive images of rock stars by noting,

heavy metal is often cited as the most straightforwardly coded example of masculine, macho posing in rock 'n' roll (thus the genre of 'cockrock').... [However,] heavy metal bands extend a curiously macho image, while stylistically feminizing the 'male body' (or perhaps 'masculinizing the feminine').... Genders are neither true nor false, but are only produced as the truth effects of a discourse that attempts to anchor identity.

Glam metal hair is not just long – it is moussed, teased, and who-knows-what else; musicians apply copious amounts of make-up to soften and add emphasis; they are adorned in exaggerated and accessorised clothing such as scarves, low-slung leather pants and jeans, and open shirts to name a few. The metal performance entails more than simply dressing up the rockers to sexualise their "maleness" with a "femininised" costume; it permeates attitude, behaviour, and persona; that is, the presentation of rock 'n' roll becomes an identity^{II}. The performative bodily gestures of glam metal involve a variety of expressions and gesticulations, including exaggerated protective, fearful, and aggressive sexual gestures, fists forward in the air, back tilted forward, guitar hoisted from the crotch, and jutting of the lips. All are means of expressing "erotic aggression," where "badness = maleness" (*Men, Masculinity, and the Media*, 50)^{III}. This distinctive demonstration, both consciously and subconsciously, of the unprecedented concoction of feminised masculinity or masculinised femininity exemplifies the ambiguity cultivated and commandeered by the mass culture's musical apparatus.

Fight Club is representative of the crisis of "masculinity." I want to focus on three key scenes that exemplify the crisis that, without inflexible and

predetermined stationing in the "natural," flesh and blood men must existentially manifest in their "masculine" identity. Simply stated, what kind of "man" can, ought, and will one become in and through an economy of existence perpetuated by images designed for mass consumption? This internal tension appears in a scene where the main character, anonymously known as "the narrator," confronts the destruction and loss of his material possessions, which he repeatedly refers to as "his life," by mourning over pitchers of beer at an isolated roadhouse with his new friend Tyler Durden, seductively portrayed by Brad Pitt. In another scene, in which the character Tyler addresses the members of fight club about their collectively ambivalent place in history, the film glimpses the ambiguity and depressing effects of "masculine" identity formation by way of the Frankfurt School's understanding of mass culture as "the culture industry"^{IV}. The final scene that I wish to emphasize involves the conflicts of emulating male role models, particularly the relationship between father and son. This scene is one of the most intense of the film, consisting of Tyler giving the narrator a chemical burn. Each of these scenes incorporates a different connotation of the affectation of "masculinity," bringing to bear witness to the external and internal discord of contemporary "men."

For the first scene under consideration, the eleventh of the film, the narrator copes with the conflict of materialism through the substitution of identity with commodities. This can be broken down into three parts. First, Tyler attempts to regain perspective on the issue by contrasting the damage of the narrator's possessions with the emasculation of John Wayne Bobbitt, saying that things could be worse. Second, Tyler follows this with a harangue regarding the superfluity of

commodities inessential to human survival, "...in the hunter-gatherer sense of the word." Finally, the climax occurs when Tyler lists those things in the culture industry that delimit human potential, with a key point of dialogue that leaves Tyler concluding, "We're consumers. We are by-products of a lifestyle obsession...." Tyler then spits sardonically to the narrator, "Well, you did lose a lot of versatile solutions for modern living. The things you own end up owning you" (*Fight Club*, scene 11). This is where Tyler realigns the narrator's perspective with not only his recent loss, but also in regards to his civilized being.

The second scene under scrutiny shows Tyler presiding over the members of a fight club, detailing the cultural pitfalls of feckless aspirations to iconic figures and roles. Tyler's speech better expresses this:

Man, I see in *Fight Club* the strongest and smartest men who've ever lived. I see all this potential. And I see it squandered. God damn it. An entire generation pumping gas, waiting tables, slaves with white collars. Advertising has us chasing cars and clothes, working jobs we hate so we can buy shit we don't need. We're the middle children of history, man. No purpose or place. We have no Great War, no Great Depression. Our Great War's a spiritual war. Our Great Depression is our lives. We've all been raised on television to believe that one day we'd all be millionaires and movie gods and rock stars. But we won't. We're slowly learning that fact. And we're very pissed off" (*Fight Club*, scene 20).

The scene concludes with Tyler assigning everyone to pick a fight with a stranger and to lose. Tyler uses this crucial monologue to darken both the atmosphere and the message of the film in an attempt to jolt self-awareness.

The last scene I shall explore is the aptly named “Chemical Burn.” This is one of the two most forceful and concentrated scenes of the film, entailing three significant components. The initial component of the scene lasts only a few seconds but carries one side of an important paradox. Tyler thoroughly and purposefully wets his lips and softly applies them to the narrator’s hand, leaving a small, damp trace of saliva in the shape of a kiss. Tyler then shakes lye onto the narrator’s hand, chemically burning it. The next component and climax of the scene have Tyler roaring amended existentialism and religion to the narrator, who is gasping and writhing in pain, compelling him, through shouts and slaps to the face, to “stay with the pain” and not to escape reality by meditation. Once Tyler has the full attention of the narrator, he appeals to the inherited ambivalence that stems from a man’s primary male role model: the father. Tyler takes this to the level of the father as God by sermonizing,

Our fathers were our models for God. If our fathers bailed, what does that tell you about God? ...You have to consider the possibility that God does not like you, He never wanted you. In all probability, He hates you. This is not the worst thing that can happen. ...We don’t need Him. ...Fuck damnation, man. Fuck redemption. We are God’s unwanted children? So be it. (*Fight Club*, scene 19)

The climax of the scene comes to a close in the third component when Tyler releases the narrator’s still searing hand, and the narrator leaves the lye to burn, accepting his pain. Only after the narrator acknowledges his mortality and consents to pain does Tyler pour vinegar on the burn to neutralize the chemical. Tyler leaves the narrator with these

prophetic words: “only after we have lost everything, are we free to do anything” (*Fight Club*, scene 19).

I have chosen these three scenes for their common thread yet diverse illustration of the issue of modern ambivalence in “masculinity.” In the first scene, the narrator proclaims his security and identity by and within his material possessions, moreover, through the progressive accumulation of these commodities, he believes himself near being “complete.” However, his conversation with Tyler refutes this as accurate and ultimately proves fatal. That is, by associating his ontology with the unattainable goal of capitalist ownership, the narrator places his identity among the commodities and objects that he desires to collect. Furthermore, identity and self-identity by and within consumeristic mass culture is fundamentally problematic and inevitably damned to self-destruction as human mortality decisively indicates that “you can’t take it with you.” The second scene characterizes the culture industry as identity forming by way of representations of glamorised and iconic figures as ideals for existence. The ambivalence observed in this is that of lacking and failure. Combine that with the ambivalence depicted in the third scene of fatherless progeny who has no tangible model of masculinity and turns to images offered by culture. All are instances and symptoms of the crisis in identity, for us “masculine” identity, and makes *Fight Club* such an exemplary case of “masculinity.”

That understood about the substantiality and relevancy of *Fight Club*, what does this mean for the meaning of *masculinity*? How is masculine identity intelligible such that these ambivalences become both possible for and understandable to a mass audience? To answer these questions, I will turn to the works of

Judith Butler, Guy Debord, and the critical theory of the Frankfurt School (viz., Adorno). In these works, we see that the very contestations of “natural” identity replaced with notions such as performance, image, commodity, and non-identity make the ambivalences of *Fight Club* possible. As we shall see, *Fight Club* is the consequence of an awareness of mass culture’s construction of identity, where that awareness – however traumatically, however wrought with anxiety – opens possibilities for thinking “masculinity.”

III

Guy Debord establishes and describes the idea of the spectacle as a mass dissemination of images responsible for changing the fundamental categories of reality. It is a tool used to facilitate and cloak the exploitation and alienation of the proletariat^{IV}. False consciousness, commodity fetishism, and capitalism’s ideology, as described by Karl Marx, further concealed and entrenched themselves into the system, reinforcing and sanctioning all forms of alienation that Marx denotes. In late capitalism’s spectacular society, mass culture presents itself as the only permitted possibility for being; that is, life is transformed into a representational life through consumption of images. Debord distinguishes that it is the economics of images rather than the images themselves that replace and become reality by stating, “the spectacle is not a collection of images; rather, it is a social relationship between people that is mediated by images” (Debord, 4). The massive stream of images representing life is not a mere distraction from it but more complexly poses as the way “life” is “lived.” Because images and illusions are social reality in the spectacle, reality itself must be negated to allow the images and illusions to replace and become the new reality. The representation of existence destroys and

assumes the role and capacity of being; in other words, unreality becomes reality; then, reality becomes unreality in the perpetuating succession of mass culture.

Culture is being. One exists only in so much as one participates in culture; that is, culture defines an individual, if even conflictually. A hermit or a recluse chooses to dwell without civilisation, yet he is nonetheless defined in its terms because the withdrawn life is only intelligible in (opposing) relation to society. In this way, an individual's ontology, epistemology, and visceral existence are and can be only as cultural. Contemporary being, as consumers of mass culture that dominate the West, though is effectively colonising globally, renders one's cultural-existence to that of scripted presentation. The mechanism of mass culture is the systematic and thorough contrivance of "desire." The system establishes and perpetuates the mutual need for materialistic consumption, thereby embossing identity as that of mass culture consumer with all of its implications. The case is not, however, an über-elite clique of masterminds plotting in secret and operating through social structures to further their own ends by exploiting a credulous public; neither is society itself an entity occupying the subject-placeholder, acting upon a predicate of populace. Rather, the constituents must be taken as a totality of the processing apparatus of being, where existence is necessarily told in the passive voice. The relation between victoriousness and victim, then, is mutual because the generation of wealth is reciprocally obligatory by the society and its civilian accomplices, who are often desirously oblivious. The process of existence oppressively profits and accrues lucre through bourgeois and proletariat collective operation. That is, both the prosperous and subjugated simultaneously desire social desires,

thereby perpetuating the deterministic cycle of civilised being. Zealously striving to satiate manipulated and manufactured "desires," the modern citizen-consumer inherits the synthetic cravings and sempiternal aspirations of the self-sustaining, cyclical process of cultural-being. Affectation is manifest in culture such that the only available and allowable existential modality is ingrained performance. The individual is the actor portraying culture's script of being, authored by "desire."

The spectacle that is contemporary being conveys the ideology of society by working to reinforce the notion of a "properly progressing" existence that affirms the influences of the dominant political and social groups. The cycle of the spectacular society is neither random nor indiscriminating. That is, the mechanism of mass culture serves a purposeful totality. Guy Debord elaborates this spectacular function in addressing the benefactors that profit within the system:

For what the spectacle expresses is the total practice of one particular economic and social formation; it is, so to speak, that formation's *agenda*. It is also the historical moment by which we happen to be governed. (11)

The images present themselves as "good" and "necessary" to create a passive acceptance for the enormous "positive advancement of civilisation" manifested in the spectacle. What this implicates for "masculine" identity is unchallenged acceptance of "natural" options for acceptable male roles. That is, the varying degrees of masculinity exist only in relation to those deemed worthy of representation by the imposing agenda of mass culture.

In describing and contemplating the mechanistic yet passive formation of identities by the apparatuses of mass culture, it is imperative not to associate

a duality or separation between society and citizen, where culture is a distinct subject acting upon, or even through, a differentiated individual. It is not the case of "das Man," autonomous and oppressive, versus "the people," innocent and subjugated. Rather, it is a hermeneutic compromise of the timeless debate of "nature versus nurture" with the terms slightly amended from their traditional meanings. Cultural identity, that is to say identity as such, is manifest. This means that the "nurture" of the denizen by all cultural institutions and social apparatuses of family, school, government, et cetera yield intrinsic, formulative qualities that reflect the norms of the nurturing institutions. Adding to this, the genetic composition that mysteriously produces one's characteristics and developmental factors in person making contributes to one's "self" and the capability of autonomous existence. Nevertheless, this latter statement is not the signification of "nature" in the discrepancy of these prior two sentences. "Nature" becomes "natural" by the unquestioned internalisation of the institutional "nurturing," such that they become the natural character of the denizen. That is, the absorption of "nurture" as identifying one's "essential" values, morality, and desires interpolates institutional mandates as innate qualities of one's "self." It is in this mildly convoluted method that the nurturing of naturalised nurture manifests identity; in this examination, manifestation of gender identity is the focus. Manifest gender identity in mass culture's terms is the condition for the possibility of the affectation of "masculinity."

"Masculinity" in contemporary existence, and perhaps throughout its history, is a potent affectation that tyrannically administers pejorative conceptions of "the natural" and "the appropriate." It is an illusion-yielding performance that embodies the striving

for genuineness, a fondness and affection for inherent instinct, and a laboured exertion to achieve what should be effortless and thus exists as affectation. “Masculinity” is an assumed behaviour that disguises as intrinsic intuition, though it is merely a brilliantly artificial pretence of the idea^{IV}. Although an assumed presentation, “masculinity,” is not an obsolete selection of impulse or caprice. The affectation of “masculinity” stems not from “nature” nor from marginal choice, it is akin to a personality trait or idiosyncratic mannerism. That is, a man who clears his throat whenever finished speaking or a family that makes a plethora of gestures when conversing acts in a manner that suggests habitual conduct etched into their personalities; their mannerisms come across as “natural” but are alterable with conscience effort. In much the same way, “masculinity” is a performance more deeply embossed than mundane choice yet a subjective option apart from some “natural essence.”

“Masculinity” as affectation, then, calls for the discussion of its traits, symptoms, and expressions as they have and currently do existentially delimit and exploit. In showing “gender” to be culturally constructed, feminist philosophers have challenged traditionally parsimonious roles of gender and have allowed for copious outlets of gender performance. Judith Butler takes this idea of a gender continuum, in which due to the awareness of the construction and interpretation of gender by culture, people of either “sex” are able to perform genders beyond “masculine man” and “feminine lady”, to its logical conclusions by directing the challenge of gender as socially manipulated to the idea of “sex.” Butler argues that sex, historically conflated to gender producing and preserving “male men” and “female women”, is itself a societal

product. To intentionally confluence sex with gender, Butler seems to undo the labour and accomplishments of her philosophic precursors in feminist thought; however, she progresses from the wisdom of the past to elucidate the constructed nature of “sex” as prior philosophers have already exposed to be the case with “gender.” Butler articulates this directly by saying,

...the idea of gender should not be conceived of merely as the cultural inscription of meaning on a pre-given sex. Rather, notions of gender must also take into account the very apparatus of production through which the sexes themselves are established. (11)

To again equate sex with gender, hence debunking the self-sufficiency and unanimity of “nature” and the “sexes,” Butler discredits the assumptions that are establishing and guiding the way we understand sex and sexuality, namely that “sex” is “natural”, indisputable, pre-cultured. The critical examination of these assumptions reveals the totalising effect that culture has over its unwitting subjects.

“Sex” is perpetuated as a duality through the appropriation and approval of channels of desire. Children are instilled with culture from the moment of birth; a crucial stage in this enculturation is the conditioning of desires. Desires are conditioned through the labelling and associated reward and punishment of proper and improper desires and expressions of these desires. Proper desire is that which is directed and applied to the opposite “sex.” Young “male” role models are usually hulking, suave, heterosexual men such as Superman, James Bond, and fathers. Young “females” are to idealise submissive, superficial women who are dependant upon a man for economical, existential, and ontological provision;

the personification of such is Barbie. These desires are continually programmed and reprogrammed by means of regulative practices that parade as customary, traditional, and necessary. From women wearing restrictive costumes of high heels and skirts to men trained to be chivalrous and aggressive, the regulation of desire and behaviour is culturally embossed into our being. It is the enactment of tariffs on desire that permits and reifies the concept of “naturally” having two sexes.

Judith Butler takes aim at the political implications and limitations encountered by critical evaluation of the problematical universalising of sex and gender terms – *women* and *men* – that detrimentally assumes a predetermined and ridged coherent, gendered identity. This, or any, constitution of gender is inconsistent and incoherent because of the dramatically varying understandings of gender throughout history and across cultures and, moreover, because of the crucial intersection that gender has with race, class, ethnicity, sexuality, and regionality. These networks of cultural classification mechanisms are deliberately misrepresented as separate entities under which a person falls, depending upon the criteria in question. In actuality, however, these forces work in tandem to systematically regulate and preserve the binaries necessary for the current power displacement in contemporary and quondam societies. In this quotation from “Subjects of Sex/Gender/Desire” an article in *Feminisms*, Butler summarises the indispensable impact that race, class, ethnicity, sexuality, and regionality have on the formation and conception of gender. She states, “as a result, it becomes impossible to separate out ‘gender’ from the political and cultural intersections in which it is invariably produced and maintained” (*Feminisms*, 278). The lattice of traversing images and prescriptive labels of gender, race,

class, ethnicity, sexuality, and regionality all comprise the complexity of the individual self, illustrating the harmful absurdity of fixed identity.

IV

I have argued in this essay against the traditional and antediluvian concepts of gender identity. I have maintained that “fixed,” “natural” identity does not exist and is inappropriate in our contemporary age of spectacular existence. In *Fight Club*, we see exemplary illustrations of the existential

ambivalence that strains both external and internal tensions in the modern “man.” In the works of Butler, Debord, and Adorno, the theoretical foundation of prescriptive, performative gender identity verifies the need for reconsideration of conventional understandings and simultaneously raises questions about future directions of theory and practice. Subsequently, we face both newly provoked and time-tested questions, but we do so with fresh footing. Paramount among these is the possibility and potential implications

of liberation. Because of the points I have made here, the possibilities of liberation do not apply only to the base underpinning of ontology, but they also become relevant as corporeal political issues. With the application of non-identity, have we left ourselves in an existential “no-man’s-land” (pun intended)? It is apparent that questions yet remain; nevertheless, having the more accurate perspective from which to take up these issues, we are better equipped to critically contemplate their complexity.

Notes

^ISee Adorno, *Negative Dialectics*, 183-189.

^{II}“Acts, gestures, and desires produce the effect of an internal core substance, “which wrongfully conveys the idea of ‘essential/natural’ sex, “. . .but these [antics] are produced on the surface of the body. Such acts are performative; that is, what we read as gender is constructed through a performance that is repeated” (Denski, Stan, and Scholle, David. “Metal Men and Glamour Boys: Gender Performance in Heavy Metal.” *Men, Masculinity, and the Media*. Ed. Steve Craig. Newbury Park: Sage Publications. 1992. 41-60).

^{III}Stan Denski and David Scholle conclude, “. . .regardless of a certain level of play with gender signification, heavy metal does not bend gender outside of a dominant view of heterosexual definitions. . . . Heavy metal may shift some outward signs of gender, but it leaves untouched the constructed core identity of binary sex, and unchallenged the dominant power relations of gender” (Denski, Stan and Scholle, David. “Metal Men and Glamour Boys: Gender Performance in Heavy Metal.” *Men, Masculinity, and the Media*. Ed. Steve Craig. Newbury Park: Sage Publications. 1992. 41-60).

^{IV}See Adorno, *The Culture Industry*, 98-106

^VSee Marx, *Selected Writings*, 65-81

^{VI}Michel Foucault regards that “. . .sexuality is not a fixed, natural fact, but is better understood as the ‘set of effects produced in bodies, behaviors, and social relations by a certain deployment deriving from a complex political technology’” (Denski, Stan, and Scholle, David. “Metal Men and Glamour Boys: Gender Performance in Heavy Metal.” *Men, Masculinity, and the Media*. Ed. Steve Craig. Newbury Park: Sage Publications. 1992. 41-60).

Works Cited

- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Butler, Judith. "Subjects of Sex/Gender/Desire." *Feminisms*. Ed. Sandra Kemp and Judith Squires. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. 278-85.
- Debord, Guy. *The Society of the Spectacle*. New York: Zone Books, 1995.
- Denski, Stan, and Scholle, David. "Metal Men and Glamour Boys: Gender Performance in Heavy Metal." *Men, Masculinity, and the Media*. Ed. Steve Craig. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1992. 41-60.
- Fight Club*. Beverly Hills: Twentieth Century Fox Home Entertainment, Inc., 2000.

Bibliography

- Adorno, Theodor. *Negative Dialectics*. New York: Continuum, 1966. *The Culture Industry*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and other essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2001.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1999. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Butler, Judith. "Subjects of Sex/Gender/Desire." *Feminisms*. Ed. Sandra Kemp and Judith Squires. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997, 278-85.
- Constructing Masculinity*. Ed. Maurice Berger, Brian Wallis, and Simon Watson. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Debord, Guy. *The Society of the Spectacle*. New York: Zone Books, 1995.
- Denski, Stan and Scholle, David. "Metal Men and Glamour Boys: Gender Performance in Heavy Metal." *Men, Masculinity, and the Media*. Ed. Steve Craig. Newbury Park: Sage Publications. 1992. 41-60.
- Feminism and Film*. Ed. E. Ann Kaplan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Fight Club*. Palahniuk, Chuck. New York: Owl Books, 1996. Beverly Hills: Twentieth Century Fox Home Entertainment, Inc., 2000.
- Friedman, David M. *A Mind of Its Own: A Cultural History of the Penis*. New York: Penguin Books, 2003.
- FST. Jaggard, Alison M. "Love and Knowledge: Emotion in Feminist Epistemology." *Feminist Social Thought: A Reader*. Ed. Diana Tietjens Meyers. New York: Routledge, 1997. 385-405.
- Giroux, Henry A. *Breaking In To The Movies: Film and the Culture of Politics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.
- Marcuse, Herbert. *One-Dimensional Man*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.
- Masculinity: Bodies, Movies, Culture*. Ed. Peter Lehman. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Masculinity Studies & Feminist Theory: New Directions*. Ed. Judith Kegan Gardiner. New York: Columbia UP, 2002.