


Spring 5-18-2017

Masculinity: Understanding Authority Across Institutional Settings as Social Control

Andre Martin
acdm1@uw.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.tacoma.uw.edu/gh_theses

 Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), [Feminist Philosophy Commons](#), [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), [Other Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), [Philosophy of Mind Commons](#), [Psychology Commons](#), [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), and the [Social Control, Law, Crime, and Deviance Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Martin, Andre, "Masculinity: Understanding Authority Across Institutional Settings as Social Control" (2017). *Global Honors Theses*. 46.
http://digitalcommons.tacoma.uw.edu/gh_theses/46

This Undergraduate Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Global Honors Program at UW Tacoma Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Global Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of UW Tacoma Digital Commons.

MASCULINITY: UNDERSTANDING AUTHORITY
ACROSS INSTITUTIONAL SETTINGS AS SOCIAL
CONTROL

André C. D. Martin
American Studies/Psychology
May, 2017

Faculty Adviser: Dr. Christine Stevens

Essay completed in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation with Global Honors,
University of Washington, Tacoma

MASCULINITY: UNDERSTANDING AUTHORITY
ACROSS INSTITUTIONAL SETTINGS AS SOCIAL
CONTROL

André C. D. Martin
American Studies/Psychology
May, 2017

Faculty Adviser: Dr. Christine Stevens

Essay completed in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation with Global Honors,
University of Washington, Tacoma

Approved:

Faculty Adviser

Date

Executive Director, Global Honors

Date

Abstract

Masculinity is observed here as it relates to authority, and as it functions within discourse surrounding the American penal and health care institutions. Understandings of race and gender are dictated by beliefs that masculinity can be “achieved,” or functions as a value within society. This piece works to stress that masculinity is instead a worldview, which assists in the distinguishing and perpetuation of dichotomy tied to plays of superiority and inferiority. It is for this reason, when recognizing masculinity within a capitalist global context, abolition becomes a necessary approach, when attempting to confront masculinized authority and institutions.

Keywords: Masculinity, Authority, Social Control, Incarceration, Health Care, Psychology, Obedience, American Studies, Bio-power, Capitalism, Abolition

As a way of perceiving and approaching the world, masculinity is rarely confronted. Timothy Beneke (2009) highlights how “the prevailing cultural notion [maintains] that masculinity is an achievement” (p. 155). Contemporary masculinity is understood by some as a useful application to personality across social and personal contexts, and is believed to appear as a quality with the ability to be possessed by and applied to individuals. For this reason, and due to its perceived value across societies, masculinity should be understood as being inherently tied to contemporary manifestations of authority. Masculinity is most truly the intangible and toxic quality utilized by authority figures and institutions, to emphasize institutional authority and promote power structures which work to limit the rights, freedoms, and creativity of all who are subjected to institutional influence.

Appearing consistently around power structures is authority, and this critical analysis recognizes masculinized perspective as influencing the course of discourse and limiting the scope and reach of disciplines (both academic and otherwise). Masculinity is the ideological shape authority takes in most instances, operating as an entity all must encounter. The shape of contemporary masculinity is narrow though, and must be understood for its limiting qualities, since beliefs about masculinity and how it should both appear and operate within the world influences and constrains the beliefs and actions of both individuals and the systems they encounter.

This understanding of masculinity will be elaborated upon here utilizing contexts of both incarceration and health care, and will be framed by the concept of bio-power in order to highlight the utilization of racialized and gendered foundational dynamics, as they function to assist in efforts aimed ultimately at social control. Pulling from the discipline of psychology, authority will be utilized throughout this analysis as a general lens through which to follow the

presence and performance of masculinity, as it is argued to influence institutional discourse and participation.

Connecting Authority to a Desire to Control

Text 1: Socialization, Titles, and Consent. Five texts served as the basis for observation while forming understandings of authority and masculinity throughout the processes of this critical analysis. The first of these texts is Stanley Milgram's (1975) *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View*. The significance Milgram's work holds to this piece is perhaps best echoed where it is stated, "this investigation deals with the obedience not of the oppressed, who are coerced by brutal punishment into compliance, but of those who willingly complied because society gives them a role and they are motivated to live up to its requirements" (p. 175). Such observations of authority highlight the capacity and capabilities of power and intent as they are transferred from and between individuals and institutions, through the acquisition and distribution of ranks or titles.

Such practices are especially notable as ranks and titles are attached to specific roles and contexts. Through processes such as socialization, the collective learn to either apply or strip value from the words and actions of others, based on their perceived status within institutional context. This is done under the guidance of those institutions authority figures are closest to, with power gained once an understanding of roles and contexts are established within the minds of those individuals who encounter masculinized systems.

Milgram (1975) explains how institutions utilize processes of socialization to lead some individuals towards believing acts such as gruesome experiments or movements involving violence, either wouldn't or couldn't be conducted successfully within their own *civilized* society: allowing authority figures to pull from individuals their consent, even in the absence of

full disclosure of intent (p. 143). Consent is thus revealed as a vital aspect or result of socialization processes, with authority utilizing approaches understood to incorporate what may be understood as bio-power, towards the sustaining of what this analysis understands and describes as masculinized agenda.

Text 2: Socialization, Bio-power, and Morality. The second text is an article entitled “*Agents of Care and Agents of the State: Bio- power and Nursing Practice*” by Perron, Fluet, and Holmes (2005). Useful within the context of this analysis, it works to call attention to how the strength of bio-power lies in its ability to reshape “individuals as moral and ethical beings, as their behaviors [are] aim[ed] to serve both collective and individual well-being” (p. 542). This is the ultimate aim of socialization as utilized by authority and its attached figures. Bio-power is observed throughout their article, principally, as it appears around the health care institutions, and as it is explained to be “characterized by the interconnection of two axes: anatomo-political (discipline of the body) and bio-political (population management)” (Perron, Fluet, & Holmes, 2005, p. 536).

The *anatomo-political sphere* could be argued as encompassing the *movements and perceptions of individuals* as they encounter or participate within institutions, while the *bio-political sphere* is concerned most with the *shape, movements, and perceptions of whole populations and their demographic identities* (Perron, Fluet, & Holmes, 2005, p. 538). To both clarify and emphasize the influence of the bio-political sphere as utilized by masculinized authority and institutions, incarceration will first serve as the observed context within this critical analysis. The anatomo-political sphere will then be confronted in a similar manner for its appearances within a context of health care, noting its masculine effect of creating and promoting gendered and racialized discourses which sustain dichotomy of superiority and

inferiority. The term neoliberal which comes to mind, as such label are thusly applied to figures and institutions which attempt to be explicit in their knowledge of such processes and effects, but fail to elude capitalist goals believed to be necessary for the sustainment of those institutions as they are to exist within global-capitalist arena.

Texts 3 & 4: Control, Capitalism, and Abolition. The masculine quality of authority within institutional settings may be identifiable due to its proximity to a desire to control the behaviors of those subject to an authority's influence. The social problem becomes for the masculinized authority figure the matter of how the mind and body are understood within and around the contexts and institutions these figures operate under. Most significant is the question of how these aspects of the individual occupy time, and as well both public and private spaces within a capitalist context. The third text is titled *Are Prisons Obsolete?*, a piece by Angela Y. Davis (2003) within which a discourse of abolitionism is explicitly connected to the topic of prisons, their emergence and ties to the practices of slavery, topics such as the new black codes, and global-capitalist practices as a whole (p. 28).

Prisons serve as one area around which to observe the exercise of bio-power and the techniques of the bio-political sphere as they utilize understandings and beliefs about masculinity, bent towards capitalist aims which intend to produce profit from efforts which result in the suppression of knowledge, and with the advancement of technology as an implied goal. With this in mind the fourth text, *Blood Sugar: Racial Pharmacology and Food Justice in Black America* by Anthony R. Hatch (2016), is better understood as an attempt to observe both the meaning and structure of themes relating to race and medical knowledge, and becomes useful as an example of the application of bio-power (p. 14).

These texts each provide a chance for the concept of masculinity to be observed not only at an institutional level, but to be understood within contexts of power as they are potentially related to knowledge, technology, and even legality.

Text 5: Oppression, Technology, and Abuse. The final text considered central to this essay was the book *Caught Up: Girls, Surveillance, and Wraparound Incarceration* by Jerry Flores (2016), which adds to the understandings of bio-power applied within this piece, by depicting for readers how institutions lead individuals to discipline and monitor themselves and others through institutional and technological means (p. 10). Connecting the institutions observed within Flores' work is what are termed "wrap-around services," with observations of their emergence used to facilitate questioning around whether or not such institutional services and their attached technologies are in fact socially designed to punish those actions defined as deviant for young women in particular, as opposed to assisting them along their path to rehabilitation.

The question of whether incarceration serves, from an economic perspective, as a chance for the capitalist to utilize the latest technologies and to profit from the bodies which occupy the space, is pulled from the work of Flores in order to highlight how bodies become *disposable material* around which institutions produce opportunities to establish regulation around.

Individual Bravado

A starting point to such observation should always be the individuals, since they act as leverage points for power. Ideas are supported by communities, but the actions they spawn are carried out and promoted first and last by individuals. Thomas Jefferson, as a former president and Founding Father of one of the world's most *powerful* nations, occupies a position of great historical influence. This individual claimed at one point though, that "Blacks, whether originally

a distinct race or made distinct by time and circumstance, are inferior to whites in the endowments of both body and mind" (Golash-Boza, 2015, p. 28). It is tragically around positions and roles such as this, where the influence of authority is far reaching, that masculinity appears most consistently to be understood as a defining characteristic of institutional authority.

Often hidden, appearances of masculine ideas influence worldviews and beliefs which work to both promote and sustain a language of *the haves and have-nots*. This means that within a capitalist global system, such masculine perspectives contribute to social distinctions and categorizations (i.e. race and gender), ultimately economic in both their designs and functions.

Such designs should be understood as constructed and sustained solely for the purposes of social and population control, and it is within such matrix that authority becomes for power, a conductor, with the ability of drawing in and directing resources and manipulating accesses. Media and politics are two examples of arena which function within capitalist systems to assist in these processes, by creating within them a social atmosphere where a language may be formed around the desires to control and influence both individuals and/or the communities to which they are tied. The language of Michel Foucault respects these processes and functions for the rules they provide the critical observer.

Returning to Jefferson's statement, it works to highlight how masculinity influences the *shape* of the beliefs one holds, and how institutional roles and those who occupy them contribute to the negative shapes and actions masculinity is narrowly forced to undertake across contemporary societies. Milgram (1975) explains "authority [as being] the perceived source of social control within a specific context," and while Jefferson's statement held with it the gravity of both his position and reputation within not only the specific context of America but the world at large, his masculinized disposition is reflected through his choice of language (p. 141). This

masculinized disposition may be indicative of not only this figure, but as well other world leaders and any individuals who'd approach positions of authority with the intention of extending their own contextual power under a pretext of security. Understanding this, it should be seen that actions tied to claims of security are often maintained, superfluously, in order to sustain some elevated position within the minds of those attached to the power or security *the bravado of masculinity* is believed to provide.

Factors such as position and reputation are further described by Milgram (1975) as being tied closely to individuals' relationships across contexts, their varied statuses within them, and the impression left by their behaviors and actions as they are either strengthened or weakened by subsequent interactions and consequences (Milgram, 1975, p. 174). Again, it is control: this desire is the characteristic indicative of contemporary masculinity across institutional settings, identifiable within the institutional context due to its seemingly symbiotic relationship with authority.

The "endowments" aspect of Jefferson's statement, while amusing when considered for its *phallic elements*, suggest from a position of authority (and more sinisterly perhaps) the presence of something(s) to be measured between conceptions "of the body and mind" (Golash-Boza, 2015, p. 28). "Status" is further stressed by Milgram (1975) to contribute to the stances and actions powerful actors take while participating within hierarchal social structures and settings, and ultimately working to influence and shape perception of the body and mind as they encounter figures which act within the institution as leverage points for power (p. 89). This plays well with the image Beneke (2009) paints of "an authority with privileged access to theory, disseminating a view of the self which offers liberation through initiatory methods to be provided by the authority" (p, 156).

The hierarchal status and masculine characteristics of Jefferson's statement and many like it have held the power to influence the lives of not only Americans, but most populations subject to the influence of authority figures and institutional systems: especially those systems which intend to control various aspects of the body and mind, through methods which promote almost exclusively binary distinctions and categories. Contemporary masculinity should be understood to assist in the perpetuation of ideas of inferiority and superiority, which ultimately work to limit the scope of creative vision both across and between areas of practice and study.

Incarceration and the Bio-Political

The Body as Property. Within a context of incarceration, it is indeed as Davis (2003) describes though: there will always remain the "question of how to treat those who violate the rights and bodies of others" (p. 113). This wording is particularly telling, considering most discourse around rehabilitation and healing within such institutional settings tends to focus, arguably, more on the processes and practices of punishment than those of more restorative aims. Davis (2003) reports around the sentiment, that "male punishment was linked ideologically to penitence and reform" (p. 69). This critical analysis questions the legitimacy of such statements of intention, as they are believed to originate from institutional sources, and when considered for their appearance within a capitalist global climate. Davis (2003) pulls from Cheryl Harris the understanding of how within such social climates "whiteness" holds the ability to operate for some as "property" (p. 30). This distinction may assist in explaining how masculinity (an idea just as intangible as whiteness) might be "possessed" or sought after, and thus holds the ability to act both as property and an identifier within and around institutions which recognize masculinized qualities as their ideal.

Defining and Targeting Bodies. From here it is important to highlight how Davis (2003) stresses, "to assume that men's institutions constitute the norm and women's institutions are marginal is, in a sense, to participate in the very normalization of prisons that an abolitionist approach seeks to contest" (p. 61). This analysis assumes instead then, that the masculine qualities of institutions are inherent in the ways its authority figures operate: in whether social control is an aspect of the institutional agenda on any level. Institutions aren't masculine or even feminine based on the physical bodies which occupy them; rather, this is determined by the shape of the desire to control and how the bodies and minds of those involved are perceived and treated by others who hold positions of authority.

The area most riddled with authority figures is, perhaps, around contemporary ideations of work or the daily job. Wage labor in particular is described as having been historically gendered as male and racialized as white within the American social context, thus contributing to processes which simultaneously function to apply value to ideas of masculinity (Davis, 2003, p. 45). What of those who deviate from these ideals or exist outside of them? Institutions are constructed which employ the techniques of the bio-political sphere towards processes of social control, since the main goal of ideas originating from this sphere of understanding tend to focus on projects of population management. "Deviant men" have historically been perceived as criminal, while "deviant women" have been constructed as insane according to Davis (2003) (p. 66). These labels hold social ramifications on their own, but when appreciated through a perspective which recognizes how they've assisted in processes such as the "racialization of crime" (described by Davis (2003) to have emerged as a result of the culture and history of white supremacy ignored or manipulated by its beneficiaries across the American context), they begin

to reveal their value within societies which recognize particularly white-masculinity and its attached ideologies as desirable above all others (p. 30).

As stated earlier, techniques adopted from the bio-political sphere are intended to address factors such as the shape, movements, and perceptions of populations and their identities as they apply to individuals across varied, but connected contexts and institutions. An example of this may be found when questioning why authority figures such as Thomas Jefferson advised penal institutions to exclude Black-slaves in particular from incarceration, suggesting instead deportation as the suitable punishment for this demographic group (Davis, 2003, p. 28). Jefferson perceived these institutions to be spaces constructed for the betterment of free white males, within which resources could be poured to further what he believed to be civilized growth.

As these institutions were twisted instead toward purposes aimed at eliminating from the national population those demographics labeled as deviant and criminal though, they increasingly targeted the poor and disenfranchised towards the efforts of “reliev[ing] us from the responsibility of seriously engaging with the problems of our society, especially those produced by racism and, increasingly, global capital” (Davis, 2003, p.16).

It may then be some considered masculinity, when utilized by institutions and individuals within such capitalists contexts, as working to abuse knowledge stemming from the bio-political sphere, towards the efforts of targeting whole groups of people for profit and termination. This is an observation based upon characteristics chosen by those holding positions of authority, and those within and around the American *justice* system where the practices of execution, solitary confinement, and other inhuman forms of *rehabilitation* are justified by authority figures who ritualize their legality and tilt the scales in favor of their own cultural beliefs, practices, and languages.

One must possess an understanding of the intangible but recognizably white supremacist masculinity if they are to, in some contexts, seek to acquire for themselves what might imperfectly be perceived as protection from those authority figures who view them as undesirable. Masculinity is thus perceived by the oppressive or masculinized authority as vital to the functioning of their ideal society: through the exercise of bio-political power, authority figures and institutions work to categorize and target whole populations deemed unworthy of participating in social processes and practices.

Discourse and Labels. The discourse around incarceration highlights women as “today’s fastest-growing prison demographic” (Davis, 2003, p. 65). The criminalization of Black and Latina women is explained to include persisting images of hyper-sexuality and deviance from the prescribed norm: perceptions which serve to justify sexual assault against them (both inside and outside of prison environments), while neglecting to address the trauma of their experiences (Davis, 2003, p. 79; Flores, 2016, p.95). With this in mind, masculinity could, even for feminized bodies, be understood and perceived as a useful or even desirable application to personality within some social and personal contexts. This is to be understood primarily as an adaptation to social conditions which are hostile to the identities of the individuals who encounter and disrupt masculinized systems, and where utilizing masculinity is perceived by the subjected individual, in a time of need, as their only means of survival. Masculinity becomes desirable in that it functions as Davis (2003) described where whiteness appears across discourse as something to be possessed (p. 30). To possess the correct combination of masculinized qualities may then ensure survival both physically and psychologically, for a time. So, masculinity might then, as whiteness, appear to some to possess the function of providing a form of social

protection, adapted or avoided in order to mitigate encounters and experiences with authority figures and the institutions to which they are attached.

Social Programs and Capitalists. Davis (2003) works at one point to highlight how, once they began to enter the prison system, the relegation of white women back into the domestic sphere became the primary goal of incarceration for the feminine demographic (p. 45). As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the hyper-sexualizing and criminalization of minoritized women contributes to their disproportionate appearances within such setting, and may even add to understandings of why there would exist a shift in goal orientation as more minoritized women were brought into the system. As authority figures became increasingly aware of the presence of Black and Latina women within such settings, the potential for institutions of incarceration to serve purposes aligned with masculine ideals (tied to social control of the mind and capitalist ideology tied to conceptions around property and the body) increases drastically. The goals and orientation of these institutions are instead directed from the social programs of rehabilitation and training, towards aims which intent to attract vast amounts of capital by exploiting vulnerable demographic populations (Davis, 2003, p. 12).

Davis (2003) further stresses that "paradoxically, demands for parity with men's prisons, instead of creating greater educational, vocational, and health opportunities for women prisoners, often have led to more repressive conditions for women" (Davis, 2003, p. 75). The paradox holds less depth though, when it is accepted how within a capitalist context, the prison system and institutions like it aren't truly interested in the rehabilitation or healing of wounded populations, but are instead motivated and guided by economic incentive above all else, while setting aside moral and ethical consideration: and thus the capitalist mentality is formed.

Symbolic violence is essentially the perpetuation of traumatic or degrading imagery, aimed at particular demographics, to elevate of one group over another (Golash-Boza (2013), p. 226). Because the discourse surrounding incarceration holds such blatant desire to produce results with social ramifications utilizing such tactics as symbolic violence to control activity, the bio-political approach taken by such institutions is again understood to be shaped by masculine qualities. This produces acts of aggression from the oppressed, stemming from their desire to survive within a hostile and masculinized environment. Intangible masculine symbols should be argued within the capitalist climate to contribute to branding processes employed by media and political authority, constructing within their realms a language which ultimately assists in the stigmatization and criminalization of whole demographic groups.

Sobriety and Encounters with Authority. It is perhaps for that reason most government supported social program don't survive long, but especially within social contexts where the recognition of masculine qualities and ideology are utilized by authority figures to control and/or monitor populations (Davis, 2003, p. 11). The research of Flores stresses two points which help to support this sentiment. The first is that individuals deemed as divergent from the norm, did not need to become "sober" in order to leave their "deviant" lifestyles (Flores, 2016). Davis (2003) promotes the importance of instead working within contexts of incarceration to foster "autonomy of the mind," as this may be a better approach when attempting to heal someone who might not have ever been afforded the opportunity to be truly healthy (p. 57). Even civil rights activists such as Malcolm X are painted as having "had to work against the prison regime," in order to achieve what for himself what he felt was some measure of rehabilitation (Davis, 2003, p. 56).

Masculinity assists authority figures in dictating what is or isn't acceptable/normal across the society and its attached contexts as they are emphasized by institutions. If such institutions

instead promote autonomy of the mind, then the masculinized expectations of society fall away and allow for understandings of deviance to be tied more positively to acts of creativity and expression, as opposed to defiance, deviance, and aggression.

Flores' second point is that "young women require as little contact as possible with the criminal justice system and wraparound supports, if they are to eventually escape the broader system" (Flores, 2016, p. 114). These support services adversely allowed for the information of individuals to be accessed by a variety of institutions and actors, as the young women are moved from one seemingly unconnected system into another. Such practices arguably allow for more punishments than assistance to enter the lives of adolescent girls caught within such systems, further complicating their development into healthy adults by increasing their interactions with authority figures and institutions built to control populations and individuals (Flores, 2016).

Prison serve as one space geared towards a "constant training of bodies [which] results in the 'control of activity'": the outcome is one form of what is termed as "docile bodies" (Perron, Fluet, & Holmes, 2005, p. 538). Understanding perceptions of masculinity clarifies this claim by pulling from observations of women, to characterize in a most dramatic sense how docile bodies (regardless of gender, and so long as they are caught under the authority of said context) are compelled within such context to measure themselves alongside a masculinized moral and ethical base, pulled from an atmosphere of white supremacy and its resulting legalities. Plays on masculinity assist in the production and reproduction of docile bodies, by providing for authority figures the opportunity to "generate huge profits from processes of social destruction," but only after successfully controlling activity and directing public and private interests through tools such as politics or media, and around symbolisms connected to the body and/or mind (Davis, 2003, p. 88).

In short, masculinity limits perspectives, which slows progression and development through life. As individuals encounter authority figures and institutions, they are expected to have been socialized into behaving within the prescribed parameters of the masculinized context: contexts they should innately perceive themselves to exist within after being successfully socialized. If they do not perceive themselves to be in alignment with the prescription, or are perceived by authoritative others as deviant, the result becomes a dehumanization which allows for authority figures and institutions to perceive individuals as disposable and exploitable docile bodies.

Prisons finally appear as another tool: one through which to exercise bio-political knowledge, and used by masculinized authority and institutions to construct social demographics. These demographics thus function as points from which to draw blame, and then target for feelings of economic inferiority and failure. This is the unfortunate result of applying masculine perspective to perceived social problems as they don't apply: the opportunity is created for bias to interfere with the construction of institutions aimed truly at human development and growth.

Health Care and the Anatomic-political

Status, Authority, and Bodies. In moving away from the penal system and on to systems of health care, nurses become recognizable as leverage points for authority. It was stated early on within the work of Flores that correctional officers were reluctant to contribute to the discourse: if prisoners are equated status-wise along the institutional ladder to patients, then for their proximities to higher authority, nurses to some extent reflect similar processes of influence upon the oppressed as those of prison guards. What may have deterred correctional officers from contributing officially to the academic discourse of Flores, apart from individual economic

concerns of course, might be their own awareness of the anatomo-political power they hold over the movements of individuals and perceptions of self, as they move around the institutions and into other contexts as leverage points for power and knowledge. This awareness would as well encompass the reality that they too are caught within this system, and if they wish to advance must appease a higher authority.

For this reason, it would be foolish to assume correctional officers aren't aware of the systems they perpetuate and participate in. Perron, Fluet, and Holmes (2005) stress the importance of "understanding nursing through the perspective of bio-power," since it "questions the taken for granted discourse that nurses always act in the best interests of individuals" (p. 543). Correctional officers and nurses are both limited by their masculinized authorities in different ways; still the techniques employed either indirectly threaten or explicitly present social ramifications as the consequence of individual failures to convince either patients or prisoners to submit to the practices of their specific social context.

And all this is expected to occur even in the absence of institutional actors. Hatch (2016) explains how it was "Foucault argued that the surveillance of the body was historically organized via a clinical gaze, a way of seeing and knowing the body and nature, that sought to rationalize the space time between life and death by classifying and organizing the body scientifically" (p. 13). Individuals are thus expected to have been socialized into understanding their existence as being bound by understandings of masculinity and femininity, as they are applied to a *civilized* understanding of the world, and as encounters with authority figures increase with time.

Gendered Discourse and Inferiority in a Civilized World. Within a health focused context breastfeeding appears as one example of bio-political intervention pervasively pushed across the *civilized* world, as "new mothers are subjected to great pressure in hospitals, clinics

and community centres to adopt breastfeeding exclusively for their infants” (Perron, Fluet, & Holmes, 2005, p. 542). In the previous section bio-political interventions (or actions aimed at influencing individuals) were described to be found most prominently around techniques employed by contemporary media and political authorities. Within a capitalist climate, these interventions remain bio-political in their orientation, since they intend to motivate individuals to participate in socialized rituals such as voting practices and market participations, and are used within masculinized discourse to either hint at or justify processes of social destruction.

The masculinization of discourse thus serves a purpose of allowing for a space to be made available, wherein the categorizing of the body and the limiting of the mind work to assist the capitalist aim of establishing systems across societies where profit can be generated from the activities and frustrations perpetuated by gendered discourse.

The anatomo-political sphere should be understood as residing closer to hierarchal authority and perceptions of how individual minds and bodies spend and experience time though (Perron, Fluet, & Holmes, 2005, p. 540). Approaches which utilize techniques adapted from the anatomo-political sphere focus less on populations (the bio-political axis), and instead more significantly on those individuals who encounter these systems, utilize their services, or are participants within them as institutional actors.

Nursing, within the context of the American institution, became over time a field of predominantly feminized bodies who “serve[ed] as cogwheels within the health care apparatus,” according to Perron, Fluet, and Holmes (2005) (p. 543). This distinction being significant here in that it highlights how gendering appears as a technique or approach of authoritative oppressors, used not as Smith (1999) suggests where analysis of colonialism and supremacy are confronted explicitly throughout the process, but are instead used to either complicate or over simplify the

discourse: thus allowing for masculinity to apply gendered dynamics to the language, shifting the intention of institutions towards the control and exploitation of demographic-populations and the cultures they produce (p.152).

Masculinity's Effect. The performances of gendered dynamics across institutions are indicative of masculinity's effect of establishing dichotomy of superiority and inferiority. Perron, Fluet, and Holmes (2005) explain "anatomy-politics aims to produce technologies that serve to exert a hold over others' bodies, 'not only so that they may do what one wishes, but so that they may [also] operate as one wishes'" (p. 538). This is perhaps the major difference between the bio-political and anatomy-political spheres. The difference being the anatomy-political holds the potential to produce technologies of control and surveillance, especially when considered within a capitalist atmosphere which, using masculinity, perpetuates a language of *the haves and the have-not*.

It may be around the health care institutions especially that the *phallic* distinctions of a masculinized discourse might become the most apparent, since clinical knowledge around the penis and other "endowments" of the body and mind are communicated from within this arena to hold particular social value: and as academic disciplines are formed around them in order to rationalize their physical shapes and functions.

One such area within which the rationalization of shape and function reflect the gendering effects of anatomy-political desires (desires already explained to be masculine in light of their proximity and subjectivity to acts of aggression, social control, and hierarchal social structures) is the metabolism. Foucault reminds us the sexuality of individuals is what is predominantly believed to have "served as the fundamental basis for power over life during the 17th and 18th centuries" (Perron, Fluet, & Holmes, 2005, p. 541). In the 19th and 20th centuries

and at the start of the 21st, race, class, and nationality serve as the basis for power across most social arena, but having been built upon a foundation of gendered approaches, are narrow in their creative scope.

The metabolism is an area of study described by Hatch as having been racialized within a capitalist context which pervasively utilizes these dichotomies of superiority and inferiority. Furthermore, the “metabolism [has become] a site for the kind of bio-politics that simultaneously manufacture[s] health problems and their remedies, deploys race as a way of concealing inequality, and construct[s] powerful ideas like metabolic syndrome to serve the relationship between body and society” (Hatch, 2016, p. 17). The previous claim of how, as a technique of discourse, institutional processes, and authority figures utilize the anatomo-political processes of institutions (more simply termed "bureaucracy") to distract and delay by unnecessarily complicating (and on some levels controlling) the issues at hand, becomes better understood for its capitalist application within the discourse surrounding metabolic deviations.

Commodifying Health Problems. In closing this section, the concept of a “metabolic syndrome” must then be addressed, but especially since it is the anchor for Hatch’s analysis of medical discourse surrounding the emergence of new technologies and academic disciplines. It was previously stressed how by complicating and controlling discourse, authority figures distract from systematic inequality and mask symbolic violence. Hatch (2016) elaborates on this by citing how it was “Foucault used the term ‘polyvalence’ to describe how discourses can be used as both the techniques and outcomes of power...structur[ing] the production and content of scientific knowledge” (p. 11).

With this in mind the metabolic syndrome (as explained by Hatch to have developed from within a context of capitalism where health problems are conceptualized and then attributed

to demographic populations) is a construct of social design stemming from the same atmosphere of white supremacy which fosters feelings of economic inferiority and failure, and as mentioned before around the contexts of prisons, media, and politics. This is done by effectively monetizing minoritized groups, capitalizing on the physical conditions imposed upon them, by the decisions of authorities they may have or desire little contact with.

Luana Ross is mentioned by Davis (2003) as observing throughout her study of Native-American women incarcerated within a women's correctional center in Montana, how socially "prisons, as employed by the Euro-American system, operate to keep Native Americans in a colonial situation" (p. 79). For Black Americans the sentiment is similar, with reference to slavery, and it is through the monetization of conditions perpetuated by social influences that the capitalist sees opportunity in exploitation. Relating this to the emergence of a "metabolic syndrome" (which pulled human resources and knowledge about the bodies and minds of black communities around the topics of nutrition and obesity), it could be similarly understood within an atmosphere of white supremacy how the capitalist utilizes academic disciplines and concepts such as the "metabolic syndrome," as sources from which to both find and create opportunity for economic gain (Hatch, 2016).

The opportunity arose for authority figures to benefit from the presence of stigmatized demographic groups yet again, as in the case of incarceration. Who become the target, as a result of the social atmosphere's conditions of economic inferiority and its attached fears of failure? On the anatomic-political side, this effect is perhaps best understood when conceptualized alongside a masculinized authority, since the fragility of the masculine construct highlights a desire for social control geared toward the ultimate aim of elevating the "endowments" of one demographic group over another. The dehumanization of black and brown bodies and minds,

highlights the effects of masculinity upon not only bodies branded as white, but any bodies striving to exist outside of a masculinized system.

Discussion

Method and Bio-power. This critical analysis has worked to show how the application of masculinity to social contexts either subtly or subliminally perpetuates a language of *the haves and have nots*. Masculinity has been described as it appears (to but a minor degree) around the areas of incarceration and health care, and is argued to be the crux of economic thinking, with race and gender both appearing across discourses to facilitate the creation of dichotomy sustained by two poles: superiority and inferiority. Gifford (2011) stresses how “having an important stake in some organization is not compatible with adopting mitigating behavior” (p. 293). While appearing within a context of climate change, such statements compliment Milgram’s depictions and explanations of how the status of individuals within hierarchal structures allows for the limiting of their actions across contexts, as morality and ethics are reduced to a state where they are allowed to be measured against financial and other economically tied risks.

By accepting how perspectives which hold ideals of masculinity function to influence the actions and beliefs of authority figures within social arena such as politics and media production, it may become ever more clear to the conscious observer how desires to exercise social control are projected across institutions and through their employed individuals.

These factors may be described as contributing to what is termed the “agentic state,” a mental state where actors and authority figures are expected to set aside morality (Milgram, 1975, p. 133). This piece has attempted to incorporate the concept of bio-power to help clarify how masculinity works as a worldview (or more simply termed, a perspective), pervasively

applied to social contexts where morality and ethical considerations are forsaken, and as one enters the agentic state upon receiving an authoritative role within hierarchal settings designed with social control in mind. The desire for social control need not be communicated explicitly from the institution or directly to its actors from higher authority figures though, because socialization ensures that within a civilized society such things aren't questioned.

Perron, Fluet, and Holmes's (2005) claim that, "knowledge accumulated by the state must be obtained directly from diverse populations if it is to be used appropriately. [And that] to this end, the compiled data becomes statistical information, irrefutable evidence of the level of performance of a society" becomes particularly problematic within this larger context of knowledge suppression. This is because both the findings and solutions of research are naturally commodified within the capitalist climate (p. 541). Perron, Fluet, and Holmes (2005) do work throughout their article though to "suggest that the nursing profession is profoundly political and that nurses, through the use of their knowledge and conferred social mandate (care-giving) act as agents of the state" (p. 543). It is in accepting this stronger aspect of their argument, where tools such as politics and media are best understood to be utilized by authority figures towards the pulling of consent from those caught within the capitalist web.

Furthermore, employing techniques of socialization works from the authority's position to support their own claims that what is observed by others is the natural state of affairs. These researchers' observation of nurses reveals what Flores early interactions with the correctional officers could not explicitly: it is dangerous to assume knowledge accumulated by the state will be used for strictly humanitarian aims.

Limitations and Considerations. Again though, "Foucault used the term polyvalence to describe how discourses can be used as both the techniques and outcomes of power...

structur[ing] the production and content of scientific knowledge” (Hatch, 2016, p. 11). When considering the methods of this analysis’ approach, *Foucault’s* theories must be critiqued for its manifestation as a discipline itself, used within and around the academic realm to *discipline* and identify others as legitimately or illegitimately academic. As applied to a context of power and knowledge, the limitations of this approach are similar to that of contemporary feminist discourse as well, since once they become academic disciplines they begin to sustain and support the very systems perhaps most detrimental to their cause: especially when considered within a capitalist society whose masculine disposition propagates dichotomy of superiority and inferiority, and where dominance and submission become the social responses expected to occur around such system. But it is with the entering of aggression onto the scene that masculinity holds the potential to bring with it acts and images of violence.

It must also be stressed, by focusing instead on masculinity and not men, the aim of this piece wasn’t to distract from those acts men across societies commit in violence. This research sides instead with the sentiment expressed by Beneke (2009), who stated “we need neither a new ‘masculinity’ nor an old one, but none whatsoever. Otherwise we will be endlessly pursuing a mirage generated by power/knowledge. Men certainly need to change, but not under the banner of masculinity.” (p. 159).

Rather, by focusing on masculinity as a worldview (or pervasively held perspective) and not a value or achievement, it may more fluidly apply to structures such as institutions and influential figures appearing throughout daily life, regardless of gender, and with respect to the constructed qualities and influences of masculinity upon discourse. The observations of Flores gain particular merit when the gendered experiences of the young women discussed are taken

into consideration: one being that “women are more likely to engage in drug and chemical behavior when men are in their lives” (p. 25).

Statements like the previous work to reveal how it is a proximity to masculinity, and not just men, produces adverse consequences for those who encounter it without constructive social supports. The intangible masculinity is like the title of feminism in that they both imply through their appearances within the language that “endowments,” whether phallic or feminine, exist to be measured, categorized, and critiqued. The difference between the two being though, that masculinity acts as a worldview while contemporary feminism performs as if confined by the boundaries of academic disciplines.

Conclusion

This is the contribution of contemporary masculinity to discourse: the narrowing of creative vision across social arena. In closing this critical analysis it must be stated that the lack of discourse relating to abolition allows institutions to utilize gendered discourse to perpetuate and manipulate racial ideology and ideas around the shape and function of masculinity across societies, and to consolidate power through the defining (i.e.: medial gaze) and confining of bodies (i.e.: incarceration/slavery). This level of observation builds on that of Davis, by highlighting within institutions a pervasive separation of work and responsibility, which is ultimately detrimental to individuals and their home communities as they move through interconnected systems, and are thus vulnerable to opinions and beliefs pulled from social contexts which work against them. What then is the proposed course of action, if “the master’s tools” aren’t sufficient and the social systems in play produce effects adverse to the healthy development of both the individual and the environment (Lorde, 2007, p. 112)?

Davis (2003) presents undertakings of abolitionism as being tied explicitly to “the global movement contesting the supremacy of global capital...directly challeng[ing] the rule of the planet...by corporations that are primarily interested in the increased production and circulation of ever more profitable commodities” (p. 44). When discussing abolition, alternatives are a necessary component of this discourse’s logical path., and it warrants for solutions to be stated explicitly. Around the institutions of academia in particular, Davis (2003) suggests transforming schools into “vehicles for decarceration” and, more generally speaking, decriminalizing drugs (p. 108). Other approaches might even involve establishing within the social system a concept of “debtors,” which would place “wrong-doers” into positions aimed at fostering feelings of individual responsibility towards the afflicted, in place of processes of legality which present as rituals of sacrifice to the white supremacist’s capitalist-pet (incarceration/practices of slavery) (Davis, 2003, p. 113).

Power and Oppression. Understanding present-day power relations as they encounter, create, and utilize institutional labels brings clarity to the variety of ways in which institutions work to influence both individuals’ and populations’ engagement and accesses across various contexts. With an emphasis on the usage of language as applied to knowledge of the body and mind within institutional settings, discourse has been observed and confirmed here as a potential source from which to both draw and exert power when leveraged by authority figures.

And for the last time, Hatch (2016) explained, “Foucault used the term polyvalence to describe how discourses can be used as both the techniques and outcomes of power... structur[ing] the production and content of scientific knowledge” (p. 11). In conducting this critical analysis (wherein masculinity is observed as it relates to authority within discourses surrounding the American penal and health care institutions) the ways in which scientific

knowledge are tied to the performance of bio-power and social controls have been confronted, in order to assist in the identifying of those effects these techniques produce as outcomes of power.

Power lies with those who have control over their own bodies, but authority results once power and influence are extended over the bodies of others. Institutions are implicated within this formula since power can be said to also result from the ability to determine what goes into and onto the body, while as well how the body and mind spend and experience time, and as they are used both as spaces for defining and establishing control.

Actions intended to sever these ties to the controller are often linked to aggression, but should be understood to contest the masculine authority by utilizing masculine techniques. These techniques which function to sustain both the desire to control (from the perspective of the oppressor) and the drive to be free of that control (from the perspective of the oppressed), paradoxically sustaining tensions within contemporary systems. It is for this reason as Milgram (1975) describes, how “every sign of tension, therefore, is evidence of the failure of authority to transform the person to an unalloyed state of agency” (p. 155). The failure of the authority results from its inability to completely control the movements and actions of individuals or opposing groups appearing across the contexts they hold a stake in. This leaves the authority figure or institution with the potential to develop inferiority complex, and increases the likelihood of participating in processes of social destruction in response to this letdown. Discourse is the method suggested to hold a most significant influence, since in the contemporary period it utilizes gender as a sort of proxy through which to establish binary indicators of superiority and inferiority in subtle or subliminal ways.

Again though, masculinity is identifiable due to its contemporary characteristic of carrying a desire to control the behaviors and movements of those subject to the authority's

influence. Beneke (2009) stresses, “to refer to any human quality as masculine or feminine is to perpetuate an artificial association between that quality and men and women,” and this is precisely the function of most institutions with economic interests, highlighted earlier (p.160).

As stated at the start of this piece, the social problem becomes for the authority figure the matter of how the mind and body are understood within and around the contexts these and other institutional agents operate under. And, as well, how those aspects of both the individual and group occupy time and public and/or private spaces. Masculinity limits creativity in the areas of politics and media and around social contexts, by narrowly focusing on the exercises and appearances of social deviance and by utilizing processes of destruction as techniques of control.

Further observations from this point might lie in confronting opponents to abolition, who may be argued as possessing masculinized qualities. One of those groups is those who cling to the promises of techno-salvation and other related ideology. Techno-salvation is the “belie[f] that technology alone (or nearly alone) can solve the problems associated with climate change,” or other socially and economically rooted issues such as racism or sexism (Gifford, 2011, p. 293). By ignoring the signs of their current social trajectory though, projected by their own social scientist, they fail to see how their own participation within the systems they value limit not only others, but also the self as it is subject to institutional structures which limit communication between people, allowing for the discarding of moral and ethical concerns when confronted with “others”. Prisons are described by Davis as explicitly employing modern technology towards the aims of social control (Davis, 2003, p. 50). It is with this in mind that Thomas Jefferson’s statement from the start of this analysis must be confronted again, since modern advances in technology would lead such a statement to imply to the contemporary a search for “endowments” at even the genetic level, which would be misinterpreted within a masculinized social climate,

and aimed towards the destruction of categorically undesirable qualities, individuals, and communities.

Observations of how masculinized ideologies influence worldviews may yield useful applications for understanding institutional perspectives, and when considering how “traditional” gender roles and the roles of technology as institutions are constructed and maintained. There exist paradox and contradictions pervasively around these systems which cannot simply be adjusted and allowed to remain in play across society, for their foundations are that of oppression rooted in plays of superiority and inferiority, and which ignore moral and ethical consideration towards the furthering of capitalist aims on a global playing field.

Accepting this, one begins to realize the depth of Davis’s depiction, of how it is “without the uniform, without the power of the state, [the strip search] would be sexual assault” (p. 83). While as well, Audre Lorde (2007) must be credited with famously stating that, “...the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house,” and reflects what Davis intended to highlight within the previous statement (p. 112). That is the sentiment that nothing is exempt from the gendered economy, so long as said economy is allowed to survive off of the carnage provide by the toxicity of masculinity. Violations of rights, freedoms, and creativity will continue so long as masculinity is allowed to limit individual and collective development.

References:

- Beneke, T. (2009). Deep masculinity as social control: Foucault, Bly, and masculinity. *The Politics of Manhood: Profeminist Men Respond to the Mythopoetic Men's Movement (and the Mythopoetic Leaders Answer)*, (p. 151). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Davis, A. (2003). *Are Prisons Obsolete?*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Flores, J. (2016). *Caught Up: Girls, Surveillance, and Wraparound Incarceration*. Oakland, California: University of California Press.
- Gifford, R. (2011). The dragons of inaction: Psychological barriers that limit climate change mitigation and adaptation. *American Psychologist*, 66(4), 290-302.
- Golash-Boza, T. (2015). *Race & Racisms: A Critical Approach*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hatch, A. R. (2016). *Blood Sugar: Racial Pharmacology and Food Justice in Black America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lorde, A. (2007). *Sister outsider : Essays and speeches* (Revised Ed.). Berkeley: Crossing Press.
- Milgram, S. (1975). *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View* (Harper Torchbooks; 1983). New York: Harper & Row.
- Perron, A., Fluet, C., & Holmes, D. (2005). Agents of care and agents of the state: Bio- power and nursing practice. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 50(5), 536-544.
- Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Dunedin, N.Z.: Zed Books; University of Otago Press.