

## Homo Sutra: Disrobing Desire in the Adult Cinema

Sam Joshi, Ph.D., Independent Scholar, Kansas City, Missouri, USA. E-mail: sammymuffin@yahoo.com.

### Statement of Purpose

*Current issues in the literature:* Feminist theorists of male sexuality in the US have noted with concern the pervasive tendency to view male sexuality in terms of universal, mechanical norms of performance (Tiefer 1987; 2004:195-208). This tendency, evident in the successful promotion of Viagra, neglects issues like intimate relations, emotionality and culture. Feminist scholars have discussed how the methods of an increasingly bio-medicalized Sexology collude with the goals of an increasingly profitable sexuo-pharmaceutical industry (Tiefer 1998:219-242). They have called for new methodologies that examine sex from outside the narrowly bio-mechanical, clinical model (Aanstoos 2001:85-88). *Description of the study:* Answering the call for methodological innovation, my study apprehends sex from a cultural, emotional and embodied perspective. For five months, I was a participant observer of male sexuality in an actual culture of sex – the public sex environment of an adult film theatre and video arcade in a US metropolis. As a sex researcher, I took the unprecedented step of freely participating in sex acts with other men in order to gather data. To accomplish this study, I adopted an autoethnographic approach (Ellis 2004), which allows for visceral engagement and evocative description. *Contribution of the study:* Analyzing my data in light of Max Weber's argument in "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism" (1998), I show how the norms of Capitalism saturate the regnant ideal of male sexuality. More importantly, I go on to show how the root concept of "Sexuality" itself is a recent concoction of Capitalist ideology, the purpose of which is to make us conform to the Capitalist economic order at the level of our most intimate desires. To liberate ourselves from "Sexuality," we must imagine alternatives to dominant social science methodologies which themselves serve Capitalist ideology.

### Preface

This essay is an expression of methodological dissent. It takes issue with methods and practices of mainstream Sexology that are excessively biomedical (Potts et al. 2006:313). The picture of sexuality that these research practices construct is one that is purely Mechanical, penile performance-oriented and biased towards a coital imperative (Potts et al. 2003:698-699). This stance of the authoritative discourse of mainstream Sexology undoubtedly pushes an increasing number of men into the clutches of the performance-enhancing sexuo-pharmaceutical industry (Potts 2005:6). But what is more insidious about this bio-Mechanical preoccupation is the total neglect of sex as a human experience, that is, the lived experience of living, breathing humans who are not mere bio-Mechanical entities. What is lacking is a competing discourse of sex that is more humanistic and holistic, one that understands sex as an experience deeply embedded within emotional life, intimate relationships and the cultural environment.

The Mechanical orientation of mainstream Sexology has roots in the doctrine of Mechanism (Merchant 1980) that powered the "Scientific Revolution" in Western thought and has constituted our "scientific worldview" ever since. This doctrine sees the universe, including the human body, to be essentially mechanical and machine-like. The doctrine of Mechanism, in turn, derives from the Protestant ethic which finds the emotional life abhorrent (Merchant 1980:195, 214). These tendencies are alive and well in Sexology, and evident in that discipline's tendency to turn sex into a functional matter of biophysics and hydraulics (Potts 2005:14). Emotional issues and relationship problems receive the short shrift. These biases are also evident in Sexology's choice methodologies, which are objective, quantifying, clinical and emotionally detached.

This study provides an alternative view of sex by describing and analyzing the sexual experience of social actors as it actually happens. The public sex venue of an adult film theatre provides an excellent

venue in which to observe the unfolding of male sexual experience. For five months, I was a participant observer in that environment. As a full participant in the sexual life of my setting, I recorded my sexual experiences in intricate, sensual detail, describing my passage through pleasure and desire, anxiety and hurt. I had hoped that my engagement with the "phenomenology" of sexual experience (Aanstoos 2001:85-88) would lead to new understanding. At the very least, I had wanted to provide an alternative to the coldly Mechanical, performance-oriented juggernaut of mainstream Sexological discourse. But the final result was surprising. It became evident that "Sexuality" is, in fact, a Mechanical concept that Mechanical methodologies have produced. It is only within the constraints of the doctrine of Mechanism that an object of inquiry called "Sexuality" becomes intelligible. From the vantagepoint of a more holistic, humanistic methodology that my autoethnographic method exemplifies, the object of inquiry called "Sexuality" simply does not come into view. From my dissenting angle, "Sexuality" simply does not exist.

Autoethnography provided the ideal methodology for my study, because it expressly concerns itself with lived, emotional experience. The social scientists who first promulgated autoethnography were looking for an alternative way of conducting and presenting their research. They opposed the social scientific tendency to turn all social experience into statistics or theoretical abstractions. Their efforts aimed at attaining a more humanistic, empathetic and emotional understanding of cultural phenomena (Ellis 1993:724; Ellis and Bochner 2003:217).

The autoethnographic approach changes the way in which social scientific research is carried out and presented. The researcher's own self is of the essence (Bochner 1994:33; Krieger 1991:29). In traditional methodology, the researcher erases herself from the object of inquiry to yield a more objective, detached research result in the name of scientific rigor. In contrast, the autoethnographer must viscerally and emotionally engage with the topic of study, recording the pulsations of her own empathetic emotional response. Her success in experiencing and confronting such a response becomes the measure of research success.

A similar criterion applies in the matter of research presentation. Traditional social science methodology favors the deadpan, detached and objective prose delivery associated with scientific writing. This display of objectivity secures for the researcher the status of an omniscient knower who has discovered some universally verifiable knowledge. The autoethnographer, however, realizes that all knowing is partial and perspectival. A postmodern researcher, she realizes that what is known is the function of the knower – a specific, unique, vulnerable knower (Bochner and Ellis 1996:20). Her writing style therefore does not erase the specific personality of the writer. On the contrary, it strives to be personal, emotional and evocative (Bochner and Ellis 1996:24; Ellis and Bochner 2003: 217). The autoethnographer believes that a specific style of social science writing cannot claim a privileged access to reality. As Goodall (2000:198) points out, "Reality does not choose a particular style in which to present itself." Consequently, autoethnographers embrace a variety of experimental writing styles apropos to their material – fiction, poetry, drama, dance, painting and sculpture. My own essay takes the form of an episodic memoir, which I intersperse with layers of socio-historical analysis.

The stress on the researcher's self does not provide a license for solipsism or self-indulgence. Refuting the allegation that autoethnography is self-indulgence, Mykhalovskiy (1996) states that writing reflexively about the self is not to abandon social research; the self is not asocial and pristine. Since the culture has written the self into existence, to write individual experience is also to write social experience. There can be no strict individual-social dichotomy. As Sparkes (2002:217) asks, "If culture circulates through all of us, how can autoethnography be free of connection to a world beyond the self?" The autoethnographer therefore constantly tries to connect the personal to the social, moving back and forth from testimony to analysis, evocation to reflection (Ellis 1997:132). In my essay, I constantly relate my experiences to the overarching theoretical framework of Weber's (1998) Protestant ethic thesis.

To sum up, autoethnography is an intervention into Western epistemology. This epistemology has come to favor cognitive, intellectual understanding above all else. To this goal of that traditional methodology, autoethnography introduces the goals of visceral response and emotional empathy, allowing the reader a more holistic apprehension of the human experience (Bochner and Ellis 1996:24). As she begins to read my essay, I therefore entreat the reader to not consider the sensual-emotional

register and the intellectual-analytic register to be opposites that cancel each other out. Instead, I invite the reader to experience these registers as intertwining braids that flow together to yield a deeper, clearer stream of understanding.

#### Homo Sutra: Disrobing Desire in the Adult Cinema

*Night. Again. But you wouldn't know otherwise. It is always dark in here.*

*We are both beating off, the large guy and I, standing in the back. Seeing that I am not about to get blown, I think "What the heck" and kneel to blow the large man. "Getting close," he says, and I whip my shirt off. I see several glistening streams of sperm flowing down my chest. The large man pulls up his pants and leaves.*

*I sit in the back row. Let my hand touch my chest. I have always had a hankering for having someone come all over me. "He sure shot off a lot," I think, surprised pleasantly. There is a thick splash of the stuff on my neck too. I marvel at how someone could come so much. My whole torso is covered in a layer of liquid. I slowly rub that good stuff all over myself, feeling my dick getting hard. My hand slides lower, rubbing my balls and hard cock, my hand and cock slickened with the large man's salty offering. I lean back, placing my legs atop the backs of seats in the row ahead of me, relaxing into the moment as I beat off slowly.*

As I begin this essay with a description of myself in an act of masturbation in the back row of an adult film theatre, I wonder if the reader is shocked. After all, the reader wouldn't be shocked if she encountered such descriptions in a book of erotica, as opposed to a scholarly forum. No, the shock derives from my refusal to conform to the dominant norms of scholarly performance. For most of its history, Western traditions of "scientific," and consequently, "social scientific" inquiry have required the researcher to adopt a stance of detachment and objectivity toward the subject of his inquiry. Rigor in research depends upon the researcher's success in erasing himself from his investigation. The researcher must never "contaminate" his findings with his own visceral and emotional response.

This strategy is evident even in the two available book-length ethnographies of public sex in the US (Delph 1978; Humphreys 1970). In these accounts, the researcher himself appears to be only a disembodied, unemotional observer, even as erotic tableaux erupt around him. Even in the newer modes of reflexive ethnography that have emerged in recent years, I don't know of any other ethnographies where the researcher actively pursues sexual encounters in public places as his primary mode of data gathering.

In this essay, I refuse to comply with the norms of the dominant Protestant, Mechanistic<sup>1</sup> methodology of social science. Instead of suppressing my own desires and pleasures, hopes and anxieties, I place them in the foreground, using them as the very means through which I arrive at new understandings. But this essay is no empty methodological exercise. Methodology is inseparable from its object of inquiry. From the Post-structuralist viewpoint, methodology, through its conventions, creates its own object of inquiry. What, then, will my methodological heresy reveal about "Sexuality," my putative object of inquiry, a concept that has become a bulwark of our reality thanks to over a century of "scientific" research? Interestingly, it will demonstrate that "Sexuality" does not really exist.

To be precise, this essay will demonstrate that the genesis of "Sexuality" lies not in our innate nature or biology, but in the realm of language and convention. In other words, "Sexuality" is a linguistic artifact,<sup>2</sup> not some eternal human essence. Moreover, "Sexuality" belongs to a system of conventions that serves Capitalist ideology. The purpose of this linguistic artifact is to make us comply with the Capitalist economic system at the level of our innermost desires. Scholarly methodologies that have manufactured and perpetuated this new linguistic artifact of "Sexuality" are themselves complicit with Capitalist ideology. To liberate ourselves from "Sexuality," we must imagine alternatives to these dominant modes of knowledge-making. In what follows, I will use a storytelling approach to show the steps by which I arrived at these conclusions.

But first, three clarifications. Firstly, to say that “Sexuality is a linguistic artifact” may not seem novel in light of the perspective of Foucault (1990), which maintains that “sexuality is a social construction.” But I feel that a detailed ideological account of the formation of the idea of “Sexuality” in Western epistemology is still missing. After all, there is no analog in many of the world’s languages for the word “Sexuality.” Even in English, the word “Sexuality” has entered the lexicon fairly recently. So how is it that we today consider the concept “Sexuality” to be a primordial reality, a universal human essence? This essay will supply the answer. It will illuminate the ideological terrain on which an utterance called “Sexuality” can take root. Secondly, this essay is an ethnography of an all-male setting, namely an adult film theatre in the US. Comparing my setting to an all-woman environment, or comparing US males to, say, transgender shamans in Burkina Faso – all these offer interesting diversions, but they are not my immediate concern here. Thirdly, I analyze my data according to the theories of classical Sociologist Weber (1998). Of course, relying on a single theorist makes for argument that, while being compelling, is also polemical. By itself, this is not a problem – there’s gobs and gobs of polemical Marxian ethnography out there. The problem is that Weber took a rather bleak view of modern society. So, I apologize to the reader who finds this essay a bit of a downer.

But let us begin this story at the beginning: How did I choose this particular research topic? I believe I did this to confront my anxiety around sexuality. Don’t all men suffer from this anxiety to an extent – this performance anxiety? *The blond guy sucked me till I was hard again, and I unrolled the rubber down my cock as he bent over. The lube dried, and although I enjoyed rubbing the cock between his buttocks like a lazy snake, I just didn’t get hard enough to penetrate. The end of the condom hung down in a long, flat tube of latex. “It’s tough to stay hard inside a rubber, man,” drawled the blond man, with a commiserating smile. But I had dark thoughts going on inside my head.*

It is no surprise that performance anxiety permeates male sexuality. After all, all the ways in which we learn about sexuality – popular culture (Potts 2002:36-37) including pornography, an increasingly medicalized sexology (Tiefer 2004:195-208) and its avaricious cousin, sexuo-pharmacology (Mamo and Fishman 2001:23, 24, 29) – all purvey the idea that a man must perform, perform, perform. Get it up, stick it in, and get off.<sup>3</sup> For the reader who finds this assertion a little extreme, I offer one word: Viagra. Had this performance obsession not been pervasive, men of all ages and sexual orientations would not have been buying Viagra legally and illegally. But the fact is that Viagra is a blockbuster success and the CEO of Pfizer is laughing all the way to the bank. This point should be of particular interest to certain scholars who like to imagine that male sexuality has now become all complex, dynamic and less monolithic. These scholars need to snap out of their theory-induced trance and wake up to the overwhelming reality of our “Viagra age.”

Besides this performance orientation, the second mainstay of the cultural ideal of male sexuality is the disdain for emotionality. I had wanted to embody this cultural ideal of male sexuality – phallic, performance-oriented and un-emotional. Aren’t “real men” always ready to perform without any sissy emotional hang-ups? (This, of course, is the logic behind Viagra: Forget about your emotional state – just pop a pill and git-r-done). But to my dismay, the issue of emotionality returned to plague me. *Driving home after fieldwork today, my thoughts return to the guy with spiky blond hair. Short, slender, soft skin, moustache, and so quiet. I recall how he had stuck out his tongue at me, inviting me to get blown. And yet he appears to me not slutty, but demure. What is this yearning I feel – this emotional, almost (dare I say it?) spiritual longing? “Oh, stop it already,” I tell myself. I mustn’t lose my focus. I am doing an ethnography of “Sexuality.” And doesn’t the concept of “Sexuality” establish its separate identity precisely by distancing itself from emotionality? It is under the aegis of this very assumption that places like adult film theatres exist – places where it is entirely possible to pursue one’s “Sexual” motivations exclusively, leaving one’s emotions at the door. I mustn’t lose my focus on “Sexuality.” All I can do is get it up, stick it in and get off, and then go write fieldnotes.*

And that, if you please, is “Sexuality,” a jewel in the crown of Western epistemology – the fiction that says I possess some “Sexual” longings that exist in miraculous separation from my emotional life. But I must continue to believe in this puissant fiction, because I am doing an “Ethnography.” If I let myself fall in love with one of my informants, who’s gonna complete my research?

*My fieldwork for the day done, I push through the crowd of men, walking toward the restroom. As I am standing at the urinal, I feel Keith come up behind me. Keith had fucked me upstairs, earlier. He is stroking my shoulders, arms, whispering "Beautiful, so beautiful." I can't piss with him doing that. He moves away towards the sink. I finally urinate and walk there to wash my hands. Keith pulls out a napkin from the dispenser for me. He is staring at me, adoration in his eyes. Though the stubble on his face is becoming, the face looks older in the bright light of the restroom. "I'm Keith" he says. "Sam" I whisper back. "Well, you're very beautiful, Sam" he says. "I like your hair. So soft. And your skin, so soft, so beautiful." I refrain from responding. "Do you go out?" he asks. "Go out where?" I ask. "Oh, clubs and such" he says. But I am on my guard by now.*

*Evidently, I am quite a babe, and every other day an informant falls in love with me. Like Dan, the realtor. And Troy, the handsome Laidlaw bus driver. Both were terribly hard to shake off. What am I supposed to say – "Excuse me, Mister, I find you very attractive too. But I am only here to do an ethnography. Kindly stop badgering me so that I can go write up my fieldnotes"? Clearly, with such emotional pitfalls behind every corner, there was no way I could have continued my ethnography. After my first week of fieldwork, I had gotten wiser. I had learned to affect a surly and solitary demeanor in my setting – one designed to nip any amorous attention in the bud.*

*"No," I say, in response to Keith's question. Turning around, I walk out of the restroom, past the Pepsi and candy vending machines, past the cashier's counter, through the front door, into the dark autumn air.*

And that, if you please, is "Ethnography," a feather in the hat of Western epistemology – the fiction of an emotionally non-stick, tangle-free encounter between the observer and observed. To use this methodology, I have to go against my nature: It is only by behaving like a macho jerk that I can even accomplish my "Ethnography" in the first place. True to its highly artificial nature, this "Ethnography" will then yield another artificial distillate called "Sexuality." Behold how methodology creates its own object of inquiry.

I wonder if Delph (1878), like me, fell for a spiky-haired, angelic informant. And did someone like Keith tempt Humphreys (1970) with amorous allure? How did these ethnographers then react? Why have they not written about these matters, preferring to maintain a façade of scientific detachment? I have discovered that in a setting where he is awash in erotic emotion, the researcher's stance of neutral passivity is no easy matter; It is instead a highly labored performance. And since the ethnographer himself is the product of such artifice, is the phenomenon called "Sexuality" that he then describes (and legitimizes) any less of a fabrication?

The upshot is that I am growing to distrust the very notions of "Ethnography" and "Sexuality." But I cannot afford to discontinue my research, because I belong to an academic system that still believes in these concepts. For now, I have to work within these concepts and see what develops. I am an international student struggling to graduate. For now, I have to get on with the program so that I can dissertate. So that I can get a tenure-track job, which is the route to a green card. I have a tough row to hoe. And I have to do it alone.

*But I wasn't alone during all this. I had Leroy, didn't I? I first saw Leroy as he stepped into a moonlit clearing. I didn't find him attractive, but one can't be too choosy in the cruisy park this late at night. I usually don't venture out this late, but I was depressed. It was the year I didn't have an assistantship, and I was broke, about to get evicted from my apartment. When Leroy invited me to his house, I accepted. Uncharacteristically. Like I said, I was depressed. A few days later, when Leroy asked me to move into his house, I accepted. I didn't have a choice. And he seemed like a nice guy.*

*And I did start liking him as the weeks went by. But Leroy answered my rising affection with estrangement. He was too busy, you see. In addition to his job, he worked on half a dozen "liberal" causes with nary a minute to spare. But for all this estrangement, Leroy's sexual interest in me never ceased. "Do you realize its three weeks since you moved in, and we have had sex every night?" he asked. "I haven't been counting," I replied, mystified. A couple months later, when I wanted no part of this*

*strange relationship, I would invent excuses to avoid having sex with him. "I've been beating off too much" I blurted once. "How many times?" he asked, as if I actually owed him some weekly quota of cumshots. The point I ponder is: What the tarnation is up with all this quantification?*

I had similar experiences during fieldwork. Like with that retired factory worker, Dale. *And afterwards, names exchanged. Him Dale, me Sam. A handshake. Small talk.*

*Dale: "You shot a pretty good load there. When was the last time you came?"*

*Me: "About half an hour ago."*

*Dale: "Wow, that is the advantage with being young. You'll probably be hard again in twenty minutes."*

*What a strange exchange! Left to myself, I'd have preferred to reminisce about his slick ass, the way I'd lost my sperm in that slick ass as he, too, gave up his dew. But not Dale; for him, it was all about numbers. Reading my fieldnotes, I underline all the questions he had asked me. "How old were you when you first started fucking guys? Do you normally shoot a load this big? How often do you come here? What's the maximum number you've fucked in one night?" I ponder: What the tarnation is up with all this quantification?*

I have no idea what the quantification is about. You could say I am pissed off. Furthermore, I am 28 year old graduate student living with a 64 year old Quaker boyfriend, Leroy, who appears more cold and distant every day. And none of my tenure-track job applications is getting results. In such moments of despondency, I drift off into a blissful reverie. I have finally ascended the academic totem pole. I have just delivered a prestigious annual lecture, and am talking to some brilliant graduate students.

Student #1: Dr. Sam, in your landmark book *Sammy does Kansas: Erotics of the Adult Cinema*, you observe that "Desire consorts not with emotion but with quantification." Please dilate.

Me: Elementary, my dear so-and-so. I was talking about how the values that suffuse male sexuality are the same values that underlie the Capitalist economic order. I started thinking about this topic when I found my informants – Dale and Leroy, for instance – subjecting sexuality to quantified norms of volume, frequency and so on. These values seemed strangely reminiscent of assembly-line production rather than any erotic emotion. There are important points of correspondence between male sexuality and the economic order. Firstly, note that contemporary colloquial language (Cameron 1992:371; Murphy 2001:17-19), like the Victorian discourse that preceded it (Marcus 1966:177), conceives of sexuality in mechanical terms: We like to get *turned on*, we want to be *sex machines*. This bio-mechanization is symptomatic of our compliance with capitalist values. As Zaretsky (1973:47) says of Capitalism: "The introduction of machinery was the culmination of this process, requiring human beings to 'identify themselves with the unvarying regularity of the complex automaton.'"

Now, to frame sexuality as a mechanical response would be to place it outside of one's conscious control. Indeed, both Victorian (Hall 1991:115; Marcus 1966:177) and present-day (Murphy 2001:23, 87, 106; Potts 2002:108-113) societies see male sexuality as a demonic force outside of the man's control. This force, which has nothing to do with me specifically even as it moves through my body is strongly reminiscent of Marxian "Estranged labor" (1964:108-111). I am estranged from my sexuality, as it has detached itself from the specific complexities of my personality. My very first encounter in the field illustrates this fact.

*He was a chubby, ruddy, fifty-something man who had riveted my attention immediately. I just knew he wouldn't be averse to getting blown, as I knelt before him without much ado. His penis was small. My hands traveled all over the large buttocks, erect nipples, and solid thighs as I sucked his dick, kneeling before him. His hollering, when he came, was memorable. A few moments later, standing up, I continued to look at him, and without thinking, leaned forward and kissed his cheek, leaving there the wet imprint of his own sperm. He laughed. We talked. He was talkative and cheerful. He said he had liked the blowjob a lot. "I haven't had any sex in a long time," he said breezily, "The wife has had pneumonia for a while." "So were you making it with guys before she got sick?" I asked, like a dork. "Sure," he said, heartily, "I used to be a traveling salesman. Took what I got."*

It still amazes me that the man equated what he did with me with what he did with his wife, our disparate relationships with him notwithstanding, into an undifferentiated substance called “sex.” This equation of our concrete, specific sexual “labors” turns them into undifferentiated “abstract labor,” which is the type of labor that counts in a Capitalist society.

The historical record brings out this correlation between the economic and sexual orders. Prior to the 1900s, when there was a “production economy,” medical authorities stressed male continence. Medical authorities asked men to preserve their vitality (Kimmel 1996:46-47, 378-379) by abstaining from “spending,” which was the word for “ejaculating” (Barker-Benfield 1976:12; Marcus 1966:22). But in the roaring 1920s, when the “consumption economy” took over, medical authorities started to prescribe sexual release rather than restraint (Mumford 1992:50). In other words, they asked us not to “save” but to “spend,” a process that has continued, culminating in the recent, successful promotion of Viagra.

Student #2: Dr. Sam, the case for the connection between economic and sexual orders is compelling. But what is the medium through which that connection occurs?

Me: Good question. We can understand the connection once we understand Capitalism as not only an economic system but as a cultural system arising from Protestantism (Weber 1998). Protestant theology held that God had immutably decided the fate of each individual as elect or (most probably) as non-elect. Given this bleak theology, the Protestant tried to convince himself of his status as elect by incessantly monitoring every aspect of his life to give the appearance of someone who possessed the guarantee of salvation (Weber 1998:115). To accomplish this, he sublimated all his actions into incessant labor in a productive occupation or “calling” (Weber 198:53-54, 112, 121) Towards the same end, he also severely constrained his emotional expressions (Weber 1998:119, 127, 148, 166).

The Protestant scheme mapped itself onto sexuality with accuracy. Sexual emotions could be dangerously uncontrollable, especially at the moment of orgasm. Accordingly, medical authorities described orgasm as a dangerously debilitating paroxysm (Kimmel 1996:379; Laqueur 2003:253). They allowed ejaculation only for the purpose of procreation (Haller and Haller 1974:129; Neuman 1975:8). Working from another angle, they conscripted sexuality into work: The loss of a man’s semen, in medical discourse, led crucially to the loss of his labor power (Barker-Benfield 1976:177, 180; Haller and Haller 1974:205, 212; Neuman 1975:4-5, 10-11; Parsons 1977:64). To sum up, sex became work, a necessary duty that the Protestant may perform only for the purpose of procreation, not for pleasure. In other words, the Protestants<sup>4</sup> funneled sexuality into reproductive teleology.

Some would say that the foregoing paragraph describes a situation prior to the 1900s. Surely things are different now? Consumerist hedonism has replaced Protestant asceticism (Bell 1979:xxv). And hasn’t the “sexual revolution” liberated our sexuality?

In response to these questions, I argue that Protestant asceticism has not waned. Turner’s (1996:124) term “ascetic hedonism” describes the situation better. Buying more and more stuff, burying ourselves under credit card debt – are these not actions of self-denial? “Consumption, to most Americans, has become a job. Like work, play has become a duty to be performed” (Lewis and Brissett 1967:9). This is especially apparent in the sexual sphere, where the Protestant ethic, far from declining, has reached a culmination. For all the talk of sexual liberation, the symbolism of reproductive teleology still governs male sexuality (Tiefer 2004:55-56). Our pleasure, or what passes for pleasure, still organizes itself along the inexorable script of getting it up, sticking it in, and (only after a sufficient duration) getting off. The standards for phallic performance loom ever higher, and we increasingly use pharmaceuticals in an effort to meet them. More than ever, sex is work (Grace et al. 2006:301; Lewis and Brissett 1967; Zilbergeld 1978:37-38), not pleasure. An encounter from my first week of fieldwork may serve as an illustration.

*He is a tall, handsome guy. Somber-faced, curly-haired, dressed in T-shirt and khaki shorts. He has been walking around the theatre all afternoon, with a large, eternal erection, which he keeps jacking off. I have seen him get blown a few times, but he ended the act before he could reach orgasm. As I*

*kneel to blow him, I notice a strange coating on his dick. Ewww, what is that, numbing ointment? He withdraws quickly and walks off; it seems he is more interested in maintaining his eternal erection than in anything else. After a while I see him comparing dicks with someone else in the left side corner. "It is so hard," he says, comparing dicks with the air of someone comparing two different drills at Home Depot. Shortly afterwards, I leave this scene of priapic play.*

The man in the account does not want to experience pleasure; he only gets a strangely ascetic sense of satisfaction in the perfect mechanical functioning of his "tool," in the adherence of his penile "implement" to the quantifiable criteria of hardness, length, longevity. A machine may only work. It does not experience emotion, especially not pleasure. Protestantism – which has strong connections to the doctrine of Mechanism<sup>5</sup> – turns sex into work by positing it as the involuntary drive of machines that are programmed to breed. Once Protestantism has thus bio-mechanized us at the level of our innermost desires, we become docile participants in the economic order of Capitalism. *At the video store I rent a bareback gangbang DVD entitled Dawson's 20 Load Weekend (Sohl and Morris 2004). I usually like gangbangs, but this movie is dull, with a counter at the bottom of the screen progressively displaying the number of loads that one Dawson takes up his ass. The DVD cover proclaims: "Hot men flew to New York City from all over the US for a chance to breed'n'seed Dawson's perfect ass." So there you have it: Quantified economic productivity (20 loads delivered) and reproductive teleology (Breed? Seed?) united in happy matrimony.*

The reverie over, I was left staring at the laptop screen, fussing over an impasse in my research. Thus far, I had excavated the ideological roots of the cultural ideal of sexuality, showing how it conscripts us into the Capitalist economist order. As a solution, I had been waiting for a certain "alternative conception of sexuality" to simply pop out of my fieldnotes and analysis and point to liberation. But an intriguing encounter in the field put an end to such hubris.

*The tattooed young man has an expressionless face. My finger searches for his asshole, slipping in through the lubed-up buttcrack, finding the slight constriction, sliding in. Hmmm... His flesh, all lubed up, and fucked numerous times today, I'm sure. The devoted guy who had been sucking me all afternoon is kneeling again, sucking my hardening dick. I remove the dick from the cocksucker's mouth and place it in the young man's buttcrack, shoving his shoulders down with my hands, making him bend over. The cock slides in easy. I am thrusting back and forth, but I feel no pleasure. Nothing. As if I am peripheral to the action.*

*In a while, others gather around me, hard cocks, perhaps waiting their turn. I am bored, bored with the young man's blank face, his softly indifferent ass. I move away a few steps, watching the action on the screen. I let the movie turn me on. I am shaking, my knees quivering so hard that I can barely stand up. It is shooting out of me now, and I shudder in my coming, ignoring the short, hung man who has joined me, rubbing his hard-on against my own.*

Typing up my fieldnotes, I wonder at myself. I had been doing everything depicted on the screen with the attractive tattooed boy, without experiencing pleasure. And yet, I was later able to enjoy the pornographic spectacle on the screen, regardless of whether or not I had enjoyed enacting that script in reality. It seems that the conventional script of sex enacted on the screen enjoys a momentum of its own in my mental life. I think about those instances where I experience pleasure in fucking or getting fucked. Does my pleasure at these times derive from the satisfaction of my innate desires, or does it derive instead from my adherence to the external realm of pornographic conventions – conventions saturated with Capitalist ideology? If the latter be the case, then I possess no authentic sexuality. What I experience as my "Sexuality" is then nothing but ideology, through and through.

Aha! So I have been barking up the wrong tree all along. I have been trying to find "an alternative conception of sexuality" as if I possessed a pristine sexuality that Capitalist ideology had obscured. But it looks like there exists no genuine sexuality that existed prior to Capitalist ideology, because the root concept of "Sexuality" itself is ideological to the core. Let me be clear: It is becoming apparent to me that there exists no pristine, pure sexuality that we may snatch from the jaws of ideology. It is more correct to say that the entity called "Sexuality" is instead itself an offspring of Capitalist ideology.

"Hold your horses, Sammy-critter," says the voice inside my head. "Thus far, you have convincingly demonstrated how our cultural ideal of sexuality is laced with Capitalist ideology, which derives from a Protestant worldview. But now, you propose the cockamamie idea that the very notion of sexuality is ideological. But to prove your point, you must actually chart the process whereby ideology has manufactured this linguistic artifact called 'Sexuality' so that it now enjoys the status of unquestioned reality. Just how do you intend to do that?"

I have no idea how to do that. My gaze rises above the laptop screen to the cream-colored walls of my studio apartment. I moved in here a couple months ago, having driven off in my U-Haul, leaving Leroy standing on the porch of his house. *Ah, Leroy, how much longer will your memory torment me? Your prone body covered in hair, large gut, large face with itty-bitty eyes. Eyes closed, face impassive, silent. Always, always.* From my fieldnotes, a conversation:

*"Isn't it interesting?" I asked, "That there are heaps of books on female sexuality, and endless debates on, say, whether a female orgasm is vaginal or clitoral, but not as much discourse on male sexuality?" Leroy replied, "Well, male sexuality is unproblematic; We have one orgasm, and it is pretty much visible. It is all these women who are coming into prominence, thinking that everyone must subscribe to their values, these women are the problem. You know, the touchy-feely stuff, that 'everyone should burst out crying.' Why don't these women let things be?"*

And that, in a nutshell, explains why Leroy and I are no longer an item. For Leroy, "Sexuality" and "Emotionality" are two separate trajectories that have no bearing on each other. Whereas I crave emotional intimacy, he finds it a waste of time – feminine and touchy-feely, preferring a merely functional sexual connection instead. I may experience intimacy with him solely in a "Sexual" context.

In divesting sexuality of emotionality, the Quaker patriarch Leroy follows the lead of his Protestant forefathers, who were at pains to deplete sex of emotion (Dorani 1996:46; Seidman 1993:14). A prominent health reformer in this mold was Graham, who blamed the emotional accompaniment to sexual excitement for a host of illnesses (Nissenbaum 1988:113). It would be easy to ascribe these beliefs to the Protestant aversion to emotion, but the facts are a little more complicated.

In advocating male continence, medical authorities held that the wife could suck out the husband's "vital force" during coitus. But what is interesting is that she could do so even by appearing in the husband's proximity (Haller and Haller 1974:112). This assertion, when combined with the medical injunction that coitus be carried out only for the purpose of procreation (Haller and Haller 1974:128-129), points to an interesting epistemological operation. The two-part argument is as follows:

1. All emotional attachment between a husband and wife is a form of coitus.
2. This coitus, for optimal results, should restrict itself to procreative ends.

The medical authorities here conceptually funneled all the emotional connection that a husband and wife may feel for each other, longings that drew them into physical proximity, into reproductive teleology. The net implication was that procreative intercourse was the only time when a husband and wife could legitimately experience intimacy.

This funneling of emotion into functional ends is in keeping with Protestant doctrine. For instance, The Protestants allowed themselves to play sports as long as the objective was exercise, not pure enjoyment (Weber 1998:167). The point is delicate but all-important: Protestantism does not ban emotion; it instead tames all our emotional potential into calculated, productive ends. The doctrine of Mechanism rears its head here. In the ideal state, any emotional excitement that a sportsman feels is nothing more than the satisfaction the body-machine feels in maintaining itself. The same holds true for a husband and wife: Any pleasure the two take in each other's company is simply the satisfaction a machine built to reproduce may feel. For optimum functioning, the couple should experience this pleasure during reproductive coitus only.

But while the Victorian era thus restricted the physical expression of "Sexuality," "Sexuality" as a discursive artifact enjoyed explosive growth (Foucault 1990:17). In fact, this contradiction has described

the formation of the root concept of “Sexuality” itself. To wit, we have stumbled upon the very definition of “Sexuality:” *“Sexuality” is what results when Protestantism takes the entire array of our emotional longings for each other and forces them down the narrow funnel of reproductive teleology.* The operation is linguistic, because the malignant expansion of the linguistic category of “Sexuality” serves to asphyxiate linguistic possibilities for other forms of intimacy. Psychologists have recorded the result: “Men become strangers to their own emotional life, and many develop at least a mild form of alexithymia (which literally means ‘without words for emotions’)” (Levant 1997:18). Nameless longings afflict us, and we perforce look to “Sexuality” for succor: “Consequently, men may seek sex when they really want emotional intimacy, sensual pleasure, or physical comforting” (Brooks 1995:11). To sum up, “Sexuality” is a property of alienated individuals in an atomized society.

According to this explanation, it is wrong to believe in the existence of a primordial entity called “Sexuality” that Capitalist ideology has later merely appropriated and corralled into reproductive teleology. The truth is that “Sexuality” is the product, not the raw material of such an ideological operation. “Sexuality” is a historical linguistic artifact that did not exist prior to the advent of Capitalism. Capitalism, working through its allied doctrines of Protestantism and Mechanism, has manipulated linguistic conventions, re-orienting them under the merciless sign of Mechanical functionality, enriching and legitimizing the new artifact of “Sexuality,” while impoverishing and de-legitimizing other possible linguistic avenues for emotional and intimate connection. If, in the Post-structuralist sense, language governs our connection to reality, then it also governs our connection to our own selves. When we apprehend ourselves from within a linguistic order in which “Sexuality” has become a bulwark of our reality, then we can say that Capitalism has secured our allegiance at the level of our innermost selves. It has now lashed our innermost desires to the iron wheels of the economic order.

We must acknowledge the commanding, legitimating role that academic research has played in the discursive explosion of “Sexuality.” This role is no surprise given the biases built into Western epistemology. The Protestant Mechanists who gave us our scientific methodology were strong advocates of taming the emotions into productive ends. They idealized “A new concept of the self as a rational master of the passions housed in a machinelike body” (Merchant 1980:214). Master your passions; Control your emotions; You are only a machine. When the academic inquirer has such a brutish relationship to himself, will his relationship with the world not be contorted also? Is it any surprise that he will then come up with an oppressive concoction like “Sexuality”? Like I said earlier, methodology creates its own object of inquiry. That “Sexuality” is the product of a certain methodology is clear by now. I have tweaked that methodology a little, and lo! “Sexuality” has started to crumble. No longer does “Sexuality” appear to be an unshakable reality or a scientific truth, for my methodological heresy has disrobed it, exposing it for what it is: Merely a result of recent commerce between linguistic conventions, an artifact fashioned in the forge of Capitalist ideology.

In this essay, I have made my case in four stages. First, I discussed how Capitalist ideals saturate our current concept of sexuality. Secondly, I proposed that this is inevitable because the root concept of “Sexuality” is itself a product of Capitalist ideology. In the third stage, I explained how Capitalist ideology has manipulated language in league with its allied doctrines of Protestantism and Mechanism in order to manufacture and promote the oppressive idea called “Sexuality.” Lastly, I showed how regnant academic methodologies, on account of their Mechanistic character, are responsible for the perpetuation of “Sexuality.” Traditional social scientific methodology is itself ideological.

I imagine a new methodology that does not shatter the inquirer’s relationship to himself. One that allows him to embrace his self as a whole self in all its fullness – pleasure and pain, snout and gut, past and present. What sort of knowledge-making would the inquirer then initiate? What kind of thought? What kind of academy? What kind of world? What kind of human?

I wonder. But there’ll be enough time to wonder. Right now, I must bring this essay to a close. I am scrolling through file after file of fieldnotes, looking for something to end my essay for a “bookend” effect. Oh look, here’s an episode from that adult video store, but it is too long. But perhaps I can keep just the beginning, truncating it with something like “And so on and so forth, another day of fieldwork unfolds”? I think I’ll give it a shot.

*The store is quiet and welcoming, painted in gray. I am standing in a spacious video booth. At the door, a tall man asks me, non-verbally, if he can come in. I nod, smiling. Black hair and moustache. Just Like Tom Selleck, I will reminisce fondly later.*

*Our hard dicks are out, rubbing each other. I am taking it easy, appearing not to be too eager. He is the opposite. His eyes shine, and he frequently whispers to me some excited entreaties that I can't decipher.*

*His torso under my hands is a thing of beauty. "Yeah, kiss those nipples" he whispers with a sense of urgency. I kiss each beautiful pec, letting my tongue walk the salty distance from nipple to nipple. He smiles; he is liking it.*

*He kneels, sucking on me. I like his enthusiasm. Lifting up my wet cock, let him lick my balls. Earnest black eyes staring up at me. Black moustache framing my balls. Eager Tom Selleck is beside himself, looking up at me.*

*Quietly, in the soft gray light, an afternoon unfolds.*

## Epilogue

The researcher began by using an autoethnographic approach to the study of sex. However, the research ran into heavy weather at the outset. The researcher's emotional reactions to his setting, and the emotional reactions of his informants to his presence – all threatened to derail his investigation into sexuality. It became clear to the researcher that there does not exist a certain object of inquiry called "Sexuality" that one may study regardless of the methodology employed. It became clear to him that the object of inquiry called "Sexuality," and traditional social science methodology (including ethnography) are bound together in a tight compact. It is only by adopting an emotionally detached and objective mindset that a researcher can "safely" isolate and study a certain object called "Sexuality." "Sexuality" appeared to have no independent existence of its own; It instead appeared to be a product of a specific approach to research – that of traditional Mechanistic methodology.

As the research progressed, it became clear that contemporary sexuality is an expression of Capitalist ideals, which themselves derive from a Protestant worldview. In the second stage, the researcher learned that it is futile to look for a more progressive version of sexuality free of Capitalist ideology, because the very notion of "Sexuality" is a recent invention of ideology. The Protestant worldview, acting through its allied doctrine of Mechanism, has re-organized the field of linguistic conventions to concoct and consecrate a new concept, a new experience called "Sexuality." This rationale for this new concept rests on Mechanistic ideals that devalue the emotional life, positing all connections between humans to be matters of merely functional teleology.

The connection between the doctrine of Mechanism and the concept of "Sexuality" now becomes abundantly clear. The concept of "Sexuality" can only become intelligible in a linguistic-cultural field that devalues the the diversity of emotional connections between individuals in favor of functional, Mechanical transactions. Traditional social science methodology derives from a "scientific" worldview that is the legacy of Mechanism; It, too prefers to see and portray the social world as a field of functional-Mechanical transactions devoid of emotional nuances. If "Sexuality" is a linguistic artifact that is purely conventional, purely a product of history and ideology, then so is the methodology that consecrates and perpetuates it. That methodology may no longer enjoy the status of being an authoritative window into reality. It follows that "Sexuality" does not have an unshakable, independent existence in reality. Replace Mechanistic methodology with a dissenting autoethnographic viewpoint, and "Sexuality" – which previously enjoyed the status of being an undisputed "scientific" fact – simply disappears.

## Notes

1. Our scientific methodology derives from a Protestant worldview. In an argument now famous as "The

Merton thesis" (Cohen 1990), Merton showed how Protestant theology was the force behind the "scientific revolution" that inaugurated modern science. At the heart of the Protestant worldview is the notion of an absent God. The Protestant God has set the universe in motion according to immutable laws (of physics, astronomy and so on), and then excused himself (Dijksterhuis 1969:491; Mason 1953:85-86; Stark 1953:346). The Protestant scientists consequently saw the universe (Burt 1932; Butterfield 1958:119-121; Westfall 1973:5, 77, 80), including the human body (Burt 1932:176; Butterfield 1958:125, 134; Merchant 1980:206, 212) to be essentially mechanical in nature, which is why Merchant (1980) calls them Mechanists. Further, the concept of a God who has set the immutable laws into motion and then left is connected to the concept of predestination – the notion that God had immutably decreed one's status as elect or (most probably) as non-elect, and then turned his face away (Merton 2001:109-110). Given this pessimistic theology, The Protestant tries to create in himself the conviction of salvation through systematic self-monitoring (Weber 1998:115). This self-monitoring is especially apparent in the emotional sphere, where experiencing or expressing unbridled emotion is taboo (Merchant 1980:195, 214; Weber 1998:119, 127, 148, 166, 167). All of which adds up to the image of the Protestant scientist, detachedly teasing out immutable laws in various phenomena, with no unnecessary emotions contaminating his findings.

2. For an elaborate discussion of the concept of "linguistic artifact," see Rossi-Landi (1983).

3. A male who gets fucked is not outside this imperative, for he has displaced this "coital imperative" onto the man doing the fucking.

4. The Protestants did not invent this ascetic conception of sexuality; Catholic doctrine has always restricted sexuality to reproductive ends. But in the centuries when Catholicism was regnant, such ascetic control of sexuality applied only to the clergy. The sexual life of the laity was more bucolic and unregulated by comparison (Foucault 1990:31-32). "Christian asceticism.... had, on the whole, left the naturally spontaneous character of daily life in the world untouched" (Weber 1998:154). But the Protestant reformation made Christian asceticism ubiquitous: "Now it strode into the market-place of life, slammed the door of the monastery behind it, and undertook to penetrate just that daily routine of life with its methodicalness" (Weber 1998:154). Christian asceticism now regulated sexuality on a society-wide scale. Medical authorities, brandishing new taxonomies and nosologies, became the agents for this control: "This scheme for transforming sex into discourse had been devised long before in an ascetic and monastic setting. The seventeenth century made it into a rule for everyone" (Foucault 1990:20).

5. The connection between Mechanism and Protestantism is discernible in the work of Newton, whose theory of gravity is the apogee of the scientific revolution. While Newton described the operations of gravity, he was unable to explain what produces gravity. A devout Protestant, he privately explained that gravity existed because of divine decree (Koyre 1957:176-189). This conclusion agreed with the beliefs of Protestant theologians, who saw the immutable laws of physics as simply expressions, in the natural world, of the immutable law of predestination (Merton 2001:109-110). The fact that Newtonian Mechanics, which has a theological cornerstone, continues to guide our scientific worldview shows that modern science remains immersed in Protestantism in spite of its claims to secular objectivity. See also note 1.

#### Works Cited

- Aanstoos, C. 2001. "Phenomenology of Sexuality." Pp. 69-90 in *New Directions in Sex Therapy: Innovations and Alternatives*, edited by P. Kleinplatz. Philadelphia: Brunner-Routledge.
- Barker-Benfield, G. 1976. *The Horrors of the Half-Known Life: Male Attitudes toward Women and Sexuality in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bell, D. 1979. *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. London: Heinemann.
- Bochner, A. 1994. "Perspectives on Inquiry II: Theories and Stories." Pp. 21-41 in *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication*, edited by M. Knapp, and G. Miller. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Bochner, A., and Ellis, C. 1996. "Introduction: Talking over Ethnography." Pp. 13-45 in *Composing Ethnography: Alternative Forms of Qualitative Writing*, edited by C. Ellis, and A. Bochner. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira.
- Brooks, G. 1995. *The Centerfold Syndrome: How Men can Overcome Objectification and Achieve Intimacy with Women*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burt, E. 1932. *Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Science*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Butterfield, H. 1958. *Origins of Modern Physical Science 1300-1800*. London: G. Bell and Sons.
- Cameron, D. 1992. "Naming of Parts: Gender, Culture, and Terms for the Penis among American College Students." *American Speech* 67:367-382.
- Cohen, I., Ed. 1990. *Puritanism and the Rise of Modern Science: The Merton Thesis*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Delph, E. 1978. *The Silent Community: Public Homosexual Encounters*. London: Sage.
- Dijksterhuis, E. 1969. *The Mechanization of the World Picture*. 1950. Trans. C. Dikshoorn. London: Oxford University Press.
- Dorani, D. 1996. "The Puritans, Sex, and Pleasure." Pp. 33-51 in *Christian Perspectives on Sexuality and Gender*, edited by E. Stuart, and A. Thatcher. Leominster, UK: Gracewing.
- Ellis, C. 1993. "'There are Survivors': Telling a Story of Sudden Death." *The Sociological Quarterly* 34:711-730.
- Ellis, C. 1997. "Evocative Autoethnography: Writing Emotionally about Our Lives." Pp. 115-139 in *Representation and the Text: Re-Framing the Narrative Voice*, edited by W. Tierney, and Y. Lincoln. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ellis, C. 2004. *The Ethnographic I: A Methodological Novel about Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira.
- Ellis, C., and Bochner, A. 2003. "Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity: Researcher as Subject." Pp. 199-258 in *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*, edited by N. Denzin, and Y. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Foucault, M. 1990. *The History of Sexuality* Vol. 1. 1976. Trans. R. Hurley. New York: Vintage.
- Goodall, H. 2000. *Writing the New Ethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira.
- Grace, V., et al. 2006. "The Discursive Condition of Viagra." *Sexualities* 9:295-314.
- Hall, L. 1991. *Hidden Anxieties: Male Sexuality, 1900-1950*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Haller, J., and R. Haller. 1974. *The Physician and Sexuality in Victorian America*. Urbana, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Humphreys, L. 1970. *Tearoom Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Kimmel, M. 1996. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. New York: The Free Press.
- Koyre, A. 1957. *From the Closed World to the Infinite Universe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Krieger, S. 1991. *Social Science and the Self: Personal Essays on an Art Form*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Laqueur, T. 2003. *Solitary Sex: A Cultural History of Masturbation*. New York: Zone.
- Levant, R. 1997. "Nonrelational Sexuality in Men." Pp. 9-27 in *Men and Sex: New Psychological Perspectives*, edited by R. Levant, and G. Brooks. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lewis, L., and D. Brissett. 1967. "Sex as Work: A Study of Avocational Counseling." *Social Problems* 15:8-18.
- Mamo, L., and J. Fishman. 2001. "Potency in All the Right Places: Viagra as a Technology of the Gendered Body." *Body & Society* 7:13-35.
- Marcus, S. 1966. *The Other Victorians: A Study of Sexuality and Pornography in Mid-Nineteenth-Century England*. New York: Basic Books.
- Marx, K. 1964. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. 1932. Trans. M. Milligan. New York: International Publishers.
- Mason, S. 1953. "The Scientific Revolution and the Protestant Reformation." *Annals of Science* 9:64-87, 154-175.
- Merchant, C. 1980. *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Merton, R. 2001. *Science, Technology and Society in Seventeenth-Century England*. 1938. New York: Howard Fertig.

- Mumford, K. 1992. "'Lost Manhood' Found: Male Sexual Impotence and Victorian Culture in the United States." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 3:33-57.
- Murphy, P. 2001. *Studs, Tools, and the Family Jewels: Metaphors Men Live by*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Mykhalovskiy, E. 1996. "Reconsidering Table Talk: Critical Thoughts on the Relationship between Sociology, Autobiography and Self-Indulgence." *Qualitative Sociology* 19:131-151.
- Nissenbaum, S. 1988. *Sex, Diet, and Debility in Jacksonian America: Sylvester Graham and Health Reform*. 1980. Chicago: Dorsey Press.
- Neuman, R. 1975. "Masturbation, Madness, and the Modern Concepts of Childhood and Adolescence." *Journal of Social History* 8:1-27.
- Parsons, G. 1977. "Equal Treatment for All: American Medical Remedies for Male Sexual Problems 1850-1900." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 32:55-71.
- Potts, A. 2002. *The Science/Fiction of Sex: Feminist Deconstruction and the Vocabularies of Heterosex*. London: Routledge.
- Potts, A. 2005. "Cyborg Masculinity in the Viagra Era." *Sexualities, Evolution and Gender* 7:3-16.
- Potts, A., et al. 2003. "The Downside of Viagra: Women's Experiences and Concerns." *Sociology of Health & Illness* 25:697-719.
- Potts, A., et al. 2006. "'Sex for Life?' Men's Counter-Stories on 'Erectile Dysfunction', Male Sexuality and Ageing." *Sociology of Health & Illness* 28:306-329.
- Rossi-Landi, F. 1983. *Language as Work and Trade: A Semiotic Homology for Linguistics and Economics*. 1968. Trans. M. Adams. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Seidman, S. 1993. *Romantic Longings: Love in America, 1830-1980*. New York: Routledge.
- Sohl, M., dir. and P. Morris, prod. 2004. *Dawson's 20 Load Weekend* [DVD]. San Francisco: Treasure Island Media.
- Sparkes, A. 2002. "Autoethnography: Self-Indulgence or Something More?" Pp. 209-232 in *Ethnographically Speaking: Autoethnography, Literature and Aesthetics*, edited by A. Bochner, and C. Ellis. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira.
- Stark, W. 1953. "Capitalism, Calvinism, and the Rise of Modern Science." Pp. 340-348 in *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*, edited by P. Wiener. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Tiefer, L. 1987. "In Pursuit of the Perfect Penis: The Medicalization of Male Sexuality." Pp. 165-184 in *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity*, edited by M. Kimmel. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tiefer, L. 2004. *Sex is Not a Natural Act and Other Essays*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Turner, B. 1996. *The Body and Society: Explorations in Social Theory*. London: Sage.
- Weber, M. 1998. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. 1904-5. Trans. T. Parsons. Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Westfall, R. 1973. *Science and Religion in Seventeenth-Century England*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Zaretsky, E. 1973. *Capitalism, the Family and Personal Life*. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Zilbergeld, B. 1978. *Male Sexuality: A Guide to Sexual Fulfillment*. Boston: Little, Brown.