

## POLITICS OF INSTITUTIONALIZED DOMINATION: HONOR IN EVERYDAY PRACTICE

Alina Žvinklienė

### ABSTRACT

The article discusses honor issues in everyday practice with specific reference to Sicily. In the frame of analysis, honor refers to the politics of institutionalization of domination. The presented case studies on honor issues deal with the legitimization of superiority during the social interaction between two males, defined as the *machismo* game. The demolition of the established symbolical or actual hierarchy is the main goal and reason to provoke and/or enter the *machismo* game. Although a female is usually not a central factor in the male's strategy for power, she may be a substantial contributing factor, even crucial to the outcome of the male's game. Cultural context displays only the language and in what way the recognition of dominance is achieved in the social game does not alter its essence.

KEY WORDS: honor, honor and shame culture, *machismo*, masculinity, femininity.

### ANOTACIJA

Dabartinių socialinių mokslų vyraujančiame diskurse garbė dažniausiai suvokiama kaip pagrindinis moralinės sistemos arba vertybių ramsis, o ne kaip politiniai individo ištekliai, leidžiantys viešai pateisinti savo elgesį, užsitikrinant reputaciją ir socialinę padėtį. Straipsnyje nagrinėjama garbės logika socialinės praktikos lygmenyje, analizuojant tris socialinio žaidimo atvejus Sicilijoje. Pagal kontekstą, dviejų vyrų vieša tarpusavio sąveika apibūdinta mačizmo žaidimu. Simbolinės ar realios socialinės hierarchijos sudarymas yra esminis mačizmo žaidimo tikslas, tuo pačiu – ir paties žaidimo provokavimo priežastis. Kultūrinis kontekstas atskleidžia tikrai kalbą ir būdus, kuriais socialiniame žaidime siekiama pranašumo pripažinimo, tačiau tai nekeičia žaidimo esmės.

PAGRINDINIAI ŽODŽIAI: garbė, garbės ir gėdos kultūra, mačizmas, vyriškumas, moteriškumas.

*Dr. Habil. Alina Žvinklienė*  
*Lithuanian Center for Social Research,*  
*Saltoniškių 58, LT-08105 Vilnius, Lithuania*  
*E-mail: alinazvin@gmail.com*

### Foreword: the intangible meaning of honor

The difficulties in conceptualizing honor are mainly caused by the western perception of honor as an abstraction rather than as a practice of social domination in a given historical and socio-cultural context, which, however, extends to postmodern times.

Mainstream social and political sciences no longer view honor as a category of stratification or a basis of behavior, but rather as a moral category, thus disregarding it as a scientific and political paradigm<sup>1</sup>. Honor is actually conceptualized as a twin sister of dignity. However, honor is usually overlooked in socio-political rhetoric whereas the indeterminate thus highly manipulable concept of dignity is widely employed.

<sup>1</sup> See: ŽVINKLIENĖ, Alina. Garbės koncepcija socialiniame diskurse (I). *Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmas*, 2009, Nr. 2 (25), p. 83–91.

In everyday language, the word 'honor' has actually been replaced by reputation. Reputation, like honor, is a mechanism of social control since it creates a social evaluation of the individual, especially in professional activities. Yet, reputation does not extend to the members of one's kinship and/or professional group, at least in its ideal meaning.

James Bowman defines a modern western society as a 'post-honor' society that is deeply uncomfortable with the notion of honor – under any form<sup>2</sup>.

Bowman, from his moralizing, ethnocentric and antifeminist standing, identifies eight qualities and, consequently, reasons for the alienation of words like honor, shame and impudence in Western, and foremost American, society. The first reason is that honor and shame are socially established and not under the control of the honored or shamed individual. Second is honor's elitist character; the existence of an honor group indicates that all men are not equal while the opinion of the honor group's members matters more than that of any outsider. Third is honor's 'judgmentalism', with reference to the violation of individual autonomy; one cannot be bound in honor to disobey the rules of honor. Fourth is honor's lack of compassion; personal shame extends to all members of the kinship group. The fifth reason is that honor is a relativistic standard; what is honored in one society or social subset may not be honored, and may even be despised, in another. Sixth is honor's confrontation with Christianity; the values of the Sermon on the Mount, in particular the injunction to 'turn the other cheek', are the exact opposite of the demands of honor 'an eye for an eye'. Seventh is honor's hypocrisy; one cannot be shamed by what has not been made public. And eighth, "the most serious problem that modern sensibility has with honor: that it is fundamentally different for men and women. Traditionally, honor for men has meant bravery – or, rather, the reputation of bravery – while honor for women has meant the reputation of chastity"<sup>3</sup>. Bowman blames the demise of the western idea of honor, first of all as *virtus* on modern warfare, which usually makes individual acts of bravery and heroism on which honor depends utterly meaningless, on feminism and on psychotherapy. Feminism broke down social and juridical distinctions between men and women and is closely related to pacifism, while psychotherapy treated the hero as a victim.

Religion, the nation-state's formation and centralization, the state's monopolization of force, and modernization (or colonization) governed the transformations of honor in every society. However, a deadly blow to the idea of honor in western discourse came from the recognition of individual rights as paramount and, therefore, above the collective rights which honor represents.

The modern minimalist concept of honor defines it "as a right to respect as an equal"<sup>4</sup>. Such definition of honor as a right is very suitable for cross-cultural comparisons and corresponds to the idea of human rights. At the same time, the sociological analysis of social practices usually reveals that all people are equal, but some people are more equal than others<sup>5</sup>.

### Honor in Doing Gender and Differences

Patriarchy in its general sense represents the institutionalization of domination and subordination. The spirit of patriarchy is imbedded in culture and consequently affects all social structures and institutions as well as individuals, both women and men. The most radical feminism, criticized

<sup>2</sup> See: BOWMAN, James. The Lost Sense of Honor. In: *The Public Interest*, 2002, Fall, p. 32–49.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p. 41.

<sup>4</sup> STEWART, Frank Henderson. *Honor*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1994, p. 145.

<sup>5</sup> "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others". See: ORWELL, George (1945); [http://www.george-orwell.org/Animal\\_Farm/9.html](http://www.george-orwell.org/Animal_Farm/9.html)

by antifeminists and feminists alike managed to demonstrate a gendered structure of society, i.e. the invisible patriarchy<sup>6</sup> is made visible<sup>7</sup>.

Honor as cultural phenomena may be considered both an integral part and a form of patriarchy. In modern context, honor, however, is rather a legacy of patriarchy that is best displayed in public presentations of masculinity and femininity.

Honor-shame societies construct and reconstruct forms of masculinities and femininities that match the current honor code's content. Honor can be imposed, defended or lost through the public presentation management of one's gender. In any society, men dominate the public sphere, which is the principal arena of male 'games' for honor. Eric Berne, creator of transactional analysis, defines a game as "an ongoing series of complementary ulterior transactions progressing to a well-defined, predictable outcome... Every game ... is basically dishonest, and the outcome has a dramatic, as distinct from merely exciting, quality"<sup>8</sup>. The patriarchal control of women may be regarded as only one tool, yet a significant one, in the male honor contest. Women are allowed to enter the public sphere only to the extent that it corresponds to men's interests.

Male honor may be analyzed in terms of hegemonic masculinity. The pioneers of men's studies defined hegemonic masculinity as "a question of how particular groups of men inhabit positions of power and wealth and how they legitimate and reproduce the relationships that generate their dominance"<sup>9</sup>. Actually, very few men correspond to and benefit from the hegemonic model of masculinity. However, many men are responsible for sustaining the hegemonic model, and most of them benefit from the subordination of women at least.

The Spanish word *macho* – a male possessing *machismo*, i.e., a display of strong ambitions to power as proof of his own masculinity – thanks to feminists discourse and an apparent individual character became a popular label for the hegemonic masculinity in the Western world and Russia as well. *Macho* and *machismo*, which originally referred to a celebration of conventional masculinities,<sup>10</sup> are often synonymous with sexism, thus are usually stigmatized.

Broadly speaking, machismo refers to the most traditional ideas of strong and forceful male behavior and how men and women should behave. Machismo describes that standard by which many men rate their own masculinity: their virility, strength, ability to stand up against difficulty and maintain their stance as true 'man among men'. The code of machismo requires individual men to make a display of physical power and social domination, and to disdain any feminine, or supposedly feminine, traits. It inevitably includes a deep-rooted homophobia<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> In contemporary feminist thought, patriarchy is defined "as a system of male authority which oppresses women through its social, political and economic institutions" (Humm, 1989: 159).

<sup>7</sup> e.g. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Emma Goldman, Margaret Sanger, Ti-Grace Atkinson, Anne Koend, Adrienne Rich, Kate Millett, Shulamith Firestone, and post-modern feminists Julia Kristeva, Mary Daly, Lucy Irigaray.

<sup>8</sup> BERNE, Eric. *Games People Play*. New York: Grove Press, Inc, 1964, p. 19.

<sup>9</sup> CARRIGAN, Tim, Connel, Bob & LEE, John. Hard and Heavy: Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity. In: Michael Kaufman (Ed.) *Beyond Patriarchy. Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1987, p. 179.

<sup>10</sup> Similarly, the celebration of female attributes is known as hembrismo (feminismo), a derivative from a woman – *hembra* (*feminista*). For instance, a popular Cuban saying is "soy tan hembra como tú macho" – I am as much woman as you are man" (LUMSDEN, Ian. *Machos, Maricones and Gays: Cuba and Homosexuality*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996, p. 220–221).

<sup>11</sup> See: RÜNZLER, Dieter. *Machismo. Die Grenzen der Männlichkeit*. Böhlman Verlag: Wien-Köln-Graz, 1988; GILMORE, David D. *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990; LUMSDEN, I. (...) 1996; VILLERREAL, Gary L. & CAVAZOS, Alonzo, Jr. 2005. Shifting Identity: Process and Change in Identity of Aging Mexican-American Males. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, March: [http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m0CYZ/is\\_1\\_32/ai\\_n13619864/pg\\_3](http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0CYZ/is_1_32/ai_n13619864/pg_3).

It is important to note that machismo can have both positive and negative meanings; positive in the sense of protecting the honor and welfare of the family<sup>12</sup>, whereas the negative elements may include heavy drinking, subjugation of women and performance of high-risk activities that increase health risks among males and potential domestic violence for females<sup>13</sup>.

Machismo is actually an individual behavior that, however, is socially shared; therefore, to some extent machismo could be used as a synonym for personal honor. However, while machismo is a personal matter, honor is always a collective matter. A group is unable to restore the machismo of its individual member, but can try to restore the group's honor, for instance, by resorting to honor killing.

Being a mechanism to achieve power – real or symbolical – machismo may be publicly exhibited by a woman as well, especially in the traditional spheres of male activities, i.e., politics and business.

A permanent process of legitimization of masculinity (and femininity, of course) can be analyzed in the frame of the canonic concept of 'doing gender'<sup>14</sup>, extended to 'doing differences' by taking into account categories such as class, race, etc.<sup>15</sup>. Gender (or difference) is understood "as a routine accomplishment embedded in everyday interaction"<sup>16</sup>; it is suggested that categorization and accountability are intrinsic features of social identities.

The concept of entangled categories (intersectionality) that has been actively elaborated in recent gender studies requires considering 'doing gender' as a social practice, in which the relevance of one's biography and social milieu must be seen in relation to the context in which the social interaction takes place. Simultaneously, a practiced gender displays a structural inequality that is perpetuated and legitimated in social interactions.

Hence, machismo, defined as a process of doing gender and differences, may be perceived as a strategy of power used in the name of honor.

### **Machismo game in Sicily**

The proposition that "the language of honor and its associated behaviors are transcultural phenomena put to use, even beyond the specific Mediterranean context, for the purpose of managing one's reputation and thus of defining (better yet, redefining) the social identity of individuals and groups"<sup>17</sup> in various ways and explanatory levels as discussed above, may be illustrated via the author's fieldwork findings in Sicily in 2001.

It should be noted that the following brief presentation of three case studies on honor issues, revealed by the analysis of males' machismo game,<sup>18</sup> is the result of the so-called anthropological tourism, whereby "researchers often begin without a hypothesis and, like the tourist, gaze rapa-

<sup>12</sup> GALANTI, G.A. The Hispanic Family and Male-Female Relationships: An Overview. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 2003, Vol. 14(3), p. 180–185. Quote taken from Villereal & Cavazos (2005).

<sup>13</sup> REDONDO-CHURCHWARD, I. "Cada cabeza es un mundo" in D. Hayes-Bautista & R. Chiprut (Eds.) In: *Healing Latinos: Realidad y fantasia*. Los Angeles, CA: Cedars-Sinai Health System, 1998, p. 87–95. Quote taken from Villereal & Cavazos (2005).

<sup>14</sup> See: WEST, Candace & ZIMMERMAN, Don H. Doing Gender. *Gender and Society*, 1987, Vol. 1(2), p. 125–151.

<sup>15</sup> See: WEST, Candace & FENSTERMAKER, Sarah. Doing Difference. *Gender and Society*, 1995, Vol. 9(1), p. 8–37. Authors follow the work of ethnomethodologists Harold Garfinkel and Suzanne J. Kessler and Wendy MacKenna, and of sociologist Erving Goffman define three separate categories of sex, sex category and gender.

<sup>16</sup> WEST, C. & ZIMMERMAN, D. H. (...) 1987, p. 125.

<sup>17</sup> GIORDANO, Christian. Mediterranean Honor and beyond. The Social Management of Reputation in the Public Sphere. *Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmas*, 2005, Vol. 1, p. 52.

<sup>18</sup> A detailed description of these case studies and their analysis are presented in: ŽVINKLIENĒ, Alina. *Machismo – varžymasis dėl garbės. Siciliškosios patirties studijos. Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmas*, 2005, Nr. 1, p. 56–69.

ciously at social scenes for signs of activities that appear to be new and different”<sup>19</sup>. However, in this case, an anthropological tourism, together with reflectivity (or autobiography), which “subverts the idea of the observer as impersonal machine”<sup>20</sup>, allowed to establish social interactions that local Italians, or even anthropologists working long-term in the field, would hardly notice because of their ordinariness. These situations became salient simply because of the Lithuanian ‘ethnographic’ context, enriched by experience in gender studies and perspective. To some extent, these case studies fall under the autoethnographical category in sociology whereby researchers “examine their own lived experiences of events, interactions, or relationships as their ‘primary data’. In doing so, they try to move toward general, sociologically informed conclusions”<sup>21</sup>.

The case studies may be defined as mini-acts of the machismo game while “It’s always such a show, when anyone is watching”<sup>22</sup> in the sphere of service between two males (*machos* or *uomini d’onore* in local context): a consumer of service and its supplier.

The basic cast of actors included a male – a professor, a female, just a woman, both are consumers, and local guest actors: namely, a taxi-driver in Rome (quite possibly of Sicilian origin), a restaurateur in Palermo, and a farmstead’s owner in *Piana degli Albanesi*, all suppliers of service.

**1. Rome: a taxi-driver.** The lazy talk between males during a trip from the airport to the hotel after payment for the service escalates into conflict due to some comments made by the professor. Moreover, the taxi-driver brings the conflict into the hotel’s lobby. Neither the receptionist nor the woman intervenes in the skirmish between the two men. Finally, the taxi driver points at the woman and says: “*e la signora pensa così*” (“and the lady thinks so”). The three men look at the woman, but she remains silent. The taxi driver, after shouting something, leaves the hotel. The professor only says to the woman: “you could have intervened”.

**2. Palermo: a restaurateur.** The bill for a dinner at the *al fresco* restaurant is presented to the woman. She passes it on to the professor. The bill cannot be paid because they do not accept a credit card. The owner of the restaurant enters the discussion between the professor and a waiter about the payment, explaining that due to problems with the phone line they cannot accept the credit card. The core of the heightened emotional conversation between the two men is mistrust towards anything and anybody, except one’s self. The restaurant’s clients chime into the conversation when it concerns evaluating the activities of the government, banks, ATMs etc. The woman keeps quiet; however, her body language expresses understanding for the restaurant’s owner and approval of the professor’s words. Suddenly, the restaurateur makes a grand gesture – he offers the dinner to the professor, the professor can go away or come another time with cash and pay.

The professor thanks him, but decidedly refuses the offer and demands to be shown to any cash dispenser in function nearby. The restaurateur and customers start to discuss where it could be, the waiters draw up a map. The woman is asked whether she agrees to wait in the restaurant while

<sup>19</sup> SILVERMAN, David. *Interpreting Qualitative Data. Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*. London-Thousand Oaks-New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 1993, p. 5.

<sup>20</sup> OKELY, Judith. Anthropology and Autobiography. Participatory Experience and Embodied Knowledge. In: Judith Okely & H. Callaway (eds.). *Anthropology and Autobiography*. London: Routledge, 1992, p. 24.

<sup>21</sup> SANDSTROM, Kent L.; MARTIN, Daniel D.; FINE, Gary Alan. *Symbols, Selves, and Social Reality: A Symbolic Interactionist Approach to Social Psychology and Sociology*. The 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Los Angeles, California: Roxbury Publishing Company, 2006, p. 16.

<sup>22</sup> JETT, Joan & LAGUNA Kenny. *Machismo*: <http://www.metrolyrics.com/machismo-lyrics-joan-jett-and-the-black-hearts.html>



the professor goes in search for cash. All look at her. She agrees. The woman remains alone. Apparently, nobody is looking at her; however, the restaurateur occasionally glances at her from the door of his restaurant. The professor returns in triumph. The owner rushes out. The emotional dialogue between the two men is about trust in each other again. The payment is made.

**3. Piana degli Albanesi: a farmstead's "Hasienda mejicana" owner.** The female students refuse to live in the farmstead because of inadequate living and working conditions. Only a male student has received a separate room. Three young women share one room where there is not even a desk. Behind a wall, the loud music blares all night long, and, moreover, every morning the owner walks through the females' room to reach the bathroom and fulfill his morning natural actions. The females would like to relocate to the convent nearby the farmstead; however, they can do so only if the farmstead's owner gives them back the money paid for accommodation. The owner of the farmstead refuses to discuss financial issues with the students. Only the professor can solve the situation in the farmstead because other professors are very busy in the field.

The owner of the *Spaghetti western* type farmstead proudly shows them a tiny female-students' room. The group relocates in the yard for further discussion. The females make further complaints, but the owner pretends not to understand the problem. The professor points out that obviously the students cannot complete their work in the present accommodation; therefore, it does not correspond to the rental agreement. The issue of the violation of the females' private space is not even mentioned. Gradually the owner seems to realize that there may actually be a breach of contract, but everything can be solved. The woman is silent during all the long-winded debates. Suddenly during a lull, she says „*E non c'è gente più*” (*There is no more people*). It is a new issue, said in bad Italian, and actually out of context. All look at her with a silent question – *What?* The owner is the first to resume conversation, and he begins using the honor rhetoric to justify the situation as a misunderstanding. Finally, he agrees to return the payment for the remaining days. The men shake hands.

The goal of the fight for honor, in terms of the analysis – machismo game – presupposes the imposition of one's superiority between more or less equals. The professor's obvious higher social status was lowered, at least in his rivals' eyes, because of his foreignness; in honor and shame societies, the 'outsider' is *a priori* inferior. The professor was on assignment; therefore, the situation's social context was more favorable to the locals. Moreover, the rivals strove to use it by creating or utilizing the public space where their machismo could be better displayed, thus evaluated by public opinion.

The institution of public opinion is very important in any honor and shame society. Sicilians, for example, “are daily confronted with problems like ‘*fama*’ and ‘*diceria*’. ‘*Fama*’ can be described as the good name of the honorable as constantly redefined by ‘public opinion’; ‘*diceria*’, on the other hand, is the subtle rumor, which establishes the ‘shamelessness’ of a person or a group. ‘*Diceria*’ is a favored strategy of discreditation, in order to create problems for the reputation of potential enemies... in all Mediterranean societies there are specific social spaces in which the construction or destruction of reputation, of status and hence of honor is carried out. Thus, in Sicily ‘*fama*’ and ‘*diceria*’ would be inconceivable without ‘*piazza*’ or ‘*corso*’”<sup>23</sup>.

In the public space of a square or a promenade the significance of an adequate ‘*façade*’ or ‘*mask*’, i.e. gender displays in Goffman's words, in the politics of reputation is revealed. “Gender

<sup>23</sup> MÜHLMANN, Wilhelm E. & LLARYORA, Roberto J. *Strummula Siciliana. Ehre, Rang und soziale Schichtung in einer sizilianischen Agro-Stadt*. Meisenheim a. Glan: Anton Hain Verlag, 1973, p. 35. Quote taken from Giordano (2001).

displays, like other rituals, can iconically reflect fundamental features of the social structure... [however]... displays are a symptom, not a portrait”<sup>24</sup>. Hence, whoever is more skilful in his/her public gender display stands the best chance of being considered a respectable person.

The originality of the social interactions discussed lies in the similarity of the honor codes used by the rivals. The locals did not apply them to the professor; for them he was a man who could not grasp the essence of honor, thus he was an honor-less man. The professor, however, in line with a good ethno-methodological tradition, provoked the taxi driver and the restaurateur to enter the machismo game and meet the ‘unexpected’ opponent, and in turn was challenged by the farmstead’s owner. In accordance with the tradition of patriarchal order, in all three cases the woman had a background role in the machismo game.

In the taxi-driver case, the professor’s provocation was perceived as an attempt on honor that was not neutralized by the professor’s justification; an apology would imply a denial of his symbolic superiority. The taxi-driver, in striving to contest the professor, unadvisedly left the public space, i.e., an empty street at night, and entered the semi-private space of the hotel’s lobby. He did not obtain the receptionist’s potential support (quite possibly of South Italian origin) for whom the hotel’s prestige was certainly more important than the taxi-driver’s good name. Desperately seeking support for his claims, the taxi-driver made a final effort by declaring that the woman backs him and, therefore shames the professor. Unusual for a foreigner, the woman’s modest behavior, i.e., she did not interrupt the men’s affairs, is perceived conversely, i.e. as disapproval of her companion.

In sports terminology, the result of the social interaction match with the taxi-driver could be defined as a no-winner draw, which discontented both contestants. Neither man upheld his own superiority nor lost it; only the woman was shamed because she did not realize the men’s expectations.

The ‘clash of civilizations’, namely ‘trust’ and ‘mistrust’ societies, provoked the case of the restaurateur. The professor, as a representative of the trust society, wanted to pay with the credit card, but the restaurateur, as a representative of the mistrust society, could not accept it from someone he did not know personally. However, his restaurant represents the trust place because consumers pay after delivery of the service; therefore, the restaurateur displays himself as a trustworthy person, i.e. as a man of honor in the mistrust society.

In their fight for honor, the restaurateur used the rhetoric of generosity whereas the professor used the rhetoric of honesty. The professor argued his fairness by involving the restaurant’s waiters and its customers in the discussion and action, thus displaying his ability to dominate even in the unfavorable situation. However, the restaurateur parried the professor’s dominance with a display of generosity that increased his own reputation, thus his restaurant’s as well.

The men recognized each other as a man of honor (only in the context of the situation) involving the woman in the interaction. It should be noted that in Mediterranean societies the wife of the man of honor is sacred (*sacra*). The woman (a child would have been even better) became a guarantee of the professor’s honesty and simultaneously proof of his confidence in the restaurateur. The restaurateur, by publicly acknowledging such pledge, assured his interim patronage of the woman. The woman, by accepting the temporary substitution in the subject of her control, adequately displayed the realization of the males’ expectations.

In sports terminology, the result of the social interaction in the restaurateur case could be defined as a no-winner draw, which however satisfied both contestants. Both men displayed and defended their own honor and both gained their part of ‘*fama*’. However, it could be said that the

<sup>24</sup> GOFFMAN, Erving. “Gender Display” from “Gender Advertisements: Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication” (1976). In: Charles Lemert & Ann Branaman (eds.) *Goffman Reader*. Blackwell Publishing: 1997, p. 224.

restaurateur received more benefits from this machismo game because he invested his honor as a symbolic capital in the future economic welfare of his enterprise.

The third case ‘classically’ represents a genre of the *Spaghetti western* movies. The owner of the agro-tourism establishment picks on the young females who came to this godforsaken place with an obscure purpose and an inadequate escort: one male. The potential “bodyguard” was too young for this role and however was ‘neutralized’ at once by receiving proper accommodation in compliance with the rental agreement. The male student accepted such ‘respect’ and withdrew from the situation totally. However, the *Spaghetti western* genre requires the appearance of the champion of the cheated and oppressed, usually represented by a *gringo*<sup>25</sup>.

It is reasonable to think that the farmstead’s owner deliberately breached the contract. First of all, he could have been aiming at a higher economic profit. Second, he could have been seeking to boost his social status (at least from his own point of view), power and undeclared links in Palermo, without which it would hardly be possible to open the farmstead for agro-tourism in Mafia-controlled territory. Clearly, however, the owner overlooked or rather underestimated the possible level of protection of the local exotica – young *tramontane* females interested in the local social life.

The professor demonstrated that he is a man of high social status and power and came to the farmstead only because of his subordinates’ (students) problems in doing research. The professor did not enter a contract personally as it was done by his female assistant and he knew nothing about the violation of the females’ private space, which could have been perceived as recognition of lost ‘family’ honor and thus would have weakened his position. The professor’s concern was the breach of contract and its consequences on the student’s work.

The owner could not define the limits of the professor’s power, his links with Palermo and the local community, where even gossip could become a fact. The professor did not mention the unexpected intervention of the woman, which was perceived as a hint to such links. In the local context, the consequence of a violation of the rules of vertical honor, i.e. when a person with a definitely lower social status offends a person with a higher social status, is the annihilation of the offender’s business activity.

That is why the owner of the farmstead changed the discourse and defined the problem as a misunderstanding. Utilizing the rhetoric of honor, he offered to give the rest of the money back as proof of his honesty. The professor displayed his benevolence and accepted the deal.

The case of the farmstead owner could be defined as a typical Zero-sum game where the benefits and losses of all players sum up to the same amount of money. In sports terminology, however, it could be defined as a draw in which both contestants lose. At the same time it could be said that the professor gained the ‘*fama*’ because he proved his high social status and ability to employ his knowledge of the honor code, which, however, was actually irrelevant in the local context, but important in his own ‘honor’ group. The farmstead’s owner, instead, provided material for ‘*diceria*’, which in due course could be used against him, thus affecting his enterprise’s economic welfare.

The analyzed cases may be regarded as typical interactions between a consumer and a supplier in the sphere of service wherein both sides represented by males need to vindicate a right to respect and thus to achieve a public recognition of their personal worth. The social hierarchy between consumer and supplier based on the principle of dominance of the consumer’s rights is

<sup>25</sup> A Spanish word, usually offensive slang, to denote people from the United States or, more generally, all foreigners in Mexico and other parts of Latin America.



usually challenged only when the social status of the consumer is symbolically or actually lower or is purportedly so.

The total score of the analyzed machismo games is fifty-fifty. In all cases, the contestants perceived this result with different level of satisfaction. In all cases, the woman's background activity had an impact on each man's advantage/disadvantage. Hence, a woman may make a substantial contribution, even crucial to the outcome of the machismo game; however, she is usually not a central factor in the strategy of legitimization of masculinity.

### **Conclusion: Metamorphosis of honor**

Both 'patriarchy' and 'honor' sound somewhat obsolete or even ironic ever since the declaration and implementation of the principle of equality between all citizens in most of the constitutions of the world. Both words are linked and related to the politics of the institutionalization of domination, i.e. they refer to the hierarchical order in society.

The omission, or rather the concealment of patriarchy, does not mean its annihilation in social life, but rather indicates the ability of patriarchy to undergo sophisticated transformations without affecting its core. Accordingly, the invisibility of honor does not mean it has lost any of its influence on the motivation of present-day 'civilized' people.

Honor as cultural phenomena may be considered both an integral part and a form of patriarchy. In modern context, honor, however, is rather a legacy of patriarchy that is best displayed in public presentations of masculinity and femininity. Honor can be imposed, defended or lost through the public presentation management of one's gender.

The goal of the fight for honor, in terms of the presented analysis – machismo game – presupposes the imposition of one's superiority between more or less equals. Machismo is actually an individual behavior that, however, is socially shared. Being a mechanism to achieve power – real or symbolical – machismo may be publicly exhibited by a woman as well, especially in the traditional spheres of male activities, i.e., politics and business.

Demolition of the established symbolical or real hierarchy is the main reason to provoke and/or enter a machismo game. The cultural context displays only the language while the ways used to achieve the recognition of dominance in social games does not change the essence of the game.

### **References**

- BOWMAN, James. The Lost Sense of Honor. In: *The Public Interest*, 2002, Fall, p. 32–49.
- BERNE, Eric. *Games People Play*. New York: Grove Press, Inc, 1964.
- CARRIGAN, Tim, Connel, Bob & LEE, John. Hard and Heavy: Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity. In: Michael Kaufman (Ed.) *Beyond Patriarchy. Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1987, p. 139–192.
- COOLE, Diana. *Women in Political Theory from Ancient Misogyny to Contemporary Feminism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. NY, London: Harvester, Wheatsheaf, 1993.
- GALANTI, G.A. The Hispanic Family and Male-Female Relationships: An Overview. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 2003, Vol. 14(3), p. 180–185. Quote taken from Villereal & Cavazos (2005).
- GILMORE, David D. *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.
- GIORDANO, Christian. Mediterranean Honor and beyond. The Social Management of Reputation in the Public Sphere. *Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmas*, 2005, Vol. 1, p. 40–55.
- GOFFMAN, Erving. "Gender Display" from "Gender Advertisements: Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication" (1976). In: Charles Lemert & Ann Branaman (eds.) *Goffman Reader*. Blackwell Publishing: 1997, p. 208–227.

- KAVOLIS, Vytautas. *Moterys ir vyrai lietuvių kultūroje*. Vilnius: Lietuvos kultūros institutas, 1992.
- LORBER, Judith & FARELL, Susan A. (eds.). *The Social Construction of Gender*. Newbury Park and London: Sage, 1991.
- LUMSDEN, Ian. *Machos, Maricones and Gays: Cuba and Homosexuality*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996.
- MÜHLMANN, Wilhelm E. & LLARYORA, Roberto J. *Strummula Siciliana. Ehre, Rang und soziale Schichtung in einer sizilianischen Agro-Stadt*. Meisenheim a. Glan: Anton Hain Verlag, 1973. Quote taken from Giordano (2001).
- OKELY, Judith. Anthropology and Authobiography. Participatory Experience and Embodied Knowledge. In: Judith Okely & H. Callaway (eds.). *Anthropology and Authobiography*. London: Routledge, 1992, p. 1–28.
- REDONDO-CHURCHWARD, I. “Cada cabeza es un mundo” in D. Hayes-Bautista & R. Chiprut (Eds.) In: *Healing Latinos: Realidad y fantasia*. Los Angeles, CA: Cedars-Sinai Health System, 1998, p. 87–95. Quote taken from Villereal & Cavazos (2005).
- RÜNZLER, Dieter. *Machismo. Die Grenzen der Männlichkeit*. Böhlman Verlag: Wien-Köln-Graz, 1988.
- SANDSTROM, Kent L.; MARTIN, Daniel D.; FINE, Gary Alan. *Symbols, Selves, and Social Reality: A Symbolic Interactionist Approach to Social Psychology and Sociology*. The 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Los Angeles, California: Roxbury Publishing Company, 2006.
- SILVERMAN, David. *Interpreting Qualitative Data. Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*. London-Thousand Oaks-New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 1993.
- STEWART, Frank Henderson. *Honor*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1994.
- WEST, Candace & ZIMMERMAN, Don H. Doing Gender. *Gender and Society*, 1987, Vol. 1(2), p. 125–151.
- WEST, Candace & FENSTERMAKER, Sarah. Doing Difference. *Gender and Society*, 1995, Vol. 9(1), p. 8–37.
- ŽVINKLIENĖ, Alina. *Machismo – varžymasis dėl garbės. Siciliškosios patirties studijos. Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmai*, 2005, Nr. 1, p. 56–69.
- ŽVINKLIENĖ, Alina. Garbės koncepcija socialiniame diskurse (I). *Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmai*, 2009, Nr. 2 (25), p. 83–91.

**On-line references** (on January 2010)

- JETT, Joan & LAGUNA Kenny. *Machismo*: <http://www.metrolyrics.com/machismo-lyrics-joan-jett-and-the-blackhearts.html>
- ORWELL, George. *Animal Farm*, 1945. Ch 9: [http://www.george-orwell.org/Animal\\_Farm/9.html](http://www.george-orwell.org/Animal_Farm/9.html)
- VILLERREAL, Gary L. & CAVAZOS, Alonzo, Jr. 2005. Shifting Identity: Process and Change in Identity of Aging Mexican-American Males. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, March: [http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m0CYZ/is\\_1\\_32/ai\\_n13619864/pg\\_3](http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0CYZ/is_1_32/ai_n13619864/pg_3)

## **INSTITUCIONALIZUOTO DOMINAVIMO POLITIKA: GARBĖ KASDIENINĖJE PRAKTIKOJE**

**Alina Žvinklienė**

Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centras, Vilnius

### **S a n t r a u k a**

Vyraujančiame dabartinių socialinių mokslų diskurse garbė dažniausiai suvokiama kaip pagrindinis moralinės sistemos arba vertybių ramstis, o ne kaip politiniai individo ištekliai, leidžiantys viešai pateisinti savo elgesį, užsitikrinant reputaciją ir socialinę padėtį.

Straipsnio tikslas – išnagrinėti garbės logiką socialinės praktikos lygmenyje ir pagrįsti garbės supratimo kaip socialinio dominavimo institucionalizacijos politikos, neprarandančios reikšmės šiuolaikinio žmogaus gyvenime, racionalumą.

Įvadinėje straipsnio dalyje teigiama, kad sunkumų apibrėžiant garbės sąvoką daugiausia kyla dėl vakarietiško garbės supratimo kaip moralinės abstrakcijos, o ne kaip socialinio dominavimo praktikos tam tikrame istoriniame ir sociokultūriniame kontekste.

Garbės perkėlimas iš stratifikacinės kategorijos į moralės kategoriją lėmė garbės studijų išstūmimą iš vyraujančios socialinės ir politinės paradigmos. O „mirtinas smūgis“ garbės idėjai Vakarų diskurse buvo individo teisių pirmenybės prieš kolektyvines teises pripažinimas.

Franko Hendersono Stewarto (1994) pasiūlyta minimalistinė garbės apibrėžtis – „teisė į pagarbą kaip lygiams“ – leidžia šiuolaikiškai traktuoti garbę kaip „teisę į pagarbą tarp lygių“, o tai atitinka dabartinį žmogaus teisių supratimą. Tačiau socialinės praktikos sociologinė analizė paprastai atskleidžia, kad nors visi žmonės yra lygūs, kai kurie iš jų vis dėlto yra „lygesni“.

Toliau straipsnyje konstatuojama, kad garbė, garbės siekimas ar kova dėl garbės pripažinimo dažniausiai suprantama kaip „paprotinga“ teisės reliktas ir tuo garbė susiejama su patriarchaline kultūra. Garbė kaip sudėtinė kultūros dalis gali būti atskleidžiama nagrinėjant vyriškumo ir moteriškumo reprezentacijas, kurios paprastai būna postmodernistinių feministinių ir (arba) kultūrinių studijų objektas. Mikrosociologijos tyrimo lygmenyje nuolatinį vyriškumo ir moteriškumo kūrimo ir įtvirtinimo procesą galima nagrinėti taikant kanoninę Candace West ir Don H. Zimmerman (1987) „gender darymo“ (doing gender) koncepciją, kurią vėliau C. West išplėtojo su Sarah Fenstermaker (1995), taip atsidaro „skirtumų darymo“ (doing differences) koncepcija, kurią taikant į analizę įtraukiamos ir kitos kategorijos – klasė, tautybė, rasė ir pan.

Daugelyje visuomenių pamatinės vyriškumo ir moteriškumo reprezentacijos susiformavo dar pagonybės laikais, iki pasaulinių religijų atsiradimo. Taigi garbės ir gėdos kultūros siejimas tikrai su islamu yra visų pirma dabartinio vakarietiškojo etnocentrizmo išraiška. Garbės ir gėdos kultūra šalyse, kuriose krikščionybė yra dominuojanti religija, nėra šių šalių visuomenių praeitis, o dabartis. Mačizmo ir jo atstovo mačo fenomenas – vienas iš garbės ir gėdos kultūros egzistavimo krikščioniškame pasaulyje pavyzdžių.

Mačo (isp. vyras, vyriška lytis), kaip vyro, demonstruojančio hegemoninį vyriškumą, apibūdinimas per pastaruosius du dešimtmečius tapo populiarus Šiaurės Amerikos ir Vakarų Europos viešajame diskurse, ypač feministiniame.

Mačizmas visų pirma yra tai, kaip vienas vyras apibūdinamas kito vyro atžvilgiu, tai varžytuvių arba, pasak Erico Berne (1964), žaidimo situacija. Jį reikėtų suprasti kaip garbės gynimą kovoje už pripažinimą ir pranašumą demonstruojant būtinas charakterio savybes. Taigi vyro ir (arba) šeimos garbės gynimas yra tiesiogiai susijęs su mačizmu. Mačizmas yra individo veikla, tačiau ji socialiai pasidalijama per kartu išgyvenamą patirtį, dėl to tam tikra prasme šis terminas gali būti vartojamas kaip asmens garbės sinonimas. Tačiau šiuo atveju reikia turėti omenyje, kad mačizmas yra asmeninis dalykas, o garbė – visada kolektyvinis. Grupė negali atkurti savo atskiro nario mačizmo, bet gali pabandyti atkurti grupės garbę, pavyzdžiui, įvykdžiusi garbės nužudymą.

Mačizmą, kuris yra galios – simbolinės ar realios – siekimo mechanizmas, dabartiniame emancipuotame pasaulyje gali viešai demonstruoti ir moterys, ypač tradicinėse vyrų aktyvumo sferose, t. y. politikoje ir versle. Kitaip tariant, mačo terminas kol kas vartojamas tikrai vyriškos lyties atstovams apibūdinti, tačiau mačizmas gali būti taikomas abiem lytims, nes kaip galios siekimo mechanizmas mačizmas yra belytis.

Taigi mačizmą, suprantamą kaip vyriškumo / moteriškumo (gender) ir skirtumų darymo demonstravimo procesą, galima apibūdinti kaip individo galios strategiją, taikomą ginant garbę.

Paskutinėje straipsnio dalyje garbės logika rekonstruojama analizuojant tris dviejų vyrų tarpusavio sąveikos atvejus, kurie vadinami mačizmo žaidimu.

Vyrų tarpusavio sąveika visais trimis atvejais vyko viešojoje sferoje, paslaugų srityje. Paslaugos teikimo ir gavimo situacija šiuolaikinėje visuomenėje praktiškai yra universali. Tačiau nagri-

nėjama is atvejais kultūrinį kontekstą suteikia socialinės sąveikos vieta – tai „klasikinė“ garbės ir gėdos visuomenė, besivaržančių vyrų garbės retorikos vartojimas siekiant įrodyti savo pranašumą.

Analizė leido išryškinti tai, kad garbė yra ne tiek moralinis kodas, kiek kalba ir racionalios socialinės strategijos, kurios tikslas – personalinės ir, atitinkamai, grupinės reputacijos siekimas norint išvengti viešos diskreditacijos ir pažeminimo. Viešojoje vyrų galios siekimo strategijoje moteris paprastai nėra pagrindinis veiksnys, tačiau ji gali būti svarbus papildomas, o kartais – netgi svarbiausias veiksnys, lemiantis socialinio žaidimo rezultata.

Išvadose pabrėžiama, kad abu žodžiai – patriarchytas ir garbė – skamba šiek tiek archajiškai ar net ironiškai nuo tų laikų, kai buvo paskelbta visų žmonių lygybės deklaracija ir lygybės principas įtrauktas į daugumos pasaulio valstybių konstitucijas. Abu žodžiai yra siejami su dominavimo institucionalizacijos politikos apibūdinimu, t. y. susiję su hierarchine visuomenės tvarka. Patriarchyto nepaisymas ir užmaskavimas nereiškia, kad jo galia socialiniame gyvenime sunaikinama, tai rodo jo galimybes patirti metamorfozę nekeičiant esmės. Taigi ir garbės nematomumas dar nereiškia, kad ji, kaip veiklos motyvas siekti asmeninių tikslų, kurie paprastai būna susiję ir su individo šeima, neteko įtakos dabartinių „civilizuotų“ žmonių gyvenime.

Kova dėl garbės atsiskleidžia mačizmo žaidime. Simbolinės ar realios socialinės hierarchijos suardymas yra pagrindinis tikslas ir priežastis, dėl kurios išprovokuojamas mačizmo žaidimas ir/ arba į jį įsitraukiama. Kultūrinis kontekstas atskleidžia tikrai kalbą ir būdus, kuriais socialiniame žaidime siekiama pranašumo pripažinimo, tačiau tai nekeičia žaidimo esmės. Taigi garbės logiką reikia suvokti kaip transkultūrinį fenomeną, kurio neįmanoma išprausti į istorinį, taip pat etnografinį ir geografinį kontekstą.