

The Male in the Head

young people, heterosexuality
and power



Janet Holland, Caroline Ramazanoglu,
Sue Sharpe, Rachel Thomson

the Tufnell Press,

London

Copyright © 1998, Janet Holland, Caroline Ramazanoglu,
Sue Sharpe, Rachel Thomson

Cover painting, *Les jours gigantesques*, 1928, by René Magritte
© ADAGP, Paris and DACS, London, 1998

All Rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

First published 1998

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is
available from the British Library

ISBN 1 872767 95 8

Contents

Preface and acknowledgements	ii
1 Introduction: Sex, gender and power	1
2 Positioning ourselves, representing others	14
3 The contradictions of condoms: Femininity, masculinity and sexual risk	31
4 Learning about sex: The gendering of sexual knowledge	56
5 Languages of love: Stories, lines and secrets	84
6 When bodies come together: Power, control and desire	106
7 Empowered women	129
8 Empowered men	149
9 The-male-in-the-head	171
10 Unnatural heterosexuality: Resistance and change	192
Notes	196
Bibliography	202
Appendix I. WRAP Publications	214
Appendix II. The Women, Risk and AIDS Project; The Men, Risk and AIDS Project	217
Appendix III. A Feminist Research Method	220
Subject index	226
Author Index	229

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION: SEX, GENDER AND POWER

This book is about power in conventional heterosexual relationships. It is the story of how we came to problematise the social and political nature of heterosexuality in order to make sense of what young people say about their sexual relations. As Tamsin Wilton (1994: 4) has commented:

‘... unequal relations of power between women and men are not simply of academic interest. In the context of HIV/AIDS they are literally life or death issues, for men as well as for women.’

Our view of male power has grown out of research on young people’s accounts of their sexuality and heterosexual practices. When we began our study in 1988, a moral panic had developed in the UK and the US over the transmission of HIV and the prospect of an AIDS epidemic (Weeks 1989). Once HIV/AIDS was identified as a fatal condition that could be transmitted through sexual activity, it aroused potent fears of death which expressed confusion and uncertainty about sexual behaviour and identities. Public responses were part of a recurring, generalised social anxiety about sex and deviance (see Bland 1982, 1996; Weeks 1985, 1988; Sontag 1989). The categories of people who were initially identified as having risky sexual identities (gay men, sex workers, Haitians, Africans, intravenous drug users) rapidly became constituted as threats to public health. Mass media campaigns, and many official policies, identified the supposedly socially deviant carriers of HIV as a danger posed by the guilty to the innocent.

Ironically, in the midst of this moral panic, governments began to develop strategies for containing the epidemic that required knowledge of how people organise their sexual relationships, what sexuality means to them, and what sexual practices people actually engage in. In order to be effective, official strategies for limiting the transmission of HIV had to challenge the belief that risks lay in the perverse natures of marginalised categories of people. As Watney (1987) argued, the development of the AIDS epidemic showed that popular stereotypes of deviance and guilt could not explain patterns of HIV transmission. He suggested that AIDS exposed the reality of sexual diversity

at the same time as destroying the organising categories with which we think about sexuality. In the UK and the US, the efforts of social researchers and those of political activists organising around gay men's and sex workers' rights and safety, and the diverse concerns of different categories of people with HIV/AIDS, rebutted the targeting of 'high risk groups' as the key social problem in explaining and containing the AIDS epidemic.

Social researchers and political activists in the 1980s argued that sexual risk-taking is not a question of who you are but of what you do, how, and with whom. This assertion that risk-taking is cultural activity carrying a range of meanings, shifted strategies for containing HIV away from moral judgements of risky social and sexual identities towards attempts to understand risky sexual practices and their meanings. In this shift, heterosexual identities lost their innocence.

Although HIV/AIDS is still spreading at a tragic rate worldwide, the threatened heterosexual epidemic in the UK has not materialised to the extent feared in the 1980s. Prevention strategies, such as needle exchange schemes for IV drug users, campaigns for and by gay men, outreach work with men who do not identify as gay but who have sex with men, screening of donated blood, and the use of condoms by sex workers, appear to have had an effect.¹

This book emerges from research on social aspects of AIDS that served to counter the moral panics of the late 1980s. Although the belief that 'nice people don't get AIDS' lingers, a number of studies have expanded our knowledge of the conventions of sexual risk-taking in different populations. Fear of AIDS suddenly legitimated social analyses of sexuality and offered opportunities for studying the beliefs, practices and management of risk by gay men, IV drug users and sex workers.²

In the early phases of research on sexuality evoked by the AIDS crisis, little attention was paid to the sexuality of the supposedly 'normal' population. Media representations of the risks posed by HIV/AIDS that dominated in the mass media initially focused on the deviance of 'high risk' groups, and young people in the 1980s generally believed that conventional heterosexual practices were 'normal' and so posed no danger of infection (COI 1986; Aggleton *et al.* 1988; COI-DHSS 1987).

The role of women in the transmission of HIV had been scarcely considered in the early stages of the AIDS epidemic, and the danger of heterosexual transmission of HIV was low on the agenda with its probability strongly contested (for example, Fitzpatrick and Milligan 1990; Fumento 1990). Young women having sexual intercourse with 'heterosexual' men were not seen to be at risk. But sexual beliefs and practices are cultural constructions and a

Introduction

fundamental inequality between women and men is central to the conventions of heterosexuality in the UK and the USA.

We intended to investigate young women's understanding of their own sexuality and sexual practice, considering that the sexuality and sexual practices of women were important and might be decisive in the spread or limitation of HIV/AIDS and crucial to understanding impediments to safer sexual practices. Our first study, the *Women, Risk and AIDS Project* (WRAP) entailed interviewing 148 young women in London and Manchester (UK) in 1988-90. Reflections on the analysis of these interviews led to the second stage of our study the *Men, Risk and AIDS Project* (MRAP) which entailed comparable interviews with 46 young men in London in 1991-92 (see Appendix II). We aimed in these two studies to build up a detailed picture of the sexual practices, beliefs and understanding of young people in order to document and interpret: their understanding of HIV and sexually transmitted diseases; their conceptions of risk and danger in sexual activity; their approaches to relationships and responsibility within them; and their ability to communicate effectively their ideas on safety within sexual relationships. It was also our intention to contribute to the development of the theory of the social construction of sexuality, by identifying the complexity of the processes and mechanisms through which young people construct, experience and define their sexuality, sexual practices and identities.

Initial analysis of young women's sexual beliefs, practices and relationships led us to reconsider 'the organising categories' with which we think about heterosexuality. Our story exposes and challenges the conventions of young people's sexual relations, and shows their struggles with conformity, agency and resistance. From this study we saw that the conventions of heterosexual masculinity and femininity powerfully contribute to sexual risk-taking and the instability of safer sexual practices; and how sexual risk-taking and sexual safety were being constituted in social relations of heterosexuality.

Our thinking has been framed by feminist assumptions about gender relations, from our initial investigation of young women's sexual identities, beliefs and their practices with male partners, to our conclusions on male power. Moving into the second stage of the study with young men made us reflect critically on the assumptions about masculinity and male power with which we started our enquiry, and led to a reconsideration of femininity. From seeing femininity as the opposite of masculinity, we came to see women's collusion with male power and their difficulties in resisting male dominance. Analysis of what had to be resisted brought us to a theory of heterosexuality as systematically privileging masculinity.

We did not want this book to develop as an abstract discussion of theories of power or sexualities. The analysis that follows is grounded in the sexual politics of the everyday dangers, desires, excitements, boredom, risks and pleasures that these young people experienced and made sense of as they brought their bodies into intimate contact with others. But we have taken into account criticisms of feminist theory (political, methodological and philosophical) in order to justify our understanding of heterosexuality. Any theory of male power is contentious, and the personal implications can also be painful. A feminist theory of power, like any other, needs to be critically appraised and adequately supported. We have tried to make our assumptions about power explicit by laying out our theoretical framework in Chapter 2, and by showing in subsequent chapters how this framework has both shaped our reading of our data and been shaped by it.

We have tried to make sense both of theories of sexuality and of young people's accounts of their experiences, and to discuss the problems of doing so. The ideas about sexuality with which we started the first study were drawn from feminism, but we have taken criticisms of feminism seriously and have had to struggle with these ideas in order to understand our interviews with young people. Without feminist theory, however, we could not make sense of our findings.

We have no party line on feminism, and we have not always agreed with each other as a research team, but explaining ourselves to each other and arguing through our differences has been productive. In our analysis of young people's accounts of their sexuality, we have attempted to work through our own reflections on the knowledge *we* have produced, in relation to young people's accounts of *their* experiences. We have tried to make our concepts and assumptions explicit, indicate our presence in the research process and explain to the reader the ways of understanding our data that make most sense to us and which respect the accounts young people have given us. (For discussion of our methodology see Appendix III). We have looked at differences of class, ethnicity, age, ablebodiedness and sexual orientation between young people but, for reasons we explain in the course of the book, we have analysed our data in terms of 'women' and 'men', femininity and masculinity.

Our data were collected at particular times, and in particular places and, while we draw out themes and patterns in the data which may be more general, we recognise the limits set by time and place. Much of the (national and international) literature on young people's sexuality which we have reviewed supports our findings, but if different data collected at other times in other places generate different conclusions, this adds to our knowledge of heterosexuality. For ease of reading this book we do not qualify our reporting

of what the particular young people in our study have said with the specificity of the location and timing of their interview each time, but refer to young people, women, or men, and write of their accounts in the present tense.

A number of published papers have come out of the various stages of our analysis since 1990, and these are numbered and listed in full in Appendix I. From Chapter 3 onwards, we note which papers are drawn on for each chapter through reference to the numbers used in this list. These papers give more detail of each stage of our findings than we can provide here. In this volume we offer the reader our conclusions on heterosexuality and male power, our reflections on how we arrived at these conclusions, and how they can be justified. The structure of the book parallels our intellectual journey into knowledge of the social construction of heterosexuality.

ITINERARY: FROM SEXUAL RISK TO INSTITUTIONALISED HETEROSEXUALITY

The journey mapped out in this chapter corresponds to the chronological and intellectual development of our analysis of young people's sexuality. It takes us from an initial concern with understanding young women's sexual behaviour in order to promote safer sexual practices, through a critical exploration of the social construction of femininity and masculinity, to identification of the male power in institutionalised heterosexuality.

The start: from sexual risk to unsafe femininity

We began by looking specifically at the accounts the young women gave of their own sexual risk-taking, and at what constrained safer sexual practices. Most of these young women felt under some pressure to become sexually active early. Almost a third of young women reported having intercourse before the age of 16 (the legal age of consent to heterosexual intercourse in England) compared to half of the young men. (A statistical description of the sample is given in Appendix II.)

We were struck by the contradictions in the young women's accounts: discrepancies between expectations and experience; between intention and practice; between different discourses of femininity. Generally the young women were concerned about sexual health, yet fears of sexually transmitted diseases paled in the light of their fears of pregnancy and the loss of sexual reputation. These young women expressed powerful intentions to practice safer sex in terms of contraception and condom use. They understood the risks and wanted, in the words of one sex education leaflet, to 'choose' safer sex. Yet they repeatedly failed to fulfil these intentions—most had at times had unprotected vaginal intercourse whatever their plans.³

Exploring these episodes of sexual risk-taking opened up accounts of inequalities of gender, and the extent of men's dominance of the young women's sexual relationships. We saw young women's ability to choose safer sexual practices, or to refuse unsafe (or any other) sexual activity, not as an issue of free choice between equals, but as one of negotiation within structurally unequal social relationships. We develop this interpretation in Chapter 3.

Young women spoke, for example, of having unprotected sexual intercourse; of not using condoms even when they were to hand; of making no protest at rape; of accepting violence; of coming under pressure to have unwanted vaginal penetrative intercourse rather than non-penetrative sex. The majority were able to practice safer sex at times but, whatever they intended or expected, they tended to be unable to do so consistently.

Dissemination of knowledge on safer sex clearly did not ensure that young people would put what they knew into practice or think that it concerned them. Accounts of their sexual relations were shaped by the definition of 'proper sex' as penetrative vaginal intercourse that starts when the man is aroused and stops after his orgasm—making her orgasm his production—a notion of sex that privileges male needs and desires in a sexual division of labour in which he is the sexual actor while she is acted upon.

The dominant discourse of femininity as the opposite of masculinity through which these young women made sense of their sexual selves stood in direct contradiction to their sexual safety. The overwhelming conclusion that came from the interviews was that femininity constituted an unsafe sexual identity, and that conventionally feminine behaviour was putting young women at risk, an observation that has subsequently been confirmed in other studies (for example: Kippax *et al.* 1990; Miles 1993; Stewart 1995). To be conventionally feminine is to appear sexually unknowing, to aspire to a relationship, to let sex 'happen', to trust to love, and to make men happy. Safer sex is not just a question of using protection, avoiding penetration, or being chaste, it brings questions of power, trust and female agency into sexual relationships. Our reflections on these issues, and comparison of the young women's accounts with those of young men, are explored in Chapter 3 through analysis of the young people's condom use.

The extent of the sexual risks facing young women began to make more sense when we could see that both accepting conventional femininity and resisting it can be risky sexual strategies. The question of how young people develop understandings of sex that privilege masculinity led us to consider how young people learn about sex, which we take up in Chapter 4.

From unsafe femininity to learning unsafe sex

The formal sources of sex education recounted by the young women showed that sex education at school and from parents tended to constitute a 'protective discourse'. This alerted them to the dangers of sex and, by default, the dangers of men. In particular the warning that 'men are only after one thing' communicated a strong message to young women about the power of male sexuality and, through its silence, the passivity or vulnerability of their femininity.

While young women heard a great deal about their reproductive capacity, they reported almost no formal or informal education about the physical pleasures of sex or the potential of their own desire. We concluded that the language and the silences through which young women had learned about sexuality and sexual conduct put them at a distinct disadvantage when it came to controlling or enjoying sexual encounters. Unless women actively resist the norms of femininity, they are caught in conventions of female acquiescence in a male activity: the point of sexual encounters is meeting men's needs and desires.

The contrast with how young men learned about sex was striking. Where young women were being educated to guard their reputations and protect themselves from danger, young men were learning that real men were knowing agents in pursuit of sexual pleasure. The gendering of learning about sex was connected to differing and gendered languages of sex, love and romance.

From learning unsafe sex to gendered languages of love

In the texts of the interviews, the language available for communication about sexuality was both limited and gendered. Distinctions between sex, love and romance had different resonance for male and female reputations. Men could access a public language of instrumental sexuality which was inappropriate for women, while women could access a respectable language of romance that did not enable them to communicate practical sexual issues or their own pain or pleasure in bodily contact. Much of the feminine language of sex was constituted in silences.

Young people talked about transgressing appropriate languages (with women seeking sexual gratification, and men falling in love) and of diversity, confusions and contradictions in communicating about sexuality. It is not possible to fully disentangle the meanings of the language used, but we argue in Chapter 5 that the way young people talk about sex, love, romance, and the differences between these, indicate access to a discourse through which the gendered subject positions of heterosexuality are reproduced.

Our initial investigation of young people's ideas of romance and love led us to look for female power and women's agency, and for resistance to conventional femininity. The rarity of such resistance was striking. We had to search through silences, hesitations, hints, and draw our own implications from these. The differences between female talk of engagement in feelings, and men's talk of distancing the self from emotion brought us to contrary accounts of male embodiment and female disembodiment.

From languages of love to embodiment/disembodiment.

In Chapter 6 we compare the disembodied femininity that we found in the young women's interviews with the much more embodied masculinity of the young men. Our feminist view of the language of unsafe femininity shifted the direction of our efforts towards trying to explain why so many young women knowingly put their bodies at risk despite their romantic expectations of sexual relationships, and hopes of love.

When women did have a critical consciousness of the embodiment of their sexuality, and were comfortable with their own desires, manifesting such desire could be experienced as directly threatening men's power to define the nature of the relationship. The intrusion of her body into his desires (rather than his desire into her body) could contribute to fears of ending the relationship, or could reinforce men's control. Much individual resistance appeared to be dependent on a specific context or relationship and could not be sustained outside this.

The absence of effective empowerment was linked to the absence of bodily pleasure in the accounts of most of the young women. This led us to reflect on the connections between an absence of female desire and the disembodied femininity that emerged from the interviews. While sexuality and aspects of embodiment are clearly socially constructed, the bodily contact entailed in unsafe sex has a material grounding which requires practical management. Although the body which engages in sexual activity is always socially constituted and managed, it is also always material, hairy, discharging, emitting noises, susceptible to pleasure and pain. This materiality is in danger of erupting into men's space and so has to be carefully regulated.

Men's acceptance of the masculinity of the male body was markedly different from women's distancing of their femininity from their bodies. Despite their doubts, apprehensions and uncertainties, young men appeared to be much more comfortable with their bodies than young women, and found the intrusion of the male body into the intimate social relationship unproblematic. It was male sexual performance that constituted the point of the bodily encounter. Men

were simply required to act as men, while women, much more problematically had to discipline their unruly bodies into conformity with male desires.

From disembodied femininity to disempowered young women

The silencing and disembodiment of female desire appeared to have been so effective that it was difficult to find expressions of a positive heterosexual feminine identity in the young women's interviews. Accounts of particular relationships showed that individual men could be educated out of conventional expectations in the privacy of close relationships or even one-night stands, and that men valued loving, communicative relationships. But the social construction of disembodied femininity, and the silencing of female desire brought us up against the force and ubiquity of male power and this is what we have needed to explain and justify.

Few young women had managed to identify and resist conventional femininity sufficiently to become openly and effectively empowered in controlling their sexual encounters safely, and expressing their own desires. Many showed the dangers of conformity to femininity as they related experiences of unwanted sexual intercourse under pressure or violence from men. In Chapter 7 we identify strategies of resistance, but we found these strategies to be limited and had great difficulty in finding empowered young women.

The young women's accounts show their active engagement in the construction of their femininity, but in our interpretation, and to some extent in theirs, young women are drawn into their own disempowerment through their conceptions of what sexual encounters are about. The masculinity of their partners contributes to the dangers young women encounter in their sexual relationships and, in understanding this, and through closer examination of how both men and women can contribute to male dominance and female subordination, we began to question the notion of masculinity and femininity as opposites in collision.

In making sense of the limits of resistance and empowerment, we distinguish between empowerment at the level of ideas (intellectual empowerment—identifying the changes and intending to make them) and empowerment at the level of practical efficacy (experiential empowerment—the ability to act on intentions). Intellectual empowerment was more common in the women's interviews than experiential empowerment, but neither alone was a sufficient condition to ensure the consistent practice of sexual safety. One of the keys to linking intellectual and experiential empowerment for young women lies in their ability to conceptualise female desire and value their own sexual pleasure. Through this understanding of empowerment, we are able to trace connections

between women's disembodiment and disempowerment, the management of safer sexual practices, and the empowerment of young men.

From embodied masculinity to empowered young men

Men's access to positive conceptions of an active, pleasure-seeking, embodied, masculine sexuality, put particular pressures on them to become 'real men' from their first sexual relationships with women, and to seek opportunities for intercourse. We found variations in the ways the young men experienced their sexuality and their masculinity, but the interviews support our view that becoming a 'normal' man implies the exercise of power over women, whether or not this is recognised, acknowledged or desired by an individual man. In Chapter 8, we consider why the young men, in spite of their differences, weaknesses and vulnerability, exercise such extensive power over their female partners. We argue that young men have considerable power that is not available to young women and the constitution and practice of institutionalised male power needs to be explained. Explanation is needed in particular of the operation of the male peer group, the normality of male violence and the difficulties young men face in resisting the pressures of masculinity.

In contrast to the young women, young men were more clearly empowered through their masculinity. They were aware that in entering into the negotiation of sexual encounters they were laying themselves open to the possibility of failure, but their strategies for dealing with vulnerability, which we explore in Chapter 8, reproduce and reinforce the exercise of male power over women. The young men's struggles to be successfully masculine define their sexuality in terms of male needs, desires and satisfactions, rather than in ways that might acknowledge and engage with female sexuality and their own emotions. The way in which this competition for masculinity is played out, protects men from acknowledging fears of an independent female sexuality, and draws women into servicing men's vulnerability.

Young men are caught in a contradiction in which they suffer pressure to conform to a narrow and constraining conception of masculine sexuality but, through acquiring this version of masculinity, can take advantage of social arrangements which systematically privilege the male over the female.

From male empowerment to the-male-in-the-head

We initially saw adolescent sexual cultures as two separate worlds of masculinity and femininity, brought into collision in sexual encounters. The understandings of sexual meaning and practice expressed by the young men contrasted with those offered by the young women: embodied where femininity was disembodied; instrumental where being a woman was relational; positive

Introduction

where the women were negative. Many of the young people commented on this contrast between the worlds of masculinity and femininity, and in particular on a 'double standard' of sexual reputation. Behaviour that made him successfully masculine, a real man, caused her to lose her reputation—to be seen as loose, slack, a slag—a reputation policed just as forcefully by women as by men. When we looked more closely at the ways women and men managed the differences in their sexual reputations the image of two worlds in collision shifted to one in which women colluded with their sexual partners in the reproduction of male power. Young women could be seen as playing an active role in constituting and reproducing male dominance.

In Chapter 9 we move from the idea of femininity and masculinity in collision to that of young people's collusion in promoting the masculinity of heterosexuality; we pass, as it were, through the looking glass that reflects our conventional visions of gender, to see young men and women jointly engaged in constituting a single standard of heterosexuality and being regulated by it in differing ways. We take the 'male-in-the-head' to indicate the surveillance power of this male-dominated and institutionalised heterosexuality, as distinct from the-man-in-the-bed of everyday experience.⁴

Individual men may reject, resist or ignore the demands and constraints of dominant masculinity. Yet in their first sexual relationships they and their partners continue to be aware of, and subject to, the exercise of its surveillance power, articulated through the male peer group and the efficacy of sexual reputation. In Chapter 9 we see how the conventions of heterosexuality privilege masculine meanings and desires. Both young men and young women must live by these rules or take the personal and social consequences of social transgression.

Having reached this point, we can no longer see masculine and feminine as oppositional categories. Femininity is constructed from within heterosexuality and on male territory, yet this territory can only exist with female consent and collusion. However hard we tried, we could not find a 'female-in-the-head' to correspond to the male. Young men are not responding to the surveillance power of femininity; they are clearly living heterosexual masculine identities under a male gaze. Young women are living feminine identities, but in relation to a male audience—measuring themselves through the gaze of the 'male-in-the-head'.

Heterosexuality is not, as it appears to be, masculinity-and-femininity in opposition: it *is* masculinity. Within this masculine heterosexuality, women's desires and the possibility of female resistance are potentially unruly forces to be disciplined and controlled, if necessary by violence.

The young people's accounts of safer sex support our claim that early heterosexual encounters put a young woman under pressure: first, to consent to the constitution of adult heterosexuality as the construction of masculinity; then, to fit herself to this construction. Men are routinely accessing male power over women, whether or not they know this, or want, or intend to exercise such power, but they are also constrained by the construction of adult heterosexuality as masculinity. We argue that sexually young people are all in the same boat, in that heterosexuality is masculinity only thinly disguised but, that from a feminist perspective, they are *not* in the same boat, in that resistance is possible and heterosexuality could be otherwise.

Resistance to heterosexuality and the possibilities of change

We understand heterosexuality as more than a pattern of sexual practices, since it anchors a set of sexual and gender relations that include lesbian and gay identities. Resisting heterosexuality is not only a question of how young people choose their sexual partners; resistance includes a critical exploration and disruption of desire, embodiment and gender. Although very few of the young people in our studies identified themselves as lesbian, gay or bisexual, such identities, while not freeing them from the gender relations of heterosexuality, can afford them a degree of freedom in the invention and negotiation of their sexual relationships.

To ensure consistency in safer sexual practice, both men and women need to resist the sexual conventions of femininity/masculinity, and to see how these identities are regulated by the 'male-in-the-head'. Some young people are clearly resisting the pressures of heterosexuality and searching for other ways of being sexual. Within the privacy of individual relationships, the rules of male domination/female collusion can be negotiated and disrupted. Levels of trust and mistrust can be managed to enable safer rather than riskier encounters. Yet these private negotiations remain exceptions to the rules of heterosexuality, or can become a form of accommodation to it.

Making heterosexuality visible is difficult, since its power as 'the natural order of things' hinders both its actors and the social theorist in extricating contested meanings from the apparent certainties of 'boy meets girl'. While young people's resistance to heterosexuality can be socially constructed in varying ways (differentiated, for example, by class, ethnicity, age, style) the potential for young people to have a subversive or transformative effect on sexual relationships appears to be limited. Analysis of the strategies of resistance that emerged in the interviews, how far they could succeed, and the extent to which they reinforce or transgress normative understandings, became important in our understanding of the location of male power in heterosexuality. Our

Introduction

analysis indicates the necessity of transforming social and sexual relationships, and in particular transforming masculinity. Clarifying what this might mean was the most challenging stage of our journey and the point we reach in our concluding chapter.

Conclusion

Our journey has brought us to questions of envisaging exactly what is needed to make strategies of change effective: how heterosexuality is constructed and reproduced, and why it privileges men. This has meant thinking critically about notions of male power, what we mean by heterosexuality and so about the politics of safer sex. In Chapter 2 we lay out our working definitions of key concepts and consider some of the theoretical problems raised by making sense of the interviews. For those who are impatient to hear the voices of the young people, this chapter can be skipped!

We have raised more problems than we can solve in this book, but we consider that by grounding abstract problems of the nature of heterosexuality in these young people's often vivid and moving accounts, we can usefully clarify the hidden power relations that young men and women meet as they move into adult sexual relationships. The subtleties of the disappearance of social aspects of sexuality into conventional assumptions of what is 'naturally' male and female, go some way towards accounting for the strength and resilience of male power. Individual efforts to subvert or transform institutionalised heterosexuality are constrained both by the social construction of heterosexual subjectivities, identities and discourses, and also by the social structures and practices of dominant masculinity. This book is intended as a contribution to making the power of heterosexuality-as-masculinity visible, and showing the relevance of this power to young people's management of sexual safety.