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Abstract

The Men’s Centre’s psychoanalytic approach to working with violent men is examined as an approach to working with domestic violence perpetrators and cross examined with other approaches to domestic violence. The Men’s Centre’s notion of masculinity is also interrogated, resulting in a conclusion that although the formulation that all men aspire to “the big M” may be useful for the Centre’s work, it is not generalizable to domestic violence theory, or an intersectional global approach for working with violent men. The unconscious is concluded as a positive aspect of The Men’s Centre’s psychoanalytical approach, and it is suggested that further exploration may benefit domestic violence theory.
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1. Introduction

This paper will look at different approaches to domestic violence in order to evaluate the ways in which the psychoanalytical framework is useful for batterer intervention programmes and to evaluate what a psychoanalytical approach to domestic violence can bring to domestic violence theory. The Men’s Centre’s psychoanalytical approach to violent men will be my case study. I will cross-examine the approach of The Men’s Centre as my case study with a psychoanalytic approach, the Duluth Model, and a feminist approach to domestic violence theory including an intersectional framework\(^1\) which pays attention to cultural issues, and in particular, migration and social relocation, as The Men’s Centre serves an immigrant South Asian diaspora. I will look at they ways in which The Men’s Centre is informed by feminist theories on domestic violence emerging out of the second wave of feminist activism beginning to appear in the late 1960’s and in the academy in the 1980’s. Influential theories in the emerging feminist academy of the 1980’s on male dominance, domestic violence, and violence against women are legal theorist Catherine MacKinnon’s work on sexual harassment as sex discrimination, Andrea Dworkin’s radical feminist theory linking pornography and rape, and Michael Kimmel’s work on violence against women and masculinity models\(^2\). These academics theorized and contested cultural norms which maintained a culture of violence against women.

---

1 An intersectional approach is an approach that looks at the ways in which a person’s multiple identities (race, religion, culture, sexuality, gender) intersect. How these identities intersect affects a person’s experience of experiencing violence on the structural, and intimate level. Hoe we interpret traits as inherently masculine can also be reconsidered in an intersectional approach as possibly attributed to other factors.

The feminist activist recognition of men as socially and politically dominant over women is influential in The Men’s Centre’s approach which includes an inclusion of a feminist politics which recognizes men’s abusiveness of women as representative of a worldwide dominance over women.³

### 1.1 Framing Domestic Violence

In this paper which analyses a psychoanalytical approach to domestic violence, I define domestic violence through the feminist lens of Evan Stark’s coercive control in combination with a gender violence framing provided by Sally Engle Merry. Coercive control recognizes not only the physical abuse that a woman may experience, but the entrapment of women in their daily lives.

Stark’s definition of coercive control is as follows:

> Coercion entails the use of force or [explicit] threats to compel or dispel a particular response... Control is comprised of structural forms of deprivation, exploitation, and command that compel obedience indirectly by monopolizing vital resources, dictating preferred choices, microregulating a partner’s behavior, limiting her options, and depriving her of supports needed to exercise independent judgement... The result when coercion and control are combined is the condition of unreciprocated authority Young identifies as domination and victims experience as entrapment.⁴

---

This definition engages with a broad range of domestic violence experiences of physical, emotional and psychological abuse. Sally Engle Merry’s framing of abuse recognizes physical injuries such as hitting and wounding, rape and murder; sexualized forms and the eroticization of violence; emotional and psychological dimensions: assaults on personhood, dignity and a sense of self worth, threats, harassment and stalking—actions which evoke fear. Specifically, how violence against women is defined by the analysis of the WHO Multi-Country Report, and The Men’s Centre’s definition will be provided in the Literature Review.

In this paper I refer victims and survivors of domestic abuse oftentimes as women and the perpetrators as men. Although a definition of abuse itself is neutral, there is not a substantial number of male victims of domestic violence. From a violence against women perspective, women oftentimes experience violence because they are women.

1.2 The Men’s Centre

The Men’s Centre in this paper is presented here as was represented by Adam Jukes in an interview in May 2011 at The Men’s Centre in London, England, and as is represented by materials from The Men’s Centre’s website as well as Adam Jukes book, “Is There a Cure for Masculinity?” The Men’s Centre is a treatment center for violent men. The Centre has both individual and group counselling sessions. Violent men referred to The Men’s Centre by the state

---

authorities are placed into group therapy. The Men’s Centre uses a psychoanalytic, psychodynamic approach to counselling domestic violence perpetrators. They serve a population of a majority of migrant men who come from Pakistan and Bangladesh in their group counselling sessions. The Men’s Centre was founded and is directed by Adam Jukes whose career of working with violent men for over 40 years as a psychoanalytic psychotherapist gives him a unique, and experienced perspective. The counsellors working at The Men’s Center are also all psychoanalytically trained. Most batterer programs do not use a psychoanalytic approach to domestic violence perpetrators\(^7\), which makes The Men’s Centre an interesting case study.

### 1.3 Methods

#### 1.3.1 Interview with Adam Jukes, clinical psychologist, The Men’s Centre, UK

Adam Jukes is a clinical psychologist who has worked with thousands of violent men for the past 35 years. He is the director and co-ordinator of the Men's Centre in Camden, London, England. I chose to contact him for an interview because of his experience and his lengthy work

---

\(^7\)Most programs in the United States are based on The Duluth Model which uses Cognitive Behavioral therapy. The Duluth Model is the most replicated abuse intervention model in the United States.

with violent men and because The Men's Centre's view that at the center of abuse lies power and control is in line with feminist domestic violence theory.

In my interview with Adam Jukes I asked a series of questions in order to know more about the population he serves, how men end up in his office, and to gain knowledge on the kinds of contexts which lead to violence in the specific cases of the immigrant population. In the interview with Adam Jukes I used structured interview questions and semi-structured interview style which allowed for the interviewer and interviewee’s expansion and elaboration on topics which arose as important. These topics which Jukes elaborated on most were the ones in which I became the most interested, and which appear throughout this paper. He elaborated on his theory “the big M”, the Oedipal complex, attachment theory and psychoanalysis as his method of treatment. The interview was recorded with consent and was transcribed by myself, the interviewer. The interview was followed later with a follow-up skype interview with additional questions for my research.

The purpose of this interview was to learn more about the population Jukes serves in Camden, London and the method of treatment as a psychoanalytic approach. In Camden, London, where The Men’s Centre is located, there are large Pakistani and Bangladeshi immigrant communities. Adam Jukes serves mainly these populations, who are mainly sent as referrals to The Men’s

---

8"About Us." The Men's Centre. Web. 05 May 2011. <http://themenscentre.co.uk/2.html>. Excerpt: “A radical model of men's abuse of women derives much of its authority from academic feminist research. It explains men's abusive behaviour as being expressive of men's need to have power and control of women in order to ensure obedience and submission. Fundamentally it aims to enable a man to have an easier life with a guarantee of future servicing and caretaking by his partner. It is also intended to ensure that she does not make demands on him. Abusive behaviour is intended to get and maintain power over women. With power, control is guaranteed even if it is not used or exercised and it is important to point out that there are many men who are not abusive to women and who are comfortable not exercising power in the home.”

9 See Glossary of Terms, Appendices 6.1.
Centre by child protection agencies or by courts. The Pakistani and Bangladeshi populations live in Pakistani and Bangladeshi enclaves in Camden, London. The majority of the population has immigrated in order to find work and the majority are uneducated, unemployed and are mainly Muslim.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Feminist Theories on Violence

In this section I will open up a series of feminist academics’ theories and literature on the topic of violence against women, and gendered violence and place The Men’s Centre within this discussion both as an organization which uses a kind of feminist approach in its theories of violence and an organization which fails to consider violence in a complex feminist approach. The Men’s Centre works with migrant communities, yet their psychoanalytic approach does not leave room for cultural issues, nor does it explore the social aspect of social relocation and what effects of social relocation could result in risk factors which affect the risk of experiencing, or perpetrating, domestic violence. By failing to recognize a multiplicity of risk factors which affect the prevalence of domestic violence, The Men’s Centre fails to use an intersectional approach.

2.1.1 Intersectionality

As an organization which uses both group counselling and one-on-one counselling for men who are domestic violence perpetrators, there are opportunities to address a larger problem of domestic violence shaped by culture, race, ethnicity and immigrant status for the men who
participate in the group sessions, but less of an opportunity to be engaged in such topics in a one-
on-one psychoanalytical session. I believe that in a one-on-one counselling session at The Men’s
Centre, that these intersectional factors are paid attention to less because of the Centre’s
psychoanalytical approach and a high emphasis on attachment theory, Freudian Oedipal theories,
penis envy with other men, and the pursuit of “the big M”.

The kinds of groups which structural violence affects can be seen through an intersectional
approach. An intersectional approach is useful because it illustrates the variety of social
identities, categories and social positions which exist and how different these different social
categories experience oppressions, and how these oppressions intersect.\textsuperscript{10} Through using this
term "intersectionality" I mean to convey a set of ideas which address the multiple ways in which
people experience the world, and the multiple oppressions they encounter. By using an
intersectional approach I wish to address the many ways in which a person experiences the world.
These experiences can be influenced by their perceived gender, gender identity, race, ethnicity,
class, sexuality, geographical location, historical location. By using an intersectional approach, I
mean using an approach which seeks to recognize the unique ways in which people experience
their lives with their multiple identities. For violence counselling, using an intersectional
approach is crucial because it recognizes the risk factors a person is experiencing, including
structural violence, which can effect their experience of violent acts in their intimate

\textsuperscript{10} Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence
Against Women of Color”. In: Martha Albertson Fineman, Rixanne Mykitiuk, Eds. The Public
<likeawhisper.files.wordpress.com/2009/01/mapping-margins.pdf>
relationships. Michelle Bograd, a domestic violence theorist, writes that “for most families, domestic violence is not the only or primary violence shaping family life.”

In Kimberle Crenshaw’s article, “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color,” she describes the ways in which women’s status as immigrants can render them vulnerable in specific and interacting ways: “Intersectional subordination need not be intentionally produced; in fact, it is frequently the consequence of the imposition of one burden that interacts with preexisting vulnerabilities to create yet another dimension of disempowerment.” In an analysis of a multi-country study by the World Health Organization (WHO) to investigate the risk factors for intimate partner violence (IPV), IPV as defined in three categories of physical violence, sexual violence and physical and or sexual violence, Abramsky et al. found that:

many risk factors appear to affect IPV risk similarly, with secondary education, high SES, and formal marriage offering protection, and alcohol abuse, cohabitation, young age, attitudes supporting wife beating, outside [extra-marital] sexual relationships, experiencing childhood abuse, growing up with domestic violence, and

---


13See Appendix A for chart outlining specific definitions of IPV for this study. Abramsky et al. "Figure 2 Operational Definitions of Intimate Partner Violence." Chart. What Factors Are Associated with Recent Intimate Partner Violence? Findings from the WHO Multi-country Study on Women’s Health and Domestic Violence. BMC Public Health 2011 11:109.
perpetrating or experiencing other forms of violence in adulthood, increasing the risk of IPV.\textsuperscript{14}

Larger social structures affect groups of people in social, economic and cultural ways. Intimate partner violence risk factors are tied to structural violence; for example, structural violence affects a person’s access to necessary social and economic resources to combat alcoholism, and the ability to attend school, and access to a job with a living wage. The WHO report’s risk factors for intimate partner violence are risk factors for being a victim of intimate partner violence and being a perpetrator of intimate partner violence. These risk factors are social positions which put a person at risk, but do not \textit{cause} violent acts. Experiencing structural violence (and other violences) increases the risk of also experiencing or perpetrating intimate partner violence.\textsuperscript{15}

\subsection*{2.1.2 The Men’s Centre’s Feminist Approach}

There are a number of reasons why The Men’s Centre can be considered to have a feminist approach. Most explicitly, The Men’s Centre website Home page, About Us and Service pages all have feminist approaches in parts of their content. Their definitions of abuse, alignment with feminist gender politics, priority of the safety of women and children\textsuperscript{16}, and placement of the male violent perpetrator at the center of responsibility for the abuse position The Men’s Centre


Excerpt: “Welcome to The Men’s Centre. Established in 1984 the Centre was the first dedicated, professionally staffed, treatment centre in Europe for men who are abusive to those they love and which placed the safety of women and children at the centre of its practice without sacrificing our concern for men’s long term mental and emotional health.”
as a feminist organization. The Men’s Centre could improve its feminist approach by considering intersectionality\textsuperscript{17} in its domestic violence approach.

The Men’s Centre defines abuse in a detailed, but “not exhaustive” manner in the Services section of their website, as a “Violent, Abusive and Controlling Behavior Checklist” for violent acts and behaviors. Included are physical, psychological, verbal, financial, emotional abuse. Listed are behaviors such as “logic chopping”, infidelity, not helping with childcare or housework, interrupting, uninvited touching, coercion to obtain sex, isolation, and abusing her pets.\textsuperscript{18} This framing of abuse is clearly extensive, and inclusive. Many of the behaviors, including those aforementioned, are detailed in Evan Stark’s \textit{Coercive Control} and both have approaches with an inclusive framing of violence.

On The Men’s Centre Home page it can be found that The Men’s Centre has a feminist politics: “Our work with abusers is founded on an integration of orthodox psychodynamic theory and a feminist understanding of the gender politics of male abuse of women and children. Politically, we believe that men’s abusiveness is representative of the worldwide reality of men’s dominance of women and the expectation of submissiveness and obedience.” Through an intersectional approach which recognizes that there may be multiple factors and causes of violence, it could be considered that The Men’s Centre has a specific approach to feminism, drawing from theorists, or parts of theories, such as those such as Charlotte Bunch, as discussed in this chapter, which place a high emphasis on global domination of men over women.

\textsuperscript{17}As defined in the Introduction, and in the Literature Review section on Intersectionality.

\textsuperscript{18}See Appendix B: The Men’s Centre’s Definitions of Abuse.
Michele Bograd asks us to consider that “Somewhat broadly speaking, two positions have
typified popular ideas about responsibility and domestic violence: (1) both parties are equally
responsible for the violence; and (2) the perpetrator is unilaterally responsible”. At The Men’s
Centre, men are held singularly responsible for their violence, because The Men’s Centre
believes that it is possible to stop domestic violence, even when other factors and underlying
problems that contribute to violence are still in effect. “Many abusive men suffer from some form
of post traumatic stress disorder or chronic low grade depression from childhood abuse or
deprivation. These may require treatment at some point, but stopping abuse and violence to his
partner does not require that these problems be resolved first.” Bograd’s remark on
responsibility brings up two separate positions, neither of which can be considered “right”, and
both of which represent different approaches in batterer intervention counselling. Both parties
(the perpetrator and the victim/survivor) as equally responsible, or at least sharing responsibility
in the violence against the victim.

With an intersectional approach, The Men’s Centre may gain useful insights into their work with
violent men, and it may benefit those who are being treated by the Centre. Adam Jukes said that
he does not believe that a man can be vulnerable to domestic violence. By using an
intersectional approach, Jukes may benefit theoretically and in practice. Bograd, a domestic
violence theorist, explains that, “with the exception of gender inequality, other social dimensions

19 Bograd, Michele. “Strengthening domestic violence theories. Intersections of race, class,
sexual orientation and gender” in Sokoloff, N. J. & Pratt, C. eds. Domestic Violence at the
<http://themenscentre.co.uk/2.html>.
Minutes 20:00.
usually are defined as stressors, rather than as key explanatory factors of the violence, and so primary attention is paid to intrapsychic, interpersonal, or intrafamilial dynamics...

Intersectionality suggests that no dimension, such as gender inequality, is privileged as an explanatory construct of domestic violence, and gender inequality itself is modified by its intersection with other systems of power and oppression.”

Jukes does recognize that domestic violence represents a larger issue of gender inequality, women’s subordination and men’s worldwide dominance.

To complement a psychoanalytic approach with one which uses intersectionality to recognize other factors which affect violence could possibly influence the outcomes of treatment for men positively, especially since the population served by The Men’s Centre is mostly immigrant and could benefit from such an approach. Additionally, complementing The Men’s Centre’s existing approach with an intersectional approach would reflect the feminist notion of domestic violence as a social, and not simply an individual problem.

The Men’s Centre: Group Counselling

The Men’s Centre provides group counselling, and unless the Centre decides to lobby for a participant to undergo private counselling, due to a personality disorder which can disrupt the sessions, all of the men who are referred to the Centre by the authorities are placed into group counselling sessions because of the lower costs to the state who pays for these referred men. Most of the men who are referred by the local authorities are South Asian, Pakistani or Bangladeshi minority men. Adam Jukes believes this is due to a combination of racism of the

authorities, and the fact that these families have already been in contact with the authorities for help regarding language, finding work and accessing local and governmental resources. Contact with authorities can therefore be seen as a predictor of being able to obtain intervention for domestic violence.

2.1.2 Cultural Violence

In a batterer program, attention to multicultural issues is crucial because of the co-construction of race and gender, culture and gender, and religion and gender. The fact that culture informs gender dynamics, gender roles, gendered expectations and gendered positions of dominance and subordination in a relationship means that they must be directly addressed as key explanatory factors. For the purposes of this study, culture refers to the multiple identities and experiences of the immigrant population which The Men’s Centre serves. The social practices, beliefs and attitudes of their home country, intersecting with the new social practices, beliefs attitudes and norms of the immigrant population diaspora in London are most important to note, especially those practices which surround gender identity, gender roles, gendered relationship expectations and constructions of masculinity and femininity specific to this diaspora community. Does the Men’s Centre pay enough attention to multicultural issues? A Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) approach to domestic violence, such as The Duluth Model, the most popular program

---

model in the United States, is a popular approach to domestic violence. The Men’s Centre cites that they have a success rate comparable with other perpetrator programs, such as those who use other approaches, for example, a CBT approach to counselling violent men. This leads to a conclusion that because The Men’s Centre’s approach is just as effective as other programs, that either a combination of a psychoanalytic approach with one which pays more attention to intersectionality, and a feminist politics which recognises a culture of violence against women as a social and not an individual problem would be even more successful, or that both programs are equally as successful because they effect men’s violent behaviors and beliefs the same.

Charlotte Bunch is a world famous feminist activist, organizer, and scholar on violence against women who began working on women’s issues in the early stages of second wave feminism in the 1960’s. I include the following lengthy quote because it contains many important points about cultural violence and because I would not be able to say it better, or with more precision myself. In a book which draws articles from an international scope, a preface by Charlotte Bunch provides important insights on cultural violence:

“Cultural violence is not some marginalized, exotic “cultural practice” that takes place somewhere else. It is the culturally

Excerpt: “Cognitive-behavioral therapy is based on the idea that our thoughts cause our feelings and behaviors, not external things, like people, situations, and events. The benefit of this fact is that we can change the way we think to feel / act better even if the situation does not change.”


embedded practice and assumption of domination over women in virtually all societies, and the general acceptance of violence as a means of maintaining that control, even of defending one’s masculinity. Rather than label some practices as “cultural or traditional” forms of violence, we need to understand that all violence against women is supported by cultural attitudes, at least as long as the culture-- one’s family, community, friends, colleagues, and religion-- generally accepts it... [A]ll human right work involves changing culture and must be shaped by the specificities of each culture to be effective in doing so"28

The kinds of cultural attitudes which are found at the Men’s Centre, and indeed at any multicultural location, are multiple and have roots in cultural practices, ideologies and beliefs which could be unfamiliar to some, even if they are trained in multicultural sensitivity. How a man may come to learn and feel domination over women may be different from the next man, who has the same feelings of domination over women. Will all types of attitudes of this kind be changed by one program model for perpetrators, even if the roots, and practices of this attitude vary across men’s experiences? Since The Men’s Centre uses a psychoanalytical approach, which focuses on the Oedipal complex and Attachment theory their attention to the issue of the social and cultural is less, which is typical of psychoanalytic approaches according to Connell29 and which will be discussed in my critique of the psychoanalytic approach.

Bunch’s theorizing of cultural violence points to the need for multiple, or at least specialized strategies to end violence in specific contexts, which leads me to consider that the different ways

---


in which men perpetrate violence, and learn to become perpetrators must also need differing or specialized strategies for treatment programs and ways of un-learning certain beliefs.

Charlotte Bunch’s insights are useful in looking at the ways in which violence must be changed socially. In a one-on-one psychotherapy session, individuality, and attention to the individual (and not the wider group beliefs) is inevitably present and the possibility of connecting violent actions with the larger social and group beliefs about gender roles and acceptance of violence in particular ways may not be apparent and is dependent on the therapist’s ability and insight to bring up issues of cultural violence in meaningful and culturally specific ways.

The psychological and spacial methods men use to control their female partners, the ways in which partners are able to, or unable to negotiate control and autonomy, are bound to be influenced by culture, and the culturally informed ways in which gender relations exist, are enacted and are expected.

### 2.1.3 A Feminist Approach to Batterer Programs: The Duluth Model

The Duluth model has its roots in feminist theory, drawing from the notion that patriarchy encourages men to control women, resulting in domestic abuse. “The Duluth model helps men confront their attitudes about control and teaches them other strategies for dealing with their partners.”

The publication also lists the alternatives to this most popularly used model for batterer intervention programs which are cognitive-behavioral intervention, group practice and

---

the controversial couples therapy (controversial because both the man and woman’s behavior is looked at, placing the woman in a shared position of blame for the abuse against her). Are special types of culturally specific training necessary in order to help men confront their attitudes about control? Is it possible that the “patriarchal ideology” which can influence men to control their partners is applicable in all circumstances? If so, is the kind of “patriarchal ideology” different across cultures and communities? In my interview with Adam Jukes, he said that, “‘The big M’ is transhistorical and transcultural.” It involves the attitude on the part of men that, ‘I am independent, strong, I don’t need anybody, I’m not vulnerable, I can cope, nobody tells me what to do, my way or the f---ing highway.’” Is it possible to deduce one kind of masculinity into a transhistorical, transcultural phenomenon? Possibly. As quoted before by Charlotte Bunch, virtually all societies practice domination over women. Although there is no society in which women as a group have decision making power over men as a group, this is not to say that all men subscribe to traits of domination, or pursue “the big M.”

2.1.4 Structural Violence

Structural violence refers to systemic violence in society which advantages some groups, while disadvantaging others from access to social resources and political representation and voice. The

---


32 (“The big M” refers to masculinity which men feel they do not already have, but which they pursue.)

cause or perpetrator of structural violence cannot necessarily be seen, but the effects of oppression are visible in socially devalued groups who have difficulty getting jobs, are discriminated against because of their skin color, gender, age, sexuality or social status. Violence prevention programmes can seek to eliminate violent acts from society yet one of the factors which influences the violence occurring in the home is the structural violence which affects less privileged, or subordinated groups of people in society. Structural violence is more likely to be experienced by migrant groups, such as xenophobia and discrimination, poverty, language barriers, lack of access to health care and state resources, and violence from the police, or fear of violence or deportation at the hands of authorities. Policies to end domestic violence could range from programs which enable violence perpetrators to redefine their beliefs and change their behavior, to providing violence prevention for all men and communities, to restructuring the social system so that structural violence is not transmitted onto devalued social groups, and in turn reflected onto family members. The lack of resources available for domestic violence programmes reflects the low priority that the state has for changing the power dynamics, gender relations and structural violence which exists in society.

A psychoanalytical approach fails to address social issues, and focuses more on the individual. Perpetrator programs typically address violence by fixing the behavior itself but do not address all facets of a person’s experiences of violence. This is important because structural violence, or socialized attitudes and beliefs about violence all affect violence in intimate relationships. Services which allow for migrants to access the benefits they need, to the kinds of power relations which reflect the ways in which power, masculinity and domination function in our society are all parts of the reasons why some men resort to violent acts, yet in not addressing these structural systems of oppression, the violence has a chance to become naturalized as an inevitable reality which cannot be prevented. There are causes of violent acts, yet denying that
these causes are socially created naturalizes the violent acts. In the same vein, addressing structural issues without changing individuals beliefs about gender relations and norms will only serve to maintain gender norms as naturalized beliefs. Non governmental organizations, charities and some state fund programs seek to address homelessness, education, employment, and a multiplicity of risk factors for experiencing violence in a relationship. A combined effort of changing individual men’s violent behavior and reducing the risk for experiencing violence is crucial.

3. The Men’s Centre’s Approach: Freudian and Attachment Theory Psychoanalysis

The Men’s Centre is a treatment program for violent men in London England that uses psychoanalysis in individual and group counselling with domestic violence perpetrators. In this chapter I will argue that in a one-on-one counselling session at The Men’s Centre intersectional factors are paid less attention because of the Centre’s psychoanalytical approach with a high emphasis on attachment theory, Freudian Oedipal theories, and the pursuit of “the big M”. I argue
that because The Men’s Centre uses psychoanalysis, they pay less attention to cultural and social issues of domestic violence, which can be seen through an intersectional approach. Nevertheless, I also argue that psychoanalysis, as an approach used by The Men’s Centre, is useful for batterer programs because of its focus on the unconscious, which is not typically the focus of other programs for violent men. I will interpret the insights and information provided by Adam Jukes using Rosalind Minsky’s insights on gender and psychoanalytic psychotherapy, psychoanalysis as an approach to domestic violence intervention programs, Richard Collier’s theories on masculinity and violence and the concept of “individual will”, and R.W. Connell on the issue of the social in psychoanalysis.

Adam Jukes and The Men’s Center use an “integration of orthodox psychodynamic theory and a feminist understanding of the gender politics of male abuse of women and children” in their therapy work with abusers. In this chapter I will explore both the orthodox psychoanalytic psychodynamic theoretical approach to domestic violence at The Men’s Centre and engage this in a dialogue with literature which also responds to this type of approach for violent men. I will look at the ways in which The Men’s Centre draws from feminist gender politics and feminist domestic violence theory. This chapter will illustrate the theories which The Men’s Centre uses in their work through the descriptions and explanations explained by Adam Jukes in The Men’s Centre.

---

34 As can be found in the Literature Review of this same paper, my reference to an intersectional approach can be understood and defined as follows. An intersectional approach recognizes the variety of social identities, categories and social positions which exist and how different these different social categories experience oppressions, and how these oppressions intersect. Through using this term "intersectionality" I mean to convey a set of ideas which address the multiple ways in which people experience the world, and the multiple oppressions they encounter. By using an intersectional approach I wish to address the many ways in which a person experiences the world. These experiences can be influenced by their perceived gender, gender identity, race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, geographical location, historical location.

Centre and as discussed in his most recent book, *Is There A Cure For Masculinity?*. This chapter will explore the ways in which a psychoanalytic approach is useful for working with men who have perpetrated domestic violence, and, through an intersectional lens, the ways in which this approach can be improved.

### 3.1 The Significance of the Oedipus Complex for The Men’s Centre

It is with the Oedipus complex that I will begin in this chapter’s purpose of examining the psychoanalytical approach of The Men’s Centre. In this section, I will outline the approach in order to follow the logic of how the Oedipus complex can be connected to violence. In this section, I will discuss the usefulness and the critiques of using a psychoanalytical therapeutic approach with violent men. I will outline the ways in which the approach of psychoanalysis is used by The Men’s Centre. Instead of providing an in-depth outline of psychoanalysis as a field, I will explain the necessary aspects as pertains to The Men’s Centre both briefly here, and along the way. Although Freudian theory discusses both boys and girls in its developmental theory, the Oedipal complex, The Men’s Centre focuses on little boys, as they see little boys as having asymmetrical development: little boys and little girls are both little girls, and while girls can stay girls, the little boys must become men, and detach from their mothers. This is a great loss for them, resulting in a lifelong search for the lost object, their mother. In Jukes’ version though, the mother can actually be a mother, father, or any primary caregiver to the child. Attachment theory, also central to the work of The Men’s Centre, is the basic understanding that if, during this
Oedipal phase of development, little boys (or girls) are traumatized through neglect, or deprivation of love from their parents, they become insecurely attached. If they do not suffer trauma during this stage, they are securely attached and can continue to form secure and healthy attachments to others later in life.

In the Freudian theory on children’s development, after the phallic phase, in which sexuality in early childhood reaches its height, young boys and girls enter into the Oedipal stage.\(^{36}\) In order to define the Oedipal complex adequately and with precision, Freud’s own writing will be necessary: the young boy, entering into the Oedipal stage

\[
\text{begins to manipulate his penis and simultaneously has phantasies of carrying out some sort of activity with it in relation to his mother, till, owing to the combined effect of a threat of castration and the sight of the absence of a penis in females, he experiences the greatest trauma of his life and this introduces the period of latency with all of its consequences.}\(^{37}\)
\]

This Oedipal theory is used by The Men’s Centre to analyse men’s early experiences and the effects on their adult lives. Jukes’ theory of “the big M”, which has its basis in the Oedipal complex, asserts that all men pursue masculinity but can the Oedipal complex be generalized to all cultures worldwide? Conceptions of the penis, and gendered practices are multiple, and varied. From this brief overview of the Oedipus complex, we can continue with a more detailed interpretation and insight by Adam Jukes who provides insights into how a young boy’s


experience of the Oedpial complex affects him into his adulthood, and lead men to be misogynistic. As Jukes has said, “Misogyny is part of masculinity.”

Adam Jukes, through his 40 year career as a clinical psychoanalyst working with violent men, sees masculinity as an illusion which men pursue and aspire to. This is what he calls “the big M” and it consists of a kind of masculinity which says “I am independent, strong, I don't need anybody, I’m not vulnerable, I can cope, nobody tells me what to do, my way or the f---ing highway.” Jukes says that he works with violent men, not to rework their masculinity, but to create a new man. He sees masculinity as a kind of disorder, one which is curable through psychoanalytic psychotherapy which would allow the patient to “develop the psychic muscle to tolerate depression, sadness and loss, vulnerability and fear which are fundamental for subverting phallic masculinity... [and] develop an identity which is not governed by the need to get rich, fight or fuck.”

This ‘disordered’ phallic masculinity is seen by Jukes as being formed in a crisis- the crisis of the Oedipal Complex.

To give a precise definition of the Oedipus Complex’s meaning in relation to masculinity, misogyny and its importance in the work of Adam Jukes and The Men’s Centre’s approach, I will provide a short excerpt for this purpose:

“Masculinity is constructed out of phallic narcissistic defences against an underlying basic fault deriving from the loss of and

separation from the maternal or primary object... [it is a] set of
defences against attachment anxieties and anxieties about loss,
either suffered or feared... [The] lives of these men were shaped by
experiences of profound loss and or emotional/physical trauma...As
a result, the phallic phase and the discovery of the comfort of the
penis and the promise of the identification with the fantasy of the
father leads to a masculinity designed to mask the underlying shame
of feeling unlovable, vulnerable and helpless... Masculinity is
fundamentally a defence against that underlying vulnerability."43

These defences, and therefore, masculinity, “emphasize potency, strength, fearlessness,
carelessness about safety (courage and bravery, risk taking --- self-destructiveness) and the denial
of attachment needs, total independence.”44 Although further discussion on The Men’s Centre,
and Adam Jukes’ definition, understanding and insights into masculinity as “the big M” will be
provided in the next chapter dedicated to this purpose, it is important to understand the Oedipal
complex as a theoretical basis for The Men’s Centre’s practice.

Psychoanalysis is useful for making men more self-reflective about their underlying issues which
cause them enact violence, but there is a clear focus on the individual, and not the social problem
of men as a group being dominant over women as a group, risk factors for violence or a culture of
violence towards women. Creating a new man during therapy, Jukes works to take away men’s
masculinity. About creating a new man, Jukes can only say what this new man is not:

It's not "the big M" it’s not feeling in control, it’s not feeling the
need to be in control, it’s not being afraid of uncertainty its not
being afraid of grief. Because Ultimately, in order to deal with this
men must deal with the loss of their mother. Most men go into
search mode [for a new mother in a partner]. Always searching,

43Jukes, Adam. "Conclusion- Is there a Cure for Masculinity?" Is There A Cure For Masculinity?
44Jukes, Adam. "Conclusion- Is there a Cure for Masculinity?" Is There A Cure For Masculinity?
always yearning for the lost object. That’s the problem with men, we're addicted to the lost object.\textsuperscript{45}

Instead of dealing with men to recognize the culture of violence we live in which positions men as dominant over women, there is a focus on the individual using a Freudian theory of the lost object.

### 3.2 The Unconscious

To practice dynamic and analytic psychotherapy, one must place the unconscious at the center of one’s endeavours.\textsuperscript{46} From this notion which Adam Jukes writes of in his book, it can be then considered that the unconscious is highly important and closely analysed in dynamic and analytic psychotherapy. In a psychoanalytic approach to a program for domestic violence perpetrators, not simply the behavior and action is targeted to change, but the roots from where these behaviors originate: in the psyche. A man’s childhood, which impacts the unconscious, is examined especially with the Oedipal Complex in mind. A child’s relationship with their caretaker is crucial and effects the child’s unconscious as well as problems later in life with attachment and relationships. Adam Jukes explains:

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
The more insecurely attached men are, the more the early transactions and exchanges with the primary careers went wrong with the little boy, then the more the big M is attractive to him. In a sense, the more damaged he is, the more masculine he wants to become. That’s why the prisons are full of people who were traumatized and damaged. 90% are victims of childhood abuse, or neglect or deprivation. And one of the ways men cope with that, is that they become hyper-masculine. Instead of being scared they become frightening.\textsuperscript{47}

When a child experiences abuse neglect or deprivation, they become insecurely attached to their caregivers. Yet, Jukes said that the loss of the carer as object, during the Oedipal Complex, can be damaging, causing the little boy to seek out “the big M”. In Freudian theory, the mother plays a significant role as not only the primary carer, but also as a gendered, female character in the family who the young boy relates to, first, not knowing she does not have a penis, then, upon finding out she ‘lacks’ a penis, believes she as been castrated which causes him to have feelings of contempt because she does not have the penis,”an object of veneration.”\textsuperscript{48}. Jukes’ use of the term “primary carer” when discussing the boy’s relationship to the lost object, may show a shift in psychoanalytic thinking, possibly influenced by a recognition of similar observations of development with male caregivers or a shift in gendered thinking about parental roles and which parent is capable, or not, of being a primary, or good caregiver.

It may be plausible to connect unconscious feelings and impulses for violence: the impulse to resort to violence, even though in conscious and rational thought one recognizes that violence is wrong, may be connected with unconscious beliefs ingrained through exposure to violence against women in culture, media and everyday dialogues which reproduce violence against


women as acceptable through jokes, or silence. What symbols, meanings, feelings or beliefs are stored in a person’s unconscious can affect a person’s everyday interactions and relationships. Rosalind Minsky in her book Psychoanalysis and Gender, An Introductory Reader, provides insights into the affects, and workings of the unconscious in our daily lives: “Let us begin by considering the question of what constitutes ‘evidence’ of the unconscious at the level of our everyday experience. We can take as example the powerful experiences of feeling an irrational dislike or hostility towards an individual or a group of people.”

From this, it may be deduced that the unconscious is a location where negative feelings, and preconceived (irrational) notions of devaluation towards women are embedded.

In Richard Collier’s discussion on changing men and masculinities, he comments on the possibilities of changing men and the social and psychological barriers to change their violence and criminal behavior. Both Colliers concept of individual will, and recognition of the unconscious are important factors in working with violent men, and theorizing masculinity and violence. Although Collier is a sociologist, these concepts of the individual will, and the unconscious are also relevant to psychoanalysis. His reference to the unconscious is in line with Minsky’s aforementioned statement that irrational dislike for a group of people is evidence of an embedded belief in the unconscious. Collier writes,

> “Individual ‘will’, as it were, might, given certain societal encouragement, eradicate the effects of patriarchal socialisation. Yet underlying such a position, Gatens (1996) argues, is a dubious voluntarism which underestimates the unconscious embedding of these ‘patriarchal’ imperatives. To state as much is not, importantly, to suggest that ‘men cannot be changed’. It is, however, to highlight the ways in which a behaviourist conception of ‘gendered’ conditioning presumes the existence of a passive (non-signifying

---

subject), a subject which might then be trained to respond ‘appropriately’ (in a non-sexist, non-criminal way for example) and be relied on, crucially, to consistently respond in such a manner.”  

It would be safe to assume that ‘individual will’ is not something that can be expected of every violent man who enters a perpetrator/batterer program or any kind of violence intervention program. In fact, most of the men who end up at The Men’s Center are referred by the local authorities and participate in counselling because of a court order. Adam Jukes said that over the course of 40 years, he had never met a truly self-referred man. He said that even the men who consider themselves to be self-referred are actually being sent by their wives who have left them, or are threatening to leave.  

Compared with a Cognitive-Behavioral Therapeutic (CBT) approach to batterer intervention programmes, a psychoanalytic approach may be more useful when encountering a man who is unwilling to change. A CBT approach entails behavioral and beliefs based intervention to change the patterns men’s violent behaviors. The fact that it can not be expected that every man will have an “individual will” to change their violent behavior means that a CBT model may be insufficient for this type of man. To push what Gatens argues a step further, men who do not have an “individual will” to change, may have especially strong unconsciously embedded patriarchal imperatives (i.e. beliefs about gender roles, masculinity connected to culture of a homeland as reproduced by female family members, gender expectations in relationships, beliefs about men’s control over women’s sexuality, and women’s relegation to certain spaces, jobs and statuses), which could be understood, and treated through an approach which specialises in the


unconscious. This is to say that an approach which does not consider the unconscious is one which does not consider the ways in which gender relations and ideologies, including violence, are embedded and ingrained in and through our thought processes, beliefs and practices. A psychoanalytical approach is then a necessary and, perhaps, crucial method for changing violent men. Even in men who “want to change” isn’t it plausible that they committed violent acts because of some patriarchal belief system to which they have ascribed which allows men to dominate women?

3.3 Critique of Psychoanalytic Approach

For The Men’s Centre, both individual and group counselling sessions are available, but, because the state funds individuals in group counselling, most men engage in group counselling. Notably, most men who are sent to The Men’s Centre by the state authorities are Bangladeshi or Pakistani residing in Camden. Most of these men Jukes sees are Muslim, and many have immigrated from their home country. Jukes did not give proportions or percentages of the amount of people he sees who are 1st or 2nd generation, by said that many are immigrants who are referred to The Men’s Centre, and this was explained by Jukes a a result of being already in contact with the authorities in order to obtain assistance in accessing social resources, and help in seeking employment after they arrived in the country. This fact makes intersectionality, and attention to wider social issues, cultures and intersections of different gendered relationships, practices and beliefs important. Social structures which privilege men, devalue women and maintain a society in which men can freely exercise control and domination over women are a
problem. A culture of violence and subordination and control of women come in many forms, and exist in different forms. Therapy as a tool to overcome violent men’s attitudes, beliefs and violent behaviors has the potential to change individual men’s lives, and the lives of those they encounter. Yet an individual approach is not accepted as sufficient for many feminist domestic violence theorists who see the larger picture of the society and culture of violence against women.

The psychoanalytic approach of The Men’s Centre is one which is represented as generalizable to all of the men who come to seek treatment. In the interview, it was unclear if the Pakistani and Bangladeshi men were 1st or second generation, and although my interest was in the immigrant population, Jukes’ approach that “all men” transhistorically, and globally, pursue “the big M” was additionally represented by the fact that anecdotally, his examples included non-immigrant men, or men from non-Pakistani, non-Bangladeshi origin. He did not see any differences in the violent behaviors, or vulnerabilities/risk factors for violent behaviors.

In R.W. Connell’s article *Psychoanalysis on Masculinity*, Connell traces a genealogy of psychoanalytic ideas about masculinity, and shows the ways in which masculinity can be understood through psychoanalytic theories originating with the classical psychoanalysis of Freud: the Oedipus Complex. R.W. Connell, a feminist scholar on masculinity writes, “[T]he understanding of the social in most psychoanalytic work is severely limited... Questions of social structure and large-scale dynamics are often very remote.”[^52] Large scale dynamics, such as cultural issues, widespread domination over women by men, gender relations influenced and informed by cultural beliefs and practices, social norms and popular culture’s influence on gender practices are all possible dynamics which can be discounted or invisible through a psychoanalytic

approach because it focuses on the unconscious, and the individual. Yet, the individual is part of a larger whole, and a larger pattern which must be addressed for the violence to end. Recognizing the social aspects of violence against women is crucial for a feminist approach to domestic violence.

Battering as a social, and not an individual problem is recognized by feminist domestic violence theorists and activists. In a 1981 Newsletter from the Center for Women’s Policy Studies, Mary Morrison, the spokeswoman for the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence explained the Coalition’s stance on domestic violence intervention program approaches: “Because the Coalition has a systematic analysis of woman abuse, we do not believe that therapy for abusers is the solution. Battering is not an individual problem that can be solved with therapy or drug and alcohol abuse counseling. What we need to do is change the system that allows woman abuse.”

This political stance, which recognizes the problem of abuse as widespread, and infused and embedded in a social system which devalues women, is a stance which sees the larger social picture, and the embedded attitudes of the whole society which need to change, in order to end violence, subordination and control over women. Alternatively, Mary Morrison’s points can be used to critique a therapeutic approach which does not address cultural issues, and larger social issues which are at play in creating and maintaining a society which accepts, maintains and practices violence and domination of women.

Morrison’s points can be used to advocate for both a more intersectional approach to domestic violence in which cultural, social and ideologies based around the subordination of women are addressed, and in which traits of masculinity are reconsidered, for example, by reconsidering that the social phenomenon of domestic violence (also, driving fast or drug abuse) could also be an

expression not of masculinity, but of a need for social recognition, poverty, youth, low socio-economic status, social relocation, social displacement or sexual anxieties.

Her statement can be used to advocate for a larger social response to domestic violence against women which targets not only changing individual abusers violent behaviors and their beliefs which justify violence but changing, and overthrowing a patriarchal system in which men rule over and dominate women through control, coercion, access to privileges such as money and social networks, etc. A critique on approaches to programs themselves is more useful, yet changing the social system which allows violence against women can also be considered for domestic violence batterer programs. The Men’s Centre uses a psychoanalytic approach with attention to the gender politics of male domination over women, as previously mentioned, yet is it possible that incorporating a specifically multicultural approach could be beneficial for changing not only men’s individual beliefs and behaviors about violence, but also their particular kinds of gendered relationships which are influenced, and exist in ways which could .

In his chapter on technologies of coercive control, Evan Stark discusses the coercive controller’s isolation of their partner, writing that a reason a controller isolates their partner is to instill dependence.  

54 In a similar question posited to Adam Jukes asking, “Do men abuse women in order to make women dependent on them, so they don’t leave?” Jukes responded, “It is an unintended unconscious consequence, but not the main reason.”  

55 Jukes’ understanding and interpretation of his patients reasons for abusing their wives, or other female family members, is because the men want to get their way.  

56 From this there are two points I would like to open up:

firstly, the conscious efforts for men to get their own way, and be the one in control, and the 
unconscious--- why is it that men feel the right to be in control, why do some men feel the desire 
to exercise dominance and control over women? Internalized ideologies, and an individual’s 
experience of a kind of widespread socialization which devalues women connects the 
unconscious with the widespread social ideologies which are naturalized because they are 
embedded in so much of societies unconscious, and because they are maintained by those who 
are served and privileged by the devaluation of women and valuation of men.

3.4 A Psychoanalytical Approach: Further Considerations

about Little Boys

Yet apart from Oedipal theory, another issue of socialization of boys can come to be seen as 
relevant and prevalent. Jukes, drawing from Kleinian psychoanalytic theory\(^\text{57}\), considers that 
little boys are actually little girls (vulnerable, dependent on carer for some needs), until they 
have to become little boys and men (not vulnerable, independent). This insight is useful 
because it provides a lens from psychoanalysis into a larger social problem of the gender 
socialization of children. They way boys are raised, to be invulnerable, independent, and to 
seek “the big M” in some form, and the way society maintains this male role as superior, 
dominant and privileged, reminds me of a Gloria Steinem quote which shows the ways in

Minutes 30:40.

\(^{57}\)More on Klein’s Freudian theory can be read in Klein, M. “Early stages of the Oedipus 
which our society privileges the male role, devalues the female role, and could change the way
society functions through differently socializing society’s children: “We've begun to raise
daughters more like sons... but few have the courage to raise our sons more like our
daughters.”

Perhaps if all parents (because I realize that some do) allowed for their sons to
continue to be raised as “little girls”, the little boys would not feel that they had to shut off
their vulnerability, their need for another person, and they would not search for “the big M”.
Considering the psychoanalytic approach is useful because it opens up the door to thinking about
the ways that children are raised, and the impact of socialization in its role towards understanding
and practicing gender roles which are harmful to women, and dehumanizing for men, who are
prohibited from experiencing a wide array of human emotions, and in turn, act out violently.

4. The Men’s Centre and Masculinities

4.1 Hegemonic Masculinity and The Men’s Centre

“I believe the real change has occurred in women as they have held up a mirror to men in ways
which would not have been possible in the majority of the 20th century. Obviously this has
requires adaptations from men as they have attempted to retain the privileges, the rank, status
and social esteem, of their gender without confirming the unpalatable image being reflected. As
to ‘the crisis of masculinity’, I believe that this is transhistorical and transcultural. I see
masculinity as being formed in a crisis. The crisis is the Oedipal complex and I believe the crisis
underpinning the resolution to the complex is omnipresent in men. As I hope to show, the threat
of the underlying anxieties breaking through is responsible for most male pathology.”

-Adam Jukes on masculinity

58Johnson Lewis, Jone. "Gloria Steinem Quotes." Women's History - Comprehensive Women's
<http://womenshistory.about.com/cs/quotes/a/qu_g_steinem.htm>

Masculinity Studies began as a discipline in the 1980’s in response and parallel to women’s studies and feminist studies which focused primarily on women. Initially, masculinity was viewed in academic discourse and literature as universal, hegemonic and stable yet this changed and the notion of multiple masculinities arose. R.W. Connell’s influential concept of hegemonic masculinity came to be widely recognized and criticized across academic fields. Hegemonic masculinity is constructed as a normative and ideal masculinity which all men are supposed to desire to embody, and position themselves in relation to, is characterized in a Western masculinity construct as a white, heterosexual, married, middle-aged, university educated upper middle class man.

Jukes idea of a singular masculinity, “the big M”, which can be found in any part of the globe in the same form and might have “minor cultural variations on the theme based on the specific culture”, is not necessarily “hegemonic” as Jukes does not consider that “the big M” has a counterpart, like hegemonic masculinity and it’s counterpart of subordinate masculinities. Jukes believes that all men aspire and pursue this “big M” which he describes as “dismissive, detached and unemotional, it’s independent and it’s invulnerable.”

Positioning a masculinity in this way ignores the multiple masculinities, and the constantly changing and shifting notions of gender, norms and ideals.

---

60 First used by Kessler et al, 1982, in a field study of Australian high schools, then, in response, developed and discussed further by Connell who popularized the concept.
Marginalization of subordinate masculinities reproduces and reinforces the myth of male power, and male domination (Kimmel and Messner 1995). Although there are power hierarchies within masculinities which marginalize certain men and masculinities and value the hegemonic masculinity, most masculinities are seen as complicit in their position as the dominant role in the gender relation in patriarchy which oppresses women. Multiple masculinities recognize the cultural, socioeconomic, class, race, historical location and geographical location influences on the constructions of masculinity which exist throughout the world and history. This mythical construction of a hegemonic and ideal masculinity which all men are supposed to desire to embody, and position themselves in relation to, is characterized in a Western masculinity construct as a white, heterosexual, married, middle-aged, university educated upper middle class man (Connell 1995).

Jukes rejects the popular notion of a 'crisis of masculinity' brought on by feminism and instead considers masculinity itself as formed in a crisis, the crisis of the Oedipal complex. Although Jukes rejects a ‘crisis of masculinity,’ which is critiqued for positing a hegemonic, stable and universal masculinity, he makes other statements about masculinity which can be seen as hegemonic. He considers this masculinity, “the big M” as formed in a crisis and he believes it to be transhistorical and transcultural.

Jukes has an essentialist belief about masculinity, yet the ways in which he uses this word, and idea, “masculinity” should also be examined, because his concept of masculinity is notably different than as frequently used in academia or even in popular discourse. Jukes notion of masculinity comes counter to the notion of multiple masculinities, developed in response to Connell’s popular study on hegemonic masculinities of an Australian high school. Although Jukes believes there are cultural variations on the theme of masculinity, he believes that the kind of masculinity is the same. Jukes has a monolithic concept of masculinity which he believes all
men aspire to, no matter their background, no matter where they live across the world, from Delhi to Rio De Janiero, to Houston\textsuperscript{64} and no matter where they exist in history.

Adam Jukes’ definition of masculinity is stable, and is used as a generalization of all men, which is surprising given that the population he serves is diverse including both british born white men, and immigrant men from Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Africa. This places him in a position to be critiqued as a positivist and essentialist. In order to make these claims, definitions of what constitutes a positivist and essentialist position are provided by R.W. Connell, a main theoretical contributor to masculinity and feminist theory:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textbf{Essentialism:}
  Essentialist definitions usually pick a feature that defines the core of the masculine, and hang an account of men's lives on that. Authors' attempts to capture an essence of masculinity have been colorfully varies: risk-taking, responsibility, irresponsibility, aggression, Zeus energy… Claims about a universal basis of masculinity tell us more about the ethos of the claimant than about anything else.\textsuperscript{65}

  \item \textbf{Positivism:}
  Positivist social science presupposes a stable object of knowledge which is constant across all the cases.\textsuperscript{66} There is no masculine entity whose occurrences in all societies we can generalize about… What is more or less constant, through shifts of culture, is the anatomy and physiology of male bodies.\textsuperscript{67}
\end{enumerate}

To say, as Adam Jukes does, that “all men” aspire to this singular and only masculinity essentializes men’s desires, and assumes that all men have this kind of aspiration. It assumes that there is not even one man who subverts a dominating, invulnerable and “my way or the f---ing

\textsuperscript{64}Jukes, Adam. "An Interview with Adam Jukes." Personal interview. 13 Apr. 2011. Minutes 16:00.
highway” masculinity by actively choosing, or never having the need or desire to enact this kind of masculinity. Although this conceptualization of masculinity may be useful for a psychoanalytic approach with violent men, it can be argued that using this notion of masculinity is not useful for feminist, sociological, masculinity studies or any other kind of academic field which seeks to theorize masculinity, or examine masculinity in practice. Jukes positions a number of traits as inherent to masculinity as something which is invulnerable, risk-taking, ambitious, addicted to pornography and seeking control. Through an intersectional approach, these traits could be considered as possibly attributed to other factors such as poverty, class, peer group association, psychological factors and/or socio-economic status, yet in Jukes’ model they are associated with masculinity.

Even in Jukes’ formulation of “the big M,” it appears that there exists no conceptual room for alternative masculinities. In Jukes formulation it could be considered that there are two groups of men: men who pursue “the big M” and men who have it taken away from them through analytic psychotherapy in combination with “the Mad Hypothesis” and become new men who do not need to be in control and no longer pursue ‘the big M.” Are there other possible routes for men towards not needing to be in control? I think that Jukes underestimates the possibility that through different life experiences, some men may find it unnecessary and less attractive to continue to pursue control, dominance and the attitudes which come with pursuing “the big M”.

Because Jukes does not consider other masculinities, this might not occur. For example, and speculatively, a man could find it more useful and fulfilling to embody a masculinity focused around being a family man and good father, which is becoming more and more rewarded in our

society, rather than to pursue certain aspects of a more normative and aggressive masculinity which he may have embodied through association with a male peer group in his college days. In a critique on the theoretical merit of Connell’s concept of hegemonic masculinity, Demetriou argues that hegemonic masculinity is not simply a “white or heterosexual configuration of practice,”69 but that hegemonic masculinity draws from multiple representations and practices of masculinity which allow for the reproduction and continuation of patriarchy, and dominance over women. In this view, Jukes’ theory of masculinity as a set of traits and attitudes that are omnipresent in men, the only difference being quantitative, not qualitative,70 are “I am independent, strong, I don't need anybody, I’m not vulnerable, I can cope, nobody tells me what to do, my way or the highway.”71 A defined set of traits which encapsulate the “disorder” of masculinity position this kind of masculinity in a way which essentialises men as prone to this disorder, and unable to escape from catching it. That all men are afflicted with this disorder which appears during the Oedipal complex, also hegemonizes and essentialises the gendered practices, concepts and relations cross culturally. By cross culturally I mean between cultures of already subversive gender constructions, sexualities and familial constructions, as well as between cultures of aboriginals in Australia, rice farmers in Japan and stay at home dads in Norway. To consider that these traits have the same meanings, are practiced in certain meaningful ways, and are reproduced by all men is problematic. Not only does it essentialize

masculinity, it disregards the possibility that these traits could be enacted for reasons other than phallic narcissism\textsuperscript{72} and masculinity.

Character traits which Jukes connects with “the big M.” could be considered in a new light so that a person’s character traits do not necessarily embody a pursuit of “the big M” or a dominant masculinity. For example, Jukes makes an argument for ambition being connected to “the big M” because, he says, “ambition is clearly phallic narcissistic.”\textsuperscript{73} Alternatively, I propose that ambition could be ignited through other human experiences, such as passion, or desire to make money for a good, and selfless cause such as an organization which tugs at a person’s heartstrings, or to be financially ambitious with a goal of being able to take a loved one on vacation one day, supporting one’s family, or being able to pay for a child’s education. How a man may enact his own masculinity, for what reasons, under what circumstances, and yielding what results are all variable, unstable and based on many factors. Factors which would influence how a man relates to and embodies traits which he feels represent a being or acting masculine include culture, race, media, ethnicity, historical and geographical location, relocation, and/or entering into different peer groups or groups who have different values attached to representations of masculinity, or gendered traits.

Evan Stark, a feminist academic and domestic violence theorist who's book re-frames domestic violence through a lens of coercive control shows how abusers entrap women, not just physically, but emotionally and mentally through isolation, subverting women’s autonomy and controlling them in detailed aspects of their daily lives. In his book, \textit{Coercive Control}, Stark gives useful


descriptions of masculinity which allow us to see the ways in which addressing violent behavior is simply not enough for domestic violence programs, since violent physical acts are not the only factor of abuse. Stark writes that, "[a]ddressing control is far more difficult than stopping men from being violent. Masculinity in our society is identified even more closely with being "in control" than it is with the use or capacity to use force." Control as an issue which must be addressed with violent men, is an issue addressed by The Men’s Centre. Jukes works to subvert masculinity, and take it away from the man. He then works to create a new man, without a “masculinity”. He could only describe this man by describing what this man is not. This new man he works to create is a man who does not need to be in control, “it’s not feeling in control, its not feeling the need to be in control, its not being afraid of uncertainty its not being afraid of grief,” says Jukes.

Jukes idea of a singular masculinity, “the big M”, which can be found in any part of the globe in the same form and might have “minor cultural variations on the theme based on the specific culture”, is not necessarily “hegemonic” as Jukes does not consider that “the big M” has a counterpart, like hegemonic masculinity and it’s counterpart of subordinate masculinities. Jukes believes that all men aspire and pursue this “big M” which he describes as “dismissive, detached and unemotional, it’s independent and it’s invulnerable.” This masculinity says, “I am independent, strong, I don't need anybody, I'm not vulnerable, I can cope, nobody tells me what to do, my way or the highway.”

5. Conclusion

The Men’s Centre is a domestic violence counselling center whose success rates, as aforementioned, are comparable to other programs in London- programs which do not use a
psychoanalytical approach. Although this paper did not have the capacity to look into this effectively, I suggest that there is a common link which may involve men participating in a community which rejects violence against women, and violence as a valued form of masculinity. The Men’s Centre’s focus on the unconscious places it apart from other programs who draw from Cognitive Behavioral models. The unconscious is a place which needs further exploration in domestic violence theory. From an analysis of the unconscious, it can be considered that young boys could be socialized differently. Perhaps it is true that most boys are socialized to act in certain masculine way. This kind of normative masculinity which involves dominance over women (and men) is something which some men choose not to participate in. For some reason, perhaps that they were bullied for not fulfilling their masculine gender role in a way their peers saw valuable, they may have decided that being dominant, aggressive, and having a “my way or the highway” kind of attitude was not all that it was cracked up to be. Men who are bullied and policed for their gendered embodiment, gendered appearance, or masculinity could respond by either becoming hypermasculine, or rejecting dominant norms which dictate valuable traits associated with masculinity. How men choose to enact certain traits, and if they are related to masculinity, psychological factors, social relocation and/or poverty is up for discussion.
6. Appendices

6.1 Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

“The big M”: Jukes’ understanding of masculinity. Invulnerability, risk-taking, ambition, use of pornography, status, power, independence, strength, sexual potency, sexual perversion, infidelity and a ‘my way or the f---ing highway’ attitude are all components of “the big M”. He posits that all men aspire to “the big M”. “The big M” is described by Jukes as being a disorder acquired during the Oedipal stage. “The big M” is masculinity, which can be cured through psychoanalytic therapy which allows a man to build mental strength to deal with his invulnerability, losses and grief of losing his mother, or primary caregiver. Opposite to “the big M” is a rejected femininity which comprises of vulnerability, passivity, vulnerability and emotionality.

Jukes Notion of Masculinity: Jukes posits that masculinity is an illusion which men aspire to, but that it does not exist. They continue to pursue it all their lives, unless they get “the cure for masculinity.” Masculinity is a phallic narcissistic construction, developed by boys in the Oedipal stage. “the more masculine a man is, the more castrated, impotent, and helpless he feels so the bigger the M he’s portraying, the more vulnerable, the more afraid, impotent, castrated he’s feeling and struggling with all the time.”

Phallic Narcissism: Originally theorized by Freud, and used by Jukes, phallic narcissism, is characterised by a belief that everyone has a penis and a development of castration anxiety when it is discovered that women (the little boy’s mother) do not have a penis.

The Cure for Masculinity: A man can be cured of his disorder of pursuing “the big M” through psychoanalytical therapy which subverts masculinity, takes masculinity away from the man and which allows a man to build mental strength to deal with his invulnerability, losses and grief of losing his mother, or primary caregiver.

The Mad Hypothesis: Part of the “cure” for masculinity through psychoanalytic therapy, the Man Hypothesis is the hypothesis that whatever is wrong in a man’s relationship is caused by the man himself, and that he is responsible for all the problems in the relationship and his life. This forces men to be self-reflective about their behaviors.

**Penis Envy:** Jukes asserts that it is not women, as Freud posited, who are jealous of penises, its men! Men are jealous of each other’s perceived masculinity. No man would ever admit that he does not have “the big M” but all men feel that other men have it.

**Attachment theory:** Central to the work of The Men’s Centre, it is the basic understanding that if, during the Oedipal phase of development, little boys (or girls) are traumatized through neglect, or deprivation of love from their parents, they become insecurely attached. If they do not suffer trauma during this stage, they are securely attached and can continue to form secure and healthy attachments to others later in life.
### 6.2 Appendix B: WHO Study Definitions of Abuse

**Figure 2 Operational Definitions of Intimate Partner Violence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Violence</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Physical violence by an intimate partner:** | - Was slapped or had something thrown at her that could hurt her  
- Was pushed or shoved  
- Was hit with fist or something else that could hurt  
- Was kicked, dragged or beaten up  
- Was choked or burnt on purpose  
- Perpetrator threatened to use or actually used a gun, knife or weapon against her |
| **Sexual violence by an intimate partner:** | - Was physically forced to have sexual intercourse when she did not want to  
- Had sexual intercourse when she did not want to because she was afraid of what partner might do  
- Was forced to do something sexual that she found degrading or humiliating |
| **Physical and/or sexual violence by an intimate partner:** | - One or more of above acts of physical and/or sexual violence |

Source: BMC Public Health © 1995-2011 BioMed Central Ltd
6.3 Appendix C: The Men’s Centre Definition of Abuse

Violent, Abusive and Controlling Behaviour Checklist

**PHYSICAL ABUSE.**
Slap, punch, grab, kick, choke, push, restrain, pull hair, pinch, bite, rape, use of force, threats or coercion to obtain sex. Use of weapons, throwing things, keeping weapons around which frighten her. Abuse of furniture, pets, destroying her possessions, tearing or spoiling her clothing. Uninvited touching, covering her mouth to stop her talking.

**PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE.**
Threats of violence, verbal or non-verbal, direct or indirect, self-inflicted injury eg. hitting your head on walls or threatening suicide. Intimidation eg. standing in doorway during arguments, angry or threatening gestures, use of your size to intimidate, standing over her, driving recklessly. Harassment, eg. uninvited visits or calls, following her, checking up on her, embarrassing her in public, not leaving when asked. Isolation, preventing or making it hard for her to see or talk to friends or relatives and others. Making derogatory comments about her friends. Yelling, swearing, being coarse, raising your voice, using angry expressions or gestures.

**VERBAL ABUSE**
Criticism, name calling, swearing, mocking, put downs, ridicule, accusations, blaming, humiliating. Angrily waking her up from sleep. Interrupting, changing subjects, not listening or responding, picking up the paper when she wants to talk, twisting her words, topic stringing. Claiming the truth, being the authority. Claiming the right to define what is logical, rational, reasonable or fair in the relationship. Calling her stupid or otherwise defining her behaviour as illogical, unreasonable irrational etc. Logic chopping, lying, withholding information about your activities, infidelity.

**FINANCIAL ABUSE**
Economic harassment, getting angry with her about 'where the money goes', not allowing access to money, the car or other resources, sabotaging her attempts to work, believing you are the provider and thinking that she could not survive without you, saying that the money you earn is yours.

**EMOTIONAL ABUSE**
Pressure tactics, rushing her to make decisions, hurry up, walking in front of her, using guilt, sulking, threats of withholding financial support, manipulating the kids. Using pornography, including home videos, against her wishes. Not helping with child care or housework, saying that you have already done a days work. Not keeping to agreements. Abusing your power over the children, either emotionally or physically.
Feeling stressed and tense and using this to get into a frame of mind when you blame her for everything which goes wrong:- things you can't find, mess etc. This is usually a prelude to a violent attack and you should pay particular attention to this so that you can stop before you reach flash point.

Emotional withholding, not expressing your feelings or giving support, thinking your problems are more important than hers, not giving attention or compliments, not respecting her feelings, rights or opinions.

Not taking care of yourself and refusing to learn basic life skills, cooking etc. Abusing drugs, alcohol, not eating properly, not making friends and seeking help and support from them.

Believing you have the right to define appropriate wifely and motherly behaviour and not offering your expectations to negotiation. Criticising her motherly qualities or performance.

Accusing her of neglecting the children or using threats of taking the kids away etc.

Telling her that if she doesn't like it she knows what she can do, pack, leave etc. Not acknowledging that the relationship is important to you, telling her that you don't need her or love her etc.

It has to be said that many of these behaviours when taken in isolation amount to control rather than abuse. The context of the behaviour is crucial in determining whether or not it is abusive.
6.4 Appendix D: Interviews with Adam Jukes


2011.

2:50 AJ: Ex-colonies, really, we have a lot of people from the Asian subcontinent who have the right of entry into the UK. We have cities who are almost entirely immigrant. Like Bradford is almost entirely Pakistani. Even Camden, The point being that these are all former colonies, so these people have a right of entry into the UK. Its becoming increasingly constrained these days, but they still come in in very large numbers. They still have the right, or their relatives have the right. So The Men's Centre gets to see quite a lot of people like that, largely because of racism in the host community. They tend to picked up more by the statutory authorities. Because they're often in contact with statutory authorities anyway because they have all of these problems interfacing with the new community: language skills, how to access benefits how to access social resources how to find work, so they're already in contact with social agonies long before any domestic violence starts, well no not necessarily, long before it comes to the notice of the authorities that there is violence going on. And often the wives, especially from the Asian community, a lot of the women don't speak any English at all. I've worked with men here who have lived in this country for 30 years, with their wives, and their wives don't speak any English at all, its quite extraordinary, and that's common.

4:45 DF: Is that because of the isolation within the community?
AJ: Its because of the ghettoization.

5:14 AJ: It is well known that first pregnancy is a major threat to marriage. Men are not equipped to be fathers. They’re not emotionally prepared.

DF: Does this have to do with socialization, of how men and women are able to deal with emotions?
AJ: Men do a lot of acting out during pregnancy. First of all they lose their girlfriend

6:40 AJ: Even if you're married to a woman, most men don't really feel too responsible. They can always walk, but then during pregnancy, they realize they can't just stay off of work sick, and their demands increase. They have to give more and more and get less from their wives.
7:30 AJ: They are suddenly aware, even if they can't articulate it, that they are about to be suddenly responsible for a new life. The whole issue of responsibility becomes quite the central thing in their lives because even if you're married to a woman, when you're just a couple, you don't really feel that responsible. Most men really don't feel that responsible. They can always walk away. If the going gets tough, the tough get going. So they can walk. But the fact is that when there is a pregnancy, its not that easy anymore. And suddenly they realize, we'll we realize, because I've been through it, we realize my god, its not just suddenly, I can't just decide to stay off of work sick if I don't feel like it, because most women still don't work after pregnancy. So the demands on the man increase, and at the same time, he gets less. So it goes down the feeding chain, but goes up the demand chain. So he has to give more and more and more and gets less and less and less. And then that’s where the problems start from there.

12:30 AJ: There's a belief [that] I'm lovable, and other people are lovable as well. And other people will love me if i need to be supported, and that's a basic secure attachment. You can relate to the world from that position, The default position is not one of anxiety, so you're not afraid of the world. That's a bit ridiculous because we're all afraid of the world. We're bred to be anxious…

13:10 AJ: Although the default position is anxiety as a species, if we are raised by loving parents and we learn that we are loved and we learn how to feel loved, because feeling loved is a capacity. If you don't learn it, you never have it. You can get all the love in the world, but if you don't know how to feel loved, you will never feel that you're loved… So that's secure attachment. Insecure attachment, and there are different kinds of insecure attachment, is when something goes wrong in those early exchanges between the baby and mother or the primary carer. And of course, if it's a woman her capacity for responding to the child in a secure way herself is going to be contingent on how her husband is relating to her. So if he’s deeply traumatized by the pregnancy and the birth, then he's going to maltreating her, then her contact with the child is going to be fraught with anxiety because she’ll be constantly looking over her shoulder wondering how his arsehole over here is responding. A lot of women go through that you know, so if the man's OK if he's secure, and she's secure, then the child will grow up with a secure attachment and they will have the capacity to form loving attachments when they grow up with other securely attached people. Healthy relationships, no neurosis, no crippling anxieties, no unresolved psychotic issues from childhood, or whatever, no serious perversions, and just be healthy people. Attachment theorists say 60 percent of the world is healthy, but I have my doubts about that.

16:00 AJ: Men are dismissive and detached. We have the default setting for men in terms of attachment style, attachment pattern that we learn as children is dismissiveness and detachment. Part of the masculinity, part of ‘the big M’ and I think there’s a big masculinity, and I think it’s transhistorical and I think it’s transcultural. I think it’s the same in Delhi as it is in Rio De Janiro, or Houston.
16:30 AJ: And the big M is, “I am independent, I’m strong, I’m not vulnerable, I can cope, I don’t need anybody, nobody tells me what to do, my way or the f---ing highway.” And now in Western culture it’s exemplified by people like Dirty Harry, Arnold Schwarzenegger, Bruce Willis, and it’s not women who go to see these things its men. And we do it because we’re full of penis envy. Not women, women are supposed to be full of penis envy according to Freud...

17:00 He’s talking rubbish, it’s men who want the penis because none of us believe we have a penis worth a damn, because we know our fathers were much bigger. So we aways feel in a sense that we are castrated and impotent. So we go and watch these big guys who aren’t frightened of anybody and they kick ass...

17:20 AJ: All men aspire to this big M. Now I know that culturally there are variations on the theme. But in terms of the ego ideal that men have, its the big M that men aspire to. Now, there might be minor cultural variations on the theme based on the specific culture whether its in India, California, Bradford or Scotland, but it’s ‘the big M’ that men aspire to. It’s dismissive, detached and unemotional, it’s independent and it’s invulnerable.

18:00 AJ: When women get pregnant, they need securely attached men. The more insecurely attached men are, the more the early transactions and exchanges with the primary careers went wrong with the little boy, then the more the big M is attractive to him. In a sense, the more damaged he is, the more masculine he wants to become. That’s why the prisons are full of people who were traumatized and damaged. 90% are victims of childhood abuse, or neglect or deprivation. And one of the ways men cope with that, is that they become hyper-masculine. Instead of being scared they become frightening.

20:00 DF: [In reference to the Respect Accreditation Standard] Is there a fine line between respecting culture, and recognizing men using culture as a justification for abuse?
AJ: I don't see men being vulnerable to being perpetrators. Religion is probably the biggest, whether they're Muslim or Christians, most holy books condone or indeed enjoin men to be abusive to women who don't tow the line. A lot of the men we work with are Muslims, so a lot of Asians are Muslim, obviously. They quote the Qur’an, they say they have a holy duty to keep women in line. I saw a young man last week who was beating up his sisters. He said, " Well how else are they going to learn if i don't beat them up" You know, I couldn't shift him at all."

DF: What exactly are they supposed to learn, their place, wherever that relative is in society?
AJ: Whatever that might be, submissiveness basically.

DF: What do you think that the transgressions are that women do that provoke men?
AJ :Just not doing what they want, whatever that is. On one day it could be talking when they don't want them to talk. Another day it could be being silent when they want them to talk, it doesn't matter. It's basically frustrating men's expectations. That is the main precipitator, the
immediate precipitator for abuse. Frustrating expectations. There are deeper reasons than that. That's why I think Respect's guidelines, in terms of treatment, are ridiculous, they're nonsensical.

22:00 AJ: The problem is that most people who are members of Respect don't have the clinical training for doing the work they are doing. Most of them are social workers or probation officers. There are very few analytically, psychologically trained people doing the work. So they're mostly into doing CBT (Cognitive-Behavioral Training) which are Duluth type programs. So it's all very structured, so you say this, and then they say this so you say this. That's the key, it changes the men who want to change. The difficulty in this work is changing the men who don't want to change. Anybody can change a man who wants to change. It's easy. Stick them in a room with 8 other men who want to change and get them to talk about what they do and they will change, with or without a structure.

23:00 Most of the men who get referred to The Men's Center are not self referred, they are sentenced to change. They're referred by child protection agencies or by courts. They don't want to change, they think its people interfering with their right to be men, to be the head of the family. They're very resistant. Men who self-refer are sent by wives, who have left or threaten to leave them. Others, sentenced by a judge or authorities, feel it is "interfering with their right to be men, to be head of the family."

24:00 DF: Would you say men who self refer are willing to change more?
AJ: Yes they are but Most of the men who are referred to The Men's Centre are not self referred they are sentenced to change.

25:00 AJ: We pay more attention to shame than most programs do. Because I believe that shame, and apart from all the usual stuff that people write about. Men feeling that they have the right to control, all the sort of normal stuff, its not a secret anymore. We pay much more attention to the depth psychology than most programs do. We talk a lot more about shame and its origins. We talk about the origins of the sense of injustice, which all abusive men feel. Every man, whenever a man attacks a woman he believes he has the right to do it. He's full of righteous rage with her. Because she's evoked his sense of injustice and he thinks she's responsible for the injustice, but she's not. All abusive men have a sense of injustice and they've ha it all their lives. So they need to create injustices…

27:00 AJ: Where does the attempt to influence become control? Where does attempt to control become abusive when control breaks down?

DF: Do men abuse women in order to make women dependent on them so they don't leave?
AJ: It is an unintended unconscious consequence, but not the main reason.
29:00 DF: What brings a man to self refer?
AJ: Threat. Always threat. Never met a self referred man. In 40 years, I've never met a self referred man. They think they're self referred. They're being told "if you don't go and deal with this, I'm going to leave you. Often they've been left, or been kicked out. Or she's called the police and he's been arrested and cautioned. And a lot of women take a huge amount of abuse before they do anything?

30:41 AJ: Men abuse to get their own way.

33:30 AJ: Little girls don't have to misidentify from their mother, and little boys do. Its a little more complicated, but in order to be a boy, you have to not be a girl. To be a woman you don't have to stop being a girl, and we all start out life as little girls.

37: AJ: I don't believe in masculinity, all of my clinical work is about subverting the notion. I think masculinity is a chimera. It's like the Lacanian Phallus.

39:30 AJ: It’s this thing about penis envy again. All men have this fantasy about masculinity, that it's something other men have, but we don't ever tell other men that we believe that. We always pretend that we've got it. But that's why we go to see Schwarzenegger cause Schwarzenegger’s got it, but we know why Schwarzenegger got it, because his father used to beat the shit out of him when he was a kid. Terrify him, made him feel helpless, frightened, he was a terrified little boy. He did bodybuilding, that’s why he did it to make himself scary. He became the phallus, his whole body became the phallus...

41:00 AJ: Masculinity is a phallic narcissistic construction: phallic narcissism being the belief in the potency of penis, especially when its erect, and little boys have that idea. Little boys, they play with it and it feels good. Its like its the first thing they've ever had that’s entirely theirs and nobody can take it away from them, well they hope, and they can play with it whenever they want, so when the going gets tough, "I will stroke this and it makes me feel better." We have it all our lives. And thats the origins of masturbation. We have this thing, and when little boys play with it, their whole body feels the pleasure, their whole body becomes the erect penis and its a whole body sensation… Then what happens is their whole body becomes identified with the erect penis, so what happens is that penis becomes perfect, so then you have is the origins of phallic narcissism, and masculinity is constructed on the perfect penis: the thing that makes you feel powerful, strong and good. And masculinity is a phallic narcissistic construction but essentially it is chimerical: the whole thing is a fantasy. But the fear of losing the thing you have total control over becomes central, and that's when castration anxiety steps in and all that Freudian stuff. So what I say to men, well I don't say it to them, well I work on this model that masculinity actually speaks to its opposite: it speaks to castration. the more masculine a man is, the more castrated, impotent, and helpless he feels so the bigger the M he's portraying, the more vulnerable, the more afraid, impotent, castrated he’s feeling and struggling with all the time. I try to take masculinity
away from them. I try to get them to face their vulnerability, to face the castration, to face the impotence, to face the helplessness. Then to help them construct a new way of being a man, which has got nothing to do with masculinity, its quite different. When I say I don't believe in masculinity I mean its an illusion. It's what men pursue but it doesn't exist. It's very useful for governments when they need people to kill people. If they've got a few million young men pursuing this thing [masculinity], and stick guns in their hands. That kind of masculinity is really useful for the state.

45:00 DF: How do you go about constructing a new man, what is this new man?
AJ: I can only tell you what it isn't. It's not "the big M" its not feeling in control, its not feeling the need to be in control, its not being afraid of uncertainty its not being afraid of grief. Because Ultimately, in order to deal with this men must deal with the loss of their mother. Most men go into search mode [for a new mother in a partner]. Always searching, always yearning for the lost object. That’s the problem with men, we're addicted to the lost object.

49:00 DF: Is how men grow up, and grow up in relation to their mother the biggest factor? What about men who have never been abusive before, yet perhaps begin abusing after, for example, migration to a new society, location?

50:00 AJ: All men have asymmetrical development, yes… I think the capacity exists for it in all men, even men who grow up securely attached with good self esteem,believe themselves to be lovable because it all depends on the degree of stress.

52: AJ: I’ve been trying to get sulking recognized as a clinical condition for the past 30 years... It’s somewhere in between depression and paranoia. When men are in a serious sulk, they’re full of feelings of victimization and injustice... They punish women especially with grunts withdrawl and rejection. The point of the sulk is to try to make the woman approach them, to try to make things better, so you can tell them to fuck off, and you tell them to fuck off enough times where you feel you’ve equalized the injustice you think they’ve inflicted on you in the first place, which was entirely a fantasy anyway. The point about that sulking is that its a kind of developmental bridge between pre-phallic and phallic development. The position in which men abuse, and its a position in which men can either commit suicide commit murder or both. And I think that all men have the capacity to go into that.

53:30 AJ: All men have the capacity to play into [sulking] so it depends on the level of real stress, like if they lose their job, or if somebody close to them dies, or they move home or move home and move jobs, depending on the level of real difficulty that they're having to cope with in real life, men can regress into a position where they can become very abusive even where they had a secure childhood and secure attachment.
In terms of the infliction of injustice, these men feel their wives are inflicting upon them...

AJ: It comes from inside, they construct it. A sense of injustice is a part of their personality, we have it all the time. It's a function of the asymmetrical development. I think it's part and parcel of becoming a man. It varies in intensity depending on the nature of the early experiences. The more traumatizing, the worse those early exchanges between the mother and the baby and the father and the baby then the more damaged the child will be. The more damaged the child is, the greater the sense of injustice will me. the child cant articulate that it just knows life feels really unfair. That’s the point, that it’s unfair mommy, it’s unfair daddy. When we get older we have that sense of unfairness in us all the time. It makes us very uncomfortable with life so we will create injustices in order to enact the drama... The stronger the sense of injustice the greater the need to create situations that can be construed as injustice because then you can feel a sense of injustice and actually have an explanation for why you’re feeling so uncomfortable.. And people do it with their wives, that’s the problem.

6.4.2 Follow Up Interview with Adam Jukes. May 6, 2011. Skype.

Measure 1295 AJ: You really need to read, 'Why Men Hate Women” because I do believe that. I do believe that we all hate women.

Measure 1325: I havent changed my mind about it... I havent changed my mind about the thesis. thesis, I do really believe that misogyny is part of masculinity.
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