

Men as Creators and Subjects Across Disciplines and Cultures

Men as Creators and Subjects Across Disciplines and Cultures

Edited by

Debra D. Andrist

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Men as Creators and Subjects Across Disciplines and Cultures

Series: Across Multi-Cultures

Edited by Debra D. Andrist

This book first published 2025

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

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

Copyright © 2025 by Debra D. Andrist and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN: 978-1-0364-6055-6

ISBN (Ebook): 978-1-0364-6056-3

Though this volume focuses on *Men as Creators and Subjects*, the changes in worldwide socio-political gender atmospheres of the 2020s lead me to reprise the dedication from the first volume in this series, *Women as Creators and Subjects*:

“To all the womyn throughout history/herstory whose artistic creations of all sorts are as yet undiscovered and/or have been misattributed and/or have been suppressed or destroyed,”

and to all those whose works may be affected anew.

CONTENTS

Preface.....	ix
Acknowledgments.....	xvi
Part I Introduction to Men as Subjects	1
A. Psychology	
On the Inner Lives of Men: Weaving Jung into Heuristic Inquiry	8
Loris Simón Salum	
B. Literature: Male Characters as Created by Women	
<i>The Agony of the Stars</i>	26
Rose Mary Salum Nemer	
C. Social Institutions: Religion and Power	
An Ecofeminist Engagement of Pope Francis' <i>Integral Ecology</i>	34
Mary Jane DeLaRosa Burke	
Pope Francis's Theology of the People: Tempering the Harmonious Articulation of Catholic Social Teaching with a Healthy Dose of Engaging Plurality.....	75
John Francis Burke	
D. Anthropology: War and Warriors	
Finding Courage in Warriors' Words? Tlaxcalteca and Cholulteca "Smack Talk" During the Battle of Cholula.....	106
Jeanne Gillespie	
E. Contemporary Economics and Energy Production	
Gender and Energy: Analysis of Power in GED Framework	118
Aritra Chakrabarty	

Part II Introduction to Men as Creators as Critiqued by Women and Men.....	137
A. Male Roles	
The Rise of the Underdog: The Anti-Hero in Two Plays by Sadallah Wannous.....	142
Samar Zahrawi	
Vargas Llosa’s Re-Creation of Reality Through Crime Mysteries.....	155
Haiqing Sun	
A Broken Masculinity: Raymond Carver’s <i>Are These Actual Miles?</i>	168
Eduardo Cerdán	
Part III Introduction to Men as Creators as Influenced by Women: Studio Art.....	175
Fernande Olivier’s Transformative Influence on Pablo Picasso.....	177
Enrique Mallén	
Pablo Picasso and Dora Maar: Portraits of One[self].....	226
Enrique Mallén	
Reflections and Conclusions	260
Editor and Contributors	263

PREFACE

Admittedly, since history has favored, or at the very least highlighted, male participation in nearly every culture and discipline, i.e., 1) the systematic inclusion of all sorts of works by men in the “canons,” as well as 2) amplified information about the historical efforts by men in the arts & life in general, in addition to 3) how men have been characterized in socio-cultural & artistic fields, this volume may seem unnecessary and/or repetitive. However, this emphasis on males changed fairly dramatically by the mid-Twentieth Century when womyn’s works and attention to same began to be included systematically pretty much across-the-board, if slowly and very selectively.¹ Yet, the nearly total absence and/or misrepresentation of those three aspects, inclusion in the canons, in history, in socio-cultural & artistic fields, and associated details for centuries, emphasizes the need for continued focus and cross-foci on both genders, especially on the comparative, though generally focused on the masculine perspective² in this particular volume.

¹ In a personal opinion/concern footnote by the editor, I have read (and am horrified by) a *New York Times/The Upshot* report on a spring 2025 study, *It’s Not Just a Feeling: Data Shows Boys and Young Men Are Falling Behind*, which states that “In the United States, researchers say several economic and social changes have combined to change boys’ and men’s trajectories. School has changed in ways that favor girls, and work has changed in ways that favor women . . . boys have always lagged girls in certain areas, yet there has been little focus on their issues, perhaps because men have dominated in so many spheres” more than implying that gains for womyn mean losses for men, which leads to my concern in the footnote immediately after this one. In Part I A, Loris talks of related issues on the part of the post-womyn’s liberation, seemingly reactive, the contemporary “highly controversial men’s movement.” The MAVRIC Project at Princeton University, which published an article from which I will quote later in this *Preface*, may be an example, if in a more inclusive rather than exclusive sense.

² In a second, related-to-the-first personal opinion/concern footnote by the editor, I observe, to my chagrin and horror, the seeming reversal of progress for womyn world-wide in the socio-political sphere. (See reference in the prior volume in this series to the Chinese campaign in the earliest years of the 2020s for “traditional” roles for womyn and calls for population growth via encouraged/expanded society-wide child-birthing.) I also note that the results of the 2024 election have birthed a

This book crosses and compares multiple world cultures, time, disciplines, and genres as the chapters of this second volume in the series highlight men as both creators (by) and as subjects (about). A unique aspect of this particular volume is how gender issues³ are “crossed” and “re-crossed,” addressed and framed by contributors, e.g., an essay on masculine psychology examined by a feminine researcher; a masculine protagonist in a short story by a feminine writer; opinions and views of feminine inclusion in a major religion’s practice by a masculine “authority,”⁴ as explicated by a feminine researcher; and an examination of said authority’s view of humankind by a masculine political scientist; a history-based study of indigenous masculine roles and interactions; the effects of (a lack of) attention to gender in science and social institutions (in this case, energy production); critiques of masculine roles in literary works by masculine authors, addressed by both feminine and masculine critics; the influence of feminine “muses” on the art of a famously misogynist studio artist by a masculine critic, and more.

The wide diversity of the contributors/collaborators, their personal and professional perspectives and insights as a result, allows for an amazing breadth of information about so many aspects of the theme of the volume. Both of the volumes so far, *Women as Creators and Subjects Across Disciplines and Cultures* and *Men as Creators and Subjects Across Disciplines and Cultures*, in this series, *Across Disciplines and Cultures*, like the eight volumes of the previous series, *Amerindian, Spanish, Latin American & Latino Worlds*, feature a majority of repeat contributors/collaborators with the loss of a few and the addition of several in each volume.

While I personally know all of the invited contributors/collaborators to each volume⁵ and some of them already know each other personally or professionally, some have met post-participation, and some have never met

current U.S. political power environment calling for same. The *New York Times* has christened this throwback phenomenon in numerous articles, as *pronatalism*.

³ As the editor, I actively made the decisions in the majority of cases to usually use references to *feminine* and/or *womyn* vis-a-vis *masculine* and/or *men*, rather than the derivative (*wo*)*men* and/or (*fe*)*male*, as well as to *gender* (actions and behaviors) rather than to sex (physical biology).

⁴ Sadly, Pope Francis has passed away just as this volume comes to press (April 2025).

⁵ I have found many contributors/collaborators to various volumes via hearing their appropriate-to-the-theme presentations at scholarly conferences, then contacting them for discussion about an upcoming theme and publication plan, and inviting them to participate.

in person, almost none have ever read the chapters submitted by their co-contributors/collaborators before the publication of a volume. However, as editor, I provide a unifying theme of each volume to be interpreted by each contributor/collaborator according to specialty and interest. It then remains to me to tie those chapters together and segue from one to the other in the organization of the volume in parts and sub-parts, as well as via introductions to each of same. To a person, according to post-publication inter-communications, we agree that we have always accessed new--and interesting, if not directly applicable to our own specialities--information, perspectives, and insights from each volume.

This particular volume is organized in two broad categories of men as *creators* and men as *subjects*. Ordinarily, because the title, mirroring the format of the first volume's title, names *creators* first, the chapters dealing with them would appear first, followed by *subjects*, as in the first volume with womyn as creators and subjects. However, with the additional perspectives of cross and re-cross-gender, of whomsoever is examining the creator or subject role of men in this volume, I felt it more appropriate to introduce the content of the volume with the latter, men as subjects, in Part I. In the case of the specialties of psychology, literature, religion, and anthropology, four feminine writers elucidate Part I A) the psyche of men in general in terms of their *anima* (Jung's term for gender behaviour associated with the feminine) by a feminine counsellor; B) a masculine character created by a feminine writer; C1) the ramifications of a masculine real-life religious power figure's views on womyn by a feminine religious scholar; and D) the stereotypical interactions, bonding behaviors, among historical indigenous men as the traditional warriors, by a feminine anthropologist. Still within Part I, the chapters by the two masculine examiners in the sections of social institutions, religion and economics/energy production, C2) first examine that same religious power figure's views as in the previous chapter--but about *both* sexes; and E) the eco-economist details the ramifications of (a lack of) gender consciousness in socio-economic institutions like energy production.

Part II moves to chapters featuring three masculine *creators* of literature: one dramatic work and two novels, the first two chapters by feminine critics and the third by a masculine one. The first chapter deals with the gendered behavior of the masculine character in the *underdog* role in drama, still a stereotypically active, masculine role, if not the usual masculine power position. The second chapter details the gendered behavior of masculine characters in traditionally masculine power roles, leaders, such as detective and soldier, and the third chapter highlights so-called failed or *broken*

masculinity by not conforming to the traditionally-dictated (*macho?*) role behavior for husband.

Both chapters of Part III also focus on the examination by a masculine examiner, in this case, addressing a single masculine *creator*, a stereotypically *macho*-type, whose works not only depict feminine subjects, who may (or may not) be depictions of the womyn in his real life--but whose production is very frequently very affected in other ways by the artist's real-life cyclical relationships with numerous womyn.

So, how does the gender of the masculine creator or the examiner of the masculine subject, the psychologist or the writer or the critic, play into her/his examination of the masculine psyche, the masculine character, the masculine writer of policy or of literature, the masculine studio artist? Why do I as editor place such emphasis on the cross and re-cross gender issues of the chapter authors themselves and/or those of the masculine creator and subject and/or those addressing the content of the chapters? This idea of why cross or re-cross gender may give insights and/or perspectives is NOT related to diverse-gender or transgender issues or gender identity in any way, all of which are more biological and/or chemical, if admittedly affecting behaviors which may or may not be traditionally associated with, or dictated to, one sex or the other. To explain why I so emphasize, I cite an article in the journal, *Gender Studies*, which defines cross-sex friendships in a much closer definition to that of the cross or re-cross gender authorship or critique or examination or interaction to which I refer:

Cross-sex friendships, or friendships between people of different genders, have long been a subject of interest in both psychological research and social discourse. While friendship is a universal human experience, the dynamics between male and female friends can be complex and layered with societal expectations, gender norms, and individual desires. In this post, we will explore what cross-sex friendships are, the challenges that arise from them, and how gender differences impact these relationships. By understanding these key aspects, we can better navigate the nuances of cross-sex friendships and recognize both the benefits and potential hurdles they present.⁶

By substituting those aforementioned cross or re-cross gender role terms of authorship, critique, examination, or interaction for “friendship” or friend(s), while not necessarily as recognized or formalized an area of

⁶ “Cross-sex Friendship: Understanding the Challenges and Benefits,” *Gender Studies*. Apr. 20, 2024. *Cross-sex Friendship: Understanding the Challenges and Benefits* » *Gender Studies*.

research as that of friendship/friends(s), a general feel for how useful awareness and consideration of cross or re-cross-gender authorship, critique, or interaction may be formally elucidated. The same challenges as for cross-sex friendship/friend(s) hold for these cross or re-cross gender authors, critics, and participants: potential (mis)interpretation, potentially exacerbated by societal expectations and stereotypes, their own socialization, communication styles, etc.⁷

While these same “friendship” factors naturally, even unconsciously, affect how individual contributors deal with “subject” content, as I edit this volume featuring cross and re-cross gender concerns, I am reminded of numerous works about gender interactions, i.e., competition (more traditionally associated with masculine interactions) vs. cooperation (more traditionally associated with feminine interactions). Thomas Hobbes wrote specifically about men and competition and the ramifications in the 16th century—but (admittedly centuries later) Nicolas Choquette-Levy, in *Masculine Identity and the Double-Edged Sword of Competition*, not only asked “In what ways does competition shape the *expression* (italics mine) of our identities, particularly for men-identified folks?”⁸ He also notably commented on the role of competition in cross-gender interactions post-a summer research program in which he participated, which inspired the aforementioned article. I quote from the article extensively, as I am convinced that his observations are central to this book treating men as creators, as well as to the effect of how the gender of the writer or critic or examiner affects the treatment of men as subjects. Choquette-Levy observes that

[When] supervisors announced there would be a prize for the best student paper to come out of the cohort . . . [across gender lines] we still remained friendly, but there was something unmistakably different about the tenor of our interactions. People started gossiping about who would win the award, and gradually many of our interactions changed from a frame of appreciative inquiry--the feeling that we were all on a journey, learning from each other--to one of judging and critiquing each other’s work. This subtle shift also had gender implications: the people who were rumored to

⁷ In the initial paragraph of Introduction to Part I A and to Part I B of this volume, I note three books which outline the challenges during cross-sex communications, followed by an episode of cross-sex or gender controversy.

⁸MAVRIC (Men’s Allied Voices for a Respectful and Inclusive Community) Project, Feb. 19, 2020. *Masculinity and the Double-Edged Sword of Competition* by Nicolas Choquette-Levy | *Masculinity and the Double-Edged Sword of Competition* by Nicolas Choquette-Levy | Men’s Allied Voices for a Respectful & Inclusive Community (MAVRIC) Project.

be favorites for the award were almost all men, even though the female students had clearly done equally impressive work, and the male students tended to take up more conversation space whenever discussions turned toward the award . . . I couldn't shake the feeling that we lost a little bit of what made the experience special the day we heard about the award, and I was especially curious to explore the gender implications of competition. We know from psychological research that competition is often associated with "agentic" or "masculine" identities, whereas "feminine" or "communal" identities are often associated with cooperation . . . How does competition contribute to our identities as men, and in what ways might it suppress expression of our full, holistic selves? . . . I also found that I subconsciously *presented a competitive "front" to my male colleagues--emphasizing that I was confident about my work and knew what I was doing--while often relying on female colleagues to express my doubts and cultivate non-competitive relationships*. Again, what consequences might these behavioral patterns have for the ability of others to express their complex identities, whether it be other men who were also looking for non-competitive friendships, or women who want to be perceived as fierce competitors?

Conversely and prior, ever so many feminists, not always womyn,⁹ too many to detail here--this book is not about competition vs. cooperation specifically but only about how those styles of interaction affect creators and subjects and examiners of those concepts according to gender as a secondary interest--have recognized and written about feminine and masculine interactive styles, though usually with an overlay of comparison in order to highlight the arguably neglected feminine psyche and productions, especially given the time period and "raised consciousness"¹⁰ of the late 20th Century, rather than to examine the male psyche and the effect of interactive style on both genders, as does Choquette-Levy. The aforementioned "feminists," if you will, were, in my experience, the first to *emphasize* the effects of a (masculine) competitive style vs. a (feminine) cooperating style. An interesting question to consider in more detail across disciplines and cultures specifically is how and how much have those interactive styles been factors in gender/power relationships and male-dominated history?

⁹ List of feminist literature – *Wikipedia*. Some of my personal favorites are *In a Different Voice* by Carol Gilligan and the three-volume series by Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, not to mention those by the "big names" of feminist theory and practice in the second half of the 20th century.

¹⁰ Used in this case as the term used by feminists of the women's liberation movement of the second half of the 20th century to call attention to the recognition of gender differences and inclusion.

In any case, read on for examinations of *Men as Creators and Subjects Across Disciplines and Cultures!*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Translations are by the chapter authors themselves. However, the entire translations of Rose Mary Salum's short story and of Eduardo's Cerdán's chapter are by the editor, Debra D. Andrist, as are several quotes in the chapters by others. Rose Mary Salum's short story, *Agony of the Stars*, is my translation from my translation of her collection of short stories, *Spaces In-Between* (the English-language title being my adapted interpretation of the collection's content intent in translation rather than a word-for-word translation). Houston: Literal Publishing INC, 2005. pp. 31-42. The Spanish-language story, *La agonía de las estrellas*, appeared in her Spanish-language collection, *Entre los espacios*. México D.F.: Editorial Tierra Firme, 2002. pp. 49-60. Salum holds all rights as both author and publisher in both cases and has authorized the inclusion of *Agony of the Stars* in this volume.

Visuals include reproductions of images in Jeanne Gillespie's chapter, which are in the public domain due to their age and/or Gillespie's own photography or art, and charts in Aritra Chakrabarty's chapter, which are his own work. All clip art images featured anywhere in or on this volume are in the public domain.

All references to illustrations of artworks and/or literature by Picasso in either chapter by Enrique Mallén are from the *On-Line Picasso Project*, founded and edited by Mallén, authorized by the Picasso Foundation. Request a password at <https://picasso.shsu.edu/>

References to prior chapters in prior volumes in this second volume come from previous books in the *Hispanic Worlds* series, seven of which were published by the now defunct Sussex Academic Publishers--and the eighth by University of Liverpool--and from the first volume in the current series, *Across Disciplines and Cultures*, published by Cambridge Scholars.

PART I

INTRODUCTION TO MEN AS SUBJECTS

A. Psychology

The heady-for-feminists days of the second half of the 20th Century and the first couple of decades of the 21st in terms of not just feminine literary and artistic production but actual attribution and inclusion in all sorts of public milieu gave rise to not just gender awareness and consciousness but to unprecedented encouragement and opportunities for womyn.¹ In addition to recognizing *Women as Creators and Subjects* (the title of the first book in this series by Cambridge Scholars), attention to comparative gender rose to the scholarly, if not social, fore with the publication of bestseller books by men like *Men Are From Mars, Women Are From Venus* by John Gray (1992), and womyn, e.g., Diane K. Ivy's 2003, *GenderSpeak: Communicating in a Gendered World* and others, and Deborah Tannen's *You Just Don't Understand; Men and Women in Conversation* (2013), in which she emphasized the dichotomy of *he said/she said*.²

This is the milieu into which Lorís Simón Salum,³ author of *Ensoulment: Exploring the Feminine Principle in Western Culture* (2016),⁴ filmmaker of the award-winning *Ensoulment: A Diverse Analysis of the Feminine in Western Cultures* (2014),⁵ creator of the *Literal Short Film Festival (2020)*, among other accomplishments, was born—and has flourished. A nepo-

¹ In spite of the dramatically-affected socio-political atmosphere worldwide in terms of *protecting women whether they want to be [protected in traditional terms of limited to male dominance-dictated mores] or not* in the U.S. and encouraged, if not specifically coerced or imposed, (neo)natalism by the political leaders of two of the most influential countries in the world, not to mention in other countries, I personally am convinced that *there's no going back*, to coin the cliché.

² I do (sadly) concede that in both titles, *men* are mentioned first . . .

³ Lorissimon.com

⁴ Ensoulmentfilm.com/book

⁵ Ensoulmentfilm.com

*baby*⁶ only in the very best and positive sense of nature (genetics) and nurture (encouragement), Loris, the daughter of the Lebanese-Mexican author, publisher, etc., etc., Rose Mary Salum Nemer, has independently established herself intellectually and professionally. Her chapter, *On The Inner Lives Of Men: Weaving Jung Into Heuristic Inquiry*, in this volume, elucidates the practice of a feminine counselor dealing with masculine clients, as well as details her tested theories on the so-called masculine vs. feminine aspects of personality according to Carl Jung.⁷ Loris especially addresses that concept of cross-gender counseling, masculine clients and feminine counselors, which segues to the next introduction of sub-topic: man-as-subject in literature/male characters as created by womyn authors.

B. Literature: Male Characters in Short Story as Created by Womyn Authors

Discussion of whether characters of another gender can be convincingly and successfully created by authors in any of the disciplines, fiction especially, echoes the controversy about whether the reader of a poem can access or relate to the feelings and emotions the poet intended. At times, such discussion has been heated, particularly during the midst of the still-changing social attitudes and mores of the second half of the 20th Century. For example, a now-very-well-known, not named since her views have changed, author during her formative 1980s years, while at a scholarly conference, raised such a concern (she maintained that cross-critique was impossible) in the most vociferous way during the post-presentation discussion of a conference paper. Though an uncomfortable moment, the introduction of the topic DID yield most thought-provoking commentary--the consensus among the discussion participants was that cross-gender characterization is decidedly NOT impossible.

⁶ According to *Wikipedia*, "*Nepo baby*, short for nepotism *baby*, is a term referring to someone whose career is similar or related to the career their parents succeeded in. The implication is that, because their parents already had connections to one or more specific industries, the child was able to use those connections to build a career in those industries. It is usually used pejoratively to indicate a celebrity or politician whose fame and success are unearned or undeserved." *Nepo baby* - *Wikipedia* Though never her teacher per se, I have known Loris and her abilities and prowess from the time of her arrival in the U.S. from Mexico with her family, thus I know of which I speak that she has made her own successful way! I was delighted to get to participate in a small way in her first film project.

⁷ See Carl Jung's *The Development of Personality*.

Emphatically and to clarify, the aforementioned angry young author in this conference discussion was decidedly NOT the previously mentioned award-winning prolific author and publisher, etc., etc., Rose Mary Salum Nemer,⁸ whose manner is always the most polite and thoughtful and informed and open to all viewpoints (additionally, Rose Mary was very, very young at the time of said conference, in any case). Among oh-so-many other endeavors and works, Rose Mary authored the short story included in this volume, *The Agony Of The Stars*, which features a male child protagonist who happens also to be Chinese, adding a cross-cultural aspect of the characterization to that of cross-gender. While Rose Mary's multiple contributions to previous volumes include essays on all sorts of topics, from socio-political to literary, familial to personal, and more, this volume includes a reprint of one of her many short stories.⁹

I made the decision to include this particular story from Rose Mary's first collection, *Entre los espacios*, which I had the honor to translate—though I adapted the title in English to *Spaces In-Between* for reasons I have long-since explained and re-explained—in this volume because this story so exemplifies that long-ago consensus, and in spades, with a protagonist both cross-gender and cross-cultural, successfully portrayed by a feminine author, cross-cultural herself. By creating Shuang-lee, the male child protagonist, Rose Mary proves that it IS possible, specifically by dealing with themes of universal philosophical *bigger* questions, as it were, in literature/fiction, for the depiction of a character whose sex is not that of the author, to rise above the not-so-mundane concerns of gender and culture in creating characters.

However, gender and other issues within the plot of the story beg elucidation in terms of power, effectiveness, and Shuang-lee's journey in a later interpretive essay! While the mother of the little masculine protagonist cannot help him with his quest, his reappearing friend/guide to enlightenment/purpose, Ling-Dan, is male, as is the god-like Son of Twilight,

⁸ See *Meet Rose Mary Salum – CanvasRebel Magazine*

⁹ I've mentioned in previous volumes that Rose Mary came to the U.S. from México and enrolled as a graduate student at the University of St. Thomas/Houston where I was chair; I had the privilege to serve as her advisor for her M.F.A. thesis there, one of the best I've ever read in my five-decade career—and which was published as *The Spiritual Body Cured by Alchemy: Francisco de Quevedo and His Knowledge of Alchemy*, in the first volume of the first series, *The Body: Subject & Subjected*, notably a topic of cross-gender critique, but heretofore not the emphasis of the volume until this current one, *Men as Creators and Subjects*.

the Great Teacher, though the latter's visage morphs from masculine to feminine and back again and Shuang-lee becomes unsure of his perception of gender. However, the Son determines when Shuang-lee is ready for what seems to turn out to be an ineffectual quest to restore the earlier utopian world in terms of good and evil. I also note the interplay of literal light/darkness and enlightenment/knowledge and good vs. evil.

C. Gender Issues in Masculine-Dominant Religious Philosophy and Practice as Examined by Both Feminine and Masculine Critics

The death and mourning of the Roman Catholic Pope Francis in April 2025, not to mention the Conclave in May 2025 to elect a new pope,¹⁰ render the next two chapters not only memorials to Francis' accomplishments but said chapters detail Francis' legacy and may (or may not) help to shape or offer a counterpoint, for possibly a conservative to be elected—maybe one regressively so on gender topics—to the philosophy and policies of whomsoever becomes the next pope, undoubtedly a male in the traditionally male-centric institution. Of particular emphasis in the case of this volume are the changes to, or at least, the dialogue on, gender topics in such an influential socio-religious institution. Said stances range from those of Francis' predecessor, Benedict (who resigned as pope for the first time in 600 years; according to the official line, due to “a lack of strength of mind and body”), seriously conservative-in-all-issues, closed- to-the-participation-of certain-segments-of society in the Church in any way, to the opening to those topics Francis broached and approached in terms of sex and gender and economic issues, among others.

Mary Jane DeLaRosa Burke, teacher and religious scholar, directly addresses Francis' stands on both ecological and gender issues in her chapter, *An Ecofeminist Engagement Of Pope Francis' 'Integral Ecology.'* In the final volume, *Rites, Rituals, and Religions*, of the previous series, *Amerindian, Spanish, Latin American, & Latino Worlds*, Mary Jane addressed a related Church and gender topic in *Re-envisioning Latina Ministry Through Ivone*

¹⁰ Who has now been revealed by the white smoke of the Conclave after (reportedly) only four votes, to be a so-called *dark horse* candidate, now Pope Leo XIV.

Gebara's Ecofeminism, Gebara being a Lebanese-Brazilian Roman Catholic nun, philosopher, and feminist theologian.¹¹

Continuing with *Pope Francis's Theology Of The People: Tempering The Harmonious Articulation Of Catholic Social Teaching With A Healthy Dose Of Engaging Plurality*, by political scientist John Francis Burke (yes, Mary Jane's husband and partner in Church activities, especially choir and music-related, though separate scholars) whose publications are wide-ranging in *Mestizo* and other political topics. Both are authors in a variety of Church-related studies in a variety of publications. John, like a majority of other contributor/colleagues in both series, has been a prolific participant in many of the volumes.

D. Anthropology: Male as Subject in Power and Bonding Issues in Masculine-Dominant Indigenous Civilization and Culture

The traditional stereotype of many of the Latin American Indigenous civilizations best known outside of Latin America, whether post-Conquest or post-Encounter, depending on the viewer's perspective or interpretation, whether Spanish-speaking, for the most part, or LOE (languages other than English)-dominant, focuses on masculine social dominance/power and so-called traditional roles.¹² The image of the socially-esteemed warrior, e.g., the Aztec Nahuatl language term, *yaotlacatl* (war man), particularly the *cuauhtil* (eagle) and *ocelotl* (jaguar) warriors, for example, the soldier, the

¹¹ Considered nearly "rogue" in some camps for various reasons but not so much by Francis, at least unofficially, Gebara's views can be discussed in terms of aspects of the Liberation Theology movement, which has given rise to the official excommunication of several Latin American Roman Catholic clergy, if admittedly those more politically active on the scene of their countries rather than focusing on the philosophical, as does Gebara. Elaine Nogueira-Godsey's article on Gebara offers insights. *07.pdf*

¹² For focused, nuanced, and comparative gender studies, see other works by Jeanne Gillespie in various publications, including chapters in the prior eight volumes of the series, *Indigenous and Hispanic Worlds*, published by Sussex Academic Press and University of Liverpool, as well as in the first volume in the current series, *Across Disciplines and Cultures*, published by Cambridge Scholars; also Karen Bell's *Kingmakers: The Royal Women of Ancient Mexico*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1992, and Lori Boormazian Diel's article, *Aztec Women and Political Power: The Inclusion and Exclusion of Noblewomen in Aztec Pictorial Histories*. Spring 2005.

military role, protecting and/or maintaining society at the very least and at most keeping the cycles of life intact through all sorts of violence, looms large. Jeanne Gillespie's *Finding Courage in Warriors' Words? Tlaxcalteca and Cholulteca 'Smack Talk' during the Battle of Cholula* in this volume pinpoints contemporary English-language lingo, so-called *smack talk*,¹³ as a so-called *mystical male bonding* technique.¹⁴

E. Social Institutions and Disciplines: Why Gender Matters in Masculine-Dominant Sciences, Specifically Energy Issues

For the second time, both in this second series of volumes, Aritra Chakrabarty adds a new cultural perspective to these collections of chapters, as well as emphasizing still fairly rare attention to gender in the practices of the sciences of energy. His current chapter in this volume, *Men as Creators and Subjects*, entitled *Just Transitions: Renewable Energy at the Cost of Gender Inequity in the Global South*, compares and details the negative results of the traditional tendency to ignore gender topics in those fields. His previous chapter, *Analysis of Power in Gender, Energy, and Sustainable Development (GED) Framework*, in the first volume, *Women as Creators and Subjects* introduced the importance of gender as a consideration in these fields, one of a limited number of such studies, at least in my limited experience via Aritra's research.

¹³ Merriam Webster defines *smack talk* as “a noun meaning trash talk, or insults, or taunts in a competitive situation,” which leads to enhanced bonding among one (usually male) group in opposition to another. SMACK TALK Definition & Meaning - Merriam-Webster

¹⁴ Not referring to intra-sex sexual interaction in any way, this usage emphasizes positive social, non-sexual, interaction among men, as in the *Wikipedia* general definition “male bonding or male friendship is the formation of close personal relationships, and patterns of friendship or cooperation between males. Male bonding is a form of homosociality, or social connection between individuals of the same gender. Male bonding can occur through various contexts and activities that build emotional closeness, trust, and camaraderie. Male bonding is an important feature of men's social functioning and can provide benefits including emotional support and intimacy, shared identity, and personal fulfillment contributing to men's mental health and wellbeing.” *Male bonding - Wikipedia* The additional of *mystical* reflects the historically secret aspect of groups like the Masons and contemporarily somewhat mocks that secrecy, as kept especially from womyn.

A. PSYCHOLOGY

ON THE INNER LIVES OF MEN: WEAVING JUNG INTO HEURISTIC INQUIRY

LORÍS SIMÓN SALUM

In 2022, I finalized a heuristic inquiry focusing on the experience and expression of men's inner lives from the viewpoint of depth psychology. It is a project that has remained with me not only because of the personal significance I find in the topic but also due to the exploration of heuristic inquiry itself. Finding novel dialects that capture the unnamable dance of human consciousness has always been a fascination of mine. Moreover, the keen interest in men's issues finally found a home after patiently waiting in my research queues. As new literature emerges around men, I continue to delve in its evolution both in theory and in practice.

My work with male patients in the mental health field has been nothing short of enriching. There is a specific type of awe in observing the formation of a relationship. There are moments in time when the therapy room becomes a magical void where two seemingly dissimilar beings decide to reflect on the questions of existence. The feelings, the meaning-making, and the evoked imagery slowly blur the culture sitting outside the door. I always argue that such an event happens in spite of gender, in spite of social rearing. However, I will never be able to outgrow my subjectivity nor my human eyes. At this moment in this life, I have received a calling for the study of men and I can only do what I know how to do: answer. It is my hope and my intention that in today's deeply polarized narratives, this text finds its home in T.S. Eliot's still point, where there is no dance, and there is only the dance (Eliot, 1980).

Introduction

One of the fundamental notions of Jungian psychology is to hold the tension of opposites where men can be emotional and rational; they can express softness and strength and they can feel without losing control. Such a discourse has been heard many times in feminist quarrels; for example, a woman can both have children and join the workforce. However, when it comes to men, the argument becomes more complicated. To speak of men's

issues implies a brief understanding of their recent history. Even though author and sociologist Michael Kimmel (2018) argues that men have no true history as a gender, it may be helpful to begin with the women's movement of the 1960's. Feminism "made gender visible—at least to women," stated Kimmel, but in relation to men, "as the proverb has it, the fish are the last to discover the ocean" (2018, pp. 2-3). The men's movement began shortly after the feminist movement. From a systems point of view that understands human interactions as a result of a collective dynamic, gender roles inherently function in relation to one another; thus, if women change, by default, so should men.

Depending on the perspective, the men's movement was criticized as a counter-reaction to women's liberation or seen as a genuine search for men's own liberation. Some of the distinctive branches of the men's movement include the pro-feminist men's movement, the men's rights movement, and the mythopoetic men's movement. The pro-feminist men's movement aligns with feminist goals in dissecting masculinity in a way that promotes equity (Fox, 2004). On the other hand, the highly controversial men's rights movement looks at the different legal and structural impositions that cause injustice towards the male gender (Farrell, 1993). There is also the mythopoetic men's movement, which fights to maintain masculine energy in the midst of mending the wounds of men (Fox, 2004). There is little comprehensive awareness of one another between the several branches of the men's movement (Fox, 2004), which leads me to believe that men lack a unified representation of the change they yearn for. It appears as though today the conversations surrounding men have seldom changed since the beginnings of the men's movement. In 1990, American poet Robert Bly wrote in his book *Iron John*, "The male of the past twenty years has become more thoughtful, more gentle. But by his process he has not become more free" (2015, p. 17). As time unfolds in its place, traditional masculinity continues to be the dominant form of masculinity in the United States (Walker, Blalik & van Kessel, 2018).

Masculinity ideology, in its most conservative sense, holds values that include strength, assertiveness, courage, aggression, stoicism, self-reliance, and a rejection of femininity (O'Neal, 1981; Levant & Richmond, 2007; APA, 2018). Throughout my multicultural rearing, I have little refutation in accepting that these factors coincide with the direct and indirect messages I have received pertaining to what it means to be a man. According to my own experience, I would further assent that women also embrace these masculine attributes as a form of adaptation to the culture's professional standards. Even though the male gender may physically and metaphorically

represent what it means to be masculine, masculine ideology sits at the very core of what society appraises as superior and desirable. In this linear illusion, if masculinity is placed above, femininity is then left below.

Throughout much of the recent research done on men, I have always drawn my attention towards the trending fear of femininity. At times, it may appear as resistance or obliviousness but there is an overall inclination away from it. Femininity has been described with words such as vulnerability, submissiveness, being nurturing and relational (Simon 2016). By inadvertently gendering these terminologies and placing them in a collective hierarchy, we risk devaluing the fullness of what makes us human. In this heuristic inquiry, I found it important to recognize the importance of gender, its place in our culture, and its associations to identity; however, for the purpose of this study, I shifted the focus from gender to an emotional perspective and language.

Jung spoke about the terms *anima* and *animus*, where *anima* was seen as the woman within man and *animus* as the man within woman. In Jung's universe of opposites, he explained the separation between inner and outer experiences through contrasting genders. By holding two ends of a spectrum in one body, an individual is then complete. Perhaps speaking with gendered definitions is an outdated method given all the new research and experience surrounding gender identity; nevertheless, the meaning behind the principle remains true. Referring to one's inner experience, the word "anima" means soul in Latin (Merriam-Webster, n.d.-a), going much deeper than what is usually associated with a woman or femininity. Coincidentally, in thinking about psychology, the word "psyche" also has its Greek roots in the word "soul" (Merriam-Webster, n.d.-c). The Greek atomist philosopher Democritus from the 1st millennium BC believed that the soul was made of fire atoms because of their common motility (Hillman, 1985; Zalta, 2016). There is also the concept of soul from a Christian perspective, as a phenomenon that exists beyond birth and death.

The wonder at our inner experience has existed since the beginning of humankind and has been given many names and explanations. I enjoy thinking of *anima* as our very own fountain of life. Too little and we are deprived of depth, meaning, and experiencing the full breadth of life. Too much and we lose direction between heaven and hell. *Anima* is the energy that mobilizes our passion for what resonates with our own inner truth. It is what connects us to the world, to others, and to ourselves. My aim is to re-label femininity as *anima* and view men's fear of femininity as a fear of *anima*. The potential impact of this shifted perspective is to lift sociopolitical

attributions to the male individual and re-conceptualize him as a transcendental being. I acknowledge that the fear of *anima* or *animus* is not an issue exclusive to males but for the purpose of this research, I only focused on men.

Men have been associated with much privilege in the wake of contemporary feminism (Heinrich, 2014; Jaye, 2017; Crockett et al., 2018). There is a vast amount of research on men's antisocial behaviors, e.g., violence, substance abuse, suicide) that both brings awareness to an important struggle but may also hinder social and cultural advancement towards empathy and understanding. Alongside newer findings, it seems that we continue to collectively prefer old-fashioned male qualities (Pew Research Center, 2017). I wonder how much has truly evolved since the foundation of the United States when it comes to the expectations of men. Descriptors such as *breadwinner* and *self-made man* are relevant not only to the turn of the 18th century but also to the year 2021 (Kimmel, 2018), when this inquiry commenced.

On the one hand, men take most positions of power in the world. On the other hand, men also take the lead in suicide, crime and incarceration, substance abuse, and a resistance in seeking help (Scher, 1981; Evans, 2013; Reed, 2014; Martin, 2016; United States Department of Justice, 2018; American Foundation for Suicide Prevention, 2019; Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), 2019a; SAMHSA, 2019b). As women are finding new identities in society and the gender and sexual diversity (GSD) community spreads its roots to claim its place, I am inclined to ask myself, what is happening with men? Where is their voice in all of this chaos? What remains unheard from them? And finally, what can we do as a culture to honor their inner truth? The importance surrounding these questions lies in a broader comprehension of men within the mental health practices and a better understanding of their role and impact in our present day culture.

The Study: Heuristic Inquiry

Developed by Clark Moustakas (1990), heuristic inquiry comes from a social constructivist ideology that is grounded in personal experience (Sultan, 2019). It is exploratory in nature, culturally embedded, introspective, and flexible (Sultan, 2019). These qualities are essential in my research process since quantitative measures or other rigid forms of understanding lack the required depth to embrace a topic such as the *anima*. A key aspect of heuristic inquiry that is parallel to the spirit of *anima* is its

dedicated emphasis on subjective experience. The inclusion of subjective experience also works to eliminate substantial bias that is inevitably present from the researcher. Jung (1960) once wrote:

people incline unconsciously to a belief in the universal validity of subjective opinions. I mention fact only to show that, in spite of the growing empiricism of the last three hundred years, the original attitude has by no means disappeared.” (70)

From a social constructivist standpoint, objectivity is only a theoretical construct that is rather unattainable. Therefore, with the goal to remain congruent to ideologies that support the validity of subjective opinions, I find heuristic inquiry to be the most effective research method to explore my subject of inquiry.

Moustakas (1990) speaks of a system of seven processes and six phases that guide the researcher towards richer knowledge around the topic of interest. The seven processes include: identifying with the focus of inquiry; self-dialogue; tacit knowing; intuition; indwelling; focusing; and an internal frame of reference (Moustakas, 1990). Underneath the seven processes, the six phases of heuristic inquiry hold: *initial engagement*, discovering a powerful and personal curiosity; *immersion*, the state of perceiving life through the lens of the topic of interest; *incubation*, a temporary retreat from the studied subject; *illumination*, the experienced breakthrough during active receptivity; *explication*, the examination and elucidation of connected findings; and *creative synthesis*, an inspired depiction of the forging of components with core themes in the study (Moustakas, 1990). Sultan (2019) explains, “The seven processes of heuristic inquiry serve as a channel for the six phases of this research methodology in the sense that each of the six phases is facilitated through implementation of one or more of the seven processes” (94). Working together, the processes and phases of heuristic inquiry form a holistic and relational practice that surrounds the study’s focus.

The seven processes of heuristic inquiry do not have a strict beginning and end but cycle throughout the length of the research. Just like the *anima*, the stages of this method are fluid and they hold a meaningful history shaped by different perspectives. Behind the heuristic practice stands a long line of philosophical influences and person-centered approaches that can best explain the direction of heuristic inquiry. Martin Buber, Carl Rogers, Michael Polanyi, Edmund Husserl, Abraham Maslow, Eugene Gendlin, and Maurice Merleau-Ponty all speak of ways in which we perceive and experience the world, oftentimes resulting in the formation of meaning.

The guiding principle of my study will be my interaction with the co-researchers, the union of two subjective perspectives that will alchemically create a third experience. Buber (1923/1970) referred to such experience as intersubjectivity, or “a shared way of knowing and being” (Sultan, 2019, 65). Rogers (1980) suggests that connecting with others, in this case my co-researchers, calls for dissolution of perceptual boundaries so as to enter into a state of genuine empathy. Furthermore, a genuine state of empathy is enhanced through an appreciation of tacit knowing. Polanyi (1966) exemplifies tacit knowing as the capacity to recognize a face amongst a million of them; but it would be nearly impossible to verbally explain how one can differentiate that face from the others. In the same way, tacit knowing is at the center of becoming familiar with the *anima*. If a man is to describe his soul, he may or may not come up with what he feels is an accurate answer. Yet if a man shares one of his best childhood memories, he would show us the clearest window into his heart.

The history of empiricism has marked a difference between *a posteriori* knowledge and *a priori* knowledge, the first being based on experience and the second pointing to an innate knowing (Sultan, 2019). It seems that throughout the study of science, people have felt the distinction between what is inside and what is outside; moreover, outer experience has been elected as the greater sense of authority than inner knowledge (Sultan, 2019). Husserl challenged this idea by pointing to the body that inevitably filters outer information; thus, one cannot escape the qualitative and subjective nature of processing the world around us (Flick et al., 2004). The encounter of these inner and outer realities is what Gendlin (1962) describes as felt meaning, and it is also known as the still point in the Jungian BodySoul approach (Marion Woodman Foundation, personal communication, 2019). Cultural and subjective opposing realities are very real, yet the principle of inner and outer duality lies in the collective unconscious. As Maslow notes, there is a path from the personal to the universal (Sultan, 2019). Nevertheless, Merleau-Ponty (1945/2013) refuted the idea of dualism, claiming all realities are rooted in one, perceptual body that is the ultimate fusion of all human perspectives. From an analytical point of view, I remember Neumann’s (1994) *ouroboros* that symbolizes the tension of opposites. Even though the snake’s head is not the same as its tail, it is still the same snake.

As a social constructivist theory, heuristic inquiry holds numerous realities available for the researcher to contemplate and subjectively define. In the same sense, Jung’s *anima* calls for a highly dynamic methodology that offers appropriate space to hold its fluctuating nature. Therefore, heuristic

inquiry is not only an adequate approach but also a preferable research method given my topic of interest.

The Researcher's Subjectivity

My role as the researcher is central to the development of this heuristic inquiry. My personal history and identity have the potential of shaping the direction of the research; thus, I will clarify some aspects of my beliefs, values, attitudes, and biases that form my worldview.

I am a heterosexual woman with multicultural traditions; hence my perspective of men is inevitably understood in reference to women, and it also changes depending on the setting I find myself in. Men's roles may vary from culture to culture, although the fundamental notions of "breadwinner" and "protector" have remained a constant in my family, community, and my overall experience with men from around the world. My dissonance with my idea of men's inner lives began with a documentary film I directed, *Ensoulment* (2013), where I explored Jung's feminine principle through multiple disciplines. Some years later, I maintained such conflict in an anthology of the film (Simon, 2016). As part of my concluding thoughts, I express:

The project's exploration of men changed me profoundly. Not only did I begin to get a sense of what genders other than my own have to deal with but I came to a clearer understanding that we are all in this mess together. We are all guilty of both hurting and helping others depending on when and where destiny brings them into our lives. Thus, I have grown a bit wary of any discourse that leaves the other gender out because it is not enough to switch the spotlight onto the underdog anymore. Now, we must turn all the lights on and begin to understand our place in relation to the other and in relation to the world. (Simon, 2016, 311)

As the daughter of a father, the wife of a husband, the sister of a brother, and most importantly to me, the mother of a son, I felt compelled to respond to the calling of men's issues. This time, however, I cannot help but feel that my view has slightly extended beyond the limits of my gender and through the eyes of my young boy. This study is an effort to mend a part of my past, as well as to bring depth and consciousness to the development of a future man.