MASCULINITIES IN PAT BARKER'S *REGENERATION TRILOGY*: MEN'S SILENCES AND VIOLENCES

Pamukkale University
The Institute of Social Sciences
Doctoral Thesis
The Department of English Language and Literature
English Language and Literature
PhD Programme

Yeliz ŞEKERCİ

Supervisor
Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL

April 2023
DENİZLİ

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude and thanks to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL for his invaluable support, guidance, and helpful suggestions during my PhD study. I would like to specially thank to the members of my thesis committee and defence jury Assoc. Prof. Dr Şeyda İNCEOĞLU, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Azer Banu KEMALOĞLU, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Faruk KALAY and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Baysar TANİYAN for their helpful contributions and enlightening recommendations for my thesis.

I should also like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ayla OĞUZ and my colleagues Ress. Assists. Okaycan DÜRÜKOĞLU and Tansel GÖKSU for their support at my department during my study.

I am greatly indebted to my friends Prof. Dr. Fikret YILMAZ, Dr. Fatih YAŞAR, Dr. Lecturer Ali GÜVEN, Dr. Ress. Assist. Adil KAYMAZ and Filiz KAYMAZ, Ress. Assist. Gamze YALÇIN and Ayşegül TAŞDEMİR for their motivation and dearest friendship throughout my PhD.

This doctoral thesis has been financially funded by Scientific Research Projects Coordination Unit (BAP) of Pamukkale University. I appreciate the financial support from BAP that helped to widen my research.

Lastly, I owe special thanks to my family and my cats for their precious love, support, and patience during my PhD education.

ABSTRACT

MASCULINITIES IN PAT BARKER'S *REGENERATION TRILOGY*: MEN'S SILENCES AND VIOLENCES

Şekerci, Yeliz
Doctoral Thesis
The Department of English Language and Literature
The Doctoral Programme in English Language and Literature
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL

April, 2023, iv + 144

This thesis aims to analyse the critique of masculinity and the war employed in the contemporary British novelist Pat Barker's *Regeneration Trilogy* within the frame of Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities and, in particular, through the lens of Raewyn Connell's concept of "hegemonic masculinity".

Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities investigate the questions of what masculinity is and how it is socially construed in diverse forms by drawing attention to men's unequal access to power. Particularly, Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity helps to understand how a specific type of masculinity becomes culturally dominant and men feel the pressure to conform to its ideals.

Written about the First World War and its impact on men's experiences of masculinity, Barker's *Trilogy* revolves around the images of shell-shocked, hysteric, paralyzed, mute, stammering men In this respect, each novel of the *Trilogy* provides a critical perspective to interrogate the construction of masculinities by looking at it from the aspect of those men who fail to live up to hegemonic ideals of masculinity, and who also have become victimized and exploited on account of the social pressures put on them in their attempts to conform to hegemonic ideals of masculinity.

Therefore, this thesis aims to explore the representation of men's attempts to negotiate with the forms of hegemonic masculinity in wartime Britain handled in Barker's selected texts in order to expose how patriarchal power and gender order also damages men while it promises them to make the most benefit of it, with a specific emphasis on men's experience of silences and violences.

Key Words: Pat Barker, Regeneration Trilogy, Hegemonic Masculinity, Masculinities, War Neurosis

ÖZET

PAT BARKER'IN *REGENERATION TRILOGY*'SİNDE ERKEKLİKLER: ERKEKLERİN SUSKUNLUKLARI VE ŞİDDETLERİ

Şekerci, Yeliz
Doktora Tezi
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Ana Bilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Doktora Programı
Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL

Nisan 2023, iv + 144

Bu tez, çağdaş İngiliz yazar Pat Barker'ın *Regeneration Trilogy*'sinde yer verilen erkeklik ve savaş eleştirisini, Eleştirel Erkeklik Çalışmaları çerçevesinde ve özel olarak da, Raewyn Connell'ın "hegemonik erkeklik" kavramı merceğinden incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Eleştirel Erkeklik Çalışmaları erkekliğin ne olduğunu ve onun çeşitli biçimlerde sosyal olarak nasıl inşa edildiğini, erkeklerin güce eşit olmayan erişimine dikkat çekerek araştırır. Özellikle, Connell'ın hegemonik erkeklik kavramı nasıl belirli bir çeşit erkekliğin kültürel olarak egemen hale geldiğini ve erkeklerin onun ideallerine uyum sağlamak için baskı yaşadığını anlamaya yarar.

Birinci Dünya Savaşı ve savaşın erkeklerin erkeklik deneyimleri üzerindeki etkisi hakkında yazılan Barker'ın *Trilogy*'si savaş bunalımı yaşayan, histerik, felçli, suskun ve kekeme erkek imgelerini merkezine alır. Bu bakımdan, *Trilogy'*nin her bir romanı, egemen erkeklik ideallerine uyum sağlamada başarısız olan, ve ayrıca bu egemen erkeklik ideallerine uymaları için yaşadıkları toplumsal baskılar nedeniyle kurbanlaştırılan ve sömürülen erkekler açısından erkekliklerin inşasına bakarak onu sorgulayan eleştirel bir bakış açısı sunarlar.

Böylece, bu tez; ataerkil güç ve toplumsal cinsiyet düzeninin erkeklere en fazla yararı sağlamayı vaat ederken; aynı zamanda onlara nasıl zarar verdiğini ortaya çıkarmak için, erkeklerin savaş dönemi İngiltere'sinde egemen erkeklik biçimleri ile uzlaşma çabalarının Barker'ın seçilen eserlerinde ele alınan temsilini erkeklerin suskunluklar ve şiddetler deneyimleri üzerinden özel bir vurgu yaparak incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Key Words: Pat Barker, Regeneration Trilogy, Hegemonik Erkeklik, Erkeklikler, Savaş Nevrozu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i
ABSTRACT ii
ÖZET iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER ONE

THEORIZING MASCULINITIES THROUGH THE KEY CONCEPTS: MULTIPLICITY, HEGEMONY, AND POWER

1.1.Gender Relations and Configurations of Masculinities........ 11
1.2. Conceptualizing Hegemonic Masculinity and Violence........ 15
1.3**.** The construction of Hegemonic Masculinity in Wartime Britain 22

CHAPTER TWO

WARRING MASCULINITIES AND DISEMPOWERMENT

2.1. Unfit for the Front, Silenced for the Front: Homosociality, Homophobia, and Emasculation in *Regeneration* 31

CHAPTER THREE

MASCULINITIES UNDER OPPRESSION

3.1. Surveilled to be a man: Violence, Torture and Victimization in *The Eye in the Door* 75

CHAPTER FOUR

MASCULINITIES AND THE LEGACY OF THE WAR, EMPIRE, AND CLASS

4.1. Masculine Anxieties and the Impact of the Past in *The Ghost Road* 118

CONCLUSION 136
REFERENCES 141
VITA 145

INTRODUCTION

The 1980s saw the publication of the contemporary British novelist Pat Barker's literary works, such as *Union Street* (1982), *Blow Your House Do*wn (1984), and *Liza's England* (1986), which focused on the experiences of female protagonists struggling to survive in post-industrial Britain. These initial works by Barker are typically categorized as "regional novels" in which she speaks out about the gender and class experiences of women from the north of England (Westman, 2001: 14). Pat Barker was born in Thornaby-on-Tees in 1943 and grew up in a working-class home; thus, the influence of her working-class background can be seen in her early writing. During this early period of her literary career, she produced works that offered a unique and critical viewpoint on the problems of poverty, violence, oppression, and exploitation faced by working-class women in post-industrial Britain. Yet, especially with the publication of the first volume of *the Regeneration Trilogy* in 1991, a distinctive phase of her writing began. In this new phase, Barker concentrated more on male protagonists and raised challenging questions about men's gender identity and its ideological formation. Hence, in each novel of her *Trilogy,* Barker developed a growing concern for interrogating masculinity by focusing heavily on the negative effects of men's gendered experiences of power, privilege and dominance set against the historical backdrop of the First World War.

It is vital to understand that the shift in Barker's subject matter from the gender experiences of women to those of men does not imply that she has abandoned her feminist stance; rather, it suggests a continuation of it. In other words, her literary concern for writing on men, war and masculinity is primarily influenced by her thoughts on feminism. As can be inferred from the writer's own words that "I never thought for a second that feminism is only about women", according to Barker, feminism is for everyone, and it concerns both men and women (Westman, 2005:14). In a sense, in Barker's opinion feminism should seek to understand the underlying causes of gender-based social injustices and violence not only by highlighting how women are oppressed in patriarchal societies but also by exposing how men hold positions of dominance, power and privilege in such societies. Accordingly, as this thesis observes, in *the Trilogy,* Barker uses the narrative of the war as an analytical tool to critically reconsider and reflect not only the distinct history of the war itself but also "his story" of war, violence, power and

dominance to profoundly reveal the social foundations on which men's gender identities have been built.

It should be noted that Barker's earlier academic experiences at the London School of Economics and Political Science, where she had studied international history, influenced her writing style, which develops a strong preoccupation with history. She writes about history primarily to investigate societal problems on both a collective and individual level. Her style, therefore, incorporates historical and fictional events into her works in such a specific way that she becomes able to "ground her fictions in a recognizable material reality, past or present" (Brannigan, 2005:13). Consequently, the past history of the war gives her the opportunity to explore the present cultural, social, sexual, and political issues as well. Because, as is also pointed out by Karin Westman, this "past history" employed in Barker's fiction is "part of our present" (2005: 16).

Just as her contemporaries like A. S. Byatt, Peter Ackroyd, Graham Swift, and Ian Sinclair have done, "Barker's fictional explorations of history have never engaged in nostalgia"; because she finds nothing worth being nostalgic for a community and culture that are on the verge of extinction (Brannigan, 2005: 5-8). It is a world shattered by the impact of the war, and this prompts the writer to produce historical fiction with the aim of criticizing modern history and society. In this regard, Barker's *Trilogy* can be identified not only as "historical fiction" but also as "a contemporary revisionist fiction of the war" (Brannigan, 2005: 94).

The *Trilogy* consists of the novels *Regeneration* (1991*), The Eye in The Doo*r (1993), and *The Ghost Road* (1995), which, Barker describes as "the novels about a period of the world's history that we have never come to terms with" (Westman, 2005: 16). In her interview with Candice Rodd, Pat Barker further explains why she chose the First World War as her subject, stating that "I chose the First World War because it's come to stand in for other wars […] It's come to stand for the pain of all wars" (Westman, 2005: 16). Therefore, in Barker's view, the First World War is not simply a historical case of trench warfare; rather, it is more complicated than it appears to be because of the many other forms of war it encompasses. Barker's fiction conveys this concept of "other wars" that the First World War epitomizes to depict individuals' warring social identities and

conflict-ridden subjectivities shaped by the systems of inequality and oppression such as gender, class, and race intersecting during the war.

In this respect, each novel in Barker's *Trilogy* gains importance as they present an interrogative viewpoint into the war among nations, the war among men and the war inside men. In other words, revisiting the years of the First World War, Barker intends to scrutinize the social structures, practices and gender relations unfolding within history that maintain men's overall domination and power not only over women but also over other men. Her *Trilogy,* therefore, provides a prolific ground to understand men's gender identities construed through the relations of power, domination and hegemony within the gender order of the wartime Britain, which eventually become damaging both for men and the whole society. Within this context, in contrast to scholarly critical studies that have mostly centred on traumatic effects of the war on men in Barker's *Trilogy*, this thesis offers to analyse her texts from the aspect of the damaging impact of hegemonic forms of masculinity experienced by men during the war. Therefore, this study suggests that in Barker's texts it is not the horror of the trench warfare on the battlefield, but the gendered-violence shaping men in conforming to hegemonic ideals of masculinity that maintains the war, and thus causes men to undergo mental and physical breakdowns at the time of the war.

It is crucial to acknowledge that Barker's personal life and literary career were greatly influenced by the war's legacy. Most specifically, the impact of the wartime experiences of the writer's grandfather inspired her to delve deeper into the connection between war and masculinity within patriarchal societies. Barker realized that her grandfather, who was a war veteran with a bayonet wound, had become silent after his wartime experiences. However, as she revealed in her interview with Stevenson, her grandfather's silence about his bayonet wound, his deafness, and her stepfather's stammer stemmed not only from their experiences of the war but also from their experiences of masculinity:

> My grandfather had a bayonet wound that was something I noticed particularly as a small child, and he didn't talk about the war. So, in a sense the bayonet wound was speaking for him. Silence and wounds were therefore linked together in that particular way. And my stepfather was certainly also marked by that war: he had a paralytic stammer, and my grandfather was very deaf. So, the idea of war, wounds, impeded communication, and silence, of course—silence about the war, because the war was not a subject of revelation—all became entwined in my mind with masculinity". (Rawlinson, 2010: 175)

As the aforementioned quotation makes clear, Barker personally observed that while her grandfather kept his silence about the war, his bayonet wound was speaking out against the violence he encountered in trying to live up to societal expectations of

masculinity during the years of the war. Accordingly, she contended that her grandfather was trying to communicate much about his experience of war and masculinity through his silence since he was unable to express it openly. She, therefore, began to comprehend how cultural standards and social expectations of masculinity hinder men from speaking out or drive them to remain silent about the violence of both the war and the constructs of masculinity that are ideologically shaped. This has become one of the major thematic concerns explored in each novel of the *Regeneration Trilogy* that centres on the stories of mute, stammering, hysteric, paralyzed, and shell-shocked men marked by mental and physical problems. As a result, Barker's importance stems from her endeavour to represent masculinity from the aspect of those men who, in wartime Britain, are unable to live up to established ideals of masculinity.

Barker does never conceive masculinity as a smooth, fixed, natural, uniform and biologically determined innate identity men are born with. Instead, she understands that masculinity is an identity that needs to be questioned since it has been shaped by social and ideological forces and is, in large part, has become the source of many social ills. To illustrate this fact in her fiction, she utilizes the history of the war by which she comes to explore masculinity as an ideological gender category and represents the war ridden society and the impact of it on its men as they are. Likewise, the critic Robert Boyers, who believes that art and politics should go together, draws attention to the political imagination Barker maintains in her trilogy by which she sees things "as they are or they were" and has the ability to keep herself far from "creating myths about the past or about staunches of spirit or honour or obligation" (Boyers, 2005: 151).

Masculinity studies, which flourished around the 1970s, have become concerned with a critical investigation of men's gender identities by exploring how masculinity has come to be construed and maintained. Moving further away from the traditional explanations of masculinity as an innate, biological, male trait or fixed, stereotyped gender role, the field rather has drawn attention to the conception of masculinity as an ideological gender category that is socially and historically constructed in diverse forms. In understanding men's lives, a specific emphasis has been put by the scholars of the field on how masculinity has come to be construed through social practices and hierarchical power relations among men, which also gives clues about the link between men's experiences of violence and social construction of masculinities in diverse forms.

Especially through the concept of hegemonic masculinity put by Raewyn Connell, it has been understood that during the years of the First World War men's silences about the war, their wounds, mental breakdowns, stammering or deafness and failures all were clashing with the established notions of what it means to be an ideal man. Connell's findings about hegemonic masculinity bear importance in understanding how in wartime Britain men were majorly expected to enact a dominant mode of masculinity characterized by physical and mental strength, heterosexuality, courage, competitiveness, aggressiveness and violence. Likewise, Barker conceives the First World War as the backbone of violence where such ideals of masculinity are forged and diverse power relations among men become deepened. Her *Trilogy*, therefore, tends to expose that the pressure put on men to live up to those abovementioned ideals is what causes the greatest harm to men, and this fact is given as the core cause of both societal and individual ills prevailing in wartime Britain.

However, it should be stated that in Barker's fictional universe, such irreconcilable binaries as feminine and masculine, heroic and unheroic, the homosexual and the military, victim and victimizer, power and powerlessness, reason and unreason are brought together to blur the boundaries and to undermine the ideological manifestations of hegemonic masculinity of the given time. In this sense, the war is reflected by Barker in a distinctive way in comparison to the canonical works produced about the war spanning from 1914 to 1930 because of those above-mentioned juxtapositions she brings together in her fiction that "disturb the categories (legal, moral and ideological) through which we reproduce our social reality" (Rawlinson, 2010: 68).

In each novel of *the Trilogy*, where historical and fictional characters coexist, it is observed that Barker's strategy of writing against the grain of existing gender order sets out to problematize and dismantle men's conceptions of masculinity, war, and power established in wartime Britain. To accomplish this, she depicts her male characters as becoming unable to conform to hegemonic ideals of masculinity while at the same time trying to come up with ways to survive the violence of the war and hegemonic modes of masculinity. As a result, within the scope of this thesis, Barker's representation of these men's mental and physical disabilities, inner conflicts, split personalities, ambiguities, anxieties and insecurities, both individually experienced and bodily registered, will be

examined to reveal how the lived reality of men contradicts the constructs of hegemonic masculinity of the given time. In this way, it will also be shown that the mental and physical breakdowns suffered by soldiers at the time of the war is not brought on by their inherent weaknesses or flaws but rather by their attempts to negotiate with the hegemonic masculinity that predominate in wartime Britain.

Indeed, Barker’s discovery that men’s silences turn out to be something entwined with masculinity can be best understood by examining their relation to male power, hegemony and domiance within the gender order of patriarchal societies. As a matter of fact, within the scope of this thesis, in their concern for representing men’s negotiation with a hegemonic mode of masculinity during the years of the war, each novel of Barker’s *Trilogy* will be treated as the texts offering to see how one’s masculinity becomes open to question. This will help to discuss how Barker understands masculinity as a position of power and status that puts pressure on men and thus turns them into both victims and perpetrators of male dominance and violence.

Accordingly, within the scope of this thesis, it will be demonstrated that men’s attempts to comply with dominant, hegemonic modes of masculinity become vital in moulding their experiences of violences and silences. This will be assessed as giving cues for the detrimental and negative effects of the social construction of different forms of masculinity working through social practices and patterns that men interact with and also through the hierarchical power relations taking place among men.

In *Regeneration,* the first volume of *the Trilogy*, the stories of both historical characters such as Siegfried Sassoon, Wilfred Owen, Robert Graves, W. H. Rivers, and fictional ones such as Prior, Manning, and Burns are conveyed, along with the effects of their past experiences of the war and masculinity upon their present lives. These soldiers and officers are portrayed by the author to have become bodily and mentally unfit for the requirements of the wartime Britain. Hence, they are taken to the Craiglockhart war hospital where they have medical treatment to be sent back to the front to fight again. In this sense, at Craiglockhart, through the therapeutic sessions conducted by the military psychiatrist W. H. Rivers, the disempowered and emasculated masculinities of these men caused by the war’s impact on them are to be restored in accordance with hegemonic ideals of masculinity. Giving the impression that their adventures start with their

movement from the trenches to a mental hospital, the Craiglockhart War Hospital seems to appear as the final point arrived at by these men, who do not conform to the ideals of hegemonic masculinity. Yet, within the scope of this thesis it will be discussed that it is the pressure they feel in conforming to hegemonic ideals of masculinity that render them physically and mentally ill.

Hence, throughout the second chapter of this thesis, Barker's representation of the Craiglockhart war hospital will be handled as a homosocial environment of all-male society whereby diverse power relations among men are traced to have been construed in line with the homophobic and hegemonic gender project in wartime Britain. The Craiglockhart war hospital, standing out for the wartime British gender order, therefore, will be analysed as an area of contestation through which the novel comes to explore how competing and warring masculinities are constructed, reproduced, and contested through gender relations of domination and subordination among men in order to make them fit into military, patriotic and nationalist ideals of wartime Britain.

However, Barker presents her male characters as uncomfortable and unsure of their masculinities at Craiglockhart. To that end, this war hospital will be analysed as a subversive environment in which the solid boundaries of men's conceptions of masculinity are shown to be open to question. In the novel, the characters' rehabilitation consists of therapeutic sessions of talking cure led by the psychiatrist W. H. R. Rivers. As a man whose masculinity is complicit with the hegemonic project, Rivers attempts to make them turn back to the front as ideal officers and soldiers fit for their duty to fight and kill in the service of their nation. However, throughout this study, it will be concentrated on the idea that Rivers' therapeutic sessions pave the way for shell-shocked soldiers and officers' to confront their emotions, which they repressed to become ideal military men. This initiates the internal battles inside them unfolding in the form of inner conflicts that cause them to doubt and feel uncertain about their masculinities.

In this homosocial domain, the characters' emerging dualities, splitting of personalities, inner conflicts, ambiguities, and bodily dysfunctions brought on by their experiences of masculinity appear as forms of individual resistance against the hegemonic masculinity of the time and the violences it perpetuates. Hence, with the help of the critical debates of the field that draw attention to the contradictory nature of masculinity as a form of power, which must be proved all the time but is never attained, Barker's male

characters in *Regeneration* will be examined as exemplifying disempowered and emasculated men feeling insecure, powerless, helpless and thus less than manly, struggling to find a place and identity for themselves within the patriarchal order. To that end, the first chapter of this thesis will specifically focus on emasculating effects of both the trench warfare and gendered power relations among men employed in the novel. By doing so, the dynamic and relational nature of hegemonic masculinity in wartime British society will be delineated, and the damage and exploitation wrought on men by the hegemonic project itself will be traced. The physical disabilities and psychological breakdowns experienced by the male characters of the novel will be exposed to be induced by their experiences of masculinity during the war. In this context, war neurosis of the characters, which Barker depicts to be linked with the social construction of their masculinities will be examined with references to historical W.H. R. Rivers' thoughts on war neurosis.

The Eye in The Door is the subsequent novel of the *Trilogy* in which Barker addresses the issue of masculinity along with the notions of class, homosexuality, and homophobia. The novel surfaces the story of a soldier Billy Prior who is rehabilitated at Craiglockhart by the psychiatrist Rivers and is released to duty of home service to work in the Ministry of Munitions as an agent of intelligence unit. Coming from a working-class family and portrayed as a spy informing against the anti-war attempts of the pacifists, Prior will be analysed as a character who is trying to come to terms with his gender and class-based identity that results with his split personality. In this sense, his negotiation with hegemonic masculinity will be handled from the *aspect* of his working-class masculinity he tries to transcend and through his complicit masculinity he adopts during the war. Additionally, as the title of the novel suggests, *the Eye in the Door* will be discussed to refer to the case of silenced men under surveillance and oppression of the state and other men. In this respect, the novel will be analysed as depicting the victimization, torture and violence experienced by the men who do not conform to the hegemonic ideals of masculinity within the patriarchal gender order of wartime Britain. Accordingly, *the Eye in The Door* will be studied in this chapter as critically elucidating the masculine surveillance and violence not only undertaken by the state but also exercised by individual men of the wartime British society trying to negotiate with hegemonic masculinity of the time and attempt to silence alternative masculinities of their own as well. Internal divisions of the characters will also be analysed to demonstrate how

violence among men increase their anxieties of being masculine enough that emerge in the form of unspoken fear.

The third volume of *the Trilogy*, the *Ghost Road* which won the Booker Prize in 1995, features Prior's return to the front to fight in France after his home service, and the psychiatrist Rivers' illness and his hallucinatory journey to his past experiences which he had in Solomon Islands. The chapter will mainly focus on making a critique of hegemonic masculinity in wartime Britain through the exploration of Barker's characters' confrontation with the ghosts of their pasts, with which they need to come to terms. To that end, a specific emphasis will be put on the novel's employment of men's need to explore their innermost fears, anxieties or their silences to resist hegemonic mode of masculinity in wartime Britain. Whether Barker's characters become regenerated after facing the ghosts of their pasts on their way to become a proper, ideal men will also be discussed to illustrate to what extent the war changed their conception of masculinity and opened it into question.

The thesis will therefore contribute to the field of masculinity studies by discussing how men have become both victims and victimizers of the gender order. This is because they are to exercise their masculinity in the form of power and dominance in order to exist and survive both individually and socially. This leads men to speak about the war and their experiences of masculinity through their wounds, stammering, twitches, mutism, paralysis and hysteria. In this sense, Barker's novels will be studied as the texts providing insights into how men are indeed damaged on their way to becoming ideal men, against which they individually resist through their inner conflicts of unconscious protest. In this way, Barker's *Trilogy* will be discussed as literary works as showing men that their attempt to live up to hegemonic ideals of masculinity is an obstacle on their way to a true regeneration of both themselves and of patriarchal societies. In accordance with this, it will be shown how Barker's texts offer men to regenerate themselves by developing new ways of looking at the violences of war ridden patriarchal world and established conceptions and norms of masculinity.

Within the scope of this thesis, since the subsequent chapter of this study aims to present introductory remarks for the theoretical background of the study, it will be quite useful to start with some critical insights developed by the field of Critical Studies on

Men and Masculinity. Within this respect, Connell's ideas on masculinity together with that of the prominent figures of the field such as Kimmel, Seidler, Hearn, Brod and Kaufman will provide prolific and thought-provoking discussions in examining the representation and the critique of masculinity in Barker's fictions within the context of hegemonic masculinity and the power relations it sustains. Therefore, it is a prerequisite to outline the debates developed by the field to clarify the definitions of key concepts such as hegemonic masculinity, multiple masculinities, and gender relations.

CHAPTER ONE

THEORIZING MASCULINITIES THROUGH THE KEY CONCEPTS: HEGEMONY, MULTIPLICITY, AND POWER

1.1. Gender Relations and Configurations of Masculinities

Emerging as an academic discipline around the 1970s, masculinity studies have become an influential field of inquiry since the last quarter of the twentieth century in investigating the construction of men's gender identities. It has been acknowledged that prior to the 1970s, the initial attempts to theorize masculinity were brought to forefront by the critical views of the second wave feminist critics centring mainly on women's oppression by men within patriarchal societies. However, how masculinity as an ideological gender identity comes to be construed, and how men exert power and maintain their dominance both over women and some other men remained an unexplored issue until the development of masculinity studies. Hence, in the 1970s a systematic analysis of male power and domination begun to be made with the emergence of Men's Movement that attempted to create a social science of masculinity.

The early theorists of the movement such as Joseph Pleck and Sawyer (1974), Warren Farrell (1974) and Jack Nichols (1975) put forth that "the male sex role was oppressive and ought to be changed or abandoned" (Connell, 2005:24). However, in the early 1980s, Men's Movement is observed to dissolve into three different groupings as Men's Rights, Mythopoetics and Pro-feminist men. While Men's Rights and Mythopoetic thinkers develop uncritical and anti-feminist stance against masculinity, and stress the victimization and oppression experienced by men because of the male gender role, the critical and anti-sexist debates on masculinity come to be developed by Pro-feminist men's group under the name of the Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities.

Therefore, the late 20th century marks the beginning of a historical moment in which new approaches probing the concept of masculinity have been developed in a more systematic and sophisticated way with the help of a set of sociological questions raised by the pro-feminist scholars. Aiming to investigate men and masculinity through the lens

of a broader and more critical perspective, their studies have adopted an interdisciplinary methodology. In seeking answers to the question of what it means to be a man, the field has utilized some other fields of studies relevant to women, gay men, people of colour and class. With the leading scholars of the field such as Connell, Messerschmidt, Kimmel, Seidler, Hearn, Brod and Kaufman, this new sociology of masculinity has offered a break with essentialist accounts of masculinity and rather set an analytical framework suggesting to discuss masculinity in a historical and social context.

The Pro-feminists have maintained a feminist stance by criticizing existing gender categories, and thus they have become complementary and supportive of women's studies. Their studies aim to discuss "the social character of masculinity" and see masculinity "as socially, historically, and culturally variable and as constituted in relation to, or more accurately as against, that which is deemed non-masculine" (Beasley, 2005: 178). In contrast to theories of patriarchy that analyse masculinity as a unitary, unchanging, ahistorical, and homogenous gender category, the scholars of the field have drawn attention to the changing, dynamic and multi-layered nature of masculinity as they have discovered that there are various and multiple ways of becoming a man.

By focusing particularly on the differences and diversities among men that result from gendered power relations between them changing over time and place, the scholars of the field have also shown how inadequate it is to explain the construction of masculinity with reference to sex role theory; because they thought that sex role theory ignores the relations of power and inequality ingrained in the social behaviour of women and men (Carrigan et. al, 1985: 580). For instance, Connell put the idea that "in sex role theory, action (the role enactment) is linked to a structure defined by biological difference, the dichotomy of male and female - not to a structure defined by social relations" (2005:26). As for Connell, while differences between the sexes are further exaggerated by sex role theory, the structures of class, race and sexuality are obscured by it (2005: 26).

Hence, the sociologists in this discipline do not see masculinity as a pre-determined norm or sex role, as psychologists had done previously. They rather investigate masculinity within a contextual and relational framework to clarify how certain men maintain their position of power and dominance through the subordination

of women and some other men. Arguing that "manhood is socially constructed and historically shifting," the pro-feminists explore men's experiences of masculinity throughout history to show that changing constructions and definitions of masculinity are, in fact, shaped around the axis of power and powerlessness (Brod et al., 1994: 120). By doing so, they come to emphasize the notion that men's struggle for power and dominance is actually motivated by their sense of powerlessness generated within a web of gender hierarchy. These findings suggest that men experience powerlessness because "all masculinities are not created equal" (Brod et al., 1994: 122). Hence, it is owing to this contradictory relationship between men and power that "masculinity must be proved, and no sooner it is proved that it is again questioned and must be proved again -constant, relentless, unachievable," (Brod et al., 1994: 122).

As is seen, with the help of the critical arguments developed by the pro-feminists, it has been underscored that it is men's unequal access to power that shapes masculinity as a multiplying experience. This determines not only what it means to be a man but also the changing definitions of the term masculinity within different times and contexts. With regard to these findings, a distinction has been made between the terms of "manliness" and "masculinity", upon which different meanings are conferred depending on their historicity.

The contemporary use of the term "masculinity" is claimed to have emerged in the past 100 years, and therefore, while "manly" and "manliness" were the terms widely used in the 19th century, the term "masculinity" came to be predominantly used around the turn of the 20th century (Pascoe et al., 2016: 38). In this respect, Pascoe et al. claim that manliness was the term denoting "a particular kind of man" whereas the term "masculine" came to be used specifically "to distinguish men from women" (2016:38). Similarly, Gail Bederman emphasized the different connotations of the terms "manly" and "masculine" throughout the 19th century, as the years after 1890 coined a change from "manly" to "masculine" in terms of changing constructions and definitions of male power (qtd in Pascoe et al., 2016:58). He claims that until the last decade of the 19th century, the word "manly" came to be used to describe admirable men. Yet, it was after the 1890s that the words masculine and masculinity were employed to describe new features of manhood exemplified by the middle-class men serving as the ideal of new powerful men (Bederman, qtd in Pascoe et al., 2016:58).

In his survey of the history of American manhood, Michael Kimmel finds out that the historically changing definitions of masculinity are tied to the economic factors that determine men's access to power in the United States. He documents two ideal types of masculinity, namely "the Genteel Patriarch" of the 18th century and "the Heroic Artisan" of the early 19th century (Kimmel, 2005b: 38). While the "genteel Patriarch" characterized the landed gentry whose masculinity was based on property ownership, "the Heroic Artisan" described Urban craftsman and shopkeepers, whose masculinity was grounded in "physical strength and republican virtue of the Jeffersonian yeoman farmer and independent artisan" (Kimmel, 2005b: 38). Yet, both of these two distinct forms of masculinity are observed by Kimmel to have been dethroned by a new version of masculinity describing "the self-made man" (Kimmel, 2005b: 38). Kimmel argues that, emerging by 1830, this new type of manhood "derived his identity entirely from success in the capitalist marketplace, from his accumulated wealth, power, and capital" (Kimmel, 2005b: 38).

Therefore, it has been discovered that men's access to power within a social system shapes changing conceptions of male power, allowing for a comprehension of masculinity as a product of "social, economic, political, and cultural circumstances" (Beynon, 2002: 59). In this way, it has been understood that masculinity is established through various forms of power men uphold within a social structure organized through relations of "authority, work, domestic and sexual life" in a hierarchical way:

> Masculinity is valued through various forms of power men can unthinkingly take for granted: the power to exert control over women, over other men, over their own bodies, over machines and technology. But it is these unexamined or "naturalized assumptions of superiority, lived out and reinforced within a social system where relations of authority, work, domestic and sexual life are typically structured along hierarchical gender lines that are at issue. (Segal, 1993:635).

In her ground breaking book *Masculinities*, R. W. Connell underscores the idea of "multiple masculinities" to clarify how different types of masculinity have come to be constructed in diverse forms (2005: 76). She puts forward that masculinities multiply due to the intersection of gender with other systems of inequality such as race, class, sexuality, and nationality. Thus, different configurations of masculinities such as gay male masculinity, heterosexual masculinity, black masculinity, white masculinity, working class masculinity, and middle-class masculinity come into being. (Connell, 2005: 80). To put it shortly, Connell's findings promote the idea that one's masculinity is informed by

the dynamics of class affiliation, sexual orientation and the racial or ethnic identity over which gender relations become operative. Henceforth, the concept of multiple masculinities has revealed the idea that masculinities are not genetically programmed or biologically fixed but are products of people's acts that come into being as a result of their social interaction (Connell, 2000: 12).

Additionally, Connell draws attention to the importance of examining the relations between these different kinds of masculinities to understand how they multiply (2005:76). According to her, different masculinities are constructed mainly through the relations of domination and subordination among men. In this way, she does not identify masculinity as "a character typology" which is fixed and ahistorical, but rather as a matter of position occupied "in a given pattern of gender relations, a position always contestable" (Connell, 2005: 76). This specific emphasis on gender relations by Connell helps her to explore the social mechanism that configures masculinity through relations of hegemony, subordination, marginalization and complicity. How a specific mode of masculinity becomes hegemonic is detailed through Connell's conceptualization of hegemonic masculinity that interacts with violence. These theoretical findings will be detailed in the subsequent part of this chapter to explore Barker's representation of hegemonic masculinity in wartime Britain.

1.2. Conceptualizing Hegemonic Masculinity and Violence

For Connell masculinity cannot be explained through essentialist and normative definitions that treat it as an essence or a universal standard ascribed to a distinct body and personal or cultural traits of men. In other words, rather than conceiving masculinity as an "object (a natural character type, a behavioural average, a norm)" she offers to see it as "a place in gender relations, the practices through which men and women engage that place in gender, and the effects of these practices in bodily experience, personality and culture whose effects manifest themselves "(Connell 2005: 71). In this way, she puts emphasis upon conceptualizing gender as "a social practice that constantly refers to bodies and what bodies do" (2005: 71). However, this does not come to mean that gender is biologically determined but rather suggests the view that "gender exists precisely to the extent that biology does not determine the social" (Connell, 2005: 71).

It has been underlined that gender relations overwhelming within social structure determine the organization of gender as a social practice, and the collective fate of people is shaped by gender politics (Connell, 2005: 76). According to Connell, there are four main social structures through which gender is organized. These structures are power relations, production relations, emotional relations and symbolic relations. Power relations structure the operation of patriarchy and construe men as the dominant group. Production relations are concerned with the structure of economic and social life marked by gendered division of labour. The structure of Emotional relations is labelled as "cathexis" by which Connell reveals the way gendered practice is shaped or organized by emotional relations and sexual orientations or desire. Symbolic relations stress the importance of gendered symbolic meaning ingrained in language, dress, make-up, art, architecture (Connell, 2005: 74-86). It is obvious that through the analysis of these structures, one of the major objectives of Connell's argument is to demonstrate the social construction of masculinity by means of a set of gender relations. Additionally, she offers to observe "the gendered places in production and consumption, places in institution and environments, places in social and military struggle" to arrive at a profound understanding of masculinity (2005, 71).

Though the term "hegemonic masculinity" was conceptualized through a theoretical framework by Connell in his book *Masculinities* in detail, the initial discussions of the concept take place in Tim Carrigan, Connell and John Lee's essay titled as "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity", which defined hegemonic masculinity as "a question of how particular groups of men inhabit positions of power and wealth, and how they legitimate and reproduce social relationships that generate their dominance" (Carrigan et al, 1985: 592). The term "hegemony," is borrowed by Connell from Antonio Gramsci and it "refers to the cultural dynamic by which a social group claims and sustains a leading position in social life" (Connell, 2005: 77). Thereby the concept of hegemony is applied to the field of gender in order to explicate how gender practice is configured through and within a relation of hegemony that positions some dominant group of men at the top level of gender hierarchy. Since hegemony is concerned with "cultural dominance in the society as a whole" (Connell, 2005: 78) Connell argues that "at any given time, one form of masculinity rather than others is culturally exalted" (2005: 77).

Yet, it is also pointed out that the position of hegemony is attained not through the practice of direct violence, but through "a successful claim to authority" (Connell, 2005: 77). In this respect, Carrigan et al identifies hegemony as a "a historical situation, a set of circumstances in which power is won and held" (Carrigan et al., 1985: 594). It is for this reason that hegemonic masculinity is "a position always contestable" (Connell, 2005: 77). To that end, it is a position never attained but constantly contested. Therefore, it is "structured through contradiction: the more it asserts itself, the more it calls itself into question" (Segal, 1993: 635). Connell also adds that the most powerful people may not always be the most visible bearers of hegemonic masculinity. The bearers of it may "be exemplars, such as film actors, or even fantasy figures such as film characters" (Connell, 2005:77).

The fact that hegemonic masculinity is relational is highlighted through Connell's discussion that "a specific masculinity is constituted in relation to other masculinities and to the structure of gender relations as a whole" (Connell, 2005: 154). These other forms of masculinities are not obliterated by hegemonic masculinity but are hierarchically situated within subordinate or marginalized position rendering the superiority of hegemonic forms of masculinity more powerful, visible, and desirable for men (Connell, 2005: 184). While homosexuals are grouped as construing the subordinate masculinity, working class men and men of colour or ethnic minorities are classified by Connell as occupying the position of marginalized masculinity. On the other hand, one's complicity with hegemonic masculinity in terms of benefiting from the advantages and privileges of hegemonic masculinity comes to denote complicit masculinity (Connell, 2005: 76-80). These diverse forms of masculinities are therefore outlined by Connell as multiple ways of becoming man that are socially and historically produced through specific gender relations of dominance, alliance, and subordination between groups of men (Connell, 2005:77). These relationships are constructed not only through definitions of difference but also through material practices of exclusion, inclusion, intimidation, exploitation and so on (Connell,2005: 154)

On the other hand, the concept of "patriarchal dividend" bears importance in understanding how hegemony works through some privileges and benefits men collectively have through the "overall subordination of women" (2005:79). These benefits consist of men's higher economic, cultural, sexual and institutional gains in

comparison to women (Connell, 2005: 261). For instance, men gain higher income, state power, social prestige and honour then women. Thus, it is this patriarchal dividend that makes most men complicit with the hegemonic and patriarchal project (Connell, 2005:79). Even these men, who are not positioned at the top of gender hierarchy try to benefit from men's collective dominance and advantaged position over women.

In this context, hegemonic masculinity features a specific form of masculinity that becomes dominant over others and "it is, overwhelmingly, the dominant gender who hold and use the means of violence" maintained by a social structure of inequality, injustice and power relations, especially among men. Connell maintains that this situation creates two patterns of violence: "First, many members of the privileged group use violence to sustain their dominance" (2005: 83). The physical harassment, verbal abuse, rape, domestic assault and intimidation exercised by men on women belong to this first category of violence that is justified and "authorized by an ideology of supremacy" (Connell, 2005: 83). The second pattern of violence is concerned with "gender politics among men" (Connell, 2005: 83). The violence exercised in major cases such as homicide or military combats are identified by Connell as "transactions among men" while terror as a means of violence is used to draw boundaries and make exclusions as in the case of heterosexual violence exercised on homosexual men (2005: 83). On the other hand, as, Connell points out "violence can become a way of claiming or asserting masculinity in group struggles" (2005: 83).

Jeff Hearn is one of the prominent sociologists of the field whose ideas provide critical thoughts on the interplay of men, masculinity, and violence. He claims that "violence is a reference point for the production of boys and men", and he thinks that the primary political priority for men is to oppose violence (1998: 7). First and foremost, he sees it essential to analyse violence not in singularity, but rather in plurality, and thus offers to use the term "men's violences" instead of "male violence" (1998: 4). According to Hearn, the term "men's violences" helps to understand the attribution of violence to men without any "biological cause of the violence" (1998: 4). Hearn remarks that the term also emphasizes "the totality of violence of men" that cannot be reduced simply to "a special form of violence that is male" as one part of this totality (1998: 4). In this context, Hearn recognizes that men's violences multiply, change over time and become interrelated to various forms of violence done by men:

> Men's violences are those violences that are done by men or are attributed to men. The range of men's violences is immense. It spans the very particular and the global; the interpersonal and the institutional; the agentic and the structural. It includes violence to strangers and to known others. It includes violence to women, children, each other, animals, and men's own selves. It varies in form and in process. It includes physical, sexual, verbal, psychological, emotional, linguistic, cognitive, social, spatial, financial, representational and visual violences. It includes violence done, threatened violence and potential violence. It includes enacted violence in the present and accumulated or consolidated violence in the past and present. It also includes the interrelation and overlap between all these kinds of violences (1998: 16-17).

It is crucial to note that the violence exercised on gay men works through the subordination of homosexual masculinity because "in patriarchal society hegemonic masculinity is defined as exclusively heterosexual." (Connell, 2005: 162). Hearn et al. note that within this "hierarchically heterosexist masculinism", "femininities and alternative masculinities are often subordinated and derogated because they are seen to be linked to women and 'passive, receptive' female sexuality (Reynaud, 1983; Hearn, 1987), which is negatively connoted (Addelston and Stiratt, 1996)" (2001: 85). Similarly, Connell emphasized the idea that not to be thought as gay and feminine, men felt it necessary to adopt hegemonic mode of masculinity, which is heterosexual and homophobic (Connell, 2005:162).

Homophobia is used as a tool in ensuring the otherness and subordination of homosexual men. Kimmel depicts homophobia as "men's fear of other men" (2005a: 39), and he goes on to argue that homophobia is "the fear that other men will unmask us, emasculate us, reveal to us and the world that we do not measure up, that we are not real men" (2005a: 35). As a result, masculinity turns into "a defensive effort to prevent being emasculated" (Kimmel, 2005a: 39). Hence, Kimmel presents the idea that men are to prove their manhood through homophobia, and this is induced by their fear of being perceived as not a real man (2005a: 35). In this sense, homophobia and sexism becomes intertwined; because homophobia "keeps men exaggerating all the traditional rules of masculinity, including sexual predation toward women (Kimmel, 2005a: 37). This causes men to perform "exaggerated masculinity" by which women are put into subordinate positions and become excluded from the public sphere (Kimmel, 2005a: 37). This is because "women threaten emasculation by representing the home, workplace, and familial responsibility, the negation of fun" (Kimmel, 2005a: 37). Consequently, men become afraid of feminization that is especially seen to be evoked both by domesticating efforts of women that emasculate boys while shaping them into men and by "an increasingly urban and industrial culture" that "denied men the opportunities for manly

adventure and a sense of connectedness with their work" as observed in the 19th century American Society (Kimmel, 2005b: 20).

Men, therefore, hopes to retrieve their manhood through repudiating and resisting femininity, which, Kimmel calls as "masculinism" (2005b: 21). According to him, "masculinism" is based on restoring manly vigour or re-masculinisation of American men "by prompting separate homosocial preserves where can be men without female interference" (2005b: 21). Kimmel argues that it was the public sphere that posited a challenge against the manhood of American men since it was won or lost within this sphere in the 19th century. However, men projected those anxieties of them onto women as agents depriving them of power, and thus suddenly became "terrified of feminization in the very homes they had created" (Kimmel, 2005b: 21). Thereby, "the feminization of American culture" at the beginning of the 19th century caused men to feel that they lost their "cultural vitality" and "national virility" (Kimmel, 2005b: 20). This incited those men to run away- off to the frontier, the mountains, the forests, the high seas, the battlegrounds, outer space-to retrieve what they feel like they've lost: some deep, essential part of themselves, their identity, their manhood" (Kimmel, 2005b: 20).

Kimmel, thus, maintains that men's homophobic fear of not being perceived as a real man by other men is indeed "the fear of humiliation" that makes them ashamed (2005a: 30). This shame, he argues, gives way to "the silences that keep other people believing that we actually approve of the things that are done to women, to minorities, to gays and lesbians in our culture" (Kimmel, 2005a: 35). Therefore, as Kimmel underlines, "our fears are the sources of our silences, and men's silence is what keeps the system running" (2005a: 35).

Likewise, Michael Kaufman suggests how men's violences against other men indicate that "relations between men, whether at the individual and state level, are relations of power" (1987: 10). These relations of power between men are directly expressed through some acts of violence that provide a "discharge of aggression and hostility" (Kaufman, 1987:10). However, men's experiences of violence such as fighting,

beating, bullying, rape, or war result with an immense sense of anxiety that should be resolved; because "that anxiety is crystallized in an unspoken fear (particularly among heterosexual men): all other men are my potential humiliators, my enemies, competitors" (Kaufman, 1987: 10).

As outlined above, studies on men and masculinities have revealed that in its attempt to produce a culturally idealized dominant model of masculinity, hegemonic masculinity principally functions through the avoidance from anything associated with femininity, emotional expression, and connection. This, especially, paves the way for the cultural exaltation of stoic men as the hegemonic ideal especially in the 19th century. As Victor Seidler reveals, the assumption that men's expression of their feelings and emotions is an indicator of their weakness, cowardice, and vulnerability results with men's emotional repression, and this becomes a desirable practice for hegemonic masculinity (1997: 126). In other words, men's distance from anything associated with the feminine and repression of their feelings is tried to be invoked to maintain an emotional self-control of them as their expression of emotions and vulnerabilities is deemed as a threat for the existing gender order. Hence, men are taught not to express what they are feeling to fit into the accepted model of masculinity, and thus prove and preserve their positions within the gender order. In this sense, for men, embodying and enacting the dominant form of masculinity through the repudiation of femininity becomes one of the ways to ensure their power and dominance both over women and other men. In this respect, Victor Seidler offers that "rather than defining masculinities exclusively as relationships of power, we need to be able to imagine complex relationships of power and vulnerability, authority and love, equality and recognition" (2006: vii).

To put it shortly, with the help of the critical debates developed within the field, it has been observed that patriarchal gender order empowers men. Yet it has been also emphasized that this order disempowers men by creating a threat for their secure sense of identity on account of both diverse positions of power men occupy that may be contested and complex "structural relations of power and violence power men engage with (Seidler, vii). In this respect, one of the main arguments developed by the field is that men constantly feel unsure about their masculinities because "manhood becomes a lifelong

quest to demonstrate its achievement, as if to prove the unprovable to others" (Kimmel, 2005a: 32). According to Kimmel this leads men constantly to question whether they are masculine enough. Furthermore, he makes a comparison between men and women in terms of their gender identity crises. He argues that while men are much concerned with proving their manhood, women do not often strive for proving their womanhood as their worries and identity crises are based on being excluded rather than being feminine enough (2005a: 32). Hence one can understand that the emasculation men feel is created by the system itself that constantly demands men to prove their masculinity about which they always feel unsure.

Consequently, in line with these arguments hegemonic masculinity turns out to be the very concept that lays bare how masculinities become multiple and intersect with violence through men's complex relation to hegemony and male power. Especially, Connell's findings concerning the practice reveal that not all masculinities are equal on account of the existing hierarchical power relations among men structuring their gender identities. Hence, dynamism and mobility become the two major features characterizing hegemonic masculinity. Based on this, hegemonic masculinity has come to be conceptualized as an ideological identity that is never fixed and is open to question; because a particular form of masculinity becomes dominant at a particular time and then is contested by a new configuration depending upon the changing politics of gender order.

Within this study, in the light of these theoretical findings, Pat Barker's novels will be analysed to point out how gendered inequalities among men create power struggles and forms of violence that damage men the most. To do this, the study intends to elaborate Barker's representation of power relations among men that construe diverse forms of masculinities trying to negotiate with hegemonic masculinity of wartime Britain. To that end, the next section of this chapter intends to discuss how men's gender identities are construed during the First World War along the axis of military, nationalist and patriotic ideals to explore Barker's critique of military masculinity as a hegemonic mode generating violence both in British society and in the lives of its individuals.

1.3. The Construction of Hegemonic Masculinity in Wartime Britain

The definition of masculinity in opposition with "natural world and emotion" comes to the forefront in the sixteenth century around the era ranging from 1450 to 1650, in which modern capitalist economy emerged, and thus formed the basis of modern gender order (Connell, 2005: 186). In accordance with this, masculinity is found out to have been shaped by such developments unfolding during this period as the decline of Catholicism, the rise of Renaissance and Protestant reformation, the emphasis on marital heterosexuality and a growing interest on individualism, which became cultural prerequisites for the construction of masculinity (Connell, 2005:186). Specifically, the role of individualism in forging "an autonomous self" and Descartes and Kant's debates in Classical Philosophy that define reason and science in opposition to the natural world and emotion are observed to have determined the definition of masculinity as they greatly associated it with rationality (Connell, 2005:186). As a result, through the identification of masculinity with rationality as a character structure and the description of Western civilization "as the bearer of reason to a benighted world", there emerged "a cultural link between the legitimation of patriarchy and the legitimation of empire" (Connell, 2005: 187).

With the emergence of the first phase of imperialism through the creation of overseas empires around the world, a division of labour between the sexes is constructed as a result of which men's major occupation becomes soldiering (Connell, 2005:187). Hence, as put by Connell, the gendering of European empires is accomplished through the social practices created by the imperial state:

> Empire was a gendered enterprise from the start, initially an outcome of the segregated men's occupations of soldiering and sea trading. When European women went to the colonies it was mainly as wives and servants within households controlled by men. Apart from a few monarchs (notably Isabella and Elizabeth) the imperial states created to rule the new empires were entirely staffed by men, and developed a statecraft based on the force supplied by the organized bodies of men. (Connell, 2005:187).

In the seventeenth century, it is observed that, with the effect of the emergence of European civil wars, there appears "the strong centralized state" by which the consolidation of patriarchal order is enabled (Connell, 2005:189). It is through "the institutionalization of men's power" in and by the state that the monarchic system sustains itself (Connell, 2005: 189). As a result, within the body of the modern state, the

professional armies come into being both to serve for religious and dynastic wars, and to provide imperial conquest by which "military prowess increasingly became an issue of masculinity and nationalism" (Connell, 2005: 189).

When the time comes for the First World War the exultation of the image of soldier warrior comes to be construed as the hegemonic model of masculinity in pre-war years by means of the ideologies of nationalism and militarism prevailing the era. These ideologies, both based themselves upon constructs of masculinities, shaped the social beliefs and cultural values of wartime Britain regarding what a proper manhood is. While nationalism encouraged the idea that individuals should devout themselves for the sake of their nation's interests, militarism aimed at glorifying wars and military male power to protect the nation. Hence, military masculinities came to be based upon the intersection of these two ideologies that demand men to devout themselves and fight sacrificially for their nations.

Joane Nagel draws attention to this relationship between masculinity and nationalism by discussing how nations become engendered because of their interaction with masculine ideology in the process of nation building. She notes that "masculinity and nationalism articulate well with one another, and modern form of Western masculinity emerged at about the same time and place as modern nationalism" (qtd. in Kimmel et al, 2005:401). As the bedrock of nationalism, the nineteenth century is outlined by Nagel as the period in which "the renaissance of manliness" is witnessed in Europe, which a great deal of scholars thinks to be caused by imperial and colonial ideology of the time as well (qtd. in Kimmel et al., 2005: 400).

Given the fact that the modern world and its state system are shaped through the nationalist, imperialist, colonial, and military ideologies and movements, which had reached its havoc in the nineteenth century, their intersection with masculine ideology cannot be denied as they are principally practiced, enacted and supported by men (Nagel, qtd. in Kimmel et al., 2005: 401). Hence it can be claimed that these social, political, and economic ideologies, movements, and their institutions all adopt a masculine ideology whereby men's interests, dominance and power are enabled and perpetuated in the name of nation-building, imperial and colonial expansion and militaristic ideals and success. It is for this reason that gender should be understood as "an ongoing process of

engenderment," and masculinities "as social structures, embedded in institutions, practices and ideologies" (Brod et al.,1994: 29).

Nationalism can be depicted as "a goal-to achieve statehood, and a belief -in collective commonality" that carry implications for the senses of "both unity and otherness" accomplished through the creation of set boundaries, a common national history, and a future design (Nagel, qtd. In Kimmel et al, 2005:400-401). The actions of a nation regarding its own national anxieties in fostering its independence, establishing its own political system, developing strategies to exclude or include its members and sustaining its international relations are all legitimized through a nationalist ideology (Nagel, qtd. in Kimmel et al, 2005: 248). Therefore, according to Nagel, "the maintenance and exercise of statehood vis-à-vis other nation-states often takes the form of armed conflict. As a result, nationalism and militarism seem to go hand in hand" (qtd. in Kimmel et al, 2005:400)

Since, first and foremost "the national state is essentially a masculine institution" and its politics allows men "a venue for accomplishing masculinity" as well (Nagel, qtd. in Kimmel et al, 2005:401). The state has its own structure of authority which is hierarchical and male-dominated and in it, men have the position of decision-makers, while women are pushed to subordinate positions through the division of labour and regulation of sexuality. Hence, as also remarked by Connell as well, "given that heterosexual men socially selected for hegemonic masculinity, run the corporations and the state, the routine maintenance of these institutions will normally do the job" (Connell, 2005: 212).

Likened to a family, the nation "is a male-headed household" in which women and men are assigned some distinct natural roles (Nagel, qtd. In Kimmel et al, 2005:404). Women are "the mothers of the nation" whose purity and honour should be preserved and defended by men because "women as wives and daughters are bearers of masculine honour" (Nagel, qtd in Kimmel et al, 2005:405). Accordingly, fighting for and defending the nation in wars is, in a way, a defence of women's honour that should be achieved in men's responsibility. Yet, the relation between honour and female sexuality is indeed very problematic because "while female fecundity is valued in the mothers of the nation,

unruly female sexuality threatens to discredit the nation" (Nagel, qtd. in Kimmel et al., 2005:405).

Nagel also points out that at the times of political crisis nations tend to maintain patriotism to which few men can oppose. Men's inability to resist this patriotic call is mostly due to men's fear of being disdained for and accused of cowardice either by their social or familial communities. On the other hand, the pacifists experience this disdain much greater than the ones who enlist in the army. In this case, the reason why most men are willing to take part in wars and also are attracted to patriotic and militaristic ideals becomes therefore linked to men's fears and masculine anxieties about being labelled as a coward, feminine or less than manly. However, Nagel finds out that it is also "the masculine allure of adventure" that attracts men to the war:

> Fear of accusations of cowardice is not the only magnet that pulls men toward patriotism, nationalism, or militarism. There is also the masculine allure of adventure. Men's accountings of their enlistment in wars often describe their anticipation and excitement, their sense of embarking on a great adventure, their desire not to be 'left behind' or 'left out' of the grand quest that the war represents. (qtd. in Kimmel et al, 2005: 402)

It is obviously seen that a culturally exalted mode of ideal manliness is emphasized through the construction of the nationalist culture in which "terms like honour, patriotism, cowardice, bravery and duty… seem so thoroughly tied both to the nation and manliness" (Nagel, qtd. in Kimmel et al., 2005:402). Building on this, Paul Higate and John Hopton stress that "expressions of nationality are refracted through military masculinity" (Higate et al, qtd in Kimmel et al., 2005:441). They argue that as an institution the British military plays an influential role in acquiring and sustaining Britain's imperial existence and its global power. They detect a reciprocal relationship between militarism and masculinity that can be best understood by looking at the ideologies of masculinity and British national politics during the First World War. As a result, they point out how Victorian ideologies that define masculinity through such hegemonic ideals as "strength, courage, determination and patriotism" incited volunteer soldiers to recruit in the early years of the war (Higate et al., qtd in Kimmel et al., 2005:434). What is more, those ideals were reinforced by means of "war propaganda" that valorises both military culture and success through an encouragement of brutality toward war resisters and those males (such as Jewish refugees from Eastern Europe) who were ineligible for military service" (Higate et al., qtd in Kimmel et al., 2005:434).

Cynthia Enloe explains that "militarization occurs because some people's fears are allowed to be heard, while other people's fears are trivialized and silenced" (1993: 246). She goes on to argue that "militarization of any nationalist movement occurs through the gendered workings of power" (1993: 246). Hence, political and ideological in essence, these culturally and socially promoted values are assumed to be natural within the society and, thereby, become hegemonic through a creation of military culture that equates the enactment of military traits and values with performing an ideal type of masculinity. The military, therefore, is an institution that demands men to be willing to kill and die on behalf of their nations to prove that they are masculine enough (Sjoberg, 2010: 8). It is on account of this link between militarization and masculinity that "men are under constant pressure to prove their manhood by being tough, adversarial, and aggressive" (Peterson et al., 1999, 118). Since the military is a "highly legitimated and organized institution within most societies, men, not only can, but- to be successful- must prove their masculinity" (Peterson et al. 1999, 118).

In the late nineteenth century a specific mode of masculinity comes into being in accordance with the imperial aims of the nations that glorify muscular and militaristic masculinity (Segal, 2007: 91). Michael Roper characterizes this mode of muscular masculinity as being shaped by more aggressive and secular ideals through which "a particular value was placed on stoic endurance, that is the forbearance of pain and the suppression of sentiment" (2005: 347). Roper furthermore highlights the idea that in an age of imperial spread and international competition that is marked by military threat, the ideal mode of masculinity was foregrounded on the notion of self-control. In this way, boys are toughened into being men by being brought up through emotional restraint to accomplish their national duties (Roper, 2005: 347).

On the other hand, the Empire's endeavour to expand imperially through a military hegemonic masculinity is accomplished through the creation of some organizations echoing a military culture to promote racial and national superiority of British nation. For instance, youth organizations such as Boy Scout Movement and Boy's Brigade flourished in the nineteenth century Britain with the aim of educating young boys through sports and some activities of drilling. These organizations aimed to teach these young boys the virtues of manliness such as "self-reliance, determination leadership and

initiative" (Beynon, 2002: 28). Hence, set in pre-war years Boy Scout Movement and Boy's Brigade functioned to produce male company in which boys could be exposed to "the great outdoors far removed from the domestic and the feminine" (Beynon, 2002: 28), Likewise, the image of heroic active males with physical and mental strength is especially seen to be cultivated and culturally idealized by means of the public schools in pre-war years. In accordance with this, Joanna Bourke argues that public schools become a site of muscular Christianity that functions through "aggressive spirituality" and "physical prowess" (2001:13). Specifically, the peer influence within these organizations helped to shape boys' understanding of masculinity as they become more exposed and thus cognizant of a military culture and values of it around their world.

Therefore, it is understood that these military and nationalist ideals and cultural values prepared the ground for the accomplishment of a dominant mode of masculinity at the break of The First World War that took place between the years of 1914 and 1918. As given by Joanna Bourke, "in Britain, more than 5 million men – or 22 per cent of the male population - were active participant in military services" during the war, and at the end of it "9.5 million men of all nations were killed" (1996: 15). The British army most of the time fought against the German army at the Western Front situated near France and Belgium. With the invasion of Belgium, Luxembourg and some regions of France by the German forces, the soldiers of the British army were sent to the Western Front to halt the German advance in the area. At the outbreak of the war, the British men who fought the war were not conscripts or professional serviceman but were mostly volunteers who did not know much about the mechanized, modern warfare (Bourke, 1996: 15). As found out by Joanna Bourke, "when war was first declared, they had been mainly enthusiastic, middle-class volunteers, eager to do their bit when they had the chance" (1996: 15). Yet, she also argues that not all men were found to be fit to enlist in the army because of the national anxieties of the Britain that sees the men who do not perform virile, aggressive, military masculinity as a threat for its imperial prowess and national efficiency.

In accordance with this dispute, Joshua S. Goldstein puts that men's identities as soldiers were constructed through military homophobia in modern armies to feminize the enemies. Conceived as a threat for the construction of the aggressive, virile, sexually dominant heterosexual male soldiers, gay soldiers were seen as homosexual men who are effeminate and whose presence disrupts the homosocial unity that needs aggressive men

to dominate over and control the enemy seen as a woman. To that end, “in modern armies homosexuality was perceived as a threat to the essential, aggressive manliness of the soldiers, as well as to discipline and rule against the fraternizing across ranks” (Goldstein: 2001:374).

It is crucial to note that during the First World War, the transition from manoeuvre war to the trench warfare begins at the winter of 1914. The British lines had been situated at the areas of Ypres Salient in Flanders and Somme in Picardy protected by 800 battalions each of which had 1000 men. As remarked by Paul Fussell, being fifty yards away from the enemy front-line, “the British trenches were wet, cold, smelly and thoroughly squalid” (1989, 43). Yet, the worst was the sense of constraint, enclosure, disorientation and loss experienced by the soldiers in these trenches who only saw “the walls of an unlocalized, undifferentiated earth and the sky above” (Fussell, 1989: 51).Similarly, as mentioned in Major Frank Isherwood’s letter to his wife in December 1914, “the trenches are a labyrinth, I have already lost myself repeatedly . . . you can’t get out of them and walk about the country or see anything at all but two muddy walls on each side of you” (Fussell, 1989, 51).

Sjoberg et al. put that “soldiering is related to and is inseparable from masculinity, where masculinity is proved by soldiering, which is reliant on pre-existing (assumed) masculinity” (2010: 44). Accordingly, the characteristics of the idealized masculinities for soldiering come to be defined through “aggression, bravery, courage, service precision and protection” (2010:44). Therefore, the trench warfare with its new techniques through the use of machine guns, artillery, barbed-wire and its labyrinthine atmosphere of enclosure and constraint caused men to become unable to meet the demands of a military masculinity that bases itself upon the success in the war accomplished through “superior physical strength, incomparable male bonding, heroic risk taking, extremes of violence, and readiness to sacrifice one’s life for the cause” (Sjoberg et al., 2010: 23).

As is seen, these findings have helped to understand how a specific mode of masculinity is created through the intersection of war, militarism and masculinity. It has been revealed that the men, who do not fit into this hegemonic model of military masculinity, were marginalized or put in a subordinate position within a condition of less than manly. Hence, it becomes clear that during the First World War the constructions of

hegemonic masculinity made men feel compelled to join the war in order not be despised or labelled as a coward. However, not all men at the time of the war could live up to these hegemonic ideals of masculinity and as also disputed by Joanna Bourke, that "those who failed to adapt were not necessarily mentally inferior: they could be too 'individualistic' and thus unable to merge with the herd" (1996: 115).

In the *Trilogy,* Barker suggests that it is this gendered-violence shaping men into becoming ideal soldiers as heroic, sacrificial warriors that causes them to undergo mental and physical breakdowns. The chasm between their upbringing as heroic men and their inability to meet this heroic ideal during the war make them feel indeed helpless and deprived of power. In a sense, Barker presents that the war that requires them to repress their emotions to become an ideal soldier turns into a subversive area of minefield in which men's repressed emotions burst out leading up to their breakdowns. In this sense, her novels demonstrate how hegemonic constructions of masculinity at the time of the war clash with the lived reality of the men in the trenches, because during the years of the First World War, the pressures placed upon men to fit into a hegemonic mode of military masculinity became so immense that they became mentally ill and underwent nervous breakdowns showing symptoms of hysteria, paralysis, stammer, muteness, hallucinations. This was because the war deepened men's internal conflicts and anxieties regarding their conception of the war and masculinity.

Therefore, within the scope of this thesis the masculinities of these mentally damaged men of the war depicted in Barker's *Trilogy* will be explored to investigate how their masculinities came to be constructed in line with hegemonic ideals of masculinity in wartime Britain, to what extent they meet these hegemonic ideals, and in what way they are individually damaged while trying to negotiate with hegemonic modes of masculinities. Hence, in line with the discussions outlined above, in the next chapters of the thesis how the violence generated within the wartime Britain is shown by Barker to be linked with the societal expectations and constructions of masculinity will be discussed. Consequently, the idea that masculinity is a contested position of power that is open to question and it damages men the most will be illustrated through gender relations of domination and subordination specifically taking place among Barker's male characters and the impact they create upon these men's psychology and inner worlds of emotion.

CHAPTER TWO

WARRING MASCULINITIES AND DISEMPOWERMENT

2.1. Unfit for the Front, Silenced for the Front: Homosociality, Homophobia and Emasculation in *Regeneration*

Having a family background of dead, wounded, deaf, inarticulate, and stammering men as the legacy of the First World War in her personal life, Pat Barker has been one of the prominent figures of contemporary English literature in her concern for representing men and the war in unconventional ways. With the publication of her novel *Regeneration* in 1991, Barker brings a new vision into men's experiences of war and masculinity by handling these issues from the aspect of those men who cannot live up to hegemonic ideals of masculinity**.** Most especially, she manages to achieve this by employing the experiences of wounded, stammering, mute, hysteric, and shell-shocked men effected by the war. Hence, Barker's novelty lies in her attempt to investigate masculinity not as an empowering experience but rather as a disempowering one. To show this, the present chapter intends to analyse Barker's critique of hegemonic masculinity during the years of the First World War and the pressures men felt to conform to it by focusing on the characters' insecure and emasculated sense of masculinity represented in the novel.

As a matter of fact, this chapter will specifically focus on the issues of homosociality, homophobia and emasculation employed in the novel to delineate the dynamic, and relational nature of hegemonic masculinity in wartime Britain and to trace the damage and exploitation wrought on men by the hegemonic project itself. The physical disabilities and psychological breakdowns experienced by male characters of the novel will be revealed to be induced by their experiences of masculinity during the wartime Britain. In this context, war neurosis of the characters, which Barker depicts to be linked with the social construction of their masculinities will be examined with references to historical W.H.R. Rivers' thoughts on war neurosis. Also, throughout the chapter, a specific focus will be put on Barker's characters' experiences of silences and violences unfolding in the novel as the lived reality of their individual lives during their

attempt to comply with hegemonic ideals of masculinity in the context of the First World War.

Set in the Craiglockhart War Hospital that historically had acted as an actual medical institution of mental facility in Scotland during the years of the First World War, *Regeneration* surfaces the rehabilitation of some military men who underwent mental and physical breakdowns at the war front. The novel depicts the story of the men, who are deemed to be unfit for the requirements of the war, and thus taken to the Craiglockhart War Hospital to have mental treatment to be sent back to fight again. However, strikingly, the novel opens with the officer Siegfried Sassoon's letter of declaration speaking out against the war. As a highly accomplished and courageous officer who fought the war at many trenches, the discomfort Sassoon feels due to the violence conducted in the war results with his protest against it that he declares as follows:

> I am a soldier, convinced that I am acting on behalf of soldiers. I believe that this war, upon which I entered as a war of defence and liberation, has now become a war of aggression and conquest. I believe that the purposes for which I and my fellow soldiers entered upon this war should have been so clearly stated as to have made it impossible to change them, and that, had this been done, the objects which actuated us would now be attainable by negotiation (Barker, 1998: 5)

As mentioned earlier in the theoretical part of this thesis, the military as an institution of male power and dominance demands men to comply with a specific mode of masculinity by setting standards for men to aspire during the First World War. Such practices of masculinity as the accomplishment of one's duty to his nation, a sacrificial patriotism, having an athletic and healthy physique for active and heroic participation in wars, and to fight in courageous, aggressive and in a competitive way in the course of their soldiering come to characterize hegemonic ideals of masculinity established by the gender order of wartime Britain. In this respect, at the beginning of the novel it is observed that Barker manages to represent a reverse image of ideal soldier by employing the unexpected protest of the Sassoon against the war. Thereby, the opening of the novel presents a non-normative masculinity through the author's depiction of Sassoon as a man who refuses to fight and kill as he thinks that "the fighting men are being sacrificed" (Barker, 1998:5).

Yet, this unexpected protest of Sassoon causes the medical board of the army to diagnose him with war neurosis as he is seen as an emasculating threat for the military

success and imperial expansion of the British nation. Therefore, even at the very beginning of the novel Siegfried Sassoon is portrayed as a combatant whose masculinity shows deviations from the established definitions and manifestations of hegemonic masculinity in wartime Britain. He adopts a pacifist stance and objects against the aggression and violence maintained within the war; and thus, he refuses to fight. At this point Sassoon poses a challenge against a hegemonic mode of military masculinity through his repudiation of such qualities as aggression, conquest, fighting and violence. In this respect, he is portrayed by the author as man who cannot live up to hegemonic ideals of masculinity and thereby is put in a subordinate position being diagnosed with war neurosis. This exposes how hegemonic masculinity functions through the subordination of the dissenters or the shell-shocked soldiers in wartime Britain experienced as in the case of Sassoon.

It is for this reason that Craiglockhart War Hospital is described by Barker as a medical institution that becomes complicit with the ideals of hegemonic masculinity during the war. This war hospital serves as a homosocial area where the shell-shocked patients' masculinities, which show deviations from the hegemonic ideals of masculinity during their experiences of the war front, are not only tested for manliness but also aimed to be re-constructed along the axis of hegemonic masculinity of the wartime Britain. In other words, it is within this homosocial environment of the Craiglockhart that soldiers' and officers' performance of masculinities are watched, scrutinized, ranked, evaluated, and approved or disapproved. In a sense these emasculated men are to be re-masculinized by the military through the medical treatment they undergo at Craiglokhart.

In her study "Welcome to The Men's Club: Homosociality and The Maintenance of Hegemonic Masculinity" Sharon R. Bird draws attention to the relation between homosociality and hegemonic masculinity arguing that homosociality perpetuates hegemonic masculinity. She puts that "homosocial interaction, among heterosexual men, contributes to the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity norms by supporting meanings associated with identities that fit hegemonic ideals while suppressing meanings associated with non-hegemonic masculinity identities" (Bird, 1996: 121). Bird identifies these shared meanings homosociality produces to maintain hegemonic masculinity as "emotional detachment", "competitiveness" and sexual objectification of women" (1996:

121). Emotional detachment in homosocial interaction functions to draw clear identity boundaries for men by depicting the emotions typically associated with women to be inappropriate for men, because "to express feelings is to reveal vulnerabilities and weaknesses; to withhold such expressions is to maintain control" (Bird, 1996: 122-125). On the other hand, competition promotes hierarchy in relationships by creating gender identity for men that is based on distinction and separation (Bird, 1996: 122). Lastly, sexual objectification of women enables the conceptualization of male individuality through othering of women that construes the male "not only as different from female but as better than female" (Bird, 1996:121).

On the other hand, Brod and Kaufman assert that "masculinity as a homosocial enactment is fraught with danger, with the risk of failure, and with intense relentless competition" (Brod et al., 1994: 129). In addition, Kimmel's ideas on homophobia that have been outlined previously gives clues about how homosociality and homophobia promote men's emasculation, because as observed by Kimmel men "are under the constant careful scrutiny of other men" and they are watched, ranked and "granted acceptance into the realm of manhood" by other men. Hence, "manhood is demonstrated for other men's approval. It is other men who evaluate the performance" (2005a: 33). As a result, these critical debates have pointed out how through homosociality and homophobic interactions among men hegemonic masculinity is perpetuated and enacted, while non-hegemonic masculinities are emasculated by means of them.

Based on this, in *Regeneration*, not only the war front but also the Craiglockhart war hospital serve as the grounds where the characters are observed to establish their masculinities in a homosocial environment of danger, risk taking and constant competition, emotional detachment and sexual objectification of women. Also the homophobic "fear of humiliation"of not being seen a true men shapes their masculinities (Kimmel, 2005a: 30) By doing so, the novel exposes how men's negotiation with hegemonic masculinity is acted out through homosocial and homophobic enactment of their masculinities. In this sense, if the definition of the word "hart" as "male deer" is taken into consideration, it is also possible to interpret the word Craig-lock-hart etymologically as referring to this homosocaility and homophobia maintained both at the Craiglockhart Hospital and within gender order of wartime Britain. In this respect,

Craiglockhart reflects the social mechanism of gender in which men feel to be "hunted", namely emasculated, deprived of power, and effeminized.

This is given in the novel through the initial sessions of Sassoon with Rivers, whereby Rivers competitively attacks on Sassoon's masculine identity that he regards to be far from taking risks. Rivers, therefore, at the beginning contends that Sassoon's protest against the war causes him to lead a life of personal safety. As is mentioned earlier, as long as a man wears his uniform, goes to the front to fight aggressively and takes the risk of dying for the sake of his fellow soldiers and country, he will be able to prove that he is a true soldier and an ideal man that is masculine enough. To that end, Rivers tries to persuade Sassoon to go back to the front by intimidating him that: "the way I see it, when you put the uniform on, in effect you sign a contract. And you don't back out of a contract merely because you've changed your mind" (Barker, 1998:22). Certainly, in Rivers' view, wearing a military uniform is like signing a contract that signifies the risk men take for their lives in the name of their nations. In this respect, the war is reflected by the author as a battlefield of challenge in requiring men to prove their manliness by taking risks rather than to lead a life of personal safety.

It is crucial to note that in *Regeneration* Barker deliberately touches on historical Sassoon's poetry that adopts an anti-war stance especially after his experience of trench warfare. Sassoon's poetry is known to be informed by his pre-war and wartime experiences of masculinity that cause his poetic career to be composed of two conflicting distinct periods. His pre-war poetry lays special stress on patriotic undertones or militarist, nationalistic ideals of bravery, fearlessness, honor and the need for sacrificial deaths of the young soldiers for the sake of British national glory as conveyed in his poem *Absolution* (1916). However, his anti-war poetry that he begins to produce after his trench warfare experience critically reflects on such issues as the predicament of the soldiers in the trenches. While the violence and the brutality of militarist and nationalist ideals that send soldiers to death are dealt with in his poem such as *Suicide in the Trenches* (1918), the sacrifice and devastation of the young in the dug-outs of the war is addressed in his poem titled as *Dug-out* (1918).

Paul Fussell informs that the historical Sassoon was twenty-eight years old when he joined the army as a cavalry trooper at the break of the First World War (1989:90).

Soon he became an admired officer nicknamed as "mad jack" owing to his enthusiasm, bravery and success at Royal Welch Fusiliers and in France as a Second Lieutenant of Infantry (Fussel, 1989: 90). However, in 1917 Sassoon adopts an anti-war stance and begins to produce his "anti-war poems collected in the volume of the Old Huntsman in may". Following this he declares his protest against the war issuing his "A soldier's Declaration", for which he expects to be court-martialed (1989:91). Thanks to Robert Grave's interference he is taken to medical board at Craiglockhart to be cured due to his protest. However, as Fussell notes, Sassoon feels compelled to give up his protest as he is overwhelmed with a sense of guilt in abandoning his men and returns to the front. (1989: 91).

Barker bases her novel *Regeneration* upon this true story of the poet Siegfied Sassoon, who cannot accomplish their duty of active service and are to have sick leave. However, it seems that what most attracts Barker's attention in the novel is why Sassoon protests the war and then gives up his protest and goes back to the front again to fight. Paul Fussell explains this dichotomous case of Sassoon in relation to his poetry: "One of the most flagrant of dichotomies is that between pre-war and post-war Sassoon, between the "nice" unquestioning youth of good family, alternately athlete and dreamer, and the fierce moralist of 1917, surging with outrage and disdain" (1989: 90). It becomes clear that Sassoon begins to raise questions about the conduct of the war and the violence it maintains.

Just as in the case of historical Sassoon, the novel maintains that the fictional character Sassoon's confrontation with the violence of the war brings about a transformation in his conception of masculinity and the war, which no more becomes entirely patriotic and sacrificial. In other words, the war dismantles Sassoon's old established views and the secure grounds of his masculine identity resulting with his interrogation of such ideals as patriotism, heroism and sacrifice. He turns into a divided man torn between his duty to his nation and his protest against the violence that this duty demands from him. In a sense, he feels the pressure to fit into accepted model of manliness construed during the war but at the same time tries to resist this pressure through his protest and anti-war poetry. As a matter of fact, Barker depicts Sassoon as a man marked by his internal conflict between duty and protest. Moreover, this conflict he experiences comes to complicate and interrogate his sense of masculinity. His war

neurosis therefore stems from this conflict he undergoes between duty and protest, and this psychologically damages him to the extent that he leads a life of depressed man seeing nightmares and hallucinations. By showing this, Barker, therefore, wants the reader to question the damage and victimization wrought on men in making them live up to hegemonic ideals of wartime masculinity. Thus, according to Barker, it becomes clear that killing or dying in the wars has nothing to do with true patriotism and heroism, but rather these practices of violence are ideologically imposed on men to validate their masculine identities as ideal patriots or heroes.

Throughout the novel, together with that of Sassoon, other patients' shell-shocked condition is shown to have been highly coterminous with the social construction of their masculinities. In this respect, within the fictional universe of the novel shellshock is described not as a pathological illness but as a condition caused by men's experiences of wartime hegemonic masculinity, to which they cannot live up. This is because, being an area of contestation "war invites men to manliness (Mosse, 1996:34), but at the same time it disempowers them by presenting an uncontrollable challenge against their established sense of masculinity.

This communicates across what historical Rivers points out on the formation of shell-shock or war neurosis in his book *Instinct and The Unconscious*: "Neurosis of war depends on a conflict between instinct of self-preservation and acquired social standards" (Rivers, 1920:130). According to him, shell-shock or in other words war neurosis is caused not by the actual physical experience of shell explosion but by their military training and duty that are based on the repression of fear. Therefore, as put by Rivers "if the repression is incomplete, it produces and maintains neurosis" (Rivers, 1920: 137). In this way, River's ideas on repression and neurosis indicates that since the military demands men to repress their feelings of fear to be manly, the atmosphere of the war that renders men more passivized, confined and helpless in the trenches leads men to become unable to repress their fear, and thus they break down.

The novel, therefore, exposes how men experience the war as a constant threat for their manliness that needs to be constantly proved. Being unable to enact the demands of hegemonic masculinity since they feel removed from the social actions and practices enabling them to exercise their power and control, Barker's men in the trenches are shown

to be passivized and thus disempowered. To be more precise, as is in Sandra Gilbert words, “paradoxically, in fact, the war to which so many men had gone in hope of becoming heroes, ended up emasculating them [. . .] confining them as closely as any Victorian woman had been confined” (1983: 447-48).

In her study on male hysteria, Elaine Showalter detects a reciprocal relationship between shellshock and masculinity. She argues that male hysteria is assumed to have a feminine aspect by the society since hysteria is identified with both effeminacy and homosexuality (1985:172). However, Showalter opposes associating male hysteria with femininity and characterizes it as a form of male protest arguing that “if the essence of manliness was not to complain, then shell shock was the body language of masculine complaint, a disguised male protest not only against the war but against the concept of "manliness" itself” (1985:172). Hence, male hysteria becomes “a protest against the politicians, generals, and psychiatrists” (Showalter, 1985:172). In this sense, Barker’s employment of the symptoms of shell shock, such as hysteria, paralysis, hallucinations, nightmares, stammering, and mutism experienced by the soldiers, do not serve within the novel to promote normative definitions for what unheroic or failed men come to mean. Rather their symptoms of shellshock are utilized by the author to show how men’s attempts to become ideal heroes work at the expense of their inner worlds. Their symptoms are therefore emotional and psychological responses of them against hegemonic ideals of masculinity with which their individual experiences of masculinity cannot comply.

Within this context, it is especially pointed out in the novel that the control and repression of men’s own emotions, which feature the pre-war Victorian masculinity and wartime muscular masculinity, becomes intolerable for men. This is because they confront how uncontrollable their emotions and feelings are in the face of the war, which, as a result renders them powerless and helpless. To put in Elaine Showalter’s words “that most masculine of enterprises, the Great War, the “apocalypse of masculinism” feminized its conscripts by taking away their sense of control” (1985:173).

In *Regeneration*, the way the First World War functions as what Showalter calls as “the apocalypse of masculinism” is conveyed through Rivers’ findings that neurosis is not induced by the horror or fear of the trench warfare but by the conflict between

masculine upbringing of men and their experience of feminine passivity in the trenches. Brought up with the stories of adventure, men were made to experience the war as a "Great Adventure" that would enable them to perform their masculinity as a position of power and control. Yet, Rivers gradually becomes aware of the paradox of war as the war's project of "mobilization" turned out to be reverse because men, feeling constricted during the war, became unable to perform manly activity with a sense of helplessness and powerlessness in the holes of trenches, and therefore, as stressed by Rivers in the novel, they broke down:

> Mobilization. The Great Adventure. They'd been mobilized into holes in the ground so constricted they could hardly move. And the Great Adventure-the real life equivalent of all the adventure stories they'd devoured as boys-consisted of crouching in a dugout, waiting to be killed. The war that had promised so much in the way of "manly" activity had actually delivered "feminine" passivity, and on a scale that their mothers and sisters had scarcely known. No wonder they broke down. (Barker, 1998: 98)

Hence, Rivers increasingly comes to realize through his sessions with the officers that it is not innate weaknesses of men that incite men to suffer breakdown during the war. He, rather, recognizes that it is men's inability to meet the hegemonic standards of masculinity that puts pressures on them. This ultimately causes them to turn into failed men on their way to become heroes. This link between war and masculinity is further uncovered by the author to interrogate the justifiability of war and its effects on shaping the constructions of masculinity. Rivers becomes aware of this fact and his way of coping with it through his own psychic suppression of it is given in his words below:

> As soon as you accepted that the man's breakdown was a consequence of his war experience rather than of his own innate weakness, then inevitably war became the issue. And the therapy was a test, not only of the genuineness of the individual's symptoms, but also of the validity of the demands the war was making on him. Rivers had survived partly by suppressing his awareness of this. But then along came Sassoon and made the justifiability of the war a matter for constant, open debate, and that suppression was not longer possible. (Barker, 1998:104-105)

At Craiglockhart, it is with the arrival of Sassoon that the justifiability of war and its demands from men are called into question. In this sense, not only his letter of declaration that speaks out his protest against the war but also his attitudes and opinions he expresses to Rivers at Craiglockhart can be seen as throwing a criticism on how the war is legitimized and men are made to participate in the violence of the war. Yet, despite his awareness for these bitter facts, which he indeed tries to suppress in order to keep his position of power, Rivers, throughout a larger part of the novel, tries to convince Sassoon to give up his protest against the war to make him go back to the front again uttering that:

"If you maintain your protest, you can expect to spend the remainder of the war in a state of complete personal safety [...] You don't think you might find being safe while other people die rather difficult? (Barker, 1998: 36).

Hence, unlike the soldiers and officers at the war front being in danger and leading unsafe life conditions, Sassoon is intentionally encompassed with a more sense of comfort and safety at Craiglockhart. When compared to the underprivileged positions of men at the front, Sassoon is allowed to have access to a more privileged and powerful position through such practices of masculinity as playing golf, joining a food club of eminent men, and having better conditions of personal comfort and hygiene at Craiglockhart. By providing Sassoon with such a privilege and power, Rivers, indeed, tries to feminize and subordinate Sassoon by making himself feel unconsciously guilty in the face of the underprivileged group of men. These men to whom Sassoon's identity is put in opposition are fighting in unsafe, uncomfortable, and poor conditions, and risking their lives at the front, which, eventually becomes influential on Sassoon's decision to turn back to the front.

Thus, the guilt Sassoon is overwhelmed with makes him feel compelled to take more risk and responsibility as a man. In a way, he feels forced to negotiate with the wartime hegemonic masculinity. Hence, his negotiation with wartime hegemonic masculinity is accomplished through his decision to go back to the front to sacrifice himself for his fellow soldiers whose lives are in danger. In this respect, it is crucial to note that the novel presents how the world of danger and adventure the war promises for men clashes with the world of personal safety and comfort outside the war. Accordingly, this shows the social mechanism regarding why men participate in wars.

As mentioned earlier within the theoretical part of this thesis concerning the social construction of masculinity, men's tendency for personal safety and an avoidance of danger and risk-taking are socially associated with men's cowardice. In other words, not to be labelled as a coward or a sissy by the society they live in, men forsake their safety and engage with the world of danger and adventure by taking risk to die or kill in the wars. To that end, it can be suggested that what drives Sassoon to decide to go back to the front is linked with the social construction of his masculine identity as he is left to

choose between cowardice and courage by means of the challenge Rivers poses against his masculinity to reproduce it in line with the hegemonic model.

On the other hand, Rivers' masculine identity that is socially constructed through his duty to restore the mental health of the patients is problematized and undermined by means of his own therapeutic method. The doctor-patient relationship employed in the novel serves to reveal both Rivers' own inner conflicts and that of his patients. As a matter of fact, Rivers' therapeutic sessions with the patients unexpectedly turn the mirror to his inner world. Therefore, he comes to understand the social mechanism upon which his masculinity is built, and the role of men's repressed emotions in maintaining this mechanism that shape not only the patients' masculinity and their attitudes to war but also that of his own.

In his work *Instinct and The Unconscious*, the historical Rivers pinpoints how men's repression of fear is linked with the construction of masculinity and notes that "it is not repression in itself which is harmful, but repression under conditions in which it fails to adapt the individual to his environment" (1920:116). According to historical Rivers, it is the repression of fear that allows soldiers to be able to return to their military duties while the failure of repression paves the way for the soldiers to break down under the conditions of stress induced by warfare. As an unconscious act of banishing some disturbing thoughts and feelings from his mind, repression indicates a man's attempt to practice his masculinity through the disregard of his own emotions and thoughts.

This is witnessed in the novel when especially Rivers tries to establish his authority over his patients, which he achieves through emotional repression of his own. Especially, his questions in the sessions give clues about the fact that he is, in fact, both the victim and victimizer of the patriarchal order. This becomes further manifest through Rivers' past life that is portrayed to be overwhelmed with his father's exercise of power and authority over him. As a result of his troubled relationship with his father on account of his father's authority and power over him, he develops a problematic father-son relationship with his patients as well. Because, as put forward by Michael Kimmel, "the boy has come to identify with his oppressor; now he can become the oppressor himself. (2005a, 31). Hence, throughout the sessions he acts like an authoritarian father who represses his feelings to exercise his authority over his patients and thus prove his

manliness. In this case, his stammering becomes the indicator of his problematic relationship both with his own father and the society he lives in, who are the agents of oppression and authority for Rivers in making him to conform. Therefore, the same oppression is further traced in his treatment of his patients for whom Rivers acts like a father sacrificing his sons in his attempt to heal them to turn back to their duties, and thereby becoming complicit with the hegemonic project.

On the other hand, like Rivers, Sassoon is depicted as a man who has a troubled relationship with his father as well. The reader is informed that when Sassoon is five years old his father leaves home, and three years later dies. Grown up as a fatherless boy, he develops a split personality that is divided between socially inscribed public world of masculinity and the private world of femininity as he feels lost and disoriented after his father's death. If his father was alive, Sassoon thinks, he would have "better education," but instead, he becomes more interested both in cricketing, hunting and in poetry and music on which he confesses to Rivers that

> the result was I went nowhere…I mean, there was the riding, hunting, cricketing me, and then there was the … the other side … that was interested in poetry and music, and things like that. And I didn't seem able to … He laced his fingers. Knot them together." (Barker, 1998:33).

In the second half of the 19th century with the growing impact of the industrial revolution that promoted the division of labour men were consigned into the public sphere of work and factories while the domestic world of home was the place consigned to women (Beynon, 2002: 18). Henceforth patriarchal order at that time based itself both on men's financial superiority over women and on the idea that men, unlike women "were innately practical, rational and competitive" (Beynon,2002: 18). Moreover, a substantial attempt to "re-masculinize men through sport and outdoor activities" prevailed the era (Beynon, 2002: 18). A growing interest in men's bodily health, strength, physical skills and discipline came to the fore through such sports as rugby and cricketing to cultivate a Victorian masculinity that's characterized by "mental and physical toughness" (Beynon, 2002: 41) To that end, physical fitness and toughness of men came to bear importance for national and Imperial well-being, military readiness and commercial success" (Beynon, 2002, 47).

Feeling trapped between these polarized public and private spheres of gender Sassoon, therefore, develops skills for both spheres, because of which he feels living in-

between these spheres with two distinct Sassoons. Thus, Sassoon's protest against the war can be linked to this in-between identity of him sourced by the absence of his father in his life. He feels himself to be neither feminine nor entirely masculine. As a matter of fact, the problematic relationship between Sassoon and his father is so influential on Sassoon's masculine identity that he becomes uncomfortable and anxious about his own masculinity. This, in a way, leads him to construct his masculinity in opposition to figures and instruments of authority and power as in the case of his protest for the war and the military practices. This becomes further manifest in one of his sessions with Rivers when Sassoon mentions a painter, Richard Dadd, who had murdered his own father, and thereby was kept in a lunatic asylum. As Sassoon talks about Richard Dadd describing him as a man who "made a list of old men in power who deserved to die, and fortunately – or or otherwise – his father's name headed the list" (Barker, 1998:33). Addressing him as "Richard Dadd of glorious mind," Sassoon indeed identifies himself with Richard because Richard's patricide, which is motivated by his denial of his father's authority and power, can be associated with Sassoon's own desire to kill his own father. Therefore, symbolically, this comes to represent his opposition against his father or any figures of power and authority within the society as well. However, surprisingly, to Rivers Sassoon admits that "I think the army's probably the only place I've ever really belonged" (Barker, 1998: 33). In this way Barker indicates how Sassoon's military experience dismembers him as he feels himself belonging only to the army.

Robert Nye puts that, "military training de-individualizes men and prepares them for sacrifice" (2007:430). In addition, Joanna Bourke draws attention to how the pressure men felt to conform to societal expectations of masculinity enforces them to be sacrificial heroes whose mutilated or disabled bodies are dignified. She argues that the ones who cannot perform heroic masculinity in a sacrificial spirit feel less dignified because "certain aspects of being a man is believed to be threatened" (Bourke,1996: 5). Likewise, Sassoon is dismembered by the hegemonic ideals of sacrifice and patriotism maintained by the wartime Britain. Hence, as a dismembered man whose individuality has been eroded by the military state, he feels himself compelled to accomplish his duty although he is against any form of exercise of power and control, and violence.

In the novel, Sassoon's dismemberment as an ideal soldier is depicted in parallel with the dismemberment experienced by Burns, who is another shell-shocked officer

treated at Craiglockhart under the guide of Rivers. Although the patients are allowed to be outside the surrounding of the hospital, Burns is one of the patients who rarely goes out of the hospital and mostly chooses to stay inside. However, wearing his coat on a rainy day, Burns walks to the gate to go away from the hospital. Passing by a country lane he climbs up a hill and arrives at a wood running among mud and trees. This act of Burns can be interpreted as stemming from his insecure sense of masculinity he is overwhelmed with at Craiglockhart. As further implied by the narrator Burns was also encompassed by a sense of disorientation to the extent that "he didn't know where he was going, or why, but thought he had to take shelter, and began to run clumsily along the brow of a hill towards a distant clump of trees" (Barker, 1998:35). Following this, Burns stands under a tree on whose branches dead animals are hung. Here, it can be suggested that the corpses of the dead animals hung on the tree come to represent the soldiers and men of British nation in the war even whose corpses are dismembered. Hence, Burns' experience of disorientation and dismemberment he confronts in the wood reinforces his sense of insecurity He releases the dead animals from the tree's branches and lays their corpses on the ground. After drawing a circle with the dead bodies of the animals he sits in the middle and undresses.

Men become anxious about being manly enough when they are unable to maintain a status of power within the society and in their individual lives. They feel insecure not only about their place and status within the gender hierarchy but also about expressing their emotions and inner lives. Likewise, Burns feels anxious about being manly enough due to his contested position of power within gender hierarchy on account of the emasculating effect of the war and other men. This, therefore increases Burns' insecurity. In this respect, Burns' undressing himself among dead animals conveys his sense of insecure masculinity that leads him to desire to get rid of his uniform and genitals, which he perceives to be incongruous with his true sense of self and belonging. As the narrator reveals, "his naked body was white as a root. He cupped his genitals in his hands, not because he was ashamed, but because they looked incongruous, they didn't seem to belong with the rest of him" (Barker, 1998:37). In a way, Burns turns into man who doubts about his prescribed masculinity with which he cannot comply and never comes to terms. Eventually, by uniting with the dead bodies of animals on the ground, Burns wants to get rid of khaki uniform, his genitals and masculine identity that the army imposes on him to be a man in power and with the power to kill.

On the other hand, Burns' release of the corpses of dead animals points out his response to the deliberate dismemberment of the soldier by the state against which he protests by arranging dead bodies in circle and sitting next to them naked. David J Morgan puts forth that "the uniform absorbs individualities into a generalized and timeless masculinity, while also connoting a control of emotion and a subordination to a larger rationality" (qtd. in Brod et al., 1994: 166). In accordance with this, Burns' nakedness indicates his attempt to regain his individuality that has been obliterated through a military mode of masculinity demanding him to control his emotions. Now, naked in the wood among the corpses of dead animals, his confession that "this was the right place. This was where he wanted to be" points out how he feels more secure and freed from the limitations and pressures caused by the social construction of his masculine identity (Barker, 1998: 37). In this context, the novel employs the motif of nakedness to suggest the idea that men should be stripped of their masculine identities conferred on them restrictively and oppressively if they are to regenerate as free individuals.

Bourke suggests that men's military existence which was characteristically based upon aggression and stoic manners leads them to long for "the homoerotic world of manly nurturing and emotiveness" (1996: 25). Likewise, in *Regeneration* Barker also figures out how a nourishing and an intimate relationship among men can become an antidote for the social and individual ills sourced by the aggressive and stoic constructions of masculinity as hegemonic ideal leading men to come. This fact is evidenced in the novel when Burns turns back to the hospital at six o'clock in the evening in exhaustion, mud and hunger for the solace and relief he hopes to have under another man's care, namely Rivers. When he falls asleep after his arrival at the hospital and then wakes up, Burns "finds Rivers sitting by his bed, unaware of being observed, tired and patient, he realized he'd come back for this" (Barker, 1998:38). Therefore, the author establishes a homoerotic and nurturing doctor-patient relationship between Rivers and Burns that envisions men's admittance and display of emotions among themselves as a panacea for the violences generated by their experiences of masculinity and the war.

In the fifth part of the novel, Billy Prior is introduced to the reader as a second lieutenant with an appearance of "a thin, fair-haired young man of twenty-two, suffering from such mental disorders of amnesia, nightmares, and mutism (Barker, 1998: 40). It is mentioned in the novel that since the day Prior arrived at the Craiglockhart he hasn't

spoken to anybody yet, and he only communicates with his psychiatrist Rivers by writing on a pad in block capitals owing to his mutism. Initially, Prior is depicted as an amnesiac man who does not remember what had happened to him before he was taken to Craiglockhart, about which he just tells Rivers “I DON’T REMEMBER” (Barker, 1998:40). When Rivers wants to examine Prior to check physical symptoms of his mutism, Prior reacts him by writing in block capitals that “THERE IS NOTHING PHYSICALLY WRONG” (Barker, 1998:39). As seen, Prior himself is aware that his mutism is caused by some deeper psychological reasons rather than physical ones, which suggests that he is trying to communicate his protest for the violence he encountered both in the trenches and at Craiglockhart by unconsciously keeping his body mute and silent.

Prior appears to be the only character who is highly aware of the gender inequality and hierarchy not only between men and women but also among men. He senses that Rivers is exercising power and authority over him thanks to his superior position in the army. Rivers’ status and authority causes him to feel that he is constantly being questioned, examined, and surveyed by him as his patient. To that end, he continually rejects submitting to the authority of Rivers. On the day when Prior’s voice is suddenly restored, Rivers realizes that Prior has a “thinner, more defensive. And, at the same time a lot tougher voice” (Barker, 1998:45). Even the characteristic of Prior’s voice indicates that he does not want to be controlled by and submit to the authority of any man as is exemplified through the antagonistic doctor-patient relationship between him and Rivers. In this sense, Prior’s answers to Rivers during the sessions become subversive of Rivers’ authority in his profession both as a doctor and a military officer. For instance, When Rivers begins to examine Prior’s file by asking some questions about the symptoms of his illness, Prior opposes River’s way of treatment by saying that “all the questions from you, all the answers from me. Why can’t it be both ways” (Barker, 1998: 47).

Here, it is presented that Prior defies Rivers’ authority by claiming his desire to reverse their roles: him as the doctor, and Rivers as the patient. In a way, Prior is shown to be challenging the prescribed positions of him and Rivers in that he attempts to become a dominating man while he desires to turn Rivers into a dominated one. By doing so, Prior, indeed, seeks to have an equal access to power with the ones who hold positions of power. Hence, Barker’s reversal of the positions of power and dominance among these two men points out the fact that masculinity is never a fixed role attributed to men, but it

is a position always unstable and contested, open to question and change depending upon what defines the conception of masculine power and one's access to this power.

Meanwhile, the dream Rivers sees about his colleague Head's painful experiment of nerve regeneration leads Rivers to question his attempt to validate his masculine authority as a doctor through the method of treatment he used for his patients. He realizes that his method that insists on his patients to remember the disturbing events of their past inflicts so much pain on them. Indeed, here it seems that, Rivers' dream-self experiences a conflict between his duty to go on with his method of treatment and his desire to not to cause pain or torture for his patients through his way of treatment of them. Rivers, therefore, becomes aware that the method he uses to treat them functions against the grain of their upbringing. Hence, as the narrator reveals:

In leading his patients to understand that breakdown was nothing to be ashamed of, that horror and fear were inevitable responses to the trauma of war and were better acknowledged than suppressed, that feelings of tenderness for other men were natural and right, that tears were an acceptable and helpful part of grieving, he was setting himself against the whole tenor of their upbringing. (Barker, 1998: 44).

In this case, it is noteworthy to remark that what Rivers is trying to do by making the patients talk about their fears and emotions is to confront them with their inner tensions, conflicts and repressed emotional responds that are sourced by their attempt to negotiate with hegemonic masculinity. Through Rivers' talking sessions, Barker's male characters come to recognize their fears and emotions repressed by them to become a proper man. This emotional repression is revealed to be imposed on them during their upbringing since their boyhood, because, as put by the narrator: "they had been trained to identify emotional repression as the essence of manliness. Men who broke down, or cried, or admitted to feeling fear, were sissies, weaklings, failures. Not men" (Barker, 1998:44).

Even though Rivers demands his patients not to repress their emotions, the novel shows him to be constantly leading an adult life of emotional repression because, as is revealed by the narrator, "Rivers himself was a product of the system," but ironically enough, during the sessions, he encourages his patients not to repress their emotions that would serve to be the cure for their mental and bodily regeneration. By doing so, Rivers recognizes that "he was excavating the ground he stood on," (Barker, 1998:44) namely the ground of established gender order and hegemonic masculinity. To put in other words, Barker tries to communicate the idea that the true regeneration of men would be possible

only by undermining the secure ground upon which men construed their masculinity. Within the fictional universe of the novel, this can be achieved through men's attempts to admit their despised and repressed emotions such as fear and tenderness into their consciousness, which would be possible "only at the cost of redefining what it meant to be a man" (Barker, 1998: 45). To put it shortly, it seems that Barker offers men to break their silence about their emotions and feelings in order to regenerate themselves and the world.

In order to show that men need to regenerate themselves by redefining their conception of masculinity, Barker presents a detailed picture of Prior's masculinity that needs regenerating. Prior's conception of masculinity mainly hinges on fulfilling his duty to his nation by fighting to death, his avoidance of emotional expression and his practice of violence. In fact, his masculinity is directly influenced by his upbringing and the problematic relationship of him with his father. Since his boyhood the power struggle between the father and the son is shaped through a hierarchical relationship of domination and subordination among them. This leads Prior to feel emasculated and disempowered due to which he constantly feels himself compelled to assert his masculinity.

This is exemplified in the novel through Prior's father's visit at Craiglockhart when he comes to talk with Rivers about his son Billy Prior. Physically, the father, Mr Prior, is described as "a big thick-set man with a ruddy complexion, dark hair sleeked back, and a luxuriant, drooping, reddish-brown moustache" (Barker, 1998: 51), suggesting the physical appearance of a dominant male. The reader is informed through Mr. Prior's account of his son's past life to Rivers that Billy Prior was working as a clerk in a shipping office by which he could get nowhere. His father thinks that Billy's ambition is caused by his mother's influence on his upbringing by schooling and drilling him. As a result, Mr Prior becomes scornful of his son as observed in his claim that "she's made a stool-arsed jack on him" (Barker, 1998: 52). Unlike his wife, Mr Prior wants to raise Billy as a tough, invincible and a domineering boy. However, Billy grows up as a weak boy in contrast to father's expectations of him. He is described to be constantly assaulted by a boy at school causing him to come home forever crying. Mr Prior feels compelled to interfere with this act of bullying Billy experiences as a boy and goes on narrating the event as follows:

> And one day I thought, well, I've had enough of this. So the next time he come in blubbing I give him a backhander and shoved him out the door. There he was, all tears and snot, yelling his bloody head off. He says, he's waiting for us, our Dad. I says, go on, then. You've got to toughen 'em up, you know, in our neighbourhood. If you lie down there's plenty to walk over you (Barker, 1998:52)

Billy's father's influence on the construction of his son's masculinity, therefore, is shown through his indoctrination on Billy to be a tough boy. Mr. Prior regards it to be an indicator of weakness if a boy is beaten up or cries. Likewise, Billy is expected by his father to obey socially set norms of hegemonic masculinity by fighting or not showing his emotions and fears. To that end, Mr. Prior dominates over his son to conform to a hegemonic form of masculinity by making him resort to violence. As evidenced from his father's words that Billy "didn't just hit him, he half bloody murdered him" (Barker, 1998: 52) Billy's masculinity as a boy is both tested and validated through a practice of physical violence he accomplishes within a rivalling power relationship with another boy.

Brod et al. argue that when men feel powerless and feel oppressed by other men, they strive to display exaggerated forms of masculinity in order to assert their power over them. They put that "marginalized and subordinated men, then, tend to display exaggerated embodiments and verbalizations of masculinity that can be read as a desire to express power over others within a context of relative powerlessness" (Brod et al., 1994:214). In this respect, on account of his powerlessness Billy always tries to assert his masculinity aggressively among his peers. By doing so, he tries to resist his father's exercise of authority and power over him only through performing his masculinity in an exaggerated way by wielding his power over other boys. Hence, Billy's relationship with his peers and his father, which turns into a relation of domination and subordination, becomes constitutive of his masculinity as a performance of violence, which he feels compelled to display in order not to be seen powerless, and despised as less than manly.

On the other hand, as a man of working-class descent, Mr. Prior's masculinity is shown in the novel to be threatened and emasculated especially by the middle-class men who keep power at hand economically and socially. To that end, since his wife is from the upper-class society, he occasionally accuses her of being ignorant for his own class-based predicament putting forth that "but you know nothing about the common people. You've had nothing to do with them" (Barker, 1998: 54). Hence, Prior's father's working-class masculinity that is based on hard work, physical strength and endurance is constructed in opposition to the middle-class masculinity and its values of comfort,

leisure, and financial power, which are represented in the novel through his wife's way of living and thinking. Described as "a small upright woman, neatly dressed in dark suit and mauve blouse" with "a carefully genteel voice" and in "fading prettiness," Prior's mother's physical appearance and manners are drawn in a sharp contrast with that of his father's to underscore the conflicting class affiliations of them (Barker, 1998: 53).

John Beynon puts that "middle-class men can wield institutional power" whereas hard labour is valorised for working-class men" (2002: 20). Hence, Prior's father's working-class origin marks him to be a victim of the social class system that exalts middle-class masculinity as a hegemonic ideal to aspire. Unable to live up to this hegemonic ideal Mr. Prior feels this pressure on him that renders him as a powerless, emasculated man. In this context, trying to assert his masculinity as a breadwinner, who earns more than his son, Billy's father attempts to maintain his power and dominance at home over his wife and son, and thereby he becomes scornful of them, whom he sees to be weaker and inferior to himself. This is because "working-class men experience little formal power in the workplace, and as a consequence of this, will frequently adopt macho identities to mask this powerlessness and compensate by dominating in the home" (Beynon, 2002:20). Therefore, the reason why Mr. Prior acts out a tough, domineering, and violent masculinity that leads him up to despise his wife and his son stems from his past life of powerlessness in the workplace and the hardship he had to endure since his boyhood. As Mrs. Prior further reveals about her husband, "he's had a hard life. I don't deny that. A lot harder than it need have been, because his mother sent him to work when he was ten" (Barker, 1998: 54).

Barker's employment of this troubled father-son relationship helps her to criticize how class distinctions create more inequalities among men that also intensify men's sense of emasculation. She therefore shows how these class distinctions shape working-class men into performing more violent modes of masculinity. For instance, the domestic violence Prior and his mother experience at home due to his father's aggressive despise on them is shown in the novel to be sourced by Mr. Prior's marginal class status. In this respect, effected by his father's dominance and authority over him, and also becoming conscious of the class distinction, Prior feels himself emasculated and deprived of power. It is for this reason that he wants to participate the war to claim power and prove his manliness.

However, in the eyes of his father, Prior never becomes a proper man despite he joins the war. The only feeling he has for his son is still contempt; and he does not feel "proud" of him because "he's neither fish nor fowl" (Barker, 1998:52). This is because, raised largely by his mother, Prior seems to be effeminized according to his father. On the day Mr. Prior goes to see Rivers to talk about Prior's condition at Craiglockart he reveals his contempt for his son more intensely; because he prefers seeing his son to be wounded in the war by a bullet rather than seeing him being hospitalized in a mental facility centre. Hence, Prior's present shell-shocked case clashes with the heroic ideal of warrior masculinity which his father expects him to perform in the army. Prior's inability to meet this ideal therefore frustrates and disgraces his father and this results with Mr. Prior's despise for his son: "he'd get a damn sight more sympathy from me if he had a bullet up his arse" (Barker, 1998: 53).

Yet, the novel also maintains that not only the civilian life but also the war front is overwhelmed by class distinctions. As shown through Prior's eyes "it helps if you've been to the right school. It helps if you hunt, it helps if your shirts are right colour. Which is a deep shade of khaki, by the way" (Barker, 1998: 60). Through these words of Prior Barker communicates that belonging to "the right school," dealing with hunting and wearing a uniform of "deep shade of khaki" upper class men become "more welcomed" in comparison to working-class men who are marginalized, lack any status and power (Barker, 1998: 60). Thus, Prior feels to be emasculated by the class distinctions he encountered both at home and at the war front as he directly expresses:

> The only thing that really makes me angry is when people at home say there are no class distinctions at the front… Ball-ocks. What you wear, what you eat. Where you sleep. What you carry. The men are pack animals" (Barker, 1998: 61)

However, it should be stated that Prior develops an unstable sense of masculinity that moves between both marginalized and hegemonic forms of masculinities. This instability of his masculinity is induced by his father's working-class origins and his mother's middle-class descent. This in between identity of him is symbolized in the novel through his description of the colour of his shirt as "nowhere near" (Barker, 1998: 60). In this sense, Prior's masculinity is constructed as neither totally hegemonic, nor totally marginalized but moves between centre and margin because of which he feels his masculinity to be fitting in nowhere. Hence, feeling himself as belonging to nowhere completely, Prior feels emasculation intensely and tries to overcome it by fitting into

accepted, ideal mode of manliness, which is joining the army. All in all, as his name suggests, what emasculates Prior is this prioritization of some other men over him owing to the gender order of Wartime Britain that provides upper class men with certain positions of power and dominance.

As a matter of fact, Prior's mutism, namely his silence about what he feels, indeed becomes sourced by his attempt to negotiate with the hegemonic masculinity of wartime Britain. Barker shows that brought up to repress his emotions and fears since his boyhood both by his family and by the society, Prior strives to live up to hegemonic ideals of masculinity by avoiding to express his feelings. He directly implies this fact in his talking cure session with Rivers by claiming that "you can make me dredge up the horrors, you can make me remember the deaths, but you will never make me feel" (Barker, 1998: 72). In his attempt to make Prior recover from his lost memories of the front, Rivers largely strives for making Prior remember his past life of front to make him express his feelings, about which he keeps his silence.

According to Rivers, Prior is suffering from "inhuman detachment". This remoteness of him even hinders Rivers to sense Prior's true emotions (Barker, 1998: 72). Since men's expression of their feelings, their need for help, intimacy and forging emotional bonds are not approved in wartime gender order, upon confronting this fact, Prior is portrayed to be overwhelmed with a sense of rage; because he discovers that being a man means to dissociate oneself and thus to repudiate everything associated with the feminine. Unable to do this, Prior turns into a divided man who wants to integrate with the feminine side of him by acknowledging his emotions. However, his experience of wartime masculinity puts pressures on him not to integrate with it if he is to be approved by the society as an ideal man. Hence, while narrating about the day of attack on which he lost his memory and became totally unconscious, Prior even denies feeling any sense of fear and instead remarks how exulted he feels:

> Where we were, it was absolutely pitted with shell-holes and the lines got broken up straight away… I looked back and the ground was covered with wounded. Lying on top of each other, writhing. Like fish in a pond that's drying out. I wasn't frightened at all. I just felt this. . . amazing burst of exultation. Then I heard a shell coming. And the next thing I knew I was in the air, fluttering down" (Barker, 1998: 73)

Hence, despite witnessing his fellow soldiers dying in a shell explosion and their corpses scattered around him, Prior goes on fighting until being shell-bombed by displaying no sense of fear as its display would be an indicator of weakness and femininity for him. It

is from that moment on that he does not remember anything. This may illustrate the fact that it is Prior's repression of fear rather than being shell-bombed that causes his loss of memory.

As a solution to Prior's shell-shocked condition, Rivers insists on Prior to remember his lost memories because, by doing so, Rivers believes that Prior will recover from war neurosis. Yet, Prior is also aware that Rivers is caring for him and other patients on account of his military duty to make them fit to the front. To that end, he implies Rivers' complicity saying that "You know, you once told me I had to win. . . You are the one who has to win" (Barker, 1998: 73). Yet, Rivers attempts to negate Prior's thoughts on his complicity with the military and patriarchal social order arguing that "I had been assuming we were on the same side" (Barker, 1998:74).

On the other hand, the novel exposes the emasculation felt by men in wartime Britain on account of women, whose lives undergo drastic change and expansion at the time of the war. This is conveyed in the novel through the relationship between Prior and his girlfriend Sarah. On the night he goes out for a drink at a pub in Edinburgh, Prior, while drinking his beer in his uniform, meets Sarah, who was sitting in the pub with her close friends. Offering her a drink, Prior tries to know more about Sarah and learns that she works at a munitions factory and is earning well when compared to the past life of her before the war breaks out. Upon this, Prior notices that the war has turned everything upside down and created a drastic change regarding both women's and men's position within the society to the extent that while women "have expanded in all kinds of ways, whereas men over the same period had shrunk into smaller and smaller space" (Barker, 1998: 82-83). Through Sarah, Prior, comes to recognize how women have become more dominant and powerful than men with the effect of the war by taking part in public area and gaining economic independence and more social freedom.

Feeling threatened by the power and independence women gained during the war, Prior accuses both Sarah and the civilians at the home front of not taking an active part in the warfare. That's why he thinks that they should be punished. In brief, he resents at the comfort and power enjoyed by women and civilians leading a safer life at the home front while the soldiers are sacrificing their lives for them at war front. It is for this reason that, as the narrator reveals in the upcoming parts of the novel, Prior constructs his

masculinity upon wreaking vengeance on Sarah due to which he "both envied and despised her, and was quite coldly determined to get her. They owed him something, all of them, and she should pay" (Barker, 1998:114).

Prior's relationship with Sarah, indeed, gives clues about the way he tries to assert his masculinity through sexual violence as well. Since his masculinity also becomes more emasculated by women's advancement and more powerful status caused by the transformative impact of the war, these new women's identities stand out in the novel as posing a threat for the solid boundaries of his identity. Hence, what he actually intends to do is to punish Sarah by sexually objectifying her. This suggests the idea that Prior constructs his masculinity not only by resisting other men's power over him, but also by asserting his power over women through his devaluation of on account of his hatred and fear of women's power.

As remarked by Mike Donaldson, there is a close relationship between hegemonic masculinity and sexual objectification of women: "A fundamental element of hegemonic masculinity, then, is that women exist as potential sexual objects for men while men are negated as sexual objects for men. Women provide heterosexual men with sexual validation, and men compete with each other for this" (1993:645). In this respect, sexually attracted to each other, Prior and Sarah's experience of sexual intercourse under the trees in a remote area of churchyard illustrates his desire to exert control and power over her body as he wants to prove his sexual potency, which will validate that he is masculine enough. The way Prior asserts his dominance over Sarah by trying to control her body and thus objectify her sexually as a flesh during the intercourse is narrated in the novel as follows:

"There, in the shadows, he pulled her towards him. He got her jacket and blouse unbuttoned and felt for her breast. The nipple hardened against his palm, and he laughed under his breath. She started to say something but he covered her mouth with his own, he didn't want her to talk, he didn't want her to tell things. He would have preferred not even to know her name. Just flesh against flesh in the darkness and then nothing" (Barker, 1998:84)

Hence, subjugated by him, Sarah would sexually pay the debt she owes him. However, at the last moment of their love making on a tombstone, Prior is rejected by Sarah, which signifies Sarah's power and resistance against being sexually conquered by

a man. By not allowing Prior to exploit her sexually, Sarah, undermines his power and dominance over her, and thus invalidates his masculinity.

As an officer suffering from mutism, this insecure sense of masculinity Prior has is conveyed in the novel through his muteness that becomes entwined with his attempt to live up to hegemonic ideals of masculinity. In one of the sessions, he asks Rivers to explain why mutism is common among private soldiers rather than officers. Rivers, therefore, depicts mutism as deriving from "a conflict between wanting to say something, and knowing that if you do say it the consequences will be disastrous. So you resolve it by making it physically impossible for yourself to speak" (Barker, 1998: 87) In this respect, Prior's mutism can be interpreted as arising from his conflict between what he desires to say and his repression of it as he knows that what he says will be unacceptable and dangerous for him in constructing his masculinity. Accrording to the critic Peter Hitchcock "real men not only fight war, but they accept all of the social hierarchies that the military confers. Prior, the character, embodies much of the disjuncture between what the nation expects and what the individual desires" (Hitchcock, 2002: 17). Therefore, Barker ciriticizes that if the men like Prior, who are angry at social hierarchies and class divisions among men, attempt to speak the truth, they silence themselves; because if they speak against the grain, they know that they will be punished or stigmatized as cowards. Hence, in order to resolve this conflict of him, Prior unconsciously silences himself by physically becoming unable to communicate.

When Rivers points out how interesting it is that as an officer Prior does not stammer but rather becomes mute, Prior says "It is more interesting that you do" hinting at Rivers' own stammering as an army psychiatrist (Barker, 1998: 88). In return, Rivers attempts to defend himself and claims that "That's d-different", and this leads Prior to oppose him asking that "How is it different? Other than that you're on that side of the desk" (Barker, 1998: 88). In a way, Rivers does not want to acknowledge that his stammering is sourced by the same reason as that of the patients, which arises from the conflict between what they desire to say and their inability to do so for fear of being unaccepted in the army. Rather, Rivers tries to deny this fact because of his superior and powerful status that positions him on the other side of the desk. In this sense, Barker's juxtaposition of Prior's mutism with Rivers' stammering points out the construction of two competing masculinities, namely Prior's working-class masculinity and Rivers'

upper-class masculinity. It is, therefore, understood that when compared to Prior's subordinate and powerless position as a man of working class, Rivers' upper-class masculinity, with his success in his profession in the army, provides him with more privileges and legitimizes even his stammering.

However, Rivers' stammering is diagnosed by Prior to be related with his repression of the truths for many years in order to keep his position of power, which indeed underpins his complicit masculinity. When Rivers implies that he is a lifelong stammerer, and his illness is genetic rather than a neurasthenic one, Prior reacts saying that "Lucky for you [. . .] Because if your stammer was the same as theirs-you might actually have to sit down and work out what it is you've spent fifty years trying not to say" (Barker, 1998: 88).

While keeping a position of authority and power by medically examining other men, Rivers turns into an object of examination by another man, namely his patient Prior, who, unexpectedly acts like a doctor and begins to interrogate him. Hence, through the writer's reversal of the roles of doctor-patient, Prior is portrayed as a doctor inspecting mental and physical disturbances of Rivers, while Rivers turns into a patient who develops the same symptoms with the patients in the hospital. Now, Rivers is depicted as a doctor with war neurosis. As also observed by the critic Catherine Lanone "Rivers ceases to be a doctor, he becomes a silent listener and a medicine man, a detective and a father confessor, sorting out tales of murder, pain" (1999: 262). Therefore, it is likely to say that it is these tales of murder and pain that turn Rivers into one of the patients in the hospital. To put it other words, his mental and physical health is damaged on his way to negotiate his masculinity by keeping his silence in the face of violence and injustices of the war that causes him not to speak truth against the grain of existing gender order.

Sheryl Stevenson points out that silence or other modes of impeded or indirect form of communication such as "dreams, slips of tongues, hesitations, jokes, symbols, stammers, handwriting, symptoms, acting out, forgetting" are a way out to unconscious feelings and hidden selves (qtd in. Monteith et al., 2005: 229). She suggests that "unconscious feelings and selves emerge in impeded, indirect forms of communications [. . .] that try to screen out threatening knowledge" (qtd.in Monteith et al., 2005: 229). Based on this, throughout the novel, it is observed that Rivers' stammering and his

occasional silence become an indicator of his unconscious feeling of guilt for his own complicit masculinity. Since his unconscious mind cannot keep its silence on his true feelings of sensitivity on the injustice and violence of the war, he feels compelled to repress his feelings to perform his complicit masculinity, and in the end, this incomplete emotional repression of him is traced through his stammering. Apparently, Rivers' stammering is sourced by his attempt to negotiate with wartime hegemonic masculinity by becoming complicit with it. To accomplish his complicit masculinity, he keeps his silence not to voice the truth about the brutality of the war and inequalities among men in the army. This, ultimately leads him to be a part of violences of both war and masculinities. However, his true emotions which he repressed about the forms of violence unconsciously try to find their way out through his stammering.

Throughout the novel Barker also skilfully employs some other images and motifs of emasculation most significantly to discover her male characters' insecurities, helplessness, and vulnerabilities. By doing so, she shows how men's experiences of the war and masculinity emasculate them. For instance, when Prior admits that his nightmares are getting worse, Rivers decides to begin a hypnosis session for him, in which the image of eyeball comes to the forefront to delineate how Prior became mute and thus underwent a breakdown. During the hypnosis session, it becomes manifest that one day at the time of a shell explosion in the dugouts, Prior witnesses the horrific death of two men under his command after which he falls unconscious and becomes unable to speak when he suddenly sees the removed eyeball of one of his soldiers staring at him on the duckboards. Following this, feeling perplexed and helpless, he touches the eyeball and puts it into his palm and trembling utters that "What am I supposed to do with this gob-stopper?" (Barker, 1998: 94).

Likening the eyeball to a gob-stopper, a kind of candy enjoyed in childhood, Prior can neither comprehend the horror, nor can express any of his emotions or grief over his fellow soldiers' death as he is to repress his feelings and his fear in order to behave like an ideal officer. Thereby, the image of the eyeball stands out for Prior's own eye (I)'s predicament as a man regarding his own powerlessness and helplessness with which he confronts in the face of such a horror upon military violence. As an officer feeling responsible for the lives of his men, Prior actually feels deprived of power as he could not protect and save them. Additionally, since he is to repress his weakness, fear, and his

true emotions over their death in order not to be seen a coward, he eventually breaks down.

However, after the hypnosis session with Rivers, Prior, for the first time, is depicted to show signs of emotions on his face and begins to cry. As a result, this may illustrate his admittance of the repressed feelings and weakness of him into his consciousness. It is known that hegemonic masculinity demands men to repress their emotions, whose expression by men is deemed as a feminine, emasculating quality. However, in the novel, with the help of hypnosis Prior is shown to have recovered from his repressed feelings after the release of which he cries. By drawing a picture of a crying man, who explores and admits his true emotions and confronts with them in a hypnosis session, Barker seems to offer men's regeneration through emasculation. She also tends to show the damaging effects of hegemonic ideals of masculinity that demand men not to display their emotions and fears, which eventually leads up them to undergo breakdowns and silences.

The impact of the pressures put on men by these ideals becomes more apparent in the novel when Rivers tries to make Prior grasp the true reason of his breakdown by relating it to the constant pressure he lives under: "You are thinking of breakdown as a reaction to a single traumatic event, but it's not like that. It's more a matter of [. . .] erosion. Weeks and months of stress in a situation where you can't get away from it" (Barker, 1998: 96). Hence, depending on Rivers' views on breakdown, it can be inferred that men's attempt to comply with hegemonic ideals of masculinity pervades their lives to the extent that the conditions of stress during their struggle to survive as a man create a kind of erosion on their state of consciousness, as exemplified through the case of Prior's mutism and nervous breakdown.

The novel furthermore presents that even Rivers' own initial signs of stammering stems from his problematic relationship with his experience of male power and authority that brings about conditions of stress on the side of him since his childhood. The reader is informed that on the day Rivers experienced his haircut as a small boy, he is humiliated by his father as he does not act as courageously as his grandfather who does not indicate any sign of fear and cowardice during his leg's amputation at the time of the war with no use of anaesthesia. Rivers' father is portrayed in the novel both as a priest and a speech

therapist and his profession in these institutional fields make him a representative figure of patriarchal authority of church and education. He, therefore, exercises his power and domination through his professions that provide him with authority and status. On the other hand, his relation to power and authority becomes more manifest through his practice of fatherhood. As an emotionally distant and strict father, he is highly influential on Rivers' Victorian way of upbringing that imposes father's authority and control over his son.

As argued by the critic Jeff Hearn, at the time of national crises, specifically in wartimes, the development of state welfare determines fathers 'relations to the state. He says "father's/men's relation to the state, country and nation, has been strongly mediated by the performance and control of violence; the construction of obedience to and breaking of the law; and the commitment to defend the country" (qtd in Hobson, 2004:257). Hearn links the root causes of the modern relationship of fathers/men and nation in Britain to the emergence of two significant wars, namely the Boer war and the First World War. At the time of those two wars, Hearn argues, men were in general kept responsible for defending "King and Country" while it was fathers' responsibilities to "defend their women, families and children" (qtd in Hobson, 2004:257). Moreover, Hearn emphasizes that there was a growing interest in recruitment campaigns that appealed to those responsibilities of men and fathers. In this sense, such questions as how Barker represents sons and fathers 'attitude to war, why fathers are willing to sacrifice their sons in the name of nation are brought to the forefront in the novel through the author's investigation of the link between masculinity and war as a patriarchal bargain.

To do this, in *Regeneration,* Barker employs the stories of Abraham and Isaac and Christ's crucifixion as literary tools through which the interplay of nation, religious faith and the construction of masculinity is explored. Therefore, the novel interrogates these Biblical stories to uncover the dynamics of father-son relationship that is construed through gender relations of domination and subordination. This dynamic is observed in the novel in term of fathers 'obedience to god's command or church's authority, and sons 'obedience and subordination to their own fathers. This, further, enables fathers ' patriarchal authority and domination over their sons. For instance, Burn's father supports war although Burns is suffering from anorexia, Billy's father is also a victimizer, as he thinks it is better to see his son dead rather than seeing in a mental hospital.

Throughout the novel, fathers' authority over their sons is linked to the institutional power of the church and religious practices of Christianity that rests upon men's obedience to god's commands. With regard to this, Barker, through this dynamic of authority and obedience between men and the god, illustrates how a kind of ideal masculinity is attempted to be created that tests fathers' courage to sacrifice their sons and sons' courage to sacrifice their own lives. Relying on the religious practices of Christ's crucifixion and Abraham's sacrifice of his son Isaac, which Barker depicts as "Two bloody bargains on which a civilization claims to be based" (Barker, 1998:149) wartime Britain is therefore represented to be constructing the masculinity of its young sons as ideal sacrificial Isaacs ready to die in the wars for the sake of nation under the command and authority of their fathers. While the obedient sons are characterized to be heroic and courageous, and thus prove their masculinity, the ones who do not comply with this ideal of heroic masculinity are seen to be unheroic and thus unmanly as they violate father's authority. Hence it can be deduced that through the story of Abraham and Isaac, Barker conveys the institutionalization of masculinity through the intervention religious and military practices. In other words, Barker lays bare how male domination and patriarchal gender order maintained through Father's power and authority over his son that is acknowledged in and by the institutions of religion and army, both of which are founded on the idea of male sacrifice.

Represented within the vortex of gendered power relations, Barker's male characters are therefore portrayed by the writer to be both victims and victimizers of the gender order as they are to exercise their masculinity in the form of power and domination in order to exist and survive individually and socially. The novel attempts to illustrate this fact through the story of another male character named Willard. The narrator depicts Willard as a man unable to walk after his frontline experience that causes him to stay in bed for two months. Although the doctors who examine him believe that he has no injury to his spine, Willard, in his talking cure sessions with Rivers, insists that the reason why he cannot walk is caused by his spinal injury. Leading a life of a successful athlete in his past life before the war, Willard relates the reason why he cannot walk to his deteriorating physical health, and he resists associating it with any psychological root causes of his unwillingness to fight back at the front, which he thinks would be "an admission of cowardice" (Barker, 1998:101).

However, Rivers opines that Willard's inability to move is indeed motivated by some psychological reasons rather than physical ones, due to which he stresses that "paralysis occurs because a man wants to save his live" (Barker, 1998: 101). He goes on to say that paralysis has nothing to do with one's sense of cowardice and a man becomes paralyzed in a state of attack because he is neither willing to take part in it nor he can run away from it (Barker, 1998: 101). In other words, as Rivers points out what Willard is experiencing as paralysis is not caused by his cowardice but rather by his experience of inner conflict between his instinct for self-preservation and the societal expectations of masculinity regarding men's military duty for their countries. He both desires to save his own life by not participating in war but at the same time he cannot escape from being a part of the war because of the social expectations of masculinity putting pressure on him as a man. Hence, it is due to this clash between social construction of masculinity expecting men to be fearless and men's experience of paralysis incapacitating them to meet those social expectations and standards Rivers believes that "paralysis is no use to a coward, Mr Willard. A coward needs his legs" (Barker, 1998: 101).

As is seen, possessing even no legs to run away the paralyzed Willard exemplifies the image of an emasculated man whose masculinity is presented in stark contrast to the hegemonic model of masculinity. This is also reinforced through the writer's portrayal of Willard in his wheelchair that is pushed by his wife on the day she comes to visit him. Seeing that up the hill at Craiglockhart Willard's wife is pushing his wheelchair, Rivers feels "Willard's fury at being stranded like this, impotent" (Barker, 1998: 107) and his offer to help Willard's wife with his wheelchair indeed emasculates him together with creating a sense of disgrace and rage on the side of Willard. In the presence of another man, namely, Rivers, who is pushing Willard's wheelchair and is physically more powerful and able-bodied than him, it is Willard's masculinity that is being tested. Feeling himself less than manly as a disabled man, Rivers' offer to help him further reminds him how physically dependent on others and is unable to keep the control of his wheelchair, namely that of his own life as a man.

On the other hand, during his three-week vacation, Rivers' stay at his brother Charles's farm in their hometown takes him back to the childhood memories regarding his relationship with his father and brothers. It is ironic that as a strict upper lip man of Victorian culture, Rivers' father is depicted to be a speech therapist who treats

stammering little boys just like Rivers himself by educating them about how to control and regulate the flow of their breath patiently. As Rivers thinks back on those days he spent with his father, he recalls that "the house was full of stammering boys, any age from ten to nineteen, and at least it meant he was not the only one" (Barker, 1998: 137). Rivers' childhood home therefore becomes a microcosm of the whole Victorian society that is comprised of strict, oppressive, religious fathers and their submissive sons suffering from stammering since they are to be trained in repudiation of the feminine by not expressing their innermost feelings or thoughts.

To put in other words, the novel illustrates that the young sons of the Victorian society are stammering due to their fathers who construe their masculinity through a relation of dominance and power over their sons unfolding within the context of emotionally restrained, rationalistic and highly religious society. Yet, this pattern of relation between the father and the son is for the first time broken in the novel when Rivers, as a boy, gives a talk to his father's pupils about monkeys, which he bases on Darwin's theory of evolution. By doing so, Rivers defies his father's authority as his speech on evolution is at odds with his father's Christian belief and the idea of Genesis that he calls into question causing his father's fury over him conveyed in the novel as follows:

His father had been furious, not because Rivers had stumbled over every single m without exception – though indeed he had – but because he'd dared to suggest that Genesis was no more than the creation myth of a Bronze Age people. Dinner that night was strained occasion. Father angry, mother upset [. . .] Rivers himself outwardly subdued, inwardly triumphant. For the first time in his life, he'd forced his father to listen to what he had to say, and not merely to the way he'd said it ((Barker, 1998: 139-140).

Meanwhile, this doomed condition of Rivers as a son of a strict Victorian father is further drawn in parallel to the destruction experienced by young sons of the Victorian society during the war, which is employed in the novel through one of the poems Owen writes at Craiglockhart and names as "Anthem for Doomed Youth." The violence and horror of the war is conveyed even in the first line of this: "What passing bells for these who die as cattle" (Barker, 1998: 140). In the poem, the young sons of wartime Britain are likened by Owen to the cattle slaughtered as masses of animals for whom there would be no rituals or mourning except the sounds of the rifles that turn out to be hasty prayers for them. Hence, what Owen achieves in his concern for writing such an anti-war poem that does not glorify war and heroism is to subvert the established normative definitions

of masculinity construed along the axis of nationalistic, patriotic, and heroic ideals that bitterly lead to the deaths of millions of doomed sons during the war.

The destruction and violence wrought by the war and constructs of masculinity on men is further elaborated in the novel through the scene of Sarah and her friend Madge's visit to the hospital where Madge's fiancé and other wounded and mutilated war veterans are kept as well. In fact, it is portrayed in the novel that Madge's lover and some other men Sarah sees in the hospital ward are not badly injured in the war and rather they are in a condition of good health and physique contrary to her expectation. However, as she walks along the hospital to the main entrance she loses her way, and at the back of the hospital in a conservatory she comes across with several mutilated war veterans in "a row of figures in wheelchairs, but figures that were no longer the size and shape of adult men" (Barker, 1998:142). In this suffocating atmosphere where silence pervades, she further sees men with "trouser legs sewn short; empty sleeves pinned to jackets" and even "one man had lost all his limbs, and his face was so drained, so pale, he seemed to have left his blood in France as well" (Barker, 1998: 142).

Also, it is made clear that these mutilated men are kept in this conservatory not to be noticed by the civilian passers-by to hide the damage caused by the war on men. At that time Sarah recognizes how they stare at her in fear, which is the "fear of her looking at the empty trouser legs. Fear of her not looking at them" (Barker, 1998: 143). In her powerful grandeur with a wholeness of her body and through her Medusa-like gaze of anger over what she witnesses, Sarah's presence frightens and petrifies these mutilated men. In other words, Sarah's gaze emasculates them by making them feel how powerless and helpless they are in their mutilated bodies when compared to that of a woman:

> Simply by being there, by being that inconsequential, infinitely powerful creature: a pretty girl, she had made everything worse. Her sense of her own helplessness, her being forced to play the role of Medusa when she meant no harm, merged with the anger she was beginning to feel at their being hidden away like that. If the country demanded that price, then it should bloody well be prepared to look at the result" (Barker, 1998: 143)

It has been observed that this image of emasculated men is further stressed through the motif of the wheelchair employed in the novel when Rivers pays a visit to his friend and colleague Henry Head and his wife Ruth in London where they come across with "men in blue hospital uniforms sat in wheelchairs, waiting for someone to come and push

them away" during their walk on Spaniard Road with Rivers (Barker, 1998:146). Seeing these helpless men in their wheelchairs, Ruth suddenly acknowledges that Sassoon is right in protesting the war (Barker, 1998: 146). However, disagreeing with her, Rivers thinks that Sassoon is destroying himself by choosing to protest. He furthermore tries to justify his own reasons of not objecting the war through these words: "I wear the uniform, I take the pay, I do the job," which signifies Rivers' complicit masculinity he practices to meet the demands of the existing military order (Barker, 1998: 146). Accordingly, Ruth's response to him that "you're tearing yourself in pieces as well as him" identifies the real problem experienced by most men of the wartime Britain as they become the victim of gendered violence prevailing at that time. Hence, Barker points out that while it is the wheel of masculinity and gender hierarchy that grinds every individual man in its gears tearing them into pieces and dismembering them by means of the diverse power relations among men, the wheelchair suggests the symbolic outcome of men's confrontation with such a victimization and oppression experienced by them in the form of powerlessness and emasculation.

The link between emasculation and infantilization of men are explored in the novel to discuss how masculinity is socially construed as a matter of power and domination. Therefore, throughout the novel, Barker's male characters are shown to be emasculated men on account of their problematic and contradictory relationship with male power and authority during the war. This is best exemplified in the novel especially through Burns' condition which Rivers notices during his visit to him in Aldeburgh, where Burns lives alone. After observing Burns' way of living and his manners of naivety, idealism and intolerance, Rivers is of the opinion that "a prematurely aged man and a fossilized schoolboy seemed to exist side by side" in Burns as well as in his other patients (Barker, 1998:150). This signifies the idea of men's immaturity contrary to widely-held belief that the war brings maturity for the young men. In this sense, Burns' story exposes how the war infantilizes men instead of ripening and empowering them. Apparently, the infantile masculinity of Burns and of the patients at Craiglockhart is derived from the power relations prevailing within the army during the war. Their acts, thoughts and feelings are kept under the control of the men who are positioned superior to them. Hence, like a little helpless child that is controlled by and dependent on his parents, each of the infantilized men cannot grow up and can no longer know how to act like a man, and thus they are seen to be not manly enough.

Furthermore, Burns' sense of infantilization and emasculation is intensified when he is given white feathers by the local civilians as he walks among them after he is released from Craiglockhart. Now, discharged from his military duty, Burns is one of the civilians whose masculinity is subordinated as he can no longer take part in the war as the saviour of the nation. Regarding this emasculating effect of the white feather given to the non-combatant young men in the streets who do not join the war in wartime Britain, Nicoletta F. Gullace says that "while Britons hailed the common soldier as the saviour of innocent women and children, the civilian male was jeered on the streets, mocked in the press, and handed white feathers by cheeky flappers policing manhood in the West End of London" (2002: 2). Hence, the white feather, functioning as a wartime symbol of cowardice during the world war, is only given to degrade and emasculate the men who do not enlist in the war and thus do not perform their military duties. Likewise, once given the white feather, Burns feels to be more infantile and comes to view himself as a little coward boy that the society deems to be unmanly and feminized.

However, the writer calls into question whether Burns is a coward or not by showing how he is still haunted by the legacy of the war and is psychologically trying to come to terms with the violence he confronted at the front through his ongoing nightmares, terror, and mental breakdowns. The cost of the war on Burns is so great that everything he experiences in his civilian life reminds him the horror and violence he experienced at the war front. For instance, on the eve of the day of a huge storm when Rivers and Burns go for a walk on the beach, Burns, coming across with several gutted cod fish on the shore, becomes so astonished that he stares at their dead heads by becoming petrified moving only his mouth and jerking back his head just as he does on the day he first arrives at Craiglockhart. The dead cod fish, therefore, stands out for the dead corpses of the veterans who were killed and gutted in the war, whose symbolic re-emergence drives Burns to a new mental breakdown.

Burns' breakdown is further implicated through the forthcoming storm in the town, for which Rivers and Burns pile sandbags against the door of Burns' house so that they could stop the possible flood that may come from the sea. This time Burns' psychology is conveyed in the novel through the image of sandbags symbolizing the trenches and the image of the storm standing out for both the war on the front and the war

in Burns' inner world that prepare his mental collapse envisaged by the image of possible flood. On the other hand, at the night of this storm, Burns' house is depicted to have "cracked and groaned, riding the storm like a ship," which rather identifies Burns' mental state of inner turmoil (Barker, 1998:157). Meanwhile, late at night, while both Rivers and Burns are asleep, a sound of a lifeboat crashing on the rocks is heard. Rivers likens the sound to an explosion of a bomb, while Burns, in fear and awe, suddenly rushes out of the house to seek shelter in a more secure area. After looking for Burns everywhere, Rivers finds him "huddled against the moat wall" and "staring up at the tower" there in a motionless state (Barker, 1998: 160). With his rigid and feeble body in Rivers' arms, Burns surrenders like a "newborn" baby and starts to shake:

> Burn's body remained rigid in his arms. Rivers was aware that if it came to a fight he might not win. Burns was terribly emaciated, but he was also thirty years younger. His surrender, when it came, was almost shocking. Suddenly his body had the rag-doll floppiness of the newborn. He collapsed against Rivers and started to shake, and from there it was possible to half lead, half push him out of the moat and up on to the relative safety of the path (Barker, 1998: 160)

As a matter of fact, portraying Burns in his attempt to cope with all this unbearable and agonizing memory of the war, the writer represents him to be the embodiment of true courage rather than cowardice. By doing so, she subverts the socially established notions and constructs of masculinity, courage and cowardice by forcing the reader to think deeply on what true cowardice and courage is. What is more, the novel conveys how Rivers' commitment to the notions of war, duty and sacrifice is shattered through his confrontation with the pain and fear Burns experiences. As a result, Burns, for the first time, calls into question the military and nationalistic ideals that he runs after. Ultimately, facing this gendered violence victimizing men, Rivers laments on the costs it creates uttering that "Nothing justifies this. Nothing, nothing, nothing" (Barker, 1998: 160). In a sense, Rivers comes to question the violence and justifiability of both his duty and the war after the recent breakdown of Burns, which helps to alter his conception of war and masculinity.

The fact that the men who do not conform to the socially set dominant mode of masculinity are infantilized by the society and mostly by their parents is also explored in the novel when Prior is portrayed to be feeling infantilized on the day he is examined by the board. On that day, Rivers describes the way Prior talks in front of the board as if he is "extracting wisdom teeth", with a "tension in his jaw" (Barker, 1998: 182). Evidently, it becomes clear that the physical tension Prior experiences in his body is the reflection

of the inner tension he feels. Rivers already had coined Prior’s internal conflict as a struggle between his ambition to go back to the front and his desire to save his life caused by his instinct for self-preservation. Yet, in his insistence on going back to France to perform his military duty, Prior wants to get rid of the shame of being destined to permanent home service. On the other hand, he instinctually does not want to go back to fight as is understood from his endeavour to draw attention of the board to the incessant asthmatic attacks he has. Nevertheless, after his examination by the medical board Prior is ascertained to be unfit for the front because of his asthma. He is, therefore, given a permanent home service due to which he becomes frustrated and, like a little child, he cries his eyes out. The “shame of home service” brings humiliation on Prior and he insists on to go back to the front (Barker, 1998: 182). This is because the front means being tested and challenged by other men in an atmosphere of danger and adventure by means of which he could prove his masculinity and ascertain his power as a man.

On the other hand, Rivers’ attempt to coax Prior through his expression that the need for self-preservation is nothing to be ashamed of does not dissuade Prior from his desire to be a part of the war. Rather, he does not want to keep himself away from the all-male society of the war due to its promises for men in performing their socially approved masculinities. This all-male society that suggests a homosocial circle for men to perform their masculinity competitively is depicted by Prior as “the hoop”. Prior thinks that “the hoop’s there, you jump through it. If you question it, you’ve failed. If it is taken away from you, you’ve failed” (Barker, 1998: 185). Obviously, it is seen that what matters primarily for Prior is to practice his masculinity within this “hoop” that should be never questioned and should never be failed. Jumping through this hoop therefore comes to mean holding positions of power and status for Prior to ascertain his masculinity through homosocial enactment of his masculinity.

It is seen that Prior is depicted as a man trying to fit into societal expectations of masculinity but at the same time, he is unable to do it since he is unfit for the front. That is why he further believes that if he is kept away from this hoop of masculinity, he will be seen less than manly and will fail to prove that he is masculine enough. Therefore, his anxieties regarding his sense of masculinity are observed through his fear of being out of this hoop which even puts him into a position of an infantile boy. This fact is implied through how he felt infantilized both by his mother, who, since his boyhood, tried to keep

him away from the hoop of nasty boys, and now by Rivers, who attempts to keep him away from "the hoop" of war front, as revealed by Prior himself through these words: "My mother was always trying the other way. Trying to keep me in [. . .] She wanted me in the house away from all the nasty rough boys. And then suddenly here you are [. . .] Doing exactly the same thing" (Barker, 1998: 186). It is for this reason that Prior identifies Rivers with his mother who infantilizes and emasculates him, and unlike the other patients of the hospital he cannot see him as a fatherly figure.

The novel reflects how the pressures men feel to conform to hegemonic masculinity give way to their anxieties, insecurities and their internal conflicts. This is implied through the pressure Prior feels to conform to hegemonic ideals of Wartime Britain not only through his devotion to his military duty but also by becoming too much stoic in his manners and appearance. However, in his last visit to Sarah at her home, Prior's stoic endurance, which he constructs as part of his masculinity operating like a shield for his helplessness and vulnerability, is undermined through the motif of nakedness that is employed when Prior and Sarah are portrayed for the first time to be undressed during their lovemaking. As the narrator reveals "Their imminent nakedness made them shy of each other" accompanied by a sense of shame on the side of Prior (Barker, 1998: 190).

In fact, Prior is ashamed of being seen unshielded in his nakedness by a woman, which signifies his fear of being known by her in all his powerlessness and insecurities as a man. He even fears that Sarah will understand his worst trench warfare experience of him and decides to hide it for fear of being accused of cowardice by her. Hence, he does not want Sarah to learn much about the front as "he needed his ignorance to hide in" (Barker, 1998: 191). To put in other words, Prior fears that Sarah will unmask him, and it is for this reason that while Sarah is unbuttoning Prior's uniform in bed, he partly tries to resist her in silence. Nevertheless, he is caught up between two conflicting desires of him, which is his desire of being both known and unknown by her. This becomes linked to the social construction of his stoic masculinity and to his strife for getting rid of the pressure it exerts on him by lying in his pure nakedness in the eyes of Sarah and confessing his love for her.

In fact, the confession of love between men and women as well as among men is presented by the writer as the panacea both for social and individual ills caused by the violence of war and masculinities in wartime Britain. This is further exemplified in the novel through the love between Owen and Sassoon, which they can never confess due to societal pressures of masculinity on them but rather feel compelled to hide for fear of being stigmatized and persecuted by the society as homosexuals. Hence, they feel obliged not to express their emotions and love for each other, which is illustrated in the novel especially at the very scene they bid farewell to each other at Conservative club days before Sassoon departs from Craiglockhart. As the narrator reveals, these two men, who indeed love each other deeply, never express any feelings of love that night, and they part in silence with no words of farewell, creating an immense sense of loss for Owen:

> Sassoon patted him on the shoulder, and was gone. Nothing else, not even 'goodbye'. Perhaps it was better that way, Owen thought, going back to the lounge. Better for Siegfried, anyway. Their empty brandy glasses stood together on the table, in the pool of light cast by the standard lamp, but the unseen listener had gone . . . The ticking of the clock was very loud in the empty room. He lay back in the chair and closed his eyes. He was afraid to measure his sense of loss (Barker, 1998:194).

Sassoon and Owen's farewell to each other is followed by Rivers' departure from Craiglockhart on the 14 November. On his last days at Craiglockhart, Rivers observes that Willard recovers from his paralysis and begins to walk, which, Willard himself believes, has come true thanks to Rivers' godly talent at reconnecting the severed nerves of his broken spinal cord rather than his talent at the therapeutic method he conducts in helping him to cope with his mental disturbance.

On the same day, visiting Sassoon for the last time before he departs, Rivers recognizes that Sassoon has been in a mood of defeat "sitting on the floor, hands clasped around his knees staring into the fire" (Barker, 1998: 194). As a matter of fact, he repents at causing Sassoon to give up his protest and his hopes for a better future as well. Hence, Rivers' confession that "Craiglockhart had done to Sassoon what the Somme and Arras had failed to do" (Barker, 1998: 195) suggests how Sassoon's masculinity has come to be re-constructed and re-generated at Craiglockhart in accordance with the hegemonic ideals of wartime Britain that results with his ultimate decision to return to the front to kill the Germans.

Yet, the damage wrought by the war on the individual psychology of men is traced in the life of Rivers too. Rivers, leaving Craiglockhart and moving to London, where he

starts to work in a hospital with his colleague Henry Head, is depicted to be disturbed by the sounds of air raids and the guns at nights, which direct his attention in the hospital to the breakdowns experienced by RFC Pilots. He thereby comes to recognize that RFC Pilots do not undergo breakdowns as much frequently and heavily as the men who float in the balloons over the sky to observe the battlefields. Hence, Rivers thinks that when compared to the lives of the men in other services, those men in the balloons are the ones who experience mental breakdown the most as they float helplessly being confined in a balloon with no instruments of attack or defence. In this sense, their confinement in a balloon once again causes him to draw a parallelism with the mental conditions of the men who undergo breakdowns not because of cowardice but rather because of the social pressures on them that lead up to their confined lives.

Eric Leed discovers that "neurosis was a psychic effort not of war in general but of industrialized war in particular […] the neuroses of the war were the direct product of the increasingly alienated relationship of the combatant to the means of destruction" (1979: 164). In the novel, Rivers explains this alienation of the soldiers through their confinement or immobility, which cause them to become unable to cope with the stress or react to it actively in a constructive way. Rivers likens this case of hysteria experienced by men during the war to the case of hysteria experienced by women in peacetime, which is sourced by their confinement in a highly patriarchal society. What Rivers therefore discovers about the relation between masculinity and men's breakdown is that "it was prolonged strain, immobility and helplessness that did the damage, and not the sudden shocks or bizarre horrors that the patients themselves were inclined to point to as the explanation for their condition" (Barker, 1998: 196). Hence, in Elaine Showalter's words "when technological warfare deprived men of their sense of agency, they lost their natural defences against fear and regressed toward neurosis, magic, or superstition" (qtd. in Higonnet et al., 62).

It should be stated that although Rivers' masculinity is complicit with the hegemonic project in his military strife for making the patients return to the front, the attitude he adopts in medically treating his patients includes some distinct deviations from the hegemonic model in terms of his explanations on the true source of men's neurosis and his approach to cure it. As mentioned earlier above, for Rivers, men undergo breakdowns due to the repression of their fears and emotions positioning them in a state

of feminine confinement. Nevertheless, rather than directing his patients to repress their fears or tender feelings, Rivers develops a method that provides his patients with psychological tools encouraging them to face their repressed feelings generative of their inner conflicts. In this respect, Rivers' method of talking cure is regenerative both for men's mental health and for a better social change. In this respect, his method differs from the ones that are heavily militarized and based on violence as exemplified through the electric shock treatment of Dr. Yealland.

Rivers meets Dr. Yealland during his visit to the National Hospital in London. Throughout the novel, Yealland is depicted as "an impressive figure" with an extremely precise way of speech (Barker, 1998: 198). Besides, Rivers sees him as an epitome of "steady, unrelenting projection of authority", whom he mocks by wanting to laugh at his steadiness (Barker, 1998: 198). Presented as a foil to Rivers, Yealland, therefore, performs an authoritarian and militarized mode of masculinity that becomes manifest through his disregard for the emotions and fears of his patients as well.

Yealland cures a mute soldier named Callan, forcing him to talk by giving him electroshock and lighting cigarettes on his tongue. His patient, Callan's breakdown and muteness is mentioned in the novel to have appeared first during his military service of transport behind the lines while he was feeding the horses. As the narrator reveals "he had suddenly fallen down and had remained unconscious for a period of five hours. When he came round, he was shaking all over and was unable to speak. He hadn't spoken at all since then" (Barker, 1998: 2009). Callan himself relates the source of his inability to speak to the head stroke he gets when he falls down. Yet, as is in the case of Prior, it can be understood that Callan's muteness is actually sourced by the conflict between what he desires to say and his repression of this desire of him owing to his fear of being punished or unaccepted by the patriarchal society in which he lives. Like Prior, he wants to speak out the violence of the war that he rejects to be a part of it, but in order to survive as a man, he represses this desire of him by unconsciously silencing and incapacitating himself to speak out his true emotions and thoughts. Lavinia Greenlaw puts that Barker's "exploration of mental and physical devastation shows us how estrangement and incapacity not only call into question identity, values and belief, but provoke the redefinition of morals, gender and sexuality" (1996: 2). In this respect, shell-shocked soldiers' incapacity to talk comes to question their masculinities and violences that

victimize and damage them, and thus it offers to redefine established notions of gender and the war.

In the novel, this damage and victimization wrought on men is more intensely conveyed through the electric shock treatment Callan receives to be cured of his mutism under the conduct of Yealland. In fact, the electric shock treatment comes to symbolize the oppression and domination men confront in conforming to hegemonic ideals of masculinity that functions to silence their protest against the violences of gender order and its configurations for men. In this respect, the electric shock sessions serve to reinforce Yealland's sense of masculinity while debilitating that of Callan's; because Yealland constructs his masculinity through an exercise of power over Callan and his other patients by practicing an authoritarian masculinity. Unlike Rivers, he establishes his authority and dominance in the sessions by making his patients obey his commands. To do this, he exerts violence and torture on his patients to keep them in a subordinate position and to claim his power over them. He, furthermore, believes that a man shall not show any indication of fear or vulnerability if he is to be defined as a true man. It is for this reason that he tortures Callan through electric shock that tests his manliness in terms of his physical and mental strength.

Even in one of the sessions, to which Rivers also bears witness, Yealland straps Callan in a chair and inserts a tongue depressor to the back of his throat in a position of "his mouth wide open and his head thrown back" to make him speak (Barker, 1998: 202). When he starts to give the electric shock to him, Callan's sense of pain and fear resulting with his sudden thrown back disappoints and infuriates Yealland to the extent that he begins to instruct him how to behave like a hero warning him: "remember you must behave as becomes the hero I expect you to be . . . A man who has been through so many battles should have a better control of himself" (Barker, 1998: 202). Hence, Yealland is represented as a man living up to hegemonic ideals of masculinity in his belief that a man should control his emotions of pain and fear if he is to be a hero. As a matter of fact, his exercise of torture and violence serve as an instrument of power and authority for Yealland. This allows him to construct his own masculinity as a victimizer punishing and oppressing Callan by making him not to express his emotions. Therefore, Yealland's masculinity is shown by the author to be open to question as he constructs his masculinity upon other men's approval of his authority and power. In other words, his masculinity is

depicted to be insecure as it can be disrupted by the threats posed by other men. It is for this reason that he strives to re-establish his power and authority by subordinating and controlling his patients.

When Yealland applies a stronger current of electric shock the session ends with Yealland's question to Callan that "Are you not pleased to be cured?", to which he just says: "yes sir" and "thank you" (Barker, 1998: 205). Therefore, through the electric shock treatment used to cure Callan's mutism his masculinity is regenerated to fit into the established ideals of hegemonic masculinity. In this respect, the electric shock treatment stands out as an instrument of domination for the enactment of a hegemonic mode of masculinity that demand men to control and silence their own emotions. These men, therefore, become unable to protest against the gendered violence and inequality maintained within wartime Britain.

The novel depicts the patients such as Prior and Callan as victimized males suffering from mutism and trying to communicate their bodily and psychological protest against the injustices and violence they encountered within the existing gender order. On the other hand, it depicts the therapists, both Rivers and Yealland, though their methods of treatment differ from each other, as agents of domination who control the patients' protest by silencing what they are trying to say through their bodily and emotional reactions. This is further implied in the novel through Rivers' dream one night in which he is haunted by an image of "open mouth," which makes him aware of the fact:

> Just as Yealland silenced the unconscious protest of his patients by removing paralysis, the deafness, the blindness, the muteness that stood between them and the war, so in an infinitely more gentle way, he silenced his patients; for stammerings, nightmares, the tremors, the memory lapses, of officers were just as much unwitting protest as the grosser maladies of the men" (Barker, 1998: 210).

Consequently, as demonstrated through Rivers' reflections above, both his and Yealland's method of curing attempt to silence the patients' unconscious protests. This can also be seen as their complicity with the existing ideology of warfare and wartime hegemonic masculinity that aim to discipline and control men in order to make them return to their duties. Likewise, the end of the novel features Sassoon as being "discharged to duty" on "Nov. 26, 1917", which causes Rivers to question his own complicity with the hegemonic project as he discovers the biggest truth that "a society that devours its own young deserves no automatic and unquestioning allegiance (Barker, 1998: 219).

To conclude, Barker's representation of Craiglockhart becomes subversive of the hegemonic project in that the patients of the hospital, who were the men of duty and patriots, are shown in the novel to be potential dissenters becoming unable to live up to the standards and ideals of wartime hegemonic masculinity and whose lived reality contradicts with these ideals. Revisiting the years of the First World War, the Trilogy therefore, underscores the emasculation men experience on account of their attempt to fit into the hegemonic ideal of military masculinity during the war. The war, which promises them to be manly, turns out to be reverse by rendering them unmanly. In this way, they feel more unsure and insecure about their masculinities as the war deepens their emotional and inner conflicts. By this way, they come to interrogate their conceptions of masculinity and the war together with their relationship with male power, dominance and privilege.

Throughout the novel Barker shows that the army and the wartime British society sees their mental illness to be sourced by their cowardice or weaknesses due to which her shell-shocked characters feel to be emasculated and less than manly. That's why the male characters are portrayed as feeling compelled to prove their manliness within the vortex of homosociality and homophobic gender order by distancing themselves anything deemed to be feminine. However, as this thesis suggests, the novel shows that the more male characters try to repudiate femininity, the more they come to explore feminine and emotional aspects of themselves. Accordingly, it is likely to say that Barker's characters come to explore their true selves and emotions by means of the emasculation and disempowerment they become subject to on account of wartime hegemonic project. Therefore, *Regeneration* is a novel that offers men to break their silence and come to terms with their repressed emotions in order to regenerate and to be freed from the violence their masculinities engage with.

CHAPTER THREE

MASCULINITIES UNDER OPPRESSION

3.1 Surveilled to be a Man: Violence, Torture and Victimization in *The Eye in the Door*

Published in 1993, *The Eye in the Door* is the second novel of *the Trilogy* that mainly deals with the issues of masculinity, violence, victimization and torture experienced by most men in the repressive state atmosphere of wartime London in 1918. Although the novel is a sequel to Barker's *Regeneration* in featuring the intertwined stories of Rivers, Sassoon and Prior, the narration mostly centres on the life of Prior as the protagonist. After his rehabilitation at the Craiglockhart, Prior is now depicted to be discharged to do his home service as a spy working at Intelligence unit of munitions ministry. Coming from a working-class family and portrayed as a spy informing against the anti-war attempts of the pacifists, Prior will be analysed as a character who is trying to come to terms with his gender and class-based identity that results with his split personality. The focus of this volume is, therefore, particularly upon the change of identity Prior undergoes in accordance with the changing atmosphere of wartime Britain that leads him to construe a new masculine identity as well. It can be claimed that, as his name suggests, Prior gains this new masculine identity of him by prying on the ones who oppose both the war and the oppressive state of British government. In this context, as the title of the novel implicates, *The Eye in The Door* will be studied in this chapter as critically elucidating the violence not only undertaken by the state but also exercised by individual men of the wartime British society. How the characters try to negotiate their masculinities in relation to hegemonic masculinity of the time will be scrutinized to trace the pressure men feel to conform to it that attempt to silence alternative masculinities of them as well.

Set in April 1918, the novel opens with an intense stress on Prior's sexual desire and tension given through his lovemaking to a married woman named Myra on the very day he meets her, and it goes on recounting his aimless drift in the streets of London. As he walks along the streets, the reader is informed that the atmosphere of panic is traced among the civilians of London on account of the atrocities caused by the ongoing war between the Germans and the British. However, as the author critically implies, it is not

only civilians but also the prisoners of the war, which mostly consist of pacifists and homosexuals, who are depicted to be in panic. Hence, at the beginning of the novel, Prior's aimless drift in the streets of London is juxtaposed with the restless lives of the pacifists and homosexuals as they become the victims of violence in wartime Britain. Hence, the novel throws a criticism on the violence of the state power that victimizes and tortures the pacifists and the homosexuals on whom the blame is put due to the national anxieties of decline in British military strength. In a sense, these men are victimized as they cannot live up to the hegemonic ideals of masculinity during the war and thus are seen as the enemy within that should be punished either through oppression or physical torture.

Haywood et al. argue that "the state sets limits on nationality and citizenship, defining who is 'national' and who is 'alien' (Haywood, 2003: 53). This patriarchal and heterosexual state has the power to regulate sexuality with the aim of producing "categories of inclusion and exclusion" (Haywood, 2003: 53) Within this frame, Prior's home service to collaborate with the state by informing against these war prisoners is shown in the novel as construing the foundation of his masculine anxieties that make him complicit with the state power and violence. To that end, the second novel of *the Trilogy* essentially engages with this intricate relationship between violence, male victimization, and masculinity whose impacts in wartime British society are especially discussed through the story of Prior. To that end, throughout the novel Prior is shown to be a man occupying the position both of a victim and a victimizer induced by his attempt to negotiate with hegemonic masculinity.

Even at the very beginning of the novel, it is observed that the author presents the depiction of male victimization and the atmosphere of the state violence in London by drawing a parallelism with Prior's violent sexual impulses he feels overwhelmed with. While at the beginning of the novel Prior is portrayed as a heterosexual man through his sexual desire for Myra, he is also drawn in a homosexual relationship with a man called Charles Manning. Hence, being a man sexually attracted not only to women but also to men, Prior's bisexuality is presented in the novel to be built on violence, which is linked with the formation of his masculinity established through a relational pattern of domination and subordination among different and competing masculinities. Barker illustrates this fact through the portrayal of sadomasochistic sexual relationship between

Prior and Charles Manning taking place on the day Prior meets him. As a matter of fact, the reader is informed that while walking in the streets of London, Prior ambitiously feels that "he needed sex, and he needed it badly" and in the park he notices a man requesting him to light his cigarette and introduces himself as Charles Manning (Barker, 1998: 232).

Described as a man "with officer's peaked cap, dark eyes, a thin moustache defining a full mouth, the face rounded. . . Adam's apple jerking in his throat," Manning, as his name suggests, appears to be physically masculine enough (Barker,1998: 233). Trying to know more about each other, both Prior and Manning increasingly become sexually aroused through their interaction as they come to sense the class antagonism among themselves. This is because, having a working-class origin Prior more deeply feels an unequal social positioning between him and Manning, who is a retired upper-class officer. As a matter of fact, Prior implies his sexual desire for Manning by asking him "Have you anywhere to go," to which Manning responds, "It is not far" (Barker, 1998:233). In this respect, it can be claimed that it is Prior's working-class masculinity that generates his anger at their unequal access to power that socially positions them differently and hierarchically. Hence, "for people like Prior, with backgrounds in the mechanized working-class, the war is more continuity than contrast" (Moseley, 2014: 81). This eventually leads Prior to develop violent sexual impulses with an upper-class man to whom he directs his anger as a marginalized man. Meanwhile, as an upper-class man, Manning sexually seeks to dominate and humiliate Prior, which is given through the narrator's depiction of Prior as a "sort of working-class boy Manning would think it was all right to fuck" (Barker, 1998: 235). As a result, the initial sexual tension among Prior and Manning can be seen actually to be sourced by their feelings of anger and humiliation informing on their class-based competing masculinities.

However, it should be noted that the novel reverses the positions of the dominant and dominated among these two men to underscore Manning's class prejudice, which he should overcome by being hurt. In other words, their class-based masculine identities are subverted in the novel by employing a sadomasochistic relationship between these two men during which Prior is shown to act out the role of active, domineering sadist male while Manning turns into a passive, submissive masochist one. This sexual tension between them is given in the novel when they enter Manning's flat to have some conversation and drink. Following this, they are portrayed lying undressed in Manning's

bed. Immediately after noticing the wound in Manning's leg, Prior begins to examine Manning's wound, and this is followed by his sudden act of rubbing "his face across the hair in Manning's groin," which initiates a sexual intercourse between them. Yet, contrary to Manning's expectations, during the intercourse Prior holds an active and dominant position by caressing and sucking Manning's genitals accompanied by his stroke to the specific parts of Manning's body such as his belly, chest and thighs. Hence, as the narrator reveals, unable to cope with the situation he finds himself in, Manning gets nervous as he feels deprived of power to control the whole tenor of the intercourse. This power struggle between these two men that unfolds during their sexual intercourse is rendered through the author's portrayal of Prior as pain-inflictor and Manning as pain-inflicted:

> He guided Manning's legs up his chest, being exceedingly careful not to jerk the knee. He was too eager, and the position was hopeless for control, he was fighting himself before he'd get an inch in and then Manning yelped and tried to pull away. Prior started to withdraw then suddenly realized that Manning needed to be hurt. 'Keep still' he said, and went on fucking. It was a dangerous game. Prior was capable of real sadism, and knew it" (Barker, 1998: 236-7).

As is seen through the eyes of Prior, Manning is a man in need of being hurt who is depicted in contrast to Prior's intense inclination to hurt. Obviously, Manning's desire to be hurt enables him to experience the position of the subordinated male and is shown by the writer as a way of overcoming his class prejudice, while Prior's desire to hurt provides him with a position of dominance and externalizes his range against the class distinction, which he directs at Manning. To put in other words, the subordination Prior is exposed to because of his working-class origins gives way to his desire to establish his sexual dominance over Manning, who, as an upper-class man, is more privileged than Prior within the gender hierarchy. To that end, Manning's socially approved masculinity holding a hegemonic position of power and dominance is aimed to be dismantled by the writer depicting him as a submissive, passive, masochistic male that needs to be hurt and oppressed. In this sense, the novel explores the existing class conflict in wartime Britain and aims to subvert it through the sadomasochistic sexual relationship Prior and Manning engage with.

Additionally, employing Manning as a character who moves from the position of the dominant and oppressor upper class male to that of the dominated and oppressed while describing Prior as moving from the position of the dominated lower class male to that of the dominant and oppressor, the author does represent gender hierarchy among them not as a steady and unchanging stratified structure marked by fixed gender stereotypes, but

rather as a mobile, dynamic and porous one that constantly opens a man's masculinity into question and contestation. As has been discussed earlier by Connell the ones who hold dominant and privileged positions of power at one time, place and social context may turn into underprivileged and oppressed beings at another owing to the intersection of gender with other systems of inequality such, as race, class, and sexuality. In this case, in the novel, not only Prior's but also Manning's masculinity is shown to be contested; because, although Manning occupies a privileged position of power in comparison to Prior, he is too subordinated within the wartime British society due to his homosexuality.

Henceforth, both Manning and Prior are represented by the author as subjugated men within the gender hierarchy, who want to get rid of their subjugation by sexually indulging in sado-masochistic relationship. Apparently, it is both Prior and Manning's individual experiences of powerlessness and emasculation sourced by the hierarchical gender relations of the dominated and the dominating that inevitably leads them to seek approval of their masculinities from each other through a sado-masochistic positioning of themselves. Hence, while Manning turns into a pain-inflicted man, Prior becomes a pain-inflictor who tries to exert his dominance and authority over Manning. This gives the impression that their sadomasochism both is a way of rejecting their subjugation by the wartime British society and is an attempt to regain their masculinity by proving their power through indulging in a sadomasochistic sexuality.

Though Prior intends not to exert violence on Manning during their sadomasochistic intercourse, he indeed does, which is evidenced through Manning's limping badly when the intercourse is over. The damage he causes on Manning's knee indicates that Prior practices violence not only to construe his masculinity and assert power over Manning, but also to make him compensate for his privileged position, which, from Prior's point of view, requires Manning to be hurt. At the end of the intercourse, Manning 's confession that "I needed that… I needed a good fucking" resonates in the eye of Prior through his expression that "You all do" (Barker, 1998:237). In this context, the sadomasochism employed in the novel serves as the politicization of male violence and dominance. Thus, during this sadomasochistic relationship Prior's practice of violence against Manning stands out for his protest against the oppression, subjugation and victimization he experienced both as part of his military life and his working-class identity.

This is also conveyed in the novel when, Prior, turning his face to the looking glass in the bathroom after their intercourse, recalls how they had been oppressed in the army being made to obey the commands keeping their caps on straight and their hair covered under the caps. This scene is further given in the novel in parallel to his memory of his mother who used to tell Prior about her own experience of working as a maid for an upper-class family. As she recalls, the members of this family demanded her to stand "her face turned to the wall" whenever she came across with them in the corridor (Barker, 1998: 237). Hence, it becomes obvious that Prior's subordinate position in the military corresponds to his mother's subjugation as a working-class woman oppressed by the upper-class society. This originally incites his rage against the class distinction he encounters and thus, motivates him to assert his masculinity by means of violence.

Although Prior is angry at the existing class distinction in wartime British society, he is depicted in the novel as a working-class man who has now become a "temporary gentleman" being given the status of an upper-class officer through his job at the Ministry of Munitions (Barker, 1998: 237). Certainly, it is his success at proving his masculinity by showing an intense desire for fighting back at the front while he was being rehabilitated at Craiglockhart that leads him to be promoted to the position of an upper-class man as an officer. In contrast to his marginalized position of a working-class male in his earlier civilian life, now he holds a dominant upper-class position benefitting from the privileges of it by joining the respectful clubs of men with a khaki uniform on him, Yet, Prior has internal conflicts sourced by his masculine identity that becomes subject to change from a working-class masculinity to that of upper class one. Therefore, as observed by Manning, Prior is a temporary gentleman, but at the same time he is "neither fish nor fowl," which evokes the idea that he has an insecure sense of masculine identity as he does not feel himself belong to anywhere (Barker, 1998:237). In a way, he is neither an exact working-class man nor an upper-class one.

As seen, in this second volume of *the Trilogy*, Barker renders the manifestation of competing masculinities more visible by depicting Prior and Manning as male characters in whose masculinities the irreconcilables coexist. As for Manning, it is observed that he is an upper-class, homosexual, military man, and married to his wife Jane with two sons. In this way, Manning's masculine identity is shown to be constructed more through a

series of contradictions. On the one hand, he is depicted as a retired military officer who got a wound in his leg while fighting at Passchendaele, for which he wins a medal, while on the other, he is represented as a homosexual, married to a woman with two children but has been arrested by the police as he is caught in a homosexual act with a young man recently.

Hence, it is seen that Manning's masculinity hinges on two irreconcilable forms of identity as the military and homosexual man that are in stark contrast to each other. As a matter of fact, the author brings together those irreconcilable identities of Manning to illustrate how his competing masculinities pose a threat for the maintenance of patriarchal military state. Meanwhile, these irreconcilable sides of his masculinity are to be reconciled through the state violence that attempts to intimidate him owing to his homosexual act. As Manning tells Prior, he is arrested and taken to the prison and is released from there on the same day with the interference of his solicitor. He further goes on to say that he would be taken to the court and would be kept in prison for two years, however, as he confesses: "wound helped. Medal helped [. . .] Connections helped" (Barker, 1998: 238).

Becoming a member of the upper-class society provides Manning with specific social connections while the wound and the medal he gets in the army grant him a military status, which privilege and help him not to be criminalized despite his homosexuality. Yet, the state violence exerted on the homosexual is illustrated by Barker as a political instrument in silencing those alternative masculinities as in the case of Manning. That is why, it is shown in the novel that Manning furthermore feels compelled to be cured of his sodomite, for which he is recommended to meet Rivers to get a treatment.

Established as the hegemonic mode of masculinity, heterosexuality becomes the dominant pattern of sexuality because, as Connell puts, "masculinity is necessarily in question in the lives of men whose sexual interest is in other men" (Connell, 2005: 90). To that end, heterosexual practice of masculinity is emphasized to be based on homophobia that functions through the subordination of homosexual men either by means of their criminalization or the material practices of exclusion, abuse, economic discrimination they are exposed to. Apparently, the novel shows that it is this construction of heterosexuality as the hegemonic ideal in wartime Britain accomplished through the

subordination and the criminalization of the homosexual that puts pressure on Manning too. That's why he tries to negotiate with hegemonic masculinity by renouncing his homosexuality as he is made to believe that it as a pathology that must be cured. Hence, at this point Rivers makes his first appearance in the novel. Rivers' new patient now is Manning, who comes to visit him to be cured of his sodomite. As put by Kaufman, "a key expression of homophobia is the obsessive denial of homosexual attraction; this denial is expressed as violence against other men" (1987: 12). In this context, it is understood that Rivers' method of treatment in curing Manning of his homosexuality becomes an example of homophobic violence in the state functioning to silence Manning's homosexual identity as it poses a threat for the existing gender order.

The violence the wartime homosexuals are exposed to by means of their persecution and criminalization is further stressed in the novel with references to Pemberton Billing affair taking place as a real historical event during the war (Barker, 1998:422-23). The author employs this affair in the novel to historically account that The British MA Pemberton Billing claims to have a "black book" consisting of the names of the eminent people of British society who are accused of homosexuality and thus blackmailed by the German secret agents. Indeed, Pemberton Billing's intention in intimidating those homosexuals is to put blame on them, whom he sees as debilitating the power of British nation and the army. Hence, the novel delineates that the homosexuals of the wartime Britain are scapegoated for the bleak and dire progress of the war that is prolonged too much; and thereby they are seen to be impacting on the course of the war negatively on the side of the British army. To put in other words, the novel explores how in wartime Britain the homosexuals came to be seen as the enemy within serving as the deviant traitors. They are believed to weaken the power and glory of the British army and the nation since they do not conform to the demands of hegemonic masculinity. Based on these historical facts, Barker portrays Manning as one of those blackmailed nonconformist homosexuals, who receives secret letters consisting of a newspaper cutting written on it "the cult of clitoris" referring to the case of Maud Allan's performance of Salome's dance (Barker, 1998: 242).

The novel has intertextual references to the play *Salome,* written in 1891 by Oscar Wilde that recounts the story of the protagonist named Salome who is represented beyond the established definitions of femininity. Wilde's Salome is an untraditional woman as

she is depicted to be disobedient in defying male authority and she enjoys the power of her own sexuality freely in male dominated Victorian society. Likewise, during the First World War, the Canadian born dancer Maud Allan's performance of Salome's dance makes references to the power of this unrestricted female sexuality that becomes impossible to control by any male authority. The dangerous sexuality of Salome, which Maud Allan externalizes through her performance, leads her to be stigmatized as a sexually deviant woman. This reinforces the suspicions on her lesbianism that deviate from heteronormative scripts of sexuality. Henceforth, historically, being a member of the military parliament Pemberton Billing accuses Maud Allan of assisting the German conspirators against the British state during the war to debilitate the state's manly power.

Throughout the novel, Manning, who is drawn to be a part of this circle of homosexuals as he joins the performance of Maud Allan in company of Robert Ross, feels the homophobic fear of being stigmatized and denigrated as a homosexual. To that end, the sense of fragmentation and terror Manning experiences is sourced by his fear of being surveilled owing to his homosexual identity. This is given symbolically in the novel through the crack he notices above the door of his house. Although Manning stays at the club of Ministry of Munitions, he occasionally visits his house, in which he used to live with his wife Jane and his two sons in the past. It is mentioned that the house got a bomb damage on account of the war and Manning finds the secret letter sent to him in the post-box of his damaged house. It is, therefore, seen that his house that stands for the fortress of his heterosexual marriage of his past life is now demolished, and the crack on its wall suggests the shattering of the secure boundaries of his heterosexual masculinity. This is given in the novel through the narrator's voice that delineates both Manning's damaged house and his depleted self as follows:

> His damaged house leaked memories of Jane and the children, and of himself too, as he had been before the war, memories so vivid in comparison with his present depleted self that he found himself moving between pieces of shrouded furniture like his own ghost (Barker, 1998: 245)

A parallelism between Manning's damaged house and his self that is split between his heterosexual and homosexual identities is therefore drawn by the author. As a site of his memories for his secure heterosexual marriage with his wife and two sons, his damaged house leaks into his present identity, and thereby he feels himself to be split into many pieces resulting with a "depleted self". This new self of him is distressed and

terrorized by a constant surveillance and intimidation his insecure homosexual identity encountered. When he further examines the crack above the door, he notices that "the whole surround of the door had been loosened" (Barker, 1998: 240). Hence, this points out his fragmentation sourced by the subordination he experiences due to his homosexual identity in contrast to the secure grounds of his heterosexual identity before the war. This is especially implied through how he feels himself threatened and insecure on account of the intrusion into his house. In a way, the anxiety and fear of being surveilled because of his homosexuality causes Manning to feel as if he is attacked under "millions of eyes" in a state of nakedness described by the narrator as in these words: "the sensation was extraordinary, one of the worst attacks he'd ever had. Like being naked, high up on a ledge, somewhere, in full light, with beneath him only jeering voices and millions of eyes" (Barker, 1998: 245).

On the other hand, the surveilled masculinities of Barkers' characters are further explored in the novel through the image of Aylesbury prison where, Beattie Rooper is kept. The image of eye in the door of Beattie's prison cell refers to an invisible instrument of control and surveillance for the ones who resist to comply with the hegemonic ideals of masculinity. Therefore, the eye in her door communicates the predicament of the pacifists and homosexuals of wartime Britain, who were seen as a threat to the existing gender order and thus felt this sense of being constantly watched, surveilled, and consequently were oppressed by the eye of the other men.

In this case, Beattie's revolting stance as a woman exemplifies the case of the pacifists opposing the war. She is convicted of planning to kill the Prime Minister Llyod George and is thereby kept in the prison cell at the door of which an image of eye is painted. Visiting Beattie in her prison cell where she is on a hunger strike, Prior realizes the disturbing image of the painted eye in the shape of "the peephole formed the pupil, but around this . . . a veined iris, an eye white, eyelashes and a lid" (Barker, 1998: 252). Hence, the novel intends to convey the tortured masculinities of the conscientious objectors through this image of the eye in the door that refers to their experience of being watched as in the case of Beattie's son William, who, in his letter to her once had told that it was not being kept in a cold prison cell with a stone floor but the sense of "being watched all the time. The eye in the door that bothers him" (Barker, 1998: 252).

Hence, the title of the novel makes a reference to the masculinities constructed through the surveillance by the eye of the other powerful men and the state. In some ways, the story depicts how one's masculinity is tested and evaluated through the scrutiny of other men, making a man feel like a little child who is expected to prove his masculinity. By doing so, what is underlined within the framework of the novel is the idea that men's experience of being surveilled by other men emasculates them by creating a sense of being confined in a prison within a state of feminine passiveness and immobility.

In this context, the atmosphere of oppression and fear that pervades Barker's characters' lives gives clues about their fears and anxieties regarding the society's approval or disapproval of their masculine identities. While Prior is depicted as a man seeking the approval of society, Beattie is drawn as a foil to him in that she holds a mirror to him, showing his anxieties about his own masculinity. Although the reader is informed that Prior and Beattie had closely known each other in the past and had a relationship like that of a mother and son, their coherence and intimacy is shown to have been disrupted now as they are no longer on the same side about the war. In other words, the harmonious relationship between them is broken on account of Prior's complicity with the institutionalized state power as a spy, which Beattie criticizes through her expression that:

> We were close once, Billy. You were like a son to me . . . I'm not going to ask whose side you are on because you might not tell me the truth . . . But just tell me this. Do you know whose side you are on" (Barker, 1998: 255).

Nevertheless, Prior keeps his silence by not replying to Beattie's question, which again implicates his complicit masculinity. Hence becoming a supporter of the war by spying on the pacifists and betraying against the emancipatory ideals of the local community of his past working-class origins as well, Prior is a traitor.

It is noteworthy to state that Prior's betrayal to the people of his own class is seen to have been motivated by his masculine anxieties within the context of the war that actually has its roots back in his past working-class life. To that end, the author depicts him visiting his hometown, where Beattie and he had once lived during his childhood, to discover not only more about Beattie but also about himself. Before going there, Prior examines Beattie's file and finds out Lionel Spragge's testimonial report on her past life in which Beattie is declared to have been a member of the independent Labour party and

an active suffragette, and now she is found out by Spragge to have sheltered the deserters and pacifists in her past life. Like Prior, Lionel Spragge is another spy working at Ministry of Munitions under the command of major Lode. Indeed, what motivates Spragge in spying on objectors whom the state sees as a potential threat for its war propaganda is the amount of the bonus he is paid for the convicts he makes arrested. He begins to spy on Beattie and her adopted son Patrick Mac-dowell who are both pacifists and socialists and are kept responsible for the strikes against the state. To get information more about Beattie and Mac, Spragge introduces himself to Beattie as a moral objector to disguise his real identity. To that end, Spragge betrays Beattie seeming to be on her side as an objector but at the same time informing against her that she plotted to kill the president, though it was not Beattie but Spragge himself who plotted the assassination by putting the blame on Beattie to make her arrest. In this sense it becomes apparent that, Spragge performs a complicit masculinity, which he construes through spying on and betraying against the pacifists in acting as an agent provocateur, and this enables him to make a benefit of the situation and held position of male power as implied through Prior's question to Spragge that "you got a bonus if she was convicted?" (Barker, 1998: 260).

In the novel, not only Prior and Spragge but also Rivers develops a complicit masculinity by keeping his silence and adopting a stiff upper lip. Rivers for the first time appears in this volume of the *Trilogy* again as a psychologist treating a pilot called Dundas, who is suffering from nausea. They practice an air flight together to make him confront his nausea. While doing this, Rivers senses that his legs are trembling but pretends not to have been frightened. He therefore realizes that he represses his own fear and thus he is exactly doing what he advises his patients not to do. When Head asks him how he felt, Rivers' confession that "I seem to be suffering from terminal stiff upper lip" indicates the way his masculinity is construed through being socially trained to be a man of "a stiff upper lip" referring to the repression of his fears and emotions to be seen and approved by the society as manly enough (Barker, 1998: 272). In other words, having a stiff upper lip, Rivers is a man who is trained to silence what he feels and fears if he is to be seen a proper man in the eyes of society. Furthermore, the novel relates Rivers' and most wartime men's masculinity formed as stiff upper lip to the influence of public school system upon them, and this is given in the novel through the words of Henry Head as follows: "It's the Public School Factor, Will. We're all too well trained" (Barker, 1998:

272). In this way, the author underscores how Public schools have been the institutions in which men are trained to be tough and emotionless.

Rivers' stiff upper lip is not only caused by the British public school system training men to repress their feelings, but also is a consequence of masculine anxieties of his own old age. Believing that "It is the silly Old Fool Factor. Too many young men around" Rivers also reveals his own anxiety as an old man regarding how he feels deprived of power among so many young men (Barker, 1998: 272). This prompts him to repress his feelings of fear not to be seen as an old decrepit man. As a man feeling deprived of power when compared to the status of young men, he eventually attempts to keep his social status within gender hierarchy by adopting a stiff upper lip that helps him not to express what he feels or thinks truly. Hence, considering Barker's description of Rivers as a man of stiff upper lip, it is observed Rivers becomes complicit with patriarchal power and hegemonic project by keeping his silence about his real emotions and thoughts.

Meanwhile, Prior's complicity with the state disturbs him so intensely that he begins to be haunted by the image of the eye that is traced throughout the novel as underscoring Prior's problematic masculine identity. Still having a treatment under the supervision of Rivers, Prior visits him to talk about his worries in his new profession and expresses that he had a nightmare of stabbing somebody in the eye that watches him from the door. At first, he tries to interpret his dream by drawing a connection between the eye on Mrs. Roper's door and the eye of his soldier fellow Towers, which he picked from the ground when they had been attacked at the front. Yet, Rivers interprets his dream to be caused by Prior's inner conflict stating that "the dreams are attempts to resolve the conflict" (Barker, 1998: 277).

According to Rivers, Prior feels himself guilty of spying on the working-class pacifists such as Beattie, her son William, and Patrick Mac-dowell, who are Prior's old acquaintances from his past life in his hometown with whom socially and politically he is not on the same side now. To that end, his nightmare of stabbing somebody in the eye seems to be an attempt of his mind to resolve his conflict through his unconscious desire to sever his own eye (I) with the aim of disintegrating himself from his complicity with the state power. In other words, he becomes aware of the state violence and power exerted on the pacifists and begins to feel guilty due to the pain suffered by them. H, therefore,

comes to discover his own complicity and declares that "so, eye was stabbing myself in the I" (Barker, 1998:279). Furthermore, Prior's confession that "I'm racked with guilt" and his account of the "seminal emissions" during the nightmares may illustrate how he is disturbed by his complicit masculinity (Barker, 1998: 277). To that end, Rivers interprets Prior's seminal emissions not to be sourced by his sexual guilt, but by a "guilt about an involuntary action" (Barker, 1998: 277).

It can be asserted that throughout his life it is Prior's working-class background that mostly causes him to be excluded and subordinated as a man within the society, and eventually it triggers his inner tensions sourced by what he does not want to confront about his class status. His home service as a spy is an attempt to transcend his subordinate class position by spying on the pacifists, through which he maintains to hold a privileged place within gender hierarchy. Hence, having no sense of belonging to anyone or anywhere, Prior is in search of his identity as he becomes so alienated from his working-class roots, and turns into a man who tries to establish a new masculine identity by becoming complicit with the gender politics of the state. Consequently, he experiences a crisis of identity that is split between what he is socially expected to be as a man and what he wants to be in reality. On the one hand, he tries to reject culturally prescribed masculine identity of him while he feels compelled to comply with it on the other. This is illustrated in the novel through the emergence of two distinct personalities of him in the form of "Jekyll and Hyde" during his sessions with Rivers (Barker, 1998: 328). He becomes split between two distinct personalities through the intervention of these two conflicting aspects of human nature as good and evil as is exemplified within Stevenson's story of Mr Jekyll and Hyde. Therefore, Prior's self becomes split in the fight between good and evil as he becomes unable to suppress his evil side anymore. In brief, the novel demonstrates how his subordinate position as a working-class man, which Prior internalizes and suppresses due to his working-class masculinity, leads him to find ways of negotiating with hegemonic masculinity in evil forms.

Michael Kaufman argues that apart from men's violence against other men, each individual man experiences violence against himself. He explains this concept of "a man's violence against himself" by drawing attention to "the structure of masculine ego" by which violence is internalized. He puts that "the formation of an ego on an edifice of surplus repression and surplus aggression is the building of a precarious structure of internalized violence" (Kaufman, 1987: 13). Men tend to deny or consciously or

unconsciously block “all the emotions and feelings associated with passivity- fear, pain, sadness, embarrassment-is a denial of part of what we are” (Kaufman, 1987: 13). Men’s denial of these emotions results with “the blocking of avenues of discharge”, and thus men become unable to discharge his fears, sadness, pain. With men’s failure to discharge these emotions, therefore, “a whole range of emotions are transformed into anger and hostility” (Kaufman, 1987: 13). Hence, as Kaufman observes “part of the anger is directed at oneself in the form of guilt, self-hate, and various physiological and psychological symptoms. Part is directed at other men” and “at women” (1987: 13.).

The dissolution of Prior’s self is first observed in the novel as his anger directed at other men. Brought up to deny his emotions Prior cannot discharge his emotions of fear, sadness and pain and thus splits his self into two by which he transforms these emotions of him into anger and hostility. This is evidenced in the scene when Rivers asks him whether his father knows about Prior’s job as a government spy. Accordingly, Prior’s answer that “I hope not” demonstrates how Prior fears to be challenged and opposed by his father because of his home service of spying rather than being a courageous officer fighting in France. However, when Rivers implies his worry over Prior’s uneasy relationship with his father that may be triggered on his future visit to his hometown, Prior’s expressions and mood suddenly change from that of helpless man to that of a formidable one. Obviously, his statement that “You needn’t worry. If anybody comes a cropper over this one, it will not be me” indicates how Prior is determined not to fail this time in the power struggle between him and his father. It is at that moment that Rivers notices a sudden change in Prior’s personality and attitudes, which demonstrates the split of his self into two distinct parts as is given by the narrator as follows:

> He looked quite different, suddenly: keen, alert, cold, observant, detached, manipulative, ruthless. Rivers realized he was seeing, probably for the first time, Prior’s public face. At Craiglockhart he had been aggressive and manipulative, but always from a position of comparative helplessness. At times he’d reminded Rivers of a toddler clinging to his father’s sleeve in order to be able to deliver a harder kick on his shins. Now, briefly, he glimpsed the Prior other people saw: The Lodes, the Ropers, the Spragges, and it came as a shock. Prior was formidable (Barker, 1998: 279).

Hence, as the quotation above indicates, the split personality of Prior is sourced by the social expectations of becoming an ideal man. This ultimately causes him to turn from a helpless, childlike man who is unable to oppose his father into a reckless, defiant one challenging his father. In other words, the evil and violent side of Prior’s self comes

into being to exercise his dominance and power over his father and some other men that hold positions of power. Therefore, on account of his subordinate position within the gender hierarchy the silence and mutism that predominates in Prior's earlier self gives way to the violence of his new self, through which he attempts to construct a new kind of masculine identity.

Prior's split self, in fact, is the product of diverse forms of violence he encountered throughout his life. Especially, the domestic violence he experienced in his boyhood plays a great role in the formation of his masculine identity, which now he comes to construe through violence just like his father. Back at his hometown to see Beattie's daughter Hettie, Prior visits his parents and realizes that nothing has changed regarding the battle between his father and mother, and to that end as the narrator depicts Billy "was not above it: he was its product" (Barker, 1998: 289). How brutal and oppressive his father had behaved against his mother at home in their past life is reflected through Prior's memories recalling "the scuffle of running steps, a stifled cry [. . .] the back of his father's hand sending his mother staggering against the wall" (Barker, 1998: 289). Hegemonic masculinity insists on the oppression of men over women by means of violence to maintain a position of dominance within the society. Based on this, Prior's father's negotiation with hegemonic masculinity leads him to resort to domestic violence at home. As a matter of fact, the domestic violence Prior encounters within the family since his boyhood generates an aloof and tense relationship between him and his father, and this evokes Prior's urge to oppose not only his father but also any figures of authority in his adult life. Overthrowing his father's authority, therefore, Prior attempts to construe and prove his own masculinity through an oppositional relationship with his father that causes them to be at war with each other.

However, although Prior and his father's conflicting masculinities appear to be sourced from the violence his father exerts within the family, Barker draws attention to a larger social structure that determines both men's and boys' lives to be intertwined with violence. In this respect, the writer's critique of the institutional power of the school that serves to elucidate how men try to maintain a position of dominance through violence since their boyhood bears importance. Identifying schools as the institutions of violent discipline system, Connell argues that "the authority structure of the school becomes the antagonist against which one's masculinity is cut" (1989: 294). Additionally, according

to Connell, within this structure, boys are invited to compete in machismo to gain social power during their struggle for dominance at school. Therefore, a specific form of masculinity is construed for the boys through institutional power of schools. The boys construct their competing masculinities through power relations that are based on the "supervision and authority among the teachers" and the "patterns of dominance, harassment, and control over resources among pupils" (Connell, 2000:153).

This influence of the school on the formation of boys' masculinities is traced in the novel through Prior and his friends' past days of childhood that he recalls after visiting his hometown many years later. Intending to investigate more about Hettie's mother Beattie and her conscientious objector husband Mac, Prior decides to go to his hometown to see his childhood friend Hettie. Back at his hometown, his schoolyard and classroom memories about his best friend Mac, whom he always remembers as a boy always beaten by other boys at the school, overtakes him. As depicted through the eyes of Prior, "Mac was dirty, and his hair was lousy. He wore men's shoes, and a jacket whose sleeves came to the tips of his fingers, and he was always being beaten" (Barker, 1998: 301). In this sense, it is observed that Mac and other children's experience of masculinity at school is construed through power relations among them that centre around acts of fighting, beating, and bullying. To put in other words, they construct their masculinities through the challenge they pose against each other brutally and violently in oppositional and competitive ways.

Given this context, it can be deduced that the novel explores how the mechanism of gender hierarchy, which the social structure of wartime Britain generates among men, becomes influential on the formation of the British boys' masculinities as well. To that end, the way hierarchies among boys are produced through the intersection of gender and class is pointed out in the novel through Mac's story of problematic masculinity at school that interrelates with the existing class distinctions within the society he lives in as a lower-class boy. Due to his mother's profession as a prostitute and the consequent indifference of her during his upbringing, Mac is portrayed as a boy seen to be a decrepit one by the other boys in the school. Moreover, he is a fatherless boy, and his neglected upbringing by his mother leads him to be marginalized at school to the extent that he is believed to deserve being beaten. Even, occasionally at school, Mac consents to be beaten for a slice of bread. As recalled by Prior: "Mac was a bread horse: he gave other boys

rides on his back in exchange for the crust from their bread or the core of their apple" (Barker, 1998:302). However, Prior himself does not encounter much discrimination at school as Mac does, and he is not believed to deserve being beaten by other boys as much as Mac; because, as he confesses, unlike him, "he was clean, tidy, well turned out, likely to win a scholarship and bring desperately needed credit to the school, he'd been spared" (Barker, 1998: 302). Hence, as indicated by Prior's expressions above, Barker lays bare how some boys at school gain social power through their access to a better physical and financial life conditions, and academic success, which Mac lacks as a boy. By so doing, Barker draws attention to the fact that the school as an institution consolidates the gender hierarchy among boys causing them to resort to violence to claim their masculinities.

Connell emphasizes that "up against an authority structure, acts of resistance or defiance mean getting into trouble" (1989: 294). In this respect, Mac's attempt to negotiate with hegemonic masculinity prompts him to resist the authority structure of the school, which he tries to accomplish by getting himself into trouble with other boys at school. Consequently, as a son of a lower-class family, Mac resents at the discrimination he encounters within the authoritarian structure of the school and attempts cross over the boundaries of his own class by fighting other boys, through which he aims to prove his masculinity aggressively resorting to violence. Likewise, Prior encounters the same class discrimination at school as he is coming from a working-class family, yet Mac's case is much worse as he is a son of a prostitute, and therefore positioned at the bottom of the gender hierarchy. All in all, through Billy and Mac's childhood memories the novel illustrates the way violence in men's lives ever since their boyhood becomes an instrumental means of constructing their masculinities in their attempt to defy anything construed as male power and authority.

On the other hand, in Mac's adulthood, the authority structure of the school is replaced by the military structure of the state, against which Mac resists by choosing to be a deserter. Adopted and raised by Beatie Roper as a son when he was thirteen, Mac turns into a literate man with the help of Beattie, who attempts to free him from the pressures of class discrimination and gender hierarchy he experienced at school and within the society as a whole. To that end, as Prior emphasizes, Mac's "debt to the Ropers was total. Without Beattie, he'd've been a scabby, lousy, neglected kid, barely able to read and write, fit only for the drovers' road and slaughterhouse. Beattie had taken him

in" (Barker, 1998: 305). After he disappears from the town for a while because he is unable to bear the humiliation caused by his mother Lizzie's profession, Beattie Roper takes charge of him. From then on, Beattie regenerates him by means of a true education she provides for him, which makes him believe in himself. Encouraging him that "You can read, can't you? Just 'cos the teachers think you're stupid, doesn't mean you are" (Barker, 1998: 305), in a way, she helps him to reconstruct his masculinity by making him removed from violence and subordination his masculinity was exposed to in his neighbourhood and at school. As a matter of fact, Mac construes a new kind of masculinity that does not conform to the hegemonic ideals of the time by choosing to become a pacifist and a deserter.

Henceforth, during their adulthood, there arises a conflict between Prior and Mac that is sourced from their competing masculinities construed in stark contrast to each other, the one as a pacifist acting against the state and the other as a spy acting for the state. When Prior meets Mac around the cattle pens in the town many years later, the close childhood relationship between them is observed to have undergone a dramatic change by growing into a strained one now. Most especially, their attitudes and beliefs regarding the war and the military duty that distinctively differ from each other create a tension between these two men. This is further traced through Prior's accusation of Mac of cowardice addressing him "poor frightened little sod of a deserter" (Barker, 1998:303), to which Mac replies with an ironic question "what about the poor frightened little sods who don't desert?" (Barker, 1998:303). Here, it is seen that both men are accusing each other of being a "frightened sod" depending upon what characterizes their sense of a true manliness defined in relation to their conception of courage and cowardice. While what it means to be a courageous man is not being a deserter for Prior, it is to be a deserter and a pacifist by not taking part in the violence of the war and the state for Mac.

As is seen, through the writer's juxtaposition of men's social conception of cowardice and courage serving to differentiate what is socially acknowledged as manly and less than manly behaviour, the meanings of the terms "a coward man" and "a courageous man" come to be interrogated as social constructs. This is exemplified in the novel by depicting the power struggle between Mac and Prior given through their opposing moral and political ideals that become entangled with the construction of their masculinities. From the aspect of Mac, Prior's commitment to military state and his

profession as a government spy come to mean his betrayal to the socialist ideals of his own working-class roots, by which he construes a privileged position for himself as a man. It is for this reason that Mac depicts Prior's case as a condition of being "equally at home" and "equally not at home" (Barker, 1998: 303) and accuses Prior of benefiting from his double-edged position uttering that: "must be quite nice really. A foot on each side of the fence. Long as you don't mind what it's doing to your balls" (Barker, 1998: 304). Here, obviously it is Prior's complicity with the state that infuriates Mac and leads him to attack Prior's masculinity through his genitals implied through the word "balls". Yet, proud of not being a deserter as a man serving devoutly for the army and the state, Prior begins to despise Mac's position of a deserter and attacks his masculinity by relating his pacifist stance to lack of his courage, which he defines over male genitals as well stating that "They are all right Mac. Worry about your own" (Barker, 1998: 304). Hence, it is understood that both Prior and Mac try to prove their masculinity through their male genitals standing out for phallic power, with which they associate having or not having courage.

However, the novel depicts Mac's conception of courage as undermining that of Prior, and in this way, it helps the reader reconsider what true courage and a true hero are. For him, being a pacifist takes more courage than it is assumed to be because of the state violence and criminalization encountered by the pacifists or conscientious objectors who are labelled as "conchies" by the military. Seen as the enemy within, the pacifists are made to conform by the state through physical and psychological torture during the war as in the case of Mac who was taken by six policemen to the station and was pushed around. The state violence, therefore, is used as a fundamental instrument to intimidate the pacifists seen as a threat to its maintenance. Nevertheless, Mac thinks that while the violence he experienced as a pacifist does not make him anxious about his manliness, the violence that most men experienced at the front in France is a matter of a test of manliness with their heads blown up and their arms and legs amputated. Hence, being aware that Prior sees fighting at the front as a proof of manliness, Mac tries to show how difficult and impossible it is to prove this for any man by fighting at the front. It is for this reason that Mac challenges Prior asking that "and of course there's always the unanswered question. Could you face it? Could you pass the test" (Barker, 1998: 304). By the same token, Mac also reveals that passing this test is "a Very Important Question" for Prior, while it is trivial for Mac himself (Barker, 1998: 304).

As the novel progresses it is made clear that Prior's profession as a government spy investigating war objectors and his attachment to these objectors as people from his past with a shared life gradually come to deepen the split in his identity and his sense of insecurity. The author emphasizes this through the image of trenches and no man's land that haunt Prior even in his childhood hometown. After seeing Mac and agreeing to disclose Spragge's secret evil deeds by which he victimized the objectors such as Beattie and others, Prior takes a walk to his parents' home across the brick fields surrounded by a landscape of waste land that remind him of the scenic atmosphere of the war front in France. This image of waste land is conveyed through Prior's eyes depicting during his walk across the brick how "sump holes reflected a dull gleam at the sky, tall grasses bent to the wind, pieces of scrap metal rusted [. . .] a jagged black shape that, outlined against the horizon, would have served as a landmark on patrol" (Barker, 1998: 307). In this sense, England is no longer a pastoral place for Prior, but rather becomes a mechanized one always reminding him of the war front because, as the narrator implies, the front had destroyed most men's sense of home "with its mechanization, its reduction of the individual to a cog in a machine, its blasted landscape" (Barker, 1998: 307).

Prior's sense of insecurity that the novel underscores through the landscape of wasteland is further given in detail when Prior suddenly falls into a muddy hole dig by the children. As the narrator reveals Prior feels "disoriented and afraid" upon encountering these holes and unable to grasp what is happening he begins to feel as if he was in a real trench and assumes that No Man's Land is over there, behind which the enemy lines lie (Barker, 1998: 307-8). Hence, it can be deduced that Prior's disorientation in a hole as if he was in a war trench is caused by the split of identity he experiences because of the social construction of his military masculinity that begins to damage and disturb him psychologically by putting pressure on him.

As a man whose sense of home and identity is shattered through the destruction and violence wrought by the war, Prior's perception of No Man's Land for the landscape over the holes reflects how he feels uneasy. There, he senses that he is on the verge of being attacked at an uncanny site where the enemy can intrude any time. This sense of him is primarily intensified when he talks with Mac about Spragge and finds out that it is Spragge himself who starts the strikes of objectors and offers them explosives for the

munition factories. As a matter of fact, Prior's uneasiness and insecurity evoked by the landscape of waste land on his way back to home is seen to have caused by his distrust to another man, namely Spragge, whom he sees as an enemy within trying to intrude into his territory and thus becoming a threat for his identity. Thus, in this uncanny area of No Man's Land where the familiar and the unfamiliar coalesce, Prior cannot feel secure as a man and seeks solace in having an intercourse with his parents' neighbour Mrs. Riley by the canal. As depicted by the narrator, after kissing Mrs. Riley's mouth, nose, and hair Prior felt "every taboo in the whole fucking country crush round his ears" and then began sucking her breasts, which indicates his Oedipal conflict and his attempt to seek shelter in mother's breast to defy every kind of taboos put by the father and the society oppressing on him to become a proper man (Barker, 1998: 309)

Meanwhile, Prior is mentioned to have bad headaches since the day he falls into the children's trench. Returning to London he is informed that the Intelligence services will be centralized and governed by the War office because of which he is given by Major Lode the task of compiling the files of the unit. At that time, sensing a ruinous disturbance in his consciousness, he sees Major Lode and Spragge talking secretly and shaking hands outside his room. This creates an atmosphere of menace, which he depicts as the atmosphere of "plots and counterplots" whose main target he assumes to be himself in the unit (Barker, 1998: 317). The menace that he senses due to the collaboration of Major Lode and Spragge increases Prior's insecurity and causes him more disturbance leading him to feel stuffed together with the increasing pain in his head. To overcome this stuffiness and restlessness, Prior needs to get out for a walk around Hyde Park. There, while walking unconsciously, he arrives at Achilles Monument. Indeed, the reason that drives him to go there is his desire to belong to somewhere safer that will help him to get rid of the unsafe restlessness he confronts in the unit. As the narrator underscores "he felt restless. . . He had a definite and very strange sensation of wanting to be somewhere, a specific place, and of not knowing what that place was. He began to stroll towards the Achilles Monument" (Barker, 1998: 317).

Yet, the meaning of Achilles Monument for Prior is not simple as it seems to be; because "its heroic grandeur both attracted and repelled him" (Barker, 1998:317). He admired the courage embodied by the monument but at the same time he repels at the idea of lost heroic ideal as the monument looked as a "representation of an ideal that no

longer had validity" with its sword and shield raised (Barker, 1998:317). The monument therefore comes to symbolize ambivalent and contradictory nature of hegemonic masculinity itself that is idealized and exalted but is never attained by any men and that changes constantly over time. As a result, Prior becomes aware that swords and shields or namely the courage in the battlefield do not any more become the markers of masculinity in this new world of menace he witnesses in the unit and gets angry at this lost heroic ideal discovering that the ideals he run after are the greatest lies.

Prior's confrontation with his disillusionment and ambivalence about his own experience of masculinity that the novel explores through the image of Achilles monument does not actually satisfy him. To that end, he hopes to encounter with something more shocking and extraordinary. This comes true at the end of his walk when suddenly he sees Spragge under the shadow of the trees. Approaching him, Spragge begins to accuse Prior of being late for their appointment at Achilles monument at Nine while Prior asserts that he does not remember having already arranged such an appointment with him. The tension between Spragge and Prior begins to increase as Spragge tries to intimidate Prior expressing that he has been following him for a while and knows all the steps he takes till he arrives at the park. Furthermore, Spragge attempts to assault Prior verbally arguing that he does not trust him as Prior had already promised a job for him in the unit but instead he got the job himself. The power struggle between the two men becomes further manifest as Spragge begins to stare and shout at him aggressively to the extent that Prior senses "he'd never experienced such an intense awareness of another person's body before, except in sex" causing him to feel not only dislike but also "an intimate, obsessive, deeply physical hatred" for Spragge. (Barker, 1998: 319). In this sense, it becomes clear that through Prior's confrontation with Spragge's aggression it is traced how Prior feels frightened, restless, and insecure due to this atmosphere of menace and violence generated through male power relations he engages with. This posits a threat for his masculine identity, which, eventually, paves the way for the emergence of his psychological disorders as indicated through his experience of temporary memory losses and headaches.

Prior's experience of intense fear and anxiety as a man in a world of menace and distress leads him to strive for eliminating fear from his life. To do this, he undergoes a mental state of fugue, which Rivers depicts as a "dissociated state" (Barker, 1998: 322).

When Prior sees Rivers to talk about the episodes of his memory loss, he confesses that he is overtaken by violent impulses during which he does not know and remember what he has done. In other words, Prior begins to develop a personality disorder to which Rivers draws attention by asking him "You've read Jekyll and Hyde?" (Barker, 1998: 322). He, therefore, implies how Prior's dissociated state resembles to that of Hyde saying that "patients who suffered from fugue states invariably referred to the dissociated state – jocularly, but not without fear- as Hyde" (Barker, 1998: 322).

By the same token, Prior's dissociated state refers to his divided self as two distinct personalities reside in him in the form of Jekyll and Hyde that unfold in the course of his struggle for adjustment to the distress he experiences as a man trying to live up to hegemonic ideals of masculinity. In his fugue state he adopts an alternate personality by which he temporarily begins to forget who he is, his identity and his past. In a way, as figured out by Rivers, whenever Prior confronts "a very unpleasant situation", his dissociated state of mind takes over him as his way of coping with it (Barker, 1998: 401). The critic Sharon Monteith observes that "many of the characters in Barker's Trilogy survive by splitting off parts of themselves into dissociated consciousness: the part that kills or fears or desires houses the experiences that it is easier to repress" (2002: 58). In this respect, Barker portrays Prior's fugue state to illustrate how his alternate personality helps him to adjust and conform to the hegemonic ideals of masculinity. Thereby, he becomes unafraid of any outside threats as his consequent fearlessness causes him to fight recklessly and feel no pain. In short, fugue state for Prior becomes a way of escaping from the menacing atmosphere posing a threat for his masculinity that is construed through his repression of fear.

Though confessed by Prior through his expression to Rivers that "I'm frightened", both Prior and the rest of the male characters in the novel survive by repressing this sense of fear of them as they feel compelled to hide their fears not to be seen as less than manly. According to Monteith Barker's employment of repressed fears make this novel "the most angry of the three novels"; because by doing so "Barker pushes to the limits of human psychological endurance" (2002: 58). This is further understood in the novel through Rivers' ongoing therapeutic sessions with Prior in which Rivers is traced as a doctor suffering from repression of his fears as well. As Prior and Rivers had done previously in the first novel of *the Trilogy*, in this second volume they again exchange their seats during

one of their sessions. This time offered by Rivers, Prior has the seat of doctor inspecting his patient Rivers who needs someone to hold a mirror into his innermost fears which he represses. Confessing that “I have no visual memory” Rivers reveals to Prior that “I can’t remember the interior of any building I’ve ever been in. I can’t remember this house when I’m not in it. I can’t remember Craiglockhart, though I lived there for over a year…” (Barker, 1998: 323-24). Following this, Rivers begins to account about the event that caused him to lose his visual memory when he was raped on the top floor of his father’s vicarage. Additionally, he admits that since then he feels compelled to forget both the memory of it and the feeling of fear ensuing from being raped that occurred when he was five years old. Consequently, this violence he encounters when he was a little boy leads him to incapacitate himself to remember anything visually as told by him in these words:

> And I ‘ve come to believe – I won’t go into the reasons – that something happened to me on the top floor that was so terrible that I simply had to forget it. And in order to ensure that I forgot I suppressed not just the one memory, but the capacity to remember things visually at all. . . I was raped in a vicarage once” (Barker, 1998, 324).

Prior makes Rivers further confront with his dividedness by making him aware that the repression of his fear caused by his experience being raped is the true source of Rivers’ own stammering. Through Prior’s question to Rivers that “how old were you when you started to stammer?” (Barker, 1998: 325), to which Rivers responds that he was five years old when his stammering began, the author , therefore, draws attention to the connection between Rivers’ rape and his repression of fear. This ultimately gives way to Rivers’ stammering standing for his inner conflict of desiring what he wants to say and his inability to do so on account of his incomplete emotional repression of the event. As for the loss of Rivers’ visual memory, Prior tries to make Rivers see the root causes of it stating that “you blinded yourself so you wouldn’t have to go on seeing it” and adds that “you destroyed your visual memory. You put your mind’s eye out” (Barker, 1998: 325). Here again, it is observed that Prior acts as a “formidable interrogator” for Rivers by means of his questions and explanations to him that make Rivers confront with his loss, namely the loss of his visual memory (Barker, 1998: 325). Yet, what Prior’s interrogation reveals is how Rivers’ experience of sexual violence and repression of its fear becomes linked with the social construction of his masculinity. As a matter of fact, this points out how Rivers’ attempt to repress the memory and the fear of the rape leads to the destruction of his own visual memory and how this repression becomes an unconscious strategy for him to survive as a man in a patriarchal gender order by forgetting his childhood experience of being sexually exploited (Barker, 1998: 326).

Rivers' confession of being raped as a little boy once in a vicarage is followed by Prior's own account of how he was also raped by the parish priest Father Makenzie, from whom he "was receiving extra tuition" (Barker, 1998: 325). Kaufman suggests that since masculinity is associated with power, it also becomes fragile depending upon what defines the expression of male power in different contexts. Therefore, men always become unsure of their own masculinity and doubt about themselves, and this creates emotional tensions they strive to overcome. (Kaufman, 1987: 8). Based on this Kaufman interprets violence as "the expression of fragility of masculinity" and draws attention to the function of it in maintaining both masculinity and male domination (Kaufman, 1987: 8). In this sense, rape exemplifies the acting out of this fragile masculinity and relations of power among men. As he says "In the testimonies of the rapists one hears over and over again expressions of inferiority, powerlessness, anger." (Kaufman, 1987: 8). Hence, even in their boyhood both Rivers and Prior are shown to have been sexually exploited by the respectable men of the church who try to maintain or validate their masculinities via interacting with sexual violence to gain control and exert power over others. Therefore, Barker expresses that fragility of their masculinities unfolding as powerless, inferior and thus angry men leads these men of the church to exercise power dominance over other men through rape.

In this respect, the novel also throws a criticism on religion and its institutional power as being marked by corruption, exploitation and power struggles victimizing most men by portraying the sexual violence these men exposed to by the clergymen. The hypocrisy of the Church and its men is, therefore, uncovered by the author to criticize how religion demands from its sons a heroic sacrifice, which becomes only possible with the abuse or exploitation of them by their religious fathers. In this sense, the author's exploration of sexual abuse or exploitation of the boys by men of the church functions to elucidate the way patriarchal authority and power is maintained in and through Christian religion during the war as is given in Abraham's story that exalts sons' silence and obedience in the face of father's power and authority. Hence, while their sons are dying in the wars, the fathers are expected to take part in the violence of the war by keeping their silence upon their sons' death as in the case of Abraham. As a matter of fact, Both Rivers and Prior's experience of being raped by the clergymen sheds light on how men of the church negotiate with hegemonic masculinity in supporting the war and the

patriarchal order it maintains, which they come to achieve by exploiting and exerting their power over their sons.

Yet, the novel suggests that rather than a heroic courage, a heroic admittance of fear can become a subversive response of the sons to their fathers' exploitative demands. In this sense, the admittance of fear can redeem a man from the monsters invading his mind and memory as implied through Rivers' warnings to Prior that "Where unknown, there place monsters" (Barker, 1998:325). Brought up with repression of fear as the hegemonic ideal, Prior fills the gaps in his memory with monsters that frighten and threaten him. Indeed, as for Rivers these monsters are nothing than Prior's projections of his worst fears regarding his masculine identity. In this respect he advises Prior to avoid filling his mind with these monsters to be cured of from the overwhelming sense of fear and threat that are triggered for him by Spragge's masculinity. Therefore, Spragge's presence takes Prior further back to his boyhood fears, which he represses just as Rivers himself.

What is more, as realized by Rivers himself it is their experience of intense fear and repression of it that results with both his own and Prior's split personalities. Since hegemonic masculinity demands men to repress their emotions and fears, if this emotional repression is incomplete, they become internally divided between rational and emotional parts of their minds triggering a "dissociation of personality". To that end, the way hegemonic masculinity functions through men's emotional repression and thus becomes the source of men's internal divisions is given in the novel through Henry Head and Rivers' nerve regeneration experiment. This experiment observes how "epicritic" level of innervation functions by integrating with or partially suppressing the "protopathic" level either "to help the organism adapt to its environment by supplying it with accurate information" or "to keep the animal within leashed" (Barker, 1998: 327). Hence, nerve regeneration experiment reflects Rivers' own and most men's internal divisions unfolding on their way to negotiate with hegemonic masculinity, because, as revealed by the narrator:

"Epicritic came to stand for everything rational, ordered, cerebral, objective, while 'protopathic' referred to the emotional, the sensual, the chaotic, the primitive. In this way the experiment both reflected Rivers' internal divisions and supplied him with a vocabulary in which to express them. He might almost have said with Henry Jekyll, it was on the moral side, and in my own person, that I learned to recognize the thorough and primitive duality of man; I saw that, of the two natures that contended in the field of my consciousness, even if I could rightly be said to be either, it was only because I was radically both (Barker, 1998: 328).

Therefore, it can be claimed that Barker's critical viewpoint on the issue of regeneration in the whole *Trilogy* is concerned with representing the process of men's being made to conform to an ideal type of manliness and the impact of this process on men. To that end, in this second volume of *the Trilogy* it is pointed out how men's required attempt to adapt to their environment by the repression and control of their emotions and fears ultimately causes them to turn into internally divided men. The novel directly implies this with reference to this above-mentioned nerve regeneration process organized by two distinct levels of innervation that are "epicritic" and "protopathic". Given this context, as revealed by the narrator while Rivers becomes "throughout most of his life, a deeply divided man" experiencing a split between "the rational, analytical cast of his mind and his emotions" (Barker, 1998: 327), Prior turns into a more complex divided man undergoing a state of "co-consciousness" that leads him to be overtaken by his imagination and his belief in monsters (Barker, 1998: 328).

On the other hand, Manning, as another internally divided male character of the novel, is observed to have been suffering from severe anxiety attacks. The reader is informed that Prior's anxiety attacks had already began after he returned from France and have now increased with the impact of Pemberton Billing affair on him. Manning's anxiety attacks are sourced by the hostility against the homosexuals evoked by this affair after which they are even addressed as "monsters" in the Times by Serrel Cooke who states that "they are monsters, they should be locked up" (Barker, 1998: 331). As a man leading a double life of co-existing irreconcilables with his military and homosexual identity, Manning becomes more distressed by the scapegoating of the homosexuals; because they are believed to exterminate "the manhood of Britain" (Barker, 1998:336).

Here, the gendering of the British nation as a manly, glorious, and invincible entity is shown as the main generator of gender-based violence for the ones who are deemed to be debilitating its manly imperial power as they pose a threat to the maintenance of it. Rather than acknowledging the true reasons for the decline of its national and military power or interrogating its reasons in taking part in the violence of the war, Britain seeks for scapegoats on whom it targets to project its political and ethical faults. This is given through Manning's expression that "I can see the war is going pretty badly and there are

always going to be people who want scapegoats instead of reasons (Barker, 1998:336). In this sense, as also acknowledged by Rivers "the real targets were men who couldn't or wouldn't conform" (Barker, 1998:336). This comes to mean that the men who do not conform to hegemonic ideals of wartime British masculinity are consequently seen as outsiders or enemies scapegoated for unmanning the British nation and depriving it from its Imperial manly power during the war

The novel also draws attention to the fact that the British army and nation's attitude for the love among men during the war is ambiguous because as Rivers suggests "in war there's this enormous glorification of love among men, and yet at the same time it arouses anxiety" (Barker, 1998:336). Thus, while on the one hand, love among men in the army is glorified in the form of "camaraderie" to make men kill or die in the wars for the sake of their fellow soldiers, it is avoided by creating the anxiety that "is it the right kind of love? On the other (Barker, 1998:336). In this respect, Rivers relates the source of this anxiety to the rise of certain impulses unfolding during the war that men have to disown formally. As told by him to Manning, "in the process sadistic impulses are aroused that would normally be repressed and that also causes anxiety" (Barker, 1998:337). To that end, fearing that repressed homosexual impulses of men will come to the surface during the war, public disapproval of homosexuality is brought to the forefront by the wartime Britain through the scapegoating of them for the dire progress of war, which would serve for a discrimination between these conforming and nonconforming types of love among men in the army.

This homophobic militarist thinking of the wartime Britain is further interrogated in the novel through Manning's ideas on bayonet practice, which state his hatred for the practice. In the sessions with Rivers, Manning argues that "the army's attitude to the bayonet is pretty bloody ambiguous" because military training for bayonet consists more sexual undertones than its emphasis on "close combat" among men (Barker, 1998:338). The investigation of the link between weapons, violence and masculinity bears importance to understand Barker's critique of this bayonet practice conveyed through Manning's thoughts on it throughout the novel. Drawing attention to the sexualized imagery of weapons as "violent phallic symbols," Henri Myrttinen remarks that "the connection between men and weapons often takes on highly sexualized characteristics [. . .] If one accepts the symbolic sexual quality of weapons, then the use of weapons

consequently becomes a symbolic sexual act." (2003:39-40). He goes on to argue that the notion of violent militarized masculinity is maintained through the phallic imagery of weapons because weapons are seen as sex symbols, as fetishes and tools for reinforcing one's masculinity" (2003:41). Hence, by means of their phallic extension, weapons become instruments for men to enact their violent models of masculinity, which "often become hegemonic, with the weapon being used as both a symbol and a tool to demonstrate and enforce this hegemony against others, including competing masculinities" (Myrttinen, 2003:44). Accordingly, the use of bayonet in the military training of wartime Britain as well as the United States helps to build "the fighting spirit of all male troops" and it "was described in explicitly sexual terms" becoming a metaphor for "the act of penetration or symbolic rape" men are expected to enact (Myrttinen, 2003:40). Yet, Myrttinen also argues that those who avoid using the bayonet are seen as 'effete' or 'feminine' (2003:40). In this context, Manning's hatred for the bayonet practice mentioned in the novel becomes linked with his homosexual masculinity clashing with the violent militarized masculinity embodied through the sexual imagery of the bayonet. It is for this reason that Manning laments at this manly war and the bayonet practice within military training as a sexualized violent enactment of masculinity stating that:

> It is proper war. Manly war. Not all this nonsense about machine-guns and shrapnel. And it's reflected in the training. I mean, it's one long stream of sexual innuendo. Stick him in the gooleys. No more little Fritzes. . . I hated bayonet practice more because . . . because the body that the sack represents is one that I . . . come on" (Barker, 1998: 339).

As is clear from Manning's statements above, Barker profoundly queries the intrinsically sexualized relationship between weapons and men to uncover the fact that "doing' masculinity with the help of a weapon is instead the visible manifestation of certain, violent and often militarized enactments of masculinity" (Myrttinen, 2003:44). Taking this fact into account, the gendered violence operating through such militarized masculinity as the dominant model and serving for the maintenance of what Manning addresses as the "proper" and "manly war" is further explored in the novel through Rivers' dream of a cadaver. The reader is informed that Rivers is perplexed by the dream one night he sees, in which he imagines a conscious, naked cadaver whose skull is being drilled by Henry Head on the dissecting table. Even though he warns Head stating that "Don't, he is alive", Head continues to drill the man's skull and this is followed by the cadaver's grasp of Head's hand and pushing him back by rising from the table. In this case, it can be claimed that mirroring the condition of the men both conforming to violent,

militarized enactment of masculinity and those of the ones tortured and victimized by it, River's dream suggests doing masculinity through a "suspension of empathy", which is identified by the writer as "the root of all monstrosity" (Barker, 1998: 342). Therefore, this "suspension of empathy" men are required to enact is critiqued by the writer through River's dream that draws a symbolic parallelism between what Heads does in the dream and what soldiers are expected to do in this "proper war" as a necessary part of their military masculinities by which they become both torturers and victims. To put in other words, as evidenced in the novel through Rivers' thoughts, his dream explores the idea that "not merely the soldier, but the torturer also practices the same suspension" (Barker, 1998: 342).

Within the context of the war, the novel delineates how masculine exercise of torture and violence functioning through the suspension of empathy results with the victimization of some soldiers. Accordingly, it is shown that the suspension of empathy, which they are required to perform to become ideal soldiers leads up to the emergence of the soldiers' intense sense of insecurity since they cannot silence their sense of empathy. This results with an increase in their level of stress and anxiety that turns them into mad men in the attic, and thus renders them unmanned. As portrayed through Rivers' wards that involve seriously disturbed, paralyzed patients with jerks and twitches, "these were men who had joked their way through bombardments that rattled the tea-cups in Kent, now totally unmanned" (Barker, 1998: 343). This image of unmanned or, in other words, emasculated men can further be seen in the novel through the characterizations of Weston and Scudder that present a subversion of the hegemonic ideal of manly, warrior soldier. Being one of the disturbed patients in Rivers' main ward Weston is depicted as a helpless man who wets himself at nights and sobs in his sodden clothes like a little child, which suggests a reversed image of manliness represented contrary to the conception of ideal, proper manliness. Henceforth, Weston is portrayed by the writer as an infantile child who is unable to manage to control both his bodily reactions and his emotions. What is more, in one occasion, this infantilized condition of Weston is rendered through the scene when he wets himself and is helped by Rivers to wear his clean pyjamas and to get back into his bed, which the narrator describes as follows:

> Weston had wet himself. He stood in the in the middle of his room, sobbing, while a nurse knelt in front of. He stood in the middle of his room, sobbing, while a nurse knelt in front him and coaxed him to step out of the circle of sodden cloth. Rivers took over from her, got Weston into clean pyjamas and back into bed. He stayed with him till he was calm. . . (Barker, 1998: 343)

What causes Weston to wet himself at nights and to sob like a child is the extent of gendered-violence he experienced as a soldier creating a profound sense of insecurity with a high level of stress and anxiety for him. In this sense, Weston's wetting himself stands out for the discharge of his distress that removes the pressure on him put by the ideal of proper manliness. Likewise, Scudder is another character in the novel whose behaviour and physical appearance come to exemplify the reverse of proper manliness. Fighting the war in Manning's platoon, Scudder is mentioned to have been a legless, shell-shocked soldier who, in the past, had an electric-shock treatment for his hysteric case and had been court-martialled as he had got drunk and been absent for parade that day. Scudder's story is revealed to Rivers by Manning who, indeed, keeps his silence about the war up to that point. As further confessed by him, he does not talk about the war not out of his cowardice but because of his inability to grasp it. To that end he says to Rivers that "it's . . . ungraspable" (Barker, 1998: 345). Indeed, what Manning cannot grasp is the violence acting on the formation of men as ideal soldiers for the sake of a bloody war. In other words, he cannot grasp this violent issue of manning, which his name may suggest. It is for this reason that Scudder, who can never become an embodiment of ideal soldier, has a very specific place for Manning as revealed by him to Rivers that "you know, the whole thing's based on the idea that if you've got the right number of arms and legs and you're not mentally defective you can be turned into a soldier. Well, Scudder was the walking proof that it isn't true." (Barker, 1998: 345).

Hence, the way Scudder rejects to conform to the dominant model of masculinity in wartime Britain is implied through Manning's claim that "if a man's properly trained, he'll function on the day almost like an automaton. And Scudder was the opposite of that. Somehow the whole thing had gone into reverse" (Barker, 1998: 347). Indeed, preoccupied with the images of mine and blood in his dreams, Scudder's mental breakdown leads him to see the reality and the world in the reverse form of what is socially imposed on men. Manning further accounts about the time when he notices Scudder's constant failure in the bayonet practice during the military trainings and confesses that his failure to do so was not sourced by his clumsiness but by his breakdown. This points out to altered perception of Scudder that conceives the world and the man reversely. Scudder's breakdown, therefore, changes his way of looking at the world and the war to the extent that "when he finally got the bayonet in, he saw it bleed" (Barker, 1998: 347). In other words, he becomes so empathic that he does not see the

bayonet as a weapon to kill, but as an embodiment of the sufferings and the blood of the men who are killed by it in the war. Henceforth as abovementioned by Manning, Scudder cannot act like an automaton, ideal soldier though he is properly trained by the military to do so. As a matter of fact, it has been revealed that Scudder is a dysfunctional man who rejects to conform to masculinist ideologies of the British nation, which eventually victimize him by causing his violent death in the war.

Manning's anxiety attacks, which have been reinforced through the public humiliation of the homosexuals with the Pemberton Billing affair, are initially caused by his encounter with the violence of the trench warfare triggering his masculine anxieties. This inevitably becomes interrelated with the military ideals of wartime British masculinity. Most specifically, the death of Scudder, which leads Manning to keep his silence about the war is central to grasp the reasons of Manning's anxiety attacks. On the night he is visited by Rivers in the hospital, Manning, for the first time, begins to talk about his trench-war experience and reveals to him that one of his men in his company, Scudder, who had gone away on the day they were heavily shelled by the enemy, was persuaded by Manning to turn back to fight for fear that the military police can pick him up. As Scudder went further away from the area of the battle, Manning thought that the military office could conceive this act of him as "a desertion in the face of the enemy", because of which he could have been shot (Barker, 1998:347). When Manning follows Scudder to bring him back and finally finds him, Scudder's remark that "This is mad" signifies his revolt against the violence of the war, to which Manning replies that "I know, but we've all got to do it" (Barker, 1998: 348). Thereby, here the novel draws attention to the fact that what happens in the trenches is entwined with cultural constructs of military masculinity foregrounded on a contempt for cowardice, the criminalization of the deserters and the exaltation of the image of ideal soldier whose primary duty is to fight wars for his country and fellow soldiers at the cost of his life.

It is therefore seen that Manning's masculine anxieties cause him to conceive Scudder's desertion as an act of cowardice and disobedience that can be punished by the military authorities. To that end, he insists on Scudder to fight rather than desert despite the heavy bombardment and shelling they are exposed to by the enemy forces. However, the reader is informed that on that day, after making Scudder return to fight, Manning and his men arrive at a line full of muddy shell-holes into which Scudder sticks up to his chest.

Despite their attempts to get him out of the hole they cannot achieve to rescue him, and hopelessly they watch him slip away slowly. Scudder's helpless, bitter condition as a suffering man panicking and pleading for help in the shell-hole is culminated by Manning's shooting him, which he sadly accounts as follows:

> Scudder was panicking and . . . pleading with us to do something. I have never seen anything like his face. And it went on and on. He was slipping away all the time, but slowly. I knew what I had to do. I got the men lined up and told him we were going to try again, while he was looking at the others I crawled round the other side, and fired. Manning closed his eyes. I missed. And that was terrible, because then he knew what was happening. I fired again, and this time I didn't miss (Barker, 1998: 349)

After Scudder's upsetting death, the writer's representation of the dynamic pattern of gendered-violence in wartime Britain is rendered more visible through Manning and Hine's visit to the Battalion of the Head Quarters to report back about the event. Strangely enough, in the Battalion they see the headquarters officers "having dinner, veal and ham pie and red wine" (Barker, 1998: 349). This indifferent attitude of them for the men who die in the war and their privileged positions benefiting from the war are juxtaposed by the author with the subordinate position of the soldiers fighting at the front and thus turning into real victims of the war by sacrificing their lives. Therefore, this juxtaposition enables Barker to criticize how prevailing gender hierarchy within the army privileges the men at the top of it while victimizing the ones at the bottom. Aware of this injustice and unequal treatment among the men in the army, Manning takes two glasses of drink for himself and Hines and proposes a toast as a reaction saying that "Gentlemen, The King" (Barker, 1998: 349). By doing so, he mockingly lays bare the hypocrite attitudes of those privileged gentlemen of the army who govern the whole tenor of the war without taking any risk for their lives, while dying in the war becomes the primary duty of the men at the subordinate position. This is further exemplified in the novel through Hines' death that happens after being shelled when he and Manning leaves the Battalion of Head Quarters; and looking straight at Manning he says his last words as "I'm all right, Mum", which signifies his proper death as an ideal soldier (Barker, 1998: 349. Therefore, it can be deduced that in *The Eye in The Door* Barker uncovers the military as a site of extreme insecurity for men due not only to its strict structure of order and command that positions masculinities hierarchically but also to the enactment of masculinity as a form of violence that demands a test of manliness within the vortex of gender relations of domination and subordination.

The idea that violence is not something inherent character trait for men, but rather it is the product of this dynamic pattern of gender relations is explored in the novel through Prior and Spragge's strife for dominance among each other to express power as well. After meeting Sarah at the railway station Prior takes her to his home where they become much closer and make love, which is followed by their visit to Kew Gardens. The sudden start of a heavy rain in Kew leads them to seek shelter in a safer area. As the narrator conveys "Prior looked for shelter, but could see only some trees" providing them with "a little protection (Barker, 1998: 353). To that end, he offers to go to the Palm House, which is a warmer and safer place. Surprisingly when they enter into the Palm House to protect themselves from heavy rain, he notices among the crowds the gaze of Spragge looking at them through the branches of a tree. Here, Prior's incessant attempt to seek shelter under trees can be seen as a clue for the intense level of insecurity and threat he senses. As a symbol of shelter and security, the tree, from whose branches Prior sees the gaze of Spragge, therefore, indicates how Prior tremendously feels to be threatened by Sppragge's dominance over him that disrupts his sense of security. Since both Spragge and Prior always try to establish their dominance over each other, they use violence to achieve it; and this is given in the novel through the scene in which Sarah and Prior move towards the river and take on a boat to escape from Spragge. Yet, as Prior's memory gaps get worse, he does not remember his subsequent confrontation with Spragge on the boat. Later on, he is told by Sarah that a fight between him and Spragge took place in the boat, where Prior hits him and then threats him by lifting his cane. In other words, Spragge's sudden menacing and tyrannizing appearance in the boat triggers Prior to exert physical violence on him and leads him up to exhibit an aggressive masculinity to establish his dominance over him. Hence, as the narrator reveals, Prior conceives Spragge as a threat to his masculinity causing him to feel "an almost excessive sense of exposure, of violation even, as if he had been seen, arse upwards, in the act itself." (Barker, 1998: 358)

Indeed, the source of Prior's loss of memory goes far back to his childhood in which he was exposed to his father's betrayal to his mother, whose memory he had to repress. On Prior and Sarah's way back home by taxi after his attack on Spragge, a sudden childhood memory of Prior overtakes him as a little boy being taken by his father out. They together sit on a bench, where a woman, who brings lemonade and lime jelly with some jelly babies, goes upstairs with his father leaving him alone. Here, it is implied that

Prior's father and the woman were having sex while Prior was swallowing the jelly babies in the bench down, and "upstairs the thick whispers came and went and the bed springs creaked" (Barker, 1998:358). His father wants him not to tell anything to his mother about what he hears and sees there; and taking his son onto his shoulders he carries little Prior to home, which creates a sense of triumph for the child Prior because up to that time "his father had never taken him anywhere" (Barker, 1998: 358). Since there was a distant relationship between the father and the son, Prior, as a little boy, always sought for his father's approval. Therefore, for the first time he felt his masculinity to be approved by such an aloof and oppressive father when he was taken out by him and promised his father not to tell his mother about his father's betrayal. Approval of Prior's masculinity by his father, which is given through Prior's triumphant ride to the home on his father's shoulders, is described by the narrator as follows:

> 'Better not tell your mam.' And then he'd sat him astride his shoulders and carried him all the way home, all the way up the street with everybody looking, his meaty hands clasped round his son's thin white thighs. For once he'd ridden home in triumph. (Barker, 1998: 359)

Furthermore, lying sick in her bed, Prior's mother is told by her husband that they had been to the park, a lie with which little Prior becomes complicit. Hence, as the narrator underscores, as a little boy Prior had "been invited to join the great conspiracy and even at the age of five he knew the value of it" (Barker, 1998: 359). In other words, as long as he keeps his silence and thus becomes complicit with what his father does, his masculinity come to be approved by his father. His complicity requires him to repress the memory of the event, which he cannot achieve totally. This is indicated through the scene when he gets sick that night and starts to cry vomiting jelly babies swallowed by him that day on the bench. His incomplete repression of the memory of his father's betrayal, therefore, now leads him to have memory gaps to cope with anything threatening. To that end, his loss of memory in the case of Spragge, is Prior's attempt to cope with the tyrannous, oppressive dominance of Spragge over him, which he associates with that of his father.

It should be noted that Prior not only develops memory gaps but also occasionally undergoes a change of mood that functions as a coping strategy for his experience of masculinity he lives as a threat. Noticing the change of mood in Prior after the event on the boat, Sarah draws attention to how he is overtaken by the dark side of his personality causing him to feel an immense sense of hatred for everybody recently. In fact, this

sudden change of his mood causes Prior not to keep in touch with anybody as he becomes unable to communicate at those moments but just despises everybody including Sarah, due to which she decides to leave him the next day. It can be suggested that the reason why Prior hates and despises everyone around him is related with his insecure manliness; because, feeling deprived of power and authority as a man whose identity is marked by systems of power and inequality, Prior strives for dominance over others by despising and hating them.

As is seen, the gender-based violence is shown by Barker to be victimizing most men through the dynamic pattern of gender relations of domination and subordination. Based on this, since violence becomes a tool to construct an honoured form of masculinity through dominance Prior strives to claim his masculinity and dominance over others by doing violence. Ultimately, he can only accomplish this through his other self that is evil and darker. Prior's evil double self that overtakes him becomes more visible after he is abandoned by Sarah and it becomes reinforced through Spragge's entrance into his flat late at night. He teases Prior by trying to read Sarah's letter for him and this highly infuriates him and causes him to attack Spragge. Therefore, it becomes apparent that Prior is overtaken by this violent, amnesiac, and evil self of him unfolding as an unconscious strategy of his masculine survival in a world where he comes to experience everything he lives as posing a threat to his masculinity. However, his evil self not only causes him to exert physical violence or despise others, but also it leads him to betray the people from his past life. Hence, as Spragge reveals, Patrick Macdowell has been arrested in Liverpool and it is Prior himself who informed against Macdowell to the police though he does not remember doing such a betrayal. In brief, it can be asserted that it is Prior's attempt to negotiate with hegemonic masculinity through his evil self that becomes complicit with the state and thus leads him to betray his childhood friend Mac.

One should keep in mind that Prior's betrayal of Mac is caused by the prevailing hegemonic ideals of masculinity in wartime Britain that trigger Prior's own masculine anxieties. Since Mac is a conscientious objector and a deserter, who is against the state and its military practices of war, his ideals represent the reverse of the ones which Prior runs after. If Mac, on account of his pacifism, had not been imprisoned or had been declared to be innocent by the state, the masculine ideals through which Prior validates his masculinity would have been proven illegitimate, which would therefore invalidate

his military masculinity as well. In this sense, it can be claimed that what drives Prior to betray Mac is related with the social construction of his masculinity that conceives him as a threat for its validity.

However, it is ironic that, while on the one hand Prior betrays a male pacifist, he wants to help a female pacifist, namely Mrs Roper in taking her out of the walls of prison. He even visits Manning in the hospital where he stays and demands his help for Beattie Roper. This contradictory stance of him about these two pacifists can be seen to be related with his conception of masculinity and femininity as two distinct gender categories and to his Oedipal conflict. This can be linked to the fact that he sees Roper's femininity as something with which he should unite, while he sees Mac's masculinity as rival to that of his own competing for the motherly love of the same woman. Therefore, taking all these facts into consideration, it is Mac, rather than Mrs Roper, with whom Prior should maintain a power struggle to prove that he is masculine enough and this becomes a drive buried deep down in his evil side.

As the novel progresses, it becomes evident that the initial seeds of Prior's evil self were planted in his boyhood by his parents, most particularly by his father. This fact about Prior is revealed in the novel through his visit to Rivers when he begins to be further overtaken by his evil alternate self. As he starts to see Rivers again on account of his worsening memory losses and headaches, on the day he visits Rivers, Prior behaves much more antagonistic to him; and turning back to his fugue state he reveals to Rivers that he hates Spragge because he resembles his father. It is due to his father's dominance and tyranny over Prior since his childhood, which, now, he associates with that of Spragge, that he hates both his father and Spragge.

Prior's hatred for his father is represented to be so immense that he attempts to defy his father's authority over him by disowning him. This enmity and complex relationship between Prior and his father is conveyed through Prior's words to Rivers that "I was born two years ago. In a shell-hole in France. I have no father" (Barker, 1998: 395). Rivers tries to make this evil self of Prior talk more about his childhood memories to have access to his unconscious mind and learns that Prior was grown up in a house where domestic violence prevails. With the help of Rivers' questions delving deep into Prior's unconscious mind, Prior begins to narrate about his experience of domestic

violence that includes his father's coming home drunk and having a row with his mother, and even beating him. It is even revealed that on one occasion while his parents were having a row, little Prior went downstairs to interrupt them but he was thrown by his father on the wall, and he confesses that from then on "he never went down again . . . he used to get up and sit on the stairs" (Barker, 1998: 395). Meanwhile, during the session Prior uses the third person narration while accounting those afflicting memories of his childhood and uses the pronoun "he" to refer to little Prior. Rivers goes on asking him what he felt on that day, and in return Prior replies that:

Angry. He used to do this.' Prior banged his clenched fist against the palm of of the other hand.'PIG PIG PIG PIG. And then he's get frightened, I suppose he was frightened that if he got too angry he'd go downstairs. So he fixed his eyes on the barometer and blotted everything-out" (Barker, 1998: 396).

As understood from Prior's words above, feeling frightened, Prior's attempt to wipe everything out by fixing his eyes on the barometer that's on top of the stairs initiates the dissociation of his personality. In a sense, he undergoes a mental state of fugue that enables him to forget who he is by putting himself into a kind of trance. Then his split-self, which is divided between a boy who is tremendously frightened and the other one who does not feel any sense of fear and pain, comes into being.

When Rivers asks him what happened at the time he wiped everything out as a boy, Prior expresses that "he wasn't there, but instead there was "somebody who didn't care" (Barker, 1998: 396). Therefore, in his disassociated state he turned into a boy who did not care for anything. In other words, being exposed to domestic violence at home through his father's tyranny and oppression over him and his mother, Prior, gradually begins to develop his evil, alternate state of consciousness as a coping mechanism for the immense sense of fear he feels as a little five-year-old boy.

It has been mentioned earlier by Rivers that, surviving for men requires them to adapt their environment through the repression of fear. In this case, one can understand that Barker expresses how Prior's evil self emerges striving to survive in a patriarchal gender order both as a little boy and adult man through the repression of his fears. This indicates the fact that Barker brilliantly traces the psychopathology of gendered violence by portraying how fearless, ruthless, sadistic, menacing, cold and violent alter ego of Prior erupts through silencing and suppressing of him the real Prior, who is frightened, abused

and insecure. Described by himself to have been “born in a shell-hole” when he was badly wounded and hurt at the front, Prior’s evil-self claims himself to be better at fighting as he does not feel any sense of fear and pain (Barker, 1998: 398). This repression of him, which has its root in his childhood, now enables him to cope with the fear he encountered at the front, and thereby turns him into an ideal soldier fighting at the front fearlessly. This is revealed through the therapeutic dialogue between Rivers and the evil self of Prior as follows:

> ‘You were born in a shell-hole.’ A pause. ‘Can you tell me about it?’
> An elaborate shrug. ‘There isn’t much to tell. He was wounded. Not badly, but it hurt. He knew he had to go on. And he couldn’t. So I came.’
> Again that elusive impression of childishness.
> ‘Why were you able to go on when he couldn’t?’
> ‘I’m better at it.’
> ‘Better at . . .?’
> ‘Fighting.’
> ‘Why are you better?’
> ‘Oh for God’s sake-’
> No it isn’t a stupid question. You are not taller, you’re not stronger, you’re not faster . . . you’re not better trained. How could you be? So Why are you better?
> I’m not frightened . . . And I don’t feel pain’ (Barker, 1998: 398).

Here as the dialogue above indicates, Barker again reflects how masculinity and violence become interrelated through men’s repression of fear and pain. To exemplify this fact further, the novel portrays Prior stubbing his cigarette out in his palm to prove Rivers that he does not feel any sense of fear and pain. In a way, on account of his urge to assert his masculinity and power he becomes so violent to the extent that he can burn himself. For Rivers, Prior was now showing symptoms of hysterical disorder as he lost his normal sensation by creating almost a “warrior double” (Barker, 1998: 399). However, the pain he feels in his burning skin creates shocking effect on Prior leading him to move out of his fugue state and turn back to normal. That day when the therapeutic session is over, Rivers advises Prior to sleep in the hospital; and the next morning when Prior is down for breakfast, Rivers notices that he looks “dejected, and in obvious pain” (Barker, 1998: 399). This change of mood in Prior may show that he has started to heal himself by admitting his repressed fears and emotions into his consciousness. As their session progresses on this second day, Rivers demands Prior to imagine himself back in his childhood again to relive and feel his repressed fears and emotions induced by his father’s violence and dominance within the family. It is in this last part of the session that Rivers expresses how and why this “warrior double” of Prior came into being:

> I think when you were quite small you discovered a way of dealing with a very unpleasant situation. I think you found out how to put yourself into a kind of trance. A dissociated state. And then in France, under that intolerable pressure, you rediscovered it (Barker, 1998: 401)

Hence, Rivers uncovers that Prior's memory gaps are caused by his dissociated state that functions as a coping mechanism he develops when he feels himself under any intolerable pressure and threat. Learning this fact, Prior wonders whether his attempt to remember the past can bring his memory back and will heal his split. In return, Rivers implies that the path to true regeneration and healing for men lies not in remembering the past but in moments of self-recognition and acceptance of their fears and feelings. Rivers reveals this fact by saying that "I think there has to be a moment of . . . recognition. Acceptance. There has to be a moment when you look in the mirror and say, yes, this too is myself" (Barker, 1998: 402,). In this way, what Barker draws attention to through the therapeutic sessions she employs in the novel is men's need to confront the social basis of gendered violence determining what it means to be a man and to reconcile with their repressed fears and feelings that they have come to live by as the essence of manliness.

In the end, after a fortnight stay in the hospital with Rivers, despite his nightmares about Mac that stand out for his sense of guilt for his betrayal and complicity, Prior's memory of his pleasant childhood days and his friendship with Mac overtakes him, and later he decides to visit him in Prison. These indicate the fact that he has started to reconcile with his repressed fears and feelings, which ultimately gives way to his desire to end the war between him and Mac. When Prior goes to see him, he finds Mac sitting on his bed at his cold prison cell that has no chair and window, but a door behind which there is "the eye". The devastating results of gendered violence causing men to be victims are shown by Barker through the portrayal of Mac's condition in his prison cell. The idea that men are the perpetrators of violence, as well as its victims is also underscored by Barker employing how Prior comes to confront with what he had done as a man who betrays his best childhood friend to seek for the approval of his masculinity by society. Prior's violent complicity with the patriarchal gender order causes Mac to have been imprisoned and thus silenced in that cell for ninety days he spent naked, in torture and loneliness. When Mac wants to learn why Prior came to see him, he implies that he has come to confront with himself, actually indicating his confrontation with the violence of his masculinity and the war. Before leaving Mac's cell, Prior, unexpectedly, takes two

bars of chocolate from his pocket and gives them to Mac with the hope of turning back to their old friendship days, which was no more possible.

Towards the end of the novel the reader is also informed that Sassoon has turned back from the front as he is wounded on his head with a bullet accidentally by one of his man; and he is staying in the American Red Cross Hospital at Lancaster Gate Hospital, where Rivers goes to visit him. As observed by Rivers, Sassoon seems not to be depressed but rather he looks "excitable" and has an urge to speak constantly, due to which he is kept in a single room in the hospital and is not allowed to have any visitors (Barker, 1998: 380). When he, surprisingly, sees Rivers in his room, he is overtaken by an ambivalent mood of joy and fear; and he begins to account how, at the time he was visited by his friends Robert Ross, Meicklejon, Sitwell and Eddie Marsh to talk about the book he is going to write about the tragedy of war, he got profoundly excited. His excitement, he reveals, leads him to have a bad night causing him to keep everybody in the hospital awake and this is followed by his confinement to a single room. This means that this time it is Sassoon's excitement that has a lot to say about the violence of the war and therefore is to be silenced by keeping him in a single room; because, his excitement to reveal about the war could suggests an awakening for millions to the violence of the war.

Sassoon appears in the novel as a man of contradictions in that while he writes critical anti-war poems on the one hand, he fights courageously in the war-front on the other. Confessing to have been happy most of the time for fighting at the front, Sassoon's expression to Rivers that "I feel amputated, I don't belong here" demonstrates how he feels emasculated within the confines of the hospital as he mainly identifies himself with the war as a devoted soldier ready to die (Barker, 1998: 383). Now feeling depressed, he is driven by a strong desire to go back to the front especially for his men. In other words, as also pointed out by Sharon Monteith the front is "a zone of obligation" and it causes Sassoon to be involved with "a tortured relationship with war based on responsibility" especially for his men (2002: 59).

Yet, Sassoon also accepts that his protest against the war was the only sane thing in his life. At that time Rivers realizes that Sassoon's "internal divisions had been deepened by the war" (Barker: 1998: 387). This fact is further admitted by Sassoon himself by saying that "I survive out there by being two people, sometimes I even manage

to be both of them in one evening" (Barker, 1998: 387). In other words, it has been pointed out in the novel that the war has made Sassoon a deeply divided man who splits himself into two distinct personalities, one is the poet, the other is the warrior. Therefore, through the portrayal of Sassoon's split personality the author delineates how he tries to survive as a divided man to cope with the patriarchal gender order of wartime Britain, just as Prior and Rivers do.

Ironically enough, the novel ends with Sassoon's obligatory return to Craiglockhart to attend the medical board to be sent to a convalescent home outside London, while Prior desires to go back to the front and demands Rivers to report about him that he is mentally and physically fit to serve at the front, though he is not.

CHAPTER FOUR

MASCULINITIES AND THE LEGACY OF THE WAR, EMPIRE AND CLASS

4.1. Masculine Anxieties and the Impact of the Past in *The Ghost Road*

Barker's *Ghost Road* is the last volume of the *Trilogy* and it communicates the impact of the past on men's lives in shaping their gender identities into a violent, hegemonic mode of masculinity required for the war. First published in 1995 Pat Barker's *Ghost Road* is a highly distinguished novel that becomes a winner of the Booker Prize in the same year. The novel broadly narrates Prior's return to the front after his home service, Rivers' treatment of his other shell-shocked soldiers, and his haunting memories regarding his past trip to the Island of Melanesia. Narrated in the third person narration, the novel's use of Prior's diary entries about the war's last months and Rivers' recollections about Melanesia in order to draw much comprehensive picture of exploitation, violence and destruction wrought by the First World War intersecting with the ideological constructs of wartime hegemonic masculinity. To that end, this thesis offers to read "ghost road" as a metaphor for the haunting and damaging impact of gendered violence on men who are made to conform into hegemonic ideals of masculinity at the time of the war. Accordingly, throughout the present chapter the pressure put on men by wartime hegemonic masculinity demanding them to comply with its ideals will be evaluated through the impact of the past on their present lives, whose voice cannot be silenced. To that end, the chapter will mainly focus on making a critique of wartime hegemonic masculinity by analysing Barker's male characters' confrontation with the ghosts of their pasts. The impact of the past on their present lives will be interpreted in terms of their fears and anxieties regarding their conception of masculinity and the war, with which they need to come to terms. Whether Barker's characters become regenerated after facing the ghosts of their pasts on their way to become a proper, ideal men will also be discussed to illustrate to what extent the war changed their conception of masculinity.

The novel covers the last months of the war and it opens with the author's portrayal of Prior as going back to the front as he completed his home service. The story begins with its portrayal of Prior among the civilians before he leaves for the front. He is drawn on a sea shore watching a family on the beach that attracts his attention. Hence,

even at the very beginning of the novel, Prior's working-class consciousness can be discerned through his impressions for this family on the beach. The family, Prior realizes, looks utterly common but at the same time appears not to be so. This becomes more manifest when an elder woman on the beach scolds her daughter who helps her little son in wearing his drawers with a cigarette in her mouth, and says that: "For God's sake, Louie. . . If you could only see how common you look" (Barker, 1998: 430). Likewise, Prior admits to himself that the look of the young woman was "gloriously, devastatingly, *fuckably* common," which indeed suggests his resentment at the class inequalities he comes across in wartime Britain (Barker, 1998: 430). Based on this, the beginning of the novel can be interpreted as featuring Prior's case of being haunted by his class consciousness as the ghost of his past.

In fact, Prior's awareness of the exploitation of the working-class people by the ones keeping power at hand is shown here as the source of his masculine anxieties. That's why he constantly strives for transcending the boundaries of his class-based masculinity by leading a formidable military life. Rather than choosing to lead a compelling life of a military man, he thinks, "he could have been a munitions worker. . . kept out of danger. Lined his pockets (Barker, 1998: 432). Yet, it turns out that it is his fastidiousness that evoked his desire to be a more challenging and agonistic man than his father or others, who opted to live under safer and less dangerous conditions of living. As he confesses, what drives him not to be one of them is "not duty, not patriotism, not fear of what other people would think" but "a kind of . . . fastidiousness" (Barker, 1998: 433) In a way, the novel exposes how Prior's fastidiousness is linked with his conception of masculinity conceiving every small detail as posing a threat for him that should be challenged to prove his manliness.

Since his boyhood, due to the pressures put on him both by his father and his socially oppressed or marginalized working-class background, which causes him to construe an insecure sense of masculinity, Prior always desires his masculinity to be approved and validated by others. In this sense, as a dangerous task, soldiering becomes the very practice through which Prior could claim his masculinity. Hence, his fastidiousness that he develops since his boyhood clarifies the root causes of his choosing to be a military man not out of duty but on account of his need to be exposed to danger, by means of which he tries to assert his masculinity. The challenge he is exposed on the

war front to protect the nation and its people from any outside danger, therefore, reinforces his sense of violent, aggressive military masculinity. Consequently, this allows him to attain a social position of power for a man who comes from working class and whose masculinity has always been marginalized.

Indeed, the impact of the past on Prior's formation of masculine identity gives clues about how Barker envisions "the ghost road" as a metaphor for to represent haunting impact of gendered violence on men who are made to conform into hegemonic ideals of masculinity. Barker, thereby, aims to show that it is men's repressed fears and anxieties that come to haunt them to shatter their secure sense of masculinity which they assume to establish and maintain by holding a position of power. It is for this reason that Prior is depicted at the very beginning to be haunted by his class anxieties and his childhood fears caused by his father's oppression on him that drive him to come to live by the hegemonic ideal of soldiering by going back to the front. To that end, he feels compelled to prove that he is fit to fight at the war front during the physical examination of him made by the army doctor Mather.

Commanding him to drop his drawers and then to "bend over," Dr. Mather begins to examine Prior's most intimate parts of his body to the extent that "he felt gloved fingers on his buttocks, separating them, and thought, Better men than you have paid for this" (Barker, 1998: 434). The act bears resemblance to the act of sexual exploitation and abuse, which Barker brilliantly portrays to convey how men have been victimized and exploited both mentally and physically by the ones keeping power at hand. Then queried for his asthma, his shell-shock at Craiglockhart, his muteness, his nerves and nightly sleeps, it is Prior's masculinity being examined and tested by Dr. Mather while, during the examination, Prior strenuously endeavours to pass the test by trying to prove in a mood of strict upper lip that he has overcome all these symptoms of unmanliness and weakness.

Meanwhile, Owen is in the same room of examination with Prior on account of his "irregular heartbeat," and he is being tested for his emotions that the army demands him to repress to fight and kill in the warfront. Prior had already met Owen at Craiglockhart during their final medical board and he draws attention to Owen's deficit saying him that "it's your heart that's wrong" (Barker, 1998:437). Therefore, the author's

depiction of Owen as a man with a "wrong heart" implies how Owen is unfit for the front on account of his loving, sensitive, humanely feelings of his heart that clashes with the monstrous violence of the war and violent military masculinity. Hence, Owen, here comes to stand for the reverse image of warrior soldier with his "wrong heart". This may suggest that he does not show any attributes of a warrior soldier such as courage to fight, kill, or sacrifice himself in the name of his country. In a sense, Owen is described as a man who is unable to mobilize himself into the war.

Robert Nye points out that the mobilization of men to fight becomes linked with the creation of the modern state founded on the idea that "the citizen must carry within himself the qualities of a warrior" (2007: 417). Hence, drawing attention to the role of the nation building in the formation of soldier's identity, Robert Nye underscores how the process of nation building in modern societies has been achieved through the effective embodiment of national identity in individual identity of the soldier. Therefore, such military ideals as "personal courage, willingness to sacrifice for comrades, the fear of shame or dishonour" has come to be produced in modern nation states through the image of modern citizen soldier (Nye, 2007:420). This citizen soldier, Nye remarks, "fought for and under the scrutiny of his comrades in arms, out of the need to defend his personal honour and that of the fatherland, or-which amounts to the same thing -to avoid shame" (2007: 421-422). Within this context, it is observed in the novel that the scene in which Prior and Owen are both examined in the barracks before they are discharged to duty signifies a test for their manliness. This test is made whether to see they are fit for the war front in terms of their courage, physical and mental competence, and emotional repression required from them to fight as citizen soldiers. This illuminates Barker's critique of the way military masculinities are maintained through men's being mobilized to fight in the name of their nations during the Great War.

In *Ghost Road*, this issue of men's mobilization during the war is further criticized through Barker's convincing evocation of Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland*. It is presented in the novel that Rivers is now in London again working at national hospital and is treating his other shell-shocked patients there. The illustrations of *Alice in Wonderland* decorating the end of the Ward Seven, which was in the past used as children's hospital and now has become a ward of the shell-shocked soldiers treated by

Rivers. These illustrations attract Rivers' attention most of the time and as revealed by the narrator they draw:

> Alice tiny enough to swim in a sea of her own tears; Alice unfolding like a telescope till she was nine feet tall; Alice grown so large her arm protruded from the window; and, most strikingly, Alice with the serpent's neck, undulating above the trees" (Barker, 1998: 439)

Alice's illustrations are deliberately made use of by Barker to draw a resemblance between Alice and soldiers' helpless condition. By doing so, the author likens the soldiers' attempt to fit into the front to Alice's attempt to fit into the house of the White Rabbit through her bodily transformation, which she cannot achieve. Moreover, Alice's bodily transformation comes to represent soldiers' predicament at the time of their mobilization; because, just like Alice, they are unable to fit in.

While treating Moffet, one of his new patients who has paralyzed legs, Rivers notices the drawings of Alice that can be seen from the end of the ward and thinks that the drawings are "savagely appropriate" to Moffet's case. He is depicted in the novel as a shell-shocked soldier who became paralyzed when he fainted at the front "shortly after hearing the guns for the first time"; and since then, he becomes unable to move his legs (Barker, 1998:440). Later, he reveals to Rivers that he is unfit for the front because he "can't stand noise" (Barker, 1998:440). Since he considers that he will be seen by the society as a failure or coward on account of this unmanly behaviour of him, he decides to enlist. When Rivers asks, "why didn't you apply for exemption?", Moffet's reply that "one is not a pacifist" demonstrates how he considers the pacifists as showing unmanly behaviour or cowardice. Apparently, it is the societal expectations of wartime masculinity that puts pressure on Moffet to go to the front despite his mental disturbance from any noise. After all, the result is "Alice in Hysterialand" as detected by Rivers (Barker, 1998: 442):

> He lowered Moffet's legs and walked round the bed. From here he could see, through a gap in the screens, the drawings of Alice. Suddenly, with Moffet's paralysed leg clamped to his side as he closed the circle, Rivers saw the drawings not as an irrelevance, left over from the days when this had been children's ward, but as cruelly, savagely appropriate.All those bodily transformations causing all those problems. But they solved them too. Alice is Hysterialand (Barker, 1998: 442).

In a sense, Barker's way of writing skilfully transforms the children's story of "Alice in Wonderland" into that of soldiers' story as "Alice in Hsyterialand" by critically re-writing it. She, therefore, reconstructs Alice's story to convey the damage wrought on men in shaping them into hegemonic constructions of masculinity in wartime Britain.

Alice's incongruously growing body parts that become unfit for the house bear resemblance to Moffet's paralysed legs with their incongruous shape that is unfit for the front. Hence, it is implied that Moffet's attempt to fit into to the front as an ideal, heroic, courageous soldier results with his hysteric paralysis after his first war front experience. He is mobilized by the army to fight and kill; yet he becomes unable to do so by unconsciously incapacitating himself through his paralysis, which hinders him from enacting such a mode of violent masculinity. As given through Rivers' own words that: "all those bodily transformations causing all those problems. But they solved them too. Alice in Hysterialand," the novel exposes how Moffet and many other soldiers like him, who are mobilized by the army during the world war, resolved their inner conflicts of fitting into the hegemonic ideal by turning into hysterics (Barker, 1998: 442).

The evil ingrained in the sexual violence that Rivers had encountered in his childhood is also symbolized in the novel through the image of Alice's serpentine undulating neck. Her neck in the drawings makes Rivers recall the evil he was exposed to as a boy by Charles Dodgson. He recalls how the woods of his childhood home at Knowles were abound with snakes, whom Dodgson hated. Hence, it is implied that the impact of Rivers' haunting past goes deep back to his childhood. Thinking back on his past childhood days he had spent together with his father, his sister Katherine and the Reverend Charles Dodgson, Rivers now recalls being sexually abused by Dodgson. As the narrator reveals, Rivers "as an innocent young boy becomes aware that he's the object of an adult's abnormal affection. Put blatantly Charles Do-do-do-do-Dodgson can't keep his hands off him, but thanks to that gentleman's formidable conscience- nothing untoward occurs" (Barker, 1998: 443).

Here, it seems that standing out for the loss of innocence, the image of snake has been used by the author to convey Dodgson's evil, sexual violence that now makes Rivers think that "a great deal of innocence had been lost in recent years. Not all of it on battlefield" (Barker, 1998:442). In this respect, Rivers' sexual abuse and exploitation by Charles Dodgson continually haunts him and this is employed by the author to illustrate how Rivers has become a victim of gendered violence that creates a dominant mode of masculinity for men. In this way, Barker criticizes how men attain a dominant mode of masculinity through sexual violence exhibited more on to women and children as weaker and vulnerable beings than men.

In *The Ghost Road*, Barker reflects monstrous side of hegemonic masculinity in setting standardized, normative ideals for men since their boyhoods into which they can never totally fit and are victimized by it. She shows that unable to attain or fit into these hegemonic ideals, men, thereby, undergo mental and physical disturbances or disintegrations caused by their inner conflicts or tensions, which render them to be unheroic and unmanly in the eyes of the wartime British society. Her characters' conflict is mainly based on their conflict between duty and protest. On the one hand, they think that it is their duty to fight in the war for their country, while on the other hand they do not want to be the part of this violence that the war and ideals of manliness require them. The violence that hegemonic wartime masculinity demands men in order to prove their manhood, therefore, unfolds in the novel as the haunting past of the characters, for the ones who either exercise it or become exposed to it. This fact is observed in the case of Rivers' other patient, Wansbeck, too. Feeling guilty of killing a German prisoner, Wansbeck is haunted by damaging consequences of his past violent military masculinity causing his self-hatred.

Wansbeck's motivation for violence in killing a German prisoner is related with his sense of masculinity that has come to be construed through a relation of domination and subordination triggering his hatred against the prisoner. While inspecting Wansbeck's file to find out the reasons of his paralysis, Rivers learns that Wanscbeck had murdered the German prisoner because at the front "he was feeling tired and resented having to escort the men back from the line" (Barker, 1998: ,443). This violent scene of murder which Wansbeck narrates easily to Rivers as if he was doing his manly duty shows how killing is normalized as a hegemonic ideal during the time of the war. Wansbeck's murder of the German prisoner while the two men are not waging war at the front therefore communicates how men were mobilized into becoming dehumanized to kill not only in the name of their nations but also in their own names to compensate their powerlessness. Wansbeck's dehumanization is observed through his narration of the murder that reveals how he killed the prisoner with a bayonet by sticking it in and out, again and again:

> He was walking ahead of me, I couldn't do it in his back, so I shouted at him to turn round. He knew straight away. I stuck it in, and he screamed, and… I pulled it out, and stuck in it. And again. And again. He was on the ground and it was easier. He kept saying "Bitte, Bitte," … The odd thing was I heard it in English bitter. I knew the word, but didn't register what it meant (Barker, 1998: 445)

Hence, Wansbeck exercises this violent act of killing through becoming insensitive to the pain of another man. Motivated by his own powerlessness and helplessness he felt at the front, Wanscbesk kills a man without any seen reason. This is evidenced when Rivers inquires Wansbeck about the true reason of his murdering the prisoner, for which Wansbeck claims there is no reason except he that he is disturbed by him:

R:What were you thinking about immediately before you picked up the bayonet?"
W:Nothing
R:Nothing at all?
W:I just wanted to go to sleep, and this bastard was stopping me
R:How long had you been in the line?
W:'Twelve days'. Wansbeck shook his head. 'Not good enough'
R:What isn't good enough?
W:That. As an excuse
R: Reasons aren't excuses. (Barker, 1998: 445)

As the dialogue above between Rivers and Wansbeck indicates, it is Wansbeck's powerlessness that drive him to kill the prisoner and to prove his masculinity that has been debilitated by the war. This implies that the war emasculates Wansbeck to the extent that he tries to compensate his powerlessness by killing a prisoner. Ultimately this act of violence, which he feels compelled to repress in order to accomplish his duty in the war, begins to haunt him by creating a sense of remorse on him eight months later.

Here, Rivers' idea on war neurosis suggesting that "if the repression is incomplete, it produces and maintains neurosis" should be kept in mind to discuss Wansbeck's psychological injury. Unable to repress his fear, Wansbeck becomes haunted by "hypnagogic hallucinations" that wake him up with the ghostly image of the dead prisoner looking at him by his bed (Barker, 1998: 443). Apart from the hallucinations, an unpleasant bad odour begins to disturb Wansbeck as if emanating from his own body. It can be therefore understood that the bad odour has come to signify Wansbeck's complicit masculinity that corrupts him to enact a violent mode of masculinity, while his hallucinations stand out for the voice of his guilt-ridden unconscious that speaks out his complicity with gendered violence. The scene of murder therefore traces how Wansbeck tries to claim his masculinity by killing a man.

On the other hand, the violence ridden haunting past of the characters from which they never escape is also exemplified in the novel through Prior's childhood memory of

his being raped by Father Mackanzie. The reader is informed that passing the test of manliness after being examined by Dr Mather for his physical and mental health, Prior is fit for the front and is about to go back to the war front in France. Yet, while walking in the streets of Scarborough before he leaves for France, he meets a red-haired woman named Elinor with whom he has a sexual intercourse. At the time of their intercourse, he is suddenly haunted by his childhood memory of rape and he sees the ghostly image of Father Mackanzie raping him that is given by the narrator as follows:

> He looked down at the shuttered face and recognized the look, recognized it not with his eyes but with the muscles of his own face, for he too had lain like this, waiting for it to be over. A full year of fucking, before he managed to come, on the monastic bed, a crucifix above it, on the far wall- he would never forget – a picture of St Lawrence roasting on his grid. The first time Father Mackanzie knelt, holding him round the waist, crying. We really touched the bottom that time, didn't we" (Barker, 1998: 452)

As understood from the quotation above, Prior had been raped by the reverend Father Mackenzie for a year in the monastic bed, whose memory he can never forget. Therefore, this scene points out how the rapist's desire for sexual dominance and control over Prior becomes a source of gendered violence victimizing him. As a victim of such a violence, Prior, ultimately, becomes sadistic man who turns into a victimizer as a perpetrator of violence.

The Ghost Road explores gendered violence in wartime Britain not only from the aspect of the individuals but also from that of different cultures. To do this, the author makes a cross-cultural examination of gendered violence by employing Rivers' hallucinatory recollections of Melanesia, a place which he visited many years before he worked as a military psychiatrist. He recalls how the native healer Njiru treats his patients through Melanesian magical solutions by massaging the patients' ill body parts and chants during the treatment. Rivers further realizes that while Melanesians believe in the power of the spirits, the Western white people believe in the power of reason. In this way, Rivers observes that Melanesians were curing their patients through a kind of ritual drama.

Situated on the northeast of Australia, Melanesia is composed of a group of islands that have been colonized. Hence, with the influence of Western colonialism, new patterns of culture are being introduced into the Melanesian society. The Melanesian people are seen by the Western culture to be barbaric and uncivilized. This has become also linked

with the intersection of gender with race shaping a hierarchical relationship between white and non-white masculinities. As put forward by Segal, "the idea of white Anglo-Saxon manhood as superior to all other forms of life was essential to the self-image of Victorian manhood" (1993:636). She goes on to argue that white Western men claim to civilize the non-white people by depicting them as barbaric "inferior breeds," since they "served as necessary foil, the essential opposition, giving substance to the superiority of the white male" (Segal, 636). Hence this racial superiority of the Empire and its men is represented in the novel as resulting with the exploitation of non-white people together with the subordination of non-white masculinities.

Although Barker acknowledges that both Melanesian and Western cultures demand their men to perform violent modes of masculinity to prove they are masculine enough, she draws a specific attention to how Western white males' claim to be civilized contrasts with their barbaric and violent attitudes during the First World War. Melanesian culture is known to be a head-hunting one that maintains itself through wars. Yet, Barker finds Western civilization to be more brutal and violent when compared to that of Melanesians. For instance, she shows that these two cultures' attitudes towards their dead are distinct from each other; because, while the Melanesians respect their dead by building skull houses for them, the dead of the white Western civilized men during the war are not even buried; and rather they are doomed to decay and putrefy in the battlefield. This indicates that the extent of the violence in wartime Britain is so immense that the people have been desensitized for the devastating and unbearable results of it. Therefore, by presenting the cultural values of Melanesian people, which are supposed to be in stark contrast to that of Western cultures, but are drawn within the novel not to be as much inhumane and uncivilized as in the First World War, Barker wants the reader to question the image of the civilized Western white man. By doing so, the novel delineates how the imperial masculinity of the white man is construed as a hegemonic ideal and becomes more violent in the guise of civilization.

In other words, the novel underscores the fact that since the British imperial expansion maintains itself through a specific mode of masculinity that is founded upon men's repression of their emotions and impulses, this imperial masculinity creates more devastating effects both individually and nationally and thus, it turns its people into more uncivilized and violent beings. In The *Ghost Road*, this fact is pointed out through

Barker's juxtaposition of the Ghosts of Melanesian people with that of Western ones. For instance, while the Melanesian ghosts were asking its people, "What were the white men doing on the island? Were they as harmless as they appeared," the ghosts of the Western culture asked its men "Why was he not in the line? Why had he deserted his men?" or they were haunted by their ghosts as in the case of Sassoon, who saw a ghost of his fellow soldier standing by his bed while "trying to decide whether he should abandon his protest and go back to France" (Barker, 1998: 554).

In this context, Barker criticizes the intervention of violence and masculinity operating in wartime Britain by showing how the Edwardian manliness of the late 19th century is promoted by the empire to generate heroic young men for the achievement of imperial ideals through the Great War. In this era of the pre-war years, the war has come to be depicted as the "Great Adventure" by which a heroic masculinity is glorified. Therefore, a dominant mode of masculinity comes into being during the Edwardian era and shapes British manliness around such qualities as "physical strength, muscular development, the stiff upper lip, adventure, fortitude and action" (Nye, 2007: 428). This hegemonic mode of masculinity forged in wartime Britain leads its men to experience the battlefield as a violent territory of contestation for their masculinities, where their manhood has come to be tested.

Yet, as the novel underscores, the ones who fail to pass the test are haunted by the ghosts of their inner conflicts registering the monstrous gendered violence in wartime Britain. As a man depicted to have failed the test of manliness by undergoing a hysterical paralysis in the trenches, Moffet, while having medical treatment under the control of Rivers at Empire Hospital, commits suicide in the bath cutting his both writs with a razor blade. Rescued by Rivers and Telford, Moffet comes to himself by moaning and vomiting. Here, the author lays bare how Moffet's sense of emasculation as a disabled paralyzed soldier disgraces him, which ends up with his suicide. The pressure he feels to comply with the demands of imperial military masculinity not only causes his paralysis but also his attempt to suicide. In this sense, it may be suggested that it is the military discipline that is based on immense emotional control and repression that causes Moffet's psychological collapse.

In the novel, apart from the soldiers, Rivers is also portrayed as a man experiencing the pressure put on him to meet the social expectations of wartime masculinity intensely. Barker is good at uncovering Rivers' problematic experience of masculinity by depicting him as a military man who can't pass his first test of manliness in his boyhood. This is presented in the novel through Rivers' memories of his childhood days. While looking at the family album with his sister Kathrine, Rivers recalls his grandfather old William who had become an embodiment of courage as he was wounded in the war and got amputated his wounded leg without taking any anaesthetics. Furthermore, little Rivers is told that his grandfather endured the pain of his amputated leg by showing no signs of cry. As the narrator reveals "he survived, married and had children, became Warden of Greenwich Hospital" (Barker, 1998, 443). Hence, his grandfather's masculinity is the very example of hegemonic masculinity prevailing in wartime Britain. Likewise, little Rivers is expected by his father to behave in a stoic and brave manner just as his great grandfather had done earlier in the war. As a coward boy, who cried when his father took him to the barber's shop and had his hair cut when he was four, River's masculinity is juxtaposed by his family with that of his grandfather with which he is to negotiate. As told by the narrator:

He'd had his hair cut, he'd just been breech, yes that was it, his neck felt funny, and so did his legs. And he was crying. Yes, it was all coming back. He'd embarrassed his father in the barber's shop by howling his head off… His father shushed him, and when that didn't work, slapped his leg. He gasped with shock, filled his lungs with air and howled louder" (Barker, 1998: 483).

As the quotation above indicates little Rivers' first hair cut is a sign of his initiation into manliness by which his masculinity is tested. However, his cry during his first hair cut demonstrates how he rejects to be initiated into such an experience that appears to be a suffering for him. On the other hand, his cry, which socially comes to mean unbecoming a man, signifies his cowardice and brings embarrassment from the side of his father. Hence, when his father reproaches him at the time of the event, Rivers feels how "bits of him were being cut off, bits of him were dropping on to the floor" (Barker, 1998: 483). From then on Rivers begins to stammer as he is expected not to express his feelings and emotions. Thinking that he has disgraced his father in the eyes of other men in the barber's shop, little Rivers trembles with fear, and even feels pain.

It is Rivers' father's oppression on him to keep his silence at the time he cried that causes Rivers to develop a problematic relationship with his father. Since he cannot keep

his silence and cannot stop crying during his haircut, he is slapped by his father on his legs. Here, little Rivers reacts to his initiation into manliness by crying. His father scolds and tries to silence his cry; because crying is deemed by the society as an unmanly, feminine act. Hence, Rivers fails in his first test of manliness. To make him pass the test, the violence exerted by his father on him makes him cry louder in a state of shock. Finally, back at home, he is shown the portrait of his grandfather in the hall and is told by his father that "you don't behave like that, you behave like this. He didn't cry. . . He didn't make a sound (Barker, 1998: 483). In this way, it becomes apparent that Rivers' masculinity is tried to be negotiated with hegemonic masculinity exemplified through his grandfather as a man who never cried when being amputated with no anaesthetics.

Additionally, Rivers' attempt to negotiate with hegemonic masculinity in pre-war years in his boyhood results with his lifelong emotional repression that turns him into a stammering man. Even when he was a little boy, the first lesson he is taught by his father is not to cry. Since then, Rivers learns not to express his emotions and feelings in order to prove his manliness. He keeps his silence not only about his emotions but also about his true ideas that are against the existing social order and the violence it maintains. Therefore, as Prior also calls him in one of their sessions in the first volume of *The Trilogy*, Rivers becomes an "emphatic wallpaper" to further accomplish his military and medical profession during his adult life. As is seen, Rivers' silence about what he really feels and thinks becomes linked with the social construction of his masculinity. He is expected by his family to enact hegemonic ideals of military masculinity by acting fearlessly and ignoring his own emotions that would help him to exercise violence easily. Ultimately, he is torn between his instinct for self-preservation and his duty as a man. While social prescription of masculinity requires Rivers that it is his duty as a man not to express his feelings and emotions, his instinct for self-preservation demands him to be emotionally open to be able to survive. The chasm between these two ideals, one social and the other individual, are so great that Rivers experiences an incomplete emotional repression due to which he begins to stammer. When he looks at his past from the present, now he ponders in silence that "the smack on the lack" was "a lesson in manliness from an over-conscientious but loving father" (Barker, 1998: 484). Therefore, he sees it necessary for himself in his adult life that he should be able to cry or grieve; because he now believes that "it's alright to grieve. Breakdown is nothing to be ashamed of- the pressures were intolerable" (Barker, 1998: 484).

In other words, little Rivers' stammering stands out as the register of his inner conflict between expressing what he desires and silencing this desire of him for fear that he will be punished both by his father and by the society. Now looking at the family album, Rivers recalls this past influence of his father on him like a haunting ghost, and confesses to his sisters that "father tried hard with Charles and me, didn't he?" (Barker, 1998: 482). Hence, it becomes evident that Rivers is haunted by this childhood memory and shows how his father's oppression turns him into a stoic, stammering man becoming complicit with the hegemonic project by keeping his silence about the violence of the manly war and the damages it brings on men.

The same gendered violence that is maintained both in pre-war and wartime Britain through the father son relationships is also conveyed by the author through Rivers' relationship with his patients. The reader is informed that Prior goes to see Rivers last time before he leaves for France to go to the war front. Depicting Prior's asthma as "fighting for breath" Rivers now recognizes that how he looks healthier and is easily breathing (Barker, 1998: 485). In a way, Prior is made by Rivers fit for fighting at the front. Prior further proves Rivers that his "chest works, Tongue works" (Barker, 1998; 486). In this way, Prior visits Rivers to make his masculinity approved by proving that he has passed the test of manliness. Although Rivers offers him another three-month home service for his memory lapses, he nevertheless states his belief in Prior's ability to do his "duty to King and country" (Barker, 1998: 487). Later on, Rivers begins to interrogate himself seeing that how uncivilized and barbarous he actually behaves in sending Prior back to the front by acting like "Abraham with the knife raised to slay his son" (Barker, 1998: 489).

Rivers' association of himself with Abraham as a father slaying his sons, namely his patients, makes him recall the Melanesian tradition of sacrificial pig in the island of Vao that is based on the sacrifice of illegitimate sons. As Rivers recalls, the custom is held for the sacrifice of these sons, who, after they are born, are adopted and raised by leading men of the island. When the boy reaches his puberty, he is initiated into manhood being given "new bracelets, new necklaces, a new penis wrapper" (Barker, 1998:488). This act is followed by the boy's being taken to sacrificial stone, where his father crushes the boy's skull in front of the upraised club.

Here, it is understood that the novel criticizes the violence unfolding in the form of monstrous slaughter of the sons by their fathers both observed in Melanesian and Western cultures. Just as the head-hunter fathers of Melanesia who kill their adopted sons, the British empire and its men are killing their sons by demanding them to sacrifice themselves in the name of the country. This is further implied through the symbolic representation of Rivers as a father killing his sons by sending them back to the Front. In this sense, a differentiation between these two cultures is made by Barker to suggest that Western culture is more violent despite its claim to be a civilized culture. Therefore, ethical dimension of Rivers' medical treatment that functions to heal the shell-shocked soldiers to make them fit into the war is called into question by Barker to indicate how manipulative Western culture becomes in shaping men into violence. Besides, this manipulative aspect of Western culture is shown in *The Ghost Road* as basing itself upon the religious story of Abraham and Isaac that makes use of the god's voice to forge a military and imperial masculinity as hegemonic ideal. Therefore, Barker, by laying bare the difference between these two cultures, shows that the West is indeed more uncivilized in respect to the Melanesian society, as they disguise their savagery in more political and ideological ways. By so doing, she undermines the meanings of the terms savagery and civilization and shows how these concepts are ideological constructs forged by imperial and colonial aims of the West.

The second part of *The Ghost Road* begins with Prior's diary entries he kept at the war front and include his experiences and observations regarding the war. Prior's diary entries do not only serve as depictions of how men make war at the front but also as the proof of how the war makes men by shaping them to conform to the demands of dominant ideologies of war and masculinity. The war scenes Barker explores shed light on how men feel fear intensely but avoid showing any sign of fear on account of the social expectations of acting like an ideal soldier.

Prior's diary covers his account of the events of the last months of the war beginning from the September I 1918. Prior keeps his diary to present the violent atmosphere of the war, and thus he tries to sooth the intense sense of insecurity he feels as a soldier at the front by writing what he sees barely. He confesses this in his diary stating that, "First person narrators can't die, so long as we keep telling the story of our

own lives we're safe. Ha bloody fucking ha" (Barker, 1998: 498). As is seen, Prior writes to feel safe in the mist of the violent atmosphere of insecurity despite his awareness that he may die one day in the war. However, it should be noted that "narration through diaries, like narration through letters, provides no guarantee of the narrator's survival (as Prior's death reminds the reader)" (Moseley, 2014: 88).

Barker conveys how participating the war and fighting at the front attracts young men at the time of the war just as in the case of Hallet. He is Prior's fellow friend at the front and he feels proud to be part of the war. Through Prior's impressions Barker conveys the effect of Hallet's father on him in making him fit into an ideal soldier. If his father's effect hadn't been, Prior thinks, "Hallet wouldn't be here. He might even have missed the war altogether, perhaps spent the rest of his life goaded by the irrational shame of having escaped. Cowed subjection to the ghosts of friends who died." (Barker, 1998: 455). Accordingly, the novel shows that during the war the effect of the past on the young men becomes visible through fathers' attempt in shaping men into the war. The sons are made by their fathers commit to the notions of duty, sacrifice and courage even through the deaths of their friends who died in the war. This is also criticized in the novel through Prior's impressions that "ghosts everywhere. Even the living were the ghosts in the making" (Barker, 1998: 455)

After having registered in his diary about his fellow soldier Hallet's "station goodbye" to his family and his "farewell to the motherland" on their way to France, Prior observes the brutal impersonality in Etaples, where British soldiers are located. As he writes:

> All right it has to be brutal – think what they are being toughened up for- but actually that misses the point. It is the impersonality that forms the biggest part of the sheer fucking nastiness of this place. You marshall men around-they don't know you, don't trust you (why should they?) and you don't invest anything in them (Barker, 1998: 497)

As his diary progresses the reader is informed that it is the day before Prior and his fellow friends leaves from Etaples to go to Somme. In the evening Owen, Prior, Hallet and Potts are drawn sitting together and talking about the war, which leads the reader to question why the war is fought for. Prior's answer bears importance in understanding the violence ingrained in the war and in the way the empire shaped their masculinities to die not for justifiable reasons but in the name of the ones who keep power at hand making the most benefit of it. By the same token, Prior now believes that war has no "rational

justification" and it is fought not for the benefit of people or "for the reasons we're told"; because he believes someone is benefiting from the war and it has turned into "self-perpetuating system":

> It is being fought for a reason. It is not benefiting the people it's supposed to be benefiting, but it is benefiting somebody. And I don't believe that you see. I think things are actually much worse than you think because there isn't any kind of rational justification left. It has become self-perpetuating system. Nobody benefits. Nobody's in control. Nobody knows how to stop (Barker, 1998: 513).

However, Hallet's objection to Prior that "we're fighting for the legitimate interests of our own country. We are fighting in defence of Belgian neutrality. We are fighting for French independence" (Barker: 1998: 514) gives clues about how the war is justified for national interests for which men are to fight.

Prior then goes on giving a detailed account of the day they joined the battalion and accounts how they live a confined life "in tamboos- a sort of cross between a cowshed and an outdoor privy" (Barker, 1998: 22). The tamboos have "iron walls and roof" from which a disturbing noise of the rain is heard. There Prior feels highly disturbed as the atmosphere of tamboos, the mud and the rain outside remind him of Craiglokhart. Living the sense of helplessness and immobility by cramping "in the holes in the ground waiting for the next random shell to put you out" Prior likens the area to Craiglockhart uttering that "same loony- different war" (Barker, 1998: 529). At that point, Prior remembers Rivers' contentment that men's breakdown during the war does not stem from their horror of the war or weaknesses but from the strain that is born "in conditions of immobility, passivity and helplessness" (Barker, 1998: 529). Thus, this proves that soldiers cramping in the shell holes in a helpless, immobile and passive position of them is in stark contrast to their military training that "is designed to prepare for open, mobile warfare" (Barker, 1998: 529). This comes to mean that men had been trained to be active but the trench warfare rendered them passive. Then, according Prior "the test is invalid" (Barker, 1998: 529).

As the novel progresses, the reader is informed that Prior's unit arrives at a German trench and take position and wait for the counter attack, which suddenly starts with "machine-gun fire on three sides" and by the side of the trench a gas barrage lingers (Barker, 1998: 541). Scraping in the trench Prior and his friends try to survive in this "breakdown territory" under "constant danger" (Barker, 1998: 541). However, after the

counter attack lying in the trenches, Prior notices Longstaffe's dead body, and by nightfall he and Lucas find Hallet gurgling with a "head wound" and his "brain exposed… One eye gone. A hole" (Barker: 1998: 542). While carrying Hallet to their trench with the help of a rope Prior hears him scream, and sees his "mouth filled with blood" (Barker, 1998: 542) Back at the trench, on top of them Hallet lies, and Prior senses a kind of muddy thing on his own face. Touching his face, he sees that it is "a gob of Hallet's brain between" his "fingertips" (Barker, 1998: 543). From then on Prior begs Hallet to die; but he doesn't and goes on suffering in pain.

Hence, confronting the true face of the warfare through his confining and immobilizing experience of the trench, Prior calls into question the hegemonic project of the Craiglockhart, namely that of Wartime Britain, uttering that "We are Craiglockhart's success stories. Look at us. We don't remember, we don't feel, we don't think – at least not beyond the confines of what's needed to do the job" (Barker, 1998: 545). The Craiglockhart War Hospital itself was a project that aimed to re-masculinize the shell-shocked soldiers whose masculinities deviate from the hegemonic ideals of wartime masculinity. In other words, it aimed to regenerate those men who are deemed to be unmanly as they underwent mental breakdowns during the war. The project based itself on the idea that those men should be mentally cured to make them fit into the war front. By doing so, as Prior implies above, it has devastated those men who reject to be a part of the violence that both Craiglockhart and wartime Britain maintain; because they had been cured to kill or die again. Therefore, in *The Ghost Road*, Barker maintains that men will be damaged more as long as the wars are waged in the world; because both war and masculinity are territories of contestation where men are to prove their masculinities violently.

The Ghost Road ends with the narrator's account of Prior's and Owen's death at the front in Somme and his fellow friend Hallet's death in Empire hospital a few days before the armistice. How the Empire devours its young men is ironically conveyed by Barker through Hallet's death in Empire Hospital. His last words, "shotvarfet. Shotvarfet" which he bitterly utters before he dies, are interpreted by Rivers as "It's not worth it" (Barker, 1998: 588). By doing so, the novel has come to represent how the young men of the Empire have come to be victimized and died for nothing.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has evaluated Pat Barker's critique of masculinity and the war in *The Regeneration Trilogy* to expose how patriarchal power and gender order also damages men while it promises men to make the most benefit of it**.** To that end, the scope of the study has been Barker's representation of the damaging impact of men's attempts to negotiate with the hegemonic ideals of masculinity forged during the years of the First World War. Revisiting the years of the war each novel of *the Trilogy* represents the concepts of masculinity and war in unconventional ways; because Barker understands masculinity as a position of power and status that should be undermined and redefined. Her narratives of war provide a critical and prolific area of investigation for the questions of what masculinity is, how it has come to be construed and maintained, and with which dynamics it interrelates with men's experiences of silences and violences. To that end, Barker's novels employ the stories of wounded, stammering, mute, hysteric, and shell-shocked men during the war and all bring a new vision into men's experiences of war and masculinity by offering to inspect these issues from the aspect of those men who cannot live up to hegemonic ideals of masculinity. In this sense, the story of the war employed in each novel of the *Trilogy* has been observed to function as a socio-historical ground, and thus helps the reader to question the social reality of men's experiences of masculinity on a multilayered level as a social and ideological construction.

Within this context, the *Trilogy* has revealed a lot about what has not previously been told about men's experiences of the war and masculinity. It explored not only the idealistic constructs of masculinity that generate social inequalities and injustices during the war, but also the victimization and damage wrought on men both socially and psychologically. This, in a way, promotes the idea that, in the fictional universe of Barker's war narratives, the war is fictionalized to explore men's gender identities that become detrimental both for them individually and for the society as a whole.

In the novels it has been observed that Barker's characters feel the pressure put on them by the societal expectations of masculinity and turn into both victims and victimizers of the gender order; because they are to exercise their masculinity in the form of power and dominance within a hierarchically structured gender order. That's why she represents masculinity not as an empowering experience but rather as a disempowering

one that needs to be constantly proved, and thus becomes damaging for most men and societies. With this in mind, Barker, exposes how men experience the war, power and violence as a constant threat to prove their manliness.

Within this respect, in this study the conception of masculinity as a contested position of power and an ideological gender category that is socially and historically constructed has been scrutinized through an analysis of Barker's characters' negotiation with hegemonic masculinity, which she sets in the socio-historical context of the First World War. To do this, the ideas developed by the field of the Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities, specifically Raewyn Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity have been utilized to present a theoretical framework for the analysis of the novels. The questions of what masculinity is, how it is construed, and how it multiplies have been clarified with references to the concepts of power, hierarchical gender relations and multiple masculinities. Connell's work *Masculinities* has been much referenced to understand how masculinity has come to be construed through a relation of hegemony by means of social practices and hierarchical power relations among men. These notions also give clues about the link between men's silences and violences that have been represented by Barker to be socially constructed. Connell's critical thoughts on hegemonic masculinity have, therefore, been utilized to understand how in wartime Britain men were majorly expected to enact a dominant mode of masculinity characterized by physical and mental strength, heterosexuality, courage, competitiveness, aggressiveness and violence. Likewise, Barker's depiction of the First World War as the backbone of violence, where such ideals of masculinity are forged and diverse power relations among men become deepened, reveals how the war and social construction of masculinities intersect. The theoretical chapter has also given way to some other critics of the field to discuss the link between masculinity and military, nationalistic and patriotic ideals through which men practice their masculinities in the form of power and powerlessness within the context of the war.

Hence, building on these ideas, *the Trilogy*, has been analysed as representing the warring masculine identities of men to prove their manhood. that is given in parallel to the war among the nations during the First World War. The concept of war explored in the novels also trace men's inner wars in the form of their inner conflicts and struggles on their way to negotiate with hegemonic ideals of masculinity during the war. Therefore,

the thesis has focused on the characters' experiences of different and diverse masculinities, the changing positions of power inhabited by them and the ways they exercise power, conform to it or reject it to illustrate the questionability of masculinity.

The thesis, therefore, has revealed that during the war men undergo emotional instabilities and inner conflicts; because, the war, while on the one hand requires them to repress their emotions, on the other hand it creates an excess of emotions caused by their repression of them to fit into the accepted model of manliness. Accordingly, at the centre of each novel of *the Trilogy,* there resides the idea that men's attempt to comply with this dominant, hegemonic mode of masculinity in wartime Britain is the very violence itself that exploits, damages and victimizes them by causing their disintegration. To that end, *the Trilogy* employs the case of hysteric, paralyzed, hallucinatory, stammering Shell-shocked soldiers as examples of disintegration caused by gendered violence in wartime Britain.

The study has also discussed Barker's male characters' ambivalent attitudes towards the war and their conceptions of masculinity that cause them to go to the front as a way of escaping from the pressures put on them by societal expectations of masculinity. However, it has come out that the war front deepens their internal divisions intensely, which functions to interrogate the validity of their masculinities and the gendered violence in wartime Britain.

In this respect, within the scope of this thesis it has been found out that silence functions in Barker's *Trilogy* as a tool to convey men's both compliance with and rejection of hegemonic ideals of masculinity. The novel pictures some characters both unconsciously silencing themselves by becoming unable to communicate what they want to say. They fear that they will be seen as a coward if they speak the truth against the gendered violence of wartime Britain. On the other hand, it depicts some other masculinities that are keeping their silence about the injustice and violence of the war to maintain their positions of power, dominance and privilege, and thus become complicit with the hegemonic project.

Throughout the thesis, the title of the *Trilogy* has been interpreted as having a double meaning: the one is the Britain's attempt to re-masculinize the emasculated men;

and the other is the possibility of individual and social regeneration by means of men's recovery from the damaging effects of hegemonic masculinity. Barker's texts achieve this by offering men to interrogate established gender assumptions and to admit their true emotions, which would bring change. In this respect, the exaltation of the image of soldier warrior as the hegemonic model of masculinity during the war has been shown in the novels to be ideological constructs shaped by British nationalism and militarism. These ideologies have been criticized by Barker as basing themselves upon the constructs of masculinity and shaping the social beliefs and cultural values of wartime Britain regarding what a true manhood is. Hence, in all novels of the *Trilogy,* Barker demonstrates how hegemonic masculinities are construed through the intersection of such ideologies that demand men to devout themselves and fight sacrificially for their nations. However, her critical approach to masculinity becomes more effective through her representation of her character's war neurosis. It shows the damage wrought on men both by their experiences of the war and hegemonic masculinities intersecting with other social systems of inequality and oppression such as class, race, and sexuality.

Hence, in this thesis, the first novel *Regeneration* has been discussed through homosociality, homophobia and emasculation to delineate the dynamic, and relational construction of hegemonic masculinity in wartime Britain. The damage and exploitation wrought on men by the hegemonic project itself has been stressed through physical disabilities and psychological breakdowns experienced by the characters who were seen by the society to be less than manly. The second novel *The Eye in the Door* has been handled as representing silenced men under surveillance and oppression of the state and the other men. In this respect, the novel has been analysed as depicting the victimization, torture and violence experienced by the men who cannot live up to hegemonic ideals of masculinity within the patriarchal gender order of wartime Britain. Lastly, in *The Ghost Road* Barker shows men's need to confront with their past of a gendered violence, dominance, and power emphasized through the examination of their innermost fears, anxieties or their silences.

All in all, Barker's Trilogy shows how the men who do not fit into hegemonic models of masculinity were marginalized or put in a subordinate position. How men felt compelled to join the wars in order not to be despised or labelled as a coward or less than manly is underscored in each novel of *the Trilogy* to uncover men's insecurities, anxieties

and powerlessness regarding their masculinities. In this way, the fact that masculinity is a gender construction that is open to question has been underscored throughout the *Trilogy.* At the center of Barker's *Trilogy* there resides the idea that men's attempt to comply with this dominant, hegemonic mode of masculinity determines the extent of their experiences of male violences and silences. Thereby, Barker represents men's violences and silences, not as innate character traits intrinsic to them, but as practices which men experience to comply with the ideals of hegemonic masculinity or to reject them**.**

Barker's texts, therefore, argue that it is the gendered-violence shaping men into becoming ideal soldiers as heroic, sacrificial warriors, which causes them to undergo mental and physical breakdowns. The chasm between their upbringing as heroic men and their inability to meet this heroic ideal during the war makes them feel indeed helpless, emasculated and deprived of power. This image of emasculated men employed in Barker's selected texts clashes with the image of ideal soldier exalted in wartime Britain and thus, it serves to call into question the wartime hegemonic masculinity. The war that promises to empower men is shown by Barker as disempowering them; because by compelling men to repress their emotions to become ideal soldiers, the war turns into a subversive area of minefield in which men's silenced, repressed emotions burst out leading up to their breakdowns. As a result, it has been shown in each novel of *the Trilogy* that men are damaged on their way to negotiate with hegemonic modes of masculinity by undergoing mental and physical breakdowns.

Therefore, this thesis has deduced that Barker's *Trilogy* shows how men's attempts to live up to hegemonic ideals of masculinity have become an obstacle on their way to a true regeneration of both themselves and of patriarchal societies. She, therefore, offers men to change and regenerate themselves by developing new ways of looking at the violences of men and the war ridden patriarchal order. In brief, throughout Barker's *Trilogy* the confrontation and interrogation of most men as well as of any patriarchal societies with the damaging effects of hegemonic masculinities have been shown as giving way to men's true regeneration from the limitations of masculinity and gender order, as it would make them recognize their problematic and contradictory relationship with male power, dominance and hegemony.

REFERENCES

Barker, Pat. (1998). *Regeneration Trilogy.* Penguin, Australia.

Beasley, Chris. (2005*). Gender and Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers,* Sage Publications, London.

Beynon, John. (2002). *Masculinities and Culture*, Open UP, Buckingham.

Bird, Sharon R. (1996). "Welcome to the Men's Club: Homosociality and the Maintenance of Hegemonic Masculinity", Gender and Society, Vol:10/2, pp. 120-132, https://wwww. Jstor.org/stable/189829.

Bourke, Joanna. (1999). *Dismembering the Male: Men's Bodies, Britain and The Great War*, the University of Chicago Press, Great Britain.

Boyers, Robert. (2005). *The Dictator's Dictation: The Politics of Novels and Novelists*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Brannigan, John. (2005). *Contemporary British Novelists: Pat Barker,* Manchester University Press, United Kingdom.

Brod, Harry and Michael Kaufman. (1994). *Theorizing Masculinities*, Sage Publications, the United States of America.

Carrigan, Tim, Bob Connell, and John Lee. (1985). "Towards a New Sociology of Masculinity", Theory and Society Vol. 14/ 5, Springer, 551-604.

Connell, Raewyn, W. (1989). "Cool Guys, Swots and Wimps: The Interplay of Masculinity and Education" Oxford Review of Education, Vol. 15/(3), 291-303.https://www.jstor.org/stable/1050420

Connell, Raewyn, W. (1987). *Gender and Power: Society, The Person and Sexual Politics*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Connell, Raewyn,W. (2005). "Globalization, Imperialism, and Masculinities." Handbook of Eds. Kimmel, Michael, Jeff R Hearn Studies on Men and Masculinities. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, E-book.

Connell, Raewyn, W. (2000). *The Men and The Boys*, Polity Press, United Kingdom.

Connell, Raewyn, W. (2005). *Masculinities*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Donaldson, Mike. (1993). "What is Hegemonic Masculinity", Theory and Society, Vol.22/5 Special Issue: Masculinities, pp. 643-657., https://www.jstor.org/stable/657988.

Enloe, Cynthia. (1993). The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Fussel, Paul. (1989). *The Great War and Modern Memory*, Oxford University Press,

Gilbert, Sandra M. (1983) "Soldier's Heart: Literary Men, Literary Women, and the Great War". Women and Violence. Vol. 8, No. 3. Retrieved from Jstor. 20 July,2021.

Goldstein, Joshua S. (2001). *War and Gender*, Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom.

Greenlaw, Lavinia. (2002). "Review of The Ghost Road", Contemporary Literary Criticism, (ed.) by Jeffrey W. Hunter, Vol. 146, Gale Literature Resource Center, link.gale.com/apps/doc/H1100036953/GLS.

Gullace, Nicoletta F. (2002). *The Blood of Our Sons: Men, Women and the Renegotiation of the Citizenship During the Great War,* Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Haywood, Chris, and Mairtin Mac an Ghaill. (2003) *Men and Masculinities: Theory, Research and Social Practise*, Open University Press, Buckingham.

Hearn, Jeff. (1998). *The Violences of Men: How Men Talk about and How Agencies Respond to Men's Violence to Women*, Sage Publications, London.

Hearn, Jeff and Wendy Parkin. (2001). *Gender, Sexuality and Violence in Oragnizations: the Unspoken Forces of Organizational Violation*, Atheneum Press, Great Britain.

Higate, Paul., John Hopton. (2005). "War, Militarism and Masculinities", *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities,* eds. Michael Kimmell et al., Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Higonnet, Margaret Randolph, and Jane Jenson, Sonya Michel ,Margaret Collins Weitz. (1987). *Behind The Lines: Gender and the Two World Wars,* Yale University Press, London.

Hitchcok, Peter. (2002). "What is Prior: Working Class Masculinity in Pat Barker's Trilogy", Masculinity and Labour Under Capitalism, (ed), Donald Morton, Issue: 35

Hobson, Barbara. (ed.) (2004). *Making Men into Fathers: Men, Masculinities and the Social Politics of Fatherhood,* Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom.

Kaufman, Michael. (1994). "Men, Feminism, and Men's Contradictory Experiences of Power." *Theorizing Masculinities,* (eds.) Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman. London: SAGE Publications.

Kaufman, Michael. (ed.), (1987). *Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change*, Oxford University Press, Toronto.

Kimmell, Michael S., (2005a). *The Gender of Desire: Essays on Male Sexuality*, State University New York Press, Albany.

Kimmell, Michael S., (2005b). *The History of Men: Essays in the History of American and British Masculinities,* State University of New York Press, Albany, NY.

Kimmell, Michael S., Jeff Hearn and Raewyn Connell. (2005) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, Sage Publications, The United States of America.

Lanone, Catherine. (1999). "Scattering the Seed of Abraham: The Motif of Sacrifice in Pat Barker's Regeneration and the Ghost Road", Literature and Theory. Vol. 13, pp. 262.

Leed, Eric. (1979). *No Man's Land: Combat and Identity in World War I,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Monteith, Sharon, and Nahem Yousaf. (eds.), (2005). *Critical Perspectives on Pat Barker.* University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.

Morgan, David H.J. (1994). "Theatre of War :Combat, the Military, and Masculinities." *Theorizing Masculinities*, (eds.) Brod, Harry., Michael Kaufman. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Moseley, Merritt. (2014). *The Fiction of Pat Barker: A reader's Guide to Essential Criticism*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Mosse, George L. (1996). *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Myrttinen, Henri. (2003). "Disarming Masculinities", Disarmament Forum, Women, Men, Peace and Security, No: 4 pp.37-46, https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/515037.

Nagel, Joane. (1996). "Nation", *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities,* (eds.) Kimmel, Michael, Jeff R Hearn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, X. E-book.

Nye, Robert A. (2007) "Western Masculinities in War and Peace", The American Historical Review, Vol.112/2, pp. 417-438.

Pascoe, Cheri J. and Tristan Bridges. (2016). *Exploring Masculinities: Identity, Inequality, Continuity and Change.* Oxford University Press, New York.

Peterson, V. Spike and Anne Sisson Runyan. (1999). *Global Gender Issues: Dilemmas in World Politics,* Westview Press, Boulder, Colo.

Rawlinson, Mark. (2010.) *New British Fiction: Pat Barker*, Palgrave Macmillan, England.

Rivers, William H. R. (1920). *Instinct and the Unconscious: A Contribution to a Biological Theory of the Psychoanalysis*, Classics in the History of Psychology, Kessinger Publishing, York University, Toronto.

Roper, Michael. (2005). “Between Manliness and Masculinity: The War Generation and the Psychology of Fear in Britain, 1914-1950”, Journal of British Studies, Vol. 44/2, pp. 343-362-Jstor https://doi.org/10.1086/427130

Segal, Lynne. (1993). “Changing Men: Masculinities in Context”, *Theory and Society*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 625–41.

Segal, Lynne (2007). *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Seidler, Victor. (1997). *Man Enough. Embodying Masculinities,* Sage Publications, London.

Seidler, Victor. (2006). *Transforming Masculinities: Men, Cultures, Bodies, Power, Sex and Love,* Routledge, Oxon.

Showalter, Elaine (1985). *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980,* Pantheon, New York.

Sjoberg, Laura and Sandra Via, Eds. (2010). *Gender, War and Militarism: Feminist Perspectives,* Praeger, The United States of America

Stevenson, Sheryl. (2005) “With the Listener in Mind. Talking about the Regeneration Trilogy with Pat Barker.” *Critical Perspectives on Pat Barker*, (eds.), Sharon Monteith et al., University of South Carolina Print, Columbia.

Westman, Karin (2005). *Pat Barker's 'Regeneration ': A Reader's Guide*, Continuum, New York.