

**Comparative Analysis of Male Homosociality in Eastern and Western Literature:
Examining D. H. Lawrence's "Women in Love" and Yukio Mishima's "Patriotism"**

(Received: November 15, 2023; Revised: May 8, 2024; Accepted: August 1, 2024)

Kanok-on Tangjitcharoenkit¹

Abstract

This article is going to make a comparative analysis of the values of male homosociality in D. H. Lawrence's "Women in Love" and Yukio Mishima's "Patriotism", investigating what it signifies through the interactions between male protagonist and other men based on different cultures and historical backgrounds of eastern and western. The study also delves into homosexuality, which is naturally engaged when male characters form strong ties, and also looks at the role of women and religious influences on the institutionality of the male-male realm. The comparison reveals that male homosociality in eastern culture and western culture are ironically exposed. In eastern culture, it did not segregate females, clinging to the strong taboo of Confucianism that males and females are human fertilities. However, in this strong taboo system, male homosociality seems to be tighter — leveraging to homosexuality implication. Conversely, male homosociality is allowed on the surface of western society, which provides a vibrant environment for men to coexist while separating women into a separate area. Nonetheless, it demonstrates how male homosociality is only acknowledged on the superficial level. Male homosexuality is dissolved; no hint is found in the text. In conclusion, it is an intriguing point of view to perceive irony in two distinct works from different parts of the world.

Keywords: Homosociality, Homosexuality, Masculinity, Taboos

¹ Faculty of Liberal Arts, Sripatum University Khon Kaen e-mail: kanokon.ta@spu.ac.th

บทคัดย่อ

บทความนี้มีจุดมุ่งหมายในการวิเคราะห์เปรียบเทียบคุณค่าของสังคมเพศชายผ่านการปฏิสัมพันธ์ของตัวละครชายในเรื่อง "Women in Love" ของ ดี. เอช. ลอว์เรนซ์ และเรื่อง "Patriotism" ของ ยูคิโอะ มิซึมา ผ่านการศึกษาวรรณกรรมและภูมิหลังทางประวัติศาสตร์ที่แตกต่างกันระหว่างสังคมตะวันตกและตะวันออก นอกจากนี้ บทวิเคราะห์เปรียบเทียบยังศึกษาไปถึงเรื่องความรักร่วมเพศซึ่งมักมีบทบาทเมื่อตัวละครชายมีความสัมพันธ์อันแน่นแฟ้น และยังพิจารณาบทบาทของผู้หญิงและอิทธิพลทางความเชื่อที่มีต่อการสถาปนาพื้นที่ของผู้ชายกับผู้ชาย ผลจากการศึกษาเชิงวิเคราะห์เปรียบเทียบเผยให้เห็นว่า สังคมเพศชายในสองวัฒนธรรมมีความแตกต่างที่ลึกซึ้งยิ่งในวัฒนธรรมตะวันออก เพศหญิงถูกหลอมรวมเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของสังคมเพศชาย ซึ่งเป็นไปตามข้อห้ามของลัทธิขงจื๊อด้วยความสมบูรณ์ของการครองคู่กันระหว่างชายและหญิง อย่างไรก็ตาม ในระบบที่เคร่งครัดนี้สังคมเพศชายกลับมีความแน่นแฟ้น และยังแผ่ขยายของความรักร่วมเพศไว้เบื้องลึก ในทางกลับกัน สังคมเพศชายในวัฒนธรรมตะวันตกกลับมีความผิวกว่า แม้จะมีพื้นที่สำหรับผู้ชายในการอยู่ร่วมกันโดยแยกบทบาทผู้หญิงออกไปอย่างเห็นได้ชัด ความรักร่วมเพศระหว่างชายและชายกลับเลือนหายไป ดังที่ไม่มีนัยยะแฝงใดสะท้อนให้เห็นผ่านตัวบทในวรรณกรรม การศึกษาได้แสดงให้เห็นความลึกซึ้งที่เกิดขึ้นผ่านงานวรรณกรรมสองชิ้นจากสองวัฒนธรรมของโลก ซึ่งนับเป็นมุมมองที่น่าสนใจ

คำสำคัญ: สังคมเพศชาย ความรักร่วมเพศ ความเป็นชาย ข้อห้าม

Introduction

The term "Homosociality" was first introduced to sociology studies in 1976 by Jean Lipman-Blumen. The word refers to social relationships within the same sex and is distinguished from homosexual in the way that it is not necessary to involve with erotic sexual interaction (Lipman-Blumen, 1976, p.16). Though the paradigm of homosociality was just defined, in practical terms, it remained in human history for a long time. The homosociality is the result of attempts to segregate male and female influenced by religious or ethnic stereotypical gender roles. Lipman-Blumen (1976; as cited in Britton, 1990, p. 424) noted that "in general, powerful social institutions are sex-segregated". Basic empirical perception may convey us to find the answer that males are segregated from females because of taboos, but that is too vague to explain this gender phenomenon.

Psychologically, Sigmund Freud proposed that human are born with 'unfocused sexual libidinal drives' that create human bisexuality. The nature of men is within women, as women within men. Although Freud did not provide a precise explanation exclusive of homosexual orientation, he asserted that "an unmistakable tendency to keep sexes apart. Women live with women, men with men," and homosexuality is branched from this tendency, effect upon individuals. (Freud, 2000, p.11).

Nevertheless, the Freudian explanation seems to focus on sex, not gender. As gender characterizes male and female roles within different cultures, it gives us a more explicit image of how humanity develops homosociality. In "Towards a Homosocial Theory of Sex Roles: An Explanation of the Sex Segregation of Social Institutions", Jean Lipman-Blumen suggested that almost every society is male-dominated (1990, p. 16). Males are placed more highly valued than females because they gain exclusive access to the entire range of resources: intellectual, political, economics, occupation, power, and status. Even human origins are male-controlled; for example, the universal historical male roles of warrior and hunter allow them to possess food (fundamental resources in any society) (Lipman-Blumen, 1990, p. 17). The power of the male is therefore institutionalized and gradually forms a patriarchal society, becoming a social organization in most parts of the world. In addition, when men need help with these sorts of things, they seek help from men. While women, who are not allowed or able to access these possessions, are instinctively segregated from the male world, Therefore, the institutionalization of homosociality is upon men.

Although homosociality refers to non-sexual attraction, homosexuality is inevitably discussed in its circle. While erotic sexual relations between men are seen as universal, the substitution of woman for man in terms of the possession of social resources and power is somehow possible to include the substitution of love. Man is not an object, and we cannot statically commit to the fulfillment of physical/external needs (such as politics, economics, profession), but also need mental/spiritual fulfillment, such as love and relationship. Although the continuous development of male-dominated society was broken in the early 20th century when women began to gain power, which allowed them access to resources such as legal rights and education (Lipman-Blumen, 1976, p. 18), the

deep relationship and love between men in society remains, which is reflected in human creations such as art, music and literature.

Homosociality in 20th century literature

Male relationship is not so explicitly shown in most of literature, however, the 20th century novel D. H. Lawrence's "Women in Love" and Yukio Mishima's "Patriotism" contain this issue. These two novels have been written upon different culture, yet share the same values of male homosociality, as they involve masculine activities such as fighting, drinking, married with women, and strong bond of freindship. In Women in Love, both Rupert Birkin and Gerald Crich have strong connection. They establish male interaction circle among each other. They are in love with women who are sisters, travel, talk, and share social activity together. In Chapter XX, it shows the conversation between Birkin and Gerald, which is so manliness. They sooth each other in tense situation (it is after Birkin was disappointed in begging Ursula to marry, and Gerald has difficult relationship with his lover Gudrun), suggesting their strong friendship and the circle of male in which women are kept outside. The character of Birkin and Gerald in this chapter, moreover, are illustrated as absolute masculinity (Birkin is able to fight with Jiu-jitsu, Gerald is elegant in formal dress and smoking cigarette). What makes Chapter XX of Women in Love queerly outstanding is the erotic interaction between two men. The other story, Patriotism, though written by eastern writer, displays male homosociality in similar way. Lieutenant Shinji Takeyama is also portrayed as absolute masculinity. He is introduced as a soldier who is "dark and severe", and always presents in military uniform, suggesting his devotion to nation which is stereotypical roles of male. Although there is only short citation about his companions, Patriotism is mainly directed on Shinji's ritual suicide, representing strong friendship between men. Both D. H. Lawrence and Yukio Mishima's novel clearly picture homosociality, but the implications behind the value of strong relationship between men left to be found. This essay is going to make comparative analysis upon values of male homosociality in "Women in Love" and "Patriotism", investigating what signifies through male protagonist's relationship and other men based on different culture and historical background. Sociological explanation is also used to

clarify male relationship between the protagonist and female, and the protagonist and other male characters within his context.

Female roles and exchange between the sexes

Although "Women in Love" and "Patriotism" display the world of male homosociality, both of the stories seem to promote female authority and importance, at least in superficial level. In *Women in Love*, the narrator focuses on Rupert Birkin, but almost all his chronicles involves with Ursula whom he is in love with, the same way that Gerald Crich involves with Gudrun (Ursula's sister). *Patriotism* similarly illustrates Lieutenant Shinji's decision to commit suicide, but narrates the story through Reiko who is Shinji's wife. The men in both stories mainly attract to female and marriage. The conversation and narration in each story is an interaction between male protagonist and his lover/wife more than interaction with his friend(s). Also, it is noticeable that in *Women in Love*, Ursula and Gudrun show dominant power over the males. The Brangwen sisters have independence in choosing or rejecting their lovers, causing Birkin and Gerald fallen into mental trouble. Although Reiko in *Patriotism* did not explicitly show her superiority over Shinji (due to Japanese context which assigns the wife to be neat and silent), her existence as a wife restrains Shinji's honor (she joins seppuku ritual for Shinji, featuring his quality as a good husband in tutoring his wife to sacrifice when needed). This may assume as the establishment of feminism in 20th century novels, the era which female roles become visible and acceptable both by legal and society (1920 for *Women in Love*, and 1961 for *Patriotism*).

Nevertheless, if we consider in deeper level, we may see that Ursula, Gudrun, and Reiko are inevitably submissive to male homosociality. According to Lipman-Blumen's research (1976, p. 16), male homosociality was established based on the rights to control resources. She further explains that the one basic need that men cannot seek from other men in *paternity*. With this restriction, men are forced to turn to women. *Paternity*, to clarify, means the survival of men existence, both in terms of biological necessity and social norm. It is why marriage becomes social obligation for both men and women. If we consider this sexual mechanical in dramatic way, we see women as sex objects. However,

Lipman-Blumen pointed out that “men have not turn women into sex objects. Rather, women have been forced to fashion themselves as sex objects to attract men and distract them from other men”. The marriage of Rupert Birkin and Shinji Takeyama may get to the conclusion that they make women fulfill what they cannot find from other men. Love has been left questionable, since ‘love’ between male character and female in *Women in Love* and *Patriotism* also most swift away from the dialogue. In Chapter XX of *Women in Love*, when Gerald asks Birkin whether he really loves Ursula, he replies in dilemma;

Gerald watched him steadily.

‘So you're fond of her then?’ he asked.

‘I think -- I love her,’ said Birkin, his face going very still and fixed.

Gerald glistened for a moment with pleasure, as if it were something done specially to please him. Then his face assumed a fitting gravity, and he nodded his head slowly.

‘You know,’ he said, ‘I always believed in love -- true love. But where does one find it nowadays?’

‘I don't know,’ said Birkin. (Lawrence, 1996, pp. 336-337)

It seems that Birkin could not reply his feeling. On the contrary, he denotatively accepts Gerald's request for love. The scene which Birkin visits Gerald, he mentions “three cure for ennui” which is sleep, drink, and travel, but Gerald claims for “works and love”. He skipped works because “When you're not at work you should be in love” and Birkin accepted him by saying “Be it then”, implying his acceptance. *Patriotism*, though it seems to narrate a lot of erotic scene between Shinji and Reiko, not a single word of “love” is expressed, not even once Shinji says love to Reiko. These two stories, the male character's emotional feeling toward female character is invisible. This might be the evidence that they are bounded to marriage because of gender roles, not individual sentiment. By this assumption, female roles are inferior. They fail to confirm their existence even in marriage which is the only value they can verify themselves to society. For Ursula, though she has tried to be conceited, restrained feminine pride by postponing Birkin's proposal and hesitating before accepts him, she is finally stunned by the fact that Birkin confirms his love to Gerald. In the same time, Reiko has to kill herself to protect Shinji's honor, which resulted from the friends' betrayal. The bond of males, Birkin and Gerald, Shinji and his

companions, finally ruin female life. We can see at last that the establishment of male homosociality has strengthened male hegemonic power, and pushed female to inferior positions.

Sexual segregation

Based on the exclusiveness of male in accessing to the social resources, many institutions around the world become male homosociality. There's remarkable evidence in history that the intensive male institutions mostly involve with absolute masculinity, such as house of priests, political forum, work office, boarding school, colleges, education, or military units, resulting in sexual segregation. Regarding this structure, we see that both D. H. Lawrence and Yukio Mishima's novels are narrated within *absolute masculinity society*. Lieutenant Shinji is a soldier of Imperial Forces. His almost life involves in men connections, from his marriage (the go-between is Lieutenant Genral Ozeki) to work (his military companions are all men; Kano, Homma, Yamaguchi). His presence is related to military units which is absolute male homosocial (he always wears military uniform, even in wedding ceremony). In D. H. Lawrence's *Women in Love* (particularly in Chapter XX), though the absolute male society is not directly shown as in *Patriotism*, the situational context directs us to see absolute masculinity circle. Birkin's thought of relief involves with drinking, smoking, soothing with his friends, and women, while Gerald appears in dinner gown (culturally, dress with shirt and trousers), convey us to see him as gentlemen-dressed. His gesture in "took his hands out of his trousers pockets, reached for cigarette" shows manly personality. Boxing, wrestling, Jiu-jitsu, are mentioned as relief of depressive feeling. All of these can be considered masculine activity, for we see no women get involve in these kinds of things.

However, what we should be notified is the dissimilarity of sexual segregation degree between D. H. Lawrence's *Women in Love* and Yukio Mishima's *Patriotism*. *Women in Love* is originated by English writer, thus the context is based on western culture, manifesting stronger gender institutional boundaries comparing to the east. Regarding religious institution, Christianity oppresses the status of women since the bible condemns women as men's temptation, luring them to commit sin by eating forbidden fruits. Religion

is highly influential factor of human culture and society, thus western culture had gained negative attitude toward female, and segregated them from male circle, pushing them to inferior status. Mentioned by Lipman-Blumen (1976; cited above, p. 31), the only value of female is *an authorization as mother*, offering paternity to the males. Yet, Christianity considers childbearing as a punishment for women. (Genesis 3:16: to the women God said "I will make your pains in childbearing very severe; with painful labor you will give birth to children. Your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you"). According to the bible, both wifedom and motherhood have been ceased from western culture, lowering the power of female. The sexual segregation is not only men-women boundaries, but an establishment of males ruling power and women subordination. Seen in D. H. Lawrence's *Women in Love*, when Birkin and Gerald set up masculine circle in the library, the male homosociality is reinforced. Their relationship is strengthened from this point onward, and finally females cannot penetrate into their relationship (In the end of the story, Ursula knows that Birkin still loves Gerald, and he said "I wanted eternal union with a man too: another kind of love" – Chapter XXXI). In order to vivid sexual segregation, "Two Blue Birds" of D. H. Lawrence is another example I shall imported hereby. In this story, the male society is 'work'. It is a mere circle Mr. Gee (a male protagonist of Two Blue Birds) involves throughout the story. Though the story never portrayed male-male relationship, we see female are absolutely separated from male's world. The little secretary Miss Wrexall, though working closely with Mr. Gee, has never seen in romantic or sentimental interaction. She is, moreover, removed from Mr. Gee's sight at the end of the story when she begins quarrel with Mrs. Gee, emphasizing her inferiority even though she always participates in male circle. Similar to Mrs. Gee who possess wifedom, ironically ends up in 'nothing in return'. Not only the story never told her quality of being a wife but also she never got emotional treat from Mr. Gee. What she received is only material (money to spend freely – as the story refers she "helped him into debt"), but when she begins to quarrel, with any reasons, she is removed from Mr. Gee's sight and is considered so annoying. The only female supremacy we can see in *Women in Love* and the *Two Blue Birds* is educational opportunity and independence. For those middle-classes like Mrs. Gee, Ursula, and Gudrun have free will to choose their lives, in choosing lovers and travel on their own (the later, Mrs. Gee). For the lower-class like Mrs. Wrexal, she is able to read

and write, as well as work to gain salary. The shift of female rights in western culture is dramatic but ironic. Biblical beliefs spontaneously root western people to condemn women, cease their status of motherhood and wifehood more than hundred years, but in 20th century female reversibly gain plenty of social opportunity. Nevertheless, female are still removed and segregated from male society, particularly in male homosocial circle which strongly attributes absolute masculinity.

The historical shift, however, is different in eastern culture. As we are looking toward religious root in western side, we shall do the same thing toward Japanese culture. Japan engraves its foundation with the god and goddess. Among all gods, *Amaterasu* is the name of goddess of the sun, who is highly praised as ancestor of Japan Emperor. In Japanese mythology, she got authorization from Izanagi, god of creation, to rule the land. As the symbol of the sun, her absence and presence becomes traditional explanation of night and day, and her mythological story originates Shinto ritual and festival. The sun, in addition, is highly important as country's symbol, as we see today's Japanese flag is sunrise. The religious history of Japan is totally different from western in terms of female role. This presumably establishes female supremacy in Japan. Gregory M. Pflugfelder (2007, pp. 66) stated that "Maps of Edo period commonly featured such legendary places as 'Isle of Women' which natives were believed exclusively females". Female in Edo period were macrocosm. Pflugfelder described that the urban environment in Kyoto (capital city of Edo) presented that male prostitution received the patronage of female clients, indicating the social context of females directed. If considering male homosociality as a result of male supremacy, the change of female roles began at the late of Edo as an influence of Confucianism. Pflugfelder's study showed that "... it was not until the Edo period that it (Confucianism) gained a degree of official patronage". Confucian teachings are based on relationship between social members such as husband-wife, father-son. One of the most famous doctrines of Confucian is the code of wifehood and motherhood that "A woman is to obey her father as daughter, her husband as wife, and her son as aged mother". Emphasizing by the rise of Shogunate (the government of Shogun – a feudal system) which allowed only men to be rulers, the status of Japanese women therefore shifted from respective models to submissive roles.

Although there were a lot of changes upon female roles in Japan, the patriarchal system in Japan did not totally segregate female from male society. Even in the absolute masculine circle, like military units, as appear in Yukio Mishima's *Patriotism*. Comparing to the west, the degree of women pride and honor is stressed rather than the western. Being a wife of Lieutenant Shinji, Reiko possesses authority in managing everything in household. She takes care of clothes, manages and prepares the room for Shinji's ritual suicide (which is considered holy acts in Japanese culture). While D. H. Lawrence's story has defined sexual segregation (female is removed from male's world), Reiko got permission to join the suicide ceremony, with the same pride and honor as Shinji. The story even narrates her death with respective tone ("After the suicide, people would take out this photograph (Shinji and Reiko's wedding, and examine it, and sadly reflect that too often there was a curse on these seemingly flawless unions"). Reiko existence as a housewife, a submissive role in terms of gender opportunity, reverses in highly rendering Shinji's existence. The male protagonist of eastern side, Shinji, also states that he has chosen Reiko as "the first mark of his trust", suggesting Reiko's feminine values as the witness of his honorable death. The comparison reveals that male homosociality in eastern culture did not segregate female. The institutionalization of male hegemonic power is lesser degree than the west. The shift of female rights in Japan is gradually. Since the late Edo period ceased the rights of women to divorce and own property, it was not until late 20th century that Japanese females gain social opportunity. The middle-class women, Reiko, who displayed in 20th century context, are still assigned to stay at home as a wife. They don't have free will to choose their life, or even choosing lovers (Reiko in *Patriotism* get married by the go-between, suggesting her arranged marriage). The status of Japanese women began to change after World War II, that the legal position of women was redefined and women get the rights to choose spouses and occupations. However, if we consider what has happened in *Patriotism*, we see that eastern culture promotes male homosociality and explicitly obliges female position, but sexual segregation is weaker than the west and women are allowed to take part in men's world.

Male homosexual in male homosociality

Within the context of homosociality, what Jean Lipman-Blumen defined is “the seeking enjoyment and preference for the company of same sex ... does not necessarily involve erotic sexual interaction” (Lipman-Blumen, 1976, p. 16). However, it is undeniable that there remains male homosexual relationship within male homosociality, and it is quite stronger than males within heterosexual society. From D. H. Lawrence's *Women in Love* and Yukio Mishima's *Patriotism*, both stories project male dominated society (male homosociality) but absolutely different in representing erotic relationship. In *Patriotism*, Shinji Takeyama mentions his strong bond with his companions. Core of the story is about Shinji's decision to do Japanese ritual suicide (seppuku – disembowelment) which caused by the betrayal of his friends, but he did not there to attack them. To emphasize male relationship, the story even narrates their names (Shinji's friends) twice, first in Shinji's dialogue about their betrayal (“I know nothing. They hadn't asked me to join. Perhaps out of consideration ... Kano, and Homma too, and Yamaguchi”) and second when he recalls his memory the day his friends had drunk in the living room (“We've seen some drinking here, haven't we? With Kano and Homma and Noguchi...”). These twice references emphasize Shinji's deep attachment to the friends. Considering in depth, we might be astonished with Shinji's implication beneath his suicide. His farewell message “Long Live the Imperial Forces” can be interpreted as solid patriotism; he kills himself because he is ashamed for the betrayal. On the other hand, it is weight enough to think that his “Long Live the Imperial Forces” implies his loyalty toward the betrayed troops, for he did not directly manifest his love to ‘country’ or ‘the Emperor’ where it should be. If so, the title of the story “Patriotism” is questionable. The fact that he must enter the seppuku ritual, which is culturally praised as honorable acts for it proves patience and fearlessness in widening the stomach alive, signifying his strong faith towards “the Imperial Forces”. The story did not directly tell what Shinji means for “the Imperial Forces”, thus the only possibility is perceived through his stream of consciousness; the spoken of Kano, Homma, Yamaguchi, and Noguchi names. What has knotted them altogether is work and duty, therefore, the underlining of male relationship in Japan side is close to friendship than homosexual activities. Nowhere in the story implies Shinji's erotic words, dialogues,

connotations, or sexual activities with his friends. What strengthens their homosociety is the masculine bond, and it is surprisingly as strong as they could betray the national troops and commit suicide without fear of death.

Highly contrast to the east, D. H. Lawrence's "Women in Love" clearly shows erotic interaction between two male characters in the story. In Chapter XX, the situation in housing library exhibits in superficial level Birkin's uncomfortable mood, which resulted from Ursula's refusal to his marriage proposal, and Gerald's loneliness. The two men relieve their uneasiness by talking and wrestling, establishing male circle in which only two of them understand each other and relief emotional troubles. However, the narrative structure goes beyond 'male conversation' to 'same-sex intercourse'. The word 'penetrate' has been used more than once to describe the movement of Birkin's rush to Gerald's 'white flesh', adding by the word 'deeper and deeper' and 'interfuse' ("...in a tense fine grip that seemed to penetrate into very quick of Gerald's being" / "They seemed to drive their white flesh deeper and deeper against each other" / "He seemed to penetrate into Gerald's more solid ... to interfuse his body through the body of the other"; Ibid, p. 330 [My emphasis]). These descriptive words convey imagination exceeding normal fight to *anal intercourse*, which is the sexual act between male and male. Scientifically, since male homosexual intercourse needs inserting of organ into another body, 'penetrate', 'deeper', 'into Gerald's being' serve the connotation of their intercourse. Although the story tells us at the beginning that they would have a 'fight' not sexual activity, the 'Jiu-jitsu' style of movement (Birkin's fighting style in the scene) is in fact totally different from the scenic description. While Japanese Jiu-jitsu focuses on grappling and throwing, Birkin and Gerald's movement seem to be clinging, hugging, and more than anything, penetrating. The underlining "...two essential white figures working into a tighter closer oneness of struggle"/"a sharp gasp of breath"/"...the physical junction of two bodies clinched into oneness" (Ibid, p. 330-331 [My emphasis]) make their interaction extraordinary. Moreover, the response of Birkin which he heard his heartbeat in sentimental way ("No, it was inside himself, it was his own heart. And the beating was painful, so strained, surcharged"; Ibid, p. 331) makes their fighting romanticized. The position of Birkin and Gerald after fighting is another evident conveying us to see them in erotic way, as Birkin lays on top, "leaning his weight on the soft body of the other man",

and they respond to each other gently ("It was Birkin whose hand, in swift response, had closed in a strong, warm clasp over the hand of the other. Gerald's clasp had been sudden and momentaneous."; Ibid, p. 330). The context in Chapter XX imperatively reflects Birkin and Gerald's relationship more than manly friendship should be. Within the context of western, what motivation leads them to be homosexual male?

Birkin and Gerald, as we see, have been portrayed as absolute masculinity (cited above, Birkin is able to fight with Jiu-jitsu, Gerald has elegant gesture and smoking cigarette). They also establish male homosociality in which they separate themselves from women (Ursula and Gudrun) as well as segregate women from them. It is found in the text that, in the opening scene, Gerald is thinking to himself to relief his uneasiness with "three things"; drink or smoke, sooth with Birkin, and women. ("And there were only three things left, that would rouse him, make him live. One was to drink or smoke hashish, the other was to be soothed by Birkin, and the third was women"; Ibid, p. 329). He put women to the third, but Birkin is raised as second thought before women. In the same way, disappointed Birkin does not find any remedy but goes straight from Beldover to Shortlands where Gerald stays, ("AFTER the fiasco of the proposal, Birkin had hurried blindly away from Beldover, in a whirl of fury./He went straight to Shortlands. There he found Gerald standing with his back to the fire, in the library ..."; Ibid. p. 325) as if he knew he would find Gerald there. He does not even mention women for "three cures" ('Some old Johnny says there are three cures for *ennui*, sleep, drink, and travel,' said Birkin; Ibid, p. 327). Jean Lipman-Blumen (1976, p. 16) explain the reason behind the foundation of male homosociality that men turn to the other men for the satisfaction of most their needs which include emotion as well. We can assume that whenever men can fulfill what other men want, women become less needed, or disposed from male society. At basic level, nature of the sex such as taste, preference, emotion, social interest, or power would better respond to those within same sex. Significantly, however, while they are able to fulfill erotic relationship within their own, why homosexuality has been ceased from male society in almost every culture? Dana M. Britton (1990, pp. 423) explained this phenomenon as homophobia; "an irrational revulsion, condemnation of homosexual" or "the fear of homosexuality" (Wienberg, 1967; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980, cited in Britton, 1990, p. 423). With Lipman-Blumen's theory (1976), Britton found out that "when powerful social institutions are sex-

segregated (male dominated) and posits that sexual activity within them may be seen as troublesome by patriarchal society as a whole. Thus, homophobia helps maintain the boundary between social and sexual interaction in sex-segregated society” (Britton, 1990, pp. 424). It is universally seen that social norms is influential in creating sexual boundary, between men and women, for example, the separation of monks and nun in religious institution, or all males and all females theatrical plays such as canonical Shakespearean plays in western culture, or Kabuki in Japan. However, it seems ironic that while humanity establish male dominated society (male homosociality), there remain the fear for imperiling the prevailing mode of social relations (Greenberg and Bystyrn, 1982, cited in Britton, 1990, p. 424), so men try to avoid being homosexual and keep themselves within their traditional role boundaries – heterosexual circle (Morin and Garfinkle, 1978, cited in Britton, 1990, p. 425). Lipman-Blumen adds that “the taboo on homosexuality prevents the expression of sexual feelings in all-male situations as a way of protecting valued males from falling the wasteful trap of homosexuality” (Lipman-Blumen, 1976; cited in Britton, 1990, p. 425).

There’s question left, why those homosexual male usually represent on surface as true manliness and absolutely masculinity? But these homosexual male do not present in universal cultures. Men in Japan are taught to possess absolute manliness, in terms of occupation, doctrines, and personality, like Shinji who is a soldier and fearless. Nevertheless, Patriotism does not insert erotic homosexuality as a part of male society. Friendship is enough for them to sacrifice their lives. Western male in *Women in Love*, on the other hand, show their strong bond through erotic relationship, but their bond are as strong as Shinji that they too cross the border of death (Birkin insists to love Gerald regardless of his death, Shinji chooses to stab himself alive rather than attack his friends). The answer lay within ‘taboos’. Accumulating and incepting in human history for thousands years, taboos has shaped people’s attitude toward life and gender roles in different ways upon different cultures. Gregory M. Pflugfelder noted in his study on male sexuality that, in Japan, Edo period regulated male-male erotic behavior in legislative ways.

“It is more accurate to say that legal regulation assumed a different form from that which prevailed in Western societies at the time or in late eras of Japanese history. In the West, the Judeo-Christian stigmatization of non-procreative sexual acts, and

particularly the sin of "sodomy", made a profound mark on legal discourse, resulting in centuries of persecution by both church and state agencies lasting even to this day" (Pflugfelder, 2007; p. 98)

"Shinto authorities did not so characterize male-male sexual practices, showing far less preoccupation with the theological implications of such behavior than their European counterpart" (Ibid, pp. 104-105)

The study of Pflugfelder revealed the dissimilarity between canonic cultures in western and Japan. Shinto religion did not stigmatize male-male sexual practices as particularly sinful, comparing to male-female, but Christianity did. Some torture devices which lasted until nowadays are the evidence of western rejection of homosexuality, but it could not be seen in eastern history (Japan in this case). Though Japanese homosexual relationship was ceased by the government during war time (late Meiji – early 20th century) when the celebration of erotic pleasure from same-sex love came to be seen as an unpatriotic form of self-indulgence, the homosexual males in Japan not entirely banished from the history.

Conclusion

In conclusion, all we could obtained from the history and religious influence tells us that the strong taboos in west oppresses male with homosexual preference, while eastern opens up for same-sex love for long times. It is so reversal and ironic that, according to Greenberg and Bystyrn (1982, p. 424), where the taboos are strong, male homosociality is increasingly presented, as if it is the reflection of human nature. Thompson, Grisanti, and Pleck (1985; cited in Britton, 1990, p. 425) found that the motivating dynamic in masculine behavior "may not be the lure of some positive goal like power. Rather, a fundamental guide for men's behavior may be a negative touchstone of anything feminine". In other word, being absolutely male protect their existence and honor within homosocial system. Homophobia may separate male from being homosexual but that would not mean homosexual vanish from human history. As long as male can seek physical and mental fulfillment from their sex, the hegemonic of male homosociality and homosexuality could last till nowadays.

References

- Britton, M. D. (1990). Homophobia and homosociality: An analysis of boundary maintenance. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 31 (3), 423-439.
- Freud, S. (2000). *Three essays on the theory of sexuality / Sigmund Freud; with an introductory essay by Steven Marcus*. (James Strachey, Tran.). United Kingdom: London Bridge Books.
- Lawrence, D. H. (1996). *Women in Love*. New York: Bantam Classics.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1976). Toward a homosocial theory of sex roles: An explanation of the sex segregation of social institutions. *Signs*, 1(3), 15-31.
- Mishima, Y. (n.d.). *Patriotism* (Geoffrey W. Sargent, Tran.). New York: The New Directions Pearl. (Original work published 1961)
- Pflugfelder, G. M. (2007). *Cartographies of desire: Male-male sexuality in Japanese discourse, 1600-1950*. California: University of California Press.