

*Mandarina malcriado, maestro  
maricón y el flojo sapo sopa*

*Glimpses of Manhood and Meaning on a  
Galapagos Island*

Gard Frækaland Vangsnes



Master's thesis

Department of Social Anthropology

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

May 2010



*Mandarina malcriado, maestro maricón y  
el flojo sapo sopa*

© Gard Frækaland Vangsnes

2010

*Mandarina malcriado, maestro maricón y el flojo sapo sopa*

Gard Frækaland Vangsnes

<http://www.duo.uio.no/>

# Abstract

This thesis is concerned with meaning and manhood on San Cristobal, an island in the Galapagos archipelago. It is argued that there is a dialectics between the production of meaning and the cultural construction of male deeds. In this perspective the thesis accounts for the particular place San Cristobal is and some of the men I met during my fieldwork. The ethnographic accounts describe interaction and praxis from the local perspective within an Ecuadorian context. The social representations are meant to be representative for masculine prototypes within the Catholic region stretching from the Circum Mediterranean region embracing Latin America. My emphasis is put on the conjunction of male deeds at play within an exclusively male context. In correlation to other anthropologists writing from the same region I argue that meaning associated to masculinity is created in the intersection between imagery and everyday praxis. The interpretation is furthermore grounded in symbolic forms of exchange, but supplemented with a psychoanalytical perspective and additionally pursued in intersubjective communication. My aims are to describe Galapagos and Ecuador in general, San Cristobal in particular and the local population, essentially men's social representations in everyday life.



# Acknowledgements

The thesis has been developed as a part of the Master program of Social Anthropology at the University of Oslo and I am grateful to all teachers and fellow students for their knowledge and support. Arve Sørum who has been my tutor has been especially helpful in directing my chaotic thoughts into something meaningful and comprehensible. I am also grateful for having received the partial funding of my stay through SAI student grant. Øystein Alexander Vangsnes has commented and corrected my English and I appreciate his effort.

My greatest acknowledgements must be directed to the local population on San Cristobal who received me with open arms. They gave me space and substance in introducing me to their world and local knowledge. To all the local boys and men: thank you for the good times and for teaching me that its good to have a big appetite for...life.

The whole project rests its case on former experiences from Ecuador, on the people who taught me Spanish and the social codes of conduit in the cultural climate. I am grateful to *la familia Armijos Loayza*, to my family-in-law, to *la familia Tapia Zavala* and all the others that I am forgetting in the last minute.

Regarding the cultural meaning of manhood no one has taught me more than my brothers in Guayaquil:

*En ese respecto agradezco la sabiduría y la naturaleza de mis panas del alma, El Negro, Gerare, Betoman, Andres, El pana Rodrigo, Miguel el furioso, Maíz, Diegura, El Pinky, Chernoman, Nuno, El Pulpo, Gianni, El Choclo, Gabriel, El Fifo, El Lucho y los gordos y los chinos mas los que me olvidan..*

The women:

*Hermanas Natalia y Berenice, Diana, Heidi, Lourdes, Lorena, la Fer y muchas mas..*

The Mothers!:

*Mama Lucia, la señora Lucrecia, Olga, Hilda, Maydee, mis tías y mis primas..*

Additionally I would like to thank *La Casa Cultural, núcleo Galápagos, La Cooperativa Pesquera X* and *La Fundación Charles Darwin* for their support and advices.

Last but definitely not least, my gratitude is directed to my patient wife, Tato who is and has been much more than a man can expect.

All translations are mine if nothing else is indicated.





# Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Aim and scope .....	4
The Backdrop in the Gender Discourse .....	7
The Theoretical Dimension .....	11
Methods and Positioning .....	12
The Plan.....	15
Ch. 1: Galapagos and The Production of Uniqueness.....	19
The Enchanted Islands .....	20
Facts and fantasy .....	23
The microcosm of a country.....	27
Paradise?.....	30
Puerto Baquerizo Moreno, San Cristobal.....	32
Résumé .....	36
Ch.2: Common Sense and the Legacy of Masculine Domination .....	39
Machismo? .....	44
The Legacy.....	47
Résumé .....	50
Ch.3: Ruptures in Everyday life .....	53
A handful of Fear .....	54
The Male Protector.....	58
Electing the Right Leader.....	61
Résumé .....	68
Ch.4: The Masculine Script and the Shortcut to Psychoanalysis.....	71
Masculinity meets an angry Mother .....	72
Analogies of “Poor Men” .....	77
Homophobia .....	82
Résumé .....	85
Ch.5: Sympathy for the Devil .....	87
The excursion .....	88
Machismo in Masculinity .....	94
Time on San Cristobal.....	99

Résumé .....	102
Epilogue .....	105
Appendix 1 .....	111
Some emic expression as categorizations of men in Galapagos .....	111
Bibliography.....	115

*Consider the subtleness of the sea;  
how its most dreaded creatures glide under water,  
unapparent for the most part, and treacherously hidden  
beneath the loveliest tints of azure.  
Consider also the devilish brilliance and beauty of its  
most remorseless tribes,  
as the dainty embellished shape of many species of sharks.  
Consider, once more,  
the universal cannibalism of the sea;  
all whose creatures prey upon each other,  
carrying on eternal war since the world began.  
(Melville 1947: 261)*

## **Introduction**

As we drove up towards the highlands I made a small prayer to myself – “please watch out on us now whoever you are, these are the moments I need your support from above”. I was in the back of a pick-up car together with another man; we were sitting in the rear end, behind the double cabin occupied by five other men. The man who was driving had been drinking for two days and had no worries about going as fast as he could on the dirt road. Just before I made my prayer I was sure we were going to crash as the car leaned over to the right in the direction of the ditch. Two of the wheels were outside the road, but somehow he managed to maneuver the car back on track and we were safe again for the moment. The two of us who were holding on in the back of the pick-up started to slam the roof as to demand a minimum of cautiousness. One of the windows were opened and we shouted *oye, chucha tu madre!!*, *casi nos matas ahí loco!!* (hey, you motherfucker!!, you almost got us killed back there you crazy man!!). *No pasa nada...* (Don't worry man, nothing's happening at all...) spoken in a lazy tone was the response we got as the window was rolled up again. The drive went on for another half an hour and nothing happened.

It was Sunday and in fact Election Day as this took place on San Cristobal, Galapagos. Both the national President and the town's Mayor were to be voted for. Things had gone by smoothly, people in town had dressed up and gone to vote with their family at one of the three high schools that, for the occasion, had been turned into assembly halls. After performing their duty - voting being obligatory by law in Ecuador - people were hanging out, having a snack and small talking with relatives or friends. Children seemed to get all the candy they wanted although some of them had to nag about it for a while. After saluting a few people I went down towards the harbor to see if I could get something to eat. On my way I was called upon by Pedro a man I had got to know through playing football from a small restaurant where he and some other guys were sitting. *Vente para acá para tomar una cerveza broder!* (Come over here and have a beer man!), he said. I hesitated for two seconds because I knew that it was against the law to drink on Election Day. As a matter of fact it was prohibited to sell and buy alcohol the day before as well. At the same time I was familiar with the phenomenon as many young people in Ecuador find it amusing to stock up on liquor or beer and use the prohibition as an incentive to have a party. Thus it was no big surprise when Pedro told me that he had been drinking the whole weekend and that he was *muy borracho* (very drunk) when he had voted. *Bueno, pero solo un par, okey?* (All right man, but only a couple okay?), I said to him. *Si loco, no pasa nada...déjame introducirte a mi primo aquí...* (Of course man, don't worry...let me introduce you to my cousin...), said Pedro while pouring a glass of cold beer and handing it over to me - *Salud!* - *Saluuud y viva la democracia!* A couple of beers were somehow turned into many more and at the end Pedro came up with the brilliant idea of getting a bottle of rum and drive up to his uncle's farm in the highlands of the island. *Vamos!* and off we went. It was still only two o'clock pm and no worries to worry about.

After the dramatic drive we finally arrived at the entrance of a farm and Pedro parked the car beside the road. We had a brief discussion about Pedro's driving and it was agreed upon that he should not have been the conductor, but as nothing happened anyway, the dispute was drowned in other subjects of talk while the bottle

of rum was opened. Some of us went for a short walk in the surroundings, but soon enough we were all standing in a circle around the car passing the plastic glass with Pepsi and rum. One of the men took control of the mixing and distribution of drinks while serious things were discussed. First of all, Ecuador's last football game was thoroughly commented upon; *Esos negros no saben meter la pata y hacer los goles que nos hacen falta!* (Those negros don't know how to do the goals that we are missing!), one of the men complained, referring to the player's (who are almost exclusively blacks) inability to produce goals. *Simon valen verga y eso a pesar de que si estamos jugando bien* (yeah, they're useless and that is despite the fact that we are playing quite good), another man answered. Football continued as the main theme for some time, but it was interrupted by comments about the election that had taken place earlier on. *Putá, yo cuando fui a votar hoy día apestaba a trago, te lo juro que pensé que alguien me iba a dar una cachetada* (when I went to vote this morning I was stinking of liquor all the way and I assure you that I thought somebody was going to give me a slap on the face), said Pedro while finishing his drink. *Ah, no pasa nada...* (Ah, don't worry man...), one of the men said as to say that there was no reason to be so tight about it in the first place. *Y quien crees que gane?* (And who do you think will win?), I asked. *De ley que gana Correa otra vez, no hay alternativas fuertes..* (I'm totally sure Correa will win again, there's no strong alternatives besides him), a man responded. *Y es bueno o malo que gane Correa otra vez?* (And is it good or bad if Correa wins again?), I continued. *Da lo mismo, todos esos políticos son corruptos igual...* (It's all the same, all those politicians are corrupt anyway...), Pedro answered before turning abruptly into another theme of talk: *Oye viste las peladas que llegaban ayer?* (Did you see the girls that arrived yesterday?), he asked one of his friends. That question directed the attention towards the foreign girls coming to the island and as the rum was passed so were the stories of romance and drinking.

To put an end to this introduction my friend Pedro got even drunker. Despite everybody criticizing his driving, he insisted on driving back. The compromise was that he had to go slowly and be accompanied by a man – one that had not been drinking too much in the seat beside him. Although it was risky and only due to his

stubbornness, he managed to drive us safely down to the village. We got another bottle of rum and continued to drink inside a warehouse close to one of the piers in the bay. By this time Pedro got into a verbal fight with a person criticizing his drinking and I decided that it was time to leave the scene.

The day after I met up with my regular friends to play football in the afternoon. As Pedro they were all schoolteachers but some fifteen to twenty years older. Pedro came in his car and joined us in the game. He was quite reduced and very worried about yesterday's happenings. He told us that the police had showed up and fined him along with three of his friends. After all, it was Election Day and prohibited to drink alcohol. One of the older teachers sympathetically comforted him by saying; "these things have happened to all of us, I remember this one time..." Pedro was in need of all the support he could get and swore to "lay off the bottle" for long time.

### **Aim and scope**

David Gilmore wrote a book he called "Manhood in the Making" (1990) which treats what he calls "the manhood puzzle" in a comparative perspective. The subject of the book is the cultural construction of the male stereotype i.e. what comes to constitute "the real man" or "a true man" in different societies (1990:1). Supplied with his own ethnography and secondary literature of other anthropologists his book describes how masculinity and manhood is contested, constituted, approved and disapproved throughout the world. His approach to this subject is a twinned perspective combining both a cultural materialism and an analytic personality psychology (1990:5). That is to say that he describes the ideals of masculinity in a framework of both socio-cultural and individual dimensions. His overall intention is a tentative step towards an understanding of what it means to be a man, a subject that, in Gilmore's perspective, was neglected twenty years ago. His conclusions are exploratory and have created a space for others to follow. This thesis is partly cast in that very space.

The aim of my study has been local men in public arenas on the island San Cristobal, in the Galapagos archipelago. One of my endeavors is descriptive and revolves around the question of; *what are the scripts for masculine behavior and how is it represented?* In this sense I am close to Gutmann's examination of what it means to be a man (*ser hombre*) in a *colonia popular* in Mexico City (1996c: 11). My goals are furthermore analytical and interpretive in the sense that they are aimed to explain some of the reasons why men act, react and talk as they do. I will not offer any firm conclusions, but follow Gilmore in the exploratory vein in what is ultimately an extremely complicated discourse of gender and meaning.

The thesis seeks to identify four claims. The first is that there is a conjunction of male deeds and ideals that is invariably present in exclusively male social contexts. It is reproduced through men's talk about each other and in their moral expressions and attitude towards known male figures, which in turn creates shared expectations to role attributes. Outside a same-sex context this remark is less noticeable, but still present. The second claim is that the representations of manhood and masculinity can be interpreted as a symbolic exchange of power between men and women. The symbol of the mother, idealized in the Virgin Mary, is of pivotal importance in the overall Catholic region and gives women a powerful position, which again creates ambivalence in men. The men respond to this by an extensive use of metaphors that mix the mother figure with sexuality and by increasing their solidarity with their peers. On the question of symbolic violence I agree with Bourdieu (2001) who claims that the friction originates in the androcentric vision as the neutral, which legitimize the potential masculine domination. The third claim is that there is reason to believe that this pattern of masculine representations is reproduced throughout Latin America and the Circum-Mediterranean region. The most obvious reasons are, of course, the historical conquest of the South American continent, the shared Spanish language (with its exceptions), the bonds to Catholicism, honor and shame, and the collective references to regional, popular culture<sup>1</sup>. Fourth, I support the claim raised

---

<sup>1</sup> It is impossible to ignore the impact of the Mexican TV series of *El Chavo del Ocho* in this case. Not only is the show a reversal of the characters of children in the sense that the actors are adults, but the

by several anthropologists that there are multiple voices and a great variety underneath the prototypes of masculinity, but I will argue that we need both perspectives to create meaningful accounts.

The essence of this thesis is *communication* in its broadest sense and this will lead us to partake in the social discourse of men in order to describe them and to account for the particular place this island happens to be. I will argue that the men on the island share more than what distinguish them when compared to their fellow citizens on mainland Ecuador. The history and demographic dynamics that support this claim will be accounted for in chapter one which is mainly a chapter of contextualization.

There are a number of exceptions to a consistency within the Catholic region and thus an important preliminary restriction to my analytical scope is that the description and interpretation involves exclusively the mestizo population. With the exception of a few references to Indians in the Andes, no other ethnic group than the mestizos are accounted for. Likewise, the notion of class differences in the local community will not be dealt with explicitly despite its situational and conceptual importance.

Another essential limitation to the following description and interpretation is that I have chosen the public sphere on the expense of the domestic realm. The consequences of this exclusion are certainly questionable and I am the first to admit that my choice of analytical scope can be seen as restricted and biased. Archetti makes a similar excuse when writing about masculinities from the arenas of football and tango: "I willingly accept that the *total* – if possible – study of masculinities in Argentina should include arenas like work, family, kinship, religion and politics – on the conditions that we ask the right questions" (1999:115). The holistic ideal is, in

---

program is a forum where everyday life is subjected to moral dilemmas through humor. Millions of Latin Americans have grown up with *El Chavo* and *El Chapulin Colorado* and anyone older than 25 years could talk extensively, if not, infinitely about the happenings in the TV series. Music alone warrants a lengthy discussion I cannot embark on here. One point however is the category of *reggaeton*, which has grown tremendously during the last 10 years and highlights macho attitude, sexual domination and vulgarity in analogy to certain Western hip-hop artists.



other words, beyond my capacity and the reason for my choice has simply been to maintain one focus instead of struggling with a vastness that presumably would have lead to a superficial interpretation. Archetti was, of course, on much safer grounds being an Argentinean with experiences from the arenas he mentioned in the quote, along with a solid scholarly integrity.

## **The Backdrop in the Gender Discourse**

If we are to understand meanings of masculinity it is reasonable to start with a view on gender. Peter Wade (2009) has recently published a book with the title *Race and Sex in Latin America*. In the introductory part he discusses the two terms, race and gender. Let us begin by sketching out some of his points in his passage about *Sex, sexuality and Gender* (2009:6-12):

The difficulties of defining gender and sex, Wade claims, lie partially in the invention and usage of each term. Historically speaking, the focus on genital anatomy in order to divide female from male is “recent” according to the definition by Oxford English Dictionary – which state that “sex” is simply the quality of being male or female. Sex, as a word for sexual intercourse is, according to Wade, a twentieth-century meaning. In this frame, *sexuality* has also come to mean *sexual identity*, which is in itself a highly complicated matter when we venture outside the heterosexual realm. That is indeed the case for heterosexuality as well, if we acknowledge it as a social construct of what is meant to be “normal” and thus the presupposition that it may be a category that hides other inclinations. For instance, and as we will see in chapter two, intersexuality challenges this categorization fundamentally. But we do not need a biological example to confound us here; homosexuality, transexuality, transgenderism are all valid categories in themselves, at least they are categories that account for the plurality of sex instead of ignoring what people say and feel that they are. In other words, and following Wade “...one would need to reject the definition of sex as being only *either* male or female” (2009: 7). This has some serious consequences for the research on gender and even more when we add the

unconscious or hidden dimension, which acknowledged that a person can be sexual without doing things related to the activity of sexual reproduction.

The feminist movement tried to redefine these matters and their attempt was to minimize the role of biology and highlight the role of socio-cultural and historical conditions in forming and shaping men and women. They also questioned the formation of the term sex, but we will leave that for now. The feminists obviously had a point and I will return to the paradox of masculine domination in chapter two.

There were other issues that complicated the Western notion of a species divided into two opposed, exhaustive categories of male and female. Anthropologists came along with strong evidences of how a biological infrastructure could give rise to a variety of gendered superstructures in the jungle of different cultures. Men and women had different attributes to their roles as fathers, brothers, sons and mothers, sisters, daughters. These distinguishable, cross-cultural differences were related to the meaning of their body and to their cosmological position and even worse, what about the existence of a third sex? This was undoubtedly a mystery to human science and, I believe it still is today.

Then came this man named Michel Foucault and wrote several books about the history of sexuality (1998). He supported the anthropologists who viewed sexuality as a social construct and sent some well directed criticism to the church for imposing their conservative and, ultimately, violent view on how sexuality should be.

Anyway, the practice of confession with its focus on “abnormal sexuality” led to the same practice in psychoanalysis and as Foucault pointed out, sexuality became a key to personal identity. This had a major impact on how people rationalized their feelings and presumably created a whole tradition of an explanatory approach.

If both sex and sexuality are cultural constructs and not simply natural phenomena, then they are both in the same boat as gender, and we cannot see sex or sexuality as a biological substratum overlain by the cultural elaboration of gender. (Wade 2009:9)

Then what? The idea that women should and must take responsibility for the childrearing the first year of the infant's life is perhaps the only feature that approximates validity cross-culturally. But that does not mean that they are obliged to run the domestic realm as the feminists underlined pretty thoroughly. The question remains; is it possible to do a distinction between male and female per se? Most people would probably tell the researchers on gender to have a look around and say, "Yes of course there is a difference!" As one of the leading figures in this game, Henrietta Moore came to the conclusion that "while the concepts of sexual difference and gender difference collide...and cannot usefully be separated, it is still the case that they cannot become identical"<sup>2</sup> (1994:20).

Peter Wade's project in the gender discourse is to explore the relation of sex and race and it is not my intention to follow him further on that. Nevertheless, his conclusion is that sexuality is gendered and that gender includes sexuality, but "sexuality and gender are not identical and their relationships are one focus of analysis" (2009:11). Wade ends up where one is doomed to end up in such an enterprise and points to the impossibility of defining sexuality and gender because they are historically – and I would add *culturally* - variable. Hence no scholars attempt to do rigid definitions of either gender or sexuality, but merely play along on the implicit associations of common sense.

The discourse of gender in Latin America is extremely heterogeneous and hybrid, in fact it is possible to ask oneself as Melhuus & Stølen (1996: 5-9) do – if Latin America is a meaningful universe for legitimate cross-cultural comparison. Nevertheless, Melhuus & Stølen hope to do justice to the bright side of their question and as I revealed above, I think that there are strong reasons of legitimate comparisons, not only to Latin America, but also to the old continent and the Circum Mediterranean region. Actually, I do not see the problem of a comparative perspective to any region, but that is another discussion.

---

<sup>2</sup> See also her discussion of gender trouble in Moore (ed. 1999: ch.6)

In their introduction to the edited book called *Machos, Mistresses, Madonnas*, Melhus & Stølen (1996: 1-28) touch upon central issues to the construction of gender identities in Latin America. Their aim is to highlight the complexities of gender imagery through production, conjunctions and interfaces of gendered representations and representations of gender. The imagery refers to both collective representations and “the fixing of cultural images in the social consciousness” – that is, gendered ideals that are reproduced. This is elaborated through the essays in the book and I am not going to enter any detailed analysis here.

Rather, I will extract some of their thoughts that might serve our purpose in this thesis. One of the main assumptions that underline their arguments is that “gender differences in Latin America appear to assume a commanding significance in the ordering of differences other than gender” (1996:23). They see gender as a potent signifier in discourses that treat subjects of any kind and refer to examples in their edited book, for instance Archetti’s (1996:ch.2) observations of masculinity and moral in the arena of football and Krohn-Hansen’s (1996:ch.5) concern with masculinity in the realm of politics. Their point is that “gender appears to be a vehicle through which morality speaks” (1996:23). I certainly agree on this matter and hope to show the relevance through my own ethnography. Another interesting thought that also resonates with my own experiences is that; “Men are classified according to degrees of masculinity; women are discretely classified according to their moral character” (1996:27). Although this generalization is not watertight, and Melhuus & Stølen are cautious to say so, it might also be “the core of gender relations” and by which there is such an abundance of ambiguity and complexity in gendered elaborations and performance.

When treating the male side of the gender opposition my interest is solely on the social elaborations that men enact or fail to enact when living up to the local norms and ideals of masculinity on San Cristobal.

## The Theoretical Dimension

I am a student and whilst Geertz writes about ethnographic research and the importance of “finding our feet” (1973:13) and follows up ten years later by saying; “The trick is to figure out what the devil they think they are up to” (1983:58), my concern is not about fieldwork, which for me is the fun part although I found it challenging - but much more a problem regarding the theoretical dimension.

Memories of relevant literature, for instance Herzfeld’s (1985b) book from Crete and Gregor’s (1985) *Anxious Pleasures* where typically elaborated elsewhere, in this case Gilmore (1990).

Bourdieu’s *Masculine Domination* (2001) is primarily theoretical, but draws upon the ethnography he conducted in Algeria and France. I chose to use it because it is convincing and it serves as an escape to the never-ending citations to his *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1977a), *Distinction* (1984) and *The Logic of Practice* (1990a). Much earlier in the process of writing I read Geertz. Although the two books referred to above (*The Interpretation of Cultures* and *Local Knowledge*) are similarly cited virtually everywhere, Geertz is much closer to me than Bourdieu. I will use them both in chapter two. The point in using Geertz’s notion of common sense is, as many anthropologists like to say, because it is good to think with. Bourdieu’s book, on the other hand, is so dense with theoretical arguments that I had to select a few of them to understand anything. One remark about Bourdieu’s book though, is that it counters the critic implied by Knauff (1996:125-6) of Bourdieu’s neglecting of human motivation and a narrow view on subjective power of agency as potential forces of change. Knauff may be right in entailing his criticism to Bourdieu’s tendency towards Western assumptions - and thus the neglecting of cultural variation - but in *Masculine Domination* a substantial part of the book (2001: 81-112) explicitly treats factors of permanence and change, he even offer a small passage on *love* (2001: 109-12). In relation to Melhuus & Stølen’s assumption that men are categorized in degrees and women according to their moral character, Bourdieu’s insistence on male domination in what he calls “differentiated societies” (2001:98) is revealed; “...to say of a woman in a position of power that she is very feminine is just a

particular subtle way of denying her the right to the specifically masculine attribute of power” (2001:99).<sup>3</sup> As mentioned, we will return to Bourdieu in chapter two.

Other central literature on men is; Gutmann’s (1996b) book from Mexico already mentioned, Archetti’s (1999) book on masculinities and Krohn-Hansen’s (2001: ch.3) analysis on masculinity in the Dominican Republic. In the edited book from 1996, Melhuus & Stølen have incorporated both Archetti’s and Krohn-Hansen’s perspectives along with other essays on the same subject. Gilmore’s (1990) classic is similarly cited in all the books regarding manhood within the catholic region. Brøgger (1996) and Beneke (1997) followed his neo-Freudian perspective and we will have a closer look on it in chapter four.

Regarding the regional literature I bought several books on Ecuadorian identity while I was there and also got some tips from Ospina, an Argentinean historian we will get to know briefly in the following chapter. Because of the difficulties in obtaining a six-months visa in Galapagos I also spent some time reading up on the archipelago at a library in Guayaquil.

All this said, I present a thesis with an emphasis on the ethnographic account, not as an escape from theory, but as to open up for others to interpret. In a discourse about men and masculinity we need perspectives and interpretations towards an understanding, conclusions can hardly be a priority here.

## **Methods and Positioning**

I was supposed to stay six months on Galapagos, but for different reasons I only stayed for three. In our methodological paradigm, which highlights the necessity of long-term fieldwork, three months is minimal and I admit; it was too short. I struggled with the local bureaucracy for two months in Guayaquil and finally decided to travel despite the short time. In realizing this problem at an early stage

---

<sup>3</sup> A funny detail in this discussion is that Knauff’s book contains 313 pages in addition to a remarkable reference list of 60 pages. In contrast, my paperback edition of Bourdieu’s *Masculine Domination* does have an index, but no reference list whatsoever.

and I have compensated by relating the field to its national context. I visited several travel agencies to hear their story and presentation of Galapagos and talked about the archipelago with many Ecuadorians. Regarding the interaction of meaning and male deeds I have looked at situations that resonate in surrounding experiences on mainland Ecuador. In the meantime, I maintained a focus on the particularity of the place by drawing on local happenings in order to examine the general pattern of masculinity.

My method was exclusively based on participant observations. I did some interviews as well, even a questionnaire to a hundred pupils in two different elementary schools, but they did not serve my purpose and I will not take them under account. The formal interviews I did with some officials in public institutions were marked by the context and formality, which made the informants respond more to the context than to what I was interested in. I do not reject that this could possibly be my lack of interview skills, but as soon as the talk found its way back to informality it became much more interesting and comfortable. I wrote up my field notes continually during the night or the next morning and by doing so, my data is colored by the contexts and situations. As a methodological point my participant observation was notably always done in a context, through sharing an activity, being in a specific location or talking about subjects of common interest. In this sense my own character, as a man with certain ideas and preferences, did play a relevant role in the production of data, but it was far from interrogative in the journalistic sense of the word.

The point about looking exclusively at the public sphere may have its limits, but regarding methods it serves to protect the people who shared their stories with me. The characters are all based on their social, public (re)presentation and should not come to represent the real and total person, which obviously hold other dimensions as well. All names in this thesis are fictive and regarding ethics in general I have found comfort in what Knauff (1996: ch.2) refers to as “critical humanist sensibility” with two major momentums: The first being “to document and valorize the richness and diversity of human ways of life” (1996:48) which I have tried to achieve by

pushing a view from the inside of the local society and Ecuadorian discourse without any normative agenda. The second and complementary momentum is: “to expose, analyze, and critique human inequality and domination” (1996:50). Regarding gender I account for this by invoking a symbolic interpretation of masculine domination, but contrary to popular assumptions on machismo I insist that this must be seen as a symbolic exchange on power between men and women where both of them share the androcentric universe and thus there is no one to blame.

I am a privileged man of 27 years married to an Ecuadorian woman – who spent three weeks with me on San Cristobal. The last decade we have lived partially in Ecuador and in Norway, roughly five years in each country. In Ecuador most of my time has been spent in the cities of Guayaquil and Machala as points of departure to travels in the country and the South American continent. I have lived in two local families, besides my family-in-law, one year as an exchange student and more than one year with a family of a friend.

This background gave me an advantage in minimizing the distance between the locals and me. Furthermore, the realm of sports was another entrance to break the ice with the local population. I happen to practice juggling and slack line (tightrope walking) and the beach close to my lodge was a suitable place for this. Typically, children and youngsters expressed a curiosity towards these activities. The arenas of football and surfing worked similarly as a positive and mutual joy. I normally had lunch and dinner with a man I got to know, rotating between three low budget restaurants. Through him I met his friends who were dedicated surfers and pool players in their mid twenties. Through playing football with a group of schoolteachers I had a contrasting circle of older acquaintances as an arena during the afternoons. In addition I attended formal football training with boys in the age from 16-18 for one and a half month. Through one of the local fish cooperatives I got to know both active and retired fishermen. I was introduced to their local knowledge and situation with enthusiasm. *El presidente* (the head of the cooperative) both shared



his experiences and supported my interest. The same goes for the local *casa cultural*, where I was also given advices on local literature.

As most people know each other I was introduced to various social networks that were always present in village life. A walk in the centre would, after a while, mean to have a talk with an increasing number of people. Sometimes brief, sometimes ending up with a plan for the evening.

## **The Plan**

As the title of the thesis and the introductory story should indicate, I will offer some stories that can be seen as glimpses into the social reality I encountered on San Cristobal. This has the obvious weakness of a potential undermining of the contexts and I have tried – to various degrees - to compensate by elaborating the setting. Meanwhile, the direct stories, which include dialogues, should bring the reader closer to the real happenings and I see that as a point in itself. The interaction of meanings and opinions should also be comprehended as representative for Ecuadorian identities.

Two momentums have circled through my head during this process. The first is: *Men on Galapagos are in their majority, Ecuadorian mestizo-men who share important moral values with the rest of Latin America with its deep roots to Catholicism and the Circum Mediterranean region. One question that follows is: How can we find this Catholic heritage empirically and consequently, how does it work in the local setting?*

The other momentum regards the temporality of the field: *Galapagos (and Ecuador) as a place exists in an epoch marked by nation building, which is mainly about improving people's material standards. At the same time, modernity as "new time" i.e. new forms of communication, media and increased flow of tourists, researchers, students and volunteers, change the alternatives of livelihood and challenge local moral ideas. Local men have to intensify their own traditional ideas of masculinity or subject themselves to new ones.*

Question to be answered is: *How and why are the traditional masculine ideals maintained or challenged?*

The first momentum is accounted for by describing male deeds and representations that are comparable to the cultural region surrounding San Cristobal. The second involves the notion of time and history and although I will touch upon it in the passing we will have a closer look in the end of chapter five.

Chapter one is, as already mentioned, a text of contextualization. It will examine the differences of Galapagos as a place and Galapagos as imagined. I do this out of a need to sketch out a comprehensible framework to the following interpretation, but also as a response to a presumable curiosity on behalf of the reader that have heard about Galapagos.

Chapter two contains the abstract framework of interpretation through Geertz' (1983) insistence on relativism and Bourdieu (2001), which I interpret as to pose a universal claim<sup>4</sup>. They are both right anyway, there must be cross-cultural similarities between men, but there are certainly many differences as well. The point is to create a friction between the universal and the particular and see them in a dialectic relation. Adoum (2000), an Ecuadorian writer, published a book on Ecuadorian identity in 1997 and gives substance to the discussion.

In chapter three, three stories are presented with the parallel intention of accounting for the particular place and to venture further into deeds of manhood. They all share a connection to their own discourse. The first being the administration of Galapagos, which immanently includes opinions and experiences from the local population, but the story in itself, is much more directed to men's tackling and handling of fear. The second story gives an example of the male protector, but most importantly to the local appreciation of tranquility. The third empirical anecdote in this chapter takes us to the realm of politics and men's debate over the election that was held during my stay. This arena is specifically salient with regard to the interplay between male

---

<sup>4</sup> To be fair to Bourdieu it should be pointed out that his claim is not universal in the strict sense of the term. His intention, as I interpret him, is to draw on both his ethnography from Algeria along with his experiences from France in order to point out the prevalence of the androcentric, unconscious domination in the so-called "Western context".

imagery and different variables that complicates a coherent, political stance. The three stories are furthermore ruptures in everyday life and emphasize people's mobilization and reactions.

The tradition of psychological oriented anthropology has undoubtedly put forth valuable perspectives in anthropology. Regarding masculinity there should be no way to an understanding without acknowledging the psychological dimension to its existence. Chapter four is an attempt to follow some points in psychoanalysis. The ethnographic accounts give substance to a discussion of social representations in this perspective. The essential argument is that men invariably must cope with ambivalence in their performance of the masculine script.

In the last chapter we look into the empathic dimension of manhood. This part is primarily a complement to the previous chapter by invoking the intersubjective dimension and situational insistence. It is followed by a further discussion of masculinity, which include the governmental view on machismo and re-directs the use of metaphors to humor. The chapter ends with a perspective on time and modernity, which place San Cristobal with its people in its current epoch. Fabian (1983), with his notion of allochronism, and Bock (1988) inspired by Goffman (1959) give substance to the argument in this chapter.

In sum the thesis at hand should account for San Cristobal in particular and Galapagos in general, within an Ecuadorian context. In this picture we find the men and their ideas about manhood, which is the anthropological subject matter (locus).



## Ch. 1: Galapagos and The Production of Uniqueness<sup>5</sup>

The Galapagos archipelago is in many ways associated with uniqueness, especially because of its endemic species and splendid representations of nature. The tameness and innocence of the animals is astonishing and does create a feeling of being in a unique place. Furthermore, Charles Darwin's visit in 1835 and the consequences of it give the place a historical depth and importance. Together with other momentums that we are going to look into, the archipelago has received much fame and attention in a global context.

As a place in the world, Galapagos lives its own life in the imagination of many people. There is a big gap between what people around the world think of as Galapagos and the reality in which the local population make their lives. Many people I have talked to in Norway are surprised by the fact that there are people and not only animals living there. This obviously has to do with the representation of the islands through medias, such as Internet, television and a number of documentaries. It also has to do with the fact that the vast majority of visitors only stay for five to eight days and spend most of their time on the cruise boats and as a consequence their interaction with *people* is brought down to a minimum. This in turn means that their memories and pictures evolve around animals and nature rather than the local population. People that have been to the Galapagos speak about how the nature was; while people who want to go there speak of the unique nature as projected through media and tourist agencies.

This chapter intends to examine the differences between Galapagos as imagination and Galapagos as a place. I will seek to describe the islands in relation to mainland Ecuador and draw upon some significant aspects in order to provide an understanding of the context in which the people on Galapagos exist.

---

<sup>5</sup> The title and idea appeared in my field notes, but its origin is from Appadurai's chapter titled "The Production of Locality" (1996).

## **The Enchanted Islands**

The Galapagos archipelago is situated in the Pacific Ocean about 900 kilometres straight west of Ecuador on the South American continent. It is a province of this country and been so since Ecuador's annexing of the archipelago in 1832. Galapagos consists of thirteen island and several islets. Four of the islands are inhabited and the total population amounts to approximately 25 000 persons. The flow of tourists is increasing every year adding up to 160 000 visitors in 2008. Isabela, the biggest of all the islands has a minor population of approx. 2000 inhabitants. Floreana a small island in the south has a permanent settlement of about one hundred people. It is Santa Cruz, which is the most common tourist destination that has the largest population of some 15 - 18 000 individuals. San Cristobal with the province capital, Puerto Baquerizo Moreno has around 6-7000 inhabitants. It is worth mentioning that each island has developed a significant patriotism and people seem to favour "their own island" much in the same way that people from different towns will do across a district anywhere. Each island has its own history and actuality and although there are many parallels there are also important differences that are emphasized by people when they talk about "their island". The most notable local patriotism is that of Santa Cruz which contrast sharply to the other three:

During the Second World War the Americans established a strategic military base and literally took control of the archipelago. It was given back to Ecuador at the end of the war, but in the meantime the American soldiers had built an airport and a considerable infrastructure on Santa Cruz. This gave the opportunity to receive the first tourists and although tourism was not important until the late 1970s - developing significantly from the 1990s - Santa Cruz was much more well-prepared than the other inhabited islands. This gave rise to tourism and foreign interference that has escalated until today. Santa Cruz thus differs in intensity and urbanity from the other islands. More tourists means more restaurants, more bars and nightlife. It is especially the associations with nightlife such as crime, insecurity and drug abuse that is held negatively against Santa Cruz on behalf of people from San Cristobal and Isabela. What the latter appreciate so much and present in contrast to these negative

aspects is the quietness and security, *la tranquilidad* of their own islands. The abundance of cars in the centre of Puerto Ayora (the major city in S.Cruz) is likewise seen as very negative. Comparing Santa Cruz with the major cities of Ecuador where traffic is a serious affair commonly emphasizes this critique.

Most of the present-day inhabitants have moved to the islands from the Ecuadorian mainland during the last 20 years. Until the Special Law<sup>6</sup> for Galapagos was passed the population increased at more than 8% per annum.<sup>7</sup> Since there never was a native population, everyone (including the domestic animals) has come from the continent. The definition of natives could be discussed, but here I'm using it in the same way as the people do; meaning that a native is a person that was born on one of the island and has spent most of his life there. The natives are a very important fraction of the population. They have a certain advantage when it comes to decision-making because of their roots in the place. The international/national researchers hold a similar prestige as far as the administration of the islands is concerned. In a political context, their voice is considered more important because they are educated and therefore presumably know what is good/bad for the environment.

A direct consequence of the demographic growth is that the natives are a minority compared to the more recent settlers. As Galapagos has achieved a higher appeal than mainland Ecuador this has led to a flow of immigrants trying their luck in this particular province of their republic. People from the highlands and people from the coast have heard about opportunities for work and a better life in Galapagos and this people make up the majority of the population. The usual story is that a man had a relative or a friend living there who talked warmly of the islands. If life was hard at

---

<sup>6</sup> The Special Law ([www.ingala.gov.ec](http://www.ingala.gov.ec)) that was implemented in 1998 says, among a number of things, that it is an obligation to register your boat in a cooperative in order to fish regularly (Ospina 2006:39). As one of the advantages it acknowledges the comparatively high costs of living in the archipelago and thus allows for higher salaries for public workers there compared to mainland Ecuador.

<sup>7</sup> In 1950 the total population of the archipelago was 1.346 while the number for the republic of Ecuador was 3,2 millions. In 2001 Galapagos had 18.640 while Ecuador had reached 12,2 millions (Carrion in Ospina & Falconi 2007:102). Today Ecuador has a population of 14,2 millions while Galapagos had 19.184 permanent settlers in 2006 (last official count) along with an unknown number of temporal residents and the constant flow of tourists.

the time, Galapagos seemed to be a promised land. Carlos Carrion writes the following:

The population on Galapagos comes from depressive regions of the country – regions that have had and have strong migratory processes – out of climatically reasons (Loja, Manabí), natural disasters (Tungurahua – *name of a province and an angry volcano*) or because of high rates of unemployment (Pichincha, Cañar). (Carrion in ed. Ospina & Falconi 2007:102, my translation and emphasis added)

In this picture it is worth noting that the mentioned provinces are all situated in the Andes with the exception of Manabí (that actually have a coast line) and this is a significant point to which I will return below. If we add a small fraction of native population and some international enclaves it is possible to state that the majority of the population came from rural regions in the highlands of Ecuador. Today however - because of the increased flow of tourist – people from urban areas on the mainland have come to challenge this trend and in fact, especially in the case of Santa Cruz, established itself as a dominating proportion of the population. In addition there are also temporal residents coming to the archipelago to work on a seasonal basis. According Carrion's estimates the majority of these people are from Guayaquil and Quito who are involved in tourism on the cruise boats. This is important for two reasons. First, the shift from fishing towards tourism as the major economical income and labor sector has led to a shift in the kind of people migrating to the islands. Secondly, the local fisheries are actually suffering from more restrictive politics and less fish at the same time as tourism is increasing every year. As a consequence of this more labor is needed in tourism, but as salaries are higher (because of higher costs) in the archipelago compared to the mainland, the tourist companies prefer seasonal workers from the mainland instead of local people who demand higher salaries. Thus it is a tricky situation for the local population since both fisheries and tourism do not seem to offer any bright future for the coming generations. Although the sector of tourism should open up for related business there is already abundance in local tourist guides where the ones with a good reputation, especially the ones who speak fluently English, are preferred instead of the newly graduated. In a long-



term perspective it is furthermore expected that international and environmental pressure will put up restrictions on the growth of tourism in Galapagos meaning that it might be hard to find a feasible work for the local population.

## **Facts and fantasy**

Galapagos had no aboriginal inhabitants and was only officially discovered in 1535 by Tomas de Berlanga, the Bishop of Panama, when his ship was becalmed and carried there by currents. He was on his way to Peru to settle a dispute between Pizzaro and his officers and to make a review on their activities (Latorre 2006: 13-4). After discovering Galapagos he wrote the following description in a letter to the Spanish throne (Carlos V): "...Like if God in a remote past had made rain out of stones..." (Sanchez & Villouta 1983:12), referring to the arid and moony landscape on the shores of the islands.

During the 17th and 18th centuries, buccaneers and pirates used the islands as a staging post, stocking up on water and giant tortoises which they stowed alive on board their ships for fresh meat, before carrying out raids on the South American coast. During the 19th century whalers and fur sealers further exploited the islands. The beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was characterized by the use of both Isabela and San Cristobal as penal colonies. This is a long story in both cases<sup>8</sup>; suffice to say that Manuel J. Cobos - "The Emperor of San Cristobal" - established a prosperous sugar cane production in the highlands by exploiting the human labor of prisoners. This was of course a difficult enterprise with regard to discipline and punishment, and one day the inevitable revolt put an end to Cobos's life and project. His descendents though, are still important landowners on the island.

In the 1930's several mysterious deaths and disappearances among the European community on the island of Floreana put Galapagos in the news<sup>9</sup>. This momentum of

---

<sup>8</sup> See: Latorre (2006) and Guevara (1999)

<sup>9</sup> I will not enter this particular story in detail, suffice to say that it is known throughout the archipelago and that it appears in different variants much like a myth and thus contribute to the

mystery, exoticism and romance is actually something that has brought lots of people to Galapagos (Norwegians, Germans etc.). For the foreigners the idea of going to Galapagos was born in the imagination of the islands, its mystification and uniqueness. More concretely the Melville-revival<sup>10</sup> in the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century played a significant role along with Darwin's (1859) *The Origins of Species* and Rousseau's concept of *the noble savage*. The particular case of Norwegian colonisers during the 1920s and 30s was probably due to the same phenomenon on top of the hard times. Hamsun's *Growth of the Soil* (*Markens Grøde*) was for instance published in 1920, but equally important was the substantial attention towards explorers like Roald Amundsen and Fritjof Nansen. The romanticising of Galapagos was a social reality in the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and still is today. The European colonization was a consequence of the idea of escaping modernity. It was an imagination and a dream about returning to the roots and establish a settlement in paradise. As they encountered the realities of the archipelago their dreams did not last very long. A few families made it, but the vast majority found the enchanted islands very inhospitable with the dominating, dry, lava landscape that welcomed them and most importantly, the lack of fresh water. The highlands of each island could provide conditions for agriculture (as it does today), but before electricity and basic infrastructure were established – life was tough and hard for the hopeful and idealistic immigrants. As the equatorial sun worn them out, almost all of them got thirsty and returned to the continent.

This Western motivation differs from the one Ecuadorians have for going to Galapagos. The most notable fact of the Ecuadorians is not the flow of migration to Galapagos, but the other way around - the majorities' lack of interest and movement to the islands. If the reason to migrate is born because of a difficult situation in the homestead most people will search for a place that offers the opportunity for a good

---

mysteriousness of Galapagos – because *no one knows what really happened*. For further reading see: LaTorre 2006:147-204.

<sup>10</sup> Herman Melville (1819-1891), the American author, especially famous for *Moby Dick*, also wrote about Galapagos in his essay *The Enchanted* (ed. Chase 1966: 230-88). His fame dropped with his death in 1891, but had its revival and recognition some thirty years later.

economic situation and security for themselves and the family. For most Ecuadorians this means the US, more specifically, Miami or New Jersey or Europe, mainly Spain and Italy. The same tendency can be seen when it comes to vacations for Ecuadorians. As a consequence of a heavy westernisation after the Second World War, the dreams of the majorities lie in ideas of modernity. Miami and New York are strong symbols that have a very appealing effect on many Ecuadorians. Thus Galapagos is far down on the list with not much to offer when it comes to modernity. A woman from Machala on the south coast of Ecuador, which I happen to know very well, stated this in a reflective way. Upon my first visit to Galapagos (April 2001) I told her that I was very excited to see the marvels awaiting. Her reaction was both dry and revealing;

*Yo no me quiero ir a esas islas para ver unos pájaros nomás. Yo prefiero irme de compras in Miami!* (I don't want to go to those islands just to see some birds. I prefer going shopping in Miami!)

Her husband stated a parallel to this when I said that I wanted to go to Ingapirca, the major Inca ruins in Ecuador;

*A mi no me interesa ir a ver esas piedras por ahí en la montaña.* (I don't have any interest in seeing those rocks up there in the mountains.)

The husband and wife are both engineers who have worked their way from a lower middleclass to a comfortable material situation. They have worked hard for many years and achieved material and economic progression. Importantly they have also achieved the opportunity to offer their children a better education than the one they received themselves. I think this focus on the project of climbing in social class has to do with the temporality in Ecuador and thus explains part of the reason of the lack of interest in Galapagos. It can also be seen as a reversing of the motivational factors that led and leads Westerners to Galapagos. If Europeans and Americans want virgin and unique nature, Ecuadorians tend towards modernity, big shopping malls and

cities. This is, of course a generalization with its apparent exceptions, but equally a clear tendency within the majorities.

As the grass is always greener on the other side, people tend to desire the things they do not have. When I speak of a flow of immigrants from the mainland to the Galapagos it is in a very small scale, but relatively speaking and nevertheless, a major movement. Increased regulations state that one can go freely on a three months tourist visa, but to stay for a prolonged time one has to have a work permit or a relative as a guarantee. This resembles very much the immigration politics that are practised in Europe and the US and the latter have probably inspired the former. Arranged marriages have grown to be a problem for the immigration authorities in Galapagos as in Europe, but its dramatic features do not belong to a high number of cases. It is emphasized because of the international pressure of keeping the population growth down as much as possible. Many researchers and biologists live in a dream of returning Galapagos to its natural settings, to a distant past before the humans came and destroyed it. It is a sort of utopia, which claims support in all the endemic species and in the examples of how it all went wrong in Hawaii. One of the reasons this dream still exists among fundamental environmentalists in Galapagos is because the archipelago is still very intact compared to others around the world. This gives rise to the whole controversy of how and who should administer the politics of Galapagos. The main actors in this theatre are; the local population (in its own complexity), the Ecuadorian government (especially the Ministry of Tourism), a number of NGOs, the Charles Darwin Research Station, UNESCO, and number of (inter) national interest groups (fish, tourism, research). The complexity is a significant one and the debate is an ongoing, important discourse in life on the islands.

So why should an Ecuadorian go to Galapagos when it is almost as difficult and expensive as going to Europe or the US? The answer is that most people don't. They prefer the latter as "the lands of opportunity", both in migration and on vacations.

Actually, from Quito or Guayaquil, it costs more or less the same to travel to Miami or Galapagos.

### **The microcosm of a country**

Migration from rural Ecuador towards the urban centres has increased over the last decades. Quito is the capital and the major city in the Andes region with its approx. two million inhabitants. Guayaquil is the largest city in the republic with almost three millions. It is also the most important commercial centre and port. The two cities are representations of *sierra* (highlands) and *costa* (coast) and differ in a number of aspects.

Geographically Quito is situated in the Andes at 2800 meter above sea level while Guayaquil is located beside a river delta in the mangroves of the Ecuadorian south coast. Quito covers the bottom of a valley surrounded by mountains and volcanoes with a rich history and architecture. The climate is warm during daytime with the sun shining, but chilly in the nights when temperature drop below ten degrees Celsius. Heavy and sudden rain is also a known characteristics of the city. The people are *mestizos* in their majority, but as any big city it is a mix of ethnicities, nationalities, hybrids and idiosyncrasies, conventions and inventions.

The same goes for Guayaquil, but the *indigenas* (indians) as a minority are much more represented in Quito. That is only true to a certain point. The native Indians on the coast are fewer in number compared to the societies and groups in the highlands. They have mixed into the meztiso population in the cities and not kept their culture isolated in the same way as many of the natives in the highlands. Thus the Indian character of the cities in the Andes (Quito) is much more apparent than in the coast (Guayaquil).

Guayaquil is first or foremost an industrial city and the commercial heart of Ecuador. It has grown tremendously the last twenty years, but always maintained an independent character that was born through the important cacao industry in the 19<sup>th</sup>

century. Although it has had a prosperous last decade the challenges with growth and maintenance are many. Guayaquil does not offer the same quantity of colonial history and architecture nor the same amount of “high culture” traditions as Quito. It is above all a city of workers in progressive construction and consumption.

Guayaquil is hot with an average of nearly thirty degrees. In the rainy season from January until May the rains are heavy causing occasional floods and an extreme humidity with sunshine during the day. This combined with heavy traffic the intensity can be quite challenging for an outsider. Although temperature does not necessarily affect a man’s mentality or mode I would dare to say that the pure, physical difference of coming from 30 degrees below zero in Bulgaria to 40 plus in Guayaquil did have an impact on me at that time (March 2005). What that impact consisted of or the generalizations of people’s actions in cold and warm climate is difficult to describe, but easy to speculate in. The point is that there is a difference between *cold* and *warm* on which humans creatively metaphorize, categorize and act. This brings us to a salient feature in the differences between Quito (highlands) and Guayaquil (coast).

People in the two cities are categorized through two different stereotypes. *Los monos* (the monkeys) belong in the coast while *los serranos* (people from the mountain) belong in the Andes. The categories are overall generalizations that neglect the heterogeneity in each one. Much more than referring to a reality they function as a distinction based on each regions patriotism. A person from Guayaquil could say something like; *the people up there in the mountains are conservative and stiff, they don’t know how to dance and wear long trousers on the beach*. A person from Quito could likewise refer to *los monos* in Guayaquil by saying: *the people down there are very spontaneous and don’t know how to organize or plan things. They are not interested in literature or arts, but, like monkeys, live in the moment, drinking to much beer*.

The climate is likewise subject to negative comments each part; the coast would be too hot and the mountains too cold. When you travel from Quito to Guayaquil during the ten hours bus drive you must take off the clothes in order to be

comfortable. This means taking away stiff clothes, letting your skin breathe and your shoulders sink to relax. One the way from Guayaquil to Quito the exact opposite happens. If you catch the bus at midnight, Guayaquil will still be hot with 25 degrees. Arriving in Quito in the morning can then be a cold experience and you will have to put on warm clothes. Men's talk about women work similarly in the same distinction, and it is generally agreed upon that the women on the coast are better looking and more liberal than the cold, conservative, but cultivated women from the highlands.

Food is equally rooted in the traditions of each region. Although people would normally favour their own choice of food as a part of their identity the good food of the other region is also emphasized. This obviously depends on the context; patriotism as in preference for own food will generally be invoked to restore a balance or harmony if there has been an overweight of compliments towards one of the regions. A personal preference, as seafood, is also normal and it does not necessarily have to belong to the typical food of the person's own region hence a person from the coast can have a particular taste for the pork traditionally served in the highlands. In reality one will find both sorts of food in both regions and while people still talk as if each region has an extra expertise in making their own food this does not have to be true<sup>11</sup>.

It has been written extensively on the distinction<sup>12</sup> between the Andes and the coast. The conclusion is that it is much more of an imagined reality than a genuine one. Some aspects truly have something in them, but the stereotypes lack all the hybrids and heterogeneity in the two regions. As for population number the two regions are almost the same. The Amazonas, which is the third region, does not represent more than two-three per cent of the total population. The total population of Galapagos, the fourth region, only represents a small *barrio* in Guayaquil with its 25 000 inhabitants.

---

<sup>11</sup> But still, in many occasions, the talk is real enough to induce people to travel to the other region because of the "food-argument".

<sup>12</sup> See for instance: Pareja (2004), Charvet (2005), Valdano (2007) or talk to a random Ecuadorian.

As the capital of the republic, Quito holds the government, the parliament and all the major national bodies. Guayaquil has a much more independent history and as it has bypassed Quito in economic importance its autonomous voice is notably loud. The city is founded on a liberal ideology where rich elites control the commerce and their populism seduce the poor majority. The mayor of Guayaquil belongs to this elite and continuously quarrels with the president as if they were two different nations. In effect this is emphasized by the current president's socialistic agenda, which clashes with the right-winged, liberal ideology of a long tradition in Guayaquil. The dispute can be a severe matter where comments that does not belong in the public slip in on an average basis.

To understand Ecuador the subjects above mentioned needs further elaboration. It is not in my intention to do that here, but for the importance of understanding Galapagos it is essential to note that the immigrants have travelled from both of the mainland regions and met in a new location, 900 kilometres off the coast of the mainland. On the islands in the Pacific they met a small native population with a relatively large fraction of Europeans. The Westerners - although very few - had important positions and clear ideas of how the islands should be administered. The local population had already been challenged in the way they were doing things. Biologists and researchers had told them that Galapagos was "a sacred place for the existence of life" and hence that they should leave nature alone. The recent settlers from the highlands and the coast - migrating for different reasons - all shared one common interest, which would evolve around the notion of *starting a better life*. After all, Galapagos belongs to Ecuador and any Ecuadorian should be able to make a living in his or hers own country, at least that is a public opinion that is repeated among the immigrants.

## **Paradise?**

In his master thesis Guribye (2000) writes about the relationship between humans and animals and make some interesting observations on how people use animals to think with. He describes how people use animal behaviour as a source for metaphors



- for instance; "...particularly active and successful woman-hunters, the ones that conquer one *gringa* after another, are called *tiburones*: sharks" (2000:107). Guribye also claims that this use of metaphors is not exclusive to the native population only, but that newcomers seem to adapt and likewise use traits of animal behaviour to describe human acts or attitudes (2000:109). This is not to say that this is unique to Galapagos - I am very familiar with this from the continent as well - but nevertheless an observation worth mentioning, especially when his concern is that of the human-animal relation.

Guribye ends his thesis by describing the relativity in the meaning of Paradise related to different agents: To many immigrants, Galapagos can be a remote and quiet paradise. To many tourists, the nature and animals look like a friendly and compelling paradise. To tourist agencies, Galapagos and nature is a paradise, a commodity and a zoo they can sell. To conservationists, it is a paradise worth protecting from change and, ultimately, also tourism (2000:163). A drunk, local man Guribye had befriended - speaking from the context of a brothel named El Paraiso - had a different version as he leaned over and said; "so now my friend, the last paradise is a brothel outside Puerto Ayora", with a smile on his face (2000:164). As Guribye was writing from his position as a Norwegian student, mainly to a Norwegian audience, this would seem to be a nice way to end a paper as to give an idea of the multiple voices that exist on Galapagos. Ospina Peralta, an Argentinean historian, now situated in a university in Quito - and perhaps the most devoted person to study the social dynamics in the archipelago - obviously holds a different position. Ospina (2006:84-5) criticizes Guribye for being radically relativistic without showing any responsibility towards concrete actions for concrete people and thus ending up with an arbitrary construction of the concept of paradise. From Ospina's position it is not enough to evaluate ideas and concepts and describe them as they appear. In his perspective there is an obligation towards what he calls; "a genuine environmental concern" which, in his own words, means "recognizing both the ontology of the material world and the autonomy of the human nature" (2006:85). In other words, Ospina's concern for Galapagos is real and understandable (he has

done research on the archipelago for almost two decades) and his perspective is instrumental in contrast to Guribye's descriptive aim. By invoking the critic here, it is not my intention to take a moral stance against either Guribye or Ospina. The point is rather to show how positioning and context do make a difference in our descriptions of Others and that we are dealing with *real people* and *real situations* that are interpreted to become fictive accounts that should say something about the social reality.

### **Puerto Baquerizo Moreno, San Cristobal**

In these modern times Google Earth *is* available for a quick review on the town where I stayed. Geologically speaking, San Cristobal is the oldest island in the archipelago. The islands move eastwards and the volcanic hotspot is now situated under Fernandina the island west of Isabela, which actually erupted during my stay.

The eco-lodge where I stayed is situated a ten minutes walk outside the centre of the town. It is placed beside a road that follow some 500 metres before it ends by a pier in the town's bay. The view from my cabin was the bay with all the boats, the town on my left and the pier where the road ends, on my right. My closest neighbour was the Universidad de San Francisco<sup>13</sup>, some fifty metres along the road to my right.

In front of the university, on the opposite side of the road there is a public beach called Playa Man. This is the most frequented beach in town and a popular hang out for locals, international students, sailors and tourists. It has a narrow waterfront, some twenty meters of sand between the black lava rocks that surrounds it. Instead of being a long beach it is more like a big area of sand with two big trees giving vital shadow to both people and sea lions. There are also some bushes and smaller trees on the fringes of the sandy area. Playa Man has gone through lots of changes over the last ten years. Originally it was a small beach that had been used to "get rid of things" and also a popular place to go gather up to drink beer. Through a project

---

<sup>13</sup> The university is actually a small extension of the biology department from its real seat in Quito. It offers introductory courses in biology and is attended by local students and groups of foreign exchange students.

with the local Boy's Scouts the community have cleaned the whole area, widened the waterfront and established the new Playa Man. The key person to this development was Agustin, a leader in the Boy's Scouts and a proud administrator of the beach. He has built a small kiosk from which he sells cold beer and refreshments. He also rents out kayaks and gives advices to where people should go. Agustin and me got along very well and he ended up being a good friend. His kiosk has a stereo and the music (often Bob Marley or salsa) fills the atmosphere of the beach.

As my lodge was situated very close to this beach the latter turned out to be an important arena and a place to meet up with people. "Everyone" would go there during the afternoon, play some football or Frisbee and have a beer in the sunset. As the bay points west, Playa Man is an extraordinary place to see the sun on its way down in the mighty Pacific.

Further along the road past the university with the coast on the left, there is an Interpretation Centre on the right hand side. The Centre has been there for fifteen years and has recently been renovated with the help of donations and international organizations. It has a stage for cultural events and various buildings that house an introduction to Galapagos's history, biodiversity and current affairs. It is one of few man-made, attractions on San Cristobal and much frequented by groups of tourists. From the Interpretation Centre there are a number of paths leading through the bushes to the coast with several viewpoints and a small bay popular for its diving and snorkelling.

The centre of Puerto Baquerizo Moreno is a public stage with a large plaza in front of it. In a Latin American context the church or cathedral would also be placed around this plaza. In this case the church has been placed three blocks away. From this plaza in the middle of the town there are four parallel streets leading three blocks down to the harbour. This area is the liveliest in town with restaurants, bars, Internet cafés, video renting, hairdressers, tourist agencies, diving schools etc. The harbour has a dock leading out in the bay where fish and cargo supplies are delivered, but beside

that, the area is dominated by tourism. The harbour-walk is recently modernized. It is situated in the middle of the bay pointing west that incorporates Playa Man, the university and my lodge on the right. The lighthouse in front of a beach called Carola marks the end of the bay in that direction. All the boats that come to San Cristobal seek comfort inside this bay and during the high season of crossing the Pacific I counted at least sixty sailing boats. There are also the big cargo ships that come with supplies from the mainland twice a week, fishing boats, cruise ships, navy vessels, smaller boats that serve as transportation between the islands and the tiny taxi boats that transport sailors and fishermen inside the bay.

Several hotels of different standards with an ocean view also characterize the harbour area. This adaption to tourism is a recent and ongoing development and far from the reality of Puerto Ayora on Santa Cruz where tourism is much more significant. When I left San Cristobal in late May 2009 the community workers had almost finished the whole promenade along what is left of the beaches. People talked warmly of how nice it had turned out and on Sunday afternoon families would walk around while having an ice cream or a soda. The children play with their skateboards or bicycles while older people sit on the benches chatting. At the far end of the new stroll there is a small beach where a colony of sea lions have found their home. During the day most of them swim around fishing or playing, but when darkness arrives at six thirty they all gather up at the same beach in the middle of the town. It is a relatively small colony, but still counting somewhere between 100-200 animals. Some of them end up lazing on the benches as to pose to the tourist's camera while most of them stay on the beach to discuss their worries with their companions. It is quite literally as taken out of a zoo, just as a lot of things are in Galapagos, but after a while it felt totally normal to me as it does to the local population.

Much of the commercial life is situated in the area between the harbour and the centre plaza of the town. In the mornings there is a lot of movement. It is as if it were important to finish off as many obligations as possible before the sun takes its share.

At one o'clock people instinctly search comfort in the shadows or inside the houses after eating almuerzo (lunch/dinner).

Standing on the centre plaza you may continue on the road instead of following the streets down to the harbour. By continuing straight ahead you will meet one out of two traffic lights on the island. By continuing forward you will eventually end up at the airport<sup>14</sup> after a ten minutes walk. By taking a right, you will come to the harbour area again and by taking a left you will go uphill and traverse the upper part of town and possibly follow the road further into the highlands. After a ten-fifteen minutes drive you will then come to the small town named El Progreso, which was the first permanent settlement on San Cristobal. In the surroundings there are farms that produce a modest number of fruits and vegetables, but very juicy oranges. Some of the farms hold cows and pigs and sell the milk/cheese and meat at the local market or nearby stores. Other farms focus on chicken production. This should be a prosperous farm type; at least chicken is something all restaurants serve most of the time. Some of the farms also produce coffee and sell it to both the local market and to the tourists in a fancy Galapagos bag.

On the occupational level, almost one third of the adult, local population is involved in public administration of some sort, as the city is the province capital. Fishing is still important and San Cristobal hold the largest fishing float, but due to regulation and overfishing it is decreasing while the sector of tourism is increasing. The local fishing boats are small, but regularly controlled by the national park and coast guard. That is fair enough, at least with respect to the sharks, but when I heard fishermen who regularly observe big trawlers frequenting popular fishing banks throughout the season inside the marine reserve, their frustration appeared extremely plausible. These trawlers fish the same amount of fish in one week as the joined local float fish in a year. I lifted the subject to an important employee in El Parque Nacional and he told me that this was not a problem anymore. Later the same day I talked to a man

---

<sup>14</sup> The airport strip was built by joined forces in the local community and many locals proudly spoke of the effort as an independent step towards progression and prosperity.

who had just returned from ten days of fishing in which they had observed a giant trawler with helicopters on its search for tuna. A local, retired fisherman with fire in his eyes expressed *his* opinion in the following way:

*Lo que a mi me molesta y lo que me duele aquí (puntando a su corazón) es que nuestros hijos no tienen buen trabajo. Es la misma historia que se ha repetido; primero los españoles, después los gringos...y yo te digo como ecuatoriano, como Indio – estoy orgulloso de tener sangre de Indio en mis venas! Las fundaciones y el parque vienen acá y imponen sus leyes y sus reglas. Haber, que hubieran hecho en tu país si yo hubiera ido a decirles como van a hacer las cosas? Olvídalo, por eso que se vayan a la verga esos hijos de puta que pretenden ser los protectores de Galápagos.*

“What upsets me and hurts me in here (pointing at his heart) is that our children do not have feasible work. It’s the same story repeating itself; first the Spanish and then the Americans...and I tell you as an Ecuadorian, as an Indian – I am proud to have Indian blood running through my veins! The foundations and the national park come here and force us to obey their laws and rules. What would they say in your country if I had come and told you how things should be done? Forget it, and that’s why those motherfuckers who pretend to be the guardians of Galapagos can go screw themselves!”

## **Résumé**

This purpose of this chapter has been to give the reader an idea of the heterogeneity in Galapagos with its inherent bond to the Republic of Ecuador in contrast to the popular image of the place. Not only is the archipelago a complex demographic place, but it is also a global space where different agendas, interests and meanings clash together. It is important to point out that this is not a static picture but an ongoing process that shape the people living there. Alliances and rivalries are inevitable in a situation like this, but it must be emphasized that social life in general is dominantly *tranquilo*, especially on Isabela and Floreana, but also on San Cristobal where I stayed, and in the rural area of Santa Cruz. It is Puerto Ayora, the largest city in Galapagos that contrasts with the rest in intensity and urbanity, but then again, this is relatively speaking as I also found this city quite calm. I will return to the controversy of tourism and fishing and also further discuss the historical developments in later chapters. As this thesis is mainly about meaning associated to manhood, the current chapter provides a context for some of the settings and

conditions that apply to the local men in their everyday life. With this context we can turn our attention towards some accounts of interaction, but first we need a view at some theoretical considerations and approaches in the following chapter.





## Ch.2: Common Sense and the Legacy of Masculine Domination

As points of departure towards an anthropological interpretation of men we can start by considering the question of *particularity vs. universality*<sup>15</sup>. Is it possible to construct a universal claim about practice when applied to the role of men, in spite of the predictable idiosyncrasies? Or is it so that men are fundamentally and qualitatively different because of their roots in local cosmology, local religion(s), local history, local ecology and to *local* common sense? In an era of globalization and increased communication it might be true that every place appear as blurred and infinitely complex, but that should not lead us away from describing the social realities we encounter in our fieldwork. The approaches to universalism or relativism are equally important today as they have been in the past, even if the task may appear more difficult. It is not so much a question of choosing one or the other, but rather to create a meaningful suspension in looking at local particularities that can be abstracted to general and conventional imagery and ideals. Local practice and representation both accept and challenge normative constructs of gender roles. This dialectic relation between convention and invention<sup>16</sup>, structure and anti-structure can be found when treating gender as any other elementary distinction. That is to say that any man has his individual *and* collective cultural ideas of self-identification regarding manhood and masculinity. The social performance and representation will obviously vary according to the context and although the scope in this thesis is the public realm we must acknowledge that there is both important variety and consistency in relation to gender practice within this sphere. Let us start with Geertz and what he says about common sense:

Religion rests its case on revelation, science on method, ideology on moral passion; but common sense rests on the assertion that it is not a case at all, just life in a nutshell. The world is its authority. (Geertz 1983:75)

---

<sup>15</sup> The term universal is used *within* the Latin American and Circum-Mediterranean region.

<sup>16</sup> See Wagner (1985) for a particular reading on this dialectic.

In his essay about common sense as a cultural system Geertz (1983:ch.4) shows how common sense is constituted empirically and differently among societies and cultures. Drawing on Edgerton he tells the story of how intersexuality (hermaphroditism) is conceived differently in historical cultures like the Romans and the Greeks and among contemporary Americans, the Navaho tribe and the Pokot (a Kenyan tribe). He says that intersexuality is a cultural challenge because it challenges the possibly most fundamental dichotomy in human existence, namely the division of man and woman (Geertz 1983:81). The Romans took the newborn hermaphrodite to be a supernatural curse and thus killed it while the Greeks drawing on the “fact” that Hermaphroditus, the son of Hermes and Aphrodite became united in one body with a nymph and let the intersexual live without significant stigmas. Although these facts could be seen as dubious and certainly do not include a participant observation that would describe local people’s different reflections on the subject matter it shows possible ways of handling an anomaly, which hermaphrodites certainly are.

The (modern) Americans use their common sense to end up with an image of horror upon these persons – who are they to marry, and how is the sex on a birth certificate to be made out? Their “rational reaction” is to encourage the person to choose his/hers sex to restore order and become legitimate males or females. As for the Navaho the story is quite different because they see hermaphrodites as more complete than both male and female, in fact suitable for both men’s and women’s work. They are thought of as “knowing everything” and are given the positions of leaders in their social structure. Thus, by holding a positive attitude towards an anomaly they do not “size-up-and-solve”, like the Americans, but “marvel-and-respect” (1983:83).

The Pokot tribe, on the other hand, offers a third view which interprets hermaphrodites as simple errors (by God) and thus regard them as useless. The uselessness is backed up by the argument that they cannot reproduce (the patriline) and are therefore treated as objects, sometimes killed, but normally left to drift around without neither kin obligations nor rights. The Pokot common sense even

scorn adult men who are not married and women who don't have children, and the hermaphrodites would thus be a sort of ultimate example of uselessness in a society that put a high value on a person's usefulness, especially with regards to the dimensions of cattle and marriage.

The diversity of different culture's view on the same phenomenon is backed up by their inherent common sense and shows the relativity in the term. At the same time there might be some universal traits of common sense (for instance the incest taboo), but the mode of explanation will certainly differ from culture to culture and from time to time.

Common sense is not what the mind cleared of cant spontaneously apprehends; it is what the mind filled with presuppositions - that sex is a disorganizing force, that sex is a regenerative gift, that sex is a practical pleasure - concludes. God may have made the intersexual, but man has made the rest (Geertz 1983:84)

Now, it can also be argued that the hermaphrodites turn out to be qualitatively different in the societies mentioned above - Edgerton's Pokot informant would for instance tell her that he conceived of him/herself as God's mistake and thereby fulfill his/hers role according to the Pokot society. Compared to the Navaho interpretation who conceives of them as "a wondrous gift produced by the gods" the Pokot, as the Romans, view them in a negative light. It is the different stances taken somewhere in the historical background of each culture that give way to the relativism when dealing with the same "fact". It shows us how common sense is constituted empirically and that it is an end in itself (the world is its authority) because it is naturally objectified through the ruling consensus in each society.

Geertz does not include any dynamics in this example, but he does emphasize that common sense is far from static as "an interpretation of the immediacies of experience" (1983:76). As other cultural systems, common sense is open to new experience-based challenges that might alter what is reasonable or practical at least - a new epoch opens up for local discourses that contain a debate on the subject. Let's

say that Pokot hermaphrodites at one point began to organize themselves in some way, that they achieved cattle through trading with another tribe and found a way to reproduce themselves. Wouldn't that challenge the Pokot common sense about the hermaphrodites as useless? It is beside the point if it would take fifty or two hundred years, the alteration of the local common sense would ultimately manifest itself and prove that it is not the structure, but the actual events that constitute the fundament for common sense. The point here is to see common sense as a dynamic order. What is more is to conceive it as existing in a dialectic relation between cognitive structure and everyday action. In this perspective common sense is produced and adapted complementarily between "what goes on in people's heads" and "people's never-ending actions".

One problem in Geertz's essay is where to draw the line between what constitute common sense and not other logical or physical, ideological, religious or economical reasons for behavior. As with the incest taboo we might admit that people still tend to avoid going out in bad weather if there isn't a particular reason to do it and that this common sense has existed for millenniums. The same could be said about not putting one's hand into a flaming fire. If this is what constitutes common sense we can say that they are structures moving very slowly in fact, they may seem to be static fundaments for behavior. Furthermore it could be acknowledged that this type of common sense is universal and not only locally rooted. One way out of this is to see common sense as a continuum where avoiding rain/fire is placed on one of the extremities given that it is continually confirmed by (bad) experiences, not only in each particular culture, but universally and across time. A natural-given-fact as the hermaphrodites, on the other hand, differs qualitatively from avoidance of rain/fire and should not be placed on the same extremity. First of all, hermaphrodites are not only hermaphrodites, but also real persons with real personalities (a bit more complex than rain, pain and fire). That fact would eventually come to challenge the phenomenon of intersexuality as a static category and leave it open to alteration. Theoretically we could therefore conceive the continuum as having two poles where one is static and cross-cultural and the other dynamic and relativistic. After all we are

the same species and we share *something*, the problem here is only if we want to incorporate it in the category of common sense or another.

If we move into a category like gender we encounter the relativism of common sense, on the hermaphrodite-side of the continuum. Common sense about gender roles is what parents teach their children, but as anthropology certainly has thought us, this process is very different from one society to another. To become a man or woman in Galapagos is not the same as becoming a man/woman in Sri Lanka, Siberia or Sudan. Different societies find support in their local common sense, local cosmology and history and fuse themselves to local religious, ideological and economical arguments. By adding the temporal axe inherent in the different cultures it is possible to see the highly dynamic character of the concept which in Geertz's words is; "a cultural system, though not usually a very tightly integrated one..." (1983: 76). The world might be its authority, but the world itself is definitely moving.

A glimpse of change can be seen through my conversations with an old man on San Cristobal who will follow us with some comments throughout the thesis. Alfredo was one of the elderly men in the town where I stayed and his voice echoed very much with what other old men told me. After befriending him we met several times in the streets close to the harbor. Sometimes we would just salute and chat about the weather, a recent happening or one to come, while on other occasions we would sit down and talk at length about the past in his life and the conditions surrounding it. Alfredo was born on San Cristobal and had spent most of his life in Galapagos with the exception of some visits to mainland Ecuador. When I told him that I was married to an Ecuadorian woman he asked (as all the old people I met) "for how long?" and subsequently "how many children?" we had. When I answered "three years and no children" he was a bit surprised and told me, in a humoristic tone, that he got "three children the first year of his marriage". We laughed, but he countered the joke by explaining to me; "we didn't have any television back then and thus no distraction in life". This explanation was repeated to me many times from different people when we talked about how earlier generations had more children than the

contemporary ones. It was uttered as a notion of common sense as something that goes without saying, as an explanation I should clearly understand.

A popular assumption regarding dynamics in masculinity is to see a move towards an egalitarian ideal that is paralleled by, or because of, the process of secularization and modernity. Clearly this is a speculative postulation – as the Ecuadorian society is a true incarnation of ethnic mix and class structures but nevertheless a tendency I have met repeatedly in dialogues both on San Cristobal and in Guayaquil.

### **Machismo?**

If we take man and woman to be given categories, like hermaphrodites and leave out the philosophical problems of their existence we are left with what is common sense, namely that man and women are different from nature. This is common sense on Galapagos and, I think, for the majority of the world's population.

*Habiendo tantas mujeres para lavar...* (With so many women to do the dishes...). As I started to wash the plates after a nice dinner in a local family an 83-year-old woman said this to me, and the others in the room. It didn't make sense to her that I as a man should do "women's work". She even insisted to do it herself, but I thought it was reasonable and decent of me to make such a small effort after receiving such a good treat and thus I insisted in finishing off the dishes. Anthropologists and most people are familiar with this, as it resembles the classic structure of woman belonging to the private sphere and men to the public. Prototypically, most of the local men are reluctant to do washing and cleaning, but compensate by bringing money on the table, at least that is the idea. This is definitely an empirical question and when I subjected the local men with direct questions concerning their homely duties they would typically discharge the stereotype with humor and claims of domestic contribution. The distinction between saying and doing would evidently apply to any interpretation here. On one hand it should be possible to do a quite vast generalization of this trait of gender roles as a social construct. On the other, it is impossible to ignore the abundance of exceptions and variations, especially in

androgynous and matrilineal cultures, but also locally on San Cristobal. Therefore, my argument is synthetic when treating the convention and prototypical in the sense that it acknowledges that there is local variation underneath the following interpretation.

In spite of its relatively short history the feminist movement has had a major impact in the US and northern parts of Western Europe. Here, the egalitarian society is close to what makes up common sense about the rights and roles for man and women. This could definitely be subjected to further discussion, but my point here concerns the normative and political correct attitude in public representations and not the profusion of countermovements and local exceptions. From the viewpoint of contemporary Norway, equality between the sexes is one of the most fundamental values and what follows is the expectations that outsiders should and must see the “obvious fact” that this is the only moral way to behave. Prototypically, in the encounter with the Muslim world, interpretations of masculine domination is held against Muslim men both explicitly through subjective and biased representations of Norwegian, moral attitude and implicitly as an assumption of the Muslim world.

One might think that masculine domination is caused by men who refuse to give away their power, but as this is *a system* it is undoubtedly maintained by both women and men. In his book about typical traits of Ecuadorian identity, Jorge Enrique Adoum (2000:191-206) offers a chapter on “machismo” from his own country. First of all his argument is that the stereotype of the Latin American man as a “macho dominator” is not at all exclusive to this region (his examples of masculine dominated societies are those of; the Turks, Arabs, Japanese and Italians) and that the macho behavior is enacted occasionally, essentially when the man has an audience on which to perform. When this happens though, the act and output of testosterone can result in a fabulous show. Politics are one of these arenas, and Adoum quote, without mentioning his name, a former Mayor of Guayaquil when he in a reflective moment answered what the criteria for a good politician should be; *Cerebro, corazón y solvencia testicular* (Brains, heart and testicular solvency) (2000:192). He then goes on

to describe the way these politicians brawl and shout with their arguments and how this has developed into a norm for political argumentation in which coherency and reason might come short. After getting to know these politicians through the Ecuadorian media, sporadically over the last decade, I can confirm that these outbursts occasionally occur. But the norm of representation, on the other hand, is much more about expressing formal, correct and moderate rhetorics – as to appear objective. The point is anyway that in some cases the brawling has developed into an expectation from the audience and reflects back on the traditional role of the strong and authoritative man as *The Man to get things done*. Hence the Mayor could publicly state what he did. Adoum follows this by referring to another presidential candidate who offers deep ideological insight when he said that his political opponents simply have “smaller testes” and “softer sperm” than him (2000:202).

In relation to common sense one may note that these quotes are ends in themselves. They refer to “biological facts” and need no further elaboration, at least in the minds of the referred politicians. When we add the fact that the actual Mayor of Guayaquil – following the rhetorics, philosophy and ideology of his predecessor is a very popular man in his own city and has maintained his position, this may say something about the population who actually gives him the power. There is obviously a more nuanced picture to be drawn of this man, but the fact that he incarnates a rough, masculine ideal and that he is famous for his shouts and gestures are not to be questioned. Besides being the Mayor he is also one of the richest and most powerful men in the Republic.

Adoum directs an ironic criticism towards the ones who fulfill the stereotype and incarnate the macho figure. As a writer he takes the stance of a man who has seen other horizons and other ideals – a morality he finds much more righteous and correct. He claims that ignorance as well as fear of being interpreted as *maricon* (gay) plays the most significant roles in the reason for their behavior.



## The Legacy

Adoum makes a point about the male construction of the female archetype as *decente* (discreet and decent) and *sufriada* (forbearing) and that it was a clever move by the ones who attributed the expectations of her role as a mother, wife and daughter because she now “functions” in favor of the man and not for herself as an individual of the human race (*no ella por si misma, individuo de la especie humana*) (2000:200). This paradox and pledge of masculine domination has been the trigger for the feminist movement, and with regard to Latin America and the Circum Mediterranean region, machismo is popularized as common sense in a Western context. Several writers have criticized this public opinion, for instance Gutmann (1996c) when writing from Mexico City. In his book he offers a new view and presents empirical arguments that depart from the stereotype of the Mexican man as the macho dominator per se<sup>17</sup>. At the same time as he describes the multiple meanings of macho (both the term and its representation), he also presents evidence of the opposite. His argument springs out of a particular neighborhood in Mexico City, a *barrio* that contrasts itself both in representation and reflection with the rest. The book is, in other words and in analogy to Brandes (2002), a description of how men struggle in opposition to the phenomenon and representations of machismo. As in so many cases, the argument about looking into details does stand for itself - we might even say that it is the major line of reasoning in the anthropological tradition. How can it be that political scientists have problems understanding this?

Despite being a sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (2001) had apparently read more than statistics in his time. He makes a persuasive argument of how male domination is hidden and deeply ingrained in our unconsciousness. Drawing upon ethnography from both the peasants of Kabyle (Algeria) and French, modern society, along with his powerful authorship he describe how men - historically and contemporarily - have suppressed women. His point is not about whom to blame, but rather to show

---

<sup>17</sup> See in particular his chapters on the role of the father and machismo; Gutman (1996c: ch.3, ch.9). For a general critic of the macho stereotype see: Melhuus & Stølen (1996, especially: 14-20), Archetti (1999), Brandes (2002), Krohn Hansen (2001:ch.3)

us how this gender structure is part of ourselves, constituted in our habitus and doxic universe. For Bourdieu this starts with the social construction of our bodies that are sexually differentiated through a number of oppositions that are charged with associations of the male and female<sup>18</sup>.

The constitution of the sexual (...) has caused us to lose sense of the sexualized cosmology that is rooted in a sexualized topology of the socialized body, of its movements and displacements which are immediately charged with social meaning – upward movement being, for example, associated with the male, through erection or the upper position in the sexual act. (Bourdieu 2001:7)

Further down, on the same page:

The division of (sexual and other) things and activities according to the opposition of the male and the female, while arbitrary when taken in isolation, receives its objective and subjective necessity from its insertion into a system of homologous oppositions – up/down, above/below, in front/behind, right/left, straight/curved (and twisted), dry/wet, spicy/bland, light/dark, outside (public)/inside (private), etc. – which in some cases correspond to movements of the body (up/down // go up/go down // inside/outside // go in/come out). (Bourdieu 2001:7)

The agent's habitus which Bourdieu sees as a system of dispositions i.e. lasting, acquired schemes of perception, thought and action - develops *in response* to the objective conditions it encounters and thus creates the doxic experience and naturalizing of the world as we see and comprehend it. The above mentioned would nevertheless not necessarily mean that the concordance between the objective and the cognitive structures should give evidence to a masculine domination. However, Bourdieu justifies this by saying that it is the androcentric vision that imposes itself as neutral and thus legitimizes the strength of the masculine order (2001:9). Although there are exceptions to an androcentric vision in other cultures<sup>19</sup> Bourdieu plays on the same team as history here, at least in the case of the Circum-Mediterranean area, and he does not need to elaborately defend that presupposition. At this level, the

---

<sup>18</sup> For a schematic overview see Bourdieu's figure of a "synoptic diagram of pertinent oppositions" (2001:10)

<sup>19</sup> See for instance: Gilmore (1990:ch.9)

interaction between the sexes is symbolic in the sense that it works through the constituted, doxic universe which already favors the man and thus:

When the dominated apply to what dominates them schemes that are the product of domination, or, to put it another way, when their thoughts and perceptions are structured in accordance with the very structures of the relation of domination that is imposed on them, their acts of cognition are, inevitably, acts of recognition, submission. (Bourdieu 2001:13)

This is Bourdieu's core argument as a symbolic form of violence, but he does open up for the possibility of antagonism and change to what in this case seems to be a rather disclosed system of domination. The reason for this, he says, is due to "the partial indeterminacy of certain objects..." meaning that the dominated (women) can draw on dominant schemes of perception (dry/wet, top/bottom, hard/soft etc.) to state something like; "You, all your tackle dangles, says the woman to the man, whereas I am wielded in stone" (2001:14). As we will see, women on Galapagos also use this strategy to counter or dominate men when the occasion is right. Bourdieu's point here is merely that women can do so only on men's home ground, and this is the androcentric worldview.

On the question of gay and lesbian movements (2001:118-124) Bourdieu's argument is similar although he sees their situation as a promising one since it radically challenges the foundations of masculine domination. Nevertheless, he directs us to the important point namely that gay and lesbian couples seem to reproduce the same structure which is prevalent in heterosexual couples, i.e. to apply the active, penetrating (masculine) to one of the individuals whilst the other put on or live out the passive, penetrated (feminine) role. This gives further support to his own argument about the historical and immanent domination in the androcentric universe and ultimately, to his authorship of *habitus*.

This logic of practice is very similar to Geertz's notion of common sense; in fact we could almost say that they are talking about the same thing - Geertz on the level of relativism and Bourdieu in the deep, hidden structures of cognition of what he

believes to be applicable to a Western context. Although Geertz in this case only briefly mentions it, Bourdieu elaborates on the dialectic relation between the practice and the cognitive structures - in which they seem to acknowledge each other and reproduce themselves. Bourdieu's focus is on the particular case of masculine domination, but his doxic argument is something he returns to throughout his authorship<sup>20</sup>.

*The strength of the orthodoxy, in other words the "straight" and conservative doxa that every form of domination (white, male, bourgeois) imposes, is that it constitutes the particularities which result from historical discrimination as embodied dispositions invested with all the signs of naturalness. (Bourdieu 2001:122)*

In this case Bourdieu was referring to discrimination of gays, but he makes a generalization to other categories of domination as to say that it is always "the natural" that equals "the dominating principle" and I believe that it certainly must be that way. The problem occurs when we apply cultural relativism à la Geertz, which seems equally contingent on another level. We could still talk about the natural as the dominant, but we would have to speak of several natures with reference to their own practical reason. Some of the traits of common sense might escape (like the avoidance of fire), but they would be closer to similarities between humans and animals and offer no real anthropological insight on a cross-cultural basis. Regarding manhood and masculinity it is also a question of defining what it really is and I think Bourdieu reveals his view when (in a parentheses) he says; "what is manliness, ultimately, but a non-femininity?" (2001:63). What is it and what can it be? As we will see, a devoted psychoanalytic adds "non-child" to non-femininity, but all the same, to answer this question we would need details about men's interaction and social life, and that leads us to the next chapter.

## **Résumé**

As theoretical points of view to an understanding of human interaction and social life one can look at the particular to comment on the general or the other way

---

<sup>20</sup> For critical discussion of Bourdieu's authorship see Knauff 1996:105-140).

around, to look at conventions in the particular. Geertz as a relativist differs radically with Bourdieu speaking in universal terms when he applies the unconscious, androcentric vision to a Western context. Combined they say that men are men *everywhere*, but they are not all the same *anywhere* when dealing with different cultures. There are important differences and important similarities and we would need both approaches in order to draw a picture that makes sense. I think Bourdieu is right, considering his ethnography, when he claims the androcentric vision to be the dominant one and I think it is applicable to San Cristobal in the sense that it can justify social representations of machismo. His theories of embodiment and symbolic exchange, which in this case give favor to men, are powerful and reasonable. In this perspective the unconscious, male domination resembles Geertz's notion of common sense because they both legitimate themselves by referring to "the natural", "the dominant", which is characterized by and gain its power by being *naturalized*. That is of course ideal and both Bourdieu and Geertz are open to change and antagonism. In any event, my intention here has been to present a perspective on the following. Common sense is relevant in accounting for the shared, practical reason between people on San Cristobal, a structure that is a cultural system in the sense that it works in dialectic with the cultural framework of Latin America. On a general level I do think that it exists everywhere although it varies in form and content, but that should not be confounded with Bourdieu's theory of domination. Bourdieu works well here, simply in juxtaposition to the concept of machismo in Latin America.



### Ch.3: Ruptures in Everyday life

The situation and context of living on an island *do* make a difference and so do economical conditions, demographic settings and the impact of tourism among other things. Nevertheless, the social discourses are very much the same on San Cristobal as on mainland Ecuador – people watch the same TV programs, read the same newspapers, raise their children in the same way, share the same family structure, listen to the same popular music, play and watch football and importantly, share references to places and events.

The method of looking into particular situations that somehow contrasts with ordinary sociality obviously has the weakness of not accounting for the complexity in conventional life. And what is conventional life anyway? Regular and reproduced structures of events and action may all result in extraordinary moment at any time. Few people will claim that their life has passed by as expected and planned and that it was a mere response to the objective structures in their time. In narratives, the storyteller talking about herself will tend to structure her story and justify certain events by referring to conditions in her surroundings, but that is generally driven by a need to organize the story so as to make it comprehensible to the audience – and far from a detailed review of the complexities in a person's life. We find this especially in (auto) biographies and films, and it is always the interests and motivations of the narrator(s) that guide the story. Reality is and must truly be, another story.

Anthropologists have a harder time in this production of legitimate storytelling because they need to fulfill certain criteria in order for their text to be acknowledged. This is an important discussion in itself, but I will not embark on her. What do follow are three examples of something unusual happening in the public sphere of San Cristobal. The three stories touch three essential keys to understanding the field and subsequently notions of manhood. The first event evolves from the activity of surfing - which is central to many young men on the island – and briefly touches, the discourse of nature administration. At the level of masculinity surfing is very much about challenging the elements, but this example is particularly about how men

tackle fear and fright. The second story also serves as a brief example on the expectation of the male role as a protector, which is an obligatory deed in the masculine script. This story is however meant to account for the local people's appreciation of tranquility, which is characteristic of the island. The third account involves the realm of politics, which grown up men share a high interest in. Politics is continuously commented upon, but as the elections were held during my stay it intensified to be a particular and dominating subject of talk. This last case in particular is necessarily part of an important discourse that inherently play the game of domination and power, but instead of following Foucault's perspective on discursive power,<sup>21</sup>I will stay at the level of interaction as much as possible.

### **A handful of Fear**

It was a sunny morning in San Cristobal. I had just put on the coffee when my friend, Enrique, came by and told me that there were waves rolling in down on the beach right next to us, some 100 meters in straight line. He already had his surfboard ready and was eager to get in the water. I knew that there was a swell around, the moon was about full, but I doubted that there would be waves outside this particular beach although he had told me that it sometimes occurs. The reason for my doubt was that this beach is situated deep inside the bay in front of the village and needs quite a heavy swell from the south to put up with a surfable wave. I took my cup of coffee down to the beach and saw that two youngsters were already having a good time. Enrique went out and after a few minutes some big sets of waves came in. I ran up to my cabin, got my surfboard and paddled out to the other three guys that were already in the water. *Buenos dias!* (Good morning!), we saluted and waited for the next set of waves. As a beginner I was skeptical to catch the waves that broke close to the sharp lava rocks on the shore. The others, in contrast, surfed all possible waves without hesitating.

---

<sup>21</sup> See for instance: *Diskursens Ordning* (1993) and *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969), especially the first part (23-79) or a critical discussion of Foucault's thoughts and tendencies in Knauft (1996:ch.5).



While I was waiting some twenty meters further out in the water Enrique suddenly started to shout on me; *Ven, ven, Gard!* (Come, come over here Gard!). At first I thought he wanted me to join them closer to the shore because they caught a lot more waves and to be honest I had not been able to surf anything. Enrique was teaching me how to surf during my stay and constantly gave me advices in the water. But this time it was not about a surf lesson. When I heard him say the word *Tiburón* (shark) I felt my heart accelerating. *No les creo nada!!* (I don't believe you!!), was my first response. It was common that the local surfers made jokes about the appearance of sharks as a sort of scary play to check the reactions of the others. Although I got scared I thought that this was just another practical joke and tried to be cool about it. When I saw his face I understood at once that this was for real. *Que quieres que haga?* (What do you want me to do?) I shouted. The two young men had already joined him holding each other by the hands with their legs raised up from the water. I saw them some fifteen meters from me and felt that I could be attacked at any moment. *Ven aca, ven aca!* (Come over here!). I got myself together and paddled slowly towards the others finally reaching them. We united our hands and formed a group with our four surfboards. Logically this was supposed to make us look bigger and thereby minimize the chances of an attack. We lay absolutely still for some minutes and Enrique told us what had happened. He had caught a wave, surfed it and, close to the shore, almost landed on a shark. He said that the shark had been in the same wave as him and momentarily stranded on the black rock. With a powerful movement it got into the water again. He said it was approximately two meters long and that it looked like a tiger shark although he was not sure. Enrique told us, and later confirmed to me, that he was as close as one meter from it and despite his doubts he emphasized that it was not a friendly, white tip shark. We all listened with excitement and tried to figure a way to get out of the water. Enrique was reluctant to return to where we had entered because it was too close to where he had seen the shark. As we were laying there in the water we tried to shout on one of the taxi boats that passed us some 100 meters further out in the bay. It was meaningless; the conductor could not hear anything because of the noise from the engine. On the beach some persons were on their way for a swim, but we managed to alert them

because of the obvious reason that there was a shark in the water. People started to mingle up on the beach.

After a short conversation we decided to paddle towards a pier some 400 meters at the right hand side of the bay. It was a risk to take, but my friend was in charge and neither the others nor I were in a position to make a better decision. As we paddled the fright, the uncertainty and doubts were enormous. Was this really happening? Was one of us to be attacked and what were the rest to do in such a scenario? How does it feel when the attack comes? Or, was Enrique only hallucinating or mistaken? As we moved towards the pier Enrique continued to confirm his experience, but now, in a humoristic tone! We all started to laugh although we were extremely scared. We asked him again and again if it was not a dolphin he had seen. *No, no, no, era un tiburón, te lo juro por mi madre santa, casi me voy encima!* (No, no, no, it was a shark; I swear on my mother, I almost landed on top of it) The paddling was tough and the others were going faster than me. I got another boost of fear, but kept going as fast as I could. When we were almost there some of the fright was gone, but reaching the shore was nevertheless, a huge relief. We met some divers going into the water and told them about the incident. They did not seem to take it seriously and said they were used to seeing sharks.

We ran back to the beach. The gravel road was extremely hot and we all got our feet burned. Enrique was eager to show us that he was telling the truth and immediately started to look for the shark. Some students and tourists were also paying close attention to movements in the water. I thought that the shark would probably be long gone by now, but Enrique explained to me that they always stay on the same spot for a while before moving on. As we waited to get a glimpse of “the beast”, the air was filled with expectation. The four of us that had been in the water were still full of adrenalin and appreciated our moments of fame. Then suddenly, in a wave that was breaking, the shark showed itself swimming gently, parallel to the shore. The amazement from the crowd was immense, people started to shout and tell the children to come and have a look. The two young surfers started to hug Enrique and

thanked him for “rescuing them”. Lots of people came down to the rocky shore. A representative of the national park was called upon and immediately showed up. International students, surfers, sailors and locals were all stunned by the sight of a shark this close to the most common and popular beach in town. The shark appeared four times in about half an hour. It was as if it was playing with people’s patience because as people got tired and went away it reappeared and the show was on again, each time causing shouts and excitement. Lots of stories of sharks were circulating among the spectators. Surfers that were used to seeing sharks and appeared brave and indifferent to this particular shark all stopped talking when seeing it in the water. The beach is first and foremost a place for the family and especially *children* taking their first swimming lessons and nobody had ever seen a shark this close to the beach, inside the village’s bay. A shark here was definitely comprehended as a threat and people began to say that the national park should do something about it. But the park guard also surprised by the sight, stayed calm and said that the shark was in his natural habitat and that nothing should be done.

The episode and excitement had a background in an event some three months earlier. In late January 2009, a young surfer was attacked by a small shark on the island of Isabela, some 200 kilometers west of San Cristobal. The attack resulted in the boy almost losing his foot. He actually had to open the jaws of the shark with his own hands to get loose. Since shark attacks occur very seldom in the archipelago the incident was covered with big interest in all medias and caused fright and uncertainty among the local population. It was a subject common in conversations during my stay and the appearance of a dangerous shark practically “in town” intensified this.

I was standing outside my cabin when a smiling Enrique passed by saying: *Bueno hermano, ahora por lo menos tienes una buena historia para tu libro. Nos vemos mas tarde...* (Well my brother, at least you got a decent story for your book. See you later on...) Our experience gave a particular substance to our relation and people in the village related our characters to the episode in the following weeks. The real danger of being

in the water with a shark could definitely be discussed, but the fright and fear in the experience was real enough – at least to us – and we had tackled it by laughing it off as a last stance if we were going to die anyway. Thus our manhood was still intact and beyond criticism.

### **The Male Protector**

The carnival had been going on for some days and people were still throwing painting, “achote” (a strong-smelling spice), and a variety of liquid mixes on each other. Trucks and pick-ups move through the streets and people in the back of the cars throw these mixes, capsulated in water-balloons on bystanders. I had been lucky not to be hit, but it was obvious that it was preferable to aim at local people, not knowing what a foreigner’s reaction might be. Sometimes I chose a different street when I saw that there was action on my regular way to the center.

While eating *almuerzo* in a local restaurant a peculiar situation occurred. The room was almost filled up of people eating on several small tables. I was sitting on a table in the middle of the room with a view over the entrance area and the surrounding tables. A woman came in and started to throw painting on a young man who was sitting next to the open door. He immediately got very angry, took a hold of the lady and told her: *Como me vas a hacer eso si estoy comiendo aquí con tranquilidad?!* (How can you do this to me while I am eating here in peace?), in an aggressive tone. He actually forced her out on the street while she said: *Pero si es carnaval...* (But it is carnival...). The dispute continued in the door and got quite intense. It ended up with the young man returning to his seat while the woman disappeared. After about two minutes a big, powerful man came rushing in saying; *Donde esta ese hijo de puta que ha pegado a mi mujer!, A ver si me pega a mí en cambio!* (Where is that son of a bitch beating my women, let’s see if he can handle me instead!!). He found the young man immediately and grabbed him towards the entrance/exit. The other persons sitting around the table all got up; one of them grabbed a chair ready to defend his friend. The young man didn’t even try to make a proper defense because this other man was way bigger than him. His friends though, reacted so quickly that what seemed to

turn out to a fight finished in a verbal, aggressive dispute with the restaurant's crowd defending the young man. The big man had no choice but letting the man loose.

As they were standing just outside the entrance a police officer came by. Instead of intervening he started to film the dispute with his mobile phone. The quarrel ended when the husband went away. The people in the restaurant returned to their seats saying things like: *Ya no hay respeto* (There is no respect anymore) or *Esta loco ese man* (He's crazy, that guy). There was a clear general agreement that dinner hour and especially the restaurant was no place for carnival celebration. If it had occurred outside it would have been a different story. In the street, as on mainland Ecuador, it is expected that you react positively on a splashing. At least you are not to react with intimidation or take any sort of revenge. Despite this, some people tend to be crueler than other mixing the water with urine, rotten eggs or whatever bad-smelling substance they can find. Pregnant women and old people have immunity and are not to be splashed upon.

This is carnival on San Cristobal and it resembles most parts of the country. Some cities, especially in the Andes region, have a particular tradition for the celebration with parades and a number of rituals – and thus attract people from other places. In the national context it is also very common to travel to the coast or a tourist destination. This mass movement is, however, characterized by an anticlimax due to many transit accidents every year along with tragic drownings on the beaches, often caused by heavy alcohol consumption. Alcohol in the forms of beer and liquor is central to all mass celebrations. Carnival, as New Years Eve or *Semana Santa* (Easter), are all identified by heavy drinking, especially by men. It highlights a legitimate time to drink, an occasion some men tend to take an advantage of.

What the episode displays is the aggressive reaction of the woman's husband. Viewed in isolation it could serve as an example of a man's duty – as the male protector – when his wife is intimidated in one way or another, but I have chosen to

include it here in order to emphasize the opposite. The public defense of the man in the restaurant is but one example of the local people's appreciation of *tranquilidad*.<sup>22</sup> Everyday life in Puerto Baquerizo Moreno is dominantly quiet and calm. This is the public opinion on how it should be and people repeatedly contrasted the tranquility with the problems of traffic and violence on Santa Cruz and the major cities of Ecuador. Alfredo, my old friend also commented on this in the following dialogue:

- *No querían turismo aquí en esta isla. Había un señor que quería poner un hotel de cinco estrellas, pero no le dejaron, la gente se oponía...* (They didn't want tourism on this island. There was this man who wanted to build a five-star hotel, but they didn't let him do it, the people opposed him...), A.A

- *Si no, porque en Santa Cruz hay mucho mas (hoteles)...* (Yeah right, there are a lot more hotels in Santa Cruz...), G.F.V

- *Claro! Allá es casi como Guayaquil. Acá en cambio es más tranquilo aunque ahora si hay más turismo aquí también.* (Of course! Over there it's almost like Guayaquil. Here, it's more quiet although nowadays there is more tourism here as well), A.A

- *Si, está subiendo, hay hartísima policía también?* (Yes, it's increasing, there is also a lot of police?), G.F.V

- *Sí, pero ya han empezado a robar también. Antes uno podía quedarse dormido por aquí nomas en el malecón borracho y no le pasaba nada. Ahora si te viran los bolsillos pues.* (Yes, but people have started to rob as well. Before it was possible to fall asleep drunk, here on the pier and nothing would happen. Now they will check your pockets you know.), A.A

- *Así?* (Is that so?), G.F.V

- *Si. Ahora es un poco más inseguro, pero sigue siendo tranquilo...* (Yes. Nowadays it's a little bit more insecure, but it's still calm and quiet...), A.A

To Alfredo the calmness and tranquility was antonyms of the opposite and a notion of deep-seated value. He even stated that he liked it better up in the highlands where he had his own little piece of land. The latter argument would refer to a preference for the rural life and presumably not be an inclination to the majorities living in the

---

<sup>22</sup> For an elaboration of the term *tranquilidad* (tranquility) on Galapagos see: Ospina (2006:79-84)

town, but the overall tranquility on the island was a common asset, not only for old people, but equally appreciated by many parents of different ages.

Young people would sometimes complain about boredom and isolation on the island, but the tranquility discourse was always a backdrop to their statements. Several young men commented on the phenomena of “island sickness” and that it was totally necessary to get away once in a while. They said that seeing the same people and surroundings everyday could sometimes drive them crazy (*me hace volver loco*) and occasionally used it as an incentive to drink. Naturally there is a number of urban attractions in Guayaquil and Quito, which many local men and women would like to have, but that sort of complaints are never-ending in many places and contexts. A few young men told me sincerely that they had had enough of the island and expressed a true desire to move away. A certain degree of frustration given the lack of opportunity many of these men had to leave the island is equally, a consequence of living in a small community that constantly receives global visitors with stories from the big world.

The point is nonetheless that the *tranquildad* is part of a local discourse of self-reflection and self-representation. The term is used both in a positive sense as to express the appreciation of security and calmness, but also negatively to complain about bad aspects of island life. The latter dimension would often contain utterances of, conservative/disclosed/stupid/conformist/boring people and complaints about the lack of things happening etc. All the same and nevertheless, the appreciation was more prominent than the complaints, as for instance reproduced as reactions to the news on TV, which continually presents the many difficulties of urban areas.

### **Electing the Right Leader**

As mentioned in the introduction, national elections were held in Ecuador during my fieldwork. A new constitution had just been approved and the President, Rafael Correa, had already announced that it was to be followed by a new election despite the fact that he had only been in office for two out of four years. The modification of

the constitution was in fact one of Correa's predicates when he ran for President the first time - and this new round of election was thus part of the plan.

But the election was not only about voting for a new President: it was also an election on the provincial as well as the municipal levels. Hence, although people were talking about the election of a new mayor (*alcalde*), more attention was drawn to the presidential candidates. The focus on the latter was dominant in the media, and consequently created a major discourse among people. National television news last for half an hour and is regularly seen while eating, as it corresponds more or less with *almuerzo* (lunch) at one o'clock pm and *merienda* (supper) at seven. It is interrupted by commercials, which often give time to comment on the issues reported.

The political sections were escalating in intensity as the Election came closer. The different campaigns of the candidates were sent as commercials, the dominant one being the one for the government, which supported the sitting President. The campaigns follow strict regulation in terms of the money and the broadcasting airtime each candidate has to his/hers disposal. The regulations were in fact being followed and respected this time in sharp contrast to previous elections in the republic. The only democratic problem was that the sitting president and government had an ongoing, independent campaign promoting itself through showing off a number of positive changes. This meant that the president used a modest amount on the re-election campaign - and made a good example when the "money- and-resource-spending" statistics was published - because he had the whole governmental, propaganda machine on his own side. This was obviously something that gave rise to frustration among other candidates, but they were surprisingly quiet about it. In Ecuador as in many places, space in the medias is the most important basis for gaining popularity - political debates where all candidates appear, are brought down to a minimum, and the actual debate goes on between the political



parties (the candidates) through the media. This is presumably a common trait of elections in many parts of the world<sup>23</sup>.

The major candidates running for President in Ecuador 2009 were the sitting, Rafael Correa, Lucio Gutierrez, a former president who was thrown out and had to escape the country after less than two years in office, Alvaro Noboa the richest man in Ecuador and Martha Roldos, the daughter of a highly esteemed Ecuadorian politician who was killed by the CIA in 1981. Roldos never had a chance, but she worked hard and gained votes because of her father's reputation. The story of ex-president Gutierrez is commonly known as a man who came to be president by promoting socialist values, but sold out to *los pelucones*<sup>24</sup> (the rich elite) when he came to power. As mentioned, he was thrown out of the country, stayed in exile for some time, came back and mobilized a new campaign. It may seem strange that this could happen, but it certainly does.

Correa and Noboa are politically, intellectually and rhetorically situated on two different poles if one may talk about left and right in Ecuadorian politics. Noboa inherited an enormous wealth and commerce after his father who had worked his way from being a simple vendor to becoming a commercial magnate. After some quarrelling with his siblings he split the companies between himself and his sister. The sister is still a very progressive figure in Ecuadorian industry and food chains. On his part, Alvaro Noboa himself is one of the richest men in South America with long arms into the liberal, right winged politicians that dominate Guayaquil and its

---

<sup>23</sup> In Norway there has recently been a debate on this subject and on the power the media have to set the political agenda and thereby decide which issues are to be debated. In such a perspective the next question would be that of *who is controlling the media*. Leaving corruption and extramarital love affairs aside, Italy is a salient case to consider in this respect. What is interesting about the Berlusconi case is that the man represents a masculine ideal and seems to win popularity by incarnating the role of "a real or true man" seen in analogy to my brief description of the Mayor of Guayaquil. There are many examples of leaders with an appealing charisma, but I think outsiders are a bit more skeptical about Berlusconi than Italians seems to be. But, then again; the history is full of this (Franco, Stalin, Mao, Hitler and Margaret Thatcher for that sake) and it seems to be a mysterious path that leads to being a leader of a nation.

<sup>24</sup> The word *pelucon* refers to *peluca*, which is Spanish for "wig". The expression refers to rich people who use wigs to hide their real hairstyle and was implemented as an expression by president Correa criticizing his political opponents.

surroundings. He has run for President four times (including this one) and been a major opponent to the winners of the elections. Regardless of his position, the public opinion often refers to him as *Bobo, aniñado o maricon* (Stupid, too wealthy or gay). From people who are more liberal in their ideology, this is often agreed upon, but countered with comments like; *...pero es un Diablo poderoso* (but, he is a mighty devil) or *pero si sabe como mover las piezas* (“but he knows how to move the pieces around”).

As any president of a nation, Rafael Correa is both criticized and rewarded. He is young (mid-forties) and a socialist. He is an economist educated in Belgium and the US, something that, along with his age, gives him a modern status. His young age is typically held against him in contexts where older men come together and politics is discussed. Instead of giving my own description of him and his campaign I will try to give the reader a glimpse of the political discourse in a context in a field context:

As mentioned earlier, I regularly played football with a group of teachers on the concrete field of one of the schools in town. This was an afternoon activity and the incentive was that of getting some exercise and having fun with friends and colleagues. Most of the teachers were aged between 40 and 50 and the majority had their background from the highlands of mainland Ecuador – none of them were born in Galapagos with the exception of one or two younger ones.

As we met up we would always have to wait a bit before there were enough people to set up two teams. Sometimes a lot of people came so that one team would wait while the others were playing and sometimes there wouldn't even be enough people to play at all. The setting was thus open to all sorts of conversations and during the campaigns for election the theme of politics would be a dominant one along with the daily talk about everyday issues, football and events:

- *Y como van los preparativos para la elección?* (And how are the preparations for the election going?), I asked.

- *Ahí más o menos, están que se pelean los candidatos...* (More or less, there they are fighting among each other the candidates...), one of the men answered.

- *Y Correa?* (And Correa?), I asked.

- *Yo sinceramente no quiero que gane ese man después de lo que ha hecho en contra de nosotros aquí en las islas...* (I sincerely don't want that man to win after what he has done to us here on the islands...), the same man answered.

- *Ah, cierto que les ha quitado el bono insular no?* (Yeah right, he took away the insular bonus thing didn't he?), I replied.

- *Si y se supone que iba a compensar con otros bonos como el cupo de "Mi Comisariato", pero las cifras son negativas, el man nos está quitando la plata.* (Yes and he was supposed to compensate with other bonuses such as the food-coupon in "Mi Comisariato", but the numbers are negative, the man is taking our money from us.), the man answered.

- *Simon, estamos jodidos, ya vamos a organizar una protesta...* (Yeah, we are in trouble, now we are going to organize a protest...), another man commented.

- *Es ridiculo que nos está quitando el bono para ponernos en el mismo nivel de los profesores afuera. Aquí los costos son mucho mayores comparado con el continente...* (It is ridiculous that he is taking away the bonus (insular) to put us on the same level as the teachers outside [i.e. mainland Ecuador]. Here things are much more expensive than on the continent), said one of the men.

- *Claro, si aquí un brócoli te cuesta un dólar y afuera ni siguiera 50 centavos...* (Of course, here one broccoli costs you one dollar, on the continent less than 50 cents...), another man approved.

- *Estamos mal si gana Correa otra vez...* (We're in trouble if Correa wins again...), concluded by one of the men.

The discussion was one out of many concerning a decreed the government had issued. Teachers as many public posts have received a large bonus since the creation of the Special Law which concludes that the high costs of living on Galapagos must be compensated for by higher salaries. The government had done an evaluation of the current situation and come up with a decreed that this had to be re-adjusted through a new system where the teachers receive a lot less than before. It was a serious matter for the teachers and came along with a commentary where the President explicitly said that Galapagos did not count that much in the election because of its modest number of inhabitants this formed a stance against the re-election of Correa.

*Nuestro problema son los préstamos que hemos cogido para comprar carro y casa. Cuando lo hicimos nos basábamos en el sueldo que teníamos y ahora si no bajan...no sabemos qué hacer...* (Our problem is the loans we took to buy a car or a house. When we did it we calculated with the salary we receive. Now, if they will end up giving us less than before...we don't know what to do...)

This was told to me by one of the teachers, but it was an utterance that represented a collective worry within the group. It touched their economical foundation and their role as caretakers of their respective families. When the news about the decreed was official the teachers had several prolonged discussions about its content. One of them was educated in law and had read the document. Others had read parts of it and the different interpretations gave rise to a dynamic discussion. Although the worry was not a matter of life or death, it was a subject of high, common interest. Numbers were calculated, salaries, loans and bonus systems compared and the conclusion was red and negative. How could this be? The conclusion gave incentive to more talk; opinions were taken into account and discussed, contact with teachers on other islands was made and collective voices were created. Finally, the local teachers organized themselves and held a demonstration, which consisted in a peaceful march through the centre of the town, finishing off outside the city hall.

Despite the teachers' reaction there was a paradox in the process of the election. Most of them explicitly uttered their discontent with Correa because of his politics in Galapagos. Besides the economic factor described above, the government had also started a big evaluative project of the nation's formal education. More specifically it was (is) an evaluation of all of the teachers in the republic in both elementary and secondary school. The government had launched the project with the object of achieving a general evaluation of the teachers' formal capacity and to sort out the ones that were (are) of poor quality. These would then be given a chance to do capacitating before returning to their jobs. The argument was a plausible one; a progressive step in making a better and more prepared educational system. It is one

out of many reforms that are part of the government's vision and clearly a part of a larger nation-building project.

I talked to many teachers about *la evaluación* and there was quite unison consent that it was a good thing. The problem was the way in which it was to be done. The testing was fragmented into different sections where one of them was an evaluation by the teacher's pupils. This was stated by one teacher as a crazy thing to do; *Como me van a evaluar a mi si ni siquiera saben leer y escribir?* (How are the children to evaluate me if they don't even know how to read or write?). The children's evaluation was to be counted as 5% of the general evaluation, but it was used to shed a negative light on the whole thing. The testing also made some of the old teachers a bit nervous or insecure and they reacted with disapproval and skepticism. It is also a point to make that one of the most powerful, national, labor unions (*UNE*) is that of the teacher's and that many of the members felt the evaluation as a threat to their integrity. Paradoxically the teachers thought of the evaluation as a good thing, but many of them did not like the idea of being evaluated themselves.

A similar paradox could also be seen at a different level of interpretation. Many of the teachers were fundamentally positive to the re-election of Rafael Correa. It was agreed upon that he was *bueno para hablar* (a good talker), that he had started important projects on infrastructure, taken a stance against corruption and that he held socialist and progressive values that resonated well in the minds of many teachers. There was no clear consent though; many of the teachers had seen several presidents with high hopes turning rotten. Liberal inclined ones were also fundamentally skeptical to his *ideas comunistas*. The paradoxical problem for the ones that agreed with him was that they now had three strong reasons disfavoring him. First of all; the drop in salary, secondly the problematic evaluation (which was a paradox in itself) and third; his public comment on the fact that he regarded the votes in Galapagos of minimal importance. There was in other words analytical ambivalence going on, and an important question was of course whether there was a better alternative candidate for president.

Elections often come down to paradoxes and compromises of strategy and ideology. As for this election everybody knew that Correa was going to win and he did, historically in the first round of voting as the first candidate to do so after the fall of the military dictatorship in late 1970s. Correa had clearly won, with 51.9% in his favor, and was to be president for four new years with the new constitution at hand.

## **Résumé**

With these three stories I aim to provide a description of how people, essentially men, handle events out of the ordinary. *Meanings* and *opinions* in interaction give a glimpse of the local, particular context and how people struggle to re-order, re-structure and re-settle everyday life.

The political realm is not necessarily masculine. Women have increased their participation on a general basis and the same can be said about the realm of business. It is beside my point here to de-gender these realms, but if we imply the perspective of domination and power, the political realm is still dominantly male. All the presidents in the history of the Republic have been men and in a comparative perspective, masculinity certainly influence the political realm, suffice to look to nations like Italy, Venezuela, Cuba, Mexico, Colombia etc<sup>25</sup>. On San Cristobal the local men's discussion of the election involves the search for male deeds represented in the candidates, but in the end the practical issues that directly affect the economical matters of everyday life where, if not dominating, of great concern in the debate. The mobilization and enthusiasm on behalf of the schoolteacher's should implicitly be comprehended to account for their role as caretakers when their economical income was put at stake.

Sharks are strong symbols of horror and mystery. They are in many ways the ultimate incarnation of evilness and raw power. Every man knows that it is impossible to put up a fight with these animals, but in contrast to this picture, the

---

<sup>25</sup> Many parts of the world might be included here, but if we stick to anthropological studies Krohn-Hansen's description of male deeds in relation to political figures in the Dominican Republic is highly revealing of this (2001, particularly ch.3).

sharks are very friendly on Galapagos as in most places. Surfers are used to seeing them in the water, and the local common sense says that you will be fine as long as you do not surf early in the daybreak or late when the sun sets. It is their potential, manifested through a possible attack that induces the fear. For environmentalists and researcher the shark is, on the contrary, a symbol of essential value to the marine reserve. Galapagos along with Cocos Island, southwest of Costa Rica are two out of few places where the sharks mingle and reproduce. From the environmentalis/scientific perspective the shark is fundamentally important for the ecosystem and their protective attitude is emphasized in opposition to a considerable activity of illegal shark fishing. Shark fins are extremely valuable and the fishing is a major problem in this area of the Pacific. On San Cristobal it was a close to being a talkative taboo, but I have seen and talked about the subject with people on the mainland coast<sup>26</sup>.

The male protector is an obligatory deed in the masculine script on San Cristobal as in Ecuador. In most cases it will consist of a diplomatic affair, but if the inducement was caused by physical contact, the response would typically involve physical pay back. The crowd's reaction to the confrontation in my story above was to support the young man because they could easily see themselves in his position. The most active defenders were also his friends and thus they enacted a solidly defense. The most prominent trait in this rupture was likewise, the collective critic of the violence. Although people could understand the reason for the incident, the violent behavior was condemned as to belong to an uncivilized past. This can be seen in analogy with the government's criticism and action against public punishments and the occasional lynching of criminals among some of the Indian populations in the Andes region. In fact, the Indian traditions of public punishment and the government's reaction of condemnation had been an ongoing theme in the TV news previous to this incident. However, the possibility of a correlation between the reaction of the people in the restaurant and what some of them may have seen in the news the day before should

---

<sup>26</sup> Suffice to say that the fishing will continue as long as shark-fin-soup is an obligatory dish in the schooling of Chinese chefs.

not be a reason to question the spontaneous response enacted by the crowd. Not only was the attack a threat to the young man, but also a threat to the local notion and appreciation of tranquility, order and security.



## Ch.4: The Masculine Script and the Shortcut to Psychoanalysis

If we take gender to be an opposition between masculinity and femininity then one of them must be identified as the lack of the other. If we acknowledge that a person must shift between deeds, behavior and identity that are associated with the two categories (masc. & fem.) then a woman should ideally lack masculinity and a man conversely lack femininity. The same man would then again lack femininity if he acts, speaks or is referred to in a way that emphasizes his masculinity. Bourdieu saw it the same way and claimed that the man has an advantage since it is his point of view that equals the natural and authoritative. He also recognized how the gay and lesbian sexualities complicate this picture, but pointed out that the androcentric vision is often reproduced in gay couples. The categorization of a man as feminine or masculine is one but many classifications of men<sup>27</sup> and they will evidently depend on situation, context, age etc. In the introduction we saw that Melhus & Stølen had been working with an assumption in which “men are classified according to degrees of masculinity of while women are discretely classified according to their moral character” (1996:27). I agree on the point that women are seldom classified as more or less feminine, but they *do* share and make use of men’s classification in degrees of masculinity, as we will see further below.

The associations attributed to masculine behavior are distinct and relative in a comparative perspective as they may be at an individual level. Gilmore (1990:220) concludes with a “definitive maybe” as the answer to the question of the existence of the Universal Male. In spite of exceptions he sees a tendency towards the validity of what he calls “an imperative triad for men’s morality, which consist in a mans duty to impregnate woman, to protect dependents from danger to supply provision for kith and kind (1990: 223).

---

<sup>27</sup> See appendix 1.

In this chapter my aim is to describe some of the prototypical qualities of the masculine script as I encountered it on San Cristobal by using a psychoanalytic perspective. It is worth mentioning again that I could hardly see any apparent differences from what I have seen on the Ecuadorian mainland among the mestizo population.

With that last point in mind and when dealing with cultural constructions of masculinity it is reasonable to suggest that men on San Cristobal would react very much the same way as they would on the continent when their manhood is at stake. If something is true about social representations it should be the fact that the subject, i.e. *la persona*, commonly have the intention to act or behave the way he or she wants the audience to interpret him or her. In that sense it creates the social reality that I will try to describe below. The fallacy of essentialism or, on the other hand, idiosyncrasy should not prevent all attempts of description and interpretations as long as we are aware of the limits involved.

Furthermore, instead of abolishing the tradition of psychoanalytic oriented anthropology<sup>28</sup> altogether it is worth considering, especially because the Virgin Mary (the Mother) is still possibly the most sacred symbol in the Latin American region with its roots to the Circum Mediterranean region and Catholicism. It is the mother who, traditionally and normally, holds the centrifugal force within the family. She is what Ortner (1973) would have called a *key symbol*. It is also worth considering because of the vast amount of metaphors in the social discourse that indicate a homophobic attitude as a normative part of the masculine script. Consider the following:

### **Masculinity meets an angry Mother**

After a couple of weeks I found myself quite settled in Puerto Baquerizo Moreno. I had talked to people of different ages and professions and was hanging out as much

---

<sup>28</sup> This is not meant to say that psychoanalysis is juxtaposed with social psychology. The point here is merely that *neo-Freudianism* is still very much about Freud. See for instance Gilmore (1990:5)

as I could to get to know both people and place. Football was notably as important here as elsewhere in Ecuador and whenever a good game was on, men were watching it on TV. Walking around in the harbor area I had noticed a particular shop. It was one of those small stores that offers sodas, chips, crackers, sweets and most important; beer and cigarettes. It had two tables outside and one inside and in the evenings I had noticed men sitting there, drinking and smoking on a regular basis. A television inside was hung up on the wall and could be pointed in the direction of the door making it possible for the people outside to see.

One day I went to this place to see a World Cup qualifying game. Ecuador was not playing, but to my interest, Argentina was. I had talked to the owner on a previously occasion a man in his fifties and confirmed his passion for football. Actually, the whole façade of the shop was painted in yellow with the logo of Barcelona, a very popular team from Guayaquil, not Spain. Inside the small room and surrounded by shelves of articles for sale I found the owner and two men watching the game. It was not Argentina, but I was told that they were to play in the next game. I asked if it was okay that I sat down, got a “yes, of course” and ordered a beer. As we were watching we inevitably commented upon what was going on, but also slipped into other subjects such as football in general, politics and tourism. I presented myself and achieved a certain status, mainly by talking their language and we started to share the beer. At first I bought one or two, and then one of them bought another one; all of it fairly distributed in our glasses. The two men were around forty years old and sort of tough guys. Their talk was loaded with *hijo de puta* (son of a bitch), *mama verga* (cocksucker) and *maricon* (gay)<sup>29</sup>.

When discussing politics, and the upcoming election, Andres, one of the men, insisted that Rafael Correa, the president, was a *maricon* (gay) and repeated it over and over again. He said that he was *un pelado* (a boy) and paraphrased a joke done by a clown on a public party some days in advance: The joke was about Correa being

---

<sup>29</sup> Although these expressions may seem very vulgar they have lost much of their literal meaning because of an extensive use. In a masculine, informal context they may be quite ingrained in the way of referring to a third person, although not necessarily.

*como la belga* (like a female citizen from Belgium), playing with the word *belga* (the president's wife is from Belgium) that resembles *verga* (penis)<sup>30</sup>. It was laughed upon and so was this man's attitude towards the president. Carlos, the other man, was more moderate and positive to the re-election of the president.

Anyway, the small shop and the football game was our setting and context. The owner brought us more beer when called for, watched the game with us, but did not talk that much. When the first game finished, we were all eager to see Argentina<sup>31</sup> in the continuing match. The following conversation took place between me, Carlos and Andres before Argentina started to play:

- *Bueno, ojala le va bien a Maradona hoy día porque la gente le tiene cualquier cantidad de expectativas* (Well, hopefully the game will turn out good for Maradona, the people have put him under a lot of pressure), says Gard.

- *Con ese equipo que tiene no le puede ir mal...* (He can't fail with the team he has got...), says Carlos.

- *Por mi que se vaya a la verga con su equipo de maricones, ese Maradona me cae mal* (For my sake he can go to hell (literally:cock) with his team of gays, I don't like Maradona), says Andres.

- *Es cierto que es medio loco, pero si jugó bien en su tiempo no cierto?* (It's true that he is quite crazy, but he was a good player wasn't he?), says Gard.

- *Claro, es el mejor de todos los tiempos, no hay nadie que le gana...* (Of course, he's the best player of all times, nobody can be compared to him), says Carlos.

---

<sup>30</sup> Initial prevocalic *b* and *v* coming out as the same sound in Spanish, the only difference between the two words thus being the *l* versus the *g*.

<sup>31</sup> Argentina is, of course, a well-known football team and often immediately associated with the person Maradona. This was his first game as the manager of the national team and we talked thoroughly about him. Maradona's life and football career is full of controversy. He is possibly the most famous person in Latin America along with the image of Che Guevara. This makes him very easy to talk about (like a grand symbol) where moral issues and meaning arise all the time. Eduardo Archetti made a compelling metaphor of Maradona being like *a lover* (female), meaning that he has given the people so much happiness that they are willing to forgive him everything. Archetti used this metaphor in an interview with *Dagbladet*, a Norwegian newspaper and I must apologize for not referring to the exact date as I just remember it because the article hangs on the wall of the outdoor toilet in my family's cabin in southern Norway. See Archetti (1999: 180-9) for a much more detailed discussion on the meaning of Maradona.

- *Pero es un maricon! Es cierto que jugó bien, pero con todo lo que ha hecho...* (But he is a faggot!! It's true that he was a good player, but with all the things he has done...), says Andres.

- *Claro, mucha farra y mucha coca....* (Of course, lots of parties, lots of cocaine...), says Carlos.

- *Si o no? A mí no me gusta ese hijo de puta...* (True or not? I don't like that son of a bitch...), says Andres.

- *Como futbolista; increíble, pero como persona; como la verga* (As a football player; incredible, as a person; like a penis), says Carlos.

- *Es cierto. A mí me sorprende que ha llegado a ser director técnico* (It's true. To me it's surprising that he has been made manager), says Gard.

- *Pura corrupción con esos argentinos...* (Pure corruption with those Argentines), says Andres.

The match got underway and the atmosphere was rising in the shop. Another man came in to have a look and joined us in the room. I went to the toilet and was struck to find the TV turned off when I returned. The man that came had left while Andres and Carlos were sitting quietly and disappointed in their chairs. *Que paso?* ("What happened?"), I said. I didn't really understand what was going for a few seconds, but then I saw a woman coming into the shop. The woman was apparently the wife of the owner and the two of them were quarreling; *Tú no eres el que paga la cuenta de la luz!* (You are not the one paying the electricity bill!), said the woman. She was tough and authoritative and insisted that we should pay for our beers immediately (normally we would have paid after consuming it all, but this was notably a problem that had been escalating). Carlos tried to interfere saying: *Pero señora, estamos consumiendo y viendo el partido tranquilamente* (But we are consuming beer (i.e. spending money) and watching the game quietly). *Ya sé como son ustedes...haber cuanto han tomado?* (I know how you guys are... how many beers have you been drinking?), said the woman. As I was still a bit struck by the woman's behavior and the reaction of the men, I first tried to ask her what the problem was. I didn't get a proper answer and figured out that she probably had her reasons to act as she did.

As young kids we paid off our beers with our heads down, and murmured our complaints as we stepped out on the street. *Esta muy brava no cierto?* (She is really angry isn't she?), I asked one of my two companions. *Sí, pero ya se ha de tranquilizar* (Yeah, but she will settle down in a bit), said Carlos. We found ourselves standing on the street, with our hands in our pocket, wondering and feeling guilty for something we had not done. We had been defeated and in no position to counter the attack. Andres went to chat with a man on the corner as if nothing had happened while Carlos and I talked for a bit. Finally we split up and went to find another place where we could see the game and drink our beers without being bothered by any angry women.

The episode – the football game, the conversation and the drinking was a very typical example of a realm of masculinity. We were men among men, talking about subjects of men and criticizing every hint of femininity, especially Andres. Although I did not know these men it was easy to identify the agenda and “tune in” to the expectations of my own role. After expressing my connection to Ecuador and thus had identified myself with Andres and Carlos instead of the foreign tourist (gringo) category – the ice was broken and we could all act naturally. On the other hand, when the incident occurred and the woman interfered I was surprised to see the lack of “resistance” on behalf of the men. Although there was obviously a history and background connected to the reasons of her behavior I was surprised that the owner did not take any action and insist on turning on the TV again<sup>32</sup>. Andres and Carlos immediately changed their strong, masculine attitude and took the role of young boys, complaining, but realizing that the battle was lost. I also found it a bit amusing because especially Andres *completely* lost his toughness in a matter of seconds.

To draw any conclusions from a single incident like this would be naïve and it is not my intention either. What is possible to see though, is the reversing of the gender roles as an act of resistance. The realm was obviously masculine as the context

---

<sup>32</sup> The case could naturally be, as Sarah Lund (pers. communication) noted, that the woman was the real owner of the shop, but the point in the story equally holds for a descriptive purpose.

should account for, and what the woman did as to interfere was to make use of a masculine (body) language to take control of the situation and impose her will upon us. In Bourdieu's words, she won the battle on men's home ground by invoking a masculine character. Throughout my stay on San Cristobal men repeatedly told me that the local woman, i.e. their own wives, were hard ones (*las mujeres aqui son duras*). The word *hard* should ideally come to represent the masculine in Bourdieu's homologous oppositions and thus we could say that the men's complaints about their wives were really complaints about the masculine character in their women. The observation of many of these women as – to put it in a nice way – *big and solid* and a potential physical threat towards the men, acknowledges the same point. The same observation has been made by Brøgger:

Traditionally there can be no doubt that women in Southern Europe have put their stake on the role of the mother. Not only can this be seen in their behavior, but apparently in their pure physics. After marriage there is an astonishing amount of women that – after a few years – appear as quite large characters, which gives associations to the Russian babushka. (Brøgger 1996:39, my translation)

This matter may be a sensitive one and Freudian reasoning may come too easily. Nevertheless, I can honestly hold on to my observation and parallel Brøgger in the quote. The woman from the episode described above was no exception and I do think that the mere physical traits in part explains the local men's sexual attraction towards foreign, young girls, in particular the young men. Pursuing that thought for a while we will now look at some examples of abnormality.

### **Analogies of “Poor Men”**

During my stay I got to know quite a few men and one of them was Juan. He was a sympathetic man, humble and balanced, but in some way a contrast to the other young men I met. In his spare time he was often hanging out with the “cool guys” although on different premises as he appeared to be somewhat “left in the cold”. The individuals in this group of men were roughly all in their mid-twenties, often surfers, tourist guides, semi-students or occasional workers. Typically their talk would

evolve around the foreign girls, heavy drinking and surfing. Juan would laugh and support them in their jokes and occasionally be very eager to comment on “last night episodes” and rumors of romances. What he never did was to brag about having any romantic adventures of his own. In the pub he would often stay until late at night, but never drink any alcohol. Meanwhile, Juan spoke quite good English and would continuously try to talk with the foreign girls at the early stages of their drunkenness. I wondered a bit, but never subjected him with his “strange” behavior in the middle of excessive drinking. After all, many people have reasons to avoid alcohol and although he never explained it himself, I was told that he was on medications that should not be mixed with beer. A friend of him also told me the rest of his story:

Some five years back Juan had slipped while shipping some goods off a cargo ship. He had unluckily landed in a way that “took away his manhood” besides putting him a coma for some time. Instead of drifting into frustration he seemed to cope with his destiny in a humble way. I often met him as he walked around smiling, checking “what was going on” on the beach and asking about the plans for tonight. More generally he worked hard as a season worker in Galapagos six months every year and traveled back to his family’s farm on mainland Ecuador for the harvests of cacao and coffee. I came to admire this hard working capacity along with his implicit stoicism. Behind his back many of the young men made fun of him (as they do with almost everyone) and I would sometimes end up defending him in the best way I could – though always in a subtle manner and never using the accident as an explanation. Some of the men seemed to do the same, but Juan’s person was continuously under attack. He “smelled bad” and was “always in the way” by clinging to his friends when they were trying to seduce a girl.

Juan’s case is comparable to one of the characters in Gilmore’s (1990: 30-56) chapter about men in Andalusia. Gilmore tells the story of Lorenzo who fails to be a man in what is the local conception of a real man. Lorenzo failed on the same grounds as Juan although the details are different. The critic directed to Lorenzo was that he did not show a significant interest in women, lived with and off his mother, withdrew



himself to reading classic literature and didn't drink much at all. His peers in the village apparently prioritized differently and criticized Lorenzo for not participating in the public sphere. Although he was aware of his situation he continued to stay in opposition to his peers and saw himself as a modern, European man simultaneously criticizing the local men for being immature. Juan similarly commented on the young men's reluctance to work and their drunkenness. He even said that some of them "went gay" after consuming sufficient alcohol. This last remark he told me as a kind of secret, but I had already observed the tendency among some of the boys.

Anyway, Lorenzo was regarded as *un pobrecito, no sirve pa' na'* (a poor guy, totally useless) by a friend who admired him for his pursuit of knowledge, but blamed him for "forgetting" how to be a man (1990:35). In a rough masculine context "less man" is easily juxtaposed with being gay and Juan's remark about the men "turning gay" can thus be seen as a self-protecting mechanism as well as a mere observation.

Gilmore's Lorenzo-case is referred to in both in Beneke's (1997:44-7) writings about "proving manhood" and in Brøgger (1995:40-4). One interesting aspect beside the point that by using an abnormal example the conventional man arises is that the description of Lorenzo is very similar to my interpretation of Juan in Galapagos. Both were humble persons, bright and intelligent, but eccentric in the views of the conventional men. They were both subjected to continuous critic because they did not handle women and did not drink. Juan differed in the sense that he worked hard, but Lorenzo not working at the time when Gilmore met him had almost finished off a doctoral thesis as the only person ever to "reach that far" in his town, which can be seen as a significant effort towards prosperity although it failed in *form*. The other main difference was that Juan might seem to subsume to the conventional, masculine ideal by *trying* to be like his peers, while Lorenzo had taken a stance *against* them.

Lorenzo and Juan were likewise a preoccupation for their friends. In both cases their friends expressed a concern regarding Lorenzo and Juan's inability to connect with the opposite sex. They were talked about in the same way and regarded as "poor

men” in the sense that they did not find their way out of their problem. The men’s dialog concerning Juan contained, depending on the context; expressions of both frustration and empathy. If he was present his person was never subjected to any explicit critic whatsoever. When he was absent, but discussed within a group of men in the midst of stories about other men somebody would always say that they did not understand his behavior or that he was “a pain in the ass”. Compared to others, especially the most opportunistic foreign-girl-hunters, he was regarded as useless<sup>33</sup>. The empathy, on the other hand, could be found when talking about Juan with a friend of him one-to-one. In this context his friends would often express a concern towards Juan and appreciate him *in spite* of his shortcomings in being a real man. This might support Adoum’s hypothesis saying that; the aggressive and competitive masculine expressions depend on an audience and that it is the context of *a group of men in interaction with each other* that creates this norm of masculinity – not the individuals themselves. To make a truce in which we bring X (male context) and Y (the man) together we might say that there is a dialectic relation going on, in Bourdieu’s view; structure-habitus-structure.

“Losing manhood” or “being less man” is obviously a sensitive matter in both cases loosely presented above. When I say that by using an abnormal example the convention should arise to the reader, the matter is obviously not that simple. It is definitely not the case that the rest of the young men in Galapagos are “macho brawlers” who venture into new romances every weekend. After what I experienced, only a few of them had that kind of charm. The truth is that most of the men struggle to fill their romantic curriculum in a satisfying way. Most of them fail, at least compared to their own hope and stories of successful men. Whatever way it may be, the point is that it is a shared enterprise among young men, at least until a certain age. It is an enduring project where there is no rest until the man settles down with a woman. In the context of Galapagos and many parts of Latin America (and I believe; many other regions) it might continue far beyond marriage. What *marriage* and potentially *children* does is to express publicly that the man is a “real man”. Before

---

<sup>33</sup> *Useless* as an analogy to the Pokot’s handling of hermaphrodites; ch. 2

marriage this success must be proven through conquests of girls, which again should, ideally, be talked about by men and thereby settled in their common memories. This is the crucial point in the masculine script where Lorenzo and Juan fail to be men, but it does not mean that there are others who do not share the same destiny. It is reasonable to say that a fair amount of men resort to lying in order to escape the same verdict. The lie can, of course, be dressed in several costumes; it can be different sorts of overstatements or it can be white lies from the mouth of virgins. Few men would tell the immediate truth and few men would see the point in being honest in such a risky situation. What is important is *representation* and few men are interested in giving themselves a bad reputation.

A much more common way of dealing with this “problem” is to express a cool and laid back attitude towards it and at the end, hide the outcome of the romance. By hiding what happens at the end, no one can tell if the person succeeded in having sex, or not. The person will equally be subjected to a lot of attention by his peers and talked about outside his presence. In this way he confirms his interest in women and is thus beyond critic since he might have good reasons not to reveal the outcome in the first place. He might even say that nothing happened, but in such a way that he implicitly states that sex actually did take place. At this stage the man has succeeded anyway. The only risk is that the girl says something about his incapability to perform when it came to the point of sex. That would be unfortunate for his reputation as a man. For what he has actually done in presenting his romantic experience is to confirm that he is heterosexual. If the girl says that he was unable to perform, his peers might doubt his “heterosexual integrity”. In fact, he could risk being interpreted as gay, and gay men are not very much cherished in the public sphere of Galapagos. What’s at stake is “the pressured type of manhood” (Gilmore 1990: 220) and the fulfillment of the masculine ideal.

## Homophobia

Timothy Beneke writes about homophobia (Ch.6: 1997) in his book titled *Proving Manhood*. He introduces us to the notion with a quote that affirms his beliefs in psychoanalysis<sup>34</sup>:

Homophobia is entirely about extinguishing the feminine and extinguishing the child. Because what are the two enemies of the masculine myth – the woman and the child! Andrew Harvey, in Mark Thompson's *Gay Soul*, in Beneke (1997:143)

When I apply it here it is because – as a social reality homophobia lives a rich life in the public sphere on Galapagos, as in Ecuador, as in Latin America and in fact, in much of our contemporary world – in a masculine context<sup>35</sup>. An a general level there is no drama attributed to this – men talk about “men’s things”, women about “women’s things” while they both ridicule each other. The negative attitude towards gays is in many ways ingrained in the Spanish language in discourses and metaphors and although this may take away some of the real meaning behind it, it certainly doesn’t make it easier to be gay<sup>36</sup>. Beneke writes about the gay hatred that he experienced growing up somewhere in the southern states of the US during the 1950s. Although racism against blacks is commonly apprehended as the most serious social and human problem in this part of the world at this stage in history, the hate directed towards gays was, in Beneke’s eyes, even worse. He finds the explanation to be a somewhat universal insecurity and fright in straight men to be looked upon as gays and because of a presumable equation of masculinity with heterosexuality

---

<sup>34</sup> For a quick review on psychoanalytic theory see: Engelstad (55-72) in *Tanke og Mistanke* (1987) ed. Aarnes & Salomonsen.

<sup>35</sup> An anecdote from a bar in a small village on the coast of Ecuador shows how this is a sensitive matter. I unfortunately said *amiga* (female friend) instead of *amigo* (male friend) when addressing a question to the male bartender. I immediately understood that I had done a serious mistake, but no matter how much I tried to excuse myself, the man was furious and incommunicable. I paid and left the bar quite fast.

<sup>36</sup> Several personal gay/lesbian acquaintances have expressed the difficulties of living with the social stigma of their sexual orientation, especially the problems with the family and I think Ecuador is not a extraordinary example in this case.

(1997:145). He then goes on to distinguish homophobia as a fright of being raped by a dominant male, and homophobia as the threat of gay effeminacy<sup>37</sup>.

According to Beneke (and: Gilmore 1990:78-99, Brøgger 1995:177-180) and several others scholars who have followed this perspective, the answer is to be found in Freud's psychoanalytic theories. They all point at the mother-son relation as the source of explanation and although that is a sort of cliché in modern reasoning, clichés are seldom accidental. The boy, as Beneke says, must make a shift in identification – from his mother to a remote father (“to grandiose stereotypes of masculinity”) - and since this shift is a difficult enterprise; masculinity is left problematic throughout the boy's life (1997:148). Beneke concludes with the following analysis of the developmental moments that may motivate heterosexual men to be attracted by men, which then again may threaten the cultural construction of the masculine ideal. For Beneke all this has to do with *identification*, and in a pre-Oedipal stage this identification relates to the mother; the boy sees the world through the eyes of his mother and may thus ideally come to desire or have an erotic perception of his father. The second relates to the shifting identification to a father (and the potential desire for mother i.e.; the potential conflict with father) and the third one relates to the process of identifying with mother's models of masculinity (1997:149). These are the sources of homophobia and Beneke, following Freud, says that the boy start to repress these feelings as he identifies with his father:

...homophobic anxiety is driven not by a lust for men, but by a terrifying fear of lust for men – a fear that behind one's affection for men is sexual desire. Behind this is a fear of losing masculinity – and behind this, ultimately, a fear of losing identity itself. (Beneke 1997:154)

So, after all, is this the reason why the men and boys on San Cristobal continuously ridicule and criticize hints of femininity in men and never stop calling each other *maricon* or *marica* (gay), *hijo de puta* (son of a bitch), *concha de tu madre* (your mother's shell), *mammon* (sucker) etc.? At the level of social representations we might be

---

<sup>37</sup> The last point is what Bourdieu calls “the taboo of the sacrilegious feminization of the masculine” which he sees as a dominant principle that is inscribed in homosexual relations (2001:119).

tempted towards such an understanding and there is a persuasive twist in Beneke when he concludes by saying that: “Masculinity is one of many ways of learning so well to pretend to be who you think you are that you forget you are pretending” (1997:176).

Among most young, local men on Galapagos, the general aspiration is to be conceived of as a “real man”. If a man has any doubts that he is not conceived this way, well what is more natural than to prove them wrong? In this perspective it could seem reasonable to suggest that the masculine ideal of solidness and heterosexuality is founded on different degrees of uncertainty and is compensated for by a consequential degree of masculine show-off. On the other hand, the individual focus in the theory of continuity from childhood to manhood in psychoanalysis avoids the fact that all social representations are linked to their context and that it is impossible to speak of a coherent, personal stance in an individual. The focus on sexuality overshadows the dynamics and complexities in social life and the implicit intersubjective meanings in a person’s adaptability and flexibility. As for the metaphors that obviously present a strong ambivalence towards the mother figure it could likewise be argued that these words live pretty much their own life. That is to say that they are part of the social discourse that new generations inevitably have to participate in, much like the fact that they would have to learn Spanish in order to be understood. This point about metaphors<sup>38</sup> is in fact quite interesting, especially if we are to follow Hastrup when she says: “Metaphors are not parasites upon reality, they are extensions of it” (1995:13).

Everyday life and action present an array of different roles to be played by any man – as he may be a father, a son, a brother, an employee, a close friend, an enemy, a compatriot – not to mention his age, (lack of) education and social position. In mentioning Erving Goffman (1959) to a reader familiar with his writings we are stepping into another psychological dimension that is much more focused on a

---

<sup>38</sup> For a well-known reading on this point see: Lakoff & Johnson (1980), Lakoff (1987) Lakoff & Turner (1989). See also Brandes (1980) and appendix 1.

contextual understanding. Goffman's situational and contextual insistence along with his concepts of frontstage and backstage, teamwork etc. could be conceived as another doxic theory in contemporary social science beyond Freud. We will follow that thought in the next chapter.

## Résumé

Regarding the manhood and masculinity it is tempting to follow Freud if the goal and claim is to be universal, or at least cross-cultural<sup>39</sup>. Part of my intension was to show some of the expectations men meet in the public sphere and how this gives resonance in psychoanalytic theories. In particular I find it hard to ignore that men, on many occasions, end up with a wife that seems to occupy the role of a mother. As most of my experiences did take place with men in the public sphere of the street, the bar, the football fields or the beach, through their talk and plans they did express themselves in psychoanalytic turns. At the same time, this is something that tends to happen when men are amongst men in Norway and many other places, especially when drinking alcohol. It is fair to say that it is part of the game of joking and having fun and it would be a serious matter if we interpreted all this behavior through the shortcut of psychoanalysis. I think Beneke has got a point in his assumption of homophobia and I would agree that it is quite widespread in social representations within and beyond Latin America.

The episodes accounted for in this chapter should serve descriptively to account for significant aspects in the masculine script and its expectations in specific settings. The communication and critic of femininity in men does manifest itself thoroughly in contexts where men are men amongst men, on the continent as well as on San Cristobal. In fact, if you look at football rivalries during any game in Latin America, and probably other places as well, the fans of each team will scream an awful lot

---

<sup>39</sup> For a classic example of this see Gregor's *Anxious Pleasures* (1985), a book that is referred to both in Gilmore (1990) and Brøgger (1996), Bock (1988:11-13) and many others. Scheper-Hughes (2001) monograph from Ireland is likewise a renowned book about serious problems with sexuality. Bourdieu does also lean on Freud when talking about; "migration of the female sexuality" (2001:15), "polymorphous perversity" (2001:22) and "the paternal discourse" (2001:71), although his arguments departs from psychoanalysis.

about the *mothers* (mainly *hijos de putas* and *chucha tu madre*) of the opposing team and the referee. If the game is hot they will also simulate a couple of movements that indicate sexual intercourse. Moreover, that behavior will be repeated publicly and in large scale among hundreds of thousands, at least once a week. That is just...a social fact that is open to interpretation.



## Ch.5: Sympathy for the Devil

(...) is wrong to think of the human use of language as characteristically informative, in fact or in intention. Human language can be used to inform or mislead, to clarify one's own thought or to display one's cleverness, or simply for play. If I speak with no concern for modifying your behavior or thoughts, I am not using language any less than if I say exactly the same things *with* such an intention. If we hope to understand human language and the psychological capacities on which it rests, we must first ask what it is, not how or for what purpose it is used. (Noam Chomsky, *Language and Mind*, 1972:70, quoted in Fabian 1983:162)

It might be conceived as superfluous, superficial or too easy to pick upon machismo and psychoanalysis. At the same time, my data and experiences from Galapagos and Ecuador strongly indicate this kind of interpretation in correlation with Brøgger, Gilmore and Beneke.

At this point however, it is important to complement the individual understanding in the psychoanalytical perspective by invoking the collective dimension that complicates the former. By doing so my intention is to shed a broader and deeper light on an anthropological understanding of men's behavior. Goffman, mentioned in the previous chapter, provides much of the background for my discussion, but instead of treating his theories explicitly I will use a direction outlined by Bock (1988):

Where others have taken the role, the relationship, or the "actone" (Harris 1964) as basic units, I have followed Goffman in selecting the more complex situation, which I define as the **expected occurrence of a class of roles within a setting**. (Bock 1988:13)

These settings are, in Bock's view, shaped two-dimensionally in an intersection between social space and social time. Fabian (1983:164) concludes to say that communication is ultimately, about creating shared time. With this, we are getting closer to the perspective I want to follow in order to establish an interpretation that departs from and complements psychoanalysis.

It is *the situation* with its area of physical space and period of time that constitute the context. As much as the different personalities at play it is also this context that defines the roles being played. There are implicit, overlapping, intersubjective associations and expectations to the subjective roles in any situation. Together with the power of significant discourses, memories and references to past or future situations (real or imagined) these variables are all at play in one shared moment of time. Ideals of masculinity infiltrate the situation, especially in an exclusively male context, but that happens to be the case for empathy, femininity, manners and common sense as well. To understand this we need to exemplify with an ethnographic account.

Meanwhile, to emphasize Bock's perspective on this, we may consider his own example (1988:13-14) involving one of his students who was a ski instructor, but also worked as a waiter in a ski lodge during the nights. During the day he was teaching a group of people in different skiing techniques and obviously held an authoritative role. When he, by coincident, was sent over to serve dinner to the same group in the evening the same day, the people became confounded by the interplay of roles in recognizing him as a waiter. Many of them even got up from their seats and tried to help him clear the table.

The example that follows is not meant to account for the totality of subjective, psychological dimensions in interaction. The excursion is used as an example on intersubjective communication with its foundation in human empathy. More concretely, it treats the relation between men's age differences, which is an important notion in every man's life.

### **The excursion**

One Sunday a local family invited me on an excursion to a remote beach. We journeyed on a small, open boat operated by a local man that had more or less given up fishing in favor of being a tourist guide in the local surroundings of his island. The family I accompanied was familiar with the man – not close friends, but

acquaintances. He told us that he had been a fisherman for all his life – as his father and grandfather. Obviously, he held an impressive amount of local knowledge, which enabled him to tell us “everything there is to know about flora and fauna on Galapagos”. When we asked him about his fishing these days he said that he occasionally went out, but that he only caught a few grown-up lobsters so that he did not interfere with the lobster population. He mentioned people fishing everything they could find, categorized them as ignorant people and finished the statement with the wanted explanation:

Es que no hay como hacer eso (pescar sin pensar) porque Galápagos no es solo para nosotros que vivimos aquí. Galápagos es único en el mundo, es un patrimonio de la HUMANIDAD y tenemos que ser conscientes y responsables de nuestras acciones.

“We just can’t do that (fish without reflecting) because Galapagos is not only here for us who live here. Galapagos is unique in the world, it is a world-human-heritage and we have to be conscious and responsible for our actions”

As we found our beach and settled our camp we continued to talk about the archipelago and related subjects. Our guide (the fisherman) found some shadow under a bush tree and leaped into a one-hour siesta while, I, the woman, her father, brother, two young sons and a peer went for a stroll in the spectacular surroundings. The context of untouched nature, white-sandy beaches and the eternal blue sea made us reflect upon the beauty of the island and inevitably created a feeling about the importance of keeping it this way. We talked about the horrible exploitation of the mangroves on mainland Ecuador where the nature have suffered intolerable pain in favor of numerous shrimp-farms. This gave further basis for a discussion and critic of the capitalist society *los pelucones*, *social-cristianos* – and we would all agree that the world is run by the wrong people (men!).

Back on the beach our guide slowly woke up. The father of the woman that had invited me was around 80 years old and began to tell the story of how he came to Galapagos from a city in the southern highlands of the Republic some 40 years ago. He told us about the hard work and harsh conditions, about his small farm and

problems with landownership related to the powerful landlords and so on and so forth. When we switched into contemporary issues in Galapagos it was notable that the old man had problems of understanding, especially when it touched the themes of politics and regulation. At this stage our guide had joined us in the conversation and made comments, answered questions and explained. It was all done in a very laid back atmosphere, there was no rush and the conversation could move slowly without anyone feeling eager to speed it up. We sat in the shadows of the bushes - close to where our guide had slept - and talked while the woman and her brother prepared the meal. The old man made some remarks that implicitly revealed his lack of understanding in some matters and it was the most admirable observation to see how the guide explained to him the “matter-of-facts” in such a subtle and respectful manner that the old man would come to understand without being insulted in any way. As our guide had been a fisherman all his life he seemed to have the kind of patience that can only be achieved after many years of contemplating in silence on the open sea. The dialogue between the two men was, I must say, a remarkable experience as it showed humanity in a nutshell in one of the most stunning contexts nature could offer. In this atmosphere it was as if the interaction mirrored the nature surrounding us and created a form of communication that contrasted very much with the hazards and practical issues of everyday talk. When we discussed the controversy in the local fishery, *the truth* was uttered by our guide:

*Bueno, yo tengo que trabajar para mi familia y cuando hay turistas voy con los turistas. Cuando no hay (turistas) tengo que ir al mar y pescar. A mí no me interesa que la langosta esta en veda si yo igual no cojo los grandes. Lo que a mí me interesa es cuidar a mis hijos y contribuir en una u otra manera para que tengan comida. Hay que aprovechar lo que el mar nos puede dar. No somos nosotros, como yo, quienes dañamos el medio ambiente, ni nosotros que ganamos la plata. Los que hacen ambas esas cosas son los barcos grandes de pesca y de turismo. Nosotros simplemente hacemos lo que hacemos para vivir y así siempre ha sido el destino del pescador – soltero y pobre.*

“Well, I have to work for my family and when there are tourists I work with them. When there is none I have to go out on the sea and fish. It doesn’t interest me if or not the fishing of lobster is in close season because I never pick the big ones. What interests me is taking care of my children in one way or another so that they have food to eat. It is not us, people like me, who destroy the environment or earn the big money. The ones who do both those

things are the big fishing and cruise boats. What we do is simply to stay alive and that's how the destiny of the fisherman always has been – lonesome and poor.”

I had already asked the man about illegal fishing and as we had built confidence between each other he told me a lot of things about it relating it to times that has passed.

As far as manhood is concerned the men's dialogue indicated something about the respect for seniors. Although our guide was somewhere in his 40s and had lived a relatively long life himself, he acted with very much respect towards the old man. He subsumed and listened to what the old man said without interfering, much like a young boy does in front of an adult. When he disagreed he was as pedagogic as any psychologist or teacher. He expressed understanding at first and then confronted the topic with his own insight in a manner that would not hurt the old man, but rather introduce him to the same insight. The guide knew that the old man had worked hard and gone through a lot and appreciated the wisdom the old man held. It was as if he regarded his own “updated insight” or information as small details in the big picture.

Both young and old generations of course benefit from having a smooth relation. At the general level the young generations arguably depend on the knowledge of elders, but as time can be conceived as moving faster now than before, the contrary is also true. Older people will to a certain degrees depend on learning about modernity, or whatever we want to call it, from the young generations that participate more actively and even constitute the “new time”. This may be true, but Nestroy reminds us that “advance” is not always what it seems to be; “it is in the nature of every advance that it appears much greater than it actually is” (opening quote: Wittgenstein 1997). We certainly cannot juxtapose “new time” with progress or advance, but it suffices for the sake of the argument I try to sketch out. Younger generations depend on the elders from childhood to adulthood and respect them although the respect does not exclude a challenge towards old traditions. What is

central here is that a man reaches a peak at some stage in his life. At one point he becomes the humble one and regards himself as less competent to lead the way. When this happens he has nevertheless contributed so much that he can take a rest without feeling guilty about it. In fact, in the context of Galapagos and Ecuador, he is expected to do so. Older generations are respected because they carry a large backpack of life-experience and although the luggage of the younger ones may contain more colors than the former, it is the size that matters here. Ecuadorians have a proverb for this: *El Diablo sabe más por viejo que por Diablo* ("The Devil knows because he is old and not because he is the Devil")

Old people hold a kind of wisdom that simply cannot be held by young people<sup>40</sup>. This is especially significant in times of crisis. It is very much similar to the service and significance of the priest. People may regard him as useless and never attend church, but in the moment of death (especially the death of a close relative) the priest is a great supporter in the grief. He holds a heavy experience and is a specialist in mourning; he is called upon and appreciated for his "solidness", empathy and ability to listen. In this way he manifests his position and gain a deep value from the ones who mourn, a value that is beyond economic and rational calculation. It is precisely this deep assessment that is paralleled in the fisherman's respect towards the old man. Furthermore, this trait has a highly implicit life since it is not normal to speak about, but merely grows with a man's life-experience and understanding. Any man on San Cristobal would have reacted with disapproval if an old person had been offended or scrutinized in the public sphere and although it might seem romantic isn't it also a good thing to know? Like pregnant women, old people have immunity from the splashing during the carnival, but the respect at play here is ultimately representative for a notion of common sense that transcends the local setting: in an ideal world it approximates a universal value or understanding.

---

<sup>40</sup> An analogy is that good historians must be relatively old in contrast to young, genius mathematicians.

The episode above is ultimately about the encounter of empathy and about a reciprocal feeling that often occur in sociality between humans. It is what Wikan (1992) talks about through her notion of *resonance* and what originally led to Bastian's concept of "psychic unity of mankind" (Koepping 1983). There was an intersubjective understanding grounded in human empathy that orchestrated the whole game of interaction, especially between the fisherman and the old man. It was as Wikan points out, *the power* of this understanding that guided the dialogue and dominated over any potential, superficial disagreement or ruptures of personal egoism. In folk-knowledge this is very much about "playing along" and I think it is possible to elaborate quite far on this thought. The point here was to exemplify the dimension of age and respect, which sheds a light on the empathic dimension of manhood.

There are many strong reasons towards an assumption in which this intersubjective understanding – i.e. resonance and reciprocity with all related associations ultimately and deeply has something to do with the concept of *love*. Human love, love in humanity, love towards fellow human beings, love as a cultural system? Although this is a worn out cliché there must be a reason for Bourdieu's escape to love when treating masculine domination. Was he just trying to anticipate his critics by offering a softer side of himself? Bourdieu asks:

Is love an exception, the only one, but of the first order of magnitude, to the law of masculine domination, a suspension of symbolic violence, or is it the supreme – because the most subtle, the most invisible – form of that violence? (Bourdieu 2001:109)

At first he answers by pointing to the potential reversal of the relation of male domination, when a man loses himself in the love of a woman, but that this is still a context of struggle that only reinforces the androcentric mythology. He follows by referring to momentarily love as mere breaks in the ordinary, but then he shifts towards the miraculous part and finally albeit a bit hard to follow from what he calls "a strictly anthropological point of view" – he reveals the possibility of true love:

...based on the suspension of the struggle for symbolic power that springs from the quest for recognition and the associated temptation to dominate, the mutual recognition by which each recognizes himself or herself in another whom he or she recognizes as another self and who also recognizes him or her as such, can lead, in its perfect reflexivity, beyond the alternatives of egoism and altruism and even beyond the distinction between subject and object, to the state of fusion and communion, often evoked in metaphors close to those of mysticism, in which two beings can "lose themselves in each other" without being lost. (Bourdieu 2001:111)

He even go as far as to say that the phenomenon of giving secret names lovers in between can have the power to mark a new birth, which is ultimately a change in ontological status (op.cit. 112). To put an end to this romantic dream – which I take to have an essential importance in the masculine script – a real and true man as Neil Young has obviously been through this movie before when he sang; *...only love can break your heart, try to be sure right from the start...*<sup>41</sup> As with gender it is impossible to define *love* since the concept could potentially contain all sorts of harmonic feelings. Nevertheless, its impact has a social reality in time and it is expressed in a number of social representations, sometimes explicitly and sometimes beneath the surface of the dialogue and interaction.

### **Machismo in Masculinity**

These days the government has launched another normative TV commercial, which goes by the title; *Reacciona Ecuador - el machismo es violencia!* (React Ecuador – machismo is violence!) It shows a caveman drinking coffee when he notices that it is cold and thus he screams in agony, implicitly complaining about his wife's effort. The next section shows the caveman sitting on a work desk looking through CV profiles of work-applications. He notices an attractive woman and screams "aaarrrrgghh, let's give this woman employment, she looks good, aaaarrrrgghh!" Next section figures three cave men walking up to a frightened girl when one of them says "aarrgh, you look cute, my queen...aaarrrrgghh!!" Last section shows the caveman coming home to his family's house asking his wife if dinner is ready. The woman who is in the middle of a harmonic reunion with her friends simply answers;

---

<sup>41</sup> *After the gold rush* (1970)



“no, we thought that you were going to cook today”. In the last section the caveman is filmed in his kitchen trying to free the tape off a tape roll, and as the camera moves behind a column the image of the caveman is transformed into an ordinary man struggling with the same problem in a violent manner. The short movie last for about a minute and is in the end accompanied by a happy tune with a female singer singing “dime que quieres, dime que quieres, dimeeee...” (tell me what you want, tell me what you waaaant...)

This is a national campaign against violence related to the phenomena of machismo, and the majority of Ecuadorians see the “advertisement” several times a day as it is repeated over and over again in the national channels. It is instrumental in the sense that it is aimed at achieving a reflective break in both woman and men – with the intention to alter the state of affairs. Ospina would have liked this instrumentality. It is exactly an obligation of responsibility towards concrete actions for concrete people he requests from Guribye in his critic of the latter’s relativistic escape. Scholarly perplexity aside, it is common sense that machismo and masculine domination have serious consequences, not only in a Western context, but in Ecuador, Galapagos and San Cristobal as well. They know and we know.

A paradox arises when we put this in an anthropological perspective, but let us first straight out some of the potential confusion of overlapping terms.

As a social construct, machismo is different degrees of male domination. In the public sphere this is prominently advocated through social representations in the overarching category of masculinity. Masculinity is furthermore part of a personality, which again is part of an identity. A personal identity may have several bonds to different spheres of social life in which the role expectations constitute a loose framework for interaction. All these terms – machismo, masculinity, personality and identity – are incorporated in a person, and for the sake of the argument, it is a man. A man is very flexible and most men know how to move around without causing any trouble. Their interest is prominently to have a smooth relation with family and

friends. The point is then that the anthropological common sense of machismo is that it is an empirical question and far from public opinion. So when the anthropologist ventures into the field and talk to people he is doomed to find Guttman's "multiple meanings of macho" because no man is a macho all the time, a man is a person and a very flexible one indeed. Guttman's book is a substantiation of human variety underneath the stereotypes and his argument is valid in the sense that it describes reflections, interactions and multiple voices in a city and a country that is commonly apprehended as being the cradle of machismo.

Social representation of male deeds are not morally bad, they are just part and parcel of what it means to be a man. There is no point in using the feminist loupe, which is ultimately based on a presupposition that masculinity holds a negative value whilst femininity is good and morally right. Outsiders coming to Latin America will immediately react to the use of vulgar metaphors and if they are feminists and stay for two weeks their interpretation is plausibly influenced by that and their moral agenda. What they do not figure out is that few men and women have a problem with this. Obviously, male violence is a problem, but that happens to be a problem in many parts of the world, and it is not necessarily caused by machismo and masculine domination although it is easy to blame it on the testosterone.

Young women in Ecuador and San Cristobal share a common desire towards a good look, we might even add *sexy* to this. Plastic surgery, especially nose operation and fat reduction, is quite common if you have the money to pay for it. The same goes for the massive and eternal beauty contests<sup>42</sup> in which a queen is elected and receives the celebration crying and thanking the people that have helped her on her road to glory. When she has got herself together a couple of weeks later, she will engage herself in all sorts of developmental projects, visiting schools and institutions protected by her good looks. This is how it works and there is no problem associated with this in the

---

<sup>42</sup> See Schackt (2005) for an interesting reading on a Mayan traditional version of the same phenomenon.

local context, it is prominently a good thing. Good looks are good and using the attention to do even more good things is similarly – a good thing.

What this indicates, is that Bourdieu was right and that his proposal can be applied to the Latin American, mestizo context. It is indeed the unconscious, androcentric worldview and mythology that equal the natural order of things. It is the male point of view that structures this order, and this is why the Virgin Mary is a key symbol in Latin America. That is also why it creates a potential ambivalence in men as the mother figure is sacred and should not be associated with any sexual attributes. Instead of handling this with silence and taboo which would be the convention in Norway, men on San Cristobal and Ecuador do the exact opposite thing and continually mix the image of mother with sexuality in metaphors (*hijo de puta* “son of a whore” and *chucha tu madre* “your mother’s cunt”). This use of metaphors is prominently associated with humor or any sort of outburst. That does not mean that they are totally void of meaning since the worst possible insult from a man to a man is to invoke a pejorative comment insulting the mother of the man, not the man himself. At the same time, women’s desire for beauty is also shaped in the androcentric vision as women to a large degree share men’s taste in what constitutes a good-looking woman and thus Bourdieu’s (potential) male domination is reproduced.

This perspective does not give much agency to women, but we have already touched upon a potential strategy in chapter five. The struggle for symbolic power can be seen on San Cristobal as in many places. The women i.e. men’s wives, make use of men’s weakness in relation to the mother character by taking the stance, the role, even the figure of a mother which is an authoritative character in men’s perspective. She is the creator and should ideally be beyond critic, not only because of her character, but because she takes care of the children and prepares the food that the man eats. It is ultimately the mother who is the boss and the men know this. Furthermore, it is exactly at this point where the male physical violence may occur, most often as the last possible way out of a frustrating situation. A much more

common thing to do when a man realizes that he is not in charge is to increase solidarity with his peers. In the exclusive male context, men can be men among men, and this is also why every hint of femininity in men is jokingly criticised. Not only can they be men, but they can also be boys again as there is no mother watching over them.

At a symbolic level this is evidently another dialectics of exchange as both men's and women's behaviour can be seen as a response to the other. In an analysis of symbolic violence this may appear dramatic, but in the public sphere on San Cristobal there is no drama attributed to the partial separation between the sexes. First of all, there is no particular tension between the local men and women, both are fond of each other and grow old together. Secondly, the distinction between the male and the female public interaction is not subjected to negative attention, but merely the natural order of things. Both men and women find solidarity and good company in same sex relations where they can make jokes on each other's expense and talk freely.

Although an exclusively male or female context will give rise to occasional complaining, it is foremost dedicated to everyday talk where opinions on actual discourses, family matters and rumours are discussed. In the male sphere, which I account for, it is of relevance to mention that humour is highly valued, and from what I know this goes for the women as well. People are interested in having a good time in their spare time and it would be farfetched to think that jokes insinuating femininity in men or masculinity in women are attacks meant at hurting someone. Let me give a brief example from an evening with the teachers who discussed the election in chapter three:

A young man who grew up on the island, but moved to Spain with his family some eight years back, showed up to play football with us. I had met him on the beach the day before and tipped him about the football. Many of the teachers recognized him, as he had been their pupil back in elementary school. Anyway, he came along and played remarkably well, shooting with both legs, representing a constant threat to the opposing team. My team was seated watching while he was playing a match

when one of the men said that, *Ese loco pateo con las dos piernas oye* (That kid shoots with both legs you see). Everybody immediately started to laugh and after about three seconds I understood as well. "Shooting with both legs" would explicitly mean that he had this ability, but implicitly say that the man does not have a preference for men (right) or women (left). The first would be a positive acknowledgement and the other a joke with no intention to hurt the man, but merely as a funny comment, which worked in the setting. Similar jokes are characteristic for the exclusive male context and should be attributed to humor more than anything else.

This contextual play was dominant in the male, public sphere and although it might be less funny in other places most men in the Catholic region would understand this form of joking. We could actually say that it is part of the local common sense that manifests itself as a cultural system when it resonates in the minds of people in social interaction and popular imagery within and beyond Latin America.

### **Time<sup>43</sup> on San Cristobal**

There are three constant variables in every anthropological study. The first is humanity, which is indicated by *anthro*, which stems from the Greek *anthrōpos* meaning "human". The second is the place/space, which is the field from where the observations are deduced. The third is the dimension of time, exemplified in terms such as history, tradition, epoch, temporality and modernity. Until now, I have been most concerned with people and place, and thus a view on some aspects of time is appropriate.

Fabian was referred to briefly in the beginning of this chapter. His book from 1983 titled *Time and the Other* raises some interesting thoughts on how anthropologists implied allochronism, i.e. the denial of simultaneity of the ethnographic *other* with the representing subject and the consequent placing of that *other* in another time, to their works. That is a debate I will not embark on, but I will answer Fabian's thought

---

<sup>43</sup> A small detail of translation here is that the word *tiempo* designates both time and weather in Spanish.

with some features that place San Cristobal in time. This is also relevant for contextualizing the local men in their encounter with new time.

First of all, Galapagos and San Cristobal undoubtedly exists simultaneously in time with the rest of the world. People from all over the world visit the islands, and although they meet the peculiarity of the place, they do not travel in time to get there. Furthermore, many of the technological features that are comprehended as innovative inventions that push a notion of progression into our existential time, are found on Galapagos just the way they are in the Western world. It is beside the point if the computers are slow; the local population are frequenting Facebook, Google, Skype and Wikipedia, just as anywhere else, albeit perhaps to different degrees. TV has done its revolutionary work here as everywhere and all people who can afford have cable TV with international channels. Discovery Channel is, by the way commonly viewed as presenting the compelling truth. Mobil telephones are as dominant on San Cristobal as in Oslo and the local population both travel and talk to travellers which again creates the (real or imagined) myths of modernity.

Secondly, the *Zeitgeist* (Time-Spirit, *tidsånd*, *la época*) is particular for Galapagos and San Cristobal as in any place<sup>44</sup>. We touched upon this in the introduction when discussing Galapagos as a global space where different traditions, agendas and interests clash together. Modernity is conceived locally and creates local meanings and local discourses of temporality. Going only four years back in time, the electricity was shut down at 11 o'clock pm on San Cristobal. When it was decided that this had to be altered it was appreciated by the local population, and it subsequently altered the configuration of social nightlife. 20 years back in time television was rare and when a former President of Ecuador visited Isabela and asked a young boy "who is the president of Ecuador?" the boy answered; "Fujimori!" Fujimori was the President of Peru at the time, and the answer was a consequence of a dominance of Peruvian TV channels in the past. Now, both TV and electricity is a common good in Puerto Baquerizo and the local population share references to the same programs with

---

<sup>44</sup> Although this approximates a discussion of *globalization* I will not treat that term here.

people on mainland Ecuador. Moreover they share Champions League references and other major TV shows with the foreigners visiting and/or their email friends. 10 years ago there was only one telephone center in town. The employees had to run and shout in order to localize the person who was receiving a call. Now, mobile phones are not only dominant, but they are strong symbols of progress, modernity and wealth. In Guayaquil there has been a Blackberry<sup>45</sup> boom during last couple of years, one that has also found its way to San Cristobal. Although it would be speculative to assess its impact, it is beyond doubt that it alters the sociality when the young generations stay connected to MSN and Facebook during family gatherings. Many grown ups express an ambivalence towards modernity at this point.

The third and last point is that modernity, as new time, influence and alter the local traditions and local conceptions of self. The influence becomes clear at two levels. First, innovations are compelling since they are introduced on the verge of the future. They symbolize a progress from a past that is conquered and improved, and by doing so they gain a positive value. By positive associations, medias, especially television has an influence on traditional gender roles. For instance, compelling American TV series featuring modern, Western men may come to be interpreted as extremely sympathetic and self-sacrificing by middle-aged women on San Cristobal. The government's campaign against machismo is likewise repeated so many times that it enters people's consciousness. Both men and women I know in Guayaquil made jokes about this commercial, and it is likely that the men on San Cristobal do the same, but it is also likely that it will have a normative effect. Secondly, the influence of modernity does receive resistance in its encounter with people. In order to understand this, we may recall the quote from Nestroy above who told us that an advance always appears bigger than it is. Electricity, TV, infrastructure, mobile phones, Internet, increased tourism and global discourses certainly have an impact on social life and gender roles, but fundamental moral values has a much deeper seat and move slower than technical innovations and other types of modernity.

---

<sup>45</sup> A type of mobile phone with Internet option.

Evidently, the old generations are generally more conservative than the young and progressive ones, but it is not only the respect from the young to the old that keeps the young generations from taking control. There is a resistance towards modernity, which is manifested in a preference for tradition instead of innovation. Innovation may be desirable, but it is also challenging and demanding as it may alter the safe state of affairs. In this uncertainty the man ask himself “who knows where this is going to lead us?” as if it is irresponsible to let modernity take control. Several men expressed frustration when their children were reluctant to do their homework because they wanted to play Playstation or watch TV. Some expressed the strategy of increased discipline and structure as an answer while others unconsciously quoted Bob Dylan singing *the times they are a-changing*. This is a common trait on San Cristobal and it is often followed by the story of how everything was better in the past; *Antes...uhh!...cuando yo era niño me papi me pegaba si no hacia los deberes...* (Before...uhh...when I was a child my father would give me a decent beating if I didn't do my homework), one of the schoolteachers told me. The point is that *time* shapes the current ideas and ideals of masculinity in a dialectic similar to the one that is involved in shaping common sense and to the dialectics between gender imagery and gender performance outlined by Melhuus & Stølen (1996:1-28).

## **Résumé**

This chapter began taking us out of the psychoanalytic focus on sexuality and the individual dimension. Bock's perspective shed light on the intersubjective dimension and I followed it to account for respect towards seniors and the notion of empathy. That is not to say that there is an opposition between the previous chapter and this one - they rather a complement each other towards a further understanding. Men's respect towards older men is a convention that can be applied to any man's attitude towards a person older than him. I believe that this respect is grounded in empathy and that it tends towards being a universal convention associated with the concept of love.



The point is that a man is much more than his performance in the public sphere, especially in an exclusively male context. In the latter context the masculine imagery is present and open for jokes and humor as a norm that is reproduced. At a symbolic level Bourdieu's theory is a possible interpretation, but it is notably influenced by feminist theory and aimed at giving evidence to masculine domination. Thus his answer corresponds to his analytical scope and intention, it is convincing, but limited as it overshadows cultural variation, multiple voices and *la joda*, which is "the good time" where the man does not worry himself of being interpreted as macho.

The particular modify the universal when we are dealing with time, and at this point we are back to the beginning of this thesis. Galapagos with its local women and men encounter modernity and globalism in their own locality on an average basis. The impact is real enough to compel and seduce the young generations in particular, while the older share a more ambivalent perspective. The popular assumption of a movement towards an egalitarian ideal because of the process of secularization and modernity might manifest itself to become true if a sufficient number of people believe in it, but it is difficult to treat such a generalization without ignoring empirical exceptions. People on San Cristobal will continue to create shared time through communication and this works as a compromise between old and young generations where the most important value is to share a *tranquilo* island.



## Epilogue

The Peruvian author, Mario Vargas Llosa wrote a short novel called “Los Cachorros” (2007) that was published in 1982. The main character is Cuellar, a boy that moves to Lima with his family. He enters a private school as a bright and talented boy and has a happy life until the day of the accident. A dog attacks him while playing football and bites him where it hurts the most. He is literally ripped away of his manhood and the rest of the novel is about his struggle to cope with his problem. When the boys reach puberty and romantic interaction with the girls begins to take place Cuellar’s problems manifests itself. He is a popular kid, admired by several girls, but withdraws himself when it comes to the point of romance. The situation escalates and he enters a self-destructive pattern that at the end takes away his life. In his frustration he tries to compensate for his lack of manhood by doing fanatical acts to receive the attention of his peers. He gets the attention all right, but instead of leading to any good it gives him a bad rumor. At one point there is hope that an operation abroad might “fix” him, but as Cuellar gets the final response that there is nothing to do, he intensifies his destructiveness. His friends try to support him as far as they can, but he does not want any pity, after all, he is a grown man and prefers to cry alone.

Seen in analogy to Juan on Galapagos and Gilmore’s Lorenzo in Andalusia, Cuellar is another example of a “poor man” and another example of how to cope with a “loss of manhood”. The three of them are all prototypes of exceptions – and thus they are used to make a point of coherence not fragmentation – from three specific settings in the Catholic region, which differs significantly in relation to the urban/rural distinction and the class dimension. If we remember Geertz’s example on intersexuality and how this anomaly was handled differently spatially and regionally it is possible to see that the three analogies of poor men (Juan, Lorenzo and Cuellar) share the same cultural system although their reaction is individual and spin off on an idiosyncratic variable. Prototypes aside, indifference is hardly a choice here.

Following Bourdieu's perspective, Juan, Lorenzo and Cuellar share the unconscious, androcentric worldview that has developed in response to the objective conditions in social life, which is particular in each case, but importantly, universal within the catholic region. Thus the doxic experience and naturalizing of the world as Juan, Lorenzo and Cuellar see and comprehend, it involves the recognition of what Melhus & Stølen referred to as the fixed cultural images in the social consciousness (1996:1). These gendered ideals are naturally reproduced in imagery, popular culture, ordinary talk, and whilst people place themselves within this frame there is still plenty of space for creative, inventional, countercultural and ambiguous meaning to gender performance: In fact the imagery itself represents a multitude of hegemonic masculinities. Archetti (1999) makes a point of this in relation to the construction of social reality and quotes Johnson (1993) on the subject.

We human beings are imaginative creatures... Consequently, our moral understanding depends in large measure on various structures of imagination, such as images, image schemas, metaphors, narratives, and so forth. Moral reasoning is thus basically an imaginative activity, because it uses imaginatively structured concepts and requires imagination to discern what is morally relevant in situations, to understand empathetically how others experience things, and to envision the full range of possibilities open to us in a particular case. (Johnson 1993: ix-x, in Archetti 1999:118)

Archetti's point is that morality is not silent and that it requires compassion, fervour and sense of engagement and that every moral action combines the dimension of obligation and reason with "moral heroism" which Durkheim saw as the moral goals of a society (and actors) that function as objects of desire (1999: 119,117). Solidarity is a key word in this perspective and if we are dealing with hegemonic masculinities these would come to constitute pinpoints in an individual man's potential imagery. Let us concretize by looking at some of the male deeds that are reproduced in the Catholic region:

In chapter four I mentioned Gilmore's tendency towards a cross cultural validity on what he called "an imperative triad for men's morality", in a man's duty to impregnate woman, protect dependents from danger and provision kith and kind

(1990:223). Krohn-Hansen (2001: 54-65) similarly makes a list of five points that summarizes men's categorizations of manhood in the Dominican Republic. These categories, he says, are used to express and reproduce male imagery and conceptualization. The **first** highlights the notion of *valentía* (courage) one which is applicable to San Cristobal as well, for instance among the young surfers and in the story of the male protector. The **second** involve a man's duty to be present in the public space, a notion that is particularly salient in Gilmore's description of Lorenzo in chapter four. Undoubtedly this is a common deed on San Cristobal represented through jokes about men who are trapped inside their home obeying their wives. The **third** notion outlined is the male deeds in his roles as a father and a seducer. The role of the father as a caretaker is definitely applicable to San Cristobal, mainland Ecuador, Guttman's and Brandes' Mexico as in the Dominican Republic. In this thesis we have touched it indirectly through the schoolteachers shared economic worry in the discussion of the election and more concretely in the fisherman's utterance where he said that his main preoccupation is to make sure his children have food to eat. The role of a *mujeriego* (seducer) is equally a well-known male concept reproduced both in imagery and praxis on San Cristobal. Number **four** focuses on the immanent power in a man's ability to speak. This is especially applicable to the realm of politics and we might remember the local men's agreement in crediting the current president with this ability *and* the critic of Noboa's (one of the candidates) lack of the same. The **last point** of conceptual categorization of male deeds treats a man's seriousness and sincerity. This is also especially salient in times of election and can be found in the critique from the president towards his political opponents when he says that they have simply missed the point of issue in important debates. Apparently this works both ways, but Correa have good reasons to respond the criticism directed by journalists that lack sufficient insight on the subject matter when writing about the flaws of governmental projects.

Krohn-Hansen argues that this last criterion of categorization is found in everyday life as a distinction between men and women of *buena o mala fe* (of good or bad faith). His example is a local man's judgment on the issue: "a man that salutes you without

knowing who you are, is a man of good faith, honest and sincere. If he does not salute you he is not completely good. He should give you the attention, that is good faith, if he doesn't salute you, then damn! That man is not entirely a man, he is incomplete" (2001:64, my translation). I have experienced the same throughout my visits to Ecuador and can merely underline what Krohn-Hansen describes. On San Cristobal there is likewise an expected formality in the encounter between men; it is one of decency and mutual respect. Depending on the context this is a guard that is lowered when the sociality has been settled and confidence has increased, but it is nevertheless an attitude that is embodied in the conventional man as to say that he rests his character on formality and seriousness.

With the word *convention* we are back to Melhus & Stølen's question of the possibility to make legitimate comparisons within Latin America. My answer is simply to say "yes" because I have focused on prototypes within the mestizo population where the common sense on Galapagos works in a dialectics with Ecuador, Latin America and the Circum-Mediterranean region and thus make up the cultural system at play. My argument is synthetic in the sense that it downplays the heterogeneity and complexity *within* prototypes of masculinity *in* the mestizo population in correlation with Gilmore who is criticized for excluding contradictions and fragmentation in his focus on "positive aspects" of manhood in hegemonic discourses (Hart 1994:51, in Archetti 1999:113).

My references to the Catholic region imply a notion of consistency that is necessarily open for discussion much like my treatment of prototypes and I agree that the anthropological pursuit of masculinity should account for the internal variety in hegemonic models of masculinity. Archetti says that "The elusive power of moral narratives and public discourses is commonly related to three properties: the claim to objectivity; the claim to universality; ... and the concern for practicality... (1999:120). In this respect the accounts involving the presidential election was touched upon in the introduction, the episode in which an angry mother intervened and in the schoolteacher's discussion of it. In sum they should account for; a plurality of male

attitudes towards it, the internal complexity and inherent paradox of any election, the search and response to male deeds among the candidates and the common concern of practicality i.e. economic consequences, which is distinguishable as the use of reason amid other cognitive components like desire, emotions and imagination. If gender is a potent signifier in discourses, "...a vehicle through which morality speaks..." (Melhuus & Stølen 1996: 23), the political realm is no exception to this, but the expressed morality would be entangled to its context, situation and social time and thus the possibility of analysis can never be complete, but much more a tentative step towards an understanding.

The humanistic point in treating the multiplicity of meaning in cultural variation does stand for itself, but as with the distinction of the particular and the universal, the variation is equally connected to the prototypical and should thus be comprehended as a complementary and necessary account. It is in the tension, suspension and friction between fundamental oppositions (like masc. and fem.), between prototypes and variation, between the particular and the universal, imagery and praxis, coherency and fragmentation that *meaning* is created and reproduced.

Galapagos is a place in the world, but it is also a situation and I have stressed that it should be conceived of as a process, much like the dialectic perspective in treating masculinity between praxis and imagery. There is a lot to be said about Galapagos in its current situation, but I think the notion of *tranquilidad* is especially salient for San Cristobal and Isabela. As we saw in the episode from the restaurant in the collective reaction and condemnation of violence, it is reasonable to think that tranquility is an idiom that mirrors back on a fundamental value of security and harmony in family life and to the individual's psychic tranquility that balance the masculine expectations.

Tranquility as in harmony is constantly challenged and it will continue to be an important buffer for the local population on the level of society in its encounter with modernity and on the level of masculinity in its dialectics with imagery and praxis.

We started this thesis with a quote from Melville and we will end it with another quote from him which should have its analogies in the above written and far beyond:

*Consider all this; and then turn to this green, gentle, and most docile earth; consider them both, the sea and the land; and do you not find a strange analogy to something in yourself? For as this appalling ocean surrounds the verdant land, so in the soul of a man there lies one insular Tahiti, full of peace and joy, but encompassed by all the horrors of the half known life. God keep thee! Push not off from that isle, thou canst never return!*  
(Melville 1947: 261)



# Appendix 1

## Some emic expression as categorizations of men in Galapagos

All of these expressions induce their own prototype in the imagery of a random man on San Cristobal and far beyond:

- *Macho, machista (esta macho)* – emphasis on known masculine attributes, also used to denounce the masculine character of things; *este ají esta macho* (this chilly is macho)
- *Maricon, marica, menestra* – gay, emphasis on feminine attributes (lack of masculinity), *maricon* and *marica* can also be used friendly as dude, mate or pal, *menestra* is literally translated “bean stew”, but equally have the emic meaning; gay
- *Machona* – a man who does not know or do not do women’s work (cooking, cleaning etc.)
- *Mandarina* – literally; mandarin, emically; a man who is dominated by his woman (wife)
- *Malcriado* – literally; bad raised, emically; irresponsible, rebellious, children who act in opposition to parents norms are *malcriado*
- *Profesor, maestro, licenciado* – literally; teacher, emically; expressions used to entitle men with brief education, not necessarily teachers
- *Una bestia* – literally, a beast, emically; very much used notion to either indicate a man’s bad manners or positively to indicate and emphasize a man’s ability
- *Loco* – literally; crazy, emically; either the crazy, silly, mad and irresponsible character in a man or; to emphasize the man’s enthusiasm towards something (a girl, an issue, food/drink). *Loco* is also used to mean mate, dude, pal etc.

- ***Hijo de puta*** – literally; son of a whore, emically; pejoratively as emphasizing a negative attitude, moral etc., positively as emphasizing a man’s ability to do something
- ***Una verga*** – literally; a penis/cock, emically; to say of a man that he is very bad at what he is doing. It is also used in the same way as English speakers say “go to hell” or “to hell with you”; *andate a la verga* (get the hell out of here)
- ***Sapo*** – literally; frog, emically; a man that is too curious about things, one that cannot keep secrets, but creates gossip
- ***Sopa*** – literally; soup, emically; a man that has feminine qualities, a man that goes home early from the bar etc.
- ***Duro*** – literally; hard, emically; a man that has a strong moral character, a stoic, a man that works hard to achieve something
- ***Flojo*** – literally; loose, slack, emically; the opposite of hard, a man who does not put an effort into his activities
- ***Vendido/pagado*** – literally; sold/paid, emically; corrupt, a man who sells out or pays to achieve something on his own
- ***Recto*** – literally: straight, honest, emically; a man who is to be trusted, a man with a firm moral character

## Bibliography

**Aarnes, Asbjørn & Salomonsen, Helge ed.** *Tanke og mistanke*. Oslo, Aventura Forlag, 1987.

**Adoum, Jorge Enrique.** *Ecuador: Senas Particulares*. 6th ed. Quito: Eskeletra Editorial, 2000 (1997)

**Appadurai, Arjun.** "Ch. 9: *The Production of Locality*" in *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. University of Minnesota Press, (p.178-199), 1996.

**Archetti, Eduardo P.** *Masculinities; Football, Polo and Tango in Argentina*. Edited by Bruce Kapferer and James Cook, *Global Issues*. Oxford, New York: Berg, 1999.

**Beneke, Timothy.** *Proving Manhood*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1997

**Bock, Phillip K.** *The Importance of Erwing Goffman to Psychological Anthropology*. In *Ethos*. Journal of the Society for Psychological Anthropology 16 (1), (p. 3-20), 1988.

**Bourdieu, Pierre.** *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice: Cambridge University Press, 1977a

**Bourdieu, Pierre.** *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice: Harvard University Press and Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1984

**Bourdieu, Pierre.** *The Logic of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice: Stanford University Press, 1990a.

**Bourdieu, Pierre.** *Masculine Domination*. Translated by Richard Nice: Polity Press, 2001

**Brandes, Stanley.** *Metaphors of Masculinity – Sex and Status in Andalusian Folklore.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980

**Brandes, Stanley.** *Staying Sober in Mexico City.* Austin: The University of Texas Press, 2002.

**Brøgger, Jan.** *Forsvarstale for Mannen.* Oslo: N.W.Damm & Søn A.S, 1995

**Charvet, Erika Silva.** *Identidad nacional y poder.* Second ed. Quito, Abya Yala, 2004.

**Chase, Richard, ed.** *Herman Melville - Selected Tales & Poems.* 16th ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966

**Darwin, Charles.** *The origin of species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life.* London: John Murray. 6th edition; with additions and corrections, 1872 (1876)

**Fabian, Johannes.** *Time and the Other – How Anthropology makes its Object.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

**Foucault, Michel.** *The Archeology of Knowledge.* London, New York: Routledge, 2006 (1969)

**Foucault, Michel.** *Diskursens Ordning – Installationsforelasning vid College de France den 2 December 1970.* Translated by Mats Rosengren. Stockholm/Stehag: Brutus Ostlings Bokforlag Symposion, 1993 (1971)

**Foucault, Michel.** *The will to knowledge. The history of sexuality: Volum 1.* Translated by Robert Hurley. London, Penguin Books, 1998 (1979)

**Geertz, Clifford.** *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books, 1973

**Geertz, Clifford.** *Local Knowledge.* 2000 ed: Basic Books, 1983

**Gilmore, David D.** *Manhood in the Making - Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1990

**Goffman, Erwing.** *Vårt Rollespill Til Daglig - En Studie I Hverdagslivets Dramatikk*. Translated by Kari og Kjell Risvik. Oslo: Pax Forlag, 1992 (1959)

**Gregor, Thomas.** *Anxious Pleasures - the Sexual Lives of an Amazonian People*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1985.

**Guevara, Enrique Freire.** *Archipelago del Llanto*. Quito: Casa de la Cultura "Benjamin Carrion", 1999.

**Guribye, Eugene.** *The last paradise: Man-animal relationships on Galapagos*. Hovedoppgave i sosialantropologi, Universitetet i Bergen, 2000

**Gutmann, Matthew C.** *The Meanings of Macho – Being a Man in Mexico City*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1996.

**Hastrup, Kirsten.** *A passage to Anthropology. Between Experience and Theory*. London, Routledge, 1995

**Herzfeld, Michael.** *The Poetics of Manhood: Contest and Identity in a Creatan Mountain Village*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1985b

**Johnson, George Lakoff and Mark.** *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980

**Knauff, Bruce M.** *Genealogies for the present in Cultural Anthropology*. London, New York: Routledge, 1996

- Koepping, Klaus-Peter.** *Adolf Bastian and the psychic unity of mankind: The Foundations of Anthropology in Nineteenth century Germany.* The University of Queensland Press, 1983
- Krohn-Hansen, Christian.** *Det vanskelige voldsbegrepet – Politisk liv i Den dominikanske republikk og andre steder.* Oslo: Pax Forlag, 2001
- Lakoff, George.** *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987
- LaTorre, Octavio.** *La Maldicion De La Tortuga - Historias Tragicas De Las Islas Galapagos.* 5th ed. Quito: Arte Graficas Senal, Impresenal Cia. Ltda., 2006
- Llosa, Mario Vargas.** *Los Cachorros.* 13th ed. Madrid: Ediciones Catedra, 2007 (1982)
- Melhuus, Kirsti Anne Stølen and Marit ed.** *Machos, Mistresses, Madonnas – Contesting Power of Latin American Gender Imagery.* London, New York: Verso (New Left Books), 1996.
- Melville, Herman.** *Moby Dick.* Edited by Willard Thorp. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947 (1851)
- Moore, Henrietta L.** *A passion for difference.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994
- Moore, Henrietta L., ed.** *Anthropological Theory Today.* Oxford: Polity Press, 1999
- Ortner, Sherry B.,** *On Key Symbols.* In *American Anthropologist.* Journal of the American Anthropological Association 75 (11) (p.1338-1346), 1973
- Pareja, Miguel Donoso.** *Ecuador: Identidad o Esquizofrenia.* Third ed. Quito, Eskeletra Editorial, 2004.

**Peralta, Cecilia Falconi and Pablo Ospina ed.** *Galapagos - Migraciones, Economia, Cultura, Conflictos Y Acuerdos*. Edited by Biblioteca de Ciencias Sociales. Quito: Corporacion Editora Nacional, 2007.

**Peralta, Pablo Ospina.** *Galapagos, Naturaleza Y Sociedad - Actores Sociales Y Conflictos Ambientales En Las Islas Galapagos*. Edited by Biblioteca de Ciencias Sociales. Quito: Corporacion Editora Nacional, 2006

**Sanchez, Luisa Rodriguez Villouta and Jorge Nuñez, ed.** *Enciclopedia de las provincias del Ecuador – "Galapagos"*. Quito: Cientifica Latina Editores, 1983.

**Schackt, Jon.** *Mayahood Through Beauty: Indian Beauty Pageants in Guatemala*. In *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, Vol.24 (3), (p. 269-87), 2005

**Scheper-Hughes, Nancy.** *Saints, Scholars and Schizophrenics - Mental Illness in Rural Ireland*. Twentieth Anniversary Edition ed. Berkley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2001 (1977)

**Turner, George Lakoff and Mark.** *More Than Cool Reason - A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1989

**Valdano, Juan.** *Identidad y Formas de lo Ecuatoriano*. Sixth ed. Quito, Eskeletra Editorial, 2007 (2005)

**Wade, Peter.** *Race and Sex in Latin America*. New York: Pluto Press, 2009

**Wagner, Roy.** *The Invention of Culture – Revised and Expanded Edition*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1981 (1975)

**Wikan, Unni.** *Beyond the Words: The Power of Resonance*. In *American Ethnologist*. A *Journal of the American Anthropological Association* 19 (3), (p. 460-482), 1992.

**Wittgenstein, Ludvig.** *Filosofiske undersøkelser.* Translated by Mikkel B. Tin: Oslo, Pax  
Forlag, 1997 (1953)



