

MASCULINITIES VISUALIZED: AN ANALYSIS OF CHATROULETTE AS A HOMOSOCIAL VIRTUAL MEDIUM

By
Melis Umut

*Submitted to
Central European University
Department of Gender Studies*

In partial fulfillment for the degree of Master of Arts in Gender Studies.

Supervisor: Anna Loutfi

Budapest, Hungary
2010

Abstract

This thesis is an analysis of a certain type of masculinity; masculinity performed on Chatroulette, a virtual medium connecting random people for web-cam based conversations. The users contribute to the website in various ways. This study focuses on the specific Chatroulette user who turns the chat session into a performance of masturbation. Accentuating on the neo-onanist as I coin it and Chatroulette as a contemporary homosocial medium, the thesis attempts to reveal the ways of representing and validating masculinities generated by the medium in question.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1: CHATROULETTE AS A VIRTUAL MEDIUM FOR THE NEO-ONANISTS	5
A BRIEF HISTORY OF MASTURBATION.....	6
1.2. THE EMERGENCE OF THE NEO-ONANIST	11
CHAPTER 2. CHATROULETTE AS A HOMOSOCIAL VIRTUAL MEDIUM	17
2.1. COMMODIFICATION AND ALIENATION OF THE MALE BODIES ON CHATROULETTE	17
2.2. THE NEO-ONANIST AS THE EXHIBITIONIST AND NARCISSIST.....	25
2.3. CHATROULETTE AS THE CYBER GENTLEMEN’S CLUB	29
CHAPTER 3. CHATROULETTE AS A SOCIO-TECHNOLOGICAL NETWORK	38
3.1. INTERNET AS A GENERATOR OF MULTIPLE IDENTITIES AND SEXUALITIES	38
3.2 CHATROULETTE AS A SOCIO-TECHNOLOGICAL NETWORK.....	43
CONCLUSION	48
BIBLIOGRAPHY	50

INTRODUCTION

Chatroulette, Internet's new phenomenon, is a website that connects random users for web-cam conversations. It was created by a 17 years old Russian high school student, Andrey Ternovskiy, in November 2009. After a short period of its launching, it has gained the attraction of media and the 500 average visitors per day have risen to 50.000 visitors the next month. The number of users by February 2010 rose to 1.000.000 new visitor per day and 30.000.000 unique visitors per month as stated by the creator of the website, Ternovskiy (Bilton, 2010). What is most attractive about the website is its user friendly interface and the easiness it promises to the visitor. By a mere click of the next game button, the visitor is connected to a random stranger and if s / he does not like what s / he sees, repetition of the very act will connect her / him to someone new.

My project is prompted by my personal experiments on Chatroulette. My data of analysis will also include a statistics of Chatroulette conducted by Robert J. Moore (Moore, 2010). He has created the Chatroulette Map using RJMetrics Dashboard¹ in which he analyzes Chatroulette users based on the categories of gender, age, location, and “perverse”² behavior. I will also consider how Chatroulette has been represented in mass

¹ RJMetrics is a Business Intelligence Dashboard for database-driven websites. It enables the customers to monitor and analyze key metrics and performance of the website. The Chatroulette Map was generated by Robert J. Moore, the CEO and the co-founder of RJMetrics (Moore, 2010).

² I am using the original term “pervert”, used in Moore’s analysis. What “pervert” means in this analysis will be explained in the first chapter.

media, including prestigious newspapers and magazines, such as the NY Times and the Guardian articles and the TV shows like the *South Park* episode *You Have 0 Friends*, broadcasted on 04.07.2010, which satirized virtual mediums including Facebook and Chatroulette. I will also investigate Chatroulette related videos on *Youtube* and websites that are launched to represent the most shocking activities on Chatroulette. The recent media fascination with Chatroulette has incited me to investigate the ongoing debates about Chatroulette on an academic level, and devote this thesis to the subject.

This thesis seeks to find out how masculinities are expressed, performed, and legitimized on Chatroulette and why men use this virtual medium as a mediator to validate their masculinities. As the statistics conducted by Moore reveal, Chatroulette is a male dominated website as 89% of the users are males. Also, according to the statistics, Chatroulette users are mostly from Western countries (Moore, 2010). Therefore, the thesis will focus on the purportedly “Western” masculinities generated by and represented on this website.

Masculinity studies have emerged as a product of and reaction to feminist theory due to the neglect of men in feminist scholarship. It has been a proliferating area of study starting from the 1990s (Whitehead & Barrett, 2001, p. 112). Masculinity studies have enabled the deconstruction of the understanding of masculinity as “timeless and universal” by introducing the pluralistic understanding of *masculinities* (see Brittan, 2001; Kimmel, 2001). It is not my aim to enter the debates initiated by masculinity studies or investigate certain masculinity types and adopt them to the analysis of the Chatroulette persona (see Connell, 2001, for discussion for the debates in masculinity studies). My attempt is to provide a reading of a certain and contemporary type of masculinity, “Chatroulette masculinity” via the related kinds of representations and

behavior patterns acted on Chatroulette. The main aim of this thesis is to explore how masculinities are validated and demonstrated through the mechanisms of representation Chatroulette offers its users.

Chapter 1 looks at the representations of male masturbation on Chatroulette. A brief historical investigation of masturbation, will be followed by the introduction of the concept of the neo-onanist, derived from the Foucauldian onanist, a product of the late 18th Century (Foucault, 1997). The neo-onanist no longer plainly seeks to reach orgasm, which is the sole aim of onania itself, but derives his pleasure from his exhibitionism on Chatroulette.

Chapter 2 will engage the Marxian understanding of commodification and alienation of the (male) body, followed by how (masculine) exhibitionist and narcissistic pleasures are generated by Chatroulette. I will give an account of the Freudian and Lacanian understandings of ego formation (Freud, 2000; Lacan, 1977). Then I will move on to a discussion of Chatroulette as a homosocial space. Homosociality is strongly linked to “hegemonic masculinity” which represents “a man *in* power, a man *with* power, and a man *of* power” (Kimmel, 2001, p. 272; italics in original). Masculinity, in order to claim its relationship to constructed understanding of “hegemonic masculinity” necessitates the homosocial enactment (Kimmel, 2001, p. 275). Chatroulette serves for this penchant via several mechanisms; the commodification of women’s bodies and an exchange of women’s representations (see Irigaray, 1985), male-to-male conversations and behavior. The link between the commodification and alienation of the (male) body, and the enactment of homosociality to understand why some men become the neo-onanists will be the scope of this chapter.

Chapter 3 will start with how the Internet generates a multitude of identities

focusing on similar virtual mediums including IRC and CU-SeeMe. The last part will introduce a more radical understanding of the neo-onanist as a fractured identity, following Donna Haraway and Bruno Latour's radical stance against nature / culture and public / private distinctions which, according to them, are the non-innocent products of modernity (Haraway, 1991; Latour, 1993). The suggested reconstruction of this distinction will guide me for a possible reading of how men can behave as they do on Chatroulette.

CHAPTER 1: CHATROULETTE AS A VIRTUAL MEDIUM FOR THE NEO-ONANISTS

The Guardian reporter Zoe Williams (2010) found out that the “odds of onanism online” is one in ten on Chatroulette because, during her experience on the website, one in ten random partners were masturbating in front of the cam. This is not overestimation, if not underestimation, as the experiment I conducted with Chatroulette presented me a masturbator one in three pairings.³ According to the statistics conducted by Robert J. Moore (2010) using RJMetrics Dashboard, 72% of Chatroulette users were solo males while only 9% of the users consisted of solo females. About %70 of the users were in their 20s and 30s. The diversity of location of the Chatroulette users is significant as Chatroulette is mostly popular among USA, France, Canada, Germany, and UK all of which are developed capitalist countries.⁴ This fact has incited me to look at how alienation and commodification, two of the most significant aspects of capitalism as asserted by Marx (1844), is carried out on Chatroulette which I will analyze in Chapter 2.

According to the Chatroulette Map (2010), the overall “pervert” rate is 13%. The

³ I have conducted approximately 1000 experiments and the users who masturbated or revealed his genitalia I have encountered is approximately 300. The episode of *South Park* broadcasted on 7 April 2010 lampoons this very fact. In the episode, Cartman attempts to find a friend for Kyle on Chatroulette and comes to conclude that “That's the way the world works. If you want to find some quality friends, you can wade through all the dicks first.”

⁴ According to the statistics conducted by Moore (2010), 47% of the Chatroulette users measured were from the US. France follows US with a sharing of 15%. The other countries enlisted include Canada, Germany, UK, and Turkey, all of which shelters approximately 5% of the overall users.

criteria to be labeled as “perverts” on Chatroulette is as follows:

- Appear to not be wearing any clothes whatsoever
- Are displaying explicit nudity
- Appear to be committing a lewd act.

Only 8% of those who are labeled as “perverts” are females. Also, one of the general tendencies of the male Chatroulette users is to show a sign to request for female nudity which is also categorized under the “pervert” label. This act, as the statistics tell us, is as twice as likely to encounter than the actual female nudity. In most of my encounters, the cam was fixed on the genital parts of the body, in some of them, the user pointed his penis towards the cam, while in others, the user represented it from side view. There was only one case in which the masturbating user revealed his face to me. The others were reluctant to show their faces.

This chapter will look at the perception and representation of masturbation in the 21st Century regarding how Chatroulette reconstructs a virtual medium for the act of masturbation. First, I will present a brief historical look into masturbation and will move onto Foucauldian understanding of the masturbation and the onanist. I will attempt to theorize the neo-onanist which is different than the Foucauldian onanist in terms of value attached to masturbation as what the onanist, in his *solitary* activity, seeks is to reach orgasm, for the neo-onanist, the longed-for desire shifts from orgasm to exhibitionist pleasure.

1.1. A Brief History of Masturbation

This practice is so frequent, and so crying an offence, especially among the male youth of this nation, that I have reason to imagine, a great many offenders would never have been guilty of it, if they had been thoroughly acquainted with the heinousness of the crime, and the sad consequences to the body as well as the soul, which may, and often do ensue upon it (“Onania”, 1986).

The above quotation belongs to the anonymous book first published in 1710 which has been perceived as the initiator for problematizing and medicalizing masturbation (see Laqueur, 2004). This is challenged in Bennett and Rosario’s book *Solitary Pleasures* (1995). According to them, it was the Middle Ages that masturbation started to be seen as a self-polluting act and a sin against nature. It is the Biblical understanding that bestows guilt on the act of “spilling of seed” without a sexual intercourse that aims for procreation (p. 2). One of the debatable issues arises how female masturbation is considered as “spilling of seed” is an account of male sexuality.⁵ However, it is beyond the scope of this thesis as I do not attempt to analyze female “perverse” behavior on Chatroulette which, according to the Chatroulette Map (Moore, 2010), only embraces the 8% of the “perverts” on the website. Nevertheless, I should add that, in my personal experience, I

⁵ The word “onanism” refers to “coitus interreptus”, in other words “pull-out method”, which is the very act of men’s taking out his penis of the woman’s vagina prior to ejaculation to prevent pregnancy. The roots of the term come from the Biblical Book of Genesis in which Onan, who is enforced to have sexual intercourse with his dead brother’s wife, has rejected the order by the God to impregnate her and spilled his seed upon the ground after the intercourse. After his disobedience, he was killed by the God and the new sin, onanism, was born (Laqueur, 2004, p. 15). The new sin affected people regardless of gender. However, despite the common wrong usage, the word *onanist*, is used to refer to male masturbators.

have only encountered females who are nude or in the act of getting nude without any sign of masturbation or further sexual activity on Chatroulette.

Thomas W. Laqueur, in his comprehensive analysis of the history of masturbation in *Solitary Sex: A Cultural History of Masturbation* (2004), presents a profound historical analysis of masturbation starting from the Classical Antiquity. However, he focuses on the Enlightenment which, in his point of view, has stamped the birth of modern masturbation. He, following Foucauldian understanding of the onanist which will be discussed later in this chapter, also focuses on the problematization of masturbation in the 18th Century. For him, the first rupture occurred with the publication of the aforementioned anonymous work *Onania; or the Heinous Sin of Self Pollution* in 1712 which constructed a new pathology, the onania. He posits several reasons to explain how the perception of masturbation as unnatural had emerged. First of all, masturbation was seen as private and secret, without any social value. Secondly, it, unlike sex with a real flesh and blood person, was perceived as a phantasm. Lastly, it was regarded impossible to moderate or sate the urge of masturbation unlike other appetites (see pp. 185-245).

According to Laqueur, the first intervention to this pathological understanding of masturbation came from Freud and his successors who pointed to the fact that masturbation constituted the essential aspect of sublimation and civilization (p. 396) which was followed by the re-structuring and re-theorization of masturbation throughout the 20th century. Especially, The Sexual Revolution⁶ has played a significant role

⁶ The Sexual Revolution is considered to be a socio-political movement in the 1960s, affected by the Western feminist thought. The time witnessed a culmination of discourses, publications, and speeches

regarding the perception of masturbation. In his own words:

Beginning in the 1970s, solitary sex was regarded as a way of reclaiming the self from the regulatory mechanisms of civil society and of the patriarchal sexual order into which the Enlightenment and its successors had put it. It became a sign of *self*-governance and *self*-control instead of their collapse. The history of masturbation is thus the history of the imagination, solitude and secrecy, private and public, excess, addiction, and control in different stages of our developing an individual sexual ethics once it could no longer be found in religion or an organic social order. (p. 277; italics in original).

It was the post-1960s, in his point of view, that has witnessed a turning point for the understanding of masturbation. The “universal secret” has gained radically a new use fueled by the feminist movement and the gay movement. One of the breakthroughs of the decade was the publication of books and articles that sought for the liberation of sexuality including *The Sensuous Woman* (1969), *Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm* (1970), and *Liberating Masturbation* (1974), all of which accentuated on the liberation of female sexuality and masturbation.

In the same period, masturbation also became an artistic expression as numerous avant-garde artists including Vito Acconci's 1972 performance *Seedbed* where he lay hidden underneath a gallery-wide ramp installed at the Sonnabend Gallery, masturbating while vocalizing into a loudspeaker his fantasies about the visitors walking above him on the ramp (pp. 397-404). The emergence of the representation of masturbation was no

seeking for sexual liberation, especially for women. One of the perceived triggers for this “revolution” was the development of contraception pills which which widened the gap between sexuality for pleasure and procreation (see Allyn, 2000 & Escoffier, 2003, for further discussion).

coincidence for the decade, as mentioned, started to see the proliferating values of masturbation. Laqueur defines his statement in this way:

For the first time in human history, masturbation was embraced as a mode of liberation, a claim to autonomy, to pleasure for its own sake, an escape from the socially prescribed path toward normal adulthood. It went from being the deviant sexuality of the wrong kind of social order to being the foundational sexuality of new sorts of imagined communities, the basis of a new covenant – or lack thereof – between self and other. Far more than free love, free masturbation came to carry new aspirations for alternative constellations “of bodies and pleasures.” And of course, such views elicited their opposite: masturbation as selfish, purposeless, meaningless, destructive of human relations, a representation of commercial excess, and much more (p. 397).

The two contradictory views of masturbation asserted by Laqueur, one that regarded it as liberating and the other as destructive and harmful, was followed by another rising discourse; masturbation, or sex in general, as a scientific discourse claiming itself as the truth posited by Michel Foucault. In *History of Sexuality* (1990), originally published in 1978, Foucault theorizes this as:

“Sexuality”: the correlative of that slowly developed discursive practice which constitutes the *scientia sexualis*. The essential features of this sexuality are not the expression of a representation that is more or less distorted by ideology, or of a misunderstanding caused by taboos; they correspond to the functional requirements of a discourse that must produce its truth (p. 68).

He states that the science of sexuality or sexuality as discourse has created the urge to confess about sexuality because it is in the “confession that truth and sex are joined” (p.

61). This confession mechanism is realized via myriad mechanism such as the Catholic Church, judicial system, familial and amorous relationships, and psychoanalysis as a modern construction that stems from the confession of the individual (pp. 58-62). These three different discourses; sexuality as liberation, as destruction, and as truth have been the prominent debates regarding masturbation starting from the 1970s.

I want to accentuate on a significant similarity regarding the two aforementioned books; *Solitary Pleasures* (1995) and *Solitary Sex* (2004). Both of the books, also the Foucauldian understanding of onania which will be analyzed in the subsequent part, regard the act of masturbation and desire derived from it as “solitary”. However, the concept of masturbation on Chatroulette I argue on this thesis is not solitary but rather it necessitates other participants most of whom, however, are unwilling to do so. The act of online masturbation and Chatroulette masturbator / onanist I am analyzing, as will be argued throughout this chapter, challenges the traditional perception and understanding of masturbation. This, the new type of masturbation on Chatroulette as a communal act, enables me to introduce the concept of the “neo-onanist”.

1.2. The Emergence of the Neo-Onanist

Michel Foucault (1997) sees the rise of “abnormality” not as an unfortunate and random phase but as a period formed in accordance with the institutions of control which has shifted the perception of “abnormality” as disruptive of the “normal” to a category that is controlled by the “normal”. This shift has occurred gradually as it paved to the emergence of three types of “abnormals”: the “human monster”, the “individual to be

corrected”, and the “onanist”⁷, respectively. The “human monster”, the first to appear among the “abnormals”, is the combination of the impossible and the forbidden whose frame of reference is law. It is the perceived potential threat to perturb the juridical regularities that makes a monster a monster which comes as a half-human and half-animal being, or a hermaphrodite. The next abnormal figure emerged was a more tame figure, the “individual to be corrected” or the “incorrigible” as he also put it. No longer perceived as a sole threat to the law, this new figure was seen as a threat to the new disciplinary techniques imposed by the army, the schools, the workshops, and the families of the incorrigible individual (pp. 51-53).

The latest figure to emerge, as part of the “construction of a general theory of “degeneration”” in the late 18th Century was the “onanist”, though having a long prehistory, coincided with the new familiar relationships with the child and the new emphasis put on the health and importance of the body, the newly constructed webs of bio-power. All these developments have led to the sexualization of the child's body. The scapegoat for the little everyday anomalies was no longer the constructed monster or the rebellious incorrigible but the innocent child, himself, as every child began to be presented as a potential threat to the society which also brought the families under scrutiny. Power was no longer solely deployed by the macro institutions, such as the church or juridical mechanisms but family became the new disciplinary status (pp. 53-55).

Masturbation on Chatroulette, in the 21st century, is no longer a universal

⁷ Both Foucault (1997) and Laqueur (2004) provide a historical analysis of the act of onania. However, Laqueur criticises Foucault's state-centric explanation which disregards the role of the civil society for the pathologization of masturbation in the 18th Century (Laqueur, 2004, p. 277).

secret, the stigma attributed to the infantile sexuality but has become the worldwide knowledge that enables the masturbators to represent and share their *dirty little secrets* on a global level. The onanist is no longer the little child, guilty of his solitary sexual pleasure, who has to live in the closet but an oxymoronic one as this is the closet every man is blamed to belong to. The neo-onanist⁸, the term I adopted to differentiate the 21st century from the Foucauldian onanist, can be anyone with an Internet connection and a webcam. It might be your boss, your teacher, your friend, your lover, or your husband who has *dirty little secrets* which he likes to hide from you but wants to share on a global level.

Chatroulette reconstructs the act of masturbation as the very act loses its solitary aim. No longer is the self-satisfaction, orgasm, the sole aim of the onanist, but his pleasure comes from his exhibitionism, his disclosure of what normally constitutes his private life to the public. The onanist does not try to boost his ratings but rather being “nexted” is his achievement because it signifies his perturbative contribution to the society which serves for his onanist pleasure. Also, as stated by *New York Magazine* reporter Sam Anderson (2010), it is very likely that the masturbator will click the “next” button one-handedly before his pairing will do so. In this contest of who will “next” the

⁸ I do not suggest a separate category of the neo-onanist similar to the Foucauldian categorization of the onanist. He suggests that the onanist is a universal figure on the basis of the attributed universal sexuality of children which he suggests has been one of the building stones of the theorization of degeneration. The neo-onanist, as I coin it, is the masturbating Chatroulette user. He adopts his identity solely on Chatroulette, between the two “next” clicks. Therefore, unlike the onanist, he does not possess a coherent and a universal identity but a “fractured identity” in Donna Haraway’s understanding (see Chapter 3).

other, orgasm gains a secondary purpose, or to put it more radically, masturbation and orgasm are separated from each other during this ongoing voyeuristic masturbation carnival on Chatroulette.⁹ It might be suggested that orgasm becomes an obstacle to achieve the intended pleasure, the pleasure gained by exhibitionism, because it will interrupt this performance of cyber masturbation for a certain period of time until the next erection is achieved.

Robert Muchembled's *Orgasm and the West: A History of Pleasure from the Sixteenth Century to the Present* (2008) looks at how the understanding of orgasm has changed in different time phrases which shows a similarity with the history of masturbation (see Laqueur, 2003). However, Muchembled contrasts with Foucault by positing that it was much earlier, the 16th century that saw the initiation of the repression of sexuality. Nevertheless, he also claims that it was the 1960s, initiated by the Sexual Revolution that this repression started to fade, though in a limited way. What I find most significant for this thesis in his book is his conclusion chapter, *The Narcissistic Society*. Referring to Christopher Lasch's book *The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations* (1978), he posits that the narcissistic society is a characteristic of a society which has lost its interest in the future. This kind of society, for Lasch, shows the qualities of people having midlife crisis who, while seeking eternal youth, no longer cares for reproducing themselves (Lasch, 1978, cited in Muchembled, 2005, p. 253). I will elaborate on Chatroulette as a generator of narcissism in the second chapter. However, I should indicate that narcissism, very simply defined as overly

⁹ I should indicate that I have not witnessed or encountered anyone claiming that s / he has witnessed an ejaculation on Chatroulette. What I have generally encountered is an ongoing masturbatory act.

preoccupation of the individual with the self, oscillates between love and hatred the individual feels towards her / himself (see Chapter 2). These opposite feelings generated by Chatroulette might be one of the reasons for orgasm to lose significance because the neo-onanists are similar to the people, I intentionally widen it to men only, facing the midlife crisis who are claiming their masculinities via exaggerated behavior. The neo-onanist wants to validate his masculinity in a similarly exaggerated way, by disclosing his penis on a global medium.

Muchembled concludes his book by the following sentences:

Never have the people of the West been so powerfully oriented and determined by their group as at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Individualism appears to triumph, but individuals are doomed by the laws of the economic market and the tyranny of the orgasm to become athletes in personal success, constantly required to demonstrate to others that they can do even better.....The perpetual renegotiation of the communal bond, stratagem of a dynamic and inventive culture, now means that we all have to take account of the best-kept secret since the origins of Christian civilization: the pleasure we call carnal (pp. 257-258).

“The pleasure we call carnal” is witnessing its most visible period due the Internet. Not only pornography (see Chapter 2 for further discussion on pornography), but also the Internet has become a personal guide for people’s sexual lives. The neo-onanist, as an Internet user, is most likely to encounter with the myriad spam mails and ads suggesting for the enhancement of sexuality, penis enlargement, and longlasting orgasms everyday. Internet, as claiming itself as knowing the “truth of sex”, generating a new discourse of sexuality which accentuates on sexuality as a personal achievement, has become a powerful and affective medium for people’s sexual lives. Presumably overexhausted with

the glut of sexual advices, the neo-onanist adopts this new type of identity and masculinity as a neo-onanist that attains its power via representation. If it is the Internet, that attempts to penetrate into his sexual life by sending these presumably unwanted messages, he, as a counter-reaction, penetrates into the Internet by masturbating towards the screen.¹⁰ It might be read as a reactionary behavior to reclaim his masculinity which, by the Internet, will face a threat, a sort of crisis, if he refuses to buy the products and obey the advices. Disclosing his penis on Chatroulette also becomes a global announcement that the neo-onanist does not need a “penis enlargement”. There is also a reactionary behavior against (cyber) pornography adopted by the neo-onanists which will be analyzed in Chapter 2.

¹⁰ Here, I use the word “Internet” metanomically. It refers to spam mail senders and, in the case of the neo-onanist penetrating, to Internet claiming itself an authoritative power over the individual’s personal life.

CHAPTER 2. CHATROULETTE AS A HOMOSOCIAL VIRTUAL MEDIUM

Chatroulette enables the users to change the glut of human representations that appear on the screen, like a “human shuffle” (Anderson, 2010). The body, no longer the property of the individual, becomes a public commodity on Chatroulette. The reflection of the Chatroulette user travels the globe, while, at the same time, enabling the user to gaze at her / himself on the screen as an alienated image of her / himself. This chapter aims to scrutinize how the commodification and alienation of male bodies, masculine desire and sex enters a new phase by Chatroulette. The main target of the chapter is to reveal how, in Marxian terms, the alienation of the body is *willfully* embodied by the Chatroulette users, turning the medium into a facilitator of homosocial encounters. I have already suggested the emergence of a new type of person, the neo-onanist, on Chatroulette. This chapter will look at how the representation and enactment of sexuality has been changed, nourished by the emergence of the neo-onanist who adopts a narcissist and exhibitionist masculinity. The analysis will move on to the discussion of Chatroulette as a homosocial virtual medium, a possible Cyber Gentlemen’s Club.

2.1. *Commodification and Alienation of the Male Bodies on Chatroulette*

Commodification of the body, in Marxian understanding, is a significant part of the capitalist mode of production (Marx, 1988). Even though Marx did not focus on the body itself, his theory of labor and commodity includes changes on bodily practices.

According to Marx, disciplining of labor power was also the disciplining of the body itself. Inside of the production, bodies and their physical needs had to be organized according to the needs of the industrial production.

Capitalism owes its existence to the division of labor. It means that the nature of work and the workload of the workers under capitalist production is meticulously measured by the factory owners so that the workers will maintain the best possible outcome to the factory. This results in the commodification of the worker as well as the work itself. There is an indirect proportion between the value of the worker and the work produced by her / him. As the worker produces more, her / his value decreases due to the increasing alienation of the object. The relation between the devaluation of the worker and the increasing value of the products results in the objectification of labor and alienation of the worker. As Marx puts it:

... the object which labor produces – labor’s product – confronts it as *something alien*, as a *power independent* of the producer. The product of labor is labor which has been embodied in an object, which has become material: it is the *objectification* of labor. Labor's realization is its objectification. Under these economic conditions this realization of labor appears as *loss of realization* for the workers; objectification as *loss of the object and bondage to it*; appropriation as *estrangement*, as *alienation* (p. 71; italics in original).

The reason of alienation is that the labor produced by the worker becomes a product external to her / him and does not belong to her / his essential being. This creates a duality as the worker feels as her / himself outside work and while working, s / he becomes alienated to her / himself. The perception of labor as belonging to someone else rather than the producer results in the “loss of his self” (p. 74). The result, in Marxian

sense, is drastic:

As a result, therefore, man (the worker) no longer feels himself to be freely active in any but his animal functions – eating, drinking, procreating, or at most in his dwelling and in dressing-up, etc.; and in his human functions he no longer feels himself to be anything but an animal. What is animal becomes human and what is human becomes animal (p. 74).

This enforced separation results in the man's turning from his species-life as it is via the production the man comes to claim himself to be a species-being. It also affects his relationship with other men as what he produces, labor, become someone else's pleasure. Thus, he is doubly alienated; alienated from himself and from the other men; resulting in a total alienation of his species-being (pp. 78-79).

Capitalism not only takes away the labor from the man but, also, takes his own body. In capitalist societies, the most precious and dazzling *object*, as argued by Jean Baudrillard (1998), is the body. As he indicates:

For centuries, there was a relentless effort to convince people they had no bodies (though they were never really convinced); today, there is a relentless effort to *convince them of their bodies* (p. 129; italics in original).

He argues that the dual system of production and consumption results in a dual activity of the individual; the representation of the body as *capital* and as *fetish* both of which requires an economic and psychical investment in the body. The body has become an “object of salvation” via the mechanisms of mass media which accentuate on the virility / femininity, long-lasting youth, and slimness (p. 129). Thus, the body of the worker outside work continues to be a commodity in capitalism effacing the aforementioned critical Marxian distinction of the human and the animal. The glut of advices for the re-

discovery of the body, mostly prompted by the mass media, enforces people to perceive their bodies as commodities that need constant care and reconstruction which would probably take place in one's leisure time. Therefore, leisure time, which in Baudrillard's sense does not connote to free and unproductive time as like the work time, which is also constructed to meet the capitalistic demands, object to rational scheduling and productivity (p. 157), is strategically dedicated to increase the prevailing commodification of the body.

The frenzy of ongoing electronic messages or "tweets"¹¹ indicating that penis is not a commodity¹², does not refrain the male's genitalia from commodification for the Chatroulette men who are supposedly pursuing their leisure time on the medium in question. Masculinity becomes an object of which the value is attached to the penis. The more visible, the more masculine the Chatroulette man becomes. Lee Edelman (1996) calls a man's penis "the part of his body least his own" (Edelman, 1996, cited in Barcan, 2004. p.185). Nevertheless, Ruth Barcan (2004), following Edelman's statement points that anatomically the most visible part of the man's body, the penis, becomes the most scarcely seen part of human anatomy in public. She relates this to the fact that no

¹¹ Tweet is a posted message on Twitter which is a social networking and blogging service created in 2006.

¹² In one of the tweets, Rob Sheridan, the creative director for the music band *Nine Inch Nails*, states: "Like most clever online communication ideas, it's ruined by 1000s desperate horny dudes...Internet dudes: This might surprise you, but your penis is NOT a commodity. Pointing a webcam at it impresses NO ONE." <http://www.ismashphone.com/2010/02/wheel-of-misfortune-why-chatroulette-is-a-losing-bet.html>

penis can overcome the phallus¹³, the symbolic counterpart of the penis, which has a ubiquitous presence. She goes on saying that how flashers, people who expose their genitalia in public places, result in creating a disappointment and comedy rather than an actual threat. The very moment of exposing creates a moment of vulnerability than power on the man's side due to the fact that penis cannot compete with the invisible power of the phallus (p.185). The construction of masculinity that depends on hiding the penis is challenged on Chatroulette. Instead, the penis, as the most and only visible part exposed, gains a commodity value. It is commodified via the reflection of the self-image on the screen. The focus of the webcam on the man's torso makes the penis a part detached from the body. I have already mentioned the neo-onanists' reluctance to reveal their faces. Penis, as being the only signifier of masculinity on the screen, celebrates its self masculinity.

The myriad human bodies on Chatroulette are a representation of the commodification of the bodies, however, through a willful participation of the users. It is not only the genitalia but other parts, as well, are affected by this. For instance, Chatroulette enables people to play tricky tricks via a mockery of genital parts by the

¹³ In Freudian psychoanalysis, phallus refers to the actual penis. In Lacanian understanding, though carrying connotations to the penis, phallus is no longer the male sexual organ but is a privileged signifier. It is during the Oedipus complex where the boy has to shift his original desire for his mother to the Name-of-the-Father that phallus appears as a *lack*. Name-of-the-Father is not the actual father but connotes to an imaginary phase which effaces the child's incestuous inclination towards his mother. The boy, assuming his father possesses the phallus, develops a castration anxiety that he will never possess the phallus. Thus, in Lacanian sense, the phallus connotes to the penis plus the recognition of lack (see Freud, 2000 & Lacan, 1977).

non-erogeneous parts of the body. “Chat Roulette: Eye Vagina” (Leach, 2010), one of the most popular Chatroulette related videos on Youtube with more than one million views, reveals how a Chatroulette user deceives people with his eyeball mocking a vagina, in other words “eyegina”. I have encountered a fist mocking an anus. Not only the genitalia but any bodily part can be commodified and serve for the exhibitionist pleasure of the Chatroulette user.

As Chatroulette users, willfully, commodify their bodies, the paired strangers respond to this in a similar way. They act as if in a shopping mall searching for an exotic product as they shuffle the images that appear on the screen. *New York Magazine* reporter Sam Anderson (2010) uses the phrase “human shuffle” to describe the site which he has experienced as an “ecstatic surrender to the miraculous variety and abundance of humankind” He describes some of the strangest pairings as follows:

Early ChatRoulette users traded anecdotes on comment boards with the eerie intensity of shipwreck survivors, both excited and freaked out by what they’d seen. There was a man who wore a deer head and opened every conversation with “What up DOE!?” A guy from Sweden was reportedly speed-drawing strangers’ portraits. Someone with a guitar was improvising songs for anyone who’d give him a topic. One man popped up on people’s screens in the act of fornicating with a head of lettuce. Others dressed like ninjas, tried to persuade women to expose themselves, and played spontaneous transcontinental games of Connect Four (Anderson, 2010).

I venture to say, based on both Anderson’s and my encounters on Chatroulette, that Chatroulette can be viewed as a human zoo that offers a peek of different kinds of human species. The glut of human representations seeking for the counter gaze of the paired user, as if in a zoo, become as a way of commodification of the human kind.

Not only the bodies but also sex is commodified on Chatroulette. Foucault argues, in *History of Sexuality* (1990), the overestimation of sexuality, via accentuating on the truth and sovereignty of sex, has changed the perception of sexuality by transcending its actual value which, as a result, has become something “worth dying for”(p. 56). In Foucault’s own words:

By creating the imaginary element that is “sex”, the deployment of sexuality established one of its most essential internal operating principles: the desire for sex – the desire to have it, to have access to it, to discover it, to liberate it, to articulate it in discourse, to formulate in truth. It constituted “sex” itself as something desirable (pp.156-157).

This hypothesis offered by Foucault which puts the emphasis on sex reveals the exclusion of the other components of sexuality, such as the sexual object of choice. For instance, pornography owes its existence to this promoted desire for sex itself because the myriad bodies pornography presents to the ravenous spectator aims to target their desire for sex itself. Chatroulette, in a similar way, serves for this penchant. However, the crucial difference between the two is the interactivity Chatroulette provides its users which will be discussed further in this chapter. The random pairing of the neo-onanist becomes the new sexual object of choice on Chatroulette. The fact that the anonymous respondent of the masturbating man can belong to either sex un genders the sexual desire. This means that not only orgasm, but also sexual object of choice is sacrificed. The homosexual connotations to the act of neo-onanism or the encounter of two neo-onanists might serve as a further topic of interest.¹⁴ The crucial point here is that, masturbation what normally

¹⁴ I would like to indicate that Chatroulette has been a role model for the website, Pinkroulette, serving as

constitutes a sexual act, is ripped of from its original definition and become desexualized.

Foucault (1996), in his reading of sado-masochism in an interview, says that desexualization of sexual pleasure is inherent in sado-masochistic practices. He perceives the practitioners of sado-masochism as the reconstructors of new type of sexuality and behavior. He states his idea in this way:

...they are inventing new possibilities of pleasure with strange parts of their body – through the eroticization of the body. I think it's a kind of creation, a creative enterprise, which has as one of its main features what I call the desexualization of pleasure. The idea that bodily pleasure should always come from sexual pleasure is the root of *all* our possible pleasure. I think *that's* something quite wrong. These practices are insisting that we can produce pleasure with very odd things, very strange parts of our bodies, in very unusual situations, and so on (p.384; italics in original).

Chatroulette helps the reconstruction of a new type of sexuality. It serves for the exhibitionist fantasies of people, for sure, but at the same time distinguishes the act of sex from its object of choice while creating new erotogenous zones. In this masquerade of “organs without bodies”¹⁵ the exhibitionist maintains a sado-masochistic relationship with his partner as he reveals his erotogenous or the newly eroticised zones, as in the example of the “eyegina” to his partner without his / her consent. Therefore, he maintains

a gay cruising medium. The website, advertising itself as “where the boys come out to play”, is aiming to shelter the male homosexuals. In my experience on Pinkroulette, I have witnessed a total exclusion of women and more nudity and “pervert” behavior such as two men having sex in front of the screen.

¹⁵ A punning reference to Slavoj Žižek's book (2004). *Organs Without Bodies: Deleuze and Consequences*. New York: Routledge.

a power relationship with the other user. This power relation between the two is switchable as the exhibitionist makes his scene till the next click pressed either by the other user or by himself, one-handedly. The next click button means the effacement of the exhibitionist from the other's life and contributes to the empowerment of the user exposed to something s / he was not willing to see. If he is the one “nexting” the other person, then he is doubly empowered; by exposing his genitalia without the other’s consent and rejecting his pairing.

In this sado-masochistic play, the masculinity of the neo-onanist is solely attached to his penis, the willfully commodified part by himself. His sexuality, alienated from the sexual pleasure, orgasm, and the object of choice, is reduced to one body part, the penis. His masculinity is validated via the representation of his penis which, at the same, gazed by himself. He exposes his penis both to his random partner and himself, as if to prove both that he is a man. His masculinity gains a self-exhibitionist and narcissistic quality which is the scope of the following part.

2.2. The Neo-Onanist as the Exhibitionist and Narcissist

The exhibitionist pleasure the neo-onanist gains is twofold; he is both seduced by the existence of the anonymous pairing who gains that status of the sexual object of choice but also by his own appearance on the screen. Therefore, what he does also serves for his scopophiliac tendency. Freud (1990) perceives scopophilia as an aberration that stems in the infantile years, concurrent with the period of the development of the ego. According to him, schopophilia, the sexual pleasure derived from looking, can be regarded normal to some extent. However, scopophilia becomes a perversion:

(a) if is restricted exclusively to the genitals, or (b) if it is connected with the overriding of disgust (as in the case of *voyeurs* or people who look on at excretory functions), or (c) if, instead of being *preparatory* to the normal sexual aim, it supplants it (p. 23; italics in original).

The Chatroulette scopophiliac, different than the common understanding of the scopophiliac who likes to look at other people or other erotic representation is, is someone who is obsessed with his own appearance. Therefore gains a narcissistic quality which will be discussed subsequently. It is also, in Freudian understanding, a perversion as it, not being preparatory to sexual act, supplants it. He states that this last category is mostly occupied by the exhibitionists. The significant difference between the Freudian scopophiliac and the Chatroulette scopophiliac is while the former one is a lasting category of perversion, the Chatroulette scopophiliac presumably adopts this category between the two “next” clicks on Chatroulette. This adoption of scopophilia for a certain period of time, in a way, depervertizes the act of scopophilia because the Chatroulette scopophiliac presumably does not gain all his sexual satisfaction on Chatroulette but indulges in a role-play, a performance, for certain period of time.

While Freud perceives the obsession with voyeurism as an aberration that occurs during the formation of the ego, in Lacanian understanding, the very formation of the ego occurs via the self-voyeurism of the individual, the Mirror Stage (Lacan, 1977). The Mirror Stage is the imaginary stage that an infantile encounters with her / his own appearance. It is the time the infantile develops her / his ego because it is the first time s / he recognizes herself / himself as someone individuated from her / his mother and the outer world.

I attempt to read the encounters of the Chatroulette user with her / his own

appearance on the screen as an incessant repetition of the Mirror Stage. The nude self-image of the onanist on Chatroulette is a parody of the infant during the Mirror Stage where the infant forms an erotic and alienated relationship with itself. For Lacan, the Mirror Stage corresponds to Freud's stage of "primary narcissism".¹⁵ Both Freud and Lacan accentuate on the formation of the ego. For Freud, narcissism is a normal phase correspondent with the formation of ego-libido; the inward-directed libido which engenders the individual to take her / himself as a sexual object choice.

In his own words:

Narcissistic or ego-libido seems to be the great reservoir from which the object-cathexes are sent out into which they are withdrawn once more; the narcissistic libidinal cathexis of the ego is the original state of things, realized in earliest childhood, and is merely covered by the later extrusions of libido, but in essentials persists behind them (Freud, 2000, p.84).

Freud differentiates the ego-libido and the object-libido; the former is oriented towards itself while the latter is towards outward objects, such as other people. Freud takes the former stage as, to some extent, normal and healthy period for the individuals. Lacan's Mirror Stage is a further development of Freud's theories on narcissism. For Lacan, this phase that gives birth to the formation of the ego in the individual is twofold; it is both erotic and aggressive. It is erotic because the individual is attracted to her / his own image. It is aggressive because of the conflicting nature between the whole specular image and the disunity of one's own body. This constitutes the first form of alienation in

¹⁵ In Freudian understanding, "primary narcissism" occurs when the infantile loses its sole sexual object outside its body, the mother's breast. This separation from the mother results in the infantile's transference of its ego to its body and shifting its sexual instinct to auto-eroticism (Freud, 2000, p.88).

Lacanian understanding. In his own words, the child's mirror image

...will crystallize in the subject's internal conflictual tension, which determines the awakening of his desire for the object of the other's desire: here the primordial coming together (*concoure*) is precipitated into aggressive competitiveness (*concurrence*), from which develops the triad of others, the ego and the object, which, spanning the space of specular communion, is inscribed there... (Lacan, 1977, p.19; italics in original).

.The neo-onanist is lost in the triad Lacan problematizes as he faces the tension between the other, the ego, and the object at the very same time. He is the other as he gazes his own appearance on the screen as an alienated other. He is the object as his representation is gazed back by the random chat partners. He also faces the alienation from his self and body via the metaphorical re-formation of the ego during this Mirror Stage-like phase.

The very narcissistic act also can be interpreted as a self-rape as the user, by pointing his penis towards the screen, he points it to the other user as well as himself. I indicated how this very behavior can be read as a metaphorical rape of the Internet which reinforces the alienation of the self and creating a sort of masculinity crisis. The act of neo-onania which enables the individual to gaze himself, also represents a metaphorical self-rape of the individual. It is a reaction to his self image, alienated from himself, and commodified due to the imposition of the Internet with its excessive promotion of capitalist values. Self-hatred is created via ads constantly warning the individual his body needs constant care and reconstruction (eg, penis enlargement). The neo-onanist reacts to this constructed self-hatred by metaphorically raping himself on the screen. As Chatroulette becomes a shelter for the glut of alienated and commodified bodies, there arises a kind of interaction between each other which will be the scope of the subsequent

part.

2.3. Chatroulette as the Cyber Gentlemen's Club

Chatroulette, as the statistics reveal, is a male dominated space. The Chatroulette Map Analysis of Robert J. Moore (2010) indicates that 89% of the Chatroulette users are male. Though it might be the wishful thinking of the users to encounter with a female user, it is very likely that they will end up with a male chatter. It might be argued that Chatroulette serves as a medium for a new type of homosociality. According to Michael S. Kimmel (2004), masculinity is a social construction. It is not static or timeless but historical as men are able to create their worlds and identities, therefore can change. However, what the static thing about masculinity is the ongoing power relations between men. He dissects how masculinity constructs itself around the “hegemonic masculinity”, a social construction of a certain time phase which meets every criteria to represent, in Erving Goffman’s words, “one complete, unblushing male”¹⁶(Goffman, 1963, cited in Kimmel, 2004, p.271).

“Hegemonic masculinity” is a social construction and an indicator of how men need other men to demonstrate their masculinity. In Kimmel’s own words:

Other men: We are under the constant careful scrutiny of other men. Other men watch us, rank us, grant our acceptance into the realm of manhood. Manhood is

¹⁶ In Goffman’s words, this “one complete, unblushing male” is “a young, married. White, urban, northern heterosexual, Protestant father of college education, fully employed, of good complexion, weight and height, and a recent record in sports. Every American male tends to look out upon the world from this perspective....Any male who fails to qualify in any one of these ways is likely to view himself...as unworthy, incomplete, and inferior” (Goffman, 1963, cited in Kimmel, 2004, p.271).

demonstrated for other men's approval. It is other men who evaluate the performance... Think of how men boast to one another of their accomplishments – from their latest sexual conquest to the size of the fish they caught – and how we constantly parade the markers of manhood – wealth, power, status, sexy women – in front of other men, desperate for their approval (p. 275).

Homosociality which is considered as one of the mediators in order to be a true man is based on the validation of masculinity via representation. However, this self-representation, in contrast to the self-representations on Chatroulette, is different in terms of social acceptance.

One of the ways men partake in this (imaginary) competition with each other is mediated via the treatment of women as a currency among them who are willing to reveal how men they are to other men. This, in a way, validates the heterosexual desire of men, one of the *sine qua non* qualities attributed to “hegemonic masculinity”. Luce Irigaray, in *This Sex Which Is Not One* (1985), also argues, however with a feminist view, the concept of homosociality. She coins the terms “ho(m)mo-sexual monopoly” and “ho(m)mo-sexuality” to indicate the masculine community of which existence is based upon the exchange of women. She, following Marxian analysis of commodification, posits that women constitute the exchange value in the so-called patriarchal societies. Men who are able to capitalize more women than the others become the rulers of the patriarchal symbolic order (pp.170-173). Both Kimmel and Irigaray construct masculinity on the base of silencing of and, in a way, totally effacing the women from the scene. As Kimmel puts it bluntly, “masculinity has been defined as the flight from women, the repudiation of femininity” (p. 273). Both of these accounts base their understanding of masculinity on a heteronormative social order. What these statements have in common is

the justification of the heterosexual desire for women.

The sharing of women is a usual behavior among the male Internet users as can be witnessed through their sharing women's nude and pornographic photographs and videos between each other. Chatroulette has added a new dimension to this women exchange by the soliciting nudity man who. According to the Chatroulette Map (2010), is twice as likely to be encounter than actual female nudity. A woman who enters the website is very likely to encounter a sign such as "Show me your boobs", and "Flash tits for Haiti". If any woman consents to do so and indulges in an exhibitionist activity, it is very likely that her screenshot is going to be saved by the other user and shared on the Internet on websites that act as the Chatroulette paparazzis.¹⁷ These sites serve for this penchant as the aim of them is to share the Chatroulette videos and screenshots of private chats that feature nude female Chatroulette users.. However, I have not encountered a site that is solely dedicated to exhibit the glut of male genitalia. This is not to contrast with what I have been formulating since. I have insisted on the commodification of the male body on Chatroulette. This is different than the commodification of female body as the commodification of the male body is the result of the willful participation of the male user. However, women's bodies are exchanged without the consent of the women.

Chatroulette, based on the statistics and the behavioral attitude I have encountered on Chatroulette, might be regarded as a perfect example of a homosocial environment. 89% of the Chatroulette users who are males are very likely to be paired with males. It is very likely that "perverse" behavior represented on Chatroulette will be

¹⁷ You can check someof the Chatroulette "paparazzi" websites via <http://www.chatroulettehof.com/>, www.chatrouletteexposed.com, and <http://wtfroulette.com/>.

encountered by a male pairing.¹⁸ This, in a way, makes the act of onania and the onanist a homosocial act, an act that is deemed to be a proper male behavior due to the perception that every Internet user male is a potential consumer of virtual pornography. As onanism, firstly promoted by pornography, turns into neo-onanism, a visual show, on Chatroulette, it gains a communal and homosocial quality. Laqueur (2003) indicates that:

The Web has made it possible for people to exchange stories about their fantasies and desires free from censorious, disciplining voices of medical, clerical, parental, or pedagogical authority... Masturbation has become not only a source of individual self-discovery, but also the basis for a new form of sexual sociability rooted in the celebration of the imagination and its infinite possibilities... There are hundreds of thousands of pornographic sites that cater to every masturbatory fantasy imaginable, but what is really new is the proliferation of virtual communities of onanists, an alternative universe of sociability that is created through the public revelation of the not-so-private vice (p. 419).

One of the reasons for this transformation regarding masturbation is the popularization of pornography which has been mostly promoted by the Internet. The pornographic websites which represent both professional and amateur nudities and sexual acts have initiated a communal masturbatory adventure. However, Chatroulette, a neutral website that originally has no connotation to sexuality or pornography, has enabled a culmination of

¹⁸ I argue that even the forementioned the Eye Vagina video serves for homosociality because it is very likely that any female Chatroulette user who is paired with the eye mocking vagina, *eyegina*, will click the next button in a second. However, a male user, who is willing to pair with a female user, preferably a *nude* one, will continue the game until he realizes that what he sees on the screen is a fake vagina. Therefore, the eye vagina image aims to shock men which attributes it a homosocial quality.

resistance to pornography and its passivity it bestows on the consumers, promoted by the neo-onanists. Before arguing how this is possible, I would like to provide a brief background of the debates on pornography to show the various reactions to and perceptions of pornography to indicate the debated possible harmful effects of it for male sexuality.

There are various debates on pornography, most of which belong to feminist scholars, which accentuate on the commodification of women's bodies through pornography (see Dworkin, 1994, MacKinnon, 1987 & Morgan, 1980). Andrea Dworkin (1997), one of the vehement antagonists of pornography, points that pornography does not liberate women's sexuality but, contrarily, helps the commodification and alienation of the women's body. She, where she argues how pornography, contradictorily, has become left-wing, states that:

The pornography glut is bread and roses for the masses. Freedom is the mass-marketing of women as whore. Free sexuality for the woman is in being massively consumed, denied an individual nature, denied any sexual sensibility other than that which serves the male. Capitalism is not wicked or cruel when the commodity is the whore; profit is not wicked or cruel when the alienated worker is a female piece of meat (p. 449).

For Dworkin, pornography is an entrapment of the women by capitalist parameters as woman's body is not treated differently than the (masculine) worker's body in Marxian sense. She also reasserts the distinction put forward by Baudrillard because, in her understanding, the women's body in the pornography industry is both a site of production and consumption; a body that is represented as "capital" and "fetish" at the same time (Baudrillard, 1989, p.129).

Among the cacophony of discourses on pornography, there are also feminist scholars who believe that pornography enables women's sexual liberation (see Camille Paglia, 1995 and Gayle Rubin, 1984 for radical sex-positive debates). Another trend is to neutralize pornography and treat it as a discourse on its own. Linda Williams, who is regarded as the initiator of porn studies, has presented a critical reading in *Hard Core: Power, Pleasure, and the "Frenzy of the Invisible"* (1989) which is an in-depth analysis of the pornography as a genre.

Some scholars, including Shere Hite and Lynne Segal, believe that pornography does not only commodify women's bodies but it does so for men. Hite, in *The Uncelebrated Beauty of Men's Sexuality* (2005), discusses the possible harmful affects of pornography on men. According to her, what pornography represents is burdensome for male sexuality. Pornography, by its false claim to represent nature, imposes an ideology of how men should behave in their sexual lives. Lynne Segal (1997) also points to how pornography, acting as a "dangerous drug", creates an anxiety for men due to the excessive virility and the utopian atmosphere where women are always available and satisfied. She posits that the social imposition on men to prove that they are "real men" results in the weakened sexual interest in women and tendency to use the sexual substitutes of sexuality and masturbation (pp. 218-219).

Jill Bennett (1996), in her wider discussion of nudity in art and pornography, points out to pornography's undermining the role of the knowing subject by constituting itself a full knowledge and denying the spectator an imaginative role. In pornography while the real subjects are the actors on the scene trying to arouse the spectators sexually, it is the spectator himself who occupies the position of the object (p. 248). Linda Kauffman, in *Bad Girls and Sick Boys* (1998), states that:

Television's deepest pleasure is frequently overlooked: it affords the pleasure of passivity (....) the male viewer of pornography is feminized; he identifies with the woman's position (....) Contrary to the assumption that the male uses pornography to confirm and celebrate his gender's sexual activity and dominance, is the possibility of his pleasure in identifying with a 'feminine' passivity or subordination (p. 106).

However, Chatroulette onanist is not the porn consumer, stuck in the porn's utopian fantasy of “a timeless world where women always want sex and men are always virile” (Kauffman, 1998, p.101) as he produces his own pornography. I read the behavior of the neo-onanist as a reaction towards the feminized passivity as rather than consuming what is represented to him in a passive way, he actively produces his own pornography. However, what he does ends up blurring the distinction between objectivity and subjectivity. He is doubly objectified; he is the object for the other user and himself due to his self-voyeurism. He is also the subject because he acts and represents his sexuality in a masculine way, rejecting the feminine passivity pornography bestows on him. Ironically, while overcoming feminized passivity, the neo-onanist helps the commodification of his own body. Nevertheless, the crucial point is the *communal* resistance and reactionary attitude of the Chatroulette onanist who is, most likely, fed up with the myriad possibilities and depictions of pornography represented to him everyday on the Internet.

It might be argued that the homosocial virtual space constructed on Chatroulette is a Cyber Gentlemen's Club. Gentlemen's Club, emerged in the 18th Century in Britain, is a private club where only the upper-class men could enter. The main aim of these clubs was to serve for the polite, civilized and exclusive male culture (Maddock & Parkin,

1993, cited in Collinson & Hearn, 2004, p. 158). John MacInnes (2004) points to the fact that Gentlemen's Club, though few exists today compared to the past, is, together with the Catholic priesthood, one of the few survivals, that runs as male bastions where women are either absent or barred (p. 313). These two male bastions, he argues, don't have the prominent status compared to the old days. He argues whether it might be the reason for the "crisis of masculinity"¹⁹ along with the changing virtues of masculinity. He states that:

What were once claimed to be manly virtues (heroism, independence, courage, strength, rationality, will, backbone, virility) have become masculine vices (abuse, destructive aggression, coldness, emotional inarticulacy, detachment, isolation, an inability to be flexible, to communicate, to emphasize, to be soft, supportive or life affirming) (MacInnes, 2004, pp. 313-314).

It might be argued that Chatroulette is a response to the "crisis of masculinity" if there exists any. The scarcity of male homogeneous social spaces have weakened the man-to-man encounters. Chatroulette has turned out to be a promising medium to fulfill this need by the users who are willing to demonstrate their "masculinities" to each other. While the (constructed) manly virtues lose their significance as stated by MacInnes (2004), men return to more natural behavior, such as showing their genitalia as in the case of the neonanist. By offering a homosocial space where men can validate their masculinities,

¹⁹ "Crisis of masculinity" is one of the vehemently debated issues in masculinity studies (see Horrocks, 1994, Petersen, 1998, Heartfield, 2002, Connell, 2004 & MacInnes, 2004). Masculinity theories mostly link this to the loss of power on the side of men. However, some of the scholars indicate that the crisis is not limited to masculinity but also includes the working class (Heartfield, 2002) and modernity (Horrocks, 1994 & Petersen, 1998) as well.

though via representation, Chatroulette becomes a kind of Cyber Gentlemen's Club of which social rites are different than the former, enabling men to pursue different social behavior.

CHAPTER 3. CHATROULETTE AS A SOCIO-TECHNOLOGICAL NETWORK

The scope of this thesis is to provide a reading of a certain type of masculinity, Chatroulette masculinity, of the Chatroulette user who adopts his identity as a neo-onanist for a certain period of time, during the time he spends in front of the screen of the computer willfully performing his part as a neo-onanist on Chatroulette. I have attempted to posit several reasons for his becoming a neo-onanist. Possible answers included the scarcity of the homosocial spaces, the resistance against commodification of the body and passivization pornography brings and a possible “crisis of masculinity” generated by the Internet. Now I will consider the Internet as an agent and attempt to reveal how it enables the emergence of the neo-onanists. Firstly, accentuating on virtual mediums similar to Chatroulette, such as IRC and CU-SeeMe, I will look at the Internet as a generator of sexual activities. Then I will move on to a postmodern discussion of the reconstruction of the dichotomies which proliferates a multitude of identities and hybrid behaviors. The discussion will guide me to conclude with the emphasis on the Chatroulette masculinity as one of the masculinities which can be willfully adopted by the individual from time to time.

3.1. Internet as a Generator of Multiple Identities and Sexualities

Sherry Turkle is among the many scholars whose studies consider how Internet changes the shape of identities (see Jordan, T. 1999, and Marcus, B., Machilek, F. &

Schütz, A., 2006 for further discussion). She, in her book *Life on the Screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet* (1997), considers how entering into a virtual community enables the reconstruction of the identities on the other side of the looking glass. For her:

The Internet is another element of the computer culture that has contributed to thinking about identity as multiplicity. On it, people are able to build a self by cycling through many selves (p. 178).

She gives the contradictory opinions of the Internet users who, on one hand, reveals a strong opposition to the virtual world of the Internet as they tend to differentiate themselves from the machines regarding their emotions, bodies, and intellect, but on the other hand, willing to be a part of the virtual world which, day by day, comes to deceive them as being alive or almost-alive. In her own words:

Now, in postmodern times, multiple identities are no longer so much at the margins of things. Many more people experience identity as a set of roles that can be mixed and matched, whose diverse demands need to be negotiated. The Internet has become a significant social laboratory for experimenting with the constructions and reconstructions of self that characterize postmodern life. In its virtual reality, we self-fashion and self-create (p. 180).

She is referring to Internet Relay Chat (IRC) and the face-to-face role-playing games (MUDs)²⁰. IRC, created in 1988, allows its users for real-time Internet text messaging and chatting and synchronous conferencing. It is possible to message on the chatrooms publicly or privately. One of the users, a 31 years old female teacher, she refers to in her

²⁰ MUD (Multi-User Dungeon) refers to multi-user computer games which consist of role-playing games, interactive fiction and online chat.

book reveals how much she enjoys the various identities she has constructed on IRC.

It is a complete escape... On IRC, I'm very popular. I have three handles I use a lot.... So one [handle] is serious about the war in Yugoslavia, [another is] a bit of nut about *Melrose Place*, and [a third is] very active on sexual channels, always looking for a good time...Maybe I can only relax if I see life as one more IRC channel (p.179).

IRC, allowing only for text messaging, might be perceived as a “complete escape” as it enables its users to play with their own identities. An IRC user can represent her / himself in the shoes of anyone, belonging to any gender, social class or age group, similar to role-playing games which let people construct their own identities. For this reason, IRC is a different generator of identities than more recent mediums. IRC might be regarded as a precursor of Chatroulette. It also enables users to have conversations with anonymous people, though without the webcams which is the crucial difference between the two. *New York Magazine* reporter Sam Anderson (2010) argues that the recently launched virtual mediums such as Facebook, Twitter, and Tumblr, which offer less anonymity than IRC and similar previous mediums, has been designed as a remedy for the tension between “chaos” and “control”. “Control” has won this battle, introducing its new tools and mediums stated above. These new mediums are created to tame the wildness of web by constructing user-friendly taxonomies. In this regard, he perceives Chatroulette on the side of the “chaos” for its promise of anonymity; as the “blast from the Internet past”, “pure social-media shuffle”, and the “anti-Facebook”.

Another virtual medium similar to Chatroulette is CU-SeeMe. It is a video-conferencing software, developed by the Information Technology Department at Cornell University in 1992 for Mac and 1994 for Windows. It was originally launched for

educational purposes as it enabled the students in the US to have conferences where they could hear and see each other. Marjorie Kibby and Brigid Costello (2001), in *Between the Image and the Act: Interactive Sex Entertainment on the Internet*, argue how CU-SeeMe is used for sexual purposes by the users. People either can have interactive sex in public rooms that can accommodate to between 15 or 25 people or can enter the private rooms where they can have one-to-one interaction. In December 2000, they declared, there were 112 active reflectors created for erotic purposes with more than 3500 members. For instance, in the reflector "Jack Off Live", there were rooms such as "Bi-curious", "Dark Alley", and "M4M Muscle". The names of the reflectors and rooms indicated the sexual orientation of the users as the software was used by heterosexuals, gay men, and lesbians (p. 355).

In their participation observation study of CU-SeeMe, Kibby and Costello were interested in the gender coded behaviors and behaviors specific to online environment. CU-SeeMe, like the earlier mediums such as IRC, generated nicknames which people were able to choose freely which is different than the anonymous users of Chatroulette who do not need a nickname to enter the site. However, many of the gendered behavioral codes are similar to Chatroulette as they indicate that:

For males,... their common mode of sexual display is a close-up shot of their genitals. The universality of this framing has led to its being given the name 'crotch-cam'. These 'crotch cam' males usually masturbate while commenting on and directing the shows of other participants and in doing so perform the role of the lone male spectator / masturbator common to traditional pornography. The conventionality of this role is tacitly recognized by the CU community where close-up shots of penises and male masturbation are not regarded as doing a show (p.

361).

CU-SeeME 'crotch-cam' males act like the neo-onanists as they are also both the producer and the consumer of what is going on the stage via representing their genitalia. However, in the crowded rooms which could accommodate up to 25 people, the users were able to watch up to 4 people due to transmission speeds. The image of the eye next to the participant's nickname is open when the participant is watching the other user. This creates a competitive attitude between the participants, especially the male ones in this medium where there is, like Chatroulette, the scarcity of women on the medium (p. 362). This contrasts with the situation of the Chatroulette users who are sure that they are being watched during their one-to-one interaction with the other user. They do not have to compete to catch the attraction of the other.

The most crucial difference between the two is whereas CU-SeeMe rooms are specifically constructed for sexual encounters, Chatroulette is sexualized by the users. As there are no reflectors or rooms that are labeled strictly as erotic or pornographic, Chatroulette, by its formation, is a neutral site which does not originally promote any sexual or explicit behavior. Also, when anyone enters the site, s / he becomes aware of the rules that prohibit nudity. Therefore, I read the sexual representations and act in two mediums, CU-SeeMe and Chatroulette, as different than each other. While the former is a formerly constructed place where people can gather for erotic and sexual conquests, the latter is constructed and intentionally turned into a medium where they can reveal their genitalia by the users themselves.²¹ The founder of the website, Andrey Ternovskiy says,

²¹ I would like to add that the trend of more customized gathering places on the Internet is still continuing.

For instance, the French matchmaking website *Turning Love* follows the trend of Chatroulette by

in his interview with Nick Bilton (2010), how this website is perceived differently by its users: “Some think it is a game, others think it is a whole unknown world, others think it is a dating service. I think it's cool that such a concept can be useful for so many people” This, in a way, relates to the fact that people have become more powerful over the Internet. They are no longer stuck with any content they are offered or, to put it differently, they are no longer the passive consumers of the Internet. It has already been mentioned how Chatroulette endangers a resistance against pornography and the glut of ads and personal advices the Internet offers. The “crotch-cam” of the Chatroulette neo-onanist is different than the CU-SeeMe exhibitionist. CU-SeeMe onanist reveals no resistance, in fact, he plays with the rules of the game on the sexually constructed space which is occupied by the users who are seeking for sexual pleasure. There is a competition and an (imaginary) sexual object of choice where rules of courtly love still prevail in a way. The neo-onanist, on the other hand, sexualizes the space offered by Chatroulette where the meanings of sex, masturbation, and orgasm are reconstructed. Willfully commodifying his penis, he reconstructs his masculinity by validating it via the representation of “the part of his body least his own” ((Edelman, 1996, cited in Barcan, 2004. p.185).

3.2 Chatroulette as a Socio-Technological Network

mediating social encounters via webcam and microphone, however, it is optional to meet a random stranger or someone according to the criteria provided by the user. You can check the website via <http://www.turninglove.com/>.

In a world of continuously changing technology, it is so naive to regard the agency and subjectivity of the human beings as a separate entity, unaffected by the other myriad agents. I have already attempted to provide how the Internet, as an agent itself, acts as a medium for the reconstruction of human identities and new social rites. Now, I will see a broadened argument which will problematize the traditional understanding of sociology that puts the human being in the center to understand what is going on in the rest (see Goffman, 1971). As this human-centered vision is inefficient in a time dominated by the ever changing technological developments, to what extent a human can be regarded as autonomous and capable of free will is problematized by the theorists of post-humanity. My aim is to provide how the theories of Donna Haraway and Bruno Latour, whose works see these vehement debates, can be mediated to analyze Chatroulette as a socio-technological network generating Chatroulette masculinities.

Donna Haraway, in *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women* (1991), where she theorizes how the metaphor of cyborgs can be adopted for a fruitful reading of postmodern feminist understanding, has provided a revolutionary step for the deconstruction of the binaries such as the nature and culture separation, the products of modernity which, she believes, are the major obstacles for women, and also other living beings such as animals, to gain an equal status with men. In her understanding, a cyborg is:

... resolutely committed to partiality, irony, intimacy, and perversity. It is oppositional, utopian, and completely without innocence. No longer structured by the polarity of public and private, the cyborg defines a technological polis based on a revolution of social relations in the *oikos*, the household. Nature and culture are reworked; the one can no longer be the resource for appropriation or incorporation by the other. The relationships for forming whole from parts, including those of

polarity and hierarchical domination, are at issue in the cyborg world (p. 151; italics in original).

The cyborg world, which she believes we are living in, is a promising space for everyone. Nature and culture separation, which, according to her, is one of the non-innocent products of modernity, is deceptive as what it posits as nature is a product of the culture while the culture is also a product of the nature. Thus, she calls for a re-invention of the nature. Haraway, by effacing the slash between, constructs *naturecultures* which provide a platform for the emergence of the cyborgs. As Haraway states:

A cyborg is a cybernetic organism, a hybrid of machine and organism, a creature of social reality as well as a creature of fiction. Social reality is lived social relations, our most important political construction, a world-changing fiction... By the late twentieth century, time, a mythic time, we are all chimeras, theorized and fabricated hybrids of machine and organism; in short, we are cyborgs (pp.149-150).

According to her, without the breaching of the distinctions between the human and the animal, animal / human (organism) and machine, and physical and non-physical, which belongs to the late 20th century, a cyborg wouldn't have emerged. The cyborg she theorizes is possible as a “fractured identity” offering partiality, contradiction, and strategicity (p.155). Her statement; “there is nothing about being ‘female’ that naturally binds women” (p.155) also can be read as a promising liberation for men whose identity also is “fractured”.

Bruno Latour, in his influential book *We Have Never Been Modern* (1993), posits his *non-modern* stance by attacking the nature / culture distinction as Haraway does. He explores in depth the two contradictory processes at work regarding the construction of modernity. According to him, while there is the ongoing tendency of purification which

attempts to reinforce the separation of nature from culture, which he extends this separation to the object and the subject, the human and non-human worlds, and the discursive and the social, there is, at the same time, the rising proliferation of hybrids combining nature and culture. According to him, this contradiction makes him to take an oppositional stance against modernity and results in his proclaimed *non-modern* standing. Thus, he calls for a non-modern institution, a socio-technological network, which will re-define freedom for the hybrids which have been ignored but, at the same time, produced by modernity (pp.10-11). In Latour's sentences, the point is defined as:

As soon as we direct our attention simultaneously to the work of purification and the work of hybridization, we immediately stop being wholly modern, and our future begins to change. At the same time we stop having been modern, because we become retrospectively aware that the two sets of practices have always already been at work in the historical period that is ending. Our past begins to change (p.11).

Latour (2005), when he introduced the actor-network theory, provided a criticism of the contemporary sociology for its placing the non-humans as the key figures of agency. In Latourian understanding, actants, who are either humans or non-humans, become the actors in the network of relations. In this network where every actant is connected to each other, none of the actants has a privileged position over the other. This basically means that technology and the humans have a co-dependent relationship with each other and we can no longer analyze human beings without considering the world surrounding them. This perception has enabled me to analyze the neo-onanist, in broader terms masculinities generated by Chatroulette, so far as the neo-onanist is in a direct relationship with the technology, the Internet.

Latour's calling for a socio-technological network which will liberate the "actants" and enable the emergence of hybridity is, in a way, mediated by Chatroulette acting like a socio-technological network. Firstly, the medium enables the users to reconstruct the social norms and, therefore, masculinities. The Chatroulette man no longer has to obey the constructed rules of being a man as in this Cyber Gentlemen's Club, it is not his tuxedo but his penis that validates his masculinity. It is a sort of return to "nature" for the validation of masculinity is based on the visibility of the penis. Secondly, a man can have a "fractured identity" by the help of Chatroulette. As I indicated he can be your boss, your husband, or your lover. He can be "the man of power", a CEO of a prominent firm or a high-ranking governor. He can be anyone who is qualified as being a "true man", approximating to the "hegemonic masculinity". For instance, one of the Chatroulette paparazzis has uploaded a screenshot of a clothed masturbating man in a Turkish police officer suit.²² It reveals the very fact that a man purportedly "holding power" in his hands might turn into a neo-onanist as on Chatroulette, he might take off his identity / masculinity for a while and join the Cyber Gentlemen's Club where the validation of masculinity no longer burdens him with social constraints.

²² You can access this photograph via <http://img24.imageshack.us/img24/3650/polisc.png>

CONCLUSION

This thesis has attempted to explore how Chatroulette, as a virtual medium, has re-shaped the representations of masculinities and male behavior. The glut of representations of male masturbation on this purportedly neutral site has incited me to devote this study to the subject. In the light of these representations, I have introduced a new category, the neo-onanist who has blurred the understanding of masturbation. Desexualizing the very act by effacing the orgasm and making it a communal act which necessitates a random pairing regardless of sex, the neo-onanist has offered a reading of a new type of masculinity which is validated via representing the genitalia.

I have attempted to provide several reasons for the emergence of the neo-onanist. I offered that, following Marxian and Baudrillard's thoughts on the subject the very act of neo-onania might be linked to the commodification and alienation of the body. Internet, as a prompter of the commodification of the body, with the glut of ads and spam mails which are imposing on the users to have a perfect shape and sexual life, has engendered the emergence of the neo-onanist who has attributed masturbation a narcissistic and exhibitionist quality.

Another possible reason might be the scarcity of homosocial places. Chatroulette users, excluding the neo-onanists, has already turned the medium into a homosocial place where women are likely to encounter sexual harassment via the signs and conversations soliciting nudity or the sharing of the women's representations on the websites solely devoted for this purpose. The neo-onanists added a new dimension to the concept of homosociality by interactively turning Chatroulette into a Cyber Gentlemen's Club where the sign of masculinity is solely attributed to the sight of the male genitalia.

I am aware that the present paper has not touched on all the other aspects of masculinities or, more broadly, sexualities and identities generated by Chatroulette as I have consciously excluded from my discussion the Chatroulette participants using the medium to meet new people and cultures. It should not be forgotten that despite the redundancy of the neo-onanists, the website might be a promising and culturally enriching space if it is used for other purposes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allyn, D. (2000). *Make Love, Not War: The Sexual Revolution: An Unfettered History*. New York: Little, Brown.

Anderson, S. (2010, Feb. 5). The Human Shuffle: Is ChatRoulette the future of the Internet or its distant past? *New York Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://nymag.com/news/media/63663/>.

Barcan, R. (2004). *Nudity: A Cultural Anatomy*. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Baudrillard, J. (1988) *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*. London: Sage Publications.

Bennett, J. (1996). Leaving Nothing to Imagination: Obscenity and Postmodern Subjectivity. In P. Duro (Ed.), *The Rhetoric of the Frame: Essays on the Boundaries of the Artwork* (pp. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bennett, P. & Rosario, V. (1995). *Solitary Pleasures: The Historical, Literary and Artistic Discourses of Autoeroticism*. New York: Routledge.

Bilton, N. (2010, Mar. 12). One on One: Andrey Ternovskiy, Creator of Chatroulette. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://bits.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/03/12/one-on-one-andrey-ternovskiy-creator-of-chatroulette/>.

Braiker, B. (2010, Feb. 13). Chatroulette: Talking to Strangers is Cheap and Often Racy. *ABC News Technology*. Retrieved from <http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/chatroulette-talking-strangers-internet/story?id=9822879>.

Brittan, A. (2004). Masculinities and Masculinism. In S. M. Whitehead & F. J. Barrett (Eds.), *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 51-55). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cavanagh, A. (2007). *Sociology in the Age of the Internet*. New York: Open University Press.

Collinson, D. & Hearn, J. (2004). Naming Men as Men: Implications for Work, Organization and Management. In S. M. Whitehead & F. J. Barrett (Eds.), *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 144-169). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, R. W. (2004). The Social Organization of Masculinity. In S. M. Whitehead & F. J. Barrett (Eds.), *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 30-50). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Dodson, B. (1974). *Liberating Masturbation: A Meditation on Self Love*. New York: Bodysex Designs.

Dworkin, A. (1997). Whores. In H. Barnett (Ed.), *Sourcebook on Feminist Jurisprudence*

(pp. 445 – 450). London: Cavendish.

Edelman, L. (1996). Men's Room. In J. Sanders (Ed.), *Stud: Architectures of Masculinity*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Escoffier, J. (Ed.). (2003). *The Sexual Revolution: How the Sexual Revolution Changed Orgasms, Female Sexuality, Pornography, Homosexuality and Marriage*. New York: Running Press Book Publishers.

Freud, S. (1997). *Sexuality and Psychology of Love*. New York: Touchstone.

Freud, S. (2000). *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, trans. by J. Strachey. USA: Basic Books.

Foucault, M. (1996). *Foucault Live: Interviews, 1961-1984*, trans. L. Hochroth & J. Johnston. New York: Semiotext(e).

Foucault M. (1997). The Abnormals. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth: The Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984, Vol. I*, trans. R. Hurley. (pp. 51-57). New York: New Press.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The History of Sexuality An Introduction Volume 1*, trans. R. Hurley. New York: Vintage Books.

Garrity, J. (1969). *The Sensuous Woman; The First How-to Book for the Female Who Yearns to Be All Woman*. New York: L. Stuart.

Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Haraway, D. J. (1991). *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.

Heartfield, J. (2002). There is no Masculinity Crisis. *Genders* 35. Retrieved from http://www.genders.org/g35/g35_heartfield.html.

Hite, S. (2005). The Image of Men in Pornography: Man-as-Raging-Beast//The Uncelebrated Beauty of Men's Sexuality.A Reality Check. *Hite Research International*. Retrieved from <http://www.hite-research.com/artmeninpornography.html>.

Horrocks, R. (1994). *Masculinity in Crisis: Myths, Fantasies and Realities*. New York: St

Martin's Press.

Irigaray, L. (1985). *This Sex Which is Not One*, trans. C. Porter. New York: Cornell University Press.

Jordan, T. (1999). *Cyberpower: The Culture and Politics of Cyberspace and the Internet*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kauffman, L. (1998). *Bad Girls and Sick Boys: Fantasies in Contemporary Art and Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kibby, M. and Costello, B. (2001). Between the Image and the Act: Interactive Sex Entertainment on the Internet. *Sexualities*. 4(3). Retrieved from <http://sexualities.sagepub.com/cgi/content/short/4/3/353>.

Kimmel, M. S. (2004). Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity. In S. M. Whitehead & F. J. Barrett (Eds.), *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 266-287). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Koedt, A. (2000). The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm. In B. A. Crow (Ed.), *Radical Feminism: A Documentary Reader* (pp. 372-377). New York: New York University Press.

Lacan, J. (1977). *Ecrits: A Selection*, trans. by A. Sheridan. New York: W.W. Norton and Company Inc..

Laqueur, T. W. (2004). *Solitary Sex: A Cultural History of Masturbation*. New York: Zone Books.

Lasch, C. (1978). *The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in An Age of Diminishing Expectations*. New York: Norton.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Latour, B. (1993). *We Have Never Been Modern*, trans. by C. Porter. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Leach, J. (23 February 2010). Chat Roulette: Eye Vagina. [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bq6xjTyw7zM>.

MacKinnon, C. (1987). *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

MacInnes, J. (2004) The Crisis of Masculinity and the Politics of Identity. In S. M. Whitehead & F. J. Barrett (Eds.), *The Masculinities Reader* (pp. 311-329). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Maddock, S. & Parkin, D. (1993). Gender Cultures. *Women in Management Review*, 8, 2,

3-9.

Marcus, B., Machilek, F. & Schütz, A. (2006). Personality in Cyberspace: Personal Web Sites as Media for Personality Expressions and Impressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(6), 1014-1031. doi: 10. 1037/0022-3514.90.6. 1014

Marx, K. (1988). *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 and the Communist Manifesto*, trans. by M. Milligan New York: Prometheus Books.

Morgan, R. (1980). Theory and Practice: Pornography and Rape. In L. Lederer (Ed.), *Take Back the Night: Women on Pornography* (134-140). New York: Morrow.

Muchembled, R. (2008). *Orgasm and the West: A History of Pleasure from the Sixteenth Century to the Present*, trans. by J. Birrell. Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.

Onania, or, the Heinous Sin of Self-Pollution and its Frightful Consequences in Both Sexes Considered (Marriage, Sex, and the Family in England). (1986). New York: Garland.

Paglia, C. (1995) "Vamps & Tramps: New Essays". London: Penguin Books.

Parker, T. (Producer & Director). (2010). *South Park: You Have 0 Friends* [TV Animation Show]. United States: Comedy Central.

Petersen, A. (1998). *Unmasking the Masculine*. London: Sage.

Rubin, G. (1984). Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory in Sexuality. In C. S. Vance (Ed.), *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*. pp. 267-319. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Segal, L. (1997). *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men*. London: Virago.
Sutter, J. D. (2010, Feb. 24). Chatroulette offers random webcam titillation. *CNN*.
Retrieved from
<http://edition.cnn.com/2010/TECH/02/22/chatroulette.random.chat/index.html?hpt=C1>.

Turkle, S. (1997). *Life on the Screen: Identity in the Age of Internet*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Whitehead, S. M. & Barrett F. J. (Ed.). (2004). *The Masculinities Reader*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Williams, L. (1989). *Hard Core: Power, Pleasure, and the "Frenzy of the Visible"*. California: University of California.

Williams, Z. (2010. Apr. 6). Chatroulette: The Odds of Onanism Online. *Guardian*.
Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2010/mar/06/zoe-williams-chatroulette>.

Zizek, S. (2004). *Organs Without Bodies: Deleuze and Consequences*. New York: Routledge.