

Routledge Studies in Hazards, Disaster Risk and Climate Change

Series Editor: Ilan Kelman, Reader in Risk, Resilience and Global Health at the Institute for Risk and Disaster Reduction (IRDR) and the Institute for Global Health (IGH), University College London (UCL)

This series provides a forum for original and vibrant research. It offers contributions from each of these communities as well as innovative titles that examine the links between hazards, disasters and climate change, to bring these schools of thought closer together. This series promotes interdisciplinary scholarly work that is empirically and theoretically informed, with titles reflecting the wealth of research being undertaken in these diverse and exciting fields.

Published:

Cultures and Disasters

Understanding cultural framings in disaster risk reduction

Edited by Fred Krüger, Greg Bankoff, Terry Cannon, Benedikt Orłowski and E. Lisa F. Schipper

Recovery from Disasters

Ian Davis and David Alexander

Men, Masculinities and Disaster

Edited by Elaine Enarson and Bob Pease

Men, Masculinities and Disaster

**Edited by
Elaine Enarson and Bob Pease**

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

2016

3 Men and masculinities in the social movement for a just reconstruction after Hurricane Katrina

Rachel E. Luft

Gender and disaster scholars note that during and after disaster traditional gender roles and patterns can be either exaggerated or subverted (Enarson, 2012; Pacholok, 2013). The temporary dissolution of normal life can facilitate the reversion to extreme forms of the gender binary or, conversely, the transgression of normative arrangements and production of new opportunities for gendered practice. While the literature indicates that regression to hierarchical gendered power dynamics is more common, transformation is sometimes possible. This chapter examines both the reinstallation of, and intervention into, dominant gendered patterns after Hurricane Katrina struck the Gulf Coast on August 29, 2005. The setting is the New Orleans-based, grassroots social movement that fought for a just reconstruction. Instead of focusing on gender identity, I explore the gendered mechanisms that differentially advanced men into movement leadership, and also the gendered symbolic meanings of ostensibly gender-neutral practices. I center men and masculinity in an intersectional framework, uncovering the ways in which both were privileged and sometimes transformed in movement activity in the years after the disaster. My interest is the practices that promote the dominance of men and masculinity after crisis as well as those that work to destabilize it.¹

Context and approach

Within hours of Katrina's landfall, local and national grassroots social movement organizers coalesced in the effort I call the Movement for a Just Reconstruction. The movement resembled other post-disaster civil society emergent groups in advancing a recovery agenda (Enarson, 2012). In significant ways, however, it also differed from them in using the language and tools of social justice as organizers sought to reframe the disaster of the hurricane as a product of long-standing racial and economic oppression. The movement politicized hurricane-related grievances and linked the disaster to ongoing US social crises. It focused on seven primary areas: grassroots relief and recovery, displacement or the right of return, the reconstruction of affordable housing and healthcare, worker and immigrant justice, and criminal justice reform.

As the site of this study, the post-disaster social movement provides the opportunity to examine men and masculinity across other social positionalities; important

intersections of race, class, place, age and political experience complicate reductive notions of gender while also revealing gendered patterns. Additionally, the Movement for a Just Reconstruction brought together local disaster survivors and non-local activists. The former includes men who were living in New Orleans at the time of the hurricane and whose lives were personally disrupted by the disaster; the latter includes people I call activist-volunteers, supporters from around the country who came after the storm to participate in the movement.

The two primary foci of the chapter are the advancement of men to positions of movement leadership and the promulgation—and occasional subversion—of dominant modalities of masculinity in movement values, visions and organizing styles. By men I mean people who accept their early male gender assignment. By masculinity I refer to normative “pattern[s] of practice” that privilege certain values, enactments and social relations over others in a hierarchy of gender power (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 832).

I am a White, feminist sociologist who had been involved in racial justice movements for years before the hurricane struck. I was living in New Orleans at the time of the disaster and spent the next six years conducting participant observation in post-Katrina movement groups. I interviewed or held focus groups with forty movement leaders and activists, plus seven others who worked in non-profit or related capacities. Thirty-one were women, fifteen were men, and one was genderqueer. Twenty-five were Black, nineteen White, and three Latino/a. There were twenty-nine hurricane survivors and eighteen who were nonlocal. The respondents featured here were very involved in the loose network of post-disaster movement groups. While I put men and masculinity at the center of this study, I draw heavily from the perspectives of women and the gender nonconforming people who worked with them. I begin by describing the reproduction of men's leadership, turn to an analysis of movement masculinity and then address instances of actual and potential intervention.

Men in leadership: the glass forklift

Scholars of gender and work have identified a “glass escalator” effect in the workplace that promotes (some) men into positions of leadership (Williams, 2013). In this section I suggest that the gendered conditions of disaster in combination with the gendered politics of social movement activity can facilitate men's leadership in post-disaster movement formations in a process I call the “glass forklift.” Here we see the normal advantages to men in the paid workforce, public sphere and social movement activity—lack of caregiving responsibilities, default masculinist practices and so forth—exaggerated and multiplied in the disaster setting.

The devastation of infrastructure after Hurricane Katrina had differential effects for differently gendered people. Since men take less responsibility for caregiving labor, the absence of adequate housing, medical care, schools and transportation was frequently simpler to navigate than it was for women who care for children, the elderly and the sick. Men were often able to return to the city more quickly and were less consumed with managing basic needs for themselves and their families.

When they did face personal recovery tasks they were more likely to receive help from the movement in ways that would turn them into people who could organize full time. Activists organized work parties to help male leaders get up and running: they cleared and cleaned storm damage, did home repair, gutted flooded residences, provided rides and, in the case of at least one local male organizer, performed childcare. The personal recovery needs of male leaders, that is, were interpreted to be politically salient. In this way, disaster relief and selective occasions of reproductive labor were reframed as political activism and practiced in gendered ways.

Conversely, women organizers in New Orleans were rarely identified as critical movement leaders for whom personal support was political. They described coming back to the city months after male leaders were already reestablished in stable living conditions and therefore in movement leadership as well. Organizers knew they had a small window of public attention after the hurricane; those who were installed first disproportionately shaped movement organizations, set agendas and directed financial resources. For example, a Black feminist woman organizer had been heartbroken not to be able to return to the city immediately, as she had to find housing and school for her young son. Despite this obstacle, she was instrumental in getting one of the larger emergent movement groups off the ground. When she and her child finally made it back to New Orleans in January 2006, she was offered a paid staff position with the group she had helped to found. She asked for one week to find an open school or childcare for her child in the devastated city and was told the organization could not wait; they offered the position to someone else. Bill Quigley, a White movement lawyer, summarized the consequences of these practices:

The leadership of the response ... the people who had jobs ... who got money ... [it was a] very high proportion of men who did that and yet for every group, the group [of movement rank and file] was 80–90% women.

As women juggled movement organizing with caregiving work, men were free(d) to spend long hours in strategy sessions, national conference calls and public events. They were recognized as leaders during the early days and weeks when the press was paying particular attention and activist-volunteers from around the country were seeking direction about how to help. Several of these men turned very early to the media, which gave them national recognition as movement leaders. For example, Jordan Flaherty, a White male anarchist and labor organizer, wrote a long description of his experiences in the first days after Katrina. The piece went viral in radical circles across the country and soon he was receiving press calls for interviews. He describes how, guided by feminist, antiracist principles, he first turned down the interviews, recommending instead several local women of color movement organizers. Later, to his chagrin, he learned that the media had not made contact with the women, instead interviewing several other White men who did not share his political commitments. From then on, he agreed to speak to the press and the experience transformed him into an independent journalist with an international reputation.

Jordan was not the first person to mention that it was often difficult to reach local women organizers by phone. The politics of visibility, accessibility and personal infrastructure are all deeply gendered and intersectional. Shana Griffin, a local Black feminist woman, was scolded by more than one White feminist philanthropist for being too busy to meet with potential donors. It was an exasperating charge. Shana was a key movement organizer in a struggle that had enormous external challenges and myriad internal sexist dynamics, which meant she was fighting on two fronts. She was also parenting a child while being constantly on call for a steady stream of “helpers” (e.g. the press, donors, eager volunteers). It would have been impossible to respond to the endless barrage of demands. As her situation and that of others after the storm demonstrates repeatedly, it takes infrastructure to create infrastructure, and access to infrastructure is gendered and racialized, both personally and organizationally. Where activist-volunteers arrived at male leaders’ homes with tools, a car or an offer of physical labor, well-intentioned people showed up to “help” Shana with a list of questions and a need for information. The end result was that some male leaders received a continuous flow of contributions—clean-up, childcare and administrative labor—allowing them to have a vocal local and national presence, which in turn increased their national profile, funds and local power.

The temporary collapse of distinctions—between public and private, between personal reproductive labor and collective movement activism—that happened disproportionately for men after the disaster has the potential to be a model for refiguring notions of movement activity and culture as well as divisions of labor in daily life. Helping people become stable so that they can lead is a powerful reformulation of political practice with potentially radical gendered implications. After Katrina, however, it was enacted in ways that served to bolster men’s power and marginalize women leaders.

There were myriad other gendered practices that interacted with the post-storm environment to solidify men’s organizational power. Forms of organizational and movement sexism that abound in non-disaster settings were exacerbated by the conditions of post-hurricane life. Rosana Cruz, a Latina feminist, chronicled some of them: “I definitely recognized that there were mad gender dynamics happening all around me. There was the dynamic of the macho model of organizing, there was the gross organizing-with-your-dick dynamic.” She described charismatic male leaders who “just romanc[e] people, specifically women, into doing stuff [for them].... [They are] very intellectual and magnetic, right.... you make women in different situations fall in love with you so that they’ll do what you want.” Others also portrayed the reign of charming men who were in prominent public positions while relying on women’s support labor behind the scenes. Khalil Shahyd, a working-class Black man from Louisiana, described these dynamics. One group, for example:

emphasized certain works, basically the house gutting which was done by all the men, this physical labor ... this is the chest beating labor, this is the valorous labor.... But yet you know the work that other partners were doing, whether it was Keneika, who was managing everything in the offices,

whether it was Shana and other folks who [were] actually managing the finances and the resources, whether it was Althea and those folks who created Safe Streets ... whether it was Shana again trying to create this woman of color health center ... there was no communication from [the organization] to the outside world about any of it.... I tried to ... show them how the gender dynamic was very uneven in the way that the organization ... was functioning, but they were not willing to hear that at all.

The gendered experience of disaster interacts with normative organizational and cultural gendered patterns to promote men's leadership during times of crisis. Identifying preexisting gendered structures and post-disaster gendered emergent response patterns are necessary to interrupt what otherwise appears to be the natural advancement of men over women.

Masculinization of a movement: from gendered people to gendered practices

In most cases, the installation of men as the public, nationally recognized, funded leaders of post-Katrina emergent movement organizations promoted a highly gendered organizing vision and set of strategies and practices. Despite the masculinization of movement choices, they were overwhelmingly coded as gender neutral. In this way, men in power are conduits for the promulgation and institutionalization of gendered culture while cloaking this approach in gender-blind language. Even those who recognize the numerical disparity of gendered bodies in leadership may have difficulty perceiving the gendered dynamics of movement culture. Jordan expressed the challenge this way:

I always had this framework of race and gender, so of trying to lift up people of color voices and within that lift up women's voices.... But I think that the next step of ... what does it mean to really make gender a crucial part of this struggle.... I'm still trying to figure that out.

The move in a gender audit from centering gendered people to centering gendered practices is difficult under any circumstance. Disasterscapes, however, are particularly challenging contexts in which to do so because they are already gendered in the popular imagination (Luft, 2008; Enarson, 2012). Normative ways of making sense of disaster settings, that is, are filtered through gendered meanings. The post-Katrina disasterscape was chaotic, desolate and heavily militarized. Organizers reflected on the gendered logic with which it was produced and narrativized, and identified the gendered consequences of these frames for the movement. As Kai Barrow, a Black feminist woman who came soon after the hurricane, recalled:

There were no children, very few women, there were no grocery stores ... it was barren.... there was dead bodies.... it felt raped, it really did. I say

all that to say ... immediately what ... emerged ... it was very much about shutting down, you know, shutting down and locking in a particular modality. It wasn't about opening up, it wasn't about creative thinking.... Or this idea around intersectionality: as we talk about race can we also look at where gender and sexuality and class come into play?

Kai describes how the gendered experience of the disasterscape was reified in ways that promoted male leadership and naturalized masculinity. What emerged were gendered standards for ideal typical organizers and gendered notions of what counted as activism, both of which were presented in gender-neutral ways. Rosana gave an example from the group that was organizing day laborers against immigration and employment injustice:

There is this gender dynamic of "well, the workers, who are men, are living in these [unsafe conditions in flooded, moldy homes or tents] and so it's OK for us to mirror their living situation." Unless you have a kid or you're taking care of people or you're in this caretaking position as a woman [in which case you cannot]. So then also the meetings that would happen where decisions would be made were in a bar at 11 o'clock at night or like all of these situations where it was gendered just "by circumstance," quote unquote.

The engendering of political activity did not simply promote male organizers, but defined the very terms of organizing: what counts as critical, what should be prioritized, how scarce resources should be utilized and distributed. Apparent martyrdom and all-or-nothing activism were gendered and they produced gendered results, creating standards by which movement effort was evaluated. People who could not meet these expectations, because of caregiving responsibilities, political differences or other reasons, were perceived to have a lack of devotion to the movement. Rosana told the story of a woman who was organizing mostly Latino day laborers. Despite the fact that the woman spoke Spanish when some of the male leadership did not, she was marginalized in the organization because she

had two small children and so basically there wasn't really any kind of accommodation [such as] let's try and figure out how this person who can actually communicate with the workers because she speaks Spanish, how can we make this work.... [Instead] it's like [she's] not reliable, she has an issue, then suddenly she became vilified.... [But] she was [just] a mom.

Rosana's observation that the ways in which male leaders' limitations—such as not speaking Spanish—were minimized while women's gendered responsibilities were perceived to be liabilities demonstrates the gendered social construction of the movement activist. It produced and valued certain kinds of organizers and certain kinds of organizing practices.

The compelling conditions of the disasterscape and the narrow window of opportunity for redress produced a palpable mood of political urgency in the movement. While there was a material dimension to this reality, urgency was constructed in gendered ways with gendered effects. Rosana described this process:

I think especially after Katrina, it felt like people did not have time for a gender analysis ... it was too urgent, we just had to do things. People use the phrase "balls to the wall," and it was very telling because there was this focus on like we have to do everything, we have to save everyone and we don't have time to figure out if people are getting paid or if their health insurance is kicking in for their jobs or these petty bourgeois concerns, we have to ... be organizing and responding to all these crises. And the fact that we were building an organization that was completely unsustainable ... raising those concerns was put down in a very gendered way.... It's like whatever landed on fire in our laps that's what we responded to.

Deciding what counts as fire when it lands in your lap is a gendered process. There are two dimensions here. First, urgency is socially constructed, a designation based on priorities and meanings which are always already gendered. Rosana observed that

there was also this very macho idea of organizing where it was about results.... you have to have certain results and it has to be sexy to funders and it has to have certain media attention. And so ultimately to me it was gendered.

Experiencing wage theft is urgent, experiencing sexual assault is not; being unable to return home because of flooded housing is urgent, being unable to return home because of caregiving responsibilities is not; having scheduling flexibility and being able to work all night is a priority in an urgent situation, while knowing the city, speaking Spanish and having feminist credentials are not.

Second, urgency encourages certain kinds of practices that are justified by expediency. Several organizers described modalities of what they called patriarchal, authoritarian organizing that were rationalized by crisis and scarcity. These modalities do not have time for feminist principles or concerns, as Rosana noted above, such as the inclusion of gender as politically important, attentiveness to default conduits of power and leadership, sustainable models of balanced or holistic organizing, or an ethic of care and justice for organizers.

Kai deepens this analysis by explaining that authoritarian modalities are resistant to "facilitative organizing," which she describes as less patriarchal and more deliberative and reflective. Facilitative organizing, she explains, means organizers

will lay groundwork, that we will engage people in a range of different activities to stimulate critical thinking, and that we will provide resources so that folks can engage their own critical production.... But does that work in emergencies, does

that work when there is crisis at work, crisis upon crisis upon crisis that we're constantly battling?

Khalil similarly distinguished organizing modalities:

you see the sort of gender dynamics play out in the way that ... it's always about this sort of growth of power in opposition to an oppressor as opposed to — using gendered terms — nurturing and developing an alternative livelihood, an alternative society....What I was really hoping for, like out of the neighborhood planning process...that there would be this sort of process of actual organizing of communities, like permanently organizing communities into a local organized institutional basis.

Engendering is always intersectional; gendered modalities were produced and consumed in racialized ways. Bay Love, a young White man who had just graduated from a liberal arts college, framed it this way:

[It] just felt like the gender dynamics—but really like the patriarchy that was present there—was just really really palpable because it was like, post-Katrina, we got to carry guns, we got to get water, we got to bust through the piles of cars and the police oppression to get there. It just felt like it was really important to be big and strong and manly, and [an older Black male leader] is a figurehead, in my mind, so sort of masculine, like really big and has a really deep voice and [a young White man who was later exposed as an FBI informant] was a lot of that too you know. A lot of the sort of militancy that was around ... at that time was all very sort of gendered and male-dominated.... I felt like I was sort of proud ... to be able to say we were part of an organization where people would carry guns if they needed to. [Pause] Even though I never really wanted to myself.

Beyond gendered bodies

A final way in which the valorization and centralization of masculinity functioned is expressed in the advancement of certain women leaders in the movement over others. Several prominent, middle-aged, local Black women were widely recognized as movement leaders. Some had professional credentials, such as law degrees, where most of the senior male leadership were authorized instead by political experience. In each case, the senior woman led with an explicit race and class framework, rarely mentioning gender. It seemed that women who rose more easily to prominence in the movement were those who promoted gender-neutral politics; their political priorities and commitments more closely resembled the men's than they did those of feminist women in the movement who were seen as having "special" interests. When charges of sexism arose, people were quick to point to the women's leadership as counterevidence, focusing on the gendered body count and not on gendered practices or feminist principles of social justice organizing.

Challenges to men and masculinity: consciousness-raising opportunities

While most of the gender and disaster literature indicates that gender is more likely to be aggressively reproduced in times of crisis, there is evidence that the radical if temporary alteration of daily life provides opportunity for gender power subversion. In the context of the Movement for a Just Reconstruction after Katrina, gendered power dynamics were disrupted in two primary ways. The first was the transformation of some women into organizers. The second was feminist consciousness-raising. I focus here on the latter.

Endesha Juakali is a middle-aged Black man who grew up in New Orleans public housing and spent much of his life working with and for public housing residents. Before Katrina he did not read gender as central to “day to day struggles,” instead focusing on race and class. This changed after the disaster:

Everything I’ve began [sic] to challenge on this issue has been post-Katrina.... if you would have talked to me prior to Katrina you probably wouldn’t still be sitting here because I was strictly nationalist, macho, kind of, “we don’t have time to worry about that, that’s personal, we need to stick with fighting the ... revolutions around race and class.... that’s an issue that just diverts us from the real issues.” So I mean yeah, most of my growth on this area has come since Katrina.

He was in a process that was driven by explicit conversations that happened organically in the midst of post-Katrina organizing, noting, “I’ve been called out quite a few times.” He describes one particular incident:

We were at a ... housing action group meeting.... And this brother did this rap thing and ... he called Bush a faggot and I mean you had the people who was really upset about him using the word and I was like well, we need to stick to the workshop. That’s going to divert us.... So then they had to stop the whole session to talk about why I didn’t think it was important... [T]hey had quite a few lesbian and gays and different people who was like, that’s important to us kind of thing, it’s a part of the work. I mean we can’t work with you if you don’t respect.

These exchanges influenced Endesha to incorporate gender into his political framework:

We’re all growing and the more I worked with people who bring forth the issue—if there’s a contradiction between racism and classism and getting rid of class would not resolve the race issue—well I’m feeling the same thing now [about gender]. Getting rid of race and class will not resolve the gender issue, that’s an issue that’s going to have to be dealt with just pretty much like racism.

Endesha believed that the Movement for a Just Reconstruction had exposed him to feminist concerns in a new way: “[Normally] I just don’t think about those things.

Well, let me say this, this gender issue was – I probably never mentioned gender prior to 2005.” The political landscape of New Orleans before Katrina, as with most US cities, was composed of relatively siloed political communities. Katrina loosed the boundaries in fruitful ways creating a new context for organizers kept apart by political differences and the demands of daily life. For a short time, Katrina was a new meta-frame that sought to link issues and people generally understood to be incompatible. While it did not often prevail, there was at times a sense among organizers that the struggle for justice after the devastation required new levels of solidarity.

During this window, there were opportunities for what Kai described as a political stance of “opening up.” Endesha observed:

Yeah, now I do absolutely [consider gender] because it affects the struggle. I mean not only in regards to a male and female but the whole lesbian, bisexual, transgender, all of that. I’ve experienced very good, wonderful comrades in these areas who think these areas are very important to them and the same way that I would expect they would understand how racism affects me I should work to understand how it affects those comrades.

After the peak period of the movement and many feminist attempts to make it more feminist, several male organizers expressed remorse that they had not supported this effort. Chris Crass, a White antiracist, feminist, nonlocal organizer who mentored young White activists reflected on his group’s hesitation to be explicitly feminist:

we have an understanding organizationally around gender and around patriarchy and around feminism, but I think we’ve struggled around how to articulate that.... I think the ways that we’ve ... talked about things had really led to people deemphasizing gender, deemphasizing the negative impacts of patriarchy on female-socialized people, the movement, on gender dynamics within organizations.

Jordan had a similar regret. He recalled the period in 2006 when women activist-volunteers were sexually assaulted by male activist-volunteers in Common Ground, one of the movement groups:

I wish I had been thinking more about how gender stuff was playing out. For example, within Common Ground, the stuff with sexual assault.... I did not see that stuff coming. I think that more of my analysis was that White males ... were coming to New Orleans with this racist, colonial, imperial attitude. So ... I felt like White males were a point to reach out to but I felt like that they needed to be especially reached out to on a race-level, not on a gender-level.

Despite the fact that feminist principles never became central to the movement, a fact that likely undermined its efficacy and its accomplishment of racial and economic justice (Luft, forthcoming), there are signs that they had an impact. As a result of the determination of feminist activists, some organizers began to develop a gender analysis while others recommitted to bringing it more centrally into their work.

Conclusion

Major disaster burns, disintegrates or, in the case of Hurricane Katrina, washes away material and social structures of daily life. Despite the power of these destructive forces, however, gender usually remains. Normative structural and cultural patterns that promote men and masculinity interact with the exceptional conditions of disaster to produce common gendered outcomes in abnormal contexts. Less often, but important, are the ways in which disaster catalyzes new possibilities. In the case of the social movement after Katrina, activists and organizers from different political orientations came together to fight for a just reconstruction, and in the process some experienced feminist consciousness-raising.

The point of this chapter is not to condemn men for being movement leaders in a time of crisis. Indeed, most of those in the Movement for a Just Reconstruction were visionary, self-sacrificing and deeply committed to the struggle for justice in what were traumatizing, disorienting and challenging conditions. Instead, my aim has been to shed light on the ways in which gender was part of the disastrous landscape. Normative masculinity was often the default or ruling relation in the movement. This social fact had consequences not only for women and for feminist principles, but also for ostensibly gender-neutral practices, such as organizing strategy and tactics, and therefore for outcomes. While the coincidence of men and masculinity means that promoting differently gendered people into positions of movement leadership is likely to make a difference, the gender of bodies alone is not sufficient. Instead, identifying and interrupting masculinity in values and practices coded gender neutral is necessary to decenter masculinity and promote feminist, intersectional outcomes.

Note

- 1 With gratitude to the organizers of the post-Katrina Movement for a Justice Reconstruction in New Orleans, I am particularly indebted to Shana Griffin, who gets credit for the best of what is in this chapter.

References

- Connell, R.W. and Messerschmidt, J. (2005) Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), pp. 829–859.
- Enarson, E. (2012) *Women confronting natural disaster: From vulnerability to resilience*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Luft, R. (2008) Looking for common ground: Relief work in post-Katrina New Orleans as an American parable of race and gender violence. *National Women's Studies Association Journal*, 20(3), pp. 5–31.
- Luft, R. (forthcoming) Racialized disaster patriarchy: An intersectional model for understanding disaster ten years after Hurricane Katrina. *Feminist Formations*.
- Pacholok, S. (2013) *Into the fire: Disaster and the remaking of gender*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Williams, C.L. (2013) The glass escalator, revisited: Gender inequality in neoliberal times. *Gender & Society*, 27(5), pp. 609–629.

4 Hyper-masculinity and disaster

The reconstruction of hegemonic masculinity in the wake of calamity

Duke W. Austin

Although the data are limited, numerous qualitative and mixed-method studies indicate that gendered sexual and domestic violence often increase in the aftermath of disasters (Fothergill, 1996; Enarson and Morrow, 1998; Enarson *et al.*, 2007). Reports show that violence against women increased following the Loma Prieta earthquake, Hurricane Andrew and the Grand Forks flood, all in the United States (Laudisio, 1993; and see Enarson, 2012 for a review). In addition, research indicates that gendered violence increased following Hurricane Mitch in Nicaragua (Cupples, 2007), the Indian Ocean tsunami in Sri Lanka (Fisher, 2010), the Whakatan flood and the Canterbury snowstorm in New Zealand (Houghton, 2009; Houghton *et al.*, 2010), the Sichuan earthquake in China (Chan and Zhang, 2011) and the 2010 Haiti earthquake (Bell, 2010), among others.

A common misconception is that heightened levels of stress following a disaster lead to increases in gendered violence (Enarson, 2012). However, research has been unable to establish a direct positive relationship between disaster-related stress and domestic violence (Clemens *et al.*, 1999). In contrast to individual-level analyses, I focus on structural causes of post-disaster gendered violence. While individual-level analysis has an important role to play in uncovering the causes of gendered violence following a disaster, focusing only on the individual fails to account for structural changes that can lead to increased levels of violence.

In this chapter, I theorize that the increase in men's violence against women is the result of a breakdown and reconstruction of masculinity following the impairment of the institutional structures that support hegemonic masculinity. During routine, non-disaster times, hegemonic masculinity maintains dominance less through actual violence and more through the threat of violence. This less violent form of dominance depends, however, on the orderly maintenance of institutional structures, and natural disasters often disrupt those structures. As a result, disaster masculinity, a form of hyper-masculinity, emerges post-disaster. Disaster masculinity often leads to increased levels of gendered violence.

The gendered violence that takes place following disasters must be understood in the context of gendered violence that occurs during routine, non-disaster times. Violence against women during these routine times occurs as a result of the subordinate status of women relative to men. Men's violence serves to express and reinforce the gendered hierarchy while controlling and maintaining men's power,

