

SEXUALITY:

BEYOND THE QUESTION OF EQUALITY

- An experimental examination of the nature of social changes -

Hiroko Hirose

【abstract】

The purpose of this paper is twofold. First, to outline the inevitable nature of social changes, and secondly, to illustrate the state of modern society in association with the first purpose, focusing on the field of sexuality. For the former, the post-modern term ‘excess’, and for the latter, the results of socio-historical researches are employed.

Through agents who live the contradictory nature of modern sexuality which tries to combine fluidity with stability, society may encounter new sets of discourse driven from excess, and will be forced to change. In general, affected by the excess, society has no option but to continue to adjust, this means any ultimate ‘utopia’ will never happen.

Key words

sexuality, modernity, social changes, excess, fetishism

1 Introduction

2 Heterosexuality

The question of equality

Order and Excess

Heterosexuality and Reproduction

3 Contraception

The introduction of contraception and its consequences for the modern world

The separation of sexual intercourse from human reproduction

4 The trap of reproductive sexual intercourse

Monogamy

Adultery

Fetishism

5 Conclusion

1 Introduction

How society reproduces has been examined in various studies ¹. However, how society changes has been less frequently considered. One attempt was through Marxism, which tried to analyze the nature of modern society and its development over time. Needless to say, this particular aspect is not effective now.

The purpose of this paper is twofold. First, to outline the inevitable nature of social changes, and secondly, to illustrate the state of modern society in association with the first purpose, starting from a feminism-oriented question, focusing on the field of sexuality.

For the first purpose, the post-modern notion of 'excess', and for the second, the results of socio-historical researches are employed.

Section 2 first indicates the nature of the two categories of gender, arguing that the categories of the two sexes are invented conceptions to accept the fact of human and hence social reproduction. To expound conceptualization, the term 'excess' and its pair term 'order' are used.

Section 3 highlights sexual intercourse and illustrates its position in modern society. The introduction of widespread contraception is listed as a historical incident which led society to its modern version by, for example, offering it an actual background for the new conception of 'an individual'. This new habit would dismantled the dominant position of heterosexual intercourse, and would, therefore, prepare the new stage for sexuality.

Section 4 moves to answer the question why, despite our being in the stage after the introduction of widely available contraception, heterosexual relationships are still keeping their dominant position. To answer this, the new coupling system - love marriage - is examined. At the same time, the instability of the system is spotlighted both from the aspect of 'order'-'excess', and from the aspect of the nature of the combination of sexuality and discourse.

2 Heterosexuality

The question of equality

Feminism sets equality as the means to solve gender-related problems. While it was once the case that women's claims to equality were regarded as confined to the activities of small but vocal groups of women, these claims are now much more universally made and views about women's equality are more widely held and accepted. The debate on whether one is for or against gender equality has shifted to concerns over the actual practicing of new gender roles and in discerning how a better situation can materialize as a result of a better understanding of gender.

However, the strategy of fighting for equality between the sexes by eliminating discrimination is an insufficient and inadequate one to solve sexuality issues.² It is of course still true that many women are being unfairly discriminated against. However, the difficulties which women face in life may go beyond their being subjected to discriminatory practices and oppression. Therefore, even if discrimination could suddenly be effectively eliminated, women would still encounter some forms of hardship in their lives. The further difficulties which women would experience, even in the hypothetical situation of complete equality with men, must be identified.

While the following is not, of course, peculiar to women, we notice comfort or discomfort, pleasure or displeasure in society as well as in our objective environment. We often feel alienated from society or feel unsatisfied with our surroundings even if we may be experiencing blameless circumstances. A satisfactorily consummated relationship does not necessarily harmonize the fulfillment of sexuality. Perfect equality, would it exist, may not always guarantee perfect fulfillment to the participants. It may offer us equal dissatisfaction as well as, conceivably, equal satisfaction. It is an important proposition of this paper that one cannot trace the roots of discomfort, alienation, dissatisfaction and instability merely from gender oppression and discrimination.

To illustrate gender-related or sexuality-related uneasiness, a very common

question will be employed as a guide in order to elucidate the elements involved, namely, whether friendship can exist between a man and a woman on a platonic level. This question can be translated as to whether an intimate relationship between a man and a woman is possible without sexual intercourse. To shed some light on these concerns, the paper elucidates the discourse on the male and female categories in heterosexual relationship. In the next section, the terms 'order' and 'excess' are introduced to discuss these issues.

Order and Excess

Both 'order' and 'excess' are epistemological and semiotic terms. When A. Asada begins *Kozo to Chikara (Structure and Power)* by stating 'At the beginning was EXCÈS. This thesis is already misleading.'³, this is an introductory attempt to codify modern society questioning the a priori and substantial existence of excess. In a similar sense, K. Maruyama attempts to sublimate mental-physical dualism by constructing the theoretical frameworks of 'Mi-wake' or categorization and 'Koto-wake' or symbolization, by which Maruyama illustrates the nature of human beings as embedded with non-instinct Gestalt, i.e. the world which is symbolized through language and which Maruyama calls 'excess'.⁴ The term 'excess' also recalls G. Bataille. In *The Accursed Share*, Bataille emphasizes that the nature of society should be interpreted as constructed with the key feature of 'surplus energy'⁵. Bataille refers to 'the consumption of wealth' and 'eroticism' as the representative process of squandering 'surplus energy'. In doing so, he highlights the significance of disintegration.⁶

Having much in common with the above works, and in exercising a post-modern approach, the term 'excess' and its pair term 'order' in this paper should be understood as follows. The process where 'order' is formulated from chaos is the process where a discourse is developed by grouping together relevant signs and symbols to present a particular world-view, which is 'order' itself. The rest is discarded. Such a grouping of signs and symbols can be described as drawing boundaries which silhouettes the 'order', and which, at the same time, relegates the abandoned elements as 'otherness' or, what this paper shall call, 'excess' leaving them behind or outside the 'order'. The generation

of order spontaneously generates excess - the logic of order relies upon the existence of the both. The paper hence asserts that order requires the notion of 'excess' to sustain itself as being meaningfully silhouetted. By 'excess' is meant the qualities and phenomena that get marginalized and, therefore, become unrecognizable, shielded behind order.

Order should be understood as being established and maintained through discourse which may take the form of 'stories', codified concepts and symbols. Stories determine what is considered orthodox, right, normal, pleasing to the senses, 'inside', noteworthy, and real; what is heretical, wrong, abnormal, unpleasant, 'outside', insignificant and unreal are also necessarily determined by stories. Acceptability and norms, together with unacceptability and abnormality, are defined within the stories, framed and maintained by discourse, while the rest is left unrecognized, not even codified by any of the elements of the world, which is 'excess'.

Such an ordered world may replicate itself continuously as the stories sustaining it get 'handed-down' from generation to generation. Thus, order described as such is fundamentally self-generating and self-sustaining. Related to this self replication of order, the concern of the paper now shifts to the domain of discussion about heterosexual relationship.

Heterosexuality and Reproduction

As order, which is maintained by stories, is the interpretation of the world by human beings, this can only be maintained and sustained by reproducing the circles of discourse in which people live, by human beings themselves, which in terns requires that successive generations of human beings continue to believe and to contribute these reproductive systems of discourse.⁷ Unquestionably, this is our heterosexual reproduction system.

The primitive concern for heterosexual discourse could not merely aim to divide human beings into two categories, i.e. men and women, but to understand the reproductive fact. This should be the means to acquire the capability to recognize the reproductive capacities of women to reason the child-birth fact. Hence the two

categories of sex in heterosexual discourse may begin by making a distinction between human beings who conceive and give birth, and those who don't, in other words, between child-bearing 'women' and non-child-bearing 'men'.

This leads to the anticipatory principle that maintaining the discourse of human reproduction requires only a crude distinction between 'women' and 'men'. More refined scientific knowledge of the actual mechanics of physical reproduction is unnecessary for this.⁸ Therefore, this crude distinction between child-bearers and non-child-bearers has been able to coexist with factual observations of cases which are seemingly inconsistent with the heterosexual system, such as hermaphrodites⁹, the Beldash system of the Native Americans¹⁰, and cross-dressing¹¹.

Inevitably, the reproduction of order runs parallel to the physical reproduction of human beings. As long as this account of human reproduction is accepted as being crucial for preserving the framework of order, and as long as it retains its epistemological status, this heterosexual discourse, where human beings are recognized as being either males or females, and sexual relations are considered to be held predominantly between the two categories, will remain fundamental to human interactions and continue as the norm.

What gives heterosexuality the dominant position against other categories, such as homosexuality and sexual fetishism, is undoubtedly sexual intercourse. Through reproduction, this activity is believed to enable the society and its participants to link themselves to generations of time, or, as if, to the perpetual time and then to the eternity. A wide range of human emotions, values and activities have flourished under this power of sexual intercourse.

Despite the fact that the primitive purpose of dividing human beings into two sex categories originated from the concern with reproduction, the reproductive process does not reveal the heterosexual discourse in its entirety. This necessitates the next argument on heterosexuality in the dimension of discourse.

Earlier on in the argument, I posed the question of whether friendship can exist between a man and a woman, and subsequently of whether an intimate relationship between a man and a woman is possible without sexual intercourse. In the light of what has discussed in the argument, the question can now be rephrased as 'Can men and women be liberated in their relationships from the power of sexual intercourse?' To

answer this, a discussion of the relationship between sexual intercourse, reproduction and sexuality is necessary.

3 Contraception

The introduction of contraception and its consequences for the modern world

Some works in socio-history have made a great contribution in highlighting the background of so called written history by tracing the daily lives of ordinary people, mainly in their family sphere, spotlighting dynamic trend in population. One of the most significant outcomes in this field is the discovery of the historical role of contraception.¹² In *Centuries of Childhood*¹³, P. Ariès illustrates its outline in connection with the notion of childhood, which he tightly relates to the occurrence of the new conception of 'an individual', one of the most fundamental elements in modern society.

The concept of 'childhood', asserts Ariès, was not manifest in pre-modern European society. Ariès goes on to claim that childhood as a recognizable and well-defined concept is in fact a product of modern times, and our own view of children is a distinctively modern creation.¹⁴

Y. Miyazawa highlights the linkage between the notion of childhood and four theoretical characteristics in modernity.¹⁵ Firstly, children as individuals, which means that children are neither the property of their parents nor that of the state. However, this should not be understood as the adaptation of the conception of 'an individual' to very young persons. On the contrary, the conception of 'an individual' became formulated alongside the discovery of childhood. Secondly, children with an inner self, which means that children have a personal and private aspect of themselves as individuals, corresponding to their 'inner conscientiousness' strongly related to Puritanism which directs and guides. Thirdly, children as the object of technology, which means that children are categorized rather as nature than as culture, thus are seen as to be manipulated with technology, which, here, denotes comprehensive education or schooling, to become members of modern society - 'free', 'independent'

individuals. Fourthly, children as potential bearers of future, which means that children will and should generate the future rather than to practice the old traditions of the past. Because of their expected creativity, children are, in some sense, entitled to take advantage of their parents' generation, and, in turn, to be taken advantage of by following generations who would contribute to further progress. Miyazawa points out that these four aspects of childhood appeared in Europe simultaneously and in an integrated fashion.

What should, particularly, be examined here is the nature of the linkage between childhood and the conception of 'an individual'. Philosophical conceptions need, in general, to be underpinned by material basis apiece to become realistic conceptions, and the notion of 'individualism' is no exception. This idea necessitates material conditions for one to recognize others as irreplaceable individuals. These conditions must include relatively stable and longer-term relationships. Otherwise, the relationships must be loose and precarious, which may readily result in also the loose and precarious recognition of relationship itself. The outcomes of demographic researches suggest that two incidents should principally be designated as the cause which realized this stable relationship and, in its consequence, individualism.

The one is the reduction of birth rates owing to contraception introduced into daily sphere¹⁶, and the other is the reduction of mortality rates owing to the improvement of living standard including development in hygiene medicine. In generating bourgeoisie in the early modern time, so called social capillary phenomenon¹⁷, where as families gaining better social economic position, they tended to have fewer children who would have better chances and more secure places of survival, therefore, more stable relationships within their families, and vice versa, was observed as an underpinning of their generation. This shows the functional linkage between the new state of children, the creation of modern agents and modern ideology.

Thus, contraception realized the conditions for individualism. It should be fair to say that contraception is one of the key bases of modern society.

The separation of sexual intercourse from human reproduction

The availability of contraception also has changed the way we view sexual intercourse. Needless to say, this has enabled the separation of intercourse from reproduction, i.e. the separation of sexual pleasure from reproduction. In the story of heterosexual discourse, where a variety of rules for reproductive system are practiced, sexual intercourse without contraception, because of its possibility of pregnancy, may be the cause for great joy when it occurs in an expected and desired setting, but may also be the cause for tragedy, dramatically altering the social lives of the participants especially when occurred in unanticipated and undesired circumstances. However, the availability of contraception has ended the outright connection of intercourse with reproduction, consequently, may end the unconditional coalition of sexual intercourse with its exceptional position in society. The more reliable the contraception, the more noteworthy is this separation.

Sexual intercourse, being detached from the transcendence of reproduction, has entered as a less ritualized activity into daily lives of ordinary people and is playing a more casual and frequent role in gender relations. Where adultery was once condemned to a punishable crime for its role in introducing chaos into the order of reproduction, with the availability of contraception, this poses fewer risks of disrupting the reproductive order and could therefore become less reproacheable. In some sense, it also could be said, that sexual intercourse without its reproductive association has become akin to any other intimate action between men and women like shaking hands, embracing, kissing, petting and even conversing.

Sexual comfort and pleasure enjoyed with the privileged status of intercourse, in fact, does not simply result from physical stimulation. It is, nonetheless, undeniable that the physical practice of sexual intercourse has comprehensively been considered to be easy and, to some extent, effective means of going some way towards satisfying the libido. In spite of this, it must still be realized that not a few cases of sexual intercourse may not bring with them supreme pleasure; indeed they do not necessarily satisfy the participants at all. Furthermore, they may lead to frigidity or may even cause physical pain and discomfort. Rape and forced prostitution are cases in point. Thus, the physical dimension of intercourse should be understood as having to be proved and reinforced by discourse either to reach orgasm or to reach soreness. The supreme pleasure of sexual intercourse, if reached, should then be understood as a product of the combination of

physical action and discourse.

With the possibility of control over reproduction, with the possibility of gaining sexual pleasure without fear of pregnancy, sexual intercourse is now forced to be freed from the dominant position in the discourse of sexual pleasure. The consequence would, then, be a chaotic realm of sensual pleasure.

I posed the question of whether it is possible for men and women in intimate relations to be liberated from the power of sexual intercourse. Given that contraception has separated sexual intercourse from reproduction and given that this is considered to have diminished the status of sexual intercourse within the heterosexual discourse and destabilized that very same discourse, the answer would have to be an uncertain 'yes'. In reality, however, we are still subjected to the 'myth' binding sexual intercourse to the core of heterosexual relationship, or binding heterosexuality to the exceptional position in sexuality discourse. This enigma should be discussed next.

4 The trap of reproductive sexual intercourse

Monogamy

M. Foucault concludes from his historical analysis that modern society is not one which hides and suppresses sexuality to control it but the one which shows great interest in various forms of sexuality and lets them emerge in society¹⁸ in order, however, not to let them be free but to control them. This elucidation suggests a direction to answer the question above. The paper exercises this view, employing some results of socio-historical findings.

As Foucault shows, sexuality became widely discussed in modern society with the result in the transformation of vision on 'diverse' forms of sexuality from punishment to analysis, or from religious concern to scientific concern. Psychology, literature, sociology, medical studies and pedagogy began to deal with related subjects. Industry and the mass media have also responded actively to topics in this field.¹⁹ Though this phenomenon might have had an inclination to launch a new stage for various forms of sexuality to enjoy the redesigned scenario of open sexuality, heterosexual discourse and

attraction to sexual intercourse are still dominant, where the emerging forms of sexuality are still labeled as exceptional or second-class. It would be insufficient to explain this dominance of heterosexuality in terms of the low level of modernization or inadequate information or the poor availability of contraceptives.

Socio-historical research has revealed the perceptions of and motivations for male-female coupling in the modern period are qualitatively different from the pre-modern concept of coupling. While the dominant motivating factor behind choosing a partner in modern times is personal happiness described in terms of romantic love, the pre-modern concern was the interest of the families to carry on the household for example. E. Shorter examines this process.²⁰ Prior to this revolution, coupling was seen to be a ritualistic activity defined and required by the community to reinforce and perpetuate stability in society; to conserve the base for social security which had benefited society as well as the participants themselves against unpredictable social changes. Romantic love, as a kind of irrational emotion because of its changeable and less predictable nature, or fluidity, was considered irrelevant, unsuitable or even undesirable for the male and female roles in the coupling process.

The romantic revolution shifted the emphasis away from the community-defined coupling system to that of mutual affections, where both individuals would exercise choice based upon their own judgments and preferences. One of the consequences of this is the acceptance of monogamy and the monogamous family as desired goals for couples who practice romantic love. Here, a family is characterized as an institution which is built on emotional relationship and yet respects relatively long term relationships to facilitate the function of reproduction which is now considered to be an activity confirming their love relationship. Thus, two contradictory characteristics - fluidity and stability - are accommodated together in a love marriage, which, if this succeeds, should be called a miraculous system.

In spite of the expectation of emerging unique households upon each couple's preference in marriage, new ritualized gender roles have been introduced: the 'sexual division of labour' in which the female is to devote herself to the reproductive sphere at home and the male to the productive sphere in the market, which is available where a comprehensive industrial market is established outside the family domain. Since these new gender roles were formulated alongside the formation of the love marriage system,

this is regarded as corresponding to some of this new coupling system. Both parties in the monogamous relationship learn to affirm each other's love not only by accepting these roles themselves, but also by assuming that practicing these new roles is the way to express their love. This would account, for example, for the possibility that reproductive housework becomes the unpaid labour undertaken freely by many housewives, which is so called 'labour of love'.²¹ Similarly, the wage-earning activities of male outside the household represent the other side of this.

It is ironic that romantic love, which was supposed to be 'free' love, has become bound by the system of monogamous marriage. The modern family here functions not only as a device to stabilize activated released sexuality but also as a place where parents practice a new type of reproduction which is exclusive to them.²² In this way, there is seen the critical consequence of the new stage of sexuality; while the introduction of contraception had separated sexuality and reproduction, these two features became unified again within the modern family. In other words, heterosexuality, which was detached from reproductive standpoint, has been caught up within the norm of the romantic love habit leading to monogamous family where reproduction is the essential part of practicing love. Thus may be resolved the question stated above in the previous section.

The concern on this complexity must go further. It is not a direction for us here to criticize the fact that sexuality in modern times once again has been caught up in a heterosexual manual. On the contrary, what has to be apprehended here are the following two points. Firstly, world-wide, practicing sexuality has a manual to follow, for sexuality to be pursued as a matter of technique either at a personal level, to perceive pleasure and to enjoy good relationships, or at a macromatic level to keep sexual energy in order to control it. Secondly, heterosexual discourse does not 'retire' - for as long as humans reproduce, the heterosexual discourse will always manifest itself. The point here is the contradictory fact about modern sexuality, which, while currently caught in heterosexual love marriage manuals, is embedded in a possibility to be freed from these very manuals.

Adultery

This section returns to the question of the discomfort of being a woman, and then refer to the relationship between this discomfort and heterosexual discourse.

As stated earlier on, heterosexual discourse still constructs the dominant social framework. Moreover, this is now blessed with the position to be pursued for personal happiness qualified with mutual respect and affection on an equality basis in gender relation and sexuality. In perusing a better male-female relationship, gender-related and sexuality problems have been spotted as discrimination problems. Towards a solution, this aspect has been effectively handling many issues such as the limited opportunity of women to participate in politics, the very small job market for women, low payment for women's work, stricter moral demands on women than on men and so on. Sexual dissatisfaction is also interpreted as the lack of equality in sexual relationship.

The resolution might, therefore, be seen to claim the complete equality of sexes, both in the public sphere, such as politics and an economy, and in the domestic sphere such as household duties and sexual relationships. However, what equality affords is no more than the state of equality. The discussion then must be shifted to the dimension of discomfort which cannot be dealt with the perspective of equality.

When a woman perceives herself in a cognitive heterosexual discourse, her problems are similarly described in terms set by the framework. Sexual desire is, within this monogamous-heterosexual world, self-defined as a desire for an equal monogamous relationship based on sexual intercourse with a member of the opposite sex. This was believed to be the liberation of women from being merely objects of male desire so that these women can then pursue their own satisfaction through sexual intercourse based on romantic love. As far as the aim was set on this route, the strategy for equality may be somewhat effective.

However, while there has been much progress in the fight against discrimination in society, women still face difficulties in life. The reason for this should not only be attributed to the insufficient attainment of equality in sexes. What should be realized is the failure to trace problems because of the inadequate or restrictive interpretation in identifying the nature and cause of unhappiness.

In the schema of order and excess outlined earlier, it will be said that desires

which do not conform to a norm may exist in two forms: heresy and excess. Heretical desire here means desire which is labeled as unusual, abnormal and socially undesirable. Excess, on the other hand, means, as argued earlier on, what is left neither signified nor codified by any of the elements in the world. The nature of heresy will be discussed in this section followed by the examination of excess in the next.

Heresy in heterosexual monogamous discourse may include, for example, homosexuality, paedophilia, sadism, masochism, etc. as well as adultery. However, what should be insisted here is the fact that heresy is also an important erotic source²³, playing a significant role as the 'villain' which, at the same time, underpins the status of the norm.

Adultery is one of the most typical forms of heresy. As argued earlier, the modern monogamous family is expected to combine the fluidity of sexual desire with a fixed structural unit. Adultery, being the predictable result of this fluid sexual desire, must represent the half nature of the monogamous-heterosexual system.

In addition, the orthodox view of sexuality is strengthened not only by the combination of norm and heresy but also by the alliance of the beneficiaries of the system and those who suffer by it. This is because both parties interpret their sexual advantage and disadvantage within the same frame of reference - the monogamous-heterosexual discourse - and in exercising this, they are accordingly both accomplices to the preservation of this criterion. Hence, for example, not only men but also women play vital roles in preserving the power of this discourse.

Fetishism

In this section, the nature of excess is argued. While both heresy and excess are characterized as non-orthodox, there is a presumptuous difference between their roles. While heresy is a constituent part in the discourse to conform it, excess is an anonymous element outside the order. While heresy plays a legitimate role in the current story, for example, as a villain, excess will alter this story itself when this appears in the order. While examples can be designated for heresy, it is impossible to do this for excess, if excess is seen to be recognized in some forms, this is not excess any

more. Excess should not be taken as something substantial, but as some invisible energy discarded from the formation of the world but then to cause changes in the world.

It is difficult, in fact, to draw a clear line between heresy and excess. The same particular feature can be categorized either as heresy or as excess depending on the context and the cognitive background of its occurrence. For example, if a certain fragrance is intentionally sought either for a very purpose of or for an alternative purpose of sensual satisfaction, this here would be understood as a heretical activity in the heterosexual monogamous discourse to fulfill sexual pleasure; if excitement comes through a certain fragrance without any intention, even without any expectation, this here should be understood as a commitment which may draw some episodes from excess into order. When this anonymous new notion is captured and brought into the cognitive world, this process may be observed as a chance for the elements of excess to shift into a part of the perceptible discourse.

The way that excess comes into order is not a predictable kind of happening. Furthermore, its appearance may either result in the formation of the new conception of normality or in adding new aspects to heresy, which is also not predictable.

Another example is given here. Until the conception of discrimination was obtained, the notion of certain unhappiness did not have a 'name' to be recognized. However, through the conceptualization of discrimination, this discomfort had transferred from the anonymous side to the recognizable world, i.e. from excess to order. Nevertheless, while criticizing this new category of 'incorrectness' was considered as a radical and irrational act against the familiar habit of society, this deed was stated as a riotous heretical activity, which now, of course, is regarded as the very centre of the officially affirmed correctness. Thus, the originally anonymous sense found a way through the notion of some agents to shift itself into the order; furthermore, this notion has eventually altered the quality of order itself. More recently, the notion of discomfort perceived as sexual harassment has been playing a similar role.

What has been emphasized here is the function of discourse to codify episodes and thus formulate the world by bringing sense into it. Based on this, the paper will now employ the term 'fetishism' to explain the relationship between sexuality and discourse. Fetishism is normally understood as a specific type of sexuality in which a person pays

excessive attention to a particular objet to satisfy his or her libido as he or she finds some kind of sensual element, which, of course, is underpinned by discourse, in this object. This notion, however, analogizes the very fundamental nature of sexuality in general - the relationship between sexuality and discourse. It should be remembered that emotions, being norm or heresy, must be perceived and realized through discourse. With only excessive attention to as well as reliance upon each relevant discourse, sexuality can function as a base to accommodate episodic excitement. On this perspective, this paper employs the notion of 'fetishism' to refer to the linkage between varied sexuality and its relevant discourse which underpins the state of each form of sexuality.²⁴ Thus, sexuality can be understood as a kind of 'fetishism'. Heterosexuality which enjoys its authorized status, of course, is not an exception.

There should not be any qualitative difference between erotic gratification which, for instance, derives from the notion of the image of bodily parts and another which derives from heterosexual love relationship, in terms of necessitating discourses to lead the participants to sexual fulfillment. This may also be rephrased as that there would not be any qualitative difference among the heterosexual excitement, the erotic excitement induced by the smell of cherry blossoms in full bloom and the excitement that accompanies the successful completion of a task. The only difference between the heterosexual excitement and the rest of the forms is that the former is expected as normal source of orgasm and the latter rarely, in the dominant discourse.

5 Conclusion

The paper has discussed firstly the inevitability of changes in society, employing the post-modern terms of 'order' and 'excess', and secondly the state of sexuality in modern society, in relation to the first concern, employing the results of socio-historical researches.

With regard to the nature of social changes, as stated in 'Order and Excess' in section 2 and in 'Fetishism' in section 4, this can be outlined with some key terms such as discourse and fetishism, together with order and excess.

Order here is an epistemological term used to refer to a so-called cognitive world.

Order generates from chaos silhouetted by discourse - a set of codified symbols, which signifies elements and episodes then brings sense into the world. Excess is the abandoned elements, discarded from order during its formation. Order requires the notion of 'excess' to sustain itself as meaningfully silhouetted, otherwise it must remain as chaos.

Any society, being a form of order, must be accompanied by its ontological partner - excess. In addition, excess affects and propels order to move at any moment sending it anonymous new conceptions through the perception of the agents of the order. This process reshapes the boundary between order and excess and alters the quality of the order. As order is bound to change because of the relationship with excess in this way, the same is said about society as this is the form of order.

With regard to the second concern, the nature of the dominant sexuality discourse in modern society has been examined, which is heterosexual-monogamous discourse. At the same time, a more universal dimension has been set to illustrate this concern, which is 'fetishism' meaning the linkage between forms of sexuality and their each relevant discourse.

As examined in sections 2 and 3, two essential bases for heterosexual-monogamous discourse are designated; the new habit of the regular practice of contraception, and the romantic love coupling system based on individualism and mutual respect.

The regular habit of contraception, as this separates sexual intercourse from reproduction, might have been thought to afford the possibility of a new stage for sexuality where diverse forms of sexuality are invited to play their roles as normal parts of society. However, heterosexual discourse still keeps its position as norm. The underlying reason for this is the new habit of romantic love marriage where a new version of sexual division of labour came to be practiced for the participants to show their love by proceeding not only household labour but also the reproductive task.

In terms of fetishism, any form of sexuality is equally one version of this. The position of the dominant sexuality is relative among all kinds, besides being a form of order, any sexuality is fated to the possibility of moving from the present position.

Here is seen a critical consequence of the new stage of sexuality: while the introduction of contraception ended the fatal connection between sexual intercourse

and reproduction, these two features have become reunified within the modern family system. In other words, while currently caught in heterosexual love marriage manuals, sexuality is embedded in a possibility to be freed from these very manuals - heterosexual intercourse 'myth'.

In the stability and instability of modern sexuality as above, not a few people may experience dissatisfaction and pain besides happiness. Through these agents, order may encounter new sets of discourse driven from excess, and be affected to move towards changes.

Though this paper could be said to have effectively designated the logic of social changes, it still has not been able to identify the clear direction of these changes. What can, however, be suggested here is that, firstly, any form of order cannot obtain a perpetual form, as this cannot exist free from its excess which continuously compels the order to face modification. Therefore, any ultimate 'utopia' will never happen. Secondly, being a participant in the order, a person may enjoy this world, as well as suffer by it, and plays a role as a vital agent to introduce episodic challenges from excess which at any moment feature in our daily lives. Within such a dynamic, society will have no option but to continue to adjust to people's lively happiness and satisfaction.

¹ For example, Althusser, L., *Essays on ideology*, London, Verso, 1984; Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J-C., *Reproduction in education, society and culture*, translated from the French by Richard Nice, London, Sage in association with Theory, culture & society, 1990; Foucault, M., *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*, translated by Alan Sheridan, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1979; Goffman, E., *Asylums: essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1968; Goffman, E., *Stigma: notes on the management of spoiled identity*, London, Penguin, 1990.

² See Hirose, H., 'Danjo Byodoron no Hihanteki Saiko (Critical Rethink of the Theory of Equality between Men and Women)', Okamura, T. ed., *Gendai no Kyoiku Riron*, Shakai Hyoron-sha, 1988, Tokyo.

³ Asada, A., *Kozo to Chikara (Structure and Power)*, Keiso-shobo, 1983, Tokyo.

⁴ See Maruyama, K., *Bunka no Fetishism*, Keiso-shobo, 1984; Maruyama, K., *Seimei*

to *Kajo*, Kawade-shobo, 1987. Maruyama explains that symbolization is not only peculiar to human beings but also is the base of the human society, which means human society is bound to excess.

⁵ See Bataille, G., *The Accused Share - An Essay on General Economy, Vol.2 The History of Eroticism*, translated by Hurley, R., Zone Books, 1991, New York, p.187.

⁶ Bataille, G., *ibid.* and *Vol.1 Consumption*, 1988.

⁷ See Maruyama, K., *op.cit. Seimei to Kajo*.

⁸ For instance, inhabitants of Trobriand Island in the Northwest part of Papua New Guinea believe that new human life is derived from souls renewed after death - the souls of 'fetuses-to-be'. A soul of a fetus-to-be returns from the other world to Trobriand and enters the womb of a woman from its own family line. According to this belief, the man's role in reproduction is merely to have sexual intercourse with a woman to open a path in her body through which a soul of a fetus-to-be can enter. Viewed in this way, the man's sperm is not strictly speaking recognized as a source of conception. See Malinowski, B., *Sex and Repression in Savage Society*, Japanese version, 1957, Kawade-shobo, p.113-114, University of Chicago Press ed., University of Chicago Press, 1985.

⁹ See Money, J. & Tucker, P., *Sexual Signatures - On being a Man or a Woman*, Little, Brown & Company Inc., 1975, Boston.

¹⁰ See Watanabe, T., *Transgenderism*, Keiso-shobo, 1989, p.35-49.

¹¹ See Watanabe, T., *Datsu Dansei-no Jidai*, Keiso-shobo, 1986, p.48-99.

¹² Ariès, P., 'Sur les origines de la contraception en France', *population*, No.3, 1953, translated into Japanese by Nakauchi, T. & Morita, N., *Kyoiku no Tanjo*, 1983, Shinhyoron.

¹³ Ariès, P., *Centuries of Childhood (L'enfant et la vie familiale sous l'ancien regime)*, translated by Baldick, R., Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1979.

¹⁴ Ariès, P., 'L'enfant dans la famille' *Histoire des populations française et de leurs attitudes devant la vie depuis le 18e siècle*, 1971, première éd, Self, 1948, in *op.cit. Kyoiku no Tanjo*.

¹⁵ See Miyazawa, Y., 'Kindai Kodomokan no Hatsumei' in Kobayashi, N. et al. (ed.), *Atarashii Kodomogaku 3*, Kaimeisha, 1986.

¹⁶ During the process of modernization, two notable stages of demographic change are

observed. The first is signaled by a rapid increase in abortions behind which has been the introduction of contraception which is still not effective enough. The second is the stage where more effective contraception contributes. With respect to modernization policy on strengthening the might of the nation, most abortions were not legally sanctioned. However, abortions still increased in number based on individual's need for birth control with the widespread introduction of contraception, which resulted from a major change in perception favoring birth control and possibility of adequate knowledge and of safe contraceptive methods. This phenomenon effectively explained from the aspect of family economics. (See Potts, M. et.al., *Abortion*, Cambridge University Press, 1977.) However, there should also be seen another reason why so many women took risk to commit themselves to giving illegal abortion in spite of the high rate of death caused by it. It is not difficult to understand this if we realize the fact that prior to the diffusion of birth control and the development of obstetrics pregnant women were exposed to the higher risk of physical disorder and death. (See Gélis, J., *Sages-femmes et accoucheurs: l'Obstétrique populaire aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*, *Annales E.S.C., sep.-oct. 1977, Les médecins et les soignants*, pp.927-957, translated into Japanese by Tamemoto, M., *San'iku to Kyoiku no Shakaishi 4*, Shinhyoron, 1984.

¹⁷ See Dumont, A.J.F., *Dépopulation et civilisation, étude de démographie*, 1902, introduced in op.cit. Ariès, P., 1971, p. 99.

¹⁸ Foucault, M., *The history of sexuality, Vol.1 An Introduction*, translated by Hurley, R., Penguin, 1990, London, p.32-33

¹⁹ *ibid.*

²⁰ Shorter, E., *The making of the modern family*, Fontana, 1977, London.

²¹ Della Costa, G.F., *Un lavoro d'amore*, Edizioni della donna, 1978, Roma, translated by Ida, K., 1991 *Ai no Rodo*, Impact Shuppankai.

²² Ochiai, E. Shows that reproduction is proceeded in the form of shadow work in modern family, listing up to eight characteristics of this institution where emotional ties play an important role to actualize this system. See Ochiai, E., 'Kindai Kazoku no Tanjo to Shuen', in *Kindai Shakai to Feminism*, Keiso-shobo, 1989.

²³ See op.cit. Bataille, G., 1991, p.124. 'The status of man's sexual activity is surprising; it is not at all forbidden in principle. It is subject to restrictions of course. But these restrictions leave open an extensive field of possibilities. Whereas the history

of eroticism is by no means that of sexual activity allowed within the limits defined by the rules: indeed eroticism only includes a domain marked off by the *violation of rules*. It is always a matter of going beyond the limits allowed: there is nothing erotic in a sexual game like that of animals. And perhaps eroticism is relatively rare (it is hard to say anything definite on this point due to the paucity of reliable data): it consists in the fact that accepted forms of sexual agitation occur in such a way that they are no longer allowable. So it is a matter of passing from the licit to the forbidden. Man's sexual life developed out of the accursed, *prohibited* domain, not the licit domain.'

²⁴ Maruyama interprets some of the cultural phenomena as fetishism. He explains that any relationship has become materialized, as if even its symbols had been unrecognized hidden behind this. See op.cit. Maruyama, 1984.

Biography (at the time of publication)

Hiroko Hirose, who holds an M.A. degree in education from Ochanomizu University and has completed the course work for Ph.D. at Tokyo University, is currently an associate professor of education at Senshu University in Japan. She has contributed to and edited books including *Sexual harassment-wa naze mondaika? (Why is sexual harassment a problem?)* and is an author of articles including '*Sengo Gakuseikaikakuki-ni Okeru Danjo-Kyogaku-ni Kansuru Ichikosatsu*' ('A Study on Coeducation in Postwar Japan').