Self-administration is, I think, what was to lie at the heart of gender’s claim to agency, voice, and participation. Yet contemporary insurrectional plots have proven themselves very different than familiar 20th-century scenarios of uprising—Zéro de Conduite (Jean Vigo, 1933), Les Quatre Cents Coups (François Truffaut, 1959), If... (Lindsay Anderson, 1968), Tomato Kecchappu Kôtei (Shuji Terayama, 1971), among countless other cinematic essays on boys at war with gendered institutional temporalities. We have a growing cultural archive of boys embattling gender, curriculum, age and the criminalities of their logic, and many such battles are encoded as boyish, the stuff of boyhood, the promise of unstoppable renewal and of an ultimate justice beyond gender. But we don’t want to take the canon’s word for it. We are increasingly looking at an order of self-tube-ing, self-texting and self-messaging, and although they are still the syntax of privilege, here may be an important field for the cyber-anthropologist: boyhood as a hypermediated embodiment of the boyish, beyond its rich yet flatter intertextualities attested by literary scholars. The new paradigm of connectivity, that is, the new self-ing invites “expression” as much as it revitalizes that metaphor, an important dynamic in view of what would be Western boyhood’s constitutive alexithymia. The name for our journal affirmatively echoes the stakes.

But it deserves arguing that we need to draw from diverse theoretical and inspirational archives. The 2002 film project, Ten Minutes Older (The Trumpet and The Cello), inspired by Herz Frank’s 1978 short by that name (Par Desmit Minutem Vecaks), shows the way by exploring time’s experiential properties, how its seeps down the interstitium vitae, and by reminding us that the things worth spending time on (biography, gender, studium) are worthy in ways that escape the ennui of politicization. The vital part of men’s studies, moreover, never behaved as an afterbirth of baby feminism, but was driven by many various “sentiments” (class, “race,” “sexuality,” and so on) that only in part answer to planned insurrections. Time will have to tell whether political flatness can accommodate deconstructive or other work at its margins. As boyhood studies commences after boyhood, it may well turn out to be a tale of posteriority, post-bellum heroism or “survival.” It would be worth the stigma.

THE BOYS ON THE SEXUAL BORDERS
MARIA PALLOTTA-CHIAROLLI (DEAKIN UNIVERSITY)

[I remember] developing a very strong fear. I never really got any education about it [bisexuality] ... and everything else [heterosexuality and homosexuality] you have resources for ... There was no one to talk to ... you can’t be yourself, because to be an individual as opposed to part of the group is just too terrifying and traumatic at school. (Jack)

Bisexual-identifying and/or bisexual-behaving boys and young men like Jack live within, between and beyond dichotomous logics, borders and boundaries that push all relationships, identities and communities into bifurcated categories (Angelides, 2001; Garber, 1995). For bisexual young people, sexual and gender identities and community
allegiances are fluid, transitory, fragmented and episodic. They interrogate, disrupt and problematise “mainstream” hegemonic discourses of gender and sexuality that frame adolescent health and educational research, policies and programmes. They “undo the logic and the clarity” (Lionnet, 1989, p. 14) of such research and resources, making visible the not-so-orderly youth identities that underlie identity, the realities of multiple masculinities and their sexual lives and cultures that are lived within “reality”, the truths of sexual desires that are concealed by “the truth.” The problem is not that there is no truth, but that there is “too much truth” that powerful dichotomous discourses conceal (Derrida, 1981, p. 105; see also Rust, 1992). Those borderzones of “too much truth,” constructed as “unreal” or negated in research with boys and young men need to be described rather than denied.

Here I draw from my own research into sexual and gender diversity in schools, specifically in relation to boys and multiple masculinities, that go beyond, within and between the hierarchical dualism of heterosexuality/homosexuality. Without discounting or denying the importance and necessity of ongoing research into homosexual, gay and same-sex attracted masculinities, given the persistence of global heteronormative institutional and cultural injustices and homophobic violence, I propose that the field of boyhood masculinity studies requires “queerification.” This differs from prevailing studies of homosexual, gay and same-sex attracted masculinities in that it allows for bisexual, pan-sexual and “queer-sexual” identifications, as well as allowing for the negation of sexual identification altogether. As Giroux writes, identity politics such as gay community politics enabled many formerly silenced and displaced groups to emerge from the margins of power and dominant culture to reassert and re-claim suppressed identities and experiences; but in doing so, they often substituted one master narrative for another, invoked a politics of separatism, and suppressed differences within their own “liberatory” narratives. (1993, p. 3)

In my research, Benjamin, 19, provides an example of this disruption of the heteronormative “master narrative” and its subsequent “homonormative,” “liberatory” narrative. He discusses the question of negation or negotiation of sexual identity constructs according to their strategic usage within the school context:

I don’t want to give myself a label ... there is such diversity that I don’t think you need to be labelled. I feel labelling or categorising is the core of our sort of problems or prejudices. I think as human beings somehow we’ve got to classify, label, to put each other into a box and I don’t see that as beneficial. I see it as detrimental. However, because we’re in a society where I cannot exist without a label, I have to label myself, and so therefore to people, if I tell people, I would say I’m bisexual .... And I mean the bisexual construct is a construct in itself too. It implies 50/50 and I don’t agree with it at
Most of the information on bisexuality has been obtained from studies with adult samples, and it is “unclear to what extent a separate bisexual cultural identity is consolidated during adolescence” (Ryan & Rivers, 2003, p. 105). As Bryan, a 17 year-old bisexual young man in my research says:

It’s simple bullshit logic! They don’t have evidence of bi kids in schools because they don’t want to find it and so don’t write their research looking for it.

As I found (Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2005b, 2006, forthcoming 2010; Pallotta-Chiarolli & Martin, 2009), accessing bisexual-identifying or bisexual-behaving young people may be difficult for two reasons. First, due to the label itself being stigmatized, many young people may feel coerced to identify as either heterosexual or homosexual to researchers. Second, the figures vary depending upon whether the research has been conducted using sexual identity and/or sexual behavior as the defining criteria (Russell & Seif, 2002). An example of the machinations of these two reasons is how many heterosexual identifying young men do have one or more same-sex experiences but would tick the “heterosexual” box in a survey.

The available recent studies in the United States, Canada, the UK and Australia are pointing to higher rates of anxiety, depression and other mental health concerns among bisexual-identifying young people as compared to homosexual and heterosexual young people (D’Augelli et al., 1998; Jorm et al., 2002; King & McKeown, 2003):

I vaguely remember waking up in the mornings and I used to think, like how can I get through another day with everyone being so horrible to me all the time ... I did think I’m really depressed, everything is really awful and I thought about suicide. (Rowan, bisexual, 19. In Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2003, p. 94)

The available research also shows that bisexual young people have more current adverse life events, greater childhood adversity, less positive support from family, and more negative support from friends and a higher frequency of financial problems (Jorm et al., 2002; see also Hershberger et al., 1997). In relation to homophobic harassment and violence, a few studies have pointed to various concerns. For example, an analysis of data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health in the United States, Russell et al. (2001) found that young people who reported attraction to both same- and other-sex persons were at greater risk of experiencing, witnessing and perpetrating violence than young people who were attracted to same-sex persons (see also Beauchamp, 2004).

In a large school-based sample, Goodenow et al. (2002) found that bisexual young people reported higher levels of sexual risk and injecting drug use than heterosexual or
gay-identified peers. They also found that bisexualy active adolescent males report especially high levels of HIV/AIDS risk behaviour. Interestingly, Goodenow et al. found that bisexual young men also reported lower rates of HIV/AIDS education, even after school absence due to fear as a variable had been controlled in the research. One plausible explanation provided by the researchers is that standard classroom instruction does not address the concerns and questions of many young men who have sex with men and is therefore dismissed, discounted as irrelevant, or entirely forgotten. Another possible explanation, however, is that HIV/AIDS education is constructed as being for straight and gay young men. In deflecting or rejecting the label of “gay,” young men who have sex with men but who identify as heterosexual may ignore or avoid HIV/AIDS education as it is “not about them.”

Given the stigma attached to nonheterosexual identities, and the promotion of nonheterosexual social and support groups as “gay groups,” it would be unrealistic to assume that adolescent boys and young men who do not identify as gay but are attracted to or having sex with other men would join gay support groups, apply for gay-related medical services or social services, or participate openly in HIV-prevention activities aimed at gay youth. Research is required into how to make mainstream classroom instruction and social and support groups more inclusive and more culturally appropriate for sexual minority adolescents who border or reject the duality or tripartite classification system of sexuality.

As Raymond, a bisexual father in my research who is also a teacher, says, there is a need for specifically bisexualy targeted health research and education:

That means stuff about bisexual relationships, not just a one line definition saying “bisexuals are sexually and emotionally attracted to both sexes”, which says nothing about Bi pride, Bi life choices, Bi relationships.

Four types of problematic representations of bisexual boys and bisexual masculinities in adolescent research that require much more investigation and interrogation (see Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2006):

(1) Under-representation. Much research into same-sex attracted young people makes bisexual young people invisible (see Dodge & Sandfort, 2007). Many educational and health organisations gain funding for projects that appear to be inclusive of bisexual boys and young men by including bisexuality as a category in their project outlines and submissions, but they do not follow through with bisexualy-specific recommendations, outcomes and services for youth (Russell & Seif, 2002; Ryan & Rivers, 2003).

We need to be mindful of what Savin-Williams (2008) calls “clinical traps” wherein research recruitment and analysis flounder if they do not allow for the fact that “sexual behaviour, sexual attraction, and sexual identity questions do not always solicit similar populations” (pp. 135-136; see also Thompson & Morgan, 2008). We need to
use very broad definitions of bisexuality, and indeed work on the feminist qualitative research premise of self-identification and self-ascription by our research participants (Yip, 2008). As Butler explains,

"restriction on speaking is enforced through the regulation of psychic and public identification, specifically, by the threat of having to live in a radically uninhabitable and unacceptable identification.... The public sphere is constituted in part by what cannot be said and what cannot be shown. The limits of the sayable .... (2004, p. xvii)"

Thus, sexually fluid and bisexual young men experience what we call “exclusion by inclusion” (see Martin & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2009) as their specificities are excluded, rendered “unsayable”, by being included in the polarising “psychic and public indentifications” of gay and straight.

As researchers, we need to question why we may harbour some reluctance to opening up our theoretical and empirical frameworks to the knowledge that comes with the new generations of boys, increasingly sexually fluid youth cultures, and twenty-first century masculinities. For instance, is it because “today’s young people are harbingers of a time in which sexual identity will have no importance, thus thrusting past research into the garbage heap of antiquated science?” (Savin-Williams, 2005, p. 221).

(2) Misrepresentation. Research into the impact on bisexual young people of media and popular culture stereotypical constructions, societal presumptions and prejudices of bisexuality is required (Bryant, 1996; McLean, 2001, 2003; Yescavage & Alexander, 2003). For example, “bisexual men as AIDS carriers” has been a dominant misrepresentation (Worth, 2003). All the bisexual adolescent boys and young men in my research are aware of this and other misrepresentations:

When I was doing my AIDS research, I came across school children aged something like thirteen to eighteen talking about AIDS and who’s to blame... [They] said stuff like it’s the murderous bisexual males that we should kill because they’re the ones who have spread it to our innocent heterosexual community. (Benjamin, 19)

In young women’s magazines, the readers, presumed to be heterosexual young women themselves, are advised that all bisexualy active young men are secretly engaging in sexual relations with other young men, that having a bisexual boyfriend is “dangerous” and “risky” since all women in relationships with bisexualy active men are unaware of or have no say in their partner’s sexual identity and sexual practices, and that bisexual men are predatory and will have sex with “anything that moves” (see Eliaison, 2001). Where is the research into successfully negotiated monogamous or open or polyamorous relationships between women and their bisexual male partners (Pallotta-Chiarolli & Lubowitz, 2003; Pallotta-Chiarolli, forthcoming 2010)? Indeed, in stark contrast to mainstream representations of bisexual femininities as “hot bi babes,” usu-
ally for the “normal” titillation of heterosexual boys and men who often adopt the role of puppeteers scripting the same-sex behaviours of their female partners, there is a strong aversion and aggressive resistance to the eroticization of bisexual masculinities, as well as an absence of research into youth cultures where “hot bi boys” perform for the pleasure of girls (Atkins, 2002; Herdt, 2001; Russell & Seif, 2002). There is also a need for mainstream media, popular cultural and literary representations of healthy and happy bisexual boys and men in healthy and happy relationships with either/both men and women. De Oliveira (2004) and Pallotta-Chiarolli (2008) are two examples of young adult novels with positive representations of bisexual adolescent boys and men. Likewise, the television series Dr Who has a positive bisexual male character, Captain Jack Harkness, who is adored and eroticised by both male and female fans to the degree that a more adult spin-off Torchwood was developed with Harkness as the main character. Meanwhile, male musical artists such as Mika, Antony Hegarty and Patrick Wolf are operationalising sexual ambiguity and fluidity as part of their lyrics and concert performances.

(3) Outdated Representation. There is a lack of research that engages with shifting discursive and societal constructs of bisexuality. Young people’s polyamorous and multi-sexual relationship negotiations and partnering preferences lack current scholarship (McLean, 2004; Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2005b; Rambukkana, 2004). Likewise, young people’s queering of bi/sexuality (Russell & Seif, 2002), the experiences and perspectives of young people growing up with bisexual parents (Arden, 1996; Garner, 2004), and culturally diverse expressions and classifications of bisexuality (Fuji Collins, 2004; Hutchins & Ka’ahumanu, 1991) are three other areas in need of substantial research.

(4) Homogenised Representation. The diversity within youth groups, youth subcultures and masculinity categories is not being adequately acknowledged or researched. For example, very rarely do we read of class, ethnicity, geographical location, gendered expectations, disability and other factors that have an impact on a bisexual young man’s decisions, negotiations and experiences (Pallotta-Chiarolli, 1995). For example, Goodenow et al. (2002) found in their research that bisexually active males were more likely than others to be members of ethnic minorities and were less likely to attend urban schools. Similarly, Paul et al. (2002) found that the highest prevalence of suicide attempts among non-heterosexual males was among native American respondents and bisexual or nonidentified respondents.

Thus, much more research is required with bisexual-identifying and bisexual-behaving boys and young men which explores questions that research has been exploring with gay and lesbian young people. This includes asking:

• What impact does having access, no access or minimal access to bi-specific and bi-specifying youth groups and information have on adolescent boys and young men identifying as bisexual or behaving bisexualy?
Given that friendships and peer group relations are of high significance to most adolescents, what are the experiences and effects on bisexual boys and young men in their interactions with heterosexual and homosexual peers at school?

To what extent do bisexual boys and young men feel invalidated and pathologised by families, health services and educational systems, particularly health services provided within schools?

What impact do negative and positive popular cultural, media, and literary representations of diverse bisexualities have on bisexual boys and young men?

What strategies of passing, negotiating and resisting do bisexual boys and young men adopt in navigating their home, school, peer group and wider societal worlds?

As adult researchers, health providers and educators, we need to ask how research projects, policies and programmes reflect the dominant discourses of hierarchical sexual dualisms, and how these may be increasingly out of step with the shifting contexts and discourses of sexual diversity that today's young people are immersed within, engaging with and negotiating:

The baby-boom generation finds itself distressed at times that youths refer to themselves as “bi”, not gay or lesbian. But that is a harbinger of things to come in the multiplicity of sexual formations and diverse sexual cultures proliferating around the world. (Herdt, 2001, p. 280)

Herdt's (2001) historical analysis of personal and systemic sexual identification finds that today's youth engages with notions of “queering” and “genderblending” in bodies and practices to a degree unimaginable in previous generations, the generations of educational and health policymakers, researchers, program developers and deliverers. These social changes are precipitated by the marked decline in heterosexism and homophobia in our society, which is facilitating the emergence, and I would add, visibility, of new sexual minorities, including bisexuality. Our research, which is used to inform and frame educational policies and programmes, needs to itself be informed and framed by the realities of sexually diverse youth. In this way, sexualities, relationships, and educational and health research and services may more effectively acknowledge that

desire is multi-faceted, contradictory, subversive: its inevitable social organization requires that we are engaged in a continuous conversation about both its possibilities and limits. (Weeks, 1995, p.50)

We're all different people and it [sexuality] all depends on the individual ... I would love to just storm into all the schools across Aus-
tralia and say [that] to them ... I mean, it's all about having that freedom. (Jack)

THE BOY IS FATHER OF THE MAN: REPRESENTATIONS OF FATHERHOOD AND THE STRUGGLE FOR ADULT MASCULINITY MARY JANE KEHILY (THE OPEN UNIVERSITY, UK)

The trails and tribulations of growing up male form a staple of the popular culture repertoire, conjured up most successfully in contemporary examples such as Nick Hornby's novels and the subsequent film About a Boy (Paul and Chris Weitz). In keeping with its televisual counterpart, Men Behaving Badly, Hornby's novels embrace the puerile modern male as a selfish and emotionally stunted commitment-phobe who has never quite grown up. The field of popular culture exemplified in men's magazines Loaded and Nuts, draws upon popular cultural forms to serve up further representational versions of masculinity in which the "lad" and the boy are never far from the surface. Hopeless, chaotic, sexually opportunistic and not to be trusted, men in the popular imagination appear to enjoy a parody of adulthood that celebrates their incompetence and immaturity.

The boy-lad-immature male trajectory has been richly mined for comedic excess and common-sense explanations of why men are the-way-they-are. How can these representations of spoiled masculinity help us to understand the emergent field of boyhood studies? The way in which fatherhood is represented in pregnancy magazines as a way of exploring potential connections between fatherhood and boyhood provides some clues. Based on a content analysis of pregnancy magazines over an 18-month period, a compelling and contradictory picture of fatherhood emerges as a transitional moment that is both exhilarating and repellent. Fatherhood calls upon the boy-man to take stock, evaluate his life and finally grow up. Of course, there are things to be gained from becoming a father, the most notably being the Wordsworthian idea of the child as father of the man, a notion that acknowledges the explicit Romantic connection between boyhood and manhood. Through the child, a father is connected to his own childhood and is also prepared to learn, or possibly re-learn, some fundamental truths as they emerge from his relationship with the child.

Pregnancy magazines for the most part do not explore the father-child relationship or conjure it up as a potential relationship to be developed. Rather, the focus is upon the couple relationship and the possible displacement of the father by the new baby. The role of men in parenting and childcare remains ambiguous, connected but not fully integrated or clearly delineated. For all pregnancy magazines, men occupy a position in the background as supportive husbands and partners. Pregnancy and birth ap-

1 This section forms part of a broader study, The Making of Modern Motherhood, funded by the Economic and Social Research Council, UK, award no. RES 148-25-005. Pregnancy magazines (a total of 8 titles, 28 magazines) were analyzed over an 18-month period from September 2004 to April 2006.