

# Prisoners of Freedom

A study on worldview of contemporary Finnish seamen

Mira Karjalainen, M.A.

May, 2004

Licentiate Thesis  
University of Helsinki  
Department of comparative religion

## Table of contents:

<b>1. SAILORS' WORLDVIEW – INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1. PREVIOUS STUDIES ON SAILORS .....	8
<i>Finnish sailors.....</i>	<i>11</i>
1.2. FREEDOM.....	14
Personal, sovereign and civic freedom .....	17
Inner freedom and spiritual freedom.....	19
Freedom of ordinary people .....	19
<b>2. WORLDVIEW, METAPHOR, FIELD: THEORY, METHODOLOGY, MATERIAL.....</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1. WORLDVIEW: THEORY .....	21
2.1.1. <i>Belief-system and Weltanschauung.....</i>	<i>24</i>
2.1.2. <i>Worldview changes.....</i>	<i>25</i>
2.1.3. <i>Individual and collective worldview.....</i>	<i>28</i>
2.1.4. <i>Categories and dimensions of worldview.....</i>	<i>28</i>
2.1.5. <i>Previous worldview study on sailors.....</i>	<i>32</i>
2.1.6. <i>Overview on worldview.....</i>	<i>33</i>
2.2. LOADED WITH METAPHORS: METHODOLOGY .....	34
2.2.1. <i>Use of metaphors.....</i>	<i>37</i>
2.2.2. <i>Boundaries of metaphor.....</i>	<i>39</i>
Metaphor among other tropes.....	39
Humor and metaphor .....	40
2.2.3. <i>Metaphor and rhetoric .....</i>	<i>42</i>
Generally on metaphor and rhetoric.....	43
2.2.4. <i>Overview on Metaphor.....</i>	<i>45</i>
2.3 FIELD, MATERIAL.....	46
2.3.1. <i>In the field as a seaman.....</i>	<i>47</i>
When a fieldworker is a worker .....	48
2.3.2. <i>In the field as a researcher .....</i>	<i>49</i>
Reflections .....	51
What did you come here for? .....	55
2.3.3. <i>Material: Field journals.....</i>	<i>56</i>
2.3.4. <i>Material: Interviews.....</i>	<i>58</i>
Interviews in 1996.....	59
Ordinary seaman managing interview situations .....	60
Interviews in 1999 and 2000 .....	61
Questions .....	64
Reflections on interviews .....	64
2.3.5. <i>Processing of material .....</i>	<i>65</i>
<b>3. SHIPWORLD.....</b>	<b>66</b>
<i>Sailor, Seaman, Crew: Terminology.....</i>	<i>67</i>
3.1. HISTORY OF FINNISH SEAFARING .....	68
3.2. TIME AND SPACE.....	71
Artificial time .....	74
Space .....	74
Hierarchical space.....	75
Judicial space.....	77
3.3. HIERARCHY AND ORGANIZATION .....	78
Mechanistic approach to ship .....	78
Captain .....	81
Organizational chart.....	82
“Duty and Mutiny”.....	83
Formal hierarchy and the social organization .....	84
3.4. CLOSED COMMUNITY, TOTAL INSTITUTION .....	85

Different types of total institutions .....	87
Barriers.....	89
Fieldwork in total institution .....	90
3.5. GENDER.....	93
Men .....	94
Kalle Aaltonen.....	94
Male kingdom on board.....	102
Occupational titles.....	104
Male attitudes towards women at sea .....	104
Personal experiences.....	107
<i>Women in seafaring</i> .....	108
Girls.....	110
...and boys .....	111
Glass ceilings of ship .....	111
Sexual harassment and sex discrimination .....	112
Biases on land.....	116
Women without gender.....	116
<b>4. SHIPWORLD, WORLDVIEW AND METAPHORS .....</b>	<b>119</b>
4.1. ANALYSIS PROCESS .....	119
4.1.1. <i>Abductive method</i> .....	120
4.2. SHIP COMMUNITY AND SHIP AS A WORKPLACE .....	123
4.2.1. <i>Home, Nuthouse, Graveyard: Ship community</i> .....	124
SPACE OR CONDITION .....	143
4.2.2. <i>Space shuttle, machine, journey: Ship as a workplace</i> .....	147
4.2.3. <i>Bride, woman: others</i> .....	153
4.3. WORLDVIEW OF SAILORS .....	154
4.3.1. <i>Freedom – Prison dichotomy in worldviews of sailors</i> .....	155
4.3.2. <i>Other aspects in the worldview of seamen</i> .....	165
Workers and Officers.....	165
Institution for everybody .....	168
Shipworld.....	170
Work place and ship community.....	171
<b>5. CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>172</b>
<b>6. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>179</b>
6.1. PRIMARY SOURCES .....	179
6.2. LITERATURE .....	179
6.2.1. <i>Newspaper clips</i> .....	191
6.2.2. <i>Unpublished literature</i> .....	192
<b>7. APPENDIX: COMPLETE LIST OF METAPHORS.....</b>	<b>193</b>

## 1. Sailors' worldview – Introduction

I want to go as far as possible. I am a free wanderer, a restless soul. (m4)  
Pete, who is a seaman with 20 years at sea, explains his view on what kind of ship he would like to work on. The following extract is from an interview I conducted with motorman Alekski on a Finnish oil-tanker. I asked him what he thought about ships.

Alekski: A ship? A power plant. Because this is a power plant.

Interviewer: What about the ship community?

Alekski: It is a prison.

Interviewer: How come?

Alekski: We are in the same situat... only that we have even worse living conditions than the prisoners. Why? Because this sways and moves and this is harder place to leave behind.<sup>1</sup> (m10)

In my previous study for the master's degree thesis, I concluded that the prison-metaphor was a prevalent metaphor seamen used for ship and ship community, and it also influenced their life at sea. The prevalent usage of prison metaphor among sailors had its background in the history of seafaring, ship community's communication tactics, and its characteristics as a closed community. As a result, seamen often perceived their life at sea as a life in prison. This consequently influenced their behavior and thus further strengthened the dominance of prison metaphor and prison-likeness of ship community. On the other hand, the sailor's life is often paired with *freedom*, not with *prison*. The free-roving 'Jack Tar'<sup>2</sup> is an enduring image of man's longing for individual freedom. A seaman is not bound to land and its mundane everyday routine. So why do seamen often call their life at sea life in prison?

---

<sup>1</sup> All quotes of interviewed seamen in this report are translated by the interviewer, and their names are changed. Unfortunately, the rich and delicious discourse of many interviewed sailors vanishes in translation. Therefore, I have included the original quote in Finnish, if it has been difficult to translate.

<sup>2</sup> Jack Tar's Finnish equivalent is Kalle Aaltonen, named after a Finnish popular song. Both will be discussed in the chapter Shipworld.

I developed interest in the freedom-prison dichotomy of shipworld.<sup>3</sup> I find that the most fruitful way to study this freedom-prison axis is through worldview studies, because I assume freedom-prison dichotomy is a vital actor in sailors' worldview. To study it, though, I needed more material. Hence three years after the fieldwork period for my master's thesis, I went to sea again, this time as a company researcher conducting a study about ship communities and their relations to the shipping company, their atmospheres, and about sailors' attitudes towards their work. I use the material produced in the company research project and the previous material conducted for my master's thesis to study seamen's worldviews through the metaphors they use to reflect on their life at sea. I will not attempt to cover sailors' worldview as a whole. Instead, my research task is to examine the worldview of contemporary Finnish seamen regarding the freedom-prison dichotomy. To do so, I first provide a short 'ethnography' of modern Finnish shipworld, focusing on those characteristics that differ from Finnish mainstream culture. For example, while the food aboard ship is very similar to any other factory-like work place food and therefore excluded from this ethnographic project, the conditions surrounding the food are discussed when they diverge from the land schema of food. Likewise, kinship is not discussed in shipworld. Be that as it may, this short ethnography attempts to cast light to the world sailors live in, because without the necessary background information about their environment, it would be impossible to comprehend their views of the world. Since there are no studies published on the contemporary Finnish shipworld, I have to make this ethnographic project a part of my research task. After examining shipworld, I will study the worldview of seamen through the metaphors they use to discuss their life at sea, focusing on that part of sailors' worldview that reflects freedom-prison dichotomy. My research questions thus are, with more specific sub-questions:

1. What are the major structures and characteristics of contemporary Finnish shipworld that differ from Finnish mainstream culture, particularly from living and working environment?

---

<sup>3</sup> "Shipworld" is the term I have coined to designate life at sea in the shipping industry, including both ship communities (the organizational level) and sailors (individual, lifeworld level).

- i. What is the basic time-space structure like in shipworld?
  - ii. What is the hierarchical structure of shipworld?
  - iii. How is the gender structured in shipworld?
2. What metaphors contemporary Finnish seamen use to reflect their life at sea?
  - i. What kind of metaphors is used for ship community?
  - ii. What kinds of metaphors are used to reflect the ship as a workplace?
3. What do the metaphors, which seamen use to discuss their life at sea, tell about their worldview?
  - i. Is freedom-prison dichotomy part of sailors' worldview?
  - ii. How does freedom-prison axis show in worldview of seamen?
  - iii. What are other prevalent features of contemporary Finnish seamen's worldview?

In this paper I will first introduce my research topic and introduce some basic terms regarding the study (Chapter 1). Then I will discuss the worldview theory, methodology and material used in this study (Chapter 2). I will discuss shipworld in order to provide the necessary background information (Chapter 3) for the analysis of worldview through sailors' metaphors and examination of freedom-prison dichotomy (Chapter 4). Finally, I will conclude with an overview of the study in the last chapter (Chapter 5).

Sailors of the modern era have received surprising little attention in social science research (Chapter 2). Especially, studies conducted on contemporary sailors or seaman communities are scarce in fields of anthropology and sociology, not to mention comparative religion. The study of contemporary sailors' worldviews does have, however, a strong link to the line of studies on worldview of various professions that have been conducted in comparative religion in Finland. For example, Ulla Halonen (1990) conducted a master's thesis study on the identities and worldviews of Finnish mathematicians and physicists, and Aila Hirvonen (1986) studied the values and worldviews of agronomists. Juha Pessi (1981) conducted his study on the worldview of

architects and graduate engineers, while Tuulikki Komulainen (1985) focused only on the worldviews and professional identities of architects. Furthermore, worldviews in general have been extensively studied in comparative religion. Helena Helve has conducted several studies on worldviews of Finnish youth (Helve 2002, 1997, 1987), while Kimmo Ketola has looked at the history and various definitions of worldview as a concept (Ketola 1997; see also Hjelm 2002; Holm 1996; Pesonen 1997). Therefore, this study on sailors continues the tradition in comparative religion to study different kinds of groups—occupational and others—and their worldviews.

I approach my study material, conducted by fieldwork and interviews, by using metaphor and rhetoric as methodology for the study on worldviews of seamen (Chapter 2). Especially the new rhetoric has enjoyed wide attention for several years now. Finnish scholars on comparative religion have contributed to this field, as well. Tuula Sakaranaho (2002, 2001, 1999, and 1998) has developed the theory of new rhetoric and has largely introduced the approach to younger practitioners of comparative religion. Heikki Pesonen (2002, 2001, and 1997) has employed the approach in his study on nature, environment and religiosity.

The main body of material for the study consists of 91 interviews done with Finnish seamen (Chapter 2). These interviews were conducted in 1996, 1999 and 2000. In addition, I utilize the field journals I wrote during my stay on board while doing fieldwork and interviews. I was in the field twice, in two different positions: First, I was a participant observer of shipworld, working both as an ordinary seaman “on watch,” and as an ethnographer conducting research for my master’s thesis, a study of a worldview and leisure. On my second trip, I was employed by the shipping company to study the relationship between the company and its ships, the atmosphere aboard, and the crewmembers’ attitudes regarding their work and life at sea. Comparative religion has paid plenty of attention to fieldwork, and one can argue that fieldwork is one of the main methods in comparative religion. Consequently, several Finnish scholars on comparative religion have written about the subject. For example, Hannu Kilpeläinen (2000) reflected on fieldwork in monastery, while René Gothóni (1997, 1994) focused on pilgrimage.

Terhi Utriainen (2002) has examined ethnography in women's studies, while Juha Pentikäinen (2002) has focused on northern and Petri Saloperä (2002) on southern ethnography. Many of these studies share some characteristics with this study at hand, and thus provide background to and opportunity for a dialogue; Saloperä writes full ethnography while I write partial; Kilpeläinen and Gothóni discuss fieldwork in monasteries while I discuss fieldwork in another closed community, the ship; and finally, Utriainen reflects upon her experiences as a both worker and fieldworker while I discuss the same regarding my fieldwork at sea.

### **1.1. Previous Studies on Sailors**

It started... I planned to go to sea for one trip, max two, but then I just ended up staying here. It was as it usually goes: my buddy went to sea first, and then he told me those sailor stories. (k7)

This is how Timo, a middle aged captain describes the reasons for his sea career. Lars, first officer from the same ship, explicates his choice of profession,

I can't tell if the life here is what I expected. I come from a seafaring community. To get home from the hospital where I was born, I was already on boat. (f7)

It has been questioned in the recent studies on sailors (see Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 187), whether it is relevant or meaningful to view the seafaring community as homogenous group. Sailors have gone to sea for various reasons, they have worked there for various time periods, and they have decided to stay or leave the seas for a wide variety of reasons. In addition, the experiences of sailors vary widely. I will discuss here briefly the significant studies on sailors that have been published previously.

The few studies done on Finnish contemporary seamen are usually reports on their medical condition or studies concerning labor policy.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, in order to get background support to the material I have produced myself, I have to rely on studies conducted on sailors of the past, mainly of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century seafarers. The lack of recent literature on one's study subject has some obvious problems. For example, the living conditions and the seaman's profession have altered dramatically over one or two hundred years. The studies conducted of windjammer era have other pitfalls, too. Reliable sources of that time are rare, and the scholars in history—and sometimes also today—have been tempted to tell the story that the audience wants to hear, although it might not be the most accurate one. For example, the Dutch maritime historian Paul C. Van Royen (1994, 33) criticizes such studies like 'Between the Devil and The Deep Blue Sea' (Marcus Rediker 1987) on Anglo-Saxon sailors of 1700-1750, for mystifying sailors' world by reinforcing the old myth of the unknown sailor, without providing any answer to the essential question: how was it in shipworld? With my study, I attempt to cast light to this question regarding today's sailors. The American anthropologist Peter McLaren (1991, 159) warns against two specific tendencies in perceiving and depicting the studied, namely the "romanticization of the other" that means seeing the natives as noble savages or otherwise through rose-colored spectacles, and the "barbarization of the other" which refers to seeing the natives as savages or otherwise through skewed spectacles. I have tried to do my best to avoid mystification, barbarization and romanticization of shipworld. However, when one does not simply try to state how the shipworld of today is, but also wants to study how sailors experience it through their worldview, one may sail into murky waters. People attach meanings to their experiences; therefore, to mystify, barbarize or romanticize one's life is among the techniques for making experiences meaningful. For example, to see oneself in the light of free-roving Jack Tar or Kalle Aaltonen may attach meaning to one's choice of career: Shipworld that otherwise would feel like prison, now beams in the light of freedom. This is the field of

---

<sup>4</sup> These kind of studies are the reports ordered, i.e., by Finnish Ministry of Labour. Examples are: Työn kuormittavuus lastialuksella (1992) Ed. Laine, M., Pentti, J., Saarni, H., Soini, S. and Tamminen-Peter, L.; Saarni, H., Soini, S., Pentti, J. (1996) Workload and Ship Safety. –Safety at Sea International. April 1996. 29-33; Merenkulkijoiden terveystyö- ja toimintakyky. Merialan työkykyhanke. (1999) Ed. Laine, M., Niemi, L., Saarni, H., Pentti, J.. Turku: Turun aluetyöterveyslaitos.

comparative religion: values, meaning constructions, myths and narratives are in the very core of our discipline.

The Swedish Knut Weibust's study in maritime ethnology *Deep Sea Sailors* (1969) is one of the foundational publications of its field. Weibust conducted his study on the seamen of sailing ships after the era of those vessels had already ended. Therefore, his material consists of written sources, mostly of memoirs former deep sea sailors have written about their experiences at sea. These sources (for example, Clements 1951, Conrad 1923, Dana 1861, Eastwick 1891, and Villiers 1932) cover the era of windjammers the way it is usually counted; between 1750 and 1920. Weibust's study is ethnology of western seamen, having mostly accounts of Scandinavian, British, Central European, and American sailors. Weibust's study will be discussed in more detail in the 'Shipworld' (Chapter 3). In addition, the Norwegian sociologists Vilhelm Aubert and Oddvar Arner (1965) conducted a study on Norwegian oil-tankers. This study is important background material for my own research, but it has its limitations. Aubert and Arner discuss shipworld mostly from the view point of total institutions (Chapter 3).

Throughout history there have been a few women working at sea, as well. The American folklorist Dianne Dugaw (1996, 34-54) has studied female sailors who cross-dressed in order to go to sea in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century. They were not allowed to work at sea because of their sex, thus they disguised themselves. According to Dugaw (1996, 35), the "female sailor bold" (she names the female seafarer after a popular song from that era) who cross-dressed and went to sea was a popular heroine of the early modern era (See also Cordingly 2001; Dugaw 1991). The most famous female sailors ever have been pirates Anne Bonny and Mary Read, who roamed the Caribbean early in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, also in male disguise. Anne Bonny and Mary Read have inspired maritime historians and storytellers for centuries (See, e.g., Cochran 1973; Black 1989; Rediker 1996; Cordingly 2001). Women first began to enter the realm of male kingdom, shipworld, in larger numbers in the 1950s, usually as cooks and custodial personnel. The 1990s, with the introduction of college level education into the maritime schools, brought more women into the profession. Today, there are women working in nearly all positions in the ship

hierarchy. Despite this development, their numbers are very limited in the higher levels of the hierarchy, and in professions that are considered inherently “masculine” (engine room jobs). The gender dimensions of shipworld will be discussed later in the ‘Shipworld’ (Chapter 3).

### Finnish sailors

A typical sailor has gone to sea at the age of 16 or 20, and he does not know shit about the society. He is conservative, stubborn and racist... and he does not spit into the glass. (f8)

A first officer with several decades at sea explains his view on Finnish sailors. The Finnish maritime historian Leena Sammallahti (1993, 16) notes that traditionally the historical research has not been concerned with seamen’s culture. Although there are a few studies on Finnish sailors, nearly all of them focus on the sailors during the era of windjammers. Studies carried out on modern sailors and ship communities are few and far in between. I will go here briefly through some of the more recent studies on Finnish sailors, in order to give background to my study. In addition, I will summarize a study on Swedish sailors, because the topic of that study is relevant to my subject.

Sailors are people just like others, they do their job. But one has to be a little bit crazy to go to sea. You know, you’ve been here yourself. You have to be a bit of a hermit or crazy to like it here. (m7)

A young officer, just starting his career, told me this when I asked him about his reflections on other seamen. Leena Sammallahti has studied the first trip of Finnish sailors (1988). Most of the men, who sought the profession or short-term jobs at sea, were from the coastal area or the archipelago of Finland. She notes that although the reason for the trip to sea might have been the love of adventure, it nevertheless forced the young man to adapt to a new work community. If he had held romantic images of sea-life, the reality often came as something of a surprise. Sammallahti (1988, 19-27) summarizes the memoirs of some first-timers at sea: they got to do mainly two kinds of jobs—tasks that

did not demand any expertise (e.g., washing the dishes), and tasks that no one else was willing to do (e.g., cleaning the toilets).

The Finnish anthropologist Marika Rosenström (previously Ramström) also has studied sailors in the era of sailing ships. In her book *Fartyget Himlen och Havet* (Ship, Heaven and Sea, 1996), Rosenström aims to give a complete picture of the sailors' culture during that era. She goes through the history of sailors, the reasons why men went to sea, and the basic characteristics of sea life. Her material consists of 68 sailor interviews – most of her interviewees were old sea captains which is important to keep in mind when reflecting on her findings. As a method she uses cultural analysis. This is similar approach to my analysis of sailors' worldview and its freedom-prison axis (Chapter 4). In her cultural analysis, Rosenström divides the culture into several basic structures, such as chaos and order, manly nature, moral, work, time, space, and cosmology. In the end of her analysis, she discusses briefly sailors' concepts of reality. This is very closely related to worldview. She also discusses ship hierarchy and its power structure. According to her, hierarchy on ships was very rigid. Moreover, life on board was very isolated, yet it offered no privacy (Rosenström 1996, 106-109). Rosenström's notions are in line with many other studies conducted on the same subject. Romanticization of sea-life is another leading topic in Rosenström's study. Rosenström states that sea-life was a basis for romance and hard masculinity alike; there was no conflict between those two. She calls the sailors of 1930s and 1940s "bruto-romantics" ("bruto-romantiker"). Romanticization of nature is another dimension of glamorized sea-life. To live through the storms and the tropics has often been viewed as indelible experience. Concepts such as freedom and "littleness" have often been used when sailors recall the experience of the open, wide horizon (Rosenström 1996, 103-111). Rosenström's study taps partially the same question I focus on. While she studies the era of windjammers, I concentrate on contemporary sailors.

I have seen old seamen and new seamen, there are all kinds of people. Back in the days it was drinking and partying, but the job got done, and we went ashore and ships spent long time on harbors. But nowadays, if people go, they go by bike or call someone from church [Seaman church] to come to pick them up because

everybody wants to save money, it has all changed... Now there is no time, if you think of seaman. This profession, it has always been thought of weirdly. If you go to bar and tell them that you are a seaman, they go “tut-tut”.<sup>5</sup> (p7)

Older pump man Jussi describes his view on old and new seamen, which he sees as two significantly different categories. Although there are hardly any studies on the workers of today’s seafaring, some attempts have been made to improve the situation. The Finnish maritime ethnologist Kim Montin notes that in the 20<sup>th</sup> century seaman professions have altered, due to technical development of ships (1995, 30-31). New professions were born, such as machinist, stoker, and radio operator.<sup>6</sup> Montin observes that the new techniques have not only altered the range of sea professions, but have changed life at sea in other fundamental ways, as well. First, the size of the crew has diminished, while the size of vessels has enlarged. Second, a modern seaman works with computers, and watches TV or VCR on his free time. Third, he<sup>7</sup> has his own cabin, with a toilet and a shower. The work identity of modern seamen has less glory and is less romantic than in the era of windjammers, Montin states, quoting a newspaper: “A romantic has become an engineer. Technical development has made a seaman to a ship operator” (Dagens Nyheter, August 13, 1995). Back in the days going to sea was often the only opportunity for a youngster from lower classes to see the world and its exotic harbor towns. Now the situation is different: the time spent in harbors is cut to the minimum, to a day, or sometimes only to couple of hours, not leaving time for the crew to go and explore the town where the harbor is located. Montin states that despite the numerous changes in the sea profession, the profession still remains distinct (1995, 34). Montin links the dramatic changes in seafaring in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the changes in seamen’s work identity, stating that the

---

<sup>5</sup> Quotation in Finnish: Ennen repositettiin ja juotiin katos, ja tota hommat tehtiin ja käytiin maissa ja laivat oli pitkän aikaa maissa. Mut nykyään ei mennä ku jollain kirkon autolla tai polkupyörällä, kaikki säästää ja ollaan nuukia ja soitetaan pappia hakemaan, se on menny ihan. Eikä oo aikaa, jos aatellaan merimiestä. Mut kyl ne on, aina on pidetty sitä ammattia niinniin semmosena... ei, jos meet johonkin kuppilaan ja sanot et oot merimies niin hyi ne sanoo. (p7)

<sup>6</sup> While the 20<sup>th</sup> century gave a birth to many new professions, many other professions became extinct, such as sail-maker, donkey man, and eventually even the radio operator.

<sup>7</sup> I will use “he” to refer to seaman, for although there are a number of women working at sea, shipworld is essentially a world of men, as will be discussed in the chapter Shipworld.

shift has been “from lifestyle to a profession” (1997, 59). Today there are approximately 12 600 Finnish sailors who are active in the profession. 3700 of them are women.<sup>8</sup>

Sailors are a certain race, all are a bit the same type of people. There is a bit of hermit in every seaman. You can be apart from your family and friends, but you still don't lose it. You don't climb the walls; you take a book and go to your cabin. (p8)

The Swedish anthropologist Klas Ramberg has studied a ship community of a modern coast-tanker in Sweden (1997). In the focus of his study are the strict hierarchy, specialized work tasks, and the leisure time of the crew. He interprets the ship and the life of sailors as peripheral. The life at sea—with its absences and partings—tears sailors apart from society. According to Ramberg, to be located in the periphery is not only negative; a periphery is also a twilight zone where the centre has not total control. Different worlds meet there and there is room for different people and ideas. Ramberg suggests that the sailors' notion of freedom can be understood in relationship to this (1997, 61-71). I will now discuss briefly some basic concepts of freedom and its background. This is necessary because, as we shall see, freedom is usually considered to belong to the realm of philosophy and political science, not cultural studies.

## **1.2. Freedom**

I went to sea because my brother went too. I hadn't seen a ship before in my life. Those sailors who have stayed here, they miss many things. Things that people usually have on land. [---] The values of sailors are not on the same level as values people hold on land (k10).

-An old captain-

Freedom is one of the most basic concepts and values in our modern world. Although several academic fields have tried to tackle it, it is usually regarded belonging to philosophical pursuits. The American sociologist Orlando Patterson (1991, 2) argues that due to the eagerness of philosophy to refine it as coherent concept for thinking people,

---

<sup>8</sup> This is the newest statistics on the matter (year 2002), according to Finnish Maritime Administration (<http://www.fma.fi/palvelut/tietopalvelut/tilastot/#kuukausi>).

there are two histories of freedom: freedom as ordinary women and men have understood it, and freedom as “people’s efforts to define ‘true freedom,’ to arrive at the essence of what freedom really is, if we only thought about it logically, or moralized correctly.” Patterson notes that however illogical and immoral the freedom concept of ordinary people may be, it nevertheless is that what they have. Therefore, in respect of Patterson’s idea, the philosophers’ attempts to define freedom often ignore the freedom of ordinary people. In this study the object is exactly that; to examine freedom of sailors from their own point of view, not from the viewpoint of theories on freedom.

To coerce a man is to deprive him of freedom – freedom from what? Almost every moralist in human history has praised freedom. Like happiness and goodness, like nature and reality, it is a term whose meaning is so porous that there is little interpretation that it seems able to resist.

As the British philosopher Isaiah Berlin (2000, 193) notes above, freedom as a concept is difficult to define. The attempts to do so outside political theory and philosophy have often proved somewhat limited. For example, the Philippine social scientist Florentino H. Hornedo (2000, 1) in his book ‘The Power to Be – A Phenomenology of Freedom’ defines freedom in the following way, “*the stuff of freedom is autonomous energy for being.*” Although one does not want to engage in philosophical debates regarding concept of freedom that have been going on for centuries, and is merely looking for a working definition of freedom, Hornedo’s suggestion will not do. The British anthropologist James Laidlaw (2002, 311) argues that anthropology has neglected the study of freedom. Laidlaw calls for ways to describe human freedom, and freedom’s manifestations in different social contexts and cultural traditions. I will attempt to examine in this paper the freedom-prison dichotomy in the worldviews of sailors, and thus develop the concept of freedom as seamen perceive it.

Patterson (1991, x) states that there is nothing self-evident in the idea of freedom, or in the high esteem in which the West holds freedom; for most parts of the world and human history freedom has not been an obvious goal. There have been several other values and ideals to desire: honor, glory and power, just to name few. Patterson argues that most

non-western cultures have paid so little attention to freedom that they often have not even had a word for it (examples are Japan and Korea that had no such concept before contact with the West in the 19<sup>th</sup> century). The American scholar Dorothy Lee (1959, 53) states that even though freedom as a recognized value is rarely present in non-western cultures, freedom is present as autonomy, or implemented in the Self. Patterson (1991, *xi-xiii*) argues that valuing freedom is not a human condition, a condition we have by birth. How was it born, then? Patterson maintains that freedom was generated from slavery,<sup>9</sup> stating that freedom as a value, as a powerful shared vision of life, resulted of the experiences of and responses to slavery, by masters, slaves, and non-slaves. Patterson (1991, 41-42) argues that some notion of freedom exists wherever slavery has been found, throughout the history. Patterson reminds us that having a notion of freedom did not make it automatically a value, stating that a value is socially constructed only when a critical mass of people or a powerful minority share it and make it a norm by acting consistently according to that value. Slaves could not have achieved that by themselves, Patterson says, because they were dishonored nonmembers of the community. An anthropologically orientated student may wish to question this statement; how come dishonored people could not develop their own values? Patterson (1991, 42) answers sharply, bundling up the history of slavery before antique Greece,

No slave, except the most degraded, such as prostitutes and robbers, wanted personal freedom where no nonslave found it worthwhile. That was like jumping from a slave ship into a shark-filled ocean. Only where the possibility existed for the isolated individual to fend for himself economically, and to survive the hostility of the freeman socially and culturally, could the slave begin even to think about his freedom as the absence of personal restraint and as doing as he pleased. No such social space ever existed before the rise of slavery in ancient Greece.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Patterson (1991, 9-10) defines slavery as form of personal domination in which a person is under the direct power of another, usually including the power of life and death; slave is always a dishonored and excommunicated person who exists only through, and for, the master. Thus, she or he is socially dead.

<sup>10</sup> Why freedom was born in ancient Greece? Patterson (1991, 47-48) lists five revolutions that took place between the 7<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E. Everyone of the five turns was tightly related to and could not have emerged without the others. First, the birth of pre-industrial economy and urban states needed extensive slave and ex-slave labor. Second, the emergence of large slave population emancipated population from economic and social dependency on its ruling class. Third, democratic state was born in Athens. Fourth, the discovery of rationality as an end in itself generated secular philosophy and the social and moral sciences. Finally, freedom was socially constructed and became a central value. Therefore, one may argue, freedom as a social value needed extensive slavery, democracy and secular philosophy for its mid-wives.

Patterson makes a gender discovery in his quest for the social construction of freedom. He (1991, 48-54) states that women played a vital role in the birth of freedom as a social value, because the gender expectations of early Greece made freedom impossible for enslaved men, but not for enslaved women. This was because, becoming a slave was a social death and once a man had suffered such a death, there was no prospect of him regaining his honor in these earliest kinds of honoric societies. Women, on the other hand, did not suffer of lost honor, because they were not expected to be able to defend themselves. Therefore, it was possible for women to restore their status. They were able to become legitimate members of the community, for example, by marrying their master. Women were also sometimes ransomed, and thus it was possible for them to return to their own communities and regain their former status. This was unattainable for male slaves. Patterson (1991, 54) summarizes, “paradoxically, because women had less to lose, they had more to hope for. In that hope, and in its realization, was born the western value of personal freedom.”

### **Personal, sovereign and civic freedom**

Patterson (1991, 3-4, 97) divides freedom into three sub-divisions that are personal, sovereign and civic freedoms. Personal freedom means in its simplest that a person is not being coerced or restrained by another person to do something desired and, the conviction that one can do as one pleases within the limits of other person’s desire to do the same. Sovereign freedom means the power to act as one pleases, regardless of the wishes of others, as distinct from personal freedom, which is the capacity to do as one pleases, insofar as one can. Civic freedom refers to rights to exercise one’s citizenship in democracies. Athenian democracy was a Men Only club, where women could not possess, nor exercise civic freedom. Thus, women turned to personal freedom while men played with their civic rights. Patterson (1991, 99-101) argues that all three elements of freedom, that together constitute freedom as a social value, were first time to emerge together in 430 B.C.E. The definition of freedom by the American sociologist C. Wright Mills (1959, 174) demands both civic and personal freedom;

Freedom is not merely the chance to do as one pleases; neither is it merely the opportunity to choose between set alternatives. Freedom is, first of all, the chance

to formulate the available choices, to argue over them—and then, the opportunity to choose.

### **Positive and negative freedom**

Isaiah Berlin (2000, 98) defines freedom as self-government, both in political and individual life, noting that whatever increases the control of the self over forces external, contributes to liberty. Berlin (2000, 112) declares his view regarding the classical question of closed doors (Am I less free if a door, through which I do not wish to enter, is locked?), stating that whether the actual doors are open or locked determine the extent of one's freedom, not her or his own preferences on the matter. Berlin (2000, 194) divides freedom into two categories; First, there is negative freedom which answers to the question “[w]hat is the area within which the subject—a person or group of persons—is or should be left to do or be what he is able to do or be, without interference by other persons?” The second question contributes to positive freedom, “[w]hat, or who, is the source of control or interference that can determine someone to do, or be, this rather than that?” Negative freedom has traditionally been simplified to mean freedom *from*, while positive freedom has been attributed to freedom *to*. The American philosopher Joel Feinberg (1973, 4-19) elaborates on Berlin, dividing constraints into positive and negative, and into internal and external. He offers as an example of internal positive constraint a headache or obsessive thoughts, while internal negative constraint would be ignorance or lack of talent or skill. External positive constraints are, i.e., locked doors, says Feinberg, and external negative constraint would be lack of money. Feinberg (1973, 13) attempts to wash away Berlin's positive and negative division of freedom,

A constraint is something—anything—that prevents one from doing something. Therefore, if nothing prevents me *from* doing X, I am free *to* do X; conversely, if I am free *to* do X, then nothing prevents me *from* doing X. “Freedom to” and “freedom from” are in this way logically linked, and there can be no special “positive” freedom *to* which is not also a freedom *from*.

Patterson (1991, 3) notes that both negative and positive freedoms have always been vital to the common conception of personal freedom, although philosophers may not have acknowledged it.

### **Inner freedom and spiritual freedom**

Patterson (1991, 145-146) argues that the Hellenistic era produced two definitions of freedom: one was the freedom as a triad of personal, sovereign and civic elements, outer freedom; the other was freedom in philosophical and spiritual levels, the inner freedom. The former was freedom of men and women that had meaning in their social and political lives. The latter was produced by elite Greek thinkers, and it generated the western philosophy of freedom. Berlin (2000, 211) criticizes the spiritual freedom practiced and encouraged mostly by church,<sup>11</sup> pointing out that although ascetic self-denial may lead to spiritual strength and serenity, it cannot be called an increased liberty. Berlin (2000, 111) states, “[t]o remove obstacles by removing desire to enter upon, or even awareness of, the path on which the obstacles lie, may contribute to serenity, contentment, perhaps even wisdom, but not liberty.” Noel Annan (2000, x) observes that Berlin paid attention to the majority of people who live their lives, unable to succumb to the spiritual rule. According to Berlin, here the pure horror of a sheer rational view of life unravels; if it can be clarified that there is only one correct way of life, people who do not share that way of life have to be coerced to do so. Therefore, positive freedom becomes the road to serfdom.

### **Freedom of ordinary people**

Sailors have always been restless. They don't stay in one place for long; they have to be up to something all the time. Something has to be going on, always. Many of them would not survive on land, it is so much more strict there that what you have to do and what you cannot do. One can always be a bit freer at sea (s6).

Cook Kalle who is in his early thirties describes here sailors as he views them. After providing brief glimpse to the development and definitions of freedom, let us turn to the freedom of ordinary people. 'Ordinary people' is a paternalistic term, indicating that

---

<sup>11</sup> Also Malinowski casts critical eye upon spiritual freedom and its practitioners. Malinowski (1964, 48-50) argues that the freedom which is achieved by union with God or the Absolute is not free from culture, society or organization. What would happen, if everybody held celibacy and retreated from society? The culture would face extinction. Therefore, Malinowski argues, the freedom achieved by hermits is always based on the existence of community which holds different view on culture and freedom.

'ordinary' people (am I ordinary? Are you?) do not engage—and thus are probably not capable in engaging—in long contemplations about profound matters in life. I will use 'ordinary people' as a term, because that is the term the philosophers use, and, at least, it is a bit more respectful than 'man in the street'. As noted above, cultural studies have overlooked freedom as people see it. Consequently, the anthropological studies on the subject are scarce. For example, Malinowski wrote extensively on freedom, but overlooked the freedom of 'man in the street' as he calls him (Malinowski 1964, 45),

The intuitive emotional and subjective meaning of freedom, as felt rather than formulated by the man in the street, conceives freedom as the ability to do what one likes or to do nothing. The claim that liberty is the absence of restraint, of trammels, and of hindrances is persistent. Were we to collect some of the finest poetic phrases, some of the classic epigrams, some of the famous sayings of moralists, theologians or orators, we would always find an emphasis on the subjective feeling of an unlimited scope for choice and expansion in thought, action, in the affirmation of oneself.

Malinowski (1964, 47) warns us of identifying freedom with power, for it leads to tyranny, just like lack of any restraint takes us to anarchy. Malinowski (1964, 29) argues that "true freedom", which he defines as freedom of order, of action and of achievement, is vital part of human life and of organized human societies. The only 'true' freedom for Malinowski is organized freedom, not freedom to do what one pleases, or to do nothing, if that is what one likes. Malinowski (1964, 25) does not approve of 'unscientific' uses of freedom concept and, therefore, offers his definition of freedom,

Freedom can be defined as the conditions necessary and sufficient for the formation of a purpose, its translation into effective action through organized cultural instrumentalities, and the full enjoyment of the results of such activity. The concept of freedom therefore can only be defined with reference to human beings organized and endowed with cultural motives, implements and values, which *ipso facto* imply the existence of law, an economic system and political organization—in short, a cultural system.

Fabian (1998, 130) reviews the concept of freedom in history of anthropology, for example in the tradition of Malinowski, calling it 'paradox of enslaving liberation'. The idea of culture originates in conceptualization of freedom – "freedom from ignorance, from greed and need, from habit and custom, indeed from nature." Although this may be considered the main object of freedom, to deny or dismiss as inadequate other concepts

of freedom, the concepts of ordinary people without formal education in philosophy, would ignore main task of anthropology and comparative religion: to learn how people see the world and what do they value. Berlin (2000, 206) states that our views of what constitutes a self, a person, a human being, directly formulate conceptions of freedom. Therefore, following Berlin, it can be stated that our worldview defines our concept of freedom. I will use these discussions as background when I proceed to examine the worldview of seamen and the freedom-prison dichotomy. Sailor's freedom has often been linked with glory and romance, as sailor's freedom would be romantic freedom and landlubber's freedom something else. This image of sailor's freedom goes hand in hand with the image of free-roving Jack Tar that will be discussed later in this paper. A middle aged first officer recalls his youth at sea,

When I was a young man, I thought that the further I get to go on the ship, the better. There I sailed the seas, happy-go-lucky, no plans for tomorrow. Then it was really nice to sail. But now, the more age I gain, the closer I want to be to land: I want to watch telly and get the newspapers. Things I wouldn't have cared at all for when I was younger (f5).

## **2. Worldview, Metaphor, Field: Theory, Methodology, Material**

After this brief introduction to the background of my study on the worldview of contemporary Finnish sailors, I proceed to the theory, methodology and material of the study.

### **2.1. Worldview: Theory**

What interests me really in the study of the native is his outlook on things, his Weltanschauung, the breath of life and reality which he breathes and by which he lives. Every human culture gives its members a definite vision of the world, a definite zest of life.

- Bronislaw Malinowski (1922, 517 in Kearney 1984, 37) -

Worldview is a complex matter. It is a word that may be applied to almost everything. Women's magazines are said to have a worldview, as well as video games, modern

human and capitalism.<sup>12</sup> Consequently, worldview has earned several definitions by scholars of various fields (e.g., anthropology, comparative religion, sociology, philosophy, psychology, and history). I will discuss here some of them.

Worldview as a term was first used to discuss peoples' beliefs of what the world was made of, the assumptions about cosmology (Ketola 1997, 8). Finnish scholar on comparative religion Helena Helve (1993, 16) observes that in primitive cultures the prevalent worldview was perceived as a consistent belief-system. Myths served as the channel for explaining the origin of the world, of humankind, and of gods. Helve remarks that the worldview held by people living in today's world is not as unified, but assumes various forms. The Finnish scholar Kimmo Ketola (1997, 9-10) notes that the idea of worldview has often been linked with the holistic view of culture, with the idea that behind every culture one can find common set of assumptions and beliefs shared with members of that culture. Ketola notes that the structured systems of beliefs, values and attitudes that are replicated in various areas of life give the special characteristics to the relationship that members of a certain culture have towards life. This holistic view of worldview fosters the idea, Ketola continues, and that these widely shared taken for granted elements of cultural processes are difficult to perceive: often the basic assumptions of worldview are hidden from the members of that culture as well. The approach to worldview that I employ in this study of sailors is not one of cosmology or holistic view of culture. That kind of view would not be possible, because ship communities are not the isolated islands (although this metaphor is sometimes used by sailors) of 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century anthropology fostering their genuine indigenous cultures. The sailors of this study are (mostly) born in Finland and into the

---

<sup>12</sup> Worldview seems to be also one of the favourite terms of academic editors who have run into trouble in titling their publications. When one is handed a bunch of manuscripts for articles lacking anything in common except the topic, the easy way out is to pair the topic—let us say *Shantal*—with the word worldview: No questions asked, no definitions needed. As a result there are large number of publications named as, e.g., the afore-mentioned *Shantal Worldview* (2001, ed. Nita Mathur); *Danger, Duty and Disillusion – The Worldview of Los Angeles Police Officers* (1999, J.C. Barker); *Rastafari and Other African-Caribbean Worldviews* (1995, ed. B. Chavannes); *Morality, Worldview, and Law* (1992, eds. A.W. Musschenga, B. Voorzanger and A. Soeteman); *Folk Religion and Worldview in the Southwestern Pacific* (1968, eds. N. Matsumoto and T. Mabuchi). All these publications share two things in common: they have the term worldview in their title and they use that term less than five times in the actual book, often failing to provide even a one-sentence definition of the “topic” of their book.

Finnish culture, starting careers at sea usually in their late teens. Therefore, the study of sailors' cosmology is not the focus of this study (Marika Rosenström, a Finnish maritime historian, has made an attempt towards that direction in her study *Fartyget Himlen och Havet*).

Helve (1993, 22-23) observes that the study of worldviews has been viewed as part of cognitive anthropology, since its focus is on human knowledge. Cognitive anthropology, Helve continues, formed in the United States during the 1950s and 1960s and became fascinated by the cognitive structures of a culture. Helve remarks that in addition to cognitive anthropology, 1960s brought worldview into the focus of sociology and structuralism. The American anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1968, 303) defines worldview as a picture of the way things really are, including concepts of nature, self and society, and the most comprehensive ideas of order. The American anthropologist Michael Kearney (1984, 9-31) argues that anthropological study on worldviews has traditionally had its background in idealism; ideas shape the world. Kearney calls for materialist worldview study where ideas are seen to arise in human brain as reflections (more or less accurate) of the external world. Kearney (1984, 41-42) defines worldview as a collection of basic assumptions that an individual or a society has about reality. According to Kearney,

The worldview of a people is their way of looking at reality. It consists of basic assumptions and images that provide a more or less coherent, though not necessarily accurate, way of thinking about the world. A worldview comprises images of Self and of all that is recognized as not-Self, plus ideas about relationships between them, as well as other ideas.

The Finnish scholars Kaj Björkqvist, Barbara Bergbom and Nils G. Holm (1996, 14) state that worldview, or *Weltanschauung* (he does not make a division between these two concepts), is a “pattern of belief systems by which an individual conceptualizes his/her world.” The Finnish philosopher Ilkka Niiniluoto (1984, 95) points out that usually ‘worldview’ means an organized whole of beliefs concerning the world; worldview is a sort of general picture of world (see also Helve 1987, 13; Kearney 1984, 42). If we mean by ‘world’ the facts that concern nature, human being and society, Niiniluoto (1984, 79) says, we can define ‘worldview’ as an organized set of arguments (justified one way or

another) concerning that world (see also Niiniluoto 1980, 85). Worldview is necessary, and everybody has one by definition – whether or not one is aware of it. The level of consciousness regarding one’s own worldview varies a lot. The Finnish scholar Nora Ahlberg (1977, 248) reminds us that a human being cannot get along without conviction that the world is a real and meaningful place.

### 2.1.1. Belief-system and Weltanschauung

The beliefs about world are not just scattered in the mind chaotically, but form a latent system of beliefs (Björkqvist, Bergbom and Holm 1996, 14; See also Helve 1987; Niemi, Nurmi and Vauras 1986, 78-79). The Finnish scholar Juha Manninen (1977, 25) refers with *belief-system* to models that help an individual to comprehend the world, humanity, her place in society and nature, and the meaning of life. Manninen states that every thinking creature<sup>13</sup> has to understand the world one way or the other, and to decide the most meaningful way for her to comprehend its dimensions. Helve (1987, 13) maintains that worldview can be seen as a belief-system regarding physical world, social world and the person. Worldview is constructed of beliefs and assumptions and it includes values. Thus, values and value systems are part of one’s worldview (Helve 1993, 89; 1987, 13). The Finnish psychologists and scholars on worldview Pekka Niemi, Jari-Erik Nurmi and Marja Vauras (1986, 80) note that values and motives are basic components of the worldview structure and, therefore, the structure of worldview is often revealed in individual’s concrete action. Nils G. Holm (1996, 3) puts it effectively:

A worldview is an abiding and serious attitude towards life, and to the trials, challenges and successes which this entails; this attitude is manifested through expectations, values, attitudes and behaviours, and can most readily be explored through its verbal expression.

Helve (1993, 14) notes that a worldview (*Weltbild*) is usually distinguished from a *Weltanschauung*.<sup>14</sup> The term *Weltanschauung* is often used to refer to the conscious and

---

<sup>13</sup> Manninen does not discuss other species than homo sapiens sapiens in his study, although he uses the term ‘creature,’ not ‘human being’.

<sup>14</sup> *Weltanschauung* is a German term which has been used frequently in worldview studies. In German, there are two words regarding worldview: *Weltbild* and afore-mentioned *Weltanschauung*. *Weltbild* is a

explicitly codified system of beliefs, in order to single it out from worldview which is more implicit. According to Manninen (1977, 25), one has to make conscious effort in order to obtain *Weltanschauung*, while everybody has a worldview. Niiniluoto (1984, 86-87) states that a wholly developed *Weltanschauung* consists of epistemology (a theory of knowledge; how do we achieve and to what do we base on our knowledge), value theory (an ethical system of values that contain beliefs about good and bad, right and wrong), and worldview (assumptions about world). Worldview is thus a part of *Weltanschauung* for Niiniluoto. Niiniluoto's view on worldview as a part of *Weltanschauung*, which' other ingredients are epistemology and value theory, differs from approach on worldview provided by Helve and Niemi, Nurmi & Vauras. While Helve states that values and value systems are part of worldview, and Niemi, Nurmi & Vauras view values as basic definers of worldview structure, Niiniluoto maintains that worldview and value systems are separate, and together with epistemology form a whole *Weltanschauung*. In this study I will examine values—for example, freedom as the other pole of prison-freedom axis—as part of worldview, thus agreeing with Helve and Niemi, Nurmi & Vauras.

### 2.1.2. Worldview changes

Some under aged 16 year old does not yet have any thoughts of his own. I went to sea and never stopped going (f6).

This is how an old first mate answered my question regarding his reasons to go to sea. Worldview is a subject to change over time, in two ways. First, Matti Kuusi (1977, 240) argues that there is no doubt that both the worldview of the individual and society are inseparable from time, place and social setting. The worldviews of medieval times differ, by definition, from ours. This is easy to illustrate with the very word 'worldview' – one just has to be reminded of the Americas, Antarctic and Australia. Helve (1993, 15-17) is in line with Kuusi by noting that people are children of their time, because at different times people consider different things to be truths. Secondly, Helve (1987, 17-18) notes that the personal experiences during one's life time change the worldview; therefore, the

---

“picture of the world” (*Welt* translates to world and *bild* to picture), while *Weltanschauung* is a “view or perspective on world.”

formation of the worldview should be perceived as an ongoing developmental process, and not only as a socialized belief-system. Björkqvist, Bergbom and Holm (1996, 14) pick up with Helve and state that it is natural that worldviews change, because people “develop” over time. Worldview can be seen as an individual entity that changes continuously, because it is in constant interaction with the environment (Helve 1987, 17-18). Helve (1993, 15) states that all individuals have a specific type of worldview. She continues by noting that the worldview of an individual begins to develop from early childhood onward. Niemi, Nurmi and Vauras (1986, 78-79) remark that worldview develops hand in hand with the individual; worldview includes the conception of the world and the conception of individual’s place in the world. Nora Ahlberg (1977, 248) suggests that the development of one’s identity, and the formation of worldview that is linked with it, should be called a process that takes place within oneself, but at the same time also in the focus of that culture one belongs to. Björkqvist, Bergbom and Holm (1996, 14) note,

When people select, or construct, their individual worldview, they do not do so in a vacuum. They construct it, rather, on the basis of accessible information, they are affected by people who are important to them, and, finally, their own personality structure is likely to play a significant role.

As a result, worldviews are often full of inconsistencies (Helve 1987, 20). Juha Manninen (1977, 16) argues that if the layers in the worldview of an individual or group conflict each other or lack unity, the situation should be seen as a conflict between different worldviews, not inside one worldview. According to Manninen (1977, 16), a worldview may have layers that *seem* to contradict each other, but even so the worldview consists of certain principles that unify the layers into a logical—or sometimes illogical—whole. Manninen criticizes the idea that one’s worldview may not be all that coherent and that one’s worldview may consist of conflicting beliefs. Kearney (1984, 52-64) divides illogical elements of worldview into two categories: external and internal inconsistencies. The external inconsistencies occur when worldview assumptions are not in check with the reality. Kearney offers as an example the shift from geocentric to heliocentric cosmology that took place due to the findings of Nicolaus Copernicus and Galileo Galilei in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. The internal inconsistencies result from the contradictions

among the assumptions of one's worldview. Kearney's example draws from Christian worldview. On one hand, there is an omnipotent benevolent God. On the other, there are evil forces roaming around the world causing suffering. How can God allow this, since it/he/she is omnipotent and benevolent? Worldviews have, Kearney says, a tendency to seek consistency. It has to be also noted that often these inconsistencies do not overly bother the people who hold them.

Study of worldviews has been criticized lately. Kimmo Ketola (1997, 10-11) notes that "worldview," as a term, refers to unity, totality and comprehensiveness, although this may not necessarily be the case with worldviews. It has been questioned how internally logical and sound worldviews actually are. A worldview may contain conflicting elements and several diverse but parallel patterns of thought. Ketola continues by noting that it may not be necessary to assume that people have sound harmonic worldviews that do not need to change. Ketola also draws attention to the term worldview which in German is *Weltbild* (*bild* = picture) and in Finnish is *maailmankuva* (*kuva* = picture): *bild/kuva/picture* as a concept is static and frozen, and therefore does not serve reality. Hill and Mannheim (1992, 381-381) argue that,

Today, with our confidence in the coherence, integration and political innocence of cultures long lost, a term [Weltanschauung] from the high-water mark of bourgeois "German ideology" must be problematic. "Worldview" also suggests reflection and mastery of a repertoire of forms and meanings, neglecting the way culture is shaped in everyday practices below the threshold of awareness. Today, both theoretical inclination and the ethnographic data force us to admit the fragmented and contingent nature of human worlds, as opposed to their "wholeness" and persistence.

The notion of continuously developing and changing worldview is vital for the study of sailors' worldviews, because if we were to assume that worldview is a belief-system socialized early in childhood, there would not be sailors' worldview to study. Sailors are not born in the ship community, but choose that career in their early years of adulthood.

### 2.1.3. Individual and collective worldview

Individual and collective worldview can be separated on a theoretical level (Manninen 1977, 25). Helve (1987, 14) notes that a person's worldview has both collective and individual features: the culture, society and living environment also affect one's worldview. Therefore, it can be argued that sailors do have worldviews characteristic to their occupational group. This argument is backed up by their strong sailor identity, the sailor culture and the long time periods sailors spend at sea. For sailors, the sea is a special element, and being a seaman is a profession unlike any other. In addition, as I will demonstrate in the following chapter Shipworld, ship as a workplace differs radically from the vast majority of modern workplaces. As a middle-aged experienced bosun puts it, *I am sailor and proud of it.* (p1).

### 2.1.4. Categories and dimensions of worldview

Many scholars have wanted to divide worldview into smaller entities, in order to get a grip of it, because as we have seen above, worldview as a term is wide and abstract. Michael Kearney employs two independent but related concepts to emphasize the different levels of worldview study. Kearney (1984, 48) defines assumptions as the images of reality that the anthropologist hypothesizes as prevalent in the worldview of a particular individual or group. The anthropologist formulates the hypothetical statements as propositions, developing a model of the propositions to replicate that particular worldview. This definition helps us to see the distinction between assumptions and propositions: while assumptions, i.e., people's worldview, can never be wrong<sup>15</sup> (although maybe not based on the facts), the anthropologist's propositions may well be, in a sense whether it is an accurate representation of the assumptions or not (Kearney 1984, 56).

---

<sup>15</sup> American philosopher Lewis E. Hahn (2001) does not share Kearney's view on worldviews never being wrong, but discusses the adequacy of one's worldview, suggesting empirical method in his quest for finding right worldview. Hahn, however, discusses contextualistic worldview, defining worldview as a world hypothesis.

The American anthropologist Robert Redfield formed in the 1950s a worldview model that has influenced the later scholar in their quest in worldview studies. Redfield divided worldview into worldview universals: human, nature and god; self and other; time and space (Kearney 1984, 37-40). Kearney (1984, 68-107) lists worldview universals which he claims to exist in the worldviews of all peoples. These worldview universals are Self and other; classification, relationship and causality; time and space. Kearney (1984, 42) makes the theoretical assumption that the worldview universals *are* universal within species, and therefore they are fundamental categories of human thought.<sup>16</sup> Kearney reminds us that although he assumes these worldview universals to be fixed, their contents are not. Kearney (1984, 48) divides worldview into assumptions that are the worldview universals and into worldview propositions that are beliefs and folk knowledge. The worldview universals are usually not articulated explicitly, while the latter people can describe.

Juha Manninen (1977, 16-17) provides his theory on the structure of worldview, dividing worldview into assumptions of:

- a) time and space,
- b) the origin of the world, supernatural (does it exist, how does it effect the world),
- c) nature and human being as a part of it,
- d) human beings themselves and their relations to others, and
- e) structures of society, nation, state and the factors determining the course of history.

Helve (1987, 19) notes that Manninen's definition of worldview is wide and, for example, the factors that determine the course of history might be difficult for young people to understand. I would say that they may remain a great mystery for most of us. According to Ketola (1997, 18), Manninen divides worldview into basic categories, thus attempting to form a typology on worldview. Manninen's worldview structure is a step further towards the worldview propositions leaning away from the worldview universals,

---

<sup>16</sup> Kearney (1984, 207-208) notices that a student of worldviews can use only those categories that are historically available to her or him: different times offer different choices. Therefore Kearney willingly admits that his worldview universals are artefacts of the western intellectual tradition.

if we employ Kearney's analysis. Although Kearney shares some of the worldview assumptions with Manninen (time, space, relations), Manninen goes into society, nation and state while Kearney keeps his worldview universals in more abstract level of analysis: causality, other.

A few scholars on religion (Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark 1966, 142-162; Eila Helander 1986, 42-49; Juha Pentikäinen 1986, 15-16; Helmer Ringgren 1975, 10) have divided religion into five dimensions that Helena Helve (1987, 21-22; 1993, 21) has used as a basis for her model of worldview. Helve's model of worldview consists of following five dimensions:

1. *Conative* (behavioral) *dimension* focuses on activities, interests and lifestyles. It is assumed that the worldview is visible in person's activities, although it does not provide such an explicit guidance as *Weltanschauung* does.
2. *Cultural dimension* contains both cultural heritage and one's subculture.
3. *Cognitive dimension* contains knowledge structures that have been socialized through home, school, church, and other institutions. Cognitive dimension includes beliefs about world, life, death, supernatural, time and space, nature and humanity, as well as beliefs about society. This dimension is closest to the afore-mentioned belief-system.
4. *Social dimension* includes relations to other people. It is assumed that one's worldview affects relationships to others.
5. *Affective dimension* contains experiences and feelings (emotions, prospects, fears, and joys).

Helve (1993, 21) acknowledges that the five dimensions may overlap each other and, therefore, it may be difficult to distinguish them from one another. Helve takes her worldview model one more step further than Manninen, leaning towards the worldview propositions rather than the worldview assumptions. In Helve's model we have church, school, and lifestyles, but no Self, other, or causality. Heikki Pesonen (1997, 48) warns about the pitfalls in worldview models. Pesonen notes that there is a great danger of falling into universalization and ethnocentrism, if one is to use already existing

theoretical constructions for interpreting the worldview of an individual or a group. The researcher will view the culture she studies through two pairs of extra-lenses: First, she will perceive the culture through the construction created by western research community. Secondly, she will approach it through her own worldview. Pesonen (1997, 52) continues by stating that if it is assumed that all individuals of a certain research group comprehend the reality through the same ahistorical model, through the same worldview, their individual ways of being in the world—as a sexual being, as a person having a certain attitude towards world in a particular moment, time and place—may not show, although it could be a very fruitful perspective to understand that culture. Therefore, there is a danger that by using the worldview models the unique experience of an individual will be reduced to a theoretically constructed model.

Pesonen's critic touches Helve and Manninen, questioning the accuracy and meaningfulness of their models. The critic leaves Kearney mostly intact, because Kearney's worldview universals function on high abstract levels. It may be easy to shoot down argument stating that every worldview holds assumptions about the structures of society, nation and state. It will be much more difficult to proclaim that there are cultures where people's worldviews do not have the idea of causality. Manninen's and Helve's worldview models are perfect examples of what later scholars (see, e.g., Hill and Mannheim, Pesonen, Ketola) have criticized: that there would be a universal model that can fit all worldviews of the world. I join the critics of 'one size fits all' worldview models.

Niiniluoto (1984, 79-83) divides worldviews into three categories: scientific, religious and metaphysical worldviews. In the scientific worldview the world is explained with claims obtained and justified by scientific methods. The scientific worldview openly corrects itself with the advanced knowledge achieved by science. Worldview is religious, if it includes claims based on religious authorities (e.g., the Bible or Tripitaka), or religious or supernatural experiences. The religious worldview does not have to be unscientific, Niiniluoto reminds us, because religious claims (such as the existence of god [-s]) cannot be proved right or wrong by using scientific methods. Third, worldview is

metaphysical (non-scientific worldview), if it interprets the world with philosophical arguments instead of empirical methods of science. Niiniluoto has been criticized by Helve (1987, 20) of ignoring ideological worldview which does not fit into these categories, because it does not believe in supernatural but it is dogmatic like the religious worldview. Furthermore, the division of three categories may oversimplify worldviews. It also creates fruitless scientific vs. non-scientific dichotomies (Ketola 1997, 13). Kearney (1984,2) states that worldview theories are as well as any general worldviews more often than not an outlook of a group or class, thus they are often ideological in nature. Therefore, there exists no neutral, “value-free” starting point of analysis. Study of worldview involves also other methodological problems; the researcher faces the difficulties in getting beneath the surface to the unconscious of subjects of the study, and the subjects themselves are unable to express this unconscious in words (Helve 1993, 23).

#### 2.1.5. Previous worldview study on sailors

The studies conducted on worldview of sailors are few and far between. In fact, there are only two studies I have been able to find. The first study is a research paper written in 1984 by the Japanese sociologist Iwao Munakata. In the study “Worldview and the Concept of Self among Japanese Buddhist Fishermen in the Shiranui Inland Sea Area,” Munakata attempts to approach a local Japanese environmental crisis by studying the worldview of fishermen. Munakata (1984, 1) argues that the mercury in the wastewater of a chemical factory (Chisso Company) did not only ruin the waters and thus the living conditions of fishermen – it also seriously damaged the traditionally held worldviews that were based on the natural environment. The other study is conducted by the Finnish maritime historian Marika Rosenström (1996). In her study, she examines the assumptions about reality among Finnish sailors who sailed overseas on windjammers in the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Although the era of sailors is different, her research topic is very close to the worldview study. Rosenström uses cultural analysis as a method, employing several cultural structures in her study: chaos and order, manly nature, individual and collective, nature and culture, society and social categories, power and hierarchy, masculine and feminine, morale, prestige, work, time and space, and

cosmology. I will discuss Rosenström's study in more detail during my own analysis of shipworld and worldviews of seamen.

#### 2.1.6. Overview on worldview

When you talk with a seaman, like my old lady says that seaman has lots of worldview, from all directions, that he does not only stare at his own belly button. (m9)<sup>17</sup>

Old bosun with nearly 40 years at sea talks about sailors. This paper studies the worldview of seamen, focusing on the freedom-prison dichotomy I have found in my previous studies regarding the worldview of sailors and shipworld. Kearney (1984, 41-42) defines worldview as a collection of basic assumptions that an individual or a society has about reality. As discussed above, I do not want to employ Manninen's or Helve's models of worldview, because as Pesonen (1997, 48) remarks, there is a great danger for universalization and ethnocentrism. Thus my task is to study freedom-prison dichotomy *because* it arose from the material. I also view suspiciously the idea that worldviews would be stable and coherent (see Kearney 1984, 42; Manninen 1977), and therefore agree with Ketola (1997). The era of unified cosmologies is gone (see Helve 1993, 10), and thus to study the worldview of a certain group is easily in the verge of sliding from challenging into meaningless. Saying that, I do perceive the concept of worldview has still much to offer for a student of culture. Despite the methodological and theoretical challenges that the worldview concept faces, worldview scholars agree that everyone has a worldview, a certain way of seeing the world. As long as it is thought that worldviews exist (see Kearney regarding external inconsistencies in worldview; what if science would come up with the finding that worldviews cannot exist according to, let us say, quantum mechanics?), they are a vital part of cultural studies. In this study I will examine worldview through the metaphors seamen employ when they discuss their life at sea. Landa F. Jocano (2001, 5) notes that language is one of the powerful means of expressing worldview. Language is not only the bearer of culture, Jocano says, but is acts also as the medium through which events and things are made explicit, communicated, and

---

<sup>17</sup> Quotation in Finnish: Mm, sen kun [merimiehen] kans juttelee niin, niinku muija sanoo että on hirveesti maailmankatsomusta, niinku joka kantilta ettei tuijota vaan omaa napaa. (m9)

experienced. Therefore, language—rhetoric and metaphors as part of it—is my method to examine the worldview of seamen. Kearney (1984, 10) asks, how worldview influences behavior and practical affairs. Without this question—if worldview did not have impact on the outside world—there would be no need to study worldviews. Niemi and Nurmi (1986, 80) note that the worldview influences the selecting one makes regarding information. As will be discussed in the next sub-chapter, language, like worldview, influences one’s perception of and reactions to the world. Therefore, metaphors are fruitful method to study worldviews. The American linguist Dilin Liu (2002, viii) states that metaphor does not only reveal, but it also shapes the worldview and behavior of speaker. Motorman Aleksy ponders,

Life at sea makes you harder. You start to think differently, you don’t take every single thing to be that damn important. You think more about yourself, and care less for the others. You are lonely here. You start to think you are always alone, you start to see the world that way. (m10).

## **2.2. Loaded with Metaphors: Methodology**

Like language in general, the use of metaphors is simultaneously shaped by and shaping the culture in which the language is spoken. In other words, language speakers’ use of metaphors is to a great extent influenced by their cultural experience, and in return, metaphors help shape the speakers’ construction of reality—their worldviews. The dominant metaphors that the speakers of a language use can provide an excellent window for us to look at the values and beliefs treasured in their culture and the worldviews they hold.

- Dilin Liu (2002, 119) -

The methodological framework for the research consists of tools to analyze worldview through metaphors sailors use to discuss shipworld. The main methodological instrument is metaphor as part of rhetoric. In the next sub-chapter, *Metaphor and rhetoric*, I discuss this relationship in the more detail. For now I focus on metaphors, starting with the American linguists George Lakoff’s and Mark Johnson’s (1980, 5) short definition of metaphor,

The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.

Metaphor, like any complex theoretical concept, has earned various definitions in its life through more than two millennia.<sup>18</sup> First, I will discuss here several of them, in order to give background for my choice of definition. In a metaphor, a concept is replaced by another which both covers and reveals (see e.g., Morgan 1986; Gordon, Lahelma, and Tolonen 1995; Lakoff and Johnson 1980). According to the Canadian scholar of cognitive psychology Albert N. Katz (1996, 2), sentences of the type *An A is a B* are interpreted as metaphors if 1) the sentence does not have an obvious interpretation, 2) the topic (*A*) is abstract or difficult to image, 3) the vehicle (*B*) is concrete and easy to grasp, 4) the sentence is seen as comprehensible and, 5) the topic and the vehicle have semantic relation.<sup>19</sup> Katz (1996, 16) notes that, in the study of metaphors, it has long been identified that metaphor seems to induce similarity between the topic and the vehicle. Here the word *induce* is in the key position. How much do metaphors generate similarity between two concepts, the topic and the vehicle? Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 153) note that when a metaphor of the form *A is B* is seen as a linguistic expression where “*A is like B, in respects of X,Y,Z...*,” the metaphor can only describe pre-existing similarities without an ability to create them. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 153-154) disagree with that view: for them, metaphor is *primarily* a matter of thought and action, and only derivatively a matter of language. They argue that the only relevant similarities to metaphor are the similarities which people *experience* between the metaphor and the original word which the metaphor replaces. Therefore, the way seamen use particular metaphors may well differ from the usages of landlubbers who do not have first-hand knowledge of sailor life.

Pollio (1996, 241) summarizes the famous interaction theory by the American scholar Max Black (1962). According to interaction theory, some words in a sentence are used metaphorically, while the rest of the words are not. A competent listener/reader

---

<sup>18</sup> There has been a distinct Metaphor Pride Movement in linguistics and related fields during the past couple of decades. The discourse sounds quite a bit the same as in Feminist and Queer Studies. For example, Fiumara (1995, 4) states that, “the topic of metaphor has been systematically ignored throughout centuries.” Now, it seems, is the right time for metaphor empowerment and emancipation. Dilin Liu (2002, 1-2) argues, accordingly, that many scholars have shown great antipathy towards metaphor, denouncing it as unnecessary show that causes ambiguity or as a scheme that degrades truth.

<sup>19</sup> The relation of A = topic and B = vehicle to the terms of other scholars (such as source domain and target domain) will be explained later in a more detail.

experiences the difference of word usage immediately. Black's sentence "*The chairman plowed through the discussion*" may illustrate the case. It is obvious that the word "*plowed*" is the metaphoric element and rest of the sentence should be understood literally. When this distinction is founded, the metaphoric element becomes a focus of metaphoric intelligence, and the sentence becomes its frame. The interpretation of the metaphor is interactional phenomenon which can be compared to the figure/ground concept known from Gestalt psychology. Just to round the picture, the American cognitive psychologist John Kennedy (1996, 215) offers a simple definition of metaphor by stating that when in language we mispresent to make a point ("*that man is a shark*"), we create a metaphor. As demonstrated above, this approach differs from many of the more elaborated definitions of metaphor. Kennedy's terse definition of metaphor is, in its clarity, quite effective.

As we have already seen, there are several theories and approaches to metaphor. Or, if anything, there are several definitions on metaphor that are not much apart. I will use in the analysis the afore-introduced definition by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980). Lakoff and Johnson emphasize metaphor's role in understanding and experiencing everyday life. This approach offers a fertile soil to examine worldview through metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 159) argue that metaphors are the basic tools for comprehension. American scholar John Fiske (1992, 125-126) is in line with Lakoff and Johnson by stating that the essence of thinking can be seen as metaphorical, i.e., the essential component of thinking *is* metaphorical; metaphors function as analyzers and arbitrators of everyday experiences, they are resources of interpretation. Metaphors permeate everyday experiences. The American linguist Howard Pollio (1996, 244) notes that figures of speech (for example, metaphors) are ineluctably figures of thought. Therefore, in studying such complex systems as worldview and shipworld, metaphors work as powerful interpreters. Thus, Pollio (1996, 251) maintains, a good metaphor is such that it does not only make the strange familiar, but it also succeeds in making familiar strange. Pollio's notion is especially crucial to the researcher studying metaphors, because a surprising, or seemingly out-of-the-place, metaphor may help to ask

the right questions, questions that one might not understand to ask without the clues provided by the metaphor.

Metaphors are culturally shared. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 146), that which is considered to be true by an individual, as a member of her culture, is the result of both her social reality and the experiences of the physical world, permeated through that reality. They state that, because most of our social reality is understood through metaphoric terms, and because our conception of the physical world is partially metaphoric, metaphors do have a significant role in defining what we think is real. Thus, metaphors have a significant role in forming worldviews. Metaphors are our tools in comprehending the world. George Lakoff (1990, 47-48) employs cognitive linguistics in his analysis of *love as journey*. According to Lakoff, the metaphor involves understanding one domain of experience, love (*topic* in Katzian terms), in terms of a very different domain of experience, journey (*vehicle* by Katz). Lakoff maintains that the use of both *source* domain (journey, *vehicle*) and *target* domain (love, *topic*) is tightly structured, and therefore the ontological correspondences are employed by such metaphors like *the relationship isn't going anywhere* or *we're at a crossroads*.

### 2.2.1. Use of metaphors

The extensive use of metaphors in the everyday language makes one wonder, why do people use metaphors? Metaphor works like a lens of a camera. Hence it helps to focus on a part of the scene and to see it clearly, but, while doing that, it blurs the rest of the view. An essential aspect of a metaphor is that it highlights certain interpretations and tends to force others into a background role (Morgan 1986, 13). For instance, to call a girl (or a man) a rose emphasizes her (or his) beauty and fragility, leaving the girl (or man) to the role of an object for gaze and care. The rose-metaphor forces to the background the girl's (man's) own will and activity. Thus, according to Jeffery Scott Mio (1996, 130), metaphors serve as filters which screen out everything else but the core ideas consistent with metaphors. Hence the metaphor may, so to say, cut off the tongue and legs of a girl or a man. The American scholar Warren Gramm (1996, 147), who has studied economic

metaphors, reminds us that metaphors can be useful, but also dangerous. David P. Ellerman (1991, 559) notes, “[m]etaphors are like lies: one metaphor requires others to round out the picture.”

Katz (1996, 4-7) lists eight independent communication goals of metaphors, having collected some of them from previous research of other scholars (Aristotle, Gibbs 1987, Lakoff & Johnson 1980, Ortony 1975, Winner 1988).

First, one reason to use a metaphor is that it is part of our lexicon and acts as a word. For example, “*Their marriage was a continual battle.*” Lakoff and Johnson (1980) have conducted a fundamental study on this subject.

Second, metaphors are used to express something an elegant way. Therefore, they may be primarily stylistic. Katz cites Percy Shelley’s poem as an example: “*Tranquility is a woodland river winding through hills in solitude.*”

Third, since metaphor forces the participant to elaborate the topic, leading to a stronger memory trace, metaphors can be used to enhance the memorability of a concept.

Fourth, metaphors are used in persuasion, to create a bond between the speaker and the audience. The presumption is that if the target audience shares—and is aware of sharing—“privileged” knowledge with the speaker, a bond is (more) likely to occur.

Fifth, sometimes a metaphor is an efficient and compact way to convey the intended meaning. An example could be the term “*black hole*” in science.

Sixth, because metaphors may be vivid, they are often used to reduce ambiguity and increase comprehension of the intended message.

Seventh, metaphors are used to fade out essential dissimilarities, in order to persuade the audience. Katz’s example is “*Saddam Hussein is the Hitler of our era.*” In this sentence the intent is to obscure the significant differences between modern Iraq and 1930s’ Germany.

Eighth, metaphor is used to clarify, explain or illuminate a concept when literal language is not capable of doing so.

According to Katz (1996, 4-6), the communication goals from second to seventh can be seen as most interesting, because here the metaphor is used in order to make a special

communication point. The American scholar on political discourse Seth Thompson (1996, 194-195) reminds us that metaphors have consequences for action because they are able to frame issues. Thompson notes that there are differences according to the use of metaphor; in politics, the framing function of metaphor is often recognized, and there are conscious attempts to control the political agenda by attempting to define the dominant metaphors.

### 2.2.2. Boundaries of metaphor

I will discuss here a couple of areas in linguistics that may help to define the boundaries of metaphor. First, I will discuss tropes, i.e., the different types of figurative language. Later, I will discuss the relationship between metaphor and humor.

#### **Metaphor among other tropes**

Trope (Latin *tropus*, from Greek *tropos* turn, way, manner, style, trope) is defined as a word or expression used in a figurative sense. Therefore, metaphor is one of several tropes, such as exaggeration, emblem, symbolism, and metonymy (Kennedy 1996, 222). The American cognitive psychologists Patricia Chantrill and Jeffery Scott Mio (1996, 171-172) state that metaphor has taken a position as a representative of all forms in figurative language. They argue that metonymy is not as well known a term in studies of language and cognitive psychology metaphor is, although in speech and writing metonymy is as common as a persuasive device. According to Chantrill and Mio (1996, 171-172), metonymy is “a substitution of a term closely associated with the literal term.” Chantrill and Mio use as an example of metonymy the old dictum “*The hand that rocks the cradle rules the world.*” Here, the hand is a synecdoche representing the mother (‘the hand of the mother,’ to make it evident). Synecdoche is the most familiar form of metonymy; it employs a literal-to-figurative association of part-to-whole or whole-to-part. In order for synecdoche to be apt, it has to be particularly and prominently related to the intended literal meaning. For example, in respect of Chantrill’s and Mio’s analysis, to say that “*The home-cooking that rocks the cradle rules the world*” is not a successful metonymy, although home-cooking and mother could be defined before 1960s as

instrumental part-to-whole synecdoche (see Chantrill and Mio 1996, 172). Chantrill and Mio note that it first may seem that metaphor and metonymy possess only a few differences. This is partially the reason, in my view, why metaphor has achieved the leading position as representing all forms of figurative language; others seem to fit under the broader definitions of metaphor.

### **Humor and metaphor**

All older sailors are more or less weird ... There is always a border, the border of privacy and... They are bogeymen.<sup>20</sup> (k8)

This is how captain Tommi describes sailors. Pollio (1996, 233-251) remarks that there are similarities between humor and metaphor, despite the differences existing between those two. He questions the barrier between humor and metaphor by asking,

Can it be that a joke or humorous remark is nothing more than a mean-spirited metaphor or, at least, one gone bad and that a metaphor is nothing but a polite form of a more mean-spirited joke or putdown?

Pollio's question is interesting, but one finds it difficult to quite agree with it. A poetic metaphor of the type "*Tranquility is a woodland river winding through hills in solitude*" (Shelley in Katz 1996, 5) is hardly a polite form of a mean-spirited joke. Pollio's notion of similarities between humor and metaphor is, nevertheless, important. According to Pollio (1996, 242-248), both metaphor and humor seem to utilize split reference; that is, to employ two different but related ideas or images that take place in proximity to each other. In split reference, the reader is able to experience something—a word or a poem—as "is-and-is-not." According to Pollio (1996, 242),

The idea of split reference yielding an experience of is-and-is-not creates a tension in the listener or reader. In the case of the figurative word, the tension is between literal and metaphorical, in the case of the figurative sentence, between *focus* and *frame*, and in the case of more extended discourse, between metaphoric and literal descriptions of what is taken to be true.

---

<sup>20</sup> Interview k8, quotation in Finnish. Kyllä kaikki vanhemmat merimiehet on enemmän tai vähemmän omalaatuisia sillai niinku et... tietty raja pidetään aina semmonen yksityisyyden raja ja muuta... et sillä lailla mörköjä.

Pollio (1996, 251) notes that both metaphor and humor appear to focus on alternatives. In respect of Pollio's statement, one can explicate that both metaphor and humor can be seen as alternative ways to express a meaning, or alternative ways to see a topic. Pollio states that the same issue can be framed from the view point of split reference; then, the boundary separating items which define split reference is in focus. According to Pollio (1996, 251), "metaphor does away with the boundary, either momentarily or more permanently, whereas humor simply emphasizes the boundary but is unable to overcome it." Quite a few of the metaphors sailors use to reflect their life at sea can be interpreted as humorous or ironic.

Focus on a metaphor is a tool for the researcher to analyze sailors' worldviews and shipworld; in studying such complex systems as worldviews and shipworld, metaphors work as powerful interpreters. The Danish anthropologist Kirsten Hastrup (1995, 36-37) reminds scholars of their duty to discuss the social consequences of their study subject. She argues that metaphorical thinking stretches into the daily life, "metaphors are not conceptual puzzles external to social life; they intervene, shape and produce action." For sailors, however, a metaphor is not in the same way a tool for intellectual striving as it is for the scholars. Sailors use metaphors to communicate meanings and to express their thoughts. They do not engage in detailed discussion regarding fine-tuning of metaphor definitions. They are not totally blind to them either; I find it important to emphasize that most of the times the metaphors sailors used, when they reflected upon their life at sea, or the ship community, were neither neutral nor semi-unconscious remarks. The metaphors sailors used were mostly stylistic; they often produced ironic or polemic notions of shipworld. The Finnish scholars Gordon, Lahelma, and Tolonen (1995, 10) remind us that metaphors are ambiguous as well, at the same time they may be both playful and solemn. This is evident in the metaphors which sailors use for their ship: for some the ship is a golden cage, for others a nut house, or a bottle. Let us thus turn to rhetoric, in order to understand sailors' often polemic and ironic notions of shipworld.

### 2.2.3. Metaphor and rhetoric

This is not life worthy for humans. You lose your life here. You are outside of everything, in the end. Even though that you have vacations. You have to be crazy to be here, or lack imagination if you don't find any other place to go than seas. If somebody has asked me, I have always said that don't you never ever go to sea. (c7).

Chief engineer Hans reflects on his life at sea, making a strong communication point. Metaphors are part of rhetoric. Katz (1996, 4) notes that in some cases the nature of communication—whether it is informative or evaluative—can determine an intent of speech as metaphoric or ironic. In many instances the evaluative-informative dichotomy, Katz continues, does not function as sufficient discriminator of metaphoric from ironic speech. By the informative and evaluative nature of communication Katz refers to the idea that the context may set up a schema for interpreting ambiguous sentences. Then, in respect of Katz's idea, evaluative speech uses irony in its criticism, while informative speech utilizes metaphor when trying to communicate meaning, although these two communication goals often mix. The Finnish new rhetorician Tuula Sakaranaho (1998, 49) supplies her study on rhetoric<sup>21</sup> with the terms *reifying rhetoric* and *ironizing rhetoric*. The former refers to rhetoric “that construct versions of the world as solid and factual.” The latter embodies undermining discourse. The division that Sakaranaho uses can be seen in relation to Katz's evaluative-informative dichotomy. According to Sakaranaho (1998, 49),

Reifying turns something abstract into material, and produces thoughts and events as objects. Ironizing treats discourse not as something literal, but as a product of interest or strategy and hence undermines the literal descriptiveness of a particular account.

---

<sup>21</sup> Recently, there has been a growing interest in new rhetoric among sociologically orientated scholars, both in Finland and abroad (see e.g., Sakaranaho 2001, 1999, 1998 and the trend of new rhetoric in comparative religion in Finland; Palonen and Summa 1996, Potter 1996, Gusfield 1989, Simons 1990, Atkinson 1990). The British psychologist Michael Billig (1987, 32) argued in the 1980s that ‘rhetoric’ as a word had a negative connotation. He stated that, “[i]t conveys speech which lacks substance, and the word seems to beg for the additional qualification of ‘mere’ or ‘empty’. Mere rhetoric is often contrasted with the reality of deeds.” Since then ‘rhetoric’ has been vindicated by the contemporary scholars. I will discuss here briefly some general aspects of rhetoric, focusing on those aspects that are relevant to my study and closely linked to metaphors. Palonen and Summa (1996, 7) remind us that rhetoric has various traditions and uses, and may, therefore, not to be described as one discipline. The American scholar William Franke (2000, 137) notes that metaphor has gained new interest through the rise of new rhetoric.

Katz (1996, 3-6) argues that even though the communication goals of metaphor and irony may seem very different, the goals of ironic and metaphoric communication are often quite similar. Katz continues that, actually, the communication goals of metaphor and irony often overlap. Therefore, according to Katz, the distinction between ironic and metaphoric communication goals is more a matter of emphasis than of type. I take this notion from Katz into account when I set to analyze the metaphors sailors use in order to express their thoughts about shipworld.

### **Generally on metaphor and rhetoric**

The American scholar Kenneth Burke is one of the founding fathers of the rhetorical turn. His famous statement “*Every way of seeing is also a way of not seeing*” (1965, 49) is in line with most definitions of metaphor. It is not the same, though; when both Burke’s remark and majority of the definitions of metaphor embrace the idea of revealing and covering, only in metaphor there is actual switch of words always taking place. Chaim Perelman (1979, 45), another father of new rhetoric, noted in the 1970s that the choice of a linguistic form was neither purely arbitrary nor simply a carbon copy of reality. Most of the modern metaphor theorists are in line with Perelman, because metaphors fit into the notion of linguistic form being located between the arbitrary and real. Perelman (1982, 5) states that new rhetoric is concerned with discourse addressed to all kinds of audiences, unlike its ancient counterpart.<sup>22</sup> Perelman notes that new rhetoric reaches even to examining arguments addressed to oneself in private contemplation.<sup>23</sup> Perelman (1979, 9) defines new rhetoric as a theory of argumentation. Tuula Sakaranaho (1998, 41) provides a crisp explanation of the relationship of rhetorical turn and new rhetoric, “the rhetorical

---

<sup>22</sup> The study and development on new rhetoric has mostly focused on active persuasion of opponents. For example, Sakaranaho (1998) conducted her study on the Turkish women scholars’ studies and debate about women’s issues in Turkey. Likewise, the British social psychologists Margaret Wetherell and Jonathan Potter (1992) studied the racist language use in New Zealand. Summa (1996, 17) argues that Burke was more concerned with rhetoric linked with non-harmonic situations, while Perelman focused more on rhetoric as a source for mutual understanding.

<sup>23</sup> Burke also recognized the potential of new rhetoric in study of private deliberation. According to Burke (1950, 35), one can extend the range of rhetorical study to reach persuasion which we impose upon ourselves, being more or less conscious or unaware of our own actions. Michael Billig (1987) has contributed to the study of rhetoric on private thinking. According to Billig, private thinking is modeled upon public argument, having more the character of dialogue than a monologue. Potter (1996, 8) states that general features of fact construction exist, that is, that the same considerations are likely to occur in every type of discourse. This means that arguing and thinking use same kind of fact construction and same kind of terministic screens.

turn means the rediscovery of rhetoric that took place in the humanistic sciences during recent decades and which has led to the formation of the so-called new rhetoric.”<sup>24</sup>

Perelman (1979, 45) claims that the reasons that induce us to prefer one conception of experience to another are a function of our vision of the world. Therefore, in respect of Perelman, our worldviews affect the metaphors we use, and in turn, our choice of metaphors influences our worldviews. Perelman (1979, 91) states that metaphor and analogy are tools for expressing and communicating thoughts, and for trying to influence others. Perelman (1982, 62) argues that always, when an idea can be defined in more than one way, ‘to define’ becomes to mean to make a choice. This choice could be acceptable without debate only if its consequences were perceived to be insignificant for the reasoning process. Kenneth Burke is more radical in his statement (in Gusfield 1989, 35). According to Burke,

Men seek for vocabularies that will be faithful *reflections* of reality. To this end they must develop vocabularies that are *selections* of reality. And any selection of reality must, in certain circumstances, function as a *deflection* of reality.

Thus, for Burke, all vocabularies to express an idea are inevitably deflections, while Perelman believes that there is a possibility for an idea to exist that could be defined only one, certain way. The American sociologist Joseph Gusfield (1989, 34) elaborates on Burke, stating that reality is screened through the terminologies—Burke calls them *terministic screens*—which we utilize in interpreting and communicating. Such taken for granted terminologies are not neutral, however. Kenneth Burke (1966, 50 in Sakaranaho 1998, 47) argues that,

*We must* use terministic screens, since we can’t say anything without the use of terms; whatever terms we use, they necessarily constitute a corresponding kind of screen; and any such screen necessarily directs the attention to one rather than another.

Therefore, according to Burke, the terministic screens are neither escapable, nor neutral. Burke’s approach to the terministic screens is in line with Kearney’s (1984, 117) notion on worldview being always partial and thus inaccurate image of reality. The terms we use

---

<sup>24</sup> In their definition of new rhetoric, Palonen and Summa (1996, 7) bring up the attempts of new rhetoric scholars to examine science itself as a rhetoric activity.

in constructing our world (-view) are always selections of reality, directing our attention and thus, our worldview, to a certain direction. The British scholar Paul Atkinson (1990, 40) notes that the discourse of everyday life is, itself, a matter of convention. It is the world in which we place our trust: bedrock of taken-for-granted faith. In respect of this idea, concepts like gender or class or community, which once were assumed to be objective, are now presumed to be culturally ‘constructed’ or ‘constituted’ (Peter Burke 1992, 119).

#### 2.2.4. Overview on Metaphor

Every religion describes God through metaphor, allegory, and exaggeration, from the early Egyptians through modern Sunday school. Metaphors are a way to help our minds process the unprocessable. The problems arise when we begin to believe literally in our own metaphors.

– Robert Langdon, in *the Da Vinci Code* (Brown 2003, 341-342) -

In the study on worldview of seamen, I will apply the metaphor theory developed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980). They emphasize metaphor’s role in understanding and experiencing everyday life. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 153-154) state that metaphor is primarily a matter of thought and action, and only secondarily a matter of language. They argue that the only similarities relevant to metaphor are the similarities which people experience between the metaphor and the original word. This approach is fruitful for examining worldview through metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 146-159) view metaphors as the basic tools for comprehension. Metaphors are culturally shared: what are considered to be true by an individual are the result of both her social reality and the experiences of the physical world which the social reality influences. Lakoff and Johnson state that metaphors have a significant role in defining what we think is real. Thus, metaphors have a significant role in forming worldviews. Metaphors are our tools in comprehending the world.

After engaging in somewhat detailed discussion of differences between various tropes (metonymy, simile, analogy), I conclude that I will use metaphor as a working term and representative of all forms of figurative language. I will focus mostly on metaphors, examining other tropes when I find it necessary. On the other hand, I will employ rhetoric

as a background for metaphors. Katz's (1996) notion on metaphoric and ironic speech leads us to employ also Sakaranaho's (1998) concepts of reifying and ironizing rhetoric. Reifying rhetoric attempts to construct solid and factual versions of world, while ironizing rhetoric tries to undermine such attempts. According to Katz, the goals of ironic and metaphoric communication are often quite similar, although the communication goals of metaphor and irony may seem different. Moreover, the communication goals of metaphor and irony often overlap. Therefore, the distinction between ironic and metaphoric communication goals is more a matter of emphasis than of type. Liu (2002, 1-10) argues that studying metaphors will help us to understand other people's worldviews. I will examine sailors' metaphors that are part of their rhetoric, in order to learn about their worldviews. With this study on the worldviews of seamen and the freedom-prison dichotomy, I attempt to enrich the field of comparative religion by adding to its traditions in studying values and worldviews.

### ***2.3 Field, material***

My study material consists of the interviews and field journals which I conducted while working different jobs aboard several ships in the years 1996, 1999 and 2000. I produced the material for my study during two periods. First, I was working on an oil-tanker owned by a big Finnish shipping company while conducting fieldwork for my M.A. thesis. I was a full-time employee aboard, and I conducted participant observation on the side.<sup>25</sup> I was an ordinary seaman, a position of the lowest rank in the ship hierarchy, according to the organizational chart (the mess girl is practically the lowest rank, because this person cleans for others and the position is occupied mostly by women). "Ordinary seaman" is most directly opposed to the "able-bodied seaman," the latter having more experience in seafaring. Ordinary seaman is the traditional profession in seafaring; it is the ordinary seaman who handles the ropes and climbs up the mast, so to speak. This fieldwork period lasted two months. Second, I was aboard ten ships as a company researcher. I was employed by the shipping company to study the relationships between the company and

---

<sup>25</sup> I use 'participant observation,' because it is well established term (see e.g., Spradley 1980). I find the term not fully satisfactory for my purposes, however, because I was primarily a worker, and after that obligation came the fieldwork.

its ships, the atmosphere on the ships, and the crew members' attitudes regarding their work and life at sea. I was aboard nine oil tankers and one barge, staying on each ship for approximately a week or week and a half. The second fieldwork period amounted to roughly three months. Prior to these fieldwork periods, I had been working aboard several smaller ships for various lengths of time. I have been an ordinary seaman for 9 years now (since 1995), and I have worked on-and-off seas for roughly ten years. This is important to keep in mind, because, therefore, I went to conduct fieldwork in a setting that I knew beforehand, to certain extent.

### 2.3.1. In the field as a seaman

I will discuss here my fieldwork as an ordinary seaman in 1996 on a Finnish oil tanker. After graduating from the merchant marine school in 1995, I applied to several shipping companies and went to work with the one that accepted me. My watch was 8-12, i.e., I worked from 8 a.m. until noon and from 8 p.m. until midnight. If we were in the harbor, then I would stand on the deck and watch that nothing spilt over. My orders came from the officer on-duty, in this case the first mate. If we were at sea during the night, I stood on the bridge and watched for up-coming vessels, i.e., kept company for the officer on watch. Otherwise, during the daylight hours, I performed tasks requested by the boatswain: my normal duties included painting, cleaning, hammering rust, sewing tarpaulin and the rest. In addition to these watch duties, I worked in the stern with the boatswain, motorman, and the 1<sup>st</sup> officer when the vessel entered or left the harbor.

I spent my free time hanging out with my shipmates, as much as possible. We used to watch TV together, or pretend to be watching TV, while we were chatting about daily events, gossips and our lives. Sometimes I was too tired or over-whelmed and went to my cabin to sleep or to write my field journal. If we were in the harbor and had matching free time schedules, we shipmates often went downtown (read: to bars and seaman clubs) together, especially in foreign harbors.

### **When a fieldworker is a worker**

Doing good fieldwork does not necessarily mean that one is good at other work. For instance, in shipworld, fieldwork and work are largely opposed to one another. A good fieldworker may be described (among other qualities) as curious and active, she gains access everywhere, takes notes and writes dutifully a wordy and descriptive field journal. A good ordinary seaman, on the other hand, will not ask nosy questions, will go where she is told and will dutifully carry out the assigned tasks. She is physically strong, wakes up three times a day, whenever the ship operations need her. After her shift she is possibly too tired to write extensively in a field journal, while the nature of her working tasks (standing on the windy deck ensuring that things are in order, or standing in the dark bridge watching for other ships) does not offer her many opportunities to take notes. Her position in the hierarchy alone denies her access to many events and places. The British anthropologist Allison Spedding (1999, 17) reflects on her experience of doing fieldwork in prison,

Another aspect of ‘normal’ fieldwork is that you are generally an outsider to the community you study. This gives you a certain flexibility of role. It’s not unlimited and I think it helps to be somewhat schizoid by nature, but you can participate in diverse social groups or categories, changing your role in a way which is largely impossible for a native. Here, I am a prisoner and that’s that.

My experience is largely in line with Spedding, for when I was aboard ship working as a seaman and doing field research, people treated me like a seaman. I did not have access to the events, places or items that were not essential for an ordinary seaman. These were, for instance, the officers’ dayroom, meetings held by officers, and conversations over dinner in their mess. I was a seaman in the eyes of the officers, thus I was given only the information they thought a seaman needed—which was not much. While being an ordinary seaman denied me access to certain situations and information, the case would have been the same with other posts as well. The captain, for example, would quite likely not have been able to gain same information about crew mess chat as I was.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> The Danish anthropologists Kirsten Hastrup and Peter Hervik (1994, 3) argue that one has to be physically present in the field. Amit (2000, 12) does not quite agree by stating that the ethnographic ‘field’ has always been as much characterized by absences as by presences and thus various methods are needed—interviews, artifacts, media materials and more—to explore processes not immediately or appropriately accessible through participant observation.

### 2.3.2. In the field as a researcher

The second fieldwork period took place three years after the first, in 1999 and 2000, when I was a company researcher, conducting study on behalf of the shipping company. When I conducted a study for the shipping company, I did fieldwork in ten vessels (and in the shipping company head quarters, but that material is not included into this study).<sup>27</sup> At that time, the shipping company managed approximately 17 vessels.<sup>28</sup> Thus, I conducted fieldwork in approximately two thirds of the company's ships. These ships were chosen mostly by the company. By which criteria? The ships represented the variety of company's vessels, if one views them *technically*: If there were sister vessels, at least one of them was on my list. This arrangement guaranteed that the ships were of different ages, sizes and traffic areas. Although age, size and area may indicate some characteristics of ship life, they tell little about the ship communities and sailors. Were there other factors the shipping company executives thought about, when they chose these particular ships, as opposed to their sisters? I do not know. Probably sheer coincidence played a big role; once I had to change a ship to its sister vessel, due to practical problems, and nobody paid any attention to it. One factor was company's will to achieve more information about problematic issues on particular ship communities. I

---

<sup>27</sup> My field was scattered between different locations, time periods and people. Ten independent ships in different times inhabited by a variety of people, who do not by and large know each other, bring up methodological questions of 'field.' The American anthropologist Peter McLaren (1991, 150) notes that the fieldworker engages not only in the analysis of field site, but also in its active production. The field is always constructed, not just found and studied. The Canadian anthropologist Vered Amit (2000, 6) points out that, "Yet in a world of infinite interconnections and overlapping contexts, the ethnographic field cannot simply exist, awaiting discovery. It has to be laboriously constructed, prised apart from all the other possibilities for contextualization to which its constituent relationships and connections could also be referred." The American anthropologist Sarah Strauss (2000, 164) takes this notion a step further, stating that the 'field,' as traditionally conceived (a bounded, isolable, cultural whole) is not only unrealistic and inappropriate, but does not, and perhaps never did, exist. Strauss's (2000, 168) solution to the problem of (non-)existent fields is a *matrix*, a 'sphere of activity.' Matrix is a method of mapping out the ways in which individuals, institutions, communities, ideas, practices and objects interact. A matrix is comprised of two or more intersecting *vectors*; a vector is defined as a quantity having the properties of both direction and magnitude. The field is a matrix for Strauss. The American anthropologist Rena Lederman (1990, 88) notes that "the field" is, rather than a place, a particular relation between oneself and others, involving a difficult combination of commitment and disengagement, relationship and separation. I find the concept of matrix very interesting, although I am yet to find a practical application for it to be able to employ it in my work.

<sup>28</sup> The accurate number depends on the definition of the ownership and management, because the legal owner of the vessel is often corporation other than the manager, or the freighter.

was told, *after* I had visited these ships, that the current or past situations in two ship communities lead them to end up in the study group. There might have been other factors as well that effected the selection of ships, but I was not informed about them, nor did I find any evidence of them.

When I was in the field as a company researcher, I did not do participant observation in Spradley's terms (see Spradley 1980). Nor was I a strict observer. I will display below a typical day schedule of my company researcher days, in order to illustrate the nature of this fieldwork period.

---

**FRIDAY**

- 7.00 am      *I wake up and get ready for the day.*
- 7.30 am      *Breakfast. I chat with chief engineer, introduce myself and my reason to be on board to the captain and the first mate.*
- 8.00 am      *Captain's office: I tell the captain more about the study, and hand out my passport. I introduce myself to the second mate and pilot. I go to the cabin and unpack my stuff.*
- 9.00 am      *I write my field journal, have a break and decide with the chief engineer the time for interview.*
- 10.00 am     *I introduce myself to the steward. I chat in the mess of kitchen personnel, and*
- 6.30 pm + *an extra arrange the interview with her.*
- 10.15 am     *I go to the bridge, and talk with second mate, captain and pilot.*
- 11.30 am     *Lunch with the chief engineer, I introduce myself and my task to the first engineer, and arrange the interview with him.*
- 11.50 am     *I introduce myself and my job in the workers' work mess (paskamessi). I arrange interviews with boatswain and repairman.*
- 12.10 am     *Interview with the chief engineer.*
- 1.50 pm      *Break*

2.20 pm	<i>Bridge: I introduce myself and talk with the second mate.</i>
2.50 pm	<i>Captain's office: I arrange the interview with the captain.</i>
3.00 pm	<i>Paskamessi (workers' work mess): I introduce myself to others, and chat with motorman.</i>
3.20 pm	<i>Interview with the captain, short visit to the bridge.</i>
5.00 pm	<i>Dinner: I arrange the interview with the first mate.</i>
5.20 pm	<i>Paskamessi: chatting.</i>
5.40 pm	<i>Cabin: short break.</i>
6.00 pm	<i>Captain's office: chatting. hour because of shift of time zone Sauna with the crew's women members (steward and mess girl)</i>
8.00 pm	<i>Captain's office: talking.</i>
11.00 pm	<i>Bridge: second mate and boatswain, talking.</i>
12.00 pm	<i>Cabin: field journal and sleep.</i>

---

As this above-illustrated table shows, my main acts were lobbying, observing and interviewing.

### **Reflections**

I feel always outsider when we dock. I am the only one who is useless here. Well, cook and steward are too, but still. (Field journal, January 21, 2000).

This is an extract of my field journal reflecting on my feelings of being aboard ship, but not performing my previous job as an ordinary seaman, now that I was a company researcher. I felt useless because everybody else (except cook and steward) were waiting for docking, wearing overalls, helmets and walkie-talkies, and smoking anxiously cigarettes. In an organization of strict closed hierarchy, one may wonder, where does the researcher stand? In a traditional bureaucratic hierarchy, one's rank may be defined by the number of people one gives orders to, and takes orders from. As a fieldworker

observing a total institution,<sup>29</sup> I was subject to, yet outside the hierarchy; I neither took nor gave orders. How then was my post defined? This is an important question in total institutions, for it directly affects the amount of information one can access. As might be expected, the captain, the officers and the crew will want to locate the research worker to a specific (even arbitrary) position in the established hierarchy of the ship.

The first indication of the research worker's hierarchical rank is her cabin assignment. Because of crew member reductions, the captain has several choices of cabins to allocate. Thus, the assignment of cabin is one way to show the visitor where she stands, since the ship's space is structured hierarchically. Frequently, I was assigned the ex-cabin of the radio operator, which is large, in good shape, and on the same floor with the captain, indicating a high placement in the hierarchy. Once I was given the owner's cabin, which is the best cabin of the ship, implying that I was very high in rank, even above the captain. Another time I was given the cabin of the 3<sup>rd</sup> engineer, which was small and full of old, half-broken furniture, hardly an officer's cabin at all. The relationship between hierarchy and space on board will be discussed later in the chapter 'Shipworld.'

The second indication of the fieldworker's rank is the captain's choice of where she will dine.<sup>30</sup> Should the fieldworker eat with the seamen or the officers? In most cases, the captains firmly directed me to dine with the officers, but once the officers were slightly surprised when I showed up in their mess. It might be a coincidence, but both of the 'downgrading' incidents—the cabin of the 3<sup>rd</sup> engineer and the assumption of crews' mess—occurred in the very same ship where I once had worked as an ordinary seaman. Perhaps the officers had difficulty adjusting to my new position.

In some ways, a high organizational status helps the fieldworker. For example, the captain and officers were more likely to help me obtain interviews. On the other hand, the resulting interviews may have an obligatory flavour. If I were not separated from them in

---

<sup>29</sup> A detailed account on the concept of total institution is found in the chapter Shipworld.

<sup>30</sup> There are some lesser indicators as well to determine the research worker's rank in the hierarchy; is her cabin cleaned daily, does the captain offer free access to soft drinks, and what kind of assigned clothing (battered or brand-new) is allotted to her if she wants to roam around the ship or participate in work.

the hierarchy, the crew members might have been more willing to give me the interview. If one keeps in mind the nature of total institutions, this distinction may be of critical importance; the fieldworker gets more candid information when she is not perceived as a member of the management authority. My gender and young age may have worked for my advantage; I did not fit into the traditional idea of seafaring authority. Furthermore, my earlier work as an ordinary seaman seemed to be a critical factor in defining my status aboard. Even though I had only worked in the lowest rank, and only for a couple of months, it seemed to be a suitable initiation for most of the seamen to accept me.<sup>31</sup> I was surprised; did a couple of months experience really pass as sufficient qualification in the eyes of sailors who have more than 30 years experience at sea? One reason for my surprising acceptance within the sailor community was the idea popular among older male sailors that it is proper for a woman to leave the seas, if she wants to have a family life. Therefore I was not expected to have more sailing experience. The other reason was that because of my study, I knew more about certain aspects of seafaring and the shipping company than an average, ordinary seaman with more experience.

I noticed during my fieldwork as a research worker that my position shifted, depending on whether the seamen perceived me as a colleague or an intruder.<sup>32</sup> Some seamen

---

<sup>31</sup> The Swedish anthropologist Helena Wulff (2000) discusses in her writing on ballet world Hastrup's position on native anthropology. According to Hastrup (1995, 154), native anthropology is a contradiction in terms: one is either an anthropologist or a native, for they are involved in 'different knowledge projects'. Wulff (2000, 149) analyzes Hastrup's statement, "the native is operating on a practical level, while the anthropologist in the end moves up to a theoretical understanding where the native's point of view and voice are included in the analysis, but are not the equivalent of it." Wulff (2000, 153) notes that nowadays there is not only a wide variation of fieldworkers, but the range of natives is also greater. Thus, the relationship between the anthropologist and the native is more complex. There are natives who are aware of what has been written about them, both by journalists and researchers, and might study the subject themselves. And there are anthropologists like Wulff, who turn to study their own roots. Wulff (2000, 153) states that her anthropological training did not obliterate her native perspective. Caputo (2000, 29) is quite clear about her position, arguing that it is a field in which she is at once 'at home' and 'away.' In the light of above-mentioned debate, the ship may be seen as a strange world from the fieldworker's perspective. Is it fieldwork at home, or away? Shipworld differs so dramatically from other aspects of Finnish society that it is appropriate to question, whether it is anthropology at home. While some of the features of Finnish sailor culture are quite familiar to the landlubbers (like the food and the sauna), there are many differences, like the special construction of time and space dimensions, and the characteristics of the total institution. The seaman language, although based on Finnish, contains so many words of sailor jargon that, in its richest form, it is impossible to understand without explanation.

<sup>32</sup> The nature of researcher's relationships in the field has received significant attention recently (see e.g., Amit 2000; Markowitz and Ashkenazi 1999; Kulick and Willson 1995). Amit (2000, 2) observes that fieldwork is the only form of scholarly inquiry in which relationships of intimacy and familiarity between

explained things to me which they would not have bothered to explain had they considered me an insider (for instance: the dinner is served at five, or smoking is prohibited on the deck). Others ended many explanations with the words *what the heck, you know what I mean, you've been there yourself...* At times, this made interviews difficult to conduct. They thought I was playing stupid when I asked them questions that had obvious answers for sailors. Yet, it is the simple questions, with seemingly obvious answers, that are needed when one is studying a culture or community with which she is already familiar. The American anthropologist Harry Wolcott (1999, 137) notes that “there are multiple insider views, multiple outsider views.” One could turn this around and state that a fieldworker can be seen multiple ways an insider, and multiple ways an outsider.

They are crazy when they tell me about their illegal smuggling businesses. It's normal that the repairman told me about his moonshine; he does not sell it or he was wise enough to leave that part out. But Sakke, he tells me about his 100 litre hard spirits and thousands of cigarettes smuggling business! He even tells me where aboard he has hidden the stuff. This is unbelievable. What a fool. (Field journal, January 24, 2000).<sup>33</sup>

Interestingly, the laborers did not seem to consider me as someone conducting research on behalf of their employer. Despite my numerous corrections, they consistently returned to the more benign explanation that I was a student, interviewing them and asking nosy questions for my school, not for the company. Or, they saw me as a shipboard priest, sent

---

researcher and subject are considered as a fundamental medium of investigation, rather than as an extraneous by-product or even an impediment. Therefore, plenty of attention has been paid to the process of 'othering.' Knowles (2000, 61) states that the process of revealing the other also brings the self clearly into view as not the Other. The British sociologist Sarah Pink (2000, 102) argues that 'othering' is not a practice reserved exclusively to the anthropologist; it is also practiced by her informants. It is part of the process of self-representation. And then, of course, the informants often other the fieldworker. Othering effects the obtained information, and relationships established in order to obtain it. The Dutch anthropologist John Van Maanen (1991, 36) reflects on his experiences studying policemen, “[t]he fact is, however, that informants probably select the researcher as much as the researcher selects them. There is a rather impenetrable barrier between what a grizzled 58-year old street cop will tell a green pea regardless whether the green pea is a rookie patrolman or a merry field-worker.” Moreover, how much can a green pea (both age-wise and profession-wise) understand the life and experience of an old professional? Sometimes, while studying the 50-year old sailors, I wondered whether we had anything in common. Why would they share the problems of being married and being at sea for 30 years with someone who had only reached the landmark of age 25?

<sup>33</sup> The names of all seamen in this paper have been changed.

by the Seaman's Church, and thus bound to secrecy.<sup>34</sup> The reason for this—at times seemingly deliberate—misinterpretation of my work may be found both in the attitudes towards the shipping company and in the seamen's attitudes towards me as a person. Most sailors were not very fond of their employer, but tended to like me regardless, because I was a new acquaintance, a young woman, and thus my presence was a novel break in the routine. The officers were much more self-conscious; the reason may have been that they had more at stake, for instance, in terms of their career development. Field journal (January 24, 2000) states that,

The officer apprentice asked in the day-room that for which school I do my study. They don't get it, even that I tell it over and over again, that this is no school thing, this is my job. They want to think that this is for school. Then I am not one of the bad guys... one of the devils.

My presence on board was a stressful factor to the whole ship community, because it is hard to put a visitor in the right niche in a strict hierarchy. When everything is going according to plan, the stress can be tolerated. But what if something extraordinary happens? An anecdote may illustrate this situation: I will relate my experience on one of the tankers I visited as a research worker.

### **What did you come here for?**

Early in the morning at the airport, I was heading for yet another fieldwork trip for my study on shipping company. While I was waiting for the plane to take off, I read the back page of a businessman's newspaper. What I saw just about made me roll off my seat:

The cargo fleet will leave Finland—the jobs of hundreds of seamen threatened in Finlines and X shipping companies (Helsingin Sanomat January 18, 2000, D1).<sup>35</sup>

The article reported that my shipping company was planning to flag out the fleet's oldest vessels. The ship I was heading to, was one of the very oldest of them all. I wondered what to do next. Should I cancel my trip? Maybe I should call the captain and ask him, if I was still welcome on his ship. At that moment my plane was announced to take off and

---

<sup>34</sup> As explained in this paper, there is not room for outsiders in shipworld. Nearly the only exceptions are the ship priests sent by the Finnish Seaman's Church. They usually stay aboard from a couple of hours to a couple of weeks. Thus it is not surprising that the crew may have misinterpreted my presence aboard.

<sup>35</sup> It is the newspaper with the largest distribution in Finland.

everybody was to board the plane... Soon I was on board an old ship, standing in the officers' mess room, handing out the very same newspaper which revealed that the shipping company I represented was planning to let them go. People were upset. The shipping company had not told them about their plans; they had heard it on the international Finnish radio news. There I was, literally handing out the bad news and inquiring whether they would like to take part in a study considering attitudes towards the shipping company, the atmosphere aboard, and their plans for the future? Not surprisingly, the first questions and comments were quite hostile.

Oh, did you come here to pick out the people you will let go, and those who can keep their jobs? Listen, if you want to hear our opinion about this company, I'll tell you what I think... (Field journal, January 19, 2000)

The shipping company was often accused of being a faceless bureaucratic employer. It was quite natural for them to wonder, whether my embarking on the ship was a mere coincidence, or part of the plan. This time, I believe, my gender and age worked for me: the crew members quickly realized that a young female researcher did not have any influence in the decision-making process of one of the largest and most conservative shipping companies in Finland. Moreover, because of the company's long history of poor communication tactics, it was quite probable that I knew as little as they knew about the flagging-out. The fieldwork turned out to be quite satisfactory, the crew members were friendly and supplied the interviews; nevertheless, the threat of flagging out the ships certainly affected my fieldwork.

### 2.3.3. Material: Field journals

I wrote field journals both times I worked aboard. As an ordinary seaman I wrote the field journal daily. I wrote about daily events, my work tasks, and detailed accounts of the incidents I considered relevant to my study.<sup>36</sup> Such occasions were, e.g., gossip and events concerning social relations of the ship's crew, the atmosphere, and the daily routines of leisure time. I did not take field notes in the strictest sense of the word

---

<sup>36</sup> I jumped almost straight to the focused and selective observation nearly ignoring the descriptive phase, if one is to employ American anthropologist James Spradley's view (see Spradley 1980, 33). This was because my field work period was not long enough to conduct a full ethnographical study about a ship community.

(Jackson 1990, 6). Instead, I climbed up to my cabin to write down everything I found relevant, when I had a chance to do so. Taking field notes among my ship mates felt a bit awkward, because I did not want to draw too much attention to my role as a researcher, I had rather them see me as a fellow crew member (See Jackson 1990, 28). My method of observing would be best described as participant observation although I find that definition quite unsuitable for my position in the field. I worked full-time as the ordinary seaman, trying to simultaneously observe everything through the lenses of an ethnographer. Most of the time this worked quite well, but there was times when I was just an ordinary seaman who was hardly able to keep her eyes open, because of the wake-up call at 3 a.m., dreaming of getting back to bed.

My double role as a seaman and a researcher aboard did not give me enough time for my study. I worked every day on watches. In addition, I worked overtime almost daily. After work I conducted the interviews. There was plenty for me to learn in both fields. Now, looking back, I realize that my field journal could have been more extensive.<sup>37</sup> The lack of time in my everyday life aboard is clearly one factor for the extent of the field journal, but I believe there is more than that. I found my place in the ship community easily, and I started to feel at home there (on some level) quite soon. This was possible because my position in the ship hierarchy was clear and most crew members were at least moderately nice to me. I did not have to lure or beg my way into the community, or create the space for myself, as many other fieldworkers have to do when entering their field.<sup>38</sup> René Gothóni (1997, 143), a Finnish scholar on comparative religion, points out that writing represents something familiar in the middle of everything new and strange, something

---

<sup>37</sup> Field journal of 1996 is 95 pages and of 1999-2000 60 pages.

<sup>38</sup> The British anthropologist Marilyn Strathern (1987, 16) asks, how does one *know* when one is at home? Kirsten Hastrup (1995, 151) rephrases the question as, where are the boundaries of one's 'home culture.' Helena Wulff (2000, 154) brings up another side to this discussion by pointing out that even if the anthropologist does not consider herself as a native, the natives may perceive her as one. The definition of 'home' can be that of the ethnographer, or the community she wants to study. This question gets more complicated when one sets out to study shipworld. No one is a native there, in the strictest sense of the word. Yet, the older sailors have spent most of their lives at sea on ships which foster a distinctive seaman culture. While the seaman profession effects one's life as much, if not more, than most other professions providing a strong sense of identity, being a seaman is, nevertheless, a choice made by an individual. Where does the fieldworker stand, when her other profession is that of a seaman? Is she studying shipworld from the inside or the outside? Wolcott's (1999, 172) suggestion that one should avoid labels like 'insider' or 'native,' because they cause more confusion than dissipate it, is here appropriate.

what is homely and safe. In that sense my short field journal indicates that I did not have the urge to write and, thus, did not feel a need for something homely and safe. Reading an old Helsingin Sanomat seemed enough of comfort for me.<sup>39</sup> My acclimatization was quite painless. But, the field notes also serve as a reminder for the fieldworker, because they state that she is a researcher, not a native (Jackson 1990, 22). The American anthropologist Simon Ottenberg (1990, 146) notes that to be able to write in the field requires us to distance ourselves from the personal contacts we have developed there. This is quite a challenging task in a community where the fieldworker has little chance to create privacy essential for being able to distance oneself. As a research worker sent by the company, my schedule aboard was even more hectic than as a crew member. I stayed such a short time on every ship—approximately a week or week and a half—that my days were filled with lobbying about the study, hanging out in order to get to know the ship crew as soon as possible, and interviewing them. There was hardly any time left for rest, even less for the field journal.

#### 2.3.4. Material: Interviews

The main body of my material consists of 91 interviews which were conducted in the years 1996 (21 interviews), 1999 (63 interviews), and 2000 (7 interviews) on several Finnish oil-tankers. The first 21 interviews in 1996 were made while I worked as an ordinary seaman. I interviewed my ship mates in my spare time. All interviews were fully voluntary—one can be quite sure about this, because I was one of the lowest ranking people in the ship hierarchy, and, therefore, I had no organizational power over my ship mates. Although the shipping company and the captain of the oil-tanker knew and approved of the fact that I was conducting fieldwork and interviews for my master's thesis, they did not—to my knowledge—encourage or discourage the crew members to take part in my study. I tried to interview every crew member who was even remotely interested in co-operating with me. A couple of crew members refused to be interviewed—one making a loud remark that I would make an awful wife one day to

---

<sup>39</sup> See a more detailed account later in this chapter.

somebody because I insisted so hard on getting interviews! (Field journal, October 6, 1996)

The interviews in 1999 and 2000 were conducted under substantially different circumstances, since I was a researcher employed by the shipping company. I visited ten different ships and interviewed seven workers on each ship. Altogether, I conducted 70 interviews. Due to my considerably higher status within the ship hierarchy than before, I had fewer problems getting the interviews I wanted. As the advocate of the shipping company, I was sure that a couple of phone calls were made by my supervisor in order to help with my stay aboard ship. My substantially different rank in shipworld has to be kept in mind while evaluating the reliability of the data gathered from these ten ships.

### **Interviews in 1996**

All of the interviewees in 1996, when I was as an ordinary seaman on board, were Finns, and most of them worked permanently on the oil-tanker under study. Their average age was 47 years, and they had spent on average 28 years at sea. Thus, most of them had worked at sea for a couple of decades or more, practically all of their adulthood. Most of them came from the Finnish coast. Their education consisted of elementary school, high school, and/or seafaring school. Three of the interviewees were women.

The interviewees were well established in the ship community if we consider the permanent work status and long stay on the ship under study. The social status is more problematic to evaluate because, in shipworld, it is strongly bound to the status in the official ship hierarchy (which is controlled and stable). One may even ask whether there is any difference between the social and official ship hierarchy. This topic will be discussed in more detail in chapter Shipworld. In the interviews I asked questions about the social hierarchy that I assumed existed next to the official. I did not get any confirmation for my hypothesis. Rather, the typical reaction to my inquiry was in line with this answer I got from a first officer Lars,

Captain will decide everything anyway. It is just a pity then if it is a dickhead who decides things around here.<sup>40</sup> (1/96).

It was easier to get an interview with officers than laborers. A few of the laborers were unwilling to be interviewed, for several reasons. For example, one crew member refused probably because of his stuttering. Furthermore, because of my family name, some crew members suspected that I was a spy!<sup>41</sup> All in all, seven crew members did not want to be interviewed.

### **Ordinary seaman managing interview situations**

The interview with Electrician yesterday went totally wrong. He wanted to have it in the mess. Puhonen and Isto (both are A.B.s) were there too, watching TV damn loudly. It was a chaos, and the atmosphere was far from being confidential or intimate. Electrician answered to every question either “of course,” or “yes, of course.” I have to review some questions, because he did not get any of them concerning worldview. (Field journal, October 16, 1996).

Unlike the above-illustrated extract from my field journal suggests, the ship mates I interviewed in 1996, while I was a crew member, were mostly quite communicative and frank. The questions were designed to be as unthreatening as possible; I mainly avoided questions which had potential to put someone in trouble. In addition, my research task, which derived from the Finnish sociologist Helena Helve’s (1987) model of five-dimensional worldview, generated few such questions. Moreover, I did not believe that I could achieve any meaningful information by posing threatening questions to my fellow crew members or asking them about forbidden or illegal acts. I was both literally and symbolically in the same boat with them and did not want to *shake the boat*, as they say.

I used a tape-recorder for interviews and occasionally wrote notes. Each interview lasted from half an hour up to two hours, depending on how talkative the interviewee was, and how good a connection we were able to establish. All the interviews were conducted aboard, mostly in the interviewees’ cabins, sometimes in the mess room, or the library.

---

<sup>40</sup> Interview 1/96. Quotation in Finnish: Niin mut se on hän [kapteeni] ku määrää kummiski... se on vaan ikävää et sit se on mulku kun määrää miten asiat on.

<sup>41</sup> There is a more detailed account on this incident provided later in this chapter.

When the interview was to take place in the cabin of a male-interviewee, that person made it usually quite clear that the cabin door stayed open.<sup>42</sup> *No reason to give a reason for gossip*, he would say. Such a precaution would never have popped into my mind; all the same, I was very thankful to them for being concerned about my (and their) reputation.

### **Interviews in 1999 and 2000**

When I came aboard as the company researcher in 1999 and 2000, my task was to interview seven crew members on each ship: the captain, the chief engineer, the 1<sup>st</sup> officer and the 1<sup>st</sup> engineer from the officers' side, and the boatswain, motorman and the steward or the cook from the workers' side of the crew. People working in these jobs tend to have long experience at sea, and they often have established their position in the ship community. The list of the job positions was defined by the shipping company. Thus, the interviewees were selected primarily because of their position in the ship hierarchy, not because of their willingness or probable contribution to the interview. This naturally changed the interview setting. I followed the proposed list of interviewees, but amended it moderately in order to meet the needs of the particular ship community at hand. Some people felt left out because they were not asked to join the interviews. They said that it reflected, once more, the arrogant attitudes of the shipping company—even when the company sets to conduct a study about the relationships between the sailors and the company; they interview mainly those who are high in the hierarchy and ignore the rest. Due to my short stay on each ship, I was not able to conduct more than those seven pre-planned interviews. I tried to discuss with all crew members outside the interview settings, as much as possible.

Because I interviewed more people than in my previous fieldwork, the individual characteristics of the interviewees varied more. The interviewees were slightly younger than the interviewees of the previous ship, but not much. This particular shipping company has the reputation of being just one step away from the rest home. Nearly all

---

<sup>42</sup> The above-described behavior is quite typical in shipworld. Kaijser (1997, 47) reflects on the shipboard social rules of the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century. A woman interviewed by Kaijser claimed, “as a woman you don’t go to anybody’s cabin without your husband. And if you have an errand to run, you stand on the doorway.”

interviewees were originally Finns, and all of them had lived in Finland for decades. I did not ask about the educational level, but the boat I studied in 1996 was quite typical in that sense.<sup>43</sup> This time, seven of the interviewees were women.

During this fieldwork period in 1999-2000, none of the interviews were purely voluntarily. When the shipping company sends out a researcher to gather information about the ship community and its internal and external relationships, one is expected to contribute to the study—no matter if he finds the study meaningful or rewarding, either for himself or the company. Consequently, there were different reactions to the study. Although categorizing is always somewhat artificial, a few different types of attitudes were apparent:

- a) The interviewee was eager to get to the interview, because he felt that the shipping company was finally asking his opinion about the company policies, etc. He took the interview seriously and contributed to it as much as possible. Some people wanted to add their thoughts to the study after the actual interview was over.
- b) The interviewee was quite eager to get to the interview, but not as much because he wanted to contribute something to the study in a constructive way as that he wanted to complain about the shipping company and his fellow crew members.
- c) The interviewee was quite eager to get to the interview, but not as much because he wanted to contribute something to the study that he wanted to chat with me, and/or he wanted to get away from his work duties.
- d) The interviewee gave the interview as part of his job; if the shipping company wanted to ask something, then he would co-operate.
- e) The interviewee was a bit nervous about the study. Perhaps because he linked my visit with some problems he was involved in the ship community, or a general concern about losing his job affected the interview. I made it quite clear that I was by no means there to evaluate the crew's job performances. But, quite naturally, some of them remained suspicious.

---

<sup>43</sup> Now there is the possibility to get the education required for officers in a college, and thus there are more people at sea who go to the (merchant marine) college. Although there were such sailors on the ships I conducted the study, none of them were in the list of interviewees.

- f) The interviewee was quite curt in his answers. He made it clear by words and/or facial expressions that he considered the whole study, and especially the interview, a waste of time.
- g) The interviewee refused to come to the interview (one person).
- ...
- h) The crew member was eager to get interviewed, but because of his work position aboard he was not chosen.
- i) The crew member was neither interested nor chosen to be interviewed.

This is a rough clustering of the interviewees' attitudes and reactions towards the interviews. An interviewee may have had a combination of two or more listed reactions, depending on which part of the interview we were in. The most prominent reaction was to give the interview as a part of the job (d). The next common attitude was the willingness to get to the interview, for various reasons (the cluster of (a), (b) and (c)). Then there were some participants who were nervous about the interview (e). Most interview situations seemed quite pleasant for both of us. The interviewee hardly ever was uncooperative or refused to be interviewed (f) and (g). As for (h) and (i), it was impossible to determine how common those reactions were, because I had no chance to ask all the crew members about their attitudes towards the study. In general, people took a positive stand towards me, although they did not necessarily consider the study meaningful. American anthropologist Joan F. Gurney (1991, 55-56) remarks that in short term fieldwork, and especially in a male-dominated setting, the gender of a female researcher may be a definite asset. Often the above-mentioned attitudes towards the interview overlapped and even contradicted one another: After one successful and constructive interview, but which the interviewee captain Fredi had tried to get off the rails by constant flirting, I asked him whether the interview had been meaningful. Fredi answered me in a tone which intended to reduce the importance of all the information I had received,

Yeah, in the sense that you are the chick who's interviewing me, so I think it's cool to chat with you, but if some guy had done this, I would have had a much more negative attitude. (k3)

## Questions

The structure of the interview consisted of a list of topics I wanted to ask about. Sometimes the interview followed exactly the lines planned ahead, often the interviewee started to talk about something interesting that I had not considered asking. In this case, we talked about that issue, in addition, to the pre-planned questions. In Wolcott's (1999, 52-53) terms, my interviews were semi-structured. The questions of 1996 concentrated mainly on the sailors' worldviews and were constructed around Helena Helve's model of a five dimensional worldview. These five dimensions are cultural, cognitive, affective, social and conative (Helve 1987, as discussed earlier in this chapter). Some of the questions were simple and easy to answer, others were more complex. Some interviewees found my questions a little difficult. Now, looking back, I realize that I should have designed some of the questions to be more interviewee-friendly. As an example, the question "How do you think the world was born, what does it consists of?"<sup>44</sup> might have been found quite challenging by most of us. I asked the ship electrician what he thought of the questions. He said,

Let's say they were good questions but they were so broad, I told you that I'd rather have Yes-or-No-questions. (4/96)

The interview questions of 1999-2000 were designed to provide information on issues that interested the shipping company. The questions were open-ended like in the previous study, and the progression of the interview went from general to personal. I had designed the questions and given them to my supervisor in the shipping company for a review. In addition to the "official question matrix," I included a couple of questions to provide information about my specific research problem for the licentiate thesis.

## Reflections on interviews

Like a perfect dancing partner, the interviewer should know when to hold the other and when to let go, when to get close and when to pull back, when to move quickly and when to move slowly, when to lead and when to be led. Dancing the tango takes work, practice, timing, and precision: if one does it right, it is like magic.

---

<sup>44</sup> Can you see my face blushing?

- Catherine Norton (1989, *xiv*) –

Looking back on the interviews I conducted as an ordinary seaman in 1996, I realize numerous flaws I am guilty of. Now I understand that my questions were often too abstract and broad, and that I did not always have courage to ask the difficult questions. Yet, the material is extensive and provides enough information for my study on sailor worldviews, when it is examined together with the 70 interviews I conducted in 1999 and 2000. The main concern in the interview material of 1999 and 2000 is the reliability of the gathered data, due to the involuntary nature of interviews discussed above. The reliability was an issue in the study I made for the shipping company, and I had to keep it in mind while analyzing the data for my licentiate thesis. This licentiate study which is based partially on the same material is not as vulnerable as the study made for the shipping company, because I have mainly used different parts of the interview material where the interviewee discusses issues that cannot possibly harm him or his ship mates. Thus, there is no need to lie or hide the honest thoughts, no more than in any other research setting.

### 2.3.5. Processing of material

All interviews were tape-recorded and later trans-scripted, with two exceptions where the interviewee preferred not to be recorded at all. Then, I wrote down the interviewee's answers on a notepad. In addition, a couple of the interviewees asked me to stop recording if they were about to reveal information which they considered to be harmful for them or the other crew members.

I did not transliterate all the “oohs” and “hmms” the interviewees uttered, but edited the wordy information they provided, leaving out occasional repetitions and such. Some of the quotes shown in this research report are slightly edited: I have left out parts that I consider uninformative and irrelevant with the convenience of the reader in mind. The editing was completed, quite naturally, during the process of translating the quotes from Finnish to English.

### 3. Shipworld

This is such a place, this is a damn good place, when the phone rings you don't have to do nothing else than lift your head and go where you are told to go. (p7)<sup>45</sup>

These remarks were made by a pump man Jussi who has more than 30 years experience at sea. Jussi describes here shipworld and his work position at sea. In this chapter I will answer my first research question; what are the major structures and characteristics of contemporary Finnish shipworld that differ from Finnish mainstream culture, particularly from living and working environment? The sub-questions ask what are the basic time-space structures, the hierarchical structures, and gender structures like in shipworld. When we discuss seafaring, it is important to define which area of this wide concept is under inspection. Kirby and Hinkkanen (2000, 188) note that there are distinct categories in seafaring, such as whaling, fishing, coastal trade, international trade, navy, coast guard and pilot service. Here the field of study is the community of people who work on modern cargo ships, or more narrowly oil-tankers, that engage in international trade. Most notions of shipworld may be extended to concern all cargo ships in Finland and abroad, but there are some aspects that are quite Finnish by nature, and some are special characteristics of oil-tanker life. The modern cargo ship and its community of seamen is a factory of its own kind – the industrial product being the transportation of goods. Unlike other factories, the workers live inside the plant. It is necessary to discuss the basic features of shipworld; for without understanding shipworld, it is impossible to comprehend the worldview and the metaphors sailors use to reflect their life at sea. I will describe the context in which the metaphors are born. I attempt to provide a short—and somewhat selective—ethnography of shipworld. I focus on those characteristics of shipworld that significantly differ from the 'mainstream' Finnish culture. For example, I mention clothing only briefly, because shipworld does not foster any distinctive dressing culture that could be told apart from any factory or construction site. Furthermore, food is largely ignored, due to the fact that it is mainly the same as in factory cafeterias. The circumstances surrounding meals, however, are discussed because they part from other

---

<sup>45</sup> Quotation in Finnish: Tää on semmonen paikka, tää on helvetin hyvä paikka, ei tartte ku puhelin soi niin se pää ylös missä on silmät ja menee sinne minne käsketään. (p7)

work places. Some ethnographic concepts do not apply to shipworld. For example, kinship and marriage are irrelevant in this study. Not to say that sailors would not engage in relationships and occasionally even marry a co-sailor, but marriage and kinship as institutions are not part of shipworld, for they belong to sailors' life on land. The chapter starts with the brief history of Finnish seafaring to provide background, continuing to analysis of the time and space dimensions, and proceeds via shipboard hierarchy to a description of total institutions. Finally, shipworld will be discussed from the viewpoint of gender studies.<sup>46</sup>

### Sailor, Seaman, Crew: Terminology

In this report, I will use the seafaring terms in the following way. This use of terms is common in maritime research, but I have learned that not all scholars of comparative religion, sociology or anthropology are familiar with them. Thus, the brief explanation may prove appropriate here.

**Captain, master** refers to the head of the ship, who is the company representative on board.

**Crew** means the entire<sup>47</sup> population working on board, except the captain. In Finnish this is *laivan miehistö*.

**Laborer, worker** means a person who does not belong to the officers. In Finnish this is *miehistö, resuperse*. This category includes deck gang, that is, boatswain/bosun, pump man, A.B./able-bodied seaman, O.S./ordinary seaman, deck-hand, and engine gang: electrician, repairman, motorman, and others: steward, cook, and mess girl/custodial person.

---

<sup>46</sup> This chapter is an elaborated version of previously published article "A Ship of Men" (Karjalainen 2002, 290-308).

<sup>47</sup> In some dictionaries the definition of crew is narrower. For example, "Crew - The personnel engaged on board ship, excluding the master and officers and the passengers on passenger ships." (See <http://www.trans-inst.org/seawords.htm#m> = Seawords Maritime Glossary, April 25, 2004).

**Officer, mate, coxswain, and engineer** are persons who belong to the licensed personnel, i.e., who are officers. In Finnish this is *päälystö, uffari*. This category includes 1<sup>st</sup> officer/mate, 2<sup>nd</sup> officer/mate, 3<sup>rd</sup> officer/mate, chief engineer, 1<sup>st</sup> engineer, and 2<sup>nd</sup> engineer.

**Sailor, seaman, seafarer, seadog** refers to all persons working aboard, also the captain. In Finnish *merimies* (can be used to refer only to the workers).

### **3.1. History of Finnish seafaring**

The growth of seafaring has always been linked with development of technical shipbuilding skills and local businesses. I will provide here a brief glimpse to the history of Finnish seafaring, because it is important to understand the roots of seafaring industry and sailor culture, the history of shipworld that is also background for sailors' worldview and notions of freedom. This overview is mostly based on the Finnish historian Yrjö Kaukiainen's excellent book "A History of Finnish Shipping" (1993).

In the sixteenth century the number of foreign vessels visiting Finnish towns and Finnish vessels visiting foreign countries (including Sweden, although Finland was then part of the Swedish kingdom) did not exceed the thousand annual visits. The most important Finnish export articles were fish, butter, furs and hides, while the most important items to import were salt, and luxury goods such as wine, spices and cloth. The Finnish vessels did not leave the Baltic Sea in order to go further to trade. In the turn of seventeenth century the Finnish shipping industry grew bigger because of the tar exports to Stockholm – at one point Finnish area was the biggest tar-producer in Europe. To summarize, during the seventeenth century the Finnish shipping remained basically the same as it was in the end of the Middle Ages (Kaukiainen 1993, 11-30).

In the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century the Finnish vessels expanded their sailing areas. They went as far as the Mediterranean to bring salt and other goods to home. Till the middle of

the 18<sup>th</sup> century the Netherlands was the primary destination for exports. After that more than half of the exports went to further destinations, seeing that in South Europe there was a steady demand for Finnish timber and timber products. Finnish sailing ships often left in the fall and arrived in South Europe before the New Year. They had extra time to spend before they could arrive back to Finnish coast, because they had to wait for the northern ice to melt. Normally they carried freight in the Mediterranean in order to utilize the extra time. Sometimes ships spent more than a year away from home if they had enough business to run in South. (Kaukiainen 1993, 38-49).

In the beginning of nineteenth century Finland became part of the Russian Empire, ending the era of extensive shipping to Stockholm. Sawn goods were the main export items, due to the industrialization of Western Europe. The imports consisted mostly of salt and colonial goods like raw cotton and coal. The ships were often sailing for years in the Black Sea, Mediterranean and British waters without visiting home harbors. In the 1840s the ocean voyages became more common. There were ships carrying goods like coffee and raw sugar from Brazil and West Indies. Some bigger sailing ships were engaged in trade around the world; foreign harbors in Brazil, USA, China, Philippines, Australia, and North Pacific were visited. By the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century approximately 20 Finnish sailing ships were engaged in trade around the world. At the same time the smaller peasant ships started to sail to German and Danish ports (Kaukiainen, 1993, 59-74). The expansion of foreign trade affected the seaman profession. There were more and more sailors who spent long periods of time—often several years—abroad, only occasionally visiting their home country. The 19<sup>th</sup> century introduced a new technical innovation, steam ships, to seafaring. First this did not affect much the Finnish sailing ships cargo trade, but by 1875 they brought an end to the business of Finnish windjammers in the Black Sea. Steamers took over the trade of high-value cargoes, leaving timber and such to sailing ships. The Finnish shipping continued to be competitive, however, because of the low-cost labor and cheap timber (Kaukiainen 1993, 77-90). The Finnish maritime historian Merja-Liisa Hinkkanen (1994, 57) notes that there were also Finnish sailors who sailed on foreign vessels, being often the only Finns aboard and did not therefore necessarily have connection to their homeland any

more. She estimates that in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century there were approximately as many Finnish sailors employed with Finland-bound ships than with others; both groups consisting of about 6 000 men.

In turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the number of the steam vessels was substantially smaller in Finland than in other shipping countries. Because of the World War I, the sailing vessels enjoyed a second 'golden' age. This was the era of Gustaf Erikson, a famous ship-owner from Åland Islands who purchased old windjammers from technically and financially more advanced countries that wanted to replace their old vessels with steam and motor ships, and used them in foreign trade. In one point, Erikson had the largest fleet of sailing ships in the whole world (Kaukiainen 1993, 100-129). The Finnish maritime ethnologist Kim Montin remarks that after the First World War, there were approximately 1.200 sailing ships in Finland. Sailing ships remained in Finland as the predominant type of ships for long—till the 1920s—although the first steamboat had been built in Finland as early as in 1833, and steamboats had been globally predominant already in the 1870s (Montin 1995, 29-30). Rosenström (2002, 57) counts that in the 1930s the crew of a sailing vessel consisted usually of 27-30 men.

The era between World Wars was time of rapid tonnage growth in Finland. Simultaneously, the change from windjammers to steam and motor vessels took place. In addition, during this era, the season for seafaring in Finland expanded, thanks to new ice-breakers. Meanwhile, Finland remained a country of low costs (e.g., wages), attracting ship-owners from countries like Sweden and England (Kaukiainen 1993, 138-150). Between the 1920s and 1940s there were approximately 10.000 seamen in Finland (Montin 1995, 29-30). In 1945, the lowest number ever of Finnish sailors was recorded: 4.700 seamen. The era of steamboats faded slowly and was finally over in the 1960's: motor vessels had been introduced to Finland in the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. At the same time, in the year 1961, training of crew members started - officers' schooling had begun already in 1813. After the Second World War, the number of seamen had grown steadily, and finally in 1980 it reached the landmark of 15.000 (Montin 1995, 29-30).

Kaukiainen (1993, 161) notes that from the 1940s till 1970s the merchant tonnage in Finland grew continuously. After the II World War the shipping industry experienced great changes. The vessels grew bigger, while the number of crew grew smaller. This change has gone hand in hand with the modernization of ships and the empowerment of the Finnish Seamen's Union that managed to improve the circumstances of Finnish sailors, especially in the 1950s. When in the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century other countries flagged out<sup>48</sup> their ships to low-cost Finland, since the 1980s Finnish ship-owners have flagged out their vessels to today's low-cost countries like Panama and Liberia. Furthermore, only a few Finnish ships travel nowadays further than European harbors. These changes in seafaring have affected the worldviews of seamen, as will be discussed in the following chapter. Kaukiainen (1993, 164) brings the viewpoint of sailors into account,

A great number of seamen who began their career just after the [II World] war or earlier have witnessed a dramatic transformation from old-fashioned forecastles to one-person cabins and from boilers fired by muscle and shovel to remote-controlled engine rooms.

### **3.2. Time and space**

The ship never sleeps; it is driven by the quest for profit. It continuously sails the seas, loading and unloading cargo. At sea, the concept of time differs from that which is common on land. The American social psychologists Joseph McGarh and Janice Kelly (1986, 111) call it 'organizational time,' the prevalent concept of time driving organizational affairs. In shipworld's organizational time it makes no difference whether it is Wednesday morning or Sunday night, or Christmas Day. The ship functions on a 24-hour basis and seven days a week. Therefore, there have to be people working on the ship

---

<sup>48</sup> To flag out the ship means that the shipping company replaces the Finnish flag of the ship with the flag of convenience. For the crew this usually means that they will lose their jobs or they will have to work with a worse contract of employment.

FLAGS OF CONVENIENCE - The registration of ships in a country whose tax on the profits of trading ships is low or whose requirements concerning manning or maintenance are not stringent. Sometimes referred to as flags of necessity; denotes registration of vessels in foreign nations that offer favorable tax structures and regulations; also the flag representing the nation under whose jurisdiction a ship is registered. Ships are always registered under the laws of one nation but are not always required to establish their home location in that country. (<http://www.trans-inst.org/seawords.htm#m>, Seawords Maritime Glossary, April 25, 2004).

every hour of the day. Thus time gets divided differently from on land, in two ways; the day is divided unusually and weeks and months are perceived as nearly meaningless measurements of time.

First, on a ship each day is divided into six watches, each lasting four hours (or, into three-watch system that rotates twice a day). The basic construction of time aboard does not concern each work group equally. For some, the watches are the backbone of their work: The watchmen and the officers work once every 12 hours, twice a day (e.g., 4 a.m. until 8 a.m. and from 4 p.m. until 8 p.m.).<sup>49</sup> In addition, to the watchmen's and officers' work shifts, there are four other work hour systems aboard.<sup>50</sup> The day crew works from 8 a.m. until 5 p.m. This group includes the boatswain, pump man, electrician, repairman, and motorman. The 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> engineers follow the day crew work shifts, except that, they alternate the stopper-watch<sup>51</sup> so that one gets the every other night on duty. The mess crew works according to the third variation of the working hours. They start to work early in the morning (approximately 6 a.m.), have a 1½ hour break after the lunch, and continue working till 5 or 6 p.m. There is considerable variation of the mess crew work shifts, because they have to cover the meal times between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. with the small crew. Finally, the captain and the chief engineer do not have regular working hours. In addition to these permanent working time frames, most of the crew is on duty whenever the ship is entering or leaving harbor. Because of the ship's continuous operations, harboring is equally likely to occur at 3 in the morning as at 3 in the afternoon. Time is intertwined with the organizational and hierarchical structure of shipworld; more power corresponds to freer work schedule. The captain and the chief engineer are the only persons aboard who do not have specific working hours.

---

<sup>49</sup> The three-watch system has its roots, in Finland, in the 1940s, when the Finnish Seamen's Union negotiated shorter working time onboard. From then on, the three-watch system gradually replaced the old traditional two-watch system (starboard and port watches), although the three-watch system became compulsory as late as in 1961 (Kaukainen 1993, 175).

<sup>50</sup> To read another analysis of the subject, the study by Wilhelm Aubert and Oddvar Arner (1965, 282) provides an interesting and adequate, although slightly different view to work hour systems aboard.

<sup>51</sup> In Finnish this is "toppari." In the stopper-watch which lasts for 15 hours, covering the time between 5 p.m. and 8 a.m., one does not have to do anything, except stay sober and aboard, unless there is an alarm in the engine room. In the older or more problematic vessels the alarm may occur several times a night.

This explanation of working hours aboard is needed in order to understand the social setting of shipworld. Despite the size of the crew (in Finnish oil tankers usually between 14 to 18 persons, couple of decades ago it was around 40 persons) which could make a crowd in a small restricted space, the ship seems often almost deserted. The crew has such diverse working hours, and therefore sleeping and meal hours, that some crew members hardly ever meet. Another social consequence of the steady and individualized working hours is that people know where to find a particular person during most hours of the day. This issue will be discussed later in this chapter under the subtitle “Closed community, total institution.”

Second, weeks and months play no role in shipworld. The relevant unit of measure is *turn* the “working period”<sup>52</sup> (i.e., the time one serves on board before going on vacation). Before the 1970s it was common for seamen to sail continuously for years at a time. Today the length of the working period has been reduced to a few weeks or, at most, a couple of months (Laine et al. 1999, 1; Soini et al. 1992, 46). The only exception is ships under the flag of convenience where the sailors work a minimum of six months for tax purposes.

While on board, everybody works every day, there is no day without work. On some ships, such as passenger ships commuting between Finland and Sweden, the working periods are quite regular. One usually knows by the hour, when he is to go on vacation. However, this is not often the case; the worker may not know, when stepping aboard, which day his turn will end. It may get extended by several weeks or, sometimes, even months. This naturally has its consequences in the land life of sailors and their general attitudes towards working at sea. To get tickets beforehand for a trip or concert is impossible, or a great risk, because the sailor does not know whether he is going to be ashore on certain time or not. Cook Anna reflects on her experiences,

The moment of getting to go on vacation gets postponed over and over again, so that the shipping company can change the crew in Finland. (s1)<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> In Finnish “törni.”

<sup>53</sup> Quotation in Finnish, s1: Lomille pääsy venyy ja venyy et säästettäis et päästäis vaihtaan Suomessa.

## **Artificial time**

Time certainly takes new meanings in shipworld. For example, the captain decides when to reset the clocks while crossing different time zones. Sometimes, due to the efficiency of ship functions, the ship might live by, for example, London time during its short visit to Finland.

The time gets shifted all the time, folks sneered that sometimes the first mate has not bothered to change the time to Finland's time zone. It tells how people are outside the society, why bother to reset the time if you spend only a day in Porvoo? (Field journal, October 21, 1999)

Clock is subordinate to the ship functions. Often, for example, the time zone is shifted after dinner, because then the shift is most convenient for the majority of crew. This kind of arbitrary use of time in shipworld has also practical consequences. If the time gets shifted in the middle of the night, the watchman and the officer on duty have to work an hour more or less than others who are sound asleep. An extract from maritime novelist Clements' *the Gypsy of the Horn* (1951, 121, in Weibust 1969, 107) provides an amusing example from the windjammer era.

Two days later, the last of July, we crossed the 18<sup>th</sup> meridian. As we were traveling from the east to west this meant an extra day in our reckoning and we had two consecutive Wednesdays. We hoped we might have two Sundays, for Sunday was a day of leisure, but no such luck. Stedman said he had never heard of a ship crossing the 18<sup>th</sup> meridian on a Sunday: he doubted if the thing were geographically possible.

## **Space**

Like time, spatial relations assume new meanings in shipworld. While the ships are huge, there is no extra room, for all space has a designated use. As the ship is ostensibly a place of work, there is little room set aside for leisure and recreation. The off duty worker spends his time in his own cabin, or in the crew's dayroom or mess-room (which are sometimes combined), and the small library. On the other hand, the playground is the whole world. Ironically, the landlubbers' idea of a carefree, wandering seafarer does not apply to the modern seamen, since, for example, oil harbors are usually located far away

from town. Moreover, because of the continuous watches and the short loading/unloading times, there are only few opportunities for workers to go ashore (Soini et al. 1992, 2). Weibust (1969, 148) reminds us that the era before modern vessels did not provide any better opportunities for sailors to go ashore; even though the loading or unloading cargo could take weeks or sometimes even months, the shore leave was allowed only by captain's permission. According to Kaukiainen (1998, 110-112), the rule was more strict with Finnish than foreign vessels. The reason for the captain to decline his crew the shore leave was often the fear of desertion (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 208).

### **Hierarchical space**

The organization of the ship's space indicates a hierarchical structure among crew members. First, the size of one's cabin corresponds directly with rank. The captain's cabin is the largest, naturally, and from there on the cabins become smaller as the rank of the sailor decreases. The size of the cabin shrinks in exactly the same proportion. In some ships the size of the ordinary seaman's cabin is roughly one-fifth the size of the captain's cabin. The standard of equipment in one's cabin also goes hand in hand with the size of the cabin (see also Tikkanen 1993, 43).

Second, the cabin's location on the boat demonstrates the hierarchical structure: The captain's and chief engineer's cabins are on the highest floor, near the navigation bridge. On the next floor down are the cabins of the officers, and on the lowest floors that still accommodate living quarters are the cabins of laborers. Aubert and Arner (1965, 262) noted in the 1960s that "The seaman eats and sleeps in places that are completely defined by his work position on board." The location of living quarters has its implications on shipboard social relations, as well. The Finnish maritime scholar Salla-Maria Tikkanen, who conducted her study on leisure time of Finnish sailors in the 1940-1980s in South-American routes, suggests that the location of living quarters on different vessel types effected the social relations among crew, because the physical space created the prospects or obstacles for interaction. She noticed that in the double amidships vessels (the living quarters are located in two amidships, one for workers and the other for officers) the loyalty among workers was stronger, whereas in the vessels of one amidships the

prospects were greater for more interaction between the workers and the officers (Tikkanen 1993, 46).

Third, access to particular areas indicates the power structure aboard. The mess-room, or mess, is a special area in the amidships which is dedicated to eating. Often the dayroom is located together with the mess, forming a larger integrated area for eating and leisure time. There are often two mess-rooms aboard: One mess is for the officers, the other is for the workers. There has been a trend towards greater equality,<sup>54</sup> even though it may not be apparent, at first, when one examines the system of two messes. Before, however, there were vessels that had as many as six mess-rooms: one for the captain, another for the chief engineer, third for the officers, messes for each the deck crew and the engine crew, and finally a mess for the mess crew. Aubert and Arner (1965, 262) reported in the 1960s in their study about social structure aboard ship of Norwegian vessels that there were five separate messes, and some of them had even designated tables for certain occupations (i.e., a table for able-bodied seamen and another for ordinary seamen). Today, the more modern cargo ships are often furnished with only one mess-room, although not everybody approves of it. I noticed during my fieldwork in one of the modern one-mess oil-tankers that the crew members occupied the dining tables according to their profession and rank: The captain and the navigation officers were on one table, the engine room officers (engineers) on the other, the deckmen on the third, and the engine room workers were sitting on the fourth table. The crew was forced to dine in one mess, but no mixing occurred between occupational groups. The steward Ritva explains,

Co-eating is still insuperable for both parties, they feel it's awkward. Nobody talks anything. The workers want to have their own mess and chat there, and the officers want their own.<sup>55</sup> (s2)

In addition, the salon is restricted from the workers, although there is hardly any activity in there when the ship is at sea. On the other hand, while the captain is officially allowed

---

<sup>54</sup> This trend is apparent in society at large, therefore shipworld only reflects, with certain inertia, the social equalization process of society.

<sup>55</sup> Quotation in Finnish, s2: Yhteisruokailut on yhä ylitsepääsemättömiä molemmille puolille, he kokevat sen kiusalliseksi. Ei meillä kukaan puhu mitään. Miehistö haluaisi oman messin ja heittää huulta, ja päällystö oman.

to go wherever he wishes, he may not be socially welcome to the workers' mess and thus he cannot go there. A captain reflects on his habits,

I do go sometimes into the mess, but I feel they can think that "What the fuck he comes here... to lurk us."<sup>56</sup> (2/96)

Weibust (1969, 276) tells about the social demarcation lines in windjammers. The workers were not allowed abaft the main mast, if they were not carrying out a designated duty. According to Weibust, person's social status could be read out of his position in space and time. Rosenström (1996, 136) notes that the formal relationships between the workers and the officers, and between older and younger workers, affected the spatial dimension of shipworld. One can argue that the formal and social structure of shipworld have penetrated the time and space dimensions.

### **Judicial space**

Shipworld's space is a complex system. On the one hand shipworld is only the space which a particular vessel contains. But on the other hand, shipworld space is a complexity of the physical ship, harbors, oceans and seas, and even the home country. The ship is legally, in this case, Finnish territory. Due to the isolation and independence of shipworld, the captain has right to perform certain public functions, e.g., judicial and religious, which the industrial leaders on the land do not possess (see Aubert and Arner 1965, 260). Hence the captain's duties include carrying out various religious functions. For example, back in the day the captains performed, among other duties, burials at sea. However, in the course of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the sea-burials became exceptional (Fast 1993, 36).<sup>57</sup> Other religious duties that the captains were to perform were morning and evening prayers and the feast day church services (Tikkanen 1993, 46). These functions still belong to the captain, but the gradual secularization of culture and the hectic time schedules aboard have made the shipboard church services virtually non-existent.

---

<sup>56</sup> Quotation in Finnish, 2/96: Kyl mä siel [messissä] joskus käyn istumassa, mut mä tunnen sen et ne voi ajatella et paskaaks toi tänne tulee...kyttäämään.

<sup>57</sup> Fast (1993, 37) notes that the burials at sea were not favored by sailors. Rather, sea-burials were unavoidable during the long voyages. This was because, at least in Scandinavia, the burial at sea was not perceived as proper; it was believed that the dead who had not been buried in sacred ground would not find peace.

These distinctive characteristics of space and time in shipworld influence the worldviews of sailors. Manninen (1977, 16-17) lists time and space as part of the basic dimensions of one's worldview. In the next chapter time and space will be discussed in relation to the metaphors that reflect sailors' worldview.

### **3.3. Hierarchy and organization**

The hierarchy of shipworld is rigid, as will be demonstrated in this study. One may argue that the ship is one of the most hierarchical organizations in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It is an "old-fashioned organization," the roots of which are well planted in the history of seafaring.

#### **Mechanistic approach to ship**

The ship organization may be best analyzed by using the mechanistic approach of organization scholars (on mechanistic approach, see Miller 1995, Morgan 1997, Robbins 2001). Theorists like to utilize different kinds of metaphors when they analyze organizations: All theories of organization are based on implicit images of metaphors. With the help of these metaphors one can see, understand, and manage an organization in a certain way (Morgan 1997, 4). As an example of some popular metaphors one can mention machine, brain, organism, and culture.<sup>58</sup>

According to the mechanistic approach, an organization is supposed to work like a machine, and the workers are expected to behave like parts of machine; "in a routinized, efficient, reliable and predictable way" (Morgan 1997, 13). It is important to look back and understand, how organizations became to look and function like machines. According to the British organizational scholar Gareth Morgan (1997, 15-23), the first prototype was created by Frederick the Great, leader of Prussia (1740-1786). He introduced to his army, e.g., ranks, the extension and standardization of regulations, intense specialization of tasks, the standard equipment, command language, and systematic training. Frederick the Great dreamed of the "mechanized army." The more

---

<sup>58</sup> One has to be careful not to accidentally confuse two levels of analysis: the mechanistic approach and mechanistic metaphor are here implemented by the scholars, not by the sailors (who will use the machine metaphor, among other metaphors, later in this paper).

theoretical—and concerned—approach was presented by the German sociologist Max Weber (1922). He studied the parallels between the mechanization of industry and the explosive growth of organizations' bureaucratic forms. He stated that a bureaucratic organization achieves its goals through fixed division of tasks, hierarchical supervision, and detailed rules and regulations. The early 20<sup>th</sup> century provided two other major contributions to the mechanistic theory of organizations: classical management theory and scientific management. These two theories were created to squeeze more profit out of organizations. Consequently, by the time of his death in 1915, the American Frederick Taylor, the father of scientific management, had gained the reputation of being “enemy of the working man.” Taylor gained his dubious honour by creating the following principles of organization management: a) shift all responsibility for the organization and planning of work from the worker to the manager, b) use scientific methods to find the most efficient ways to carry out a task, c) select the most suitable worker for the job, d) train the worker, and e) monitor the worker (see Taylor 1916, 13-23). Morgan states that the principles of scientific management have been a cornerstone of organization design for the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Many organizations are still based on those principles. Classical management theory created by, e.g., the French Henri Fayol, is in line with scientific management. Unity of command, span of control, centralization of authority, and discipline are among other principles of classical management theory (Morgan 1997). It is easy to perceive that the classical theorists did not pay much attention to the human aspects of organization.

In the ship hierarchy this mechanistic approach, explained above, is seen in the way how every single task is coded and supervised by the “Quality folders” of the shipping company.<sup>59</sup> In addition to this, Taylor’s scientific management rationalizes the workplace in such a way that the workers become interchangeable (Morgan 1997, 25; see also Taylor 1916, 13-23). This feature of mechanistic approach and scientific management is apparent in shipworld: all posts aboard ship are double-manned, and it should not matter

---

<sup>59</sup> The shipping company started their quality (folder) movement in the early 1990s. As result, the ships were furnished with twenty some folders which prescribe in detail how to carry out every imaginable task aboard. The number of folders was reduced later, after the complaints by sailors who were supposed to utilize them.

which one of the two captains or cooks are on board (needless to say, it does matter). Moreover, sailors are interchangeable between ships and even shipping companies. The ideal is that from the day one, a sailor can work fully efficiently and reliably in his new ship.<sup>60</sup> Aubert and Arner (1965, 272) are in line with Taylor's ideas,

The formalization makes it possible for a new man to come on board a ship and find his cabin and his place at the dining table practically without guidance. [---] The ship community is an empty structure of roles, reflected in the ecology aboard, ready to be filled at short notice by a group of highly different and individualistic men.

The American organizational scholar Stephen Robbins (2001, 429; see also Morgan 1997, 13) notes that the mechanistic approach is nowadays synonymous to bureaucracy; the extensive departmentalization, high formalization, limited communication network (mostly downward), and little participation in decision-making by organization's low-level members are common features for both. The mechanistic approach is rooted deep in the attitudes of superiors in ship organizations. When I asked captain Timo what was his impression of crew's thoughts about ship's atmosphere, he provided me with this view of his crew, *I doubt they ever think that, they just do their work* (11/96).

The mechanistic approach shows in the nicknames of sailors.<sup>61</sup> The crew members are most often called by their occupational titles, or abbreviations of them, such as Electrician, Steward, Second, and Mess girl.<sup>62</sup> Aubert and Arner (1965, 261) noted the same phenomenon in their study of shipworld of the late 1950's. They concluded that the use of work titles as personal names derived from the fact that workers' social contacts and work relationships were practically the same. This system of using occupational titles as names emphasizes the sailor's position in the ship as part of machinery. Pump works as pump man and is responsible for the pumps.

---

<sup>60</sup> It is calculated that in McDonald's, which is an archetype of mechanistic approach, a new worker can be trained in 15 minutes for the job, and the top efficiency is achieved in 30 minutes after a new worker steps behind the counter (see Pratt 1988, 22).

<sup>61</sup> There is another explanation for sailors' nicknames provided by Weibust. Weibust (1969, 278) engages Goffman's (1956) analysis of avoidance rituals in shipworld. Weibust uses the traditional avoidance of another's personal name as such ritual. He's analysis can be viewed just, but it does not undermine the fact that the nicknames of sailors derive from the mechanistic approach.

<sup>62</sup> In Finnish these titles would be Sähkö, Stuju, Konekakkonen, and Messilikka.

## Captain

Good thing about this job is that I don't have to get along with nobody, but everybody has to get along with me. (k8)

This is how Tommi, the captain, deliberates on his work position. Later he says that he is *a god on board* (field journal, November 26, 1999). One can say without exaggeration that back in the era of windjammers, the captains' status was next to that of a god (Ramström 1992, 23). While the ships were sailing, the captain held the authority and responsibility for everything occurring on board ship (Bergholm 1996, 4). One should keep in mind that the captain's authority over his crew was restrained in practice by the fact that the captain was dependent on the skill of his crew (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 209). The Dutch maritime historian Jaap Bruun (2002, 22) notes that the captain did receive his power from somewhere, too. Usually the power was given by the ship owner, and in the case of navy, by the military. Although times have changed and the captains have mostly lost or given up their reign (of terror, as described in Kaukiainen 1998), the underlying principles have not altered a bit. First mate Lars, although third highest in the hierarchy, has to suffer from the rigidity and the power of the captain as well,

In some ships the captain is a total prick. Then everybody has to be on tiptoes, because nothing is good for him. (1/96)

A strict hierarchy has long been an essential part of sea practices. Its roots are planted in the radical change of seafaring that occurred, in Finland, in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>63</sup> Then the shift from small vessels, that were engaged in the coastal and home sea trades, to the larger ocean-going ships lead to bigger crews, and that in turn lead to a new, more hierarchical organization of labor on board (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 207-208). The strict hierarchy has ever since played an important role in shipworld. Since the 1950s, changes in marine technology, international seafaring regulations, and a more competitive economic environment have greatly influenced sea practices. Nevertheless, the position held by the captain is still powerful and the hierarchy on board ship remains strict. An experienced boatswain Teemu deliberates,

---

<sup>63</sup> Before the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the shipboard organization of labor was not as hierarchical, rather, it should be described as collegial or patriarchal (Kaukiainen 1994, 69-73).

Every captain has his own way. You just have to learn the specific things that the particular captain pays attention to, those things that stick out to him. (p4)

### Organizational chart

#### Officers

Captain			
1 <sup>st</sup> officer		Chief engineer	
2 <sup>nd</sup> officer	3 <sup>rd</sup> officer	1 <sup>st</sup> engineer	2 <sup>nd</sup> engineer

#### Crew

Boatswain and/or pump man	Repairman and/or electrician	Steward
Able-bodied seaman (-men)	Motorman	Cook
Ordinary seaman		Custodial person (Mess girl)

This is the basic organizational chart of Finnish modern oil-tanker of the year 1996, as it was when I first conducted fieldwork. Since then there have occurred some changes in the crew size that also affected those oil-tankers I studied in the years 1999-2000. All changes took place in the lower ladders of hierarchy. There is no custodial person anymore in the crew, although the same work is now done mostly by the cook, and often the ex-custodial persons are working now as cooks. The same type of change has occurred in the other two departments of crew—deck and engine—as well. Often there are not anymore such occupational titles like boatswain, pump man or repairman on board, but the same workers still work there, only under different rank, and often partially performing the same job tasks as before (and receiving the same pay as before). This is the reason why I placed above this approximately 6-year old organizational chart, rather than the new one. This organizational chart was in official and social use in 1996, and it still remains in its social use.

There are some slight variations in the organizational chart between the vessels. Some of the variation in the chart is due to the vessel size, some to the cargo the vessel is carrying.

As the organizational chart illustrates, Aubert's and Arner's (1965, 260) notions from the 1960s shipworld are still accurate:

The positions on board a ship are more graded and specialized than in most industrial plants, relative to the total number employed. On each ship there are only small groups of men who are in the same position—rarely more than three or four. Lines of demarcation that disturb contact go according to rank, according to field of specialty, and according to watch-times.

The latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century changed the above described conditions aboard only in one way. Now there is no more than *one* person in the same position aboard, never as many as three or four. The hierarchical division of labor and power remains strict on board. Each member of the crew has special responsibilities and a distinct status. There is a trend towards more flexibility between officers and laborers, and between workers in the engine room and the deck, but this trend enforced by the shipping company does not often show in the attitudes of the parties involved. I asked an old officer Jouko what he thought of the relations of deck and engine crew. Jouko answered,

The attitude comes more from the side of engine officers, they go “the deck crew is nothing, they are just ballast.” (21/96)

### **“Duty and Mutiny”**

Weibust's (1969) study on sailing ships gives a good picture of the history behind the ship hierarchy. Weibust (1969, 188) puts the nature of the shipboard hierarchy quite tersely: “*Work*. Orders must be obeyed even if they are wrong.” Weibust<sup>64</sup> (1969, 372) also provides an old sailor's advice to an apprentice in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century England:

There is no justice or injustice on board ship, my lad. There are only two things: Duty and Mutiny—mind that. All that you are ordered to do is duty. All that you refuse to do is mutiny.

Weibust (1969, 251-252) notes that the sailors seemed to agree with the authoritarian element in ship's hierarchy. This is because in emergencies, which could occur in any moment, orders must be obeyed without argument. I detected in my study the same

---

<sup>64</sup> This quote has first appeared in Eastwick's novel *Master Mariner* (1891).

attitude towards the shipboard hierarchy. Pete has worked as motorman for couple of decades,

The skipper should be someone who gets along with people. BUT, he has to remain a bit above rest of us. I mean, he has to run the show. That's absolutely necessary. (m4)

Although the crew members complain about the execution of hierarchy, they do not question the right for such structure to exist. This is an extract written by a modern Finnish seaman Timo Pusa (1988, 32). In his novel *Tattooed Heart* Pusa's alter ego, a sailor Tuomo, deliberates,

What would that be if everybody would do they work the way they happen to feel? Hey boss, now I feel that I will load up this ship this way—only half of it—or now I feel that we'll make these really tiny paper rolls, or actually now I feel that I am going to steer this ship to Virgin Islands, and not to some shitty Black Sea. Or now I don't feel like cleaning this stinky place, or I don't feel like doing anything, but the salary must be paid, because I feel like it. What the fuck?!<sup>65</sup>

The blind obedience of orders may cause dangerous situations. The officers, too, are humans and therefore make mistakes. In addition and in relation to this, the blind obedience of orders may be used as a weapon against the supervisors. The officer Jouko talks about his workers,

It is still the basic nature of sailor that even if he well knows that the job is going to be screwed, he does it. So that he can show it to his boss and go: "You don't know a shit even that you're the boss!"<sup>66</sup> (21/96)

### **Formal hierarchy and the social organization**

In addition to the formal hierarchy, one can detect traces of informal social structure among the crew. These two hierarchies are, naturally, inseparable. Rosenström (1996, 119) remarks that the power structure in sailing ships was simple: the higher up in the hierarchy, the more power one had. She adds, though, that there was some informal power, as well, possessed by older and more experienced sailors. Weibust (1969, 211)

---

<sup>65</sup> Translated by Mira Katjalainen.

<sup>66</sup> Quotation in Finnish, 21/96: Se on melkeen tämmönen merimiehen, vieläkin semmonen perusluonne, et vaikka hyvin tiedetään että homma menee päin helvettiä, niin se tehdään et voidaan näyttää sitte et siinä näit vaik olet pomo.

notes that for a new-comer in the ship community, there were two kinds of requirements to meet; those of the technical-economical system and formal organization, mostly enforced by the officers, and the informal norms maintained and built by the workmates. According to Rosenström (2002, 58), the rigid hierarchy of sailing vessels derived from the contemporary concept of manhood. One could suggest, however, that the strict hierarchy derived from the various reasons, explained in this subchapter, such as the shift to larger crews, and the concept of manhood, rather, affected the informal social hierarchy among the crew. Kaukiainen (1998, 262) maintains that the hard discipline aboard did not ease the life of the weaker men in the crew, quite opposite, it seems to have encouraged the rule of the stronger which was prevalent in crew's living quarters. Rosenström (2002, 67) discusses the social place of the lowest in rank,

The almost military hierarchic system on board regarded the captain as a “god,” the officers as “semi-gods,” while the apprentices were on the lowest step of the ladder, just beneath the rats, as the saying went.

In the modern ship communities relations between sailors are more equal. One may find several possible reasons for this. For example, all the newcomers on board have been in merchant marine schools and they are generally older than the apprentices of windjammers. The Finnish maritime historian Ingrid Kaijser (1997, 45) reminds us that seaman has his work role on all the time while he is aboard, no matter if he is on duty or not. The formal and informal rules for both work and social relationships define and restrict his being. Therefore, it is necessary to be able to adjust to shipworld. Aubert and Arner (1965, 272) note that the highly formalized roles, and the specialized duties and rights that come with it, make it possible for sailors to live aboard without developing personal relationships with other crew members. They suggest that this is one reason for the difficulties in breaking down the invisible (and sometimes visible as well) demarcation lines aboard ship.

### **3.4. Closed community, total institution**

Think about it, half of my life... when I sit there in my cabin and think that I have spent half of my life in such a small hole. It's a prison yard what you see here from the window. It is really quite closed. (p4)

This is how boatswain Teemu reflects on his life at sea. In normal land jobs workers leave the factory after a day's labor and are able to choose their company for the rest of the day. In shipworld, all activities take place at the work site, or in areas related to it (Soini et al. 1992, 87). From the seaman's point of view, this means that whatever he does—works, eats, watches television, or goes to sauna—there are always the same people sharing those activities with him, people he did not choose to be living with. His only option is solitude. Aubert (1965, 238) remarks, "[i]n modern societies the differences between work and private life are considered to be profound, calling for different qualities, different attitudes and behavior." The inability to choose one's companionship causes stress to sailors. This is not, however, the most dramatic social consequence of total institution; because of the limited space and opportunities available, one cannot help getting monitored by fellow crew members. A repairman describes his life on board as follows,

Here you are watched over all the time... no matter whether you are on duty or not... Here you can't really go anywhere in peace and quiet. If you are on land working in some factory, at six you punch the clock card and go home - drop into a pub, nobody is watching over you ... but here you can't go anywhere without somebody watching behind your back, checking where you are going and where you are coming from... Well, I'm used to this though; I've been working here all my life so I'm used to it all right. (p5)

Surveillance is woven into the physical and social structure of the ship. According to French philosopher Michel Foucault (1984, 192), power is organized as multiple, automatic and anonymous; although surveillance rests on individuals, it functions like a network of relations. Thus, while the monitoring and guarding of fellow workers in shipworld is mostly unofficial, unrecorded, and uncodified, it remains an established part of the ship's practices. Because of the constrained space and the limited activities, it just happens that crew members know what their shipmates are doing. The case of limited privacy was even more severe in sailing ships. B. H. Shaw (1953 in Weibust 1969, 434) described it quite tersely in his novel *Splendour of the Seas*, "[i]t must be remembered

that a windjammer's fo'c'sle<sup>67</sup> offered less privacy than a goldfish bowl." Aubert's and Arner's (1965, 263) remarks of Norwegian oil-tankers are not far apart,

As a consequence of the total character of the ship, the authority relations on board a ship are directed toward a wider area of life than is usually the case on land. And what happens within one area, for instance the more private area, has repercussions in other areas.

### **Different types of total institutions**

The Canadian sociologist Erving Goffman (1961, 4-6) calls these types of establishments 'total institutions.' They are places where nearly all aspects of life are conducted in the same location and under a single authority. Goffman organizes total institutions into five groupings: First, such institutions are established to care for harmless persons whom are considered to be incapable of caring for themselves. These are homes for the aged, or the orphaned. Second, total institutions are established to care for persons who are judged to be both incapable of looking after themselves and a threat to the community, even though the threat is unintended; e.g., mental hospitals. A third type is organized to protect the community from those who intentionally endanger it. The welfare of persons sequestered in these places is not a major issue. This third type primarily describes jails. Fourth, there are institutions purportedly established to more effectively pursue specific tasks and justifying themselves only on these instrumental grounds; these are such places as army barracks, ships, and work camps. Finally, some total institution can be designed as retreats from the world; examples are abbeys and monasteries. When using Goffman's categorization, ships belong to the fourth category in which being part of the institution is not meant as a punishment, yet the well-being of the group members is not the primary concern. Thus, a group member is a tool for the greater goal of the institution—in merchant ships the goal is transporting goods to make a profit. Leena, the experienced female officer, says,

This is by no means normal that people are put here into small community where they stay for a defined time period, and then there are the same faces in leisure time and work time. (7/96)

---

<sup>67</sup> Fo'c'sle (forecastle) is the area fore the main mast where the workers used to live on sailing ships.

While Goffman focuses mostly on broad characteristics of total institutions, the Norwegian sociologists and Goffman's contemporaries Vilhelm Aubert and Oddvar Arner (1965) have studied ships as total institutions. Their study rests on Goffman's analysis of total institutions. Therefore, Aubert and Arner compare ships to the other total institution, such as cloisters. The social structure of the ship is discussed in detail. This analysis is based on Norwegian oil-tankers and is, therefore, important background material to my study, although 40 years have passed between them. Weibust (1969, 214) analyses in his study many features of total institution, for example the lack of privacy and the loss of previous identity. Weibust does not believe that the concept of total institution holds in the eyes of sailors, "[c]ertainly most of our informants would shake their heads and deny that this statement holds good for the 'hard but healthy and well-ordered life' on the windjammers." Weibust is not the only maritime scholar to criticize the concept of total institution when applied to seafaring. The German maritime scholar Heide Gerstenberger (1996, 174) writes indignantly,

Sociologists, for example, should have noticed that asylums, prisons, barracks and all the other "total institutions" enumerated by Goffman are social institution which, though often separated from outside world by bolted doors or high fences, is not in fact created by these technical devices. "The ship," on the other hand, is first and foremost a technical artifact, and anyone who claims that it is a "total institution" is also accepting that the social relations at sea are functions of technology.

I doubt if the designers of other total institutions like prisons would agree with Gerstenberger. Starting from the Panopticon<sup>68</sup> by Jeremy Bentham, the buildings have been designed to serve the social objectives the developer wants to achieve. The physical structure of a building and the social networks it enables or forbids go hand in hand, and are well thought of in modern building design. Furthermore, whether building has been designed with this in mind or not, the architecture of a building influences social

---

<sup>68</sup> "The Panopticon of Jeremy Bentham is an architectural figure which "incorporates a tower central to an annular building that is divided into cells, each cell extending the entire thickness of the building to allow inner and outer windows. The occupants of the cells . . . are thus backlit, isolated from one another by walls, and subject to scrutiny both collectively and individually by an observer in the tower who remains unseen. Toward this end, Bentham envisioned not only venetian blinds on the tower observation ports but also mazelike connections among tower rooms to avoid glints of light or noise that might betray the presence of an observer." (**Barton, Ben F., and Marthalee S. Barton.** "Modes of Power in Technical and Professional Visuals." *JBTC* 7.1, 1993. 138-62.)  
<http://users.rcn.com/mackey/thesis/> (April 26, 2004).

networks inside its walls, enabling and forbidding them. But to get to the point of Gerstenberger: the fact that ships are not designed with the concept of total institution in mind—but rather the profit—does not undermine the observation that the ship community has at least some of the characteristics of total institutions and can be effectively compared with other kinds of total institutions.

### **Barriers**

The character of total institutions is symbolized by the barriers they pose both to relationships (i.e., social interaction) and personal privacy (i.e., escape). Yrjö who works as an engineer aboard,

If you think how it is here nowadays, you can't get out of here. The time spent in the harbor is short, every other day I have to stay in anyway, because of my work duties in the engine room... it's like a prison 24 hours a day ...try to get out... no chance. (y5)

Control over workers is indexed, most literally, by how easy it is to get into and out of the physical plant of the organization (Webb and Weick 1983, 220). In shipworld these barriers are not an end in themselves: rather, they are a side effect of the ship functions. Aubert (1965, 240) remarks that, therefore, “the physical isolation of the ship from the seamen’s families and home communities is not in itself considered useful; it is not included in the purpose of the institution.” The isolation is merely a side effect from the corporate perspective. Nevertheless, the water surrounding the vessel, odd working hours, and the harbors located far away from towns serve as barriers against a crew member’s possible departure.

In the same manner, by and large, the authoritarian shipboard hierarchy is not the purpose of ship. It is a side effect of the structure considered to be most efficient for ship functions. The sailors have historically had little power over their living and working conditions. Ramberg (1997, 66) states that because sailors did not possess much power over their life aboard, their only way to enhance their life conditions was to “jump ship.” Rediker (1987, 100-115) notes that deserting ship was one of the few ways for sailor to enhance his living and working conditions.

### **Fieldwork in total institution**

Because of the ship's strict hierarchy and the characteristics of the total institution, it does not have room for free actors. Everyone aboard has his own specific position and is responsible for performing the duties related to that post. These duties are essential to the ship's operations. During my fieldwork as an ordinary seaman, the strict hierarchy helped me to achieve my goal to conduct fieldwork in a total institution. The moment I walked down the gangway, I was an essential component of the ship functions. I was needed; other people's lives depended on me. Although not everybody approved of women working aboard, especially on the deck, no one questioned my right to be there. I was an ordinary seaman of the ship; and, that's that. As a seaman, the proper work and social categories for me were found immediately. There was no one else in that category, and without me it would have been empty. Thus, by definition, I was an insider. The post of an ordinary seaman determined my place in the sitting order of the crew's mess, the size and the location of my cabin, my locker, and my working hours.

In retrospect, I feel that my role as a fieldworker was sometimes lost. It might have been too much to learn at once: the fieldwork, the ship duties, and adjusting to the hardships of sea life. But, is it even possible for a fieldworker to achieve the objective and detached perspective to her field, if the field is a total institution and she is a member? If one wants to get inside a closed community by taking a job there, then one becomes part of it. There is no room for half-members, thus the fieldworker is in danger of losing her 'ethnographic spectacles.' Is it necessary to commit herself into that community, in order to make it through the experience? In such a world the circumstances may force the ethnographer to *go native*.<sup>69</sup> Hastrup (1995, 159) writes that it is not possible to speak simultaneously from both a native and an anthropological position. From a student's point of view the issue is twofold: a student may go native while working in the field, but, before and after, she *goes anthropologist*. Neither one is her 'original identity,' only later she will perhaps become an anthropologist. In the long research process which

---

<sup>69</sup> The debate of possibility to go native in the first place has been gone on for long time (see Hastrup 1994, 1995; Wulff 2000).

continues after the field (i.e., transcription and analysis of the interviews, and the field journal, writing the research paper), the new-born identity or standpoint of a native identity has a sufficient period of time to wash out. In the process, an identity or standpoint of a 'native to anthropology' is built in, which Hastrup (1995, 160) finds necessary. Helena Wulff (2000, 147-159) discusses Hastrup's question whether it is possible to be a native and anthropologist simultaneously. Wulff writes about her ex-nativeness in the ballet world, wherein she later conducted a study. According to Wulff (2000, 153), her anthropological training did not obliterate her native perspective. Although in my case there was not that much native perspective formed before I entered the field, I felt that in the field both native and anthropologist perspectives formed. This process was wearisome and not without reversals, as I will illustrate below.

Adjusting to a new fieldwork setting is difficult; the rules of the new reality may differ radically from the rules of one's homeland. This is, indeed, the case with total institutions. Yet, for a fieldworker, the adjustment may be easier. The fieldworker knows that, although it is now her life, it is not necessarily her future. Moreover, the study, itself, is a distinctive element in her new life. Although she has become a seaman, she is a researcher, too. Therefore she may be able to extend herself mentally more than if she were put there by others. One has to be aware of the amount of adjusting and extending one makes in order to meet the requirements of life in a closed community, for the stress may be surprising and counterproductive for the purposes of fieldwork. I used to read Helsingin Sanomat newspaper whenever I got hold of one. One night I was reading a fresh newspaper, a rarity on the ship because of our few and busy visits in Finnish harbors, on my watch. This is not allowed on watch, although everybody does it, for we are supposed to stand on the deck and watch the cargo being loaded. In any case, I was sitting in the crew's dayroom when the motorman walked in, snatched the paper out of my hands, and made a comment about the watchman's duties. I exploded with rage. I ran after him to his own cabin—the door was closed, and it is considered very rude in shipworld to open someone's door without permission—and informed him in a very loud voice that he was a mean asshole. I do not usually get mad about something as unimportant as snatching a newspaper. Why did I get so angry this time? There is more to

this case than at first appears. In the world of hassle, three wake-ups per day, hard physical work and all those old men cracking chauvinist jokes around me, the newspaper represented something safe and peaceful, something with which I was familiar. It was a piece of my own world that I left behind. When the motorman yanked the newspaper from my hands, he—no doubt unknowingly—yanked away something more profound, the symbol of my own safe world, the security and psychological grounding of home.

The British anthropologist Alison L. Spedding (1999, 17), who is spending her time involuntarily in another total institution, a prison, writes,

I think that in 'normal' fieldwork one adopts a screen personality which is compatible with the host culture, but it is always possible to get away to 'be oneself' – go off for a walk down to the river, go to market in town, go to the city once every couple of months to pick up letters and visit expat friends for a few days. Here I am a prisoner, 24 hours a day. I therefore feel I have to live as my real personality (in so far as I have one) which is the intellectual and writer, a role which is not very acceptable in a woman anywhere. I am incapable of pretending, as I did when I was in the field in Bolivia, that I think other than I do or sympathize with something which in fact I reject.

Spedding writes about the very same phenomenon, although her experience is much more intense and long lasting. In other fieldwork settings one can leave the field (for an hour or longer), but in a total institution the anthropologist is not able to escape even if she feels the need to do so. Thus, she turns to the familiar and the safe.

Perhaps the most important characteristic of a total institution for the fieldworker is Erving Goffman's (1961, 6) notion of daily activities (work, living and leisure time) being conducted under a single authority. The fieldworker is subject to the same systems of surveillance and control experienced by the community at large; everything she does and says is common knowledge. It may be difficult for the fieldworker to relinquish her privacy. A more severe implication, however, is the possibility that others will see her as one of the controllers. *Are you monitored like others, or are you the monitor of others?*

In a total institution rumors play an important role, for only necessary information is passed on by the authorities (Goffman 1961, 9). In addition to providing entertainment,

gossip has a remarkable function in shipworld's communication network.<sup>70</sup> I experienced this when I first went to sea as an ordinary seaman. There was a man working in the shipping company who shared my last name, Karjalainen.<sup>71</sup> Karjalainen is a common name among Finns, yet a rumor circulated that I was his niece and had come to the ship to spy on the crew! I was unaware of the rumor or its implications for my fieldwork. Afterwards, I learned that at least two workers had refused to give me interviews because of this misunderstanding. It is hard to cut the wings of gossip, if one does not know it exists. Nevertheless, it may affect the fieldwork.

Now, after looking at ship as total institution and closed community, in addition to history of seafaring, and shipworld's temporal, spatial and hierarchical structures, let us turn to gendered shipworld.

### **3.5. Gender**

If the maritime world can be thought of as having a gender, the world of the northern seas, as well as that of other seas, has very definitely been traditionally regarded as a male one. Indeed, in the various stereotypes of the seafaring professions [---] the promiscuous, free-roving Jack Tar or the Scandinavian sailor who was, in contrast to mere landlubbers, 'a real man' – it is precisely the traditionally masculine characteristics of manliness, bravery, physical strength and fearlessness that have been highlighted (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 231).

The masculine characteristics of shipworld are revealed in many aspects of sea life. Sailor culture has usually been described as masculine; it is rough life for rough men, with the everlasting immanence of danger. Romanticism, or bruto-romanticism, has also been linked with the masculine culture of seafaring life (see Rosenström 1996). As Kirby and Hinkkanen (2000, 237) argue in their study of the Baltic and North Seas, the gender division of the 19<sup>th</sup> century maritime labor was such that men were working at sea on the ship or boat, and women were working at home and on land. Today, there are women

---

<sup>70</sup> Weibust (1969, 240) reports that in sailing ships the most important actors in chain of rumours were the galley crew and the man at the wheel. Things have not changed much, in this sense, from the era of windjammers; it is common knowledge that the mess crew knows first no matter what event takes place aboard.

<sup>71</sup> When it comes to originality, Karjalainen is nearly as common to Finns as the family name Smith is to English speakers.

working at sea, but the 19<sup>th</sup> century gender-divisional line of sea and land has not diminished away in the minds of sailors or landlubbers. I will first examine masculinity as one of the most predominant characteristic of sailor culture. After that I turn to women working at sea.

## **Men**

We all went to day room and watched the movie *Matrix*. The testosterone level was so fucking high. The cook was getting his videos back with hand gun, in his mind, in the market square of Rauma. Those boys. I wonder if they are really like that. Does my friend Pasi [a seaman as well] talk with me all different stories than with his sailor buddies? And which stories he likes more? I felt that the cook was angry and a bit ashamed, because he did not want Sakke to tell all his detailed dick stories when I was there.

Are *seamen* different than other men? Is there a closed male community—not spiritual—in which the members are highly educated? It would be great comparison, to see what part of this is of seamen, what men, and what the working class [culture]. (Field journal, January 20, 2000)

Writing about men is difficult. One does not want to fall into the same pits that some of the previous scholars of women and men studies, and before that the male scholars, have tumbled off. It is the problem of writing about “them” as a whole, as one male entity, because it does not exist, nor is that kind of approach tempting at all. One does not have to face the same dilemma with women’s studies, because woman is considered the Other while man is the original whole; it is easier to write about the Other than the original soundboard. Therefore, I approach men in shipworld via masculine myth of sailor. By doing this, I hope to cast light to the being of the real male sailors as real life persons. Let us begin with a famous popular sailor song, written by a landsman:

### **Kalle Aaltonen**

I have courted a widow, a bride  
I have deserted a rosy smile.  
I have followed the devil in my wanderings,  
and gone to his gatherings.  
I have the ship decks trampled,  
and made the captains tremble  
and fear the death by my rustless knife.

I don’t brag, but that kind of chap

is Kalle Aaltonen.  
No sorrow in that tract, if there is our lad  
Kalle Aaltonen!

Ask in Frisco, Hull, or Melbourne  
Ask in Rio de Janeiro way  
just ask for a joke  
if Aaltonen's been there for a day. [---]  
And try finding someone who'll boast  
That he didn't with me toast.  
There is no "lady" in London  
who wouldn't walk with me?  
And wherever is Kalle-Aaltonen-chat  
the "misses" will go, *Ooh, that chap!* [---]  
A basketful of wee Aaltonens  
there are in harbors here and there.  
Little practical jokes will happen now and then  
when you have fun everywhere.  
Blacks, and reds, and checkered  
you will see some day.  
They talk India and Irelandish,  
Finnish is their dad's language anyway.

I don't brag, but that kind of chap  
is Kalle Aaltonen.  
No sorrow in that tract, if there is our lad  
Kalle Aaltonen!  
(J. A. Tanner)

The song presented above in English was written originally in Finnish by Johan Alfred Tanner in 1910 (the humble translation is my doings).<sup>72</sup> It was a famous popular song of

---

<sup>72</sup> Lyrics in Finnish: Olen liehinyt leskeä, morsianta, olen hyljännyt ruususuun.  
Olen retkillän' seurannut paholaista, sen jälkiä enempi kuin muun.  
Olen polkenut kansia laivojen, ja kuoleman pelkohon on saattanut henget kapteenien  
minun veitseni ruostumaton.  
Tippaakaan en kehu, mutta sellainen jehu on Kalle Aaltonen.  
Seuduilta sieltä pitää surut olla pois, missä vain on Kalle Aaltonen.  
Kysy Friscossa, Hullissa, Melbourness', kysy Rio de Janeiron tiell',  
sa kysy vaan noin niinkuin lystikses', eikö Aaltost' oo nähtynä siell'.  
[---] ja näytä sitt' joukosta sellainen, jok' ei kanssani ryypännyt ois!  
Tippaakaan en kehu, mutta sellainen jehu on Kalle Aaltonen.  
Seuduilta sieltä pitää surut olla pois, missä vain on Kalle Aaltonen.  
Sellaista "ladya" ei Lontoossa näy, jok' ei astelis' vierelläin'.  
Ja missä vain puhe Kalle Aaltosest' käy, niin "missit" ne sanoo: "Jasso, hän!"  
[---] Kai kapallinen pieniä Aaltosia on satamassa siellä ja täällä'.  
Sattuuhan niit' pieniä kolttosia, kun on joutunut lystille pääll'.  
Mustia, punaisia, kirjavia saat nähdä joskus viel'.

that era. Kalle Aaltonen song represents in several ways the stereotype of sailors in our culture. The archetypical seaman Kalle Aaltonen follows the devil, sails the seas around the world, picks up fights, gets wasted, hits on women and leaves them in trouble, for he does not look back. He is an exaggerated model of careless masculine man, a vagabond image that can be found also in movie Westerns and their modern successors like biker culture, and in lore of adventurers. Kirby and Hinkkanen (2000, 187) note that,

The prevalent view from the land is that sailors constitute a highly distinctive community, with its own language, dress, customs and habits. It is an oft-repeated cliché that the sea is 'in their blood'. 19th century novels are fully stocked with mariners, active and retired, and many of the stereotypical images of the seaman are derived from such characters.

Kirby and Hinkkanen (2000, 213) note that maritime historians have shown this image of archetypical seaman Kalle Aaltonen or 'Jack Tar' being skewed. They suggest that the Jack Tar image tells us more about the era's bourgeois values than about seamen.<sup>73</sup> This image provides the soundboard for studying sailors and seaman culture, because they utilize and reflect the same stereotypes.

The mythical 'Jack Tar'<sup>74</sup> or Kalle Aaltonen is a womanizer. He has had his share of affairs, as Kalle Aaltonen brags, *I have courted a widow, a bride, I have deserted a rosy smile*. The nature of his relationships with women is not sincere as he goes on, leaving the rosy smiles behind. Furthermore, the women he engages himself with are not necessarily the marrying type, but rather the 'loose' or promiscuous lot, as Kalle Aaltonen hints to us, *There is no "lady" in London who wouldn't walk with me. And wherever is Kalle-Aaltonen-chat, the "misses" will go, Ooh, that chap!* This lifestyle lets Jack Tar/Kalle Aaltonen go free his own way without the bondages of marriage. Not to say that Jack Tar or Kalle Aaltonen would not have a wife or two in different harbors; those wives, quite simply, cannot follow him to the sea and are then excluded from his

---

He puhuu kyllä intiaa, irlantia mutta suomi on pappansa kiel'.  
Tippaakaan en kehu, mutta sellainen jehu on Kalle Aaltonen.  
Seuduilta sieltä pitää surut olla pois, missä vain on Kalle Aaltonen.  
(Suuri toivelaulukirja 6, 1985). Lyrics by Johan Alfred Tanner.

<sup>73</sup> Kirby and Hinkkanen (2000, 213) remind us that this image of free-roving Jack Tar was also disliked by sailors themselves, because they felt that it was, as a stereotyping image, a source of their oppression.

<sup>74</sup> The counterpart of Kalle Aaltonen in Anglo-Saxon countries.

lifestyle. Jack Tar/Kalle Aaltonen takes freedoms with women, behaves irresponsibly and leaves them in trouble, *A basketful of wee Aaltonens there are in harbors here and there. Little practical jokes will happen now and then, when you have fun everywhere. Blacks, and reds, and checkered you will see some day. They talk India and Irelandish, Finnish is their dad's language anyway.* Kalle Aaltonen does not care if he has fathered children around the world, for him they are 'little practical jokes.' This kind of freedom, freedom of responsibilities and cause-and-effect-relationship of one's behavior, has always been appealing to some aspects of human nature. Malinowski (1964, 81-83) dismisses this kind of freedom as freedom of 'miracle mongers' which is,

one aspect of human culture in which the idea of freedom, free-floating, pervasive and omnipotent, is actually embodied and standardized. All that we embrace under the heading of mythology, fairy tales, and folklore [---] wonderful and ever successful adventures represent the same craving for unlimited freedom. It seems to be an essential ingredient of relaxation from the cramping force of determinism and logic, to enjoy the fictitious feeling of freedom. The whole universe must remain open and accessible to those who wish to enjoy that mental expansion which, moving on the line of least resistance and of wishful thinking, expresses our deeply ingrained craving for emotional freedom.

Malinowski does not take into account the freedom that one may gain by using society for one's own ends and not recognizing the chains of society and culture: by doing this one may overthrow determinism, at least in short term, and perhaps even in long term if we do not assume moral conscience to play a role here. In one sense sailor life was exactly that, for one could escape the laws of the land by taking off on a ship. Sea life has never encouraged long-term relationships, although the vacation system has made it more possible to maintain a relationship. Chief engineer Hans recalls his youth,

Sailor [life] has changed a lot in last 40 years I have been at sea. In 1970s there were very few women and they were on coast. Everybody was unmarried, especially on workers' side, maybe there were more married men among officers. Now that we have vacation systems people go steady with someone or marry (c7).

The vacation system allows maintaining a marriage, but the long periods away from home still take their toll. A motorman explains,

I would not recommend life at sea to others. The family life will always get screwed, at some point. It doesn't suit everybody, this life. We just laughed

another day in mess that two out of eight of us were not divorced with kids. That makes you think. (m6).

Jack Tar or Kalle Aaltonen does not bend under the bondages of fatherland, for he is a free soul. He does not care much for the church and its moral teachings. Kalle sings, *I have followed the devil in my wanderings, and gone to his gatherings*. This is another example of the bourgeois values of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries that sailors were believed to neglect. Contemporary sailors sometimes call church and its workers ‘Devil Defense Unit.’<sup>75</sup> It is quite possible that in general sailors secularized earlier than mainstream land culture, because they did not have the chance, nor the pressure put on them by the family and village community, to attend service regularly. Hinkkanen (1994, 64) suggests that there was contradiction between the international seamen's culture and its norms, and the education and expectations of Finnish seaman and his family. It has to be noted, that in addition to this ungodly lifestyle seamen were believed to sport, and Finnish sailors were also believed to be sea wizards. In 12th century and from then on, it was told that Finns sold favourable winds to merchant sailors (Toivanen 1993, 88-89). This myth has survived till the 20th century, due to the *History of Northern peoples* (1555) by Olaus Magnus, with stories of wind knots, wind merchants and storm raisers, functioning as mediator. Toivanen (1993, 89) argues that several Anglo-Saxon writers—Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Joseph Conrad, Richard Henry Dana, Daniel Defoe, Jack London and Herman Melville, among others—have used the same myth of Finnish sorcerers. Kirby and Hinkkanen (2000, 41-42) note that in the sailing ship era storms were viewed to be the work of the devil, often raised by evil sorcerers: violent seas were seen as hell, devils dancing on the waves. Sailors attach meanings to sea; it is hardly a neutral element for a seaman. Especially in the windjammer era, but ultimately also today, their lives depend on the sea. Proverbs in northern Europe warned of the dangers at sea: in order to learn to pray, one just had to go to sea (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 41). Therefore seamen do not perceive the sea as a neutral or value-free element. Religion does not show in shipworld, because it is considered a private matter and the general discourse is more in line with ‘Devil Defence Unit,’ discouraging open religiosity.

---

<sup>75</sup> In Finnish: Piruntorjuntajoukot.

The recklessness and irresponsibility of mythical Jack Tar or Kalle Aaltonen shows in his unpredictable behaviour. Kalle boasts about bringing havoc on board, *I have the ship decks trampled, and made the captains tremble, and fear the death by my rustless knife.* Alcohol has always played a role in the lives of both mythical and real life sailors. In the lives of real sailors the crimping system of sailing ship era was a way to provide sailors with accommodation and such they needed while on land, including alcohol and other leisure time activities. The crimping system, according to Hinkkanen (1994, 62), worked so that the crimp lurked a sailor, who had just got to the harbour and was looking for a place to stay, into his inn. There was a full service; the accommodation, food, and drinks were provided by the crimper, and because the sailor had given his money-purse to the crimp's safe, everything was based on credit. The fiesta would go on till the sailor's money was used up - then the crimp would kick the sailor out or look up a ship for him to work on, if latter, the crimp would get certain percentage of the next salary, beforehand of course. In addition to crimps, other dangers waited for sailors on land, for example press gangs which could haul a drunken sailor to a new ship, in order to get the needed number of sailors on board for the ship to take off. Marcus Rediker (1987, 77-115) notes that the hard spirits ratio was one of the assets that helped captains to obtain the crew he needed for his voyage. Even today, the captains are sometimes compared regarding the amount of hard liquor one is allowed to buy tax-free on board. *Ask in Frisco, Hull, or Melbourne, Ask in Rio de Janeiro way, just ask for a joke if Aaltonen's been there for a day. [---] And try find someone who'll boast, That he didn't with me toast,* sings Kalle Aaltonen. Needless to say, the drinking dimension of Jack Tar did not fit into the bourgeois values of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, either. Old seamen often recall longingly the days when they would have parties both on board and on land. Pump man Jussi recalls his youth,

Back in the day it was drinking and partying, but the job got done, and we went ashore and ships spent long time on harbors. [---] This profession, it has always been thought of weirdly. If you go to bar and tell them that you are a seaman, they go "tut-tut" (p7).

Finns in general sport a drinking culture; this is even more so with sailors who do not have the family and home community to keep them in-check with drinking. To be able to party and drink as much as one pleases is a manifestation of personal freedom, although not praised by philosophers. It is freedom of common people. Jaakko Haataja, a Finnish mate who is the father of the lyrics for the famous song *Laiva Toivo Oulu*, wrote in the 1860s,

Oh, Sicily is wonderful  
Life of Northern sailors joyful  
Wine makes your blood rush  
Like the eyes of girls make you blush  
When they take you into their arms.<sup>76</sup>

In big harbor towns there were plenty of prostitutes to meet the desires of young sailors. Kaukiainen (1998, 114) notes that women, love, and longing for both were popular themes in sailor songs, although the reality of harbor towns did not provide many opportunities for romance, causing sailors to turn into services of prostitutes. As we have seen, Jack Tar Kalle Aaltonen's life is not very well planned, but follows the options that a sailor in the windjammer era had. As Rediker (1987, 77-115) notes, a sailor was free to jump ship, because he formed, for first time in the history, a class of free labour. He was free to move around, the lack of bondages resulted in a life style that was in the surface level care-free and happy-go-lucky. The Finnish sociologist Pertti Alasuutari (1986, 71) states in his study about working class men of Finland that the division between self-discipline and desires is linked to their worldview: because one has to balance in life between two contradictory desires—desire for freedom and the will to maintain social relationships—one has to have self-discipline. It is believed that, Alasuutari continues, the desire for freedom is part of the male nature. Kalle Aaltonen sings, *I don't brag, but that kind of chap is Kalle Aaltonen. No sorrow in that tract, if there is our lad, Kalle Aaltonen!*

The New Zealander media scholar Roger Horrocks (1995, 20) argues that symbolically gender is represented in various myths. One may argue that the narrative of sailors, the myth of free-roving seaman, is among one of the prominent myths of male gender in

---

<sup>76</sup> "Thanassa Sisiliassa/ on hauska meripoikain pohjolan/ viini veren kiihottaapi.../ neitoin silmät suloa sykkii/ meripoikaa kaappaapi kainaloon... (JH 23)" In Kaukiainen (1998, 49).

western culture. The American historians Margaret Creighton and Lisa Norling (1996, vii) note that maritime history and literature have been about the tales of men, ships and the sea, and about narratives of tough sailors. These kinds of stories have constructed the myth of seaman and, through that, the male gender. Horrocks (1995, 18) remarks, “[m]asculinity has to be maintained, or like the male erection itself, it threatens to topple. Thus myths of masculinity must promise both rewards and conformity, and punishment for transgression.” In respect of this statement, the myth of seaman is significant for the maintenance of masculinity. R. H. Dana (1840, quoted in Weibust 1969), who wrote in the era of windjammers, deliberated on the subject, “[a]n overstrained sense of manliness is the characteristic of seafaring men, or, rather, of life on board ship.” Horrocks (1995, 18) remarks that the gender myths have to be maintained and reinforced also then when the childhood is already over. One could argue that the gender myths are actually more important for adults and in adult culture than for children. The British sociologist Sean Nixon (1997, 301) reminds us that even though masculinities are taken as invented or constructed and, thus, masculinities do not have the foundation that roots masculinity in divinity or biology, they are still important. These inventions or constructions are necessary, because they define our place and identity in relation to others. This means that even that we know gender is by large a construction, we nevertheless tend to succumb to its rule. Rosenström (2002, 58) notes that the study of sailors’ concepts of reality is also a study of masculinity. According to her, the strict hierarchy on board in the windjammer era was based on the concept of masculinity of that era.

It has to be emphasized once more that what we have been discussing here is the *image* of the seaman, not truth claims about his actual life. As noted above, sailors themselves have also been eager to state that that image is not true. At the same time, though, this image has also played on their advantage. Kaukiainen (1998, 40) describes how the sailors of the 19<sup>th</sup> century wanted to stand apart from landmen by wearing distinctive sailor uniform (white pants, blue coat, silk scarf and black flat cap furnished with long silk ribbon) and integrating foreign words into their stories about distant exotic countries. No wonder that sailors enjoyed the attention of women, the jealousy of men, and the

admiration of boys. Jaakko Haataja (in Kaukiainen 1998, 40) reflects in this poem *Little Cabin boy* his memories from childhood in the 1850s,

When I was a boy I admired  
The Sailor Man's attire  
His tanned face and tarred hand  
His fancy clothes and shiny hat.<sup>77</sup>

### **Male kingdom on board**

Shipworld is the world of men, also historically. There have been a few exceptions in the course of the history (see e.g., Cordingly 2001; *Iron Men, Wooden Women* 1996). Creighton and Norling (1996, *ix*) note that seafaring has been one of the most exclusively male-dominated occupations for centuries. The women who began working aboard large cargo ships in the 1950s and 1960s adjusted to the culture and practices established by and for men.<sup>78</sup> Aubert and Arner (1965, 282) wrote in the late 1950's about women entering shipworld in Norwegian vessels. According to them, women were "[an] element which is entirely alien to the old tradition of the sea." Weibust (1969, 422) remarks that there was strong opposition to women working at sea, "[o]ften this was expressed categorically, that women had no business to be on board." It was also said that women would bring accidents aboard with them. A. Villiers (1932, 228, in Weibust 1969, 423) provides the following illustration of old attitudes,

It was simply their superstitious resentment of a woman in the ship; they held that it was bad luck, unnecessary, and in any case a damned nuisance. It meant the instant and irrevocable destruction of our male kingdom, our little Utopia in which only men smoked cigarettes and argued the point, and worked and slept and talked. It was a rotten blow to our dignities and to the dignity of the sweet-lined old sailing ship that carried us.

This extract by Villiers illustrates the fragility of "male kingdom" aboard ship. Men felt that the mere existence of a woman aboard was enough to ruin their masculine construction of the world. Horrocks (1995, 18) argues that the vigorousness of the

---

<sup>77</sup> "Pieni käpenpoi": Katemiellä katselin minä piennäpoikana/ merimiehen uljuutta sen maissa ollessa/ sen päivänpahtokasvoja sen tervakourija/ sen pulskaa pyhäpukua ja kiiltolakkia (Jaakko Haataja). In Kaukiainen (1998, 40).

<sup>78</sup> There had been women working aboard in the coastal transports in Finland. These women worked mostly in the kitchen of family businesses.

masculine identities is a pointer, not to their solidity, but to their fragility: “to be *mucho hombre* is not a birthright, but an accomplishment won and maintained with pain and difficulty.” In other words, rough manliness has to be gained, it does not come naturally. This fits into the Kirby’s and Hinkkanen’s (2000, 220) notion that a boy in many Finnish maritime communities in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century had to sail at least one voyage before he was properly regarded as a man. Today, there are not anymore such requirements for Finnish boys to gain manhood through experiencing seas, although many sailors maintain that they are often regarded as more masculine, because of their profession, among landlubbers.<sup>79</sup> Rosenström (2002, 62) notes that to spin a yarn about sea adventures and exotic harbors was a rewarding way for a sailor to identify as a seadog and a real man, opposite to a boring landsman. Horrock’s argument about the fragility of manhood seems appropriate, especially so, when we compare it to women’s femininity in masculine world. American sociologist Christine Williams (1989, 11), who studied female soldiers, maintains that women’s femininity is not threatened, like men’s masculinity is, when they engage in nontraditional activities. Although women’s womanhood may not be threatened by fellow workers, it may have to go into hiding because of other reasons which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Aubert and Arner (1965, 282) noted in the 1960s that the few women entering shipworld had hardly influenced the social structure of the ship community. Aubert’s and Arner’s remarks of shipworld are still accurate 40 years after their study. Although there are now more women working aboard, and in wider variety of professions, shipworld is still structurally the world of men. Morgan (1997, 226) argues that formal organizations are classically built upon the stereotypical western male values and have been through history dominated by males. This is the case with organizational structures within seafaring, as well. The women may challenge the male kingdom, but they cannot destroy it.

---

<sup>79</sup> Men crossing the gender boundary into child care, on the other hand, challenge assumptions about heterosexual masculinity (Murray 1997, 144). After all, some professions are regarded as suitable for men and masculinity, when some are not. Men maintaining the gender boundaries may, therefore, receive positive sanctions, while the men crossing the boundaries may receive negative feedback.

### Occupational titles

The world of men is reflected in the titles of crew members. Kirby and Hinkkanen (2000, 251) note that the pattern of Scandinavian women becoming in the 20<sup>th</sup> century entrenched in many trades that used to be males-only—such as doctors, lawyers, and priests—does not apply to the most maritime professions. Still, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, almost all of the titles for workers end with *-man*: *repairman*, *seaman*, *watchman*, *motorman* and so forth.<sup>80</sup> Unlike in other organizations, where the sexist language is primarily found in the titles for upper posts like ‘chairman,’<sup>81</sup> in the ship hierarchy nearly all posts end with *-man*. However, the highest position, captain—in Finnish *päällikkö*, *kapteeni*—does not have the explicit implication of male gender.

Women are still perceived to be so new and few in shipworld that their existence does not have to influence the definition of occupational titles at sea. Thus, in the year 2000, the qualifications for sea professions were altered, and the traditional profession ‘ordinary seaman’ was changed to *vahtimies*, ‘watchman.’ There are more and more women attending seafaring schools and entering seafaring profession. Yet, this trend has not had any effect on the politics of defining the occupational titles. The occupational titles remain titles for men. The only exception is the name in seaman jargon for the custodial person. Nowadays they are often called *messilikka*, mess girl, when a few decades ago they were called *messikalle*, mess Charlie. Characteristically, women have influenced only the seaman jargon, and only job titles in the ship hierarchy’s lowest level.

### Male attitudes towards women at sea

The attitudes of many seamen towards women are often chauvinistic and skeptical. Most women working at sea are working in the kitchens of cargo ships, or as waitresses or sales persons in passenger ships. Women working in other positions on board—for example as a motorman or boatswain—are still quite rare. When I asked an

---

<sup>80</sup> Job titles in Finnish, *mies* means a man in English: *konekorjausmies*, *merimies*, *vahtimies*, *moottorimies*. In addition to this, also some of the job titles which in English do not include explicitly the gender, such as electrician and officer, end in Finnish with *mies*: *sähkömies* and *perämies*.

<sup>81</sup> Hearn and Parkin (1987, 145). This study is made in Great Britain, and does not concern Finland or the Finnish language. In Finnish, however, signs can be found of the same gendered language system; for instance boss is *esimies*.

approximately 30 years old motorman with about 10 years at sea, would it matter to him if he had a female chief engineer or a female captain, he replied to me,

Well, if she would show up all of a sudden, sure it would matter. For there is no..., we never had... I've never seen one in the engine room. Yeah, it would matter, like I'd be surprised if there was a dog walking there... well that was a rather bad comparison. (m8)

The British sociologists Jeff Hearn and Wendy Parkin (1987, 82) remark that institutional organizations are not neat, uniform asexual structures; they are usually amalgamations of groups of women workers and groups of men workers. Thus, women tend to work in the kitchen, and men tend to occupy the other positions in the ship hierarchy. Consequently, women officers are rare. American psychologist Elizabeth Aries (1996, 16) argues that regardless of recent changes in society, there is still a division of labor by sex that ascribes different work and responsibilities to women and men and social structures that grant greater power and dominance to men. According to the Officers' Union of Finland and the Ship Engineers' Union of Finland,<sup>82</sup> there are presently no female captains and no female chief engineers working at sea. Hearn and Parkin (1987, 91) note that in most industries, hierarchical divisions by gender are rarely random, men tend to occupy the higher and women the lower levels. In this respect, seafaring is no exception.

Women seeking to pursue a career at sea often face considerable discrimination from salty crew members. Williams (1989, 59) argues in her study on female soldiers that the 'adjustment problems' women often face in the nontraditional fields are used to justify barring women from them altogether. When I asked ship's engineers why there were hardly any women working in the engine room in Finnish ships, I heard this explanation from an approximately 55-year old chief engineer Hans, who had roughly 40 years at sea,

A woman in the engine room... she should be able to do all those tasks there are, no matter HOW disgusting and dirty... the hair-do could get ruined, or their fingernails might break, you know. But that's how it is; a woman in the engine room should be more like a man... a bit straightforward, not so emotional. (3/96)

---

<sup>82</sup> Suomen Laivanpäällystöliitto and Suomen Konepäällystöliitto, telephone conversations, March 28, 2003, there are no official statistics on this.

Now, would Hans be concerned for the hair-do and fingernails of male workers of the engine room? The American organization theorist Stanley A. Deetz (1992, 191) notes that the differences perceived between female and male emotional reactions within organizations are often treated as products of nature (see also Aries 1996, 164). The American scholar Lisa Frehill (1997, 131) argues that men are assumed to be “mechanically inclined” and not to mind of getting their hands dirty, while women are typically assumed to be lacking such skills. Frehill’s study concerns the United States, but the same phenomenon is apparent in Finland, as well. It is as if women and men were different in some fixed, predictable manner. Thus, gender norms are used as a justification for certain attitudes or actions; in this case, the “norms” are cited as a reason to exclude women from the engine room. An old 2<sup>nd</sup> engineer told me about a woman who had been working with him in the engine room,

Her eyes filled with tears when she couldn’t do something, or didn’t understand. One should have a tough character. One shouldn’t start to cry. (9/96)

It is also worth of asking, why women are barred from *engine* rooms. The Dutch historian Ruth Oldenziel (1999, 10) argues that technology itself is not masculine affair; the idea of men’s native and women’s exotic relationship to technology is only a historical result of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Western ideals. Frehill (1997, 118) carries on Oldenziel’s argument by stating that engineering is a gendered profession. According to her, due to the historical exclusion of women from the profession, engineering as culture is masculine. This does not lead to a conclusion that engineering or technology itself would have a gender. When discussing gendered engine rooms, one has to keep in mind that not all sailors want to exclude women from certain professions. There are opposing views as well, here expressed by a motorman Alekski,

It would be gorgeous to have a female chief engineer or female engineer. It would be great to see how they handle things. (m10)

By saying this, an old motorman stated that he would not mind having himself a female supervisor. Motorman Matti is in line with his colleague quoted above; *It wouldn’t hurt at all to have as a boss a female engineer or a female chief* (m2). Some male seamen

wish that they had women aboard. A seaman from the barge which does not allow female sailors, due to the lack of separate bathroom, states,

It shows, I mean the female nature. They do things what guys don't understand to do, I don't mind women aboard at all. I liked to sail on ships that had women, the atmosphere was quite different. (p6)

### **Personal experiences**

When I was working as an ordinary seaman, I was doing a man's job. Not everyone approved. There were men who considered women unsuitable for sea life and unfit for working on the deck. I asked a ship cook Robert what he considered to be sailors' attitudes towards women at sea,

It gets divided almost in half. Some say that women should stay away from ships. Maybe not anymore, but let's say 15 years ago there were more those who said that no women aboard, or: Let's women get a ship of their own... [Laughs] without an engine or anchor in the middle of Atlantic. (5/96)

Chauvinist attitudes towards women were still robust in that community. This was often apparent in crew members' attitudes towards me. It may well be that a female is more easily accepted into the community when she does something 'feminine' for work, such as kitchen work. A woman working on the deck or in the engine room is often considered a burden by male workers. An example from my field journal may illustrate the case (November 14, 1996): "The winter came today and we had to cover parts of the superstructure of the ship with tarpaulin to prevent ice from clinging to it. Some of the tarpaulins had to be tied up several meters above the deck. The deck and the ladders were icy and, therefore, very slippery. The pump man Jussi I was working with kept grumbling, *The last one is then the tall one and there has to be a tarpaulin too, but you probably can't do it. You make the old man climb up...* I took the tarpaulin and started to ascend the ladders. Immediately Jussi changed his tune, *Hey, be careful... The ladders are really slippery. I can do it. If you get scared just climb down!*

As this incident illustrates, it is thought that women are not physically or mentally fit to carry on the "hard" tasks of men. However, this attitude is questionable, especially in the

light of research which shows that the work in the ship kitchen is physically as hard as or even harder than the work in the engine room (Laine et al. 1992, 1; see Saarni, Soini and Pentti 1996, 29). Aries (1996, 17-18) remarks that beliefs about women and men have power and reality of their own. Therefore, although kitchen work is actually physically more demanding than other work tasks aboard, it is still regarded as work for “weak” women. Women who take on the “men’s jobs” may threaten the fragile manhood that is in danger to topple, as Horrocks (1995) might put it. An illustration of this threat is provided by motorman Pete who told me that having a female engineer as a boss would not be a problem. It would be as OK and normal as having Maria as his officer. But, quite intimidated, Pete says,

Except that I’ve been a bit like: Is this a girl school or needlework club or what is this? When we were on dock and I was in the fore with Tuula and Maria, then I was a shy and quiet boy.<sup>83</sup>(m4)

## Women in seafaring

With pitch and tar her hands were hard  
Tho’ once like velvet soft,  
She weighed the anchor, heav’d the lead  
And boldy went aloft.  
- Anonymous (in Black 1989, 101) -

Kirby and Hinkkanen (2000, 238) remark that historically in the Baltic area it was not uncommon that women took part in seafaring by participating in the actual fishing or working on board the peasant trading vessels. Women were few and far between in the area of seafaring that is now under study; the professional and international sailing. Through history there have been few female sailors working at sea. The studies made on the subject are even rarer, although now the field is starting to recognize the void of studies on women in seafaring (see e.g., Jensen 1995; Cordingly 2001; Creighton and Norling 1996). Also the role of sailors’ wives and families in the seafaring has gained

---

<sup>83</sup> Interview m4. The original quotation in Finnish: Paitsi että tottakai siin on vähän niinku katellu et onks tää ompeluseura vai mikä tää on. Kun telakalla oltiin niin mä olin keulassa niin siel oli Tuula ja Maria, mä olin hiljasta poikaa.

plenty of interest among scholars (see Herndon, Norling 1996; Kaijser 1997; Hinkkanen forth-coming).

Although women have never been great in number in seafaring, they have ended up in the mythical level of sailors and sailing. Dianne Dugaw (1996, 34-54) has conducted a study on female sailors who cross-dressed in order to get to go to sea in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century. They were not allowed to work at sea because of their sex, thus they disguised themselves. According to Dugaw (1996, 35), the “female sailor bold” (she names the female seafarer after a popular song from that era), who cross-dressed and went to sea, was a popular heroine of the early modern era. Dugaw’s study suggests that, as popular heroine, ‘female sailor bold’ had also mythical dimensions. In contemporary popular culture this ‘female sailor bold’ and the myth of sailors have various manifestations, as illustrates the Japanese popular culture’s manga (comic) and anime (cartoon) character *Sailormoon*.<sup>84</sup> *Sailormoon* is a young Japanese schoolgirl who fights for justice and transforms, then, into a super heroine, who dresses in western traditional sailor suit (Grigsby 1998, 59-63). Her co-soldiers in war against evil are *Sailormercury*, *Sailorjupiter* and *Sailorvenus*, among others. The American sociologist Mary Grigsby (1998, 63) argues that *Sailormoon* is a hybrid of Japanese and western cultural motifs. The western cultural component is the mythical sailor—although in this case female—who does not bend under the norms of society. Grigsby (1998, 72) states that “[a]s *Sailormoon*, she is juvenilized adult female that is outside the realm of the work-a-day world in which becoming a mother or wife is an issue.” Therefore, one may argue, the mythical sailor and his freedom have produced, with a gender spin, a Japanese popular product with quite fantastical qualities. Grigsby (1998, 76) argues that *Sailormoon* incorporates more the idealized and stereotypical modern western than Japanese female gender characteristics. This may be true, but Grigsby forgets that also in western popular culture the stereotypical sailor is predominantly a male character and may be a female only as a spin-off.

---

<sup>84</sup> The cartoon is currently shown in the channel SubTV.

The most famous female sailors ever have been pirates Anne Bonny and Mary Read, who have long enjoyed mythical status. Marcus Rediker (1996, 1-33; See also Black 1989, 101-117; Cordingly 2001, 68-87; Paravisini-Gebert 2001, 59-93) has studied from the historical point of view the lives of these two most famous female pirates who also had to disguise themselves as men in order to pursue a career at sea in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century. Anne Bonny was originally from Ireland, but she moved as a child to South Carolina, living and sailing as pirate mainly in the Caribbean in the early eighteenth century (Rediker 1996, 1-33; see also Cordingly 2001, 68-87). She is one of most well-known women in the history of seafaring. Her story has been re-told many times in several publications. Some of them are like Rediker's academic study of Anne Bonny and Mary Read (1996); some are more like children books about pirates (e.g., Hamilton Cochran 1973). Anne Bonny and Mary Read are part of the lore that may assist young girls and boys to pursue a career at sea. Interestingly, Rediker suggest that Anne Bonny herself may had been drawn to the sea, and to piracy in particular, by the popular lore in her homeland Ireland about Grace O'Malley, a pirate queen who in the late sixteenth century raided up and down the Emerald Isle (1996, 11). Thus, a mythical seafaring woman Grace O'Malley functioned as an inspiration for another female sailor with mythical dimensions, Anne Bonny.

## Girls

Today we had MOB-boat drill; we were cruising around the fjord [on the coast of Norway]. The 2<sup>nd</sup> mate kept explaining to me all sort of the simplest things, like "this is a rope". It must be fun for them. They (I mean these old codgers, who call me "girl") do not ask what I know but keep telling me the obvious. It does not bother me that much, though. (November 8, 1996)

This is an extract from my field journal during my time as ordinary seaman. As discussed above, the world of men shows in the titles of sailors. On the other hand, and perhaps as a reaction to it, many women aboard are referred to as 'girls,'<sup>85</sup> regardless of which

---

<sup>85</sup> The tradition of calling women 'girl' may also derive from the history of seafaring. According to American maritime novelist Herman Melville (1957, 57, in Weibust 69, 213),"In merchant ships, a boy means a greenhand, a landsman on his first voyage. And never mind if he is old enough to be your grandfather, he is still called a boy: and boy's work is put on him." In this case, calling me a girl could have

position they hold in the shipboard hierarchy or of their age. One has to keep in mind that while calling somebody ‘girl’ is typical in Finnish, it also functions as a way to belittle someone. This belittling is also practiced by some female sailors, like here by officer Maria, *If the captain yells on the radio that “what the hell you are doing!” you should put up with it, you shouldn’t take it girlishly and get cross.*<sup>86</sup> (x4). In addition, as above-mentioned quote illustrates, some women, as well, seem to use *girl* as derogatory term. Maria, who has worked at sea for almost two decades, sounds like she would not like to have more women at sea,

Now that this shipping company has employed more these female officers, now you have girls all over the place, in every ship. It is not that special anymore. (x4)

### **...and boys**

Men’s world? People always talk about men’s world, but I haven’t yet seen a sole man here. I wait quite eagerly to see what kind of creature it is, this thing called man, I wish I’d see one before I die! (7/96)

A female officer Leena, with 20 years experience at sea, laughed when I asked about being a woman in men’s world. I asked her, what did she consider her work mates to be?

Flat out brats, kids... I think that she who has come up with the saying that men are children forever, she is 150% correct. I mean, they are totally brats. (7/96)

Dismissing male sailors as boys is Leena’s strategy to be able to cope with the prevalent male culture in shipworld. Other strategies will be discussed in the following sub-chapter Women without gender.

### **Glass ceilings of ship**

The female sailors—also those whose job requirements do not include any physically demanding tasks (e.g., officers)—report that, because of their gender, they have difficulty progressing in their career. Leena, who has been a lower level officer for 15 years of her 20 years at sea, says,

---

been just an alternative for a boy. Then again, this theory is undermined by the fact that many women with decades at sea are called girls as well.

<sup>86</sup> Interview x4. Quotation in Finnish: Jos päällikkö huutaa radioon että mitä helvettiä te luulette tekevänne niin kyllä se pitää kestää, ei sitä saa heti tyttömäisesti ottaa nokkiinsa.

I had gone to sea in 1974, and I kept putting the coxswain school off and off, because at the time there were only few women on the deck and the general attitude towards them was cold. So I kept worrying, “what if don’t make it, if I don’t manage as a coxswain.” (7/96)

Finally she decided to go to the navigation officer school. She describes her work experiences as an officer,

When I was offered to my first ship as the 3<sup>rd</sup> officer, the captain told me later that he had asked if there were no other options. He had his bias. And then I have to be much better officer than an average male officer. If a guy is a bad officer, he will still get jobs, but if a woman is a bad officer, she won’t get any job. (7/96)

Leena’s story is a typical example of covert sex discrimination. The American sociologist Nijole Benokraitis (1997, 12) defines covert sex discrimination as, “unequal and harmful treatment of women that is hidden, purposeful, and often, maliciously motivated. [It] refers to male behavior that consciously attempts to ensure women’s failure—especially in educational and employment situations.” Leena tells that the captain ended up offering her a steady job as an officer. But, she remarks,

I am told much easier that “don’t do it like that,” than what would be told to a male officer. But so it is that the old codgers have easier time commenting on women than on other old codgers. (7/96)

A female cook Anna agrees with Leena, when she tells about her hardship in pursuing her career,

It matters that I am a woman. To get promoted to steward seems difficult. They think that it is easier to put women to clean. Women will still do it, unlike men. (s1)

### **Sexual harassment and sex discrimination**

...I am “a woman in man’s world!” Late at night, my first day on this ship; I try to fix the lock of my cabin’s door, for there is no way I’m going to sleep in my cabin as a lone woman on a ship of 17 men, if I can’t lock it. Well, I stand there when a helping hand appears – Sakke is standing in front of me, wet hair with only a towel around his hips, and asks if I’d like to join him for a beer or coke. I refuse to have a drink with him, but he gives me some advice concerning the lock. However, he does it in a loud voice, so that the passersby (and there were some, I

heard the steps) can see and hear him, standing there half-naked, late at night, at my door! Talk about marking territory! (January 18, 2000)

The quote above is an extract from my field journal while working as researcher aboard. The extract illustrates a typical case of friendly harassment. According to Benokraitis (1997, 16), it is “sexually oriented behavior that, at face value, looks harmless or even playful. If it creates discomfort, embarrassment, or humiliation, however, it is a form of subtle sex discrimination.” Many women say that sexual harassment and all types of sex discrimination are more a norm than a rarity on ships (Interviews 1996 and 1999). It is common and accepted fact of sea life that women working there are supposed to keep in mind. When working at sea, I heard a euphemistic story about rape, and other stories were told to convey to me the lines of proper behavior for women working aboard. Unlike in some other male-dominated communities, the moral of the stories was not to warn women away from certain “loose” behavior but to encourage them to be sexually active. A deckhand told me that there used to be a mess girl working aboard who would clean the staircase wearing a short skirt but no underwear. The deck man did not moralize her in his story, on the contrary. As this short story exemplifies, the standards of sexual behavior aboard did not seem any harder on women than men. It was not uncommon that some crew members would tell ordinary-seaman-me that I should not hesitate to ask them for help, if I felt lonely. They would imply that “it was quite normal onboard that those affairs exist between crew members.” Often the parties involved in aboard-affairs have their spouses on land, but the fellow crewmembers usually help to keep it as secret from them. It seems that what takes place onboard does not count, or at least it remains onboard.

In addition to the aggressive sexual harassment, or blatant sex discrimination<sup>87</sup> (such as grabbing and making smutty personifying sexual comments), women are subjects to the constant flirtatious sexual remarks. Women do not necessarily see this as wholly negative. Anna, the female cook, explains,

---

<sup>87</sup> Benokraitis (1997, 5-30) divides harmful sexual treatment of women to several categories: blatant sex discrimination, subtle sex discrimination, covert sex discrimination, condescending chivalry, friendly harassment, and subjective objectification. One does not have to look much around in shipworld, to find traces of all the manifestations of sexual harassment or sex discrimination.

Well, people joke around. And there is always somebody trying to score, almost every day. But you get used to it. (s1)

Such a culture in shipworld functions as a distinctive factor for women. Women remain objects. One has to keep in mind that most women deliberately choose to pursue a career at sea, even that it is hardly the obvious choice for anybody. Therefore the women who have chosen a sea career, and decided to stay with it, have found ways to cope with masculine shipworld. Moreover, not everybody necessarily suffers from excessive male attention. Shipworld remains masculine, taking much more acclimatization for women to enter that world than for men to adapt to the presence of a few women aboard. For instance, steward Ritva told about her experiences of sexual harassment that went on for years. I asked her, did she do something about it. For example, did she tell the captain? Ritva explained,

I waited for it to pass over time. Oh, no. You don't complain about those things. It's part of this life, you see. (s2)

When I was an ordinary seaman aboard, it did not take long for me to get drawn into this reality. I came to accept as normal the dirty jokes, constant efforts to hit on me, and so forth. My reaction, although not necessarily the most effective one, was to laugh through the whole charade of masculine remarks, or, when the talk became too uncomfortable, to say something spiky myself. What else could I do? Later, I wrote in a report that there was "not that much sexual harassment." A colleague reading the draft noticed it immediately. What did I mean by "not that much sexual harassment"? Why did I make it sound as if it was OK? I realized that under those circumstances, life at sea, that is, everything less than harsh grabbing was hardly considered sexual harassment. Actions, which I would never tolerate on land, were somehow more acceptable at sea, probably because I thought of myself as having stepped voluntarily into the men's territory. There were different customs there that I could not change and, hence, it was necessary to adjust. This is in line with the study the American sociologists Richard Harris and Juanita Firestone conducted on women in the U.S. Army. They (1997, 168) conclude that often women define sexually harassing behavior as 'normal,' or 'to be expected' of male-female relations, and therefore do not consider it worth reporting.

As a research worker, my position in the hierarchy played an important role regarding my vulnerability to sexual harassment. Being sent by the shipping company may have functioned as a protective wall against the crew members' advances towards me. If I were seen as a representative of their employer, then a certain distance between me and the seamen would be easier to establish and maintain. Or, so I thought. This is an extract from my field journal (January 24, 2000), written on ship where I was the only woman aboard,

It has been rolling quite a bit now. The deckhand Sakke came here and told me about rolling: it is more difficult to cope with it if you are a woman—especially if you have big tits—because they affect your balance. On the other hand, you can use dick to maintain your balance. This is it: guys are testing me. They are checking that I am a good guy that I can put up with their stories. These are stories that they wouldn't tell to each other. I doubt that the guys talk together about their balancing dicks. Or I don't know.

I was not needed like the crew members; and, I was not going to stay there for long. This made me quite vulnerable to harassment. How much should I tolerate their flirting and sexual remarks? Being brisk and easy-going is considered a necessary virtue if one is at sea.<sup>88</sup> The ability to put up with the remarks about one's physical appearance and behavior is important. Joan Neff Gurney (1991, 59) discusses her experience in a male-dominated fieldwork setting, the police, and particularly her reaction to the sexual remarks,

I felt it was better to respond passively or mildly to such things rather than to make a major issue of them. I wanted to avoid, at almost any cost, doing anything that might damage my rapport with my hosts.

Gurney's outlook is in line with my reaction to the constant sexual remarks. I temporarily adopted a thick skin and decided to stand it all, unless the talk became extremely greasy. This is in line with Alison Spedding's (1999, 17) notion that in 'normal' fieldwork one

---

<sup>88</sup> Weibust (1969, 264) lists courage, virility, and good humor among the necessary and respectable characters of a sailing ship sailor. Rosenström (1996, 129) emphasizes good humor in her study of windjammer era. Again, not much have changed in the seaman culture in this perspective.

may adopt a screen personality that fits in the host culture. For a short time, it was possible for me to pretend to tolerate values, of which in fact I could not approve.<sup>89</sup>

### **Biases on land**

In addition to the difficulties and prejudices women face in shipworld, they often face similar biases on land. I asked Leena about her experiences with the land folks,

In early years of my career, when the sailors had a really bad reputation on land, it was quite a common belief that all sailors were drunkards to begin with and all the women at sea were whores. You can still hear it every now and then. I have been called names, too. Such as hooker or sea whore. But the word can't hurt you. It is indifferent to me if somebody calls me names, as long as he doesn't start to batter. Then I will of course punch him back. (7/96)

Men face prejudices on land as well, but the nature of the biases is quite different for men. Men are thought to be drunkards and tough guys. The image of an alcoholic does not flatter most of people, but the image of a “bad ass” may be quite welcomed by some men.

### **Women without gender**

The crew's day-room, where people come to smoke cigarettes: Sakke tells me—Electrician is there too—about their young female officer who is a good guy. She has learned the ways of the dudes. This is, she knows how to swear, and she can talk fluently about the batteries for dildo. That is, a woman is accepted when she is a good guy, not if she is a good woman. In order to be accepted, you have to employ the dude-discourse. (January 19, 2000)

In ship communities, women's gender is often a problematic issue, as this incident illustrates. Is it so that women cannot be ‘women’ in shipworld? As a response to the chauvinism—both structural and individual—women working aboard often describe

---

<sup>89</sup> There are opposing views to this stand in the anthropology. John Van Maanen (1991, 39) reminds us that neutrality in fieldwork is an illusion; and neutrality is itself a role enactment. Kirsten Hastrup (1995, 91) points out that already in the 1950s Erving Goffman separated the self as character and the self as performer. Today, Hastrup says, the primary concern is not to explain deception, but to comprehend why deception is impossible, for there is no acting apart from the self. Hastrup's argument is important, but it leaves us with the problem of the ‘role’—whether or not it is possible to deceive by enacting a role, we anyway perceive others (and ourselves) to do so. Personally, I find ‘screen personality,’ or rather a ‘temporary thick skin,’ a useful concept while discussing fieldwork experiences, for people—including fieldworkers—do adopt roles of various lengths of time, and use them to filter undesirable experiences.

themselves as genderless and asexual while within shipworld. Ritva, who has 30 years of experience at sea working in the kitchen, describes her coping mechanism against the male dominated shipworld,

In the course of years one becomes like me, perfectly genderless. It is one possible way to survive here. The concept has sort of blurred for me, so I am almost like sexless.

- And when you go on land? I ask, and she laughs:

Then I am quite a normal woman... nowadays it is like two entirely different lives, this sea life and land life. When I get my bags on dock, I transform to a completely different person. Then I am a normal woman. (s2)

In the light of Ritva's story, one may find surprising the results of a study conducted on American female marines. Williams (1989, 6) found that within this non-traditional occupational group the redefinition of womanhood caused a reinforcement of gender differences, not the opposite like this study of female sailors would suggest. Williams (1989, 75) maintains,

The first misconception about women in the Marine Corps that must be dispelled is that they are masculine. For the most part they value femininity and identify themselves as feminine. As one sergeant put it, "I'm a marine twenty-four hours a day, but I'm a woman *always*."

Why there exists such a dramatic difference in attitudes towards femininity and gender? One may first naturally look for the answer in the differences of these occupational groups (sailors vs. soldiers), place and its culture (Finland vs. the US), or era (1996-2000 vs. mid-1980s, although I doubt that this gap would make a great difference). I suggest that other possible reasons could be the probable difference in age of these occupational groups, because the average age of interviewed female sailors was closer to 50, and the female soldiers were probably younger. In addition, shipworld is closed and, therefore, chances of bumping into an outside boss or a new acquaintance are remarkable small. When this is added to the dirty and—in the case of oil-tankers—somewhat fetid work conditions, it is not surprising that sailor women often dress to an old sweat suit or a like. Not an outfit considered to be very feminine at all. Williams (1989, 79) states that marine women do not feel their womanhood to be threatened if they engage in 'non-feminine' activities. I do not believe that this would be the case with female sailors, either. It is not that sailor women feel that they loose their femininity; they do not want to or cannot

express it in shipworld. Rather, I would look for the possible answer for the differences in experienced femininity—together with the above-described possibilities—in the nature of these institutions. It may well be that military is an easier place for women to express their femininity, because of its more formal nature, its public functions (causing more publicity), and the larger units that it maintains. Leena explains her defense strategy in shipworld,

I view this so that when I step aboard I am a genderless creature. I mean everybody can regard me the way he likes... But I have hardly even used such a word as woman while working here. (7/96)

Let us go back to the young female officer who is—according to Sakke—a good guy, a real dude. When we discuss women’s difficulties in adjusting to shipworld, and the possible readjustments they have to temporarily make to their gender, we need to keep in mind the other possible sides of the matter, for example, the concept of *female masculinity*. The American queer theorist Judith Halberstam (1998, 2) states that female masculinity has been ignored both in the culture and inside academia, even in studies of masculinity. She argues that “the widespread indifference to female masculinity, [---] has clearly ideological motivations and has sustained the complex social structures that wed masculinity to maleness and to power and domination.” It is quite possible that the above-mentioned young female officer just wanted to chat about dildos with Sakke and other sailors. Therefore, when discussing women, men, and genders, one has to be wary of not to victimize women and villainize men. According to Halberstam (1998, 15) one should be careful not to insist that masculinity is the property of male bodies alone. Furthermore, is swearing and dildo-chat somehow more masculine, than feminine, by nature?

## 4. Shipworld, worldview and metaphors

You lose half of your life here on ship. You are outside of everything, for young sailors it is absolutely horrible.<sup>90</sup> (s2).

- Steward Ritva -

This is one of the best jobs in the world. You are on the brink of society. When you are here at sea, you are an entity outside the society. That suits me fine.<sup>91</sup> (k3).

- Captain Fredi -

Here are two different viewpoints to the life at sea, first provided by an old steward Ritva, and the other by young captain Fredi. Having discussed the shipworld as context, let us turn to the metaphors sailors use to think and talk about and to make sense of their lives at sea. In this chapter I discuss what kinds of metaphors are used for ship community, and what kinds of metaphors are used to reflect the ship as a workplace. Various types of metaphors appear in the discourse of the sailor interviews. For the purpose of analysis, I group the metaphors into several clusters which illustrate and emphasize the different aspects of shipworld. Some metaphors emphasize the aspects of the ship as a community; others emphasize the ship as a work place. First, I briefly describe the categorization process. I explain how and why I chose the most meaningful groupings for the analysis. Second, I discuss the metaphors about ship community and what these metaphors tell about sailors' worldview. Third, I discuss the other main category, ship as a work place, and how the metaphors reflect upon worldview of seamen.

### 4.1. Analysis process

I found 83 metaphors and 13 other expression regarding shipworld in the interviews I conducted with seamen. Eighty-some metaphors are difficult to handle and make sense of, if one does not group them into meaningful categories and clusters. The categories and clusters I found rose partly from my earlier experiences and from other studies

---

<sup>90</sup> Interview in Finnish: Kuitenkin puolet elämästä menee tavallaan haaskuun kun täällä on. Sitä on kaiken ulkopuolella, nuorelle ihmiselle se on ihan hirveä. (s2).

<sup>91</sup> Interview in Finnish: Tää on yks maailman parhaita ammatteja. Sä tavallaan roikut yhteiskunnan reunalla, siis silloin kun sä pyörit täällä niin sä pyörit yhteiskunnan ulkopuolisena yksikkönä. Se sopii mulle (k3).

conducted on ship communities. I tried consciously not to let them hinder my vision when I formed new categories, trying to inspect my material “objectively” like I had read it for the first time, but still keeping in mind the hints and clues of previous studies.<sup>92</sup>

#### 4.1.1. Abductive method

The method I employed is called abductive reasoning in the philosophy of science. The Finnish sociologist Pertti Alasuutari (1994, 30-31) states that reduction of data, which is part of the analyzing process,<sup>93</sup> is done in two parts. First, the material is reviewed from a specific theoretical-methodological perspective that will steer the researcher to see the substantial to the research task. Second, the materials are further screened out by combining them: Separate unsorted data get combined into a single finding, or a group, by searching for a common aspect or denominator, or by forming a rule, that applies to the whole material. One should attempt to show the chain of reasoning that is used to draw conclusions from the material. The reader should not be left out of the process, to trust the intuition of the researcher, if this intuition will not be explained (Mäkelä 1990b, 3). The Finnish sociologist Jari Ehnrooth argues that the chains of associations can be followed, if they are openly explicated (1990, 40). All of the chains of reasoning may not be necessary to lay out—in order to save the reader—but an example of them would be appropriate. Abductive reasoning states that new scientific findings are based on some kind of lead, or a clue. According to the Finnish sociologist Martti Grönfors (1982, 33), new theory is not created only through inductive reasoning – some kind of clue or a basic principle is needed to steer the researcher’s attention to discover something new, and to focus on certain aspects. Therefore, intuition has a remarkable importance in the analysis process (see Ehnrooth 1990, 37). The abductive reasoning will be illustrated here with an example: I had “freedom” in mind as a lead, when I began the analysis of

---

<sup>92</sup> In practise, my method was to write every single metaphor or saying down on a separate piece of paper. Then I would lay them all on the floor and start to form and try out different groupings. After doing this for a while, almost all metaphors had found their place. Then I would name the clusters after one of the predominant metaphors in that group. Of course, these groups would transmute and be under constant inspection also after the categorizing process.

<sup>93</sup> Klaus Mäkelä (1990a, 57) is largely in line with Alasuutari when stating that the identification of an analysis unit is already in itself a part of the interpretation process. According to Jari Ehnrooth (1990, 40), in qualitative methodology interpretation takes place in all phases of the analyzing process; in processing the material, in categorization, and in the actual analysis.

the material. The sea has often been perceived as a source of adventure and freedom in the sea literature and previous studies of sea life. Therefore, I looked for traces concerning “freedom of seas:”

I went to sea to experience adventure and to roam around the world. The first years were sort of that what I was looking for.<sup>94</sup> (7/96)

- Leena -

~ ~ ~

There is a saying that kids were enchanted by Malmsten<sup>95</sup> to go to sea. These kids would come here with their romantic ideas about sea life. All sea romance has been washed out of me long time ago.<sup>96</sup> (3/96)

- Hans -

This led me to ponder, why sailors do not leave the seas behind?

If I had brains, I wouldn't stay here; I would have a job somewhere far away from here. (1/96)

- Lars -

~ ~ ~

I have sometimes wondered, whether I am cursed with a sea. I've been here forever... what else the sea is if not a curse?<sup>97</sup> (6/96)

~ ~ ~

Sailor does lottery. Sailor puts his money in lottery tickets so that he could leave the seas. To get out of here.<sup>98</sup> (3/96)

- Hans -

This led me to look for evidence of involuntarity:

It is a prison yard you see from the window. It is really quite closed. (p4)

- Teemu -

~ ~ ~

This is voluntary prison. (5/5)

- Robert -

~ ~ ~

This is a golden cage. (k8)

- Tommi -

---

<sup>94</sup> Interview 7/96, quotation in Finnish: Sitä lähti et pääsis seikkailemaan ja kiertämään maailmaa ...ekat vuodet vastaskin tavallaan sitä mitä meriltä haki.

<sup>95</sup> Georg Malmsten was a popular singer of the 1950s who had several “sailor songs” in his repertoire.

<sup>96</sup> Interview 3/96, quotation in Finnish. Ennen sanottiin että Malmsten laulo merelle ku tuli uusia jolppeja romantisine kuvitelmineen...kyl mul on romantiikka jääny aikaa sitten maihin.

<sup>97</sup> Interview 6/96, quotation in Finnish. Olen sitä joskus ajatellut, että onko meri kirous...kun olen täällä niin pitkään ollut...että mikä se meri on jos ei kirous.

<sup>98</sup> Interview 3/96, quotation in Finnish. Merimies lottoaa. Merimies lottoaa, toiveenaan et sais lopettaa merillä. Pääsis pois täältä.

And so on. Grönfors (1982, 37) argues that abductive method recognizes that the researcher's attention may focus on something she finds important, for one reason or another. This does not imply that the researcher would study her material just in order to find what she wants to find. In abductive reasoning a lead, or a hypothesis, can be discarded or modified in whichever phase of the research one is in (Grönfors 1982, 37). Alasuutari (1989, 36) notes that what was detected will be reviewed as possible allusions of a larger system. On the other hand, individual observation will be explored in order to find support for the theory; these two models shift during the analysis. For example, the prison theme was a frame—or a construction—that would help to understand the interdependence between people, things, and actions (see Alasuutari 1986, 31-32). But how to know which interpretation is correct? According to Alasuutari (1994, 132), the interpretation is valid if it provides a logical explanation to why the group members act and talk the way they do.

After studying my material from different perspectives, and by applying the abductive method, I came up with a few main clusters of metaphors. These clusters—graveyard, nuthouse and prison, home, island, another life, machine, and journey—were needed for handling the extensive data. Some of the metaphors and sayings were fit to more than one group, while some were hard to place anywhere. Some of the clusters house plenty of metaphors, while sometimes only two sayings have got their own cluster. Why? I believe that these clusters are the most useful ones – this is not a quantitative grouping style. Alasuutari (1994, 32) notes that qualitative analysis attempts to form rules or rule structures that will apply to all material.

It is not always easy to determine which bits of discourse are metaphors and which are not. If we employ the metaphor as a representative for other tropes (see Chantrill and Mio 1996, 171-172), we will get away from demarcating, for example, *slavery* or *dictatorship*, as exaggerations rather than metaphors. *Another life* fits into the most basic definitions of metaphor, “the essence of metaphors is understanding one kind of thing in terms of another (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 5),” but *another life* could be interpreted as another trope, exaggeration, as well. Whatever the case, *another life* is clearly figurative

language. But what about our other example, *closed authoritarian society*? One may first be eager to state that it is certainly not a metaphor, but rather a sprout of a theoretical analysis of ship life. If one looks carefully, the part *society* is clearly a metaphor, and *closed authoritarian* can be seen as a quite accurate perspective, or as an exaggeration of the subject. Therefore, it is debatable with some expressions, whether they are metaphors in the strictest sense of the concept, ‘metaphors’ (including all tropes), partial metaphors, or other expression that are not metaphors at all. I list these other expressions in appendix, because they are used in the analysis process as supporting material for the metaphors. Many of them are not metaphors but simple similes, or hyperbolic comparisons – figures of speech, that is. It is worth noting that some of the sayings which sailors use are quite analytic, for example *institution*, and *industrial process*. These sayings I do not include to the actual list of metaphors, but I use them to support the analysis of sailors’ worldviews through metaphors. Some metaphors are quite strong and perhaps even polemic: *prison*, *graveyard*, *nuthouse*, and *home*. This is not the first time, or era, when sailors use such metaphors for their ship. Marika Rosenström’s study (1996) of the Finnish sailors in the 1930s and 1940s reveals the same discourse. According to Rosenström (1996, 114), due to the compulsory intimacy aboard, the sailors compared their ship with everything from a “home” to a “prison.”

#### **4.2. Ship community and ship as a workplace**

When I examine the clusters, two categories seem to form: the ship community and the ship as a workplace. To keep things clear, I use *category* to refer to these two main categories I found in the material. *Cluster* is reserved for the groupings of metaphors which I formed in order to get the grip of the extensive material. These two categories are quite motivated groupings for the ship metaphors. First, people go on board primarily to work; second, the nature of the profession requires that they have to live aboard ship. As noted earlier in this paper, Erving Goffman (1961, 15-16) names this type of establishment a total institution: a place for living and working where a number of like-situated individuals spend a lengthy period of time together, isolated from the wider society. Goffman (1961, 17) continues by remarking that, in modern society, the basic

social arrangement is such that an individual usually sleeps, plays, and works in different places, under different authorities, and with different co-participants. In total institutions these different spheres of life conjoin. The division between ship community and ship as a workplace is arbitrary due to the nature of total institutions, but it has to be made because the division between work and free time is one of the basic organizers of human life.

#### 4.2.1. Home, Nuthouse, Graveyard: Ship community

These metaphors focus more on the ship community, not as much on the ship as a work place, although there is some blurring between these categories, because of the above-mentioned characteristics of total institution. Some examples of the most predominant metaphors that are grouped into this category are *village*, *prison*, *home*, *family*, *space shuttle*, and *graveyard*. Altogether, in the interview material there are 70 different metaphors and sayings about ship community. I group them here under different clusters. Furthermore, I divide the metaphors under two subtitles: metaphors about space or condition—for example, kindergarten or funeral—and those about agents—for example baby or cog in the machine—both workers and bosses. This division is important, because it turns the attention to the relationship between people-metaphors and place-metaphors. Sailors produce metaphors about the place where they live in. For example, they use the machine metaphor, and one could argue that, because of it, they end up seeing themselves as cogs in a machine. According to Lakoff and Johnson, metaphors are self-fulfilling prophecies; therefore these kinds of cognitive consequences are important (see Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 156).

#### **Ship is Graveyard**

<i>Space or condition</i>
Funeral
Graveyard
Mess

There are messes that are like being in a funeral when you come for the breakfast. It doesn't take more than one man to spoil the mess, if he's away people chat all right. (1/96)

This is how a 1<sup>st</sup> mate Lars with 20 years at sea reflects on different types of mess rooms. Ship is a *graveyard*, where the atmosphere is as in a *funeral*. I will discuss here this cluster of metaphors, and how they reflect the worldviews of seamen and their living environment. Graveyard and funeral are strong and negative metaphors. It is difficult to comprehend why people use such deathly or macabre metaphors for their living environment. Yet, metaphors are culturally shared; and, we can use that which is commonly shared when we describe the metaphors that are used in analysis (Gordon, Lahelma and Tolonen 1995, 6). Therefore, I can feel quite safe to describe the graveyard as silent, dead, nothing moving. One does not meet anybody anywhere. It is a negative expression, but the commentator can at least move freely around – the expression does not indicate any limitations but the lack of company and liveliness. The graveyard metaphor rises from the hollow or mean-spirited ship community, but it has historical background, as well: in the windjammer era, the middle watch from midnight to 4 a.m. was sometimes referred to with the slang term *graveyard watch* (see Weibust 1969, 50). It is most likely that the sailors who used the graveyard metaphors approximately 250 to 100 years later in my study, did it subconsciously to the former usage of the term.

Nowadays it is walking in a graveyard, you can't find anybody anywhere... everybody has their own gadgetry in their cabin, and there they sit and sulk then. (21/96)<sup>99</sup>

Officer Jouko, with 40 years at sea, compares the sea life to his early sailor years. These metaphors are often used when the sailors compare the life at sea some 20 or more years ago to the present. Back in a day there used to be many more workers aboard. Therefore, the mess-room and the other areas of the ship were livelier. The space dimensions of shipworld play a role in graveyard metaphors. Ship is a closed space where there are no outsiders or passers-by promenading around. In addition, as explained in the chapter

---

<sup>99</sup> Interview 21/96, quotation in Finnish. Nykyään on ku hautausmaalla liikkuis, ketään ei näy missään... jokasella on omat vehkeet hytissä ja siellä mökötetään sitten. Gadgetry/vehkeet refer to the VCR and television.

Shipworld, space is divided hierarchically on ship. Two mess-rooms and highly specialized and divided working hours cause situations where crew members end up spending their leisure time alone. For example, after my watch from 8 p.m. till midnight, I would go and have late snack in the workers' mess. Simultaneously, the first officer had his sandwich in the officers' mess. Due to the hierarchical division of space, I could not go to his mess, and he was not always quite that comfortable in going to workers' mess. We often ate alone.

The mess-room, or mess, is a special area in amidships which is dedicated to eating. Often the dayroom is located together with the mess, forming a larger integrated area for eating and leisure time. In some newer ships there is only one mess for the whole ship crew, but it is more common to have separate messes for the officers and the workers. Mess is a social space which can be described as *good*, *bad*, or *dead*. Weibust (1969, 451) describes how windjammers were called brave, friendly, kind, strong, or selfish, vicious, brute, and such. "Happy ship" was an often used term. Although these descriptions were mostly used to describe the ship as a whole (i.e., seaworthiness, management and the atmosphere of ship), the tradition of today's sailors to call a mess good, bad, poisonous, or dead can be traced to this convention of windjammer era. Mess is a metonymy, or, more precisely, a synecdoche, where mess replaces as part-to-whole the entire ship and, even more so, the ship community (see the previous chapter on metaphor theory; Chantrill and Mio 1996, 171-172). In this sense, mess can be placed in the same cluster; although, strictly speaking it is a metonymy, not a metaphor. Such expressions like dead mess or mess goes bad, justify the examination of "mess" with metaphors, and in this cluster of metaphors. For example, a cook Robert described the mess during his last working period,

Two, three guys can poison the atmosphere. Mess air becomes heavy as poison, I wanted to hang myself. (5/96)

Graveyard, funeral and (good, bad, dead) mess metaphors reflect negative insights on sailors' worldview. Ship community is not lively, but fosters apathy. Helve (1987, 17-18) notes that worldview is in constant interaction with the environment, therefore changing gradually. Ship community has not always been seen in the light of graveyard metaphors.

In earlier days ships were livelier due to the larger and younger crews and fewer options to spend relaxed time in one's own cabin (cabin mates, no televisions or VCRs). In fact, graveyard metaphors have most likely emerged to describe this shift in shipworld. To employ Helve's (1987, 21-22) five dimensional worldview model, these metaphors reflect the affective dimension of worldview that contains experiences and feelings.

Graveyard metaphors, as noted above, have most likely emerged to illustrate the shift in shipworld that has taken place in last three decades. Seamen often longingly recall the times when no one would have called mess a funeral. These metaphors are far apart from the mythical freedom of sailors that has been discussed earlier; no parties, no booze, no adventure, nothing what Kalle Aaltonen would have enjoyed. Joel Feinberg (1973, 12-14) divides constraints—or lack of freedom—into positive and negative, plus internal and external restraints of freedom. Nobody forbids a seaman to spend time with ship mates on his free time, thus there are no external positive constraints for him to be with other sailors. Today, the lack of available shipmates prevents him to do so, resulting an external negative constraint. A first officer explains, *I spend my time here alone. I don't go to mess. Nobody is there.* (f4).

### Ship is Prison and Nuthouse

<i>Space or condition</i>	<i>Agents: Workers</i>	<i>Agents: Boss</i>
Boy camp	Ward	Shepherd
Hotel	Baby, Child	
Institution	Mite, Wretch	
Kindergarten		
Nuthouse		
Waste plant		
<b>Root metaphor: prison</b>		
Behind bars	Prisoner	Prison guard
Cell		
Cubicle		
Golden cage		
Jail		
Open prison		
Prison		

He is a child forever,

said cook Kalle, who is in his early thirties and has worked approximately ten years at sea, when I asked him to describe a sailor. How is that? I asked him to continue,

I believe that when sailors are aboard they do not grow older during that time. That they get older only when they are on vacation. They are in a boy camp here, among people like themselves, so they don't grow up here. They miss always a half a year in their age, every year (s6).

The metaphors of custody vary widely. Ship is a *boy camp*, *prison*, and *nuthouse*. Inside these institutions there live *wretches*, *babies*, and *prisoners* who are looked after by a *shepherd* or *prison guard*. I will discuss these metaphors in relation to shipworld, metaphor study, and the worldviews of seamen. Some metaphors are positive, some negative – what is common to all of them is that they are about custody and closed space. For example, a boy camp could be described as brisk and funny; all sorts of things happen there. A kindergarten can be fun too, but the emphasis is more on the childishness of the fellow crew members. In other words, kindergarten emphasizes the sailors' inability to co-operate and their egocentricity. A baby is a step further back; he is helpless. A shepherd, on the other hand, tends other, and thus to use shepherd metaphor indicates that one puts himself above others. This latter metaphor was, quite expectedly, used by a captain about himself. I will first discuss these metaphors and then turn to *prison* as a root metaphor.

Ship is an institution. You get pea soup on Thursdays, you have regular meal times, and your sheets get changed frequently (k3),

Captain Fredi explicates. The more negative examples of these custody metaphors are an institution<sup>100</sup> and nut house. An institution is for helpless mites, persons under guardianship; full service is provided and necessary. A nut house has bizarre inmates – nut house as a metaphor gives an unorganized impression. *Nuthouse* is loaded with negative connotations, having a judgmental tone. Nuthouse metaphor is sometimes also used in an affectionate manner to describe the life in the ship community. Nuthouse then

---

<sup>100</sup> In Finnish *hoitolaitos*.

is more a humorous remark about one's living conditions. It has been discussed previously that humor and metaphor share several similarities (see Pollio 1996, 233-251). Humor and metaphor can be seen as alternative ways to express a meaning, and as the nuthouse example illustrates, it is not always possible to determine water tightly, whether an expression is either metaphor or humor. I would rather suggest that examples like nuthouse (in its latter, non-judgmental use) are humorous metaphors.

This cluster, with both positive and negative metaphors, is a continuum; boy camp, shepherd, kindergarten, baby, institution, mite, nuthouse, wretch. One sees the situation as a cheery boy camp; another perceives the same as a nut house. Metaphors of custody arise from the highly organized and standardized living conditions of ship and lack of ability to exit. Ship is supposed to provide a worker with everything he needs—or is thought to need—while on board. I asked a chief engineer, how he saw the ship community and ship as a workplace.

I don't know, I haven't been in a nuthouse or a prison yet, but I guess it is something between them.

I demanded an explanation, so the chief engineer gave me one,

I have sometimes joked that I wouldn't take it that bad if I'd get five years in some labor camp, it wouldn't be any worse than here. I would get to vacation from there, I'd know that it does not swing anywhere. I would get to go to watch video at five at my leisure, and come for breakfast in the morning. [---] I think this is something between those two. I mean one gets here a bit—I bet I get too—but when I look at those codgers of my age from the workers' mess-room, they are badly institutionalized. Absolutely no initiative, except when it is time to go on vacation, or to eat. (c10)

Sailors often talked about their institutionalization. According to most interviewees, sailors tend to get more or less institutionalized during their years at sea. This is, because seafarers *live* on board. Aubert (1965, 239) notes that all institutions, including ships, have to take care of “all” needs of a group member for long periods of time. It is quite natural that seamen feel institutionalized, if their food is served ready for them (without them deciding what, when, or where they eat), if the sheets are changed by others, and if

their living conditions are defined by the shipping company and the sea traditions (e.g., the location and size of the cabin, and the place in the sitting order of mess). There is another side to this institutionalization of ships, because someone has to provide it all, *If the hotel gets some satisfaction from giving the boot at midnight to someone...*,<sup>101</sup> (5/96). A cook Robert called ship a hotel, quite ironically, when we discussed the drug and alcohol policy of the shipping company. Robert works in the kitchen and does not get the “benefits” of hotel, for he provides the services for others. Therefore he utilizes evaluative ironic rhetoric as he discusses his position at sea.

As noted above, the metaphors of custody have a background in ship’s nature as a total institution. Therefore these metaphors are often about other institutions like kindergarten, nuthouse and boy camp. Nuthouse metaphor, in fact, relates to Goffman’s (1961, 4-6) other group of total institutions; some total institutions are established to care for persons who are judged to be both incapable of looking after themselves and a threat to the community, even though the threat is unintended; e.g., mental hospitals. Kindergarten and boy camp are very close to Goffman’s first group of total institutions; institutions that are established to care for harmless persons whom are considered to be incapable of caring for themselves. The concept of total institution is reflected also in other metaphors in this group. These are metaphors that describe the inhabitants of the afore-mentioned institutions: *baby, child, ward, mite, and wretch*.

The nuthouse metaphors could be viewed as allegories as well as metaphors. These metaphors fall into the seventh communication goal introduced by Katz (1996, 4-7): metaphors are used to fade out essential dissimilarities, in order to persuade the audience. Katz’s example is “Saddam Hussein is the Hitler of our era.” In this sentence the intent is to obscure the significant differences between modern Iraq and 1930s’ Germany. Thompson (1996, 194-195) notes that metaphors have consequences for action because they are able to frame issues. Therefore it is by no means indifferent if the crew members of a large oil-tanker view themselves living in boy camp or kindergarten, and their

---

<sup>101</sup> Interview 5/96, quotation in Finnish. Jos hotelli siitä jonkun tyydytyksen saa, et se saa puolenyön aikaan antaa lempu...

supervisors perceive them as babies or mites. Nuthouse metaphors reveal significant aspects in worldviews of seamen. These metaphors emphasize both helplessness and irresponsibility of sailors. The former is about seaman's inability to have influence over his own living conditions, and thus over his own life. The latter—irresponsibility—is in line with the Jack Tar/Kalle Aaltonen notions of seaman masculinity. Sailor is in a boy camp aboard ship, he does not grow older while he is at sea, for he lives with men like himself. In one sense, to spend life at sea with other like-minded happy-go-lucky sailors is a manifestation of masculine freedom.

There is a deep ambivalence between these two aspects of shipworld which the nuthouse metaphors reflect. The freedom-prison dichotomy is dominant in this group of metaphors. Prevalent metaphors manifest how people view the world and construct their reality, Dilin Liu (2002, 8) says, because frequently used metaphors not only reveal the conceptual systems of speaker, but also constantly reinforce his worldview.

### **Ship is Prison**

It does good to get outside, that you don't have to stay behind bars, for couple of hours<sup>102</sup> (13/96),

A 1<sup>st</sup> engineer tells about his short evening leaves. Prison is an extremely negative metaphor; it is hard to find anything good in it.<sup>103</sup> In a *jail*, *golden cage*, or *open prison*, a *prisoner* lives in a *cell*, *behind bars*. Perhaps only death would be more negative in this context of metaphors. In order to understand such an ultimately negative metaphor, we will rely on the common image of prisons, rather than the prison statistics and facts (see Gordon, Lahelma and Tolonen 1995, 6). Prison metaphors are among the most popular metaphors in the material. Prison metaphor was the major revelation of my study for master's degree thesis. I had gone to the field to study sailors' worldview; I came back with the prison metaphor analysis of ship community. Therefore, I had already tested its power when I set out to conduct research for my Licentiate. The material collected for

---

<sup>102</sup> Interview 13/96, quotation in Finnish. Tekee hyvää päästä kaheks kolmeks tunniks rautojen sisältä ulos.

<sup>103</sup> As an anecdote, in traditional jail-jargon of Finland, the dormitories of prisons are often called by the maritime term hold or bay (ruuma in Finnish), this is also the case in English.

this research supports my previous prison metaphor analysis. Prison was not the only metaphor found in the material and I have therefore tried to be careful to not let it steer or hinder my focus.

You don't have to be here. But, in a sense, this is a golden cage. (k8)

Captain Tommi explicates his view on ship. Prison is a root metaphor for other metaphors like *cell*, *cubicle*, *golden cage*, *behind bars*, *jail*, *open prison*, *prisoner*, and *prison guard*. Metaphors have a significant role in forming worldviews, because they are our tools in comprehending the world. George Lakoff (1990, 47-48) studied root metaphors like *love as journey*. The metaphor involves understanding one domain of experience, love, Lakoff says, in terms of a very different domain of experience, journey. Lakoff maintains that the use of both *source* domain and *target* domain is tightly structured, and therefore the ontological correspondences are employed by such a metaphor like *the relationship isn't going anywhere*. Prison metaphor has entered the conceptual system, and now it gives birth to new metaphors, prison being the source domain and ship community the target domain. A motorman says,

There is nothing fun here except that you have to be here if you want to eat.<sup>104</sup>(m7)

Prison metaphor is one of the traditional metaphors for ship which has been used widely already in sailing ship era. Rosenström (1996, 136) argues that *isolation/freedom* was one of the main dichotomies of sailing ship communities. This dichotomy, which is very closely related to freedom-prison dichotomy, partially explains the popularity of prison metaphor; the ideal of freedom, which is associated with sailor life, and the routine of shipworld do not meet. *You can't really call this a prison, this is actually worse after all*, says the captain. How come? I ask, because claiming ship to be worse than a prison is quite a strong statement.

Because everybody is here in their own free will. And because you can always run away from prison, but here if you run away at sea that means that your life is over then, too. That you jump over the brink.<sup>105</sup>(k10)

---

<sup>104</sup> Interview m7, quotation in Finnish. Ei tääl oo mitään hauskaa muuta ku et pakko olla et saa leivän.

The captain names two reasons to claim that ship is worse than prison. First, there is the paradox of going willingly to a prison-like environment. Second, to escape the ship at sea means to commit suicide—to jump over the brink—while one can runaway from prison without facing a certain death. In my fieldwork at the oil-tanker in fall 1996, the interviewed seamen constantly referred to their ship as a prison. There were other metaphors in use, too, but prison-metaphor was the most popular one. Furthermore, it worked when I tried it out for analyzing my field material. When analyzing my material by using prison metaphor, I found several reasons for the use of it: First, the cultural traditions of seafaring, and seeing their gradual transformation, were factors in the birth process of prison metaphor. As discussed before, the time and space dimensions of shipworld contribute to prison metaphors, because one's location in time and space are by large dictated by the organization, not by one's own will. Second, the discrepancy in the myth of freedom and the realities of shipworld was one factor. The highly organized and standardized shipworld clashes with the images of free-roving Jack Tar/Kalle Aaltonen. Third, the characteristics of total institution and the organizational structure of ship played vital roles as well. In Goffman's (1961, 4-6) grouping of total institutions, prison is in the third group, in which a total institution is organized to protect the community from those who intentionally endanger it; the welfare of persons sequestered in these places is not a major issue. After ten ships I noticed that the prison metaphor was not a golden key to open up all ship communities. The interviewed seamen used several other metaphors, too. The ship was a *submarine*, *kindergarten* and *spaceship*, as well as a *prison*. Interestingly, it seemed that in some ships no one said anything about prison, and in others it was a common frame of analysis for everyday life onboard. Why? There may be many ways to explain this. First, ship communities differ in their atmosphere, so it is natural that seamen use different metaphors to conceptualize it. Secondly, crew members often spend a lot of time together, so they may have come up with a metaphor which has stuck to their discourse. Third, they have heard or read somewhere, how ships get often

---

<sup>105</sup> Interview k10, quotation in Finnish. Ei sitä nyt ihan vankilaks voi sanoo, pahempihan tää loppujen lopuks on. – Minkä takii? – No tääl on jokainen omasta vapaasta tahdostaan, ja se että vankilasta aina saattaa päästä kyllä karkuun mut täällä se karkaaminen merellä ollessa tietää sen et se loppuu kokonaan elämä siihen, et hyppää yli syrjän.

described and use that metaphor. Fourth, when it comes to the prison-metaphor, there is historical background for combination of prison and ship: there used to be a formula for taxpayers who worked at sea – the same formula was used in prisons and other institutions as well. It is possible, and probable, that all these explanations are partly true. Nevertheless, I argue that the prison-metaphor would not live in discourse if it was not a valid and meaningful frame for analysis of everyday life onboard.

Here it is good occasion to remind us again that metaphors allow us to examine and discuss our objects from several perspectives by employing alternative sets of images, but they do not reproduce mirror-like representations of the objects they characterize. Therefore the same ship community can be characterized by using metaphors that seem to oppose each other – like *kindergarten* and *prison*. They highlight different aspects of that social reality, and may exist simultaneously. They both also share the inability to leave, because they are closed. Few images are as totalizing as prison. Therefore prison metaphors make a strong communication point.

By emphasizing certain aspects of reality, and thus forcing others to the background, metaphors may create social realities for us. If sailors employ prison metaphor to reflect on their ideas about shipworld's hierarchical structure, it may create a social reality that expands beyond the original phenomenon, the source of the metaphor. Then the prison metaphor which was originally meant to reflect the shipboard hierarchy may, for example, distort sailors' view about their options for leisure time activities aboard. Thus, a metaphor may be a guide for future action. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 156) state that such actions will naturally fit the metaphor, and this will, in turn, reinforce the power of the metaphor to make the experience coherent. In this sense metaphors can be self-fulfilling prophecies. Therefore, it is significant what kinds of metaphors seamen use in conceptualizing their ship communities. If they employ prison metaphor, certain type of outcome is more probable to occur than if they were engaged with circus metaphor, for example.

Due to prison metaphor's extreme negativity, sailors sometimes deny it: *This is not a prison for sure...* Why does this metaphor earn a negation? Because it is too true? Prison metaphor is so powerful that the interviewees, who do not see ship as a prison, want to emphasize it. Not everybody, of course, sees shipworld as prison, but this explanation alone does not clarify why one does not just skip the metaphor. This is in line with Rosenström's (1996, 136) isolation/freedom analysis; the tension between imprisonment and freedom—which is so salient in shipworld—has to be somehow coped with. Freedom-prison seems an internal relation, built in to many aspects of shipworld.

Prison metaphors reveal a significant dimension in worldview of seamen, as nuthouse metaphors do. They belong to the same group, emphasizing different hues of the same spectrum. Ship is prison for sailors, but how come they choose a life in prison? Motorman Aleksi had told me that he viewed ship as prison, I asked him for how long he had thought so? *For quite some time now*, he said. Why you didn't leave the seas then, I asked. Aleksi answered,

I am so used to this. I take it easy, I keep it calm. I think about vacation. That's why I'm here (m10).

A worldview changes over time. Personal experiences shape the worldview; therefore worldview is ongoing developmental process, not only a socialized set of beliefs (Helve 1987, 17-18).

There is a strong tension between freedom of seas and prison of shipworld. A chief engineer states, *Prison is easier place than this, prison doesn't sway* (c8). Another chief engineer, Hans, laughs explaining ship and prison,

The difference is that here you close the door behind you yourself. They say that the difference is that here you close the door yourself, when in prison someone else closes it behind you. (c7).

This freedom-prison dichotomy plays a vital role in sailors' worldview. Prison metaphors quite naturally emphasize the prison pole of freedom-prison axis. As Helve (1987, 20) notes, worldviews are full of inconsistencies and therefore it is possible that seamen have such a strong ambivalence as freedom-prison dichotomy dominant in their worldview.

Freedom is a vital value in sailors' self-image as discussed in the chapter Shipworld. Values and value systems are part of one's worldview (Helve 1993, 89; Niemi, Nurmi & Vauras 1986, 80).

Manninen (1977, 16) argues that if the layers in the worldview of an individual or group conflict each other or lack unity, the situation should be seen as a conflict between different worldviews, not inside one worldview. According to Manninen, a worldview may have layers that seem to contradict each other, but even so the worldview consists of certain principles that unify the layers into a logical—or sometimes illogical—whole. I cannot quite agree with Manninen, because I find freedom-prison dichotomy highly ambivalent, but prevalent and deep-rooted part of sailors' worldview. There is no two rival worldviews fighting in one's head. The freedom-prison axis which is ambivalent and creates tension is a dominant part in sailor worldview. Kearney (1984, 52-64) divides illogical elements of worldview to two categories: external and internal inconsistencies. External inconsistencies occur when worldview assumptions are not in check with the reality. Examples of this are the shift from geocentric to heliocentric cosmology that took place due to the findings of Nicolaus Copernicus and Galileo Galilei in 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, and the shift—that is still to take place in some fundamental communities—from creation myth to evolution theory. Internal inconsistencies result from the contradictions among the assumptions of one's worldview. Kearney's example draws from Christian worldview. On one hand, there is an omnipotent benevolent God. On the other hand, there are evil forces roaming around the world causing suffering. How can an omnipotent and benevolent God allow this? Kearney says that worldviews have a tendency to seek consistency. It has to be also noted that often these inconsistencies do not overly bother the people who hold them. Freedom-prison dichotomy creates an internal inconsistency in the worldviews of seamen, although sailors do not necessarily consider this on a conscious level.

### **Ship is Home**

<i>Space or condition</i>	<i>Agents: Boss</i>	<i>Agents: All sailors</i>
Apartment building	Village chief	Family

Company housing Home Village community		Village nutter
--	--	----------------

The first three years in this ship the only thing what I did on land was to go to the dock... You get institutionalized. You are afraid to leave your safe work environment, when you come back your home has ran away.<sup>106</sup> (7/96)

Leena, a female sailor, grins, with couple of decades experience at sea. In a *home, village community*, or *apartment building*, there is *family*, but also the *village chief*. These metaphors are mostly positive metaphors about ship life. The metaphors of family and home emphasize the interdependent roles of crew members aboard: In a home you know your family members, and you are expected to give them a hand (to a some extent). Sailors may help each other, there may be the “father” to look after others, but everybody is in charge of one’s own life. Metaphors of family and home are not about custody. Rather, they are metaphors expressing security. Shipmates often spend some of their leisure time together and they may do favours to each other. Some become friends and keep in touch also when they are on vacation. Leena’s use of home metaphor is humorous, but it is not ironizing rhetoric (see Sakaranaho 1998); she is not trying to undermine the metaphor of ship as a home, instead she laughs at herself when she realizes that ship has become a home for her. Many use home metaphor for ship without irony. An old boatswain, with nearly 40 years at sea, remembers his old ship, *Oh, Tiira... Leaving that ship behind after twelve years was leaving home* (m9).<sup>107</sup> A young custodian, with only three years sea experience, states what she thinks about ship,

It’s so boring on land, I always want back to work. All my friends are here. I could just sail, I’m not interested in vacation (s9).

Home is an often used metaphor for ship. Therefore—like prison metaphor—it has also earned negation. Many interviewees put emphasis on the notion that they did not perceive ship as. A steward Ritva explains her view, *This ship is not homelike, people come here to work. They don’t spend much time together.* (s2)

<sup>106</sup> Interview 7/96, quotation in Finnish. Ekat kolme vuotta tässä laivassa niin ainoo mitä mä kävin maissa niin oli kaijalla... sitä laitostuu. Ei uskalla lähtee turvallisesta työympäristöstä mihinkään, kun tulee takas niin on koti karannut.

<sup>107</sup> Interview p9, quotation in Finnish. Eihän se Tiira... kotoonst ois lähteny kun kakstoista vuotta siel oli.

*We are one big family* (k7), declares Timo who is a captain. I can hear a touch of irony in his voice. Timo's "one big family" consists of approximately 15 grown-ups, whose life aboard is dictated by the rigid shipboard hierarchy. A boatswain has a firm opinion about the idea of family; *I wouldn't want this kind of family for sure* (p10). Captain Timo and boatswain employ family metaphor as a part of ironizing rhetoric. As in ironizing rhetoric (Sakaranaho 1998, 49), they aim to undermine the idea of ship community as a family. This use of family metaphor indicates that captain and boatswain are not very happy with the "family" they have got on ship.

Jussi who has approximately 30 years at sea, working now as a pump man, reveals his leisure time activities, *I'm in my cabin, the company housing, and read.*<sup>108</sup> (p7). Company housing is an ironic account by the pump man, who lives in one of the smallest cabins aboard; in the home provided by company there is always a touch of hierarchy. Company housing, again, is ironic speech like home and family metaphors often are. Katz (1996, 4) states that the informative or evaluative nature of communication may determine whether the speech is ironic or metaphoric. According to Katz, the evaluative-informative dichotomy, however, does not always serve as a satisfactory divider of metaphoric and ironic speech. Katz (1996, 3-6) states that, actually, the communication goals of metaphor and irony often overlap. Therefore, according to Katz, the distinction between ironic and metaphoric communication goals is more a matter of emphasis than of type.

This has changed you see, it is not anymore cozy here. You don't know others anymore, this is living in an apartment building.<sup>109</sup> (y5)

First engineer Yrjö views his life at sea. In an apartment building people live close to each other, but they do not spend much time together or know each other well. Perelman's (see 1979, 92) view of metaphor as condensed analogy works here well: On ship one does not know his crew mates anymore, because times have changed and people

---

<sup>108</sup> Interview p7, quotation in Finnish. Oon hytissä, työsuhteasunnossa, ja luen.

<sup>109</sup> Interview y5, quotation in Finnish. Tää on menny kato ei tää oo mukavaa enää sillä tavalla, etä tääl ei enää tunne toisia, tää on kerrostalossa asumista.

go to their own little cubicles—the cabins—to spend their leisure time and don't socialize with others. In apartment building one does not know his neighbors anymore, like one used to know in village communities, because times have changed and people go to their own little cubicles—the flats—to spend their leisure time and don't socialize with their neighbors. This metaphor can be interpreted in the same way as the funeral and graveyard metaphors. They all refer to the notion that in days of old there used to be more liveliness in shipworld. Now both the number of workers and the time spent in harbors are cut to the minimum. Naturally this has its consequences in the social life aboard as well. Thus apartment building is a kind of negation of the home.

A village community is a closely related metaphor to home; although, it puts more emphasis on the organization. There is a hierarchical structure in the village; there are the villagers, the village chief, and a village nutter (often the unofficial scapegoat). In addition, in most parts, village is independent from others. A captain views the ship community, *This is a small village community, someone may try to poke a bit from outside, of course, but it does not have much effect. Things go on their own pace anyway.* –And what are you in that village community? I ask, to which the captain answers firmly, *The village chief.* (k9)

Village, family and home can also be interpreted as manifestations of seaman identity. In this approach, concept of sailors as a big family or a village is part of sailors' worldview. This approach gets more support when we discuss metaphors of 'Ship is island'. Home metaphor separately may also be viewed through sailor identity and worldview: seaman's home is ship and the seas. Then apartment building metaphor is a negation of home, emphasizing the loneliness of one's life in today's shipworld. Is home freedom? For Malinowski, it is. Home and village metaphors emphasize the stability, organization and security of shipworld. True freedom, that is, freedom of order and organization, Malinowski (1964, 29) says, is found in organized human societies. As noted before, this is not necessarily the freedom of ordinary people, and even more so, not the freedom of sailors who have often gone to seas in search for something quite different than the organized everyday life of land.

## Ship is Island

<i>Space or condition</i>	<i>Agents: All sailors</i>
Bottle	Bogeyman
Space shuttle	Psychopath
Satellite colony	Race of its own
Island	Tribe of its own
Oil rig, Fire brigade, Lodge	Forested
Fetus (umbilical cord)	
(Closed community, closed space)	
(Small community)	
(Closed authoritarian society)	
(Miniature model of society)	

These people are totally unable to break the mold. Crowd here is so forested. They live in 1950s, they haven't followed the progress.<sup>110</sup> (11/96)

Captain Timo explicates on his views about his crew. Ship is closed; it is isolated, enclosed both in good and bad, nothing permeates it or leaks out of it. Kearney (1984, 92) notes that when we deal with the space dimensions of the worldview, we focus on the relationship between the environmental space and people's images of it. Ship is closed *bottle, space shuttle, oil rig, or island*, and it fosters a *race, or a tribe, of its own*, i.e., *bogeyman*. When ship is characterized by metaphors related to isolation, it reveals features concerning both social and work place aspects of ship. This is natural, because in a total institution it is not possible to separate the social and work realms. Closed community, divided physically from others by sea, emphasizes the independence of the community, and the interdependence of its dwellers.

A ship is a miniature model of society. It is a little satellite colony, one has to act independently... and the umbilical cord is the shipping company. (k5)

A captain explains his view on the ship. Ship is self-sufficient, or seems to be such, as *miniature model of society* and *satellite colony* suggest. It is not that simple, however, as the captain reminds us with the *umbilical cord* that suggests ship to be a *fetus*. Even

<sup>110</sup> Interview 11/96, quotation in Finnish. Nämä ovat niin kaavoihin kangistuneita. Nämä ovat niin mehtiintynyttä porukkaa vielä tänä päivänä. Ne elävät 50-lukua, eivät ole menneet kehityksen mukana.

though ship appears to be independent, it needs both supplies and a reason for existing from outside. Because ship represents society in its semi-independence (a miniature model or a satellite), it is also hierarchical. These metaphors put emphasis on the organization of shipworld, in a closed space there is no anarchy. This is often the case on an island as well – it is an isolated place where people know each other, it is a miniature society. A chief engineer deliberates,

Ship is an island, small crowd there, you can't get away. (c1)

Because shipworld is isolated and closed, it has given rise to special “races” of humankind; such as a *race of its own*, or more precisely put, the *bogeyman*. I asked a boatswain to tell me about the sailors.

Well, it is a race of its own, you know. He is like... a sailor who has spent all his life at sea and has never done anything else, well, he is not able to do nothing else either. So, he is quite stubborn. An old boatswain, he has only spliced and sewed tarpaulin, he can't do nothing more. And paint. (p6)

And motorman Alekski says,

Sailors are a race of its own, so that they can stay here. Not everybody survives here, it takes good nerves (m10).

Captain Tommi from another ship agrees with his description about sailors:

All older sailors are more or less weird ... There is always a border, the border of privacy and... They are bogeymen.<sup>111</sup> (k8)

Tommi continues by explaining the history behind the species of bogeyman and the other expression which he brings in to the conversation, psychopaths:

I believe that you need balls to take off and come here. [Back in the day] to go to sea demanded that you would “jump ship” and leave your home. And I think it still takes that, if a person goes to sea it demands that... Some people say that all sailors are psychopaths. I mean, the positive way, psychopaths.<sup>112</sup> (k8)

---

<sup>111</sup> Interview k8, quotation in Finnish. Kyllä kaikki vanhemmat merimiehet on enemmän tai vähemmän omalaatuisia sillai niinku et... tietty raja pidetään aina semmonen yksityisyyden raja ja muuta... et sillä lailla mörköjä.

<sup>112</sup> Interview k8, quotation in Finnish. No mun mielestä se vaatii kuitenkin tietynlaista skrebaa et lähtee tänne. Se vaati [ennen vanhaan] sen et sä hyppäsit pulkasta pois, toiseen pulkkaan. Ja kyllä mun mielestä viekäksi vaatii sen, et jos ihminen lähtee merille niin kyllä se vaatii sen... Et joku sanoo et kaikki merimiehet on psykopaatteja. Siis positiivisessa mielessä psykopaatteja.

Most sailors claim that their way of life demands a special character. For some, it is a touch of craziness: madman, crazy, psychopath (I mean the positive way!). For others, it is toughness. The stereotype of masculine sailor plays a role here (see chapter Shipworld). The isolation demands the qualities of a hermit. On the other hand, the tight group life of a total institution takes an ability to adapt. All in all, when these demands are combined with the long periods the sailors spend at sea, the opinion of a steward that she would not recommend the ship life to anyone seem quite understandable,

This job demands a special nature, this is lonely work. Staying for half a year out there, it takes its toll. (s5)

If one considers this cluster of metaphors from the viewpoint of work place, the isolation and comprehensiveness are emphasized. The ship is a closed and self-contained entity; the hierarchy is rigid and stable. In isolated places responsibility is emphasized, because nobody will help you there, you are alone, no fire-department to call on. This is one of the major reasons why solidarity is among the characteristics of sailor ideal (see chapter Shipworld). A chief engineer analyzes his view of ship,

It is very hard to place among other phenomena of world... hm, perhaps a space shuttle. There you float in your own world and you can't get much help... there you are stuck, until you get down to orbit or ashore. It is very small, closed, and condensed group. Sometimes you have to consider carefully whether you say "Morning" or "Good Morning" to someone.<sup>113</sup> (c6)

Several metaphors in this cluster—oil rig, fire brigade and lodge—can be viewed as analogies of ship (see Perelman 1979, 92). As noted earlier (see Chantrill and Mio 1996, 171-172), metaphor is often viewed as a representative of all tropes. I use metaphor as representative of all figurative speech.

This group of metaphors reflects the independence from and the interdependence of others in worldviews of seamen. On one hand, once when you leave the harbor behind, you are on your own. You are free from the chains of land life. On the other hand, you are very interdependent with other crew members. Everybody on board is needed, and

---

<sup>113</sup> Interview c6, quotation in Finnish. Ei sitä voi sijoitella mihinkään oikein muihin maailmanympyröihin... no ehkä avaruussukkula sitte... siel ollan omineen sitten, kunnes sitten päästään alas tai täältä päästään rantaan. Et siin on sitten vaan hyvin pieni suljettu suppea piiri. Että sanooko huomenta vai hyvää huomenta, että sitäkin pitää joskus harkita.

anybody on board can blow (literally, when it comes to oil-tankers) the whole thing up. These metaphors reflect the closed conditions of shipworld, as prison and nuthouse metaphors do. The difference is, however, that while in prison and nuthouse one is helpless victim, on island and space shuttle one is an active actor, responsible and able to have impact on his surroundings, to a certain extent. Hence, Michael Kearney's (1984, 5) notion on worldview's relationship to reality is crucial,

A worldview is linked to reality in two ways: first by regarding it, by forming more or less accurate images of it, images that mirror the world; and second, by testing these images through using them to guide action. By being put into action faulty images are corrected and brought more into line with the external world. And of course in the process of acting, of getting on with making a living, the actors modify the world they perceive.

Therefore, it is not indifferent, what kind of worldview seamen have, because it effects their action in both everyday work and in crisis situations. Furthermore, their worldview influences the world surrounding them.

These metaphors do not reflect the freedom aspect of shipworld, because they emphasize the closed qualities of ship. Bottle metaphor, however, is a positive account, describing the negative freedom, freedom from big crowds, as motorman Matti says,

Ship is a bottle, [---] I don't like to hang out with big crowds anyway, this is small gang but it does not trouble me at all. (m2)

### **Ship is Another life**

As a family man, to be always half of the time away. That has bothered me for a long time. (s3)

- Steward -

<i>Space or condition</i>
Another life
Different world

It is good life to be on vacation at home and be left in peace [laugh]. To be able to do what one wants to do. [---] The other half is not that good life. (17/96)

I got this answer, when I asked a chief engineer, how he would define a good life. Ship is *another life*, in a *different world*. The metaphors in this cluster refuse to describe shipworld. They indicate that shipworld is so special and it differs so much from the land life that only such totalizing metaphors can grasp its essence. Kirby and Hinkkanen (2000, 186) note that the inability of the landlubber to comprehend shipworld is a deep-rooted belief among sailors, because to go to sea is to enter another element which is unpredictable and dangerous, and it takes special skills and knowledge to sail the seas. Another life and different world are not metaphors an sich, but figures of speech. In the metaphor communication goals provided by Katz (1996, 4-7), they fall into the eighth category, where metaphor is used to clarify or illuminate a concept when literal language fail to do so.

When sailors talk about living at sea, one can detect several ways to, and viewpoints of, sailor life. Life itself is an ambiguous concept in shipworld. First, there is a view into ship life that it is not life at all. Leena states,

When I go on land I get the urge for living, because here I feel all the time that I'm missing something. The urge for living and for having fun and doing crazy little things. (7/96)<sup>114</sup>

Leena does not feel that she is alive while aboard. Then when she goes ashore, she has to take back the lost time, she needs to live. Kirby and Hinkkanen (2000, 215) state that sometimes sailors, upon returning home, saw their sailing lives with new eyes and even came to the conclusion that all the years of sailing in fact formed an empty hole in their lives. Why does Leena choose to stay in a place which deprives her life from her? She explains, *I am here because when I am off-duty, on vacation, I am 100% free. It suits me and my lifestyle very well.* (7/96)

Second, there are metaphors which emphasize the abnormality of sailor life. In most cases, the emphasis is on the characteristics of total institution that prevail in shipworld.

---

<sup>114</sup> Interview 7/96, quotation in Finnish. Ku menee maihin tulee semmonen tarve elää, ku täällä on semmonen tunne jatkuvasti läsnä että täällä menettää jotain. Tarve elää ja saada rillutella ja rallatella ja nauttia elämästä ja tehdä mitä hassuimpia tekosia.

A captain deliberates; *This is not human life at all. It is so that you are isolated here all the time, after all. This is by no means a recommended way of life.* (k10).

Third, there are metaphors that put emphasis on two almost totally different worlds that co-exist in sailors' lives; one at sea, the other at home. These metaphors illustrate that shipworld is wholly different; thus, there is no use for partial explanations of life at sea. As a 1<sup>st</sup> engineer explains, *Aboard there is a deviant lifestyle, totally different world.*<sup>115</sup>(y1)

Ship has been represented as its own world also in literature. Here is an extract from C. Holmqvist's novel *Under Segel* (1966, 182 [in Weibust 1969, 166]):

Everyone, from the captain down to the youngest cabin boy, was very upset by what had happened. Of course it was understandable: a ship is a world of its own, in which death often brutally and almost visibly snatches a comrade.

This other life, existing in shipworld, is different from the first one that is on land. One major reason for the dramatic division of sailors' lives into two is the working period. It is always very clear whether one is at work or not, and these two spheres of life—work and home, family—do not meet.

For me this is another life, because this gets divided clearly, so that one is at home when I am on vacation, and another one is here. (c4)

For many sailors this distinct division between work and rest of the life suits well. Often it is one of the major reasons for pursuing career at sea. What do 'another life' and 'different world' tell about worldview of seamen? In sailors' worldview life gets divided into two halves that do not meet. There is a land life, and there is a ship life which is object of this study. Without the clear distinction between these two lives, to examine worldview of seamen regarding shipworld would be impossible. This distinction is a crucial factor in worldview of seamen. In Helve's (1987, 17-18) five-dimensional worldview model these metaphors reflect the cognitive dimension of worldview. 'Another life' metaphors represent two sides of freedom-prison dichotomy. On one hand,

---

<sup>115</sup> Interview y1, quotation in Finnish. Laivalla on poikkeava elämäntapa, perin juurin erilainen maailma.

this other life represents prison, a lack of freedom, as several chief engineers note, here in Hans' voice, *This is half a good life* (3/96).

I would like to go to work on land, but there are no jobs there where I live. I am jealous of others' lifestyle. Me, I loose the finest part of summer swaying here on board. (y3)

This view is wide-spread among sailors. On the other hand, 'another life' also represents freedom, lack of constraints. It is Berlin's negative freedom from chains of land: as officers Leena and Jouko note above, their lifestyle allows them to be free. This approach goes in hand with Malinowski (1964, 29), who states that freedom arises from the organization of society. In case of Leena and Jouko, they organize their life in such a manner that one half they work aboard ship and the other half they are *100% free* and can live the way they like – which, of course, is a great exaggeration.

There is also another type of freedom from land chains that is also negative freedom in Berlin's terms. Pump man Jussi explicates,

I am always ready to leave to sea, I have a ready-packed rucksack waiting next to my bunk (p7).

Jussi's notion reflects what Swedish anthropologist Klas Ramberg (1997, 61-71) has noted about sailor's life. According to Ramberg, absences and partings tear seamen away from society.

There is also a third type of freedom of 'another life' at seas. One may establish a whole full life at sea that is fully apart from his life on land. An example is provided by a middle-aged officer, married for long time with wife who is not a sailor. He has also lived for years with a crew member from the same ship, sharing his life with her while on board. Therefore, the officer has two lives with two life companions in two different places. He exercises his positive freedom to establish another family in his other life.

These freedoms may not meet the requirements established by philosophers. They are, however, freedoms as these people—the sailors—experience them. 'Another life'

metaphors emphasize both ends of freedom-prison dichotomy: for some ‘another life’ is prison, for others it provides freedom on land, and yet for others it is a source of freedom at seas.

#### 4.2.2. Space shuttle, machine, journey: Ship as a workplace

All together, there are 36 different metaphors about ship as a workplace in the interview material (some of them over-lap with the other main category of metaphors – ship community). Morgan (1986, 13) notes that by examining an organization through a metaphor, one can learn something new from the organization. This is why I examine the metaphors which sailors use for their workplace. Especially, in the case of such a rigidly organized structure as shipworld, the organizational dimension of metaphors plays an important role. Work is an essential part of sailors’ worldview; after all, work makes them seamen.

#### Ship is Machine

<i>Space or condition</i>	<i>Agents: Workers</i>	<i>Agents: Boss</i>
<b>Root metaphor: machine</b> Factory Production line work Industrial plant, power plant Labor camp Ballast (Industrial process) (Establishment) (Productive unit)  Dictatorship Slavery Talking to the wall	Machine Engine Job of a robot Number Cog in a machine  Slave Ragamuffin Dog	Office desk Executive  God, Lord Khalif Old codger Clown Lion Madman

I do not find this important in a sense that if I am not here, someone else will always do the job ... this is an establishment. (y5)

Yrjö answered, when I asked him, whether he finds his own work meaningful to him. The first engineer refers to one of the basic features of mechanistic organization: the parts of the machine—the workers—are interchangeable. Then I asked a pump man, if he believes that his work is meaningful or important. He said, with a touch of irony in his voice, *Well, someone has to take the garbage bag to land* (p10).<sup>116</sup> Here we can detect the outcome of organizations as machines which is discussed in the chapter Shipworld. Machine metaphors of ship are such as *industrial plant*, *oil rig*, and *labor camp*. A worker does *production line work*, being merely a *cog in a machine*, or an *engine*. A worker is part of an organized effective machine; he is not required or encouraged to be innovative.

Gareth Morgan (1986, 30) argues that the modern workplace produces apathy, negligence, and lack of pride. This is especially the case with mechanistic organization. Therefore, the lack of pride for one's own work—which is apparent in previous quote of a pump man—can be seen as a result of the mechanistic approach. Or, as Morgan (1986, 30) calls it, a byproduct. Morgan continues by stating that mechanistic organization discourages ambition; it, rather, encourages workers to obey orders and not to question what they are doing. This cluster of metaphors goes hand in hand with Max Weber's theory of organizational structure: organization is a machine (see Miller 1995, 29-31; Weber 1922). This is easy to perceive in a captain's notion about his crew and drinking parties,

For a month people have been working very hard. The engine has to be greased sometimes as well. (k1)

Morgan (1986, 27) claims that machine metaphors are an inevitable outcome of mechanistic organization. According to Morgan, metaphors create always partial ways of seeing, and thus, understanding organization as a rational, technical process, mechanical metaphors tend to underplay the human aspects of organization. By playing up the mechanistic view, it overlooks the fact that the tasks facing organizations are often much more complex, uncertain, and difficult than the tasks performed by machines. These metaphors illustrate the feelings that workers have when their capabilities are

---

<sup>116</sup> Interview p10, quotation in Finnish. Jonkun ne on aina roskatki vietävä maihin.

underestimated. In addition, machine metaphors may illustrate the change in maritime traditions. Here an old 2<sup>nd</sup> engineer describes the new sailors (as compared to those of his era), *These are produced on a conveyor belt, these are machines.* (9/3)

Ship is like a workplace. This is an industrial plant moving at sea. I don't see this as a ship. This is an installation which is moved from one place to another (s3).

A steward, with approximately 20 years experience at sea, responded when I enquired to what he would compare a ship. As discussed above, there is a firm foundation for such extensive usage of machine metaphors. Therefore, it is not surprising that machine has become a root metaphor (see Lakoff 1990) for several other metaphors of this cluster: job of a robot, engine, and cog. Furthermore, factory, production line, power plant, and industrial process are loci for machine and thus descendants of the 'machine' root metaphor. Engine and cog are synecdoche of machine, which in turn is a metaphor for ship (see Chantrill and Mio 1996). These metaphors function as reifying rhetoric for mechanistic approach to ship organization.

Machine and factory metaphors emphasize the hierarchical structure of the organization. Sailor's place in the organization is to be *cog in the machine*. Therefore, the *machine* root metaphor has not only resulted the various machine metaphors, but also other metaphors as reaction to it. When an organization does take into account the mental input of its workers and thus reduces them into engine parts, the workers perceive the situation as dictatorship or slavery.

Everybody knows that it is a total dictatorship onboard, there is no democracy. It is the captain who decides..., whether he does like something or not.<sup>117</sup>(p4)

Teemu, who works as a bosun aboard, reflects his views on ship as a workplace. In hierarchy—which some call dictatorship and slavery, while others choose to refer to it as herding—the emphasis is mostly on the organization members. Therefore, most of the metaphors in this cluster are about sailors. Here again, not all sayings in this group are strictly speaking metaphors. For example, dictatorship can be viewed as a well grounded

---

<sup>117</sup> Interview p4, quotation in Finnish. Kun sen hyvin tietää että laivoissa on täys diktatuuri, tääl ei oo demokratiaa, ei voi sanoa. Se on päällikkö kun ...jos häntä ei miellytä.

sprout of analysis regarding ship hierarchy. Then again, dictatorship works here as a metaphor: it highlights certain aspects of shipworld, forcing other aspects into the background (see Morgan 1986, 13). These metaphors also emphasize that ship as a workplace is closed space. One cannot get out, for a cog in a machine is not master of his own work. In this sense dictatorship and slavery are closely linked to metaphors of nuthouse and prison; the former emphasize ship as a workplace, the latter ship community. God, lord, khalif, old codger, clown and madman are carnevalistic and contemptuous notions reflecting workers' attitudes towards their superiors. When workers' possibilities to participate in the decision making processes of ship organization are reduced to minimum, it is quite natural to steam out the frustration by employing carnevalistic names.

What does machine as a root metaphor tell us about worldview of seamen? Sailor is part of a machine, an interchangeable unit. Interchangeability often leads to one feeling disposable as well. This breeds contempt, and is reflected on sailors' worldviews. They are part of the international pool of sailors, and may be replaced by seamen from another country if shipping company decides to flag out its ships.

Seaman is often named after his work position. Few engineers are named 'Engineer', but in shipworld often the only name a boatswain hears for himself during his entire work period is 'Boatswain'. Being boatswain also determines his cabin, place in a sitting order, and locker, as well as his working hours and positions. This ultimately affects his identity and view of the world. Shipworld's hierarchical structure permeates every area of ship community. Manninen (1977, 16-17) includes into his worldview model the structures of society, nation and state. These metaphors of machine reflect seamen's view on their position in the ship, and thus also in larger society.

Metaphors of machine, at the first sight, do not seem to reflect any kind of freedom. Mostly machine metaphors emphasize worker's small and largely helpless role in effecting his environment. Parts of machine are not supposed to think by themselves but function as part of a greater system which they do not need to understand. How could one

be free, if he is just a cog in a machine? Being part of a machine can be liberating too, however. Boatswain from a cargo ship ‘Finnfellow,’ where I was as an apprentice when I started my career at sea, told me that he put his brain into a glass of water when he stepped aboard, like you would put your denture for the night. He would take it out again when he went on vacation. He said he did not need his brain for work so he gave it a rest. One does not have the freedom to be innovative in work, but one is free to let the brain sleep.

There is also another kind of freedom which derives from the same source. You may be free from yourself, momentarily. You give yourself to a greater cause. I have experienced this on my work at sea. Once when you step on board, you surrender your own will and needs, and become part of ship functions. You are to work and to be waken up for work any hour of a day, you eat when there is time for that. This kind of experience may be close to the spiritual and inner freedoms that Patterson (1991), Berlin (2000) and Malinowski (1964) discuss. I do not say that it is a religious experience, but it may be very liberating.

### **Ship is Journey**

<i>Space or condition</i>	<i>Agents: Boss</i>
Bus Car Freight train Space shuttle Old-timer moped Gig Canoe Pail Finnish summer	Tour leader

Ship is a hybrid of a power-plant and a freight train nowadays (k6), a captain says. In a journey one is in a *car*, *space shuttle*, *old-timer moped*, or *freight train*. It is a *gig*, which needs a *tour leader*, because *you never know what happens next*.

Journey metaphors are mostly used by the engine crew, although other sailors use these metaphors occasionally as well. The engine crew is specifically responsible for keeping the ship moving. Therefore, they often call the ship with the names of other moving vehicles like space shuttle and bus. Another group of sailors that has contributed to this cluster is the crew of a barge with work of slightly different nature than other vessels under study; they talk about gigs. This is because their vessel waits for long periods in a harbor and then when they work they push long hours. A motorman from this ship says, *A gig. When we are at work, we work, but otherwise we have long holidays.* (p6)

*This is a cozy relaxed old-timer moped, old gang and simple low-tech.* <sup>118</sup>(c7), chief engineer Hans says. He describes the ship as an instrument, a tool, which will take us where we want to go, and which has to be maintained. 'Old-timer moped' is also a simile, where Hans pairs his old oil-tanker to a moped. This is an extremely technical perspective that underplays the social dimensions of shipworld. By using this kind of technical metaphors and sayings, the engine room crew also emphasizes the importance of their role on the ship.

I would recommend this work for friends, at least my workplace travels (x4), an officer Maria states, whose former job was office work. Journey metaphors illustrate mostly the aspects of ship as a workplace – although the ship may travel through the seven seas, the ship community and life onboard remain static. A ship constantly sails from harbor to harbor, but this traveling loses its meaning to sailors. Thus journey is not the journey a landsman would think of: often the workers do not know where they are going to head this time when they step aboard ship. Sometimes they do not even care; if the ship stays only for hours at harbor and you work for that time, why would you care in which country you are in? A steward says,

I think ship is a good workplace. It is always going somewhere, and you are here and then you get to be on vacation (s4).

---

<sup>118</sup> Interview c7, quotation in Finnish. Tää on tämmönen mukava rauhallinen pappamopo, vanhaa jengii ja yksinkertainen vanha tekniikka.

There is an ironic account by a captain, who calls himself a *tour leader*. Other somewhat ironical or dismissive names for an oil tanker are a *canoe* and a *pail*. This habit is known to the sea literature as well. Mikkelsen (1954, 12, in Weibust 1969, 139) writes in his novel *Fra Hundevagt til Hundeslaede*, “She was a real ocean greyhound... not a tea-tray, not a wash-tub like this one. [---] It wasn’t dog food, as it is in this floating poorhouse!” The line between humor and metaphor has been approached by metaphor theorists: humor is only able to emphasize the barrier, not to dispel it (see Pollio 1996, 233-251). ‘Pail’ and ‘canoe’ are ironizing rhetoric, for they aim to undermine ship’s prestige (see Sakaranaho 1998). One has to keep in mind though, that ironizing rhetoric, as well as undermining the message, also reifies the metaphor, because by using certain metaphor one sets up a certain schema. Therefore, even if the metaphor’s message is criticized, this criticism takes place inside the schema of that metaphor.

*Ship is a Finnish summer, you never know what the next day will bring with it* (f3), says a first officer reflecting upon his work at sea. The metaphor of Finnish summer may first appear out of place. However, first officer’s view of the ship shows that it is essentially about journey: in both Finnish summer and journey one does not know what will happen next, what kind of adventures the next moment will bring with it. Journey metaphors reveal the adventurous elements in the worldview of seamen. Ship sails the seas and you never know where you go next. As noted above, this element, although existent, is not prevalent factor in journey metaphors.

#### 4.2.3. Bride, woman: others

<i>Space or condition</i>
Bride
Woman

Ship is a woman, back in the day the ships had women’s names, and I guess it is also old beliefs. (m6)

- A motorman -

Ship is a bride. I like to be on board. (k1)

- A captain -

It was at first quite hard to categorize these rare metaphors or sayings in sailor discourse like “Ship is a bride” or “Ship is a woman”, because they did not fit into either one of the two main categories (ship community and ship as a workplace). These woman metaphors seemed way too easy or light-hearted. After listening to various prison, machine, and nut house metaphors, bride seemed to be coming from yet another reality. One may not dismiss clashing views or material which does not fit in the analysis, because the basic principles of qualitative research do not allow such a maneuver. These metaphors are good reminders that the metaphors of ship are not always negative or harsh. Both bride and woman are in accordance with the tradition of English language to call a ship she. Therefore it may be that their use rises from this tradition. Weibust (1969, 35) claims that all sailors with no exceptions called a sailing ship she. In the sea literature the sailors have often been described having some kind of romantic feelings towards the ship they are working aboard. Therefore calling ship a bride may illuminate the personal feelings towards ship. This image leads to the idea of bruto-romantics which Marika Rosenström (1996) has discussed in her study. Sailors do have also romantic aspects in their worldview, ‘bride’ being a good reminder of that. Bride may illustrate both freedom and constraint. One may feel free to be able to sail on her and take care of her. On the other hand, one has to take care of her for being stuck with her in the Atlantic. It is implied that he is wedded to the ship.

#### ***4.3. Worldview of sailors***

In this sub-chapter I answer my last research question regarding the metaphors, which seamen use to discuss their life at sea, and what they tell about the worldview of seamen. The sub-questions are: Is freedom-prison dichotomy part of sailors’ worldview? How does freedom-prison axis show in worldview of seamen? What are the other prevalent features of contemporary Finnish seamen’s worldview? These questions are by large discussed amidst the metaphor analysis earlier in this chapter, so I now review that analysis and discuss further the freedom-prison dichotomy and other features in the worldviews of contemporary Finnish seamen.

#### 4.3.1. Freedom – Prison dichotomy in worldviews of sailors

Is freedom-prison dichotomy part of sailors’ worldview? The above-described analysis of shipworld metaphors strongly supports the research hypothesis; in the worldview of seamen, there is a freedom-prison dichotomy. Freedom-prison dichotomy was found in all metaphor groupings that were formed in the material. This is discussed in more detail in the next sub-chapter. The second sub-question of the research task was: how does freedom-prison axis show in the worldviews of seamen. Here is an easy-to-grasp simplified analysis of freedom-prison poles in the shipworld metaphors. I will discuss here all the clusters individually.

#### Freedom – Prison

	Freedom	Prison
Another life	X	X
Island	(x)	X
Nuthouse, prison	(x)	X
Machine	(x)	X
Graveyard		X
Home	(x)	(x)
Journey	X	
Bride	X	(x)

**Another life** represents here both prison and freedom. Another life reflects prison in a sense that life in shipworld is quite different, or it is not life at all, because one has to live in prison-like institution. The metaphors in this cluster broadly describe shipworld. They indicate that shipworld is so special and it differs so much from the land life that only such totalizing metaphors can grasp its essence. When sailors talk about living at sea, one can detect several ways to, and viewpoints of, sailor life. Life itself is an ambiguous concept in shipworld. First, there is a view into ship life that it is not life at all. Or, as first engineer puts it, *This is not normal life, always half a way from home* (y9). ‘Another life’ metaphors represent two sides of freedom-prison dichotomy. Another life represents prison, a lack of freedom and livelihood. As an engineer says,

You start to get the feeling that you lose something, when you spend long periods here at sea, that maybe it would be better to be on land (y2).

How can another life, then, represent freedom? This is possible, because metaphors like another life and different world assume various types of meanings in shipworld. For some, they mean prison, but for some they represent the lifestyle that differs from landlubbers and, thus, provides an option to the suffocating work schedules on land. As Jouko says about land jobs,

I don't know...I'm useless on land and fatal at sea. I couldn't even imagine of working on land from 7 till 4, every day. It suits me fine that one time you are here, and other time you're free.<sup>119</sup> (21/96)

Another life, therefore, also represents freedom, lack of constraints. It is Berlin's negative freedom from chains of land; therefore this lifestyle allows the sailor to be free. This approach goes in hand with Malinowski (1964, 29), who claims freedom to arise from the organization of society. Sailor can organize his life in such a manner that one half he works aboard ship and the other half he is *100% free* and can live the way he likes. To be 100% free is naturally a grand illusion, but the sailor can free himself from some of the wearisome routines of the landlubber life.

In sailors' worldview life gets divided into two halves that do not meet. There is a land life, and there is a ship life. Without the clear distinction between these two lives, it would be impossible to examine ship worldview of seamen. This distinction is a crucial factor in worldview of seamen. In Helve's (1987, 17-18) five-dimensional worldview model these metaphors reflect the cognitive dimension of worldview.

When you go to sea you are not bound to the land tube anymore. You see, on land systems are based on laws and such and you swing in that tube, you go to work do your job and go home at night. Now you come here on board, you leave the harbor behind and at the same time you kind of leave that tube of society behind.<sup>120</sup> (k3)

---

<sup>119</sup> Interview 21/96, quotation in Finnish. En minä tiedä, maissa mitään tekemätön ja merellä hengenvaarallinen. En mä osais kuvitellakaan että oisin maissa 7stä 4ään töissä päivittäin. Mulle sopii tää että ollaan täällä yks aika ja toinen sitten vapaalla.

<sup>120</sup> Interview k3, quotation in Finnish. Kun sä lähdet laivalle niin sähän et oo enää tohon ns. meidän maaputkeen sidottu elikä jos sä katsot niinku maissahan rakentuu järjestelmät tiedätsä lakeihin ja asetuksiin kaikkiin tämmösiin, sä pyörit siellä niinku siinä putkessa koko ajan sä pelaat siihen et sä meet duunin teet

Freedom side of freedom-prison dichotomy shows also in captain Fredi's explanation of sea life. This is another type of freedom from land chains that is also negative freedom in Berlin's terms. Fredi's view reflects what the Swedish anthropologist Klas Ramberg (1997, 61-71) noted earlier about sailor's peripheral location. According to Ramberg, absences and partings tear seamen away from society. This is not solely negative phenomenon, Ramberg says, because periphery is a twilight zone where one is free from the totalizing control of the centre. Thus, sailors experience more freedom due to their peripheral locus. This idea is in sharp contrast with Malinowski who sees freedom rising only from organized society. The third type of freedom of 'another life' at sea is to establish a whole full life at sea which is fully apart from the life on land. A middle-aged officer, with long-lasting marriage on land, has also lived for years with a crew member from his ship, sharing his life with her while on board. Therefore, the officer has two lives with two life companions in two different places. He exercises positive freedom by establishing another family in his other life. These freedoms may not meet the requirements established by philosophers. They are freedoms as the sailors experience them. 'Another life' metaphors emphasize both ends of freedom-prison dichotomy: for some 'another life' is prison, for others it provides freedom on land, and yet for others it is a source of freedom at seas.

**Bride** is a metaphor that at first does not seem to fit any analysis of shipworld. Besides the most obvious interpretation—ships are women—it also draws attention to the romantic side of ship culture. Therefore, it may be interpreted as an expression of romantic freedom often linked with seas. As an old captain says, *Ship is a bride. I like to be on board* (k1). In the sea literature the sailors have often been described having some kind of romantic feelings towards the ship they are working aboard. Therefore calling ship a bride may express the personal feelings towards ship, bruto-romanticism (see Marika Rosenström 1996). As 'bride' suggests, seamen do have also romantic aspects in their worldviews. Bride may both illustrate freedom and constraint. One may feel free

---

määrätyt hommat tuut himaan illalla. Nyt sä tuut tänne näin, sä lähet laiturist irti sä lähet siitä yhteiskuntasiteestä määrätyllä tavalla irti.

and be proud of his ship, and be happy to be able to sail on her and take care of her. Then again, one has to take good care of her for fear of being stuck with her in the Atlantic. He is wedded to the ship.

**Island.** Metaphors in this cluster are various and popular. Mostly they emphasize the prison-likeness of shipworld. One cannot get away when one wants to, because ship is closed and isolated place. This may bring frustration to sailors' lives. A chief engineer deliberates, *Ship is an island, small crowd there, and you can't get away* (c1). 'Closed' may, somewhat surprisingly, represent freedom to some people. A motorman Matti argues that he likes to be aboard, because ship is a closed place and therefore he can be there as he likes, to be himself, *I like to step aboard, because this is its own closed community. I don't like to hang out with big crowds anyway, this is small gang but it does not trouble me at all* (m2). Isolation is negative freedom, in a sense that it may also provide freedom from the chains of life on land (see Berlin 2000). It also captures the image of the free-roving sailor that is nourished by many sailors. One cuts himself off from land, it takes courage, but that is what a sailor does. Captain Tommi's account reflects this attitude,

I believe that you need balls to take off and come here. [Back in the days] to go to sea demanded that you would "jump ship" and leave your home. And I think it still takes that, if a person goes to sea it demands that (k8).

This group of metaphors reflects the independence from and the interdependence of others in the worldviews of seamen. Once when you leave the harbor behind, you are on your own. You are free from the chains of land life, but you are also interdependent with other crew members. Everybody on board is needed, and anybody on board can blow things up. These metaphors reflect the closed conditions of shipworld, as prison and nuthouse metaphors do, although island metaphors emphasize the active role of sailor, while prison and nut house metaphors tell about helplessness. Michael Kearney (1984, 5) notes that a worldview is linked to reality and works in two ways; one forms a more or less accurate images of the world and tests these images by using them in action. In this process one modifies the world that is perceived. Therefore, it is not indifferent, what

kind of worldview seamen have, because it effects their action in both everyday work and in crisis situations. Furthermore, their worldview influences the world surrounding them.

**Nuthouse, prison** metaphors are closely linked with the island metaphors. Nuthouse and prison—custody—metaphors are, as well, mostly representing prison dimension of shipworld. In prison people lurk what others do, and the guards are supposed to know everything about the prisoners. Both the island and custody metaphor clusters are linked to the theory of total institutions (see chapter Shipworld). First officer says, *This is closed institution. This narrows my personal freedom a lot, this is an institution for me, I hardly ever get to go on land* (f8). Custody may also have a positive side that is linked with freedom. For some, being in custody in shipworld allows them to not to take full responsibility for their own lives when they are at sea. Cook Kalle explains,

I believe that when sailors are aboard they do not grow older during that time. That they get older only when they are on vacation. They are like in a boy camp here, among people like themselves, so they don't grow up here. They miss always a half a year in their age, every year. (s6)

Nuthouse metaphors reveal significant aspects in the worldviews of seamen. These metaphors emphasize both helplessness and irresponsibility of sailors. The former is about seaman's inability to have influence over his own living conditions, and thus over his own life. The latter is in line with the Jack Tar/Kalle Aaltonen image of seaman masculinity. Sailor is in a boy camp aboard ship, he does not grow older while he is at sea, for he lives with men like himself. In one sense, to spend life at sea with other like-minded happy-go-lucky sailors is a manifestation of masculine freedom. There is a deep ambivalence between these two aspects of shipworld which the nuthouse metaphors reflect. The freedom-prison dichotomy is dominant in this group of metaphors. Dilin Liu (2002, 8) notes that prevalent metaphors manifest how people view the world and construct their reality, because frequently used metaphors not only reveal the conceptual systems of speaker, but also constantly reinforce the worldview. Prison metaphors reveal a significant dimension in worldview of seamen, as nuthouse metaphors do. They belong to the same group, emphasizing different hues of the same spectrum. Ship is prison for sailors, but how come they choose a life in prison? Motorman Alekski had told me that he

viewed ship as prison, I asked him for how long he had thought so? *For quite some time now*, he said. Why you didn't leave the seas then, I asked. Aleksi answered; *I am so used to this. I take it easy, I keep it calm. I think about vacation. That's why I'm here* (m10). A worldview changes over time. Personal experiences shape the worldview; therefore worldview is ongoing developmental process, not only a socialized set of beliefs (Helve 1987, 17-18).

At sea you are a prisoner of sea (s7). Other metaphors help us to understand what the sailors may mean when they say that ship is a prison. Sailors use also many other strong or agitating metaphors, e.g., ship is not life at all, ship is nuthouse, funeral, and labor camp, to reflect upon their life at sea. These markedly emotional metaphors have also a function of distancing the person from her or his current living environment. Kaarlo Laine has studied the metaphors that the pupils used to describe school. He came to the conclusion that school as a "concentration camp" or "prison" was not anymore a concentration camp, or a prison: The institution had got a shape, an otherness, which did not include the pupil anymore. Life and self were elsewhere (Laine 1995, 24). There is a strong tension between freedom of seas and prison of shipworld. A chief engineer states, *Prison is easier place than this, prison doesn't sway* (c8). This freedom-prison dichotomy plays a vital role in sailors' worldview. Prison metaphors quite naturally emphasize the prison pole of freedom-prison axis. Helve (1987, 20) argues that worldviews are full of inconsistencies. Therefore it is possible that seamen have such a strong ambivalence as freedom-prison dichotomy dominant in their worldview. Freedom is a vital value in sailors' self-image. Values and value systems belong to one's worldview (Helve 1993, 89; Niemi, Nurmi & Vauras 1986, 80). Freedom-prison dichotomy can be viewed through sovereign, personal and civic freedoms; one's will to do exactly what one pleases ignoring will of others, is conquered by personal freedom which allows one to do what one pleases in so far as one can, and, one's will to do what one pleases within the limits of other person's desires, is overrun by the lack of civic freedom in a sense that one cannot influence the circumstances of one's living conditions, because one is not part of the decision making processes in such matters. Motorman Pete declares,

The dictator may go and rage around freely, they can insult you and rage, but if a ragamuffin takes a bit beer, he gets fired (m4).

If the layers in the worldview of an individual or group conflict each other or lack unity, Manninen (1977, 16) says, the situation should be seen as a conflict between different worldviews. A worldview may have layers that seem to contradict each other, Manninen continues, but even so the worldview consists of certain principles that unify the layers into a logical—or sometimes illogical—whole. I cannot quite agree with Manninen, because I find freedom-prison dichotomy highly ambivalent, but prevalent and deep-rooted in the worldview of seamen. Therefore there are no two rival worldviews fighting in one's head. The freedom-prison axis is ambivalent and creates tension, but it is also dominant in sailor worldview. Kearney (1984, 52-64) divides illogical elements of worldview to two categories: external and internal inconsistencies. It has to be also noted that often the inconsistencies do not overly bother the people who hold them. Freedom-prison dichotomy creates an internal inconsistency in the worldviews of seamen, although sailors do not necessarily consider this on a conscious level.

**Machine** metaphors are somewhat parallel to the prison-like dimensions of shipworld. Metaphors like job of a robot, machine and such are not used if one wants to emphasize the positive sides of his work. These metaphors are closely linked to the organization of work in shipworld, also known as mechanistic approach (see chapter Shipworld). Any sailor is a part of the machine, an interchangeable unit. Interchangeability often leads to one feeling disposable as well. This is reflected on sailors' worldviews. They are part of the international pool of sailors, and may be replaced by seamen from another country, as well. A seaman is often named after his work position. Few store managers are named solely 'Store Manager,' but in shipworld often the only name a boatswain hears for he during his entire work period is 'Boatswain'. Being boatswain also determines his cabin, place in a sitting order, and locker, as well as his working hours and positions. This ultimately affects his identity and view of the world. Shipworld's hierarchical structure permeates every area of ship community. Manninen (1977, 16-17) includes into his worldview model the structures of society, nation and state. These metaphors of machine

reflect seamen's view on their position in the ship, and thus also in larger society. A boatswain puts it rather bluntly,

This is production line work this job of mine. This is like a production line where you work in a belt of some industrial plant. Same things keep repeating over and over again in a different order. (p8)

In shipworld the functions are extremely organized and very hierarchical. Hierarchy could nearly be seen as an antithesis of freedom. A ship's engineer states, *Nobody asks your opinion here, it is like it usually is on ships: god in heaven, captain in vessel*<sup>121</sup> (y10). Metaphors of machine do not at first seem to reflect any kind of freedom, because machine metaphors mostly emphasize worker's small and largely helpless role in his environment. How could one be free, if he is just a cog in a machine? As noted earlier, being part of a machine can be liberating, as well: Boatswain from a cargo ship told me about putting his brain into a glass of water when stepping aboard, like you would put your denture into a glass for the night. He said that he did not need his brain for work. Therefore, it can be argued that although one does not have the freedom to be innovative in work, one is free to let the brain rest. For some, it may be liberating to be a cog in a machine. When you step aboard ship, you surrender your will and needs, and you become part of ship functions. You will work and be waken up for work any hour of a day, and you may eat when there is time for that. This type of experience can be close to the spiritual and inner freedoms that Patterson (1991), Berlin (2000) and Malinowski (1964) discuss; although it is not (necessarily) a religious experience, it may be liberating.

**Graveyard** metaphors emphasize the prison-like environment of shipworld. They state that, socially, to be in shipworld is like to be in prison; nothing goes on. As Jouko puts it,

Nowadays it is like to be in a graveyard, you can't find anybody anywhere... everybody has their own gadgetry in their cabin, and there they sit and sulk then. (21/96)

Graveyard and funeral metaphors reflect negative insights on sailors' worldview. Ship community is not lively, but fosters apathy. Ship community has not always been seen in

---

<sup>121</sup> Interview y10, quotation in Finnish. Ei tääl niinku muiitten mielipiteitä kysytä, tääl on niinku yleensä on et jumala taivaassa, kippari laivassa.

the light of graveyard metaphors. In earlier days ship life was livelier because of the larger and younger crews and fewer options to spend relaxed time in one's own cabin (cabin mates, no televisions or VCRs). In fact, graveyard metaphors have most likely emerged to describe this shift in shipworld. To employ Helve's (1987, 21-22) five dimensional worldview model, these metaphors reflect the affective dimension of worldview that contains experiences and feelings.

In winter, when there are no visitors on board, you don't see anybody anywhere after eight in the evening. And now they are planning to get televisions for every cell, after than you won't see absolutely anybody (y2).

Ship's engineer discusses his ship in wintertime. Graveyard metaphors have most likely emerged to illustrate the shift in shipworld that has taken place in the last three decades of seafaring. Seamen often longingly recall the times when no one would have called mess a funeral. These metaphors are far apart from the mythical freedom of sailors; no parties, no alcohol, no adventure, nothing what Kalle Aaltonen would enjoy. Joel Feinberg (1973, 12-14) divides lack of freedom to positive and negative, plus internal and external restraints of freedom. Nobody forbids a seaman to spend time with ship mates on his free time, thus there are no external positive constraints for him to be with other sailors. Today, the lack of available shipmates prevents him to do so, resulting an external negative constraint. A first officer explains, *I spend my time here alone. I don't go to mess. Nobody is there* (f4). Chief engineer from the same ship says,

I spend my leisure time alone. You can't see anybody here (c4).

**Home** metaphors are among the few positive and popular metaphors of shipworld. Home metaphors do not link with prison root-metaphor (this is not to say that nobody ever could feel that prison is their home, or that home is their prison, rather it means that nobody feeling that a place is home-like would use prison-metaphors to express it). Village, family and home are sometimes metaphoric representations of ship as community. In this approach, the concept of sailors as a big family or a village is part of sailors' worldview and the seaman identity. This approach gets more support when we discuss metaphors of 'Ship as island.' In addition, the home metaphor may be viewed

through sailor identity and worldview: seaman's home is ship and the seas. Then the apartment building metaphor is a negation of home, emphasizing the loneliness of one's life in today's shipworld. Do these metaphors have a link with metaphors of freedom? In the sense that "at home" one is allowed to feel safe and welcomed (we talk about metaphors, thus images, not realities), the home metaphor may represent freedom.

Home is freedom for Malinowski, because home and village metaphors emphasize the stability, organization and security of shipworld. True freedom, that is, freedom of order and organization, Malinowski (1964, 29) says, is found in organized human societies. As noted before, this is not necessarily the freedom of ordinary people, and even more so, not the freedom of sailors who have often gone to sea in search for something quite different than the organized everyday life of land. But for some, ship provides home and satisfaction, as a young custodian says, *It's boring on land, I always want back to work. All my friends are here. I could just sail, I'm not interested in vacation* (s9).

**Journey** metaphors are among the most pronounced metaphors of freedom. Journey is an adventure; one never knows what will happen next, where the road will lead. Journey metaphors reveal the adventurous elements in the worldview of seamen. They embody the traditional and popular image of reasons to go to sea – at sea one can be free from the bindings of land life and society. Sailors do not experience adventure and traveling as much as before, because of the many changes in the ship industry already discussed in chapter Shipworld. This adventure vs. lack of adventure contrast belongs to the affective dimension in Helve's model of worldview (1987, 17-18). Adventure/lack of adventure is closely related to sailors' freedom. A boatswain says, *I went to sea because I longed to be in faraway places* (p8). Before the 1950s, to go to sea was virtually the only way for a Finnish working class youngster to see the world. And still, although the visits to foreign harbors are shorter than before, sailors sometimes go to land to see the foreign towns. This kind of freedom is very much the freedom of ordinary people, which has not traditionally found its way to the scholarly inquiries. I asked cook Kalle, why did he go to sea. Kalle said, *I don't know. I wanted to get out. At first it was just that I needed to get away*. Was this what you expected, I asked,

First yes. Long voyages at sea, exotic countries, warmth... [---] The first ship I sailed was Igloo Norse, we sailed around the world in my first year. I liked that. (s6)

First officer is in line with Kalle,

When I was a young man, I thought that the further I get to go on the ship, the better. There I sailed the seas, happy-go-lucky, no plans for tomorrow. Then it was really nice to sail. But now, the more age I gain, the closer I want to be to land: I want to watch telly and get the newspapers. Things I wouldn't have cared at all for when I was younger. (f5).

#### 4.3.2. Other aspects in the worldview of seamen

Finally I want to answer the question regarding other aspects, besides the freedom-prison dichotomy, of the worldviews of seamen.

##### **Workers and Officers**

In theory, ship community relationships outside work roles are free to develop in any directions. In practice, work roles strongly condition the leisure time relations among seafarers. The shipworld structures play a significant role here. The hierarchical construction of space aboard ship allows some relations, while discouraging others. For example, two mess-rooms divide the crew in two, according to their ranking. Living quarters and day-rooms are also located hierarchically. In addition, the tradition of calling each others with the names of work positions reminds one of the hierarchical structures of shipworld. Therefore worker vs. officer distinction remains a vital factor in the worldviews of seamen. The choice of words tells its own story of the crew members' perception on their own role within the ship. The workers refer to themselves as slaves, dogs, or ragamuffins. A boatswain explicates what is a good foreman, because he has currently had problems with his first mate,

A good foreman comes every now and then to the watchmen's mess room, drinks cup of coffee, chats a bit, cracks a joke, tells about the cargo. And does not yell at you like you'd be a dog. (p1)

This kind of reflection of one's own position within the hierarchy is neither new nor radical. Rosenström (1996, 117) notes that the hierarchical structure of the sailing ship era was such that, for example, the apprentice was within the hierarchy only slightly *lower* than rats. The strict hierarchy was—and still is—often maintained by both officers and workers. Aubert (1965, 255) noted that the demarcation line which occurred aboard between officers and workers was visibly marked by uniforms. This may partially explain the popularity of name *resuperse*—ragamuffin—for workers. *Resuperse* means literally a person whose pants are ripped. Motorman Pete says,

Those old-timer skippers go: a lord is a lord, and a ragamuffin is a ragamuffin. That caste system which is crumbling now when there are younger captains and younger bosses coming. Now we are more in the same caste so that a worker and well-read are more in the same line.<sup>122</sup>(m4)

The captain is called a god, lord, khalif, clown, or old codger, by the people lower in the hierarchy than him. Sometimes also the other higher officers are talked about in these terms, depending on the situation. On the other hand, the officer may use the same metaphors to refer to those who are higher in the hierarchical ladders than himself. In short, these metaphors are mostly used by workers to refer to their captain, with some exceptions – what matters is that they always refer to a person who is higher in the rank. These metaphors or nick names for the captain are particularly fruitful if they are examined together with the metaphors captains use for themselves. A diagram of the names for the ship community members looks like this:

	<b>Worker's view</b>	<b>Boss's view</b>
<b>on: worker</b>	Dog Ragamuffin Slave	Baby Child Mite Wretch
<b>on: boss</b>	Clown God Khalif Lord Madman Old codger	Executive Lion Shepherd

<sup>122</sup> Interview m4, quotation in Finnish. Se on se vanhanajan kipparit et herra on herra ja resuperse on resuperse... Toi kastijako mikä nyt murtuu koko ajan kun tulee nuorii kippareita ja nuorii johtajii että nyt ollaan samaa kastii, et duunari ja lukenu on samalla viivalla.

These metaphors tell their own story about hierarchical structure of shipworld, and its members' outlook about it. The four-field analysis shows that the only positive or respectful metaphors given here are those which the captains use to describe themselves. They see their own post as one of an executive, lion, or shepherd. As one captain reflects his stand on his own management techniques, *It is better that there is one lion leading the crowd, than a pride of lions* (k1). They call their subordinates poor little mites or babies. Captain Timo discusses his crew,

You have to know how to handle seafarers, they are poor little mites, you see. They are such because everything has been taken care of, a man is so well looked after here. It is like "Let's put gloves on now that your hands won't freeze". Like the mother talks to her child, it is very much like that here.<sup>123</sup> (k7)

Workers use two types of metaphors for their bosses. First, the metaphors tell about unconditioned power: god, khalif, and lord. Second, the metaphors question their competence to hold power and ridicule them: a clown, madman and old codger. This is quite natural outcome in an organization in which the lower-level members do have hardly any influence over their superiors (see mechanistic approach in chapter Shipworld). The steam is let out by the carnevalistic figures of speech. A boatswain declares his view about captains,

I tried to stay away from this shipping company for a long time, if I don't have to sail with madmen, I won't. Here the officers have a bit weird attitude, they think they are gods. (p3)

Unlike captains who use respectable and positive metaphors to talk about themselves, the workers see themselves as equal to ragamuffins, dogs, or slaves. A boatswain says, *I doubt that anyone would listen to us ragamuffins*<sup>124</sup> (p10). Worldview of seamen gets reflected through the metaphors they use for their work. Seamen use these ironical and contemptuous names for themselves, to bring into daylight their low rank in the hierarchy. Hierarchy plays a significant role in sailors' worldview: there are certain names for officers and others for workers. The concept of self is assumed to be part of

---

<sup>123</sup> Interview k7, quotation in Finnish. Merenkulkijaa täytyy varsinkin osata käsitellä eri tavalla kuin muita. Ne on vähän semmosii resukoita katos. - - No ne on jotenkin semmosii et ku kaikesta on huolehdittu, tääl on huolehdittu niin hyvin ihmisestä. Se on et laitetaan nyt käsineet käteen ettei kädet palellu, niinku äiti lapsellensa, se on hyvin pitkälle sitä.

<sup>124</sup> Interview p10, quotation in Finnish. Tuskin ne kuitenkaan meitä resuperseitä kuuntelee.

worldview in theories of worldview (see Kearney, Redfield, Geertz, Manninen, Helve). Manninen (1977, 16-17) names a few assumptions that construct worldview, including human beings themselves and their relations to others, and structures of society. The names for sailors reveal these aspects of their worldview: you are what your work is when you are in shipworld. Therefore the names for sailors locate them in shipworld and reveal the hierarchical aspects in the worldviews of seamen. Kearney (1984, 68-107) divides worldview into the worldview universals that are Self and other; classification, relationship and causality; time and space. Metaphors that seamen employ for other sailors reveal their assumptions about Self and other; there are clearly two groups with very distinctive names – us and them. As noted here, sailor metaphors also emphasize classification and relationship, for there is no blurring between categories; ragamuffins and khalifs do not mingle.

### **Institution for everybody**

There is yet another level to employ for the analysis of metaphors: the laborers' point of view vs. officers' point of view. Therefore, we can study metaphors from either worker's or boss's angle. How does a worker describe sailors or shipworld? How does a boss call workers or work place? A diagram looks like this:

	<b>Worker's view</b>	<b>Boss's view</b>
<b>Sailor</b>	village nutter	bogeyman, psychopath
<b>Worker</b>	ragamuffin	mite
<b>Boss</b>	clown, god	lion
<b>Shipworld</b>	institution	institution
<b>Work place</b>	slavery	machine
<b>Ship community</b>	boy camp, home, prison	funeral, apartment building, prison

### **Sailor**

It has been discussed previously that there are differences between workers' and bosses' perceptions. What are these differences? Is there anything in common, shared? Workers describe sailors (all seafarers) nutters, while bosses employ such metaphors like bogeyman and psychopath. *I can't recommend this life to anyone. You get so isolated here. When you go to seas you get isolated. You need to have a special kind of character*

to like it here (y5), ship's engineer Yrjö reflects his view on sailors. It is a widely shared belief that one has to have a special character, to be a bit crazy or hermit, to survive the life at sea. Young officer declares,

Seaman needs to have really good nerves. It is the most important work tool here, you have to adapt to different situations here. You have to work with others, no matter if you hate them. It is not their fault if you hate them. You have to get along (y6).

Chief engineer deliberates on seamen,

A sailor is an obstinate person – This job lops off fairly well those who can't cope. It is a certain category which gets selected, those who end up staying, they are pretty independent characters. It is difficult for many to adapt to this way of life and rhythm and what we have here at sea. Sailors are the tribe of their own (c6).

Sailors see themselves as a distinct group, because their profession is quite unlike any other, demanding special characteristics of a man. *I am a sailor and proud of it* (p1), a bosun declares. Seamen utilize mythical aspects of seamanhood in their discourse. For example, an old captain draws from the stereotypical image of a sailor as a man who is always ready to leave everything behind, for he is not bound to the same trammels as the boring landlubbers are. He states,

If I would take off now (snaps his fingers) like a seadog takes off, I would possibly have to even sell my house (k5).

This kind of notion of free-standing independence and mobility is part of the self-image of seamen. I asked captain Timo, if he was concerned about losing his job. Timo answered, *Not me, I have always money in my pocket and a clean shirt in the closet, I can leave right now* (k7). Then I asked pump man Jussi the same question. Jussi stated, *I am not afraid of anything, I am ready in 5 minutes—includes shaving—I have things sorted out* (p7). Sailor identity is a significant factor in the worldview of seamen. *Merimies on erimies* (seaman is real man) is popular saying among sailors.

Sailors are odd creatures, if you ask landlubbers: wild bunch, alcoholics. But that is not true, sailors are pretty normal (f7).

Seamen also discuss the popular image of them on land, dismissing it as untruthful; first officer Lars talks about his experiences with landmen. Sailors also employ the stereotypical Jack Tar/Kalle Aaltonen image as a soundboard for their own experiences and their ironizing rhetoric. For example, pump man Jussi answered my question, why did he go to sea, in the following way,

Me? Because you get to travel for free on ship, and they even pay you. I went to sea because they play accordion here and you don't have to do anything. I like to be on board. I don't care for land (p7).

### **Workers and boss**

As discussed above, when workers talk about workers, they call themselves ragamuffins (resuperse). Bosses call their workers mites. There is a definite discrepancy on the emphasis. Workers imply that they are not respected, while bosses state that workers have to be taken care of, because they are so helpless. When workers talk about their bosses, they use metaphors like clown or god (ironic). Bosses see themselves in the different light; they like to describe themselves as lions or shepherds.

### **Shipworld**

Shipworld is institution for both workers and officers. Institutionalization is a problem in shipworld. Most interviewees mentioned it one way or the other. Steward Ritva says,

Always when you come back from vacation, after one day it feels like you haven't been away at all. You fall into the same routine. And the truth is that after five years nothing can motivate you in your job, if the job doesn't change at all (s2).

Chief engineer's opinion about his work follows the lines of institutionalization,

Work is never interesting, it can't be. We get always in trouble when somebody comes here for self-fulfillment. This work is not interesting (c9).

Captain Timo provides his view on institutionalization, *It has always been very difficult to sell new ideas on ship, seafarer is very conservative. They still live in 1950s in many ways here* (k7). Sailors do recognize the danger of institutionalization. Engineer Yrjö says,

You can't be satisfied with this life. If somebody says he's happy with this, he's already institutionalized, or adapted to this, institutionalized totally (y5).<sup>125</sup>

Institutionalization can be viewed as a collective trace in the worldviews of seamen, for an individual has both individual and collective aspects in his worldview (Manninen 1977, 25; Helve 1987, 14). One's worldview is reflected in person's activities: For example, the cognitive dimension—which is close to the belief-system—shows in one's interests, activities and lifestyles (Helve 1987, 21-22). Is it so that sailors' worldviews cause the apathy and institutionalization? More likely, one's worldview may be able to resist the institutionalizing aspects of shipworld, but for some it is more difficult than for others. Chief engineer says,

I mean one gets here a bit—I bet I get too—but when I look at those codgers of my age from the workers' mess-room, they are badly institutionalized. Absolutely no initiative, except when it is time to go on vacation, or to eat (c10).

### **Work place and ship community**

When seafarers talk about their work place, it shows as slavery for workers and as machine for higher officers. Neither of these metaphors have positive connotations, but there is a certain disparity in their intensity and emphasis. While both metaphors are negative, machine metaphor views both worker and officer to be in the same boat, to be just cogs in the machine. Slavery metaphors emphasize the distinction between workers and officers, because officers are masters and thus enslave workers. These metaphors put emphasis on the helplessness and inability to influence one's surroundings. Worldview includes one's assumptions about the society and one's place in it (see Manninen 1977, Helve1987). Ship community shows in the discourse of workers and bosses in different light, as well. For workers it tends to have a bit more social meanings, such as *boy camp* or *home*, addition to prison which both parties share. For higher officers the ship community seems to be interpreted with more negative terms that emphasize loneliness and isolation within ship community: *apartment building*, *funeral* and *prison*. In the metaphors of ship community, there is a shift in emphasis; boy camp and home reflect on a living community, while funeral and apartment building reflect loneliness. While the

---

<sup>125</sup> Quotation in Finnish: Eihän tähän voi tietysti tyytyväinen sillai olla. Joka sanoo et on tyytyväinen niin on täysin laitostunut jo, tai niinku sopeutunu täysin tähän, niin on täysin laitostunut. (y5).

worldview of seamen puts emphasis on the independent hermit-type image of sailor, seamen do often feel lonely in shipworld.

## 5. Conclusion

In my previous study for master's degree thesis, I had concluded that prison-metaphor was commonly used for ship and ship community, influencing sailors' life at sea. The usage of prison metaphor among sailors had its background in the history of seafaring, ship community's communication tactics, and its characteristics as a closed community. As a result, seamen often perceived their life at sea as a life in prison. This consequently influenced their behavior and thus further strengthened the dominance of prison metaphor and prison-likeness of ship community. Sailor life is usually paired with *freedom*, rather than with prison, for the free-roving Jack Tar is an enduring image of man's longing for individual freedom. Seaman is not bound to land and its mundane routines. In my quest to examine the unbalance between freedom and prison in shipworld, I found worldview to be a fruitful concept in studying the freedom-prison dichotomy.

My task here has been to examine the worldview of contemporary Finnish seamen especially regarding the freedom-prison dichotomy, not to study worldview as a whole. I provided a short 'ethnography' of modern Finnish shipworld, focusing on those characteristics that differ from Finnish mainstream culture; I had to take this ethnographic project as a part of my research task, since there are no studies published on the contemporary Finnish shipworld. After examining shipworld, I studied the worldview of seamen through the metaphors they use to discuss their life at sea, focusing on that part of sailors' worldview that reflects freedom-prison dichotomy. My research questions were:

1. What are the major structures and characteristics of contemporary Finnish shipworld that differ from Finnish mainstream culture, particularly from living and working environment?

- a) What is the basic time-space structure like in shipworld?
- b) What is the hierarchical structure of shipworld?

- c) How is the gender structured in shipworld?
- 2. What metaphors contemporary Finnish seamen use to reflect their life at sea?
  - a) What kind of metaphors is used for ship community?
  - b) What kinds of metaphors are used to reflect the ship as a workplace?
- 3. What do the metaphors, which seamen use to discuss their life at sea, tell about their worldview?
  - a) Is freedom-prison dichotomy part of sailors' worldview?
  - b) How does freedom-prison axis show in worldview of seamen?
  - c) What are other prevalent features of contemporary Finnish seamen's worldview?

In order to answer these questions, I utilized two previous studies I had conducted in shipworld. The corpus of data utilized in this research consisted of 91 interviews which were conducted in the years 1996 (21 interviews), 1999 (63 interviews), and 2000 (7 interviews) on several Finnish oil-tankers. The first 21 interviews in 1996 were made while I worked as an ordinary seaman, conducting fieldwork for my master's thesis. The second fieldwork period took place three years later in 1999 and 2000, when I was a company researcher, conducting study on behalf of the shipping company. When I conducted a study for the shipping company, I did fieldwork in ten vessels. I wrote field journal during both fieldwork periods.

First, I wrote a short ethnography of contemporary Finnish shipworld, trying to answer the research question, what are the major structures and characteristics of contemporary Finnish shipworld that differ from Finnish mainstream culture, particularly from living and working environment. What is the basic time-space structure like in shipworld? Ship works on 24-hour basis seven days a week. This affects the time structure of shipworld, because someone has to be working in every hour of the day and there are no rest days for the crew onboard. Space is divided hierarchically on ship. One's cabin, the place in the sitting order of mess-room, and locker are all defined by the work position. Ship is therefore organized hierarchically. What is the hierarchical structure of shipworld? The

organization is mechanistic (Morgan 1997); everything is organized in standardized, interchangeable and predictable manner. The captain holds ultimate power over others, a fact which is both criticized and embraced by the crew members. Ship is a closed community, isolated by the ocean. It is a total institution (Goffman 1961), although it is not intended as such. Moreover, the gender structure in shipworld plays a vital role: Ship is a world of men. It is the kingdom of mythical Jack Tar/Kalle Aaltonen, a free-roving sailor, who does not bend under the expectations of society. Women have been working in the international seafaring for a half a century now, but they still face salty chauvinism and are held back by the glass-ceiling effect. Many women cope with this by down-playing their femininity on board.

Second, I answered the next research question, regarding metaphors that contemporary Finnish seamen use to reflect their life at sea. What kinds of metaphors are used for ship community? What kinds of metaphors are used to reflect the ship as a workplace? In the study on worldview of seamen, I applied the metaphor theory developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). They emphasize metaphor's role in understanding and experiencing everyday life. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 153-154) state that metaphor is primarily a matter of thought and action, and only secondarily a matter of language. They argue that the only relevant similarities to metaphor are the similarities which people experience between the metaphor and the original word. Metaphors are culturally shared: what are considered to be true by an individual are the result of both her social reality and the experiences of the physical world which the social reality influences. Lakoff and Johnson state that metaphors have a significant role in defining what we think is real. Thus, metaphors have a significant role in forming worldviews. Metaphors are our tools in comprehending the world. I used metaphor as a working term and representative of all forms of figurative language. I also utilized rhetoric as a background for metaphors. I employed Katz's (1996) notion on metaphoric and ironic speech and Sakaranaho's (1998) concepts of reifying and ironizing rhetoric. Reifying rhetoric attempts to construct solid and factual versions of world, while ironizing rhetoric tries to undermine such attempts. Liu (2002, 1-10) argues that studying metaphors will help us to understand other people's worldviews. Various types of metaphors appeared in the discourse of the

sailor interviews; I found 83 metaphors and 13 other expressions regarding shipworld. Abductive method was employed in the analysis, and its theoretical background was also discussed in detail. By utilizing abductive method, I divided the metaphors into two main categories which were ship community and ship as a work place. Furthermore, the metaphors were placed in seven different clusters. These were:

Ship is Island

Ship is Nuthouse and Prison

Ship is Machine

Ship is Graveyard

Ship is Home

Ship is Journey

Ship is Another life

Some metaphors emphasize the aspects of the ship as a community; others emphasize the ship as a work place. These two categories are quite motivated groupings for the ship metaphors, because people go on board primarily to work and the nature of the profession requires that they have to live aboard ship. Goffman (1961) names this type of establishment a total institution: a place for living and working where a number of like-situated individuals spend a lengthy period of time together, isolated from the wider society. In total institutions the different spheres of life conjoin. The division between ship community and ship as a workplace are arbitrary due to the nature of total institutions, but it had to be made because the division between work and free time is one of the basic organizers of human life.

Ship community metaphors focus more on the ship community, not as much on the ship as a work place, although there is some blurring between these categories, because of the above-mentioned characteristics of total institution. Some examples of the most predominant metaphors that were grouped into this category are *village*, *prison*, *home*, *family*, *space shuttle*, and *graveyard*. Altogether, in the interview material there are 70 different metaphors and sayings about ship community. All together, there are 36 different metaphors about ship as a workplace in the interview material, such as *space shuttle*, *machine*, *slavery*, and *journey*. In the case of such a rigidly organized structure as

shipworld, the organizational dimension of metaphors plays an important role. Work is an essential part of sailors' worldview; after all, work makes them seamen.

Finally, I answered the third research question, regarding what the metaphors seamen use to discuss their life at sea tell about their worldview. Is freedom-prison dichotomy part of sailors' worldview? How does freedom-prison axis show in the worldview of seamen? What are other prevalent features of contemporary Finnish seamen's worldview? I do not claim that all sailors share the same worldview, nor do I state that all sailors have same kind of notions of freedom in their worldviews. As noted earlier in this study, sailors are not a homogenous group, and to find any group in today's world to hold exactly same unison beliefs and values would be highly unlikely. I found that prison was not a golden key to crack open all the sayings and metaphors of shipworld, although it played a very important role. I realized that almost all of the metaphors under study could be located into the freedom – prison axis.

Kearney (1984, 41-42) defines worldview as a collection of basic assumptions that an individual or a society has about reality. I did not apply models of worldview to my study, because I saw there a danger for universalization and ethnocentrism (see Pesonen 1997, 48), therefore I focused on worldview propositions (Kearney 1984). I studied freedom-prison dichotomy *because* it arose from the material, not because it was generated from a worldview model. I viewed with suspicion the possible existence of stable and coherent worldviews, because the era of unified cosmologies is gone (see Ketola 1997; Helve 1993). I examined worldview through the metaphors seamen employed when they discussed their life at sea, for language is one of the powerful means of expressing worldview (Jocano 2001).

Freedom is one of the prevalent concepts and values in our modern world. Therefore it is surprising how little attention it has received from comparative religion and anthropology. Patterson (1991, 2) argues that because philosophy has wanted to define freedom as a coherent concept for thinking people, there are two histories of freedom: freedom as ordinary women and men have understood it, and philosophers' definitions of

‘true freedom.’ Therefore, following Patterson, the philosophers’ attempts to define freedom often ignore the freedom of people. In this study the object was exactly that; to examine freedom of sailors from their own point of view. In order to be able to discuss freedom as sailors see it, I employed some terms of philosophers. Patterson (1991, 3-4, 97) divides freedom into three sub-divisions that are personal, sovereign and civic freedoms. Personal freedom means in its simplest that a person is not being coerced or restrained by another person to do something desired and, the conviction that one can do as one pleases within the limits of other person’s desire to do the same. Sovereign freedom means the power to act as one pleases, regardless of the wishes of other, as distinct from personal freedom, which is the capacity to do as one pleases, insofar as one can. Civic freedom refers to rights to exercise one’s citizenship in democracies. This study focused on the personal freedom. Berlin divides freedom into two categories; Negative freedom has traditionally been simplified to mean freedom *from*, while positive freedom has been attributed to freedom *to*. Feinberg (1973, 4-19) elaborates on Berlin, dividing constraints into positive and negative, and into internal and external. Feinberg (1973, 13) argues that freedom to and freedom from—positive and negative freedom—are logically linked and cannot be torn apart.

As has been noted in this paper, cultural studies have overlooked freedom as people see it. Consequently, the anthropological studies on the subject are scarce. For example, Malinowski wrote extensively on freedom, but overlooked the freedom of ‘man in the street.’ The only ‘true’ freedom for Malinowski is organized freedom, not freedom to do what one pleases, or to do nothing, if that is what one likes. Berlin (2000, 206) states that our views of what constitutes a self, a person, a human being, directly formulate conceptions of freedom. Therefore, following Berlin, it can be stated that our worldview defines our concept of freedom. I examined sailors’ metaphors that are part of their rhetoric, in order to learn about their worldviews. By doing this, I attempted to enrich the field of comparative religion by adding to its traditions of studies on worldviews and values.

It was shown that freedom-prison dichotomy is prevalent in the worldviews of seamen. This dichotomy was present in both ship community and work place aspects of shipworld. Freedom-prison dichotomy is internal in many deliberations of sailors, as it has been stated in this paper. It is present in most aspects of sailors' worldview. The other prevalent characteristics in the worldview of contemporary Finnish seamen were deep division between workers and bosses, institutionalization, and strong seaman identity. All these themes require further research which I shall undertake in my doctorate study. In my doctorate dissertation, I will study in more detail the freedom of ordinary people. The future research task will consist of following questions:

1. What are the metaphors of freedom?
2. Can freedom exist in discourse without dichotomy and its counterpart?
3. How freedom is constructed?
4. How other groups besides sailors construct freedom?

## **6. Bibliography**

### **6.1. Primary sources**

Interviews from the year 1996: 1 – 21.

Interviews from the years 1999 and 2000: 'LetterNumber.' An example is p4 or k10.

Field journals from the years 1996, 1999 and 2000.

### **6.2. Literature**

Ahlberg, Nora (1977). Vastakulttuuri vaihtoehtoisena maailmankuvana. In Maailmankuvan muutos tutkimuskohteena. Eds. Matti Kuusi, Risto Alapuro and Matti Klinge. Keuruu: Otava. 244-263.

Alasuutari, Pertti (1994). Laadullinen tutkimus. Jyväskylä: Vastapaino.

Alasuutari, Pertti (1989). Erinomaista, rakas Watson: Johdatus yhteiskuntatutkimukseen. Helsinki: Kustannusosakeyhtiö Hanki ja jää.

Alasuutari, Pertti (1986). Työmiehen elämäntarina ja alkoholismi. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto.

Amit, Vered (2000). Introduction. In Constructing the Field. Ed. Vered Amit. UK: Routledge. 1-17

Annan, Noel (2000). Foreword. The proper study of mankind: An anthology of essays. Eds. Henry Hardy and Roger Hausheer. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux. ix-xv.

Aries, Elizabeth (1996). Men and Women in Interaction. USA: Oxford University Press.

Atkinson, Paul (1990). Ethnographic Imagination. UK: Routledge.

Aubert, Vilhelm (1965). Hidden society by Vilhelm Aubert. USA: The Bedminster Press.

Aubert, Vilhelm and Arner, Oddvar (1965). On the social structure of the ship. In Hidden society (Vilhelm Aubert). USA: The Bedminster Press. 259-287.

Barker, Joan (1999). Danger, duty, and disillusion: The worldview of Los Angeles police officers. Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press.

Benokraitis, Nijole V. (1997). Sex Discrimination in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. In *Subtle Sexism: Current practice and prospects for change*. Ed. Nijole Benokraitis. USA: Sage Publications. 5-30.

Bergholm, Tapio (1996). Halpatyövoimasta hyvinvointiin. Suomen merimiesten ammattiyhdistystoiminta 1916-1996. Turenki: Suomen Merimies-Unioni.

Berlin, Isaiah (2000). The proper study of mankind: An anthology of essays. Eds. Henry Hardy and Roger Hausheer. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Billig, Michael (1987). *Arguing and thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Björkqvist, Kaj, Bergbom, Barbara and Holm, Nils G. (1996). World View and Personality. In *World Views in Modern Society*. Eds. Nils G. Holm and Kaj Björkqvist. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University. 14-15.

Black, Clinton V. (1989). *Pirates of the West Indies*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Dan (2003). *The Da Vinci Code*. USA: Doublday, Random House Inc.

Bruun, Jaap (2002). "Kapteeni on Jumalasta seuraava." In *Nautica Fennica 2001-2002*. Vammala: Museovirasto. 20-28.

Burke, Kenneth (1969) (1950). *A Rhetoric of Motives*. USA: University of California Press.

Burke, Kenneth (1966). *Language as Symbolic Action*. USA: University of California Press.

Burke, Peter (1992). *History & Social Theory*. UK: Cornell University Press.

Caputo, Virginia (2000). At 'home' and 'away'. In *Constructing the Field*. Ed. Vered Amit. UK: Routledge. 19-30.

Chantrill, Patricia A. and Mio, Jeffery Scott (1996). Metonymy in Political Discourse. In *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*. Eds. Jeffery Scott Mio and Albert N. Katz. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 171-183.

Chavannes, Barry (ed.) (1995). *Rastafari and Other Arican-Caribbean Worldviews*. UK: Macmillan.

Clements R. (1951). *A gipsy of the Horn*. London.

Cochran, Hamilton (1973). *Karibian kaapparit ja merirosvot*. Helsinki: Uusi Kirjakerho.

Conrad, J. (1923). *The Mirror of the Sea*. London Toronto.

Cordingly, David (2001). *Women Sailors and Sailors' Women*. USA: Random House New York.

Creighton, Margaret S. and Norling, Lisa (1996). Introduction. In *Iron Men, Wooden Women: Gender and Seafaring in the Atlantic World, 1700-1920*. Eds. Margaret S. Creighton and Lisa Norling. USA: The John Hopkins University Press. vii-xiii.

Dana, R.H. (1861). *Seamen's friend: Containing a treatise on practical seamanship*. London.

Deetz, Stanley A. (1992). *Democracy in an Age of Corporate Colonization*. USA: State University of New York Press.

Dugaw, Dianne (1996). *Female Sailors Bold: Transvestite Heroines and the Markers of Gender and Class*. In *Iron Men, Wooden Women: Gender and Seafaring in the Atlantic World, 1700-1920*. Eds. Margaret S. Creighton and Lisa Norling. USA: The John Hopkins University Press. 34-54.

Dugaw, Dianne (1991). "Wild Beasts" and "Excellent Friends": Gender, Class and the Female Warrior, 1750-1830. in *Jack Tar in History: Essays in the History of Maritime Life and Labour*. Eds. Colin Howell and Richard Twomey. Canada: Acadiensis Press. 132-142.

Eastwick, R.W. (1891). *Master mariner*. London.

Ehmrooth, Jari (1990). Intuitio ja analyysi. In *Kvalitatiivisen aineiston analyysi ja tulkinta*. Ed. Klaus Mäkelä. Saarijärvi: Gaudeamus. 30-41.

Ellerman, David P. (1991). Myth and metaphor in orthodox economics. *Journal of post Keynesian Economics*, Vol 13 No. 4. USA: M.E. Shapre Inc. 545-563.

Fabian, Johannes (1998). *Moments of freedom: Anthropology and popular culture*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Fast, Maija (1993). *Burial at Sea in the Merchant Fleet*. In *Nautica Fennica 1993*. Helsinki: The Finnish Association for Maritime History. 34-38.

Feinberg, Joel (1973). *Social Philosophy*. USA: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Fiske, John (1992). *Merkkien kieli*. Jyväskylä: Vastapaino.

Fiumara, Gemma Coradi (1995). *The metaphoric process: Connections between language and life*. London: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel (1980). *Tarkkailla ja rangaista*. Keuruu: Otava.

Franke, William (2000). Metaphor and the Making of Sense: The Contemporary Metaphor Renaissance. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*. Volume 33, n:o 2. USA: Pennsylvania State University Press. 137-151.

Frehill, Lisa M. (1997). Subtle Sexism in Engineering. In *Subtle Sexism: Current practice and prospects for change*. USA: Sage Publications. 117-134.

Geertz, Clifford (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. USA: Basic Books.

Geertz, Clifford (1968). Ethos, world-view and the analysis of sacred symbols. In *Every man his way*. Ed. Alan Dundes. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. 301-315.

Gerstenberger, Heide (1996). Men Apart: The Concept of "Total Institution" and the Analysis of Seafaring. *International Journal of Maritime History*. Vol VIII no1 June 1996. Canada: Maritime Studies Research Unit. 173-182.

Gibbs, R. (1987). Mutual knowledge and the psychology of conversational inference. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11. 561-581.

Goffman, Erving (1961). *Asylums*. USA: Aldine Publishing Company.

Goffman, Erving (1956). The nature of deference and demeanor. In *American Anthropologist*. Manasha: Wisconsin.

Gordon, Tuula; Lahelma, Elina; Tolonen, Tarja (1995). "Koulu on kuin..." In *Metaforat fyysisen koulun analysoinnin välineinä*. Nuoristotutkimus 3-1995 Vol 13. Helsinki: Allianssi ry. 3-12.

Gothóni, René (1997). Eläytyminen ja etääntyminen kenttätutkimuksessa. In *Kaukaa haettua*. Ed. Anna Maria Viljanen and Minna Lahti. Vammala: Suomen Antropologinen Seura. 136-148.

Gothóni, René (1994). *Tales and truth: Pilgrimage on Mount Athos*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.

Gramm, Warren S. (1996). Economic Metaphors: Ideology, Rhetoric, and Theory. In *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*. Eds. Jeffery Scott Mio and Albert N. Katz. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 147-168.

Grigsby, Mary (1998). Sailormoon: Manga (Comics) and Anime (Cartoon) Superheroine Meets Barbie. In *Journal of Popular Culture*. Vol. 32.1. Summer 1998. USA: Bowling Green State University. 59-79.

Grönfors, Martti (1982). *Kvalitatiiviset kenttätutkimusmenetelmät*. Juva: WSOY.

Gurney, Joan Neff (1991). Female Researchers in Male Settings. In *Experiencing Fieldwork*. Eds. William B. Shaffir and Robert A. Stebbins. USA: Sage Publications. 53-61.

Gusfield, Joseph R. (1989). The bridge over separated lands: Kenneth Burke's significance for the study of social action. In *the Legacy of Kenneth Burke*. Eds. Herbert W. Simons and Trevor Melia. USA: University of Wisconsin Press. 28-50.

Hahn, Lewis E. (2001). *A Contextualistic Worldview*. USA: Southern Illinois University Press.

Halberstam, Judith (1998). *Female Masculinity*. USA: Duke University Press.

Harris, Richard J. and Firestone, Juanita M. (1997). Subtle Sexism in the U.S. Military. In *Subtle Sexism: Current practice and prospects for change*. USA: Sage Publications. 154-168.

Hastrup, Kirsten (1995). *A Passage to Anthropology. Between Experience and Theory*. UK: Routledge.

Hastrup, Kirsten and Hervik, Peter (1994). *Social experience and anthropological knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Hearn, Jeff and Parkin, Wendy (1987). 'Sex' at 'Work.' *The Power and Paradox of Organisation Sexuality*. Great Britain: Wheatsheaf Books.

Helander, Eila (1986). *To Change and To Preserve*. Helsinki: Missiologian ja ekumeniikan seura.

Helve, Helena (2002). *Arvot, muutos ja nuoret*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.

Helve, Helena (ed.) (1997). *Arvot, maailmankuvat, sukupuoli*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.

Helve, Helena (1993). *The World View of Young People: A Longitudinal Study of Finnish Youth Living in a Suburb of Metropolitan Helsinki*. Jyväskylä: Gummerus/Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Helve, Helena (1987). *Nuorten maailmankuva*. Helsinki: Helsingin Yliopisto Uskontotieteen jaoston toimitteita 4.

Herndorn, Ryth Wallis (1996). Domestic cost of seafaring. In *Iron Men, Wooden Women: Gender and Seafaring in the Atlantic World, 1700-1920*. Eds. Margaret S. Creighton and Lisa Norling. USA: The John Hopkins University Press. 55-69.

Hill, Jane and Mannheim, Bruce (1992). Language and Worldview. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21. 381-400.

Hinkkanen, Merja-Liisa (1994). Kun koti tuli satamaan: Suomalaisten merimiesten yhteydet kotimaahan Englannin satamista 1800-luvun loppupuolella. In *Meren Kansaa*. Loviisa: Kymenlaakson maakuntamuseo. 57-66.

Hjelm, Titus et al. (2002). *Dialogi tiedosta ja maailmankuvista*. Helsinki: Tammi.

Holm, Nils G. (1996). Introduction. In *World Views in Modern Society*. Eds. Nils G. Holm and Kaj Björkqvist. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University. 1-9.

Holmqvist, C. 1966. *Under segel*. Tammerfors.

Hornedo, Florentino H. (2000). *The Power to Be. A Phenomenology of Freedom*. Philippines: UST Publishing House.

Horrocks, Roger (1995). *Male Myths and Icons*. UK: St. Martin's Press.

Jackson, Jean E. (1990). "I am a Fieldnote": Fieldnotes as a Symbol of Professional Identity. In *Fieldnotes*. Ed. Roger Sanjek. USA: Cornell University Press. 3-33.

Jensen, Vickie (1995). *Saltwater Women at Work*. Canada: Douglas & McIntyre.

Jocano, Landa F. (2001). *Filipino Worldview. Ethnography of Local Knowledge*. Philippines: PUNLAND Research House.

Kaijser, Ingrid (1997). Sjömannens yrke: Ur hustruns perspektiv. In *Sjömannen*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi. 36-48.

Karjalainen, Mira (2002). A Ship of Men. In *Styles and Positions: Ethnographic perspectives in comparative religion*. Eds. Heikki Pesonen, Tuula Sakaranaho, Tom Sjöblom and Terhi Utriainen. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. 290-308.

Katz, Albert N. (1996). On Interpreting Statements as Metaphor or Irony. In *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*. Eds. Jeffery Scott Mio and Albert N. Katz. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 1-21.

Kaukiainen, Yrjö (1998). *Laiva Toivo*, Oulu. Jyväskylä: SKS.

Kaukiainen, Yrjö (1994). Viisi vuotta maston edessä: Huomioita merenkulun työntekijöiden oloista Suomessa ja muualla. In *Meren Kansaa*. Loviisa: Kymenlaakson maakuntamuseo. 69-77.

Kaukiainen, Yrjö (1993). *The History of Finnish Shipping*. UK: Routledge.

Kearney, Michael (1984). *World View*. USA: Chandler & Sharp Publishers.

Kennedy, John M. (1996). Metaphor in Tacticle Pictures for the Blind: Using Metonymy to Evoke Classification. In *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*. Eds. Jeffery Scott Mio and Albert N. Katz. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 215-228.

Ketola, Kimmo et al. (1997). Näköaloja uskuntoon: Uskontotieteen ajankohtaisia suuntauksia. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.

Kilpeläinen, Hannu (2000). Ethnography is a heavy rite. In *Ethnography is a heavy rite*. Eds. Nils G. Holm et al. Åbo: Åbo Akademi. 231-244.

Kirby, David and Hinkkanen, Merja-Liisa (2000). *The Baltic and the North Seas*. USA: Routledge.

Knowles, Caroline (2000). Here and there. In *Constructing the Field*. Ed. Vered Amit. UK: Routledge. 54-67.

Kulick, Don and Willson, Margaret (eds.) (1995). *Sex, identity and erotic subjectivity in anthropological fieldwork*. UK: Routledge.

Kuusi, Matti (1977). Yksilötutkimus ja maailman metaforat. In *Maailmankuvan muutos tutkimuskohteena*. Eds. Matti Kuusi, Risto Alapuro and Matti Klinge. Keuruu: Otava. 220-243.

Laidlaw, James (2002). For an Anthropology of Ethics and Freedom. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. Vol. 8. Number 2, June 2002. UK: Royal Anthropological Institute. 311-327.

Laine, Kaarlo (1995). ”Pakollinen aivojenkasvattamispaikka:” Nuorten metaforia ja koulukokemuksia. *Nuorisotutkimus 3-1995 Vol 13*. Helsinki: Allianssi ry. 21-32.

Laine, M, Niemi, L., Saarni, H., Pentti, J. (1999). *Merenkulkijoiden terveys, työ- ja toimintakyky: Merialan työkykyhanke*. Turku: Turun aluetyöterveyslaitos.

Laine, M., Pentti, J., Saarni, H., Soini, S. and Tamminen-Peter, L. (Eds.) (1992). *Työn kuormittavuus lastialuksella. Työpoliittinen tutkimus n:o25*. Helsinki: Työministeriö.

Lakoff, George (1990). The Invariance Hypothesis: Is abstract reason based on image-schemas? *Cognitive Linguistics*. Vol 1. UK: Morton De Gruyter.

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

Lederman, Rena (1990). Pretexts for Ethnography: On Reading Fieldnotes. In *Fieldnotes*. Ed. Roger Sanjek. USA: Cornell University Press. 71-91.

Lee, Dorothy (1959). *Freedom and Culture*. USA: Spectrum book Prentice-Hall Inc.

- Liu, Dilin (2002). *Metaphor, Culture, and Worldview*. Maryland: University Press of America.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw (1964). *Freedom and Civilization*. USA: Indiana University Press.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. London: Routledge.
- Manninen, Juha (1977). Maailmankuvat maailman ja sen muutoksen heijastajina. In *Maailmankuvan muutos Tutkimuskohteena*. Eds. Matti Kuusi, Risto Alapuro and Matti Klinge. Keuruu: Otava. 13-48.
- Markowitz, Fran and Ashkenazi, Michael eds. (1998). *Sex, Sexuality, and the Anthropologist*. USA: University of Illinois Press.
- Mathur, Nita (2001). Introduction. In *Santhal Worldview*. Ed. Nita Mathur. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company. vii-xiii.
- Matsumoto, N. and Mabuchi, T. (eds.) (1968). *Folk Religion and the Worldview in the Southwestern Pacific*. Tokyo: Keio Institute of Cultural and Linguistic Studies.
- McGarth, Joseph E. and Kelly, Janice R. (1986). *Time & Human Interaction: Toward a Social Psychology of Time*. USA: The Guilford Press.
- McLaren, Peter (1991). The Discourse of the Other. In *Experiencing Fieldwork*. Eds. William B. Shaffir and Robert A. Stebbins. USA: Sage Publications. 149-163
- Melville, Herman (1957). *Redburn*. New York. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1849.
- Mikkelsen, E. (1954). *Fra hundevagt til hundeslaede*. Kobenhavn.
- Miller, Katherine (1995). *Organizational Communication*. USA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Mills, C. Wright (1959). *The Sociological Imagination*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- Mio, Jeffery Scott (1996). Metaphor, Politics, and Persuasion. In *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*. Eds. Jeffery Scott Mio and Albert N. Katz. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 127-145.
- Montin, Kim (1997). Den moderna sjömannen. In *Sjömannen*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi. 49-59.
- Montin, Kim (1995). Sjömännen under tre epoker. In *Skärgård 3/1995*. Åbo: Åbo Akademis tryckeri. 29-34.

- Morgan, Gareth (1997). *Images of Organization: New edition*. USA: SAGE Publications.
- Morgan, Gareth (1986). *Images of Organization*. USA: SAGE Publications.
- Munakata, Iwao (1984). *Worldview and the Concept of Self among Japanese Buddhist Fishermen in the Shiranui Inland Sea Area*. Institute of International Relations, Sophia University, Tokyo, Japan. Research Papers Series A – 48.
- Murray, Susan B. (1997). *It's Safer This Way: The Subtle and Not-So-Subtle Exclusion of Men in Child Care*. In *Subtle Sexism: Current practice and prospects for change*. USA: Sage Publications. 136-151.
- Musschenga, A.W. et al. (1992). *Morality, Worldview, and Law*. The Netherlands: Van Gorcum.
- Mäkelä, Klaus (1990b). *Alkusanat*. In *Kvalitatiivisen aineiston analyysi ja tulkinta*. Ed. Klaus Mäkelä. Saarijärvi: Gaudeamus. 3-8.
- Mäkelä, Klaus (1990a). *Kvalitatiivisen analyysin arviointiperusteet*. In *Kvalitatiivisen aineiston analyysi ja tulkinta*. Ed. Klaus Mäkelä. Saarijärvi: Gaudeamus. 42-61.
- Niemi, Pekka; Nurmi, Jari-Erik; Vauras, Marja (1986). *Johdatus persoonallisuuden psykologiaan*. Turku: Turun yliopiston Psykologian laitos.
- Niiniluoto, Ilkka (1984). *Tiede, filosofia ja maailmankatsomus*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Niiniluoto, Ilkka (1980). *Johdatus tieteenfilosofiaan*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Nixon, Sean (1997) *Exhibiting Masculinity*. In *Representation – Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Ed. Stuart Hall. UK: Sage Publications. 293-329.
- Norling, Lisa (1996). *Women in American whale industry*. In *Iron Men, Wooden Women: Gender and Seafaring in the Atlantic World, 1700-1920*. Eds. Margaret S. Creighton and Lisa Norling. USA: The John Hopkins University Press. 70-91.
- Norton, Catherine Sullivan (1989). *Life Metaphors. Stories of Ordinary Survival*. USA: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Oldenziel, Ruth (1999). *Making Technology Masculine*. Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- Ortony, A. (1975). *Why metaphors are necessary and not just nice*. *Educational Theory*, 26. 45-53.

- Ottenberg, Simon (1990). Thirty years of Fieldnotes. In *Fieldnotes*. Ed. Robert Sanjek. USA: Cornell University Press. 139-160.
- Palonen, Kari and Summa, Hilikka (1996). Johdanto: Retorinen käänne? In *Pelkkää Retoriikkaa*. Eds. Kari Palonen and Hilikka Summa. Tampere: Vastapaino. 7-17.
- Paravisini-Gebert, Lizabeth (2001). Cross-Dressing on the Margins of The Empire: Women Pirates and the Narrative of the Caribbean. In *Women at Sea*. Eds. Lizabeth Paravisini-Gebert and Ivette Romero-Cesareo. UK: Palgrave. 59-93.
- Patterson, Orlando (1991). *Freedom*. USA: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Pentikäinen, Juha (2002). Northern Ethnography. In *Styles and Positions: Ethnographic perspectives in comparative religion*. Eds. Heikki Pesonen, Tuula Sakaranaho, Tom Sjöblom and Terhi Utriainen. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. 20-45.
- Pentikäinen, Juha (1986). *Uskonto, kulttuuri ja yhteiskunta*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Perelman, Chaïm (1982). *The Realm of Rhetoric*. USA: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Perelman, Chaïm (1979). *The New Rhetoric and The Humanities*. The Netherlands: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Pesonen, Heikki (2001). Vihertyvä kirkko. Suomen evankelis-luterilainen kirkko ympäristötoimijana 1990-luvun kirkollisessa lehdistössä. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.
- Pesonen, Heikki (1997). Sukupuolitettu maailmankuva. In *Arvot, maailmankuvat, sukupuoli*. Ed. Helena Helve. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. 38-59.
- Pesonen, Heikki and Sakaranaho Tuula (eds.) (2002). *Uskonto, julkisuus ja muuttuva yhteiskunta*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Pink, Sarah (2000). 'Informants' who come 'home'. In *Constructing the Field*. Ed. Vered Amit. UK: Routledge. 96-116.
- Pollio, Howard R. (1996). Boundaries in Humor and Metaphor. In *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*. Eds. Jeffery Scott Mio and Albert N. Katz. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 231-252.
- Potter, Jonathan (1996). *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. UK: Sage Publications.
- Pratt, Jason (1988). McDonald's—We Do It All for You. In *The Electronic Sweatshop: How Computers Are Transforming the Office of the Future into the Factory of the Past*. Ed. Barbara Garson. NY: Simon and Schuster. 17-39.

- Pusa, Timo (1988). *Tatuoitu sydän*. Hämeenlinna: Kirjayhtymä.
- Ramberg, Klas (1997). *Sjömän I svensk kusttankfart*. In *Sjömannen*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi. 61-71.
- Ramström, Marika (1992). *Aspekter på Kap hornarnas verklighetsuppfattning: En studie i maskulin identitet*. *Suomen Antropologi* 1/1992. 16-25.
- Rediker, Marcus (1996). *Liberty beneath the Jolly Roger: The Lives of Anne Bonny and Mary Read, Pirates*. In *Iron Men, Wooden Women: Gender and Seafaring in the Atlantic World, 1700-1920*. Eds. Margaret S. Creighton and Lisa Norling. USA: The John Hopkins University Press. 1-33.
- Rediker, Marcus (1987). *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robbins, Stephen P. (2001). *Organizational Behavior*. USA: Prentice Hall.
- Rosenström, Marika (2002). *Elämää viimeisillä purjealuksilla*. In *Nautica Fennica 2001-2002*. Vammala: Museovirasto. 55-65.
- Rosenström, Marika (1996). *Fartyget Himlen och Havet*. Helsingfors: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Saarni, Heikki, Soini, Sinikka and Pentti, Jaana (1996). *Workload and Ship Safety*. In *Safety at Sea International*. April 1996. 29-33.
- Sakaranaho, Tuula (2002). *Women and rhetoric of religion*. In *Styles and Positions: Ethnographic perspectives in comparative religion*. Eds. Heikki Pesonen, Tuula Sakaranaho, Tom Sjöblom and Terhi Utriainen. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. 194-211.
- Sakaranaho, Tuula (ed.) (2001). *Retorinen tutkimus uskontotieteessä*. Helsinki : Helsingin yliopisto.
- Sakaranaho, Tuula (1999). *Hunturetoriikkaa*. In *Uskonto ja sukupuoli*. Eds. Tuija Hovi, Aili Nenola, Elina Vuola and Tuula Sakaranaho. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino. 296-318.
- Sakaranaho, Tuula (1998). *The Complex Other: A rhetorical approach to women, Islam and ideologies in Turkey*. Helsinki: Department of Comparative Religion, University of Helsinki.
- Saloperä, Petri (2002). *Towards a new ethnography*. In *Styles and Positions: Ethnographic perspectives in comparative religion*. Eds. Heikki Pesonen, Tuula Sakaranaho, Tom Sjöblom and Terhi Utriainen. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. 230-248.

Sammallahti, Leena (1993). Some Reflections on Ethnological Research into Seamen's Culture in Finland. In *Nautica Fennica* 1993. Helsinki: The Finnish Association for Maritime History. 16-20.

Sammallahti, Leena (1988). Suomalaisen merimiehen ensireissu. In *Kotiseutu* 1/1988. Forssa: Suomen Kotiseutuliitto. 19-27.

Shaw, B.H. (1953). *Splendour of the Seas*. London.

Simons, Herbert W. (1989). Introduction: Kenneth Burke and the Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. In *the Legacy of Kenneth Burke*. Eds. Herbert W. Simons and Trevor Melia. USA: University of Wisconsin Press. 3-25.

Spedding, Allison (1999). Dreams of leaving: Life in the feminine penitentiary centre, Miraflores, La Paz, Bolivia. *Anthropology Today*, vol.15 n:o2, April 1999. 29-33.

Spradley, James (1980). *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Strathern, Marilyn (1987). The limits of auto-anthropology. In *Anthropology at Home*. Ed. Anthony Jackson. USA: Tavistock Publications Ltd. 16-37.

Strauss, Sarah (2000). Locating yoga: Ethnography and transnational practice. In *Constructing the Field*. Ed. Vered Amit. UK: Routledge. 162-189.

Summa, Hilikka (1996). Kolme näkökulmaa uuteen retoriikkaan. In *Pelkkää Retoriikkaa*. Eds. Kari Palonen and Hilikka Summa. Tampere: Vastapaino. 51-81.

Vuoristo, Aapeli (ed.) (1985). *Suuri Toivelaulukirja*, osa 6. Helsinki: Musiikki Fazer.

Taylor, Frederick W. (1916). The Principles of Scientific Management. In *The Bulletin of Taylor Society*, December 1916. 13-23.

Thompson, Seth (1996). Politics without Metaphors is Like a Fish without Water. In *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*. Eds. Jeffery Scott Mio and Albert N. Katz. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 185-200.

Tikkanen, Salla-Maria (1993). Vapaa-ajan viettoa Suomen Etelä-Amerikan Linjan laivoilla. In *Nautica Fennica* 1993. Helsinki: The Finnish Association for Maritime History. 40-59.

Toivanen, Pekka (1993). Wind Merchants, Storm Raisers and Birds of Ill Omen: Finnish Seamen in World Literature. In *Nautica Fennica* 1993. Helsinki: The Finnish Association for Maritime History. 88-91.

Utriainen, Terhi (2002). In word and deed. In *Styles and Positions: Ethnographic perspectives in comparative religion*. Eds. Heikki Pesonen, Tuula Sakaranaho, Tom Sjöblom and Terhi Utriainen. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. 176-189.

Van Maanen, John (1991). Playing back the tape. In *Experiencing Fieldwork*. Eds. William B. Shaffir and Robert A. Stebbins. USA: Sage Publications. 31-42.

Van Royen, P.C. (1994). Hollannin kauppalaivaston miehistöistä. In *Meren Kansaa*. Loviisa: Kymenlaakson maakuntamuseo. 33-43.

Villiers, A. (1932). *Sea-dogs of to-day*. London.

Webb, Eugene ja Weick, Karl E. (1983). Unobstrusive Measures in Organizational Theory. In *Qualitative Methodology*. Ed. John Van Maanen. USA: Sage Publications. 209-224.

Weber, Max (1996). Bureaucracy (1922). In *Classics of Organization Theory*. Ed. Jay M. Shafritz & J. Steven Ott. USA: Harcourt Brace College Publishers. 80-85.

Weibust, Knut (1969). *Deep Sea Sailors. A Study in Maritime Ethnology*. Stockholm: Kungl. Boktryckeriet P.A. Norstedt & Söner.

Wetherell, Margaret and Potter, Jonathan (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. London : Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Williams, Christine L. (1989). *Gender Differences at Work: Women and Men in Nontraditional Occupations*. USA: University of California Press.

Winner, E. (1988). *The point of words. Children's understanding of metaphor and irony*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wolcott, Harry F. (1999). *Ethnography: A way of seeing*. USA: Sage Publications.

Wulff, Helena (2000). Access to a closed world: Methods for multilocal study on ballet as a career. In *Constructing the Field*. Ed. Vered Amit. UK: Routledge. 147-159.

### 6.2.1. Newspaper clips

Dagens Nyheter. August 13, 1995.

Helsingin Sanomat. January 18, 2000, D1.

### 6.2.2. Unpublished literature

Halonen, Ulla (1990). Matemaatikko- ja Fyysikkoliiton jäsenten maailmankuva. Pro gradu -työ Helsingin yliopiston uskontotieteen laitokselle.

Hirvonen, Aila (1986). Agronomien arvot ja maailmankuva. Pro gradu -työ Helsingin yliopiston uskontotieteen laitokselle.

Karjalainen Mira (1999). Merimiehen matkakertomus – Laivayhteisö vankila-metaforan valossa. Pro gradu -työ Helsingin yliopiston uskontotieteen laitokselle.

Komulainen, Tuulikki (1985). Arkkitehtien ammatti- ja maailmankuva. Pro gradu -työ uskontotieteen laitokselle.

Pessi, Juha (1981). Diplomi-insinöörin ja arkkitehdin maailmankuva. Pro gradu -työ Helsingin yliopiston uskontotieteen laitokselle.

## 7. Appendix: Complete list of metaphors

Here is a complete list of the metaphors which sailors used in the interviews, concerning shipworld. They exhibit wide meanings for both the ship and its sailors. First the metaphors of ship:

### Metaphors of ship or condition

Translation from Finnish:	The original metaphorin Finnish:
Another life	toinen elämä
Apartment building	kerrostalo
Behind bars	rautojen sisällä
Bottle	pullo
Boy camp	poikaleiri
Bride	morsian
Bus	bussi
Canoe	kanootti
Car	auto
Cell	selli
Company housing	työsuhdeasunto
Cubicle	koppi
Dictatorship	diktatuuri
Different world	erilainen maailma
Factory	tehdas
Family	perhe
Fetus	sikiö
Finnish summer	Suomen kesä
Fire brigade	palolaitos
Freight train	tavarajuna
Funeral	hautajaiset
Gig	keikkahomma
Gig	keikkatyö
Golden cage	kultainen häkki
Graveyard	hautausmaa
Home	koti
Hotel	hotelli
Institution	hoitolaitos
Island	saari
Jail	linna
Job of a robot	robotin hommaa
Kindergarten	lastentarha
Labor camp	työleiri

Lodge	tukkilaiskämppä
Nut house	hullujenhuone
Office desk	konttoripöytä
Oil rig	öljynporauslautta
Old-timer moped	pappamopo
Open prison	avovankila
Pail	kiulu
Power plant	voimalaitos
Prison	vankila
Production line work	vaihtotyö
Sheltered work	suojatyöpaikka
Slavery	orjatyö
Space shuttle	avaruussukkula
Talking to the wall	ku puhuis lokeille
Village community	kyläyhteisö
Waste plant	jätelaitos
Woman	nainen

Together this makes 50 metaphors of ship or conditions on ship.

### Metaphors of sailor

Translation from Finnish:	The original metaphor in Finnish:
Baby	Pikkulapsi
Ballast	painolasti
Bogeyman	mörkö
Clown	pelle (captain)
Cog in a machine	ratas koneistossa
Dog	koira
Engine	moottori
Executive	yrittäjä (captain)
“Forested”, wild	mehtiintynyt
God	jumala (captain)
Hermit	erakko
Khalif	kalifi (captain)
Lion	leijona (captain)
Lord	herra
Machine	kone
Madman	hullu
Mite	reppana
Number	numero
Old codger	nitroukko
Prisoner	vanki
Prison guard	vankilanvartija (captain)
Psychopath	psykopaatti
Race of its own	oma rotunsa

Ragamuffin	resuperse
Shepherd	paimen (captain)
Slave	orja
Social welfare (I am no -)	sosiaalivirasto (en oo mikään -) (captain)
Tour leader	matkanjohtaja (captain)
Tribe of its own	oma heimonsa
Village chief	kyläpäällikkö (captain)
Village nutter	kylähullu
Ward (or dependant)	holhottava
Wretch	ressukka

Together this makes 33 metaphors of sailors.

### Other expressions

Translation from Finnish:	The original in Finnish:
Closed authoritarian society	suljettu autoritääriinen yhteiskunta
Closed community	suljettu yhteisö
Closed space	suljettu tila
Cold being	kylmä olento
Establishment	laitos
Industrial plant	teollisuuslaitos
Industrial process	teollisuusprosessi
Institution	laitos
Miniature model of society	pienoismalliyhteiskunta
Productive unit	tuottava yksikkö
Satellite colony	satelliittiyhteiskunta
Small community	pieni yhteisö
Voluntary prison	vapaaehtoinen vankila

Together this makes 13 other expressions of shipworld that may not be easily fitted under the predominant definitions of metaphor.