UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

https://helda.helsinki.fi

Helda

In the shadow of freedom : life on board the oil tanker

Karjalainen, Mira

2007

Karjalainen, M 2007, 'In the shadow of freedom : life on board the oil tanker', Helsinki.

http://hdl.handle.net/10138/267620

unspecified
acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

+

Työn otsikko:

In the Shadow of Freedom

Life on board the oil tanker

Abstract

The aim of this study was to look at the freedom of ordinary people as they construct it. The scope, however, was limited to contemporary Finnish sailors and their freedom discourses. The study belongs to the field of the anthropology of religions, which is part of comparative religion.

Worldview, which is one of the key concepts in comparative religion, provided the broader theoretical basis of the study. The data consisted of 92 interviews with Finnish professional seafarers conducted in 1996, 1999, 2000 and 2005, field journals that were written during two periods of fieldwork in 1996 and 1999-2000, and correspondence with some of the seafarers during 1999-2005. The analysis process incorporated new rhetoric and metaphor theory.

The thesis is in three parts. The first part discusses the methodological challenges of this type of ethnography, the second – an ethnography of modern Finnish shipworld – focuses on work, organization, hierarchy and gender, and the third part discusses the freedom concepts of seafarers. It was found that seafarers use two kinds of freedom discourse. The first is in line with the stereotypical Jack Tar, a free-roving sailor who is not bound to land and its mundane routines, and the second views shipworld as 'freedom from freedom, meaning one is not responsible for one's own actions because one is not free to make a choice. It was also found that seafarers are well aware of the stereotypical images that are attached to their profession: they not only deny them, but also utilize, reflect on and construct them.

Acknowledgments

After finishing my Licentiate thesis research in spring 2004 I made my boyfriend Tapani swear that if I ever mentioned a word about doing a doctorate he would whack me on the head. I was so happy to be done with that research that I never again wanted to be faced with the same fatigue, frustration and enthusiasm. As you are reading this you know that something went wrong with that resolution.

I thus wish to express my gratitude to Professor René Gothóni for his encouraging attitude and his words that convinced me to carry on with my research: "Remember Mira that at least your research keeps you off the streets and from granny-bashing", and Professor Juha Pentikäinen for talking me into beginning my graduate studies in the first place. Although at times I have felt frustrated, the decision to bash on with my dissertation has, indeed, kept me out of mischief.

I would especially like to thank my advisor, Dr. Tuula Sakaranaho, for her encouragement, support and supervision throughout my studies. You have guided me from my Master's thesis to my Ph.D., which I am sure was not an easy task. Thank you! I would also like thank Dr. Terhi Utriainen for her advice and support – and for her efforts to point me and my research in a more phenomenological direction.

The supportive work community and my friends within it have made the days brighter in my home department of Comparative Religion at the University of Helsinki. I wish to thank each and every one of you for putting up with my loud laugh and my ‘great’ sense of humor.

I owe a debt of gratitude to several scholars abroad and in Finland. First, I would like to thank Professor Harold W. Scheffler and the Yale Anthropology Department for organizing my research year at Yale University and for making it so enjoyable. I am also grateful to Professor Heide Gerstenberger from the University of Bremen and Professor Yrjö Kaukiainen from the University of Helsinki for giving me some very helpful comments on the larger seafaring framework of my study.

Furthermore, I wish to thank Professor Lisa Norling from the University of Minnesota and Professor Nils G. Holm from Åbo Akademi University, both of whom functioned as preliminary examiners of my doctoral thesis. Their commentaries were very useful when I revised the thesis for publication.

Elsi Hyttinen from the University of Turku and Kirsi Eräranta from the University of Helsinki have read parts of the manuscript from a gender perspective. I wish to thank you both for your comments. Having thanked all these kind scholars who have voluntarily read and commented on my manuscript, I should emphasize that I am solely responsible for any flaws that remain in this work.

My gratitude so far has been directed at the academic community. I have no intention of forgetting another equally important community, however, for this study would absolutely not have been possible without the help of the seafarers. There are several people and institutions in seafaring I wish to mention specifically. First, I would like to thank all of the ships’ communities and sailors who welcomed me onboard their ships. My time onboard was very illuminating, demanding, and fun. I am especially grateful to Captain Lauri Vuorinen, who kindly read my manuscript and gave me some very useful comments, especially on English professional jargon and ships’ practices.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Vice President Erkki Kotiranta and Neste Shipping, as well as to The Finnish Seamen’s Union, for supporting my research in its

different phases. Furthermore, I am grateful to the institutions that provided financial support, which made it possible for me to conduct this research: ASLA-Fulbright, the Jenny and Antti Wihuri Foundation, Merenkulun Säätiö, The Finnish Work Environment Fund and the University of Helsinki. Furthermore, I wish to thank Joan Nordlund for her help with the language.

Finally, I wish to thank my whole family, and especially my mother Dr. Aulikki Sauramo who read my texts, suggested some books, and put some necessary pressure on me by defending her own dissertation in spring 2006.

Thank you, Tapani, for gracefully putting up with me in my stressed state. Now looking back, I am grateful to you for not whacking me on the head, even though I made you promise to do so. I am happy that I didn't listen to myself!

In my cozy little study on a sunny afternoon in April 2007.

Mira Karjalainen

List of Tables

Glossary: sailor, seaman, crew

Below are the main maritime terms used in this work.

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

Crew means the entire population working on board (in Finnish *laivan miehistö*). Some definitions exclude the captain, and the crew may refer only to "the personnel engaged on board ship, excluding the master and officers and the passengers on passenger ships." (Seawords Maritime Glossary, website). From now on, the crew is defined here as the personnel working aboard ship, including the captain, if not stated otherwise.

Deckhand refers to an ordinary seaman, or able-bodied seaman.

Laborer, worker means a person who is not an officer. This category includes members of the deck gang, in other words the boatswain/bosun, pumpman, deckhand (AB/able-bodied seaman and OS/ordinary seaman), and the engine gang – the electrician, repairman and motorman – and others including the cook steward, the cook, and the mess girl/cook's assistant (in Finnish *miehistö*).

The mate and **the engineer** belong to the licensed personnel, i.e., they are officers. This category includes the chief/first mate/officer, the second mate/officer, the third mate/officer, the chief engineer, the first engineer, and the second engineer (in Finnish *päällystö*).

Sailor, seaman, seafarer, and seadog refer to all persons working aboard, including the captain (in Finnish *merimies*: it can be used to refer only to the laborers). In this study these terms are used as interchangeable synonyms.

I “I am a free wanderer, a restless soul” – an introduction to seafarers' views on freedom

I woke up hungry. Last night’s sleep was cut short because we’d docked in the small hours. I climbed up the ladder and crossed the deck because, once again, there was no yoghurt in the caboose. Then I heard the hum of voices. There were dozens of onlookers on the pier admiring the 50-meter three-masted wooden beauty in the historic center of Gdansk. I was caught off guard in my pajamas holding the yoghurt pot standing on the floodlit deck, thus getting some of the attention. I heard a couple, leaning towards each other, talking about me. They wondered what it was like to sail on such a beautiful windjammer, to be as free as a bird, to live the life of adventure, and to survive the forces of nature. “She must be very brave – to have such freedom!” was the last thing I heard before ducking below deck. For them I was the adventurous and carefree – but at the same time brave and perhaps reckless – sailor, while I just felt like a hungry and somewhat grumpy slave. I realized that had I not gone to merchant marine school and to sea on oil tankers and windjammers I might have the same admiration for the brave and carefree crew of a visiting ship I saw in the port. Oh well! I finished the yoghurt.

This event from the summer of 2001 in Poland came to my mind when I started writing my thesis. It evinces some essential aspects of my research interest. Freedom, as ordinary people (read: non-scholars) construct it, fascinates me. Given that it is one of the prevalent concepts and values in our modern world, it is surprising how little attention it has generated in comparative religion and anthropology. One explanation may be connected with its definition. This problematic nature of freedom is well-captured by Isaiah Berlin (2000, 193) when he states:

> 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.

Perhaps this complexity has discouraged scholars outside political theory and philosophy from studying freedom. As a result, Orlando Patterson (1991, 2) argues, because within philosophy it is defined as a coherent concept for thinking people, there are two histories involved: 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". Thus, according to Patterson, philosophers' attempts to define it often ignore the freedom of people. Unfortunately, as James Laidlaw argues, it has also been neglected in the field of anthropology. He calls for efforts to find ways of describing human freedom, and freedom's manifestations in different social contexts and cultural traditions. (Laidlaw 2002, 311.)

The objective in this study is exactly this: to examine the conceptions of freedom from a sailor's[1] own point of view. This brief narrative from Gdansk illustrates the various elements of freedom to be scrutinized. First, it shows how the bystanders used certain elements to construct their own idea of freedom. Secondly, it shows what elements they decided to choose for communicating their own construction, and thirdly, it illustrates the wavering nature of freedom: I had had the same kind of idea about freedom at sea as the whispering spectators had, but it was washed away at sea, only to turn up later to be utilized. Finally, the dual image of a tiring sea life (hungry and grumpy, why is there no food in the galley?) and heartfelt freedom (this is great! I'm privileged) demonstrates its endogenous contradictory nature. Thus, freedom may look quite different from the inside and the outside. Situations or events that an outsider may perceive as free may not be experienced as such by the insider, and vice versa.

Sailors symbolize freedom

"Rio ahoy, I left on the banana boat, to see you, to fall in love with your women," sings the former sailor from the Finnish pop band Dingo (Dingo, song lyrics of *Rio Ohoi!*[2]). During the peak of its popularity in the 1980s, Dingo and its figurehead Neuman made use of his past as a seaman, tapping into the myth of a free-roving sailor. They had several songs in their repertoire about the sea and sailors, and Neuman's previous profession was frequently referred to in the interviews and articles written about him and his band. The myth of the sailor's freedom is represented in music and literature in the Finnish culture: there are plenty of references to the free-roving sailor who does not

[1] In this work, sailor refers to professional seafarers and is thus used as a synonym for seaman, seafarer and seadog.

[2] Lyrics by Dingo: Rio ahoy, I left on the banana boat/ To see you/ To fall in love with your women [---]/ And the hands of sailors play on the hips/ Hot sand tickles the toes.
Rio ohoi, mä lähdin banaanilaivalla pois/ Sinua katsomaan/ Sinun naisiisi rakastumaan [---]/ Ja kädet merimiesten lanteilla karkeloi/ Kuuma hiekka varpaita kutittaa. (Translated by Mira Karjalainen.)

conform to the rules and expectations on land. Therefore literature and other products of culture have been influential in the construction of the sailor image (Uola 2004, 9). Accordingly, the stereotypical image of freedom is often attached to seafarers, mostly by ignorant landsmen. Countless are the songs that embrace this idea in the Finnish popular culture (*Tähti ja meripoika* - Star and Tar, *Merimies merta rakastaa* - Sailor Loves the Sea, and such). The old stereotype of a seaman's life is also replicated in numerous lyrics written more recently – not only in those produced by Dingo – such as *Ankkurinappi*[3] (The Anchor button) by J.Karjalainen, *Rion satamassa* (In the Harbor of Rio) and *Liputtomat laivat* (Ships without Flags) by Tuomari Nurmio.

The example of the pop singer and ex-sailor Neuman illustrates why Finnish contemporary seafarers are suitable research subjects: sailors, of all groups that one can realistically study, most obviously carry the emblem of freedom. During the times when other occupational groups in Finland (and abroad) were mostly bound to their home areas, seamen were already roaming the oceans of the world. They formed the first more freely moving group in the history of labor because being free-wage labor they were not bound to their employers as many others were (Rediker 1987, 77-115). This history still shows in the seaman's culture, as will be demonstrated later on. It also strengthens the myth of sailors' freedom.

This fulsome image of sailors raises the question of how the real seafarers of today view this stereotype attached to them. It seems that opinions vary: while one may dismiss the whole idea of mythical freedom in the sailor's life, another – like motorman Pete[4] with a couple of decades at sea – may proudly declare, "I'm a free wanderer, a restless soul." When asked if sailing along the Finnish coast depressed him he replied, "Sure it does. I'd like to go further out, but it's impossible right now."[5] The contradictory views that sailors have regarding their stereotype image are intriguing. My interest is therefore in how

[3] Lyrics by J.Karjalainen: The ocean is black and the waves splash onto the shore/ I wait for you and the ship ever more/ When we met it was dark, when we parted it was darker./ I have only your anchor button as a memento/ the anchor button was taken from your shirt. (Translated by Mira Karjalainen.)
Meri on musta ja aallot rantaan lyö/ Sinua ja laivaa ootan joka yö/ Kun kohdattiin oli pimeää/ Kun erottiin oli pimeämpää/ Ankkurinappi vain muistoksi jäi/ Ankkurinappi sinun puserosta jäi.
[4] All the names of the sailors have been changed in order to preserve their privacy. A motorman is a laborer who works in the engine room.
[5] Interview HYUL99/29:m4. There is a list and a short description of some of the key informants in Appendix 1.

modern seafarers view the mythical freedom of sailors, and how they place themselves in relation to the myth.

Studying sailors

Deckhand Puhonen stared at me, weighing up his words.[6] He had just answered my question regarding women at sea, saying that women belonged in the galley. When I continued, asking why they were no good on deck, after a long pause he replied, "[cough] Like today when we were carrying this long pilot ladder[7] up to the catwalk. [She] couldn't to carry it alone."[8] The situation was awkward, and we both fell into an uncomfortable silence. I was the only woman working on deck so it was pretty clear to whom he was referring to.

I had gone to sea because the modern shipworld[9] fascinated me. It was unlike any other work place: it moves constantly around the world and is in touch with nature. Yet it seems to contradict the stereotype of the sailor's freedom because of its factory-like work environment and the highly technological and competitive seafaring practices. When I searched through the maritime literature, however, I soon found out that most studies conducted on seafarers focused on the sailing-ship era, and interest seemed to abate the closer I came to the present day. Thus the sailors of the modern era have attracted surprisingly little research attention in humanities and the social sciences. In particular, studies conducted on contemporary sailors or seaman communities are scarce in the fields of anthropology and sociology, not to mention comparative religion. Although a couple of ethnographies have been published on the topic of contemporary shipworld (Lane 1986; Ramberg 1997; du Rietz 2001; and Gerstenberger & Welke 2004), they focus on ships of other seafaring countries, often with ethnically mixed crews.[10] Furthermore, the perspectives of some of these studies derive from other disciplines, such as political science and labor-market research. Therefore this study expands the field in two ways: first, it is the only ethnographic work focusing on contemporary Finnish shipworld, and secondly, while most crews in international seafaring include people of several

[6] Deckhand is a name for an ordinary seaman and an able-bodied seaman.
[7] A long rope ladder (also known as a Jacob's ladder), rigged for the pilot, so that he can board the ship.
[8] HYUL96/19.
[9] "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).
[10] Crew in this study means the entire population working on board.

nationalities, the shipping communities investigated in this study consist solely of Finns. It therefore examines a moment in seafaring history that may later prove to have been the last glimpse of seafarers in crews of one nationality that are relatively homogenous. It will also reveal something about freedom constructions among Finns.

Given the lack of previous research conducted on this subject, fieldwork was an essential and necessary part of the study. Shipworld is different from life on land in so many respects that one cannot comprehend where the freedom discourses of seamen are coming from without first understanding their world. I thus provide an ethnography of contemporary Finnish shipworld that emphasizes the characteristics that distinguish it from mainstream Finnish culture. These include – among other things – the construction of time and space, work and its organization, the internationality of the trade, and the effect of the sea on all of a ship's functions. Moreover, seamen's jargon has a myriad of words and expressions that are incomprehensible to landlubbers. For example, the sentence "*puolikas torppasi kongin turkin*" would mean, if translated literally into 'land' Finnish, that "a half 'crofted' the fur of 'a bell'", when in fact it means that an ordinary seaman cleaned the floor of the corridor. Therefore it is essential for the researcher to be familiar with the sailors' jargon and with the objects and events they refer to. For example, even if one checks in a dictionary what catwalk means (it is a raised bridge that runs fore and aft from the midship) and looks at a picture of a pilot ladder, only the experience of carrying that ladder over the wet rolling deck will reveal how strikingly obnoxious the job can be. Furthermore, only by doing it do the implications become clear: as soon as the above-mentioned Puhonen realized that I had succeeded in the task, he became significantly more agreeable.

This story of pilot ladders exemplifies some methodological questions – the expectations placed on female workers and the first-hand experience as an ordinary seaman – connected with doing fieldwork in shipworld. My methodological goal was thus two-fold. First, I looked at the fieldwork from the perspective of a female in a male-dominated research setting and secondly, I focused on the complexity of insider/outsider views – how to function as a vital part of the field under study, to be an insider, and yet to stay outside in order to analyze it. The question of fieldwork at 'home' or 'away' has been discussed in several studies in the area of comparative religion, also in Finland. For example, Marja Tiilikainen (2003, 93-103) conducted fieldwork among Somali women

living in Finland, and therefore reflected on it in terms of home anthropology. Tuomas Martikainen (2004, on fieldwork 27-38), who carried out his fieldwork concerning immigrant religions in his hometown of Turku, was also in the same kind of situation as Tiilikainen: being at home and away at the same time. With respect to personal commitment to the field, Kennet Granholm (2005, 55-60) discusses in his study on dark magic how he balanced his own personal interest in the topic and his stance as a researcher. The issue of being 'at home' or 'away', and of personal commitment, is discussed in more detail in Part II.

The main body of data for the study consists of nearly 100 interviews conducted with Finnish seamen during the last ten years. I have also used the field journals I wrote during my stay on board while doing the fieldwork and conducting the interviews. I was in the field twice, in two different positions. The first time 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 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 crew's attitudes regarding their work and life at sea. As noted above, fieldwork is a common practice in comparative religion – one could even refer to it as one of its main research methods. Consequently, several Finnish scholars in this area have written on the subject: Hannu Kilpeläinen (2000) reflected on fieldwork in a monastery, while René Gothóni (1997, 2000) focused on monasteries and pilgrimage. In addition, Terhi Utriainen (2002) has written about ethnography and women's studies. All these share some characteristics with the work at hand, and thus provide some background and the opportunity for dialogue: Kilpeläinen and Gothóni discuss fieldwork in monasteries while I discuss fieldwork in another closed community, the ship; and Utriainen reflects upon her experiences as both a worker and a fieldworker, as I do regarding my fieldwork at sea.

How sailors view the world – theoretical background

While shipworld studied through ethnographic fieldwork gives context to freedom discourse, the worldview provides the theoretical background. Because freedom as a value is part of the worldview, this theoretical context helps the reader to place freedom discourse in a meaningful framework (see Helve 1987, 13). As one old boatswain's view

of sailors illustrates, however, worldview is a complex and problematic term that should be utilized with some caution: "When you talk with a seaman, like my old lady says, the seaman has a *huge* worldview, from all directions, and he doesn't only stare at his own belly button."[11]

Worldview as a term was first used in the context of peoples' beliefs about what the world was made of, their assumptions about cosmology (Ketola 1997, 8). In indigenous 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. In today's world, however, the worldviews held by people are not as unified, and take various forms. (Helve 1993, 16.) The notion of the worldview has often been linked with the holistic view of culture and with the idea that behind every culture lies a common set of assumptions and beliefs shared with members of that culture. These 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 with life. The holistic view fosters the idea that these widely shared taken-for-granted elements of cultural processes are difficult to perceive: moreover the basic assumptions are often hidden from the members of that culture as well. (Ketola 1997, 9-10.)

Given the focus on human knowledge, the study of worldviews has been viewed as part of cognitive anthropology, a discipline that developed in the United States during the 1950s and 1960s, and was characterized by its fascination with the cognitive structures of a culture. The worldview was soon brought under the umbrella of sociology and structuralism. (Helve 1993, 22-23.) As an example of the structural approach, Clifford Geertz (1968, 303) defines worldview as a picture of the way things really are, including concepts of nature, the self and society, and the most comprehensive ideas of order. Although Michael Kearney also supports the structural approach, he criticizes its ideological context, arguing that the anthropological study of worldviews has traditionally had its background in idealism: ideas shape the world. Therefore he calls for a materialist approach in which ideas are seen to arise in the human brain as reflections (more or less accurate) of the external world. Accordingly, he defines worldview as a collection of basic assumptions that an individual or a society has about reality:

[11] HYUL99/63:m9.

> 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. (Kearney 1984, 9-31, 41-42.)

With respect to underlying assumptions, Ilkka Niiniluoto divides worldviews into three categories: scientific, religious and metaphysical. On the scientific level the world is explained in terms of claims obtained and justified by scientific methods openly corrected as knowledge advances. The religious worldview incorporates claims based on religious authorities (e.g., the Quran or Tripitaka), or on religious or supernatural experiences. It does not have to be unscientific because claims such as the existence of a god [-s] cannot be proved right or wrong by scientific means. Thirdly the worldview is metaphysical (non-scientific) if it interprets the world through philosophical arguments rather than empirical investigation. (Niiniluoto 1984, 79-83.) Niiniluoto could be criticized for ignoring the ideological worldview, which does not fit into these categories in that it shuns the supernatural but is dogmatic like the religious worldview (Helve 1987, 20). Furthermore, this division into three categories may be an oversimplification. It also creates fruitless scientific vs. non-scientific dichotomies (Ketola 1997, 13).

Worldviews in flux

The old first mate[12] shrugged his shoulders. Then, after a long pause, he answered my question regarding his decision to go to sea as a youngster: "An under aged 16-year-old doesn't have any thoughts of his own. I went to sea and never stopped going."[13] He implies here that his worldview had developed during his lifetime. Worldview is considered subject to change over time in two ways. First, there is no doubt that for the individual and for society it is inseparable from time, place and social setting (Kuusi 1977, 240). The worldviews held in medieval times differ, by definition, from ours – the very word illustrates this: one needs only to think of the Americas, Antarctica and Australia. People are children of their time, because at different times people consider different things to be truths (Helve 1993, 15-17). Secondly, one's personal life

[12] A mate is a deck officer.
[13] HYUL99/39:f6.

experiences change one's worldview. Its formation should thus be perceived as an ongoing developmental process, and not only as a socialized belief system. It is in a continuous process of change, because it is in constant interaction with the environment. (Helve 1987, 17-18.) As 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). It should also be noted that these inconsistencies rarely overly bother the people who hold them.

The study of worldviews has nevertheless attracted criticism over the last couple of decades. For example, Jane Hill and Bruce Mannheim (1992, 381) argue:

> "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.

'Worldview' as a term refers to unity, totality and comprehensiveness, although this is not necessarily the case in practice. The nature of internally logical and sound worldviews has been questioned: they may contain conflicting elements and several diverse but parallel patterns of thought. Therefore it may not be necessary to assume that people have sound harmonic worldviews that do not need to change. Furthermore, Kimmo Ketola (1997, 10-11) 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.

Dimensions of worldview

Worldview has often been divided into smaller and more manageable analytical entities. Kearney, for example, lists certain universals, which he claims exist in the worldviews of all peoples: the Self and the other; classification, relationship and causality; and time and space (Kearney 1984, 42-48, 68-107). These universals are based on a worldview model Robert Redfield formed in the1950s, which has influenced later scholars. He also broke down the concept into certain universals: humans, nature and god; the self and the other;

and time and space. In this system ethos, which is an internalized value-system, borders the worldview. (Redfield 1955, 80-95.) Kearney also makes the theoretical assumption that worldview universals *are* universal within species, and therefore they are fundamental categories of human thought.[14] Although he assumes these universals to be fixed, he reminds us that their contents are not. He also divides worldview into *assumptions*, which are the universals, and *propositions*, which are beliefs and folk knowledge. The universals are not usually articulated explicitly, while people can describe propositions. (Kearney 1984, 42-48, 68-107.)

There is also a strong Finnish tradition in worldview studies, especially in the areas of structure and models. Juha Manninen (1977, 16-17), for example, has developed a structural model incorporating assumptions concerning: (a) time and space, (b) the origin of the world, and the supernatural (does it exist, how does it affect the world), (c) nature and human beings as a part of it, (d) human beings themselves and their relations with others, and (e) societal structures, including nations, states and the factors determining the course of history. According to the model, values could be considered in the contexts of nature, human beings and their relations with others (c, d and e). This worldview model is wide and, as Helena Helve (1987, 19) argues, it might be difficult for young people to understand the factors that determine the course of history. I would add that they may remain a great mystery for most of us. Moreover, Manninen divides worldview into basic categories, thus attempting to form a typology (Ketola 1997, 18). His structure is therefore a step away from the idea of worldview universals, if we use Kearney's analysis. Although Kearney shares some of his assumptions with Manninen (time, space, relations), Manninen includes society, nations and states, while Kearney keeps his universals on a more abstract level of analysis: causality and the other.

Helve has also contributed to worldview studies. She based her model on divisions of religion developed by several scholars (see Glock and Stark 1966, 142-162; Helander 1986, 42-49; Pentikäinen 1986, 15-16; see also Ringgren 1968, 12-13): it comprises the following five dimensions. (1) *The conative* (behavioral) *dimension* focuses on activities, interests and lifestyles: it is assumed that the worldview is visible in people's activities,

[14] However, Kearney notes that a student of worldviews can use only the categories that are historically available: different times offer different choices. Therefore he willingly admits that his worldview universals are artifacts of the Western intellectual tradition. (Kearney 1984, 207-208.)

although it does not provide such explicit guidance as Weltanschauung does. (2) *The cultural dimension* includes one's cultural heritage and one's subculture. (3) *The cognitive dimension* includes knowledge structures that have been socialized through home, school, church, and other institutions. It incorporates beliefs about the world, life, death, the supernatural, time and space, nature and humanity, as well as about society, and is closest to the afore-mentioned belief system. (4) *The social dimension* includes relations with other people: it is assumed that one's worldview affects one's relationships with others. (5) Finally, *the affective dimension* covers experiences and feelings (emotions, prospects, fears, and joys). Helve acknowledges the fact that these five dimensions may overlap, therefore that it may be difficult to distinguish one from another. (Helve 1987, 21-22; 1993, 21.) Hence, in this model values cannot be confined to one category: they are manifested in all dimensions, one way or another, although the cognitive dimension may be the key hostess. With respect to worldview universals and propositions, Helve takes her model one more step further than Manninen, leaning more toward propositions than to assumptions: she includes the church, school and lifestyles, but not the Self, the other, or causality.

One size does not fit all: the dangers of worldview models

Worldview models have pitfalls, as Heikki Pesonen warns us. For instance, there is a danger of falling into universalization and ethnocentrism if one uses existing theoretical constructions for interpreting the worldview of an individual or a group. As a result, the researcher will view the culture he or she is studying through two pairs of lenses: through the construction created by the Western research community and through his or her own worldview. In addition, if it is assumed that all individuals of a certain group comprehend the reality through the same ahistorical model, through the same worldview their individual ways of being in the world – as a person having a certain attitude towards the world in a particular moment, time and place – may not show, although it could be a very fruitful perspective from which to understand that culture. Therefore, there is a danger the use of worldview models will reduce the unique experience of an individual to a theoretical entity. (Pesonen 1997, 48, 52.)

These considerations apply to Helve and Manninen, but leave Kearney mostly intact because his worldview universals function on significantly abstract levels. It may be easy to criticize arguments holding that every worldview carries assumptions about the structures of society, nations and states, but it is much more difficult to proclaim that there are cultures in which people's worldviews do not incorporate the idea of causality. Manninen's and Helve's models could be viewed as examples of what later scholars (see, e.g., Hill and Mannheim, Pesonen, and Ketola) have criticized: that there is a universal model that fits all worldviews in the world. In the light of this 'one size fits all' criticism, I will make every attempt to avoid these problems. I will not attempt to explore sailors' worldviews as a whole, and will rather look at the different elements in order to give a theoretical context to the notion of freedom. Furthermore, my analysis of the freedom discourses of seamen is based on the data I have collected, and not on a worldview theory or model created by former scholars.

What the world looked like from a windjammer

Studies on the worldview of Finnish sailors are few and far between and they focus on sailors of the windjammer era. For example, Merja-Liisa Hinkkanen studied sailors on sailing ships, exploring the seaman experience by means of mentality history and focusing on the experiences of first-timers at sea. The newcomers were faced with a new world on board. They stepped into a new social community, learned its ways and a new profession – they were confronted by surroundings that they could not adapt to, without a re-interpretation of the world. Therefore they were forced to revise their earlier worldviews in order to achieve congruency with their new environment and the sailor lifestyle that prevailed. (Hinkkanen 1988, 446-447.) It has been suggested that the structure of life on board alone differentiated the mentality or worldview of sailors from that of farmers, for example: a farmer could live his life more or less as his ancestors had, but a sailor had to adapt to a new lifestyle (Lybeck 2000, 42).

In another study Marika Rosenström (1996) investigated Finnish sailors who went overseas on windjammers at the beginning of the 20th century. Most of her interviewees

were old sea captains[15] who had already retired, which should be kept in mind when reflecting on her findings. She used cultural analysis as her method, which resembles the worldview in some respects. She divides culture into several basic structures, including chaos and order, manly nature, the individual and the collective, nature and culture, society and social categories, power and hierarchy, masculine and feminine, morale, prestige, work, time and space, and cosmology. At the end of her analysis she briefly discusses sailors' concepts of reality. I will discuss Rosenström's study in more detail in the context of my analysis of shipworld and the freedom discourses of seamen.

Although few studies on sailors have been conducted in the context of comparative religion, the study of contemporary sailors' freedom discourse does, however, have a strong link to the line of Finnish studies on the values and worldviews of various professions conducted from that perspective during the last two decades. For example, Ulla Halonen (1990) wrote her Master's thesis on the identities and worldviews of Finnish mathematicians and physicists; Aila Hirvonen (1986) studied the values and worldviews of agronomists; Juha Pessi (1981) carried out his study on the worldviews of architects and graduate engineers, while Tuulikki Komulainen (1985) focused on the worldviews and professional identities of architects. Furthermore, Helve has conducted several studies on the worldviews of Finnish youth (Helve 2002, 1997, 1987), while Ketola has looked at the history of the worldview as a concept (Ketola 1997; see also Holm 1996; Pesonen 1997). Therefore, this work on sailors continues this tradition in comparative religion: the study of different kinds of groups – occupational and others – and their values.

The study of worldviews and values

While worldviews may be theorized in several ways, values are inevitably part of them. Values and motives are basic components, revealed in individuals' concrete actions (Niemi et al. 1986, 80). A worldview (*Weltbild*) is usually distinguished from a *Weltanschauung*.[16] The term Weltanschauung is often used to refer to the conscious and

[15] The captain is the head of the ship and the company representative on board. 'Sea captain' refers to the qualification obtained in merchant-marine institutes.

[16] Weltanschauung is a German term, which has been used frequently in worldview studies. German has two words for worldview: Weltbild and the afore-mentioned Weltanschauung. Weltbild is a "picture of the world", while Weltanschauung is a "view or perspective on the world."

explicitly codified system of beliefs in order to single it out from a worldview that is more implicit. (Helve 1993, 14.) Moreover, one has to make a conscious effort to develop Weltanschauung, while everybody has a worldview (Manninen 1977, 25). Furthermore, a fully developed Weltanschauung, as Niiniluoto states, comprises epistemology (a theory of knowledge; how do we achieve and on what do we base our knowledge), value theory (an ethical system of values that contain beliefs about good and bad, right and wrong), and worldview (assumptions about the world) (Niiniluoto 1984, 86-87).

Worldview is thus a part of Weltanschauung for Niiniluoto. His view differs from the approach advocated by both Helve and Niemi et al.: Helve includes values and value systems into her worldview model and Niemi et al. see values as the basic definers of its structure, but Niiniluoto maintains that worldview and value systems are separate, and together with epistemology comprise Weltanschauung. His approach assumes a high level of consciousness in order to achieve this. Often people are not very aware of their views on the world or of their values, however. Moreover, splitting of Weltanschauung into three sections may be theoretically reasoned, but may prove problematic in practice. I therefore find the broader concept that includes values more useful for my purposes and examine freedom as a value and as part of the worldview, as advocated by Helve and Niemi et al.

The worldview including values that are its basic elements is also expressed through language. 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.

Accordingly, worldviews are best studied through discourse. Freedom, like other values, is best explored through discourse because it is not something one can collect in a box and then take to the laboratory for examination. We cannot touch freedom, and the only way to scrutinize it is to study how people express it. Discourse could be described as language in use, or human meaning-making, the latter being a broader definition (Whetherell, Taylor and Yates 2001, 3). There are two main approaches to the analysis of language in use, as Jokinen et al. note: either as a picture of reality or as constructing reality. In the latter case it is a practice that not only reflects the world, but also makes meanings and thereby organizes and constructs, renews and alters the social reality in

which we live. (Jokinen et al. 1993, 9-14.) Accordingly, I explore the freedom of sailors through their discourses and bind it to the larger theoretical context of the worldview.

During the analysis process, as will become evident, I found several freedom discourses. Contemporary seafarers utilize the old stereotype of Jack Tar, or 'Kalle Aaltonen' as Tar's Finnish counterpart could be called. This freedom discourse constructs itself on the basis of adventure, independence, traveling, womanizing, and alcohol, among other things. The other main type of freedom discourse uses as its building blocks the factory-like environment of shipworld, the introversion of the social scene, and the sea as a barrier. These discourses are discussed in detail later in this work.

The aim and scope of this study

This work continues the discussion on freedom, focusing on the freedom constructions of ordinary people who have been largely ignored in studies conducted so far. The scope of this research, however, is limited to contemporary Finnish seamen. Structurally, the work is divided into three parts, of which the first discusses the methodological challenges of this type of ethnography. The second sets out the context of the freedom discourses of seafarers. This ethnography of modern shipworld provides the background for the third part of the study, which deals with the freedom discourses of present-day Finnish seafarers.

An ethnography of the modern Finnish shipworld

In order to comprehend the freedom discourses of seafarers, it is crucial to look first at the setting in which they were formed. In studying the environment from which the freedom discourses of seamen derive I am addressing my **first research question: what the setting of freedom discourses, shipworld, is like.** My aim is to write an ethnography of the modern Finnish shipworld, focusing on the characteristics that differentiate it from the mainstream Finnish work culture. My sub-questions are thus:

- How is shipworld organized and how does it affect life at sea?
- How is gender constructed in shipworld?

Methodological aspirations

As discussed earlier, writing an ethnography on fieldwork also raises methodological questions. Doing fieldwork as a young female researcher in one of the most male-dominated work places there is raises the question of gender. Furthermore, carrying out fieldwork as a professional in a closed community invokes the issue of being an insider or an outsider. Therefore this work also addresses the following **methodological questions**:

- How does the gender of the researcher affect fieldwork in a strongly male-dominated research setting?
- How is the complexity of being an insider or an outsider to the research topic affected when one is a professional in the field and thus a vital part of it?

The freedom discourses of Finnish seafarers

The contradiction between modern seafaring and the stereotypical freedom of sailors proves intricate. The history of both Finnish and international seafaring, the organization of shipworld and work onboard, folklore and genderlore, and the elements of nature have all in their way created this incongruity. The sailors of today, however, are not bound by the dichotomy between the stereotypical freedom and contemporary seafaring: they rather overcome it and utilize it in various ways. I will look at the freedom discourses of seamen through rhetoric and metaphor, thus analyzing the ways in which they discuss their life at sea. In order to succeed in this, I have analyzed the data in the context of shipworld ethnography. In addition, the theoretical subtext of freedom is provided by worldview theory. I will consider the ways in which seamen reflect, deny, utilize and construct the stereotypical images of freedom attached to them. **The second research question concerning the freedom discourses of modern Finnish sailors** is thus divided into the following sub-questions:

- What kind of freedom discourses do seafarers construct?
- What kind of expressions do these freedom discourses culminate in?
- How do contemporary sailors utilize the stereotypes of freedom that are attached to them? How do they reflect, deny and construct these stereotypes?

What will follow

This study is the first ethnography to be written on modern Finnish ship communities. While continuing the discussion on shipworld, it brings it toward into the contemporary era. In addition, it is the first study to focus on the freedom discourses of sailors, and thereby extends the study of freedom – which is usually being pursued from the perspective of the philosophy of political science – to incorporate ordinary people, to develop an anthropology of freedom.

I describe my data and fieldwork in Part II, and discuss methodological questions regarding the fieldwork. I address the first research question in Part III by providing an ethnography of the contemporary Finnish ship community. Part IV focuses on the other research question and the freedom discourses of sailors, which are set in the wider contexts of shipworld, worldview and freedom theories. Finally in Part V I draw and discuss my conclusions. Thus, the study consists of three parts: the methodological goal, the shipworld ethnography and the rhetoric of freedom.

II Transporting the ancient life: fieldwork on board

We were docking at Lonna in a harbor in Latvia. The second mate and I were leaning on railing and enjoying the sun. The old mate smiled and said, "We're transporting ancient life. The oil we carry was formed millions of years ago from living things." This happened in 1996, when I was working as a deckhand[17] for a big Finnish shipping company and conducting fieldwork for my M.A. thesis. The ship, which is renamed Lonna[18] here, was an oil tanker built in the 1980s that usually carried petroleum products, but also sometimes crude oil. It was a medium-sized tanker, which meant that it carried approximately 10, 000 tons – ten million liters of ancient life – at a time. MT Lonna did not have any fixed route, although it usually sailed in the Baltic and North Seas.

[17] A deckhand (which refers to an ordinary seaman or able-bodied seaman) works on deck.
[18] The name of the vessel has been changed in order to preserve the privacy of the crew.

The crew consisted of 18 professionals. I was a full-time employee aboard, and I was carrying out participant observation on the side.[19] I was an ordinary seaman, a position of the lowest rank in the ship's hierarchy, according to the organizational chart (the cook's assistant or mess girl is, in practice, the lowest rank because this person cleans for the others and is usually a woman). An ordinary seaman (OS) is most directly parallel with the 'able-bodied seaman' (AB), the latter having more experience in seafaring. This is the traditional job; it is the ordinary seaman who handles the ropes and climbs up the mast, so to speak. This fieldwork period lasted two months.

I conducted my second fieldwork period in 1999 and 2000. This time I was employed by the shipping company to study the relationships between the company and its ships, the atmosphere on the ships, and the crew members' attitudes to their work and life at sea. I was aboard nine oil tankers and one barge, staying on each ship for approximately a week or a week and a half.[20] One of these ships was the same Lonna, on which I had worked as a deckhand. This second fieldwork period amounted to roughly three months. The ships varied a lot in terms of size, age and traffic area, and the crew comprised between 14 and 23 persons. Prior to these two fieldwork periods I had worked on several smaller ships for various lengths of time. I had been an ordinary seaman since 1995, and I had worked on-and-off at sea for roughly six years. This should be kept in mind in that it meant that I was doing my fieldwork in a setting with which I was, to a certain extent, familiar.

Sailing the field

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 in Lonna was 8-12, i.e., I worked from 8 a.m. until noon and from 8 p.m. until midnight. If we were in port then I would stand on deck and make sure that nothing spilled over. My orders came from the officer-on-duty, in this case the first mate. If we were at sea during the night I did my fire watch rounds to the engine room, but most of the time I stood on the bridge and looked out for on-coming vessels, i.e., kept company with the deck officer on watch.

[19] I use 'participant observation' because it is well-established term (see e.g., Spradley 1980). It is not fully satisfactory for my purposes, however, because I was primarily a worker and the fieldwork was subordinate to that obligation.
[20] I also conducted research in the shipping company headquarters by interviewing the workers, but that material is not included in this study.

Otherwise, during daylight hours I carried out tasks given for me by the boatswain: my normal duties included painting, cleaning, hammering rust, sewing tarpaulins and many more. In addition to these watch duties, I also worked in the stern with the boatswain, the motorman, and the first mate when the vessel came into or left port.

I spent my free time hanging out with my shipmates as much as possible. We used to watch TV together, or we pretended to be watching when we were actually chatting about daily events, the gossip and our lives. Sometimes I was too tired, or I'd had enough, and I went to my cabin to sleep or to write my field journal. If we were in port and had matching free-time schedules we shipmates often went downtown (read: to bars and seamen's clubs) together, especially in foreign ports. A typical day was like this:

Table 1.

A typical day as an ordinary seaman

7.30 a.m.	the cook wakes me up, breakfast, change into work clothes (overalls).
8.00 a.m.	work: at sea the bosun gives me tasks; in port I oversee the loading or unloading of cargo. I wake the next watch up at 11.30
12.00 a.m.	watch is over. Eat lunch in the mess alone because the others had their lunch at 11.30.
12.30 a.m.	in the cabin, I write field journal and sometimes a have an interview with a crew member.
3.00 p.m.	afternoon coffee in the mess with the others.
3.30 p.m.	back to the cabin, afternoon nap.
5.00 p.m.	Dinner with the others, chatting in the mess. Sometimes take a nap.
7.40 p.m.	the watchman wakes me up.
8.00 p.m.	the watch starts. I am either on the navigation bridge keeping company with the officer on watch, or out on deck watching over the cargo. I wake the next watch up at 11.40 pm.
12.00 p.m.	the watch is over. I go to the mess and have a late-night snack. Nobody is awake.
12.30 p.m.	bedtime.

Notes in the dark: when the fieldworker is a worker

After going to sleep past midnight when my watch was over, I was again woken up for docking at 2 a.m. Half an hour later we started to dock, so around 3.30 a.m. I was able to go back to bed. Therefore I had a four-hour sleep before the telephone rang to wake me for the morning watch at 7.30 a.m. No wonder that I was a bit tired and upset when I wrote the field journal (1996):

> Viljanen won't come for his interview. Goddamn it. I don't want to interview anybody, I just want to sleep. But I've got to interview them if I want to finish this work. I just want to forget all these extra responsibilities and watch a movie. This job is pretty hard. Wake-ups are nasty, especially when there are three of them every day. Every time I wake up I have no idea where I am, what's going on, and what time of day it is. Every time.

The contradiction of roles shows in this note, as it was sometimes difficult to meet the requirements of both. Doing good fieldwork does not necessarily mean that one is good at other work (and vice versa). For instance, fieldwork and ship work are largely contradictory. A good fieldworker could be described (among other things) as curious and active, gaining access everywhere, taking notes and dutifully writing a wordy and descriptive field journal. A good ordinary seaman, on the other hand, will not ask questions, will go where told to and will dutifully carry out the assigned tasks. One is physically strong, wakes up three times a day, or whenever the ship operations need it. After the shift an ordinary seaman is possibly too tired to write extensively in a field journal, while the nature of the work tasks (standing on the windy deck ensuring that things are in order, or standing on the dark bridge watching out for other ships) does not allow for the taking of notes. Furthermore, the very position of an ordinary seaman in the hierarchy denies access to many events and places. In this context, 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 that of Spedding in that when I was aboard ship working as a seaman and doing field research people treated me like a seaman (for a

more detailed discussion, see Karjalainen 2002, 290-311). Therefore I did not have access to the events, places or items that were not essential for an ordinary seaman – the officers' dayroom, meetings held by officers, and conversations over dinner in their mess. I was only given the information it was thought a seaman needed – which was not much. While being an ordinary seaman denied me access to certain situations and information, it would have been the same with other posts as well. The captain, for example, would quite likely not have been able to gather the same information regarding the social relations in the crew's mess as I was.[21] Thus a captain reflected on his visits to the laborers'[22] mess: "I do sometimes go into the mess, but I feel them thinking: *What the fuck is he coming here for... to spy on us*." [23]

"How dare you take my paper!" – Problems of nativeness

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 work duties, and adjusting to the hardships of sea life. Given the all-embracing nature of shipworld,[24] this is not surprising: if one wishes to get inside a closed community by working in it, then one becomes part of it. There is no room for half-members, thus the fieldworker is in danger of losing her 'ethnographic spectacles.' It is worth asking whether it is necessary to commit oneself to that community in order to make it through the experience. In such a world the circumstances may force the ethnographer to *go native*.

According to Kirsten Hastrup (1995, 154-160), it is not possible to speak simultaneously from both a native and an anthropological position: one is either an anthropologist or a native, for they are involved in 'different knowledge projects'. In view of that I would like to point out, however, that from the 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*

[21] With respect to access issues, Kirsten Hastrup and Peter Hervik (1994, 3) argue that one has to be physically present in the field. However, Vered Amit (2000, 12) does not quite agree, stating that the ethnographic 'field' has always been characterized as much by absence as by presence, and thus various methods are needed – interviews, artifacts, media materials and more – in order to explore processes not immediately or appropriately accessible through participant observation. In this case I was physically present yet my access was denied to several areas and social situations on the oil tanker.

[22] A laborer is a worker in the ship's hierarchy who is not an officer. Laborers include the boatswain, pumpman, deckhand, electrician, repairman, motorman, cook steward and cook's assistant. In Finnish this is *miehistö*.

[23] HYUL96/2.

[24] A detailed account on the concept of the total institution is provided in Part III.

anthropologist. Neither one is her 'original identity,' and it is only later that she will perhaps become an anthropologist. In the long research process that continues after the field (i.e., in the transcription and analysis of the interviews and the field journal, and in the writing of the research report), the newborn identity or standpoint of the 'native' has a sufficient period of time to be washed out. In the process, the identity or standpoint of a 'native to anthropology' is built in, which Hastrup finds necessary.

Helena Wulff also discusses Hastrup's question of whether it is possible to be a native and an anthropologist simultaneously. She reflects on her ex-nativeness in the ballet world, wherein she later conducted a study. However, Wulff criticizes Hastrup's statement that the native is operating on a practical level, while the anthropologist eventually moves up to the theoretical level in which the view and voice of the native are included in the analysis, although they are not equal. Nowadays, however, there is not only a wide variation of fieldworkers, but the range of natives is also greater. Thus, the relationship between the two is more complex. There are natives who are aware of what has been written about them, both by journalists and by researchers, and who could study the subject themselves, and there are anthropologists like Wulff who turn to study their own roots. Accordingly, she claims that her anthropological training did not obliterate her native perspective. (Wulff 2000, 149-153.)

It is no longer always clear when one is 'home' and when one is 'abroad' or 'away' (Eriksen 2001, 29). There may also be a sense in the field that one is at the same time 'at home' and 'away' (Caputo 2000, 29).[25] In the light of the above-mentioned debate, the ship could be seen as a strange world from the fieldworker's perspective. Is it fieldwork at home, or away? Shipworld differs so dramatically in so many aspects from Finnish society that it is appropriate to question whether it is anthropology at home. While some of the features of the Finnish sailor's culture are quite familiar to landlubbers (such as the food and the sauna), there are many differences, including the special construction of the time and space dimensions, and the characteristics of the total institution. The seaman's language, as demonstrated earlier, although based on Finnish, contains so many jargon words that, in its richest form, it is impossible to understand without explanation.

[25] In respect of this, Marilyn Strathern (1987, 16) asks how one *knows* when one is at home. Later Hastrup (1995, 151) rephrases the question as, where are the boundaries of one's 'home culture'?

Although in my case there was not that much native perspective formed before I entered the field, I felt that once there I was developing both native and anthropologist perspectives. One has to be aware of the amount of adjusting and extending one makes in order to meet the requirements of fieldwork, especially in a closed community, for the stress may be surprising and counterproductive. In view of that, this process of giving birth to native and anthropological perspectives was wearisome and not without reversals, as I illustrate below.

I used to read the Helsingin Sanomat newspaper whenever I could get hold of it. One night I was reading a fresh one, a rarity on the ship because of our few and rushed visits to Finnish ports, on my watch. This is not allowed on watch, although everybody does it, for we are supposed to stand on 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 I told 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 sexist 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 had left behind. When the motorman yanked the newspaper out of 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.

Fieldwork demands, according to Gothóni, both involvement and detachment. Involvement means participating in order to understand: for example, one lives like a nun in order to understand what it means to be a nun. Detachment, on the other hand, refers to distancing oneself from that life in order to gain a critical perspective on the subject and to scrutinize it from an academic viewpoint. (Gothóni 2000, 46; see also 2005, 116-117.) With respect to involvement and detachment, Kilpeläinen notes that this method also has its dangers: involvement may lead to false situations in which the researcher ends up acting 'more papal than the pope himself'. The researcher may then be viewed as an

impostor, or the informant may be ashamed of his or her own ignorance on the matter. (Kilpeläinen 2000, 65.) One could also imagine a situation in which the excessive eagerness of the fieldworker may turn him or her into a laughing stock: acting more papal than the pope may make the informant feel – besides hoaxed or ignorant – that she/he is a spectator at a comedy. Involvement for a couple of months as part of fieldwork cannot possibly be the same as living it for decades.

The field is under construction: fieldwork on ten tankers

During my second fieldwork period as a company researcher, the field was scattered around different locations, time periods and people. I was on ten independent ships at different times inhabited by a variety of people who did not, by and large, know each other, which raises methodological questions concerning the 'field.' More attention has been given recently to the field as the constitutive site of anthropological knowledge production. The fieldworker engages not only in an analysis of the field site, but also in its active production. (Bunzl 2004, 435; McLaren 1991, 150.) The field is therefore always constructed, not just found and studied. Amit also points out that in a world of endless interconnections and overlapping contexts, the ethnographic field does not just exist, only awaiting discovery – it has to be carefully constructed, distilled from all other possible options (Amit 2000, 6). In this case, it had to be constructed of ten ships and their crews, both present and absent. These were not the only building blocks – there were other to be added: the shipping company, families on land, oil terminals and such. Therefore '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 (Lederman 1990, 88).

At that time, in 1999 and 2000, the shipping company managed approximately 17 vessels.[26] Thus I conducted fieldwork in two thirds of its fleet. The ships were chosen by the company. What criteria did it use? The ships represented the variety of the company's vessels, in *technical* terms: if there were sister vessels, at least one of them was on my list. This arrangement guaranteed that the ships were of different ages and sizes, and

[26] The precise number depends on the definition of the ownership and management, because the legal owner of the vessel is often a corporation other than the manager, or the freighter.

covered different traffic areas. Although age, size and area may be indicative of some characteristics of ship life, they say little about the ship's community and its sailors. Were there other factors the shipping company executives had in mind 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 ship to its sister vessel, due to practical problems, and nobody paid any attention to it. One factor was the company's wish to receive more information about problematic issues within particular communities. I was told, *after* I had visited the ships concerned, that the current or past situations in the two communities led to their being included in the study. There may have been other factors that influenced 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 no participant observation (see Spradley 1980), nor was I a strict observer. My time on board was filled with meetings with crew members, because I was trying to get to know them as quickly as possible in order to be able to conduct successful interviews with them. Below is a typical daily schedule of my life as a company researcher: it illustrates the nature of this fieldwork period.

Table 2.

My first day on a ship as a researcher

7.00 a.m.	Wake up and get ready for the day.
7.30 a.m.	Breakfast. Chat with the chief engineer,[27] I introduce myself to the captain and the first mate, and tell them my reason for being on board.
8.00 a.m.	Captain's office: I tell the captain more about the study, and hand over my passport. I introduce myself to the second mate and the pilot. I go to the cabin and unpack my stuff.
9.00 a.m.	Writing my field journal, have a break and decide with the chief engineer the time for the interview.
10.00 a.m.	Introduce myself to the cook steward. I chat with her in the mess of the galley personnel, and arrange the interview with her.
10.15 a.m.	On the bridge, talking with the second mate, the captain and the pilot.
11.30 a.m.	Lunch with the chief engineer, I introduce myself to the first engineer and arrange the interview with him.

[27] The engineer is an officer-level person who belongs to the 'black gang', i.e., works in the engine room.

11.50 a.m.	I introduce myself and my job in the workers' duty-mess (*paskamessi*).[28] I arrange interviews with the boatswain and the repairman.
12.10 a.m.	Interview with the chief engineer.
1.50 p.m.	Break
2.20 p.m.	Bridge: introduce myself and talk with the second mate.
2.50 p.m.	Captain's office: arrange the interview with the captain.
3.00 p.m.	Workers' duty-mess: introduce myself to the others, and chat with the motorman.
3.20 p.m.	Interview with the captain, short visit to the bridge.
5.00 p.m.	Dinner: arrange the interview with the first mate.
5.20 p.m.	Duty-mess: chatting.
5.40 p.m.	Cabin: short break.
6.00 p.m.	Captain's office: chatting.
6.30 p.m.+ an extra hour because of the shift of time zone. Sauna with the crew's women members (cook steward and mess girl)	
8.00 p.m.	Captain's office: talking.
11.00 p.m.	Bridge: second mate and boatswain, talking.
12.00 p.m.	Cabin: field journal and sleep.

As this table shows, my main activities on board were lobbying, observing and interviewing.

Insider views, outsider views

The room was filled with smoke. The docking crew was wearing overalls, helmets and walkie-talkies, anxiously smoking cigarettes. There was the usual anticipation in the air, we were just about to dock and the others were waiting for stand-by. But not me, for I was on board as a researcher. Having some difficulties in adjusting to the new role, I wrote in my field journal: "I always feel like an outsider when we dock. I'm the only one who is useless here. Well, the cook and the cook steward are too, but anyhow." (Field journal, 2000.) I felt useless because (nearly) everybody else was waiting to start work. This story illustrates how the researcher's status may be problematic to define in an organization with a strict closed hierarchy.

In a traditional bureaucratic hierarchy like a ship, the number of people one gives orders to and takes orders from may define one's rank. As a fieldworker observing shipworld,

[28] *Paskamessi* is Finnish sailor jargon that literally translates as "shit mess". Here one does not have to remove one's dirty work clothes, hence the name.

however, I was subject to yet outside of the hierarchy: I neither took nor gave orders. How, then, was my position in ship's community defined? As might be expected, the captain, the officers and the laborers wanted to locate the research worker in a specific (even arbitrary) position in the established hierarchy of the ship. I noticed during this fieldwork that my position shifted depending on whether the seamen perceived me as a colleague or an intruder. The nature of the researcher's position and relationships in the field has received significant attention recently (see e.g., Markowitz and Ashkenazi 1999; Kulick and Willson 1995). It has been observed that fieldwork is the only form of scholarly inquiry in which relationships of intimacy and familiarity between researcher and subject are considered a fundamental medium of investigation rather than an extraneous by-product, or even an impediment (Amit 2000, 2).

The first indication of this research worker's hierarchical rank was her cabin assignment. Because of crew reductions the captain had several options. Thus, the allocation of a cabin is one way of showing the visitor where she stands, since the ship's space is structured hierarchically. I was frequently assigned the old radio operator's cabin, which is usually large, in good shape, and on the same floor as the captain's cabin, thereby indicating a high placement in the hierarchy. Once I was given the owner's cabin, which is the best in the ship, implying that I was very high in rank, even above the captain (socially, that is, for legally the captain is always at the top of the hierarchy). Another time I was given the cabin of the third engineer, which was small and full of old, broken furniture.[29] The second indication of the fieldworker's rank is the captain's choice of where she will dine.[30] Should she eat with the workers or the officers? In most cases I was firmly directed to dine with the officers, but on one occasion they were slightly surprised when I showed up in their mess. It could have been a coincidence, but both of the 'downgrading' incidents – the cabin of the third engineer and the assumption that I would eat in the crew's mess – occurred on the very same ship on which I had once worked as an ordinary seaman. Perhaps the officers had difficulty adjusting to my new position.

[29] The relationship between the hierarchy and the space on board is discussed in more detail in the next part.

[30] There are also some lesser indicators of 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 join in the work.

In some ways, a high organizational status helps the fieldworker. For example, the captain and officers are more likely to help in organizing the interviews, but on the other hand, this could result in some sense of obligation. If I had not been separated from the crew hierarchically, they might have been more willing to be interviewed. Given the nature of total institutions, this distinction may be of critical importance: the fieldworker obtains more candid information when she is not perceived as a member of the management authority. Then again, my gender and young age may have worked to 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 been of the lowest rank, and had only worked for a couple of months on oil tankers, it seemed to have been initiation enough for most of the seamen to accept me. I was surprised. Did a couple of months' experience really pass as sufficient qualification in the eyes of sailors with more than 30 years at sea? One reason for this acceptance within the sailor community was the common idea among older male sailors that it was proper for a woman to leave the sea if she wanted to have a family life, and I was therefore not expected to have more sailing experience. Furthermore, because of my research interest I knew more about certain aspects of seafaring and the shipping company than an average, ordinary seaman with more experience.

While the researcher's position and relationships in the field have attracted scholarly interest lately, a lot of attention has also been given to the process of 'othering.' This process of revealing the other also brings the self clearly into view as not the Other (Knowles 2000, 61). 'Othering', however, is not a practice reserved exclusively for the anthropologist: it is also practiced by her informants (Pink 2000, 102), and is part of the process of self-representation. Othering affects the obtained information and the relationships established in order to obtain it.[31] The fact is, however, as John Van Maanen notes after studying the police, that informants doubtlessly 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". (Van Maanen 1991, 36.) Moreover, how much can a green pea (both age-wise and profession-wise) understand the life and

[31] It has been noted, however, that critics of stereotyping and othering are often guilty of holding the same view: they often begin with the premise that others lack the critical capability to see past rumour and stereotypes, thus othering the 'otherers' (Brown and Theodossopoulos 2004, 3).

experience of an old professional? Sometimes as I was studying 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 age of 25?

When I was in the field as a company researcher some seamen explained things to me that they would not have bothered to explain if they had considered me an insider (for instance: dinner is served at five, and smoking is prohibited on deck). Others ended many explanations with the words *what the heck, you know what I mean, you've been there yourself….* Sometimes, this made it difficult to conduct the interviews. The subjects thought I was playing stupid when I asked them questions that had obvious answers. Yet, it is the simple questions with seemingly obvious answers that are necessary to someone studying a culture or community with which he or she is already familiar. Following this, Harry Wolcott (1999, 137) remarks that there are several insider views, and various outsider views. One could turn this around and state that a fieldworker could be seen in many ways as an insider, and in many ways as an outsider.

Furthermore, Wulff (2000, 154) brings up another side of this discussion by pointing out that even if the anthropologist does not consider herself a native, the natives may perceive her as one. Therefore the definition of 'home' could be that of the ethnographer, or of the community she wishes to study. This question becomes 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, and this fosters a distinctive seaman's culture. While the profession affects one's life as much as if not more than most other professions in terms of 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? This makes Wolcott's (1999, 172) suggestion that one should avoid labels like 'insider' and 'native,' because they cause rather than dissipate confusion, worth considering.

> They're crazy when they tell me about their illegal smuggling activities. It's normal for the repairman to tell me about his moonshine; he doesn't sell it, or he was wise enough to leave that part out. But Sakke, he tells me about his 100 liter hard spirits and thousands of cigarettes smuggling business! He even tells me

> where aboard he's hidden the stuff. This is unbelievable. What a fool. (Field journal, date omitted.)

Interestingly, as the above extract from my field journal illustrates, when I was doing fieldwork on ten oil tankers the laborers did not seem to treat 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. Alternatively, they saw me as a shipboard priest, sent by the Seaman's Church, and thus bound to secrecy.[32] The reason for this – at times seemingly deliberate – misinterpretation of my work could lie both in their attitudes towards the shipping company and in their attitudes towards me as a person. Most sailors were not very fond of their employer, but nevertheless tended to like me, because I was a new acquaintance, a young woman, and thus my presence was a novel break in the routine. Consequently, I was moved to write in my field journal (2000):

> The mate apprentice asked in the day room which school I was doing my study with. They don't get it, even if I tell them over and over again, that this is no school thing, and this is my job. They want to think it's for school. Then I'm not one of the bad guys… one of the devils.

The officers were much more self-conscious, however, possibly because they had more at stake, for instance in terms of their career development. All in all, my presence on board was a stressful factor for the whole ship's community: 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 illustrates the case.

"What did you come here for?"

Early in the morning at the airport, I was heading for yet another fieldwork trip for my study for the 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, for the headline stated: "The cargo fleet will leave Finland – the jobs of hundreds of

[32] As explained in this study, there is no room for outsiders in shipworld. Almost the only exceptions are the ship's 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.

seamen threatened in Finnlines and X shipping companies" (Helsingin Sanomat January 18, 2000, D1).[33]

The article reported that my shipping company was planning to flag out[34] the fleet's oldest vessels. The ship that 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 board. At that moment my flight was called and everybody was asked to board the plane, thus leaving no time for phone calls. Hours later I walked up the gangway[35] into the officers' mess, and handed out the very same newspaper that 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 on attitudes towards the shipping company, the atmosphere aboard, and their plans for the future. Not surprisingly, the first questions and comments where quite hostile: "Oh, did you come here to pick out the people you'll 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, 2000.)

The shipping company was often accused of being a faceless bureaucratic employer. Therefore it was quite natural for the men 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 would not have any influence in the decision-making process of one of the largest shipping companies in Finland, which was often also considered the most conservative. Moreover, given its long history of poor communication tactics, they realized that it was quite probable that I knew as little as they did about the flagging out. The fieldwork turned out

[33] Helsingin Sanomat is the newspaper with the largest distribution in Finland.
[34] To "flag out the ship" means that the shipping company replaces the Finnish flag with a flag of convenience. For the crew this usually means that they will lose their jobs, or they will have to work under 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." (Seawords Maritime Glossary, website.)
[35] The gangway is a narrow movable platform moored between the vessel and quay for persons to enter and leave the vessel.

to be quite satisfactory, the crew members were friendly and supplied the interviews. Nevertheless, the threat of flagging out certainly had its effect.

Interviews and field journals - the material of the study

The material of this study consists of the field journals I wrote and the interviews I conducted with seafarers during the fieldwork. Complementing this main body of data is some correspondence and an additional interview with a captain that was conducted on land.

Notes on the field

I wrote field journals both times I worked aboard. As an ordinary seaman I wrote my field journal daily. I wrote about daily events and my work tasks, and gave detailed accounts of the incidents I considered relevant to my study.[36] These included gossip and events concerning the social relations of the ship's crew, the atmosphere, and the daily routines followed during their leisure time. I did not take field notes in the strictest sense of the word (Jackson 1990, 6), but climbed up to my cabin to write down everything I found relevant when I had the chance to do so. Taking field notes while I was with my ship mates felt awkward because I did not want to draw too much attention to my role as a researcher: I preferred them to see me as a fellow crew member (See Jackson 1990, 28). As discussed earlier, I worked full-time as a deckhand, trying at the same time to observe everything through the lenses of an ethnographer. Most of the time this worked quite well, but there were 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., and dreaming of getting back to bed.

My double role as a seaman and a researcher aboard did not give me as much time for the study as I would have liked. I worked every day on watch, and worked overtime almost daily, then did the interviewing after work. There was plenty for me to learn in both fields. Now, looking back, I realize that my field journal could have been more

[36] I jumped almost straight to the phase of focused and selective observation, almost ignoring the descriptive phase, in Spradley's terms (see Spradley 1980, 33).

extensive.[37] The lack of time in my life aboard was clearly one factor for the extent of the field journal, but I believe there was more to it than that. I found my place in the ship's community easily, and I started to feel at home there (on some level) quite soon.

This was possible because my position in the hierarchy was clear, and most of the crew members were at least moderately nice to me. I did not have to beg my way into the community, or to create space for myself, as many other fieldworkers have to do. Gothóni points out that writing represents something familiar in the middle of everything new and strange, something that is homely and safe (1997, 143; see also 1993, 165-166). In that sense my short field journal indicates that I did not have the urge to write, and thus I did not feel the need for something homely and safe. Reading an old Helsingin Sanomat seemed enough comfort for me, as mentioned earlier. My acclimatization was quite painless. However, fieldnotes also serve as a reminder in that they state that the writer is a researcher, not a native (Jackson 1990, 22). Being able to write in the field requires us to distance ourselves from the personal contacts we have developed there (Ottenberg 1990, 146). This is quite a challenging task in a community in which the fieldworker has little chance of creating the privacy that is essential if one is to distance oneself.

As a researcher 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 a week and a half – that my days were filled with promoting the study, hanging out in order to get to know the crew as soon as possible, and interviewing them. There was hardly any time left for rest, even less for writing the field journal. Furthermore, shipworld was no longer such a novelty. As I will discuss later in the part concerning shipworld ethnography, oil tankers – like cargo ships in general – are quite similar, and there is no need to write detailed accounts of each and every one of them. Hence the field journal concentrates more on the social rather the than material culture of the ships' communities in question.

Interviews with sailors

[37] The 1996 field journal comprises 95 type-written pages, and the 1999-2000 one 60 pages.

The boatswain Gale was blind drunk. He tottered in when I was on anchor watch and announced that he would give only a partial interview, and actually that he would interview me instead. I agreed: partial and bidirectional interviews were just fine. Previously he had refused totally, saying that there was no way he would be interviewed. What made him change his mind? Next morning in the mess, when he was sobering up but still suffering with a severe hangover, I asked him if today would be good for the interview. Although he was holding his head in his hands, he firmly assented. This is one example of the insecurities I faced when I was conducting interviews on board. People declined, and then agreed to be interviewed, or agreed but then the time had to be postponed over and over again because one of us had to work overtime. Despite the hardships, the main body of my data consists of 91 interviews and the field journals I wrote at the time. These interviews were conducted in the years 1996 (21 interviews), 1999 (63 interviews), and 2000 (7 interviews). After the fieldwork periods I corresponded with several sailors for a few years, and as a result I interviewed Tommi, a sea captain I had interviewed in 1999, again in 2005. This interview was the only one to be conducted on land. The correspondence with Tommi during 2000-2005 is also included in the study data.

When I was working as an ordinary seaman in 1996 I interviewed my shipmates in my spare time. All the interviews were fully voluntary – I can be quite sure about this because I was one of the lowest-ranking people in the hierarchy and had no organizational power over my shipmates. My social leverage aboard did not count for much either, because I was new and professionally low in rank. Although the shipping company and the captain of the oil tanker knew and approved of my conducting fieldwork and interviews for my Master's thesis, they did not – to my knowledge – encourage or discourage the crew members in terms of taking part in the study. I tried to interview all of those who were even remotely interested in co-operating with me. A couple of them refused – one making a loud remark that I would make an awful wife for somebody one day because I insisted so hard on getting my interviews! (Field journal, 1996.)

The interviews in 1999 and 2000 were conducted under substantially different circumstances, since I was a researcher employed by the shipping company. Given my considerably higher status within the hierarchy, I had fewer problems getting the

interviews I wanted. As a representative of the shipping company, I was sure that a couple of phone calls were made by my supervisor in order to ease my stay aboard ship. My substantially different rank in shipworld has to be kept in mind when the reliability of the data gathered from these ten ships is assessed. One person refused to be interviewed, even under these circumstances.

A sailor interviewing sailors

The Mess girl of Lonna asked at breakfast if I was angry with her. I said I was not angry, I just wanted to know why she did not want to be interviewed. She answered that she wanted to be, but she could not because she did not have any insights and she did not know about things because she was not an educated person, and that I should ask someone who did know. I told her that she was the expert on being a mess girl[38], and that TV talk-show hosts do not know anything about that life. Finally she agreed and the interview turned out to be very successful. (Field journal, November 1996.)

As this story indicates, it was not always easy to convince my fellow crewmates to be interviewed. I was able to conduct more than 20 interviews, however, which is reasonably good given that the crew size (me included) was 18. The number of interviews exceeded the crew size because some left for home and thus I had a chance to interview the replacement. All of the interviewees in 1996 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 coastal areas. Their education consisted of elementary school, high school, and/or seafaring school. Three of the interviewees were women.

Given their permanent work status and long stay on the ship in question, the interviewees were well established in the ship's community. The social status is more problematic to evaluate because in shipworld it is strongly bound to the status in the official hierarchy (which is controlled and stable). For example, when I asked questions about the social hierarchy that I assumed existed alongside the official one, I did not get much

[38] A 'Mess girl' is seaman jargon for the cook's assistant.

confirmation of my hypothesis. The typical reaction I received was in line with the first mate Lars's answer, "The captain decides everything anyway. It is just too bad then if it's a dickhead who decides things around here."[39] Lars made it quite clear that there was no space for social order other than the official hierarchy. Therefore, one may well ask whether there was any difference between the social and the official hierarchy. This is discussed in more detail in Part III.

It was easier to get an interview with the officers than with the laborers – a few of them were unwilling to be interviewed for several reasons. For example, one crew member refused probably because of his stuttering. Furthermore, my family name caused confusion and made some crew members suspect that I was a spy![40] All in all, seven of them did not wish to be interviewed.

An ordinary seaman managing interview situations

The interview with the Electrician was a disaster. He wanted it to be in the mess, but the deckhands Puhonen and Isto were there too, watching TV that was on damned loud. It was chaos, and the atmosphere was far from confidential or intimate. The Electrician answered every question with either, "Of course" or, "Yes, of course." Frustrated, I realized that I had to revise some questions because, as I wrote later that day, *He did not get any of them concerning worldview* (Field journal, 1996). This particular interview also suffered from a sudden call to work in the middle. We continued later in the evening when I had finished the job, but such an unexpected interruption did not help the atmosphere.

Unlike this story suggests the shipmates I interviewed in 1996 were mostly quite communicative and frank. The questions were not very threatening: I mainly avoided ones that could potentially get someone into trouble. In addition, my research task, which derived from Helve's (1987) model of a five-dimensional worldview, generated few such questions. Moreover, I did not believe that I would obtain any meaningful information by

[39] HYUL96/1.
[40] There is a more detailed account of this incident in Part III.

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 *rock the boat*, as they say.

I used a tape-recorder during the 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. They were all conducted aboard, mostly in the interviewees' cabins, and sometimes in the mess room or the library. When male subjects were interviewed in their cabins they usually made it quite clear that the cabin door would stay open.[41] *No reason to invite gossip*, they would say. Such a precaution would never have entered my mind, but all the same, I was very grateful to them for being concerned about my (and their) reputation. This precaution also marked the 'heterosexual matrix' of shipworld, thus endorsing it (see Butler 1990, 42).

A company researcher interviewing sailors

When I came aboard as the company researcher my task was to interview seven seafarers on each ship: the captain, the chief engineer, the first mate and the first engineer on the officers' side, and the boatswain, motorman and the cook steward or cook on the workers' side. People working in these jobs tend to have long experience at sea, and they have often established their position in the ship's community. The shipping company defined the list of job positions. Thus, the interviewees were selected primarily because of their position in the hierarchy, not because of their willingness or potential contribution to the study. This naturally had its impact on the interview setting. I followed the proposed list of interviewees, but amended it moderately in order to meet the needs of the particular community. Some people felt left out because they were not asked for interview. They said that it reflected, once more, the arrogant attitudes of the shipping company – even when it set out to conduct a study about the relationships between the sailors and the company it was mainly those who were high in the hierarchy who were interviewed and the rest were ignored. Due to my short stay on each ship I was

[41] This is quite customary in shipworld and has its roots in history, as Kaijser notes on the shipboard social rules of the mid 20th century. For example, 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." (Kaijser 1997, 47.)

not able to conduct more than the seven pre-planned interviews. Nevertheless, I talked to all of the crew members outside of 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. They were slightly younger than before, but not much. This particular shipping company has the reputation of being just one step away from the rest home. Nearly all of the interviewees were native Finns, and all of them had lived in Finland for decades. I did not ask about their educational level, but the population I studied in 1996 was quite typical in that sense.[42] This time, seven of the interviewees were women.

None of the interviews conducted during this fieldwork period were purely voluntary. When the shipping company sends out a researcher to gather information about the ship's community and its internal and external relationships, the informant is expected to contribute to the study no matter how meaningful or rewarding he[43] finds it for himself or the company. Consequently, there were different reactions to the study. Although categorizing is always somewhat artificial, different types of attitude were apparent.

a) The interviewee was eager to give the interview because he felt that the shipping company was finally asking his opinion about its policies, etc. He took it seriously and contributed to it as much as possible. Some people wanted to add their thoughts after the actual interview was over.

b) The interviewee was quite eager to give the interview, but not so much because he wanted to contribute something to the study in a constructive way, but because he wanted to complain about the shipping company and his fellow crew members.

c) The interviewee was quite eager to give the interview, but not so much because he wanted to contribute something to the study, but because 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.

[42] Now it is possible to obtain college-level officer training, and thus there are more people at sea who have been or go to the (merchant marine) college. Although there were such sailors on the ships I studied, none of them were on the list of interviewees.

[43] I use "he" to refer to a seaman, for although there are a number of women working at sea, shipworld is essentially a world of men, as discussed in the next chapters.

e) The interviewee was a bit nervous about the study. Perhaps he linked my visit with some problems he was having in the community, or was generally concerned about losing his job, and this affected the interview. I made it quite clear that I was by no means there to evaluate the crew's job performance. But, quite naturally, some of them remained suspicious.

f) The interviewee was quite curt in his answers. He made it clear in his words and/or facial expression 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 be interviewed, but because of his work position aboard he was not chosen.

i) The crew member was neither interested in nor chosen to be interviewed.

This is a rough clustering of the interviewees' attitudes and reactions towards the interviews. One interviewee may have shown a combination of two or more, depending on which part of the interview we were in. The most prominent reaction was that the interview was part of the job (d), and the next common concerned the willingness to give it, for various reasons (the cluster of (a), (b) and (c)). Then there were some participants who were nervous about the interview (e). Most of the interview situations seemed quite pleasant for both parties. The interviewee was hardly ever uncooperative, or refused to be interviewed (f) and (g). As far as (h) and (i) were concerned, it was impossible to determine how common those reactions were because I did not have the 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.

It has been argued that in short-term fieldwork, and especially in a male-dominated setting, being a female researcher may be a definite asset (Gurney 1991, 55-56). Often the above-mentioned attitudes towards the interview overlapped, and were even contradictory: after one successful and constructive interview, but which the interviewee, Captain Fredi, had tried to disrupt by constantly flirting, I asked him whether the interview had been meaningful. He answered in a tone that was intended to reduce the significance of all the information he had given, "Yeah, in the sense that you're a chick

and it's great to chat with you, but if some guy had done this I would have been a much more negative."[44]

The topics of the interviews

The interviews were structured around a list of topics I wanted to ask about. Sometimes they followed these lines exactly, but the interviewee often started to talk about something interesting that I had not considered asking. In that case, we talked about that issue in addition to following the pre-planned questions. In Wolcott's (1999, 52-53) terms, my interviews were semi-structured.

The questions in 1996 concentrated mainly on the sailors' worldviews and were constructed around Helena Helve's five-dimensional model, the cultural, the cognitive, the affective, the social and the conative (Helve 1987, as discussed earlier in this chapter).[45] Some of the questions were simple and easy to answer, and others were more complex. Some interviewees found my questions a little difficult. Now, looking back, I realize that I should have designed some of them to be more interviewee-friendly. For example, the question, "How do you think the world came into being, what does it consist of?"[46] would be quite challenging to most of us. Consequently, when I asked the ship's 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-No questions."[47]

The interview questions in 1999-2000 were designed to provide information on issues in which the shipping company was interested. They were open-ended, as in the previous study, and the interview progressed from the general to the personal. Two major areas were covered, work and work-related things, and the social and mental aspects of shipworld. These two areas were discussed on three different levels – of the shipping company, of the ship and on the personal level. Naturally the areas and levels overlapped, and provoked a wide range of questions from "What do you think about the crude oil department of the shipping company?" to "Are you afraid of the sea?" I had designed the questions and given them to my supervisor in the shipping company for comment. In

[44] HYUL99/20:k3.
[45] The questions asked in the 1996 interviews are listed in Appendix 2.
[46] Can you see me blushing?
[47] HYUL96/4.

addition to the question matrix designed for the corporate study I included a couple of questions designed to elicit information for my academic research.[48]

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.

Above Catherine Norton (1989, *xiv*) describes the perfect interviewer and the perfect interview situation. Looking back on the interviews I conducted as a deckhand, 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 the courage to ask the difficult questions. Yet, the data is extensive and provides enough information for my study when it is examined together with the interviews I conducted in 1999 and 2000.

The main concern with the interview material of 1999 and 2000 is the reliability of the data due to the involuntary nature of the interviews, as discussed above. Reliability was an issue in the study I conducted for the shipping company, and I had to keep it in mind when I was analyzing the data for this work. This study, however, is not as vulnerable as the one done for the shipping company because I have mainly used the various parts of the interview material in which the interviewees discussed issues that could not possibly harm them or their shipmates. Thus, there was no need for them to lie or to hide their thoughts, at least no more than in any other research setting.

Processing the data

All the interviews were tape-recorded and later transcribed, with two exceptions when the interviewee preferred not to be recorded at all. On those occasions I wrote down their responses on a notepad. In addition, a couple of the interviewees asked me to stop the

[48] The questions asked in the 1999-2000 interviews are listed in Appendix 3.

recording when they were about to reveal information they considered harmful to them or to other crew members.

I did not transliterate all the "oohs" and "h'ms" the interviewees uttered, and I edited the wordy information they provided, leaving out occasional repetitions and such (see Hirsjärvi and Hurme 2001, 139-141). Some of the quotes given in this research report are slightly edited: I have left out parts that I consider uninformative and irrelevant, bearing in mind the convenience of the reader. The editing was completed, quite naturally, during the process of translating the quotes from Finnish into English.

III A shipworld ethnography

"This is that kind of 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're told."[49] These somewhat ironic remarks were made by a pumpman, Jussi, with more than 30 years experience at sea, when he was describing shipworld and his work. His remark illustrates how 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. My aim in this part is to address my first main research question: What is a modern shipworld, or more precisely a modern Finnish shipworld of oil tankers, like? What are the major structures and characteristics of shipworld that make it different from Finnish mainstream culture, particularly in terms of the living and working environments? The sub-questions concern the basic time-space structures, the hierarchical structures, and the gender structures in shipworld. I have taken the writing of this ethnography as part of the research task because there are no ethnographies of the contemporary Finnish shipworld, not to mention of oil tankers. Because this study is also the first ethnography of Finnish ships that is based on fieldwork, I have had to include studies conducted in other seafaring countries in my background literature.

It is necessary to describe the basic features of shipworld, for without an understanding of it, it is impossible to comprehend the discourse on freedom and the metaphors sailors

[49] HYUL99/48:p7. 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.

employ to reflect on their life at sea. I will therefore describe the context in which the metaphors were born. I will provide a short – and somewhat selective – ethnography focusing on the characteristics that make shipworld significantly different from the 'mainstream' Finnish culture. For example, while the hierarchy is scrutinized in detail, clothing is mentioned only briefly because shipworld does not foster any distinctive dressing culture that would set it apart from any factory or construction site. Food is largely ignored too, due to the fact that it is mainly the same as in factory cafeterias. The circumstances surrounding meals are discussed, however, because they are not the same as in other work places. Moreover, some ethnographic concepts do not apply to shipworld: kinship and marriage are irrelevant in this study, for example. This is not to say that sailors do not engage in relationships, or occasionally even marry a co-sailor, but marriage and kinship as institutions are not part of shipworld because they belong to sailors' life on land.

When seafaring is discussed it is important to define which area of this wide concept is in focus. There are distinct categories here, including whaling, fishing, coastal trade, international trade, naval operations, and coastguard and pilot services (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 188). In this case the field is the community of people who work on modern cargo ships, or more specifically oil tankers, that engage in international trade. Most notions of shipworld could be extended to include all cargo ships in Finland and abroad, but there are some aspects that are quite Finnish by nature, and some are special characteristics of life on an oil tanker.

It is also worth stressing that all the ship communities under study consist exclusively of Finnish sailors. A non-multinational crew is a rarity these days in global seafaring, and therefore this study also provides a view of a sailor's culture that may face extinction in the near future. For example, the British, Dutch and Norwegian merchant navies consist mostly of mixed crews, and the pressure in Finland to engage cheaper crews is strong. Many shipping companies that originate in Finland have flagged out their ships and have hired multinational crews, but this particular one has not done so. One major factor in this decision is that the company belongs to a state-owned enterprise, which is, furthermore, the biggest oil importer in the country. Therefore, because the safety of Finland's oil

distribution is at stake, the shipping company is yet to fall into foreign ownership, and its ships to be flagged out for the purposes of engaging multinational crews.

All this shows in the ship communities under study. For example, the sailors come from a homogenous cultural background that is mostly Christian or atheist. Although religion in general is usually avoided as a topic of discussion onboard, the cultural background shows in the food served at meal times, for example. Thus the meals usually consist of all kinds of meat, and in general there is no alternative dish. With multinational crews that may include Muslims, Hindus and Buddhists, in addition to the omnivorous Christians, the dinner table looks quite different with its vegetarian, non-pork and non-beef alternatives. Furthermore, while members of multinational crews often spend their leisure time among their own ethnic groups, in one-nationality crews the division is based on other matters. (See Du Rietz 2001, 109-153.) In this study, it was between officers and laborers.

The following chapter gives a brief history of Finnish sea life, by way of background. This leads on to an analysis of the time and space dimensions and, via the shipboard hierarchy, to a description of this closed community. Finally, shipworld is discussed from the perspective of gender studies.

A history of Finnish sailors and seafaring

"Your typical sailor has gone to sea at the age of 16 or 20, and he doesn't know shit about the society. He's conservative, stubborn and racist… and he doesn't spit into his glass."[50] This is how a first mate who had spent several decades at sea viewed Finnish sailors. Given this kind of perspective, it is unfortunate that seamen's culture has not traditionally been a subject of historical research (Sammallahti 1993, 16). Furthermore, almost all of the studies conducted on Finnish seafarers focus on the windjammer era of the 19th and early 20th centuries. There is a lack of information from before this time because the recorded history of Finnish seafaring does not go back very far (Kaukiainen 1997, 211). The problem with the post-windjammers period seems to be a lack of interest. Therefore

[50] HYUL99/53:f8.

studies carried out on modern sailors and ship communities are few and far between. Moreover, the ones that have concerned contemporary Finnish seamen are usually reports on their medical condition or studies of labor policy.[51] Therefore, in order to provide background information on the data I have produced I have to rely to some extent on studies conducted on sailors of the past, mainly from the 18th, 19th, and early 20th centuries.

The lack of recent literature on the object of study presents some obvious problems. For example, the living conditions and the seaman's profession have altered dramatically in the last one or two hundred years. Studies of the windjammer era have other pitfalls, too. Reliable sources are rare, and scholars of the past – and sometimes also of today – have been tempted to tell the story that fits the expectations of the audience, although it may not be the most accurate. Paul C. Van Royen (1994, 33; 1997, 1-6) criticizes studies such as 'Between the Devil and The Deep Blue Sea' (Rediker 1987), which focused on Anglo-Saxon sailors of 1700-1750, for mystifying life at sea by reinforcing the old myth of the unknown sailor without providing any answer to the basic question of what it was like in shipworld. Furthermore, McLaren (1991, 159) warns against two specific tendencies in perceiving and depicting the study object in anthropology, namely the "romanticization of the other", which means seeing natives as noble savages or otherwise through rose-colored spectacles, and the "barbarization of the other", which refers to seeing them as savages or otherwise through skewed spectacles.

My aim in this study is to throw light specifically on the question to which van Royen demands an answer: What is it like in shipworld? I will try my best to avoid mystification, barbarization and romanticization. However, when the intention is to go beyond merely stating what present-day shipworld is like, and to study how sailors experience it, there is a danger of sailing into murky waters. People attach meanings to their experiences, and to mystify, barbarize or romanticize one's life are techniques available for making experiences meaningful. Seeing oneself as a free-roving Jack Tar or Kalle Aaltonen may attach meaning to one's choice of career, for example. Thus the

[51] These include the reports ordered by the Finnish Ministry of Labor such as: Työn kuormittavuus lastialuksella (1992) Ed. Laine, M., et al.; Workload and Ship Safety (1996) Ed. Saarni, et al.; Merenkulkijoiden terveys, työ- ja toimintakyky. Merialan työkykyhanke. (1999) Ed. Laine, M., at al.

mystified, barbarized and romanticized picture of the seaman's life may be portrayed as such by sailors, and not necessarily by the scholar.

It has also been questioned in recent studies on sailors whether it is relevant or meaningful to view the seafaring community as a 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 (see Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 187). In addition, their experiences vary widely, which is also evident in this study.

The history of the Finnish merchant seaman is inextricably linked with the history of seafaring, as well as with the international development of the seaman's profession. Furthermore, the growth of seafaring has always been related to developments in shipbuilding, foreign trade and local industry. I will provide a glimpse of the history of Finnish sailors and seafaring because I think it is important to understand the roots of the industry and of the sailor's culture. It will also give some background to the freedom discourses of sailors. The following discussion will therefore cover sailors and the history of Finnish seafaring, although it has to be borne in mind that the further back we go in history, the fewer sources we have.

Finnish sea life under Swedish rule

In the Middle Ages, Finnish ships were confined to the Baltic Sea. The major export articles were fish, butter, furs and hides, as Yrjö Kaukiainen notes, while the most important import items were salt, and luxury goods such as wine, spices and cloth. At the turn of the seventeenth century the Finnish shipping industry expanded because of the tar exports to Stockholm and beyond – for a long time Finland was the biggest tar producer in Europe. In sum, during the seventeenth century Finnish shipping remained basically the same as it was at the end of the Middle Ages: the crew sizes were usually between four and six men, and only the largest vessels had more than fifteen sailors. (Kaukiainen 1997, 211-213; 1993, 11-30.) Therefore there was not necessarily a distinct sailor profession in Finland engaged in international trade, or storong links to international seamen's culture, because Finns were yet to engage in seafaring beyond the Baltic Sea.

Finnish vessels expanded their sailing areas at the beginning of the 18th century, going as far as the Mediterranean to bring salt and other goods back home. The Netherlands was the primary destination for exports until the middle of the century, after which time more than half of the ships went further: there was a steady demand in South Europe 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 get back to the Finnish coast because they had to wait for the northern ice to melt. Normally they carried freight around the Mediterranean in order to put the time to good use. Sometimes ships spent more than a year away from home if they had enough business. (Kaukiainen 1993, 38-49.) These long winters further south became part of the Finnish seaman's culture: Finnish sailors had a chance to experience foreign cultures and enjoy their ports. Kaukiainen also suggests that the shift from a more egalitarian hierarchy to the rigid system adopted from the navy took place in Finland during the 18th century (1997, 227-228). This shift greatly affected shipworld and the sailor's life. Although rigid hierarchical system has softened during the past two-three hundered years, it is still in use in the modern shipworld.

Finnish sea life under the Russian empire

Finland became part of the Russian Empire at the beginning of the nineteenth century, thereby ending the era of extensive shipping to Stockholm. Sawn goods were the main export items, due to the industrialization of Western Europe. Imports consisted mostly of salt and colonial goods such as raw cotton and coal. The ships often sailed for years around the Black Sea, the Mediterranean and in British waters without visiting their home ports. Ocean voyages became more common in the 1840s as ships began to carry goods like coffee and raw sugar from Brazil and the West Indies. Some bigger sailing ships were engaged in trade around the world, visiting foreign ports in Brazil, the USA, China, the Philippines, Australia, and the North Pacific.

By around the middle of the 19th century approximately one third of cross-trade cargo was carried beyond Europe, and at the same time smaller peasant ships started to sail to

German and Danish ports. It has been estimated that there were almost six thousand registered sailors in Finnish seaports by the mid-nineteenth century. (Kaukiainen 1993, 59-82; 1997, 220.) The longer trips that took Finnish sailors to new exotic countries affected the seaman's culture and its lore. One could suggest that this was – in terms of internationality – the golden age of Finnsih seaman's culture because 19th-century windjammers sailed much further and visited more exotic ports than present-day ships do, for example.

The expansion of foreign trade also affected the seaman's profession. There were more and more sailors spending long periods – often several years – abroad, only occasionally visiting their home country. The 19th century brought a new technical innovation, steam ships. This did not affect the cargo trade of Finnish sailing ships very much at first, but by 1875 they had brought an end to the business of the Finnish windjammers in the Black Sea. Steamers took over trade in high-value cargoes, leaving timber and other items to the sailing ships. Finnish shipping continued to be competitive, however, because of the low-cost labor and the cheap timber. Furthermore, the introduction of the first Finnish icebreaker in 1890 expanded the seafaring season. (Kaukiainen 1993, 77-112.) Some Finnish sailors were employed on foreign vessels and were often the only Finns aboard, and therefore did not necessarily maintain their connection with their homeland. It has been estimated that in the late 19th century there were approximately as many Finnish sailors employed on Finland-bound ships as on others – both groups consisting of about 6,000 men. (Hinkkanen 1994, 57.)

Young sailors

A young seafarer, just starting his career, mused for a moment when I asked him about his reflections on other seamen. Then he said, "Sailors are people just like anyone else, they do their job. But you have to be a 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."[52] In her research on young sailors' experiences at sea, Leena Sammallahti studied the first trips of Finnish sailors in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Most of the men who sought permanent or short-term jobs at sea were from the coastal areas or the Finnish archipelago. Although

[52] HYUL99/49:m7.

the reason for their trip might have been the love of adventure, they were nevertheless forced to adapt to a new work community. To someone holding romantic images of sea-life the reality often came as something of a surprise. The memoirs of some first-timers at sea describe their work duties: they mainly did two kinds of jobs – those that did not demand any expertise (e.g., washing dishes), and those that no one else was willing to do (e.g., cleaning the toilets). (Sammallahti 1988, 19-27.)

The education of sailors improved during the 19th century. The first maritime schools in Finland were founded in 1812 in Helsinki, Turku and Vaasa (Rossi 1994, 18). The first institution to give instruction in Finnish was the Maritime School of Oulu, founded as a bilingual school in 1863 (Heikkilä 2000, 28). Sailors were mostly young men: in the 1850s, almost two thirds of the seamen in Rauma were aged between fifteen and twenty-four. (Kaukiainen 1997, 226.) Seafaring was therefore a profession for young men: if we were to compare the statistics of the 19th-century Rauma with this study the seamen of present-day cargo ships would be three decades older than their predecessors.[53] The young age of the 19th-century sailors quite naturally affected the seaman's culture comprising the sounding board for the generations of sailors to come.

The shift to the modern shipworld

At the turn of the 20th century the number of steam vessels was substantially smaller in Finland than in other shipping countries. Because of World War I, sailing vessels enjoyed a second 'golden' age. This was the era of Gustaf Erikson, a famous ship-owner from the 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. Erikson used them in foreign trade, and at one point he had the largest fleet of sailing ships in the whole world. (Kaukiainen 1993, 100-129.) After the First World War there were approximately 1,200 sailing ships in Finland, and they remained dominant in shipping for a long time – until the 1920s – although the first steamboat had been built as early as in 1833, and steamboats were globally predominant already in the 1870s (Montin 1995, 29-30).

[53] One has to be cautios with this kind of comparison because the numbers are not commensurate. It gives, however, a picture of the changes in seaman's profession.

Other countries had long since left the sailing-vessel era, but it was still going strong in Finland during the first half of the 20th century. This meant that the crew sizes were relatively big: the average number of sailors on the largest sailing ships was close to 20 (Kaukiainen 1988, 366).[54] The crews of the small peasant ships were considerably smaller, but the sailor culture that is more relevant to this study evolved on ships engaged in international trade. At the beginning of the 20th century there were approximately 8,000 sailors in the Finnish merchant navy (Kaukiainen 1988, 354).

The era between the two World Wars was a time of rapid tonnage growth in Finland, and coincided with the change from windjammers to steam and motor vessels. Meanwhile, Finland remained a low-cost country (e.g., in terms of wages), attracting ship-owners from countries like Sweden and England. In fact, between the 1920s and 1940s there were approximately 10,000 seamen in Finland, and the number of sailors working on foreign-going vessels varied from nearly four thousand to over seven and a half thousand. The lowest number of Finnish sailors ever recorded was 4,700 in 1945. The era of steamboats faded slowly, and finally came to an end in the 1960s: motor vessels were introduced in Finland at the beginning of the 20th century. (Kaukiainen 1993, 138-152; Montin 1995, 29-30).

Perhaps this economic and technological change in seafaring inspired the famous Finnish song that praises the old seaman's ethos: "In the old days men were iron, ships were wood, ahoy!"[55] ("*Ennen oli miehet rautaa, laivat oli puuta hii-o-hoi!*") The ships were made of wood, but what made the men iron? According to Rosenström, the hierarchy on board was very rigid. Life was very isolated, yet it offered no privacy. Sea life provided romance and demanded masculine toughness, and there was no conflict between the two. She refers to the sailors of the 1930s and 1940s as "bruto-romantics" (*bruto-romantiker*). The romanticization of nature is another dimension of the glamorization of sea-life. To live through the storms and the tropics has often been viewed as an unforgettable experience, and concepts such as freedom and "smallness" have frequently been used

[54] According to Rosenström (2002, 57), however, in the 1930s the crew of a large sailing vessel usually comprised nearly thirty men.
[55] This is the famous chorus line of the song "Laivat puuta, miehet rautaa" (1952, lyrics by Toivo Kärki).

when sailors recall the experience of the open, wide horizon. (Rosenström 1996, 103-111.)

The romantic becomes an engineer - contemporary sea life

The merchant tonnage in Finland grew continuously from the 1940s until 1970s (Kaukiainen 1993, 161). After World War II the shipping industry experienced great changes: the vessels grew bigger, while the crew grew smaller. This change went hand in hand with the modernization of the ships. Thus the above-mentioned 'sailor's song' goes on: "In the old days men were iron, ships were wood, ahoy. Now the men are wood, and the ships are iron, ahoy, ahoy!"[56] Nevertheless, the number of seamen continued to grow steadily, until it reached the landmark figure of 15,000 in 1980 (Montin 1995, 29-30). During this era the empowered Finnish Seamen's Union managed to improve the conditions of Finnish sailors, especially in the 1950s (see Soukola 2003, 289-332). Furthermore, the training of crew members started in 1961 – officers' schooling had begun in 1813 (Montin 1995, 29-30).

While other countries were flagging out their ships to low-cost Finland in the first decades of the 20th century, since the1980s Finnish ship owners have been flagging out their vessels to today's low-cost countries such as Panama and Liberia. Furthermore, many sailors who began their careers just after the Second World War or earlier have experienced the drastic transformation from old-fashioned forecastles to single cabins, and from boilers heated by muscle power and the shovel to the remote-controlled engine rooms. (Kaukiainen 1993, 164; Soukola 2007, 349.) In addition, only a few Finnish ships nowadays travel beyond European ports. These changes in seafaring have affected the freedom discourses of seamen, as will be discussed Part IV.

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

[56] the original lyrics in Finnish: Ennen oli miehet rautaa, laivat oli puuta hii-ohoi. Puuta ovat miehet nyt ja laivat ovat rautaa, hii-ohoi, hii-ohoi!

> everybody wants to save money, it's all changed… Now there's no time, if you think of the seaman.[57]

This is how an older pumpman, Jussi, described his thoughts on old and new seamen, which he saw as two significantly different categories. He thought that the seaman had changed drastically during the three decades he had spent at sea. Although there are hardly any studies on the sailors of today, some attempts have been made to redress the balance. According to Montin, the professions altered during the 20th century due to the technical development of ships: new professions were born, such as machinist, stoker, and radio operator.[58] Furthermore, the technological developments have not only altered the range of work at sea, they have also changed life at sea in other fundamental ways. First, as discussed above, the crew size has diminished, while the size of vessels has increased. Secondly, the modern seaman works with computers, and watches TV or DVDs in his free time. Thirdly, he has his own cabin, with a toilet and a shower. In terms of work identity he has less glory and is less romantic than his predecessors on windjammers: "The romantic has become an engineer. Technical development has turned the seaman into a ship operator" (Dagens Nyheter, August 13, 1995). (Montin 1995, 30-34.)

In the old days going to sea was often the only opportunity for a youngster from the lower classes to see the world and its exotic harbor towns. Now the situation is different: the time spent in port is cut to a minimum, to one day or sometimes only a couple of hours, which does not allow time for the crew to go and explore the nearest town. According to Montin, the dramatic changes in seafaring in the 20th century have affected seamen's work identity, shifting it "from a lifestyle to a profession." Despite the numerous changes in the profession, however, it remains distinctive. (Montin 1997, 59; 1995, 30-34.) Today there are approximately 11,500 working Finnish sailors, 3,300 of which are women.[59] When women first began to enter shipworld in larger numbers in the 1950s they usually worked as cooks or mess girls. The 1990s, with the introduction of college-level education in the maritime schools, brought more women into the profession, and today they appear in nearly all the positions in the ship's hierarchy. Despite this development, their numbers are very limited in the higher levels and in areas that are

[57] HYUL99/48:p7.
[58] While the 20th century gave a birth to many new professions, many others became extinct, such as the sail-maker, the donkey man, and eventually even the radio operator.
[59] The latest available statistics are from 2005 (up-dated April 24th, 2006, Finnish Maritime Administration [http://www.fma.fi/palvelut/tietopalvelut/tilastot/]. Read April 21st, 2007.)

considered inherently “masculine” (engine-room jobs). This is discussed in detail later in this part.

Sailors abroad

In addition to research conducted on Finnish seafaring, there are some relevant studies that cover wider geographical areas. In the 1960s Vilhelm Aubert and Oddvar Arner conducted a study on Norwegian oil tankers. It provides important background information for this work, but it has its limitations: Aubert and Arner discuss shipworld mostly in terms of total institutions. Furthermore, Klas Ramberg (1997) studied the community on a modern coast-tanker in Sweden, focusing on the strict hierarchy, the specialized work tasks, and the leisure time of the crew. Another Swedish study on contemporary seamen and the ship community was conducted during a cargo ship’s world tour when Peter Du Rietz studied and Maria Ljunggren (2001) documented on film the organization, work, leisure time, and port time, among other things, during their stay on board the cargo ship Isolde. Heide Gerstenberger and Ulrich Welke (2004) also studied shipworld, this time from the perspective of globalization. There is also a study on British sailors in the latter half of the 20th century, which was conducted by Tony Lane (1986) – who worked as a seaman before turning to academic pursuits and thus had also an insider view in his writing on seafarers.

Of the studies on life at sea, ‘Deep Sea Sailors’ by Knut Weibust (1969) is one of the seminal publications. Weibust conducted his study on the seamen on sailing ships after the era of sail had already ended, and his material consists of written sources, mostly memoirs of former deep-sea sailors about their experiences at sea. These sources (for example, Clements, Conrad, Dana, Eastwick, and Villiers) cover the era of windjammers as it is often calculated – between 1750 and 1920. Weibust’s study is an ethnology of Western seamen, mostly comprising accounts by Scandinavian, British, Central European, and American sailors. The life of these seamen is depicted from various angles, one of them being the organizational level of shipworld. The organization of contemporary shipworld is scrutinized in the following pages, after which the focus shifts to a topic that Weibust did not pay much attention to – gender.

The organization of shipworld

The first thing that one needs to keep in mind regarding shipworld is that it is a place of work. The fact that seafarers live there is a side-effect of ship's functions, not a goal. Therefore everything on the organizational level is planned with work in mind. This organization is discussed on the following pages, in the context of time and space, and then in terms of the hierarchy. Finally the outcomes are analyzed in a sub-chapter concerning shipworld as a closed community, a total institution.

Time and space in shipworld

They woke me up at three a.m., to go into the tanks with the first mate and two deckhands. We cleaned four tanks. The first mate Lars had checked the air quality with a meter, so it was safe for us. We climbed the ten-meter vertical oily ladder and washed the tanks out for more than four hours. I was in a very good mood and hilariously happy, which is unheard of at such an early hour. Later I realized why. The gas fumes made us high for the whole time. I wonder what the first mate's gauge was really for – to indicate that we would not drop dead right away? (Field journal, 1996.) As this story from my time as a deckhand on the oil tanker Lonna shows, ship work is such that you may be called upon at any hour of the day.

The ship never sleeps: it is driven by the quest for profit. It continuously sails the seas, or is loading or unloading cargo. At sea, the concept of time differs from that which is common on land. In shipworld's organizational time – the prevalent concept of time that drives organizational affairs – it makes no difference whether it is Wednesday morning, Sunday night, or Christmas Day.[60] The ship functions on a 24-hour basis, seven days a week. There have to be people working on it every hour of the day. Thus time is divided in a different way than on land in two ways: the day is divided into watches, and weeks and months are perceived as almost meaningless measurements of time.

[60] On organizational time, see McGarth and Kelly 1986, 111.

The first way in which ship's time is different from time land is that each day on a ship is divided into six watches, each lasting four hours (or into a three-watch system that rotates twice a day). The basic construction of time does not apply to each work group equally, however: there are five working-hour systems aboard.[61] For some, the watches are the backbone of their work: watchmen and mates work four hours in every 12, twice a day (e.g., 4 a.m. until 8 a.m. and from 4 p.m. until 8 p.m.).[62] Secondly, the day crew works from 8 a.m. until 5 p.m. – this includes the boatswain, the pumpman, the electrician, the repairman, and the motorman. Then, the first and second engineers have yet another work schedule: they follow the day-crew work shifts except that they alternate the stopper watch[63] so that one is on duty every other night. The mess crew works according to the fourth variation in working hours: they start work early in the morning (at approximately 6 a.m.), have a 90-minute break after lunch, and continue working until five or six p.m. There is considerable variation in the mess crew's work shifts because they have to cover the meal times between seven a.m. and six p.m. with a 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 port. Given the continuous nature of the ship's operations, this is equally likely to occur at four in the morning as at four in the afternoon. Time is intertwined with the organizational and hierarchical structure: more power corresponds to a freer work schedule. The captain and the chief engineer are the only persons aboard who do not have specific working hours.

The system of working hours, in turn, dictates the social setting of shipworld. Despite the size of the crew (on Finnish oil tankers it is usually between 14 and 18 persons, while couple of decades ago it was around 40), which can seem like a crowd in a small restricted space, the ship often seems almost deserted. The crew has such diverse working hours, and therefore sleeping and meal times, that some members hardly ever meet. Another social consequence of this system is that everyone knows where to find a

[61] As another analysis of the subject, the study conducted by Aubert and Arner (1965, 282) provides an interesting and adequate, although slightly different, view on working hour systems aboard.

[62] The three-watch system has its roots in Finland in the 1940s, when the Finnish Seamen's Union negotiated shorter working time on board (Soukola 2003, 228-235). From then on it gradually replaced the traditional two-watch system (starboard and port watches), although it did not become compulsory until 1961 (Kaukiainen 1993, 175).

[63] In Finnish this is "*toppari*." On the stopper watch, which lasts for 15 hours and covers the time between 5 p.m. and 8 a.m., one does not have to do anything except stay sober and on aboard, unless there is an alarm in the engine room. Then the engineer on watch goes down to check what has caused the alarm to go off. This may happen several times a night in older or more problematic vessels.

particular person during most hours of the day. The consequences of this are discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

The second difference from time on land is that weeks and months play no role in shipworld. The relevant measurement unit is *the turn*, or the "working period"[64] (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, but nowadays the working period has been reduced to a few weeks or, at most, a couple of months (see Laine et al. 1999, 1). The only exception is ships under a flag of convenience, on which sailors work for a minimum of six months for tax reasons. While on board everybody works every day and there is no day off.

The working periods on some ships, such as passenger ships commuting between Finland and Sweden, are quite regular. Crew members usually know by the hour when they are going on vacation. This is not always the case, however: the sailor may not know when he steps aboard on which day his turn will end. It may be extended by several weeks or, sometimes, even by months. This naturally has its consequences for the land life of sailors, and affects their general attitudes towards working at sea. It is impossible to buy tickets beforehand for a trip or a concert, or at least very risky, because the sailor does not know whether he will be ashore at a certain time or not. Anna, a cook, reflects on her experiences: "The moment of going on vacation gets postponed over and over again, just so that the shipping company can change crew in Finland."[65]

Arbitrary time

Time certainly takes on new meanings in shipworld. For example, the captain or a mate decides when to reset the clocks when crossing different time zones. Sometimes, due to the efficiency of its functions, the ship might live by, let us say, London time during its short visit to Finland. For example, on one of my fieldwork ships the crew sneered at the

[64] In Finnish "*törni*."
[65] HYUL99/3:s1. On this note, my sailor buddy Pasi provides an amusing story. His shipping company needed him to work. Pasi agreed, but made it clear that he had to be back in Finland after three weeks. The captain assured him that this was no problem. As soon as they were under way, however – the dock was still in sight – he was informed that the turn would last at least a month. He was practically shanghaied in 21st-century Finland.

first mate who sometimes did not bother to change to Finnish time when the ship was in a Finnish port. This implies that sailors may see themselves on the margins of society: why bother to reset the time if you are only spending a day in Porvoo?

As this story illustrates, time aboard is subordinate to the ship's functions. Often, for example, the time changes after dinner because then the shift is most convenient for the majority of the crew. This kind of arbitrary use of time also has practical consequences: if the time is changed in the middle of the night, the watchman and the officer on duty have to work an hour more or less than those who are sound asleep. An extract from the maritime novelist Clements' *The Gypsy of the Horn* (citation in Weibust 1969, 107) provides an amusing example from the windjammer era:

> Two days later, the last of July, we crossed the 18th 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 18th 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 space, for it all has a designated use. As the ship is ostensibly a place of work, there is little room set aside for leisure and recreation. The sailor off-duty can spend his time in his own cabin, or in the crew's dayroom or mess room (which are sometimes combined), or in 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 seaman – oil terminals are usually located far away from town, for example. Moreover, because of the continuous watches and the short cargo-handling times there are few opportunities for workers to go ashore (Laine et al. 1992, 2). It is not surprising that this has had an impact on the social level of shipworld. As one chief engineer reflected: "Always when people are stuck together on a 24-hour basis for five or six weeks, it doesn't take much before somebody explodes."[66]

[66] HYUL00/7:c10.

The era before that of the modern vessels did not necessarily provide better opportunities for sailors to go ashore, however: even though the loading or unloading of cargo could take weeks, or sometimes even months, shore leave was allowed only by permission of the captain (Weibust 1969, 148). Furthermore, the rule was stricter with Finnish than with foreign vessels (Kaukiainen 1998, 110-112). The reason why a captain might forbid shore leave was often the fear of desertion (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 208). Desertion was a big problem in the 19th-century sailing-ship industry, and Finns were in third place in terms of deserters to the Canadian fleet, for example (Fischer and Nordvik 1988, 385-387).

Hierarchical space

The organization of the ship's space indicates the hierarchical structure among the crew members. For example, the size of one's cabin corresponds directly with one's rank. The captain's cabin is the largest and from there on the cabins become smaller as the rank decreases – the size shrinking in 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 the cabin corresponds with its size (see also Tikkanen 1993, 43).

The cabin's location on board is another hierarchical indicator: the captain's and the chief engineer's cabins are on the top deck, near the navigation bridge, the officers are on the next deck down, and the laborers are on the lowest decks that have living quarters. Aubert and Arner (1965, 262) also noted in the 1960s that seamen ate and slept in places that were completely defined by their work position on board. As mentioned earlier, the type of cabin assigned to the researcher reflects the same hierarchical structure. The location of the living quarters also has its implications for shipboard social relations. According to Salla-Maria Tikkanen, who conducted her study on the leisure time of Finnish sailors on South American routes between the 1940s and the 1980s, the location of the living quarters on the different vessel types affected the social relations among the crew because the physical space facilitated or inhibited interaction. She noted that in double-amidships vessels (in which the living quarters are located in two amidships, one for workers and the other for officers) the loyalty among the workers was stronger,

whereas where there was only one amidships there were better prospects for interaction. (Tikkanen 1993, 46.)

Furthermore, access to particular areas indicates the power structure aboard. The mess room, or mess, is a special area in the deckhouse and is dedicated to eating. The dayroom is often located in the same place, forming a larger integrated area for eating and leisure time. There are often two mess rooms aboard, one is for the officers and the other for the workers. There has been a trend towards greater equality,[67] even though this may not be immediately apparent at first sight. Previously, however, there were vessels with as many as five or six mess rooms – one for the captain, another for the officers, a third for the engineers, one each for the deck crew and the engine crew, and finally a mess for the mess crew (see Du Rietz 2001, 109). Aubert and Arner (1965, 262) also reported in their study on the social structure on board Norwegian vessels that there were five separate messes, and that some of them had designated tables for certain occupations (i.e., one table for able-bodied seamen and another for ordinary seamen).

One of the more old-fashioned ships under study was furnished with four messes. All of them were still in use at the turn of the 21st century, although they functioned socially in a different way than originally intended. First, there was a workers' duty-mess (paskamessi) for laborers who did not have the time or the inclination to change from their dirty overalls while taking a break. In addition, the ship still maintained two messes for eating: one for the officers and another for the workers, and the old galley crew's mess was still in use. The cook steward said that both the officers and the workers would come and sit down, have a cigarette – sometimes together. Thus the galley mess functioned as a neutral meeting ground between the two groups.

Nowadays 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 these oil tankers that the crew members occupied the dining tables according to their occupation and rank: the captain and the navigation officers were at one table, the engineers at another, the deckhands at a third, and the engine-room workers were sitting around the fourth table. The crew was forced to dine in one mess, but there was no mixing between

[67] This trend is apparent in society at large, therefore shipworld only reflects, with certain inertia, the social equalization process.

the occupational groups. As the cook steward from the ship in question, Ritva, explained, "Co-eating is still an insuperable problem for both parties, they feel it's awkward. Nobody talks. The workers want to have their own mess and to chat there, and the officers want their own."[68]

The hierarchy does not stop at cabins and messes: the salon is barred to the workers, although there is hardly any activity there when the ship is at sea. On the other hand, while the captain is officially allowed to go wherever he wishes, he may not be socially welcome in the workers' mess. The hierarchical structure of space has its roots in maritime history. For example, the social demarcation lines in windjammers were such that the workers were not allowed abaft the main mast if they were not carrying out a designated duty: a person's social status could be read from his position in space and time (Weibust 1969, 276). In addition, the formal relationships between workers and officers, and between older and younger workers, affected the spatial dimension of shipworld (Rosenström 1996, 136). One could argue that the formal and social structures have penetrated the time and space dimensions.

Judicial space

Space in shipworld forms a complex system. In one sense, shipworld is only the space that a particular vessel contains, but on the other hand, shipworld space is a combination 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 the right to perform certain public judicial and religious functions, which industrial leaders on land do not possess (see Aubert and Arner 1965, 260). Hence the captain's role includes carrying out various religious functions: he is authorized to conduct burials at sea for example, although this practice became exceptional in the course of the 20th century (Fast 1993, 36).[69] Captains also used to officiate morning and evening prayers and other feast-day services (Tikkanen 1993, 46),

[68] HYUL99/8:s2.
[69] Sailors at sea did not favor sea burials, it was just that they were unavoidable during long voyages. In Scandinavia, at least, burial at sea was not perceived as proper: it was believed that the dead who were not buried in sacred ground would not find peace. (Fast 1993, 37.)

but the gradual secularization of society and the hectic time schedules aboard have made shipboard church services virtually non-existent.

Time and space are basic dimensions of one's worldview (Redfield 1955, 80-95; Manninen 1977, 16-17; Kearney 1984, 42-107). These distinctive characteristics in shipworld also influence the worldviews of sailors, and therefore their values. Time and space are discussed in the context of sailors' freedom discourses in Part IV.

Hierarchy and organization

The hierarchy of shipworld is rigid, as demonstrated in this study. One may argue that the ship is one of the most hierarchical organizations in the 21st century, together with the military. It is also an "old-fashioned organization," the roots of which are well planted in the history of seafaring as was discussed earlier in this chapter. The ship will be examined first in mechanistic terms, then the focus shifts to the position of the captain on board, and finally to the rigid hiearchy.

The mechanistic approach

A ship's organization could best be analyzed in terms of mechanisms (on the mechanistic approach, see Morgan 1997; Robbins 2001). Theorists like to utilize different kinds of metaphors when they analyze organizations, and the theories are often based on implicit metaphorical images. These metaphors make it easier to understand and manage an organization in a certain way (Morgan 1997, 4). Some of the more popular metaphors concern machines, the brain, organisms, and culture.[70]

According to the mechanistic approach, an organization is supposed to work like a machine, and the workers are expected to behave like machine parts 'in a routinized, efficient, reliable and predictable way'. A look back in time will show how organizations came to look and function like machines. Frederick the Great, the leader of Prussia

[70] Care must be taken not to confuse two levels of analysis: the mechanistic approach and the mechanistic metaphor here are implemented by scholars, not by sailors (whose use of the machine metaphor, among others, is discussed later in this work).

(1740-1786), created the first prototype. He introduced ranks into his army, extended and standardized regulations, and instigated a high level of task specialization, standard equipment, command language, and systematic training.[71] He dreamed of a "mechanized army." (Morgan 1997, 13-23.) A more theoretical – and concerned – approach was later advocated by Max Weber. He studied the parallels between the mechanization of industry and the explosive growth of bureaucratic organizational forms. He stated that a bureaucratic organization achieved its goals through the fixed division of tasks, hierarchical supervision, and detailed rules and regulations. (Weber 1922, 956, 973-975.)

The early 20th century brought 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 and it is not surprising that, by the time of his death in 1915, the American Frederick Taylor, the father of scientific management, had gained the reputation of being the "enemy of the working man" (Morgan 1997, 22). Taylor achieved this dubious honor by creating the following principles of organizational 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 of carrying out a task; c) select the most suitable worker for the job; d) train the worker; and e) monitor the worker (Taylor 1916, 13-23). According to Morgan, the principles of scientific management were a cornerstone of organizational design for the first half of the 20th century, and many organizations are still based on these principles. Classical management theory as developed by the Frenchman Henri Fayol, for example, follows the same lines: unity of command, spans of control, the centralization of authority, and discipline being included among its main principles. (Morgan 1997, 18-22.) It is clear that the classical theorists did not pay much attention to the human aspects. Although industry in general has exchanged Taylorist principles of labor management for a more intensive and holistic approach to employees, this shift has not affected shipworld.[72]

This mechanistic approach is seen in the ship's hierarchy in the way every single task is coded and supervised according to what is laid down in the "Quality manuals" of the

[71] Weber (1922, 982) notes that the king arranged uniforms for the royal Garde du Corps as early as in 1620.
[72] On the macro changes in industrial processes in Finland, see Alasoini 1990.

shipping company.[73] Furthermore, 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), which is also apparent in shipworld: all posts aboard ship are double-manned, and it should not matter which one of the two captains or cooks are on duty (needless to say, it does matter). Moreover, sailors are interchangeable between ships and even shipping companies. The idea is that from day one a sailor can work fully efficiently and reliably on his new ship.[74] Aubert and Arner (1965, 272) also discuss Taylor's ideas, focusing more on the sociological dimension of the organization:

> 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.

Today the mechanistic approach is synonymous with bureaucracy: extensive departmentalization, a high level of formalization, a limited communication network (mostly downward), and little participation in decision-making by the organization's lower-level members are common features of both (Robbins 2001, 429; see also Morgan 1997, 13). It is by no means a thing of the past: an analysis of 23 international organization and management journals covering the years 1993-2003 showed that *machine* metaphor was the second most frequently used – the key words were control, structure, size and design (Cornelissen et al. 2005, 1545-1578). The mechanistic approach is deeply rooted in the attitudes of superiors in ships' organizations. For example, when I asked Captain Timo his views of the crew's thoughts about the ship's atmosphere, he said, "I doubt they ever think about it, they just do their work. "[75]

The mechanistic approach also shows in the nicknames of sailors.[76] The crew members are usually called by their occupational titles, or abbreviations of them, such as

[73] This shipping company started its quality (manual) movement in the 1990s. As result, the ships were furnished with some twenty manuals that described in detail how to carry out every imaginable task aboard. The number of manuals was reduced later following complaints by the sailors who were supposed to utilize them.

[74] It has been calculated that in McDonald's, which is an archetype of the mechanistic approach, a new worker can be trained in 15 minutes for the job, and top efficiency is achieved within 30 minutes of stepping behind the counter (Pratt 1988, 22).

[75] HYUL96/11.

[76] Weibust (1969, 278) provides another explanation for sailors' nicknames, based on Goffman's (1956) analysis of avoidance rituals in shipworld, one of which is the traditional avoidance of using another's

Electrician, Steward, Second [Engineer], Pump and Mess girl.[77] Aubert and Arner also noticed the same phenomenon in their study of the shipworld of the late 1950s. They concluded that the use of job titles as personal names derived from the fact that the workers' social contacts and work relationships were practically the same. (Aubert and Arner 1965, 261.) Gerstenberger and Welke refer to this system in contemporary shipworld as the ritualization of the formal hierarchy (2004, 70). This system of using occupational titles as names emphasizes the sailor's position in the ship as part of the machinery. Pump works as the pumpman and is responsible for the pumps.

"God on board": the captain as an authority figure

"The good thing about this job is that I don't have to get along with anybody, but everybody has to get along with me."[78] This was Captain Tommi's response when I asked him how he liked his work. Later he said that he was *God on board*.[79] One could 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 at sea the captain held the authority, and had responsibility for everything that occurred on board (see e.g., Bergholm 1996, 4). It should be borne in mind, however, that the captain's authority over his crew was restricted in practice by the fact that he was dependent on their skill (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 209). Furthermore, he did receive his power from somewhere (Bruun 2002, 22) – usually from the ship owner, and in the case of the navy, from the military. Although times have changed and 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, also suffered from the rigidity and the power of the captain, as he explains here: "On some ships the captain is a total prick. It's like walking on thin ice because nothing is good enough for him."[80]

---

personal name. Although this could be considered reasonable, it does not undermine the argument that the nicknames of sailors derive from the mechanistic approach.

[77] In Finnish these titles are *Sähkö, Stuju, Konekakkonen, Pumppu* and *Messilikka*.

[78] HYUL99/52:k8.

[79] "God on board" is a relatively often heard phrase in shipworld. Another saying that derives from the same image is "God in Heaven, Captain in the Vessel" ("*Jumala taivaassa, kippari laivassa*").

[80] HYUL96/1.

A strict hierarchy has long been an essential element of sea practice. In Finland its roots are in the radical change in seafaring that occurred in the early 18th century.[81] The shift from small vessels engaged in coastal and home sea trades to the larger ocean-going ships led to bigger crews, and that in turn led to a new and more hierarchical organization of labor on board (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 207-208). This strict hierarchy has played an important role in shipworld ever since. Since the 1950s, changes in marine technology and in 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 remains strict. The crew has to learn to cope with that, as an experienced boatswain, Teemu, explains: "Every captain has his own way. You just have to learn exactly what quirks each one has, what bees he has in his bonnet."[82]

Table 3.

The organizational chart of an oil tanker

Officers

Captain			
Chief mate (1st mate)		Chief engineer	
2nd mate	3rd mate	1st engineer	2nd engineer

Crew

Boatswain and/or pumpman	Repairman and/or electrician	Cook steward
Able-bodied seaman (-men) (AB)	Motorman	Cook
Ordinary seaman (-men) (OS)		Cook's assistant

This is the basic organizational chart of a Finnish oil tanker in 1996, as it was during my first fieldwork period. Since then there have been some changes in crew size, which also

[81] The pre-18th-century shipboard organization of labor was not as hierarchical as it is today, and could rather be described as collegial or patriarchal (Kaukiainen 1994, 69-73).
[82] HYUL99/27:p4.

affected the oil tankers I was studying in 1999-2000. All the changes took place on the lower levels of the hierarchy. This chart was in official and social use in 1996, and it remains in social use to this day. For example, although there is no longer cook's assistant in the crew, the cook now mostly does the same work and often former cook's assistants are now working as cooks. Therefore only the official titles have changed. The same type of change has occurred in the other two departments – deck and engine. Often there is no one officially called boatswain, pumpman or repairman on board, but the same workers still work there, only of different rank, and often performing the same tasks as before (and receiving the same pay as before).

There are some slight variations in the organizational charts of different vessels – some of which is due to the vessel size, and some to the cargo being carried. As the above chart illustrates, Aubert's and Arner's (1965, 260) notions from the 1960s shipworld are still valid:

> 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 20th century changed the above-mentioned conditions aboard in only one respect: now there is usually no more than *one* person in the same position, and never as many as three or four. The hierarchical division of labor and power remains strict. Each member of the crew has his special responsibilities and a distinct status. There is a trend towards more flexibility between officers and laborers, and between the crews in the engine-room and on deck, but this trend is enforced by the shipping company and does not often show in the attitudes of the parties involved. I asked an old third mate, Jouko, what he thought about the relations between the deck and engine crews. He answered, "The attitude comes more from the side of the engine officers, they go *the deck crew is nothing, they're just ballast*."[83]

"Duty and Mutiny"

[83] HYUL96/21.

Weibust's research on sailing ships gives a good historical picture of the hierarchy on board. He puts it quite tersely: "*Work*. Orders must be obeyed even if they are wrong" (Weibust 1969, 188).[84] This view has its roots deep in maritime history, as the following piece of advice from an old sailor to an apprentice in late-18th-century England illustrates: "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" (Eastwick 1891, 25). The sailors, however, seemed to agree with the authoritarian element in the ship's hierarchy: in emergencies, which could occur at any moment, orders must be obeyed without argument (Weibust 1969, 251-252).

I found in my study that the same attitude towards the shipboard hierarchy still prevailed. For example, Pete, who had worked as a motorman for couple of decades, had quite a clear opinion: "The skipper should be someone who gets along with people. BUT [emphatically] he has to remain a bit above the rest of us. I mean, he has to run the show. That's absolutely necessary."[85] As he shows, although the crew members complain about how the hierarchy operates, they do not question the existence of such a structure. This attitude also shows in the literature, as the following extract written by a modern Finnish seaman, Timo Pusa, illustrates. In his novel *Tattooed Heart* his alter ego, Tuomo, is deliberating:

> What if everybody did their work just as they felt like doing it? Hey boss, I guess I'll load up this ship this way – only half of it – or now I fancy making these minute paper rolls, or now I feel like taking this ship to the Virgin Islands and not to some shitty Black Sea. Or now I don't feel like cleaning this stinking place, or I don't feel like doing anything, but the wages have to be paid, because I feel like it. What the fuck?![86] (Pusa 1988, 32.)

All in all, contemporary seafarers do not question the strict hierarchy of shipworld, although they often complain about its execution. The blind obedience of orders may be dangerous, however: officers are humans, too, and therefore they make mistakes. More importantly, it could be used against the supervisors. Jouko talks about his workers, "It's still the basic nature of a sailor to do the job even if he well knows that it's going to be screwed up. So he can say his boss: *You don't know shit even if you're the boss!*"[87] In this

[84] Original italics.
[85] HYUL99/29:m4.
[86] Translated by Mira Karjalainen.
[87] HYUL96/21.

case the subordinates are using the strict hierarchy against their superiors turning what usually subjugates them to function for their own benefit.

Just below the rats: the formal hierarchy and the social organization

Despite the formal hierarchy, there are traces of an informal social structure among the crew. The two are inseparable, and some of the sailors under study questioned whether the latter even existed. Although the formal hierarchy may be very rigid, in shipworld – as in every organization – there is always some latitude to tradition, to accommodate the way it is 'lived' (Gerstenberger and Welke 2004, 76). This also applies to the windjammer era. Thus, the power structure in sailing ships was simple: the higher up in the hierarchy you were, the more power you had, although some older and more experienced sailors also had informal power (Rosenström 1996, 119). Therefore a newcomer to the community had to meet two kinds of requirements – those of the technical-economic system and the formal organization, mostly enforced by the officers, and the informal norms maintained and built up by the workmates (Weibust 1969, 211). According to Rosenström (2002, 58), the rigid hierarchy of sailing vessels derived from the contemporary concept of manhood.

It may well have been, however, that the strict hierarchy was enforced for other reasons, explained in this chapter, such as the shift to larger crews and the mechanistic approach. According to Kaukiainen (1998, 262), the hard discipline aboard did not ease the life of the weaker men in the crew – quite the opposite: it seems to have encouraged the rule of the stronger, which was prevalent in the living quarters. In sum, 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 below the rats, as the saying went".

The relations between sailors are more equal in modern ships' communities. There may be several reasons for this. For example, all newcomers have been to merchant-marine schools and they are generally older than the apprentices in the windjammers. In addition, society at large has become more equal. It should be remembered, though, that the seaman is in his work role all the time he is aboard, whether he is on duty or not (see

Kaijser 1997, 45). Therefore, neither his background, age and life experiences nor his education outside of seafaring matter as much as they would in other social settings.

Formal and informal rules covering both work and social relationships define and restrict one's being. As Aubert and Arner note, the highly formalized roles and the specialized duties and rights that go with them make it possible for sailors to live aboard without developing personal relationships with other crew members. They suggest that this is one reason why it is difficult to break down the invisible (and sometimes visible) demarcation lines aboard ship. (Aubert and Arner 1965, 272.) As an example, the electrician on the ship on which I was his co-worker and part of the crew explained the partially structural and partially social pecking order of shipworld to me as follows: "About the pecking order, I bet you've already experienced it yourself. If you say something to a mate you can't possibly be right because you're a deckhand and he's an officer."[88]

The privacy of the goldfish bowl: closed community, total institution

In normal land jobs workers leave the factory after a day's labor and are free to choose their company for the rest of the day. In shipworld, however, all activities take place at the work site, or in areas related to it. From the seaman's point of view, this means that whatever he does – works, eats, watches television, or goes to the sauna – there are always the same people sharing those activities with him, people he did not choose to be living with. If he does not like these people, his only option is solitude. Therefore it is not surprising that boatswain Teemu speaks of his life at sea in such bitter tones, "Think about it, half of my life… when I'm sitting there in my cabin and thinking I've spent half of my life in such a small hole. It's like a prison yard out there through the window. It's really quite closed."[89] In the 1960s Aubert (1965, 238) remarked that in modern societies the differences between one's work and one's personal life were profound, and called for different character, attitudes and action. The inability to choose one's companions causes stress to sailors. This is not the most dramatic social consequence of total institution, however: because of the limited space and opportunities available, one cannot avoid being monitored by one's fellow crew members. One repairman described his life on board as follows:

[88] HYUL96/4.
[89] HYUL99/27:p4.

> You're watched over all the time… it doesn't matter whether you're on duty or not… You can't go anywhere in peace and quiet. If you're on land working in some factory, at six you punch the clock card and go home – drop into a pub, nobody's watching over you … but here you can't go anywhere without somebody watching you behind your back, checking where you're going and where you're coming from… Well, I'm used to it. I've been working here all my life so I'm used to it all right.[90]

This extract shows how surveillance is woven into the physical and social structure of the ship. According to Michel Foucault (1984, 192), power is multiple, automatic and anonymous: although surveillance rests on individuals, it functions like a network of relations. Thus, while the monitoring of and watching over fellow crew members 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 is inevitable that crew members know what their shipmates are doing. There was even less privacy in sailing ships, as B. H. Shaw describes quite tersely in his novel Splendour of the Seas: "It must be remembered that a windjammer's fo'c'sle[91] offered less privacy than a goldfish bowl" (citation in Weibust 1969, 434). Aubert's and Arner's (1965, 263) remarks about Norwegian oil tankers describe the same phenomenon:

> 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.

Orphanages, mental hospitals, jails, ships, and monasteries

These types of establishment are named 'total institutions' by Erving Goffman. They are places in which almost all aspects of life are conducted in the same location and under a single authority. Goffman distinguishes five types of total institutions. The first type comprises those that are established to care for harmless persons who are considered to be incapable of caring for themselves – homes for the aged or the orphaned, for example. Secondly, such 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 – these include mental hospitals. The third type comprises

[90] HYUL99/32:p5.
[91] Fo'c'sle (forecastle) is the area fore the main mast where the workers on sailing ships used to live.

institutions designed protect the community from those who are intent on harming it, and the welfare of those sequestered in these places is not of major concern: this primarily refers to jails. Fourthly, there are institutions that are purportedly established in order to facilitate the more effective pursuance of specific tasks, and which are justified only on such instrumental grounds: these are places such as ships, army barracks, and work camps. Finally, some total institutions are designed as retreats from the world: these include abbeys and monasteries. (Goffman 1961, 4-6.) According to Goffman's categorization, ships belong to the fourth group 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, the group member is a tool employed by the institution in pursuance of its greater goal – in merchant ships this is transporting goods in order to make a profit. As an experienced third mate, Leena, said: "It's not normal in any sense for people to be put into a small community for a defined time period, where you see the same faces in your leisure time and at work."[92]

While Goffman discusses total institutions from a broader angle, his contemporaries Aubert and Arner focus on ships, which – in line with Goffman's analysis – they compare to the other total institutions such as cloisters. They describe the social structure of the ship in detail. Their study was conducted on Norwegian oil tankers, and therefore provided important background information for my study, although there were 40 years between them. Weibust also discusses many features of total institutions, including the lack of privacy and the loss of identity. He does not believe, however, that the concept 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 1969, 214). He is not the only maritime scholar to have criticized the concept of the total institution as to seafaring. Gerstenberger (1996, 174) also takes a critical stance:

> 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

[92] HYUL96/7.

institution" is also accepting that the social relations at sea are functions of technology.[93]

I doubt that designers of other total institutions such as prisons would quite agree with Gerstenberger here. Starting from Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon,[94] 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 prevents go hand in hand, and are well thought of in modern building design. Furthermore, whether it has been designed with this in mind or not, its architecture influences the social networks inside its walls, enabling and forbidding them. To return to Gerstenberger's point, however, the fact that ships are not designed as total institutions – but rather as generators of profit – does not invalidate the claim that a ship's community shares some of the characteristics and could be effectively compared with other kinds of total institutions. Accordingly, "the hard but healthy and well-ordered life" described by Weibust does not contradict the characteristics of the total institution found in shipworld. It is thus quite safe to state that, although shipworld is not *totally* a total institution, it surely shares some of the characteristics.

The brim of the goldfish bowl

The character of total institutions is symbolized by the barriers they impose with regard to relationships (i.e., social interaction) and personal privacy (i.e., escape). Yrjö, who works as an engineer aboard, put it as follows: "If you think what it's like here nowadays, you can't get out. The time in port is short, and I have to be here every other day anyway because of my work in the engine room… it's like a prison 24 hours a day …try to get out… no chance."[95]

[93] For more discussion on this topic, see also Gerstenberger and Welke 2004, 17-19.
[94] Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon is an architectural feature in which a tower is central to an annular building which is divided into cells. Each cell extends the entire thickness of the building so that it allows inner and outer windows. Therefore the occupants of the cells are backlit, and while they are isolated from one another by walls, they are subject to scrutiny both individually and collectively by an observer who remains unseen in the tower. In order to achieve in this, Bentham envisioned not only Venetian blinds for the tower but also mazelike connections between tower rooms "to avoid glints of light or noise that might betray the presence of an observer." (Barton and Barton 1993, 139.)
[95] HYUL99/30:y5.

Control over workers is reflected, literally, in how easy it is to get into and out of the physical plant of the organization (Webb and Weick 1983, 220). These barriers are not an end in themselves in shipworld, but are rather a side-effect of the ship's functions. Isolation from the seamen's land networks (family, home community) is not included in the ship's institutional purpose: it is not considered useful (Aubert 1965, 240). It is merely a side-effect of the corporate perspective. Nevertheless, the water surrounding the vessel, the odd working hours, and the ports located far away from towns serve as barriers against a crew member's possible escape.

Similarly, by and large the authoritarian shipboard hierarchy is not inherent in the ship's purpose – it is a side-effect of the structure that is considered to be the most efficient. Sailors have historically had little power over their living and working conditions, and their only way of improving their life situation was to "jump ship" (Ramberg 1997, 66). Desertion was thus one of the few ways in which they could enjoy better conditions, or get more money (Kaukiainen 1997, 223-224; Rediker 1987, 100-115). Nowadays, too, a seafarer has very limited options in this respect. As one chief mate put it: "This is a closed institution. This restricts my personal freedom a lot, this is an institution for me, and I hardly ever get to go on land."[96] Thus, although a ship is not built as a closed institution, it nevertheless functions as one.

Fieldwork in a goldfish bowl

The mess girl was standing at my door: I was late for work. As I rushed down to the mess everybody was grinning at me, which was puzzling. It turned out that the watchman had tried to call me three times in my cabin but I had not picked up the phone. Now everybody was playing the guessing-game – where had I spent the night if not in my own bunk? The fact that I had been wearing ear plugs was ignored. It was obvious that anything outside of the everyday routine was attracting attention among the crew. (Field journal, 1996.)

[96] HYUL99/53:f8.

As this story illustrates, perhaps the most important characteristic of a total institution for the fieldworker is Goffman's (1961, 6) notion that daily activities (work, living and leisure time) are 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 her to relinquish her privacy, but a more severe implication is that others may see her as one of the controllers. *Are you monitored like others, or are you the monitor of others?* I will now discuss the implications of this in the fieldwork I conducted in two very different positions and situations.

Because of the ship's strict hierarchy and its nature as a closed community, it does not have room for free actors. All aboard have their own specific positions and are responsible for performing the duties related to them. These duties are essential to the ship's operations. During my time as an ordinary seaman the strict hierarchy helped me to achieve my fieldwork goal. The moment I walked up the gangway I was an essential component of the ship's functions. I was needed, other people's lives depended on me. Although not everybody approved of women working aboard, especially on deck, no one questioned my right to be there. I was an ordinary seaman and that was that. My work and social categories were prescribed, there was no one else in that position, 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 seating order in the crew's mess, the size and the location of my cabin, my locker, and my working hours. Spedding (1999, 17), who was spending time involuntarily in another total institution, a prison, writes on the researcher's position in fieldwork:

> 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.

She is referring to the very same phenomenon, although her experience was 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.

Rumors play an important role in a total institution, 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.[97] 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. When it comes to originality, Karjalainen is nearly as common to Finns as the family name Smith is to the English. Yet the rumor circulated that I was his niece, and had come to the ship to spy on the crew! I was unaware of this or its implications for my fieldwork. It is hard to cut the wings of gossip if one does not know it exists. Nevertheless, it may have its effect. Afterwards I learned that at least two workers had refused to be interviewed because of this misunderstanding.

As a researcher sent by the shipping company, I found the question of who was monitoring whom even more relevant. There was certainly some confusion concerning the topic of my research and my status aboard. As discussed previously, the nature of total institutions does not leave much space for actors from outside of the organization. Quite surprisingly, at times this helped me to carry out my research (see Part II).

Gender in shipworld

> 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.

As Kirby and Hinkkanen (2000, 231) state above, shipworld has traditionally been regarded as masculine. Starting with the occupational titles, most of which end with man,

[97] In sailing ships, Weibust (1969, 240) reports, the most important actors in chains of rumours were the galley crew and the man at the helm. 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.

the masculine characteristics are revealed in many aspects of life at sea. The sailor's culture has also been described as manly: it is a rough life for rough men, with the everlasting threat of danger. The gender division of 19th-century maritime labor in the Baltic Sea was such that men worked at sea on the ship or boat, and women worked at home and on land (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 237). There are women working at sea today, but the 19th-century gender-divisional line between sea and land has not faded in the minds of sailors or landlubbers.

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.[98] According to Aubert and Arner, women in Norwegian vessels were a total novelty in the old tradition of the sea. By the 1960s the few women entering shipworld had hardly influenced the social structure of the ship's community. (Aubert and Arner 1965, 282.) Surprisingly, their observations are still valid 40 years after their study. Although there are more women working aboard nowadays, and in a wider variety of occupations, shipworld is still structurally a world of men. The formal organizations are classically built upon stereotypical Western male values, and have been male-dominated throughout history (Morgan 1997, 226). This is also the case in the organizational structures within seafaring: women may challenge the male kingdom, but they are yet to eradicate it.

A ship is loaded with masculinities

We all went to the day room and watched the movie "Matrix". The testosterone level was amazingly high. In his mind cook was getting his videos back with the help of a handgun in the market square of Rauma, and the deckhand Sakke was boasting about his dick. This made me wonder if they were really like that, or if they were putting on a show because of the presence of a female (researcher). However, I felt that the cook was angry and somewhat ashamed because he did not want Sakke to go into such a detail about the size of his penis when I was there. Later I wrote in my field journal:

> Are sea*men* different than other men? Is there a closed male community – not spiritual – in which the members are highly educated? It would be great to make a

[98] There were some women working aboard in the Finnish coastal transport system, but they were mostly in the galleys of family-owned vessels.

> comparison, and to see which part of all this is the seamen, which part is men, and which part is the working-class culture. (Field journal, 2000)

Writing about men and masculinities is difficult. One does not want to fall into the same trap that has caught some previous scholars of women's and men's studies, and before that male scholars. Understanding man as a gender rather than a norm is not as easy as it first may seem, as Jiri Nieminen notes. It is not enough to put a male in front of soldier, as is done with female soldiers: in order to understand man as a gender we have to consider the epistemological and political dimensions as well. (Nieminen 2006, 27.) If it is the case – as the extract from the field journal suggests – that the masculinities of the working-class culture and seaman's culture could be distilled from other masculinities, what would be left? What is masculinity? The idea of pure masculinity that is to be found in every male object is easily left lurking in the shadows, despite all attempts to dismiss it for good.

There are two different approaches to masculinity, as Jokinen argues. On the one hand, it could be defined as a category referring to aspects of the personality and the body, which has its analogies and symbols in the world of artifacts and phenomena. On the other hand, it could also be defined as the manly ideal toward which man has to strive in his life. The more a man meets the requirements of being masculine, the more respected he is as a man. Therefore one is not born as a man, manhood has to be earned. (Jokinen 2003, 8-11.) As Horrocks (1995, 18) argues, the vigorousness of 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". This observation extends the remark made by Simone de Beauvoir (1949, 295) regarding women: "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman". The views put toward by Horrocks and Jokinen, however, deviate from the one presented by de Beauvoir. While both arguments hold that a person is not born into a gender, Horrocks and Jokinen state that the gender has to be earned, while de Beauvoir claims that womanhood is produced by civilization (1949, 295).

Therefore, according to Connell, the concept of masculinity is intrinsically relational: it does not exist without being juxtaposed against 'femininity.' Gender is social practice, and therefore masculinity and femininity could be viewed as gender projects. Consequently, social practice in general is structured through gender. This does not apply

only to a special type of practice: gender unavoidably permeates (other) social structures. Masculinities, when understood as socially constituted compositions of gender practice, are also formed throughout history and the world, that is in time and space. (Connell 1995, 68-75; 2005, 1805.) This suggests that the strong masculine dimension of shipworld is the result of a historical process. Hegemonic masculinity is a dynamic performance, which is socially and historically sanctioned, and is usually rewarded with power and popularity (Robinson 2005, 22). In other words, rough manhood has to be gained for it does not come naturally, and its accomplishment is rewarding.

As the discussion above illustrates, masculinities and men are often viewed as inseparable, even as synonyms. Therefore, Judith Halberstam states, *female masculinity* has been ignored both in the culture and inside academia, even in studies of masculinity. She argues that the pervasive lack of interest in female masculinity clearly has ideological motivations and has served to sustain the compound social structures that have paired masculinity with maleness, power and domination. (Halberstam 1998, 2.) Accordingly, neither Horrocks nor Jokinen mentions female masculinity in their discussion of masculinities. However, we only need to look at Finnish advertisements, for example, to find moderate female masculinities, which at times may even have been shown as ideal images (Rossi 2003, 62).

Enacting masculinities

A boy in many Finnish maritime communities in the early 20th century had to sail at least one voyage before he was considered as a man (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 220). Thus to spin a yarn about sea adventures and exotic ports was a rewarding way for a sailor to be identified as a seadog and as a real man, opposite to a boring landsman (Rosenström 2002, 62). Nowadays Finnish boys are no longer required to prove their manhood by putting to sea, although many sailors maintain that because of their occupation, they are often regarded as more masculine among landlubbers.[99] Being a seaman thus strengthens

[99] Men crossing the gender boundary into childcare, on the other hand, challenge assumptions about heterosexual masculinity (Murray 1997, 144). Thus men who enter the nursing field often seem to come into conflict with others' views at masculinity as well as with their own view (Abrahamsen 2004, 12). After all, some professions are regarded as suitable for men and masculinity, and some are not. Men maintaining the gender boundaries may, therefore, receive positive sanctions, while those crossing them may receive negative feedback.

perceived masculinity. In a way this supports the theory put forward by Nieminen, noted earlier, that adding male in front of soldier does not neutralize the latter term. Thus saying that someone is a male seaman implies that he is double man, a man-man, bursting with *super masculinity*. As Robert Nye (2005, 1950-1951) states:

> Between the male body and cultural ideals of gender lies a zone in which men enact masculinity in rituals, speech, and gesture. This is crucially important and under-researched part of gender studies. It encompasses the historically male-segregated settings of workplace, the gym, the school, the military training ground, the monastery, the club, and drinking venues, where masculinity has been transmitted from older to younger men by the force of personal example and the appropriation of technique.

Nye discusses male-segregated, or homosocial, communities such as shipworld in his analysis. As boys of the early 1900s acquired their masculinity at sea and enacted it on land, today's sailors also use speech, gesture and rituals. A good example of this is the traditional saying *Merimies on erimies*, 'A seaman is a real man'. This kind of talk also reinforces the masculine/feminine distinction, thus supporting the heterosexual matrix (see Butler 1990, 42). When sailors adopt deeply gendered language, they establish who they are, both to themselves and to outsiders (Nye 2005, 1951).

Several aspects of shipworld are discussed below in the context of gender. First, the historical and mythical female sailor is described in the light of popular culture, and this is followed by a look at gendered language, both the official and the informal. The focus then moves to the glass ceiling of shipworld, which is viewed from different angles, and then to sexual harassment. Finally, as a reaction to all this, I explore the phenomenon of women who perceive themselves as genderless.

She weighed anchor

Shipworld is a world of men and always has been, as noted above: seafaring has been one of the most exclusively male-dominated occupations over the centuries (Creighton and Norling 1996, *ix*). There has been a strong opposition to women working at sea, often expressed outright that they have no business being on board (Weibust 1969, 422). It

was also believed that they would bring misfortune aboard with them. A. Villiers (citation 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 illustrates the fragility of the "male kingdom" aboard ship. Men felt that the mere presence of a woman aboard was enough to ruin their masculine construction of the world.

There have been a few women working at sea over the years, however (see e.g., Cordingly 2001; Creighton and Norling 1996; Mäenpää 1996, 4-33). Historically it was not uncommon in the Baltic area for women to take part in seafaring by getting involved in the fishing or working on board the peasant trading vessels (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 238). However, they were few and far between in the area of seafaring that is now under study – professional and international sailing.[100] It is not surprising either that the few female sailors there were also attracted the public interest, as this poem from the early 19th century shows:

> With pitch and tar her hands were hard, tho' once like velvet soft,
> She weighed the anchor; heav'd the lead and boldly went aloft.
> Just one and thirty months she braved the tempest we are told
> And always did her duty did the female sailor bold.

This ballad, which was published around 1835 in the US, tells the story of a young woman, a 'female sailor bold,' who worked as a seaman in windjammers plying the Atlantic trade. In the 18th and 19th centuries some female sailors cross-dressed in order to get to sea: because they were not allowed to work at sea due to their sex, they disguised themselves. This 'female sailor bold' who cross-dressed and went to sea was a popular heroine of the early modern era. (Dugaw 1996, 34-54: see also Cordingly 2001; Dugaw 1991.) In Finland the first woman reported working as a deckhand on large sailing ships was Lena Ringbom in the 1930s. Like the stories of her colleagues in the past, Lena's

[100] There have been very few studies conducted on the subject, although now the field is starting to recognize the void (see e.g., Jensen 1995; Cordingly 2001; Creighton and Norling 1996). The role of sailors' wives and families has also attracted some interest among scholars (see Herndon 1996; Norling 1996; Kaijser 1997).

story was retold in several newspapers around the world, although she did not have to cross-dress in order to go to sea. (Mäenpää 1996, 23-27.)

Gender myths

Although seafaring women have never been great in number, they have ended up as legends. Dugaw's (1996, 34-54) study suggests that, as a popular heroine, the 'female sailor bold' also had mythical dimensions. In contemporary popular culture she and the sailor myth are manifested in various ways, as 'Sailormoon', the famous manga (comic) and anime (cartoon) character in Japanese popular culture illustrates.[101] Mary Grigsby argues that she is a hybrid of Japanese and Western cultural motifs. Sailormoon is a young Japanese schoolgirl who fights for justice, and then turns into a super heroine who dresses in a traditional Western sailor suit. Her co-soldiers in the war against evil are 'Sailormercury', 'Sailorjupiter' and 'Sailorvenus', among others. The Western cultural component is the mythical sailor – although female in this case – who does not bend under the norms of society. Sailormoon is a grown female made younger who is outside the sphere of the everyday world in which becoming a mother or a wife is an issue. (Grigsby 1998, 59-72.) One could thus argue that the mythical sailor and his freedom have produced, with a gender spin, a Japanese cultural product with fantastical qualities. Furthermore, Grigsby (1998, 76) argues that Sailormoon incorporates the idealized and stereotypical modern Western image more than Japanese female gender characteristics. This may be true, but in Western popular culture, too, the stereotypical sailor is predominantly a male character, and may be female only as a spin-off.

In October 2005 there was a big breast-cancer-awareness campaign in Finland, October being the dedicated international breast-cancer-awareness month. The salient campaign picture showed a pirate woman, with the 'proper' pirate hat, pants and sword, holding a rope on the wet deck at sea.[102] Her chest was bare, except that one breast was covered

[101] The cartoon was shown on the Finnish channel Sub TV until 2005.

[102] Regarding gender myths and piracy, there is a fascinating story about Anne Bonny, a world-famous pirate. In fact, the most famous female sailors ever were the pirates Anne Bonny and her colleague Mary Read, who roamed the Caribbean early in the 18th century and have inspired storytellers for centuries. Unlike most female sailors, they have also attracted the interest of scholars, who have taken a historical perspective on the lives of these two pirates, who also had to disguise themselves as men in order to pursue

with the eye patch that is typical of a buccaneer image. The advertisement was carried in several newspapers and women's magazines, and was displayed at bus stops.[103] The campaign was an interesting spin on the sailor myth, making a female sailor the hero. It is an example of the previously discussed idealized female masculinities that can be found in Finnish advertisements (See Rossi 2003).

Gendered language

The gendered language of shipworld is examined here in terms of occupational titles. Both formal and informal job titles are discussed, in addition to the tradition of calling all women 'girls', no matter how old they are.

Occupational titles: plenty of men and one girl

My first example of gendered language in shipworld concerns the titles of the crew members, which reflect the masculine world aboard ship. The trend among Scandinavian women in the 20th century to establish themselves in many professions that used to be male-only – as doctors, lawyers, and priests – did not affect most maritime occupations (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 251). Even now, in the 21st century, almost all of the titles of seafarers end with –man: repairman, seaman, watchman, motorman, and so forth.[104] Unlike in other organizations, where sexist language primarily remains in the titles of the high-level posts such as 'chairman,' in the ship's hierarchy it prevails in that nearly all

a career at sea. Anne Bonny was originally from Ireland, but she moved as a child to South Carolina, living and sailing as a pirate mainly in the Caribbean in the early eighteenth century. (Rediker 1996, 1-33; See also Black 1989, 101-117; Cordingly 2001, 68-87; Paravisini-Gebert 2001, 59-93) She was one of most well-known women in the history of seafaring, and her story has been re-told many times in several publications. Some of the accounts are like Rediker's (1996) academic study of Anne Bonny and Mary Read and some are more like children's books about pirates (e.g., Cochran 1973). Anne Bonny and Mary Read are part of the lore that may have helped young girls and boys to pursue a career at sea. Interestingly, Rediker (1996, 11) suggests that Anne Bonny herself may have been drawn to the sea, and to piracy in particular, by the popular lore in her homeland about Grace O'Malley, a pirate queen who raided up and down the Emerald Isles in the late sixteenth century. Thus, this mythical seafaring woman may have functioned as an inspiration for another female sailor with mythical dimensions, Anne Bonny.

[103] The campaign, including the picture, was designed by the advertising agency Hasan&Partners.

[104] The occupational titles in Finnish, in which *mies* means a man, include *konekorjausmies, merimies, vahtimies, and moottorimies*. In addition, some of the titles that do not specifically include the gender in English, such as electrician and mate, end in Finnish with *mies*: *sähkömies* and *perämies*.

posts end with –man (Hearn and Parkin 1987, 145).[105] However, the highest position, captain – in Finnish *päällikkö, kapteeni* – does not have an explicit gender marking.

Women are still perceived to be so new and few in shipworld that their existence does not have to influence the occupational titles at sea. Thus when the occupational qualifications were altered in 2000, the traditional 'ordinary seaman' was changed to 'watchman,' *vahtimies*. There are more and more women attending seafaring schools and entering the profession, but this has not had any effect on the politics of job titles, which remain titles for men. This evinces the homosociality of shipworld: it is a men's club in which women are not really included. The only exception is the name in seaman's jargon for the cook's assistant: nowadays they are often called 'Mess girl', *messilikka*, when a few decades ago they were called 'Mess Charlie', *messikalle*. Characteristically, the existence of women aboard has only influenced the jargon, and only the occupational title at the lowest hierarchical level.

Hey girl, this is a rope

We had a lifeboat drill on Lonna and were cruising around the fjord on the coast of Norway. The second mate kept explaining all sorts of the most simple things to me, like "this is a rope." It annoyed me quite a bit, although I didn't admit it even to myself. I wrote later that day:

> It must be fun for them. They (I mean those old codgers who call me "girl") don't ask me what I know but keep telling me the obvious. It doesn't bother me that much, though. (Field journal, 1996.)

This was my experience when I was onboard as an 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,' regardless of their age or of their position in the shipboard hierarchy.[106] It should be borne in mind that, while calling

[105] This study was conducted in Great Britain, and does not concern Finland or the Finnish language. There are signs of the same gendered language system in Finnish, however: for instance boss is *esimies*.

[106] The tradition of calling women 'girl' could also derive from the history of seafaring. As the maritime novelist Herman Melville notes, "But you must not think from this that persons called boys aboard merchant ships are all youngsters, though to be sure, I myself was called a *boy*, and a boy I was. No. 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." (Melville 1929 [1849], 76.) In this case, calling me a girl could have been just an alternative for a boy. Then again, this theory is undermined by the fact that many women with decades at sea are also called girls.

somebody 'girl' is typical in Finnish, it also has a belittling function. Such words indicate little dominance and much tenderness, and embody several characteristics that are conventionally associated with women, thus reinforcing the heterosexual matrix (Cralley and Ruscher 2005, 302).

This belittling was also practiced by some female sailors, such as Maria, a mate: "If the captain yells over walkie-talkie that 'What the hell are you doing!' you should put up with it, you shouldn't take it like a girl and get cross."[107] As this illustrates, some women seem to use the word girl as a derogatory term. Maria, who had worked at sea for almost two decades, gave the impression that she would not have liked having more women at sea: "Now that this shipping company has employed more of these female mates, now you have girls all over the place, on every ship. It's not that special anymore."[108] For one reason or another Maria – a mate herself – did not look favorably upon 'these female mates' that her shipping company was hiring. It is worth noting that when I did my fieldwork, out of 36 mates two were female, and there were no female captains (out of 12) or engineers (out of 36). Therefore, to say, 'You have girls all over the place' could be considered a slight exaggeration. According to a study on Swedish sailors, female seafarers often want to be the only woman aboard, believing that there is then a better chance of maintaining 'gender neutrality' (Kaijser 2005, 148-149). Perhaps this is one reason for Maria's derogatory discourse about female sailors.

Glass ceilings in ship(world)

Further evidence of a gendered shipworld is provided by female sailors who claim that because of their gender they have difficulty progressing in their career. This is also the case with sailors whose job requirements do not include any physically demanding tasks (e.g., mates). As Leena, who had been a lower-level mate for 15 of her 20 years at sea, said:

> I'd gone to sea in 1974, and I kept putting off going to mate school because at the time there were only a 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 mate.*[109]

[107] HYUL99/25:x4.
[108] HYUL99/25:x4.
[109] HYUL96/7.

Leena postponed taking a step forward in her career because she was not sure if she would succeed. In fact, it has been suggested that discourses that describe mathematics, which is essential for navigation, in masculine terms make it more difficult for women to feel talented and comfortable with it (Mendick 2005, 217). Leena's hesitation was not surprising given the attitudes of some of the older seamen who were now her colleagues or supervisors. As an example, one captain answered in the following way when he was asked what he thought about having a female chief engineer or female first mate on board: "What's their motivation? Is it just a passing enthusiasm and then they're too embarrassed to quit, or is it an unhealthy obsession with showing others they can do it, or is it real interest."[110] This old captain put the possibility of a real interest in seafaring last on his list when he was talking about women, but when we were discussing men he did not utter one word about unhealthy obsessions or whims. The reasons why men resent women making professional progress could lie in the social definitions of masculinity, Connell suggests, such as being "strong." The move toward gender equality may also make men seem less worthy of respect. (Connell 2005, 1811.)

Finally, Leena decided to go for training as a navigation officer. She described her work experiences as a mate in a following way, however:

> When I was offered my first ship as the third mate, the captain told me later that he had asked if there were any other options. He had his bias. And then I have to be a much better officer than your average male. If a guy is a bad mate, he'll still get jobs, but if a woman is she'll get nothing.[111]

Leena's story is a typical example of covert sex discrimination, which could be defined as unequal and harmful behavior towards women that is hidden, deliberate, and often maliciously motivated. The aim is to ensure women's failure – especially with regard to education and employment (Benokraitis 1997, 12). Nevertheless, Leena told me that the captain ended up offering her a steady job as a mate. She added, however: "They're much quicker to tell me "*don't do it like that*" than they'd tell a male mate. I guess the old codgers find it easier to go on about women than about other old codgers."[112]

[110] HYUL99/40:k6.
[111] HYUL96/7.
[112] HYUL96/7.

The sex discrimination does not seem to be restricted to officer posts. One female cook, Anna, agreed with Leena when she was talking about how hard it was to pursue her career as a cook steward: "It matters that I'm a woman. It's hard to get promoted to cook steward. They think that it's easier to put women to clean. They'll still do it, unlike men."[113] As Gorman notes, organizational cultures are prone to forming specific categories and schemas relating to the structures and positions of that organization. Every organizational position identifies a category of people who have performed it well in the past or will do so in the future. (Gorman 2005, 704.) Therefore it was difficult for Leena and Anna, among others, to advance in their careers. For Leena it was the perceived uncertainty of succeeding as a high-level officer, while for Anna it was the certainty of her doing well as a cook who cleaned, when a man might not do the job.

When Leena was appointed a third mate it so happened that at one time all three deck-officer positions – first, second and third mate – were occupied by women. She tells the story:

> The captain went bananas: He wanted to bring in a reporter from a women's magazine to write a story about us. All three of us were horrified, asking *why?* We saw the situation as nothing special. But the men around us were going crazy, wondering how it was possible. For example, a captain from another ship called our captain just to ask if the rumor was true, that all of his deck officers were *women.* But the three of us, we didn't even talk about it. We were workmates, we just happened to be women. There was nothing peculiar about it. The ship got loaded and unloaded as usual.[114]

While the three female mates just wanted to do their job, the captain was obsessed with their gender. This is another example of Gorman's notion that pre-structured categories are viewed as proper for certain positions. Breaking this mold creates uneasiness in the organization.

When the hair-do is ruined and the fingernails break

The attitudes of many seamen towards women are often colored by stereotypes and skepticism, thus promoting the homosocial ideal of shipworld. Most women working at sea are employed as waitresses or sales persons on passenger ships, and some in the galleys of cargo ships. These are positions in which they can be perceived to be doing a

[113] HYUL99/3:s1.
[114] HYUL96/7.

'feminine' job that does not threaten the heterosexual matrix on board. It is still quite rare to find women working in other positions, such as a motorman or boatswain. When I asked a motorman in his thirties, with about a decade at sea, whether it would matter to him if he had a female chief engineer or a female captain, he replied:

> Well, if she suddenly showed up, sure it would matter. For there's no… we've never had… I've never seen one in the engine room. Yeah, it would matter, like I'd be surprised to see a dog down there… Well I guess that was a pretty bad comparison.[115]

Institutional organizations are not neat, uniform asexual structures, but they are usually amalgamations of groups of women workers and groups of men workers (Hearn and Parkin 1987, 82). Thus, women tend to work in the galley, and men tend to occupy the other positions in the hierarchy. In seafaring, the decision to work in the galley is made at the vocational school, where soon-to-be sailors go to get the training and necessary certificates to qualify them for working at sea. Thus, 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 (Aries 1996, 16). According to the Finnish Maritime Administration, in 2005 there were three female captains working on Finnish ships engaged in international trade, and no female chief engineers.[116] In most industries too, hierarchical divisions by gender are rarely random: men tend to occupy the higher and women the lower levels (Hearn and Parkin 1987, 91). In this respect, seafaring is no exception.

Women seeking to pursue a career at sea may face considerable discrimination from salty crew members. Consequently, as Christine Williams (1989, 59) argues in her study on female soldiers, the 'adjustment problems' women often face in nontraditional fields are used to justify barring them altogether. According to Elina Lahelma, who studied Finnish young men on military service regarding their construction of masculinities, women joining the army are often viewed rather negatively by the young male soldiers. These negative views are passed on, even if they are based on hearsay rather than on personal experience. It seemed difficult for them to accept a female soldier of equal rank, or even worse, to have one as a supervisor. The examples of male soldiers' discourse that Lahelma provides could be taken from my data – so similar is their rhetoric to that of

[115] HYUL99/57:m8.
[116] Finnish Maritime Administration, Statistics Department, private notification (correspondence August 17, 2006).

male sailors when they talk about women as being 'weak and whining'. (Lahelma 2005, 311-312.) For example, when I asked why there were hardly any women working in the engine rooms of Finnish ships, I was given this explanation by 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 the jobs there are, no matter HOW disgusting and dirty… the hair-do might 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.[117]

Now, would Hans be concerned about the hair-do and fingernails of the male workers in the engine room? On the subject of ruined fingernails, Lisa Frehill (1997, 131) argues that men are assumed to be "mechanically inclined" and not to mind getting their hands dirty, while women are typically assumed to be lacking in such attributes. While Frehill's study concerns the United States, the same phenomenon is apparent in Finland as well. It is as if women and men were different in some fixed, predictable manner. An example of this use of norms for the purposes of exclusion is provided by an old second engineer who 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. You have to have a tough character. You shouldn't start to cry."[118]

As this illustrates, the perceived differences between female and male emotional reactions within organizations are often considered products of nature (Deetz 1992, 191; see also Aries 1996, 164). In the Scandinavian culture, the seaman is associated with strength and capability, while the woman is connected with weakness and passivity (Kaijser 2005, 15). Stereotypes influence the way in which people interpret what they perceive, and stereotype-consistent behavior is thus viewed as a sign of a stable personality, while stereotype-inconsistent behavior is interpreted as an unreliable reaction to a particular incident (Gorman 2005, 704). Thus, gender norms are used as a justification of certain attitudes or actions: in this case the "norms" are cited as a reason to exclude women from the engine room.

It is also worth asking why women are barred from *engine* rooms. Technology in itself is not a masculine phenomenon: it has been argued that the idea of men's native and women's exotic relationship with technology is only a historical result of the 20th-century

[117] HYUL96/3.
[118] HYUL96/9.

Western ideals (Oldenziel 1999, 10). Accordingly, engineering is a gendered profession, and due to the historical exclusion of women from it, engineering as culture is masculine (Frehill 1997, 118).

On the subject of gendered engine rooms, however, one has to keep in mind that not all male sailors want to exclude women from certain occupations. Acknowledging the trend towards greater gender equality in society in general, one chief engineer said in response to my question concerning women engineers:

> You have to do physical work there, but women have managed as apprentices. There are women who can do the same as men, and it's not that hard. A female captain would be a bit odd at first, but so were the women officers. You get used to anything.[119]

There are more proactive views as well, expressed here by a motorman, Aleksi: "It would be fantastic to have a female chief engineer or a female engineer. It would be great to see how they handle things."[120] By saying this, the old motorman was stating that he would not mind having a female supervisor, although he seemed to believe that her sex would somehow be evident in her work. Motorman Matti was of a similar opinion: "It wouldn't hurt at all to have a female engineer or a female chief as a boss."[121]

Some male seamen, in fact, wished they had women aboard, suggesting that they would bring with them a 'homely atmosphere'. For example, one seaman working on a barge that did not allow female sailors due to the lack of separate bathrooms stated: "It shows, I mean the female nature. They do things what doesn't occur to guys to do, I don't mind women aboard. I liked it on ships that had women as the atmosphere was very different."[122] These attitudes, expressed by seamen of various ages and in different positions, indicate that women are not perceived as neutral colleagues, quite the contrary: either they take something away (such as the relaxed work environment by being emotional and weak) or they bring something with them (a home-like atmosphere).

Please come down that ladder!

[119] HYUL99/24:c4.
[120] HYUL00/1:m10.
[121] HYUL99/10:m2.
[122] HYUL99/42:p6.

The winter came and we deckhands had to cover parts of the superstructure of the ship with tarpaulin to prevent ice from sticking 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 pumpman Jussi, with whom I was working, kept grumbling, "The last one's the tall one and there has to be a tarpaulin too, but you probably can't do it. You'll make the old man climb up…" I took the tarpaulin and started to climb up the ladder. Immediately Jussi changed his tune: "Hey, be careful… The ladders are really slippery. I can do it. If you get scared, just come down!" (Field journal, 1996.) When I was working as an ordinary seaman, I was doing a man's job. Not everyone approved. As this incident illustrates, it is generally thought that women are not fit to carry out the tasks of deckhands because it is a job that is considered masculine and thus physically and mentally demanding, or even dangerous. This kind of outlook reinforces the idea of strong men and weak women.

This attitude is questionable, however, especially in the light of research showing that the work in a ship's galley is as physically hard as, or even harder than, work in the engine room (Laine et al. 1992, 1; see Saarni, Soini and Pentti 1996, 29). This demonstrates that beliefs about women and men have a power and reality of their own (Aries 1996, 17-18). Although galley work may actually be physically more demanding than other jobs on board, it is still considered work for 'weak' women. Women who take on 'men's jobs' may threaten the fragile manhood that is in danger of being toppled, as Horrocks (1995) might put it. Motorman Pete, who told me that having a female engineer as a boss would not be a problem, nevertheless perceived it as a threat. While he said that it would be as alright and normal as having Maria as his deck officer, he quite sheepishly added, "Except that I've been a bit like: *Is this a girls' school or a needlework club or what is it?* When we were in dock and I was in the fore with Tuula [a female deckhand] and Maria, I was a shy and quiet boy. "[123] Pete's story seems to support Horrocks' argument about the fragility of manhood, particularly when compared with women's perceived femininity in traditionally masculine settings: it has been argued that women's femininity, unlike men's masculinity, is not threatened as a result of engaging in nontraditional activities (Williams 1989, 11). Although women's womanhood may not be threatened by their fellow crew members, it may have to go into hiding for other reasons, which are discussed later in this chapter.

[123] HYUL99/29:m4.

Some male sailors consider women unsuitable for sea life, and unfit for working on deck. I asked my shipmate Robert, the cook, what he thought about 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 saying no women aboard, or let the women get a ship of their own... [laughs] without an engine or an anchor, in the middle of the Atlantic![124]

As Robert's words show, sexist discourse was still prevalent in that community. This was often apparent in the crew members' attitudes towards me when I was working as a deckhand. It may well be that a female is more easily accepted into the community when she is doing some kind of 'feminine' work, such as working in the galley. A woman working on deck or in the engine room is often considered a burden by male seafarers.

Sexual harassment – "Oh no, you don't complain about that!"

It is late at night, on my first day aboard ship, and I'm trying to fix the lock on my cabin door. This is important, for there is no way I am going to sleep in the cabin as a lone woman on a ship with 17 men if I can't lock the door. Well, I'm standing there when a helping hand appears – Sakke is there in front of me, wearing only a towel around his groin, asking if I'd like to join him for a beer or a coke. I refuse to have a drink with him, and he gives me some advice about the lock. However, he does it in such a loud voice that the passers-by (and there are some, I hear the steps) can see and hear him, standing there half-naked, late at night, at my door! Talk about marking territory! (Field journal, 2000.)

This story illustrates a typical case of friendly harassment that is sexually oriented conduct, which at face value seems harmless or even playful, but it creates uneasiness, embarrassment, or humiliation (Benokraitis 1997, 16). It is also suggested that sexual harassment may serve as the enforcement of heterosexuality (Epstein 1997, 167). Thus male sailors who harass their female colleagues may want to reinforce the heterosexual culture of shipworld. Many women say that sexual harassment and all types of sex discrimination are more the norm than a rarity on ships (Interviews 1996 and 1999). It is

[124] HYUL96/5.

a common and accepted fact of sea life, which women working there are supposed to keep in mind. Sexual harassment could be seen as the product of a gender system that is maintained by the prevailing normative form of masculinity (Uggen and Blackstone 2004, 66).

When I was working at sea I heard a euphemistic story about rape, but other stories were told to convey the lines of proper behavior for women working aboard. Unlike in some other male-dominated communities, the moral of the stories seemed not be in warning women against engaging in certain "loose" behavior, but to encourage them to be sexually active. For example, a deckhand told me that there used to be a mess girl working aboard who would clean the staircase wearing a short skirt and no underwear. The deckhand did not pass judgment on her in his story – on the contrary. As the story shows, the standards of sexual behavior aboard did not seem any harder on women than on men. It was not uncommon for certain crew members to tell ordinary-seaman me that I should not hesitate to ask them for help if I felt lonely, the implication being that "it was quite normal onboard for these affairs to go on between crew members." Often the parties involved in such affairs have spouses on land, but their fellow crew members usually conspire to keep it a secret from those left ashore. It seems that what takes place on board does not count, or at least it remains on board. This suggests that sexual freedom for women and men might be closer at sea than in the mainstream Finnish culture. On the other hand, the "encouragement" of sexual freedom easily turns into sexual harassment.

When I working as an ordinary seaman my captain once groped me as I tried to pass him in a corridor. My initial raction was to turn around and slap him to the face, but luckily I did not do it: punching one's captain would have been a big mistake and could have caused me a lot of trouble and perhaps even penalties. Sexual harassment could also be defined as a physical, visual or sexual act inflicted upon one individual by another, which stresses the former's sexual identity over his or her identity as a person, and causes embarrassment, fear, hurt, discomfort, or degradation: it weakens one's power and confidence (Robinson 2005, 21). In addition to enduring aggressive sexual harassment, and blatant sex discrimination[125] (such as being grabbed and the target of smutty

[125] Benokraitis divides harmful sexual treatment of women into several categories: blatant sex discrimination, subtle sex discrimination, covert sex discrimination, condescending chivalry, friendly

personalized sexual comments), women are constantly subjected to flirtatious sexual remarks. Their reactions to this vary, but they hardly ever make a serious attempt to put an end to it – they do not want to 'make a fuss'. As Anna, the female cook, explains: "Well, people joke around. And there's always somebody trying to score, almost every day. But you get used to it."[126] The cook steward Ritva, who suffered from extensive harassment for years, decided to play it cool and to wait for it to pass over time: "When I first came to this shipping company there was plenty of sexual harassment, it was quite uncomfortable. Now, either I've got too old for them or they've finally figured out that I am not here for that."[127]

This kind of culture in shipworld functions as a distinctive factor for women, who remain objects. It should nevertheless be borne in mind that most of the women deliberately choose to pursue a career at sea, even if it is hardly the most obvious choice. Those who have chosen this career and have decided to stay with it must have found ways of coping with what is sometimes an aggressively masculine shipworld. Moreover, not everybody necessarily suffers from excessive hetero-normative attention. I asked a cook steward with more than 30 years experience at sea how she had found it working as a woman among all those men? She explained:

> I've had it better here than if I'd worked somewhere where there was majority of women. I've never had problems working with men. I've always worked with them. When I was a young girl I was the only woman working in a timber lodge …and I never had any problems. I've not been harassed. [*Really?* I asked] Well, very rarely, at first yes, but it wasn't serious.[128]

Shipworld remains masculine, and it requires much more acclimatization on the part of women to enter that world than it does for men to adapt to the presence of a few women. When I was a deckhand, it did not take long for me to get drawn into this reality. I came to accept as normal the dirty jokes, the constant efforts to hit on me, and so forth. My reaction, although not necessarily the most effective, was to laugh through the whole charade of masculine remarks, or when the talk became too uncomfortable, to make pointed remarks myself. What else could I do? Later I wrote in a report that there was

---

harassment, and subjective objectification (1997, 5-30). One does not have to look very far in shipworld to find traces of all types of sexual harassment and sex discrimination.

[126] HYUL99/3:s1.

[127] HYUL99/8:s2.

[128] HYUL99/31:s5.

'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 alright? I realized that under those circumstances, life at sea that is, everything less than blatant grabbing was hardly considered sexual harassment. Actions I would never tolerate on land were somehow more acceptable at sea, probably because I thought of myself as having stepped voluntarily into male territory. There were different customs there that I could not change, and hence I found it necessary to adjust. This is in line with the findings of a study conducted by Richard Harris and Juanita Firestone on women in the U.S. Army. They conclude that women often define sexually harassing behavior as 'normal,' or 'to be expected' in male-female relations, and therefore do not consider it worth reporting. (Harris and Firestone 1997, 168.) For instance, when the cook steward Ritva told me about her experiences of sexual harassment that went on for years, I asked her if she had done anything about it, such as telling the captain. She explained, with her three decades' experience at sea: "I waited for it to pass over time. Oh, no. You don't complain about these things. It's part of this life, you see."[129]

As a researcher, my position in the hierarchy played an important role in terms of my vulnerability to sexual harassment. The fact that I had been 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 it would be easier to establish and maintain a certain distance between us – or so I thought. This is an extract from my field journal (2000), written on a ship on which I was the only woman aboard:

> It's been rolling for quite a bit now. The deckhand Sakke came here and told me about the rolling: it's 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 your dick to maintain your balance. This is it: the guys are testing me. They are checking that I'm a good guy, that I can put up with their garbage. These are stories they wouldn't tell each other. I doubt that the guys talk to each other about their balancing dicks. Or what do I know?

Because I was not needed as a crew member and was not going to stay there for long, I was quite vulnerable to harassment. How much should I tolerate the flirting and sexual remarks? This is important, because being brisk and easy-going is considered a necessary

[129] HYUL99/8:s2.

virtue if one is at sea.[130] The ability to put up with the remarks about one's physical appearance and behavior is considered important. On the researcher's ability to cope with personal remarks, Joan Neff Gurney discusses her experience in a male-dominated fieldwork setting, the police, and particularly her reaction to the sexual innuendos: "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 1991, 59.) Gurney's attitude reflects my reaction to the sexual remarks. I temporarily adopted a thick skin and decided to take it all, unless the talk became extremely dirty. This is in line with Spedding's (1999, 17) notion that a person engaged in 'normal' fieldwork may adopt a screen personality that fits in with the host culture.

There are opposing views to this stand in the anthropological literature. For example, Van Maanen (1991, 39) reminds us that neutrality in fieldwork is an illusion; and neutrality is itself a role enactment. Hastrup also points out that even in the 1950s Goffman separated the self as character and the self as performer. Today, she 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 1995, 91.) This 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. I have found 'screen personality,' or rather a 'temporary thick skin,' a useful concept in terms of discussing fieldwork experiences, for people – including fieldworkers – do adopt roles for various lengths of time, and use them to filter undesirable experiences. For a short time it was possible for me to pretend to tolerate values of which, in fact, I could not approve.

Women without gender

As a response to the sexism – both structural and individual – women working aboard often describe themselves as genderless and asexual while within shipworld. This is their strategy for surviving in the homosocial ship's community. Ritva, for example, whose experiences of sexual harassment were discussed above, describes her coping mechanism against the male dominated shipworld:

[130] Courage, virility, and good humor have traditionally been regarded as necessary and respectable characteristics for a sailor (Weibust 1969, 264; Rosenström 1996, 129).

> Over the years you become like me, perfectly genderless. It's one way to survive here. The concept has sort of become blurred for me, so I'm almost like sexless. [*And when you go on land?* I ask, and she laughs:] Then I'm a normal woman… nowadays it's like two entirely different lives, this sea life and land life. Once my bags are ashore I change into a completely different person. Then I'm a normal woman.[131]

It may well be that women, when stepping on board, want to ignore their gender altogether (Kaijser 2005, 15). In the light of Ritva's story, the results of a study conducted on American female marines could be considered surprising. It was found that within this non-traditional occupational group the redefinition of womanhood caused a reinforcement of gender differences, not the opposite as this study of female sailors would suggest (Williams 1989, 6). In addition, Williams (1989, 75) argues:

> 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*."

There are several aspects to be taken into account in considering differences in attitudes towards gender at work. One might naturally first look for the answer in the differences between these occupational groups (sailors vs. soldiers), between the countries and cultures (Finland vs. USA), or the time frame (1996-2000 vs. the late-1980s, although I doubt that this gap would make a great difference). I suggest that another reason might be the probable age differences in these occupational groups: the average age of the female sailors I interviewed was close to 50, and the female soldiers were probably much younger. Furthermore, while shipworld is part of an international and mostly private business, the Marine Corps is part of the public sector in which the uniforms, the working methods and such are codified and controlled. The focus in shipworld is on transportation, and phenomena such as politically correct language are yet to enter its realm.

It was stated in the Marine Corps study that marine women do not feel that their womanhood is threatened if they engage in 'non-feminine' activities (Williams 1989, 79). I believe that female sailors do not feel threatened either. I would rather look for an explanation in the nature of these institutions. It may well be that the military is a safer

[131] HYUL99/8:s2.

place establishing one's gender because of its more formal nature, its public functions (high-level publicity), and the larger units that it maintains. Perhaps these factors explain why the views of these female marines differed so much from the views of the female sailors I interviewed. For example, Leena explained her defense strategy in shipworld as follows: "As I see it when I step aboard I'm a genderless creature. I mean everybody can think of me however they like … But I've hardly ever used a word like 'woman' while I've been working here."[132]

The female gender is thus often a problematic issue in ships' communities, as this following story illustrates:

> It's the crew's day-room, where people come to smoke. Deckhand Sakke tells me – the Electrician is there too – about their young female mate who's a good guy. She has learned the ways of the dudes. In other words she knows how to swear, and she can talk freely about getting batteries for her dildo. So a woman is accepted when she's a good guy, but not if she's a good woman. In order to be accepted, you have to use the dude discourse. (Field journal, 2000.)

This young female deck officer – according to Sakke – was a good guy, a real dude. But was her dildo-chat expressing female masculinity, reproducing feminity, or reinforcing the heterosexual matrix? Care should be taken not to victimize women or to villainize men in discussions on women, men, and genders. Gender is not an attribute of the body alone, it also presents itself in action, gestures and speech. According to Halberstam, one should be careful not to insist that masculinity is the property of male bodies (1998, 15). Furthermore, one may well ask whether swearing and dildo-chat are masculine or feminine in nature.

Most female sailors do not have offspring. Sailing women often make the decision during their first decades at sea, at the latest, that they do not want to have children. For those who have not made the deliberate decision, the issue may become problematic. A cook steward explains:

> I would not recommend this life for women. I don't feel personally that I've missed anything, but I decided when I was 16 that I didn't want to have kids. When I look at these younger sailor women, I can tell some are very bitter. They see how life is passing them by, and they can't find a partner, they can't find a normal family life. Or what is a normal family life, I think I have normal family life [laughs]. But yeah, are you ready to give up all that?[133]

[132] HYUL96/7.
[133] HYUL99/55:s8.

When she mentioned her own normal family life she was referring to her relationship with a crew member from the same ship. They planned it so that their working periods matched. When they left for vacation the cook steward went her way and her lover returned to his wife and family. This had been going on for years. This kind of story is not unheard-of in shipworld. Unfortunately, not everyone considers themselves so lucky with their affairs, as the cook steward's story from the past reveals: "An old friend of mine was a sailor. But she got into trouble – she got pregnant on her first ship. They were out at sea, so she couldn't do anything about it. She had to have the baby."[134] She went on to say that because there were naturally no maternity clothes on board, her sailor friend had to make her own out of some old sheets. This story demonstrates that shipworld is a world of men on many levels: while the sailormen may leave their troubles behind when the ship leaves the harbor, it may be quite the opposite for female sailors. One might also ask whether the decision to remain childless is part of the genderlessness female sailors often experience in shipworld.

Shipworld and the freedom of seamen

Part III examined shipworld from various angles that shed light on the freedom discourses of today's sailors. First, I gave some historical background and then considered the organizational aspects, including the time and space dimensions and the hierarchy. Finally, the focus shifted to gender, which was scrutinized in terms of masculinities, the heterosexual matrix, homosociality and genderlessness. All these elements constitute the background of freedom discourses: shipworld is the setting in which they arise. Their effects on the freedom discourses of seafarers are discussed in the following chapters.

IV The sailor's freedom

Gale was – once again – worthy of his name. We were to fix the 'monkey ropes' of the lifeboat and he was preaching at me like an old bosun can preach at a young deckhand.

[134] HYUL99/55:s8.

The only problem was that he was utterly wasted. We were standing in the swaying lifeboat. On one side was the deck meters below and on the other side the Baltic Sea swelled some 20 meters beneath us. Gale was storming away about sailorhood. He said that a seaman was a *real man* and a *free man*: he did whatever he wanted whenever he wanted. He was not bound to land, or to people. He had a knife in his hand and he was using it to emphasize the key words in his ramblings. He was holding the wire rope with his other hand to keep his unsteady balance. As I looked at this old drunk preaching away waving his knife around I thought that he probably believed every word he said.

When we scrutinize Gale's idea of freedom we should keep in mind what Patterson has to say about it as a value: there is nothing self-evident in the idea of freedom or in the high esteem in which the West holds it, and in most parts of the world and in the history of humanity it has not been an obvious goal. Several other values and ideals have been considered worth striving for – honor, glory and power, just to name few. In fact, most non-western cultures have paid so little attention to freedom that they often have not even had a word for it (Japan and Korea, for example, had no such concept before they made contact with the West in the 19th century). (Patterson 1991, *x.*) However, even though freedom as a recognized value is rarely present in these cultures, as Dorothy Lee (1959, 53) argues, it is nevertheless present as autonomy, or it is implemented in the Self.

According to Patterson, valuing freedom is not a human condition we have at birth. How did it arise, then? Freedom derives from slavery, because as a value, as a powerful shared vision of life, it resulted from the experiences of and responses to slavery by masters, slaves, and nonslaves. Throughout the history some notion of freedom has existed wherever slavery has been found. Having the notion of freedom did not automatically make it a value, however, because 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 it. Slaves could not have achieved that by themselves because they were dishonored nonmembers of the community. (Patterson 1991, *xi-xiii,* 41-42.)[135]

[135] An anthropologically orientated student may wish to question this statement: why could dishonored people not develop their own values? Patterson is quick to respond, bundling up the history of slavery before Ancient 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." Thus, only then when the possibility existed for an individual to manage economically and "to survive the hostility of the freeman socially and culturally, could the slave begin even to think

Why, then, was Gale preaching away about freedom, and not about some other value? My aim is to analyze the freedom discourses of sailors, including his, in order to understand how they construct freedom and why they present it as such a fundamental value. As discussed previously, this is best explored through their verbal expressions (Holm 1996, 3), through their discourse. In this study, discourse analysis is understood as a generic concept that entails rhetoric and metaphor analysis. There is a slight emphasis on metaphors because sailor discourse is very rich in them (for a detailed analysis of the metaphors of sea life, see Karjalainen 2004).

Part IV begins with a description of the methodological framework for the analysis: rhetoric and metaphor. This is followed by an introduction to the abductivist approach in the analysis process. Having prepared the ground, I will then scrutinize the freedom discourses of sailors, beginning with the freedom of Kalle Aaltonen and moving on to freedom from freedom.

Rhetoric in the study of freedom

> This is not a life worthy of humans. You lose your life here. You're outside of everything in the end. Even though you have vacations. You have to be crazy to be here, or then you must lack imagination if you can't find any other place to go than the sea. If anyone asks me, I always say never ever go to sea.[136]

Chief engineer Hans makes above a strong rhetorical communicative point when he reflects on his life at sea. As this example illustrates, rhetorical analysis fits well into the study of sailor discourses. It also works well in discourse research, although the two approaches do have certain differences of emphasis (Jokinen 1999, 47). The new rhetoric in particular has been attracting research attention for several years now, and its founding fathers Chaïm Perelman and Kenneth Burke[137] have once again captured the interest of scholars. Finnish scholars in the field of comparative religion have also contributed to this discussion: Tuula Sakaranaho (1998, 1999, 2001, and 2002), for example, has developed a theory of new rhetoric, and has introduced this approach to younger practitioners. For example, Pesonen (2002, 2004) with his study on nature, the

about his freedom as the absence of personal restraint and as doing as he pleased." The era before Ancient Greece with its thriving slavery did not offer such social space. (Patterson1991, 42.)

[136] HYUL99/44:c7.

[137] In addition to Stephen Toulmin.

environment and religiosity, and Titus Hjelm (2005) with his research into media discourse on Satanism, have both focused on discourse in comparative religion. Rhetoric has spread to the field of anthropology as well. According to Carrithers (2005, 578), this shift brings argumentation, persuasion and other micro politics to light, discovering a dynamism in social life that anthropology has previously ignored.

Rhetoric is part of all language in use: it is not a burden on language, but is fundamental to it (Jokinen 1999, 47). It was argued in the 1980s that 'rhetoric' as a word had a negative connotation, as speech that lacked substance, and was often paired with the adjective 'mere' or 'empty' (Billig 1987, 32). Since then it has been vindicated by contemporary scholars. I will briefly discuss some general aspects of rhetoric, focusing on aspects that are relevant to my study and closely linked to metaphors. Because rhetoric has various traditions and uses, it cannot be described as one discipline (Palonen and Summa 1996, 7). It has been noted, for example, that metaphor has also gained in interest through the rise of the new rhetoric (Franke 2000, 137).

The new rhetoric concerns discourse addressed to all kinds of audiences, unlike its ancient counterpart, and even extends to examining arguments addressed to oneself in private contemplation (Perelman 1982, 5; 1979, 9.). It has been argued that Burke was more concerned with rhetoric linked with non-harmonic situations, while Perelman focused more on rhetoric as a source of mutual understanding (Summa 1996, 17). However, Burke also recognized the potential of the new rhetoric in the study of private deliberation. He claims that we can extend the range of rhetorical study to reach the persuasion we impose upon ourselves, being more or less conscious or unaware of our own actions. (Burke 1950, 35.) Michael Billig (1987, 5) has also contributed to the study of rhetoric in private thinking, which he suggests is modeled upon public argument and is more like dialogue than monologue. According to Potter, there exist general features of fact construction, in other words the same considerations are likely to occur in every type of discourse. This means that arguing and thinking use the same kind of fact construction and the same kind of terministic screens. (Potter 1996, 8.)

The new rhetoric could thus be defined as a theory of argumentation. Perelman noted in the 1970s that the choice of linguistic form was neither purely arbitrary nor simply a carbon copy of reality. (Perelman 1982, 5; 1979, 9-45.) Modern metaphor theorists – as I

will show in the next sub-chapter – are in agreement with Perelman because metaphors fit into the notion that linguistic form is located between the arbitrary and the real.

When an idea can be defined in more than one way, 'to define' means to make a choice. This choice is acceptable without debate only if its consequences are perceived to be insignificant to the reasoning process. (Perelman 1979, 91; 1982, 62.) However, another elder of the rhetorical turn,[138] Kenneth Burke, is more radical in his view: "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." (Burke 1969 [1945], 59, italics original.)

Thus for Burke all vocabularies expressing an idea are inevitably deflections, while Perelman believes that there is a possibility for an idea to exist that could be defined only in a certain way. Joseph Gusfield (1989, 34) elaborates on Burke's argument, stating that reality is screened through the terminologies – Burke calls them *terministic screens* – we utilize in interpretation and communication. Such taken-for-granted terminologies are not neutral, however. Burke (1966, 50, italics original) argues:

> 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.

Thus, terministic screens are neither escapable, nor neutral. By using language people construct versions of their social world (Potter and Whetherell 2001, 199).

Metaphors in the study of freedom

Within discourse, special emphasis is put on metaphors in the data analysis. According to George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, metaphor is primarily a matter of thought and action, and only secondarily a matter of language. They emphasize its role in understanding and experiencing everyday life, stating that the only relevant similarities are those people

[138] Sakaranaho (1998, 41) summarizes the relationship between the rhetorical turn and the new rhetoric as follows: "The rhetorical 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". In their definition of this new rhetoric, Palonen and Summa (1996, 7) mention the attempts of new rhetoricians to examine science itself as a rhetorical activity.

experience between the metaphor and the original word. According to this approach, metaphors could be considered the basic tools of comprehension. They are culturally shared: what is considered to be true by an individual is the result of her or his social reality and of the experiences of the physical world which the social reality influences. Metaphors have an important role in defining what we think is real, and consequently in forming values. (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 146-159; see also 1999.) In discourse research language is perceived to construct social life, building social relations, minds, objects and worlds (Whetherell 2001, 16).

Metaphor, like any complex theoretical concept, has taken on various definitions in its existence throughout more than two millennia. To put it briefly, in a metaphor one concept is replaced by another, which both covers and reveals it (see e.g., Lakoff and Johnson 1980). According to Albert N. Katz, 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 a semantic relation.[139] It has long been recognized that metaphor seems to induce similarity between the topic and the vehicle. (Katz 1996, 2, 16.) Here the word *induce* is in the key position: how much do metaphors generate similarity between two concepts, the topic and the vehicle?

If a metaphor of the form *An A is a B* is seen as a linguistic expression where *"A is like B, in respects of X, Y, Z…,"* as Lakoff and Johnson note, the metaphor can only describe pre-existing similarities and cannot create them. However, they do not hold with that view: for them, metaphor is *primarily* a matter of thought and action, and only derivatively a matter of language. The only relevant similarities to metaphor are the similarities people *experience* between the metaphor and the original word it replaces. (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 153-154.) Therefore, the way seamen use particular metaphors may well differ from the way in which landlubbers, who do not have first-hand knowledge of the sailor's life, use them.

[139] The relation of A = topic and B = vehicle to the terms of other scholars (such as source domain and target domain) is explained in more detail later.

Metaphor works like the lens of a camera. Hence it helps to focus on a part of the scene and to see it clearly, but in doing so it blurs the rest of the view. An essential aspect of the 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 that screen out everything else but the core ideas consistent with them. In other words, the metaphor may, so to say, cut out the tongue and cut off the legs of a girl or a man. This is very close to what the new rhetorician Burke states: "Every way of seeing is also a way of not seeing" (1945, 91). It is not the same, however: while Burke's remark and the majority of the definitions of metaphor embrace the idea of revealing and covering, only in metaphor does the actual switching of words always take place.

Of the various theories and approaches to metaphor I will mostly rely on the short definition provided by Lakoff and Johnson: "The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another". This is useful for the purposes of this study because it emphasizes the metaphor's role in understanding and experiencing everyday life: metaphors are the basic tools for comprehension. (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 5, 159.) Therefore the essence of thinking could be seen as metaphorical – in other words the essential component of thinking *is* metaphorical. Metaphors function as analyzers and arbitrators of everyday experiences and permeate them. They are resources of interpretation. (Fiske 1992, 125-126.) Consequently, they are also ambiguous – they may be both playful and solemn at the same time (Gordon et al. 1995, 10). This is evident in the metaphors sailors use for their ship: for some it is a *golden cage*, for others it is a *nuthouse*, or a *bottle*.

Worldviews, rhetoric and metaphors in the study of freedom

The mess chat is usually about the day's events. People often let off steam about mistakes made by their supervisors or colleagues – this is one of the main reasons why crew and officers often want to have separate messes. Another favorite topic concerns previous sailing buddies and yarns about their antics. The recurring talking points on Lonna, where I worked as a deckhand in 1996, were the second mate who was considered to be feather-

head, and the repairman with a speech defect who had earned his unpopularity by refusing to retire or to help his co-workers. Then there were the individual hobby-horses – Puhonen, for example, talked endlessly about alcohol. There was also constant joking, such as calling the shipping company a 'young novice company' that they had to support by re-using their disposable coffee cups (when in fact it was partially government-owned and one of the biggest shipping companies in Finland). Language is one of the most powerful means of expressing one's worldview. It is not only the bearer of culture, it is also the medium through which events and other things are made explicit, communicated, and experienced. (Jocano 2001, 5.) A good example of this is the mess talk described above: it was considered suitable to boast about alcohol use, and to joke about supervisors, co-workers and the employer, while politics and religion were generally viewed as inappropriate talking points.

People use language to create versions of the social world (Potter and Whetherell 2001, 199). Metaphor is an efficient tool for the researcher attempting to analyze the freedom discourses of sailors, for example, because metaphors work as powerful interpreters. For sailors, however, it does not serve the same intellectual purpose. They use metaphors to communicate meanings and to express their thoughts, and do not engage in detailed discussion regarding the finer points of metaphor definition. They are not totally blind to them either. I think it is worth emphasizing that most of the time the metaphors sailors used when they were reflecting upon their life at sea, or on the ship's community, were neither neutral nor semi-unconscious remarks: they often produced ironic or polemic notions of shipworld and freedom.

The idea of terministic screens – the terminologies through which the reality is screened – developed by Burke is in line with Kearney's notion that the worldview is always a partial and thus inaccurate image of reality (see Kearney 1984, 117). The terms we use in constructing our world are always selections of reality, directing our attention, and thus our worldview, in a certain direction. Therefore, the discourse of everyday life is itself a matter of convention. It is the world in which we place our trust: the bedrock of our taken-for-granted faith. (Atkinson 1990, 40.) It follows on from this idea, as Peter Burke (1992, 119) notes, that concepts such as gender, class and community, which once were assumed to be objective, are now presumed to be culturally 'constructed' or 'constituted'.

How does one's worldview influence one's behavior and practical actions (Kearney 1984, 10)? This is a highly relevant question because if one's worldview did not have an impact on the outside world it would be pointless to study it. It matters because it influences our selection of information (Niemi et al. 1986, 80). On the other hand, language constitutes the world. Metaphor not only reveals, but also shapes the worldview and the behavior of the speaker (Liu 2002, viii). This process is well formulated by Dilin Liu (2002, 119):

> 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.

I discussed shipworld in the previous chapters, and worldview in the introduction – the former providing the context and the latter the theoretical framework within which to consider the freedom of sailors. I will now look at their freedom discourses by analyzing their rhetoric and metaphors.

Metaphors in the air, followed by abduction

Metaphors were hovering around me, literally: I had written every one of the sailors' metaphors or sayings regarding freedom and life at sea on a separate piece of paper. Then I had set them all out on the floor and had started to try out and form different groupings in order to find the most well-grounded categories for analysis. Now I had mistakenly opened the window and the little pieces of paper with the metaphors written on them were flying about in the air. It was time to put them in place.

I found 83 metaphors and 13 other expressions regarding sea life. Eighty-some metaphors are difficult to handle and to make sense of if they are not grouped in meaningful clusters. The clusters I chose arose partly from my earlier experiences at sea and partly from other studies conducted on ships' communities. However, I consciously tried not to let these previous experiences and studies hinder the process of forming new groupings, and to look at the material as if I were reading it for the first time, while

keeping in mind the hints and clues given in previous studies (on this process, see Karjalainen 2004).[140]

The method I employed is called the abductivist approach in the philosophy of science. Charles Sander Peirce (1955, 150-156) has been credited for theorizing it so as to leave room for the scholar's intuition. While abduction can be viewed from many angles, it has been discussed whether it is logic at all, or mere intuition (Paavola 2006, 15). According to abductivist reasoning, new scientific findings are based on some kind of lead, or clue. New theory is not created only through inductive reasoning – some kind of clue or basic principle is needed to steer the researcher's attention toward the discovery of something new, and to focus on certain aspects (Grönfors1982, 33).[141] Therefore intuition has considerable importance in the analysis process (see Ehrnrooth 1990, 37).

The abductivist method recognizes that the researcher's attention may focus on something he or she finds important for one reason or another. This does not imply that the researcher is studying the material merely in order to find what he or she wants to find. Furthermore, a lead, or a hypothesis, can be discarded or modified at any phase of the research in question. (Grönfors 1982, 37.) Consequently, what was detected will be reviewed as possible allusions to 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, the problem being how to ascertain which interpretation is correct. According to this approach, the interpretation is valid if it provides a logical explanation of why the group members act and talk the way they do. (Alasuutari 1989, 36; 1994, 132.)

Luckily the most liberating thing about methodology is, as Rita M. Gross notes, that it is a *tool*. Therefore one should not be too orthodox in employing it because "sometimes we need a hammer and sometimes we need a screwdriver" (Gross 2005, 153-154). After studying my material from different perspectives, and by applying the abductivist approach, I discovered two main themes of freedom discourse. Some of the metaphors

[140] There is a complete list of the metaphors and other sayings I found in the sailors' discourse in Appendix 4.

[141] According to Klaus Mäkelä (1990, 57), the identification of a unit of analysis is already part of the interpretation process. Therefore qualitative methodology involves interpretation in all phases of the analyzing process – in the processing, categorization, and the actual analysis of the material (Ehrnrooth 1990, 40).

and rhetoric fitted into more than one group, while some were hard to place anywhere. These themes – and their sub-themes – helped in the handling of the extensive data.

The freedom of Kalle Aaltonen

It was as windy as hell. At times it reached 35 meters per second, which is hurricane force. It was hard to keep balance and sleeping was pretty tricky too: my bunk was in such a position towards the waves that I sort of stood up every now and then when it reached the vertical point. The general mood onboard was not very cheerful because the whole crew had difficulties sleeping and the cook apprentice was turning green with seasickness. Still some deckhands were in good enough humor to ask me if I had failed to pay some man in the port to cause such a fierce storm. I replied that given the OS salary I had had to leave without paying because he was so damned pricy.

My focus in this chapter is on the freedom discourse of sailors as reflected through stereotypical sailor images. For example, the above story is a traditional sailor's yarn retold with a novel gender spin: it is an old belief among sailors that leaving port without paying prostitutes for their services will stir up the wind. The joke was that a young female sailor would go to a brothel. I found it meaningful to interpret these freedom discourses through seafarer stereotypes, as I will show below. One such stereotype is Jack Tar, or 'Kalle Aaltonen' as he is called in Finland. As discussed earlier, the free-roving Jack Tar is an enduring image of man's longing for individual freedom: a seaman is not bound to land and its mundane everyday routine. This classic romantic image of sailors was at its height in the latter half of the 19th century, at roughly the same time as sailors found their way to folk songs (Kaukiainen 1988, 345). Kalle Aaltonen (literally translated as "Charlie Wavy"), is named after a famous Finnish "sailor's song" written by a landsman. The song reinforces the traditional stereotype of sailors.

Kalle Aaltonen

I've courted a widow, a bride: I've deserted a rosebud smile.
I've followed the devil worldwide, kept him company, side by side.
I've pounded the deck and have made captains sweat
In fear of their life by my glistening knife.

I'm not bragging, but that's Kalle Aaltonen.
No sorrow abounds if our Kalle's around!

Ask in ‘Frisco, Hull, Melbourne, ask down Rio way,
Just ask anyone for fun *Seen Kalle today?* [Chorus]
And try finding someone to boast he hasn't joined me in a toast!
There is no 'lady' in London who would pass me by.
And 'Misses' hearing Kalle-talk go *Now there's a guy!* [Chorus]
Bundles of Aaltolets left in ports far and wide,
Just practical jokes from those bits on the side.
Black, red and checkered – you might see them some day
Speaking India or Irelandish - not their father’s Finnish anyway.

I’m not bragging, but that's Kalle Aaltonen.
No sorrow abounds if our Kalle's around!

Johan Alfred Tanner wrote this song in Finnish in 1910.[142] It was a famous popular song of that era – so popular, in fact, that the theme was taken up in the movie ‘The Bride of Kalle Aaltonen’ (*Kalle Aaltosen morsian*, 1948, directed by Ossi Elstelä) and the novel ‘Sailor Kalle Aaltonen and his bride’ (*Perämies Kalle Aaltonen ja hänen morsiamensa*, written by Aino Pekkarinen in 1944). Even today the musical inspired by this song, ‘The Bride of Kalle Aaltonen’ (*Kalle Aaltosen morsian*, written by Aino and Tatu Pekkarinen, 1947), is still staged every once in a while.[143]

The Kalle Aaltonen song represents several stereotypes of the sailor's life. The archetypical seaman Kalle follows the devil, sails the seas around the world, gets into

[142] This humble translation was done by Mira Karjalainen and Joan Nordlund. The lyrics in Finnish:
Olen liehinyt leskeä, morsianta, olen hyljännyt ruususuun.
Olen retkilläin’ 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’,
sä kysy vaan noin niinkuin lystikses’, eikö Aaltost’ oo nähtynä siell’.
[kertosäe] ja näytä sitt’ joukosta sellainen, jok’ ei kanssani ryypännyt ois!
Sellaista “ladya” ei Lontoossa näy, jok’ ei astelis’ vierelläin’.
Ja missä vain puhe Kalle Aaltosest’ käy, niin “missit” ne sanoo: “Jasso, hän!”
[kertosäe] Kai kapallinen pieniä Aaltosia on satamassa siellä ja tääll’.
Sattuuhan niit’ pieniä kolttosia, kun on joutunut lystille pääll’.
Mustia, punaisia, kirjavia saat nähdä joskus viel’.
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.
Lyrics by Johan Alfred Tanner. (Suuri toivelaulukirja 6, 1985).

[143] For example, it was staged by Nuorisoseurojen kesäteatteri (The Nuorisoseurat Summer Theater) in 2005, and by Kotkan Kaupunginteatteri (Kotka City Theater) and Salon teatteri (The Salo Theater) in 2004.

fights, gets wasted, hits on women and leaves them in trouble, for he does not look back. He is an exaggerated model of carefree masculine man, a vagabond image that is also to be found in Westerns and their modern successors such as the biker culture, and in the lore of adventurers (see Horrocks 1995; Wood 2003, 336-351). The prevalent view from the land is that seamen form a highly distinct community that fosters its own language, dress and customs. This and the cliché that the sea is 'in their blood', derive from 19th-century novels that are fully stocked with mariners. (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 187.)

Maritime historians have shown that the image of the archetypical seaman Kalle Aaltonen, or Jack Tar, is skewed, and that it may tell us more about the era's bourgeois values than about seamen. Sailors themselves also disliked this image of free-roving Jack Tar because they felt that it was, as a stereotyping image, a source of their oppression. (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 213.) Sailors of today are also aware of their image in popular culture. As chief engineer Hans recalled, "They used to say that it was Malmsten[144] who sang them to sea when you saw a new fellow on board singing hearty sailor songs."[145] Here Hans was reflecting ironically on the naivety of young, enthusiastic tenderfoot sailors who had no idea what the real sailor's life was about. Present-day seamen, being aware of the popular image of them on land, often dismiss it as untruthful. For example, first mate Lars said of his experiences with landsmen: "Sailors are odd creatures if you ask landlubbers: a wild bunch, alcoholics. But that's not true, sailors are pretty normal."[146] He talked about one aspect of the real and the imagined seaman life, alcohol. This is one of many dimensions of the Kalle Aaltonen freedom discourse, and is discussed later in this chapter.

As much as maritime researchers are eager to deny this Kalle Aaltonen stereotype, it is nevertheless utilized by sailors. For example, Captain Tommi explained this in his letter: "Sometimes I have used the prejudices against sailors for my own advantage, to justify some stupid things I have done, things I wouldn't have done otherwise. You have to keep up the image, right?"[147] As this extract illustrates, contemporary seamen deny, but also use, reflect and construct this stereotype in their discourse.

[144] Georg Malmsten was a famous Finnish singer of popular music during and after the 1930s. He had several "sailor songs" in his repertoire.
[145] HYUL96/3.
[146] HYUL99/45:f7.
[147] Correspondence: Tommi 2002.

The stereotypical image of sailor's freedom is a mirror they use for reflection, and in doing so they simultaneously refine its reflective surface. Therefore, there are several reasons for the researcher to use the image in interpreting these freedom discourses. To begin with, sailors themselves employ it. It thus provides a useful sounding board because the sailors use and reflect the same stereotypes, and by so doing they construct a paradoxical relationship with it. While they may have suffered from the stereotype, they have also exploited it, as the above extract shows. Moreover, as Kaukiainen remarks, sailors of the 19th century wanted to stand apart from landsmen by wearing a distinctive uniform (white pants, blue coat, silk scarf and black flat cap decorated with a long silk ribbon), and by integrating foreign words into their stories about distant exotic countries. No wonder that they enjoyed the attention of women, the jealousy of men, and the admiration of boys. (Kaukiainen 1998, 40.)

Another reason I chose the Kalle Aaltonen song to give a structure to this chapter was that it organizes one kind of freedom discourse. Although the heading of the chapter is inspired by the song, the contents derive from the data, in other words the interviews and correspondence with sailors. This was vital for the research task: in order to study the phenomenon of freedom as an ethnographic research question, I had to derive the analysis from the study material, not from a theory or schema that has been forced upon the voice of the original data.

Yet another reason for using the stereotypical sailor's image as a sounding board was that people outside shipworld often tend to believe it. Since landsmen usually know more about the stereotypical than about the real life of seafarers, it is useful to employ the stereotype in discussing the freedom discourses. It is, nonetheless, the stereotypical image that creates the attributes of seamen's freedom in our minds. As an example, Tommi told me what he thought of the skewed images held by landlubbers. He could see no reason to explain the reality of sea life to people on land because they stubbornly believed that it was a continuous party with loose women and plenty of liquor:

> I won’t even try to explain how it is at sea, there's nothing to tell, so why should I say anything when there's nothing to tell? And I’m absolutely certain they wouldn’t understand. They have an idea how it is, and they won’t change that, whatever I tell them. If I told them that we have a ball, that the hookers are on the

> house for us to bang at will, they'd be like "yeah that figures". But if I say that we're not allowed a glass of beer under any circumstances they won't believe me. Because they've decided that we hit the booze and get wasted. If we have time left after banging the hookers. Oops.[148]

I will analyze the different aspects of the Kalle Aaltonen freedom discourse in the following sections. I will start with discussing the adventure, and proceed to the idea of the sailor as a free-floating outsider. I will then consider the seaman's identity as part of the Kalle Aaltonen discourse. Fourthly, I will look at Kalle Aaltonen with women, and then at his relationship with alcohol. Finally, I will discuss his affiliation to religion and the church, and the symbolic meanings of the sea.

Ask in 'Frisco, Hull, Melbourne, ask down Rio way: longing

> When I was a young man, I thought that the longer the voyage, the better. I sailed the seas, happy-go-lucky, no plans for tomorrow. Then it was really nice to sail. But now, the older I get, the closer I want to be to land: I want to watch telly and read the paper. Things I wouldn't have cared at all for when I was younger.[149]

This is how a middle-aged chief mate recalled his youth at sea. He used to be carefree and, as a youngster, found it fun to be at sea. His longing for faraway places was satisfied by the long voyages his ship made. Now that he was older his priorities had changed and he wanted to stay near home. Because people change during their lifetime, it is natural that their worldviews do too, over time (Björkqvist et al. 1996, 14). Therefore the events the mate considered important when he was young had given way to something quite different. Leena, also a middle-aged mate, expressed the same kind of view regarding her youth as a seaman, although she still would not have minded having the same rhythm in her sea life:

> When I was young I found it fascinating to roam around the world and have some adventure and… I had a bit of a rosy picture of sea life. And when I started my seaman career, then in the 70s the pace was quite different. I've worked all my life on tankers, and they were not technically very developed then so we stayed in the ports for long periods and it was more easy-going. There were more crew, it was very different than today. Those first years were what I was looking for.[150]

These stories are typical of seafarers who spent their youth at sea: before it was a real sailor's life, but now that has gone. This nostalgic approach to sea life was characteristic

[148] HYUL05.
[149] HYUL99/34:f5.
[150] HYUL96/7.

of many of the sailors. They repeatedly told stories about the past and stressed that life onboard was not like it used to be. As discussed in the previous chapters, the nature of ship work has changed due to the competitive nature of the shipping business and the technical development of ships. The voyages of Finnish cargo vessels are generally shorter nowadays. This transformation had taken place in the ships and shipping company under study: the vessels rarely sailed beyond the North Sea. The long sea voyages of Leena's youth were a thing of the past, and at the same time, the average time needed in dock for cargo handling had been shortened drastically, leaving less time to spend in the ports. This shows in the discourse of the seamen; the emphasis regarding freedom is mostly on the nostalgic past when things were better. This was the case with the older seafarers in particular, as one chief engineer bluntly put it: "There's no longer the same glory in the seaman's profession."[151]

Before the 1950s, virtually the only way a Finnish working-class youngster could see the world was to go to sea. Nowadays too, even though the time spent in foreign ports is shorter, sailors sometimes go ashore to explore the foreign towns. They do not experience the adventure or travel as much as they used to because of the many changes in the ship industry mentioned above. This contrast between adventure and the lack of it is part of the freedom of sailors, and it shows in their discourse. When Kalle, a cook in his early thirties who had worked for approximately ten years onboard, talked about his reasons for going to sea, he expressed some feeling for adventure: "I don't know. I wanted to get out. At first it was just that I needed to get away. 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."[152]

An old bosun Jussi was one of the sailors who used the stereotypical Kalle Aaltonen image as a sounding board for his own experiences. He answered my question regarding his reasons for going 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 the accordion here and you don't have to do anything. I like to be on board. I don't care for the land."[153] In his discourse Jussi was trying to undermine the literal meaning of his words, thus using

[151] HYUL99/1:c1.
[152] HYUL99/37:s6.
[153] HYUL99/48:p7.

ironizing rhetoric (see Potter 1996, 107). According to Katz, in some cases the nature of communication – whether it is informative or evaluative – can determine the intent of speech as metaphoric or ironic. In many instances the evaluative-informative dichotomy does not function as a sufficient discriminator of metaphoric from ironic speech. The informative evaluative distinction is connected to the idea that the context may set up a schema for interpreting ambiguous sentences. (Katz 1996, 4.) In the extract above provided by Jussi the context steers the interpretation toward irony – there is no accordion on board and the work is hard. Thus, evaluative speech uses irony in its criticism, while informative speech utilizes metaphor in communicating meaning, although these two communication goals are often mixed. Even though the communication goals of metaphor and irony may seem very different, they do, in fact, often overlap and the distinction is more a matter of emphasis than of type. (Katz 1996, 3-6.)

Although the older seafarers find today's shipworld to be just a shadow of past, the younger ones may still live the adventure. For example a young mess girl with only three years' sea experience showed the same type of enthusiasm that her older colleagues had when they were young when she talked about her career choice: "It's so boring on land, I always want to go back to work. All my friends are here. I could just sail, I'm not interested in holidays."[154] This type of freedom discourse – drawing on the past or the present – is about adventure: you never know what will happen next, where the road will lead. It reveals the adventurous elements in the worldviews of seamen. It also embodies the traditional and popular image of reasons for going to sea – at sea you can be free of ties of land life.

Because the ship is constantly sailing from port to port, the traveling may lose its meaning to sailors. Thus a sea voyage is not a journey as a landsman would think of it: seafarers often do not know where they are heading when they step aboard ship. Sometimes they do not even care: if the ship is only a few hours in port and you are working for that time, why would you care in which country you are? As discussed previously, the captain does not always even bother to shift the clocks in line with the new time zone. Even though the era of Finnish oil tankers sailing around the world seems

[154] HYUL99/58:s9.

to be over and the voyages are mostly limited to the Baltic and North Seas, some sailors are still content. Maria, for example, a mate whose former job was office work, described her reasons for working at sea: "I would recommend this work to friends: at least my workplace travels."[155]

One might wonder whether it was just a co-incidence that the only other person on Maria's ship to praise her work place for the travel involved – in this case a wide and irregular sailing area – was also female. The cook steward had this to say: "I think the ship is a good workplace. It's always going somewhere, and you're here and then you get to be on vacation."[156] It may well be that, while the seafaring profession has, for the most part, lost its glory for men, who have had this option for centuries, it still carries some splendor for women, who have been part of it for only half a century.

No sorrow abounds, if our Kalle's around!: the maverick

"This is one of the best jobs in the world. You're on the edge of society. When you're here at sea you're somehow apart from the society. That suits me fine."[157] This is how young Captain Fredi explained, with some enthusiasm, the benefits of his profession. At sea he was on the verge of society and therefore he did not have to play by its rules. He continued:

> When you go to sea you're no longer bound to life on land. You see, on land the systems are based on laws and such and you're on that treadmill, you go to work do your job and go home at night. Now when you come here on board you leave the harbor behind and at the same time you kind of leave that society treadmill behind.[158]

This type of freedom discourse is very much at the core of the Kalle Aaltonen image of sailor's life. It is another type of freedom from the land chains that is *negative* freedom in Berlin's terms. He divides freedom into two categories. First, there is negative freedom, which "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

[155] HYUL99/25:x4.
[156] HYUL99/28:s4.
[157] HYUL99/20:k3.
[158] HYUL99/20:k3.

second type is *positive* freedom, "the source of control or interference that can determine someone to do, or be, this rather than that". (Berlin 2000, 194.) Negative freedom has traditionally been simplified to mean freedom *from*, and positive freedom to imply freedom *to*.[159] Thereby Fredi enjoys the negative freedom from society on land when he takes off to sea. According to Patterson (1991, 3), both negative and positive freedoms have always been vital to the common conception of personal freedom, although philosophers may not have acknowledged it. The type of freedom Fredi expressed is even more evident in Tommi's observation: "When you step on board you don't have to worry about the problems on land at all. You just come along… we're not on the edge of society, we're free from it. You're away from society at sea. You don't have to be part of it."[160]

These views expressed by Fredi and Tommi support Ramberg's notion of the freedom of sailors. He describes the ship and the life of sailors as peripheral. Life at sea – with its absences and partings – tears sailors apart from society. Yet, to be located in the periphery is not only negative: a periphery is also a twilight zone, away from the total control of the centre. Different worlds meet and there is room for different people and ideas. Sailors' notions of freedom could be understood in this context. (Ramberg 1997, 61-71.) Thus, sailors experience more freedom due to their peripheral locus. Tommi connected his reasons for going to sea as a teenager to this:

> I guess the main reason for me to go to sea at the end of the 60s was that then you absolutely had to be a so-called 'tough guy'. In the neighborhood where I lived then there were plenty of bad guys there and we got into various stuff. At some point we were going to harder drugs and the only reasonably legitimate way of getting out without losing my 'tough guy' status was to go to sea. At that time work at sea was considered a hard job and so it was much more acceptable than joining a youth theater or any other group of sissies.[161]

Tommi's story reveals the values and worldview that drew him to the sea: one's worldview is the outcome of the socio-cultural circumstances of one's community, including the different life conditions, stages and values (Hembram 2001, 130). Here is an illustration of how Kalle Aaltonen is not restrained by the bondages of his fatherland, for he is a free soul. Gender is represented symbolically in various myths (Horrocks

[159] This view is questioned by Joel Feinberg (1973, 13), who argues that positive and negative freedom are logically linked and cannot be torn apart.
[160] HYUL05.
[161] Correspondence: Tommi 2002.

1995, 20). One could argue that the narrative of sailors, the myth of the free-roving seaman, is one of the prominent male-gender myths in Western culture. Consequently, maritime history and literature have featured tales of men, ships and the sea, and narratives of tough sailors (Creighton and Norling 1996, *vii*). These kinds of stories have constructed the myth of the seaman, and through that of the male gender. Therefore, 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." It is through the study of language and its social dimensions that we get closest view of men enacting masculinity (Nye 2005, 1952).

Thus, the myth of the seaman is significant for the maintenance of masculinity. This overloaded sense of masculinity was also distinctive of seafaring men and sea life in the era of windjammers (Weibust 1969). It seems that gender myths have to be maintained and reinforced also when childhood is over (Horrocks 1995, 18). One could argue that they are more important for adults and in adult culture than for children. Even if masculinities are taken as invented or constructed, and thus are not rooted in divinity or biology, they are still important (Nixon 1997, 301). These inventions or constructions are necessary because they define our place and identity in relation to others. Thus even if we know that gender is, by and large, a construction, we nevertheless tend to succumb to its rule. In this sense, the study of sailors' concepts of reality is also a study of masculinity (Rosenström 2002, 58).

Seafarers often fancy themselves as freestanding, independent people who are ready for anything. This kind of freedom from responsibility and the cause-and-effect-relationship of one's behavior have always been appealing to some aspects of human nature. Malinowski dismisses it as wishful thinking, but suggests that the idea of free-floating, pervasive and omnipotent freedom is actually embodied and standardized in folklore. Therefore, the wonderful and ever successful adventures represent the craving for unlimited freedom. It seems that this fictitious is a prerequisite for those seeking release from the cramping force of determinism and logic. The whole world must remain open and accessible to those who wish to enjoy it. (Malinowski 1964, 81-83.)

According to Nikolas Rose (1999, 61-67), who has studied the genealogy of freedom, the process of *responsibilization* has made us think that proper freedom is civilized freedom that arises from responsibility. Malinowski thus 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 those of culture: by doing this one may overthrow determinism, at least in the short term, and perhaps even in the long term if we do not assume that moral conscience plays a role here. In one sense, the sailor's life was exactly that, for sometimes with good luck and timing he could escape the laws of the land by taking off on a ship. With this in mind, I asked Tommi if he had come across the belief that seamen were somehow more liberated or free than others, or that they stood outside society. He replied, "I have taken that belief on board and have also believed it myself. I have felt self-pity because society doesn't understand or accept us *free and international adventurers*. My God, am I ashamed now."[162]

Jussi, a pumpman, also considered independence part of freedom. In answer to my question whether he was afraid of losing his job he said, "I'm not afraid of anything, I'm ready in five minutes – that includes shaving – I've got things sorted out."[163] This kind of representation has its roots deep in the history of seafaring. As discussed earlier, seamen were the first people in the history of labor to form a more free-moving profession (Rediker 1987, 77-115). Especially in Finland, with an economy based on agriculture, seafaring was a sharp contrast to most other work available to the working class: while the logging industry deployed workers to various part of Finland, only seaman were offered a chance to see the world.

Seafaring thus celebrated mobility and independence like no other traditional vocation. As an old captain, drawing from the same stereotypical image of a sailor, said, "If I took off now like a seadog takes off [snaps his fingers] I might possibly even have to sell my house."[164] He saw the seaman as a man who is always ready to leave everything behind, for he is not bound by the same ties as the boring landlubbers. This notion of freestanding independence and mobility is part of the self-image of seamen. Worldviews are images of a reality that is constructed in a particular culture by an individual, and therefore also

[162] Correspondence: Tommi 2002.
[163] HYUL99/48:p7.
[164] HYUL99/35:k5.

incorporate these kinds of conceptions of freedom. Another informant who considered mobility and readiness and important value was Captain Timo. When I asked him if he was concerned about losing his job he answered, “Not me, I've always got money in my pocket and a clean shirt in the closet, I'm ready to leave right now.”[165] This extract leads to the next topic, the seaman's identity.

I'm not bragging but that's Kalle Aaltonen: identity

> 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 all the time. Many of them wouldn't survive on land, it's so much more strict there what you have to do and what you can't do. You're always a bit more free at sea.[166]

Thus Kalle, the cook, whom I interviewed in 1999, described seamen: at sea one is freer than on land and therefore there is room for those who would not necessarily survive in the more stringent work environment. Kalle’s view is an example of how sailors see themselves as a distinct group. They think that because their profession is quite unlike any other, it demands special characteristics of a man. Sailors have a strong professional identity that also affects their freedom discourse. Their lifestyle and worldview also interact with their cultural identity (Mathur 2001, xi). In turn, the worldview also unifies the group, thus creating inner strength and forming basic viewpoints (Manninen 1977, 44). Deckhand Puhonen provides another example of the restlessness Kalle described. Puhonen had been sailing for two decades, and explained his impatience on land and at sea: “After being on land for two to three weeks I’m in a damned rush to get back on board. And then when I’ve been here for two or three weeks I’m in a hurry to get back on vacation.”[167] This type of rhetoric stresses the restlessness of the sailor's soul. A seadog cannot settle down, for it is in his blood to roam the world. This is one way seamen utilize the mythical aspects of seamanhood in their discourse.

> You need balls to take off and come here. [Way back] to go to sea meant that you had to “jump ship” and leave your home. And I think it still does, anyone who goes to sea has to do it … Some people say that all sailors are psychopaths. I mean this in a positive way, psychopaths.[168]

[165] HYUL99/47:k7.
[166] HYUL99/37:s6.
[167] HYUL96/19.
[168] HYUL99/52:k8.

According to Tommi (above), seafarers need to have guts to survive in this demanding profession, which may mean, though, that a degree of psychopathy is essential. The psychopath metaphor was used here in an affectionate manner to describe seadogs, and was more of a humorous remark about the seaman's character. This illustrates how metaphor and humor could be viewed as alternative ways of expressing meaning. The same issue could be framed in a split reference, as Pollio puts it: then the focus is on the boundary separating items that define it. It enables the reader to experience something – a word or a poem – as "is-and-is-not." Both metaphor and humor seem to use split reference, in other words two different but related ideas or images that take place in proximity to each other. Only metaphor does away with the border, either briefly or more permanently, however, while humor simply emphasizes the boundary but cannot overcome it. (Pollio 1996, 242-251.) Quite a few of the metaphors sailors used to reflect life at sea or their fellow crew members could be interpreted as humorous or ironic. Nevertheless, as the psychopath example illustrates, it is not always a watertight case, whether an expression is a metaphor or humor. I would rather suggest that such examples are humorous metaphors.

Thus, calling sailor a psychopath creates a metaphor. When in language we misinterpret in order to make a point, as John Kennedy (1996, 215) states, we form a metaphor as a result (his own example is "that man is a shark"). As demonstrated earlier, this approach differs from many of the more elaborated definitions of metaphor. Nevertheless, Kennedy's terse definition is, in its clarity, quite effective. Tommi used the psychopath metaphor to indicate that sailors are somehow different from landlubbers, that their worldviews are different. Thus, as discussed previously, 'a seaman is a real man' (merimies on erimies) is a popular saying among them. Thus one bosun declares, "I am a sailor and proud of it."[169]

"A race apart"

> Well, it's a race apart, you know. He's like… a sailor who has spent all his life at sea and has never done anything else, well, he can't do nothing else either. So, he's

[169] HYUL99/2:p1.

> quite stubborn. An old boatswain, he's only spliced and sewn tarpaulin, he can't do nothing else. And paint.[170]

Contradicting the proud sailor image, another old bosun put down seamen and his own boatswain trade in particular. He seemed to think it was embedded in the seaman's character, making him inflexible and limited in his skills. Although this account is not flattering, most sailors claim that their way of life demands special characteristics. For some it is a touch of craziness – a madman, or a psychopath ("I mean the positive way!") – while for others, it is toughness. The stereotype of the masculine sailor plays a role here. The isolation demands hermit-like qualities, while the enclosed group life of a total institution requires an ability to adapt. This type of rhetoric may thus indicate that the difficulties seafarers face at sea are expressed in this way in order to avoid whining. Lane (1986, 40) also found that seafarers were vocal about being 'a race apart', that living at sea was being 'different'. All in all, if we consider these demands together with the long periods spent at sea, we can understand what this chief engineer was talking about:

> A sailor is an obstinate person – This job throws overboard those who can't cope. It's a certain type that's chosen. Those who end up staying, they're pretty independent characters. A lot of them find it difficult to adapt to this way of life and rhythm and what we have here at sea. Sailors are a tribe apart.[171]

The worldviews of seafarers set them as a race or tribe apart, but still as highly individual people, which suggests multi-layeredness. The individual and collective elements could be separated on a theoretical level, as one's worldview is also affected by the culture, society and the environment (Manninen 1977, 25; Helve 1987, 14). The idea that sailors are highly individual people is a *collective* trait in their worldviews. It could thus be argued that sailors have worldviews that are characteristic of their occupational group because of their strong identity, the sailor's culture and the long periods they spend at sea. For them the sea is a special element, and being a seaman is a profession unlike any other. In addition, as demonstrated in Part III, the ship as a workplace differs radically from all other workplaces.

"All the older sailors are weird to a greater or lesser extent, there's always a border, the border of privacy and… They're bogeymen."[172] This is what Tommi answered when I asked him to describe sailors. He considered the older seamen somewhat bizarre,

[170] HYUL99/42:p6.
[171] HYUL99/41:c6.
[172] HYUL99/52:k8.

bugbears of a kind. Bogeyman as a metaphor is an example of sailor humor. There are similarities between humor and metaphor, as Pollio noted, despite their differences. Unsure of the barrier between them, he wonders whether a joke or humorous remark is nothing more than a mean-spirited metaphor, or at least one gone bad, or is a metaphor nothing but a courteous form of a spiteful joke or putdown? (Pollio 1996, 233-251.)

The answer lies in poetry: a poetic metaphor of the type "The light danced in her hair" is hardly a polite form of a mean-spirited joke. This notion of similarities between humor and metaphor is nevertheless important, and both appear to focus on alternatives (ibid., 251). They could thus both be seen as alternative ways of expressing a meaning or of seeing something. Quite a few of the metaphors the sailors use to describe their life at sea could be interpreted as humorous or ironic. Let us now turn from discussing sailor identities in general to the different identities inside shipworld that are formed in accordance with the position aboard.

"Caliphs and ragamuffins"

In theory, ships' communities are free to develop relationships outside work roles in any directions. In practice, however, the work roles strongly condition the leisure-time relations. The shipworld structures play a significant role in this process. The hierarchical construction of space aboard ship allows some relations, while discouraging others. For example, two mess rooms divide the crew, according to their ranking. Living quarters and day rooms are also located hierarchically. Moreover, the tradition of addressing people by their job titles highlights the hierarchical structures. The worker vs. officer distinction thus remains a vital factor in shipworld. Their choice of words tells its own story about the crew members' perceptions of their own roles on the ship: the workers refer to themselves as slaves, dogs, or ragamuffins. One boatswain explained what a good foreman was, because he currently had problems with his first mate: "A good foreman comes every now and then to the watchmen's mess room, drinks a cup of coffee, chats a bit, cracks a joke, and talks about the cargo. And he doesn't yell at you like you were a dog."[173]

[173] HYUL99/2:p1.

This kind of reflection of one's position in the hierarchy is neither new nor radical. It was suggested in the previous chapters that the hierarchical structure in the sailing-ship era placed the apprentice only slightly below the rats, for example (Rosenström 1996, 117). A strict hierarchy was – and still is – often maintained by both officers and workers: both formal and informal uniforms visibly mark the demarcation line (Aubert 1965, 255). This is expressed in the widespread use of the name *resuperse* – ragamuffin – for workers: it means literally a person whose pants are ripped. Motorman Pete illustrated the point: "These old-timer skippers go: a lord is a lord, and a ragamuffin is a ragamuffin."[174]

The people lower down the hierarchy call the captain 'god', 'lord', 'caliph', 'clown', or 'old codger'.[175] They are thus using two types of metaphors. Those of the first type imply unconditional power – god, caliph, and lord – and those of the second type question their competence to hold power, and ridicule them – clown, madman and old codger. This is a natural outcome in an organization in which the lower-level members have virtually no influence on their superiors. God, lord, caliph, old codger, clown and madman are carnivalistic notions and reflect the workers' contemptuous attitudes towards their superiors. Since they have minimal opportunity to participate in the decision-making processes, it is quite natural that they should let out their frustration by employing carnivalistic figures of speech. As one boatswain said 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 mates have a weird attitude, they think they're gods."[176]

Sometimes the other higher officers are also talked about in these terms, depending on the situation, or a mate may use the same metaphors to refer to those who are higher on the hierarchical ladder than he is, such as the captain. In short, they 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 rank. These metaphors or nicknames for the captain are particularly interesting if they are considered alongside the metaphors captains use for themselves: they see their own position as that of 'executive', 'lion', or 'shepherd'. Table 4 below lists the names used for the ship's community members.

[174] HYUL99/29:m4.
[175] Interestingly, it seems that in Finnish prison slang too, the supervisor – in this case the warden – is called caliph (Historian nettilehti, website).
[176] HYUL99/19:p3.

Table 4.

Metaphors for workers and supervisors

	Worker's view	**Boss's view**
Of the worker	Dog Ragamuffin Slave	Baby Child Poor little mite Wretch
Of the boss	Caliph Clown God Lord Madman Old codger	Executive Lion Shepherd

These metaphors tell their own story about the hierarchical structure of shipworld, and about its members' view of it. The table illustrates that the only positive, or respectful, metaphors used are those the captains apply to themselves. For example, one captain put himself in quite a flattering light when he reflected his stand on his own management techniques: "It's better that there's one lion leading the crowd than a whole pride."[177]

Unlike the captains who use respectable and positive metaphors to talk about themselves, the workers see themselves as ragamuffins, dogs, or slaves. As one boatswain said, "I doubt that anyone would listen to us ragamuffins."[178] The freedom discourse of seamen also shows through the metaphors they use for their work status: they describe themselves in ironic and contemptuous terms in order to highlight their low rank. Because of the significant role of the hierarchy in their discourse, there are certain names for officers and others for workers, thus reflecting the respective power they hold in the organization. This is natural in that the concept of the self is assumed to be part of the worldview: Manninen (1977, 16-17), for example, refers to certain assumptions that construct the worldview, including human beings themselves and their relations to others, and societal structures. The names that the sailors use for themselves reveal these aspects: you are what your work is when you are in shipworld.

[177] HYUL99/6:k1.
[178] HYUL00/5:p10.

Swashbucklers and sea whores cause prejudice on land

> I was playing the big adventurer among my peers. Think about it, I was tanned, my shirt sleeves rolled up, a box of Marlboro in my breast pocket, and more money than my former school friends had. Of course these are golden memories, but sometimes it was like that.[179]

Sailors have all kinds of prejudices and beliefs attached to their profession. Tommi was recalling his youth and his trips to visit old friends on land. These prejudices and beliefs that are attached to the seaman's profession do not treat women and men equally. Men have to cope with them on land as well, but they are quite different in nature. Men are thought to be drunkards and tough guys. The image of an alcoholic does not flatter most people, but the image of a "bad ass" or a swashbuckler may be welcomed by some. When Tommi was talking about his visits to his old friends on land, there was a hint of this halo surrounding him. Pumpman Jussi said something similar: "This profession, it's always been thought of as weird. If you go into a bar and say you're a seaman they go *'Ah-ha'."* [180]

The prejudices concerning women are quite different. I also asked Leena about her experiences with the folks on land:

> In the early days of my career, when sailors had a really bad reputation on land, it was generally believed that all sailors were drunkards to begin with and that all women at sea were whores. You still hear that every now and then. I've been called names such as hooker and sea whore. But the words can't hurt you. I don't give a damn if somebody calls me names as long as he doesn't start to beat me up. Then I'll of course let him have it back.[181]

While male sailors may enjoy the reputation of being swashbucklers, women often suffer from the biased views. As a result of this, another female seafarer, a cook steward, was reluctant to tell her acquaintances on land what her job was because she was aware of about the prejudice against women sailors.

When the worldview is seen as a collection of basic assumptions that an individual has about reality, concepts such as freedom are inevitably part of it. Therefore the freedom conceptions of sailors are viewed in a framework of beliefs, attitudes and assumptions about life. The fact that seafarers are highly individual people is a further collective

[179] Correspondence: Tommi 2002.
[180] HYUL99/48:p7.
[181] HYUL96/7.

aspect of their worldviews – which, it could also be argued, are also characteristic of their occupational group. This originates from their strong identity, their culture and the long periods they spend at sea. Moreover, the ship as a workplace differs radically from all other workplaces. For seafarers the sea is a special element, and being a sailor is a profession like no other.

I've courted a widow, a bride, I've deserted a rosebud smile: women

When Tommi recalled his youth and how his profession had affected his relationships with women, he did not paint a very rosy picture: "I missed out on teenage romance, totally. It's a bit different dancing at a high-school ball, nibbling your girl's ear than boozing with some hooker in Rio."[182] While Tommi did not attempt to portray his early years at sea in the classical romantic mode, his determination to be described as a tough guy was evident. The mythical Kalle Aaltonen is a womanizer. He has had his share of affairs, thus he brags, *I have courted a widow, a bride, I've deserted a rosebud smile*. The nature of his relationships with women is casual as he moves on, leaving the rosebud smiles behind. Furthermore, the women he takes up are not necessarily the marrying kind, but are more likely to be 'loose' or promiscuous, as he hints: *There's no "lady" in London who would pass me by. And 'Misses' hearing Kalle-talk go,* ***Now there's a guy!*** As in this one, so in the genuine sailor songs women, love, and longing were recurrent themes, although in reality the harbor towns did not provide many opportunities for romance, causing sailors to turn to the services of prostitutes (Kaukiainen 1998, 114).

Even during the sailing-ship era the big ports had a plentiful supply – and this tradition still continues. According to Marjatta Nieminen (2003, 24), who studied Finnish sailors in the ports of Argentina, even now in the early 21st century two Argentine harbor towns are planning to open a special sex district for seafarers. This lifestyle leaves Kalle Aaltonen free to go his own way without the bondage of marriage. Tommi continued with his memories from his youth:

> Actually this was a great profession. Think about it. You're young lad and it's a world without AIDS and bombs. If we were in port for long you worked for a week and then you had money and the world was your oyster and you could booze and screw around. It was great, really.[183]

[182] HYUL05.
[183] HYUL05.

Gale, the old boatswain, who had been at sea since the 1950s, gave his thoughts on women and relationships. For him a relationship was a peaceful break from sea life, but he could not tolerate it for long because the sea was in his blood: "I've spent most of my life on board, and I have to say it's a good environment. On land there's the little woman and the intimacy. Here I kind of hang about and lose contact with land. I warm up for the week in her arms and then I go back to sea."[184] The life of this old boatswain was a constant balancing act between land and sea, although the sea seemed to win. On the concept of freedom, Alasuutari states in his study about working-class men in Finland that the division between self-discipline and desire is linked to their worldview: because one has to find a balance in life between two contradictory desires – the urge for freedom and the wish to maintain social relationships – one has to have self-discipline. It is believed that the desire for freedom is part of the male nature.[185] (Alasuutari 1986, 71.) Hence Kalle Aaltonen sings, *I'm not bragging, but that's Kalle Aaltonen. No sorrow abounds if our Kalle's around!*

> You have to remember that the seaman's life you experienced is quite different from that in the 70s. The rotation system has been the biggest change. It's made social contacts, mortgages and other horrors accessible to people who had previously lived vagrant lives. I've sailed with folks who met their own kid for the first time when the kid was two years old, and with those who were afraid to retire because they had no place to go and no one waiting for them on land.[186]

Tommi was reminding me here that the sailor's life I experienced in the 1990s and early 2000s was not like the life seamen lived in previous decades. A great change took place in 1980 when Finnish ships started to use the 1:1 rotation system giving seafarers one day off for every day worked (Soukola 2003, 406-413). In practice this means working for

[184] HYUL96/15.

[185] On the subject of freedom, Patterson made a gender discovery in his quest for its social construction. Women played a vital role in the birth of freedom as a social value because the gender expectations in Ancient Greece made it impossible for enslaved men, but not for enslaved women. This was because becoming a slave was social death and once a man had suffered such a death there was no prospect of his regaining his honor in these earliest kinds of honoric societies. Women, on the other hand, did not suffer a loss of honor because they were not expected to be able to defend themselves. Therefore, it was possible for women to regain 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 to regain their former status. This was unattainable for male slaves. Therefore, "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." (Patterson 1991, 48-54.)

[186] Correspondence: Tommi 2002.

five weeks, for example, being free for five weeks, returning to ship for five weeks, and so on. Chief engineer Hans, who started his career a few years before Tommi, recalled his youth:

> The sailor's life has changed a lot in the last 40 years I've been at sea. There were very few women in the 70s and they were on coastal trade. Nobody was married, especially on the workers' side, maybe there were more married men among the officers. Now with this vacation system people go steady with someone or marry.[187]

Despite the changes in the seaman's culture, the Kalle Aaltonen stereotype endures among landlubbers, causing harmful prejudices against seamen. Tommi, and especially his wife, have suffered from it as well. Therefore, recalling the first years of their marriage, Tommi asks:

> How many wives of sales assistants have been asked for their wedding certificates when they go to see their husbands? During the first years of our marriage my wife always carried the wedding certificate with her when she came to the docks. So it's not only a myth, she was asked for the certificate in both Helsinki and Kotka.[188]

When the port security asked his wife for the wedding certificate the implication was that they suspected that she was not a seaman's wife, but a prostitute who was there for business.

Sea life has never encouraged long-term relationships. The vacation system has made it more feasible to maintain one, although the long periods away from home still take their toll. It has been argued that the culture of masculinity at sea has produced a "super masculinity" that also affects the fatherhood concept of seamen (Heikell 2004, 295). As one deckhand explains,

> I wouldn't recommend life at sea. Your family life always gets screwed up, at some point. It doesn't suit everybody, this life. We were just laughing the other day in the mess that only two out of eight of us were not divorced with kids. That makes you think.[189]

The image of Kalle Aaltonen is such that he has 'a wife' or two in every port. He takes liberties with women, behaves irresponsibly and leaves them in trouble, *Bundles of Aaltolets left in ports far and wide. Just practical jokes from those bits on the side.* He

[187] HYUL99/44:c7.
[188] Correspondence: Tommi 2002.
[189] HYUL99/38:m6.

sees no problem in having a freewheeling lifestyle in which the woman is left holding the baby. On the contrary, he prides himself on spreading his seed around the world: *Black, red, and checkered – you might see them some day. Speaking India or Irelandish – not their father's Finnish anyway*. This idea of freedom is in sharp contrast with Malinowski's view that it arises only from an organized society. He argues that "true freedom", which he defines as freedom of order, of action and of achievement, is a vital part of human life and of organized human societies. It can only exist among human beings embracing specific cultural motives, implements and values, which necessarily entails the existence of legal, economic and political organizations. Consequently, the only 'true' freedom is organized freedom, not freedom to do what one pleases, or to do nothing if that is what one chooses. (Malinowski 1964, 25, 29.)

Therefore the freedom of Kalle Aaltonen discussed above does not meet the standards set by Malinowski, who would most likely consider freedom in relationships to arise from an organized set-up such as a marriage. Johannes Fabian refers to the concept of freedom in the history of anthropology as advocated by Malinowski as a 'paradox of enslaving liberation'. The idea of culture originates in the conceptualization of freedom – "freedom from ignorance, from greed and need, from habit and custom, indeed from nature." (Fabian 1998, 130.) The technologies of responsibilization stir an individual to strive for a life that follows a set of ethical norms. According to Rose, "the good citizen would be fused with the personal aspiration for a civilized life: this would be the state called freedom". (Rose 1999, 78.) Thus the goal is to standardize freedom. Although some may consider this the main object of the study of freedom, to deny or dismiss as inadequate other concepts, the concepts of ordinary people with no formal education in philosophy, would ignore the main task of anthropology and comparative religion – to learn how people see the world and what they value.

"The ship is my bride"

Although women in shipworld may suffer from prejudice and discrimination, the ship itself is considered female, as one deckhand in his early forties explained: "The ship is a

woman, in the old days the ships had women's names, and I guess it was also the old beliefs."[190] This is in accordance with the tradition in English of calling a ship 'she'.

Gendering ships as female has long been the tradition in seafaring. Indeed, Weibust (1969, 35) claims that all sailors without exception called sailing ships she. Sailors in literature have often been described as having some kind of romantic feelings towards the ship on which they are working, and calling it their bride could indicate such personal feelings. This is an example of 'bruto-romantics', which Rosenström (1996) discussed in her study. Sailors also have romantic aspects in their freedom discourses, as an old captain showed: "The ship is my bride. I like to be on board."[191] The bride metaphor could indicate both freedom and constraint: one could feel free to sail on her, but on the other hand, one has to take care of her if one is stuck with her in the middle of Atlantic. The implication is that he is wedded to the ship. These are good reminders that metaphors are not always only negative and harsh or positive and great – on the contrary: they often play with ambiguity.

And try finding someone to boast he hasn't joined me in a toast: alcohol

Alcohol has always played a role in the lives of both mythical and real-life sailors. Captain Timo recalled their old drinking habits:

> It's always like in the old days things were better. Of course there was a bigger crowd and we stayed longer in port. Especially those at the lower end, they didn't get to know the locals, they just got stuck in the first joint they came across and stayed there till they ran out of money.[192]

Timo's recollections from his youth in the1960s describe a phenomenon that has its roots in the history of seafaring. For sailors, the crimping system of the sailing-ship era was a way of providing them with accommodation and whatever they needed while on land, including alcohol and other leisure-time activities. According to Hinkkanen, system was that the crimp lured a sailor who had just landed and was looking for a place to stay to his inn. He offered a full service: Accommodation, food, and drink were provided, and because the sailor had put his money in the crimp's safe, everything was based on credit.

[190] HYUL99/38:m6.
[191] HYUL99/6:k1.
[192] HYUL96/11.

The feast would go on until the sailor's money was used up, then the crimp would kick him out or look up a ship for him to work on – in the latter case the crimp would get certain percentage of his next salary beforehand, of course. (Hinkkanen 1994, 62.) As this indicates, alcohol played a substantial role in the lives of seamen. In fact, the hard-spirits allowance was one thing that helped captains to crew their ships (Rediker 1987, 77-115).

Even today, captains are sometimes compared in terms of the amount of hard liquor the crew is allowed to buy tax-free on board. Needless to say, the drinking dimension of Jack Tar did not fit into the bourgeois values of the 18th and 19th centuries, either. *Ask in Frisco, Hull, Melbourne, Ask down Rio way, just ask anyone for fun '**Seen Kalle today?**' And try finding someone to boast, he hasn't joined me in a toast,* sings Kalle Aaltonen.

"Drinking doesn't play much of a role here anymore. I'd say people drink one tenth of what they used to."[193] This was how a first mate reflected on the change in the shipping industry, and consequently also in shipworld. Due to the fundamental changes in shipping companies' alcohol policy (for which seafarers often blame the oil catastrophe of 1989 in Alaska caused by the tanker Exxon Valdez) and the down-sizing of the crew on board, drinking is less and less of a problem on Finnish oil tankers. A Swedish study on contemporary cargo ships tells the same story: alcohol has traditionally been a problem aboard, but not any longer (Du Rietz 2001, 122-123). A chief engineer gave further confirmation: "Today's seaman has to be mentally strong. You can't escape portside anymore and get wasted and lost for a couple of days, like you could before."[194] There are vast differences in alcohol use in different cultures. It has been suggested that the special characteristics of the drinking culture do not change easily even in a society facing serious transition. The drinking habits of a particular culture embody the constructions of female-male relationships, the juxtaposition of nature and culture, relations between self-control and control, and in general the relations between the self and the community. (Mäkelä 1999, 76.)

Alcohol abuse is a recognized problem in Finland. This applies especially to sailors, who do not have a family or home community to keep them in check. To be able to party and

[193] HYUL96/12.
[194] HYUL99/51:c8.

drink as much as one pleases is a manifestation of personal freedom, although it is not approved by philosophers: it is the freedom of common people. Old seamen often fondly recall the days when they would party both on board and on land. Thus the role alcohol plays in shipworld is also illustrated in the stories told aboard (Du Rietz 2001, 122-123). Stories of drinking are stories of freedom, and in fact alcohol becomes the symbol of freedom (Alasuutari 1986, 112-123).

Another strong trait in the seaman's culture, smuggling, is related to alcohol (on smuggling in the Baltic Sea, see Ersson et al. 1994). The sailors under study considered smuggling (*smugeli, smuglaus*) their right – if not by birth then by profession. Those in positions of authority also had a good laugh about their own smuggling activities and often talked about them openly with other shipmates. For them it was a 'nice hobby'. As chief engineer Hans explained: "Booze and fags, the seaman sees it as his moral right to smuggle in his own cigarettes and liquor. Why should I pay a fortune on land when I can get them cheap elsewhere?"[195]

Earlier I recalled how a deckhand, Sakke bragged about his smuggling. He told me precisely where his stash for hard liquor and cigarettes was – both are heavily taxed in Finland and thus expensive. He was smuggling frequently because he had built a hiding place, and would have been heavily fined if it had been found by the customs (sailors call customs *musta kontra*).

Drinking and smuggling are part of the seaman's culture. They are also manifestations of independence, of the ability and will to stand outside of society and its regulations. They allow the sailor to express his stand on rules: he is a free man and he does as he pleases. Alcohol is a problematic issue for modern European societies, and its heavy usage fuels the complex dialectic of personal freedom and control/self-control (Valverde 1998, 5). Again, freedom is considered a goal that is to be achieved by adopting a civilized life style and exercising self-control. This discrepancy in the freedom conceptions of the people and the state policies may have dangerous consequences. As Berlin states, the horror of purely rational view of life begins to show. If it is set down that there is only one correct way of life, people who do not confirm to it have to be coerced to do so. Hence positive freedom becomes the road to serfdom. (Annan 2000, *x.*)

[195] HYUL96/3.

I have followed the devil worldwide, kept him company, side by side: the sea

Kalle Aaltonen does not care much for the church or its moral teachings. Thus he sings: *I've followed the devil worldwide, kept him company, side by side.* This is another example of the bourgeois values of the 18th and 19th centuries that sailors were believed to shun.

In addition to pursuing this apparently ungodly lifestyle, Finnish sailors were also believed to be sea wizards. From the 12th century onwards, as Toivanen reports, legend had it that Finns sold favorable winds to merchant sailors. This myth survived until the 20th century, partly due to Olaus Magnus' History of Northern peoples (1555), with its stories of wind knots, wind merchants and storm raisers. Several Anglo-Saxon writers – Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Joseph Conrad, Richard Henry Dana, Daniel Defoe, Jack London and Herman Melville, among others – also used the same myth about Finnish sorcerers. (Toivanen 1993, 88-89.) In the sailing-ship era storms were considered to be the work of the devil, often raised by evil sorcerers: violent seas were seen as hell, the devils dancing on the waves (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 41-42).

The sea is hardly a neutral element for seamen. Their lives depended on it in the windjammer era, as they ultimately do today. Proverbs in northern Europe warned of the dangers at sea: if you wanted to learn how to pray, you only had to go to sea (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 41). Seamen therefore attach various meanings to it, as one old mate illustrates:

> I have thought about it, why I've been here so long. What is this sea, is it a curse or what, I've been here so long. This is a demanding job, it takes so much mentally and physically to stay here for so many decades. You're here in your free time too, you see, and your family and friends are elsewhere and your thoughts are elsewhere. If you can't deal with this, you could see it as a curse.[196]

Religion or religious thinking hardly shows in shipworld because it is considered a private matter. The general discourse therefore discourages open religiosity. For example,

[196] HYUL96/6.

the habit of calling the Church and its workers 'The Devil Fighting Unit',[197] which is the name contemporary sailors sometimes use, is an effective way of discouraging religious discourse on board. In a crew consisting only of Finns the reason for refraining from talking about religion is that it is not considered a suitable subject – it belongs to the private realm. A contemporary Swedish study of a multicultural cargo-ship community came to the same conclusion – that a ship's community is clearly non-religious – possibly in this case due to the different backgrounds (Du Rietz 2001, 95). Multinational and multicultural crews include followers of several religions and religious talk may thus be considered a touchy subject.

As far as Finnish ships were concerned, it is quite possible that, in general, sailors secularized earlier than the mainstream land population because they did not have the chance, nor the pressure put on them by their families and village communities, to attend services regularly. There was therefore a contradiction between the international seamen's culture and its norms and the education and expectations of the Finnish seaman and his family (Hinkkanen 1994, 64).

Although shipworld discourages religiosity, the sea is a powerful element, which embodies various meanings it. Some love it, some hate it, but it is virtually impossible to be neutral about it. Bosun Gale declares his love for it: "The sea is mine."[198] Then he continues, deliberately casually, "I have twice survived a shipwreck, and a gypsy once told my fortune at a bus station and said, *Gale, the third time you'll stay in the sea*. Well, I'll find out, won't I?"[199]

Many of the other seafarers viewed the sea in a certain light. As deckhand Puhonen put it: "I have always had good relations with sea, I've lived all my life on the coast. It's 20 meters to the Finnish Gulf from my old man's croft."[200] When I asked him if he felt close to the sea he was quick to deny any sentiment: "I dunno if it's close to me as it's always been there, goddammit."[201] The hidden pride of being born almost at sea is evident in Puhonen's words, although his tough-guy image did not allow him to admit it openly. It is quite common for sailors to mention their closeness to the sea in a throwaway remark:

[197] In Finnish: Piruntorjuntajoukot.
[198] HYUL96/15.
[199] HYUL96/15.
[200] HYUL96/19.
[201] HYUL96/19.

it may be family heritage in one way or another, or they may always have wanted to go to sea, or the profession runs in the family. Like Puhonen, Lars also boasted about his semi-nativeness: "I couldn't even get home from the maternity hospital without a boat, you see. I could never in a million years live somewhere that wasn't close to the sea, that's for sure."[202] Robert expressed similar sentiments, adding that he had always wanted to go to sea: "As I said, as a kid I had no other idea than 'to sea, to sea'. It's because I was born in a port town, so it was a matter of course."[203] Lane (1986, 55), too, claims in his study on British seafarers that being in contact with nature moulds seafarers, although they do not like to talk about it.

There are also seamen who have always had the sea in their blood even if they do not come from a coastal area, or have seafaring in the family. One mess girl with 20 years at sea explained her reasons for choosing this career path: "Every time I saw a ship I felt more and more sure about going to sea. I'm the only sailor in the family."[204] She was an exceptional sailor in that she was already nearly 30 when se chose the sea profession – usually seamen have gone to sea in their teens are early twenties.

Kalle Aaltonen is nostalgic

Interestingly, the Kalle Aaltonen freedom discourse is always nostalgic: the great times of adventure are always in the past. Luckily, the narrator was there just in time to experience the freedom. The old seamen who stepped onboard in the 1950s had the opportunity to sail with seadogs who had worked in windjammers – in the 1950s it was still a real sailor's life, and since then it has only been a shadow of its glorious past. For those who went to sea in the 1960s, they were best times and it has never been the same since then. Then again, the sailors who started their careers in the 1970s were lucky enough to experience the final moments of freedom, while those who first stepped aboard in the 1980s still had the opportunity to live the great sailor's life. Even the younger generation, those who first went to sea in the 1990s, says the same: those were the good times, the great 1990s, that is.

[202] HYUL96/1.
[203] HYUL96/5.
[204] HYUL96/18.

Sailor discourse is thus filled with nostalgia. Even in the competitive and global seafaring industry of the late 20th and early 21st centuries it is drawn from the past. It is surprising that those aged 30 or above talk about the glorious past – only for some the glorious past is in the1950s, and for others it is in the 1990s.

The sailor's freedom from freedom

We were at a florist's, the Lonna AB and me. We had cycled downtown – I think it was in Gothenburg, Sweden – had a couple of beers, and then we had the splendid idea, which we were now realizing, of furnishing my cabin with a plant. When the florist asked if the plant was going to be placed in a north-facing or south-facing window we burst out laughing: "It revolves," I answered. The florist said that it was not good for the plant to be moved around, and it would be better to find a place for it and to keep it there. By that time the AB and I were laughing our heads off: "No, it's not the plant that moves, nor the window. It is the whole room!" The poor florist, of course, had no idea what we were laughing about.

This story reflects some aspects of freedom discourses that are not so apparent. In a sense, the plant we bought represented us sailors. Just as the plant would be changing direction, so would we. We did not know where we were heading next: if the captain had told us it was north, it might well be south if the shipping company so decided. Like the plant, we would also suffer from the bad weather and the rolling, without having any say in it. Moreover, we would be woken up for work at any hour of the day when necessary. Still we laughed: because we did not have any power over the decisions, we did not have to bother ourselves with them. We just sailed.

Sailors have other types of freedom discourses in addition to that expressed by Kalle Aaltonen. These are often not so obvious, and play on the tension between freedom and its counterpart, prison. Some of them derive from the concepts of 1) institutionalization, 2) isolation, 3) lifelessness, and 4) machine. I categorize these freedom discourses as 'freedom from freedom', by which I mean the rhetoric that, by denying the individual's freedom also absolves the individual from responsibility and himself. While there is also freedom from responsibility in the Kalle Aaltonen discourse, here it is in the form of one giving up his power to others. Freedom from responsibility means that one is not

accountable for one's actions or the decisions one makes. Freedom from oneself, in a nutshell, means that the individual has the opportunity, for a period of time, to deny his or her own will, to yield power over one's life to others. Freedom from responsibility and from oneself both play a role in the four manifestations of freedom from freedom discussed below.

These ways of discussing freedom came out of the data, as did the Kalle Aaltonen. Both seafaring and, therefore, shipworld have gone through extensive changes in recent decades. These changes have also had an impact on the lives of sailors. They therefore reflect the transformation in their discourses, especially in their freedom discourse. Although the notion of 'freedom from freedom' arose from my study data, other researchers have come to the same type of conclusion. For example, with regard to institutionalization, Pärssinen (1976) and Goffman (1961) obtained similar results concerning the seaman's life, while on the subject of isolation, Rosenström (1996) reported the same kinds of reflections by sailors concerning the windjammer era. I will discuss these other kinds of freedom discourse, 'freedom from freedom', in the following sub-chapters.

"Sailors are poor little mites"

> A seaman is always a child. I believe that when sailors are aboard they don't grow older: they age only when they're on vacation. They're in a boys' camp here, among people like themselves, so they don't grow up here. They always lose half a year of their lives, every year.[205]

This is how the cook Kalle described a sailor. His view is reminiscent of the Never Never Land of Peter Pan, where boys do not grow up. In shipworld they escape from the day-to-day reality, things they have to face on land, for they get older on vacation but not on board. Captain Timo had the same type of image of sailors, although his attitude was slightly less benign. Here he was discussing his crew, describing them as children who had to be taken care of, as if in kindergarten,

> You have to know how to handle seafarers, they're poor little mites, you see. They're like that because everything has been done for them, they're so well

[205] HYUL99/37:s6.

> looked after here. It's like, "Let's put gloves on you now so that your hands don't get cold." Like a mother talks to her child, it's a lot like that here.[206]

This kind of rhetoric depicts sailors as carefree, but at the same time as helpless creatures who have to be taken care of, although they do not necessarily realize it. According to Morgan (1997, 227), this kind of relationship in organizations, when people look to others to initiate action when problems arise, is congruent with the child deferring to parental rule. Mate Leena also shared the viewpoint of Kalle and Timo, although she put a gender spin on it. When I asked her about being a woman in a man's world for twenty years, she laughed: "A man's world? People always talk about a man's world, but I haven't seen a single man here. I' looking forward to seeing what kind of creature it is, this thing called 'man'. I hope I see one before I die!"[207] I asked her what she considered her work mates to be, in that case. She had a ready reply: "Absolute brats, kids… I think whoever came up with the saying that men are children forever is 150% correct. I mean, they're absolutely brats."[208] Dismissing male sailors as boys and brats was Leena's strategy for coping with the prevalent masculine culture in shipworld. At the same time, however, she emphasized the irresponsibility and childishness of her fellow sailors.

In terms of the above-mentioned rhetoric, kindergarten and boys' camp are very close to Goffman's first group of total institutions – those established to care for harmless persons who are considered to be incapable of looking after themselves. This concept is also reflected in other metaphors. The nuthouse metaphor relates to Goffman's group of total institutions that 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 – such as mental hospitals. (Goffman 1961, 4-6) as one chief engineer said about his life aboard ship:

> I don't know, I haven't been in a nuthouse or a prison yet, but I guess this is something between the two. I've sometimes joked that I wouldn't take it that bad if I got five years in some labor camp, it wouldn't be any worse than here. I would have some vacation from there, I'd know that it wasn't going anywhere. I'd get to watch a video at five in the afternoon, relax, and then come for breakfast the next morning. I think this is something between the two. I mean you get a bit – I bet I do as well – but when I look at those guys of my age in the workers' mess room,

[206] HYUL99/47:k7.
[207] HYUL96/7.
[208] HYUL96/7.

> they're badly institutionalized. Absolutely no initiative, except when it's time to go on vacation, or to eat.[209]

This kind of rhetoric creates helpless mites, people under guardianship: full service is provided and necessary. The allusion to custody arises from the inability to get out and the highly organized and standardized living conditions on board: the ship is supposed to provide its crew members with everything they need – or are thought to need. Consequently, the sailors often talked about their institutionalization.

'Baby', 'madman', 'mite', 'wretch': these could be considered as allegories as well as metaphors. They fall into the seventh of the eight independent communication goals of metaphors introduced by Katz, some of which he took from the work of other scholars (Aristotle, Gibbs 1987, Lakoff & Johnson 1980, Ortony 1975, Winner 1988). He lists these reasons for using them as follows. (1) The metaphor is part of our lexicon and acts as a word, as in "Their marriage was a continual battle." Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999) conducted a ground-breaking study on this subject. (2) They express something in an elegant way and thus may be primarily stylistic. Katz cites Percy Bysshe Shelley's poem as an example: "Tranquility is a woodland river winding through hills in solitude." (3) Since metaphors force the user to elaborate on the topic, leading to a stronger memory trace, they can be used to enhance the memorability of a concept. (4) They can be persuasive creating a bond between the speaker and the audience. The assumption is that this is more likely if the target audience shares – and is aware of sharing – "privileged" knowledge with the speaker. (5) It is an efficient and compact way to convey the intended meaning, for example the term "black hole" in science. (6) Because metaphors may be vivid, they are often used to reduce ambiguity and increase comprehension of the intended message. (7) They are used to gloss over essential dissimilarities, in order to persuade the audience. An example is George W. Bush's "axis of evil", which he coined in 2002 to label Iran, Iraq and North Korea. He said, "States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world."[210] His intention was to obscure the vast differences between these three countries, to hint at the Axis of the Second World War, and to construct the idea of 'evil' lurking behind their borders. (8) They clarify, explain or illuminate a concept when literal language is not capable of doing so. (Katz 1996, 4-7.)

[209] HYUL00/7:c10.
[210] President Bush delivered this state of the union address on January 29, 2002. (White House, website.)

According to Katz (1996, 7), the second to the seventh goals are more interesting because the metaphor is used in order to make a special communicative point. They therefore influence action because they are able to frame issues (Thompson 1996, 194-195).[211] Thus it is not insignificant that crew members on a large oil tanker view themselves as living in boys' camp or kindergarten, or that their supervisors perceive them as babies or mites.

These metaphors – mite, brat and baby – reveal significant aspects of the freedom discourse of seamen: they emphasize both helplessness and irresponsibility. The former is about the seaman's inability to have any influence over his own living conditions, and thus over his own life, while the latter – irresponsibility – is in line with Kalle Aaltonen's notions of the seaman's masculinity. The sailor is in a boys' camp aboard ship, and does not grow older while he is at sea because he is living with men like himself. In one sense, spending one's life at sea with other like-minded happy-go-lucky sailors is one kind of manifestation of freedom. Shipworld could be seen as a refuge for the old 'boys will be boys' attitude, which is no longer universally acceptable on land.

Institutionalized in work

Ship functions are designed to provide sailors with everything they need while onboard. As discussed above, they recognize the danger in this kind of organization, namely that of institutionalization. The same danger faces those who provide, namely the galley crew. Ritva had worked as a ship's steward for more than a decade and had been at sea for three decades. She no longer found her work aboard ship interesting: "Always when you come back from vacation, after one day at work 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."[212] For her there was no career planning. She had held the senior position (of two, cook steward and cook's assistant) in the galley

[211] Thompson (1996, 194-195) notes that there are differences according to the use of metaphor: in politics it often has a framing function, and there are conscious attempts to control the political agenda by attempting to define the dominant metaphors. Bush's "Axis of evil" is an example of this.

[212] HYUL99/8:s2.

for years, and there were no options for her to move up, and no real danger of losing rank.

According to most of the interviewees, sailors tend to get more or less institutionalized during their years at sea because they *live* on board. All institutions, including ships, have to take care of "all" the needs of their members for long periods of time (Aubert 1965, 239). Hence young captain Fredi remarked, "The ship is an institution. You get pea soup on Thursdays, you have regular meal times, and your sheets get changed frequently."[213] It is therefore quite natural for seamen to feel institutionalized if their food is served to them (without their deciding what, when, or where they eat), and if their sheets are changed by others.[214] Furthermore, their living conditions are defined by the shipping company and the naval traditions (e.g., the location and size of the cabin, and the seating order in the mess). Engineer Yrjö's opinion of his work reflects this, although he was more cynical than Ritva and Fredi: "You can't be satisfied with this life. If anyone says he's happy with it, he's already institutionalized, or he's adapted to it, he's institutionalized totally."[215]

As illustrated above by Ritva, Fredi and Yrjö, institutionalization plays a significant role in the lives of seamen. It could therefore be viewed as a collective trace in their worldviews, for an individual has both individual and collective aspects in his or her worldview (Manninen 1977, 25; Helve 1987, 14). Moreover, one's worldview is reflected in one's activities: for example, the cognitive dimension – which is close to the belief-system – shows in one's interests, activities and lifestyle (Helve 1987, 21-22). It matters what kind of view of the world seamen have because it affects their actions both in their everyday work and in crisis situations. Furthermore, their worldview influences the world surrounding them. The lifestyle shipworld allows – with the freedom to let others take over daily routines such as cooking and cleaning – easily leads to institutionalization. In this sense institutionalization is the price seamen pay for their 'easy living.' It is also strengthened by the strict division of work combined with inflexibility in the work roles.

[213] HYUL99/20:k3.
[214] In this shipping company, everyone – even a deckhand – still had their sheets changed and cabin cleaned in 1996. Today, this is a privilege confined to the highest in the hierarchy.
[215] HYUL99/30:y5.

Home runs away

Mate Leena, with couple of decades' experience at sea, grinned when I asked her how often she went ashore and visited the nearby towns: "The first three years on this ship the only thing I did on land was to go dockside to check the Plimsoll mark[216]… You get institutionalized. You're afraid to leave your safe work environment, when you come back your home has run away."[217]

Leena's use of the word *home* is humorous, but it is not ironic rhetoric (see Potter 1996): she was not trying to undermine the metaphor of the ship as a home, but was laughing at herself when she realized that ship had become her home. Prevalent metaphors show how people view the world and construct their reality because they not only reveal the conceptual systems of the speaker, but they also constantly reinforce his or her worldview (Liu 2002, 8). As an example, Captain Tommi told a sad story from his youth:

> About commitment… after the army I worked on this tanker as an AB. There was this old codger there. The Second World War had cut him off completely from his family, and he had stayed out and sailed here and there after it had ended. Then at the end of the sixties or in the early seventies he had come back to work on Finnish ships and realized that he had nobody here in Finland, NOBODY [emphatically]. He had a sister somewhere but after not hearing a word from him for 30 years she no longer cared about him. Then came the day he had to retire and leave the ship. We spent one and a half day in Sköldvik unloading and loading the cargo and then he had to leave the ship. He waited until the very last moment, as he had no place to go. I decided then that I wouldn't let that happen to me, that I wouldn't have anywhere to go. Some place, some people have to be there for me. We heaved the gangway, and there he was standing alone on the dock with his bundle.[218]

After a lifetime at sea, the sailor in Tommi's story had no place to go on land: his only home was the ship. Thus, while the idea of a ship as a home may build the seaman's identity, as discussed previously, it may also institutionalize him. Moreover, this man had become so helpless that even when he knew that he had to leave, he was not capable of arranging housing or making plans for his future. Thus he was left standing alone on the dock when the ship sailed.

[216] The Plimsoll mark is the mark painted on the ship's broadside indicating the maximum depth to which it can sink when loaded with cargo.
[217] HYUL96/7.
[218] HYUL05.

There was also a trace of helplessness and longing in the voice of an old boatswain, with nearly 40 years at sea, when he remembered his old ship: "Oh, Tiira… Leaving that ship behind after twelve years was like leaving home."[219] For him to leave the ship he had worked on for more than a decade was more than leaving a workplace, even a beloved one, it was leaving home. At home one knows one's family members, and is expected to give them a hand (to some extent). Sailors may help each other, there may be the "father" (captain) to look after the others, but everybody is in charge of their own life. Metaphors of family and home express security and emphasize the interdependent roles of crew members aboard. Shipmates often spend some of their leisure time together, and they may do favors for each other. Some become friends and also keep in touch when they are on vacation. These expressions are mostly positive metaphors about ship life, but when Captain Timo said, "We are one big family", I detected a touch of irony in his voice.[220] His "one big family" consisted of approximately fifteen grown-ups, whose life aboard was regulated by the rigid shipboard hierarchy. Here the demarcation line between officers and workers, the caliphs and ragamuffins, shaped his view of shipworld.

Jonathan Potter coined the terms *reifying rhetoric* and *ironizing rhetoric*. The former refers to rhetoric that creates versions of the world as solid and factual, and the latter embodies undermining discourse. This division could be seen in relation to Katz's evaluative-informative dichotomy. According to Potter, reifying discourse represents an attempt to turn something abstract into an object (in its widest meaning, which includes thoughts and events) and thus constructs versions of the world as if they were solid and factual. Ironizing rhetoric, on the other hand, undermines these versions, questioning the literal descriptiveness and thus turning the material back to motivated, distorted and flawed discourse. (Potter 1996, 107.) Thus Timo above was using the family metaphor as a form of ironizing rhetoric – the aim of which in this case was to undermine the idea of the ship community as a family. This use of the family metaphor indicates that the captain was not very happy with the "family" he had on board.

This is not the first time, or era, that sailors have used such metaphors for their ship. For example, Rosenström's (1996, 114) study of Finnish sailors in the 1930s and 1940s reveals the same discourse: due to the compulsory intimacy aboard, they compared their

[219] HYUL99/63:m9.
[220] HYUL99/47:k7.

ship with everything from a "home" to a "prison". Sailors' worlview and the shipworld as a living and working environment show in this discourse.

Isolated by the sea

'Isolation' is a second kind of discourse that expresses the sailor's freedom from freedom, and again, different kinds of isolation are referred to. The seamen I interviewed utilized the symbol of anti-freedom, prison, in their contemplation of life at sea, and also discussed shipworld through the island metaphor, for example. It has been noted that *isolation/freedom* was one of the main dichotomies also in sailing-ship communities (Rosenström 1996, 136).

"At sea you're a prisoner of the sea"

Chief engineer Hans burst out laughing when I asked him his thoughts regarding the comparison between shipworld and prison. Then he said, "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, while in prison someone closes it behind you."[221] Here Hans was ridiculing shipworld, but it also illustrates how sailors develop jokes about their life at sea. The ship is a closed environment, isolated in good and bad ways: nothing permeates it or leaks out of it. Prison is an extremely negative metaphor – it is hard to find anything good in it.[222] In 'jail' a 'prisoner' lives in a 'cell, behind bars'. Perhaps only death would be more negative in this metaphorical context.

To be able to laugh at one's living conditions is a strategy for distancing oneself from them. This type of discourse, ironizing rhetoric, helps sailors to cope with their choices of profession and thus of living environment. There is a strong tension between freedom and prison in shipworld, which makes seafarers often use strong polemic rhetoric to convey their view on sea life. Thus one chief engineer said, "Prison is easier than this, prison doesn't roll."[223] It is a widely held view among sailors that they have to stay at sea

[221] HYUL99/44:c7.
[222] Interestingly, in traditional jail jargon in Finland, the prison dormitories are often called by the maritime term hold or bay (*ruuma* in Finnish), which is also the case in English.
[223] HYUL99/51:c8.

because there is no work for them on land. Working at sea requires highly specialized skills, which are often useless on land. This belief is likely to generate prison metaphors: if one believes there is no other choice than to stay working at sea it affects one's perspective on shipworld.

Positions such as captain and deck officer are especially problematic because they require many years of schooling, but do not develop the vocational proficiency that is easily translated to the skills needed in land jobs. Therefore there are very few jobs available should they want to work on land. This also applies to boatswains and ABs, although they do not need as much training. In general, deck crews have few options other than sea work. The situation is better for cook stewards and engineers, for example, because there are almost parallel occupations on land. Cooks can find work in restaurants and in industrial kitchens such as schools and hospitals, and engineers could work in power plants. The problem is that after a decade or two at sea the sailor is relatively well-paid and the salaries land positions can offer are no longer attractive. Furthermore, life in the institution starts to take its toll and the seafarer may lose confidence and job-application skills. As one first engineer said, "I would like to work on land, but there are no jobs where I live. I am jealous of others' lifestyles. Me, I lose the finest part of the summer rolling around here on board."[224]

"It does you good to get outside, that you don't have to stay behind bars, for a couple of hours."[225] This was how one first engineer described his short evening breaks. Prison serves as a root metaphor for other metaphors such as cubicle, golden cage, open prison, and prison guard. Metaphors have a significant role in forming worldviews because they are tools for comprehending the world. Lakoff, for example, studied root metaphors such as *love as a journey*. This metaphor involves understanding one domain of experience, love, in terms of a very different domain of experience, journey. Because the use of both the *source* domain and the *target* domain is tightly structured, the ontological correspondences are given in statements such as 'the relationship isn't going anywhere.' (Lakoff 1990, 47-48.) The prison metaphor has entered the conceptual system, and now it gives rise to new metaphors, prison being the source domain and ship's community the

[224] HYUL99/16:y3.
[225] HYUL96/13.

target domain. Captain Tommi gave his view on ship: "You don't have to be here. But, in a sense, this is a golden cage."[226]

The prison metaphor has traditionally been used in the shipping context since the sailing-ship era. Moreover, the isolation/freedom dichotomy discussed above is very closely related to the freedom-prison dichotomy (see Rosenström 1996, 136). This partly explains the popularity of the prison metaphor: the ideal of freedom, which is associated with the sailor's life, and the routine of shipworld do not meet. "You can't really call this a prison, this is actually worse, after all", the captain says. "How come?" I ask, because claiming that a ship is worse than a prison is quite a strong statement. He answers, "Because everybody is here of their own free will. And because you can always run away from prison, but if you run away at sea you lose your life – you jump over the rail."[227]

The captain gave two reasons for claiming that the ship was worse than prison: there was the paradox of going willingly to a prison-like environment, and the fact that escaping from the ship at sea meant committing suicide – jumping over the side – while one could run away from prison without facing certain death.[228] In employing such strong rhetoric he was constructing the anti-thesis of freedom, hence also defining freedom and its boundaries. Prison functions as a terministic screen that also guides the gaze of the new generation when they step aboard.

There are several reasons for the popularity of prison rhetoric among sailor. For one thing, the gradual transformation in the cultural traditions of seafaring has had an effect. As discussed previously, the time and space dimensions of shipworld contribute in as far as the sailor's location in time and space are, by and large, dictated by the organization. Secondly, there is the discrepancy between the myth of the free-roving Kalle Aaltonen freedom and the highly organized and standardized realities of shipworld. The characteristics of the total institution and the organizational structure of the ship are also highly relevant. Prison is in the third group of Goffman's (1961, 4-6) categories of total institutions, organized to protect the community from those who intentionally endanger

[226] HYUL99/52:k8.
[227] HYUL00/6:k10.
[228] There is an interesting trait in seafaring culture regarding suicide: it is considered polite for the person committing it to leave his shoes alongside the railing. This way his co-workers do not have to waste time in searching for him onboard. There are countless hideouts in a big cargo ship and thus searching every nook and cranny would take hours.

it, and the welfare of persons sequestered in these places is not a major issue. Finally, prison rhetoric constructs freedom by defining its anti-thesis.

Interestingly, on some ships no one said anything about prison, and in others it was a common frame of reference for everyday life onboard. There may be many explanations for this. First, ship communities differ in terms of 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 that typifies their discourse. Thirdly, they have heard or read somewhere how ships are often described and use that metaphor. Fourthly, concerning the prison metaphor, there is a historical background to the combination of prison and ship: there used to be a form for taxpayers who worked at sea – the same form was used in prisons and other institutions as well. It is possible, and probable, that there is some truth in all these explanations.

We should keep in mind 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's community could be characterized in apparently contradictory metaphors – like 'kindergarten' and 'prison'. They highlight different aspects of the social reality, and may exist simultaneously. They both also share the inability to leave because they are closed. Few images, however, are as totalizing as prison. The tension between imprisonment and freedom – which is so salient in shipworld – has to be somehow coped with (Rosenström 1996, 136). Therefore prison rhetoric makes a strong communicative point. The freedom-prison relation seems to be an internal one, built in to many aspects of shipworld.

By emphasizing certain aspects of reality, and thus forcing others into the background, metaphors may create social realities for us. If sailors employ the prison metaphor to reflect their ideas about the hierarchical structure of shipworld, it may create a social reality that expands beyond the original phenomenon, the source of the metaphor. In that case the prison metaphor, which was originally meant to reflect the shipboard hierarchy, may distort the sailors' views about their options for leisure-time activities aboard, for example. Thus a metaphor may influence future actions. Such actions will naturally fit it and this, in turn, will reinforce its power to make the experience coherent. In this sense metaphors can be self-fulfilling prophecies (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 156). There is

therefore significance in what kinds of metaphors seamen use in conceptualizing their ships' communities. If they employ the prison metaphor, a certain type of outcome is more likely than if they used a circus metaphor, for example. If they were to use the circus metaphor to describe their life at sea, this self-fulfilling prophecy would encourage quite different self-image, job performance and leisure-time activities, for example, than the prison metaphor implies.

The freedom-prison dichotomy in freedom discourse can be viewed through different approaches to freedom. For example, Patterson sub-divides freedom into personal, sovereignal and civic. Personal freedom in its simplest form means that the person is not being coerced or restrained by another to do something, and the conviction that one can do as one pleases within the limits of the other person's desire to do the same. Sovereignal freedom, on the other hand, means the power to act as one pleases regardless of the wishes of the other, and civic freedom refers to the right to exercise one's citizenship in democracies. (Patterson 1991, 3-4, 97.) In this sense, the freedom conceptions of seafarers are mostly on the personal level. However, the rigid hierarchy of shipworld could be seen as a manifestation of sovereignal freedom. As motorman Pete declares, "The dictator can freely go on the rampage, he can insult you and shout at you, but if a ragamuffin takes a sip of beer, he gets fired."[229]

Prison metaphors reveal a significant dimension of the freedom discourse of seamen, as 'nuthouse' metaphors do. They belong to the same group, emphasizing different hues of the same spectrum. The ship is prison for sailors, but how do they come to choose a life in prison? Motorman Aleksi told me that he saw the ship as a prison, and I asked him how long he had thought that. "For quite some time now", he said. "Why don't you leave the sea then?" I asked. He answered, "I'm so used to this. I take it easy, I keep calm. I think about the vacations. That's why I'm here."[230] As Aleksi's view indicates, personal experiences shape the worldview. It is an ongoing developmental process and not only a socialized set of beliefs (Helve 1987, 17-18). This freedom-prison dichotomy plays a vital role in sailors' freedom discourse and also in their worldviews. Prison metaphors quite naturally emphasize the prison pole of the freedom-prison axis. Since freedom is a

[229] HYUL99/29:m4.
[230] HYUL00/1:m10.

vital value in sailors' self-image, as discussed previously in this chapter, one might well ask how this inconsistency can prevail.

Manninen provides one possible answer: if the layers in the worldview of an individual or group conflict or lack unity, it should be seen as a conflict between different worldviews, not within one. Thus a worldview may have layers that seem to contradict each other, but even so it consists of certain principles that unify the layers into a logical – or sometimes illogical – whole. (Manninen 1977, 16.) In this context, I find the freedom-prison dichotomy highly ambivalent, but a prevalent and deep-rooted aspect of sailors' worldviews. However, I do not see that there are two rival worldviews fighting in one's head: the freedom-prison axis, which is ambivalent and creates tension, is part of the sailor's worldview.

Furthermore, Kearney divides illogical elements of the worldview into two categories: external and internal inconsistencies. External inconsistencies occur when worldview assumptions are not in check with the reality. Examples of this include the shift from geocentric to heliocentric cosmology that took place due to the findings of Nicolaus Copernicus and Galileo Galilei in the 16th and 17th centuries, and the shift – which is still to take place in some communities – from the creation myth to evolution theory. Internal inconsistencies result from contradictions among the assumptions of one's worldview. Christianity provides an example: on the one hand there is an omnipotent benevolent God, and on the other there are evil forces roaming around the world causing suffering. How can an omnipotent and benevolent God allow this? In the main, worldviews have a tendency to seek consistency. (Kearney 1984, 52-64.) It should also be noted that these inconsistencies often do not overly bother the people who hold them.

"At sea you're a prisoner of the sea": a cook's assistant who had wanted to leave the sea for years reflected on her experiences.[231] This markedly emotional rhetoric also has the function of distancing the person from her or his current living environment. Kaarlo Laine, in his study of the metaphors pupils use to describe school, also came to the conclusion that school as a "concentration camp" or "prison" was no longer a concentration camp, or a prison: the institution had a shape, an otherness, which no

[231] HYUL99/50:s7.

longer included the pupil. Life and the self were elsewhere (Laine 1995, 24). This view may also have practical consequences: as discussed above, one reason why seafarers view their ship as a prison is because they believe that they have to work there because there is no work for them on land. This creates a vicious cycle: if a sailor thinks he is in prison, he is not likely to apply for jobs elsewhere because prison is not an environment one can leave if one wants to.

The ship is an island, or a bottle

The captain paused for a long time before he answered my question asking him how he would describe shipworld. Finally he said, "A ship is a miniature model of society. It's a little satellite colony, you have to act independently… and the umbilical cord is the shipping company."[232] A ship is self-sufficient, or seems to be, as 'miniature model of society' and 'satellite colony' suggest. It is not that simple, however, as the captain indicated when he mentioned the 'umbilical cord', which implies that the ship is a fetus. Even though it appears to be independent, it needs both supplies and a reason for existing. This discourse, like that of Kalle Aaltonen, is linked to the peripherical locus of sailors (see Ramberg 1997, 61-71). Because the ship represents society in its semi-independence (a miniature model or a satellite), it is also hierarchical.

These metaphors emphasize 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. As one chief engineer put it, "The ship is an island, there's a small crowd there, and you can't get away."[233] How is it freedom then, if you cannot leave? According to Berlin (2000, 112), the answer to the classical question of closed doors (Am I less free if a door through which I do not wish to enter is locked?) is quite clear: whether the doors are open or locked determines the extent of one's freedom, not one's own preferences. However, as I will show below, closed space can also be viewed as freedom by some seafarers.

It is not always easy to determine which pieces of discourse are metaphors and which are not. Thus several metaphors – oil rig, fire brigade and lodge, for example – could be

[232] HYUL99/34:k5.
[233] HYUL99/1:c1.

viewed as analogous to a ship (see Perelman 1979, 92). If we employ the metaphor as a representative of other tropes, we will get away from demarcating *slavery* or *dictatorship*, for example, as exaggerations rather than metaphors (see Chantrill and Mio 1996, 171-172). *Another life* fits into the most basic definition of metaphor, as "the essence of metaphors is understanding one kind of thing in terms of another" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 5), but it could also be interpreted as another trope, an exaggeration. Whatever the case, *another life* is clearly figurative language.

What is the case with our other example, *a closed authoritarian society*? The first impression may be that it is certainly not a metaphor, and is rather an off-shoot of the theoretical analysis of ship life. After careful consideration, it could be said that *society* is clearly a metaphor, and that *closed authoritarian* is quite an accurate perspective, or an exaggeration of the subject. Therefore, it is not always clear in some expressions whether they are metaphors in the strictest sense of the concept, 'metaphors' (including all tropes), partial metaphors, or other expressions that are not metaphors at all. Many of them are simple similes, or hyperbolic comparisons – figures of speech, that is. It is worth noting that some of the sayings of sailors are quite analytic – such as *institution* and *industrial process*. Some metaphors are quite strong and perhaps even polemic: *prison*, *graveyard*, *nuthouse*, and *home*. I use the concept as representative of all figurative speech. One example of the rich language that is most fruitfully analyzed as such was provided by a chief engineer talking about how he viewed a ship:

> It's very hard to place it among other phenomena in the world… hmm, perhaps a space shuttle. You're floating in your own world and you can't get much help… you're stuck there, until you get down to orbit or ashore. It's a very small, closed, and condensed group. Sometimes you have to think carefully whether you say "Morning" or "Good Morning" to someone.[234]

Another metaphor – the ship as a bottle – is a positive account describing the negative freedom, freedom from big crowds. As motorman Matti said, "The ship is a bottle, I don't like to hang out with big crowds anyway, this is a small gang but it doesn't bother me at all."[235] Matti likes to be aboard because the ship is a closed place and therefore he can be himself there: "I like to step aboard, because this is its own closed community."[236] Isolation is negative freedom in the sense that it may provide freedom from the chains of

[234] HYUL99/41:c6.
[235] HYUL99/10:m2.
[236] HYUL99/10:m2.

life on land, for example from social expectations (see Berlin 2000). It also captures the image of the free-roving sailor that is nourished by many: cutting oneself off from land takes courage, but that is what a sailor does. It is a widely shared belief that you have to have a special character, to be a bit crazy or a hermit, to survive life at sea. "I can't recommend this life to anyone. You get so isolated here. When you go to sea you get isolated. You need to have a special kind of character to like it here", as ship's engineer Yrjö put it.[237] Another interviewed, a young mate said:

> A seaman needs to have really good nerves. It's 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's not their fault if you hate them. You have to get along.[238]

When the ship is characterized by metaphors related to isolation, it reveals features of both its social and work-place aspects. This is natural, because in a total institution it is not possible to separate the two realms. This closed community, divided physically from others by the sea, emphasizes the independence of the community and the interdependence of its dwellers.

"There are three kinds of people: the living, the dead and those that sail on ships"

This observation is said to have been made by Anarcharsis, the Prince of Scythia, in 600 BCE (Hope 2001, 6). He was implying that seafarers did not belong to the realm of life, or to death. This idea was echoed much later by the trans-Atlantic travelers before the era of aviation, when the ship they boarded was considered a "world between worlds" (Rennella and Walton 2004, 371). The third type of discourse that belongs to sailor's freedom from freedom is termed lifelessness here, and draws from the same notion that Anarcharsis and the trans-Atlantic travelers had. 'Lifelessness' was represented in two kinds of freedom discourse found in the data, Another life and Graveyard.

"Another life"

[237] HYUL99/30:y5.
[238] HYUL99/43:y6.

When I asked one chief engineer how he would define the good life he answered, "It's the good life to be on vacation at home and to be left in peace [laughs]. To be able to do what you want to do. [---] The other half is not such a good life."[239] Life on board is often described as another life, or a different world. The metaphors in this cluster do not describe shipworld, which is considered so special and so different from life on land that only such all-embracing metaphors can capture its essence. It has been noted that the inability of the landlubber to comprehend shipworld is a deep-rooted belief among sailors: to go to sea is to enter another element that is unpredictable and dangerous, and it takes special skills and knowledge to sail the seas (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 186). Another life and different world are not metaphors as such, but are rather figures of speech. They fall into the eighth category of Katz's (1996, 4-7), in which metaphor is used to clarify or illuminate a concept when literal language fails to do so.

When sailors talk about living at sea they reveal several aspects of and viewpoints on the sailor's life. Life itself is an ambiguous concept in shipworld. First, according to some, ship life is not life at all. As Leena said, "When I go on land I get the urge for living, because here I feel all the time that I'm missing something. It's the urge for living and for having fun and doing crazy little things."[240] She did not feel that she was alive when she was aboard, and when she went ashore she therefore had to take back her lost time, she needed to live. Sailors on windjammers too, upon returning home, sometimes saw their sailing lives with new eyes, and even came to the conclusion that all the years were just an empty hole in their lives (Kirby and Hinkkanen 2000, 215). Why did Leena choose to stay in a place that deprived her of her life? She explained: "I'm here because when I'm off-duty, on vacation, I'm one hundred-percent free. It suits me and my lifestyle very well."[241]

Some metaphors emphasize the abnormality of the sailor's life. In most cases the emphasis is on the characteristics of the total institution that prevail in shipworld. As one captain said, "This is not human life at all. You're just cooped up here all the time, after

[239] HYUL96/17.
[240] HYUL96/7.
[241] HYUL96/7.

all. I wouldn't recommend this way of life to anyone."[242] For this captain the time spent onboard did not meet the minimum requirements of human existence.

Finally, there are metaphors that put emphasis on the two almost totally different worlds that co-exist in sailors' lives, the one at sea and the other at home. They illustrate the fact that shipworld is wholly different, and that partial explanations of life at sea serve no purpose. As one first engineer explained, "Aboard there's a deviant lifestyle, a downright different world."[243] The ship has also been represented as its own world in literature. C. Holmqvist writes about the sudden death of a sailor in his novel *Under Segel*:

> 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. (Citation in Weibust 1969, 166.)

This other life, which exists in shipworld, is different from life 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 or the family – do not meet. As one chief engineer put it: "For me this is another life because it's clearly divided, so the one is at home when I am on vacation and the other one is here."[244]

This distinct division between work and the rest of one's life suits many sailors well, and is often one of the major reasons for pursuing a career at sea. In their worldview life is divided into two halves that do not meet: the land life and ship life, which is the object of this study. Without this clear distinction it would be difficult to examine the freedom discourses of seamen. This distinction is a crucial factor in their worldview. These metaphors reflect the cognitive dimension in Helve's five-dimensional model (1987, 17-18). 'Another life' rhetoric may represent both freedom and its anti-thesis. On the one hand, this other life represents prison, a lack of freedom: as Hans solemnly said, "This is half a good life."[245] On the other hand, some are quite satisfied with the freedom it offers: as Jouko said about land jobs, "I don't know…I'm useless on land and hopeless at sea. I

[242] HYUL00/6:k10.
[243] HYUL99/5:y1.
[244] HYUL99/24:c4.
[245] HYUL96/3.

couldn't even imagine working on land from seven till four, every day. It suits me fine that sometimes you're here and at other times you're free."[246]

Another life, therefore, constitutes freedom for sailors. It is Berlin's negative freedom from the chains of land, and it allows the sailor to be free. This approach goes in hand with what Malinowski (1964, 29) states about freedom arising from the organization of society. A sailor can organize his life in such a manner that for half of the time he is working aboard ship and for the other half he is *100-percent free* and can live the way he likes. To be one hundred percent free is naturally a grand illusion, but the sailor can free himself from some of the wearisome routines of landlubber life.

Living in the graveyard

First mate Lars, with 20 years at sea, talked about different kinds of mess rooms: "There are mess rooms that are like being at a funeral when you come down for breakfast. It doesn't take more than one man to ruin it, and if he's away people chat all right."[247] As he said, it was easy to ruin the mess atmosphere. Social relations, practices and micro-politics permeate the mess on a daily basis: at every breakfast, lunch, dinner and evening snack. Thus all the problems with social relationships on board are easily tracked by the others. This sometimes turns the ship or mess into a *graveyard*, where the atmosphere is *funeral*. Often the informative or evaluative nature of communication may determine whether the speech is ironic or metaphoric. However, the evaluative-informative dichotomy does not always serve as a satisfactory divider of metaphoric and ironic speech. In fact, the communication goals of metaphor and irony often overlap, and the distinction is more a matter of emphasis than of type. (Katz 1996, 3-6.)

The mess room, or mess, is a special area in the deckhouse that is dedicated to eating. The dayroom is often in the same area, forming a larger integrated space for eating and leisure time. As discussed earlier, some newer ships have only one mess for the whole ship, whereas the older ones separate the officers and the workers. The mess is a social space that could be described as *good*, *bad*, or *dead*. Windjammers were also referred to

[246] HYUL96/21.
[247] HYUL96/1.

as brave, friendly, kind, and strong, or selfish, vicious and brutish (Weibust 1969, 451). The term "happy ship" was often used. Although these descriptions mostly applied to the ship as a whole (i.e., its seaworthiness, management and atmosphere), the tradition of today's sailors to call the mess good, bad, poisonous, or dead could be traced back to this convention of the windjammer era.

Mess is a metonymy, or more precisely a synecdoche, where the mess as part of the ship refers to the whole, and even more to the ship's community. According to Chantrill and Mio, metonymy is "a substitution of a term closely associated with the literal term." Their example is 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). The synecdoche is the most familiar form of metonymy, with its literal-to-figurative association of part-to-whole or whole-to-part. To be apt it has to be particularly and prominently related to the intended literal meaning. (Chantrill and Mio 171-1996, 172.) For example, to say that *"*The home cooking that rocks the cradle rules the world" is not successful metonymy, although home cooking and mother could, before the 1960s, be defined as instrumental part-to-whole synecdoche. In this sense, mess represents the whole ship's community. For example, Robert, a cook, 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."[248] Hence the poisonous atmosphere in the mess reflects and refers to the whole ship.

Mate Jouko, with 40 years at sea, compared sea life now to his early sailor years in the following way: "Nowadays it's like walking in a graveyard, you can't find anybody anywhere… everybody has their own gadgetry [TV and VCR] in their cabin, and there they sit and sulk."[249] Seafarers cannot choose their co-workers or the people they live with. Therefore, the only option that is left for them to exercise their freedom of association is to isolate themselves from the others by staying in their own cabins.

These metaphors were often used when the sailors compared life at sea some twenty or more years previously to the present. Back in those days there were many more sailors aboard, and the mess and the other areas of the ship were livelier. The space dimensions

[248] HYUL96/5.
[249] HYUL96/21.

of shipworld are embodied in these graveyard metaphors. A ship is a closed space where there are no outsiders or passers-by promenading around. In addition, as explained in Part III, space is divided hierarchically on board. The fact that there are two mess rooms and highly specialized and individual working hours means that crew members often end up spending their leisure time alone. For example, after my watch from 8 p.m. until midnight I would go and have late snack in the workers' mess, while at the same time the first mate had his sandwich in the officers' mess: I could not go to his mess and he was not always comfortable in going to the workers' mess. We often ate alone.

First engineer Yrjö, talking about his life at sea also referred to the loneliness: "This has changed you see, it's not cozy here anymore. You don't know others anymore, this is like living in an apartment building."[250] In an apartment building people live close to each other, but they do not spend much time together or know each other well. This is an example of a metaphor as a condensed analogy (see Perelman 1979, 92): on ship people no longer know their crew mates because times have changed and they go to their own little cubicles – their cabins – to spend their leisure time and do not socialize with others. People living in apartment buildings do not know their neighbors, as people did in village communities, because times have changed and everyone goes to their own little cubicles – their flats – to spend their leisure time and do not socialize with their neighbors. This rhetoric could be interpreted in the same way as the notions of the funeral and the graveyard. They all refer to the perception that in days of old there was more liveliness in shipworld. Now due to the changes in the maritime industry both the number of crew members and the time in port have been cut to the minimum. Naturally this also has its consequences for the social life aboard. The apartment-building metaphor is thus a kind of negation of the home.

The graveyard and funeral metaphors are strong and negative. It may be difficult to understand why people use such macabre imagery in describing their working and living environments. Yet, metaphors are culturally shared, and as such are open to analysis (Gordon et al. 1995, 6). Therefore it is quite safe to describe the graveyard as silent and dead, with nothing moving. One does not meet anybody there. It is a negative expression, but the narrator can at least move freely around – the expression does not indicate any limitations, only the lack of company and life. There is another use of the graveyard

[250] HYUL99/30:y5.

metaphor in seafaring. In the windjammer era, the middle watch from midnight until 4 a.m. was sometimes referred to as the 'graveyard watch' (see Weibust 1969, 50), and the former seafarer Lane (1986, 63) makes a similar reference in his study on 20th-century shipworld: "this graveyard of a watch…"

"In winter, when there are no visitors on board, you don't see anybody anywhere after eight in the evening. And now they're planning to get televisions for every cell, then you'll see absolutely nobody."[251] This ship's engineer paints a rather gloomy picture of his ship in wintertime. The ship's community has not always been seen in the light of graveyard metaphors. It was livelier in earlier days when the crews were larger and younger, and there were fewer opportunities to relax in one's own cabin (cabin mates, no televisions or VCRs). In fact, graveyard metaphors may well have emerged to describe this shift in shipworld. In Helve's five-dimensional worldview model they reflect the affective dimension involving experiences and feelings. The seamen often longingly recalled the times when no one would have likened the mess to a funeral.

These metaphors are far from those depicting the mythical freedom of sailors discussed earlier: no parties, no booze, and no adventure, nothing that Kalle Aaltonen would have enjoyed. What kind of freedom is this, then? It may be helpful to turn to Joel Feinberg (1973, 12-14), who elaborates on Berlin's work and categorizes the lack of freedom as positive and negative, and refers to internal and external constraints. For example, nobody forbids a seaman from spending his free time with his shipmates, thus there are no external positive constraints on him in terms of being with other sailors. An internal positive constraint would be that he finds his co-workers annoying and thus withdraws from their company, and an internal negative constraint a lack of energy, due to the heavy work schedule. Finally, the lack of shipmates to hang out with would constitute an external negative constraint. As one first mate explained, "I spend my time here alone. I don't go to the mess. Nobody's there."[252] The chief engineer from the same ship said, "I spend my leisure time alone. You don't see anybody here."[253] Therefore the freedom that graveyard metaphors express – together with the 'another life' discourse – is freedom deriving from lifelessness: you do not have to be social, or to be active, or to live a full life.

[251] HYUL99/13:y2.
[252] HYUL99/23:f4.
[253] HYUL99/24:c4.

A cog in the machine

Carrying things like the pilot ladder was sometimes hard on the biceps, and sometimes pulling the ropes was, too. The really tough part for me as an ordinary seaman, however, was doing nothing – standing on the deck just waiting for orders, or standing on the navigation bridge making sure that the officer on duty did not fall asleep. Often when I was standing on the deck for hours, waiting for something to happen, I felt like an extension of a machine, an arm of a giant robot that was controlled from above. Consequently, I wrote in my field journal (1996), "My job is pretty much alright; the good thing is that I don't need to think about anything, the downside is that it is pretty physical and I shouldn't think of anything." I was a cog in the machine.

As discussed in Part III, examining an organization through a metaphor opens up new insights into it (Morgan 1986, 13). Here, however, the perspective is not that of the organization, but that of an individual living in it, although the organization naturally strongly affects the experience. The organizational dimension plays an important role especially in the case of such a rigid structure as shipworld. Work is an essential part of sailors' worldviews and freedom discourses: after all, their work makes them seamen.

"I don't consider this important in the sense that if I'm not here someone else will always do the job … this is an establishment."[254] This is what first engineer Yrjö answered when asked him whether he found his own work meaningful. He was referring to one of the basic features of a mechanistic organization: the parts of the machine – the workers – are interchangeable. A pumpman answered the same question with a touch of irony in his voice: "Well, someone has to take the garbage out."[255] The nature of organizations as machines, as discussed previously, can be detected in this rhetoric. The machine is a root metaphor for expressions such as *industrial plant*, *oil rig*, and *labour camp*. A worker does *production-line work*, being merely *a cog in the machine*, or an *engine*. The worker is part of an organized effective machine, and is not required or encouraged to be innovative. According to one chief engineer, this is how it should be: "Work is never

[254] HYUL99/30:y5.
[255] HYUL00/5:p10.

interesting, it can't be. We're always in trouble when somebody comes here for self-fulfillment. This work is not interesting."[256]

It has been argued that the modern workplace produces apathy, negligence, and a lack of pride (Morgan 1997, 11-31). This is especially the case in mechanistic organizations. Therefore, the lack of pride in one's own work – which is apparent in the words of the pumpman above – could be seen as a result of the mechanistic approach, or as Morgan calls it, it is a byproduct. According to him, mechanistic organizations discourage ambition, and rather encourage workers to obey orders and not to question what they are doing (Morgan 1986, 30). This cluster of metaphors goes hand in hand with Max Weber's (1922, 956-975) theory of organizational structure: the organization is a machine. This is evident in one captain's notion about his crew and the drinking parties he offers them every now and then: "For a month people have been working very hard. The engine has to be greased sometimes as well."[257] According to Morgan, machine metaphors are an inevitable outcome of the mechanistic approach. Metaphors always reflect certain ways of seeing things, and thus in viewing the organization as a rational, technical process, mechanical metaphors tend to underplay the human aspects. The emphasis on the mechanistic view overlooks the fact that the tasks facing organizations are often much more complex, uncertain, and difficult than the tasks performed by machines. (Morgan 1986, 27.)

These metaphors illustrate the feelings that seafarers have when their capabilities are underestimated. They could also reflect the change in maritime traditions. An old second engineer comparing new sailors with those of his era, illustrated this: "These are produced on a conveyor belt, these are machines."[258] The machine as a root metaphor views organizations as mechanical systems and implies that they consist of a chain of mechanically structured interconnected elements and resources (Cornelissen et al 2005, 1559; see also Lakoff 1990). The old engineer was not satisfied with the transition to a more mechanistic organization, and showed his disappointment by complaining that the new generation of sailors were mere machines.

[256] HYUL99/60:c9.
[257] HYUL99/6:k1.
[258] HYUL96/9.

"The ship's like any other workplace. It's an industrial plant moving at sea. I don't see this as a ship. This is an installation that is moved from one place to another."[259] This was the response of a cook steward with approximately 20 years' experience at sea when I asked him to describe his ship. As discussed above, there is a firm foundation for such extensive usage of machine metaphors, and it is not surprising that the machine has become a root metaphor for several others: *the job of a robot, engine,* and *cog*. Furthermore, *factory, production line, power plant,* and *industrial process* are loci for machines and thus descendants of the 'machine' root metaphor. Engine and cog are synecdoches of machine, which in turn is a metaphor for the ship (see Chantrill and Mio 1996, 171-172). In sum, all these metaphors function as reifying rhetoric in the mechanistic approach to the ship's organization.

Machine and factory metaphors emphasize the hierarchical structure of the organization, and the sailor's place in it is to be cog in the machine. Therefore, the 'machine' root metaphor has engendered not only various machine metaphors, but also other metaphors in reaction to it. When an organization does not take into account the mental input of its workers, and thus reduces them to engine parts, the workers perceive the situation as a dictatorship or as slavery. Therefore it is not surprising that Teemu, who worked as a bosun aboard, had this to say about the ship as a workplace: "Everybody knows that it's a total dictatorship onboard, there's no democracy. It's the captain who decides… whether he likes something or not."[260] The emphasis in the hierarchy – which some described as dictatorship and slavery, while others (the captain) chose to refer to it as herding – was mostly on the organization's members. Therefore, most of the metaphors in this cluster are about sailors. Here again, not all of the sayings in this group are metaphors in the strictest sense. For example, dictatorship could be viewed as a well-grounded analytical off-shoot regarding the ship's hierarchy. Then again, dictatorship functions here as a metaphor: it highlights certain aspects of shipworld, forcing other aspects into the background (see Morgan 1986, 13).

What does machine as a root metaphor tell us about the freedom discourse of seamen? Sailors are parts of a machine, interchangeable units. Interchangeability often also leads

[259] HYUL99/15:s3.
[260] HYUL99/27:p4.

to the feeling of being disposable, which in turn breeds contempt and is reflected in the sailors' worldviews. They are part of an international pool of sailors, and could be replaced by seamen from another country if shipping company decided to flag out its ships. One boatswain put this rather bluntly: "This is production-line work this job of mine. It's like a production line where you're on a belt in some industrial plant. The same things over and over again in a different order."[261]

Machine metaphors, at first sight, do not seem to reflect any kind of freedom and mostly emphasize the worker's small and largely helpless role in affecting his environment. Parts of a machine are not supposed to think for themselves but function as part of a greater system, which they do not need to understand. How can anyone be free if they are just a cog in a machine? Being part of a machine may also be liberating, however. The boatswain on the cargo ship on which I was 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, as you do with your dentures at night. He took it out again when he went on vacation. He said he did not need his brain for work so he gave it a rest. You do not have the freedom to be innovative at work, but you are free to let the brain sleep.

In this situation one may be free from oneself, momentarily, free to give oneself to a greater cause. I have experienced this in my own work at sea. As soon as I step on board I can surrender my own will and needs, and become part of the ship's functions. I am to work and to be woken up for work at any hour of a day, to eat when it is the right time: what kind of freedom is that? Patterson argues that the Hellenistic era produced two definitions of freedom: as a triad of personal, sovereignal and civic elements, or outer freedom, and inner freedom on the philosophical and spiritual levels. The former was the freedom of men and women, which had meaning in their social and political lives, while the latter was produced by the elite Greek thinkers and generated the Western philosophy of freedom. (Patterson 1991, 145-146.) The freedom found in letting one's own will go could be viewed as one type of inner freedom. I am not saying that feeling like part of a machine is a spiritual experience, but it may be very liberating.

[261] HYUL99/56:p8.

Such spiritual freedom, however, is criticized by Berlin: although ascetic self-denial may lead to spiritual strength and serenity, it cannot be called increased liberty. He 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." (Berlin 2000, 111, 211.) Thus he strongly opposes the idea that freedom does not manifest itself in real opportunities for one to act upon, and finds it impossible to accept the idea of inner freedom, or freedom that is gained by giving up one's own will.

Grandad's moped or a monster

We climbed down the ladder in the dark. Descending to the ballast tank was not required of a researcher, but when the boatswain offered me the opportunity he made it clear that seamen climbed down into the abyss and cowards stayed in the open air. So there I was, without a flashlight. As we were going down more than twenty meters of vertical ladder in the pitch-dark to the bottom of the tank, all sorts of ideas came into my mind. What if the bosun fainted and his flashlight was lost? Would I find my way back? The ship was more than 200 meters long and I couldn't even see the tip of my nose. Searching for a leak that was more than 15 meters below sea level was a bit nerve-wracking. I was inside a 200-meter monster made out of steel.

Sailors, especially the engine-room gang, often call the ship or shipworld a *car, a space shuttle, Grandad's moped*, or *a freight train.* Chief engineer Hans called his ship a moped: "This is a cozy relaxed old-fashioned moped, the old gang and simple low-tech."[262] He described the ship as an instrument, a tool, that would take us where we wanted to go, and which had to be maintained. This is an extremely technical perspective that underplays the social dimensions of shipworld. By using these kinds of technical metaphors and sayings the engine-room crew was also emphasizing the importance of their role on the ship.

Oil tankers are sometimes referred to in somewhat ironical or dismissive terms as *a canoe, a pail* or *a bus*. This habit is also known in the sea literature. For example,

[262] HYUL99/44:c7.

Mikkelsen (citation 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, as discussed previously, could be defined the following way: humor is only able to emphasize the barrier, and cannot dispel it (see Pollio 1996, 233-251). *Pail, canoe* and *bus* are ironizing rhetoric, for they aim to undermine the ship's prestige. It should be borne in mind, however, that as well as undermining the message, such rhetoric also reifies the metaphor because in using a certain metaphor one sets up a certain schema. Even if the message is criticized, this criticism takes place inside the schema of the metaphor.

Home for some, a machine for others

Sailors employ several discourses when they talk about freedom. Although the two freedom discourses found in the study – the freedom of Kalle Aaltonen and freedom from freedom – were utilized by workers and officers, there were certain differences in emphasis. When the seafarers talked about their work place the workers saw it in terms of slavery and the higher officers as a machine. Neither of these metaphors has positive connotations, but there is a certain disparity in their intensity and emphasis. While the implication in the machine metaphor is that both worker and officer are in the same boat, just cogs in the wheel, slavery metaphors emphasize the distinction between the ranks: the officers are the masters and thus enslave the workers. These metaphors emphasize the helplessness and the inability to influence one's surroundings. One's worldview also includes one's assumptions about society and one's place in it.

The ship's community is also shown in a different light in the discourse of workers and bosses. For workers it tends to have more of a social meaning, such as 'boys' camp' or 'home': 'prison' is used by both parties. Higher officers seem to talk about shipworld in more negative terms that emphasize the loneliness and isolation: 'apartment building', 'funeral' and 'prison'. This reflects the work tasks on the different levels: mates, in particular, are very isolated. There is a shift in emphasis here: boys' camp and home suggest a live community, while funeral and apartment building reflect loneliness. While their worldview stresses the independent hermit-type image of the sailor, seamen often feel lonely in shipworld.

The freedom from freedom discourse discussed in this chapter depicts one kind of freedom – freedom found by letting one's own will go. Paradoxically, stories of working-class Finnish men tell of full personal freedom being achieved when self control and discipline are delegated to other people or life circumstances (Alasuutari 1986, 102). According to Berlin, however, this kind of freedom is not freedom. He defines freedom as the area in which one is free to make an unforced choice – the wider the area the better, even if the individual concerned would be content with a very narrow range of choices. (Berlin 1978, 189-192.) What if one's unforced choice is to give control over one's life to others? This – at times – seemed to be the experience of some sailors.

V Kalle Aaltonen goes to prison - conclusions

We were approaching Helsinki and its historical fortress Suomenlinna from the Gulf of Finland. I was steering. It was pretty neat, the sun was shining and all. The pilot told me just to steer towards a marked point near the oil terminal, and turned to gossip with the captain. I was a bit nervous – this was my first time at the helm of a big oil tanker. For a moment I saw myself making it to the national news: *Oil tanker crashes into the world-famous UNESCO heritage site. The Gulf of Finland is destroyed by spilled oil. The seaman at the helm says she's sorry.*

Like steering an oil tanker for the first time, doing research is also both exhilarating and frightening. When I chose a study subject that was unconventional, especially in the field of comparative religion, I was aware that if I did not steer my vessel carefully, I might run it aground. I took the risk, however, and brought the study safely to port. My aim was to examine the freedom of ordinary people. The scope of this study was limited to the freedom discourses of contemporary Finnish sailors, who – although ordinary people – form a special group of professionals.

I chose the freedom discourses of *sailors* as my subject because, of all groups one can realistically study, sailors seem to carry the emblem of freedom with them. They were the first group in history to form a more free-moving labor force, an occupational group that was able to leave behind the trammels of their land communities. This was the case

especially in Finland, where before the 1950s virtually the only way in which a working-class youngster could see the world was to go to sea. Furthermore, seafaring allowed a hardworking young man of a working-class background to move up the societal ladder more freely than most other occupations. In this final part, I discuss my findings in the light of the aims set out in this work.

Present-day shipworld – a place for work

The ethnography of contemporary Finnish shipworld filled a gap in maritime studies in that it is the first to have been published on this topic. The focus was on the first main research question: what is modern shipworld like. There have been radical changes in recent decades. The rationalization policies that began in the 1980s and that have altered industrial work places so drastically are also evident in shipworld.

The emphasis throughout was on shipworld primarily as a place of work, all activities taking place onboard being subordinate to it. In this sense, this part of the study could also be viewed as an ethnography of work. When I was writing it I was focusing especially on the characteristics that differ from the Finnish culture and the concepts that prevail on land. The emphasis in the discussion on time and space construction in shipworld was therefore on the features that are specific to that life.

The first sub-question concerned the organization of shipworld and its influence on life at sea, and in answering it I concentrated on both the emphasis on work and on the features of ship life that were different from life on land. For example, time in shipworld differs from time on land: the ship works on a 24-hour basis, seven days a week. This affects the time structure because someone has to be working every hour of the day and there are no rest days onboard. Because the organization of time is hierarchical, it does not affect all members of the crew equally. Moreover, weeks and months are not functional units of time: time revolves around the work period – the period of time one works aboard. In the shipping company under study the work periods usually lasted between three and six weeks, sometimes longer. Space is also divided hierarchically on a ship: one's cabin, one's place in the seating order in the mess room, and the locker are all defined according to the work position. The hierarchical structure of the ship's community also affects the

space that is available to people on different levels: laborers are not allowed to spend time in the officers' mess, while the captain – although officially granted with access everywhere – may not be welcomed in the workers' mess.

This led to the question of hierarchy in shipworld. The hierarchical structure and the organization are mechanistic: everything is organized in a standardized, interchangeable and predictable manner. This means that, ideally, any seaman doing any particular job can be switched to another ship in any minute. In theory this applies not only within a particular shipping company but also globally: a seaman is part of an international pool of sailors that, according to the mechanistic organization theory behind it, is totally interchangeable. Another characteristic of shipworld is that the captain is perceived to hold the ultimate power on board. Given the nature of the mechanistic organization and the seafaring tradition, this power is both criticized and embraced by the crew.

The nature of shipworld led me to view it as an institution. The ocean surround it and the above-mentioned time and work structure make the ship a closed community. Today, the increasingly stringent safety measures in ports also strengthen the isolation of the ship's community. All this gives shipworld some characteristics of the total institution, although it is not intended as such. All these perspectives – time, space, hierarchy, closed community, total institution – made it evident that shipworld was organized around work.

The tradition of calling a seaman by his job title also emphasizes the focus on work in shipworld. Few sales managers are only called 'Sales manager' to their face, but often the only name a boatswain hears himself called during his entire work period is 'Boatswain'. Being a boatswain also determines the places that are allowed to him, as well as his working hours and the jobs he has to do. This ultimately affects his identity and his view of the world, because shipworld's hierarchical structure permeates every area of the ship's community. The sailor discourses reflect seamen's views of their position on the ship, and also in society at large.

The second research question concerned the gender structure. It is clear: the ship is a world of men. Seafaring has been one of the most exclusively male-dominated

occupations for centuries, and shipworld has therefore developed into a homosocial kingdom of sea*men* exhibiting super masculinity in various ways. Thus studying sailors' views of the world necessarily means studying masculinities. In addition to the mythical sea*man*, however, seamen's masculinity – in general – draws from the seaman's culture and the glorious past of the profession. This ethos is captured in the popular saying among sailors: Seaman is a real man (*Merimies on erimies*). It suggests that also seaman masculinity has to be gained.

Women have been working in international seafaring for a half a century, but they still face salty attitudes regarding their gender and are held back by the glass-ceiling effect. Moreover, gendered language reflects and reinforces the 'still life' of homosocial shipworld. Women – regardless of their age, experience or rank in the hierarchy – are called 'girls'. Moreover, the only change in job titles due to the number of women working at sea has been in the jargon and in the lowest level of hierarchy: while cook's assistants were previously called *Messikalle*, Mess Charlie, their name is now *Messilikka*, Mess girl. The heterosexual matrix in shipworld forces women into certain positions and jobs, thus making the career progression of 'weak' women to positions that demand 'strong' – mental or physical – male characteristics quite difficult.

This heterosexual matrix also reinforces the assumed gender differences. Thus even if we know that gender is, by and large, a construction, we are nonetheless likely to succumb to its rule. One perspective to the dominantly masculine shipworld is female masculinity which suggests that masculinity is not a property of male bodies alone. As another reaction to it, many women cope by downplaying their gender on board. They may see themselves as genderless beings who turn back into women when they walk down the gangway on vacation.

The challenges of the field

The data for this work consisted of nearly 100 interviews conducted during the past ten years. I also carried out fieldwork in two stages, first as an ordinary seaman and later as a researcher employed by the shipping company. Because the fact that I was a professional

seaman – and I worked in one of the ships' communities under study – necessarily had an impact on this research, a further methodological goal was to contribute to the discussion on fieldwork.

Inside or Outside, Seaman or Researcher

When I was working on the oil tanker Lonna as an ordinary seaman I was, by definition, an insider. I was a necessary part of the ship's functions, a sailor among sailors. Therefore, carrying out fieldwork as a seaman in a closed professional community raised the question of the fieldworker's position in the field. My position in the field not only raised the issue of involvement and detachment, and of viewing the researcher as a tool for qualitative study: being a seaman, I was also one of the research subjects. Therefore another methodological goal in this work was to discuss the question of being an insider/outsider when one is committed to the field and a vital part of it. As a company researcher, however, my position was radically different: I was no longer a necessary part of the shipworld functions, but I was still a seaman. Thus self-positioning – seaman or researcher, or both – was sometimes a challenging task.

This issue is closely linked to the question of Othering in the field. There are several insider views and several outsider views and, accordingly, there are several ways of seeing the fieldworker as an insider and several ways of seeing her as an outsider. The ideal of finding one's own island to study is long gone, and anthropologists have turned to the local, and to the study of their native cultures. Shipworld, however, has complex relationships with both the local and the nativeness: its locality may be confined to a particular ship, or it may spread to the whole world. Is it a study of a local Finnish culture when Finnish sailors roam the seven seas and enjoy the port towns of Latvia or China? The question of nativeness is also problematic: sailors are not born in the ship's community, but choose that career (usually) in their early years of adulthood. Yet they spend most of their lives at sea. Accordingly, I discussed the methodological questions of being an outsider or an insider, being native or not, and trying to gain access to a group or being undeniably a part of it.

A female researcher in a male-dominated community

Shipworld with its homosociality and professed heterosexuality offers a fascinating context in which to study men. The international cargo trade in particular has been one of the most male-dominated work places for centuries. Doing fieldwork as a young female researcher in one of the most male-dominated work places raised the issue of gender in fieldwork: sometimes the mere presence of a female stirred up the ship's community. A further methodological goal was to discuss how the gender of the researcher affects the fieldwork in a strongly male-dominated research setting. She may be a welcomed novelty in a shipworld that is filled with daily routines, but she is also a threat. If masculinity is understood as something that has to be achieved, women onboard may – depending on their position – either threaten or reinforce the masculine ideal of the seaman. If a woman is on board as a researcher she may very well boost the heterosexual matrix: she is merely asking as an outsider how the men live their lives at sea. Here the dualism of passive/active or spectator/doer reinforces the dichotomy between feminine and masculine.

The situation is different, however, if the female researcher is working on board as a seaman. Then the dichotomy is challenged and the heterosexual matrix (women's weakness and faint-heartedness and men's strength and bravery) is threatened. If a woman copes with the roughness of deckhand work, it challenges the tough masculinity associated with that job. Indeed, if she succeeds, does it mean that *anyone* can do it? The vision of gender equality in seafaring occupations may decrease the prestige of the seaman's job for men.

Freedom discourses

Another main research question focused on the freedom discourses of contemporary Finnish seafarers. The data was analyzed in the ethnographical context of shipworld and the theoretical subtext was provided by worldview theory. Comparative religion has a long tradition of studying the values and worldviews of occupational groups. This study continued that tradition by examining the freedom discourses of seafarers in this context. Because worldview includes values it provided a meaningful theoretical framework for the study. A person's worldview is the framework through which he or she interprets the

world and interacts in it. Worldview theories – and especially the models – have been criticized in recent decades, however. In light of the criticism, the different perspectives on worldviews were scrutinized in order to provide a theoretical context for freedom discourses without forcing the findings into any pre-existent model. Furthermore, the analysis of the freedom discourses of seamen arose from the data, not from a theory or model created by former scholars.

The first sub-question concerned the general types of freedom discourse. Discourse faithfully reflects the worldview because it is the medium for recalling events and expressing thoughts. Metaphors also allow us to examine and discuss 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's community can be characterized by means of metaphors that seem to contradict each other – like 'kindergarten' and 'prison'. While language reflects the world, it also makes meanings and thereby organizes and constructs, renews and alters the social reality in which we live.

The second sub-question regarding the expression of freedom discourses focused on rhetoric and metaphor. Rhetoric is a fundamental part of all language in use. The new rhetoric – or the theory of argumentation – is concerned with discourses addressed to all kinds of audiences, including arguments that are addressed privately to oneself. Metaphors that are part of rhetoric share several characteristics: in both the choice of linguistic form is not entirely arbitrary, yet it is formed from a pool of possibilities. Metaphor works like the lens of a camera: it helps us to focus on part of the picture and to see it clearly, but consequently it blurs the rest of the view. It highlights certain interpretations and tends to force others into the background. It was used as a working term and as representative of all forms of figurative language.

The third sub-question – concerning how contemporary sailors utilize the stereotypes of freedom that are attached to them – was also discussed throughout the work. It was shown that while some deny the stereotypical image of the free-roving Jack Tar, insisting that it is a skewed image of their profession, others gladly piggyback onto it. They use it as a mirror reflecting who they are, who they could be, and who they do not want to be. In using this mirror image they simultaneously polish it: their perspective on the

stereotype reshapes it and the reflection they see. Therefore, when seamen utilize, deny and reflect the stereotypical mythical image of the sailor's freedom, they are also constructing that image.

Kalle Aaltonen discourse

I called the first freedom discourse the seafarers constructed *Kalle Aaltonen* (Jack Tar in Anglo-Saxon culture) after a famous Finnish "sailor song" in which Kalle Aaltonen brags about his life at sea. This discourse is close to the stereotypical idea of the sailor's freedom as adventure and independence from society, religion and other institutions, and in terms of taking liberties with the opposite sex and alcohol. It could also be called 'freedom from shackles' if we ignore the possible resultant restraint of the excessive use of intoxicants, for example.

This discourse reflects the freedom attached to the stereotypical sailor image. It is a point well-made in many maritime studies that this stereotypical image is skewed. This work went further, however, in suggesting that modern seafarers nevertheless utilize the stereotypical image of sailors' freedom. Although I tried to avoid mystifying, barbarizing and romanticizing the research topic, the study subjects themselves often did so wholeheartedly.

This is worth bearing in mind in the context of the Kalle Aaltonen discourse, which features several elements that are familiar from "sailors' songs" and naval literature – a longing for faraway places, independence, romance, heavy drinking, the power of the ocean, rootlessness, and adventure. Often these elements intertwine. For example, adventure, longing for faraway places and journey metaphors form a whole that is an essential part of the Kalle Aaltonen freedom discourse. The peripherical locus of the sailor and his image of independency and rootlessness were also found to be fundamental building blocks of this discourse: the seafarer is not part of society in the same way as landlubbers are.

Super masculinity is another essential element in Kalle Aaltonen discourse – the discourse of the Seaman is a real man, and the idea that sailors are 'a race apart'. Thus the

seaman's identity was analyzed in its various contexts – in relationships with other people, with shipmates and with shipworld. This discourse constructs super masculinity in various ways, one of which is the sailor's traditional, mythical and real relationship with women and romance. He is quite a womanizer, for in every port there is a girl waiting for him. Likewise, the seafarer's relationship with alcohol and smuggling is an essential element of the Kalle Aaltonen freedom discourse: freedom to drink whenever and as much as one wants. This, however, is far from the truth in today's seafaring due to the strict legislation and the alcohol policies of the shipping companies. Nevertheless, the discourse lives on in the sailor's culture, reinforcing his super masculinity.

Religion is usually beyond open discussion in shipworld, and the general discourse is in line with the common name for the church: *Piruntorjuntajoukot*, The Devil Fighting Unit. It was also suggested that the general secularization of society started at sea. Sailors often attach spiritual meanings to the sea, however: they call it a curse, home or their beloved. There is thus leeway for bruto-romantics in the construction of super masculinity.

This freedom discourse is a combination of the ideal sailor's life in the windjammer era and the glorious past the speaker has lived but which is now gone. It is nostalgic and the freedom it manifests is mostly in the past. Interestingly, if the seaman in question had sailed in the 1950s and had experienced that life, the nostalgic past of the free-roving Kalle Aaltonen was located in that era, while if he first started to sail in the 1970s, that is where his nostalgia originated. Similarly, the focus of freedom for a sailor in his thirties is thus in the 1990s, in the last decade of the freedom at sea. Thus, the Kalle Aaltonen freedom discourse is always nostalgic and always in the past, yet has always been experienced by the speaker.

'Freedom from freedom' discourse

The ship's engineer Yrjö rolled his own cigarette, contemplating the question about his workplace. Then he said, "The sailor doesn't care where he's working, as long as he gets his pay and his vacation, he doesn't care, the sailor does his work."[263] With this statement

[263] HYUL99/30:y5.

Yrjö manifested one element in sailors' conceptions of freedom: not to care. This second type of freedom discourse was named 'freedom from freedom'. As a cluster it was not as obvious as the first one because it did not tap into the well-known stereotype of the free-roving Jack Tar. It used as its building blocks the isolation of the ocean trade, the time structure, and the factory-like organization, and social restrictions of shipworld discussed in the ethnography.

Although today's seafarers live in a different world, and in a different shipworld, than their predecessors, their discourse often manifests the rootless independency that derives from not caring or bothering about things. This attitude also shows in Tommi's view of his place in society: "I guess I'm part of society, I bring crude oil to the country." When I asked if it was meaningful to him, he answered, "Listen, Mira, if I was to deliver cow shit and someone paid me to do it, I'd deliver cow shit. I don't give a damn, if I get paid I don't give a damn."[264] A sailor, although in many ways not free, is free not to concern himself with things. Freedom from freedom, the other main group of freedom discourses, concerns this type of manifestation: the concepts of freedom that arise from institutionalization, isolation, lifelessness, and the machine-like environment.

Freedom cannot exist without its anti-thesis. In shipworld, this anti-thesis is prison. Freedom-from-freedom discourse exemplifies this tension: prison was often referred to in the context of life at sea. Seafarers frequently compared the ship with prison: it was a significant factor in their freedom discourse. For example, institutionalization as an expression of freedom echoes the notion of not having to be responsible for one's own actions, or for taking control over one's own life, because one is not free to do what one would like to do. Consequently, shipworld could also be a home in which one does not have to lead the life of an adult: the ship is a kindergarten or a boys' camp. Another feature of this discourse is the reference to isolation, which emphasizes the remoteness and loneliness of life at sea. Although this narrows down the choices available, for some it is freedom; they like the fact that the ship's community is small and restricted because it allows them to be themselves.

Yet another aspect of the freedom-prison dichotomy depicted life at sea as not life at all, or at least as very different from life on land. Because seafarers live their lives in two

[264] HYUL05.

places, at sea and on land, they often view themselves as living two lives that never meet – their working life and their life on vacation. Some, on the other hand, feel that they have only half-a-life, life on land, and that their time spent onboard does not even count as living. At the extreme, they likened the ship to a graveyard. Finally, life at sea was depicted as being part of the machinery. This was also an expression of freedom for some in that one gives the authority over one's life to the ship's functions, or more precisely to those who are making the decisions regarding its functions. The idea of being a cog in a wheel could also be seen in terms of constructing one kind of super masculinity.

Given these philosophical considerations, it should also be kept in mind that the setting for these freedom conceptions was not only a theoretical construction, it was an oil tanker that sailed the Baltic and the North Sea. Thus it is not insignificant if the crew members of a large oil tanker view themselves as living in boys' camp or a kindergarten, and if their supervisors perceive them as babies or mites.

Besides giving the freedom not to give a toss about anything, this discourse also, in rhetorical terms denies people their freedom, and in so doing absolves them from responsibility and from themselves. While there is also freedom from responsibility in the Kalle Aaltonen discourse, here it is found in the form of giving up one's power to others. Freedom from responsibility means that one is not answerable for one's actions or the decisions one makes. Freedom from the self, in simple terms, means that an individual has an opportunity to dismiss, at least for a moment, her or his own will. This kind of freedom is not freedom as Berlin sees it. For him the only acceptable freedom is such that one is free to make an unforced choice, and it does not matter if the individual would be happy with a very narrow range of choices or with no choice at all. Nevertheless, freedom from responsibility and the self both play a role in all of the four manifestations of freedom from freedom discussed above. Again, the freedom conceptions of seafarers do not meet the 'requirements' of freedom established by philosophers.

Final remarks

This study extended the field in two ways. It is the first ethnography that has been written on modern Finnish ships' communities, and in continuing the discussion on shipworld it brings it into the contemporary era. At the same time as this work has filled a gap in

maritime studies, the current seafaring policies in Finland are creating new demands for maritime research. For example, the college-level education of seafarers, although it began already in the late 1990s, had no impact on those interviewed for this study. It might be interesting to consider the effect of such education on the sailor's identity.

A more burning issue, however, is the current tendency to hire multinational crews for previously all-Finnish ships. This has been going on for decades in other seafaring nations, but Finland has been an exception. Therefore this study also provides a porthole on a moment in seafaring industry that is quite unique and may soon become historical. This change from crews relatively homogenous to multinational and multicultural crews will generate the need for more research – at least if maritime studies are seen to concern living seafarers and floating ships, and not only dead sailors and sunken hulls.

In addition to being the first ethnography of contemporary Finnish shipworld, this is also the first study focusing on the freedom discourses of sailors. Therefore it extends the study of freedom, which has usually being approached through philosophy and political science, to concern ordinary people and to develop an anthropology of freedom. It was found that the freedom conceptions of sailors were far from the theoretical constructions hypothesized by most philosophers. In this sense, the freedom of ordinary people does not seem to meet the "requirements" of scholars. Both types of freedom discourse – Freedom from shackles aka Kalle Aaltonen and Freedom from freedom – are essentially about freedom from responsibility. As far as seafarers are concerned, freedom often pairs up with irresponsibility and carelessness. Sometimes, however, the pair is the absence of the self. These findings call for anthropological studies on the freedom constructions of ordinary people. Although this work extended the field of freedom studies, it is evident that not everything has been said about the freedom of ordinary people. More groups should be studied, and in particular the blind spot between organizations, people and freedom ought to be scrutinized in more detail.

It was found that the sailors made a use of the old stereotypical image of the free-roving seafarer, even though they well knew that it was not based on reality: they still constructed their own freedom discourses around it. The 'freedom from freedom', which is a negation of the stereotypical image, was also constructed around it. Thus it was also

shown that, as much as maritime researchers are eager to dismiss the Kalle Aaltonen stereotype as untruthful, it nevertheless is utilized by sailors.

It was found that the freedom conceptions of sailors were often bound to the context, and also to their dreams. Therefore freedom manifests itself in different ways at different times and in different situations. It was also established that it needs its anti-thesis, without which it cannot really exist. Another element of surprise was to find freedom in places that do not usually belong to that realm. For example, it was found in the sailor discourse in references to lifelessness and to being part of a machine. It was also found that conceptions of freedom were nostalgic. Nostalgia, in fact, was one of the defining elements of the discourses the sailors used. Freedom is never quite here for them: it is always right behind the corner, in yesteryear.

VI Bibliography

Primary sources

Interviews

Interviews 1996:

HYUL96/ 1
HYUL96/ 2
HYUL96/ 3
…
HYUL 96/ 21

Total 21 interviews.

Interviews 1999:
HYUL99/1
HYUL99/2
HYUL99/3
…
HYUL99/63

Total 63 interviews.

Interviews 2000:
HYUL00/1
HYUL00/2
HYUL00/3
…
HYUL00/7

Total 7 interviews.

Interview 2005:
HYUL05

Field journals

Year 1996
Year 1999
Year 2000

Correspondence with seafarers under study, years 1999-2006

Other sources

Dagens Nyheter. August 13, 1995.

Helsingin Sanomat. January 18, 2000, D1.

Literature

Abrahamsen, Bente (2004). Career development and masculinities among male nurses. *Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*. Vol. 12, 2004. Taylor&Francis. 31-39.

Alasoini, Tuomo (1990). *Tuotannolliset rationalisoinnit ja teollisuuden työvoiman käyttötapojen muutos*. Helsinki: Työministeriö.

Alasuutari, Pertti (1986). *Työmiehen elämäntarina ja alkoholismi*. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto.

Alasuutari, Pertti (1989). *Erinomaista, rakas Watson: Johdatus yhteiskuntatutkimukseen*. Helsinki: Hanki ja jää.

Alasuutari, Pertti (1994). *Laadullinen tutkimus*. Jyväskylä: Vastapaino.

Amit, Vered (2000). Introduction. *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: Routldege.

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. *Hidden society by Vilhelm Aubert*. USA: The Bedminster Press. 259-287.

Barton, Ben F., and Marthalee S. Barton (1993). "Modes of Power in Technical and Professional Visuals." *JBTC* 7.1, 1993. 138-162.

Benokraitis, Nijole V. (1997). Sex Discrimination in the 21st Century. *Subtle Sexism: Current practice and prospects for change*. USA: Sage Publications. 5-30.

Bergholm, Tapio (1996). *Halpatyövoimasta hyvinvointiin. Suomen merimiesten ammattiyhdistystoiminta 1916-1996*. Turenki: Suomen Merimies-Unioni.

Berlin, Isaiah (1978). *Concepts & Categories*. *Philosophical Essays*. Ed. Henry Hardy. London: The Hogarth Press.

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 & Holm Nils G. (1996). World View and Personality. *World Views in Modern Society*. Eds. Nils G. Holm and Kaj Björkqvist. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University. 14-28.

Black, Clinton (1989). *The History of Jamaica*. San Juan: Longman Caribbean.

Brown, Keith and Theodossopoulos, Dimitrios (2004). Others' Others: Talking about stereotypes and constructions of otherness in Southeast Europe. *History and Anthropology*, Vol. 15, No.1, March 2004. UK: Routledge. 3-14.

Bruun, Jaap (2002). ”Kapteeni on Jumalasta seuraava.” *Nautica Fennica 2001-2002*. Vammala: Museovirasto. 20-28.

Bunzl, Matti (2004). Boas, Foucault, and the "Native Anthropologist": Notes toward a Neo-Boasian Anthropology. *American Anthropologist*. Volume 106, September 2004. University of California Press. 435-442.

Burke, Kenneth (1969 [1945]). *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burke, Kenneth (1950). *A Rhetoric of Motives*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Burke, Kenneth (1966). *Language as Symbolic Action*. USA: University of California Press.

Burke, Peter (1992). *History & Social Theory*. UK: Cornell University Press.

Butler, Judith (1999 [1990]). *Gender Trouble*. Second edition. USA: Routledge.

Caputo, Virginia (2000). At ‘home’ and ‘away’. *Constructing the Field*. Ed. Vered Amit. UK: Routledge. 19-30.

Carrithers, Michael (2005). Why anthropologists should study rhetoric. *Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute*. Vol. 11, September 2005. 577-583.

Chantrill, Patricia A. and Mio, Jeffery Scott (1996). Metonymy in Political Discourse. *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*. Eds. Jeffery Scott Mio and Albert N. Katz. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 171-183.

Cochran, Hamilton (1973). *Karibian kaapparit ja merirosvot*. Helsinki: Uusi Kirjakerho.

Connell, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities*. UK: University of California Press.

Connell, R.W. (2005). Change among the Gatekeepers: Men, Masculinities, and Gender Equality in the Global Arena. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. Vol. 30, Spring 2005. The University of Chicago. 1801-1825.

Cordinlgy, David (2001). *Women Sailors and Sailors' Women*. USA: Random House New York.

Cornelissen, Joep, Kafouros, Mario and Lock, Andrew (2005). Metaphorical images of organization. *Human Relations*. Vol 58. December 2005. London: SAGE Publications. 1545-1578.

Cralley, Elizabeth and Ruscher, Janet (2005). LADY, GIRL, FEMALE, OR WOMAN. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. Vol. 24, September 2005. USA: SAGE Publications. 300-314.

Creighton, Margaret S. and Norling, Lisa (1996). Introduction. *Iron Men, Wooden Women – Gender and Seafaring in the Atlantic World, 1700-1920*. USA: The John Hopkins University Press. vii-xiii.

De Beauvoir, Simone (1949). *The Second Sex*. Translated by H.M. Parshely. UK: Picador Classics.

Deetz, Stanley A. (1992). *Democracy in an Age of Corporate Colonization*. USA: State University of New York Press.

Du Rietz, Peter (2001). *Isolde av Singapore. På Världsomsegling med bilar i lasten*. Borås: Sjöhistoriska Museet.

Dugaw, Dianne (1996) Female Sailors Bold – Transvestite Heroines and the Markers of Gender and Class. *Iron Men, Wooden Women – Gender and Seafaring in the Atlantic World, 1700-1920*. USA: The John Hopkins University Press. 34-54.

Eastwick, Robert W. (1891). *A Master Mariner. Being the Life and Adventurers of Captain Robert Eastwick*. (Ed. H. Compton). London: T. Fisher Unwin Adelphi Terrace.

Ehrnrooth, Jari (1990). Intuitio ja analyysi. *Kvalitatiivisen aineiston analyysi ja tulkinta.* Ed. Klaus Mäkelä. Saarijärvi: Gaudeamus. 30-41.

Epstein, Debbie (1997). Keeping them in their place. *Sexual Harassment – Contemporary Feminist Perspectives*. Eds. Alison Thomas and Celia Kitzinger. UK: Open University Press. 154-171.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland (2001). *Small Places, Large Issues*. England: Pluto Press.

Ersson, Boris, Hult, Eva and Skogman, Olle (1994). *Smuggling – Berättelser om lurendreji och varusmuggling*. Borås: Sjöhistoriska museet.

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. *Nautica Fennica 1993*. Helsinki: The Finnish Association for Maritime History. 34-38.

Feinberg, Joel (1973). *Social Philosophy*. USA: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Fischer, Lewis and Nordvik, Helge (1988). Finländare i den kanadensiska handelsflottan. *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland* 3. 1988. Ekenäs Tryckeri. 373-394.

Fiske, John (1992). *Merkkien kieli*. Jyväskylä: Vastapaino.

Foucault, Michel (1984). The means of correct training. *Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rabinow. UK: Penguin Books. 188-205.

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. *Subtle Sexism: Current practice and prospects for change*. USA: Sage Publications. 117-134.

Geertz, Clifford (1968). Ethos, world-view and the analysis of sacred symbols. *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.

Gerstenberger, Heide and Welke, Ulrich (2004). *Arbeit auf See. Zur Ökonomie un Ethnologie der Globalisierung*. Germany: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Gibbs, R. (1987). Mutual knowledge and the psychology of conversational inference. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11. 561-581.

Goffman, Erving (1956). The nature of deference and demeanor. *Amercan Anthropologist*. Manesha: Wisconsin.

Goffman, Erving (1961). *Asylums*. USA: Aldine Publishing Company.

Gorman, Elizabeth (2005). Gender Stereotypes, Same-Gender Preferences, and Organizational Variation in the Hiring of Women. *American Sociological Review*. Volume 70, August 2005. USA: ASA. 702-728.

Gordon, Tuula, et al. (1995). "Koulu on kuin..." Metaforat fyysisen koulun analysoinnin välineinä. *Nuoristotutkimus* 3-1995 Vol 13. Helsinki: Allianssi ry. 3-12.

Gothóni, René (1993). *Paradise within Reach: Monasticism and Pilgrimage on Mt Athos*. Helsinki : Helsinki University Press.

Gothóni, René (1997). Eläytyminen ja etääntyminen kenttätutkimuksessa. *Kaukaa haettua*. Ed. Anna Maria Viljanen ja Minna Lahti. Vammala: Suomen Antropologinen Seura. 136-148.

Gothóni, René (2000). *Attitudes and Interpretations in Comparative Religion*. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

Gothóni, René (2005). Understanding the Other. *How to do Comparative Religion?* Ed. René Gothóni. Germany: Walter de Gruyter. 99-126.

Granholm, Kennet (2005). *Embracing the Dark. The Magic Order of Dragon Rouge*. Saarijärvi: Åbo Akademi University Press.

Grigsby, Mary (1998). Sailormoon: Manga (Comics) and Anime (Cartoon) Superheroine Meets Barbie. *Journal of Popular Culture*. Vol. 32.1. Summer 1998. USA: Bowling Green State University. 59-79.

Gross, Rita M. (2005). Methodology – Tool or Trap? *How to do Comparative Religion?* Ed. René Gothóni. Germany: Walter de Gruyter. 149-166.

Grönfors, Martti (1982). *Kvalitatiiviset kenttätyömenetelmät*. Juva: WSOY.

Gurney, Joan Neff (1991). Female Researchers in Male Settings. *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. *The Legacy of Kenneth Burke*. Eds. Herbert W. Simons & Trevor Melia. USA: University of Wisconsin Press. 28-50.

Halberstam, Judith (1998). *Female Masculinity*. USA: Duke University Press.

Harris, Richard J. and Firestone, Juanita M. (1997). Subtle Sexism in the U.S. Military. *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.

Heikell, Thomas (2004). Miesten kesken ja perheen parissa – merimies isänä. *Isäkirja*. Eds. Aalto, Ilana and Kolehmainen, Jani. Tampere: Vastapaino. 293-312.

Helander, Eila (1986). *To Change and To Preserve.* Helsinki: Missiologian ja ekumeniikan seura.

Heikkilä, Tuomas (2000). Alexander Cannelin – Suomenkielisen merenkulkuopetuksen tuntematon uranuurtaja. *Keulakuvia ja peränpitäjiä*. Eds. Riitta Oittinen and Marjatta Rahikainen. Vammala: Suomen Historiallinen Seura. 21-38.

Helve, Helena (1987). *Nuorten maailmankuva*. Helsinki: Helsingin Yliopisto Uskontotieteen jaoston toimitteita 4. Diss.

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 (Ed.) (1997). *Arvot, maailmankuvat, sukupuoli*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.

Helve, Helena (2002). *Arvot, muutos ja nuoret*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.

Hembram, P.C. (2001). *Santhal Religion*. UK: Mittal Publications.

Herndorn, Ryth Wallis (1996). Domestic cost of seafaring. *Iron Men, Wooden Women – Gender and Seafaring in the Atlantic World, 1700-1920.* 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 (1988). ”En sjöman älskar havets våg”. *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland.* 3/1988. Helsinfors: Historiska föreningen. 439-464.

Hinkkanen, Merja-Liisa (1994). Kun koti tuli satamaan. Suomalaisten merimiesten yhteydet kotimaahan Englannin satamista 1800-luvun loppupuolella. *Meren Kansaa*. Loviisa: Kymenlaakson maakuntamuseo. 57-66.

Hirsjärvi, Sirkka and Hurme, Helena (2001). *Tutkimushaastattelu. Teemahaastattelun teoria ja käytäntö.* Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.

Hjelm, Titus (2005). *Saatananpalvonta, media ja suomalainen yhteiskunta*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. Diss.

Holm, Nils G (1996). Introduction. *World views in modern society: Empirical studies on the relationship between world view, culture, personality and upbringing*. Eds. Nils G. Holm and Kaj Björkqvist. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University. 1-9.

Hope, Ronald (2001). *Poor Jack. The perilous history of the merchant seaman*. London: Chatham Publishing.

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. *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.

Jokinen, Arja (1999). Diskurssianalyysin suhde sukulaistraditioihin. *Diskurssianalyysi liikkeessä*. Eds. Jokinen, Arja, Juhila, Kirsi and Suoninen, Eero. Tampere: Vastapaino. 37-53.

Jokinen, Arja, et al. (1993). Johdanto. *Diskurssianalyysin aakkoset*. Eds. Jokinen, Arja, Juhila, Kirsi and Suoninen, Eero. Tampere: Vastapaino. 9-14.

Jokinen, Arto (2003). Miten miestä merkitään? *Yhdestä puusta – maskuliinisuuksien rakentuminen populaarikulttuureissa*. Ed. Arto Jokinen. Tampere: Tampere University Press. 7-31.

Kaijser, Ingrid (1997). Sjömannens yrke – ur hustruns perspektiv. *Sjömannen*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi. 36-48.

Kaijser, Ingrid (2005). *Kvinnliga sjömän – finns dom*? Sweden: Statens Maritima Museer.

Karjalainen, Mira (2002). A Ship of Men. *Styles and Positions: ethnographic perspectives in comparative religion*. Eds. Heikki Pesonen, Tuula Sakaranaho, Tom Sjöblom and Terhi Utriainen. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. 290-311.

Karjalainen Mira (2004). *Prisoners of Freedom*. E-thesis: University of Helsinki. Licentiate. Diss.

Katz, Albert N. (1996). On Interpreting Statements as Metaphor or Irony. *Metaphor: Implications and Applications.* Eds. Jeffery Scott Mio and Albert N. Katz. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 1-21.

Kaukiainen, Yrjö (1988). Från Jungman Jansson till Kalle Aaltonen. *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland*. 3/1988. Helsinfors: Historiska föreningen. 345-372.

Kaukiainen, Yrjö (1993). *The History of Finnish Shipping*. UK: Routledge.

Kaukiainen, Yrjö (1994). Viisi vuotta maston edessä: Huomioita merenkulun työntekijöiden oloista Suomessa ja muualla. *Meren Kansaa*. Loviisa: Kymenlaakson maakuntamuseo. 69-77.

Kaukiainen, Yrjö (1997). Finnish Sailors, 1750-1870. *Those Emblems from Hell*. Eds. Van Royen, Paul, Bruijn, Jaap and Lucassen, Jan. Canada: International Maritime Economic History Association. 211-232.

Kaukiainen, Yrjö (1998). *Laiva Toivo, Oulu*. Jyväskylä: SKS.

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. *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*. Eds. Jeffery Scott Mio and Albert N. Katz. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 215-228.

Ketola, Kimmo (1997). Maailmankuvat ja niiden tutkimus: kognitiivinen lähestymistapa. *Arvot, maailmankuvat, suokupuoli*. Ed. Helena Helve. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. 8-13.

Kilpeläinen, Hannu (2000). *Valamo – karjalaisten luostari? Luostarin ja yhteiskunnan interaktio maailmansotien välisenä aikana*. Helsinki: SKS. Diss.

Kirby, David and Hinkkanen, Merja-Liisa (2000). *The Baltic and the North Seas*. USA: Routledge.

Knowles, Caroline (2000). Here and there. *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*. Eds.Don Kulick and Margaret Willson. UK: Routledge.

Kuusi, Matti (1977). Yksilötutkimus ja maailman metaforat. *Maailmankuvan muutos tutkimuskohteena.* Eds. Matti Kuusi, Risto Alapuro and Matti Klinge. Keuruu: Otava. 220-243.

Lahelma, Elina (2005). Finding communalities, making differences, performing masculinities. *Gender and Education*. Vol. 17, August 2005. Routledge. 305-317.

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., et al. (1992). *Työn kuormittavuus lastialuksella*. Helsinki: Työministeriö. Työpoliittinen tutkimus n:o25.

Laine, M, et al. (1999). *Merenkulkijoiden terveys, työ- ja tomintakyky*. Merialan työkykyhanke. Turku: Turun aluetyöterveyslaitos.

Lakoff, George (1990). The Invariance Hypothesis: Is Abstract Reason Based on Image-Schemas? *Cognitive Linguistics*. 1, 1. 39.74.

Lakoff, George and Johnson, Mark (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. USA: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George and Johnson, Mark (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh. The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought.* New York: Basic Books.

Lane, Tony (1986). *Gray dawn breaking. British merchant seafarers in the late twentieth century.* Oxford: Manchester University Press.

Lederman, Rena (1990). Pretexts for Ethnography: *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.

Lybeck, Jari (2000). “Nyrkki on lyhennetty merilaki”. *Keulakuvia ja peränpitäjiä*. Eds. Riitta Oittinen and Marjatta Rahikainen. Vammala: Suomen Historiallinen Seura. 39-61.

Malinowski, Bronislaw (1964). *Freedom and Civilization*. USA: Indiana University Press.

Manninen, Juha (1977). Maailmankuvat maailman ja sen muutoksen heijastajina. *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.

Martikainen, Tuomas (2004). *Immigrant Religions in Local Society*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press. Diss.

Mathur, Nita (2001). Introduction. *Santhal Worldview*. Ed. Nita Mathur. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company. vii-xiii.

McGarth, Joseph E. & 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. *Experiencing Fieldwork*. Eds.William B. Shaffir and Robert A. Stebbins. USA: Sage Publications. 149-163

Melville, Herman (1929 [1849]). *Redburn*. London: Constable and Co. Limited.

Mendick, Heather (2005). A beautiful myth? The gendering of being/doing 'good at maths'. *Gender and Education*. Vol. 17, May 2005. Routledge. 203-219.

Mio, Jeffery Scott (1996). Metaphor, Politics, and Persuasion. *Metaphor: Implications and Applications.* Eds. Jeffery Scott Mio and Albert N. Katz. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 127-145.

Montin, Kim (1995). Sjömännen under tre epoker. *Skärgård* 3/1995. Åbo: Åbo Akademis tryckeri. 29-34.

Montin, Kim (1997). Den moderna sjömannen. *Sjömannen*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi. 49-59.

Morgan, Gareth (1986). *Images of Organization*. USA: SAGE Publications.

Morgan, Gareth (1997). *Images of Organization – new edition*. USA: SAGE Publications.

Murray, Susan B. (1997). It's Safer This Way: The Subtle and Not-So-Subtle Exclusion of Men in Child Care. *Subtle Sexism: Current practice and prospects for change*. USA: Sage Publications. 136-151.

Mäenpää, Sari (1996). Tyttö lähtee merille – naiset Gustaf Eriksonin purjelaivoissa vuosina 1913–1937. *Nautica Fennica 1995*. Turku: Suomen merimuseo. 4-33.

Mäkelä, Klaus (1990). Kvalitatiivisen analyysin arviointiperusteet. *Kvalitatiivisen aineiston analyysi ja tulkinta*. Ed. Klaus Mäkelä. Saarijärvi: Gaudeamus. 42-61.

Mäkelä, Klaus (1999). *Valtio, väkijuomat ja kulttuuri*. Tampere: Gaudeamus.

Niemi, Pekka, et al. (1986). *Johdatus persoonallisuuden psykologiaan*. Turku: Turun yliopiston Psykologian laitos.

Nieminen, Jiri (2006). Maskuliinisuus ja hegemoninen politiikka - kysymyksiä kriittisen miestutkimuksen epistemologiasta. *Naistutkimus*. Vol 19. 1/2006. Suomen Naistutkimuksen Seura. 17-27.

Nieminen, Marjatta (2003). *Suomalaiset merimiehet 1900-luvun Buenos Airesissa ja siirtolaisuus.* Vammala: Siirtolaisuusinstituutti.

Niiniluoto, Ilkka (1984). *Tiede, filosofia ja maailmankatsomus*. Helsinki: Otava.

Nixon, Sean (1997). Exhibiting Masculinity. *Representation – Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Ed. Stuart Hall. UK: Sage Publications. 293-329.

Norling, Lisa (1996). Women in American whale industry. *Iron Men, Wooden Women – Gender and Seafaring in the Atlantic World, 1700-1920*. USA: The John Hopkins University Press. 70-91.

Norton, Catherine Sullivan (1989). *Life Metaphors. Stories of Ordinary Survival*. USA: Southern Illinois University Press.

Nye, Robert (2005). Locating Masculinity: Some Recent Work on Men. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. Vol. 30, Spring 2005. The University of Chicago. 1937-1962.

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. *Fieldnotes*. Ed. Robert Sanjek. USA: Cornell University Press. 139-160.

Paavola, Sami (2006). *On the Origin of Ideas: An Abductivist Approach to Discovery*. Philosophical Studies from the University of Helsinki 15. Vantaa: Dark. Diss.

Palonen, Kari and Summa, Hilkka (1996). Johdanto: Retorinen käänne? *Pelkkää Retoriikkaa*. Eds. Kari Palonen and Hilkka 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. *Women at Sea*. Eds. Lizabeth Paravisini-Gebert and Ivette Romero-Cesareo. UK: Palgrave. 59-93.

Patterson, Orlando (1991). *Freedom*. USA: HarperCollins Publishers.

Peirce, Charles Sanders (1955). *Philosophical Writings of Peirce*. New York: Docer Publications. First published under the title "The Philosophy of Peirce: Selected Writings" in 1940.

Pentikäinen, Juha (1986). *Uskonto, kulttuuri ja yhteiskunta*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Perelman, Chaïm (1979). *The New Rhetoric and The Humanities*. The Netherlands: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Perelman, Chaïm (1982*). The Realm of Rhetoric*. USA: University of Notre Dame Press.

Pesonen, Heikki (1997). Sukupuolitettu maailmankuva. *Arvot, maailmankuvat, sukupuoli*. Ed. Helena Helve. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. 38-59.

Pesonen, Heikki (2004). *Vihertyvä kirkko. Suomen evankelisluterilainen kirkko ympäristötoimijana.* Vammala: Suomen Tiedeseura. Diss.

Pesonen, Heikki and Sakaranaho, Tuula (eds.) (2002). *Uskonto, julkisuus ja muuttuva yhteiskunta*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.

Pink, Sarah (2000). 'Informants' who come 'home'. *Constructing the Field*. Ed. Vered Amit. UK: Routledge. 96-116.

Pollio, Howard R. (1996). Boundaries in Humor and Metaphor. *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.

Potter, Jonathan and Whetherell, Margaret (2001 [1987]). Unfolding Discourse Analysis. *Discourse Theory and Practice*. Eds. Whetherell, M., Taylor S. and Yates S.. 198-209. UK: Sage Publications.

Pratt, Jason (1988). McDonald's—We Do It All for You. *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.

Pärssinen, Tapani (1976). *Merimiesten psyykkinen hyvinvointi*. Lahti: Merimieseläkekassan julkaisu VII.

Ramberg, Klas (1997). Sjömän I svensk kusttankfart. *Sjömannen*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi. 61-71.

Ramberg, Klas (1997). *Bitumenjagare. Sjöman i kusttankfart*. Uppsala: Sjöhistoriska museet.

Ramström, Marika (1992). Aspekter på Kap hornarnas verklighetsuppfattning - en studie i maskulin identitet. *Suomen Antropologi* 1/1992. 16-25.

Redfield, Robert (1955). *Little Community*. Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri.

Rediker, Marcus (1987). *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rediker, Marcus (1996). Liberty beneath the Jolly Roger – The Lives of Anne Bonny and Mary Read, Pirates. *Iron Men, Wooden Women – Gender and Seafaring in the Atlantic World, 1700-1920.* USA: The John Hopkins University Press. 1-33.

Rennella, Mark and Walton, Whitney (2004). Planned serendipity: American travelers and the transatlantic voyage in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. *Journal of Social History*. Vol. 38, Winter 2004. USA: George Mason University. 365-383.

Ringgren, Helmer (1968). *Religions form of function*. Lund: Gleerups.

Robbins, Stephen P. (2001) *Organizational Behavior*. USA: Prentice Hall.

Robinson, Kerry (2005). Reinforcing hegemonic masculinities through sexual harassment. *Gender and Education*. Vol. 17, March 2005. Routledge. 19-37.

Rose, Nikolas (1999). *Powers of Freedom. Reframing political thought*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenström, Marika (1996). *Fartyget Himlen och Havet*. Helsingfors: Svenska litteratursällskapet I Finland.

Rosenström, Marika (2002). Elämää viimeisillä purjealuksilla. *Nautica Fennica* 2001-2002. Vammala: Museovirasto. 55-65.

Rossi, Leena (1994). *Koulun kautta merille*. Helsinki: Opetushallitus.

Rossi, Leena-Maija (2003). *Heterotehdas.* Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Saarni, Heikki, et al. (1996). Workload and Ship Safety. *Safety at Sea International*. April 1996. 29-33.

Sakaranaho, Tuula (1998). *The complex other: a rhetorical approach to women, Islam and ideologies in Turkey*. Helsinki: Department of Comparative Religion, University of Helsinki. Diss.

Sakaranaho, Tuula (1999). Hunturetoriikkaa. *Uskonto ja sukupuoli*. Eds. Tuija Hovi, Aili Nenola, Elina Vuola and Tuula Sakaranaho. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino. 296-318.

Sakaranaho, Tuula (Ed.) (2001). *Retorinen tutkimus uskontotieteessä*. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.

Sakaranaho, Tuula (2002). Women and rhetoric of religion. *Styles and Positions: ethnographic perspectives in comparative religion*. Eds. Heikki Pesonen, Tuula Sakaranaho, Tom Sjöblom and Terhi Utriainen. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. 194-211.

Sammallahti, Leena (1988). Suomalaisen merimiehen ensireissu. *Kotiseutu* 1/1988. Forssa: Suomen Kotiseutuliitto. 19-27.

Sammallahti, Leena (1993). Some Reflections on Ethnological Research into Seamen's Culture in Finland. *Nautica Fennica* 1993. Helsinki: The Finnish Association for Maritime History. 16-20.

Soukola, Timo (2003). *Riistorauhaa rikkomassa. Suomen Merimies-Unionin ja sen edeltäjien vaiheita 1905-2000*. Keuruu: Otava.

Soukola, Timo (2007). *Järjestö jäänmurtajana: Suomen merimiesunioni työmarkkinaosapuolena ja suomalaisten laivatyöntekijöiden turvallisuuden vankentajana 1944-1980*. Kansalliskirjasto, E-thesis. Diss.

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. *Anthropolgy at Home*. Ed. Anthony Jackson. USA: Tavistock Publications Ltd. 16-37.

Summa, Hilkka (1996). Kolme näkökulmaa uuteen retoriikkaan. *Pelkkää Retoriikkaa*. Eds. Kari Palonen and Hilkka Summa. Tampere: Vastapaino. 51-81.

Taylor, Frederick W. (1916). The Principles of Scientific Management. *The Bulletin of Taylor Society*, December 1916. 13-23.

Thompson, Seth (1996). Politics without Metaphors is Like a Fish without Water. *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*. Eds. Jeffery Scott Mio and Albert N. Katz. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 185-200.

Tiilikainen, Marja (2003). *Arjen Islam. Somalinaisten elämää Suomessa*. Vantaa: Vastapaino. Diss.

Tikkanen, Salla-Maria (1993). Vapaa-ajan viettoa Suomen Etelä-Amerikan Linjan laivoilla. *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. *Nautica Fennica* 1993. Helsinki: The Finnish Association for Maritime History. 88-91.

Uggen, Christopher and Blackstone, Amy (2004). Sexual Harassment as a Gendered Expression of Power. *American Sociological Review*. Volume 69, February 2004. USA: ASA. 64-92.

Uola, Kirsi (2004). *Vastakohtien meren ristiriitainen sankari. Suomalainen merikirjallisuus – oppositioasetelmia ja rajanvetoja*. Helsinki: SKS. Diss.

Utriainen, Terhi (2002). In word and deed. *Styles and Positions: ethnographic perspectives in comparative religion*. Eds. Heikki Pesonen, Tuula Sakaranaho, Tom Sjöblom and Terhi Utriainen. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. 176-189.

Valverde, Mariana (1998). *Diseases of the will. Alcohol and the Dilemmas of Freedom*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Van Maanen, John (1991). Playing back the tape. *Experiencing Fieldwork*. Eds.William B. Shaffir and Robert A. Stebbins. USA: Sage Publications. P. 31-42.

Van Royen, P.C. (1994). Hollannin kauppalaivaston miehistöistä. *Meren Kansaa*. Loviisa: Kymenlaakson maakuntamuseo. 33-43.

Van Royen, Paul (1997). The 'National' Maritime Labour Market: Looking for Common Characteristcs. *"Those Emblems of Hell"?* Eds. Paul Van Royen, Jaap Bruijn and Jan Lucassen. St. John's, Newfoundland: International Maritime Economic Association. 1-6.

Vuoristo, Aapeli (1985). *Suuri toivelaulukirja 6*. Porvoo: Musiikki Fazer.

Webb, Eugene ja Weick, Karl E. (1983). Unobstrusive Measures in Organizational Theory. *Qualitative Methodology*. Ed. John Van Maanen. USA: Sage Publications. 209-224.

Weber, Max (1978 [1922]). *Economy and Society*. Ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. USA: University of California Press.

Weibust, Knut (1969). *Deep Sea Sailors. A Study in Maritime Ethnology.* Stockholm:Kungl. Boktryckeriet P.A. Norstedt& Söner.

Whetherell, Margaret (2001). Themes in Discourse Research. *Discourse Theory and Practice*. Eds. Whetherell, M., Taylor S. and Yates S.. 14-28. UK: Sage Publications.

Whetherell, M., et al. (2001). Introduction. *Discourse Theory and Practice*. Eds. Whetherell, M., Taylor S. and Yates S.. 1-8. UK: Sage Publications.

Williams, Christine L. (1989). *Gender Differences at Work – Women and Men in Nontraditional Occupation*s. USA: University of California Press.

Winner, E. (1988). *The point of words. Chidren's understanding of metaphor and irony*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wolcott, Harry F. (1999). *Ethnography – a way of seeing.* USA: Sage Publications.

Wood, John (2003). Hell's Angels and the Illusion of the Counterculture. *The Journal of Popular Culture*. Vol. 37, 2003. UK: Blackwell Publishing. 336-351.

Wulff, Helena (2000). Access to a closed world: methods for multilocale study on ballet as a career. *Constructing the Field*. Ed. Vered Amit. UK: Routledge. 147-159.

Web sites

Seawords Maritime Glossary. http://www.trans-inst.org/seawords (read April 10, 2006).

Finnish Maritime Administration. (http://www.fma.fi/palvelut/tietopalvelut/tilastot/). (read April 21, 2007).

Historian nettilehti. http://intra.tkukoulu.fi/YALU/aineisto/arkisto/vankila/slangi.htm. (read February 21,2006).

White House. http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html (read April 17, 2007).

Unpublished literature

Halonen, Ulla (1990). *Matemaatikko- ja Fyysikkoliiton jäsenten maailmankuva*. MA – thesis for the department of comparative religion, University of Helsinki.

Hirvonen, Aila (1986). *Agronomin arvot ja maailmankuva*. MA –thesis for the department of comparative religion, University of Helsinki.

Komulainen, Tuulikki (1985). *Arkkitehtien ammatti- ja maailmankuva*. MA –thesis for the department of comparative religion, University of Helsinki.

Pessi, Juha (1981). *Diplomi-insinöörin ja arkkitehdin maailmankuva*. MA –thesis for the department of comparative religion, University of Helsinki.

VII Appendices

Appendix 1: The key informants

This list of key informants gives some background information to enable the reader to remember more easily the seafarers discussed in this study. They are listed in alphabetical order.

ALEKSI worked as a repairman onboard. He was an exceptional sailor in the sense that he had worked for his entire career – twenty years – in the same shipping company and on the same ship. Sailors usually first move between ships and shipping companies, and only settle down later on. Aleksi was interviewed in 2000. (HYUL00/1: m10)

ANNA was a cook's assistant (mess girl) who cleaned the living quarters, although she had the qualification of cook steward which she needed to be able to work as head of her department. She had asked for promotion several times, but had not been successful. She had worked at sea for ten years, all the time with the same shipping company. She was in her thirties. Anna was interviewed in 1999. (HYUL99/3: s1)

FREDI was a sea captain in his late thirties. He usually worked as a mate, but at the time of the fieldwork he was substituting for the captain of the ship. He was pretty excited about this because the substitute system also works as a practical training ground for future employment as a ship's captain. He had also been active in the shipping company, for example he wrote his navigation school reports for his employer. He had worked at sea for twenty years and liked it. I interviewed him in 1999. (HYUL99/20: k3)

GALE was an old boatswain who worked on Lonna at the same time as I did. He had been given his nickname at sea: he said it illustrated his way, for he was like a storm. I interviewed him in 1996, when he was also one of my supervisors. When it turned out that I knew some old seaman skills such as knot-tying and splicing, he started to get enthusiastic. After that we spent a couple of days – which we were supposed to dedicate to other job tasks – working on these skills and he taught me some new knots. He went to sea in the early 1950s, and had therefore sailed with seadogs who had started their careers in windjammers. He was an old school seadog who respected his roots. For

example, he said that he bowed every time he saw an old style cargo ship. (HYUL96/15: 15/96)

HANS was a chief engineer who was waiting for retirement: he was in his late fifties. He had spent 40 years at sea, half of it in the shipping company under study. He was the chief engineer on Lonna. He did not like working at sea, but considered it necessary: he said that every sailor over 40 does the lotto in the hope that they would be able to leave the sea. I interviewed him twice, first in 1996 and later in 1999. Although we were working aboard at the same time, he was not directly my boss because my job did not have much to do with the engine room. (HYUL96/3: 3/96; HYUL99/44: c7)

JOUKO was an old mate who celebrated his 41st anniversary at sea while I was onboard. He came from a seafaring family from a coastal town and several of his family members worked at sea. He was in his sixties but had not retired, even though he was entitled to: he said that it was easier to work at sea now that it was voluntary. We worked on Lonna at the same time and I interviewed him in 1996. (HYUL96/21: 21/96)

JUSSI had worked at sea for more than three decades. He was a pump man on Lonna. Although he was officially working as an AB, he still received a pump man's salary and was in charge of pump maintenance. He had worked for the same shipping company for 20 years, and was concerned that the company would face retirement before he did. He was in his late forties, so he had six more years to go. I worked with him on Lonna as an ordinary seaman, and interviewed him later in 1999. (HYUL 99/48: p7)

KALLE was a sailor in his early thirties. He was working as a cook steward, but also had to take care of some of the cook's assistant's duties. Despite his young age, he had already spent a decade at sea. He used to sail on cargo ships that roamed around the world, but now he preferred the coastal routes because he wanted to be close to his family. He was interviewed in 1999. (HYUL 99/ 37: s6)

LARS was still a first mate in his forties, although he was a qualified sea captain. He came from a seafaring community and had spent basically all of his adult life at sea, almost thirty years. He was a first mate on Lonna, the oil tanker on which I worked as an ordinary seaman. He was also my immediate supervisor on Lonna, where we worked on

the same watch. I interviewed him twice, first in 1996 and later in 1999. (HYUL96/1: 1/96; HYUL99/45:f7)

LEENA was a second mate on Lonna. She went to sea in the 1970s and had worked there ever since. First she worked as a deckhand for years and only later trained as a navigation officer, in the early 1980s. She was in her forties. I interviewed her in 1996, when she said that it was first time she had talked so much with anybody onboard the ship she had worked on for years. She did not want to talk about her private life on land and believed that there were all kinds of rumors circulating about her personal life. (HYUL96/7: 7/96)

MARIA was a mate onboard. She had previously worked as a radio operator at sea, but she was forced to re-train because her previous occupation disappeared due to the technological developments in seafaring. She was in her late thirties and had worked at sea for nearly two decades. She was thinking about going back to school in order to train as a sea captain. The problem was, she said, that the certificate would not guarantee her any progress in her career because she was a woman. Maria was interviewed in 1999. (HYUL 99/25: x4)

MATTI was a motorman in his late thirties. He had already spent nearly two decades at sea, and had worked for this shipping company for almost ten years. He worked in the engine room and found his job meaningful. He was interviewed in 1999. He liked working at sea because he liked the isolation and the closed nature of the ship. (HYUL99/10: m2)

PETE was a motorman in his early forties. He had worked for more than twenty years at sea, and still liked it. He would have liked to sail around the world, but because of the international labor-market and trade situation he found it impossible. He had been with the same shipping company almost all the time and had quite a few opinions about how to run it. I interviewed him in 1999. (HYUL99/29: p4)

PUHONEN was a deckhand in his early forties. He was an able-bodied seaman without any formal seafaring training except some short courses: at the time he went to sea in the 1970s one did not need any training. He had been at sea for more than twenty years, and

was then working on Lonna, where I interviewed him in 1996. Puhonen came from a seafaring community and was proud of it. (HYUL96/19: 19/96)

RITVA was a cook steward and head of her department onboard (meaning that she had one subordinate, the cook's assistant). Ritva had been three decades at sea. She engaged voluntarily in further training by taking cooking classes while she was on vacation. She was in her late forties. I interviewed Ritva in 1999. (HYUL99/8: s2)

ROBERT was a cook on Lonna. I interviewed him in 1996, when there were still cook stewards, cooks and cook's assistants on board. He was in his early fifties and had worked at sea since the 1960s. (HYUL96/5: 5/96)

TEEMU was an old bosun. He had worked at sea for over three decades and was quite bored with it. He had worked on the same ship for a decade at the time I interviewed him in 1999. (HYUL99/27: p4)

TIMO was the captain of Lonna. He went to sea when he was 16 years old, and had worked there ever since, for over thirty years. He had been with this shipping company for two decades. He was in his early fifties and very conservative in his attitudes. I interviewed Timo twice, in 1996 and 1999. (HYUL96/11: 11/96; HYUL99/47: k7)

TOMMI was a captain of a big oil tanker. He had worked at sea for more than 35 years, and for 10 years as a captain. He was a company man – three decades in the same shipping company. I interviewed him in 1999 and 2005. We were also in correspondence during this time, and his letters are included in the study data. (HYUL99/52: k8)

YRJÖ had worked at sea for almost three decades. He was relatively new on the ship, having worked for the shipping company for a little over two years. He was a first engineer in his fifties. He was interviewed in 1999. (HYUL 99/30: y5)

Appendix 2: The questions for the interviews in 1996

1. **Work**

a) How did you become a seaman?
b) Has the work been as you expected it to be?
c) How long have you been working at sea? In this shipping company? Aboard this ship?
d) What do you think about your work? Are you happy with what you do?
e) How has the seaman's job changed during your life at sea? What do you think about it?
f) How do you see your future in the profession?
g) Are you afraid of losing your job? Are the others afraid of losing their jobs?
h) What do you think about the shipping company? What do others think about it?
i) What do you think about the drug and alcohol policy of this shipping company? How it could be improved?

2. The seaman's culture

a) What do you think about the 'old' seaman's culture?
b) What is the new seaman's culture?
c) What kind of role does alcohol play at sea?
d) Are there any seaman's beliefs you respect? Do you follow them?
e) What do you think about women at sea? What do others think about them?
f) What do you think about the use of drugs onboard? Do you know people who have used them onboard?
g) How would you describe a seaman? Do you fit that description? Why?

3. Worldview

a) What is the world like? How did it come into being?
b) Is the world changing? In what way?
c) Does anyone have any influence on it? Who? What about yourself?
d) What kind of creature is a human being? How would you describe human nature?
e) Can human beings change? Who can change?
f) Can human beings develop?
g) Why we are here in this world?
h) Does the human being have any kind of duty in the world? What about you?
i) What is the role of society in people's lives? (Does it support? Or restrict?)
j) What kind of personalities do you like?

k) What is a good life? Do you live one?
l) Are you afraid of anything in your life?

4. Religion

a) What do you believe in? Do you believe in a god (which?), science and/or something else?
b) How do the seaman's beliefs fit in with this?
c) What do you think about the sea? What kind of relationship do you have with it? What do others think about sea?
d) What do you think about death? Would your outlook be any different if you worked in an office on land, for example?

5. Leisure time

a) How many hours do you work per day?
b) Do you have enough, just the right amount or too much free time on board?
c) What do you do with your free time? Where do you spend it? With whom? Do you ever feel lonely?
d) Are you satisfied with the way you spend your free time? Why? How might it be better?
e) Do you have enough to do in your leisure time? What activities would you like to have available here?
f) Do you go often on land when the ship is in port? What do you do there? With whom?
g) What do you think about the Seamen's Service?
h) What do you think about the Seamen's Church?

6. Relationships

a) What do you think about the atmosphere on board? What do others think about it? Why it is the way it is?
b) Do you ever talk about personal matters with anybody on board? Do you have anybody here you could talk with if you ever felt the need to do so?
c) What are the things people do not talk about here? Why?
d) What is the pecking order on this ship?
e) Is there anybody who has been frozen out of this ship's community? Why?

7. Being comfortable in shipworld

a) What kinds of things make a ship cozy? What does it mean to be comfortable in shipworld?
b) Do you like it here? Why?
c) Is there anything that would make you like this ship more?

Appendix 3: The questions for the interviews in 1999-2000

1. Work

a) How long have you been working onboard this ship? In this shipping company? At sea?
b) How did you become a seaman?
c) Was this work as you expected it to be?
d) What do you think about your work? Are you happy with what you do?
e) How has the seaman's job changed during your life at sea? What do you think about it?
f) How do you see your future in the profession?
g) How would you describe a good shipping company?
h) Do you get enough information regarding your work, the ship, and the shipping company?
i) Do you usually know when you will be going on vacation?
j) Do you get paid on time?
k) Do you find your work meaningful?
l) What is important to you in work? Does this work satisfy those needs?
m) Would you ever think of going to work on land?
n) Would you recommend your job to anyone, such as your neighbor's son?

2. Atmosphere

a) Do you like going back to work after being on vacation?
b) How do you compare the atmosphere on this ship to that on other ships?
c) How would you describe the atmosphere on board?

d) How do you find the captains? Are they liked?
e) Do you find the ship atmosphere important?
f) How could the atmosphere be made better?
g) Is there any tension between officers and workers?

3. Leisure time

a) How do you spend your free time on board?
b) Are you usually alone or with others?
c) Do you go on land when the ship is in port?
d) Is there anyone here you would call a real friend? Could you discuss your problems with him if you had any?
e) Would you like to have more get-togethers here? How are they usually organized? Who puts them together and who initiates them?
f) Do people drink alcohol on board? Is it a problem?

4. Seaman's culture

h) What do you think about the 'old' seaman's culture?
i) What do you think about women at sea? What do others think about them?
j) How would you describe a seaman? Do you fit that description? Why?
k) What do you think about the sea?

5. Interview

a) How did you find this interview?
b) Was this meaningful to you?
c) Do you think the results of this will matter in the shipping company?

There were also questions that focused on the shipping company discussed in addition to those listed here. They focused n the shipping company, its head quarters, business and organizational matters. Because those questions included detailed information of the shipping company they were omitted from this list.

Appendix 4: The complete list of metaphors

Below is a complete list of the metaphors concerning shipworld the sailors used in the interviews. They exhibit wide meanings for both the ship and its sailors. First there are the metaphors of the ship or the conditions, then the metaphors of sailor and finally the other expressions regarding shipworld.

Metaphors for the ship or the conditions

Translated into English	The original in Finnish

Another life	toinen elämä
Apartment building	kerrostalo
Behind bars	rautojen sisällä
Bottle	pullo
Boys’ 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
Grandad’s moped	pappamopo
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
Open prison	avovankila
Pail	kiulu
Power plant	voimalaitos
Prison	vankila
Production-line work	vaihetyö
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 the ship or the conditions on ship.

Metaphors of sailor

Translated into English	The original in Finnish

A race apart	Oma rotunsa
Baby	Pikkulapsi
Ballast	painolasti
Bogeyman	mörkö
Clown	pelle (captain)
Cog in a machine	ratas koneistossa
Dog	koira
Engine	moottori
Executive	yritysjohtaja (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
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

Translated into English	The original in Finnish
Closed authoritarian society	suljettu autoritäärinen 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

This amounts to 13 other expressions concerning shipworld that may not easily fitted into the predominant definitions of a metaphor.