

SADOMASOCHISM AND STOICISM IN DEBBIE TUCKER GREEN'S *DIRTY BUTTERFLY* AND TANIKA GUPTA'S *INSIDE OUT*

Abstract

This paper sets out to articulate the reasons why Jo's husband and Godzilla in Debbie Tucker Green's *Dirty Butterfly* and Tanika Gupta's *Inside Out* respectively, are sadomasochistic to their white spouses on the one hand, and why the white women, Jo and Chloe, stoically remain in their abusive situations. The study is hinged on the hypothesis that, the two black men, Jo's husband and Godzilla, in the two texts use sadomasochism to assert their hypersexuality and as a medium of revenge and resistance (against past black and white relational unfairness) on their white spouses who exercise stoicism to express their frustrations and emotional attachments to their virulent black sexual partners. Frantz Fanon's postcolonial psychoanalysis is the theoretical tool employed in the interpretation and analysis of the play texts under review. The application of the tenet of the black man having an insatiable sexual desire for a white spouse or sexual partner is effective, since both texts explore the virulent sexuality and aggressive violence of two black men on two white women. The methodology employed in the analysis is an interpretative, comparative and contrastive one. The paper comes out with the findings that Jo's husband and Godzilla brandish their sadomasochism not only to assert their psychedhypersexuality on white women whom they had been deprived of sexually for centuries, but to also avenge themselves for past black dehumanisation by callous and racist colonialists and imperialists. On their part, the two white spouses, Jo and Chloe, manifest stoicism because they do not only depend on their black partners financially, but are unconsciously enjoying black hypersexuality which they had been denied for centuries, lack meaningful love/marriage relationships with white men and the absence of community ethics and social responsibility. Finally, the paper argues that literature, in its critical realist tradition, contributes immensely to foreground Green and Gupta's denunciation of sexual, physical and mental violence not only in the British society, but everywhere in the world.

Keywords: sadomasochism, stoicism, hypersexuality, Psyched and Community Ethics.

Introduction

Domestic violence or abuse is a universal phenomenon as it occurs in all cultures, traditions, religions, creeds and classes. This entails that it is traditionally, culturally, religiously, politically or economically influenced. According to Amina Mama, “domestic violence is not restricted to any particular family form or structure” (90) as all the women she interviewed for her study captioned “*Woman Abuse in London’s Black Communities*”, confessed having been sexually, physically and mentally abused by their “current or past emotional and sexual partners: husbands, cohabitees or men with visiting relationships” (Mama 95). Honestly, most men especially, Afro-Caribbeans and Asians brandish traditional and religious mores to justify women or wives’ subservience and obedience to them, and are quick in resorting to violence against them when they fall short of this. This point of view is corroborated by Mama when she argues that not only tradition/culture, but other factors are responsible for violence against women:

...culture, material circumstances such as bad housing and economic stresses, drug abuse, childhood relational experiences, sexual insecurities and jealousies, deep mistrust and suspicion, misogynistic (woman-hating) attitudes and the lack of communication are just some of the recurrent themes... (Mama 97).

As observed from the preceding quote, not only tradition or culture is the cause of domestic violence, there are many causes or themes coupled with the validation of patriarchal values by social professionals in both black and white communities in charge of bringing sanity in abusive relationships. In such circumstances, the abused women are doomed; indeed, they only have to depend on God Almighty to rescue them from the hands of their sadomasochistic husbands and lovers.

It is also a truism that when women are fairly powerful economically than the men they have relationships with, this may cause the men to assert their patriarchal authority literally with a vengeance through violence. Again, it has equally been speculated that black men in the diaspora abuse white women with whom they have relationships sexually and physically, because they themselves are callously brutalised by racist state repression in their diasporic homes. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that some of the stated preceding causes of domestic violence must have been the reasons for Jo and Chloe’s sexual and physical abuse by their

unseen partners in Green and Gupta's *Dirty Butterfly* and *Inside Out*, respectively. Whatever the reason(s) for a man (black or white) to physically or sexually or mentally abuse a woman he has chosen as an emotional and sexual partner, one thing is very certain, the abusive act itself is a very disgusting, crude, barbaric, degrading or shameful form of oppression or aggression. Such aggressive and violent acts may not only handicap the women physically, as attested by some of the women Mama interviewed in both black and white communities in London, but may result in death like the celebrated Nigerian gospel singer, Osinachi Nwachukwu, who died in April 2022 from severe protracted domestic violence inflicted on her by her abusive and jealous husband.

The primary objective of this paper is to interpret, analyse and evaluate, in an attempt to proffer reasons why the two black men (Jo's husband and Godzilla) in Green's *Dirty Butterfly* and Gupta's *Inside Out* respectively, are sadomasochistic towards their white spouses (Jo and Chloe) respectively, and why the abused white ladies adopt stoical or uncomplaining attitudes and continue to remain in their abusive relationships instead of quitting. Exploiting the postcolonial psychoanalytic position of Franz Fanon as the theoretical framework within which this paper shall be based, while employing the concept of the unconscious and some related existing literature on domestic violence in the analysis.

Theoretical Framework

The abusive sexual relationships between Jo and her black husband in Green's *Dirty Butterfly* and Chloe and her black lover, Godzilla, in Gupta's *Inside Out*, can better be analysed and understood through the postcolonial psychoanalytic lens of Frantz Fanon. This is proven by the fact that both play texts deal with sexual relationships between black men and white women. In his prophetic text, *Black Skin, White Masks*, Fanon uses psychoanalysis to study the effects of racism on people, particularly its impacts on the self-perception of blacks, and "how colonialism is internalized by the colonized, how an inferiority complex is inculcated, and how, through the mechanism of racism, black people end up emulating their oppressors" (Sardar x). According to Fanon, a black man wants to be a white man, and he goes further to track the implications of the black man envying the position of the white man across the domains of language, sexuality, dreams and behaviour, finding in which instance the persistence of this wish – the taking on of the white man's culture, the desire for a white spouse or sexual partner, the dream of turning white, actions of skin whitening and hair straightening. Interestingly, even in his use of a

psychoanalytic interpretative approach, Fanon points out that such pathologies of effect, even once generated through the sexual realms, through unconscious processes, are ultimately derived from inequalities present in wider structures and cannot as such be reduced to the internal psychical workings of individual subjects. Furthermore, when Fanon argues that racism or the relationship between blacks and whites cannot be clearly understood without reference to sexuality, it aligns with Robert Young's colonial psychoanalytic theory propounded in his *Colonial Desire. Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*, 2005. Young discovers Britain's colonial desire as an obsession with sexuality, fertility and hybridity – a desire for interracial sex that projects an image of English culture which in turn defines itself by its repulsion toward the desire. This brings to the fore the hypocrisy and double-standards that characterised British colonial and imperial policies in particular and those of European countries in general.

In interpreting Fanon, Joan Phillips reiterates the socio-cultural aspects of incentives when he argues that Fanon maintains “that black men have long ago internalized their inferiority vis-à-vis their white counterpart” (207). Consequently, it is unequivocal that the black man's striving for equality can take the form of his “sexual quest for white women” (Ibid). taking Phillips argument into consideration, one can submit that the sadomasochistic relationships existing between Jo's husband and Godzilla and their white spouses in Green's *Dirty Butterfly* and Gupta's *Inside Out* respectively, suggest that these black men have constructed a gendered identity that tends to emphasise their sexual prowess, their animalism and natural instincts. According to Phillips, “The awareness and employment of such power become even more significant within the context of a post-colonial society where race, status, color, and class are very much intertwined and where whiteness is accorded status and privilege” (Ibid). An intuitive reading of Phillips' postulation indicates that, underneath the black man's sexual drive for white women, lurks the desire for vengeance in order to self-actualise and alienate the black self.

As a critique against Fanon's psychoanalytical theory, one might argue that, when he directs attention to the dynamics of sexuality inherent in racism, looked superficially, this may sound less convincing because thinking intuitively, one might suggest that racism has nothing at all to do with sexuality, or sexual attraction. Honestly, sexual attraction seems to be the direct opposite of the prejudicial hatred that characterises racism! However, when Fanon further argues that: “If one wants to understand the racial situation psychoanalytically, not from a universal viewpoint but as it is experienced by individual consciousnesses, considerable importance must

be given to sexual phenomena” (123), this makes his theoretical position plausible and effective in analysing the two play texts of this paper. Having articulated the theoretical optic to be employed in analysing, interpreting and evaluating the play texts under examination, the textual analysis can now be looked into.

Textual Analysis

In Green’s *Dirty Butterfly* and Gupta’s *Inside Out*, both Jo and Chloe’s abuse is sexual, mental and physical, respectively. There are suggestions that their dependency is both emotional and financial. Both of them are apologetic towards and about their abusive partners, and the abusive relationships at the hearts of the play texts, however, are not witnessed by the audience (the spouses are never seen) but rather narrated to them by choric-like ensembles of Jo’s next-door neighbours (Jason and Amelia) in *Dirty Butterfly*, and Chloe’s daughters (Di and Affy), in *Inside Out*. Furthermore, both plays: “bring and forcefully hold together, distinct but proximate perspectives so as to dramatise, or conjure, otherwise impossible encounters and exchanges that cut to the core of pain, grief, guilt, injustice, fear, desire, shame, and regret” (Adiseshiah and Bolton 74).

Again, both Jo and Chloe are white women who are subjected to nightly abuse by their violent husbands while their dysfunctional black neighbours, Amelia and Jason (in *Dirty Butterfly*) stand by, unable and unwilling to help (Reid 53), or helpless (Chloe’s Daughters in *Inside Out*). It is arguable that, Jo and Chloe continue to live with their black male partners despite their incessant sexual and physical abuse of them, due to the extreme sexual pleasure they attain as Jo’s husband and Godzilla are extremely hypersexual. In fact, having been sexually deprived for centuries, and now that they have the opportunity, it is obvious that the black men should display their psychic aggressivity and vengeance on their white female partners, who also derive psychic sexual gratification in pain uncomplainingly. In Gupta’s *Inside Out*, Godzilla’s animalism and sadomasochism are stressed and detested by Affy when she tells her sister, Di, that:

AFFY: *I gotta get out. I can’t stand it no more. His stinking breath, his moods, his booze, the nights lying in bed hearing him going at mum. It’s disgusting. She cries every day and we all dance his little tune. All three of us. We’re like performing fucking monkeys. He’s only one man but look at us.*

DI: *We do it for mum*

AFFY: *He's evil.*

In fact, according to Affy, everything of Godzilla is disgusting, his stinking breath, his moods and his abuse of alcohol, coupled with his sadomasochism. He does not only send fear waves through the spine of his white girlfriend, Chloe, but also through those of her half-caste daughter, Di and Affy, the white daughter, as his presence is always in the back of the sisters' heads.

Similarly, physical violence is brought to the limelight in Act Two Scene 1, in which the two helpless sisters and their mother are severely beaten up by Godzilla with Affy losing a tooth and a broken arm. His action does not only bind the two girls together, but it also depicts the helplessness of their situation, as they cannot turn to their mother for help, who is also a victim of Godzilla's abusive actions, nor tell anyone else because they are afraid that the consequences might be worse than the beatings they are already used to. In addition, they cannot lodge a complaint with the police for fear of their mother's wrath, as she would not want to lose her boyfriend because she is compassionately in love with him, since, "he's the only bloke who's ever loved me back" (35). Honestly, it is from the brutal and repeated experiences of domestic violence inflicted on Chloe and her two daughters by Godzilla, that one can conclude that he is a sadomasochist.

By the same token, on her part, nothing is said about Jo's husband but for the fact that he profusely abuses her sexually and physically on nightly basis, leading to fear and silence. Jo, the white woman, repeatedly cries out: "Sorry...I'm sorry...sorry...sorry I'm sorry ..." (3), to her, black husband, and the only wall that separates her from her neighbours, Amelia and Jason, does not prevent them from over hearing her pleas and sufferings. Meanwhile, Jo is trapped in her tragic situation, constantly afraid of doing anything that could disturb her partner or make a noise that could wake him up while he sleeps. Actually, she does not seem to be able to leave her husband, even though every day she wakes up thinking that he is going to kill her: "You ever wake wishing this day to be your last. You ever wondered that?... it still felt like butterflies, Jason. Felt like bad butterflies, deep down to my depths a me, disturbin me as I lay there cold wonderin... waitin..." (23). Jo's husband's hypersexuality and sadomasochism are vividly captured in the dialogic exchanges between Jason and Jo:

JASON: *It's a quiet morning thru' the flimsy walls, after a lively night a activity*

JO: *Can't hold out have to go*

JASON: *It's a quiet morning thru' the flimsy walls after a lively night of the usual.*

JO: *fuckin*

JASON: *usual*

JO: *fighting*

JASON: *Unusual fighting back and – I – I can't I c-c-can't (18).*

Actually, the virulent sexuality and cruelty of Jo's husband is hard on Jo, "... Like butterflies gone ballistic" (4). Jason also underscores the precarious situation in which Jo finds herself when he states that: "... -listening out. Hard for him – hard for her-" (Ibid), and Jo crowns it all when she laments that: "Me looking up above us, layin there in our duvet over us- looking across at husband and wondering if this was gonna be my last" (Ibid). Again, Jo's sexual abuse is externalised twice in the play. First, when she tells Jason and Amelia that: "...I'm bleeding" (26), and Amelia blames her for getting brave: "And who asked you to go get brave last night? Who asked you to brave up yourself last night and fuck up all a we morning?" (27). Second, when she meets Amelia in the café in which she works dripping blood from between her legs (perhaps, a precipitated menses or abortion as a result of her husband's sexual violence).

Jo's husband's hypersexuality is exacerbated by the fact that, apart from his extreme sexual violence on Jo, he also abuses her physically. Indeed, a kind of antagonistic black and white relationship which foregrounds bad faith, vengeance and resistance. A kind of assertion of bestial hypersexuality and patriarchy by both Jo's black husband and Godzilla, in order to wade off their inferiority complex, and to alienate and actualise themselves. A relationship that replicates the whites and blacks during the colonial period, but this time with black men avenging black dehumanisation by whites on white women. Allegorically, being blacks, Jo's husband and Godzilla can be said to be representatives of the oppressed and the colonised, who are using white women as objects of revenge and resistance against past black and white relational unfairness. Although they do not physically interact with any of the actors on stage, their presence is all-pervasive and determine the qualities of the other actors/actresses' lives and dramatised psyches. Indeed, both Jo's husband and Godzilla are endowed with tremendous sexual powers, sexual potency which is hallucinating. According to Fanon, psychoanalysts who

study black sexual potency soon find out that, the mechanisms of every neurosis is predominantly coached in sexual anxiety (122).

Nevertheless, Sara Ahmed undercuts the preceding line of thought on patriarchy when she thinks that “any model in which ‘pain becomes a means by which women’s experience is universalized as an effect of patriarchy, at the same time as it remains individuated at the level of experience’ she acknowledges that:

[...] is problematic because its fetishism: the transformation of the wound into an identity cuts the wound off from the complex histories of “being hurt” or injured, histories which cannot be gathered together under a single concept such as patriarchy (Ahmed 173).

Contrary to Ahmed, and in corroborating black hypersexuality as a medium for self-alienation, Derek Hook argues that: “The hypersexual black men alienate themselves from systematic racism, dehumanization and inferiorisation through sexual and physical violence on white women” (Hook 121). The researcher’s stance on black men’s sexual and physical assaults on white women as revenge and resistance is equally supported by Jean Veneuse when he argues that black men:

... tend to marry in Europe not so much out of love as for the satisfaction of being the master of a European woman; and a certain tang of proud revenge enter into this... above all, to be drawn on by desire for white flesh that has been forbidden to us Negroes as long as white men have ruled the world, so that without my knowledge I am attempting to revenge myself on a European woman for everything that her ancestors have inflicted on mine throughout the centuries (Veneuse, qtd. in Fanon 50).

Fanon accepts Veneuse’s viewpoint when he contends that the colonial condition is characterised by extremely high levels of sexual anxiety and patriarchy especially in white men, who are usually preoccupied with threat posed by black men to white women (120). Fanon further argues that, the racial other inevitably poses the threat of moral corruption, the degeneration of values, the violation of law and orders. In fact, he sums this as: “the Negro destroys, brings to nothing, ruins, damages...[is] the detriment of what we have of our civilization” (Fanon 180). Consequently, Jo’s husband and Godzilla’s brutal and aggressive sexual and physical violence on Jo and Chloe respectively, maybe considered by them as sweet revenge for past black

dehumanisation by the white people, but in the twenty first century, this is downright animalism and barbarism.

Moreover, it can be argued that Jo's neighbours, Amelia and Jason, manifest sadomasochistic tendencies towards Jo, as she is quite aware that they are accomplices to her abuse and critical of Jason's voyeuristic behaviour (Tejero 55): "I hear him hearing .../I hear him hearing me hear. /And he knows it" (14). However, Jason maintains silent, obsessively glued on the flimsy wall separating their apartments listening and not going to her rescue: "sitting up, back to the wall, ear to the glass- stayin into listen –stayin up to listen – stayin up to listen in on her – and her man – from my side a the wall- again-" (15). In fact, Jason represents the 'bad witness', as he is paralysed and hypnotised by being "Complicit for his own purposes" (Peacock, qtd. in Tejero 55). Whereas Jason is a victim in her marital relationship with her husband, both of them become the perpetrators of Jason's obsession, as their orgasmic cries and the screaming of Jo when beaten by her spouse, donot only disturb his sleep but also arouse him sexually to the point where he climaxes orgasm: "I'd never pissed like that till t-t... today. And I'm still shaking and you've shut-up..." (34). This is the reason why he berates Jo towards the end of the prologue thus: You got me not eating. Not sleeping/ you got my ear against our wall/ [...] hourly disgusted and disgusted I'm still here and /enjoying my disgust and knowing I'll s-s-/stay" (35). By secretly enjoying Jo's husband's virulent sexual and physical violence on Jo, Jason can be said to be guilty of sadomasochism, as through the virulent sexuality of his black brother on a white woman, he psychosexually attains orgasm. Adiseshiah and Bolton corroborate this argument when they say that: "In a perverted fusion, Jo-victim to the 'fuckin' and 'fighting' to which Jason compulsively listens (p.18). – seems to be both disgusted by and derive gratification from Jason's deviancy" (76).

Again, Jo, at the apex of her desperation and disappointment with Jason for not coming to save her from her abusive husband critiques him thus:

And you were gonna whisper me choice words a wisdom to help me out?... that be you still being my next door knight in shining armour. That be you still being my next door knight that never moves a muscle that loves listenin in and whispers words of comfort that get lost passing through. That be you or whatever part you're wishing yourself play in your audio version any morning –Jason (32).

Here, Jo alludes literarily to Jude Deveraux's *A Knight in Shining Armour*, one of the most classic romantic novels of all time, which narrates the love adventures of a present – day heroine, Douglas Montgomery, and a dashing hero, Nicolas Strafford from the Sixteenth century. Jo compares Jason to Strafford and herself to Montgomery in this glorious love story, that spans centuries, worlds and soils. Strafford failed to help out Montgomery despite his confession of excessive love for her, like Jason is also unable to come to Jo's rescue. Honestly, Jo's unseen husband's sexual and physical violence on her is having total control over Jason, and Jo is very conscious that she has a certain power over him. This is why when Jason protests that were Jo with him, he "would a treated you c-c- careful, Jo, gentle like" (32) but Jo crisply retorts, "you wouldn't [...] you couldn't" (Ibid), because she is certain that Jason cannot help himself, let alone her. It is from an analysis like this one that one can say that, Jason is also sadomasochistic in his relationship with his abused neighbour, Jo. In fact, he expresses his tacit sexual desire for Jo, which aligns with Fanon's postcolonial psychoanalytic tenet of the black man's desire for a white spouse or sexual partner. Like Jo's husband externalises his hatred of the white race by brutalising Jo sexually and physically, Jason would have also wished to vent out his repressed hatred of the white folks on a white woman.

On her part, the noise averting Amelia, manifests her sadomasochistic attitude towards Jo, when she accuses her of letting Jason listen to their nasty sex sounds and wailings and their effects on him: "You got him doin like you[...] "You got him hooked you have[...] You got him so I don't see him[...] You got him where you wanted him, Jo, [...] You got him that he don't come out[...] You know he was listening[...] And –you know what you wanted him to hear, knowing he would stay and you know what that would do" (35-36). Furthermore, when Jo visits Amelia at the café where she works, in spite of explicit instructions from Amelia "not to" (37), Amelia is completely dismissive, despite having confirmed that "this is the worst" physical state she has ever seen Jo in (39); her reactions to Jo bleeding on the floor: "[...] what's coming out? You? Me/ only you? /Only me" (44) is to hand her an opened pack of sanitary towels and "lay paper towels unapologetically around Jo's feet where she is dripping and marking the floor" (ibid). when Jo (while trying to comment caustically about Amelia's shiny floor) is overcome with pain, nevertheless, Amelia "slowly and painfully [...] half guides half watches Jo's attempts at sitting, which is agony, but eventually successful" (45). The stage directions that: "this is part routine for both of them" (Ibid) and Amelia handing a glass of cool water to Jo, suggest that both

of them are hooked up “into an intersubjective dependency, consolidated via routines and repetition, about which neither can do anything to change”. (Adiseshiah and Bolton 78). However, when Amelia accuses Jo of hooking Jason with their ‘fuckin’ and fighting’ (18) so much that she cannot see him nor he coming out to fellowship with her, lays “paper towers unapologetically around Jo’s feet”, “slowly and painfully half guides – half watches Jo” and eventually, frustratedly explains that as Jo always returns to her abusive husband means: ‘We’re fucked’ (50) underscore her sadism or being gratified by Jo’s pain and sufferings. It is from an interpretation like this one that one can say that, Amelia and Jason do not only validate systemic domestic violence but also manifest sadomasochism towards Jo.

Contrary to the manifestation of sadomasochism by black men to their white spouses, is that orchestrated by a mother to her daughter. When Chloe stops working as a prostitute, both mother and daughter find it very difficult to make ends meet, but as a solution, Chloe advises Di to prostitute: “You could get off your arse though couldn’t you?” (60). When Di replies that: “I’ve got to finish me exams first” (ibid), Chloe further tells her that: “what’s the point of exams? If you strutted your stuff a bit, we could get some proper cash. Men pay well for black pussy” (60). Accordingly, Chloe’s value system which is based on racial hierarchy, makes her racialise and sexualise her mixed race daughter, Di. Elisabeth Lechner confirms this viewpoint and condemns child prostitution when she pointedly states that: “... racialisation and sexualisation go hand in hand. That it is the mother who suggests selling her own daughter as a racial object of lust to foreign men makes the deed even more horrible” (76).

Additionally, in Act Three, Scene 2 when Affy blames Di for the death of their mother, Di recounts her teenage sexual violence their mother exposed her to thus: “Our mum sold me – like a slave at a market – from the age of thirteen, I was giving blow jobs to Godzilla’s mates for ten quid a hit” (94). Indeed, trafficking her own daughter for sexual exploitation to her boyfriend’s peers is very awful. Candidly, this is downright child abuse which is both condemnable and unpardonable (as it is one of the eight laws of gender violence recognised by the British government), given that Di suffered physically, mentally and sexually. Moreover, as a stoic, Di, as innocent as she was, fulfilled her mother’s wish uncomplainingly, and tells her ordeal to Affy now because she is being accused of having killed their mother.

Again, Chloe's statement to Di that "Men pay well for black pussy" (60), can be seen as Chloe's desire and admiration of her mixed race daughter's pussy which both black and white men long for and which yields much profit if prostituted. Derek takes this argument further by contending that:

... racism contains within it the identification of highly valued social trait. There is ambivalence here as the racist admires and covets the trait of the object of racism, is jealous of it, wants to have it, and comes to fear and hate it, more directly, the racial other for possessing it. This trait is most valued by the racist other because it is something that cannot be duplicated, it is an inherited trait; this is why it is so powerfully desired (131).

Little wonder that Chloe demonstrates psychical aggressivity on Di in relation to cultural difference, citing cultural stereotypes (body parts) as the causes of sexual drive. Similarly, Green also explores the theme of child domestic abuse in *Born Bad* (2003) (which is not part of this study) which centres on a "Dawta" confronting her family-Mum, Dad, Sister 1, Sister 2 and Brother for being complicit in her father sexually abusing her throughout her childhood, raising questions about the validity of their individual memories of the past and showing how their family dynamics is built on sibling rivalries in response to the abuse. This is to suggest the endemic nature of domestic sexual violence in Britain in particular and the world at large. Having discussed the exhibition of sadomasochistic tendencies in the play texts under scrutiny, attention can now be paid to the orchestration of stoicism.

There are representations in both play texts under investigation that suggest why Jo and Chloe stoically remain in their disgusting, despicable and awful violent relationships with their black spouses. First, both of them lack meaningful love or marriage relationship with white partners, second, both are passionately in love with their hypersexual black lovers and lastly, the absence of community ethics and the blaming of abusive situation on the abused women. The absence of white lovers or husbands or frustrated white love relationship can be constructed as being responsible for Jo and Chloe's continuous stay with their abusive husbands in Green's *Dirty Butterfly* and Gupta's *Inside Out*. Chloe, in Gupta's *Inside Out*, had taken after prostitution as early as fifteen years old with both black and white clients, the reason why her first daughter Di, is mixed race and her second, the white Affy. In Act Two, Scene 1 she confesses to Di that: "Suppose I had it coming. Always made friends with the wrong people. I'm fucking useless I

am. It's just I so confused..." (56), to suggest her frustrated life style. Actually, she is really unfortunate for always dating men who always abandon her in the end.

In addition, in Act Two, Scene 2, she tells Affy where she met her father and how he frustrated her: "On the Pier. I was having my palm read by this gypsy woman and Tom was waiting to have his read. He bought me some candy floss" (61). Then, on how he deceived her: "He abandoned me - ... minute I was pregnant with you, didn't see him for dust. [...] promised me the world ..." (59). From her confession, it is quite clear that failed or frustrated love relationships made Chloe become a professional prostitute in order to make ends meet for her two children and herself. Presently, she is in a serious love relationship with Godzilla, a black man who violently abuses her sexually and physically like Jo's husband does to Jo in *Dirty Butterfly*. It is quite unbelievable that despite having suffered from Godzilla's repeated virulent sexuality and extreme physical assaults on her children, Chloe is unwilling to quit the relationship on the grounds that: "I love him. He is the only bloke who's ever loved me back" (35). When Affy asks her: "what about when he beats the shit out of you? Is that what you call loving you back? (Ibid), Chloe problematically blames herself instead of accusing Godzilla of sexual, physical and mental violence: "It's my fault he gets angry. It's all my fault. I egg him on and he loses his rage and takes on my girls:(36). Chloe does not only blame herself for her brutish boyfriend's cruelty and barbarism on them, she also blames Affy, her white daughter, for her racist attitude towards Godzilla: "No. I expected he's well pissed off with her. It wasn't right what Affy did" (50), not minding that: "He fractured her arm, burst her lip ... broke her tooth... and you should've stopped it" (Ibid). In fact, Chloe's love for her animalistic lover has eroded her love for her daughters so much that she now blames them for Godzilla's cruelty on them.

Similarly, Chloe's love for Godzilla parallels the love a white prostitute had for black men as she confessed to Fanon:

A prostitute told me that in her early days the mere thought of going to bed with a Negro brought on an orgasm. She went in search of Negroes and never asked them for money. But, she added, "going to bed with them was no more remarkable than going to bed with white men. It was before I did it that I had the orgasm. I used to think about (imagine) all the things they might do to me: and that was what was so terrific" (122).

This goes to highlight black hypersexuality which Jo and Chloe are secretly enjoying in order to satisfy their repressed desire, the reason why they continue to remain in their abusive situations. Fanon confirms this argument when he asserts that: “A white woman who has had a Negro lover finds it difficult to return to white men. Or so at least it is believed, particularly by men: ‘who knows what ‘they’ can give a woman?’” (132).

Obviously, one can doubt what makes Chloe continue to allow Godzilla live with her instead of sending him away since she has no child with him like Sukie in Mama’s interview who continues to live in her abusive relationship because of the kids, so that they can have a father. It is from an interpretation like this one that one can say that, Chloe stoically continues to remain in her abusive relationship with Godzilla due to the lack of meaningful white love or marriage relationship or frustrated white love relationships and her love for her monster of a boyfriend. Psychoanalytically, it is the insatiable desire for black hypersexuality lodged in the psyches of white women (Western sexuality), that keeps tempting Chloe to continue to house the monster woman-beater, Godzilla. Moreover, when Godzilla leaves after beating the entire family, Chloe promises Di never to let him in again, but she continues to live in an ambivalent perpetual fear and love for the patriarchal Godzilla: “It’s the waiting that gets to me. The time in between—before the next beating ...” (55). Honestly, she has been traumatised so much that every car that passes looks like Godzilla’s with him sitting in it; he has constantly become a nightmare in her life. Nevertheless, she is quite certain that he is going to come back one day: “He’ll find us, he said to me once—wherever I went, he’d track me down. If he couldn’t find me, then someone else would” (53). Chloe’s fear validates one of Mama’s findings in her authentic descriptive data on domestic violence:

Ex-husbands and ex-boyfriends not deterred from assaulting women. This upholds the theme ‘that once a woman has engaged in any form of sexual relationship with a man, his social dominance over her is assumed... and this includes the right to physically assault her’. In some cases, indeed, the man only became more violent at the point when a woman tried to end the relationship or alter the terms on which it would continue (Mama115).

However, it would appear that the more Chloe is sexually and physically abused, the more she becomes indifferent to pain and uncomplaining hence, a stoic. Actually, a few weeks later, Godzilla is seen asleep upstairs by Di after giving out Chloe to some clients for the night, much to her chagrin.

Like Chloe in Gupta's *Inside Out*, Jo in Green's *Dirty Butterfly*, also continues to live with her sadomasochistic husband, despite his incessant sexual and physical abuse of her. Also, like Chloe, the more Jo is virulently sexed and physically assaulted, the more she becomes indifferent to pain, though complaining and wishing that her neighbours should help her out. Again, like Chloe, she continues to live in an ambivalent perpetual fear and love for her hypersexual and phallogentric husband. It is the insatiable fear and desire for her black husband, repressed in her psyche (western sexuality) that lure her to stoically remain in her abusive marital relationship. It is equally convincing to think that the lack of a white husband, her passionate love for her black spouse and the lack of support from her neighbours are the reasons why she is adamant to send away her black cruel husband. In addition, Jo's uncomplaining attitude for her abusive situation is illustrated when she transforms it into a sex contest as observed by Amelia:

You made it extra-see! You made it different, Jo, you let it get worsen what it needs to be. You wanna hit back you make sure you win. You wanna play contender-you stay in the ring. Five minutes a your inspired fuckries last night- (9).

By playing the contender and making sure to defeat her husband, Jo is robbed of the neighbours' sympathy for her plight. In fact, her tragic situation makes her live stoically in perpetual fear and silence.

Finally, it is explicitly clear that from the behaviour of both Jo and Chloe, the lack of fruitful love or marriage relationship with white men is responsible for their unwillingness to quit their violent and abusive partners. By continually remaining in such disgusting and despicable relationships, Jo and Chloe become accomplices and perpetrators of their abuse. It is equally possible to submit that by remaining in their abusive homes, Jo and Chloe are seemingly fulfilling some repressed private dreams, of inner wishes. Applying Fanon's phenomenon of turning against self to Jo and Chloe's situations, it will be plausible to say that they are the ones abusing themselves sexually and physically. Fanon further argues that, this can be proven by the fact that it is commonplace for women, during the sexual act, to cry to their partners: "Hurt me!" (138). Moreover, he contends that, women in crying that they should be hurt during sexual acts, are indirectly expressing a wish to be sadomasochistic to other women if they were in the positions of the men. Little wonder that Di and Affy in Gupta's *Inside Out* blame their mother, Chloe, for allowing Godzilla to continue living with her, and Amelia in Green's *Dirty Butterfly*,

berates Jo for enjoying her domestic violence as she plays the contender. It is from an interpretation like this that one can say that, both Jo and Chloe are stoics on the one hand, and psychologically, sadomasochistic on the other.

The lack of community ethics or **community solidarity (that is, the spirit of being one another's keeper in happiness and sadness)** or direct action (**that is, intervening in abusive situations to stop them without being invited**) is one of the reasons why Jo and Chloe in Green's *Dirty Butterfly* and Gupta's *Inside Out* respectively, are stoics. Being Afro-Caribbean British and Asian British, Green and Gupta respectively, critique a culture in which lack of community ethics or direct action allows unacceptable situations of violence and harassment to continue. Indeed, a lack of social responsibility which parallels the aloofness the neighbours and public of the Nigerian celebrated gospel singer Osinachi maintained when she was repeatedly being physically abused by her jealous husband that led to her demise. Nevertheless, it is twenty first century social violence with impurity in this study, which is equally the observation of Elizabeth Schneider, that understanding privacy or individualism in such a way that violence against women is seen as 'an individual and not a systemic problem' (43) is a form of denial that 'plays a particularly subtle and pernicious ideological role in supporting, encouraging and legitimating violence against women' (44).

Furthermore, Amelia in Green's *Dirty Butterfly*, raises the typically ignorant objections that allow the abuse of women to go unchecked, perpetrating the gender norms that underline male violence against women by refusing to understand why Jo stoically remains in an abusive relationship, and blaming Jo for continuing living with her bestial husband. Interestingly, women are often accused of perpetrating abusive situations by either being a nag or supporting and enjoying the violence, and are especially condemned when they stay with abusive husbands and lovers. Amelia's focus on Jo's behaviour, rather than on the abusive husband, invites questions about how discourses of privacy lend support to the view that male-female domestic violence scenarios are women's fault. Once more, "the lack of solidarity between Amelia and Jo, highlights feminist concerns about action and support needed to address issues such as domestic violence" (Lynette Goddard 76). Again, the lack of community ethics or direct action that characterises *Dirty Butterfly*, is replicated in Gupta's *Inside Out*, by the helplessness of Di and Affy on the one hand, and the aloofness of the people who usually drink at "Three Bells" (56)

and in the streets where Chloe used to be beaten up by her barbaric and callous boyfriend, Godzilla, on the other.

Conclusion

In conclusion, domestic violence is one of the discomfoting and shameful phenomena that continues to be sporadically spilt in the post-modernist era in the British society in particular, and the world in general. Through Fanon's postcolonial psychoanalytic optic, it has been proven that Jo's husband in Green's *Dirty Butterfly*, and Godzilla, Chloe's boyfriend, in Gupta's *Inside Out*, wield their sadomasochisms through virulent sexuality and aggressive physical violence on their spouses. They brandish their patriarchy and hypersexuality not only to self-actualise and gratify their senses, but to also avenge themselves on white women for past black dehumanisation by white racist colonialists and imperialists. On the contrary, their victims, Jo and Chloe stoically bear the pains because they depend on their sadomasochistic partners emotionally and financially, lack meaningful love/marriage relationships with white men and the absence of community ethics. Domestic violence is rather seen "as a private problem that ...involves a particular male-female relationship, and for which there is no social responsibility to remedy" (Schneider 42). Honestly, witnesses of physical or sexual violence can be considered to collude to the abusive situation by failing to speak out about what they know.

REFERENCES

- Adiseshiah, Sian and Jacqueline Bolton. *Debbie Tucker Green and (the Dialectics of Dispossession: Reframing the Ethical Encounter Critical Perspectives*, Sian Adiseshiah and Jacqueline Bolton. (eds.). Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020.
- Admed Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. 2nd Edition Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.
- Fanon, Frantz- *Black Skin, White Masks*. New Edition London: Pluto Press, 2008.
- Gobineau Joseph Arthur Conte de, *Essai sur l'inégalité de races humaines*, 4 vols (Paris Firmin Didot, 1853-5)
- Goddard, Lynette. *Contemporary Black British Playwright: Margins to Mainstream*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- _____. *'I'm a Black Woman. I Write Black Characters': Black Mothers, the Police, and Social Justice* in Sian Adiseshiah and Jaqueline Bolton (eds.). random and hang in debbie tucker green: Critical Perspectives. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020.
- Green Debbie Tucker. *Dirty Butterfly*. London: Nick Hem Books Ltd., 2003.
- _____. *Born Bad*. London: Nick Books Ltd., 2003.
- Gupta, Tanika. *Inside Out*. London: Oberon Books ltd; 2002
- Hook, Derek. *Fanon and the Psychoanalysis of Racism* [online]. London: LSE Research [Online@http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/2567](http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/2567) Accessed on 26Aug.2022.
- Hyam, Ronald. *Britain Imperial Century 1815-1914: A study of Empire and Expansion*. London Batsford,1976.
- Mama, Amina. *Woman Abuse in London's Black Communities*. Black British Culture and Society, Kwesi Owusu (ed.) New York: Taylor & Francis e-library, 2005.
- Peck, John and Martin Coyle. *Literary Terms and Criticism*. Third Edition. London; Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

- Phillips, Joan. “*Female Sex Tourism in Barbados: A post-colonial Perspective*” *Brown Journal of the World Affairs* XIV (2): 2008, pp 201-211.
- Reid, Trish. ‘*What About the Burn Their Bra Bitches?*’ *Debbie Tucker Green as the Willfully Emotional subject*. Sian Adiseshiah and Jacqueline Bolton (eds.), *Debbie Tucker Green: Critical Perspective* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020, pp 45-65.
- Sardar, Ziauddin. *Foreword to the 2018 Edition of Black Skin, White Masks*. New Edition. London: Pluto Press, 2008.
- Schneider, Elizabeth M. ‘*The Violence of Privacy*’ in Martha Albertson Fineman and Roxanne Mykitiuk (eds.) *The Public Nature of Private violence. The Discovery of Domestic Abuse*. London: Routledge, 1994, pp36-58
- Smith, S. Stephenson et al (eds.). *The New International Webster’s Comprehensive Dictionary of the English Language*. Encyclopedic Edition. New York: Typhoon Media Corporation, 2010.
- Tejero, Sara Montes. *Witnessing, Testimony and Ethics: The Theatre of Debbie Tucker Green* [Sic].up. University of Barcelona, 2012.
- Veneuse, Jean. *Un Homme Pared aux Autres* (Paris, Aro-en-ciel, 1947)
- Young, Robert J.C. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. New York: Taylor & Francis e-library, 2005.