

MEN OF THE WORLD

GENDERS, GLOBALIZATIONS, TRANSNATIONAL TIMES

JEFF HEARN



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Boston

4

FROM PATRIARCHY TO TRANSPATRIARCHIES

Since the late 1970s I have been trying to make sense of patriarchy, and I still do not think we have finished yet. The concept has much to offer. The very first versions of some of the ideas in this chapter were presented in conference papers at the Finnish National Women's Studies Conference, Helsinki, November 2005; the 6th European Feminist Research Conference, University of Łódź, August 2006; and the University of Uppsala, October 2006. This version has been considerably rethought for present purposes.

What is patriarchy? This chapter returns to an engagement with earlier theories of the structural dominance of (at least some) men over women, children, and some men, in short, patriarchy, in the light of more recent theoretical and empirical developments. It builds on critical debates around the concept of patriarchy, and relates them to intersectionalities and transnationalizations. While much social analysis has been strongly nation-based, with many analyses framed by methodological nationalism, there is growing concern with more precise specifications of men's individual and collective practices within gendered globalizations or glocalizations or transnationalizations. Similarly, debate on hegemony has also largely been framed in terms of a given society, yet there is now greater recognition of moves from a single society outlook towards transnational hegemonies. Despite some obvious critiques, the concept of patriarchy persists, with historical shifts to transpatriarchies.

The chapter outlines five theoretical approaches to the concept of patriarchy: patriarchy in the singular, referring to a single society or type of society; patriarchies in the plural, where there is recognition of a range of different

patriarchal arenas and patriarchies of different scopes; intersectional patriarchies; transnational patriarchies, or transpatriarchies, that are specifically constituted across and between nations, states and societies; and potentialized transectional transpatriarchies.

Yet in some ways, this chapter has a modest aim – to suggest a word to refer to what is no doubt a huge problem. The problem is the structural tendency and individualized propensity for men's gender domination globally, and the word is 'transpatriarchy', or rather 'transpatriarchies'. The plural is important; it complicates the analysis, and avoids some of the pitfalls and ambiguities of terms like 'world patriarchy' or 'global patriarchy' (Daly, 1978). It focuses on non-determined structures, forces, and processes, not comprehensive unity or fixity. In many ways this chapter frames the remainder of the book. But before spelling this out more fully, I would like to say a little about the importance of words, and then tell how I got here ...

WHAT'S IN A WORD?

The 'linguistic turn' in the social sciences and the humanities has shown the need to take language very seriously. Most of that effort has been directed to the language of the text and language in use among the researched in society. Perhaps, somewhat surprisingly, the linguistic turn has brought rather less attention to the words, or at least some of them, in use among researchers in the social sciences and the humanities themselves. After all, this is what theory and conceptualization has been trying to do for a long time ...

The arguments for a new word, in this instance, come from several directions and rest on several premises. First, a (new) word can be a *convenient shorthand*, whether conceived simply as an orthographic word (i.e. a word being a sequence of letters with a blank space either end) or as a lexical item (i.e. as an abstracted unit of language). It allows one to say one word rather than twenty or thirty. It documents and stands in for something more complex. It allows the making of sentences and thus more complex meanings.

Next, there is *recognition by naming*. For example, naming some actions as 'sexual harassment' (as was done in the 1970s by some activists and journalists), gave a word to unwanted and uncomfortable experiences that had been there for a long time. This process can also apply to large-scale geopolitical phenomena, as with the naming of different forms of imperialism – that then may facilitate oppositional political and other practices in relation to that which is named as such.

Third, a word can become a concept, and a concept can become part of a theory of understanding and explanation. In other words, there is the case for *theoretical conceptualization*. Here, words provide the building blocks, in relation to other building blocks, for more elaborate, composite constructions theories and attempted explanations.

And fourth, there is the strong programme of linguistic constructions and translations that sees language as (re)constructing and (re)producing the world.¹ This may be elaborated as an idealist position, but more promising is to characterize it as *materialist-discursive construction*. For all these reasons, a word, words, can help in elucidating material questions.

GETTING HERE ...

In reflecting on how words and concepts develop, we can ask: how do we get here? This is not just a question of personal reflexivity; it is a matter of biography, history, and geography. Words, concepts, theories, styles of doing academia shift, subject to temporal processes of differentiation, promotion, popularization, ideology, critique, sometimes reinvention as 'new' words and concepts. And this can also be so in studies on gender. The word and concept of patriarchy, and some of the theoretical traditions that have been deployed in its use and development, have been for some time rather out of fashion.

The concept of patriarchy remains a useful way of focusing on the societal and broadly structural forms and flows of gendered powers, even if the earlier structuralism now has to make way for the insights of poststructuralism and some other 'posts-'. It is also useful as part of the gendered critique of academia and the social sciences (O'Brien 1981; Smith 1989; Sprague 1997). This is not to posit any gender essentialism, but rather to focus on the construction of gender and gender categories within patriarchy and patriarchal relations. However, this chapter is not in any sense a re-evaluation of the concept of patriarchy; rather, it is an attempt to relate the tradition of theorizing patriarchy more closely to contemporary concerns around transnationalization.

Working on the notion of patriarchy in the 1970s and 1980s led me to frame the concept in terms of various social structures and arenas, with a special focus on sexuality, reproduction, generativeness/care,² and violence (Hearn, 1983, 1987, 1992a). At about the same time several, probably many, others were doing something similar. This was, and is still, a very contradictory project, in terms of an awareness of the shortcomings of an over-simple structuralism or of monolithic analyses. It has also involved recognizing the need to move well both beyond the lures of the more immediate and the more individual, and also beyond isolating gender from the intersectionalities with age, class, (dis)ability, racialization, sexuality and other social divisions/differences.

I now jump forwards some years ... with a transnational life, and with many colleagues, researching a range of transnational studies. In this way, conceptual development follows embodied experiences of living, working, and researching transnationally and the differences in experience which that brings. In different ways, such various researches have raised questions around transnationalization, in transnational organizations, suprapstates, social movements,

migration, virtual communication, or some other social form. They highlight the need to theorize and problematize not only gender and sexuality, but also nation, nationality and nationalism, race and ethnicity, language, intersectionalities and multiple oppressions.

In accordance with transnational postcolonial feminism and transversal politics, the nation and other 'centres' of analysis and 'given' units of analysis are problematized. Politics speaks across difference, as well as raising questions for one's own and others' shifting personal, political and spatial positionings. These transnational politics and studies take me back to long-established debates on patriarchy, or patriarchies.

THE CONCEPT OF PATRIARCHY

DEBATE

From the 1960s different theories of patriarchy emphasized different forms and especially aspects of men's social relations (especially structural social relations) to women. Different scholars, especially feminist scholars, have focused on biology (Firestone, 1970), politics and culture (Millett, 1970), the domestic mode of production (Delphy, 1977, 1984), kinship patterns (Weinbaum, 1978), family (Kuhn, 1978), economic systems (Eisenstein, 1979; Hartmann, 1979), 'the politics of reproduction' (biological reproduction, care of dependent children, care more generally) (O'Brien, 1981, 1990), 'sex-affective production' (production of sexuality, bonding and affection as core societal processes) (Ferguson and Folbre, 1981; Ferguson, 1989), sexuality (MacKinnon, 1982, 1983), 'love power' (Jónasdóttir, 1988), and various combinations thereof.

Many of these feminist theorists analysed 'something(s)' that are routinely taken-for-granted, sometimes even beyond words. To take the last example, Anna Jónasdóttir has brought the full powers of feminist interrogation to focus critically on love and love power, the power of 'socially organized love (as an interhuman, creative and practical activity)' (Jónasdóttir, 1988: 220). This is not to belittle 'love', and of course there are many different kinds and contexts of love and love power; rather, even the most positive or contradictory of emotions and social practices are open to and part of analysis, power and politics, especially in this case gender analysis. I have much sympathy with *inter alia* Jónasdóttir's (2009) analysis of what is elsewhere usually called 'reproduction' as 'production' (see Delphy, 1977, 1984), although it is equally necessary to think of 'production' as 'reproduction': sexual, biological, generative, violent, and materialist-discursive in character (Hearn, 1987, 1992a; Hearn and Parkin, 1987/1995).

Much, though not all, of feminist work that has addressed and developed patriarchy theory has sought an engagement, often critical in some respects,

with Marxism, dialectical and historical materialism, and structuralism. The manner of this has often attended to some of the ‘empty spaces’ (Jónasdóttir, 1991: 63–64), of most of that body of theory. The non-materialism of much so-called materialist theory has been highlighted by such feminist scholars as Christine Delphy (1977, 1984). In these various works on patriarchy, I recognize many linkages to political and analytical questions that have long concerned me. I think of these political and analytical points of contact as ‘familiar friends’. I see them as part of a broader range of attempts to rethink materialism more thoroughly, more accurately. For my own part, I have been concerned to make materialist theory *more materialist*, including recognizing the materiality of the body – and of discourse, of text, of the everyday. If you were working in a factory or down a mine or as a domestic servant or a child-minder, you might not need to be told that.

Feminist re-workings of the concept of patriarchy have sought to do so from strong critical, often materialist, perspectives, and have foregrounded sexualities, intimacy, care and less recognized forms of work/labour. Thus it may be seen what might follow if sex were to be ‘taken seriously’ in political and social theory (Jónasdóttir, 1991). There is not enough materialist or materially-grounded analysis of patriarchy, or, if you prefer, patriarchally-organized society, viriarchy (Waters, 1989), androcracy (Remy, 1990), male-dominated gender orders (Stacey, 1986), gender systems or gender contracts (Hirdman, 1988). A major focus through these debates on various theories of patriarchy has been how different gender categories and gender practices have been analysed societally, structurally and collectively, and what that means politically and practically.

PATRIARCHY, NATION, STATE AND CITIZENSHIP

The nation-state has often been represented in the modern era as hegemonic, a powerful form of hegemony, a powerful form of patriarchy. Likewise, the gendered, raced, classed state and nation have often been conceived as ungendered or non-gendered or unraced or unclassed; or sometimes alternatively represented as a raced, classed female, ‘a woman’, the motherland, to be protected, promoted, ruled by men; or, yet still, may be constructed as a raced, classed male, as in ‘the fatherland’. One example of these conjunctions is citizenship.

Citizenship has historically been framed by the city-state and the nation-state, and their supposedly gender-neutral, in practice often male, often raced, often classed citizenry. This not only involves, in different combinations and degrees, formal political representation but also social and cultural rights, access to state machinery, and perhaps most obviously national militaries and militarisms. The nation-state has been characteristically gendered in the sense

that its 'making' has usually been a project historically led by men, and at least initially for men or certain classes of men. It is onto this political base that women's political participation has been grafted in many, though not all, countries. More generally, some forms of (male) citizenship, based on notions of male individualism, are in tension with forms of male-dominated nationalism based on notions of collective, often homogenizing, lineage, culture, language, and exclusion of difference, including violent confrontations occurring in the name of such mythic entities as nation, 'the people', religion, or 'blood'. Many nationalisms, for example, Hindu nationalism (Banerjee, 2005), do not coincide with territorial nation-states. Different state formations mediate more or less between such individualisms and collectivism.

At times 'Men', 'Nation' and state have been represented as almost indivisible. This is perhaps clearest in times of war, but also in terms of seeing nations as the nation-state or the state, or in terms of state machinery, the military and paramilitary apparatus, the state security services, the departments of internal affairs, state foreign policy machinery, and so on. Men/Nation/state is one way of talking about this. Approaching the nation and nationhood through the lens of explicit critical analysis of men and masculinity suggests many possible avenues for theorizing, empirical study and politics. Even relatively critical studies of men and masculinity are often primarily located within the confines of the nation-state, as a form of methodological nationalism, and an understated aspect of the ethnographic moment in studies of men and masculinities. Critically considering the place of nation and state in relation to critical studies of men and masculinities assists both their gendering and problematization.

Having said this, it is important to immediately acknowledge that there are considerable variations in how the gendering of citizenship operates at the level of the nation-state. For example, the 1906 granting of full political rights to all adult men and women in Finland followed closely on the nationalist movement. This is not to say that such national citizenship is non-gendered, far from it. Despite formal degendering of citizenship, they often remain patriarchal in form, not least through the continuation of pre-nationalistic discourses and practices, sometimes around particular notions of 'equality', as in the Soviet regimes, or more generally in the lack of freedom from gender-based violence, surely one of the most obvious and least recognized negations of citizenship.

In the light of the various historical marginalizations and exclusions of women, full inclusion of female citizens requires addressing basic structures of gender inequality in society and societies. In sociological terms, citizenship is usually conceived of as rights-based or, alternatively, as responsibility-based. The concept of citizenship is inclusive of political and economic entitlements, access, and belonging, and encompasses a number of rights and obligations. Women's gendered, and indeed men's, citizenship is mediated by a broad range

of rights and responsibilities (social, political, or economic) that might enable them to possess the status of ‘full members’ of a political community, in the widest sense of the words. One example lies in the attention by some feminists to questions of care, emotionality, and (inter)dependency in redefining citizenship (Sevenhuijssen, 1998; Hobson, 2000; Lynch et al., 2009). In this process, or struggle, gender equality policies can be important tools in enhancing women’s rights and participation, yet that process of achieving more gender equal citizenship can be highly problematic in re-inscribing a given gender order. These debates also need to be directed to changing men, masculinities, and men’s relations to nation and citizenship.

One reason for this is that the concept of citizenship needs to be understood from an intersectional gender or gendered intersectional perspective. Though it is often constructed in a universal way, it is not possible to interpret and indeed understand citizenship without situating it within a specific political, legal, cultural, social, or historical context: lived experiences of citizenship should not be objectified or universalized (Lister, 2007, 2011). This matches, albeit in an explicitly gendered intersectional way, what Engin Isin (2008) proposes, namely the need for more complex analyses of differential subjects, sites, acts, responsibilities and answerabilities in relation to citizenship.

The relations of gender, equality, and migration, and the implications of each for the others, are complex contemporary issues, and no more so than in the context of European and EU debates and practices on citizenship, national and beyond. This has involved multiple exclusions of those beyond the borders of Fortress Europe, with many thousands (various estimates put the figure at over 20,000 over the last twenty years) dying in the Mediterranean while attempting to migrate into the EU, especially from North Africa. Despite all these complications, political debates on citizenship have often continued to be couched in strangely gender- and race-neutral terms – or more precisely ‘the citizen’ has frequently been both genderless and male. Such obscuring of gender is challenged by feminist scholarship and critical gender commentaries, and increasingly also intersectional analyses.

Yet despite such critical insights on men/nation/state, gendering men and citizenship often remains primarily within the context and confines of the nation-state or supra-nation-state, as in the EU, rather than across, beyond, or transcending nation-states. Indeed the EU, with its supposedly free movement of capital, goods, persons, and services, provides a unique social and societal laboratory to assess the implications of the evolution of gender equality and related policies for European nationalism and transnational citizenship. Indeed limiting analysis of men, masculinities, citizenship, and patriarchy/patriarchies to a *particular* society, nation or ‘culture’ is increasingly problematic, with both greater awareness of global and transnational linkages, and assertion of new nationalisms in that context. This may suggest

new formulations of ecologically sustainable citizenship that include gender transformation and social inclusion for future citizens as yet unborn.

CRITIQUING PATRIARCHY: DISPERSED PATRIARCHIES

Much of the work on patriarchy has shown that it is necessary to focus rigorously on gender, not just as a variable but as a fundamental analytical and political category. Whatever the discussions on inter- or multi- or trans-disciplinarity, different disciplines vary significantly in how much (or how many of) their leading practitioners seem bothered by this kind of question. For example, dominant men and articulations by men in and around economics and political science have appeared to be even more resistant to studying gender than they have been (which they certainly have been and continue to be) in some sub-fields of sociology or social psychology. Patriarchy has thus had an uneven life in and between disciplines – both conceptually within the productions of disciplines, and within the social conduct of disciplines themselves.

However, even, by the late 1970s, a number of feminist and profeminist critics (Atkinson, 1979; Beechey, 1979; Rowbotham, 1979) (as opposed to mainstream, ‘malestream’ or anti-feminist critics) were suggesting that the concept of ‘patriarchy’ was too monolithic, ahistorical, ethnocentric, biologically overdetermined, and dismissive of women’s resistance and agency (see Hearn, 1987, 1992a). One set of critiques has been that patriarchy does not have a ‘logic’, as capitalism is seen to have. Such defence of the specificity of capitalist logic now needs to be made more complex, with apparent blurrings of the economic and the political (Hardt and Negri, 2000; Smith, 2004), of state and capital, as in massive profiteering in war (War profiteering, 2006). On the other hand, there could be other logics to patriarchy just as there are diverse capitalisms. Such logics might include continuance of men’s power and domination, processes of recouping such power, and persistence of uneven combinations of forms of power.

One can also critique the term, patriarchy, as not being exactly accurate in ‘this kind of society’, in that there is not a legal or moral rule and/or control of possessions by fathers or of adult men, as there has been in some past times or is (at least locally) in some other places. It is not difficult to find problems with the word, for example, from critiques of structuralism. Some anthropologists are particularly critical of the term, patriarchy, in that it may be confused with parilinear, patrilocal, and patrifocal societies. But in taking terms literally, we would have also abandoned such terms as monarchy, democracy, dictatorship, autocracy, monopoly capitalism, perhaps even pluralism, along with many others. Similarly, capitalism is no longer, or perhaps

more accurately is no longer understood, as such a unified social or even an economic formation. Recent theorizations of capitalism and its contemporary globalized, neoliberal and neo-imperialist forms often stress the interplay of the economic and the political, and the blurring of boundaries between the economic and the political. If one finds it more acceptable to refer to the male-dominated (or men-dominated) gender order or system or contract, then so be it!³

It is helpful to think of 'patriarchy' in this way, as there are both very different forms of it across time and space, as well as those that operate simultaneously according to social arena and with varied scopes, scales, and historical trajectories. These can be of different extents or domains, unevenly developed and overlapping. In the light of these debates, greater attention has been given to:

- first, the historicizing and periodizing of 'patriarchy', for example, from private to public patriarchy (Brown, 1981);
- second, to other structural gender systems, such as androcracy, fratricide, and viriarchy (Waters 1989; Remy 1990); and
- third, to the presence of multiple arenas, sites, structures and oppressions of patriarchy.

In the last case, Sylvia Walby (1986, 1990) has specified the following sets of patriarchal structures: capitalist work, the family, the state, violence, sexuality, and culture; while I have specified reproduction of labour power, procreation, regeneration/degeneration, violence, sexuality, ideology (Hearn, 1987, 1992a). In *Men in the Public Eye* (Hearn, 1992a), I argued for a conception of overlapping and interrelating patriarchal structures, as well as for a concept of *patriarchies*. This pluralizing of patriarchy to patriarchies, like the pluralizing of sexuality to sexualities, and of masculinity to masculinities, opens up some new avenues of exploration. There are both very different forms of patriarchy across time and space, and also there are various forms of patriarchies that operate simultaneously, across different social arenas and with different scopes, scales, and historical trajectories. These can be of different extents or domains, and can be unevenly developed and overlapping.

In these historical developments, state, public domain and organizational forms have become increasingly important, with moves towards a world where and a time when all is public and the private is if not abolished, then severely problematized and curtailed (Hearn, 1992a). Organizational studies of the diverse gendered powers operating at these levels are central in theorizing public patriarchies (see Chapter 6). Relative neglect of such studies, especially those on the top management of state and capitalist organizations is a prime lacuna in many analyses of patriarchal relations.

RETHINKING PATRIARCHIES THROUGH INTERSECTIONALITIES: INTERSECTIONAL PATRIARCHIES

The concept of intersectionality has a rich feminist history,⁴ and has been a very important aspect of theorizing in critical race studies, race critical theories, Black Studies, postcolonial studies, and kindred fields, including in relation to critical studies of men and masculinities. It has been used in many different ways: between relatively fixed social categories, in the making of such categories, in their mutual constitution, in transcending categories. Intersectionality can be understood, albeit differently, within the full range of epistemologies, feminist or otherwise. Of special interest is in what times, places and situations do intersectionalities *appear* most evident.

The notion of intersectionality is not new. It was spoken of in the 19th-century Black feminism and anti-slavery movement, probably long before then too. Sojourner Truth in her historic speech, 'Ain't I a woman?', delivered at the 1851 Women's Convention in Akron, Ohio, USA, articulated intersectionality, the relations of class, race and sex, in direct terms. Even the 'founding fathers' of sociology addressed what might now be called intersectional relations, albeit in different ways. Marx wrote not only of class alone, but also of class fractions, class contradictions, local, regional, and international specificities of class, and gender, sexuality, and class (Hearn, 1991a). Durkheim was at pains to stress interdependence and social solidarity in societies, whether in terms of mechanical/traditional solidarity or organic/modern solidarity. And perhaps most relevantly, Weber developed his tripartite scheme of class, status, and party. Various forms of pluralist analysis follow with ease. Intersectionality can also be understood as a means of mediating between modernist and postmodernist paradigms.

In the elaborations following 1960s 'Second Wave' feminism, intersectionality was reaffirmed, though often under different names, especially in calling attention to intersections of gender, 'race' (or ethnicity) and class. The Combahee River Collective, named after the location of the freeing of slaves in 1863, a Black feminist lesbian collective, active from 1974 to 1980 in Boston, USA, is perhaps best known here. They developed collective statements and actions on interlocking oppressions, including classism, heterosexism, racism, sexism, and identity. Intersectionality is fundamental in Marxist feminism, socialist, anti-racist and postcolonial feminism, and many other kinds of feminisms. In 1981 Angela Davis published *Women, Race & Class*; in 1984 bell hooks wrote on Black women and Black men as potential allies in *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*; and in the same year, Mary O'Brien (1984) drew attention to the dangers of commatization – of the commas between lists of social divisions. The commas are as important as are the 'etc.s' and the 'so ons' in many contexts.

The notion of intersectionality has since flourished, along with related complex social phenomena, including multiple social divisions, multiculturalisms, multiple differences, multiplicities, diversity, postcolonialities, hybridities, multiple oppressions, differential consciousness (Sandoval, 2000), inappropriate/d otherness (Minh-ha, 1986/7; Haraway, 1992), interferences (Moser, 2004), and interdependences (Walgenbach et al., 2007). Helma Lutz (2001, 2014) lists 14 'lines of difference': gender; sexuality; 'race'/skin-colour; ethnicity; nation/state; class; culture; ability/able-bodiedness; age; sedentariness/origin; wealth/property; North–South; religion; stage of social development.⁵

Seen thus, men are intersectionally gendered. Much of the intersectionalities debate has been towards recognition of differences, and the complex intersections between such differences and divisions. These questions of difference, division, and intersection apply equally to men (Kimmel and Messner, 1989/2009; Hearn and Collinson, 1994, 2006; Jones, 2006; Christensen and Larsen, 2008). Indeed masculinities theory developed from the late 1970s at the same time as feminist and anti-racist critiques of the concept of patriarchy. Both these debates around patriarchy and around masculinities were very much about intersectionalities. The rethinking and problematization of patriarchy and the identification of differential classed, raced patriarchal arenas both fed into masculinities theory, and can be seen as part of the debate on intersectionalities.

In developing these various ideas and analyses, there were, however, two issues, both of which revolved around the matter of intersectionalities, that were not clear at the heyday of the patriarchy debate, as now. First, the distinctions noted above about historical periodizing of patriarchy, about other versions of gender systems, about multiple arenas and structures, and about the pluralizing of patriarchy to patriarchies are also debates on intersectionalities, for example, family/generation, work/class, sexuality. Indeed they could be said to be debates on intersectionalities given different social or spatial form. Second, the focus in most of the earlier work on patriarchy, both that by others and by me, has been largely on the national, societal or cultural context, rather than whatever lies between and beyond. As noted, discussions sometimes address 'global' or 'world patriarchy', but these terms seem too monolithic, not sufficiently differenced or intersectionalized. This perspective thus introduces a second kind or realm of intersectionalities.

Let me take the first of these points. Historicizations, arenas, and structures, as identified above, are also about intersectionalities. The move from private to public patriarchy is a move from the intersections of family, age, generation, sexuality, and indeed work, with gender, to intersections of work, class, employment, occupation, organization, and state, with gender. Both also entail intersections of gender with relation to law and the state – in terms of citizenship, nationality, ethnicity, racialization, religion, and many further social

divisions. The identification of what were thought of in the 1980s as various structures and arenas of patriarchy (Walby 1986, 1990; Hearn, 1987, 1992a) can also be rethought in terms of intersectionalities, for example:

- capitalist work (work, class, occupation)
- reproduction of labour power (work, family, sexuality)
- the family (age, generation, sexuality, work, religion)
- procreation (age, generation, sexuality)
- the state (citizenship, ethnicity/race, family, nationality, religion, violence)
- regeneration/degeneration (age, body, generation, disability)
- sexuality
- violence
- culture/ideology (identity, culture, multiple intersectionalities).

These listings are indicative, not exhaustive. In each case, connections can be made between the intersections of gender and one or more social divisions and differences, in the form of multiple oppressions, and thence the analysis and theorizing of patriarchy. For example, in the case of capitalist, and indeed socialist or other non-capitalist, work and its social organization, through relations of class, occupation, reward, and wealth, this can be examined through intersections of gender and class, as in Marxist feminism and feminist Marxism. In such approaches combinations of class power and gender power can be understood to be more or less determinate of other social relations, such as ethnic or family relations. Similarly, intersections of family or state or other social arenas with gender relations affect a wide variety of other social divisions and differences, such as ethnicity or violence. Moreover, both the state and the family operate closely, sometimes in contradiction, with societally dominant gender relations, forming complex combinations of contingent intersections at the levels of societal structure, collective social movements, and individual identity.⁶

One of the key issues of intersectional analysis, whether of patriarchy or not, is the extent to which two or more social divisions and differences are understood as determinate of other social divisions and differences. In all the forms of patriarchal arena listed above there is the question of to what extent they are determinate of patriarchy or patriarchal relations, not only in the social arena in question, but also more generally at the societal level of analysis. Indeed, one can ask: to what extent are such patriarchal arenas separate from each other or interconnected in the formation of patriarchy as a society-wide form? In speaking of society-wide here, I am immediately forced to consider

what now counts as ‘a society’. The notion of society now necessarily needs to be conceived as transnational. Thus, the relation of patriarchies to intersectionalities is further highlighted with the growing importance of transnational forces. These add weight to the need for a word to refer to this.

RETHINKING PATRIARCHIES THROUGH TRANSNATIONALIZATIONS: TRANS(NATIONAL) PATRIARCHIES

The focus in much, probably most, earlier work on men’s domination within patriarchy has been based in a national, societal or cultural context, rather than whatever lies between and beyond, transnationally. Similarly, formulations of hegemony have been characteristically based on domination within a particular society or nation (Bocock, 1986; Hearn, 2004a). Indeed, the nation has often been represented in the modern political era as one of the most powerful forms of hegemony, as another instance of methodological nationalism. A focus on nation, patriarchy and national hegemony is in contrast to movements across, beyond, or transcending nation-states, within what might be called *transnational patriarchies*, or more economically, *transpatriarchies*.

The methodological nationalism of much social science, as evident in the development of the specific concept of patriarchy, is particularly challenged by analyses of the transnational. Indeed, global transformation, as well as regional restructurings, such as Europeanization through the EU and EU expansion in the post-Soviet period, may be part of the changing hegemony of men (Novikova et al., 2005). As noted (see p. 24, fn. 13), moving beyond national, societal or cultural contexts has, for me, been prompted by various transnational researches over recent years. In these I have found it useful to refer to patriarchy in transnational contexts as transnational patriarchies, or transpatriarchies for short, as a way of talking about patriarchies, intersectionalities and transnationalization at the same time.⁷ In these moves, structured gender domination – ‘patriarchy’ – shifts from being located in or limited to national or societal contexts towards transnational contexts. Moves to transnational patriarchies offer various potential for extending some men’s transnational intersectional power, individually and collectively. This may involve non-responsibility, surveillance, and disruption, loss of expected security and privilege – from individual men to state to transnational institutions.

Increasingly, analyses of men, masculinity, and nation need to be considered as part of gendered, sexualized, violenced, embodied, transnational, not just national, processes. Broadening the interconnections of gender and transnationalization means gendering men as an explicit part of analysis. In these debates there remains a general repeated resistance to considering men’s practices as gendered, to ‘naming men as men’ (Hanmer, 1990; Collinson and Hearn, 1994). Men’s

practices are integral in (re)producing gender inequality between men and women and amongst men. These are heavily embedded in social, economic, and cultural relations, so that men's dominant or complicit practices may easily be equated with what counts as a normal, usual or official way of doing things: hegemony of men, as category and actors. There is the need to put together gendering men and gendering transnationalization.

Despite these silences and absences, historical disruptions of nation-state and national and indeed imperial power have been in some cases a spur to critical reflection on men and masculinity, as in loss of the frontier (Kimmel, 1987); the ravages of the First World War (Filene, 1975); post-Second World War fracturings of the dominant fiction (Silverman, 1992); loss of the British Empire (Tolson, 1977) and reassertion of imperial masculinity from the Falklands War (Metcalf, 1985); US defeat in the Vietnam War (Bliss, 1985); Russian defeat in Afghanistan; post-socialist turmoils in Central and Eastern Europe; nuclear threat; and various disruptions of some men's sense of entitlement with globalization. These have all been very largely in men's hands.

In the book *The Gender of Oppression* (1987) I began by talking about 'causes, explanations and critiques' of 'men and masculinities' by addressing the context of 'military and international change'. It is as if such disruptions, such losses of national confidence may be accompanied by reflection on the state of men. This can of course be conducted in the political realm from many positions and out of many motivations. These might include eugenic concerns, loss of manhood, the move to finance capitalism, backlash against feminism, 'break-up' of the nuclear family, loss of the rights of fathers, as well as various more positive motivations of men who are uncertain and seek more equal relationships and positionings. Thus the general term, the 'crisis of masculinity' can be located in relation to the nation-state and Men/Nation. This is so, even though the meaning and assumed direction of that 'crisis' may point in diametrically opposed political directions, including for whom the 'crisis' is really a problem. This assists both the gendering of the nation, and the problematization of the nation.

A significant aspect of this increasing complexity is contemporary global challenges, albeit probably more limited than often supposed, to the nation-state. This is seen in what may appear as currently opposed transnational forces: on the one hand, the USA's (and its allies') culturally Christian military capitalist neo-imperialism; and, on the other, multi-national Islamic power bases of both the oil-rich post-feudal capitalist, and the diasporic jihadist varieties. As discussed (see p. 63ff.), most mainstream theories of globalization have been remarkably lacking in attention to gender, let alone sexuality. The clear need to gender globalization has gone hand-in-hand with moves to recognize the transnational as a more accurate concept than the global.

The focus on transnational patriarchies, transpatriarchies, is distinct from that on globalization, or even those approaches that seek to gender globalization,

even if the topic of transnationalization has often been handled under the rubric of ‘globalization’. Transpatriarchies emphasize transnational *forces*, not a ‘world system’ (Wallerstein, 1984; Frank and Gills, 1994). The notion of transpatriarchies highlights various overlapping transnational fields, economic, organizational, political, cultural – not some system of globalization, gendered or not. Whatever the balance of power between nation-states and forces that transcend them, transnational processes introduce a variety of intersectional issues into analysis, including analysis of (trans)patriarchies. At the very least, they bring into the picture intersections of gender relations with *inter alia* citizenship, culture, ethnicity, identity, location, migration, movement, nationality, place, racialization, religion, and space. These transnational intersectionalities complicate the previous set of intersectionalities identified in the previous section in terms of social arenas or structures with patriarchies.

This kind of conceptualization of transpatriarchies raises major questions – especially so when one considers the gendering and gendered power of men on a global or transnational scale, within and constituting transpatriarchies. This applies in terms of men and transpatriarchies in multinational business corporations; international finance; the sex trade; ICTs; militaries; energy policy; global circulation of representations; and governmental and transgovernmental machineries – all based upon domination of unpaid local and transnational labour. Transnational patriarchies or transpatriarchies comprise acutely contradictory processes, with interplays of men’s transnational privilege and transnational threat to (some aspects of being) men, or other parallel processes.

As noted in Chapter 1, ‘the transnational’ invokes two elements: the *nation* or *national boundaries*, and ‘*trans*’ (across) relations, as opposed to ‘*inter*’ relations or ‘*intra*’ relations (Hearn, 2004d). This raises a paradox: *the nation is simultaneously affirmed and deconstructed*. This is partly a question of what is meant by the ‘*trans*’ in ‘the transnational’. In short, the element of ‘*trans*’ refers to three basically different notions, as well as more subtle distinctions between and beyond that:

- *moving across* something or *between* two or more somethings, in this case, across national boundaries or between nations;
- *metamorphosing*, problematizing, blurring, transgressing, breaking down, even dissolving something(s), in this case, nations or national boundaries – in the most extreme case, leading to the demise of the nation or national boundaries;
- *creating new configurations*, intensified transnational, supranational, or to different degrees, deterritorialized, dematerialized or virtual entities: structures, institutions, organizations, classes, groups, social movements, capital flows, networks, communities, supra-identities, cultural and public spaces, involving two or more nations, or more often different actors there interacting across national borders (Hearn and Blagojević, 2013: 9).⁸

This is partly a critique of mainstream analyses of globalization. Many texts, even critical ones, present globalization as agendered and asexual, emphasizing ‘neutral’ transnational economic units within ‘neutral’ economic processes, reproducing an implicit male narrative. In simultaneously affirming and deconstructing the nation, transnationalization may be a more useful term than globalization. Transnational social processes, or transnationalizations, take many forms, with many implications for men and gender relations. The movement from the national to the transnational can be more voluntary or more involuntary. It can be: structural, institutional, organizational, individual, or through more complex webs, networks and linkages. Especially when it is voluntary, it is important to understand the gains that may accrue for the local power frameworks for different men’s lives through transnational linkages.

There are many ways in which transpatriarchies and transpatriarchal processes develop and change through various forms of transnationalizations. These may include *processes of extensions of transnational patriarchal power*, whether through new technologies or corporate concentrations. Such extensions can easily facilitate *processes of transnational individual and collective non-responsibility* of men, whereby social problems created are held to be the business of others, be they women, other men, governments, or those in other parts of the world. This disconnection is part of a long history of patriarchal imperialism and colonialism. New, changing forms of transpatriarchies operate partly very much in the flesh, partly virtually – creating new forms of extended power for certain groupings of men. Interestingly, such changes bring with them *processes of loss of expected security and privilege* for some men. This can be seen as partly an historical, and partly a geographical set of processes, from the individual to the state to transnational institutions. At the same time, losses, or perceived losses, of power amongst certain groupings of men can interplay with *processes of recouping patriarchal power*. Specifically, there are growing *processes of surveillance*, along with reciprocal, even symbiotic, *processes of disruption*, as in computer hacking or terrorism; *processes of transnational movements and formation of transnational social, political, cultural spaces*; and even *processes of transnational impacts of emotions* (Hearn, 2008a, 2009). Together, these make for very complex processes of contradiction, as for example in the *contradictions of citizenship*.

In many transnational movements, both physical and virtual, particular groups of men are the most powerful actors. To use the example of the sex trade – men are involved and implicated in the sex trade, trafficking, and prostitution in many interconnected ways: as buyers or potential buyers of different kinds; as pimps, one man or more organized; in the management of sex trade organizations, large and small; in other support work, such as ICT support, travel and other services, financial or legal expertise; as complicit actors in other related realms of activity, for example, through acceptance of the pornographization in/of the media (Dines, 2010; Jeffreys, 2013). There are at the same time men

in intervention agencies, police, criminal justice agencies, counselling services, and exit services, and there are men being, or who have been, trafficked and prostituted. Naming these various groups and categories of men, and their connections, is part of the analysis of transpatriarchies.

Transnationalization involves transnational spaces, physical, social, virtual. With men's military power, transnationalization easily links with territorial space, where territoriality can be one dimension of intersectionality, thus raising questions of congruency, or not, between local and transnational gender hierarchies. Changing relations of national and transnational space have different implications for power, prestige, money, and wealth. This raises the question of different connections between men, transnationalization and social stratification, both empirically and theoretically. Different groups of men move transnationally, between nations, becoming more or less situated in different national and transnational realms, with very different consequences depending on their political-economic power and prestige. Some men are fixed in a national/local space; others are forced into transnational space; some seek affluent transnational 'freedom'; some construct national space through transnational endeavour. Such transnational locations and movements do not necessarily reduce social stratification, but rather impact on it in concrete ways. This entails attention to the materiality of physical being and security in national and transnational spaces, to varying material resources, to actual and potential movement (desired or forced), and to the access and use of virtual communication. These connections are not only about 'blurring' between realms. They involve the very bodily and fleshly materiality of different groups of men, and women and children, in changing connections between transnationalization and social stratification.⁹

RETHINKING TRANSPATRIARCHIES THROUGH TRANSGENDER AND TRANSECTIONALITIES: POTENTIALIZED TRANSPATRIARCHIES

It is clear that the term, transpatriarchies, is open to various interpretations. It may also, perhaps surprisingly to some, invoke the idea of transgender; this may at first seem an odd way of thinking about patriarchies or transpatriarchies, as after all the notion of patriarchy, as in transpatriarchies, refers to the rule of men, or at least certain men. The prefix, 'trans', can also be seen in a broader sense than its use in the transnational, as referring to both transgender and transectionalities: the 'transformation' of social categories rather than just their mutual constitution (Hearn, 2008c).

There are even incipient signs that patriarchal domination might be entering a new historical phase: on one hand, some women in leading positions adopting patriarchal styles (Wajcman, 1998), and yet men in power adopting less

obvious patriarchal styles *whilst retaining patriarchal power* (cf. Moore, 1988; Brittan, 1989). This could usher in changing forms of ‘transgenderized’, perhaps paradoxically queer, patriarchal power or patriarchal relations separated from the bodies of men and women, as in some virtual futures. This possibility may link with forms of transgenderism that appear to reproduce sexist or patriarchal gender stereotypes, and transwomen who negatively affect gender non-conforming and lesbian women. Additionally, ‘feminism’ can itself be used to justify (trans)patriarchal relations and forms of domination (cf. Eisenstein, 2004; Fraser, 2009). Queer, though powerful, is not in itself automatically liberatory (Edwards, 1998).

It seems increasingly difficult to discuss gender or any other social division in isolation from others. Though this may have always been so historically, it does not seem to have been noticed so readily until recently. Societal changes, such as towards virtualities, may contribute to increasing elaboration of intersectionalities between social divisions. The very formation of people as persons, bodies, individuals may be in process of profound historical change. Rather than people being formed primarily as fixed embodied *members* of given collectivities, defined by single social divisions, people may increasingly appear to exist in social relations, spaces and practices *between* multiple oppressions and power differentials. Persons and bodies no longer appear so easily as equivalents. Following this logic, one might consider whether there is already a need to abandon the concept of transpatriarchies in favour of supposedly broader conceptualizations of transnational dominations of all kinds. This may be so conceptually, but patriarchal transnational domination does seem peculiarly persistent.

At the same time, intersectionalities should be treated with caution; in some uses they may be part of contemporary hegemonic ways of obscuring gender, men and men’s powers. Transsectional patriarchal power could be a way of recouping power for certain men. This can be alongside the disposability and dispensability of men, certain men, in abject poverty, even to death, as in war and militarism, with young, minority ethnic, working-class and subaltern men most vulnerable. Recouping can involve the replaceability of different kinds of men and individual men, by other men, as long as he is a ‘man’, of some certain age, bodily facility, race, experience or ...

★★★

The concept of transpatriarchies is, in some ways, a plea to return to the political and analytical terrain of dialectical materialist approaches to patriarchy, but now in contexts of transnationalizations; it is a modest proposal for a new word, though a word is not only a word. There are several reasons

why transnationality, though a strongly neglected arena of intersectionality, is important. First, it concerns relations between nationalities, and nations. Second, it highlights intersectionalities with and between nationality, language, culture, location, movement, mobility, and also across these boundaries. Third, transnationality may involve the metamorphosing of boundaries, national and other. Thus transnational categories are becoming defined in more complex ways, with more blurrings in interrelations with other social categories, and the deconstruction, transnationalizations and reformulation of those categories – hence transectionalities, with hybrid categories more than the sum of, say, gender/race/languages. Transnationality can be a social division or intersection itself, just as real as age or class. An intersectional approach to men demands engagement with not only age, class, disability, ethnicity, racialization, sexuality, but also transnationality, and much more, such as non-humans.

NOTES

- 1 The possible need for new words is made clear when one considers how different languages present and construct reality, gendered reality. The well-established debate on the relation on 'sex' and 'gender' that was very much part of the central insights of (Anglophone) Second Wave feminism, and its subsequent critique, looks different across even European languages. In some languages – an example is Finnish – sex and gender are embedded heteronormatively within the same word, and there are no gender pronouns. In Scandinavian languages, the near-equivalent words for sex and gender are not only *not* exact equivalents, but their meaning has shifted over time, in different political or policy contexts, and between different countries and languages. The Slovak language has its own term for gender (*rod*) different from sex (*pohlavie*), but the difference is not clear for many people, in addition because *rod* also has another meaning. In Slovak grammar there are three 'genders' (*rody* – plural of *rod*): masculine, feminine, neutral. The word *rod* also means a family/dynasty (such as the Habsburg dynasty). I am grateful to Alexandra Bitusikova for this information. In Turkish, depending on the context, *cinsiyet* refers interchangeably to biological sex and gender, I am grateful to Alp Biricik for this information.
- 2 This refers to social construction of processes of bodily degeneration and regeneration, including care or non-care.
- 3 Interestingly, there has recently been a revival in the use of the term, patriarchy, as, for example, in Beatrix Campbell's (2014) coining of 'neoliberal neopatriarchy' (cf. Sharabi, 1988).
- 4 See, for example, Davis, 1981; Crenshaw, 1989, 1991; Williams, 1989; Meekosha and Pettman, 1991; Brah and Phoenix, 2004; McCall, 2005; *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 2006. Also see Schwalbe, 2014: ch. 5.
- 5 Recently, intersectional thinking has been extended into ecological and environmental issues, such as animal studies (Twine, 2010) and climate change (Kaijser and Kronsell, 2014).

- 6 Seen in this way, the notion of intersectionalities is far from new. Their recognition is certainly not the result of poststructuralism, feminist or otherwise. As Yvette Taylor (2007) in her review on the relations of feminist theory and queer theory has written, some leading feminist theorists (citing Stevi Jackson, Diane Richardson and Rosemary Hennessy) ‘... would reel at the depiction of feminist theory and politics as ... unable to theorize complication or multiplicity ...’ (p. 387). The intersectional questions raised by poststructuralists are important, but they are certainly not the preserve of poststructuralism, especially when it comes to empirical research, social explanation and social theorizing (Jónasdóttir and Jones, 2009a, 2009b). Likewise, intersectionality is not to be reduced to subjectivism or identity.
- 7 Hearn, 2004d, 2005, 2008a, 2009.
- 8 These three interpretations convey three models of space: as egocentric density of space, engaging with barriers; as spread, scope and extent in meta-space; and transformations of emerging, immanent spaces.
- 9 This paragraph draws on collaboration with Marina Blagojević (Hearn and Blagojević, 2013).