



University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

Hearn, Jeff

Deconstructing the Dominant: Making the One(s) the Other(s)

Original Citation

Hearn, Jeff (2014) Deconstructing the Dominant: Making the One(s) the Other(s). Organization : special edition : Editors' Picks: Diversity and Organizations. ISSN 1350-5084

This version is available at <https://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/21869/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

Deconstructing the Dominant:
Making the One(s) the Other(s)

Jeff Hearn

Professorial Research Fellow in the Faculty of Economic and Social Studies,

School of Social Policy

University of Manchester

For 'Connexions'
Organization
Sage

Manchester
M13 9PL
UK

Deconstructing the Dominant: Making the One(s) the Other(s)

Jeff Hearn

When Organization was launched - upwards, sideways or downwards - the feature 'Connexions' was described as addressing the links between 'theory and practice, between the international political and economic order and organizational analysis, between action and disinterested observation' - a modest task!

So what am I to say? What 'connexions' or 'connections' are to be drawn? And does the 'x' have a special significant standing for mystery, multiplicity and cross-cutting meanings that go far beyond the mere 'ct'?

So much could be said, in so many ways, there are too many connexions - all is relevant, one of the routes to madness. And because of this, writing may become more difficult, liable to be frozen in anomie, depressed in infinitude. To begin needs some grounds, and some obvious ones are provided by the themes of the special issue - questions of class, colour, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, sex, sexuality are themselves doorways to multiplicity. Furthermore, re-viewing organizations in this way, a way that highlights multiple social divisions across race, sex and class, necessarily directs concern to the international and the global. The intersections of race, sex and class are more fully understandable through developing a broader view, for both practice and theory.

Whose Voice? Whose Practice?

Reflecting on the special issue 'topics' may of course seem to invite greater attention to those social groups and categories whose voices are often absent, under-represented or unheard, and whose practices are often excluded, oppressed or unnoticed. These would include women, black women and men, women and men of colour, minority ethnic women and men, lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and those who identify as 'queer' - those who are made 'other'. Changing organizations so that such othered voices are heard and these othered practices are powerfully present is essential. This applies in individual organizations and types of organization, in the process of organization itself, and in organizational analysis and theory. It is equally urgent in practice in organizations and theorizing on organizations. I know from my own teaching and research, and indeed being in organizations, that it is often worth asking what if this student or this seminar class or these lecturers were members of a different social category to the one they appear to belong to - and how would that change what I would do/say/write/think/theorize?

In the worst cases, silencing and exclusion involves violence and death - the destruction of the 'missing', 'the invisible ones', that are no longer even present, alive, in organizations to practice, to respond to, to theorize on. In the worst organizations, the process and practice of organization is explicitly and purposefully directed to the mass destruction of people, whether in the former Yugoslavia, China, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, or the many authoritarian regimes that negate human rights. At Auschwitz-Birkenau over four million people were killed - over four million less voices to give an account of that organization.

Silence, and indeed din, are fundamental processes of power and domination in organization (Harlow, Hearn and Parkin, 1995). And while it is a mistake to demonize all organizations or

organizational process, for organizations can certainly be places of love, pleasure and equality, I do feel the full tendency to violation and violent destructiveness, actual and potential, of many organizations is rarely faced (see Hearn, 1994).

These processes of power and domination, of silence and din, in turn prompt another question: what of those who do the ignoring and the exclusion? Thus focusing on race, sex and class, and their various interconnexions also raises an additional agenda - the deconstruction of the dominant, in this context the dominant of organization(s). Indeed one of the things that has absorbed me about organizations, and organization, has been the deconstruction of the taken-for-granted, the unspoken centre(s) of organizations, the dominant One(s). To some, including members of both subordinated and superordinate groups, this may appear to be a strange and unnecessary task. It may also be contrary to the interests of dominant groupings, including several of which I am a member, for example, 'white' and 'male'. It may be enough to note that there is a long history of alliances between oppressors and oppressed, and this is something that I am happy to be part of. While this is most obvious with class and race struggles, there is no reason why this should not apply in all political areas. Perhaps most importantly, this is as much a personal and political project as an academic and theoretical one.

In this essay, I want to reflect on a number of paradoxes on the dominant, the centre. First, social phenomena and social arrangements, such as organizations, are characterized by dominance and centres of dominance, yet those dominant centres are themselves avoided as serious objects of study in social science in general and organization theory in particular. Second, while those centres of dominance are fundamental in understanding organizations and other social phenomena, they should not be conceptualized a priori as solid, unified or singular; more usually, they are multiple, dispersed and sites of series of contradictions. Third, such tendencies in dominant centres to dispersal and fragmentation are constantly being reinforced and yet at the same time they are also being countered and supplemented in the formation of new centres of dominance. These paradoxes are considered through a focus on men, and necessarily different men, within the context of globalization, considered as a gendered social phenomena.

Searching for the Dominant, Searching for the Centre

The search for the dominant centre can continue in all spheres of life and society. It can be a self-reflective process (what or where is the dominant centre of myself?) or a globalizing quest (where or what is the dominant centre of the world order?).

The search for the centre of things continues across the range of social phenomena and experiences. It applies in the assumption of a centre for individuals ('the true self'), for organizations, and indeed for whole societies, and possibly too for the world. There are parallels between the searches for a centre at these various 'levels', or more accurately in these various realms. I assume I have a 'real self', even though there is little I could produce in evidence to most other people to show or explain why this is the case. Likewise, while dominance persists in most, perhaps all, organizations, the notion of a fixed dominant centre is doubtful. And similarly, structured dominance may characterize societal relations, yet those structurings are unlikely to be consistent or without contradiction. Indeed in each case, there could be said to be a search for a central self - be it for the individual, the organization or the society. (Overly) Centred thinking often carries with it a tendency to

anthropomorphism, as, for example, in the notion of the healthy, sick or psychopathological or neurotic organization.

Searching for the dominant in organization and organizations quickly takes us to the search for centres of power, and particularly centres of managerial power. Such centres are to an extent made explicit in some of the 'classics' of organization theory: C Wright Mills' (1968) The Power Elite, William H. Whyte's (1956) The Organization Man, and Melville Dalton's (1959) Men Who Manage. Such United States studies describe in different ways dominant powers in and around American corporations, that themselves have formed a further level of dominant centre in the international organizational world. They posit a centre, or centres, of power but they do not open up that dominant centre(s) to deconstruction in a number of crucial respects. In particular, they do not address the fact that they are talking about dominant groups of men, and the ways in which such men are socially constructed, produced and reproduced. Critical attention to the powerful is in itself no guarantee of analysis of race, sex and class and other social divisions.

Similarly, much organizations theory has implicitly or explicitly assumed a given centre, without subjecting that centre to deconstructive analysis. Dominant centres may be either romanticist or modernist - rational-legal authority, human relationality, system dynamics, community within organization, technology or socio-technical relations, the metaphorical psyche of the organization or the organizational psyche of the individual, or whatever (Hearn and Parkin, 1993). Often romanticist centres are reincorporated within modernist paradigms, as a means of further 'rational' organizational control. But again those centres themselves are immune from focused critique, even where the effects of the power of centres is analysed. Thus what is missing - a different kind of 'missing' - in both empirical studies and theoretical analyses is an explicit attention to the social construction and then deconstruction of those dominants. Usually, this isn't just 'men' as a general category but particular groups of men - often white, heterosexual, able-bodied men (WHAMs) (Hearn and Collinson, 1993), itself a neat summation of race/ethnicity, sexuality, (dis)ability and gender. Again this dominant centre might be recognized in particular organizations, in organization, and in organization theory.

Deconstructing the dominant (or the superordinate) involves making clearer the social construction of 'men', of 'whiteness', of 'able-bodiedness', and so on. The considerable recent research and writing on men as a general category is now being extended to men in and around organizations (for example, Cockburn, 1991; Collinson, 1992; Hearn, 1992; Roper, 1993; Collinson and Hearn, 1996a). This involves naming men as men (Hanmer, 1990; Collinson and Hearn, 1994), that is, as socially constructed not naturally this or that. It also involves analysing the ways that being in and around organizations and being a man/men simultaneously construct each other. Similarly, 'white people', 'white men', 'white women', 'whiteness' and related categories need explicit deconstruction, both in general (for example, Frankenberg, 1993) and in and around organizations. For example, in many 'western' organizations 'whiteness' may often be the taken-for-granted norm that is unspoken, especially in the minds of those who locate themselves implicitly as part of it. Whiteness may only be known because it is not blackness; and 'white people' may only know they are white because they are not black. Organizations are major social means of defining, categorizing, including, excluding such different kinds of ethnicities. Sometimes, whiteness may be defined, usually implicitly, in relation to nation ('English'), religion ('Protestant'), culture ('Anglo-Saxon'), or some similar other social division. 'Whiteness' is itself created by perceived ethnic variation and by international, often imperialist, powers.

Heterosexuality, heterosexual people and heterosexual men and women are also produced in specific social and institutional contexts (Buchbinder et al., 1987). Organizations are especially important in constructing and reinforcing heterosexual norms (Pringle, 1988; Collinson and Collinson, 1989; Cockburn, 1991; Hearn, 1992). (Dis)able-bodiedness may be defined in even more precise ways in organizations, through organizational practices, and by organizations. This particularly applies to the organizational specification of bodily, mental, emotional skills and capabilities in organizational jobs, status, positions and hierarchies. This is done through formal job specifications and all manner of micro, everyday and informal practices. These specifications are both local and worldwide - there is in effect a worldwide social construction of (dis)ability.

All of these dominant categorizations are in turn interconnected and combined together in specific actions, individuals, organizations and social formations. Moreover, these dominant centerings beset not only theoretical analysis but also the performance of practical actions in specific organizational situations. To be a 'good manager', or a 'good supervisor' or a 'good worker' may often involve reference or deference to some assumed dominant centre of the organization in question. One of the things that I have struggled with in recent years, and particularly whilst being a 'Head of Department', is how to be a 'white man', a 'manager' and 'pro-feminist', without reproducing one or more of the dominant centres of race, sex, class and organizational discourse - indeed this may have been an impossible aspiration, not least because this process is quite beyond individual control.

While the Other has been used as a frame of reference to interrogate subordinated groups, categories and classes, the possibility of making the dominant, the One, into the Other has been hardly begun. Sometimes, there are avenues for approaching this conundrum of dominance through the association of two or more social categories, of which one or more are each subordinated and superordinate. For example, 'black gay men' may be seen as Other in terms of their 'blackness' and 'gayness' and the interlinks between those aspects and being men (Mercer and Julien, 1988; Hearn and Collinson, 1993). An alternative approach to deconstruction of the dominant is through psychoanalytic analyses and interventions, whereby the unconscious and subconscious structures and texts are brought to more conscious attention. These may be predominantly psychological, textual, socio-political, or some combination of these. For example, Kaja Silverman (1992) brings these different emphases together in unearthing what she calls the 'dominant fiction' of male subjectivity. She argues, along with Freud, that belief depends upon the attribution of reality to that which is fantasy, including that which is most "real" for subjects. Accordingly, 'if ideology is to successfully command the subject's belief, then it must necessarily intervene at the most profound level of the latter's constitution' (Silverman, 1992, p16), including the constitution of the subject and male subjectivity themselves. It is a challenge to remember that the dominant is simultaneously both real and fictional.

Deconstructing dominance from within - be it the social construction, production and reproduction of men, white people, the able-bodied, or whoever - is difficult. It is less obvious how to proceed than deconstructing the dominated. Deconstructing the dominant involves a simultaneous and ambiguous process of distancing and engagement, of subjecting that which is taken for granted to ongoing critique.

Hard Core, Empty Centre or Site of Contradictions?

Fundamental as such dominance of men, white men, WHAMs, and so on is, the question remains what kind of centre might there be to organizational power - is it a hard core or an empty centre? In general, it would be a mistake to see these centres as solid or unproblematic edifices; while dominance persists, this is often not from any clear or solid centre. Rather dominant centres are typically multi-faceted - diffuse, dispersed, composite and shifting, even self-motivated and self-moving. Male-dominated centres, whether individual, organizational or societal, involve contradictoriness: hierarchy and hierarchical relations over others, and relations of similarity with similar 'selves'; they are simultaneously patriarchal and fraternal; heterosexual(ized), in hierarchies of men over women, and homosexual(ized), through homosexual subtexts and circuits of desire. In some ways, this divergence within organizations mirrors divergent forces in and interpretations of the male psyche and male subjectivity. Male psychic centres, that are directed towards power and control, may be both rigidly hypermasculine and surprisingly fragile, even empty (Craib, 1987). Just as the male psyche has been deconstructed as a site of contradictory and multiple subjectivities (Jefferson, 1994), so too male-dominated centres of organizations and even societies can be deconstructed as contradictory and multiple, even empty centres.

For individuals, organizations and societies, there are plenty of false monoliths with falsely solid centres. Indeed this appearance is one way in which dominance persists and is reproduced. Instead it is the contradiction of extreme rigid power and emptiness that is more real. We need to disrupt any simple notion of dominant centres, in whatever arena.

This combination of core and vacuum is also to be found at the centre of many organizations. Power centres are not unified. From my experience in universities, as one approaches the centre of the organization one realises the contradiction that there is both real power there and there is a dispersal of power that no-one and no group can find a means to control. This kind of post-structuralist view of power is described in terms of a slightly different set of contradictions by more structural analyses. For example, Kanter (1977, 1993) described the intersection of exclusion/separation/hierarchy and difference/differentiation within managerial power centres. Thus men's domination of the managerial centre of corporations was analysed through both 'homosexual reproduction', whereby women are excluded from managerial posts, and 'homosocial reproduction', whereby certain managers/men are selected and differentiated according to their ability to display appropriate social credentials. Thus what Kanter calls 'homosexual reproduction' contributes to the heterosexual norms of many organizations, and what she calls 'homosocial reproduction' contributes to the homosexual subtext and circuits of power in organizations - a further set of contradictions. Furthermore, these various distinctions respectively emphasize unities (through hierarchy and exclusion) and differences between men and between managers (Collinson and Hearn, 1996b). Accordingly, men's power is maintained in organizations through a complex mixture of separation and integration.

Interestingly, the comparative dynamics of organization and management, as addressed by Kanter, in terms of exclusion/separation/hierarchy and difference/differentiation are paralleled at the national, societal and international levels. For example, similar dynamics are reproduced at the societal level in terms of the interaction of the principles of hierarchy and difference - as elucidated by Hirdman (1988, 1990) in describing the male-dominated gender system (cited in Duncan, 1994, Duncan, 1995; Rantalaiho, 1996). Such distinctions make possible the comparative analysis of patriarchy, or patriarchies, through the exploration of

different 'gender contracts', along with different forms of welfare system, social policy, and state intervention.

With difference, women are constructed as clearly distinct from men in both ideas and practice - thus implying some degree of separation in organization for men and women. With hierarchy, men are constructed as having primacy over women in both ideas and practice - thus implying some degree of integration. Difference is the embodiment of fraternal organization, hierarchy of patriarchal organization; together they make up the male dominated gender order (see Stacey, 1986; Remy, 1990). These contradictory features may apply to organizations, nations, societies, as well as the international and the global.

The Loss of Identity, Organization and Nation: Globalization as Gender(ed)

Meanwhile, there is a further complication to this search for the centre(s), whether they are hard, empty or contradictory - namely, that which any centre is supposedly central is itself open to change and perhaps loss. Individual identity, the notion of 'the organization', and the nation are all problematic. Just as excessive focus on the nation is becoming outdated and the subject may be dead or dying, so organization is becoming a vulnerable concept. Indeed perhaps the journal, Organization, is paradoxically part of the project for not just the deconstruction but the destruction of the concept, 'organization'.

The loss, or potential loss, of identity, organization and nation may occur for a number of reasons, but one of the most important is the movement towards globalization. This is assumed to be the product of fundamental change in global technology, media, communication, industry, education, governmental institutions, finance, militarism, environmental change. Thus the deconstruction of dominance and dominant centres also needs to be understood in the context of globalizing processes. The deconstruction of dominance is severely complicated when considered internationally and globally. In one sense globalization theories and theorizing offer a fruitful way of proceeding with such a deconstruction; at the very least they undermine the notion of a simple centre of power, whether of a particular group of men or any other social group. They also point to the need to recognize multiple and contradictory centres of power. On the other hand, globalization may facilitate new centres of power, forms of dominance, and new powerful social categories of men, for example, men who have access to the control of international finance. However, while globalization theory (and much of it is to say the least abstracted theory) attempts to look beyond the confines of the nation-state, that nation-state has itself rarely been theorized in terms of the intersection of class, race and sex.

Furthermore, globalization theses typically do not use gender as a major conceptual building block. More popular have been agendered conceptual frames, such as centre-periphery relations; band-tribe-chieftdom-state evolutions; stateless-state dualism (Friedman, 1994, p3,7); capitalism and imperialism; modernization. More recently, there have been the contrasting theories of post-modernization, whether as a development out of or even within modernization, or as a fundamental undermining of modernization. Commentators have sometimes formulated such distinctions within the frame of the 'world-system', whether formulated primarily in political and economic terms, a long term historical perspective or more cultural, ideological or ideational terms.

In contrast to all this agendered conceptualization, Maria Patricia Fernández Kelly (1994) has written in Organization of the role of gender as 'a principal vector in the distribution of power

and resources in a world increasingly affected by international economic trends' (p249). Such gendered interpretations are increasingly being found in analyses of 'third world politics' (Waylen, 1996), 'international relations' (Grant and Newland, 1991), as well as what is indeed meant by the very notions of economics (Waring, 1988), finance and accountancy (Lehman, 1996) and labour itself (O'Brien, 1981; Mies, 1986; Hearn, 1987). Thus the very building blocks of 'organization' and 'organizations' are, if not crumbling, then being metamorphosed.

Men of the World

This gendering of the global and of globalization theories is to be welcomed. In some instances, there is also attention to the deconstruction of the dominant centre - the naming of men, particularly dominant men. Rarely is this general naming extended to the more specific naming of white men or western men or ruling/owning men. For example, Fernández Kelly (1994) does present a critique of culturalist explanations of Mexican masculinity/machismo, and instead argues for a broad gendered approach as noted above. She also notes that '... the social definition of manhood and womanhood vary with the ebb and flow of political and economic change in a non-deterministic way. ... man and woman are simultaneously empty and overflowing concepts whose content depends on the articulation of production at particular moments in time' (emphases in original) (p259). However, she does not develop a specific analysis of men or 'masculinity' or gendered practices of those men that control the international decision-making processes that affect the fate of the 'maquiladora' program and other Mexican industrial developments in export-processing zones.

What is especially significant is that in the globalization debate in general and globalization theorizing in particular, there is really no attempt to develop explicitly theory on the category of 'men' within the changing world context - what might be usefully referred to as the category of 'men of the world'. This is another of those missing categories: one of those dominants that needs deconstructing. Not surprisingly, this absence is particularly clear in those analyses of the global that attempt to produce 'gender-neutral' accounts that draw on mainstream traditions in economics, politics, cultural studies or sociology (see, for example, Featherstone, 1990). These may be one further attempt to avoid the analysis of certain key social divisions, such as age, gender, race.

The category, 'men of the world', however much it might be a dominant centre, remains invisible, perhaps empty. The most obvious way for it to be approached is through societal or cultural individualism - that is, treating the society or culture as a given 'individual'. Accordingly, 'men' are assumed to be constructed differently within different societies and cultures, especially those that correspond to the nation-state or substantial parts of them with strong ethnic solidarities. This is the dominant tradition, or centre, of comparative and cross-cultural studies, and has been strongly influential in social anthropology and sociology, though interestingly much less so in cultural studies.

A good example of an attempt to look explicitly at 'men of the world' through the lens of culture is David Gilmore's (1990) Manhood in the Making. He combines a generalized psychoanalytic conceptualization of men's enforced separation from the mother and reidentification with the world of culture, with focussed studies of the forms of 'manhood' in particular cultures in the Mediterranean, South Pacific, Brazil, New Guinea, Uganda, and elsewhere. These studies emphasize cultural specificity in the forms of 'manhood', whilst attempting to develop some generalizations on men's dominance that is paradoxically often

pursued through some sense of self-sacrifice and service to others. Even so, this kind of approach to 'men of the world' is strongly influenced by cultural individualism, the culture as an 'individual' object, an identity.

Some feminist studies have looked beyond the society, nation or culture in locating the power of 'men of the world' at the international level. This involves some notion of the international division of labour, and some conceptualization of men's dominance on the global scale, as in the term 'world patriarchy'. A good example of such an approach is Maria Mies's (1986) Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale. She is at pains to demonstrate the depth of international and imperialist dominations; however, her specific analysis of 'men of the world' is rather limited, being focussed on the impact of 'BIG MEN' (sic), that is, 'western(ized)', powerful men on 'little men', that is 'non-westernized', local, less powerful men, in the reproduction of violence in the context of Indian society. She argues that 'women's first and last 'means of production' is their own body' (p170), and this is not easily or fully subordinated. This project of men to dominate women's bodies is itself the means by which BIG MEN dominate little men. Women thus become an object in domination between men. In essence, such violence is necessary in economic production and reproduction.

A rather different approach still to 'men of the world' is outlined by R. W. Connell (1993) in his paper, 'The big picture: Masculinities in recent world history'. His perspective is to develop a political sociology of men in gender relations. While employing a framework of 'multiple cultures and multiple masculinities' that is superficially reminiscent of Gilmore's work, his major contribution is his maintenance of historical and global breadth whilst still remaining focussed on men. This leads him to critique the dominance of 'Euro/American culture' in the world now including the massive importance of imperialism and its virtual obliteration of some cultures' gender regimes. He argues that '(t)he history of how European/American culture, economy and states became so dominant and so dangerous is inherently a history of gender relations (as well as interwoven with class relations and race relations). Since the agents of global domination were, and are, predominantly men, the historical analysis of masculinity must be a leading theme in our understanding of the contemporary world order.' (p606). This therefore directs attention to the history of men in the state, militarism and warfare, industrialization, the professions, technology, management, and so on (also see Hearn, 1992). The significance, forms, power and practices of 'men as managers' and 'managers as men' in the production and reproduction of global domination remains severely neglected in terms of not only gender, but also class and race (Collinson and Hearn, 1996a). To look at 'men of the world' in this kind of way represents a major deconstruction of, and indeed threat to, dominant understandings of organization and management. To be more precise, most texts on organization and management fail to begin to mention the simultaneous power of men and managements/organizations in the context of international, globalizing processes.

The Local Global I: Local Access to the Global

These genderings of globalization are not distant 'global' phenomena but happen and are experienced locally. The global is itself a local topic. These global processes are difficult to make sense of but are felt through different mediations and to different degrees by individuals, us, locally. The deconstruction of the dominant 'men of the world' also has profound implications for the immediate and the local. The global, including 'men of the world', occurs locally, communally, personally. This is so in a number of ways.

First, we can interrogate our own modes of access to the topic of the global. How do we hear, learn, know the global? How do we relate to the global? And why should certain academics, researchers and commentators - rootless, intellectual nomads, international flaneurs/flaneuses - be so interested in the global? Is it the result of the scientific world view? Or merely a reflection of access for some to international travel - the so-called academic jet-setting, enjoyed by a few, despised by many?

Then there are the daily impacts of 'world news' - regular horrors, occasional ameliorations. Often these stories are themselves the product of the emerging and re-emerging ethnicities/nationalisms, most obviously in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, but also elsewhere in North and Central America, Africa, Asia. In some instances, long-standing ethnic and nationalistic battles are being re-energized through new technology. For example, Third World guerilla groups may have access to limited computer technology. Multi-ethnicity is the national norm, as if it ever were not. Global news is our everyday lifeline to globalizing processes.

Meanwhile we live in particular places, sometimes more than one, and probably work in a different place or places; while other places may have special significance as localities of friendship, intimacy, leisure, tourism, sexuality, affection. Still other places have value or exist through electronic communication. We all have our particular biographical relations to multiple localities. The global is local(ized), especially in the cosmopolitan city, and in cyberspace, 'anywhere, anytime, anyhow'.

It is no accident that aesthetic modernism (Lunn, 1985) and then postmodernism in all its forms is a product of the cosmopolitan city. There, taken-for-granted 'truths' are undermined and refuted. The centres of both traditional and rationalist, modernist projects may be dissolved. In the city, we cannot assume that there is a centre of known truths, a known centre of understanding, and explanation, whether class-less, gender-less and race-less, as in dominant discourses, or constructed through one or more social divisions, as in more critical discourses. Those 'truths' are threatened; they may go.

These decentering processes are now also developing through electronic communication throughout the world, albeit extremely unevenly. The Internet, the 'superhighways' and cyberspace more generally are a gendered means of access to a disembodied global; and at the same time, in their creation of the virtual and 'virtual organizations', a fundamental deconstruction of fixed centres, fixed truths.

The Local Global II: The Global in the Local

The global is made local in a second, somewhat different way - namely, the concentration of the effects of global forces in particular places. Living in Bradford brings some such global forces to immediate perception, through the operation in the present of the effects of a particular history of immigration. This history is itself only understandable in the context of a broader history of British colonization and imperialism. For a medium-sized city of under half a million people, it is unusually cosmopolitan. Not only is there a large Asian population, particularly Mirpuri but also Punjabi, Kashiri, Indian, Bangladeshi and East African, Asian (which amounts to about 35% of the city population), but there have also been several previous immigrations, principally of Jewish, Irish, East European, Italian, Afro-Caribbean people.

Thus in Bradford there is no one dominant centre to power: there are several, perhaps many. A single dimension analysis, based say on class alone, does not work. There are different kinds of local patriarchies (Hearn, 1992); most obviously there are contrasts between the White (Christian?) cultural community/patriarchy and the Asian Muslim cultural community/patriarchy, but there are also contrasts between communities/patriarchies within each. These patriarchies co-exist, interrelate or conflict, and in some cases develop their dynamic in relation to parts of the world that are relatively distant. For example, political developments within Pakistan may bear on the local politics of Bradford.

These global and historical forces bear on the behaviour of the dominant groups within each cultural community/patriarchy. While White men may have relatively easier access to the well established and dominant patriarchal organizations in the city, many Asian Muslim men have more limited access to those organizations but have in recent years created their own patriarchal organizations. Many Asian Muslim men may also tend to have much closer ties and obligations to families and extended families than is the case with many White men. In addition, many Asian men show much greater warmth, affection and solidarity with each other, for example, in ritual greeting and in single-sex organizations. These differences are even more complicated for young men, a subordinated group in both White and Asian Muslim patriarchies. Young men in both groups may seek collective solidarity with others in their own group, and this may be seen on the streets, in clubs, schools and colleges, in their assertion of difference, sometimes aggressively, from young women. Whereas for young Asian Muslim men this takes place in the context of relatively strong family networks and clear sex segregation in religion, culture and politics, for young White men this often occurs in the context of relatively weaker family obligations and more subtle sex segregation in religion, culture and politics. Thus different groups of young men form their own organizations, often in contradictory ways, simultaneously both showing resistance to older men and dominance over younger women. For Asian Muslim young men this situation is further complicated by their own organizations, both formally and informally, that resists dominant racializing and racist, White patriarchal cultures. For example, it may be particularly difficult to interpret the mutual hand slapping that some young Asian Muslim men may do on greeting - is it solidarity, care, affection, ritual, aggression or ascertainment of difference from young women, young White men and White patriarchal cultures? How do gendered globalization and 'men of the world' construct the use of men's hands on each other - whether slapping, shaking, fighting or loving - in the immediate, communal moment?

The Local Global III: Personal Experience in the Organizational World

A third and fundamental way in which global/local phenomena occur is through the personal, through personal experience. Globalization processes provide the social context of the personal, personal experience, personal relations, and personal relationships. Change and personal change, including of course my own personal change, occur within this daunting globalizing context. Construction and deconstruction of identity occur through the increasingly globalized sets of personal experience. Information and media technology, as well as international travel and trade themselves, produce ever more contradictory global influences and global artefacts that are available for use in the process of people becoming 'a particular person'.

The pressures of these rapid and contradictory changes and imperatives may be overwhelming. This is not just an intellectual or analytical problem but an emotional and lived one. Learning about the new, whether it is new products, new cultural influences, new

places, new organizations positions the novice or newcomer (see Gheradi, 1995) as both privileged and ignorant. The outsider, the alien, the emigrée, the flaneur/flaneuse is able to see both more and less of what is happening around them.

The formation, or perhaps more accurately constant reformation, of identity occurs through personal relations set within this changing, globalizing context. The search for meaning, and for elusive totality is both social and individual. A number of writers, notably Alberoni (1984) and Friedman (1994), have tried to connect global forces of modernism/postmodernism to the fragmentation of the person and identity. The dissolution of the modernist project and associated crises of personhood may lead to a series of alternative personal states, as the world no longer conforms to the person's structure of desire and the person is open to depression, 'depressive overload', and psychological despair. In this situation, the fragmented person may indeed experience mental collapse or may 'survive' through fetishistic and obsessive individualism, increasing dependence on the gaze of the other ('the (so-called) narcissistic state') or total identification with the gaze of the other ('the nascent state'). In the last case, psychic salvation may come from submitting oneself to a larger project, either interpersonally, as in 'falling in love', or socio-politically, as in identification with a social movement.

The resources - that is, aspects of social phenomena (such as, colours, shapes, clothes, cultures, appearances and so on) - that are available for these various identifications are themselves increasingly globalized. Identifications in both love relationships and attachment to social movements occur through personal experience, and through impersonal contacts, and these are subject to all the processes of fantasy; romanticism; power and felt authentic wholeness. One's self may be simultaneously lost and re-found in these 'personal' and 'political' encounters.

Tourism, travel, trade, hospitality, electronic communication and internationalism more generally provide the means for both such personal and impersonal contact, whereby people may both find and lose themselves. The new international division of labour and the new world order/disorder provide the materials for women and men to differentially find and lose themselves in personal, sexual and emotional relationships. This may be in the romance of the 'brief encounter', the 'holiday fling', the 'business affair', the 'arranged marriage', the 'meeting of soulmates'. Each of these may be based in or develop through fantasy or reality confrontation. International networking increasingly constructs such relationships both for women and men. Slightly differently, women and men may be differentially constructed and may construct themselves through computer pornography, sex tourism, men's trafficking in and purchase of women, children and sometimes men, and men's use and abuse of the Internet to procure women and other groups of people. For example, Internet 'Users can select a wife from on-screen listings of hundreds of young Filipina, Thai or Russian women at the click of a mouse or call up information on world prostitution from street-by-street directions to price lists for a variety of sex acts and names of prostitutes.' (Rose, 1995). Electronic media are now available for both men's procurement of women and for mutual 'meeting' of possible intimate, emotional and sexual partners whether for 'cybersex' or 'bodily sex' - and thus provide the grounds for the re-formulation of identity. Indeed there is now more room for the confusion of 'good' and 'bad' sex.

For both individual men and 'men of the world' more generally, the implications are immense. Centres of dominance, of men's dominance, may in their way be reinforced, relocated and fragmented. Similarly, men's structural power in globalization processes may

increasingly be enacted by individual men and groups of men who are themselves contradictory, fragmented and have their own structures of desire mediated through and perhaps constructed through cyberspace. Gendered globalization has without doubt made the interconnections between the real and the fictional both more intense and more real.

Notes

- 1 Mies's (1986) use of the term 'BIG MEN' should not be confused with the 'Big Men' of East Africa (such as the Dodoth of Northern Uganda, where a real man is a man with cattle) or New Guinea (where big men become big through the demonstration of hands-on leadership), discussed by Gilmore (1990).
- 2 Although Connell (1993) uses the 'multiple masculinities', he notes the possible limitations of the concept of masculinity as culture-bound in Euro-American culture (pp 605-6). Also see MacMahon, 1993; Hearn, 1996.
- 3 Somewhat confusingly Friedman (1994, p247) links narcissism with increasing dependence upon the 'gaze of the other', rather than conceptualizing narcissism as independence from the other through obsessive self-absorption.

- Alberoni, F. (1984) Movement and Institution, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Buchbinder, H.; Burstyn, V., Forbes, D. and Steadman, M. (eds) (1987) Whose on Top? The Politics of Heterosexuality, Toronto: Garamond.
- Cockburn, C. (1991) In the Way of Women, London: Macmillan.
- Collinson, D.L. (1992) Managing the Shopfloor, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Collinson, D.L. and Collinson, M. (1989) 'Sexuality in the workplace: The domination of men's sexuality' in J. Hearn, D. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff and G. Burrell (eds), The Sexuality of Organization, London: Sage.
- Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (1994) 'Naming men as men: implications for work, organizations and management', Gender, Work and Organization 1(1), 2-22.
- Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (eds) (1996a) Men as Managers, Managers as Men, London: Sage.
- Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (1996b) 'Men managing leadership? 'Men and Women of the Corporation' revisited', International Review of Women and Leadership 1(2).
- Connell, R.W. (1993) 'The big picture: Masculinities in recent world history', Theory and Society 22(5), 597-623.
- Craib, I. (1987/88) 'Masculinity and male dominance', Sociological Review 35(4), 721-743.
- Dalton, M. (1959) Men who Manage, New York: John Wiley and Son.
- Duncan, S. (1994) 'Theorizing differences in patriarchy', Environment and Planning A, 26, 7177-7194.
- Duncan, S. (1995) 'Theorizing European gender systems', Journal of European Social Policy, 5(4), 263-284.
- Featherstone Kelly, M.P. (1994) 'Making sense of gender in the world economy: Focus on Latin America', Organization, 1(2), 249-275.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993) White Women, Race Matters, The Social Construction of Whiteness, London: Routledge.
- Friedman, J. (1994) Cultural Identity and Global Process, London: Sage.
- Gheradi, S. (1995) Gender, Symbolism and Organizational Cultures, London: Sage.
- Gilmore, D. (1990) Manhood in the Making, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Grant, R. and Newland, K. (eds) (1991) Gender and International Relations, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

- Hanmer, J. (1990) 'Men, power and the exploitation of women' in J. Hearn and D. Morgan (eds) Men, Masculinities and Social Theory, London: Unwin Hyman.
- Harlow, E., Hearn, J. and Parkin, W. (1995) 'Gendered noise: Organizations and the silence and din of domination' in C. Itzin and J. Newman (eds) Gender, Culture and Organizational Change, London: Routledge.
- Hearn, J. (1987) The Gender of Oppression, Brighton: Wheatsheaf; New York: St Martin's.
- Hearn, J. (1992) Men in the Public Eye, London: Routledge.
- Hearn, J. (1994) 'The organization(s) of violence: men, gender relations, organizations and violences', Human Relations, 47(6), 731-754.
- Hearn, J. (1996) 'Is masculinity dead? A critique of the concept of masculinity/masculinities' in M. Mac an Ghaill (ed), Understanding Masculinities: Social Relations and Cultural Arenas, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Hearn, J. and Collinson, D.L. (1993) 'Theorizing unities and differences between men and between masculinities' in H. Brod and M. Kaufman (eds), Theorizing Masculinities, Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage.
- Hearn, J. and Parkin, W. (1993) 'Organizations, multiple oppression and postmodernism' in J. Hassard and M. Parker (eds), Postmodernism and Organizations, London: Sage.
- Hirdman, Y. (1988) 'Genussystemet - reflexioner kring kvinnors sociala underordning', Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidskrift, 3, 49-63.
- Hirdman, Y. (1990) 'Genussystemet' in Demokrati och Makt i Sverige, Stockholm: Statens Offentliga Utredningar.
- Jefferson, T. (1994) 'Theorizing masculine subjectivity' in T. Newborn and E. Stanko (eds) 'Just Boys Doing Business', Men, Masculinities and Crime, London: Routledge.
- Kanter, R.M. (1977, 1993) Men and Women of the Corporation, New York: Basic Books.
- Lehman, C. (1996) 'Quiet whispers ... men accounting for women, West to East' in D. L. Collinson and J. Hearn (eds), Men as Managers, Managers as Men, London: Sage.
- Lunn, E. (1985) Modernism and Marxism, London: Verso.
- McMahon, A. (1993) 'Male readings of feminist theory: 'the psychologization of sexual politics in the masculinity literature'', Theory and Society, 22(5), 675-696.
- Mercer, K. and Julien, I. (1988) 'Race, sexual politics and black masculinity: A dossier' in R. Chapman and J. Rutherford (eds) Male Order, London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Mies, M. (1986) Patriarchy and Accumulation on World Scale, London: Zed.
- Mills, C.W. (1968) The Power Elite, New York: Oxford University Press.
- O'Brien, M. (1981) The Politics of Reproduction, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Pringle, R. (1988) Secretaries Talk, London: Verso.

Rantalaio, L. (1996) 'Contextualizing gender' in L. Rantalaio and T. Heiskanen (eds), Gendered Practices in Working Life, London: Macmillan.

Roper, M. (1993) Masculinity and the British Organization Man, 1945 to the Present, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Remy, J. (1990) 'Patriarchy and fratricarchy as forms of androcracy' in J. Hearn and D. Morgan (eds), Men, Masculinities and Social Theory, London: Unwin Hyman.

Rose, E. (1995) 'Adverts selling women flood on to the Internet', The Guardian, November 13.

Silverman, K. (1992) Male Subjectivity at the Margins, London and New York: Routledge.

Stacey, M. (1986) 'Gender and stratification. One central issue or two?' in R. Crompton and M. Mann (eds), Gender and Stratification, Cambridge: Polity.

Waring, M. (1988) Counting for Nothing, Wellington NZ: Allen and Unwin.

Waylen, G. (1996) Gender in Third World Politics, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Whyte, W.H. (1956) The Organization Man, New York: Simon and Schuster.

Jeff Hearn is Professional Research Fellow in the Faculty of Economic and Social Studies, University of Manchester, based in the School of Social Policy. His latest book is Men as Managers, Managers as Men (Sage, 1996), co-edited with David Collinson.