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becoming possible, global gender solidarity is possible! She believes that an alternative normative political-economic space is developing in many parts of the globe, paving the way for various concrete, political solidarity practices and organizations guided by different but not conflicted principles of justice like equality and freedom. This, she claims by a concrete feminist example about the development of feminist reproductive politics from the 1960s to the present, can morph into a transformational solidarity movement using a new more radical paradigm of justice.

Globalization is not gender-neutral. This chapter outlines some global and transnational gender and sexual scenarios. By scenarios I mean possible alternative, and indeed most likely contradictory, trajectories of changing gendered and sexual social relations at the global level. While my emphasis here is on gender, sexuality, and thus also sexualized violence, these necessarily intersect with and are formed simultaneously with and through other social divisions, such as age, class, ethnicity and racialization. More generally, I focus here on gender and sexualities, as themselves deeply political-economic-cultural phenomena, rather than as located with, for example, ‘political economies’ or ‘cultural contexts’. In this sense, I am antagonistic to both those approaches that place gender and sexualities within political economy and to those approaches that fail to recognize their political-economic character. The former is perhaps more usual in discussing ‘gender’; the latter perhaps more common in discussing ‘sexuality’. To pursue this line of inquiry involves considering shifts from intersectionalities towards transsectionalities: the ‘transformulation’ of social, and in this context gender and sexual categories rather than just their mutual constitution and interrelations (Hearn 2008d).

After a brief discussion of theories of globalization, this chapter considers ways in which critical gendered approaches to and analyses of gender, globalization and transnationalization can be developed. The final section assesses the possible impacts of socio-technology on sexualities, including potential new scenarios of ‘postsexualities’.

GLOBALIZATION, TRANSNATIONALIZATION AND GENDER

Understanding the contemporary and future social changes that are often referred to as ‘globalization’ demands attention to a wide range of modes of sociality: material, political and symbolic exchanges (Waters 1995). Globalization theories have analysed contemporary change in many ways. Robertson (1995) highlights greater material interdependence and unity, but not greater integration, of the world; greater world consciousness;
promotion or ‘invention’ of difference and variety; and ‘clashes, conflicts, tensions and so on constitute a pivotal feature of globalization’ (Robertson and Khondker 1998: 29). Giddens (1990) asserts the importance of the nation-state, modernity (capitalism, surveillance, military order, industrialism), time-space distanciation, reflexivity. Lash and Urry (1993) emphasize transcendence of the nation-state, and significance of signs, symbols and transnational cultures.

Malcolm Waters (1995) argues that globalization affects the movement or not of people, goods, services, and information, through material, political and symbolic exchanges. In each case there are contradictions. Economic change is increasingly global, but immediate production of material goods is favored to an extent, with high transportation costs. The nation-state remains a key unit of political organization, especially for those not citizens of particular nations. Symbolic exchanges are both global and local, with degrees of self-referentiality not reducible to global communication. Overall he defines globalization as: ‘[a] social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding’ (Waters 1995: 3).

There are many ways to make connections between gender, sexuality and global change. Globalization and debates around it are material-discursive. Talk on globalization, sometimes optimistic and evangelical, sometimes pessimistic and antagonistic, is part of struggles and contestations over globalization and what it might be(com) materially. Interestingly, ‘globalization’ is persistently represented as ‘political economic’, and indeed as agendered and asexual, even within strongly critical analyses of globalization and the ‘new world order’ (Gill 2008). A materialist-discursive approach can be applied not only to gender relations, but also to sexualities, sexual violence(s), bodies and, as discussed later in this chapter, the ‘sexualing’ of globalization(s) (Hearn 2008b). Globalization, though usually constructed as non-gendered, economic, sometimes political and cultural, is also gendered, sexual(ing) and violence(d). While sexuality is often understood in terms of desire felt to be most one’s own, globalization may disturb this with consequences that are difficult to predict.

Globalization is best thought of as complex, simultaneous and contradictory combinations of the global and local, as in the term ‘glocalization’ (Robertson 1995). In turn, transnationalization may be a more accurate representation of contemporary social changes. In most conceptualizations of the transnational the nation is simultaneously affirmed and deconstructed. The element of ‘trans’ can refer to moving across or between nations and national boundaries, or problematizing, metamorphosing, even dissolving nations or national boundaries (Hearn 2004).

Most mainstream theories of globalization and transnationalization neglect gender relations or relations of sexuality, despite their clear importance. The implications of globalization for gender, sexuality and sexualized violence characteristically remain implicit. Yet, gender-absent accounts of globalization can be re-read in terms of gender and sexuality, for example, as reductions of men’s dominance to supposed ‘gender-neutrality’ or as indicating uneven effects on women and men. Many texts present globalization and transnationalization as ‘gender-neutral’, emphasizing the growth of transnational economic units, framed within ‘gender-neutral’ economic processes, and reproducing an implicit male narrative. Moreover, such ‘genderless’ analyses of globalization persist, even though there is now a large, mainly feminist literature on the relations of globalization, women and gender relations. There is a specific need to gender globalization, and growing interest in the gendered aspects of global change and development, including the gendering of globalization. Many commentators note the transformation of boundaries: spatial, temporal, national, organizational; but rather fewer note how this creates changing possibilities for genders, sexualities and sexualized violence, producing complex social divisions and oppressions (Hearn and Parkin 2001).

Though most of the various approaches to globalization and transnationalization remain typically ungendered, and in that sense part of mainstream malestream social science (O’Brien 1981), even in the 1990s there were many strong examples of more fully gendered perspectives that focused on, for example, international relations and world politics (Grant and Newland 1991; Waylen 1996; Zalewski and Parpart 1998; Peterson and Runyan 1999; Marchand and Runyan 2000), the international division of labor (Mies 1986), local and global economic change (Gibson-Graham 1999), and sustainable economic development (Harriott 1994; Mies 1998). Such texts attend to a wide range of gender and sexual questions, such as male-dominated transnational governance of multinational companies; impacts of transnational neoliberal national policies; gendered patterns of migration, refugee movements, expatriation and repatriation; gendered and sexual global symbolic systems; and expansion of the global and regional sex trade (Pyle and Ward 2003).

In the light of such genderings of globalization and transnationalization, this chapter considers how we can reconceptualize such key terms and ideas as common and conflicted interests, human plurality, solidarity and action through the lens of socio-sexual complexity theory? In the following sections, I suggest that critical gendered approaches to and analyses of gender, globalization and transnationalization can be further developed by including the explicit gendering of men; attending to multiple, often contradictory, gender scenarios; ‘sexualing’ globalization and transnationalization; and extending analysis of gender scenarios to sexual scenarios, and thus also to sexualized violence.

GENDERING MEN IN GENDERED GLOBALIZATION AND TRANSNATIONALIZATION

Oddly, and despite the growth of critical studies on men and masculinities (Kimmel, Hearn and Connell 2005), the gendering of men still seems to be
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a relative lacuna in many critical gender analyses of gendered globalization and transnationalization. This is somewhat strange as such critical studies on men have developed and expanded considerably in recent decades, and have provided various insights at macro and meso as well as micro levels. For example, theorizing patriarchy has included theorizing imperialism (Hearn 1987).

Though for more than a hundred years the notion of men as ‘world leaders’ has become established, men have long led global exploration, adventuring, conquest, appropriation, colonialism, imperialism, pioneering, pillaging, raping, crusading, collective destruction, and wars and warfare. In many of such global processes, men, in particular groups of men, are the main purveyors of power (Hearn 1996). As Connell (1993: 606) suggests, ‘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.’ The histories of nation-building, empire-building and militarism are largely (retold as) histories of men, or certain kinds of men (Hooper 2001; Hearn and Niemi 2007). Such macro-historical changes are relevant for rethinking the global context. The constructions of men and masculinities in gendered transnationalizations remain central.

The task of global geopolitical analysis has been addressed more explicitly in ‘Masculinities and globalization’ (Connell 1998). Connell identifies three forms of “globalizing masculinities”. First, ‘masculinities of conquest and settlement’ refer to those practices by men at the frontiers of incipient empires. In the period 1450–1650 several decisive social changes profoundly disrupted established gender orders in Europe. These included the rise of the Renaissance and Protestant Reformation; creation of overseas empires by the Atlantic seaboard states, building on men’s soldiering and sea trading; growth of cities fueled by commercial capitalism; and religious and dynastic wars. These linked with and led to the first radical assertions of gender equality, consolidation of strong state structures, and the increased centrality of warfare (Connell 1993). Second, ‘masculinities of empire’ concern practices of men in the context of more established empires. This has involved gender ranking of different men and masculinities—some more highly valued, more ‘masculine’ (often the imperialists, colonizers and certain resistant colonized) or more ‘effemelized’ (certain others, perhaps less resistant colonized) than others.

In turn, and third, processes of decolonization have tended to challenge and change former imperial gender orders and hierarchies, producing ‘masculinities of postcolonialism and neoliberalism’. In some cases this has involved associations of masculinity, violence and resistance that are often disruptive of community-based gender orders. With the breakdown of old empires, new postcolonialisms and postcolonial masculinities have developed, often through global capitalism, neoliberalism (Griffin 2005), and the new right. Though generally couched in gender-neutral terms, for example ‘the market’, such changes have implications for various forms of masculinity. Thus ‘transnational business masculinity’ and ‘bourgeois-rational masculinity’ have come into their own along with runaway capitalist globalization, with its intensifying financial and communications linkages (Youngs 2004: 86). Contemporary globalizing masculinities can also be seen to extend to virtual and cyber-glocalizing masculinities.

The idea of ‘globalizing masculinities’, or configurations of men’s globalizing individual and collective practices, is useful. The use of ‘globalizing’ rather than ‘global’ is especially helpful. But there are also several problems. First, the approach can easily become ethnocentric or western-centric, whereby globalization is assumed to ‘spread’ from western centres. However, while there is a western European ethnocentrism in some of these characterizations noted above, the broad approach could be applied to other geopolitical fields. A rather different viewpoint from the western-centric is needed to develop an analysis of the historical and geopolitical context of men and power in other regions of the world. Second, another set of problems relates to the need to deconstruct the dominant—in this case, globalizing masculinities—or to put this another way, to apply the insights of postcolonialism to the centres, the ‘men of the world’, the Ones, rather than to the ‘Others’ (Hearn 1996). Third, there is a range of further theoretical and conceptual problems with the concepts of masculinity, masculinities and hegemonic masculinity, such as around materialism, poststructuralism, postcolonialism and queer theory (Hearn 1996, 2004; Whitehead 2002; Howson 2006).

CONTRADICTORY GENDER SCENARIOS IN PROCESSES OF TRANSNATIONALIZATION

In this section I build on this explicit gendering of men in global contexts to consider alternative scenarios in processes of transnationalization. In considering gender relations in relation to possible gendered future(s) of explicitly gendered men and women, different scenarios can be noted based on differentiation of, first, gender equality and inequality, and, second, gender similarity and difference (homogeneity/heterogeneity) between women and men. Thus four scenarios can be outlined through intersections of gender equality/inequality and gender similarity/difference. First, the doomsday or global patriarchy scenario: men becoming more divergent from women, and with greater oppression and inequality. There is an assertion of men’s difference from women, coupled with trends towards inequality stemming from neo-liberalism. Second, the bi-polar model: men becoming more divergent from women and with greater equality. In this scenario traditionalism is combined with gender equality, and perhaps ‘human rights’ orientation and practice. Arguably, this might be represented within some relatively static, nationalistic versions of the ‘social democratic’ welfare state model.
Globalization need to be sexualized, just as they need to be gendered. It has been unusual for globalization theories to address questions of sexuality and sexualized violence as central concerns. So what are the implications of globalization for sexuality?

Building on the gendering on Waters’ non-gendered framework for analysing globalization, sexuality can be seen within globalization in several ways: economically, politically, culturally. In economic terms, production of ‘exchangeable’ (sexual) items involves local concentrations of (sexual) labor, (sexual) capital and (sexual) raw materials; sexual contact is a local, immediate bodily matter; global organization and movement of people and goods accompanies local material ‘exchanges’, as in trafficking. Politically, the dominant national focus of sexual citizenship may extend to attempts to control transnational activities, even with the difficulties of controlling ICTs across borders. Culturally, forces of moral authoritarianism seeking to turn sex into a problem (Phoenix and Oerton 2000) contrast with the mainstreaming of pornographization in MTV, pop culture, digitalization (Hearn and Jyrkinen 2007). However, it is not material sexual ‘exchanges’ or the political control of sexuality or symbolic sexuality in general that are globalized but particular forms of men’s sexuality and men’s sexualized violence that are dominant and particular forms of women’s sexuality that are so dominated.

Sexuality and sexual violence are not centrally addressed in most globalization theory, but global changes strongly affected by and bearing on sexuality and sexual violence include: extension of commodity exchange and production; trafficking in women; militarism and prostitution; global pornography; computer sex; new technological developments in computer imaging; use of advanced interactive technologies on the web, in which the man can direct the show; sexuality in global militarist symbolism/practices (‘new pornography’ of arms sales presentations); and expansions of sex trade, not least through ICTs (Hearn and Parkin 2001; Hearn 2006).

Just as cities are characteristically organized sexually and spatially, so the world is organized in specific sexual-spatial and sexual-geographical ways. A clear example is the close association of European and US imperialism and militarism with mass prostitution and sex tourism in South East Asia (Enloe 1983). In the face of such globalizing and globalizing forces, sexuality, as the social expression of, social relations of or social references to physical, bodily desire or desires, is liable to considerable historical transformation. Povinelli and Chauncey (1999) have gone further. They have criticized the literature on globalization for often proceeding

as if tracking and mapping the facticity of economic, population, and population flows, circuits and linkages were sufficient to account for current cultural forms and subjective interiorities, or as if an accurate map of the space and time of post-Fordist accumulation could provide an accurate map of the subject and her embodiment and desires.

SEXUALING GLOBALIZATION AND TRANSNATIONALIZATION

Not only is globalization gendered, it is also ‘sexualized’, that is having meanings and needing to be understood in relation to sexuality. Analyses of
Sexuality may often be understood in terms of that desire which is felt to be 'primordial' (MacKinnon 1982), felt to be most one's own. Globalization may disturb this naturalism socially and geographically in ways whose consequences are difficult to predict (for discussion of some of these, see Chapters 1, Jackson, and 6, Tornqvist, this volume).

FROM GENDER TO SEXUAL SCENARIOS: CONTRADICTORY SEXUAL SCENARIOS IN PROCESSES OF TRANSNATIONALIZATION

So, what happens if we relate the gender scenarios and potential gender changes discussed previously to sexuality? In extending analysis from gender relations to sexuality, and thus also to sexual violence, and its multiple dialectics, sexuality is not a separate or autonomous phenomenon or set of phenomena. As noted, sexualities persist in relations with other social phenomena, social experiences, and social inequalities—among gender, class, ethnicity/racialization, embodiment and multiple intersectionalities.

Again, we may consider sexual or gender/sexual equality and inequality, and also sexual or gender/sexual similarity and difference. There are pressures towards both unequalizing (for example, capitalist commodification) and equalizing (for example, sexual emancipatory movements), sexual differentiations (for example, segmentations, identifications) and sexual de-differentiations (for example, collectivizations, blurrings) at the global and transnational levels. These suggest various possible gender/sexual scenarios. Put simply, there are possible moves towards four scenarios: the sexual violence or global heteropatriarchies scenario; the sexual diversification scenario; the sexual blurring scenario; or the environmental, postmodern or late capitalism scenario. As with gender scenarios, sexual scenarios might also be understood as operating in various permutations and with various contradictions.

In the first, sexual violence or global heteropatriarchies scenario, greater sexual or gender/sexual difference is coupled with greater sexual or gender/sexual inequality. In this, dominant sexualities, especially men's sexualities, and especially dominant men's sexualities, are likely to continue much as they are now. This includes the pervasive dominance of various masculine heterosexualities, as well as the associations of some of those heterosexualities with invocations of violence. There is a common violencization of sexuality by men (Hearn 1999b), in addition to an eroticization of dominance or violence (MacKinnon 1982).

This general theme of the relations of gender, sexuality and violence has been addressed across various societies. Howell and Willis (1990) posed the question: what can we learn from peaceful societies? They found definitions of ‘masculinity’ having significant impact on the propensity towards violence and sexual violence. In societies where men were permitted to acknowledge fear, levels of violence were likely to be lower; in societies where masculine bravado, repression and denial of fear defined masculinity, and masculinity and femininity were highly differentiated, violence was likely to be higher. Themes linking with interpersonal and inter-societal violence included: most public interaction being between men, rather than between men and women, or among women; boys and girls systematically separated at early age; male economic activities and products of male labour prized over female's; highly elaborated emotional displays of male virility, ferocity and (hetero)sexuality (Kimmel 2002). Most societies are still organized much along these lines. Violence and sexual violence are unlikely to go away, unless men's dominance goes away. It is likely that there will be more explicit articulations of interplays of sexuality and violence, whether 'public domain' war, torture and terrorism, or (inter)personal wounding, B&D and S&M as technologies of the self (Burr and Hearn 2008). These may be coupled with various sexual commodifications and differentiations within late capitalist and postmodernist developments.

The sexual diversification scenario involves both greater sexual or gender/sexual difference and greater sexual or gender/sexual equality. In this scenario diversification of sexualities, especially LGBT sexual identities, becomes more apparent, influential and even accepted in places, geographical and social. Diversification may also proceed through the ageing of populations and ageing of sexualities, including both relatively dominant and relatively subordinated sexualities. There is likely to be a growth in the age-conscious naming and claiming of older, ageing sexualities, including more focus on the intersections of ageing, disabilities, illness and disease. This theme has been taken up in terms of the complicated and fracturing life course dynamics of the identities and subjectivities of ageing amongst older men and men with disabilities (Jackson 2001, 2003). Ageing sexualities may challenge bodily (hetero)sexual normativity, and highlight greater discussion and practice of adult intergenerational sexual relations.

The third scenario, sexual blurring, is similar in its recognitions of diversity but can be characterized as combining greater sexual or gender/sexual similarity and greater sexual or gender/sexual equality. Profileration of sexual identities is likely to increase the problematization of (hetero)sexual normativity. This may well promote further blurring of sexual categories, most obviously the homo/hetero binary (Brickell 2006), as well as the growth of bi-curious and other changing sexual practices. These might include more public discourses and sexual practices that drift in quite opposite directions regarding sexual power and inequalities. The development of rip theory (McRuer 2006), at the intersection of disability theory and queer theory, may provide a fertile base for further elaboration on the intersections of theory and practice of disability, sexuality, ageing and indeed dying.

Finally, the environmental, postmodern or late capitalism scenario is one of greater sexual or gender/sexual similarity and greater sexual or gender/sexual inequality. This possibility might arise from one of two routes. First,
late modern or postmodern sexual commodification, or indeed capitalist financial collapse, may reduce sexuality to similarity of (economic) function, even with diversification (and differentiation and de-differentiation) in the market. Sexual commodification can be understood as having both differentiating and de-differentiating tendencies, thus suggesting different scenarios, just as queer perspectives can lead to both more autonomous and less autonomous sexualities. A somewhat different route is through the impact of environmental changes, not least climate change and associated water shortages, drought, poverty and hardship, in some parts of the world. These, coupled with imperialist adventuring, are likely to ferment wars and conflicts. Some experts predict that mass global plague-type disease is very likely in the coming decades, made more difficult to control through travel and migration, and greater transnationalization of sexualities. ‘Having sex’ along with disease may become more common throughout the world, not only in areas of high HIV/AIDS infection. This is in addition to long established relations of sexuality, illness and disease from STDs.

A SIGNIFICANT CODA ON SOCIO-TECHNOLOGY: TOWARDS POSTSEXUALITIES?

These broad scenarios are not the whole story. Cutting across them are the variable global impacts of socio-technological change. A key aspect here is the increasing interrelation of sexualities and ICTs. These complicate global/sexual scenarios, with many possible, often contradictory, tendencies and trends. They may elaborate all the gender/sexual scenarios outlined. Moves to and interplays of virtualities and surveillances, along with specific changes around (cyber)sexualities and non-direct physical contact mediated by ‘new’ technologies, constitute major historical changes with profoundly contradictory implications for sexual citizenship (Hearn 2006). These are likely to bring new forms of transnationalization, transpatriarchies, imperialism and neo-colonialism, with virtual imperialist/neo-colonialist exploitation flourishing alongside and supportive of direct non-virtual imperialisms/neo-colonialisms, as in uses of ICTs to facilitate the sex trade.

ICTs create major opportunities to organize sexuality differently, and for the practice and experience of new forms of sexuality: techno-sex, high-tech sex, non-connection sex, mobile phone sex, internet dating, email sex, email flirtation, cybersex, cyberaffairs, virtual sex, multimedia interactive sex, and so on. Virtual communities of interest, around, for or against particular sexualities may appear to offer a safe and trustworthy arena for support, for some, and this may be so in some cases. Yet they also bring their own contradictions (Wellman and Gulia 1999). The familiarity of the web can be deceptive: its increasing familiarity may constitute new hegemony. Comparison may be made with critiques of engineered ‘familial’ corporate cultures (Ezzy 2001) developed at the same time as greater disembodiment of global corporate institutions. ICTs and the web increasingly offer an apparent ‘home’ for members of sexual communities, but are also sites for the extension and diffusion of disembodied sexual capitalism, sexual consumer cultures and sexual pleasures (Bernstein 2001). MySpace.com, the networking site and blog community, with in 2005 about 92 million registered users, was bought from Intermix Media by Rupert Murdoch’s NewsCorp (Behr 2005). What may initially be founded as self-help sexual-communal communities of interest can become exclamationary, pay-to-use capitalist enterprises.

In particular, ICTs have produced hugely successful historical transformations in promoting global trafficking and sexual exploitation, supplying encyclopedic information on prostitution, and the (re)constitution and delivery of the sex trade (Hearn and Parkin 2001; Hughes 2002). Live videoconferencing is amongst the most advanced technology currently on the web: live audio and video communication is transmitted over the Internet from video recorder to computer, and back again. This can involve buying live sex shows, in which the man can direct the show in some cases, with real time global communication. Pornographers are leaders in developing Internet privacy and secure payment services. DVDs provide increased possibilities for making videos with scenes shot from multiple angles, so the viewer can choose that preferred. Viewers can interact with DVD movies similarly to video games, giving the man an apparently more active role. ‘Real’ and ‘representational’ converge; sexual commodification can proceed apace.

Moreover, ICTs do not merely act as media for sexualities and sexualized violence but increasingly can be constitutive of them; they can in effect reconstitute sexualities, and may do so in new ways in the future. For example, sexual activity, without any payment, whether on one’s own (for example, masturbation) or with another or others, is possible in many and various embodied forms, beyond the reach of ICTs, in the privacy of ‘one’s own home’ or elsewhere. On the other hand, sex is increasingly constructed in the context of disembodied social institutions, the state and large corporations, and the laws, controls and ideologies engendered. ‘Private’ sexualities are sites of power and dominance; they may constitute sexual violence, but do not usually constitute prostitution or pornography. However, such (non-commercial) sex can be recorded, written about, photographed, videoed, televised, placed on the web (with various access rights), retrieved from ICT interfaces, with or without participants’ permission or knowledge, transferred to other technologies and multimedia. The same or similar sexual practices can be enacted forcibly or non-forcibly, with or without payment (as with ‘do-it-yourself’ pornography on the web). These possibilities are ever more at hand, and are likely to increase. Moreover, some forms of sexual violation, such as some forms of pornography, may be experienced as affirmation of sexuality for some consumers and controllers.
As the modes of exchange, production and communication become more disembodied, possibilities for the reproduction of those sexual texts increases—accessible on millions of pc screens worldwide through photo- and video-sharing. Various uses of ICTs for sexualities and sexually violent purposes can blur into each other. Representation is pornographized globally; pornography is liable to virtualization, as images once stored electronically can be reproduced and manipulated: ‘the woman’, and perhaps ‘the man’, becomes dispensable. The impact of ICTs increases potential for creating global sexualized cultures and pornographizing. When buying a car, information on or advertising of the car do not in themselves comprise the offer of the car. With sexuality and sexual violence, information or advertising of sexuality and sexualized violence can themselves comprise the offer and experience of sexuality and sexualized violence. For some people at least, especially some men, there is little separation of sexual information, sexual advertising, production of sexual material and sexual experience.

Possibilities for, or rather the existence of, cyber(org)sexualities can take relatively mundane forms, such as possibilities of greater sexual exertion following heart surgery. Far-reaching innovations might be sexually-coded ‘implants’ that would allow people to seek others with similarly or presumed compatibly coded sexualities (Monbiot 2006). Such technologizations can be external to the body skin, in a ‘Blackberry’ or mobile phone-type device, or implanted within. ICTs provide possibilities for various forms of sexual experience, such as, as places for meeting by mutual agreement potential romantic/sexual partners (perhaps with less emphasis on physical appearance) or ‘safer’ sexual experimentation and identity exploration. There are increasing technical possibilities for many-to-many ‘social software’ new sexual affordances for mutual identification (as with Yenta matchmaker system that combines virtual community, collaborative filtering and web-to-cellphone technology, so people can know who is in their physical vicinity at that moment and who shares affinities and willingness to be contacted) (Rheingold 2000; Wellman 2003; Schofield 2003).

This links with technological possibilities of making public people’s emotional lives and emotional-sexual lives. There are now well-established policy practices and research studies on how non-verbal behavior conveys information of human knowledge, plans, intentions and emotions. This is being developed by biometrics and photo-tracking of micro-movements of faces, as in security and counter-terrorism applications at airports (Hughes 2006). Psychology, photography and computer technology may converge to edge of what they are thinking or feeling, emotionally, sexually. One might it might be possible to meet people either with or without such knowledge or others. In the future, it might be possible to meet people with the options of: (i) no such information on either side (assuming two parties); (ii) full knowledge by both parties; or (iii) knowledge by one but not both parties, which the other might accept or to block, as in current filtering technology. Social-sexual contacts could be conducted in two parallel social-sexual ‘universes’—with or without knowledge of others’ sexual or other feelings. Going out on a date could in the future be done with or without (some degree of) access to the other person’s thoughts and emotions, sexual or otherwise.

ICTs offer possibilities for new forms of sexualities whereby people, individually or in groups, display their sexualities, even the ‘whole’ of their sexual lives. Webcams, mobile phones and television reality shows offer new possibilities for practice, identity and image-making, through ‘revealing’ rather than hiding from surveillance (Koskela 2004), and thus new possible forms of sexuality in the face of ‘the disappearance of disappearance’ (Haggerty and Ericson 2000). Sexual surveillance through ICTs brings its own contradictions. Surveillance is generally presented negatively as a means for more centralized control of others, qua individuals and social categories, including individual sexualities and sexual violences. While many ICTs are experienced and represented as giving individuals access to ‘more information’, they also provide means for corporate entities to access far more information ‘about us’. Google and similar companies hold masses of information on people’s personal preferences, including sexual preferences, shown through their virtual inquires and searches (Brown 2006). Compilations of information and surveillances, sexual or otherwise, promoted in tendencies towards combinations of technologies and systems integrated into larger wholes, are part of ‘surveillant assemblages’. These are producing and are likely to further produce new forms of ‘the body’ and commodifications of the self, whereby flesh and sexualities are at least partly reduced to ‘data doubles’ (Haggerty and Ericson 2000).

More generally, socio-technological change extends to the problematization of biological sex ‘itself’, including the very definitions and understandings of ‘female’ and ‘male’, and their presumed inviolable natural ‘givenness’. Relevant here is the development of various forms of genetic engineering, or rather socio-genetic engineering, including IVF, foetal monitoring, cloning, and genetic (self-)monitoring. The problematization of biological sex, and the biological body more generally, undermines references of sexuality to biological sex, as well as reminding us that ‘gender’ is not in itself a radical or critical concept (Bondi 1998). This drastic rewriting of the body is an issue suggested by a range of work from biologists (Roughgarden 2004) to cultural theorists (Kirby 1997).

CONCLUSIONS

Put together, these global changes and scenarios are likely to produce significant changes in what is meant by sexuality, or sexualities. They exert effects on what sexuality is; sexualities, as political-economic-cultural,
are likely to be reformulated. Sexuality categories are likely to become defined in more complex ways and blurings, in interrelations with other social categories and intersectionalities, and in the reconstructions, transnationalizations and transformations of those categories. There may even be new scenarios of postsexualities. Thus, we may speak of growing sexual transsectionalities, within more general moves to social transsectionalities.

NOTES

1. I am grateful to Richard Howson for discussions on this point. In this sense, strict oppositions between 'political economy' and 'postmodernism' need to be transcended (cf. Hearn 1992; Mavroudeas 2006; Bieler and Morton 2008).

2. There is considerable literature that, from diverse positions, questions the theoretical usefulness and empirical accuracy of the very notion of globalization (Hirst and Thompson 1999; Alasuutari 2000; Rugman 2000; Banerjee and Linstead 2001; Petras and Veltmeyer 2001, Kite 2004). One aspect of the critique is the need to give greater emphasis to the ways that nation-states, national boundaries and organized labor at the national level remain important within political economy, even with increases in various transnational flows (Edwards and Elger 1999; Gibson-Graham 1999; Waddington 1999). Partly for this reason, it may be more accurate to speak of growing tendencies towards transnationalization.

3. For example, refocusing of globalizing masculinities in terms of transitional, post-Soviet nations means that different forms of masculinities of conquest and settlement, empire, and postcolonialism and neoliberalism can be drawn on to those based in or usually stressed from Western European, North American and Australasian perspectives. Relevant configurations include: the Czarsist empires; the conquest and settlement of Siberia; the development of Soviet Union empire, including the Stalinist 'ethnic cleansings' and mass political purges; communist and proto-communist empires; processes of Russification; post-Soviet and post-socialist transitions; restatement and re-formation of republics, nations and ethnicities sometimes from pre-Soviet times; the particular complex empires and national/ethnic formations and conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, including the Serbian empire; the particular forms of post-Soviet capitalism and neo-liberalism.

4. Several points may be highlighted here. First is the cross-cutting complexity of the intersection of masculinities with gender, nationality, ethnicity, religion and other social divisions. Second, there are the complications of empires having multiple centres, and of contradictory empires. Third, the interplay, yet distinction, between the land of empires and imperial political systems needs to be noted. Fourth, there are the specific political histories and recent trajectories of nations, proto-nations and ethnic groups of the former Soviet bloc and its allies—some within the Russian Federation, some now independent republics within the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), some within newly independent republics, and so on. Fifth is the changing position of large numbers of Russians outside Russia in the post-Soviet period is important. Sixth, there is the complex, sometimes contradictory, gender imagery and symbolisms of empires and nations, and resistances to them (Hearn 2003).
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The intense conflict that emerged between feminists and other progressives in the 2008 U.S. Presidential primary campaign presents a sharply drawn text from which to study the rhetorical politics of solidarity and betrayal in American feminism. As the field of Democratic contenders winnowed down to just Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama, observers around the world recognized that history was in the making given the certainty that the nominee would be either a white woman or a black man. Yet as the contest between Clinton and Obama unfolded, it was also clear that the excitement and hope that had buoyed the early stages of this campaign threatened to run aground in the shallow rhetoric about whether the race or gender barrier demanded to be broken first. As American history cast an ominous shadow over the competition, fears that the Democratic coalition might splinter over the push and pull of the ‘race versus gender’ rhetoric were not unfounded. In the 19th century, a similar contest between ‘women’s’ suffrage and ‘black’ suffrage ended badly when the struggle over slavery concluded with constitutional amendments that extended the right to vote only to the freedmen. As a consequence, notable First Wave feminist leaders such as Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton parted ways with their abolitionist allies and with the Republican Party (Spruill 2002; Newman 1999; hooks 1981; Caraway 1991). Animated by a sense of profound betrayal, Anthony and Stanton not only campaigned to block the passage of the 15th Amendment but went on to strike dubious alliances with the forces of domestic racism and global imperialism as winning the vote became the singular goal of their suffrage-feminism.²

Even as the specter of a similar debacle hung over the election, Clinton-feminists such as Gloria Steinem (2008) and Robin Morgan (2008) led high-profile charges that sought to mobilize feminists and fellow travelers to break the gendered glass ceiling first. While the conventional narrative highlighted the dilemma of choosing between two courageous candidates each confronting equally compelling historic barriers, Clinton-feminists mobilized a set of arguments aimed to convince sympathetic voters that the two candidates were not similarly situated at all. In their narrative,