

Emasculated Patriarchy

Paul C Mocombe¹, Carol Tomlin², Ericcson Mapfumo³

¹West Virginia State University The Mocombeian Foundation

²Leeds University

³Independent Scholar

*Corresponding author:

Paul C. Mocombe, West Virginia State University The Mocombeian Foundation.

Submitted: 10 Oct 2022; Accepted: 17 Oct 2022; Published: 02 Nov 2022.

Citation: Paul, C. Mocombe., Carol, Tomlin., Ericcson, Mapfumo. (2022). *Emasculated Patriarchy*, *J Huma Soci Scie*, 5(4):397-401.

Abstract

This article posits that the shift from industrial capitalism to postindustrial capitalism in the West has led to what Mocombe deems emasculated and feminine patriarchy, the assumption of patriarchal norms by the state, its ideological apparatuses, and women (given the feminization of the postindustrial workplace) from individual men whose masculinity is no longer associated with being producer and provider as it was under industrial capitalism; instead, they have been interpellated and embourgeoised to define their masculinity as sensitive entrepreneurs, consumers, and or service workers. The work concludes that this has led to the emasculation of men, by removing their patriarchal norms and authorities over the family, which do not disappear; instead, the latter has been assumed by the state, women, and queer folks operating through ideology, state ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse.

Keywords: Ideological Domination, Capitalism, Underclass, Globalization, Feminism, Theory, Phenomenological Structuralism, Structurationism, Masculine Studies, Gender Studies

Introduction

This article posits that the shift from industrial capitalism to post-industrial capitalism in the West has led to what Mocombe deems emasculated and feminine patriarchy, the assumption of patriarchal norms by the state, its ideological apparatuses, queers, and women (given the feminization of the post-industrial workplace) from individual men whose masculinity is no longer associated with being producer and provider as it was under industrial capitalism; instead, they have been interpellated and embourgeoised to define their masculinity as sensitive entrepreneurs, consumers, and service-workers under post-industrial capitalism. The work concludes that this has led to the emasculation of men, by removing their aggression, patriarchal norms, and authorities over the family, which do not disappear; instead, the latter has been assumed by the state, women, and queer folks operating through language, communicative discourse, the ideology (identity politics) of the workplace, and state ideological apparatuses.

Using Mocombe's . structurationist theory of phenomenological structuralism against feminist and masculine theories, in other words, we put forth the argument that the third wave (1990 to the present) of feminine activism against the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism of the West, as it transitioned from industrial capitalism to postindustrial capitalism, has given rise to feminine patriarchy, the push by women for equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution with their white male counterparts

by recursively organizing and reproducing the patriarchy, which is only a particular of the universality of the system, of the society, which is institutionalized as the nature of reality as such, in a, paradoxically, genderless position of their own [1]. Women have pushed for integration and equality in the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism as gender neutral agents of the protestant ethic against any other alternative forms of system or social integration, which renders their historical activism dialectical, oppressive, and exploitative. They paradoxically reify, commodify, and glorify their gender identity as feminine men, the ability to be and do as men (producers, providers, entrepreneurs, and consumers) despite being women, a gaze they would like their male counterparts to also assume by celebrating their success in the system, for equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution. Men have been relegated, given the lost of industrial work that gave them their producer/provider identities under industrial capitalism, to the socioeconomic positions of sensitive entrepreneurs, consumers, and service-workers, given the feminization and queerification of the postindustrial workplace, where the military and athletic spheres have become the only sanctioned and regulated spheres in the public realm left for men to exercise their masculine (aggressive) energies.

Background Of The Problem

According to Lengermann and Niebrugge (2007), feminist theory identifies three waves in its development, which is tied to femi-

nist activism, within the constitution of the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism global social structure: first wave feminism (1848-1920), which is tied to the fight for voting rights and integration into the political process; second wave feminism (1960-1990), which is tied to the fight for equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution with men; and third wave feminism (2000 to the present), which Mocombe argues is a continuation of second wave feminism characterized not by a change (feminization) of the social structure given their formal integration [1]. Instead, third wave feminism highlights the integration and equality of women into the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism social structure as feminine men, giving rise to what Mocombe calls “feminine patriarchy.” The latter is characterized by women holding leadership positions while reifying, commodifying, and glorifying their gender identities in those positions amidst their masculine purposive-rationality, i.e., recursively organizing and reproducing their behaviors as embourgeois agents of the Protestant Ethic in pant and skirt suits for equality (of opportunity, recognition, and distribution with men), capital accumulation, domination, and exploitation. Hence, their identities become both reified and commodified; the former as feminine men (women agents of the Protestant Ethic) who behave like men, and the latter as a market for capital accumulation in the postindustrial stage of Protestant capitalism where they produce commodities and services for their female counterparts who are then celebrated by men as successful (independent) women. Women, essentially, have become feminine patriarchs producing and providing for their families, as men once did under industrial capitalism, via entrepreneurialism and consumerism in the postindustrial landscape (Lengermann and Niebrugge, 2007; Ritzer, 2007; Matlon, 2016; Mocombe, 2022) [2].

Given the lack of focus on the impact the feminization and emasculation of the workplace has had on men by feminist theories, which overwhelmingly tends to applaud this transition, masculine studies have emerged in the attempt to analyze the sociopsychological effects America’s transitioned, beginning in the 1980s, from an industrial economy to a postindustrial one, which integrates the other as entrepreneurs, consumers, and service-workers for capital accumulation, has had on men (Matlon, 2016) [2]. These studies for the most part tend to focus on either the sociopsychological impacts (the rise of fascism, domestic violence, anomie, and alienation) the transition from producer/provider to entrepreneur/consumer/service provider has had on men who are unable to find employment in the transition, or the purposive-rationality (conspicuous consumption, materialism, entrepreneurialism, defender of identity politics) of those who do [2,3]. This work does not focus on either position; instead, we want to highlight the social structural changes, i.e., emasculated patriarchy, using Mocombe’s theories of phenomenological structuralism and feminine patriarchy, which have occurred as a result of this transition.

Theory and Method

Mocombeian phenomenological structuralism, which is a structurationist theory that views the constitution of society, human identity, and social agency as a duality and dualism, views the con-

temporary postindustrial social structure in the West and America as paradoxically constituted via patriarchy and emasculation highlighted by its emphasis on both neoliberalism and identity politics [1,4]. Mocombeian phenomenological structuralism posits that societal and agential constitution are a result of power relations, interpellation, and socialization or embourgeoisement via five systems, i.e., mode of production, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse, which are reified as a social structure or what Mocombe (2019) calls a “social class language game” by persons, power elites, who control the means and modes of production in a material resource framework. Once interpellated and embourgeois by these five systems, which are reified as a social structure and society, social actors recursively organize, reproduce, and are differentiated by the rules of conduct of the social structure, which are sanctioned by the power elites who control the means and modes of production, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse in a material resource framework. Hence, societal and agential constitution are both a duality and dualism: a dualism given the reification of the social structure via the five systems; and a duality given the internalization of the rules of the five systems, which become the agential initiatives or praxes of social actors. Difference, or alternative social praxis, in Mocombe’s structuration theory, phenomenological structuralism, is not structural differentiation as articulated by traditional structurationists such as Bourdieu, Sahllins, Habermas, and Giddens; instead, it is a result of actions arising from the deferment of meaning and ego-centered communication given the interaction of two other structuring structures (physiological drives of the body and brain; and phenomenal properties of subatomic particles that constitute the human subject) vis-à-vis the mental stance of the ego during the interpellation and socialization or embourgeoisement of social actors throughout their life span or cycle, which produces alternative praxis that is exercised at the expense of the threat these practices may pose to the ontological security of social actors in the social structure or society.

Mocombe’s theoretical framework is a universal framework that makes no gender, racial, or ethnic distinctions in its application: all, regardless of their standpoint, are interpellated, embourgeois, and differentiated by the language, mode of production, communicative discourse, ideology, and ideological apparatuses of the social structure or social class language game [1]. Hence, applying Mocombe’s conceptualization to the constitution of female and male identities and theorizing about them, his understanding is that feminine consciousness, praxis, and pride in the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism social structure of the West rests on the interpellation and embourgeoisement of biological women to be agents of the Protestant Ethic without serving as power elites in the social structure or society, which is dominated by men who are deemed the power elites, producers, and providers. Hence women, once interpellated and embourgeois by society, participate in their own oppression as they recursively organize and reproduce the ideals of the society for themselves in their praxis as their practical consciousness amidst its discriminatory effects. Be that as it may, they either seek to recursively organize and reproduce their

structurally differentiated differences in the society for acceptance; in a national position (standpoint theory) of their own, celebrating their difference as an alternative form of system and social integration, i.e., patriarchy, outside of the greater metaphysical system, which produced the difference; or attempt to recursively organize and reproduce the masculine ideals and practices of the society as women for equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution with their male counterparts. Third wave feminism, according to Mocombe, is dominated by the latter form of system and social integration and oppression under (neo) liberal Protestant globalization. The majority of women, contemporarily, in the age of neoliberal globalization, are pushing for integration and equality in the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism as gender neutral agents of the protestant ethic, as defined by their male counterparts, against any other alternative forms of system or social integration, which renders their historical activism dialectical, oppressive, and exploitative. They, paradoxically, reify, commodify, and glorify their sexual female identity as feminine men, female agents of the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism, amidst the society's discriminatory effects, seeking to hold power positions in the society like their male counterparts by recursively organizing and reproducing the (neoliberal Protestant) rules of conduct that are sanctioned, for men, in the society, not change its universal orientation, i.e., form of system and social integration. In short, third-wave feminism in the age of neoliberal globalization is dominated by (neo) liberal feminine men, feminine patriarchy, wherein women seek equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution with men by exercising their practical consciousness against their discriminatory effects (sexual harassment, the glass ceiling, and stereotypes of irrationality and femininity pertaining to women).

Masculine identity, in this postindustrial society, is no different from their female counterparts. Their aim, like the feminine men (women) is to become producers and providers for their families as entrepreneurs, service workers, and consumers of goods by becoming agents of the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism. However, the feminization, "qualification," and otherization of the workplace has replaced their authoritative roles they once held under industrial capitalism as the sole breadwinner of the family in favor of a gender, queer, and other sensitive workplace that has been emasculated. The patriarchy of masculinity has been assumed by the owners, whether queer, women, or straight, of the postindustrial workplace via identity politics. Masculine energy, for the most part, has either been assumed by the state, queers, women, and other others, or relegated to the emasculated military and athletic spheres. That is to say, the agential initiatives of patriarchy in postindustrial capital have not been supplanted. On the contrary, it has been assumed by women, queers, and all others as they seek equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution with men whose aggressive energy is only suitable for the emasculated military (with its emphasis on identity politics and imperial warfare) of the West or the athletic sphere.

Put differently, contemporary neoliberal globalization represents a Durkheimian mechanicalization of the world via the Protestant

Ethic and the spirit of capitalism under American (neoliberal) hegemony. The latter (American hegemon) serves as an imperial agent, an empire, seeking to interpellate and embourgeois the masses or multitudes of the world to the juridical framework of the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism as originally defined by men. However, in the age of (neoliberal) capitalist globalization and climate change this is done within the dialectical processes of two forms of fascism or system/social integration: 1) right-wing neoliberalism, and 2) identity politics masquerading as cosmopolitanism or hybridization. Both positions represent two sides of the same fascistic coin in the age of (neoliberal) globalization and climate change, where structurally differentiated identities, in this case, women and men, are simply seeking integration by recursively organizing and reproducing both sides of the fascistic coin for equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution.

On the one hand, in other words, neoliberal globalization represents the right-wing attempt to homogenize (converge) the nations and social actors of the globe into the overall market-orientation, i.e., private property, individual liberties, and entrepreneurial freedoms, of the capitalist world-system under the carrot and stick of American dollar diplomacy. This neoliberalization is usually juxtaposed, on the other hand, against the narcissistic exploration of self, sexuality, and identity of the left, which converges with the neoliberalizing process via the diversified consumerism of the latter groups as they seek equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution with white male agents of the former within their market logic. Hence private property, individual liberties, diversified consumerism, and the entrepreneurial freedoms of the so-called marketplace become the mechanisms of system and social integration for both groups in spite of the fact that the logic of the marketplace is exploitative and environmentally hazardous. Women in their third wave of activism in the age of neoliberal globalization seek integration in the aforementioned systemicity, paradoxically, through the narcissistic exploration, reification, and commodification of their sexual and gender identities as a market and commodity, means for capital accumulation, amidst their attempt to behave like men (agents of the Protestant Ethic) and hold power positions as signs of their equality. In other words, gender identity has been reified and commodified amidst the liberal push by women to achieve equality of opportunity, recognition, and distribution with men by behaving like them in similarly situated status positions and roles, not to offer an alternative form of system and social integration to the universality of the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism by which the West fascistically attempts to homogenize the globe.

Hence third-wave feminism in the academy and the larger society is dominated by what Mocombe calls "feminine patriarchy", women fascistically and paradoxically pushing forth their reified and commodified market, gender identities, whose praxis assumes masculine behavior in order to integrate in the universality of the Protestant capitalist social structure despite the fact that its systemicity is exploitative and environmentally hazardous. Men also attempt to recursively organize and reproduce this patriarchy by

which the society has always been constituted but must do so by emasculating themselves in the workplace, in order to be sensitive to their female and queer colleagues, who paradoxically, behave and want to be treated like the men once did.

Future research must explore this ever-increasing emasculation of individual men amidst the assumption of patriarchal roles by the state, women, queer, and other others in postindustrial capitalism [5-78].

References

1. Mocombe, P. (2022). Feminine Patriarchy. *Sociology International Journal*, 6 (3), 78-82.
2. Matlon, J. (2016). Racial capitalism and the crisis of black masculinity. *American Sociological Review*, 81(5), 1014-1038.
3. Hooks, B. (2004). *We real cool: Black men and masculinity*. Psychology Press.
4. Mocombe, P. (2019). *The Theory of Phenomenological Structuralism*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
5. Adorno, T. (1973). *Negative Dialectics* (New York. Continuum, 14.
6. Althusser, L. (2006). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. Aakar Books.
7. Althusser, Louis and Étienne Balibar (1970). *Reading Capital* (Ben Brewster, Trans.). London: NLB.
8. Archer, M. S. (1985). Structuration versus morphogenesis. SN Eisenstadt & HJ Helle (ed.), *Macro-sociological theory: perspectives on sociological theory içinde* (58-87).
9. Helle and S.N. Eisenstadt (Eds.), *Macro-Sociological Theory: Perspectives on Sociological Theory* (Volume 1) (pp. 58-88). United Kingdom: J.W. Arrowsmith Ltd.
10. Balibar, E., Wallerstein, I. M., & Wallerstein, S. R. I. (1991). *Race, nation, class: Ambiguous identities*. Verso.
11. Bell, D. (1982). *The social sciences since the Second World War*. Transaction Publishers.
12. Bhabha, H. K. (1995). *Cultural diversity and cultural differences*. na.
13. Ashcroft et al (Eds.), *The Post-colonial Studies Reader* (pp. 206-209). London and New York: Routledge.
14. Bhabha, Homi (1995b). *Signs Taken for Wonders*. In Bill Ashcroft et al (Eds.), *The Post-colonial Studies Reader* (pp. 29-35). London and New York: Routledge.
15. Bhabha, H. (2015). □ Remembering Fanon: Self, Psyche and the Colonial Condition. In *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory* (pp. 112-123). Routledge.
16. Boswell, T. (1989). Colonial empires and the capitalist world-economy: A time series analysis of colonization, 1640-1960. *American Sociological Review*, 180-196.
17. Brecher, Jeremy and Tim Costello (1998). *Global Village or Global Pillage: Economic Reconstruction from the bottom up* (second ed.). Cambridge, Mass.: South End Press.
18. Brennan, Teresa (1997). The Two Forms of Consciousness. *Theory Culture & Society*, 14 (4): 89-96.
19. Chase-Dunn, Christopher and Peter Grimes (1995). *World-Systems Analysis*. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21, 387-417.
20. Chase-Dunn, Christopher and Richard Rubinson (1977). *Toward a Structural*
21. *Perspective on the World-System*. *Politics & Society*, 7: 4, 453-476.
22. Chase-Dunn, C. (1975). The effects of international economic dependence on development and inequality: A cross-national study. *American Sociological Review*, 720-738.
23. Clark, R. P. (2018). *The global imperative: An interpretive history of the spread of humankind*. Routledge.
24. Cohen, J., & Kaelber, L. (2003). Protestantism and capitalism: The mechanisms of influence. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 28(4).
25. Coser, L. A. (1998). *The functions of social conflict* (Vol. 9). Routledge.
26. Crothers, C. (2003). Technical advances in general sociological theory: The potential contribution of post-structurationist sociology. *Perspectives*, 26(3), 3-6.
27. Durkheim, E., & Halls, W. (1984). *The Division of Labour in Society* [De la division du travail social].
28. Eagleton, Terry (1999). *Marx*. New York: Routledge.
29. Eagleton, T. (1993). *Ideology: an introduction*.
30. Engels, Frederick (2000 [1884]). *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*. New York: Pathfinder Press.
31. Fanon, Frantz (1967). *Black Skin, White Masks* (Charles Lam Markmann, Trans.). New York: Grove Press.
32. Fanon, F., Sartre, J. P., & Farrington, C. (1963). *The wretched of the earth* (Vol. 36). New York: Grove press.
33. Fraser, N. (2014). *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the "postsocialist" condition*. Routledge.
34. Frazier, Franklin E. (1939). *The Negro Family in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
35. Frazier, E. F. (1957). *Black bourgeoisie: The rise of a new middle class* New York.
36. Frazier, Franklin E. (1968). *The Free Negro Family*. New York: Arno Press and The New York Times.
37. Birsl, U. (2016). *Anthony Giddens: The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration*, Cambridge: Polity Press 1984, 402 S.(dt. Die Konstitution der Gesellschaft. Grundzüge einer Theorie der Strukturierung, Campus: Frankfurt/New York 1988, 460 S.). In *Klassiker der Sozialwissenschaften* (pp. 346-349). Springer VS, Wiesbaden.
38. Gilroy, P. (1993). *The black Atlantic: Modernity and double consciousness*. Harvard University Press.
39. Glazer, N., & Moynihan, D. P. (1970). *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City* (p. xxxivxxxv). Cambridge, MA: mit Press.
40. Gramsci, Antonio (1959). *The Modern Prince, and Other Writings*. New York: International Publishers.
41. Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action: Lifeworld and system* (T. McCarthy, Trans. Vol. 2). Boston, MA: Beacon.
42. Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Jurgen Habermas; trans. By thomas McCarthy*. Heinemann.

43. Harris, D. R., & Sim, J. J. (2002). Who is multiracial? Assessing the complexity of lived race. *American sociological review*, 614-627.
44. Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (1972). *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, trans. John Cumming. New York: Herder and Herder, 120-167.
45. Hudson, Kenneth and Andrea Coukos (2005). The Dark Side of the Protestant Ethic: A Comparative Analysis of Welfare Reform. *Sociological Theory* 23 (1): 1-24.
46. Jameson, F., & Miyoshi, M. (Eds.). (1998). *The cultures of globalization* (p. xii). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
47. Kellner, Douglas (2002). Theorizing Globalization. *Sociological Theory*, 20:3, 285-305.
48. Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2014). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics* (Vol. 8). Verso Books.
49. Lukács, G. (1972). *History and class consciousness: Studies in Marxist dialectics*. mit Press.
50. Lukács, G., & Lukács, G. (2000). *A defence of history and class consciousness: Tailism and the dialectic*. Verso.
51. Lyman, Stanford M. (1997). *Postmodernism and a Sociology of the Absurd and Other Essays on the "Nouvelle Vague" in American Social Science*. Fayetteville: The University of Arkansas Press.
52. Vidich, A. J., & Stanford, M. Lyman. 1985. *American sociology: Worldly rejections of religion and their directions*.
53. *Rejections of Religion and Their Directions*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
54. Lyman, S. M. (1972). *The black American in sociological thought* (Vol. 379). Putnam Publishing Group.
55. Mageo, J. M. (1998). *Theorizing self in Samoa: Emotions, genders, and sexualities*. University of Michigan Press.
56. Mansoor Moaddel (2005). *Islamic Modernism, Nationalism, and Fundamentalism: Episode and Discourse*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
57. Marshall, G., & Scott, J. (Eds.). (1998). *A dictionary of sociology*.
58. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2002). *The Communist Manifesto*, ed. Gareth Stedman Jones. London: Penguin, 229, 258.
59. Karl, M. (1909). *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Charles H. Kerr.
60. Marx, Karl (1998 [1845]). *The German Ideology*. New York: Prometheus Books.
61. Mason, P. L. (1996). Race, culture, and the market. *Journal of Black Studies*, 26(6), 782-808.
62. McMichael, Philip (2008). *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*. Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.
63. Ortner, Sherry (1984). Theory in Anthropology Since the Sixties, *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26: 126-66.
64. Polanyi, K. (2001). *The great transformation: The political and economic origins of our time*. Beacon press.
65. Reyna, Stephen P. (1997). Theory in Anthropology in the Nineties, *Cultural Dynamics* 9 (3): 325-350.
66. Roediger, D. R. (2017). *The wages of whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class*. Class: The Anthology, 41-55.
67. Said, Edward (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
68. Sennett, R. (1998). *The corrosion of character: The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism*. WW Norton & Company.
69. Sklair, L. (1995). *Sociology of the Global System*. Baltimore: MD. The Johns.
70. Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (Eds.). (2006). *The post-colonial studies reader*. Taylor & Francis.
71. Wallerstein, Immanuel (1982). *The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis*. In Hamza Alavi and Teodor Shanin (Eds.), *Introduction to the Sociology of "Developing Societies"*(pp. 29-53). New York: Monthly Review Press.
72. Weber, M. (1958). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Scribner.
73. Wilson, K. H. (1999). Towards a discursive theory of racial identity: The souls of black folk as a response to nineteenth-century biological determinism. *Western Journal of Communication*, 63(2), 193-215.
74. Wilson, W. J. (2012). *The declining significance of race: Blacks and changing American institutions*. University of Chicago Press.
75. Wilson, William J. (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
76. Brown, A. R. (2003). The world is a ghetto: race and democracy since World War II [book review]. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 26(1), 177-178.
77. Wright, K. (Ed.). (2001). *African-American Archive*. Black Dog & Leventhal.

Copyright: ©2022 Paul C. Mocombe. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.