

Introduction

SEXUALITY, GENDER AND VIOLENCE IN THE 21st CENTURY:

AN INTRODUCTION¹²

Begonya Enguix Grau, PhD

Department of Arts and Humanities

MEDUSA Research Group

Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain

Cristina Pereira Vieira, PhD

Department of Social Sciences and Management, Open University (UAb) Portugal

Interdisciplinary Centre for Gender Studies (CIEG-ISCSP)

University of Lisbon, Portugal

INTRODUCTION

Many years ago, the American anthropologist Gayle Rubin used “hierarchy” to illustrate how different systems of sex and gender become organised around (socially accepted) valued positions and produce sex-gender hierarchies where the top is the institution of heterosexual marriage (Rubin, 1989). Next to heterosexual marriage in value terms, we find heterosexual monogamous non-married people followed by other heterosexuals. Stable lesbian and gay couples are right on the edge of respectability, but promiscuous gays and lesbians hover just above the groups at the bottom of the pyramid. The most despised sexual castes include, according to this author, transsexuals, transvestites, fetishists, sadomasochists, sex workers and those who work in pornography. In the absolute lowest position we find those whose eroticism transgresses generational boundaries. Sex and gender hierarchies together with the sociocultural valorisation of the masculine over the feminine are deeply entangled with power and privileges and have brought about injustice and violence.

Hierarchies rely on classification. Sexuality-gender classifications are basic to the social order organised around the Social Standard, which establishes guidelines as to how the relations between the people of a given society should be constituted and developed,

¹ Corresponding Authors: benguix@uoc.edu and Cristina.Vieira@uab.pt.

² This chapter is a result of the research project ‘Genders and Postgenders: A Cartography of Meanings for Social Transformation’ (I+D Programa Estatal, Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad. Gobierno de España. Referencia: FEM2016-77963-C2-2-P) (2016-2020).

contributing to the reproduction of the social order (Vieira & Costa, 2016). They structure human reproduction and the relationships between people. The vertical character of the classifications is influenced by the existing power relations and by what Bourdieu (1979) designates as the symbolic power. With regard to classification, we must consider that the different systems of classification are related to our symbolic universes and also to our identity paradigms; that is, to the way in which we think about the world and the way we think about ourselves. They are narrative (they explain), performative (they shape) and normative (they regulate) (Sáez, 2018).

The historical and cultural classifications of sexuality and gender have been very variable. Not all cultures establish the same boundaries between the sexes and do not attribute the same importance or value to sexuality and gender as classifying criteria. Taken historically, the classification processes based on the categories of sex and gender have run through varied landscapes drawing moving borders. For example, before the 18th century, the Galenic paradigm advocated for the existence of a single sex and two genders: the female sex was simply the same as the male but turned inward. According to Laqueur (1994) this sexual model is based more on behaviour and attitude than on anatomy. Laqueur affirms that the Galenic unisex model turned gender—and not sexuality—into the prevalent classificatory criterion until the 19th century. The gender system divided men into effeminate and virile men. According to Chauncey (1994), this division (which privileges gender over sex) was maintained in the US. until the 1920s and 30s.

However, in the 18th century the concept of sexuality started to replace gender as an identity marker, in relation to the incipient capitalism that required a (re) production of producers and a control of population (Foucault, 1984). The bourgeois social boom drew up re-productive policies and the most valued social position became that of heterosexual couples with offspring. The process of the construction of homosexuality and heterosexuality (both produced in the 19th century) illustrates the shift from gender to sexuality. “Sodomites” were once represented as a third gender but throughout the 19th century they were gradually conceived as a third sex. The third sex theory poses no threat to heterosexuals as it transforms sodomites into non-male men who do not endanger the virility of "normal" men or hegemonic masculinity. At a time—the end of the 19th century—when new models of masculinity were developing in Europe—in sports and in the military, among colonisers, nationalists and Zionists—the Uranists were considered

incompatible with masculinity (“a woman’s soul in a man’s body” to quote Ulrichs, in Enguix, 1996: 33).

The normative binary configuration of sex (sexual dimorphism), gender and sexuality, is symbolically connected: two sexes correspond to two genders and two sexual orientations, one of them socially accepted and another one (the homosexual) subject of rights in some democratic contexts. Our cultural repertoire is limited and we generally consider that the change in one of the three elements (sex, gender, sexual orientation) produces a change in at least one of the others. For many years, male homosexuality was conceivable only by feminising the gay and masculinising the lesbian. It was after Stonewall and the modern Gay Movement (now LGBTQ*) that sexual orientation, body and gender started to be considered separately (Enguix, 2011b, 2011c, 2019).

In fact, sex and body, gender, sexuality and affects can be thought of as an assemblage. The concept of “assemblages” provides us with a useful way to think about social entities as

wholes whose properties emerge from the interactions between the parts... [they are] characterised by relations of exteriority that imply that a component part of the assemblage may be detached from it and plugged into a different assemblage in which its interactions are different (De Landa cited in Tamboukou 2010: 685).

Assemblages are not just things, practices and signs articulated into a formation, but also qualities, affects, speeds and densities. Although some theorists consider that they work through flows of agency rather than specific practices of power, we think that in an assemblage there are flows of structural power and that flows of power are never neutral (Ringrose and Coleman 2013:132).

Assemblages do not privilege one element over the other and they attend to non-hierarchical relations, interactions or intra-actions (Barad, 2007). Thinking of the relations of body, gender, sexuality and affect and other human and non-human components as an assemblage does not give priority to any of these elements over the others. That is, a biological body does not determine a sociocultural gender, as social constructionist rules stated. A performative and discursive understanding of gender, such as that of Butler (1990), is not considered to produce heterosexuality and sexual difference. It is in the course of their relations that the different components come into

being. In this assemblage, the body is not the biological condition for sexual difference, nor is gender conceived as purely cultural. Body, sex and gender are all “natureculture”, to use Haraway’s term. They are all embedded, entangled, and embodied with affects and affective ways of relation. In their assemblage, gender-and-affect-embodied flows of significance (not meaning) circulate with different speeds and intensities. Body, sex and gender can no longer be thought of as either/or: they are not pure matter, they are not pure discourse. As feminist new materialists have stated, they are matter and discourse. For centuries we have been questioning what a body is, where its limits are, what gender is, and how sex and gender relate through bodies. It is now time to move towards a more productive (and Deleuzian) question, asking how sex, gender, bodies and affect work and who they work for rather than clinging to the question regarding what they are. After decades of questioning identities, we can now start exploring agency and agency flows.

Most contributions to this book add to what sexuality and gender have done and do in our cultural context. But even though this way of thinking opens up alternative possibilities for thinking bodies, sexualities and genders, and breaks up with stable correspondences, as some chapters in this edited volume show, we still dive into rigid binary models of sex-gender that are rooted in nature and biology and produce exclusion and violence. This rigid vision is based on opposed definitions of what being a male and a female means (sex) and of what being masculine and feminine means (gender). In those models, sex is considered an unquestionable biological and objective reality, whereas gender is considered a social construction. Normative sexuality is the one and only—heterosexuality, despite some space opening up for dissident sexualities, following the hierarchies that Rubin traced in the 1980s. And the system of sex/gender/sexuality is conceived to be unidirectional and binary (men-masculine-heterosexual and active; women-feminine-heterosexual and passive).

ANCIENT SEXUAL REGIME AND CURRENT CONFIGURATIONS

In what Preciado calls the Ancient Sexual Regime (2018) there is nothing more “natural” than the sexed body. We are born with a body that places us in one of the two halves in which we, the Western world, classify (sexually) humanity.

Gender is attached to sex as a sociocultural issue, as the set of meanings that a particular society gives to the physical or biological features that differentiate men and women.

These meanings provide members of a society with ideas on how to act, what to believe and how to make their experiences meaningful.

Sex and gender are practically presented as inseparable. According to Teresita de Barbieri, in *Gender Studies*, gender is formed “as a category that socially corresponds to the anatomical and physiological sex of the biological sciences. Gender is socially constructed sex” (1993: 149). This author defines “gender / sex systems” as

sets of practices, symbols, representations, norms and social values that societies elaborate from the anatomical-physiological sexual difference and that give meaning to the satisfaction of sexual impulses, to the reproduction of human species and in general to the relationship between people. In Durkheimian terms, they are the patterns of social relations that determine the relationships of human beings as sexed persons (1993: 149 and 150).

Consequently, she considers that "sex/gender systems are, therefore, the most extensive object of study to understand and explain the female subordination-male domination pair" (1993: 150).

The Ancient Sexual Regime is based on a rigid binary system based on the "objectivity" of biology and nature. As already commented, in this oppositional, hierarchised and binary system, gender norms are marked and limited by their connection with sex and sexuality, with the understanding that there are two possible sexualities (homo and heterosexual), although only one is socially legitimated globally. This understanding, which refers to the logic of sexual orientation models, leads us to an entanglement of logics that flow into the space of the homo-hetero borders that create distinctions between "us" and "them/ the other" (Vieira, 2012; 2017a; 2017b). The claim that the "natural" is a justification for social sex-gender-affect practices is clear when some discuss practices different to the normative monogamous married heterosexuality as not belonging to “human nature” (Weeks, 2003). It is based on this architecture of thought that all sexual desire of the so-called marginal, peripheral and sterile sexualities is discussed as being “against nature” (Foucault, 1984).

However, now, some feminist philosophers (some examples may be Judith Butler, Elizabeth Grosz, Rosi Braidotti) and biologists (Anne Fausto-Sterling) and other scientists (Donna Haraway, Karen Barad) claim that sex and nature are not “real”, just

as gender and culture are not built. Fausto-Sterling, for example, considers these statements as a "false dichotomy" because "our real, scientific understanding of hormones, brain development [and] sexual behavior is constructed and supports the imprints of specific historical and social contexts" (Fausto-Sterling, 2000: 29). We know now that our understanding of the natural (sex included) is cultural but the Ancient Regime is still strong and stubborn, with biology still being considered a realm for objective truth. For instance, as recently as in the 19th century and in old Physiognomics, some scientists at Stanford University in the USA have developed an algorithm that with almost a 100% success rate can tell the sexual orientation of a person by analysing his or her face. This technology relies on body signs as passive elements and considers sexual orientation as something fixed, immutable and identifiable. This and other recent technologies are anchored in past beliefs, they violate the right to privacy and, in non-democratic countries, they violate human rights (Enguix, 2017c; Vieira, 2017a).

The New Social Movements of the 1960s were identity-based and turned bodies into political bodies (Enguix, 2012; Enguix, 2017a and 2017b). If the first homosexual movement, brutally eliminated by the Nazis, had defended biology as a destination by placing sexual desire in the biological—the innate and the inescapable—the modern gay movement (now LGBTQ+), emerged from the Stonewall revolts (1969), articulates emancipation processes based on reappropriation and resignification of sexed bodies and their gender. Black Power, feminism and Gay Power are three examples of how "new" ways of being, doing and presenting ourselves became available to people and bodies that in previous decades had been socially excluded, punished and stigmatised. Feminist and Gay/LGBTQ* movements, in particular, will change the social understandings of sexuality and gender by introducing power and privilege differentials into the social debate. Following social constructionists, Queer Theory considered identities as a non-stable conglomerate, as something that does not reside in the body nor is unquestionable nor fixed. The idea of gender as representation, as performance (Butler, 1990), questions the "natural" link between sex, gender and desire. Gender and sexuality are reformulated as practices and not as stable essences from a conception of power—as something restrictive but also productive (Braidotti, 2013), and male control is connected with heterosexuality and capitalism (Connell, 2001: 36) and with particular affective configurations (romantic love, heterosexual marriage). The legalisation of homosexual marriage is seen by many as a mainstream strategy used to neutralise social dissidence and critique.

Feminist epistemologies (Judith Butler, Karen Barad, Donna Haraway, Elizabeth Grosz, Luce Irigaray, Rosi Braidotti, Iris van der Tuin and many other theorists), queer theories, post-humanism and the new materialisms of the 1990s promoted the rejection of dualism and binary oppositions between the given and the constructed, between nature and culture, and between body and mind (Braidotti, 2013: 3). The post-human condition urges us to think critically and creatively about who we are and what we are in the process of becoming (Braidotti, 2013: 12; Coleman, 2009). Determination, linearity and mechanicism now become embodiment, performance, entanglement and embeddedness. Feminist epistemologies "reject unitary identities indexed on phallogocentric, Eurocentric and normative standardized views of what constitutes the humanist ideal of 'man'" (Braidotti, 2011: 131) and assume the impossibility of speaking from a single unified voice about women, ethnic groups, and other marginalised subjects. French post-structuralists, queer theory, feminist epistemologies and post-humanism question the body-sex-gender-sexuality system from an "anatomy" that is no longer understood as a fixed destination. The body is not understood as a given and immutable being but as a variable frontier, "a surface whose permeability is subject to political regulation, a significant practice in a cultural field of gender hierarchy and mandatory heterosexuality" (Butler 1990: 189).

Feminist critique and epistemologies situated the feminine body at the centre of the critique to dual, binary, dichotomic and essentialist gender and sexual models. They affirmed that these models are connected to social inequality, hierarchy, and violence, and proposed, among others, a rejection of dualism and of the binary opposition between nature and culture (Braidotti, 2013: 3) and a critical and creative epistemological turn from "being" to "becoming" (Braidotti, 2013: 12; Coleman, 2008; 2009). Bodies are active participants and contributors to sex identification, formation and practices. (Hester, 2004).

In the 1990s, some feminist thinkers (Grosz, Gatens, Butler) shaped what has been known as "corporeal feminism". Grosz used the corporeality of sex and sex difference as the starting point of a feminist discussion on subjectivity (Grosz, 1994). Previous discourses had relied on a dualist and stereotypical understanding of gender where masculinity, (as) mind, (as) rationality and (as) culture was opposed to femininity, (as) body, (as) irrationality and (as) nature. For Grosz, the idea that sexual biological differentiation is a product of the sociocultural production of gender leaves the body as a passive entity. For her, sex and gender are as pencil and paper: they both produce the text,

so we must take into account the materiality of the sexed body, the effects of sexual difference and the sociocultural effects of gender. In fact, the feminist interest for gender is incomplete without the actual interest for the sexed body that has come to fill an important gap in feminist thinking. Through bodies, they criticise the masculine privilege in gender, in knowledge construction and as a universal reference.

Bodies are becomings, sexualities are becomings and genders are becomings. This does not mean thinking about them as a process, as “in becoming” means real in-betweenness—not as a point between A and B. Haraway expressed this very well: “Gender is a verb, not a noun. Gender is always about the production of subjects in relation to other subjects, and in relation to artifacts” (Haraway 2004). Some authors like Dvorsky and Hughes talk about Postgender to express the “multiplicity of gender possibilities resulting from new ontologies, agencies and politics (beyond essentialism, naturalization, social constructionism, binarism and hegemonies)” (Dvorsky and Hughes, 2008: 13). Relation, anticipated by Rubin, has become a nodal concept.

“Corporeal Feminism” (Grosz, 1994) reinstates the body as a critical tool used to question eurocentrism, androcentrism, dual systems, hierarchies and inequalities. In fact, for these thinkers, it is binarism and hierarchy that produce inequality and violence. Our bodies are de-essentialised, denaturalised and problematised. They become active participants in the constitution of gender identity, subjectivity and ideology (Grosz, 1994; Balsamo, 1996; Shildrick, 1997). They become instruments of power (*potestas*) and resistance/resilience (*potentia*) thanks to their generative capacity to produce experiences, practices and meanings (Harrison, 2010). Sexuality, gender and body are understood as co-constitutive of each other (Harrison, 2010). Our body and our sex are no longer “matter” to the same extent that gender is “discourse”, but rather they exist in a conglomerate of matter-discourse. These epistemological, methodological and ethical positions allow us to think of identities as constructed from within discourses and produced in specific historical and institutional contexts (Hall, 2000: 17). This new perspective opens up the possibility to think and socially display non-binary categories of sexuality-gender (which are not necessarily “new”). Braidotti considers that a material-discursive conceptualisation of the body is necessary to carry out better analyses of power based on a radical critique of male universalism (Braidotti, 2013: 22). This, in addition, will allow us new forms of resistance adapted to the polycentric and dynamic structures of contemporary power (Patton, 2000); a type of micropolitics that reflects the complex

and nomadic nature of contemporary social systems and the subjects that inhabit them (Braidotti, 2013).

We can now pose different questions such as "why do we need sex, what happens if we have hundreds [of different sexes]?" (Hester, 2004: 223); "What happens to gender identities if sexuality is not based on opposite terms? What happens when there is sexuality without the possibility of hetero or homosexual union?" (Braidotti, 2016: 688). Instead of asking what a body is, what gender is or what sexuality is, we should instead ask how they work, who they work for and what they can do. This change in the kind of questions we pose allows for the Posthuman epistemologies to also be ontologies and be driven by ethics. They also place our attention on that which has conventionally escaped or troubled social science – the virtual, the affective and the ephemeral.

Trans, Inter, Post-gender and other multiple possibilities of sexuality and gender becomings operate beyond essentialism, naturalisation, social construction and binarism. However, the new possibilities of expression and empowerment that we now know overlap with the old forms. They exist in tension with each other. Sex (biology), gender (culture) and sexuality (practices) overlap as moving tectonic plates producing classification processes whose boundaries varied, vary and will vary historically and contextually.

This is how, committed to a critical perception arising and living up to the new possibilities of expression and empowerment, we understand the complexity of this existence in tension. In a daily life based on inclusive contexts we are invited, not only to accept the difference, but also to protect lives that will resist the normative assimilation models (Butler, 2004). In this context, it is necessary to cultivate a plural society in order to dismantle hegemonic and dominant ways of relating, loving and interacting. Only in this way can we contribute to the reconfiguration of a more just and balanced society in human relations, personal growth and life in society, promoting equal rights and opportunities among people. Educating from and for a plural social perspective can be the instrument to fight different forms of discrimination and violence that persist in modern society in a more or less hidden way (Vieira, 2017a).

GENDER, MASCULINITY AND VIOLENCE

The journey from the Ancient Sexual Regime to Posthuman understandings is neither a simple nor a straightforward one. We can see the different models of existing body-sex-

gender-sexuality configurations as superimposed and moving tectonic plates, a set of intersectional processes that are happening in the crossing of different identity belongings, underlying the construction of the human being (Vieira, 2017a). The notion of intersectionality, as thought of by Crenshaw (1989), pointed out the multiple forms of domination associated with hierarchies of oppression, victimisation and lack of agency. These dimensions are not lived separately, but are interconnected and are part of a life trajectory producing resistance (Weeks, 2011 in Vieira, 2017a). Today, that intersectional position, in addition to the relation between race, gender and class, do not leave out sexuality issues. Today, it is not possible to conceive different models of existing body-sex-gender-sexuality configurations without understanding what forces are crossing each other, what power relations exist and how all these elements are entangled, assembled and embodied. Forgetting about intersectional domination can contribute to different forms of violence.

There is a certain obsession to contrast "traditional" or "old" models with "modern" or "new" models in relation to sex, sexuality, gender, and affective relationships. This "obsession" is fed by media which constantly reaffirm the idea that the "new" replaces the "old" and is "better." But just as the division between nature and culture is a false dichotomy, the counterposition between the new and the old is also a false dichotomy. "Old formulas" of correspondence between a body and an identity subsist today and remain majoritarian in social terms. The multiplicity of categories available today define the centres and peripheries as mobile, permeable and porous, but heterosexuality, machismo and marriage still remain as dominant ways of relating. They coexist with many other categories (trans, inter, bisexual, asexual, etc.) that have come out of the closet and are increasingly present in the media and particularly in gender media. Some categories (bigender, polysexual, nonbinary, queer, graysexual, bisexual, panromantic, etc.) are still constructed in reference to the binary body and gender understandings. Bigenderism is resilient: We keep thinking about the world in two opposing halves. The sex/gender/desire continuum (Nicholas, 2014) operates between the male and female boundaries. It is still difficult to think that a woman (sex) can act in a masculine way (gender) and vice versa. It is still difficult to separate sex and gender (Diamond and Beh 2006 in Enguix, 2011a). The body is also acting as a limit because gender requires recognisable bodies and sexes to express and have subjectivity and agency (Hester, 2004: 221). Despite all the current changes, biological dimorphism remains a socially accepted "truth" and "ideal".

Certainly, some legal changes such as the appearance of a gender neutral category in Australia and Germany, for instance, can be seen as an advance. But, given the available technologies for identification (physical scanners, fingerprints, iris photographs) it is interesting to note that gender is still considered a relevant identity marker in our contemporary world. In the Iberian Peninsula, once upon a time our ID bore our marital status. There were only three "acceptable" categories: married, widowed, single. After the passing of divorce laws, undoubtedly an enormous social advance, "divorced" was added to the list. However, the real difference came once the marital status disappeared from documents in the Iberian Peninsula all together. Many will say that everything related to gender is relevant as long as the structures of inequality between men and women remain. True: as long as there is inequality, abuse, injustice and gender violence, the different gender positions will have to be evidenced. At the same time, however, this also attracts attention to the fact that in a world where artificial intelligence is gaining positions and technological advances open up multiple possibilities of being, sexuality and gender continue to be just as defining to us and relevant in classifying ourselves.

This book aims at reflecting on the role of gender and sexuality in our everyday lives, and considers how we build value and how alternative and resistant models can open up new possibilities for a different reconfiguration of the body-gender and sexuality assemblage. This text illustrates some of the old—traditional, heteropatriarchal, violent—configurations and some of the new configurations.

We are inspired by three main ideas: the idea that matter (body) and discourse (gender) do not exist as separate or distant elements but are entangled with one another; the idea that centres and peripheries are mobile, and value can change over context and history; and the idea that sexuality and gender are still key elements today for understanding our cultural context. From an ontological, epistemological, methodological and ethical perspective, sexuality and gender have served as means for social classification, violence, injustice and exclusion. It is necessary to insist on critical analyses that can visibilise other becomings in order to generalise non-discriminatory societies and gender justice.

The chapters in this book illustrate the tensions, articulation and hybridisation of old and new systems.

Chapters by Enguix, Berga and Vaquerizo explore posthuman configurations of gender, sexuality and affects. Begonya Enguix in her chapter "Gender, Sexuality and Affects: Changing Classifications" explores what posthumanism and other feminist epistemologies (such as new materialisms) can “do” with and for gender studies and for our understanding of actual sex-gender configurations. Through narratives and digital ethnography, she explores how sexuality, gender and affect categories circulate among young people and how they embody them. She affirms that despite a deep knowledge of a variety of possible identifications, most people she worked with still identify according to traditional sexuality, gender and affect categories.

David Berga in his chapter "Loving No-Body: Polyamorous Thoughts on Romantic Love and Widowhood" considers how the advent of Polyamory and other challenges to the Romantic Love Model has erased heteronormativity or sexual exclusivity, and changed the individual management of emotions. Through an ethnographic exploration in Catalonia, he explores how the body—or its absence—affects the ideas on polyamorous relationships.

Sabrina Vaquerizo in her chapter "Deterritorialising the “Modern Girl” in Netflix's Cable Girls" analyses how the Spanish series “Cable Girls”, set in Madrid in 1928, depicts different models of “working” femininities. She explores the strategies producers use to enact identification and emotional links between today's spectators and those girls. She explains how femininity and feminism circulate through this series of Cable Girls.

Erick Gómez Narváez's work on "Minors' Absences, Major Offences: Grindr and Minors' Sexuality" discusses the difficulty of tracing boundaries between protection against pedophilia and children pornography and freedom in relation to children sexuality and consent. He addresses here what Rubin called the most despised sexual caste: those who enjoy sexual/affective exchanges with minors. Social media and other kinds of digital interactions currently provide an ideal setting for these kinds of relationships. Despite regulations, under 18 year old users' intense use of hook-up apps expose them to risks but also jeopardise other users. Sexual-affective interactions with underaged people are highly paradoxical in our times of almost-universal access to digital devices.

In a time of increasing awareness to cases of gender violence, it is important to highlight schools' power in education of more democratic and egalitarian sexual and loving experiences. Sofia Almeida Santos and Eunice Macedo, in their chapter "Unveiling Silence and Pressures in the Messages of School Sex Education: a Path

Towards More Egalitarian and Democratic Relationships" explore the practices of Sex Education in the Portuguese schools with young people 15-17 years old, questioning how gender relationships (female and male performance) are being thought of in education. Through young people's voices, we can see they want to challenge the silence and gendered bias that shrouds the whole structure of school and want to demystify and talk openly about sexual norms. The authors show that young people want to be recognised as "sexual subjects".

Many feminists claim to destroy the woman whereas Deleuze talks about "becoming women". Masculinity, for some feminists, is rather untouched. However, not being discussed as much as femininity does not mean it is not under the feminist focus. Critical Studies of Men and Masculinities have largely explored how masculinities relate to power, privilege and violence from a critical perspective. Many contributions in this book focus on masculinity and trace what it means to be a man today and how masculinity is related to hegemony and violence.

Cristina Pereira Vieira in her chapter "Portuguese Youth's Discourses on Masculinity: Broken Silences" analyses the discussion of the mechanisms by which people live in a gendered society. Here, she seeks to clarify the logic of masculinity, as understood by young Portuguese, as part of two research projects separated by an interval of 10 years. Thus, this chapter proposes to reflect on the changes brought on by modernity, making it possible to rethink the concept of masculinity. In this regard, she criticises the invisibilities imposed by hegemonic masculinity and visibilises multiple ways of being a man.

Luís Santos in his chapter "Men Behind the Mask: the Epistemology of Difference" considers masculinity as a process of social construction and analyses the discursive constructions of different configurations around men and masculinities by men with non-normative sexual orientations (for example, gay, bisexual). He shows how most discourses are recalcitrant to the idea of hegemonic masculinity thus producing uncritical submission or other possible ways to be a man.

Sofia Neves, Ariana Correia, Mafalda Ferreira, Joana Topa, Janete Borges, Ana Luísa Abreu and Estefânia Silva in their chapter "The Portuguese Observatory of Dating Violence: Reflections on the Potential of Informal Reporting" talk about dating violence, which is a serious human rights and public health problem that affects young people around the world. The Portuguese Observatory of Dating Violence (ObDV) is an

initiative set up by *Plano i* Association and integrated into UNi+. This chapter presents a profile analysis of victims and perpetrators and types of violence, as well as some strategies activated by victims in order to face victimisation (based on 222 reported cases).

Paco Abril, Rafa Soto and Pedro Unamunzaga in their chapter "Sexualised Violence Against Boys in Spain" explore how gender violence can also be directed towards other men. In Spain, it is estimated that 14% of men have been the object of some type of sexualised violence (17% for women). After quantitative and qualitative research, they have found that men, in general, are less prone to revealing abuse. In consequence, in Spanish society, we need to pay more attention and devote more resources to address this problem.

Juan A. Rodriguez-del-Pino, in his chapter on "The Male Savage Mind. Violent Male Interrelationships, from Casual to Daily Occurrences", explores how media depict masculinity and the extent to which an aggressive and possessive masculinity is still the norm today. Indeed, this affects men's relations with other men and with women. He considers that the Posthumanist erasure of Male as the measure of all things can be helpful in order to deconstruct the patriarchal mandate.

Dália Costa, Anália Torres and Bernardo Coelho in the chapter "Sexual Harassment in the Workplace in Portugal: Main Results from One National Study" analyse part of the results from the recent nationwide study (Torres et al., 2016) related to sexual harassment. The main study, by using a survey, provides us with an overview (characterisation, perception of sexual and moral harassment, situations in which the person has been the victim of both forms of harassment and reactions to the harassment from both men and women). The chapter shows how organisations and labour relations reproduce the gender order perpetuating inequalities between men and women. The chapter also shows how the prevention strategies developed by Portugal are aligned with the actions proposed by the International Labor Organization in its Convention on Violence and Harassment.

Abril, Gómez, Enguix, Berga, Vaquerizo and Rodríguez's chapters are a result of the research project "Genders and Postgenders: A Cartography of Meanings for Social Transformation" (I+D Programa Estatal, Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad. Gobierno de España. Referencia: FEM2016-77963-C2-2-P) (2016-2020), a driving force for the publication of this book. We all wish to thank Caitlin Trathen for her careful revision of our texts.

REFERENCES

- Balsamo, A. (1996): *Technologies of the Gendered Body: reading Cyborg women*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Barbieri, T. (1993): *Sobre la categoría de género: una introducción teórico-metodológica*. *Debates en Sociología* 18, pp. 145.
- Braidotti, Rosi (2011): *Nomadic Theory: the Portable Rosi Braidotti*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2006): *Transposition: On Nomadic Ethics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2013): *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2016). Posthuman Feminist Theory. In L. Disch & M. Hawkesworth (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (pp. 673-698).
- Bourdieu, P. (1979). *La Distinction*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Butler, J. (1990): *Gender Trouble*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that Matter. On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.
- Coleman, R. (2009): *The Becoming of Bodies: girls, images, experience*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Connell, R. W. (2001): Understanding Men: Gender Sociology and the new International Research on Masculinities. *Social Thought and Research*, vol. 24:1-2, pp. 13-31.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*. Vol. 1989 (1) Article 8, 139-167.
- Dvorsky, George and Hughes, James 2008: Postgenderism: Beyond the Gender Binary, Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies IEET Monograph Series <https://ieet.org/archive/IEET-03-PostGender.pdf> (retrieved 10 October 2019).
- Enguix, Begonya (1996). *Poder y Deseo. La homosexualidad Masculina en Valencia*. Valencia: Edicions Alfons el Magnànim.

- Enguix, B. (2011a). XXY: Representing Intersex. In T. Krijnen, C. Alvares, & S. Van Bauwel (Eds.), *Gendered Transformations. Theory and Practices on Gender and Media*. Chicago: Intellect/ University of Chicago Press (pp. 115-132).
- Enguix, B. (2011b). Cuerpo y Transgresión: De Helena de Céspedes a Lady Gaga. *Relaces, Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios sobre Cuerpos, Emociones y Sociedad*, N° 5, Año 3, 25-38.
- Enguix, B. (2011c). Fronteras, cuerpos e identidades gays. *Quaderns de l'ICA*, Barcelona: Institut Català d'Antropologia, 83-107.
- Enguix, B. (2012). Cuerpos, Camisetas e Identidades como Estrategias de Protesta. In T. Benjamín & I. Perugorria (Eds.), *Global Movements, National Grievances. Mobilizing for 'Real Democracy' and Social Justice*. Bilbao: Servicio Editorial de la Universidad del País Vasco.
- Enguix, B. (2013). Cuerpos Desbordados. La Construcción Corporal de la Masculinidad. *Argos*, 30 (59), 61-86.
- Enguix, B. & Roca Girona, J. (2014). Etnografiando los márgenes y las periferias sexo- amorosas. In A. Tomàs, Y. Puerta, D. Cendra, J. Muñoz, J. Girona, M. Masdeu (Eds), *Periferias, Fronteras y Diálogos. Una lectura antropológica de los retos de la sociedad actual*. Tarragona: URV (pp 125-137).
- Enguix, B. (2017a). Protesta, Mercado e Identidad en las celebraciones del Orgullo LGTB en España. *Convergencia*, N° 73, 165-186.
- Enguix, B. (2017b). No desfilamos, nos manifestamos: activismos y manifestaciones LGTB en España. *Onteiken*, N°. 24, 40-55.
- Enguix, B. (2017c). Algoritmos y Sexualidades. In *El Periódico*, 21/9/2017 Retrieved from <https://www.elperiodico.com/es/opinion/20170921/algoritmos-y-sexualidades-begonya-enguix-articulo-6302064> (consulta 18 junio 2018).
- Fausto-Sterling, A. (2000). *Sexing the Body. Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality*. New York: Basic Books.
- Foucault, M. (1984). *Historia de la Sexualidad (1). La Voluntad de Saber*. Madrid: siglo XXI.
- Grosz, E. (1994). *Volatile bodies: towards a corporeal feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hall, S. (2000). Who Needs 'Identity'?. In S. Hall & P. Gay (Eds.): *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage.
- Haraway, D. (2004). *The Haraway Reader*. Nueva York: Routledge.
- Harrison, K. (2010). *Discursive Skin: Entanglements of Gender, Discourse and Technology*. Linköping University: Linköping Studies in Arts and Science, N° 513.

- Hester, D. (2004). Intersexes and the end of gender: Corporeal ethics and postgender bodies. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 13:3, 215-225.
- Laqueur, T. (1994). *La construcción del sexo. Cuerpo y género desde los griegos hasta Freud*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Martí, J. & Yolanda A. (Eds.) (2010a). *Desvelando el Cuerpo. Perspectivas desde las ciencias sociales y humanas*. Madrid: CSIC.
- Martí, J. & Yolanda A. (2010b). La presentació social del cos. Pròleg, *Quaderns de l'Institut Català d'Antropologia*, 26, 5-15.
- Nicholas, L. (2014). *Queer Post-Gender Ethics: The Shape of Selves to Come*. London: Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Patton, P.(2000). *Deleuze and the Political*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Preciado, P. B. (2018). #MeToo: Carta de un hombre trans al antiguo régimen sexual. *Diario Ara*, 26/1/2018.
- Rubin, Gayle (1986): El tráfico de mujeres: Notas sobre la "economía política" del sexo. In M. Lamas (Eds.). *El género: la construcción cultural de la diferencia sexual*. México: PUEG, 35-96.
- Rubin, G. (1989). Reflexionando sobre el sexo: notas para una teoría radical de la sexualidad. In C. Vance, (Eds.). *Placer y peligro. Explorando la sexualidad femenina*. Madrid: Revolución (pp 113-190).
- Sáez, B. (2018). *Formas de Clasificación*. Seminario dictado en el seno de los Seminarios sobre lo Posthumano, grupo de Investigación Medusa, Barcelona, 2 de marzo 2018.
- Shildrick, M. (1997). *Leaky Bodies and Boundaries: Feminism, Postmodernism and (Bio) Ethics*. New York: Routledge.
- Vieira, C. P. (2012). *Eu faço sexo amoroso - A sexualidade dos jovens pela voz dos Próprios*. Lisboa: Editorial Bizâncio.
- Vieira, C. P. & Costa, P. (2016). Norma Social. In R. L. Maia et al. (Eds.). *Dicionário - Crime, Justiça e Sociedade* (pp. 339-341). Lisboa: Edições Sílabo.
- Vieira, C. P., (2017a). Sexualidade e Género: educar para um social plural. In S. Neves & D. Costa (Eds.) *Violência de Género*. Lisboa: Edições CIEG (pp317- 337).
- Vieira, C. P. (2017b). Diagnosticar o Género: Desenvolvimento Social a partir de Princípios de Igualdade e Não-Discriminação em Função do Sexo e da Orientação Sexual. In J. Fialho, C. P. Vieira, A. Moreira & C. C. Vieira (Eds.). *Diagnóstico social: Reflexões teóricas e desafios empíricos. Género, saúde, envelhecimento e desenvolvimento social* (pp:74-85). Santo Tirso: Whitebooks.

Weeks, J. (2003). *Sexuality* (2.º ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Reviewed by Dr Paco Abril (Lecturer, Universitat de Girona) and Caitlin Trathen (BA in Social and Cultural Anthropology, Universitat de Barcelona, UB).