

【特別講演】

Globalisation, Gender, Space and Place: Introduction to a Seminar at Ochanomizu University, on 26 March 2014

Doreen MASSEY

I Introduction: On Being a Feminist Geographer

It is perhaps important by providing some context. I come from what we often call “second generation feminism” that is to say, in the UK, the feminism that took off in the late 1960s. It was indeed in part a response to the macho nature of many aspects of the famous protests of 1968. At the same time it took some of the arguments of those protests even further. The social-democratic settlement of the post-war years in parts of ‘the West’ had been to some degree effective for feminists on a whole range of issues, most particularly on redistributive claims towards equal pay, but it had not given space to challenge a whole range of issues around, for instance, what it even means to be a woman and how that meaning is constructed. But addressing this raises far wider issues and a first point to make about the feminism of those days was that its concerns went beyond issues of gender as such to encompass a vision of a really different society. The implications of challenging constructions of gender reverberate everywhere.

For me, what this means as a feminist geographer is that we need feminist geographers in all parts of the discipline, studying everything. Feminist geographers, for me, do not necessarily, or only, ‘do gender’. What they do is bring a feminist perspective and politics to whatever they are studying. I shall try to illustrate this in what follows, especially in relation to space and place - which, on the face of it, are not specifically gender issues. I shall argue that they are.

Feminism in this guise also challenges patriarchal *modes* of knowledge and knowledge-production. We should undermine unnecessary hierarchies and the often ridiculous pomposities that so frequently disfigure the academic world. One serious disappointment of the postmodern turn, in the academy as a whole not only geography, has been the generation of a ‘star’ system of academics. I say this in full awareness of the fact that you have invited me to come half around the world in order that we can talk. And I am deeply grateful. But we

must be very careful, to keep conversations open, not too easily to pay obeisance to ‘big names’ (even if they are feminist ones) just because they *are* big names, and to persist in thinking for ourselves and discussing within our own collectivities.

And finally, in this opening consideration of the workings of the academy, it is important that we recognise to a far greater extent than we do that intellectual development does not only take place in universities and research institutes. Indeed, to return again to second-wave feminism, I would argue that much of the most profound thinking about (anti)essentialism and identity went on in that feminist political struggle, alongside similar developments in multi-racist struggles. Two points follow. First, quite simply we should recognise this. Second, we should learn from it and keep active channels open between our academic labours and our wider engagement in society.

It is probably worth saying, as a framework for what follows, that my overall approach is what one might call a Gramscian one. We live in capitalist societies, but we also live in patriarchal ones. And the latter does not simply follow from the former (if anything it might be the other way around!), nor is it in any way subordinate to it. The two - patriarchy and capitalism - are relatively autonomous from each other, articulated together in ways that vary from time to time and from place to place. Gender issues are not an add-on to an analysis of capitalist relations, they are a relatively independent structuring force. One can see here immediately a difference from the economism of some strands of thought in radical geography (see Massey, 1991).

I want now to take up some issues of space and place, and their intersections with feminist arguments about gender. In the time we have, I can only make some basic points. Many of the arguments are more fully developed in Massey, 1994. It is also important to stress that I speak as a woman from England who knows very little indeed about your debates in Japan about these issues. As I shall stress later, specificity is central to geography, and I hope you will bear this in mind,

and that it can be the basis for exchange between us.

II Space and Place

1. Space

It has become a common theme within much feminist debate that we structure the world, very frequently, in a framework of dualisms, and that these dualisms on occasions need to be interrogated. Geography as a discipline is full of them: physical/human; space/time; global/local, and so on.

'Space', it can be argued, is the defining dimension of geography. And in this sense it is counterposed to time (understood in disciplinary terms to be the domain of history). Philosophically, and in popular discourse, the two dimensions are often set against each other. Space/time is a classic dualism in which Time is the privileged signifier, the term in the dualism through which definition is secured. Space is the term defined *in relation to* the dominant term. Moreover that relation is one of *lack*. Time is A to Space as not-A. And what Space lacks in this formulation is temporality. Space is the realm, in this dualism, of stasis, of the given, of the structure in which all terms are related positively, to which change is not intrinsic. I have spent much of my intellectual life arguing against this dualistic structure and its consequential definitions.

However, before going on to that, note the startling parallel between this structure of dualism between space and time, and a dualistic structure into which so frequently is set the mutual definition of male and female. Here male is A, the universal, the standard against which deviations are measured and defined; the privileged signifier. Female is the special case, defined in relation to the universality of the male, and defined by lack.

Two further observations are pertinent at this point. First, that in the West (and I want again here to raise the point I made earlier about geographical specificity) Time tends to be associated with the masculine and Space with the feminine. Time is Becoming; Space is Being. (There have been many jokes about how patriarchal male geographers have coped with this designation! - we shall see one of these means in the next section.) The second observation is very different. It is that here the intersection between gender and geography is at the level of the conceptual. It concerns how we formulate our most basic of ideas. It is not immediately to do with the empirics of gender, in terms of inequality or discrimination for instance, but goes right to the heart of how we think of

gender in the first place.

However, we do not have to conceptualise space in this way, as the counterposed and subordinate term to time. Rather, my argument has been that we understand space as a product of social relations. It is thus alive and always being made. It is also, in consequence, necessarily full of power. As such it is impregnated with the temporal (for a fuller account of this alternative conceptualisation see Massey, 2005). This makes a profound difference to any proposed analogy with the conceptualisation of gender. It rejects a static essentialism in favour of production through social interaction. It also thereby implies that such a product is a social and political responsibility. In sum, the work of reconceptualising space, one of the crucial terms of geography, also productively disturbs some elements of that persistent dualistic definition of gender.

2. Place

However space is also involved in another dualistic counterposition - that between space and place. This takes a different form in that it is not of the A/not-A variety, but its gender connotations are equally powerful.

What is astonishing, however, is that in this counterposition space is the masculine to place's feminine. Space is here bound up with mobility, with the global, with the abstract, the general, the universal and the theoretical. In gender terms, these are coded masculine (so the male patriarchal geographer can stick with abstract spatial theorising if he does not wish to be too contaminated with the feminine!). Place, on the other hand, is characteristically associated with local specificity, the concrete, with containment and authenticity. And in gender terms these are (and again I am speaking of Western culture) coded female.

The first thing to note is the contradiction. Space in relation to time is female; space in relation to place is masculine. And both 'work'; both are effective. Common-sense ideological understandings such as these do not have to be logical or consistent. Indeed they rarely are. We are quite capable of believing all kinds of contradictory things at the same time. This is the power of 'common sense'.

Second, once again in these counterpositions of space and place it is the bundle of terms associated with place/the feminine that is persistently subordinated - local, specific, concrete.

Third, these connotations are wielded politically, including

by some on the Left. Thus we read, in the works of some great male geographical theorists, of certain struggles being 'only local struggles'. And yet, as I and many others have long argued, that kind of counterposition of local and global is itself untenable: all supposedly 'global' things have local roots and bases; all 'local' places are inextricably linked in to the global. On a rather different note, though equally problematically, there is a tendency to romanticise the local, to see 'local people' as the privileged site of authenticity. (Why are ordinary people so often called local when they too are globally interconnected?)

Once again, here in the matter of our understanding of place and space, the connection between gender and geography begins right back with our initial conceptualisations. Which means that challenging these is gender-work too; the work of feminist geography.

It is perhaps worth picking up again, briefly, this issue of romanticisation. Both women and local place are romanticised and idealised, and at the same time denigrated. It is another example of the internal contradictoriness of our (often implicit) conceptualisations. What is more place, as opposed to space, is often empirically imaginatively associated with women. Place as home, as the basis of community, as containments of security, as stable and coherent. Once again, however, we know that these imaginations misrepresent. Both places and homes are sites of negotiation; they can be locations of conflict, even violence, and oppression. Both are structured through relations of (often unequal) power. Some recent evocations of the present world as one of flow and movement, over and over again counterpose it to a totally imagined past where home/community/local place were secure and unchanging. It is a counterposition we must reject. It is wrong empirically, it is wrong conceptually, and it helps to propagate reactionary understandings of gender.

III Globalisation

'Globalisation' was the third term I was asked to address. This raises rather different issues.

The first thing I would say is that, in principle, 'globalisation', when referring to an empirical case, should always be modified by an adjective, or adjectives. The kind we are experiencing today is neoliberal capitalist, financially dominated, and corporate. In other words, globalisation can come in many forms. It is always specific.

One of the central tenets of geography must be its recognition of specificity. I cannot help but to speak as a woman from the United Kingdom. All the time I have been presenting these ideas I have wanted to know whether these geographical and gender conceptualisations and issues and debates are similar to, or very different from, the ideas that circulate here in Japan. Space is the dimension of co-existing multiplicity - of difference, of specificity.

Now, one of the intellectual manoeuvres we often perform with difference and multiplicity is to obliterate them by rearranging them into temporal sequence. This happens very often in discussion about today's globalisation. We imagine some countries as 'advanced', or 'developed', in contrast to others that are somehow behind. Thus, geographical specificity (and interdependence, and the mutual production of our - often unequal - differences through our relations) is turned into a temporal difference, where each country is in an assumed, singular, historical process. (This has serious political effects, some of which are discussed in my Tokyo lecture - Massey, 2015.)

It also raises issues that relate to gender. How, for instance, does a feminist like me address attitudes to, and the position of, women in many fundamentalist religious societies? An immediate response is often to characterise them as 'old fashioned' and to argue that they should 'modernise' - by which we mean 'be more like us'. In many ways that is to be preferred to a supine relativism that has abandoned all political judgement. But, as in the previous example, it turns real co-existing cultural difference into a temporal one. The attitudes are understood, not as contemporary, but as somehow of the past. (And yet as we know there has been a recent surge in various forms of religious fundamentalism.) This relegation of others to the past is both deeply political and depoliticising. It is deeply political because it is a form of dismissal - it shows a lack of respect. (And space - as the dimension of co-existing multiplicity - is the dimension that requires us to recognise coevalness, to show respect.) And this relegation of different others to the past is depoliticising in that it deprives us of arguments. By dismissing 'them' to the past we fail to take them on politically. The reason I disagree with those views on women is not because they are old fashioned and I, by contrast, am a 'modern' woman, but because I disagree *politically*, and it is these political arguments that I must mobilise. This is by no means easy; it opens up all kinds of other issues, the difficulty of finding

common terms for instance, but at least it is about discussion and engagement.

The globalisation of today - neoliberal capitalist, financially dominated, and corporate - has had momentous implications for women. In order to open up our discussion let me just point to a few of them. I would argue that what they exemplify is some ways in which neoliberal capitalism has articulated to patriarchy, to their mutual benefit. Most evidently, capital has used its global mobility to search out and exploit regional differences in gender relations (at the same time as undermining trades unions in the countries of the global north and west). The ambiguous results for women - trading escape from oppressive patriarchal systems for more immediately economic exploitation - have been much analysed. Much of this has also been accompanied by new forms of sexual exploitation, often coercive and violent. At the same time, where previously there had been some welfare provision through the state, the dismantling of the public sector has loaded increasing responsibilities, and unpaid labour, on to women. The proliferation of wars - and wars of a different kind, in which rape has become a 'normal' weapon - has been devastating for women around the world. And the rise of religious fundamentalisms, already noted, has often brought further restrictions on the lives of women. This grim intersection of neoliberalism and patriarchy is not a logical necessity, but all systems of power provide an environment for each other and the current conjunctural meeting-up of these two systems does seem to have been worked to their mutual benefit.

【解説】マッシー教授お茶大セミナー「グローバリゼーション、ジェンダー、空間、場所」に寄せて

熊谷 圭知

I マッシー教授の紹介

ドリーン・マッシー教授は、1944年英国に生まれた。ペンシルヴァニア大学で修士号を取り¹⁾、1968年～1980年まで英国の環境研究所に務める。同研究所がサッチャー政権下で廃止された後、オープンユニバーシティの地理学部に移り、2009年まで活躍。退職後は名誉教授となる。

マッシー氏の業績は幅広い。中期まではイギリスの産業構造の変化に伴う地域の衰退と地域問題の理論的・実証的解明が中心的課題であった。その代表作が、1984年

Which raises a question for feminism: are things in fact getting worse for women? I grew up in European social democracy. In spite of all its inadequacies, it did enable many gains by women, and it generated an overall sense of progress, of a larger history in which things would change for the better. There was much wrong with all this, but its loss is catastrophic. Even within the purely economic the new articulations of capitalism and patriarchy do not give me hope. The new capitalisms, especially in Asia, seem to be based more on the subordination of women, and on new forms of masculinity and male dominance. Is this so? And 'at home', in the UK, the 'new' sectors that are hailed as our economic future are 'high technology' (dominated by forms of scientific masculinity) and by a testosterone-fuelled finance sector. What does all this foretell? How does it look from Japan?

References

- Massey, D. 1991. Flexible sexism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 9: 31-57. (reprinted in Massey 1994)
- Massey, D. 1994. *Space, Place and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Massey, D. 2005. *For Space*. London: Sage. (translated into Japanese, and published in 2014)
- Massey, D. 2015. Tokyo Lecture: Geography and Politics. *Geographical Review of Japan* 88B, in press.

Doreen Massey (ドリーン・マッシー)

Emeritus professor of the Open University (英国オープンユニバーシティ・名誉教授)

に刊行された *Spatial Divisions of Labour* (邦訳『空間的分業』富樫幸一・松橋公治訳、古今書院、2000年刊) である。

しかしその頃からすでにフェミニスト地理学者としてのマッシー氏の問いが顕在化している。『空間的分業』と同じ1984年に、マッシー氏はフェミニスト地理学者のリンダ・マクドゥエル氏とともに「女性の場所？」と題された論文を書いている (McDowell and Massey 1984, Massey 1994に再掲)。その中で彼女は、男性の肉体労働に支えられる石炭業と女性の雇用を作り出してきた綿織物産業を対照しつつ、地域の基幹産業がジェンダー化されていること、そしてそれゆえに地域衰退への対策として取られた英国の地域開発政策に石炭産業地域は組み込