ACENO

INTERVIEW

To take the field forward:
an interview with Raewyn Connell[1]

Mateus de Melo Albuquerque[2]
Soraya Barreto Januário[3]
Universidade Federal de Pernambuco

Image 1 – Prof. Raewyn Connel.
Source: Author's personal website

Abstract: The interview presents contemporary and urgent perspectives to the studies of masculinities based on provocations made by Raewyn Connell. During this interview, Connell reflects not only on the reach her book *Masculinities* has had, as it completes 30 years since its first publication, but also on the new challenges for the field of masculinities studies in a world profoundly marked by authoritarianism and bombarded by violent images of what it can mean to be a man — from politics to sports. For the author, the time has come to break free from exhausted theoretical debates and to take the field forward.

Keywords: masculinities; interview; Raewyn Connell.

[1] We would like to thank professor Sofia Aboim (ULisboa) for making the contact bridge between us and professor Raewyn Connell, the Fegeccap team, specially Danyelle Alves da Paixão, Paloma de Castro Melo and Lydia Gomes Barros and the Communication Studies Department of UFPE. We would also like to thank Gustavo Leal and Lucas Valença for their technical support. Video available at: youtu.be/IW8FWN0I8jg.
[2] PhD candidate in Communication at the Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPE). Holds a Master's degree in Human Rights (2023) and a bachelor's degree in social communication – Advertising (2019), also from UFPE. Member of the research groups Center for Critical Studies on Feminisms, Gender, Consumption, and Capitalism (Fegec-cap/UFPE) and the Digital Economy and Extreme Politics Lab (DeepLab/UCD).
[3] Holds a PhD in Communication from the Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal. Professor in the Department of Communication at the Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPE) and the Graduate Program in Communication (PPGCOM/UFPE). Completed postdoctoral research at McGill University (IGSF), Montreal, Canada.

DOI: 10.48074/aceno.v13i32.20485

ALBUQUERQUE, Mateus de Melo; BARRETO JANUÁRIO, Soraya. **To take the field forward: an interview with Raewyn Connell.** *Aceno – Central-West Anthropology Journal*, 13 (32): 305-318, May to August 2026. ISSN: 2358-5587

Levar o campo adiante:
uma entrevista com Raewyn Connell

Resumo: A entrevista apresenta perspectivas contemporâneas e urgentes para os estudos das masculinidades, a partir de provocações feitas por Raewyn Connell. Ao longo da entrevista, Connell reflete não apenas sobre o impacto de seu livro *Masculinities*, que completa 30 anos de publicação, mas também sobre os novos desafios enfrentados pelo campo das masculinidades em um mundo profundamente marcado pelo autoritarismo e bombardeado por imagens violentas sobre o que significa ser homem — da política aos esportes. Para a autora, é hora de superar debates teóricos já esgotados e levar o campo adiante.

Palavras-chave: masculinidades; entrevista; Raewyn Connell.

Llevando el campo hacia adelante:
una entrevista con Raewyn Connell

Resumen: La entrevista presenta perspectivas contemporáneas y urgentes sobre los estudios de las masculinidades, basadas en las provocaciones de Raewyn Connell. En la entrevista, Connell reflexiona no sólo sobre el alcance de su libro *Masculinities*, al cumplirse 30 años de su primera publicación, sino también sobre los nuevos desafíos para el campo de los estudios de las masculinidades en un mundo profundamente marcado por el autoritarismo y bombardeado por imágenes violentas de lo que puede significar ser hombre — desde la política hasta el deporte. Para la autora, ha llegado el momento de romper con los debates teóricos agotados y avanzar en este campo.

Palabras clave: masculinidades; entrevista; Raewyn Connell.

DOI: 10.48074/aceno.v13i32.20485

Raewyn Connell is a sociologist, now professor emerita at the University of Sydney, in Australia, and widely known by her seminal contribution to the gender studies field and masculinities studies field, especially because of the book *Masculinities*, originally published in 1995 and re-edited 10 years after, in 2005. Though the book was consolidated as her biggest and most influential work, to the point that many scholars refer to Connell as one of the founders of this study field, it would be incorrect to limit Connell to this area of knowledge.

Connell has an intellectual trajectory marked by a notable thematic nomadism (HAMLIN and VANDENBERGHE, 2013), characteristic of scholars whose methods defy strict division of knowledge. Through Connell's career, she transited on a wide range of themes and debates, contributing in a most significant way to areas as social theory, sociology of education, globalization, neoliberalism, southern theory and, of course, gender studies (CONNELL and PEARSE, 2015; CONNELL, 2016). To mention these fields alone is an attempt to illustrate, even in an incomplete way, the extension and diversity of Connell's knowledge, which is still profoundly engaged with social and political transformations of the contemporary world.

Limiting us to our theme of interest, even in *Masculinities* it is possible to see the investigating versatility used by Connell: from historical revisions to case studies, the author makes a global panorama that, even today, canonizes the book in gender studies due to its contribution. As the author herself will speak, her proposal was never to make a "masculinities theory", but a "gender theory", toward which it is inevitable to put together a transdisciplinary strategy, as the investigation, in all its complexity, demands the analysis of various questions, as politics, health, psychoanalysis, sociology, workfields, matters of the gay movement, amongst so many others.

In 2025, the research group Fegeccap (Group of Critical Studies in Feminisms, Gender, Consumption and Capitalism), linked to CNPq [National Council for Scientific and Technological Development of Brazil] and to the Department of Communication Studies of Federal University of Pernambuco, held their 3rd International Symposium. At the occasion, the event was held under the theme "Rethinking hegemony: feminist epistemologies and masculinities" and Professor Raewyn Connell was the keynote speaker, talking about authoritarianism and masculinities in a global context. At the end of her speech, which was pre-recorded due to the immense difference between the time zones of Sydney and Recife (host city of Fegeccap in Brazil), members of the group were able to take a few questions to professor Connell, regarding not only the theme of her speech, but her contribution to masculinities studies as a whole — which allowed the publication of this moment of the meeting in the format of the interview that we now present here.

DOI: 10.48074/aceno.v13i32.21340

The main lesson that we took from the dialogue with Connell was, as provoked by herself, “to take the field forward”. In our interpretation, this calling is owed to two main issues. The first one, would be the need to abandon a discussion upon which we've already seen signs of exhaustion: the debate regarding the idea of “hegemonic masculinity”. Though Connell uses the concept in *Masculinities* (even though she's not the first author to do so), her proposal served as a way of describing the masculinities which occupy an hegemonic position in gender hierarchy (CONNELL, 2005). A wide repercussion and controversy followed the use of the term, which made Connell revisit its use afterwards (CONNELL e MESSERSCHMIDT, 2013). The second, equally relevant question, is that “to take the field forward” means, literally and symbolically, to move on. To continue to formulate pertinent and innovative research problems, sensible to the transformations of the contemporary world. Also means to search for new ways of approaching our research objects, writing on them in a way that preserves their singularities at the same time that we broaden the horizons of the masculinities studies field. To reach previously unthinkable territories, especially if we consider the context in which this field emerged in the 1980s.

The interview

Mateus Albuquerque (MA): In this year, 2025, marks the 30th anniversary of the first edition of *Masculinities*, your book, which a lot of scholars claim to have inaugurated the study field of masculinities. After three decades, what is the main contribution you hope the book has made?

Raewyn Connell: Well, my hope in writing the book was to create a base, a platform. Not in an electronic sense, but a groundwork on which researchers and activists could stand and do things that I was not able to do. If it has had an influence, I think it was because it managed to bring together, to synthesise, a lot of work that had already been done. When I wrote it, there was already 10 years' worth of research on questions about masculinities, which had been done in many parts of the world. The book brought that research together and showed how it hung together. You could see a shape to a lot of the findings that had come out.

The book is best known for the term “hegemonic masculinity”. Indeed, a lot of people talk about “hegemonic masculinity theory”. This embarrasses me, because I never had a theory of hegemonic masculinity. I had a theory of *gender*, within which hegemonic masculinity was the name for a particular structural position and a certain kind of mechanism.

Nevertheless, it seems to me that the book did serve as a starting point for work that has become much more diverse and much more sophisticated than that work in the 1980s and early 1990s could be. I'm happy about that. It is the fate of any researcher to become obsolete! And I have to point that out to people at times. The structural model of masculinities in that book is now obsolete. We can leave that version of the field behind and move on to new ideas — which, in a way, incorporate what my generation of researchers did, but you can now do new things, and do the old things better.

So, that's my feeling about the book. I'm very happy that it has circulated. I'm not going to write a third edition [laughs]. Ten years after the first edition, it seemed worth trying to connect with the work that had immediately followed the publication of the first edition. Therefore, I wrote a second edition, published in 2005. But I'm very happy now for other people to take the field forward. And I'm

DOI: 10.48074/aceno.v13i32.20485

fascinated and impressed with the work that has been coming out.

MA: Indeed, a lot has changed, not only theoretically in the gender studies field, but in the global geopolitical scenario as well. With the changes from the last thirty years, especially the rise of authoritarianism, which new dynamics do you observe in the world?

RC: I would talk about masculinity in relation to the economic, political and cultural changes that have happened in recent decades. They have produced what many people think is a dramatic turn towards authoritarianism in politics — and towards certain kinds of masculinity, which are often summarized through the idea of "toxic masculinity".

So, let me start with the political story. There I want to say: Yes, I think we really are in authoritarian times. It is striking that, if we look at the four most powerful governments, economically and militarily, in the world, all of them are currently headed by political leaderships which have a very distinctly authoritarian flavour.

That is clearly true for the United States, as the newsfeed every day will tell us, about the current Trump administration. Let me go on to the next most economically and militarily powerful state: the People's Republic of China. In images of their central political group, the political bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, the ruling party in the one-party state of China, we see Xi Jinping smiling, formal and apparently contented. The way in which masculinity is presented in these images is noticeably different from the way, for instance, in which Donald Trump constantly presents himself in the media.

They also differ from the way in which the president of the Russian Federation tends to present himself, coming to the third major nuclear and economic power. There is a famous image of Vladimir Putin, one that he posed for and circulated himself. It is one of a series of images in which Putin shows himself deliberately as an outdoorsman, as a hunter, in the snow, in rough country, or on horseback. He is very distinctly constructing an image of a strong and outdoor type of masculinity. Which is, of course, a facade, since he is actually a bureaucrat — a security bureaucrat from the old regime, who has succeeded in the new conditions (after the end of the Soviet Union) and gradually constructed a personal dictatorship.

DOI: 10.48074/aceno.v13i32.21340

Image 2 – Vladimir Putin on horseback (2022). Source: UOL Notícias

RC: And then the fourth in my list of superpowers is the Republic of India. This is a former British colony, which was divided up at the time it gained independence from Britain in 1947, into about 5 successor states. Of these, the Republic of India is by far the biggest.

The current head of government is Narendra Modi. India was, for a while, a multi-party democracy and still has a democratic constitution. But under Modi, it is nevertheless being turned into an authoritarian state based on religious and racial hierarchies. Staying for a moment with India, behind the rise of the BJP (*Bharatiya Janata Party*), that is, Modi's Hindu-nationalist party, is a social movement. Part of this is a paramilitary movement known as RSS (*Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh*). They are an organized militia, which is noted for holding large-scale demonstrations, marches of their militants, often using sticks as weapons, obviously mimicking the use of the rifle in military parades. You will notice in the picture that all the militants are men. And this is perhaps the biggest militia in the world, it has a membership of something like 5 million at the moment. When you hear about the so-called riots in India between Muslims and Hindus, in many of them this is the group involved in street fighting and attacks on Muslims. So we are seeing a mass mobilization of a highly militaristic kind, which is involved in the authoritarian takeover of the Indian government.

DOI: 10.48074/aceno.v13i32.20485

Image 3 – RSS Parede. Source: Wikipedia

RC: If we look at the next layer down, at states that are not quite so powerful, we also can find quite a number of authoritarian leaderships. In Iran, of course, there is an Islamist regime. There is a newer authoritarian regime in Hungary, which is also based on religious and racial hierarchies. There is an authoritarian Islamist regime of a different kind in Turkey. There is an authoritarian regime in Byelorussia, modelled to some extent on the Putin regime. And, of course, there is a new Islamist dictatorship in Afghanistan. And we could go on, there's a good many more.

Now these are, if you like, the regimes at the head of the state. But there is more to consider. Many of these regimes have come to power through the mobilization of an authoritarian social movement. These exist in somewhat different forms. We can think of the "Tea Party" in the United States, an anti-tax, extreme-right movement, which helped to radicalize the Republican Party — in a way that allowed Donald Trump to become the party leader. We can see the mobilization of an extreme-right movement in Germany, which is behind the rise of the *Alternative für Deutschland* right-wing party, which is now having considerable success. We see Islamist militias in significant parts of North Africa, West Africa, the Middle East, and Southwest Asia. Very well-known examples are the Islamic State movement in Iraq and Syria, and the *Boko Haram* movement in northern Nigeria. And there are others too.

Soraya Barreto (SB): How do you evaluate the contribution of the media in the new rise of authoritarianism?

RC: Behind social movements, too, of course, are media. We have also seen the recent growth of very distinctly right-wing media in many parts of the world. In the United States, I'm sure many of you will have seen Fox News. This is a subsidiary of an international media empire owned by someone who's actually originally Australian, Rupert Murdoch, the multi-millionaire who controls the corporation behind Fox News. We can see online media mobilizations, such as

DOI: 10.48074/aceno.v13i32.21340

the so-called “Manosphere”.[4] This has a variety of sites — subreddits, individual sites, forums and so forth —- which have extremely anti-feminist, misogynist content. And we see online enterprises, such as the pretend “Hustlers University” set up by the online influencer Andrew Tate, whom you will have heard of if you have been following online masculinity politics.

So, we have an authoritarian, masculinized media universe, a pattern of social mobilization, and political parties, some of which have come to power, some of which have not. And through the combined influence of all of those developments, we see shifts in state policy, and in the policies of governments, which impinge on a considerable variety of people.

Many of these changes are directly or indirectly tied to the control of women's lives. Very directly and spectacularly so in Afghanistan, of course. Slightly, less comprehensively, the current agenda of the Republican Party in the United States. Notably, the attacks on abortion rights and the clamping down in about half of American states now, on women's abortion rights, which have been held universally in the United States for the previous 50 years.

We see a common pattern in many of these authoritarian regimes: a persecution of minorities, whether they're religious minorities, such as the Muslims in India and in significant parts of Europe, or sexual minorities, or ethnic minorities. We see a pattern of political manipulation too: the attempt to take over not just the current policies of the state, but the actual personnel of the state, for instance by taking political control of the courts. That is a common move, which was spectacularly seen in Russia recently, in the United States too, but also in India, and other places. We see manipulation of the elections, such as the common practice of imprisoning or exiling or criminalizing whoever is the leader of the opposition to the regime.

Importantly, we also see a shift in economic and welfare policy. In many, though not quite all of these regimes, the shift is towards a neoliberal austerity regime, which cuts social welfare services as a way to cut taxes for the rich. That is happening on an international scale at the moment, with the cutting of overseas aid, including health aid, by the United States. That is just one example. So, I think people are not mistaken to talk about this historical moment as a time where there is a heavy impact of authoritarianism. Authoritarian movements and regimes existed 20 years ago, but not on this scale, or with this intensity.

SB: Is anti-feminism an indispensable content for the contemporary global authoritarianism that you speak about?

RC: I think it's very widespread. It's not always thematized, but it can be there. An example would be the regime in China, which is officially in favor of gender equality. It has never come out ideologically against the advancement of women. But it treats feminist organizing as subversive, it has actually disrupted attempts at feminist organizing in ways that are easily available to an established dictatorship without ever having to come out and say that's what it's doing. It has made it impossible for any active feminist movement to emerge. It has made it even more impossible for any active gay or lesbian movement to emerge. The Chinese regime can take pride from the fact that it hosted the last of the World Conferences on Women, which adopted a famous feminist document known as the *Beijing Declaration of 1995*.

[4] See Villaça and d’Andrea, 2021.

DOI: 10.48074/aceno.v13i32.20485

Other movements, of course, are much more explicitly anti-feminist. So the Republican right-wing in the United States is very explicitly anti-feminist. They've been the cutting edge of the reintroduction of bans on abortion globally.

SB: In your opinion, are there structural or ideological elements in common between these different authoritarian movements?

RC: If we step for a moment behind these manifestations of authoritarianism that I have been listing, we can see some immediate sources of these movements and shifts in political and popular consciousness.

Firstly, many of them are connected one way or another to what we might think of as men's spaces. Here I am not thinking so much of the toxic masculinity space of the "Manosphere", but well-established, institutionalized spaces, which are predominantly occupied by men, or where men hold a very striking degree of control. One example is commercial sport. We now see a surge in women's participation in commercial sport. Nevertheless, sport has been, in many ways, almost overwhelmingly, a men's space. Women have entered in a distinctly marginal and subordinated way. Here is a picture of a football hero in Australia, my country. This is a different kind of football from the kind that is played in Brazil, but you can see the point that I'm making. The hero — and the recipient of the very big salary of a football star — is an exemplary man. The women in the picture, although they are equally visible, are totally marginalized. They are simply the cheerleaders for the performance of the men.

I could multiply that kind of pattern across different sports codes, again and again and again. It is not surprising, then, that a number of the authoritarian figures in other arenas maintain, display or have historically had a connection with commercial sport. Andrew Tate, to go no further, got part of his start as a professional kickboxer, in a particularly aggressive form of commercial sport.

Another men's space that has interesting connections with authoritarianism is the high-technology business, the computing industries, online industries and electronic media. We're familiar enough with where Elon Musk comes from, and he's not the only one. Jeff Bezos comes to mind, who has recently bought the famous newspaper *The Washington Post*, and shifted that politically to the right. Rupert Murdoch made a large part of his fortune out of television, broadcasting commercial sports and getting monopoly rights to particular popular sports.

Another striking economic "men's room" is the finance industry, which is very definitely connected with the economic side of the new authoritarianism. Yet another is the military and the police forces, which until recently have been entirely masculine. They still are male-dominated to a striking extent, and are a source of support for authoritarian regimes, and a site of important practices of authoritarian government.

DOI: 10.48074/aceno.v13i32.21340

Image 4 – Australian football star poses next to cheerleaders. Source: Couriermall

MA: At Trump's inauguration, we saw, in line, 6 CEOs from big techs, like Amazon, Google, Apple, and others. In your perception, how have these platforms been investing in the public perception of authoritarian regimes?

RC: Yes, the social media platforms in particular have certainly enabled ideological themes of authoritarianism to circulate. They have not been particularly complicit, as far as I know, in the organizational side of authoritarian politics. That isn't absolutely excluded, simply because they are very rich and are able to donate to right-wing parties, and some of them do. However, their activity as platforms is not integrated with the authoritarian activity of the state to any very large extent. You may know better than me about this, because I'm not any kind of expert on the contemporary digital economy [laughs], but that is my impression, at least.

What we could say is that the digital economy is an important vehicle for social changes which produce underlying conditions for the turn to authoritarian and racist politics. For instance, the growth of precarious employment, even in relatively affluent economies. The digital economy is very much involved in that. Amazon is one of the leading bad employers that we have in the current corporate scene [laughs]. The affordances of the online world, and the various platforms on it, have been important in the growth of the gig economy. Think of systems like Uber, which use the digital world as the point of contact for an insecure pattern of employment.

It is easy to be a little overwhelmed by the individual scores of particular online influencers. Probably the best-known example is Andrew Tate, but there are others, as you all know. They can have spectacular personal followings (or apparently so, because those figures are artificially bolstered in various ways). But there is so much media talk about a few leading examples that it can distort our understanding of what's going on more broadly. The more *indirect* effects of the digital economy may actually be more important in the growth of authoritarian politics. That is guesswork on my part, I cannot give a hard backup for those thoughts, but that is the way I'm reading the scene at the moment.

MA: I was thinking that maybe the world of business could be one of these male-dominated spaces that you've cited.

DOI: 10.48074/aceno.v13i32.20485

RC: Yes, I would say that there is a background to contemporary authoritarianism in business — in economic forms that have become dominant in global capitalism in the last two generations. I'm thinking here especially of the shift in political policy towards "neoliberalism", which includes deregulation of markets, especially capital markets, anti-unionism, attempts to promote individualism in culture.

A very significant part of this economic movement is a cult of the entrepreneur', the idea of business being driven by risk-taking, bold, individual leaders ("undertaker", curiously, is the English word that is the exact translation of "entrepreneur"). The figure of the entrepreneur is almost always imagined as masculine. This is connected with the financialization of contemporary capitalism. The shift of resources into financial enterprises — merchant banking, various forms of stock market manipulation, hedge funds — was bound up with the global financial crisis in 2007 but has remained as a feature of the international capitalist regime ever since.

So, we see a shift towards the cult of the entrepreneurial manager happening at the same time as economic and political shifts have allowed an enormous concentration of wealth in the hands of a small number of people. In images of masculinity, we have transitioned from the image of the transnational manager, the manager embedded in multinational corporations such as General Motors, ITT or IBM, the highly controlled "organization man", to the image of the contemporary "billionaire". Jeff Bezos is an example, starting out, amazingly, as a bookseller. By expanding the techniques of online selling and management, and through a really ferocious attitude to the income and well-being of his workforce in Amazon, he has become immensely rich. Bezos is notoriously hostile to unions and drove wage levels down to a very striking extent in the early history of his company. He gives a perfect example of the disconnection from the workforce that is characteristic of the top leadership of the contemporary capitalist regime.

SB: Could you develop, a little more, the analysis that you've done on masculinities, politics and sports?

RC: I would have to say, first, that non-authoritarian politicians also like to be seen with football stars. Although I gave the example of a rugby football star from Australia, what I was most concerned with in that picture was the whole *mise-en-scène*. The role of the women there, the role of the crowd, the construction of a masculinized performance in what is, in fact, a very brutal sport (rugby football is more brutal than soccer, i.e. association football).

That seemed to me a strong example of a masculinized cultural space, which has enormous reach. Because the relentlessness of sports media is astonishing, and the size of its audience is also astonishing. Sports media familiarize a mass audience with a masculinized space that is a very hierarchical space. Commercial sports are extremely competitive and extremely hierarchical, with massive salaries at the top, massive levels of disappointment at the bottom.

There are other features of the kind of masculinity I've been talking about, the combativeness, the willingness to inflict pain, the cult of hardness, which is such an important feature of competitive sports. This background seems more important than any particular moves by individual sports figures or politicians (such as Hulk Hogan endorsing Donald Trump). But when that happens, it highlights the fact of connection between the political world and the particular form

DOI: 10.48074/aceno.v13i32.21340

taken by commercial sports.

MA: The man's spaces that you cited also include religion, right?

RC: Yes, established men's spaces also include conservative and authoritarian religions. About 10 years ago, in France, a mobilization known as "*Manifs pour tous*" went to the streets against what was being called "theory of gender" or "gender ideology" (the occasion was a proposed law allowing marriage between same-sex couples). This was an early public mobilization in the Catholic church's campaign against the concept of gender.

"Gender theory", in the language of the right-wing Catholic network that organized the mobilization, means feminism, gay liberation, the existence of trans groups, and any idea that supports those features of our social life. The anti-gender movement has produced a series of political memes, which surface in right-wing mobilizations and political campaigns from time to time around the world.

It happened in Australia, a few years after this French mobilization. The right-wing parties insisted on a referendum which they thought would oppose gay marriage (a tactic that the Republican Party in the United States had been using at the time). Their campaign used themes from the anti-gender mobilizations. Actually, that attempt failed. The popular vote supported gay marriage, and the right-wing parties were then forced to pass a law in favor of gay marriage. It is a story that should be more widely known!

Other manifestations of authoritarianism are connected to other religions. Modi's movement in India, for instance, is very strongly connected — not to traditional Hindu religion, but to a new version of Hindu identity, commonly called "*Hindutva*" (popular Hindu religion used to be very plural, tolerant and syncretic, involving many gods and goddesses, many different forms of worship, and fluid mixtures of beliefs). This has been changed into a set of doctrines and fixed beliefs, and a fixed set of gods, so that it actually operates like a religion of the book — like evangelical Christianity, with all the antagonism to other religions that we find in certain forms of Christianity.

In Islam, also, there are authoritarian, militant versions which have come to prominence, and in some parts of the Islamic world have come to power, in the last couple of generations. Salafist forms of Islam, especially the Wahhabi sect, are build upon the idea of prestige of Arabia in Islamic culture.

So, there are cultural bases as well as economic bases for the shift to authoritarianism. It will be no surprise to anyone to observe that most of those cultural forms are male supremacist. There is a specific place for women in their churches and mosques, and women have participated in the anti-gender demonstrations, for instance, which always claim to be in support of "the family". But women's place here is a distinctly subordinated place.

MA: Judith Butler (2024), in recent discussions on the term "gender ideology" has said that this term is being used by conservative segments as a scapegoat towards which authoritarian politics project their fears and anxieties when facing crises as economic instabilities. From this perspective, do you identify any resistance movements to this agenda, specially in the context of the Global South?

RC: There are parts of the world, and forms of authoritarianism, where this kind of anti-gender ideological thinking, coming from this particular network in the Catholic Church, really has no grip. The Catholic campaign is small beer in

DOI: 10.48074/aceno.v13i32.20485

India, small beer in China. Those are the two most populous countries in the world, and both of them have authoritarian regimes, though different types of authoritarianism. That's the first post-colonial point that I would make. A lot of discussion of the new authoritarianism, like a lot of the ideological work of the political right itself, is centered in the Global North.

Having said that, I think Judith Butler is right about what she says in her recent book about the ideas of that network in the Catholic Church (I don't think all of the Catholic Church is of the same mind about this, but the anti-gender group is a powerful faction of the contemporary church). Like other far-right groups that Judith discusses in her book, they do indeed construct what she calls a "phantasm", a kind of fantasy that overlaps with a common feature of authoritarian masculinities — the belief in an endless struggle, opposed by endless enemies out there in the world.

The new authoritarians have constructed a fantasy of endless enmity. This mechanism is perhaps most appalling so far in the Indian case, because it has produced very serious loss of life in "communal" violence. But it is impinging on lives in Latin America, too, in so-called "social cleansing" violence. It is making life very much harder, right now, for the families of trans children in half the states of the United States. It is making life harder, creating a constant sense of threat, among many gay and lesbian groups in the Global North.

What I'm not sure of yet is how far this construction of fantasy enemies has actually become part of popular consciousness. In authoritarian politics, as well as some genuine social movements, there is a lot of what the North Americans call "astroturfing". That is, creating an *appearance* of popular consent or social movement, which is actually not there (in the way that AstroTurf constructs an appearance of grass across a playing field). The referendums that happen in authoritarian states are classic examples of the creation of a pretense of popular support; manipulating elections is another way of doing that. It is true that authoritarian parties sometimes win real elections, and we should never forget their capacity to do that. Whether that means a massive number of people shifting towards authoritarian beliefs is very much open to doubt.

Received on October 20, 2025.
Approved on June 22, 2026.

DOI: 10.48074/aceno.v13i32.21340

References

BUTLER, Judith. *Quem tem medo de gênero?* São Paulo: Boitempo, 2024.

CONNELL, Raewyn. *Masculinities*. 2 ed. Berkeley e Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2005.

CONNELL, Raewyn; MESSERSCHMIDT, James W. Masculinidade hegemônica: repensando o conceito. *Estudos Feministas,* Florianópolis, 21(1): 241-282, 2013.

CONNELL, Raewyn; PEARSE, Rebecca. *Gênero: uma perspectiva global*. São Paulo: nVersos, 2015.

CONNELL, Raewyn. *Gênero em termos reais*. São Paulo: nVersos. 2016.

HAMLIN, Cynthia; VANDENBERGHE, Frédéric. Vozes do Sul: entrevista com Raewyn Connell. *Cadernos Pagu,* 40 (1): 345-358, 2013.

DOI: 10.48074/aceno.v13i32.20485