
Chapter 1: THE LEGACY OF PATRIARCHY

Author(s): ROBERT BAHLIEDA

Source: *Counterpoints*, 2015, Vol. 488, THE DEMOCRATIC GULAG: Patriarchy, Leadership & Education (2015), pp. 15-67

Published by: Peter Lang AG

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/45136330>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to
Counterpoints

JSTOR

THE LEGACY OF PATRIARCHY

Nothing is more despicable than respect based on fear—Albert Camus

Human experience has been characterized by a history of male domination, control, and violence—in short, a history of patriarchy and power (French, 1985; A. Johnson, 2005). Eisenstein (1999) describes the latter's parameters as follows:

Power, or the converse—oppression—derives from both sex and class, and this is manifested through both the material and ideological dimensions of patriarchy and capitalism. Oppression is inclusive of exploitation but reflects a more complex reality. It reflects the hierarchical relations of the sexual division of labor and society. (p. 203)

Although patriarchy is now draped in the clothing of postmodern civilization with all its superficial artifice and guile, it operates in exactly the same way that it did thousands of years ago (French, 1985; A. Johnson, 2005). As feminism has long asserted, the evolution of the separation of the roles of men and women into public and private spheres is a social and patriarchal construct responsible for the historical dialectical tension between the sexes and is entrenched in the gender socialization that pervades human experience

(Gaskell & McLaren, 1991; Lerner, 1986). As Fox (1989) explains, patriarchy is a “system of practices, arrangements and social relations that ensure biological reproduction, child rearing and the reproduction of gendered subjectivity, as well as gender ideology, or the sense of gender identity, itself” (p. 147). It is also responsible for the same tension between all of our societal institutions: religion, politics, economics, education, and culture. Radical and socialist feminists are among a limited number of intellectuals who focus serious attention on patriarchy and its negative impacts on society. Eisenstein (1999) again points out:

Radical feminism offers a criticism of patriarchy through the analysis of sex roles themselves. Patriarchy is defined to mean a sexual system of power in which the male role is superior in possession of power and economic privilege. Patriarchy is the male hierarchical ordering of society. Although the legal institutional base of patriarchy used to be more explicit, the basic relations of power have remained intact. (pp. 202–203)

As she correctly notes, patriarchy has become subsumed within today’s world and synonymous with our current social environment despite the absence of its formalized presence. Eisenstein (1999)—like others—makes the connection among patriarchy, gender, power, leadership, education, and economics. These have been the key themes of patriarchal society throughout history and are the key issues this book will critically examine. It will investigate the legacy and meaning of patriarchy for modern society, the evolution of neopatriarchy, and specifically the ongoing effects of patriarchy on leadership and education. These factors and many others are the perfect storm of social evolution that has created our current flawed reality.

What is critical in Eisenstein’s (1999) definition is that patriarchy is gender-based and hierarchical. Radical feminist research accurately asserts that it is rooted in male power, domination, and control as well as capitalism (A. Johnson, 2005; von Werlhof, 2007). This association is a critical and often overlooked implication of the dominance of patriarchy and its influence on democracy. These definitions maintain that patriarchal attitudes, values, and beliefs shape our cultural, social, political, and economic decision making, interpersonal relationships, leadership models, religious beliefs, and educational practices. The reciprocal relationship between men and women, the family and society, and production and reproduction defines the lives of women and men everywhere as it has throughout human history (Eisenstein, 1999).

However, the four major theoretical traditions of feminist research—radical, Marxist/Socialist, liberal and dual-systems theory—like many other areas of scholarly investigation in this area, often restrict their focus and their theorizing about patriarchy primarily to the role of men or capitalism or both in the subordination of women or in the case of liberal feminism on generic social factors like sexism, deprivation, or discrimination that hold women back (equal rights etc.) (A. Johnson, 2005; Walby, 1990) rather than viewing it as an all-encompassing, overarching, multidisciplinary ideology that affects everyone—men and women alike—across multiple cultures, histories, religions, economics, geographies, and institutions. The four main feminist theoretical positions limit their validity with this theoretical essentialization of the role of patriarchy and thus leave it under-theorized and our understandings incomplete. These major theoretical traditions fail to fully integrate the key roles of religion, education, and politics in addition to economics and male values in their theoretical constructs and in determining the influence of patriarchy as Walby (1990) attempts to do with her theory of patriarchal structures.

With progress in women's rights over the past century across multiple cultures and institutions there has also been a decline in the criticism of patriarchy and its effects (Gilligan & Richards, 2009). Patriarchy has increasingly become viewed narrowly as a familial anachronism that has been dispatched with the advent of women's rights in the 20th century rather than an invasive and growing meta-ideology (Lerner, 1986; Daly, 1978 cited in Walby, 1990). It continues to benefit only a select few (both male and female) at the top of the social and economic pyramid, yet the reasons for this are rarely attributed directly to patriarchy. It is less about gender than it is about socialized domination and power—by either gender—and how this is employed in social and other relations (Laxer, 1999). Laxer muses about society's limited response to this circumstance: "Should we draw the conclusion that we would be better advised to turn our attention to minor ameliorations of the condition of those around us than to confront and challenge the idea of class-divided society" (p. 251)?

The wellspring of the "domination of the many by the few" as Laxer describes it is the system of patriarchy (p. 251). In practice, patriarchy has been overwhelmingly male, but to this day women who have led have also done so in a patriarchal manner. Ultimately, the contributions of feminist scholars are unhelpful in untangling the pervasiveness of the source of the real problems at the core of society because their viewpoints are often restricted to theoretical silos and marginalized and have not been normalized in academic or popular

views of society (A. Johnson, 2005; Daniels, 2010). This is often due to the morass of cross-disciplinary problems that patriarchy generates like many other areas of research. Scientific rationalism encourages the atomization of academic research through the bureaucratic, hierarchical segmentation and over-specialization of organizations and academic disciplines—a system that works against a comprehensive, integrative response to, and analysis of, its influence that ensures its ongoing supremacy (Lerner, 1997). It is a system of organizational and societal divide-and-conquer that has worked in favor of patriarchal values for centuries. Society spends its time putting out a myriad of small social fires rather than removing the fuel source (A. Johnson, 2005). Men have both consciously and unconsciously manipulated and taken part in its ethos over the history of the world and everyone else has been socialized beneath its umbrella. This has occurred for centuries and centuries for tens of thousands of years (Lerner, 1986; Wong & Sunderman, 2001).

Feminism is also hampered by interdisciplinary biases suffered by all scholarly and other research including this work, written from the perspective of a white, middle-class, North American male (Brookfield, 2005; Capper, 1998). Despite the accuracy of many of the arguments of radical and socialist feminists Apple (1995) points out that they also have been affected by the recognition that their own critiques were often positioned from a privileged white, middle-class, Western perspective that ignored the perspective of black feminists and other marginalized women (Acker, 1994; Daniels, 2010; Lerner, 1997). They are also hampered by the fact that any scholarship that is openly critical of the existing status quo—of academia, education, society, politics, economics, science, organizations or leadership—is quickly marginalized by the dominant and traditional scholarly and other discourses in each of these areas (A. Johnson, 2005). Taking a change position is not an easy task as Copernicus or Galileo or Christopher Columbus discovered (Lerner, 1986).

Nonetheless, the more important point about the variety of theoretical, epistemological, and philosophical scholarly debates and positions about the origins and impact of patriarchy on society is not the differences in theoretical positions themselves or the successful dominance of one or the other but the collective voices that are clamouring for change in our patriarchal world. The diversity of voices is the important issue in research on patriarchy and it is exactly this diversity that reflects the true problematic reality of patriarchy and our struggles to confront it. The real problem is that feminist theories of patriarchy have not resonated with men and women around the globe and change has slowed or been reversed in the emancipation of women

(A. Johnson, 2005). Motivating both men and women to change is the major challenge for theory. Attacking patriarchy and the status quo is also often like shadow boxing because patriarchy has no form, no substance, and no reality beyond that evoked through human interaction. Both sexes have a great deal invested in the current social system and are loathe to fundamentally destabilize it. Despite these difficulties, patriarchy is palpable in every human event we witness. Because it is rooted in genetic sexual differences and the related gender-socialized behaviors between men and women that these generate, patriarchy is as palpable today as it has ever been and forms the ever-present, dominant, and yet transparent ideology of human relations in the 21st century (Eisenstein, 1999). This book will explore its role across the broad spectrum of human experience and its key expression through the critical vehicles of leadership and education.

Where to Start?

The key to changing our civilization lies in understanding patriarchy and its overwhelming control over who we are, how we act, and how we think as a human civilization. This book will employ the perspective of critical theory to evaluate the influence of patriarchy on our modern world (K. Brown, 2006). It is the most dominant yet least critiqued ideology in history because it is a male ideology and as such is rarely open to challenge; it is not viewed as a clear political or religious ideology but rather as a set of normalized relationships between the sexes and in families. Half the world's population does not see patriarchy as a problem (A. Johnson, 2005). At the geopolitical and historical level it has been the values of the dominant, the victorious, and powerful who have coincidentally been, for the most part, men. Brookfield (2005) provides a critical perspective on the meaning of ideology:

Critical theory views ideology as the broadly accepted set of values, beliefs, myths, explanations, and justifications that appears self-evidently true, empirically accurate, personally relevant, and morally desirable to a majority of the populace. The function of this ideology is to maintain an unjust social and political order. Ideology does this by convincing people that existing social arrangements are naturally ordained and obviously work for the good of all. (pp. 40–41)

Thus when ideology is a shared, debated, and contested concept it has relevance and vibrancy, but when individuals or societies become slaves to a particular ideological interpretation, it becomes oppressive and frequently

accepted and tolerated—as it is in the case of patriarchy in many oppressive socialist regimes, like Russia, China, and other authoritarian systems, but is also similarly problematic in Western democracies (A. Johnson, 2005). The moment ideas become crystallized into dogma, they become ideology. Even ideologies such as democracy become oppressive when they no longer are subjected to rigorous scrutiny and the tempering of penetrating critical debate. To a large degree modern democracy is subjected to limited critical scrutiny by Western societies in particular. The ideology of patriarchy conforms to Brookfield's (2005) interpretation. Thus he views ideology as pervasive and cohesive but also covert and manipulative. Ideology is frequently dogmatic although it does not need to be.

Ideology within patriarchy has been this way but ideology within a non-authoritarian society could be equally democratic and positive. Obviously democracy is an ideology that most humans value while the values of dictatorships are ones they revile. Ideologies that suppress human freedom are almost universally rejected by their citizens yet frequently imposed. The latter are almost always the values of patriarchy and yet most modern democracies are also patriarchal. Ideology can also be subtly and covertly oppressive as in the case of Western democracies. Most people unfortunately idolize the ideal with little critical reflection on whether that ideal can be demonstrated in their lives. Ideology generally places value on rigid belief over rational thought and as soon as belief dominates an ideology, it becomes detached from reality and becomes repressive. Most major religions fall into this category. Even though people willingly subordinate themselves to mythical religious figures and beliefs, these values demand unbending adherence from their advocates often to the point of extremism. Rational logic ceases to become a mediating factor.

There are myriad social examples of this process throughout history. The mass brainwashing of the German people during World War II, the equally effective brainwashing of the Cambodian people by Pol Pot, and the actions of Hutus in Rwanda and the Serbs and the Croations during the Bosnian conflict are only several in a litany of human experiences where nations were manipulated into believing in genocidal and anti-Semitic values that led to actions that caused enormous human tragedies. Equally compelling is the phenomenon of St. Vitus' Dance, a temporary madness that took over medieval society, demonstrating the power of suggestive thinking. Wright (2004) in his book *A Short History of Progress* quotes Adolf Hitler as having once gleefully exclaimed, "What luck for the rulers that the people do not think!" (p. 130).

Ideologies can also be informal, positive, and fluid as with the hippie revolution of the 1960s when young people bonded around a loose ideology of sex, drugs, and rock and roll to dramatically transform society but continued to confirm patriarchal attitudes toward sexual freedom. The ideology of peace and love that permeated the thinking of millions of young people at the time brought wide-reaching and fundamental change to post-war North American and global society that persists to this day (Evans, 2009). One thing it did not change was patriarchy and radical feminism grew out of the subordination of women in the political protest movement that was dominated by males (A. Johnson, 2005). Ideologies can be constructive or oppressive depending on how slavish they become to their own values and the orientation of the particular ideology. In the hands of shrewd or unscrupulous politicians or dictators, ideology can be a formidable weapon for evil. Ideology in the service of ambition or power becomes dangerous.

Brookfield's (2005) concept of ideology also gives rise to an understanding of the related concept of hegemony—a far more subtle form of social manipulation described by Antonio Gramsci. It entails the impress of a wide variety of cultural, gender, ideological beliefs and practices that convince people that a socially unjust system is an acceptable natural order (Reynolds, White, Brayman, & Moore, 2008; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 1999; Lerner, 1986; Williams, 1977). Most importantly, as Osborne (2001) notes, "In short, hegemony is a process, not an end-state" (p. 39).

Hegemony is an accurate description of the action of patriarchy. The final internalization of hegemony that leads to self-controlling behavior follows upon a long period of direct or indirect control lasting, in some cases, centuries if not longer. Determining the critical difference between ideological brainwashing and real democracy is a difficult and challenging process since one can often masquerade as the other. In a true democracy, its ideology is always open to real debate, challenge, and change, something that is seen only in formulaic, stultified ways in modern democracies. If this happens, ideology is always vibrant and adapting to meet the needs of society and culture at a particular moment in history. If it fails to do this then culture (and democracy) can become a means to an end. The reason for this is the ingrained complexity of culture as Sergioivanni and Corbally (1987) explain: "...culture includes customs and traditions, historical accounts be they mythical or actual, tacit understandings, habits, norms, and expectations, common meanings associated with fixed objects and established rites, shared assumptions and inter-subjective meanings" (p. viii cited in Giles and Proudfoot (1994), p. 204).

Culture is the social expression of ideology and patriarchy is the social expression of culture. It is like society-wide “group-think,” a term coined by Irving Janus (1982) regarding the propensity of groups to collectively come to decisions (often wrong or dangerous) by ignoring obvious conflicts with their sequestered views. Patriarchy, ideology, hegemony, and culture are inextricably intertwined. It is important to understand their interrelated roles in understanding the evolution of society.

Thus patriarchy is the primary and oldest group-think ideology of humankind upon which all other ideologies are premised and from which all other ideologies arise. It is interwoven with culture, gender, economics, religion, education, leadership, and power. These elements are the lifeblood of all our global social institutions. Patriarchy simultaneously coexists within these bodies while also creating their complexity. It has not taken control of society overnight but through a glacially slow evolution throughout human history in which generation after generation has been socialized into its ideologically restrictive belief system and relationships. As Reich (1974) notes in his book *The Sexual Revolution*:

Based on these conditions of production, certain ideas about life, morals, philosophy, etc., develop. They generally correspond to the level of technology at a particular time, i.e., to the ability to comprehend and master life. The social ‘ideology’ thus created forms the human structure and is turned into a material force to be preserved in that structure as ‘tradition.’ Now, everything depends on whether the whole society or only a small minority participates in the formation of the social ideology. If a minority holds political power, then it also determines the type and content of the general ideology and the formation of human structure. Therefore, in an authoritarian society, the thinking of the majority corresponds to the economic and political interests of the rulers. Conversely, in a work-democratic society, where there are no minority power interests, the social ideology would correspond to the vital interests of all members of society. (p. xxiv)

What Reich is indicating is that power creates the ruling ideology and the ruling ideology of the world is male. He is also describing an ideal, fully participatory, substantive democracy where power is balanced, all are enfranchised, and none excluded. This is similar to Young’s (2000) concept of “deliberative democracy” described by LiPumaa & Koelbleb (2009), which to be valid must meet the threshold of inclusion, political equality of participants, reasonableness of discussion and equal accountability on all partners for implementation of any results (pp. 203–204). Few would argue that any society has realized such a state to date. Those with power control the ideology of culture, politics,

religion, and economics and create these in their own image. In human history this image has been patriarchal. While you can eradicate any living thing it is much harder to erase an idea that exists within that living thing, much like the Islamic extremists currently brutalizing Iraq. Eradicating people is easy; eradicating ideas is much more difficult. Like a virus, patriarchy mutates and changes to survive in another form. Just as humankind contains genetic links to the earliest humans, the world holds ideological links to the earliest forms of patriarchy. Just as *Homo sapiens* are the most highly evolved of the animal species, modern patriarchy is the most highly developed form of ideological belief. Its trend will not be reversed overnight but the change can begin by acknowledging its power and breaking down its grip on social functioning with real changes that attack its authoritarian, paternal core. Rather than being a political curiosity and an anachronism, patriarchy is a vibrant, active, living presence in our modern world. It is the true "invisible hand" of society, in contrast to the economic one spoken of by Adam Smith (1965).

Modern capitalist democracies have been most successful in implementing this hegemonic view of society that is implemented in their economic systems. They are the highest and most refined iteration of patriarchy and male dominance yet perfected by our gendered society. Brookfield's (2005) perspective views the concepts of ideology and hegemony as sublimated within thousands of years of complex socialization and social, political, economic, religious, and other forms of historical human development, but patriarchy is as powerful a force today as it has ever been and still dominates human relations in overt and clandestine ways (Chinoy, 1967; Daly, 1978 cited in Walby, 1990). As Gramsci correctly points out, every relationship in human existence is an educational one and thus the overwhelming importance of understanding the role and purpose of both formal and informal education and socialization in society (Brookfield, 2005). This implies a detailed appreciation and understanding of the role of leadership and education.

In contrast to the linear progression of society toward an improved civilization as believed by Enlightenment thinkers, and generally accepted in society today, humankind's progress toward evolution has been anything but smooth and progressive. Society has tended to block out, erase, or minimize the continuous male-driven conflict that has characterized social history. Many would say these are merely random occurrences that are a normal part of human development, but the pattern is so consistent that clear trends are

evident. Schafer (2008) underscores the frequently negative potential of our patriarchal social culture:

There is also a more sinister side to history that must also be taken into account in all future developments: the countless conflicts and confrontations between the different cultures and peoples of the world, and the record of acts of brutality, barbarism, violence, and oppression. As the history of colonialism, imperialism, Nazism, fascism, and “cultural revolutions” throughout the world confirms only too well, there are always problems when too much power is concentrated in too few hands and there are major inequalities in the world. This makes it imperative, as indicated earlier, to be ever mindful of, and to create safeguards against, the abuses of culture. (pp. 183–184)

Power, and with it patriarchy, subverts the spontaneous progression of social evolution toward the most beneficial state for humankind as it has been doing for thousands of years since *Homo sapiens* began evolving. Enlightenment thinkers did not factor the distortion of human progression by political and social power into their views—in contrast, they accepted it as part of the natural process. Power concentration is and has been a fundamental problem in society, and power concentration is the fundamental premise of patriarchy. The use and application of power and force is a conscious human choice, not a random act. Thus patriarchy is a key issue requiring the attention of all of society. Dobbin (1998) links hegemonic ideology and power in modern times: “Ideology has been called meaning in the service of power, that is, the creation of rationalizing myths, ideas, and, in today’s lexicon, “common sense,” that pave the way for people to accept conditions they would otherwise protest against” (p. 184). Campbell (1969)—a highly respected historical and religious scholar—provides a similar conclusion to an interpretation of the instrumental and self-serving role of primitive patriarchal myths such as Genesis that are accepted as historical fact by major religions and blame women for man’s fate:

We have already noted the role of chicanery in shamanism. It may well be that a good deal of what has been advertised as representing the will of “Old Man” actually is but the heritage of a lot of old men, and that the main idea has been not so much to honor God as to simplify life by keeping woman in the kitchen. (pp. 322–323)

So clearly in Campbell’s view, ideologies such as patriarchy are not random and spontaneous but the willful acts of a self-interested and controlling male culture. Social power has progressed from overt and periodic to covert and continuous. With increasing frequency, subliminal socialization is the

preferred method of groups who hold power, but physical force is still employed as necessary to maintain control at both the geopolitical and domestic level. There exists in society a continuum of authoritarian responses that ensures the maintenance of the system. Authoritarianism has progressive levels of control that are implemented depending on the need and circumstances, from casual and subtle auto-suggestion as occurs through media and advertising to physical violence such as occurs during riot control by governments and dictators or the slaughter of people that we are currently witnessing in Iraq by ISIL (J. Acker, 2006). Covert distortion, disinformation, and propaganda are more discrete and subliminal methods regularly utilized by modern governments, businesses, and other groups to create an illusion of reality (a spin) surrounding a certain event or events (Cook, 1990). Such manipulation of reality has become commonplace and literally indistinguishable from actual reality, distorting people's ability to discern fact from truth.

The inexplicable violence we experience everywhere today comes in many forms and types from centuries old cultural patterns—all or most of which have been generated by patriarchal views of the world (Lerner, 1986). As O'Sullivan (2001) points out:

One of the perennial problems of community life is the presence of differences of power that lead to structures of oppression and domination. We can see oppression and domination both between and within human groupings. Structures of oppression and domination exist at all levels of human interaction and seem to be present in human history from its very beginnings. (p. 248)

What must be acknowledged is that these are merely ways of acting learned by generations of humans that can be just as easily unlearned, if we are willing to do so. They are not natural, immutable, unchangeable, or intractable—they are simply ways of behaving and thinking that can and must be altered (Lerner, 1986).

Patriarchal domination, control, and violence have diversified their manifestations and now exist in overtly physical as well as subtle cultural, psychological, and emotional forms. Violence occurs through direct physical means as well as passively through economic, political, educational, racial, religious, and cultural means—all at the psychological and emotional level—all of which have their roots and their current genesis in the history of patriarchy (Schafer, 2008).

The impact of this is the same as it has been for thousands of years—a selected small group of males have benefitted at the expense of all others by

employing various forms of violence to accomplish their goals. At times this reaches the extreme heights of global conflict while at others it is a tolerable cruelty of poverty, exploitation, and neglect as we exist in today. At its core such a system is grossly unfair, destructive, and unsustainable. In today's world we are quickly reaching the limits of the rule of patriarchy as the products of its values threaten to destabilize and ultimately destroy the world in the ethnic and cultural violence in Ukraine, Syria, and Iraq, and the rapid destruction of the planet driven by self-interest and competition. It is a complex polarized and polarizing system and as such creates winners and losers. The winners generally gain at the expense of the losers.

Patriarchy as the archetypal myth pits one gender, person, religion, race, and nation against the other in a competitive, destabilizing zero-sum win-lose struggle for control of the social, intellectual, and human and material resources of the planet (Walby, 2004). Most people today are oblivious to this ideological basis for their present behavior. O'Sullivan (2001) points out that the dominance and subordination structures of patriarchy occur in all cultures and races in the modern world, operating over all classes and ages. The structure of patriarchy operates globally. It is the most dominant, long-lasting, repressive, and universal ideological myth that humankind still adheres to with dogged uncritical determination.

The History of Patriarchy

Patriarchy is the most elemental essence of society that has existed since the dawn of time and certainly since recorded history more than 5000 years ago (French, 1985; Lerner, 1986). Societal values are governed by the single overarching ideology of patriarchy that is known to reach back formally 5000–7,000 years (von Werlhof, 2007). Crocco (2007) points out this subtle influence of patriarchy as she notes the seminal work of Gerda Lerner on patriarchy and the difference between “oppression” and “subordination”:

The origins of patriarchy in the West go back millennia. Gerda Lerner chronicles the evolution of patriarchy in *The Creation of Patriarchy* (1987) and *The Creation of Feminist Consciousness* (1993). In both books, she highlights the differing effects of patriarchy according to time, place, and social class. Lerner prefers the word subordination to oppression in describing women's status in most societies, defining oppression as “forceful subordination,” a term signifying the “subject condition of individuals and of groups” (1987, 233). She believes the term oppression inadequate in capturing “paternalistic dominance, which, while it has oppressive aspects, also involves a set

of mutual obligations and is frequently not perceived as oppressive" (Lerner 1987, 233). (p. 258)

Subordination also constitutes what can be termed "silent violence" whose impact is most often seen through poverty, homelessness, and neglect rather than open hostility and can victimize both men and women. It also indicates the unconscious and conscious mutual socialized acceptance of patriarchy by both women and men (Lerner, 1986). The damage is no less real. It is violence perpetrated by withdrawing or withholding the conditions for life rather than directly affecting them. More and more in our present world this form of violence has become the norm, although physical violence and social unrest are still pervasive as well. We are a global culture suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) resulting from the effects of pervasive patriarchal violence, domination, and control (A. Johnson, 2005). Far more people have been killed as a result of silent versus overt violence. As Freire (1985) suggests: "The relationships between the dominator and the dominated reflect the greater social context, even when formally personal. Such relationships imply the introjection by the dominated of the cultural myths of the dominator" (p. 73).

More recently, Europe was swept by waves of intense "patriarchalization" as von Werlhof (2007) terms it during the last several thousand years in the form of the Roman conquest, the rise of Christianity, and feudalism—all of which consolidated its values within society (p. 23). The eminent religious and historical scholar Joseph Campbell (1969) reminds us in his book *Masks of God: Primitive Mythology* of the important historical caveat that accompanies the study of history and patriarchy—it even influences the study of patriarchy itself:

In Part Four, diagramming sketchily the main blocks of the prehistoric periods of myth, from the first we know of man's appearance on earth to the dawn of the ages of writing when the literary record of mythology begins, we must try to bear in mind the force of this dialogue. For it is one of the curiosities and difficulties of our subject that its materials come to us for the most part through the agency of the male. The masters of the rites, the sages and prophets, and lastly our contemporary scholars of the subject, have usually been men; whereas, obviously, there has always been a feminine side to the picture also. (pp. 352–353)

Patriarchalization occurred during periods where the control and presence of patriarchy was intensified in society. Schafer (2008) notes that society was

governed during this time by dominant cultural themes as well—in the Middle Ages, the age of religion; the Renaissance, the age of aesthetics; and in the 18th–20th centuries, the age of economics (capitalism)—but all these parallel periods were governed by the mega-age of patriarchy and its values. All the great periods of history are essentially the records of male achievements (Martin, 2001). In the past century we have witnessed a similar pattern culminating with the technological intensification period we are currently undergoing. The various ages identified by Schafer (2008) and von Werlhof (2007) were expressions of the continued efforts by ruling male elites to craft a society that consolidated their power and entrenched their preferred status in perpetuity. The torch of patriarchy has been handed down from generation to generation, from father to son, from dynasty to dynasty as an accepted and unalterable values lineage of male social power and authority that was achieved with physical power and authority. While there is substantial evidence that those who were subject to it intensely disliked, resisted, and rejected it, patriarchal aristocracies ruled through a mixture of brutal power and religion (Laxer, 1999). Religion was the earliest servant of patriarchy as males created mythological beliefs that romanticized their exploits and superiority (A. Johnson, 2005; Lerner, 1997). Each age in history was built upon the elite legacy of the previous ones and had the effect of increasing and expanding the influence and power of its presence. Scientific breakthroughs such as the discovery of gun powder, the printing press, the Industrial Revolution, the development of modern science, the broad acceptance of intellectual rationalism, the discovery of nuclear power, and the development of information and computer technology have all contributed significantly to the enrichment and entrenchment of the male worldview of human existence across societies worldwide and were extensions of its development (Laxer, 1999). They were also almost totally the creation of males with few exceptions, since women and others were categorically excluded from any form of social participation that would have led to such advances (Lerner, 1997). In this regard women continue to be effectively denied full participation as equals in countries around the world. Male assumptions became the enforced reality and that reality became social dogma.

This patriarchal social state replaced more matricentric societies that existed around 6500 BC–3500 BC and as far back as 9,000 years ago when agriculture was being established (A. Johnson, 2005). French (1985) points out that there is some evidence that truly matriarchal societies (the rule of women over men) did exist but there is more compelling evidence of matricentric societies organized around mothers and child-rearing:

In the beginning was the Mother; the Word began a later age. The single universal covering primate and ungulate (hoofed) species, indeed all mammals and much other animal life as well, is that the core of society, the center of whatever kind of social group exists, is mother and child. Such a social organization is called matrifocal or matricentric. These terms are not the same as matriarchal, a word formed by analogy with patriarchal, which denotes leadership (from the Greek root *arche*, meaning chief, and *archein*, to be first, to rule). A matriarchy would thus be a society in which mothers rule in the same way fathers have ruled for the past few thousand years. (p. 27)

Lerner (1986) in her seminal work *The Creation of Patriarchy* concludes that the historical and archaeological evidence does not support the existence of matriarchy at any point in history. Walby (1990) asserts the same conclusion. Nonetheless, even matricentric or matrilineal societies have been rarer throughout recorded Western history in comparison to the dominance of patriarchy. They primarily existed during periods where primitive peoples began moving from hunting and gathering cultures to more stable agricultural periods. Formally institutionalized patriarchy is a relatively recent development historically (A. Johnson, 2005). Despite the presence of elements of patriarchy throughout history Wilkinson and Pickett (2010) point out that for millions of years, hunter-gatherer societies lived relatively egalitarian lives that changed to the more distinctly contemporary form of sexually divided patriarchy with the shift to a more agrarian existence. In pre-patriarchal times around 7,000 years ago goddess imagery was a central feature of European, African and Middle Eastern countries (A. Johnson, 2005). The characteristics that would have been selected in more egalitarian societies were much different than those in patriarchal, dominant ones that followed. Miles (1993) observes that women had a better chance of equality in primitive versus advanced societies. Sanal (2008) points out a similar circumstance in Turkey prior to the Turks accepting Islam as their primary faith. Patriarchy was more strongly rooted in hunting and gathering societies such as North America and Europe while farming societies that had little access to game often evolved in more matricentric ways. Women were associated with the fecundity of the earth and its life-giving abilities to feed early clans and bear children. Frederick Engels (1975) in his book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* points out the Marxist case that the patriarchal family unit was a transition between the matriarchal communistic family that existed in primitive humankind and the modern isolated family of industrialization. Engels asserted that inequality originated in the family and women were the first oppressed group (A. Johnson, 2005). Lerner's (1986) historical analysis supports this view. This is the same concept proposed by Socrates in Ancient Greece versus the

accepted polarized patriarchal Aristotelian worldview largely embraced by present humanity (Lerner, 1986). Reich (1974) explains that in the evolution of matriarchy into patriarchy, early primitive clans migrated from matricentric clans to patriarchal families with the male patriarch gradually dominating the family structure and taking over prominence as the economic unit moved from the clan to the family and the family became the crystallization point of patriarchy as it continues to be today (Lerner, 1986).

These matricentric female values and social culture have survived into modern times, but only as cultural adornments to patriarchy while holding a massive parallel history that has never been told or valued. For current practical purposes, patriarchy has been the modal experience of societies around the globe for millennia (Lerner, 1986). Matricentric societies have been post-scripts to the others and generally preceded recorded history in many civilizations. They have been suppressed and distorted to serve as subsystems of patriarchal expectations throughout recent history (French, 1985). As a result our entire human experience has been skewed toward a male-slanted interpretation and practices of human experience, success, and values. The world has struggled (mostly unsuccessfully) to resist the hegemony and the insidious, forced domination of patriarchy.

More importantly, patriarchy has carried out a process of cultural socialization that has normalized male domination, violence, and control in human relations (including modern democratic societies), leading to an inability to potentially conceive of more successful social systems to organize human behavior (French, 1985; Lerner, 1986). As J. Ryan (1996) points out in describing Michel Foucault's view of power:

The crucial point here is that power does not act on people from a distance from the outside, but on the interior, so to speak, through an individual's self-intervention on social relations. In other words entrapment proceeds as we become ourselves: we are very much our own prisoners. In this sense power not only works on us, but perhaps more importantly, through us. We are not just its target, but also its vehicle. (p. 12)

Patriarchal power is absorbed and deeply embedded into the psychological fabric of humankind. We become unwitting hosts of its effects and co-collaborators in its action—whether male or female. Von Werlhof (2007) also suggests that a key difference is that truly matriarchal societies where they have existed have not known "...a state, domination, classes, war, gender conflicts, or ecological catastrophes." (p. 27; A. Johnson, 2005). Lerner (1986) points out, however, that this suggestion is based on a single case of Catal

Huyuk in Turkey where warfare did occur in neighbouring communities and the settlement was inexplicably abandoned in about 5700 BC indicating either calamity or inability to adapt. She concludes that peaceful societies such as this if they did exist simply did not survive. While this particular situation may be true we have very little experience with this type of society to be able to suggest with any certainty that they would not be subject to the same flaws as patriarchy if more established.

The roots of patriarchy and violence lie in the long distant historical past, tens of thousands of years ago, where hominid survival in a hostile environment was dependent on genetic physical strength and animalistic prowess. It was a world where the dominant natural social reality was violence and death that were a necessary daily experience as pre-humans fought to survive. Aggression and violence were hard-wired into early societies in order to exist and thus there are few examples of groups who peacefully co-existed and survived (Lerner, 1986). Those that did were often conquered by violent and aggressive tribes and disappeared from the social and anthropological landscape. However, as humankind evolved and stabilized into more secure social units, the aggression and violence became internalized rather than extinguished through more pastoral existence. This destructive evolutionary pattern continues today. Passive and peaceful cultures throughout history have been victimized by those who revered power and control. Unfortunately, aggression and violence are the great levellers, preventing more peaceful, often more highly developed and democratic species from surviving. French (1985) points out that it took millennia for patriarchy to gain domination over the minds of people but it has now spread to all corners of globe:

But patriarchy is a militant ideology. To revere power above everything else is to be willing to sacrifice everything else to power. Many cultures accepted such a morality only with reluctance, but power worship is contagious. If a worshipper of power decides to extend his power over your society, your choices are between surrendering and mounting an equal and opposite power. In either case, the power worshiper wins—he has converted your society into a people who understand that power is the highest good. Over the millennia, patriarchy spread to all corners of the planet, and only a couple of tiny societies still exist that appear not to have been influenced by it. (pp. 18–19)

French expresses the corrupting influence that patriarchal power has had on society. When presented with power, if we ignore it we are at risk of not surviving, but if we respond to it then we become an unwitting party to its influence. When given the conditions and the opportunity to live more peaceful

and agrarian lives, early societies adopted these practices, indicating that violence was not the preferred but the required mode of operating prior to the rise of such cultures. Primitive violence defined and continues to define the experience of the human species and to be a visceral part of patriarchy from its earliest inception to the most recent newscast. But while early humans needed the genetic disposition toward violence to survive, they lacked the cranial development to mediate those primitive instincts to prevent eradicating the species through overkill. *Homo sapiens* was the first hominoid to overcome this evolutionary hurdle but not without its ongoing problems. Biologically and genetically males were more powerful physically and thus better equipped to dominate the small social pods of early society (Lerner, 1986). In our well-educated and civilized world of today, we have no such excuses for our inability to restrain our bloodlust. Our threats and anxiety are more often internal to our psyches than external to our perceptions.

More recently, the work of Charles Darwin (1859) in the 19th century exacerbated the mythical view of societal violence as normalized through his work *The Origin of Species*. In his research on natural selection Darwin noted that animals competed for resources to survive, which resulted in the survival of the fittest, the most intelligent, and the strongest (Schafer, 2008). This resulted in increasing the quality of the surviving breeding line. More recently works such as Robert Ardrey's (1966) *The Territorial Imperative* have reinforced that view and fed the mythical nature of male violence and the superiority of the victor (Miles, 1993). Rather than acknowledging that humans aspire to be a different breed of animal, as a society we continue to embrace and accept Darwin's beliefs as self-fulfilling explanations for our more primitive behaviors while we apply his theories as explanations for a wide variety of maladaptive modern social behavior (Parsons, 1964).

Humans also soon learned that some things could only be accomplished collectively and that survival depended not only on an individual's capacities but often on the collective capacities of larger groups of people working in concert. Humankind was an increasingly social but inherently violent species. As social communities of beings with shared interests in survival grew, nomadic existence progressed to more stable and efficient agrarian subsistence, which allowed communities to create more enduring social entities. However, this did not stop the propensity for violence. Banding together still meant a collective massing of potential for even greater violence directed toward anyone outside of the group. Fear was still a powerful social motivator. Throughout this process the dominance and influence of patriarchal male values and

behavior permeated early social development based on physical violence, power, and force and continued to dominate human experience long after the need to survive had passed. As Lerner (1997) points out:

In its earliest form patriarchy appeared as the archaic state. Long before its formation in the 2nd millennium B.C. gender had already been created and defined.¹⁵ Gender—the different roles and behavior deemed appropriate to each of the sexes—was expressed in values, customs, and social roles. During the long period that led to the establishment of patriarchally organized archaic states, gender definitions became institutionalized in laws, the organization of hierarchies and in religion. Gender was also expressed in leading metaphors that shaped the culture and entered the explanatory systems of Western civilization. (p. 155)

Patriarchal aggression became etched in the genetic biology of humans and increasingly poses a major challenge to the ongoing survival of mankind (Miles, 1993). Thus while we have a necessary biological need and drive to survive, if we cannot suppress this instinct in humankind we may not survive at all. Our intellectual progress has outstripped our behavioral evolution and this may be the Achilles heel of modern humanity.

Many of the qualities that gave rise to violence are rooted in primeval genetics, survival, and social conditioning, which can be reversed—although slowly and can be overcome more quickly by conscious mental and moral constraint, the supposed qualities of a civilized human honored more in the breach than the observance. We give ourselves more credit than we are due as a species. Qualities that were necessary and valued for millions of years have now become a serious and deeply ingrained liability for humankind as our global village approaches the end of its zenith. Humankind has overreached its genetic evolution and is now capable of destroying the entire human species with the push of a button while also being yet unable to fully control the compulsion to do so. As Gilligan and Richards (2009) state: “The great historical lesson of the 20th century is the terrifying price we pay when our technology is so much in advance of our ethics and politics” (p. 237). Patriarchy and leadership may have permitted humankind to survive into modern times but the life cycle of humankind in anthropological terms has been exceedingly brief. We may be simply a shooting star in the anthropological cosmos—burning brightly for a few moments in the history of the earth and then disintegrating to be replaced by a new species that develops in a more peaceful, collective, shared, and nonviolent manner that is respectful of the social and natural environment, much like the practices

of the early First Nations peoples of North America and indigenous peoples around the world. Living in harmony with nature and only taking what was absolutely required for survival reflected their sustainable approach to the natural world (Lerner, 1997). In the past several centuries under capitalism the ethos has been to take as much as you can for personal gain while disregarding the consequences to one's self, the environment, or others. If that future is not to be humankind's, significant changes need to be made to our social psyche and our collective direction together as a species. Or perhaps the whole human experience on earth is simply an evolutionary experiment that will expire. Perhaps in the billions and billions of galaxies, stars, and solar systems that Carl Sagan made us wonder at, there is a peaceful human race that is evolving to succeed us. As sophisticated as we think we are, we are still exceedingly primitive.

As societies grew and flourished throughout the modern world, social organization became increasingly more complex with a diverse range of predominantly male religious, social, and political leaders taking the most important positions in society. Religious aristocracies developed and evolved into military, political, economic, social, and cultural elites (Lerner, 1986; 1993). Patriarchy simultaneously expressed itself at the individual and interpersonal as well as the societal level (Daly, 1978 cited in Walby, 1990). Men dominated within their own families and enforced the patriarchal code of compliance on their partners, their children, their consorts, and ultimately all women (Lerner, 1986; Miller, 2003). They also enforced this code on other males as well. The role of males evolved as public and outside the home, while women's was private, domestic, and within the home (Apple, 2006; Gaskell & McLaren, 1991). The hierarchy of male power and authority reflected within patriarchy reinforced the dominance of males in vertical social, family, and political structures and organizations as well as in other dimensions of society (Eisenstein, 1999; A. Johnson, 2005; Lerner, 1986).

Patriarchy is an unsustainable ideology for the future of humankind yet it has persisted for thousands of years and been responsible for untold violence and human cruelty. As Stegemann (2009) describes the views of Professor Colin Starnes regarding the future of patriarchy:

There can be no correction to the unsustainable life of the rich half of the world—which we have obtained by making the lives of the poor half unlivable—without bringing about the end of patriarchy in both its consuming and producing halves. Patriarchy has been the driver of all civilization to this point. And it has now brought us to the strange point of recognizing that civilization no longer depends on patriarchy.

Human civilization can exist without patriarchy. In this new situation, holding on to this wildly awkward, intensely abstract (where there is only right or wrong), appallingly wasteful, inherently unfair, and now quite unnecessary assumption for a second longer than we need to, is transforming it into a dreadful destroyer of all it has brought to pass. (p. 24)

Unfortunately, there has been only marginal and superficial progress made in changing patriarchy, but our capacity for violence has increased exponentially. Thus the assertion that we have evolved into a more civilized and higher form of entity is open to serious challenge. A cursory look at the ongoing global violence around the world would be argument enough. One could suggest that we are nothing more than intelligent thugs much like Al Capone. It is important to note that when we say that, we are referring categorically to men who perpetrate the vast majority of the world's violence in its various forms.

Patriarchy, leadership, education, and religion have worked in concert for thousands of years to dominate the historical landscape of our social knowledge, experience, and ideas and to infuse their values into successive generations of men, women, and children. We need to begin the process of deprogramming society and reversing this trend before it is too late. The world is at a tipping point where our intellectual and psychological evolution is at a sophisticated enough point to realize that we must control our baser violent instincts or we will not survive, but whether we are capable of succeeding at this will write the final epitaph of humankind. The first step must be awareness; the second step, change.

Thus far, rather than attempting to suppress these violent instincts humankind has revelled in them and mythologized, romanticized, and popularized them (Elmore, 2000). We desperately need to stop the idolatry of patriarchy. What this has resulted in is a world that operates on two different levels –the fantasy of male history and culture and the paradoxical fantasy/reality of modern life for the rest of the world's inhabitants that happen to exist at the whim of male interests. Increasingly in our e-world we are fed a glossy, biased, global illusion of life and gender relationships that focuses on a small percentage of the successful world's population while the actual grim reality for the vast majority is ignored. The former informs the latter. Patriarchy socializes and subordinates everyone into a hierarchy of valuing concluding with the one supreme individual (most frequently male) at its apex (Lerner, 1986; Miller, 2003). We are taught from an early age to accept this situation as “normal.” The expressions of patriarchy, gender, leadership, and religion can be witnessed

everywhere, in every age and in every interaction, whether large or small, and are not difficult to discern but are extremely difficult to change (Rao & Kelleher, 2000). Every human being experiences patriarchy in their daily lives. Thus the reality of life is that we need to pay much more attention to the informal, unwritten social codes and rules of organizations and society than the formal veneer that we use to paper over them. It is these informal codes that govern the reality that people live. This is certainly the case with patriarchy.

Many of its modern effects are blatantly obvious but are ignored by society as though they were unchangeable and immutable. An example is the numbers of men who continue to dominate business and politics worldwide (Stegemann, 2009). Despite advances by women into these positions their role remains token and ceremonial on the grand scale despite notable exceptions. Men continue to believe they should dictate the opportunities for women, their value, their reproductive rights, and their entire lives. Extremist Islamic cultures are experiencing a resurgence as are right-wing extremist views in countries around the world. The rights of women and society are being unilaterally rolled back across the globe including Western democracies. In more recent history women have simply been permitted to take part in patriarchal leadership rituals without disturbing the ideological and practical dominance of patriarchy that sets the rules of engagement for it (French, 1985). Also, women have done little to change the fundamental dynamics of traditional leadership or its impact on the followers of leaders. In fact, women who have broken through the “glass ceiling” have simply picked up where men left off and shown little interest in or self-awareness of reforming the fundamental traditional leadership paradigm as males have constructed it (A. Johnson, 2005).

For the most part we benignly accept patriarchy as the way things are and a natural form of human behavior rather than a nurtured social, economic, and historical construction as Lerner asserted (Crocco, 2007). History itself is the history of victorious patriarchal leaders—whether religious or political, benevolent or malevolent—and their conquests or failures. However, the monotheism of patriarchy cannot continue if we wish to change our future world and its prospects for survival. To do so we must examine, critique, and change the major historical forces of patriarchy, leadership, education, religion, and economics and with them the essence of our social value structure, beliefs, attitudes, practices, and institutions that they have generated and that we hold dear. We must hold them up to scrutiny and challenge their premises as well as their application. It is a tall order but not impossible, and it is absolutely imperative that we accomplish it.

The Meaning and Influence of Patriarchy

Taken literally, *patriarchy* is defined as the rule of the father (Vavrus, 2002). Walby (1990) offers the following definition: "...a system of social structures and practices in which men dominate, oppress and exploit women" (p. 20). Monagan (2010) elaborates:

The most commonly accepted definition of patriarchy is the social structure of society based on the father having primary responsibility for the welfare of and authority over their families. However the true reach of patriarchy extends far beyond the privacy of the familial realm. (p. 160)

Von Werlhof (2007) adds: "For most women, it has simply meant the rule of men or fathers, within the family, the workplace, or the state. It is known that patriarchy is older than capitalism" (p. 23). In practice it is a pervasive, idealized system of social power in which men dominate (O'Sullivan, 2001)—values that permeate every aspect of our modern social being and are the foundation of our entire social fabric (Lerner, 1986; von Werlhof, 2007). A. Johnson (2005) identifies the three salient characteristics of patriarchy as follows: "A society is patriarchal to the degree that it promotes male privilege by being male dominated, male identified, and male centered. It is also organized around an obsession with control and involves as one of its key aspects the oppression of women" (p. 5). Reich (1974) asserts that patriarchy was a repressive socio-familial ideology that influenced every aspect of human life with a conservative worldview in support of authoritarian ideologies including the critical sexual development and mores of children and later adults:

It is the bridge between the economic structure of society and its ideological superstructure; it is permeated by a conservative atmosphere which necessarily makes an ineradicable impression on each of its members. Through its very form and its direct influence, it not only transmits general attitudes toward the existing social order and a conservative way of thinking, but also, due to the sexual structure from which it springs and develops, it exercises an immediate influence, in the conservative sense, on the sexuality of children. (pp. 74–75)

Thus the birth of patriarchy in each new generation is in the family and thus the family is a critical area of change if patriarchy is ever to be reformed. Gilligan and Richards (2009) offer the following anthropological view that coincides with focus provided by Reich:

Patriarchy is an anthropological term denoting families or societies ruled by fathers. It sets up a hierarchy—a rule of priests—in which the priest, the *hieros*, is a father, *pater*. As an order of living, it elevates some men over other men and all men over women; within the family, it separates fathers from sons (the men from the boys) and places both women and children under a father's authority. (p. 22)

Eisenstein (1999) further points out that the family still plays a crucial role in patriarchy: “Today patriarchy, the power of the male through these sexual roles in capitalism, is institutionalized in the nuclear family” (p. 205). This philosophy has permeated modern life and continues to have a strong although mediated influence in Western religious traditions, leadership practices, educational and political organizations, economic theories, and personal relationships. Hierarchic ordering makes patriarchy a self-policing and self-leveling distributed system where power of all kinds and forms determines an individual's place on the patriarchal ladder (J. Acker, 2006). As Chesterman, Ross-Smith, and Peters (2003) state:

The dominance of gendered ideologies is reflected in a deeply embedded belief in Western cultures that public work is peripheral to women's lives despite the growing number of women who work outside the home. Women are essentialized in a patriarchal discourse that presumes heterosexuality, domesticity and motherhood (p. 425).

As French (1985) indicates regarding the values that surround patriarchy:

This morality, which is still with us, holds power (control) to be the highest good, and values qualities that tend to strengthen or sharpen the male image of isolation, individuality, and control. Virtue is equated with manliness; one proves one's manhood by demonstrating control over women, children, property, and other men. (p. 18)

Smith (1981) makes a connection to economics: “patriarchy is a system of property relations firmly anchored in a politics of interpersonal domination” (p. 338). Eisenstein (1999) additionally observes: “The reality of social relations involves both capitalist class *and* patriarchal relations” (p. 198). Hartmann (1981) indicates the paradoxical complexity that accompanies the presence of patriarchy in relation to women when defining the term:

We can usefully define patriarchy as a set of social relations between men, which have a material base, and which, though hierarchical, establish or create interdependence and solidarity among men that enable them to dominate women. Though patriarchy is hierarchical and men of different classes, races, or ethnic groups have different places in the patriarchy, they also are united in their shared relationship of

dominance over their women; they are dependent on each other to maintain that domination. Hierarchies 'work' at least in part because they create vested interests in the status quo. (p. 197)

Patriarchy and hierarchy are thus closely linked (Lerner, 1986). Our organizational structures that we use in society are key symbols of patriarchy that reflect and support the ideology that we live by. They are all part of the enculturation subtext that convinces society to comply with its values. Thus patriarchy is more than just a method of dominance; it is a socially connected and socially entrenched way of knowing and being that men and women equally participate in together in relation of dominance and subordination in both conscious and unconscious ways (Lerner, 1986). It also gives rise to social and cultural attitudes and physical and organizational structures that reciprocally reinforce its power. As Hartmann (1981) correctly notes, all men are invested in patriarchy since they are in one form or another the direct and indirect beneficiaries of its presence. Whether they are the poorest of the poor or the most powerful individual on earth, they all receive some relative status from being male in society. For many males this is the only status they may possess. Eisenstein (1999) adds, "As a power structure, patriarchy is rooted in biological reality rather than in an economic or historical one. Manifested through male force and control, the roots of patriarchy are located in women's reproductive selves" (pp. 202–203) while Fox (1989) in contrast argues that it is clear that patriarchy is intertwined in society:

Elsewhere, in attempting to define patriarchy, I have argued that the term refers to the 'system of practices, arrangements and social relations that ensure biological reproduction, child rearing and the reproduction of gendered subjectivity', as well as gender ideology, or the sense of gender identity, itself (Fox 1988a: 175). While the social relations organizing 'reproduction' are distinct from other relations, once it is recognized that men and women differ in their personal identities, it is no longer possible to separate gender from other aspects of social organization. (p. 147)

Fox's (1989) view reflects Collinson's (2005) perspective that patriarchy is a contested, dialectical process of social interaction. Monagan (2010) describes a similar view of patriarchy as much more than a familial social contract:

Carole Pateman argues in *The Sexual Contract* that "Modern civil society is not structured by kinship and the power of fathers; in the modern world, women are subordinated to men as men, or to men as a fraternity (Pateman, 1997)." In patriarchal systems, as a collective group, women are systemically unrepresented or

underrepresented in the economic, political, military, criminal justice, legislative and educational arenas. Men serve in the highest levels in all areas of society. This is particularly important when examining women's rights of equality and freedom from violence. Men ultimately decide freedom and the extent to which it is afforded to others. Woman only has the freedom that man has willingly given to them. (p. 161)

French (1985) raises another key point with patriarchy—although it is primarily directed at and applied to women, the system is a vertical hierarchy of power in which men are also marginalized by other men higher in the competitive order than they are. Ideologically, patriarchy is a massive Ponzi scheme much like capitalism where those on the lower rungs of the ladder support the success of those higher up and artificially prop up the entire system that has no inherent validity (A. Johnson, 2005; Lerner, 1997).

Thus patriarchy is a massive pyramid system that is based on individual competition, power, and dominance. It is a social caste system that designates a value and social place for every person on earth (Lerner, 1993). Tan (2009) describes the exploitation hierarchy of Singaporean working women who hire off-shore domestics from developing countries at poverty wages that they subsequently abuse in a perverse exercise of social power by middle class women who often have little power themselves. Therefore patriarchy is not, has never been, and will never be about democracy. It is at best about benevolent conservative paternalism and at its worst patronizing, inhumane sadism such as that recently evidenced by ISIS in Iraq. The ironic fact—both puzzling and paradoxical—is that patriarchy is and has been for the most part accepted for centuries as the dominant social code and currently masquerades as democracy in Western and other societies around the world with little widespread or concerted resistance due to its virtual invisibility in social relations. What people see is the behavioral expression of patriarchy without making the connection to its source. It is a pervasive, subtly invasive set of beliefs that insidiously socializes succeeding generations of people into its skewed value structure. It is paradoxically accepted for the most part without question by both women and men. It creates a complex global socioeconomic value-ladder that most directly affects women but that also forces everyone to climb the same steps to improve their position in the world. It is the penultimate global sorting system that slots people into predetermined social roles based on their gender and their ability to control and dominate others. To do this one must compete—not cooperate—to move up. It forces all social interaction to be an individual, competitive, zero-sum game where for someone to win, someone else must

lose. Zero-sum games are always destructive. Rather than reinforcing shared effort and cooperation, patriarchy endorses human control and competition.

Thus patriarchy predates capitalism and is its parent (von Werlhof, 2007). Everyone, whether men or women, rich or poor, children or adults, blacks or whites, Christians or Muslims, have been socialized to believe that a patriarchal society is normal, God-given, and the only kind of social organization possible (French, 1985), just as capitalism—another outgrowth of patriarchy (von Werlhof, 2007)—has more recently convinced our present world that capitalist economics and the theories that justify it are the only way to organize the economies of the world (Schafer, 2008). Patriarchy is like a set of Russian dolls with capitalism, politics, education, and religion all nested within it. As the dominant ideology of humankind, patriarchy has been responsible for generating all the major institutions of society throughout history: religion, economics, politics, and education. It has also shaped our leadership models, gender and race relations, and our entire human social experience in a profound way in both democratic and despotic political regimes. These have become the pillars of the democratic gulag where everyone on earth is imprisoned. We live in a global ideological penal colony.

In addition, it has been reflected in the development of physical structures and artistic expression that reify its concepts and ideology: art, music, architecture, organizational structuring, and other forms of human expression that reflect and imbue society with its values. Many of these influences are subtle, covert, and indistinguishable unless one makes a concerted effort to see them. We all worship at the altar of patriarchy. Patriarchy has defined the knowledge base that informs the world. Myth and symbol play important roles in its consolidation and continuance. Myth and religion are two of the most powerful and long-serving adjuncts of patriarchy. O'Sullivan (2001) summarizes its more recent historical influence:

Our own historical prehistory appears to stem from the worship of a father god. The Judaeo-Christian heritage, with its emphasis on father-god worship, also carries with it a gender dominance of male privilege. This hierarchy of male dominance is accompanied by the presence of violent social structures. (p. 136)

Prior to being consolidated under monotheism, patriarchy also influenced religious beliefs from our earliest times. Engels (1975) also identified monogamy as the beginning of the sexual dominance of women. So patriarchy, religion, economics, militarism, and a host of other forces and institutions in society that we take for granted express and exude patriarchy in our modern

world. Our physical reality is like a mirror that reflects the internal ideology and psyche of humankind throughout history, just as our intellectual ideologies are projected upon the world through physical expression. Our physical world reflects the accomplishments of men. What we see is a concrete and reciprocal manifestation of what people believe—the Washington Monument, the American eagle, the statue of Christ in Sao Paulo, Brazil, the stones of Stonehenge, the pyramids in Egypt, the twin towers in New York. This would be nothing more than an obvious truism unworthy of note if the direct, crushing, and continuous impact of patriarchy were not felt by every person on earth every day in myriad undetectable, subliminal, and direct ways. Patriarchy is the artist painting the canvas of our lives. Throughout history humankind has influenced and been influenced by the physical reality around it and the physical reality it created. There is a reciprocal relationship between human and object—between perceptual and physical reality. We can look to both to understand our world and ourselves. The person driving the Bentley is making a silent statement about success and power. The monarch, president, or pope is doing the same, as is the headmaster and father. In most cases these are men saying “we are in control.”

Patriarchy is pervasive and persistent in its effects and hidden in its operation. It is the global context for all human experience and must be recognized as a critical and often negative normative factor in all our major social institutions. It has permeated every part of human life and expresses itself in the most miniscule events of personal interaction to the most life-changing circumstances of history. The majority of the great art we admire was produced by men. Even feminists are unconsciously affected by it. Patriarchy is everywhere and nowhere, much like being white (Dickinson & Vasby Anderson, 2004). Patriarchal masculinity is the invisible force that controls everything in the same way that whiteness does as an expression of racial dominance (Blackmore, 2006; A. Johnson, 2005). Being white is mute evidence that you are elite in society. In fact, these forces work in complementary, integrative, and additive ways that are much more effective than any one influence, creating an oppressive and impenetrable matrix of social, political, economic, and cultural forces that resist liberating change (Dickinson & Vasby Anderson, 2004; Lerner, 1997).

It is this collective and all-encompassing complexity of interlocking influences that ensures the dominance of patriarchy. Changes in one area of society have little ultimate impact on its influence, which gathers its strength from multiple sources and the power of interpersonal socialization that occurs

between men and women in families and personal relationships. There is a socio-historical inertial mass built up in patriarchy throughout the centuries that makes it difficult if not impossible to stop. The only way to change its effects is to attack its influence at its core—the family—as well as on multiple social and political fronts simultaneously by making the connections between situations explicit. This requires a concerted and coordinated effort on behalf of the world's peoples to assert the value of their common knowledge, their right to have their views heard and be given equal weight with all others if they are ever to free themselves and our future world from the dominance of patriarchy. It effects every action of human life in conscious and unconscious ways—some of which are buried thousands of years in the past and others that appeared yesterday (Beasley, 2008; A. Johnson, 2005). Many of its effects are invisible and innocuous, but others are observable and prescient in contemporary human history (Lerner, 1986). When we step back from the human world and take a holistic view of what we have created, it is an undeniably paternal and patronizing social environment by whatever measure of scholarship it is assessed that operates by encouraging people to use each other for their own gain and to separate themselves from one another along gender and other lines in master/servant relationships—in opposition to their primal human instincts for cooperation (McQuaig, 2001).

Rather than being a social curiosity, as some scholars contend (Miller, 2003), patriarchy is in contrast the vibrant core of our modern world that actively but subconsciously influences individuals every single day and that exists as a social backdrop everywhere in our human experience. It is the canvas that society is painted on. People are the bristles on the brush recording the events of social history. Patriarchy has formed and continues to shape our social values, beliefs, actions, and relationships in ways that control social development while suppressing fully democratic and collective ways of organizing society. It expresses itself through “hegemonic masculinity” that inculcates in everyone the normative male code of behavior in society. Of this male cultural code described by Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) they indicate, “Hegemony did not mean violence, although it could be supported by force; it meant ascendancy achieved through culture, institutions, and persuasion” (p. 832). The hegemony of patriarchy has evolved from being a familial and interpersonal concept into a highly sophisticated neopatriarchal social value code that permeates the modern psyche to such a degree that we are unaware of its subtle effects on our thought processes. Bierema (2003) states that “The rules and roles accompanying gendered power relations are so ingrained in the

culture that they are practically invisible, neither questioned nor challenged by most people” (p. 5).

Patriarchy is mythologized and symbolized in our institutions and relationships, organizational structures, art, language, architecture, sports, social interactions, economic philosophies, religious traditions, education systems, and our modern electronic media. It permeates and molds our social experience yet remains largely transparent within it. It is rarely the subject of serious or sustained critical attention in modern Western society regarding its impact or identified as a problematic causal agent in key social changes (A. Johnson, 2005). It is also responsible for much of the devastation visited on society throughout history and the wellspring of problematic social issues that we face today. We would be well advised to pay close attention to it. As with all history our present is the legacy of our past.

Patriarchy has dominated our leadership and economic models, theories and practices, and influenced our political and legal systems, our religious traditions, and our gender stereotypes. It has governed our political decision-making and societal structures for thousands of years. It is in our museums, universities, sports stadiums; our military-industrial complex, policing system, media, and economies. Patriarchy is at its core right-wing, patronizing, elitist, racially and gender-biased, and authoritarian. It appeals to every negative instinct of humankind yet it is vigorously defended at every turn. As a system it is dysfunctional and primarily targeted at women but equally affects everyone in society. Everyone is a victim and a perpetrator of patriarchy—including those who benefit from it. It saturates our social structures, our psyches, and our attitudes and it generates values, biases, conflicts, and disparity while oppressing others in society. It is adversarial and ultimately pits everyone against everyone else in a relentless competition for survival. It has come to be viewed as the way we are rather than the way we have become and blinded us to the way we can be.

We live in a continuously violent patriarchal social culture despite the superficially relative peace and political stability of the world community. It is a peace enforced by the threat of violence or overt violence. For thousands of years our society has mythologized violence and lionized heroic and violent leaders. Violence always simmers just below the surface despite our supposedly civilized veneer but that same violence is perpetrated by a miniscule number of people worldwide when compared with the total population of the earth. It is this minority that is the most dangerous group while the remaining majority want nothing more than to lead peaceful, productive, cooperative lives.

Patriarchy and leaders are the rogue elements in society that should be suppressed, not saluted. Violent confrontation has never delivered peace as long as history has been recorded. While Western nations have a self-satisfied smugness about our democratic societies, we are in reality the most bigoted and delusional about our purported success. While in Western democracies we claim to be peace-loving, violence saturates our cultures and is mythologized and romanticized in our media, the Internet, electronic games, and on television. Our entertainment viewing is filled with police, medical, and legal melodramas based on violence, hero worship, and fantasy (Eliade, 1976). This is counterbalanced with heavy doses of mindless, inane escapist comedy sitcoms and reality TV that provide a counterpoint to the more “serious” programming. This is intended to distract us from critical analyses of the intractable problems created by our patriarchal relationships. The fiction that the good guys always win and that life is just a bunch of laughs is important to maintaining the control of patriarchy on our world by papering over its grim, unrelenting negative reality that the majority in society experience. Both the comedy and the violent programming are all stereotypical and biased escapism. Neither stimulates any serious reflection on the state of life and society—in contrast, they are intended to do exactly the opposite. As Herman and Chomsky (2002) observe, “Furthermore, in a system of high and growing inequality, entertainment is the contemporary equivalent of the Roman ‘games of the circus’ that diverts the public from politics and generates a political apathy that is helpful to the preservation of the status quo” (p. xviii). The modern drug is electronic entertainment. It has given an entirely new and prophetic meaning to the 60s drug guru Timothy Leary’s famous quip to “tune in, turn on, drop out.”

Everything we see currently has patriarchy as its foundation. This fundamental effect of patriarchy can be seen in evidence throughout the ages. We have built our modern civilization on a base of mythological male power, control, conflict, and forced submission and agreement, rather than unrestricted freedom, democratic decision making, and human autonomy that is unencumbered and free of intimidation (French, 1985). Men have been the primary enforcers and beneficiaries of patriarchy since its inception. The hierophanies of the world’s religions are populated by male deities and our monotheistic deities are gendered masculine (A. Johnson, 2005; Miles, 1993). This is not a coincidence or divine act. Men continue to receive a disproportionate amount of the rewards and benefits from a social structure that gives their patriarchal gender ideology deferential preference and continues

to skew the world into an unequal balance that favors their interests while disenfranchising the majority to serve the minority. Those in power control the rules that govern the definition of knowledge, values, decisions, social relationships, political and economic decision making, and religious beliefs that the world is predicated on (Martin, 2001). In short, they control the rules of the game. Patriarchy is at the root of all the social, political, religious, racial, and interpersonal strife in the world and through the ages because it is an ideology based in divisiveness, superiority, conquest, dominance, and violence. It is on patriarchy that we must focus our attention if we ever hope to change our world.

Patriarchy, Gender, and Violence

Patriarchy creates what O'Sullivan (2001) terms an "ecology of violence" that is deeply woven into global male cultures whose common denominator is the dominance of women, children, and the earth itself. As he points out: "It is nested in all of our institutions of power from the government to the boardroom to the military-industrial complex to the school room" (p. 147). Violence is the one constant that defines all of human and animal experience with one significant exception. While animals kill only to survive, humans have evolved to the point where they do not need to kill to survive, yet they continue to do so despite this. Power for survival and evolutionary dominance has become power for capricious social dominance. As humankind has evolved, the physically strongest and best breeding line no longer survives. Anyone can survive by employing sophisticated weapons of war. Thus the evolutionary insurance of Charles Darwin has been broken by advances in civilization's ability to destroy itself. We continue to be primitive, senseless, and aggressive while proclaiming our progress as a civilization. The mark of a truly civilized society is the restraint of power in relation to the powerless. Without doubt, humans are the most dangerous animal on earth and a growing threat to global survival.

While it is understandable that in order to survive, violence was required in the past, the human species remains unique in its expression of senseless, gratuitous violence far beyond what is required for continuance. *Homo sapiens* has developed extraordinary capabilities during its evolution that supposedly separate it from lower orders of the animal kingdom and previous forms of humans—the ability to reason, believe, imagine, and create; the possession

of a conscience and morality; and the ability to feel compassion and express love and affection beyond simple sexual gratification, to name only a few (Lerner, 1986). The human species has always lauded itself for its ability to be governed by a moral conscience that controls human behavior yet repeatedly we allow our animal instincts to prevail. The superego, the id, and the ego of Freud described the internal psychological struggle that all humans go through in determining their behavior. The id continues to persist in social evolution rather than atrophying as humankind becomes more civilized. Our self-pretentious belief in our superiority and civilization is overextended.

In contrast, however, the capacity of the human species to employ violence to kill other things and each other without reason or hesitation and without need continues to be a serious evolutionary developmental flaw that threatens the entire human race with extinction as our proficiency in killing continues to grow. We are the Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde of social evolution. We operate on the geopolitical military logical/illogical acronym of MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction) as our nuclear deterrent philosophy or what Lerner (1997) terms a “balance of terror” that has ruled Cold War and subsequent politics for 50 years (p. 89). You must possess the capability of responding and destroying your adversary after a pre-emptive attack that will in all likelihood destroy everything in your country. This is appropriately named. Despite the entire world being destroyed, one surviving military can claim ultimate victory. This truly is the ultimate deranged madness of patriarchy and is not viable as a survival strategy for the human race. Most of the major scientific and technological developments have been created in the service of military or business needs and are immediately put into service to increase the ability of the discoverer to eradicate their enemies or competitors and control the world. We pour trillions of dollars into war-making instead of peacemaking. In the animal world, combatants rarely fight to the death unless their own lives or territory are threatened. Humans seem incapable of exercising the same restraint. Humans will kill without reason and without provocation and thus by far are the most dangerous, unpredictable, and wasteful species ever to walk the earth. While aggression is a way of maintaining a hierarchy of order necessary to survive in the animal world, it is a serious problem in the human one.

In our modern patriarchal world we not only accept violence, we encourage, condone, and celebrate it, despite many platitudes to the contrary. Our paradoxical attitudes toward violence and many other issues are a hallmark of postmodernity. As O’Sullivan (2001) observes:

When patriarchy is the norm, then the top of the hierarchy is a white, male heterosexual. All sorts of violence and selection are carried out within the normative structures of patriarchy. Within the norms of patriarchy there are high correlations between position and gender and this positioning or favouring of males is legitimized by the culture through its political, economic, religious and educational institutions. The institutions of patriarchy, like any other deeply violent social formations, combine direct, structural and cultural violence into a vicious triangle. Patriarchy is not only an institutional structure that protects male privilege; it also serves as a legitimizing institution for the perpetration of male violence. (p. 164)

While violence may never be totally eradicated from the human species, it also does not need to be celebrated and socialized into human culture. We need to be serious about violence everywhere and all the time. Nonviolent modeling should be our primary goal as a society because of its fundamental importance in de-socializing violence. Rather than suppressing and sanctioning violence at every level of society, we openly accept it as a necessary adjunct to successful existence. We have a paradoxical and duplicitous stance toward violence that we celebrate in thousands of ways from sports, to media, to music to video games while decrying real violence in our society. We will never eradicate it as long as we allow these paradoxes to exist. Conquest is hard-wired into our psychological make-up from an early age. We cannot have it both ways. There are more positive ways to organize society that do not condone or include violence. Instead, we sanction mixed martial arts blood sports that metaphorically return to the symbolic Roman coliseum and the death of gladiators in the arena. If we find no difficulty in socializing a society *into violence*, we should also find no difficulty in socializing it *into peace and nonviolence*. The two alternatives are simply social and moral choices. If we say we are peaceful then we need to act that way and structure our society to socialize and reinforce that view. In contemporary postmodern society, under the guise of individual rights we have abdicated our collective social responsibilities to establish moral expectations encouraged by hedonistic, predatory capitalism. In today's world this is more and more the case. Morality is becoming more *laissez-faire* each day.

We both glorify and vilify violence and male aggression, creating a constant tension that creates paradoxical inconsistencies in our value structures, sending mixed messages about our social behavior, particularly to young people in their formative stages of development. These are in perpetual competition with each other. Our values and social conditioning are conflicted and inconsistent with democratic principles. While we intellectualize democracy, we actualize violence and authoritarianism. Our social, political, economic,

educational, and religious beliefs under the umbrella of patriarchy are forced—and as such give rise to constant antagonism between those who want a more democratic vision and those who support the controlling status quo. As Henry Giroux (2002) notes of the events following the September 11 terrorist attacks, militarism often intensifies patriarchal attitudes and anti-democratic assaults on dissent. We must create a social structure that mimics the ideals we want to achieve. We are troubled at the deepest psychological level over which of these values to embrace and which to reject.

Our entire social make-up and all the major institutions within it socialize society to be competitive and aggressive while paradoxically promoting peace and harmony. We live in a democratic social oxymoron. The two cannot continue to coexist. Violence is like drinking to an alcoholic—one drink could set off an orgy of drinking—just as one violent act triggers an orgy of violence throughout society and sanctions violent acts for others. Both set off a cascade of catastrophic effects for the alcoholic, the violent individual, and society. Nonviolence may be utopian, but this should be our goal nonetheless—yet we do little to realistically achieve it, and the stark reality is that we need to structure society to make it possible to achieve it. As Lerner (1997) asserts: “Such an Utopian approach may, in fact, be far more practical than the endless repetitions by politicians, statesmen and military leaders of worn-out and utterly inappropriate clichés of 19th-century wisdom” (p. 103). Eradicating violence involves coordinating the various institutions in society to send the same messages about sanctioned social behavior, not simply incarcerating people who perpetrate it. All serious social change requires change at the source, not the presentation of problems. Real arms control at the level of production, reductions in military spending, strict gun laws, and antiviolence socialization from the earliest years of life in education and parenting would begin the process of turning society around. We control nuclear proliferation at the source; why not weapons of all kinds? Why are small weapons acceptable but big weapons are not? The moral issue is identical. Our violent, pro-business culture must be radically altered if society is ever to evolve and progress, but if we do not make the structural and societal changes required it cannot be achieved. We need to disabuse ourselves of the notion that because someone is an employer they have a moral right to override the collective common sense of the public in conducting their business and to ruthlessly exploit people for personal gain. We have compartmentalized the morality of society and business, insulating business from the moral and legal consequences of their actions.

The solution to violence rests in economics, politics, militarism and social culture as well as socialization in self-control through education and social sanctions through governments. It does not require an army of classical economists or academics to know that people who have a decent standard of living and are treated fairly and equitably are much less inclined to be angry, frustrated, and violent than people who don't, yet our social and economic system continues to operate in ways that are diametrically opposed to this goal and to deny this to the vast majority of the world's population—in contrast, it actually encourages the problem rather than helping it. Capitalism encourages a culture in which the individual is only concerned with himself or herself. People who grow up in nonviolent cultures and families are less likely to be violent. This has huge implications for the role models of parents, educators, politicians, economists, and religious figures to do more than go through the motions of decrying violence and to move to action on violence of all kinds and at all levels. The most powerful human statement that leaders of Islam could make currently is to soundly condemn and disavow ISIL and other Islamic extremists, yet they remain silent on this issue. This is not rocket science. Currently, we live with a schizophrenic democratic social personality that idolizes and romanticizes violence while censoring and abhorring its effects. This is the essence of a destabilizing and destructive paradox within our postmodern neopatriarchal world.

Gender violence against women and their overall subordination is a major sub-component of patriarchy. They are inextricably intertwined. Gender violence encompasses violence against women as well as men and all other forms of violence perpetrated between the sexes. By far the most violent group by gender are men, and women suffer the most physical violence at their hands (Ehrenreich, 2001). When we think of violence we immediately think of physical forms of violence such as domestic abuse, rape, assault, murder, and other forms of sexualized violence driven by gendered power, but violence within patriarchy against women occurs in the economic marginalization of women who are often single parents, of wage inequity between men and women, and in the absence of women in other than token positions of power (A. Johnson, 2005). It also occurs in the system from schoolyard bullying and name calling to intimidation of employees by supervisors on the job. O'Sullivan (2001) indicates that violence against women crosses all cultural, religious, and regional boundaries in social, political, and economic systems.

Throughout their lives, women are disproportionately exposed to this gendered abuse and vilification at the hands of males starting with their

fathers and extending throughout their lives in their relationships with other men and their employment circumstances. Violence has myriad forms and intensities and permeates our social structures in such pervasive ways that we have become habituated to its effects. Like a heroin addict who can take a larger and larger hit before finally overdosing, as a society we are developing a higher and higher tolerance for social violence of all kinds and intensities because we are increasingly exposed to its reality vicariously through media and personal experience. Other forms of violence are not so obvious—cutting off funding for homeless shelters, cutting benefits and pensions, exploiting workers in sweatshops, and taking advantage of vulnerable women and children through pornography, to name only a few (Lerner, 1997; Walby, 1990). Genital mutilation is a particularly egregious example of patriarchal cultural violence against women that is most often perpetrated by women on their daughters, driven by archaic moral and cultural social codes (A. Johnson, 2005; Monagan, 2010; Walby, 1990). The cooperation of women in patriarchally driven cultural rights like stoning have a long history (Lerner, 1986).

We are saturated in a continuum of patriarchal violence that targets women particularly and extends from murder to subtle social exclusions and stereotyping. This mimics the authoritarian male social continuum that governs our society at large. We have been indoctrinated to respond aggressively and violently by our patriarchal culture when we are threatened in any way. Our responses can range from mild upset to vicious physical attacks. These forms of violence are all aspects of the culture of violence that animates patriarchy. Patriarchy and violence set the tone for socialized violent relationships between men and women and the social rules and structures that define them. The gender attributes of males contribute to and reciprocally reinforce patriarchy while also being the reference point against which all other elements of society are measured and shaped. The role of women has largely been influenced by patriarchal values that portray and socialize them as subordinate, submissive, and deferential to males (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Women in particular have been subordinated and socialized within a patriarchal history and have been excluded from the concerns of “the history, culture, politics, and economy of (paid) work, industrial relations, and organizational studies” (Franzway, 2005, p. 270). History, for the most part, is the history of men, written by men about the exploits and achievements of men (French, 1985; Lerner, 1986; Smith, 1991). Coulter (2005) further suggests of more recent events:

As Boutilier and Prentice argue, the professionalization of history by the first half of the twentieth-century meant that the discipline became, by definition, one that “privileged male experience and preserved most permanent academic jobs for university-trained men” 52. Donald Wright is even more blunt: “Sexism not only protected the status of history as a masculine discipline but protected the academic labour market for men.” 53. (p. 678)

The same can be said of literature, science, and technology (St. Pierre, 1999). Women and all other groups are afterthoughts in these disciplines if they are acknowledged or mentioned at all and are often portrayed in submissive, subordinate, and passive roles. The contributions of women are absent from our history books with few notable exceptions (Lerner, 1997).

The expression of violent patriarchy in society is one of male values, beliefs, and attitudes toward society and life. Patriarchy is expressed through the male gender with the support of physical sexual differences between men and women (physical strength, aggression, domination, etc.). Male models and norms continue to define what is acceptable and legitimated (St. Pierre, 1999). Violence is often directed at women in society by men, but violence between males through personal aggression, sports, wars, and other conflicts is also widespread. Within this elitist male view all other groups are marginalized using physical or other kinds of threats for the benefit of males in society (A. Johnson, 2005). It is an extraordinarily dysfunctional social view that taken to its ultimate conclusion leaves one man standing on earth as the ultimate victor in human competition. Is this a sustainable social model? Brunner (2002, pp. 705–706) quotes bell hooks (2000) about the effect of patriarchal thinking on society and women:

...an inferior and a superior party, one person is strong, the other weak, and that it is therefore natural for the powerful to rule over the powerless. To those who support patriarchal thinking, maintaining power and control is acceptable by whatever means.... While the contemporary feminist movement has done much to intervene with this kind of thinking, challenging and changing it, and by so doing offering women and men a chance to lead more fulfilling lives, patriarchal thinking is still the norm for those in power. (p. 97)

It is not that patriarchy is a problematic expression of specific gender relationships—although it is, it is that it becomes a way of thinking about *all* human relationships. It becomes generalized and normalized across our entire society (A. Johnson, 2005). Violence is the patriarchal framework of gender relationships between men and women and between men and other men.

One also cannot discuss gender and patriarchy without noting the use of rape against women as a systematic and systemic form of male violence and dominance employed to reinforce and enforce the unwritten code of patriarchy, particularly in developing or Middle Eastern countries or any areas of conflict throughout the ages (Lerner, 1986). Reproductive dominance is the ultimate form of male social power. Women can withhold their reproductive power selectively to ensure the best possible mate. Men can force their reproductive power on women. In most cases there is an acceptance of the right of the woman to withhold her reproductive power, much like the female of animal and bird species will. There is no acceptance of the male's right to force his advances on a female. This only happens in human species. There is extensive research indicating that men are the primary perpetrators of sexual violence. In Canada 98% of domestic violence is committed by men against women (O'Sullivan, 2001). Rape is about power, not sex, as Susan Brownmiller (1975) detailed in her book *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. Chowdhury's (2009) research indicates that single women in Bangladesh are targets of sexual harassment and violence and women are viewed as chattels of men with no rights. It is also about economics, race, and class. Sommers (1994) cites research showing that the potential of poor women to be raped was significantly higher than middle-class women. French (1985) points out that black women are three times more likely to be raped than white women. The reality is that one in four women can expect to be raped during their lifetime (Martin, 2001). A. Johnson (2005) indicates that up to one-half of American women can expect to experience some form of sexual violence in their lifetime. In Canada in 2014 the RCMP inquiry into almost 1200 missing or murdered Aboriginal women found they are four times as likely to be murdered as white women. Fifty-seven percent of Aboriginal women have been sexually abused. Of every 100 cases of sexual assault committed, only 6 are reported to police (Sexual Assault Statistics in Canada, 2014). Of every 100 Canadian sexual assault victims, only 12 will ever see the inside of a courtroom (Muisse, 2014). The act of penetration and images of penetration are pervasive in our social history and our modern culture. The erect phallus is a symbol of the power of men over women and weapons of war are simply extensions of this Freudian symbol. In this way our physical reality reflects our psychological one. All violence is ritualized and sexualized domination. Rape has been used by men throughout history as a conscious and intentional method of degradation and domination of women (and men) and is still employed in the same manner around the world today (Chowdhury, 2009;

Sommers, 1994). Male rape in prisons is employed as a similar form of social dominance in the absence of female victims. War and military conquest is still viewed as a male preserve where Alpha males do battle for pride dominance. Rape is simply another weapon in their arsenal to subordinate those they wish to dominate while carrying out a most primal act in a degrading and humiliating way.

In sub-Saharan African dictatorships and other unstable countries rape is employed as a military weapon of terror and degradation and as a way of brutalizing women to demonstrate total power and control over them. In the civil war in Libya there were reports of the dictator Muammar Gaddafi giving commands to his loyalists to murder civilians and rape women. Similar reports are now coming out of Iraq at the hands of ISIS fighters. Systematic military rape is never treated as a war crime although it is no different than the brutalizing and murdering of male and female civilians during conflicts. The ethos and the reality of military conquest throughout history is captured in just three words—not “god, king, and country” but “rape, pillage, and plunder.” Rape has been a key part of military conquest strategy for centuries whether in the Spanish conquistadores of Latin America or the comfort houses of Japan during World War II populated by Korean women. Rape was a common part of both World Wars I and II, with all armies participating in the practice, and continues to be so when female hostages are held by revolutionary groups. It occurred in Rwanda during the Hutu genocide and in Chechnya during the Russian occupation.

Rape is equally widespread in peaceful democratic developed nations despite legal sanctions and social disapprobation. Thanks to a decidedly biased legal approach to rape resulting from a judicial common law written primarily by males, even today the vast majority of sexual assaults and rapes go unreported due to an insensitive male-biased legal system that still trivializes male behavior in this regard: the “boys will be boys” defense. Provocative dress, intoxication, and male implied sexual signals are still used as justifications for rape in civilized societies. In reality our courts turn a blind eye to sexual assault. In modern Western cultures rape is treated with mixed messages—sex is promoted and celebrated throughout society and in the media while forced sex is censured. Todd Akin, a 2012 Republican Senate candidate attempted to suggest there is “legitimate rape” which would not result in pregnancy (M. Williams, 2012). Women are expected to dress provocatively but are at risk for doing so. There is a clear double standard for women in this regard while there are no standards for males (Lerner, 1997). However it occurs, rape

is an expression of primal violence and domination of males over females and defies social control to this day. As O'Sullivan (2001) states: "Rape is not an illustration of passion; it is rather an illustration of the misuse of power. Rape is a desecration pure and simple" (p. 277).

Rape, then, is an expression of patriarchal domination and control (Chowdhury, 2009). Homosexual rape is no different (A. Johnson, 2005). Other forms of sexual violence are carried out through acts such as female genital mutilation (FGM), which is estimated to have been performed on a staggering 85–114 million women worldwide, an act of genital mutilation still practiced in many patriarchal African societies (A. Johnson, 2005; O'Sullivan, 2001). Monagan (2010) reports that the World Health Organization estimates that 100–140 million girls and women worldwide have been victims of FGM and an estimated 3 million girls each year are at risk of having the procedure done to them (pp. 180–181). Reich (1974) attributes the repression of normal sexuality to the development of patriarchal authoritarianism:

The history of the formation of ideology teaches us that every social system, consciously or unconsciously, uses the influencing of children to anchor itself in man's structure. If we follow the way in which the social order was transformed from matriarchy to patriarchy, we can establish the sexual education of the child as its central mechanism. (p. 249)

In opposition to the sexual evolution suggested within matricentric values dominating society, in contrast we are dominated by the repressive patriarchal psycho-sexual views of Sigmund Freud, the Catholic Church, and various fundamentalist Islamic beliefs (Lerner, 1986). The struggle for gender equity and against violence directed at women has not been easy or simple. Patriarchy operates in complex, conflicting ways that undercut resistance and change. As Lerner (1986) points out both sex and class are involved:

From the second millennium B.C. forward control over the sexual behavior of citizens has been a major means of social control in every state society. Conversely, class hierarchy is constantly reconstituted in the family through sexual dominance. Regardless of the political or economic system, the kind of personality which can function in a hierarchical system is created and nurtured within the patriarchal family. (pp. 216–217)

A final element of patriarchal cultural history that has had an ongoing and key impact on human development worldwide is racism. Fuelled by the elitism of patriarchy and religion, cultures since the beginning of time have

practiced racial bias in one form or another against other cultures (Miller, 2003; Lerner, 1997). Major Christian religions representing the white, Eurocentric worldview willingly assisted conquering nations in destroying active and vibrant indigenous aboriginal cultures around the world and are only the most egregious recent historical examples of this pattern of ethnic cleansing. Muslim and East Asian cultures participated in the same forced aggression and domination of various civilizations throughout the ages as well. Racism has not only been the purview of white races although they are most frequently and recently associated with its abuses. All races and cultures around the world have practiced their own forms of racism or ethnic cleansing leading to the maltreatment of minorities identified by dominant cultures or groups as different, subordinate, or sub-human. Racism is a subsystem of patriarchal attitudes. Lerner (1997) quotes the historian Dorothy Roberts (1993): "Racism is patriarchal. Patriarchy is racist. We will not destroy one institution without destroying the other" (p. 195). Whether the Publicans of the Bible, the South American Aztecs, Incas or Mayans, the Jews of Nazi Germany, the Romas of Hungary, the Muslims of Srebrenica, the unclean of India, the Aborigines of Australia, the Tutsi of Rwanda, or the First Nations and Inuit peoples of North America, all societies and cultures have been subject to racism and violence as a part of another culture's social dominance. In turn they have also participated in such racism as well. "Racism and patriarchy are used, privately and publicly, to rationalize people's dispossession of private or public autonomy" (Singh, 2005, p. 125). Racism is one of the many justifications for violent dispossession throughout history and continues to be so today (Lerner, 1997).

For the past several centuries the world has come to be dominated by the ascendancy of white European culture. No cultural group in history has had such a destructive and worldwide effect on the evolutionary progression of the human species as this group while also being responsible for tremendous advances. In addition, those whites who benefited from its ascension are also a tiny subset of the white race itself. From slaughtering bison to near extinction in the settlement of North America to committing genocide against the First Nations "savages" they encountered and destroying their societies and cultures, the white race has delivered horrendous arbitrary suffering to any other cultures that it came into contact with, many of whom welcomed them in peace and with open arms. However, the same can be said of the Spanish, Portuguese, and Chinese cultures as well. No culture is without blame. Currently the ISIS Islamic terrorists are carrying out a jihad to destroy Western infidels everywhere. Eurocentrism now saturates our global village with values

of whiteness that are reflected in media, government, consumer goods, social preferences, and geopolitical policies. Whiteness is the ethnic race that no one speaks of because it is the norm that all other societies and cultures are referenced against (Dickinson & Vasby Anderson, 2004). Apple (2006) speaks of whiteness as being the “absent presence” (p. 239). The same can be said of patriarchy. Lerner (1997) observes:

But “whiteness” as a constructed social category within a system of power bestows privileges on whites which are withheld from “Others.” One of these privileges is that it is whites who do the defining of the social categories and who can remain unconscious of their own racial construction. (p. 194)

Patriarchy can be thought of in the same terms. Many early cultures such as the Chinese, First Nations, and the South American tribes were more highly evolved than the white Europeans who discovered them. They lived in sustainable harmony with nature and only took from it what they needed to feed their families (Lerner, 1997). They also had a more holistic and symbiotic relationship with nature and their gods. However, they were also highly patriarchal warrior cultures. The parallel evolution of patriarchal societies around the globe underscores the male-gendered nature of patriarchy that has arisen in virtually every hunter/gatherer and subsequent agrarian society despite geography, religious orientation, historical evolution, or political structures. It was the ascension and development of white society that changed the sociocultural landscape of history for the worse and combined with other coincidental historical developments to entrench its power across society. The problem for global society is that all cultures and nations are governed by patriarchal ideals so that no matter what social or governance structure is in place, it will be premised on male worldviews that result in the impoverishment of the many for the whims of the few.

Racism has also played a key part in the evolution of capitalism. As Moody (1997) states:

Though it is an old, unscientific way of viewing the differences among human beings, both ideologically and institutionally, racism played such a crucial role in the origins of capitalism and has been reproduced over these hundreds of years in many so different ways, it is virtually impossible to separate it from the geographic, economic, occupational, social, and ideological structures of modern capitalist society. The argument that capitalism, as a social and economic system, does not “need” racism to function is simply too abstract because the history of this social-economic system is too intertwined with the history of white-supremacist ideology and occupational

segregation—first and foremost through slavery and colonialism, and later under conditions of rural peonage and wage labor. (p. 155)

Force, violence, and domination are the tools of advancement employed by and endemic to patriarchy and thus to our present society. It is the only way to impose a social caste system that is both unfair and inequitable while rewarding a small male elite for doing so. The problem today is that while throughout history the gap between the rich and the poor, the rewarded and the denied has always been large, there was always a general sense (mostly misguided) that this balance was being redressed with each successive generation as society became more civilized and more and more people were benefitting from society under free-enterprise capitalism. The historical and economic data over the past centuries simply do not bear this out—quite the contrary. There is no factual evidence to support this and there is massive empirical evidence to refute it. Relative to the successful few, the majority have lived in squalor. In the past century following industrialization, however, the balance of deficits and benefits has become increasingly skewed in favor of a shrinking minority of extremely wealthy and powerful people at the top of the pyramid, leading to a general feeling that the majority in society are regressing, rather than progressing. Advancement for humanity has always been deceptively relative. The gains that have been made in the standard of living of more people around the world have been purchased at an enormous and growing cost relative to the benefits received, which are marginal at best. To improve the wages of working people by even a few dollars, billions must be earned in profits by the companies in return. The relative rate of exploitation of working people and the public has increased astronomically in the past half century as indicated by skyrocketing wealth/poverty inequality data (Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010). The health and well-being of the worlds' wealthiest and most powerful has skyrocketed exponentially to only produce modest gains in quality of life for the rest. The richest countries in the world such as the United States regularly rank last among developed countries in the amount of GDP they dedicate to social programs and have a tax system that heavily favors the wealthy (Hertz, 2003). In this sense, modern civilization is in reality more exploitative than in the past. With the massive growth in the global wealth and income of the top 1% and the relative stagnation of the rest, the world is moving backward in economic equity terms, not forward (Kersley & O'Sullivan, 2013). Because a larger number of people (still a small percentage of the world's population) lives a bit better does not mean that things are improving

for the majority. A Dutch statistician, Jan Pen, created a way of showing historical economic social position in the form of a parade that takes one hour and that demonstrates a society's relative wealth by the heights of the people marching by, beginning with the poorest and ending with the wealthiest. What is striking is how few people have significant stature until the last few seconds of the parade. Those at the end of Pen's economic parade become stratospheric giants (McQuaig & Brooks, 2010). The rest are all relatively comparable in height and income. This economic reality has led to growing tensions worldwide. What we are now seeing is the full expression and extension of patriarchal global capitalism in all its destructive potential.

Our contemporary world is an amalgam of leadership, racism, gender relationships, economics, politics, religion, education, and social culture all united under the banner of patriarchy that one cannot examine or change by critiquing any individual part of our global world in isolation. A multivariate approach is required that examines the interrelationships between social institutions and their origins if we are ever to unravel the complexities of patriarchy and violence (Lerner, 1997).

Beyond Patriarchy

Patriarchy is the apex of the ideological hierarchy—the over-arching umbrella ideology that governs all others and every aspect of human existence. Patriarchy subsumes all ideologies within it and was the core influence of all other ideologies as they evolved. It is the oldest ideology still in existence today and yet despite its pre-eminence, it receives only marginal attention in the social evolution of society or the daily events of humankind. It is and has been the most powerful transparent conceptual force since the beginning of time and has spawned all major religious traditions, economic philosophies, and social beliefs for the past 6000 years and beyond (von Werlhof, 2007). Despite this, it is rarely the focus of popular attention or scholarly discussion in relation to its seminal and continuing role in the development of the major social institutions of democratic society as we currently know it and the complex and integrated manner in which it forms a web of power and control over our daily lives. Patriarchy is accepted and as a result ignored as a background factor in leadership, economics, education, politics, and religion when in fact it is the critical part of all these institutions and every aspect of human awareness. It is the elephant in the room in every discussion or situation of social functioning.

Rather than being a mainstream topic of academic and popular study, it is relegated to the margins of academic research in such fields as radical feminist and other peripheral theories of human development that are dismissed as being extreme, biased, anachronistic, and irrelevant. Gilligan and Richards (2009) note this problem in their study titled *The Deepening Darkness: Patriarchy, Resistance & Democracy's Future*:

We are aware that our focus on patriarchy is controversial, both because the word itself has lost its root meaning, becoming something of a code word for men's oppression of women, and, we believe, because of a reluctance to confront the effects of patriarchal demands on men and the complicity of women in enforcing such demands on men, on one another, and on the next generation. We are struck by the fact that discussions of gender are often dismissed now as passé—that the darkness associated with gender, the patterns of loss, traumatic rupture of relationships, repression of an ethically resisting voice and also of what might be called sexual voice continue into the present, at times with increasing fervor, despite or perhaps because of the gains toward equality and liberation that women and men have made over the past decades. (p. 4)

Lerner (1986) expresses a similar concern regarding the millennial-long complicity of women in the evolution of patriarchy. Part of the reason for this is also the socialized normalization of gender relationships that privileges one form of academic and human knowledge over another and that idolizes traditional leadership research above critical leadership study. This social acceptance of gender relationships also leads even today's women to accept the subordinate positions they are in without significant self-awareness of the reasons for their situation and without questioning or challenging it (St. Pierre, 1999). This book would assert that rather than being passé, patriarchy is central to our understanding of who we are and who we must become.

Few historical or other forms of analyses put patriarchy at the center of the ideological universe and seriously confront, attribute, or hold it accountable for the evolutionary or current behavior of global society, nor do they give serious credence to the depth of its influence, the gravity of its implications for the future, or its pervasiveness in modern human experience. Patriarchy is the ideological Rosetta stone of humanity. For example, among the thousands of academic articles and theoretical pieces written each year on leadership, few of them even mention patriarchy directly and even fewer make it their primary focus, particularly among male researchers (Keamy, 2008). The study of patriarchy is restricted to developing or Third World cultures where traditional patriarchy is more explicit, but even here the research is limited

on this topic compared to that of, say, leadership. Patriarchy is an invisible and ignored backdrop to leadership research that is accepted and normalized (Bierema, 2003; Lerner, 1986). The very structure of academic institutions and study themselves mediate in favor of reinforcing traditional, hierarchal, and patriarchal views of leadership and other topics. Professors have superior/subordinate relationships with their students, limiting the latter's ability to think openly and creatively and socializing them into acceptable traditional academic discourse. Scientific research frowns on qualitative research while endorsing factually based empirical studies. Peer review effectively becomes peer censorship that restricts change and the free exchange of academic ideas. These analyses choose instead an insular silo approach to their area of study without making a causal link to the ideology of patriarchy or other arenas of society. Linking social institutions to patriarchy immediately problematizes them and makes them much more difficult to assess, rationalize, defend, and change. While many scholars, theorists, and researchers focus on specific theories or a particular discipline within social history, few examine their areas of expertise in the full context of patriarchy or even of other scholarly or popular topics that may be relevant to their discipline. Most scholars have their disciplinary blinders on. The influence of rational science and thought with its focus on compartmentalized, detailed data as the unit of focus encourages a consideration of the minutia of daily life rather than a more holistic view of social problems that would lead to a fuller understanding of the forces at work in our world. In reverse, we can see the trees but not the forest. It is much easier to dismiss scientific study that takes this approach because it is so particularistic that thousands of studies need to be assembled over decades to provide any reasoned direction. In many cases this process means many problems are never solved because by the time they are fully examined the problem has mutated—particularly when studying social phenomena.

A more holistic approach to research looking at larger issues from a historical perspective would trigger macro insights into problems that could then trigger more specific research to validate the assumptions. This would be much more efficient and effective than current scientific theorizing and study. It is easier to ignore the problems that the study of patriarchy brings to bear on a self-contained concept such as leadership. This fragmented and blinkered approach to academic study that is a derivative of rational scientific philosophy and method isolates and fragments research issues and de-contextualizes them from the full spectrum of historical significance that gives meaning to their implications. The discovery of nuclear fission is a clear example. Scientists

naively believed it would be used for positive purposes. Critical theory embraces this diversity in its analysis of society and considers it crucial to effective examination of social evolution and problem solving (Brookfield, 2005).

Any academic investigation that does not consider patriarchy within its study is left incomplete due to its compartmentalized focus on a specific phenomenon such as leadership, economics, religion, or education while the reality of social experience is that all these social institutions are integrated and interactive at all times. They are collectively governed and directed by patriarchy and its incumbent ideology. A multiple, comprehensive, and multivariate qualitative analysis must be employed to consider all these key social elements as outgrowths of patriarchy and analyze them in this context using quantitative analysis to complement them (Lerner, 1997). When we place it in its proper place at the center of social history, and at the apex of the ideological values hierarchy, with all other ideologies organized beneath it, the rest of social/historical development makes sense and becomes clearer. De-contextualized, irrelevant, and disconnected events are given meaning. The dominance of patriarchy also becomes much more problematic. We need to understand both the diachronic and synchronic relevance of patriarchy in social development and, more importantly, the social dysfunction it creates.

The reasons behind contemporary social phenomena and social problems are firmly rooted in the foundation of patriarchy upon which they rest and its iron grip on our conscious and subconscious intellectual development. Any reasoned assessment of this phenomenon must necessarily be a conclusive indictment of the society that permitted this evolution to occur and of those who profited from it. Prior to being able to introduce healthy changes that can transform society from a patriarchal culture to post-patriarchal and fully democratic one, it is necessary to understand the depth and complexity of the influence of patriarchy today. It is also necessary to begin to challenge and expose their accepted premises and ideological rationales. This process is akin to the courage of Copernicus challenging the accepted view of the universe as revolving around the earth in the Middle Ages (Lerner, 1986). As Lerner (1993) states of change in women's status in society:

While the development is uneven, depending as it does on the existence of women's movements, it is also irreversible. Once the basic fallacy of patriarchal thought—the assumption that a half of humankind can adequately represent the whole—has been exposed and explained, it can no more be undone than was the insight that the earth is round, not flat. (p. 273)

To accomplish this we must examine the history of patriarchy and its presence in our modern world. O'Sullivan (2001) observes that despite evidence of peaceful and democratic cultures in anthropological history, "we are nevertheless led to a very critical perspective on our own historical legacy which appears to be deeply embedded in a hierarchical conception of power that comes specifically from the structures of patriarchy" (p. 136). To study patriarchy and its effects on world history and social development is to call into question and attempt to fully understand the entire evolution of humanity, and much of what constitutes our current world, its purpose and its fundamental validity and sustainability. It is also to directly challenge the self-righteous arrogance of modern Western democracies to call themselves "the chosen ones." The study of patriarchy is beyond culture, leadership, politics, economics, religion, and education but also an integral part of them. They are the corpus of patriarchy. A critical analysis of this ideology calls into question the underpinnings of our modern social structures and beliefs and attacks the credibility of their moral claims of civilized superiority and advanced development for humankind. Critical approaches reveal the reality behind the rhetoric, thus providing a window of opportunity for change.

Until society understands, accepts, and acknowledges the key, pervasive, and ongoing role of patriarchy in social history, it cannot begin to move beyond it into a post-patriarchal society. Patriarchy has existed since the dawn of recorded time and has evolved to the present day as society has evolved, while firmly maintaining and enhancing its grip on social beliefs and development. As it evolves, its pervasively negative effects multiply exponentially. It is flexible and malleable but it does not relinquish its grip on this process—far from it. It operates in an invasive and pernicious manner, colonizing human consciousness and social behavior in ways that are subtle and insidious. It has become so advanced within contemporary civilization that it is virtually impossible to eradicate. It is possible, however, to expose its effects, challenge its premises, and change its path by revealing the duplicity and dangers of its position to humankind. Despite the struggles of society against patriarchy and its expressions, its dominance remains largely unquestioned and unchallenged in anything other than the academic community. Patriarchy is literally and figuratively the invisible ideological Big Brother of Orwell's 1984.

The philosophical theory of patriarchy has been completely ingrained in our deepest social psyche from the beginning of time (French, 1985; Lerner, 1986) and is driving us toward the end of human existence. This view is not irreversible or fixed in biological determinism, Biblical certainty, or political

apathy, but is a conscious choice we are making individually and collectively every day in every moment of our lives to support, ignore, or acquiesce to its influence. In our obsession with hedonistic “presentism” and materialism we are mortgaging and jeopardizing the future for generations to come (Lerner, 1997). We are debasing human morality, compassion, and cooperation in the process. Patriarchy is alive and well in our leadership models, workplaces, homes, shopping malls, on television, in sports and leisure activities, in our governments, religions, educational and legal systems, and in our economic institutions. It is the most insidious form of social control that has ever evolved because it is self-monitoring, self-regulating, self-policing, and self-replicating. The hegemony of patriarchy is pervasive. Each day that we turn a blind eye its damaging effects puts us a day closer to extinction.

We continually focus on the problem, not the cause, in many of our futile attempts to cure social ills, yet if we focus on the damaging influence of patriarchy we can simultaneously enhance the health of all our global social institutions and dramatically improve our world by endorsing the autonomy and freedom of the person and the inalienable right of all people to a fully enfranchised, active, participatory, and substantive democracy. By focusing on dealing with social issues in a manner that is consciously less patriarchal, we can immediately begin to affect significant real change in the world. This means thinking of everyone’s self-interest beyond our own but not to the exclusion of our own. Global society is slowly realizing the huge social democratic charade that is being perpetrated on the citizens of the world and they are resisting as they have for centuries. Global dysfunction is a clear signal that something is seriously wrong in how we run our societies and how we relate as genders. A change in philosophy will bring big changes in practice. Every decision made from a patriarchal base is a decision to deny other people human dignity, autonomy, and freedom. This requires both men and women to use their personal power to make change. As millions of years of evolutionary development have shown, the human species is nothing more than a small blip on a massive anthropological radar screen. We must all learn to view our role in human society as an integral part of every other on earth, however small or insignificant. Every act of neglect of this obligation comes back to us where we live. Half the planet cannot continue to use up the majority of its resources while the other half goes without. People cannot continue to live in wealth when people a few blocks away or a few countries away live in poverty. We are truly becoming Marshall McLuhan’s (Schafer, 2008) global village, with global responsibility to every person on the planet. We need to

globalize human compassion, not economics. We are a worldwide interrelated ecosystem and one part cannot ignore its responsibilities to the other parts that make it work. Moving away from patriarchal thinking opens the doors to the open and equitable sharing of the world's wealth and creates immediate, real solutions to intractable issues such as poverty, homelessness, health, and economic well-being.

To accomplish this requires changing the dominance of males in the social organization and operation of cultures around the world. This is an indisputable fact that cannot any longer be ignored and remains unchanged today. Men do not have the right to run the world. It is one of the most fundamental challenges that humanity must come to grips with if it is to move forward (Femea, 2003). If we are to ever reach a higher level of civilization, we will have to actively restructure our social psyche and development to create a more harmonious, equitable, and balanced future for the human race. To do this we must make a conscious, aggressive, and purposeful effort to forgo and actively censure all violence as the solution to problems, and begin an active, honest dialogue about violent, patriarchal gender relationships and their impact on social institutions and decision making. We must challenge unreasonable and ineffective authority that does not serve the collective needs of everyone and pays lip-service to the electorate, dismantle and restructure vertical organizational bureaucracies that buttress the ideology of patriarchy, and demand the development of participatory democracy in all governments and organizations around the world while working collectively to share the wealth of the earth in an equitable and sustainable way. This will require courage, fortitude, and action by leaders and governments who are not listening to the cries of their citizens to "let their people go." Socialism and social democracy are the right ideas ideologically—they have simply been hijacked by patriarchal authoritarian regimes such as Communism. Despite this, we do have some positive examples of working social democracies in the Scandinavian countries. We need to look to their positive social models to begin our journey.

In many ways this seems idealistic, but in reality it only requires changes in thinking and then policies to make massive differences around the world. While it is easy to do, it is an enormous challenge. We must demand open, democratic values from our politicians and leaders. Changing the mental and practical stranglehold that patriarchy has on society is a huge hurdle to cross. Self-realization and change is the most difficult act to carry out and must be done collectively as a shared mass of humanity. The era of the nation state, different religions, and opposing cultures is in the past and must be left behind

as we build a free global society. In a post-patriarchal, truly globalized, and democratic world these differences will gradually merge into one amorphous multicultural, multi-faith, tolerant human society where difference does not define social policy or geopolitical conflict and men and women are treated as equals. Realizing such a world is neither simple nor easy and will require difficult choices by governments and peoples everywhere for centuries to come and a serious effort to intentionally abandon practices and beliefs that have created the current inequitable world we live in. It also requires us to collectively realize and bring into being practices that create true equality, democracy, and freedom for every human being and every natural species on our planet. If we start from the premise that everyone has the right to own everything and negotiate what that means in real-life terms, we might be able to make a start. Private property has divided up the world as well as its people. Patriarchy is the biggest ideological terrorist threat facing humanity and we must confront it as aggressively as other forms of extremism. Patriarchy is a massive challenge but we must begin somewhere. This book attempts to do this. It will take real leadership, real collaboration, and real consensus to achieve this change, not the false domineering forms of these concepts that we currently practice.

We need to start walking the talk. As O'Sullivan (2001) points out regarding what he terms the "new socialism":

The new socialism is based on workers' and peoples' control of their workplaces and communities, of the important conditions and decisions that affect their lives. It means the end of double and dishonest discourse. Personal lifestyles should be in accord with public discourse. Intellectuals cannot critique neoliberalism and then engage in frenzied consumption of imported consumer goods. One cannot preach equality up to the doorstep of one's household and then practice authoritarian (patriarchal) politics within the family. The new socialism recognizes the complexity of the contradictions in the transition-foremost the need to democratize gender, ethnic and race relations, a key element in the transition from globalism to a new socialism. (p. 172)

The "new socialism" O'Sullivan speaks of is not a political but a social and cultural concept much like the age of culture envisioned by Schafer (2008) that moves beyond an "economic age" and the politics, gender, and economics of division to a new age of shared human collaboration and freedom. The "new socialism" that O'Sullivan (2001) speaks of is really the "new democracy" where the ideal of substantive democracy is realized for all people everywhere and becomes an inalienable global right of all citizens, rather than

the preserve of selected elites. It is the “work democratic society” referred to by Reich (1974) decades ago and the “deliberative democracy” described by Young (2000) (cited in LiPumaa & Koelbleb, 2009, pp. 203–204). This belief and desire for real democracy is not new, nor unique among people everywhere. The place to begin to change it is through education. Maxcy (1991) describes the belief in this form of democracy of the great American educator, John Dewey:

Dewey pegs his conception of participatory democracy to human nature. He proposes that we must have faith in the capacities of human nature, human intelligence, and pooled and cooperative experience. Dewey finds himself in direct opposition to the view that some autocrat or authoritarian scheme is better. The notion that a select superior few, because of inherent natural gifts, are endowed with the ability or right to control the conduct of others Dewey finds contrary to his ideal of democracy. Although his conception of democracy is relatively recent in history, he states, “men’s minds and feelings are still permeated with ideas about leadership imposed from above, ideas that developed in the long history of mankind” (Dewey, 1937, p. 458). (pp. 63–64)

Nothing has appreciably changed in terms of our conceptions of leadership since Dewey asserted this position. A century later we are no closer to the democracy that Dewey spoke of. Democratic societies and their leaders often spend more time denying and controlling democratic freedoms than they do liberating them. It is to this process that we now turn.