

UDC 305-055.1(8)
Biblid 0543-3657, 69 (2018)
Vol. LXIX, No. 1172, pp. 26–41
Review paper

THE IMPORTANCE OF GENDER EQUALITY IN THE COUNTRIES OF LATIN AMERICA AFTER *BREXIT*

*Ivan DUJIĆ*¹

Abstract: The paper points to the importance of gender equality in the Latin American countries after *Brexit* from the standpoint of the profound and tight interconnection of this aspect of equality with normative heterosexuality. Also, the paper offers an explanation for the long-ago introduced hegemonic masculinity which not only led to the formation of society and a state but also contributed to the emergence of capitalism in the period of conquest and colonisation of the future Latin American countries. Capitalism contributed to the creation of capital-based complex and diverse relationships which enabled the processes of national and sub-regional integration to unfold due to the (unwritten) law of hegemonic masculinity. The work of some international organisations, particularly those dealing with economic issues, tacitly relies on the law of hegemonic masculinity. Unlike legal and political sciences in which the gender equality has found its place, the economy still indicates that relationships among individuals within society and a state continue to depend on hegemonic masculinity. It means that economic understanding of gender equality is linked with gender inequality that features old binary relations of public-private, superiority-subordination and productive-reproductive between men and women. Such relations are also characteristic of the Latin American countries.

Key words: gender equality, Latin America, *Brexit*, normative heterosexuality, society, state, international organisations, hegemonic masculinity.

¹ Ivan Dujić, Research Fellow, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade. E-mail address: ivan@diplomacy.bg.ac.rs

The article was realised within the project: “Serbia in contemporary international relations: Strategic directions of development and consolidating the position of Serbia in international integrative processes – foreign affairs, international economic, legal and security aspects”, Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Serbia, no. 179029 (2011-2019).

A NEW PARADIGM ON GENDER EQUALITY AND A STARTING POINT FOR A MORE COMPREHENSIVE UNDERSTANDING OF OVERALL RELATIONS WITHIN A STATE AS WELL AS INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AFTER BREXIT

Consider the relationships among individuals with equal social status as the basis for establishing a new paradigm on gender equality and a starting point for a more comprehensive understanding of the overall relations within a state as well as broader international relations. The main argument for this assumption, particularly bearing in mind the *post-Brexit* transition period (the 2016 referendum on the United Kingdom exit from the European Union) is not ungrounded: thanks to them, individuals maintain long-term, multiple and intricate ties which are the basis of intra-state relations. The above paradigm and the starting point should be considered in the context of the most recent period of human history after *Brexit*, drawing on this fact.

As research from selected literature indicates, relationships within a state are the result of the dynamics of overall relations development. However, due to the development of transport outside the borders of a state, as well as the improvement of international trade, the national borders have been overcome, leading to the complexity of international relations and the inevitable establishment of the world-system of autonomous states. It can rightly be noted that international relations in the 21st century reached a level of complexity that was unimaginable until the end of the Cold War.

One of the aspects of intra-state relationships is a relationship between genders. The development of the overall relations in a state is based on the fact that both genders build and cultivate mutual relations for the sake of meeting biological and other needs by using natural resources. Dujić (2016, pp. 309-310) gives an explanation of natural resources according to Webster's Dictionary, which refers to 'the natural wealth of a country consisting of land, forests, mineral deposits, water [...]'.

Men and women are the anchors of intra-state relationships, not only because of the exploitation of natural resources but also because of the tendency of their relations to grow into diverse, complex social relations. These are economic, cultural, political, and social relations that, according to Paxton, Hughes and Green (2006, p. 899), were the result of the development of a positive discourse in favour of the general aspiration for '[...] acquisition of political power [...] of women. Such a discourse led to the perception of the economy, especially the global political economy (GPE), as a concept that reveals that since ancient times, complex social relations within a state, as well as international relations, have been based on laws tacitly established by men.

Gender equality, as a universally accepted global discourse, conceals the paradox that complex social relations within a state, as well as international relations, have not changed much in their essence. Evidence for such a claim includes '[...]' gendered configurations of power, knowledge, representation, and identity [...]' (Griffin et al., 2012, p. 5; Griffin, 2010, p. 10). As it will be seen in this paper, social relations continue to be based on the greater role of men compared with women in defining the overall relations in one state, but also international relations, which is contrary to the global discourse on gender equality.

Why is this new paradigm of gender equality the basis for a more comprehensive understanding of the overall relations in one state, as well as international relations? If we perceive *Brexit* as one of the most important events in world history, we note that it did not develop without the greater role of men. Gender equality – an institution of the modern era, generally approved by bilateral and multilateral treaties and ratified in the form of laws in all countries of the world – implies several meanings in itself as a notion, depending on how it is defined. This paper will consider its political, legal and economic aspects, especially in the GPE, which entails a new paradigm of gender equality.

From a political science perspective, the notion of gender equality is related to the definition and continuous implementation of policies that give the possibility and/or provide greater space for the participation of women in the political life of a state. Studies conducted by, for example, Paxton, Hughes and Green show that the discourse on the participation of women in the political life of a state has evolved into a global discourse, regardless of the fact that women are '[...] substantially underrepresented in politics [...]' (Paxton et al., 2006, p. 898). This means that, despite significant progress regarding gender equality, the position of women in a country is still determined by codes imposed by men millennia ago, which have occasionally negatively reflected on the global comprehension of the women's position in a state and in international relations.

The legal aspect of gender equality implies that states are obliged to protect the institution of gender equality through laws and other rules. On the other hand, based on the decisions of international organisations, it is clear that there is a strong global institutionalisation of gender equality. The tendency of universal and general international organisations to address the issue of gender equality is observed, for example, in the preamble of the Charter of United Nations emphasising that it is necessary to '[...] reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small [...]' (The 1945 Charter of United Nations, par. 2).

Unlike in political and legal sciences, in the economy, especially the GPE, gender equality is understood differently. This claim is supported by the fact that the work of certain universal and special international organisations, such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the World Bank and the World Trade Organisation, represents ‘[...] prominent (...) examples of global governance, which takes shape in a variety of forms.’ (Griffin, 2010, p. 87). Although they always publicly advocate the promotion of global discourse on gender equality in the world, in their work these international organisations tacitly rely on an entirely different discourse that is otherwise difficult to notice: normative heterosexuality that tends to become and remain a truly global phenomenon. This discourse, no matter how paradoxical it seems, is also supported by the countries of Latin America.

Gender equality as one aspect of equality in general and as a global discourse is grounded in the long-established normative heterosexuality. It is a very old phenomenon related to ‘[...] identities and practices of (...) privileged (men, hegemonic masculinity) and subordinated (women, the feminine) [...]’ (Spike Peterson, 1999, p. 56). It is a pattern of behaviour accepted in most societies and states for the sake of their survival, according to which the relations between men and women are defined in a way that they are considered desirable and where men are seen as the primary holders of privileges and hegemony in relation to women. From an economic, but also sociological standpoint, regardless of gender equality, these relations are defined as relations with an everlasting tendency to transcend into the sphere of binary divisions of roles between the genders and that are expressed through mutually opposed relations: the current, now tacit old public-private, superior-subordinate and productive-reproductive relations.

The Status of the Latin American Countries Regarding Gender Equality after Brexit

The social status of individuals has for centuries been tied to the status of men as the primary basis for the development of society and a state. The traditionally narrow view that men, thanks to their privileges and hegemony, are solely responsible for the dynamics of the development of society and a state shows how strongly it impeded the establishment of the institution of gender equality. However, this understanding has found its foothold in the discourse of universal but also regional international organisations dealing with economic issues, as can be seen in the implementation of ‘[...] policy interventions that are intrinsically sexualised, that is, predicated on a politics of normative heterosexuality.’ (Griffin, 2007a, p. 221).

Is hegemonic masculinity, in addition to normative heterosexuality, the basis for the social contract and the creation of society and a state? In an effort to provide a positive answer to this question, in her research Youngs points to the existence of a '[...]' hierarchy (sexual contract) that has traditionally framed politics (and economics) as predominantly public spheres of male influence and identification [...]' (2004, p. 81). The sexual contract-based hierarchy, in which men are a significant factor in the formulation of politics and economy, is confirmed by the privileges and hegemonic masculinity in the always regulated public-private relations, and the identification of male influence.

The fact that men are a factor in the formulation of politics and economy constitutes the basis for analysing the status of women in society and a state. In their research, Griffin, Parpart and Zalewski point out that '[...]' men are persistently deemed to be largely responsible for the perpetration of violence against women [...]' (Griffin et al., 2012, p. 4). This means that privileges and hegemonic masculinity – as a pattern in the formulation of politics and the economy – other than positive, have a negative side that is manifested as violence against women.

The magnitude of the problem of violence against women in the Latin American countries is seen in the fact that, together with Canada and the United States (US), these countries have adopted an important international treaty to protect the institution of gender equality – the Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment and Eradication of Violence against Women (Convención de Belém do Pará). The treaty contains a provision which obliges the countries of Latin America to

“[...] condenan a todas las formas de violencia contra la mujer y convienen en adoptar, por todos los medios apropiados y sin dilaciones, políticas orientadas a prevenir, sancionar y erradicar dicha violencia [...]” (OAS, Convención de Belém do Pará 1994, Artículo 7).²

The countries of Latin America ratified the Convention in the period from 1994 to 2005 (OAS, Tratados Multilaterales). It is a legally binding international agreement.

Although the Convention is a legally binding international agreement for the Latin American countries, the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) does not essentially support the generally accepted global discourse on gender equality but advocates a tacit discourse on normative heterosexuality. Promoting and continually advocating the economic growth as an idea finds

² “[...] condemn all forms of violence against women and agree to pursue, by all appropriate means and without delay, policies to prevent, punish and eradicate such violence [...]”.

its foundation in normative heterosexuality, as well as in hegemonic masculinity. Pointing to the importance of the fully integrated regional market of the Latin American countries (LACFTA), the IADB states that this market, provided it is established as an international organisation and trading block, has [...] the potential to boost scale, efficiency, productivity, exports, and growth with likely modest economic and political costs.' (IADB, 2017, p. 74).

The capacity of the Latin American countries to work, both individually and collectively, on increasing volumes, efficiency, productivity, exports and growth with the aim of reducing economic and political expenditure, is based on normative heterosexuality. In fact, the promotion of the idea of economic growth by the IADB is fully in line with the increase in the volume, efficiency, productivity, exports and growth of the Latin American countries and is based on an established [...] logic of compulsory (normative) heterosexuality, where 'sex' produces the 'sexual' to revolve around the signifier of 'sexuality' as heterosexuality.' (Griffin, 2007b, p. 229). The work grounded in the logic of compulsory normative heterosexuality not only of the World Bank, as a universal international economic organisation – which is the subject of thorough research by Griffin – but also of the IADB is related to neo-liberalism that supports the tacit discourse on heterosexuality.

If we relate neo-liberalism to Smith's view, who saw capital as a means of supporting the development of the domestic industry with the aim of gaining the benefit, we observe that capital as a concept is more widely comprehended. Among other things, it relates to the man's satisfaction of his own interests for the better functioning of the community. According to Smith, '(b)y pursuing (man's) own interest he frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than when (the man) really intends to promote it [...] (in order) to trade for the public good.' (2007 [1776], pp. 349-350). This great scholar and the pioneer of contemporary economic thought understood capital more widely - as a public good created by joint efforts in which a man is an essential factor in the achievement of profit, regardless of the far greater importance of his education in the contemporary society and a state.

In terms of the logic of normative heterosexuality, capital can be grasped not only as a public good but also as a tacit reason for the manifestation of hegemonic masculinity – expressed in the form of (unwritten) society and state's laws. A man – as it happens in most cases – strives to remain an (in)direct master in the sphere of public, superior, and productive. However, it is interesting that when instead of a man a woman comes to the sphere – who, according to the logic of normative heterosexuality, cannot become or remain the mistress, for the sake of establishing and maintaining the ancient, overcome hegemonic femininity – the attitude towards capital remains the same. We can find the reason for this in the fact that everything works in

favour of the hegemonic masculinity which strives to put a public good into the sphere of the public, superior, and productive.

On which ground can we see that the law of hegemonic masculinity still exists despite the universally accepted global discourse on gender equality? Although gender equality is ratified by international treaties and state's laws as a desirable aspect of overall relations, the economy and politics consider this institution only an illusion as to the real gender roles in society and a state. As evidence that it is actually a matter of gender inequality in society and a state, we can take, for example, research done by McGuire and Olson, where it is observed that hegemonic masculinity has led to the fact that a man '[...] use(s) some of the (natural) resources (that) he controls to provide public goods that serve the whole society.' (1996, p. 80).

Male endeavour to remain the essential factor – who by means of control uses natural resources for the purpose of making public goods available – contributes to achieving a long process of multi-level integration of society and a state. In the Latin American countries, it is manifested in the definition and implementation of policies aimed at using public goods for the long-term connection of state spaces. Perhaps Argentina is a good example of investing in public goods, such as transport, communications and technology, which is in line with its plan to earmark USD 26.5 billion for this purpose by 2022 on the basis of public-private partnership revenues (MercoPress, 2017).

The result of investing in public goods positively influences the process of multi-level integration of society and state and, consequently, is the basis for the process of sub-regional integration. Together with the countries of South America, Argentina participates in the process of sub-regional integration, *inter alia*, through making defence-related decisions and the strengthening of the gender equality institution in the member states of the Union of South American Nations (Unión de Naciones Suramericanas – UNASUR). In accordance with the UNASUR Constitutive Treaty, the member states have committed themselves to enabling “[...] desarrollo de una infraestructura para la interconexión de la región y entre nuestros pueblos de acuerdo a criterios de desarrollo social y económico sustentables” (Tratado Constitutivo de la UNASUR, Artículo 3, pár. e).³

Acting collectively in the international arena, the UNASUR member states strive to achieve mutual physical integration. The proof of their solidarity in the international arena is confirmed by the establishment of the Initiative for the Integration of the Regional Infrastructure of South America (Iniciativa

³ “[...] development of infrastructure for the interconnection of the region and among our peoples, based on sustainable criteria of social and economic development”.

para la Integración de la Infraestructura Regional Suramericana – IIRSA) at the end of the 20th century. The following step towards South American states co-operation was the establishment of one of the many types of councils within the UNASUR – the South American Council on Infrastructure and Planning (Consejo Suramericano de Infraestructura y Planeamiento – COSIPLAN).

The importance of the COSIPLAN for achieving physical integration of the countries of South America can be seen in the fact that, together with the IADB, it supported the digging of the new tunnel ‘Agua Negra’ which will link together the road traffic of Argentina and Chile (IIRSA, 2017). This is one of the projects aimed at overcoming the existing geographical barriers to the integration of the UNASUR member states. The confirmation of further cooperation between Argentina, Chile and other South American countries, even after *Brexit*, is reflected in the efforts of these countries to equally include representatives of both sexes in the implementation of mutual integration.

However, while the UNASUR member states, as well as other Latin American countries, can often boast with the progress achieved with regard to the development and improvement of the institution of gender equality, the reality has demonstrated even before *Brexit* that, from a sociological point of view, gender inequality still prevails. The current discourse on normative heterosexuality – which does not exclude the countries of Latin America – encourages the division of roles among the genders that has been created for hundreds of years. The involvement of the countries of Latin America in the actualisation of discourses on normative heterosexuality is undeniable before, during and after their gaining independence.

The institution of gender equality is not only relevant to the Latin American countries individually but also collectively because international organisations – acting as trade blocks – assume the significant participation of women in their work. How the role of women in the work of international organisations of the Latin American countries is important can be seen, for example, in the operation of the UNASUR. According to the provisions of the UNASUR Constitutive Treaty, it is stipulated that the functioning of the trade block depends not only on the participation of men but also women (Tratado Constitutivo de la UNASUR, Artículos 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 y 10).

The participation of women in determining the fate of the societies and states of Central America depends partly on political (in)stability that characterises this part of Latin America. The general opinion is that the states of Central America show a greater inclination towards internal political difficulties and crises. In order to avoid these conditions, the Central American countries participate in the work of the bodies of the transnational

international organisation – The Central American Integration System (Sistema de Integración Centroamericana – SICA) for the sake of collective resolution of individual economic, political and social problems. This includes, in particular, the resolution of gender equality issues both individually and collectively through the SICA body responsible for the strengthening and legal protection of gender equality – The Council of Women’s Affairs Ministers (Consejo de Ministras de la Mujer de Centroamérica y República Dominicana – COMMCA).

The introduction of the institution of gender equality in the Latin American countries did not imply the suppression of the dominant role of men and the abandonment of the tacit discourse on hegemonic masculinity – on which the majority of societies and countries of the world are based. Perhaps the best proof for this claim is, as Barry observes, quoted by Rich, a century old and partially overcome phenomenon manifested in the form of ‘[...] the primacy and uncontrollability of the male sexual drive.’ (Rich, 1980, p. 645). The creation and constitution of the Latin American states, as separate territories, on the basis of the sexual drive of men before, during and after gaining independence, is not a novelty: thanks to the greater role of men, these countries are the product of hegemonic masculinity in economy, politics and law.

The explanation of the sexual drive of men, as an essential and lasting component in the functioning of countries, in particular the countries of Latin America, starts from new studies conducted by Blackwood, quoted by Borneman, stating that ‘[...] the trope of the dominant heterosexual man rests at the core of kinship.’ (Borneman, 2005, p. 31). The meaning of the term ‘dominant heterosexual man’ must not be limited only to kin relations; it must also be extended to the domain of other relations, especially economic and political relations. Normative heterosexuality rests on the domination of men, while women are an irreplaceable link in the sphere of reproduction that is impossible without the sexual desire of the stronger gender.

Studies show that the continuous development of society and state does not depend so much on gender equality, as it is presented in some state and international reports, but also on the tacit discourse on normative heterosexuality. This is supported by the Human Development Report (HDR) published annually by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). According to the latest data, Chile and Argentina are ranked 38th and 45th, respectively, and fall into the group of countries with very high human development (HDR, 2016, p. 200).

Other member states of the UNASUR and wider Latin America are ranked into the countries with high and medium human development (HDR,

2016, pp. 200-202). The HDR does not raise the question of the actual importance of gender equality in Latin America and the world but takes the purchasing power parity (PPP) as one of the important criteria for evaluation and, accordingly, the country's ranking by the level of human development. The measurement of PPP of a state is based on the minimum participation of both genders in determining its economic power, which points to the great importance of gender equality.

A deeper analysis, however, reveals that gender equality is not a factor in determining and achieving the economic power of states. More recent research shows that gender equality as an institution was the object of defining relations in society and a state, as well as interstate relations, even before *Brexit*. In the case of the Latin American countries, it is seen that the institution of gender equality is an inseparable part of the development of Latin America, thanks to the legal commitment of the ratified bilateral and multilateral treaties stipulating this form of equality.

Regional Conference on the Status of Women in Latin America and the Caribbean held in 2013 undoubtedly confirms that the Latin American countries are continually working on the cultivation and development of gender equality as an institution. The aim of this meeting was to point out the need to reduce and/or stop violence against women, especially when they find themselves in the public and not the private sphere (UNDP, 2017a, p. 72). Women's endeavour to be equal in the public sphere and, together with men, participate in the dynamic development of society and state leads to the need for the prevailing normative heterosexuality to be gradually redefined in the direction of partial alleviation or complete eradication of hegemonic masculinity for the purpose of giving more room to the institution of gender equality.

In addition to the need to reduce and/or stop violence against women, the UNDP points to a significant tendency to promote the institution of gender equality in the public administration as something belonging to the public sphere. The result of this tendency is '[...] to improve trust between state and society.' (UNDP, 2017b, p. 19). It is possible to build trust between the state and the society, provided that the institution of gender equality is the main pivot in increasing the participation of women in the public sphere.

The discussion on how important the institution of gender equality is in the Latin American countries after *Brexit* can also be held in the context of encouraging the further analysis of the process of national and sub-regional integration of these countries. The selected literature shows that the discourse on gender equality in the Latin American countries supports a gradual process of spreading the global discourse on equality between men and women. The arguments strong enough to support the spread of this

discourse can be found in contemporary research conducted by Paxton, Hughes and Green, stating that '[...] the global institutionalization of women's equality powerfully affects country-level attainment of political power for women.' (Paxton et al., 2006, p. 911).

Global institutionalisation of women's equality implies the attempt to redefine current normative heterosexuality in order for it to be in line with the institution of gender equality. In a rapidly changing world, the global institutionalisation of women's equality aims to allow the participation of women in the political life of a state in the name of compensating for theirs, from a historical point of view, largely marginal role in the public sphere. Observed at the level of general development, the Latin American countries have a chance to build and strengthen a positive attitude towards women's participation.

However, some new research suggests that the Latin American countries do not have a positive attitude towards women's participation in the political life of a state, but shows a tendency to '[...] demonstrate significantly more negative gender ideology views.' (Kunovich and Paxton, 2005, p. 519). These views of gender ideology in the Latin American countries prevent better, more efficient and even more equal participation of women in political life. To overcome this, a state should have a developed democracy and political culture in order for its life to depend on every type of diversity, including gender.

The answer to the question why the Latin American countries do not have a positive attitude towards women's participation in the political life of a state lies in capitalism and relations arising from it, which is characterised by '[...] the dominant mode of production (...) (as) the result (...) a long historical process.' (Navarro, 1979, p. 115). Establishing a dominant mode of production, thanks to a positive attitude towards men's participation, meant creating complex relations: this later inevitably led to the establishment of capitalism, coinciding with the period of conquest and colonisation of the future states of Latin America. Based on the above, it can be concluded that due to the much larger participation of men in its creation and maintenance, capitalism – as a form of capital-based relation – is responsible for the lack of a positive attitude towards the participation of women in the political life of the Latin American countries.

The emergence of capitalism contributed to the affirmation of normative heterosexuality as a strong link in capitalist relations. From the historical point of view, the period of conquest and colonisation of Latin America was characterised by the need for normative heterosexuality to be linked to hegemonic masculinity in order to establish the necessary order resulting in the creation and overall constitution of the Latin American countries. The

fact that current hegemonic masculinity has lost significance to gender equality means that the economic, political and legal establishment of the Latin American countries in most cases does not depend on the full participation of men in the functioning of these states.

Gender equality, as a recognised institution in the world, including the countries of Latin America, does not have the same importance in the economy and in political and legal sciences. The GPE completely differently interprets the institution of gender equality due to the connection with the neoliberal discourse of solving social issues in society and a state (Griffin, 2007a, p. 222). In fact, the GPE relies on a discourse on hegemonic masculinity where social issues are viewed as the reason for the implementation of the (unwritten) law of hegemonic masculinity and which does not exclude the countries of Latin America.

Based on the above, the question to be answered by future research is whether gender equality, as a generally accepted global discourse, is justified given the exceptional importance of the GPE. Hegemonic masculinity, even after *Brexit*, continues to be a key factor in determining the fate of society and a state, including Latin America, for the simple reason that gender equality has not found its foundation in the economy, especially in the GPE. From this, it follows that hegemonic masculinity is *per se* a dogma of the man's irreplaceable role in the creation of society and state, the implementation of the man-created laws and the use of the privileges that make up the world of the man, regardless of whether a man or woman is in power.

CONCLUSION

The equality of individuals among the male population by their social status has for centuries been the basis for the development of society and a state, as well as for the maintenance of established international relations. The involvement of the Latin American countries in the development of societies and states could not be effected without the role of men who confirmed the importance of hegemonic masculinity and normative heterosexuality. Therefore, it can rightly be said that contemporary relations in a state, as well as international relations, continue to be characterised by the prevailing normative heterosexuality, as well as by the institutionalisation of the global discourse on gender equality.

Bearing in mind that normative heterosexuality is an important part of the long process of globalisation, the key question is raised as to whether the countries of Latin America and international organisations deliberately want to extend the actuality of hegemonic masculinity for the sake of a greater

scale of the economy, productivity, labour, and the like. The significance of this issue is based on the analysis of the reality that is often not in line with the explicit global discourse on gender equality. Connell, quoted by Griffin, relates the discourse on hegemonic masculinity to ‘transnational business masculinity’ characterised by ‘[...] increasing egocentrism, very conditional loyalties (...), and a declining sense of responsibility for others [...]’ (Griffin, 2012, p. 14). While the development of relations in a state and beyond, including the states of Latin America, flows with a certain dynamics, gender equality has found its place in political and legal sciences and contradicts hegemonic masculinity that continues to play the role of an important factor in the economy, especially in the GPE.

The significance of gender equality in the Latin American countries after *Brexit* depends on what their actual attitude towards normative heterosexuality is. If gender equality is one of the necessary prerequisites for the development of modern society and a state, then the established hegemonic masculinity should give way to various forms of equality, including the gender equality, in the GPE as well. This means that the current discourse on normative heterosexuality should be in line with gender equality in order for the countries of Latin America to benefit from the equality of men and women from an economic point of view as well.

REFERENCES

- Borneman, J. (2005). Marriage Today. *American Ethnologist*, 32(1), 30-33.
- Dujić, I. (2016). Klimatske izbeglice kao sledeća faza globalizacije i osnova za ponovno planiranje svetskog (ne)reda [Climate Refugees as the Next Era of Globalisation Process and the Ground for Re-shaping of World (Dis)order]. *International Problems*, 68(4), 309-326.
- Griffin, P. Parpart, L.J. & Zalewski, M. (2012). Men, Masculinity, and Responsibility. *Men and Masculinities*, 16(1), 3-8, doi: 10.1177/1097184X12468103.
- Griffin, P. (2012). Gendering Global Finance: Crisis, Masculinity, and Responsibility. *Men and Masculinities*, 16(1), 9-34, doi: 10.1177/1097184X12468097.
- Griffin, P. (2010). Gender, Governance and the Global Political Economy. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 64(1), 86-104, doi: 10.1080/10357710903460030.
- Griffin, P. (2007a). Sexing the Economy in a Neo-liberal World Order: Neo-liberal Discourse and the (Re)Production of Heteronormative

- Heterosexuality. *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 9, 220–238, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-856x.2007.00280.x.
- Griffin, P. (2007b). Neoliberalism and the World Bank: economic discourse and the(re)production of gendered identity(ies). *Policy Futures in Education*, 5(2), 226–238, doi:10.2304/pfie.2007.5.2.226.
- Iniciativa para la Integración de la Infraestructura Regional Suramericana (IIRSA). (2017). Reunión sobre el PTI Túnel Binacional Agua Negra. COSIPLAN. Retrieved from <http://www.iirsa.org/Event/Detail?Id=389>
- Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). (2017). Fixing Regional Integration: What Would Be the Result? *2017 Latin American and Caribbean Macroeconomic Report: Routes to Growth in a New Trade World* (pp. 61–74). Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).
- Kunovich, S. & Paxton, P. (2005). Pathways to Power: The Role of Political Parties in Women's National Political Representation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 111(2), 505–552.
- Mercopress*. (2017). Macri's ambitious infrastructure investment plan begins with 7.700kms of roads. Retrieved from <http://en.mercopress.com/2017/11/03/macri-s-ambitious-infrastructure-investment-plan-begins-with-7.700kms-of-roads>
- McGuire, C. M., Olson, M. (1996). The Economics of Autocracy and Majority Rule: The Invisible Hand and the Use of Force. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 34(1), 72–96.
- Navarro, M. (1979). Research on Latin American Women. *Signs*, 5(1), 111–120.
- Organización de los Estados Americanos. (1994). Convención Interamericana para prevenir, sancionar y erradicar la violencia contra la mujer, (Convención de Belem do Para). Ministro de Relaciones Exteriores. San Salvador, El Salvador.
- Organization of American States (OAS). (1994). Convención Interamericana para Prevenir, Sancionar y Erradicar la Violencia contra la Mujer “Convención de Belém do Pará”. Retrieved from <http://www.oas.org/juridico/spanish/tratados/a-61.html>.
- Organization of American States (OAS). A-61: Convención Interamericana para Prevenir, Sancionar y Erradicar la Violencia contra la Mujer “Convención de Belém do Pará”. Retrieved from <http://www.oas.org/juridico/spanish/firmas/a-61.html>.
- Paxton, P., Hughes, M. M. & Green, L. J. (2006). The International Women's Movement and Women's Political Representation, 1893–2003. *American Sociological Review*, 71, 898–920.

- Peterson, S. V. (1999). Sexing Political Identities: Nationalism as Heterosexism. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 1(1), 34–65.
- Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence. *Signs*, 5(4), 631-660.
- Smith, A. (1776). Of Restraints upon the Importation from Foreign Countries of such Goods as can be produced at Home. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (pp. 347-362). New York: MetaLibri.
- Unión de Naciones Suramericanas (UNASUR). (2014). Tratado Constitutivo de la Unión de Naciones Suramericanas. Secretaría General de UNASUR. Quito, Ecuador.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2017a). Legal and Policy Reform to Prevent and Respond to VAWE. *Preventing Violence against Women in Elections: A Programming Guide* (pp. 69-84). UN Women, UNDP.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2017b). Correlation analysis: The Interplay between Gender Equality in Public Administration, Economic Development and Gender Equality in Society and Work. *Gender Diversity in the State: A Development Accelerator?* (pp. 12-21). McKinsey & Company and United Nations Development Programme.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2016). Statistical Annex, *Human Development Report 2016: Human Development for Everyone* (pp. 193-270). New York: The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
- United Nations. (1945). *Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice*. San Francisco.
- Youngs, G. (2004). Feminist International Relations: A Contradiction in Terms? Or: Why Women and Gender Are Essential to Understanding the World 'We' Live in. *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, 80(1), 75-87.

ZNAČAJ POLNE RAVNOPRAVNOSTI U DRŽAVAMA LATINSKE AMERIKE NAKON BREXIT-a

Apstrakt: U radu se ukazuje na značaj polne ravnopravnosti u državama Latinske Amerike nakon Brexit-a s aspekta duboke i tesne povezanosti ovog oblika ravnopravnosti s normativnom heteroseksualnošću. Osim toga, u radu se daje objašnjenje na osnovu koga je davno uspostavljen hegemonistički maskulinitet doveo ne samo do formiranja društva i države, već je doprineo i nastanku kapitalizma u periodu osvajanja i kolonizacije budućih država Latinske Amerike. Kapitalizam je uslovio stvaranje raznovrsnih i složenih

odnosa zasnovanih na kapitalu koji je omogućio procese nacionalnih i (pod)regionalnih integracija zahvaljujući (nepisanom) zakonu hegemonističkog maskuliniteta. Rad pojedinih međunarodnih organizacija, posebno onih koje se bave ekonomskim pitanjima prećutno se zasniva na zakonu hegemonističkog maskuliniteta. Za razliku od političkih i pravnih nauka u kojima je polna ravnopravnost našla svoje mesto, ekonomija i dalje pokazuje da odnosi među pojedincima u društvu i državi nastavljaju da zavise od hegemonističkog maskuliniteta. To znači da se ekonomsko poimanje polne ravnopravnosti vezuje za polnu neravnopravnost koju karakterišu stari binarni odnosi javnog-privatnog, nadređenosti-podređenosti i produktivnog-reproduktivnog između muškarca i žene. Ovi odnosi su takođe karakteristični za države Latinske Amerike.

Ključne reči: polna ravnopravnost, Latinska Amerika, *Brexit*, normativna heteroseksualnost, društvo, država, međunarodne organizacije, hegemonistički maskulinitet.

Received: 04.11.2018.

Revised: 7.12.2018.

Accepted: 21.12.2018.