

# DIRECTOR'S LECTURE

23 January 2002

**Speaker:** Anthony Giddens

Good afternoon everybody, I hope that you will have a marvellous term at the LSE. This lecture is the fourth lecture that I am giving in this series and I will be giving one more next week, same time, and the final lecture will be about democracy and its future. Today I am going to talk about the global revolution, really, in family patterns and I am very pleased to welcome – sitting here on the stage, looking very modest – Susie Orbach who is a visiting professor at the LSE and perhaps is the most famous person in the country writing about psychotherapy, psychoanalysis, their relation to social issues.

One of the main themes of what I have to say today is that the global changes that I discussed in previous lectures are not just big changes out there in the large institutions, they are also changes in here. They are also changes to do with our emotions and with our intimate lives. We have to chart out the implications of these transformations which are as world historical in scope of some of the bigger changes. Susie is in the forefront of proposing highly original interpretations of these transformations and their policy consequences for us. I am sure she is well known to everybody here: she has written a number of books that influence me very strongly, especially an early book -- which I thought was written in the 1990s but you say is written in the 1980s, so it shows you how time passes -- called *Hunger Strike*, about the changes affecting the body, bodily identity, eating disorders and how those are in some sense sweeping through many aspects of our lives. I suppose the most well known book is *Fat is a Feminist Issue* which is a global best-seller and she has just written a new book, which is called *On Eating*. These things might sound remote from the theme of the family but they are not as I will try to demonstrate in this lecture.

We will follow the same format as before: I will talk for about thirty-five minutes or so, Susie will ask me a couple of difficult questions and then we will have about ten minutes for questions from the audience.

Let me begin this lecture by just recounting a story which in this case is a true story of a friend of mine who is a world famous sociologist, who I won't name by name, but following the tradition of Kafka novels I'll call him 'H'.

H had, apparently on the surface, a straightforward family life up until aged about 30-32 or so. He had two children, he seemed a "normal" family person. He went to Greece on holiday and a tragedy happened there: his wife was killed in a car crash. After that time, for whatever reason, he changed his sexual orientation, he became gay, had a period of promiscuity in gay relationships and then settled down to a stable relationship with a partner, who I will call 'G', which has lasted about 15 years so far.

That is not the point of the story. Well it's part of the point of the story because there is something more mobile and fluid in people's sexual lives, their identification of self, the way in which we live our emotions and their relationship to our sexuality than there probably ever has been before. These are significant changes which we have to understand and also cope with in our personal lives. That is not the central point of the story, because the central point of the story is what happened next.

G, H's homosexual partner, has a sister, who is also gay and lives in a lesbian relationship. Well, the gay sister of G decided that she wanted a child and her partner asked G to impregnate her (through artificial technology) so that she would have a child. She then conceived and believe it or not, she

had twin boys and these twin boys are now cared for by the two women living in the lesbian relationship, but they are also cared for by the two gay men, because one of them after all is the biological father of the child. This situation is very different from the sorts of things we ordinarily associate with family life in orthodox discussions. Do these children have a father or not? Well, they do, they have a biological father, but what rights does that father have with the child, we don't really know. It isn't even clear in law what obligations G has towards the children that he biologically fathered. Is one of the women in a fathering relationship and the other in a mothering relationship to the child? I think that is an open question. H, with whom the story started, sees the children all the time: what is H's relationship to the children? The children in some sense have four close loving parents, but they are not the sort you would traditionally associate with the family.

Well I tell this anecdote, not only to give a sort of dramatic expression to the things that are happening around us in personal relationships and in family life but to ask you to think about the reactions to that phenomenon. This is a liberal institution and I think probably here most people's reactions would be what you could describe as the liberal reaction to that situation, which is essentially that the family is simply becoming more diverse, people are exploring different forms of sexuality and relationships, in the field of the family as in other areas we should, as it were, let a 1000 flowers bloom. We should not condemn people who live differently from the majority and should openly accept whatever kind of family life, no matter how different it looks from the past, that people are currently pioneering. That's one point of view, it is linked to a liberal position is the view I think that most liberal people will hold, but it is also a kind of sociological position too, which and I will come back to a bit later.

There is an alternative and opposite reaction, I think, which many people also take to the circumstances I just described, a much more critical and a hostile reaction. That reaction would be that what is happening here is an affront to the natural nature of human relationships and family life; that this kind of relationship should not be tolerated; that you cannot form a type of family which is so different from traditional families and still call it a family. I think this school of thought -- which tends to be, but is not inevitably, linked to rightist political positions -- would say that the family is in a state of crisis. There are so many things breaking down established and stable family life, which has many consequences for wider social problems. For example, many people link the so-called breakdown of the family to increasing criminality, to a feeling of disorientation, a lack of adequate parenting and so forth. So you find two quite dramatically opposed interpretations of this situation. Who is right?

Well, I would like to say who I think is right a bit later on, but to understand what is going on here one has to grasp that elements of the family today -- intimacy; our emotions; sexuality -- are undergoing changes as fundamental as those that I have described in previous lectures. They are directly related to and an expression of these wider social, economic and other changes and if you understand what is going on in the realm of the family, sexuality, intimacy, you can understand a good deal about what is happening in wider patterns of social life. These are not just personal issues they do, themselves, have a global dimension as I mentioned earlier.

What is happening in the family, what major changes are occurring? Well, there are many but I will stick to discussing just four, given the limitations of time.

Well, there are four basic changes affecting the family which are most advanced in western, industrial countries, but which are becoming global, which I think are largely irresistible and are largely positive, but they do bring some very profound problems with them and these are problems which refract back upon the example of the relationship between H and G which I just mentioned.

First, the family today in western countries and increasingly in other countries around the world is no longer primarily an economic unit, it is a set of relationships based much more upon

communication and especially based upon emotional communication. This is so familiar to us in the west, or most of us in the west, that it is hard to see that it is not the norm for most of the history of the family. The family has been above all an economic unit, the relationships within family life have been formed above all for economic and sometimes strategic political reasons too, in a broad sense of political. But this, by and large is no longer true and it is becoming less and less true in traditional cultures and societies around the world, as the changes that we have discussed associated with globalisation have their impact more or less everywhere. A good way of charting the change is to look at the changing position of children and the reasons why people have children. Putting it too crudely one could say that in the traditional family the family as it existed in traditional cultures and for hundreds of years across the world, the decision to have a child was basically a positive economic decision, that is to say if you have a child, especially in an agrarian setting, it is a positive economic benefit for you because having a child, or having several children, is crucial for the economic prosperity of the agrarian unit or a farming household. Children help look after the farmer at an early stage in their lives, they start working at five, six or seven often doing simple tasks of economic value and the decision to have a child is very much geared to tradition focussed around these economic considerations.

Virtually none of this is true today, what is actually the case is really the opposite. To have a child now is a massive economic cost in a western country or any country with a developing open market economy. You sitting here probably don't know how much you cost your parents but the cost of having a child in the UK, giving them a decent education, decent food to eat, decent life to live is estimated at something like £200,000 across the life-span of the child especially if that child goes into higher education when higher education is no longer completely supported by the state.

Across Europe, and this is becoming generalised to other countries too, there is a radical reduction in the birth rate, the greatest reduction I think ever seen. If you look at countries like Spain or Italy, they are in principle Catholic countries where the use of contraception is banned by the church, but where the average family size has gone down to about 1.2, a rate of reproduction well below what you would need to sustain those countries demographically. An average family size of 1.2 children is the lowest ever known in human history, but all across the European Union the average size in the European Union is only about 1.6 children, which is a truly remarkable thing, because the average family size only a generation ago was about 2.6 in the European Union countries, so there are big changes going on there. This is not only related to the fact that having a child is an economic cost, it is related to the fact that having a child is much more of an emotional decision than it used to be and we live in an era of what you could call the prized child. There is so much stuff around about child abuse and so forth that it is important to recognise the big cultural shift in our time is the prizing of children. A child is regarded as in many ways a highly privileged being in our contemporary culture, this was by and large not true for most of the past and it is not true in most traditional cultures where children were not prized in the sort of emotional legal way they are to us today. For us to kill a child is the worst crime you can commit but this was not true in medieval Europe and it has not been true in many cultures in the past. So there are very big shifts there which are really interesting I think, the implications for family life and lots of other things too.

Second big change happening is a generation ago the relationship between men and women, especially in orthodox marriage, was largely based on fixed roles. If you were a woman you knew what fate held in store for you: you could anticipate a life of domesticity, basically linked to the bringing up of children because even a generation ago as I said family size was larger than it is now. If you are a woman you might expect to work up until the time you were married, you might expect to have some kind of working life after that, but by and large your life tended to be a heavily domestic one. If you doubt that you only have to look back at recent social histories to see it was in fact true not just in the UK but of most industrial countries. The basic role for man in western countries was to be the breadwinner. That meant you went out to work and you were paid a family

wage, which was the way in which the family was supported.

In the course of a generation more or less all this has changed, roles are not fixed in a clear way they were in the past. Two years ago for the first time the proportion of women in the labour force overtook that of men in the UK, which again is an extraordinary change really. That means that in family life, in marriage, in other relationships between men and women or indeed same sex relationships, what you do is much more open to negotiation, how you behave is much more open to negotiation. It is no longer clear what it means to be a woman, what it means to be a man in terms of the obligations and the forms of identity which flow from it. There is a quite profound change in the nature of identity related to this which Susie has explored so beautifully in her books though she may very well differ with what I say about it. What is happening in my view anyway in relation to these changes is first of that we no longer live our lives so much in terms of what culture or what some kind of destiny held out for us, if you are a woman or a man you no longer have a kind of destiny which is fixed by your role. But more generally who we are as people is not given so much by the social roles we play, we all have to actively discover an identity. Or, to put it more technically, self-identity for us becomes a reflexive project, you have to endlessly work on who you are in relation to how you look, in relation to what you want to be and these have become much more open questions than they were in the past. This has a highly problematic aspect to it as well as an emancipatory one, but it is by and large an emancipatory phenomena I think. It is a form of freedom, the freedom to find out who you are rather than simply being told who you are by the wider society or by the roles that you are obliged to play in that society.

The third big change involves the changing position of women and their power relationships with men. Our societies are becoming more egalitarian in the relationship between the sexes. This is still a change which has a long way to go because if you look at the economic statistics for this country, for example, where women do the same jobs as men on average still earn less than men, we are far short of true economic equality. But the fact that there are so many women in the labour force has certainly radically changed, not just the position of women but of course the position of men too.

Now, in western countries levels of divorce have risen, depending on how you interpret the statistics, because it is not a simple matter actually. Probably one marriage in two that is contracted at the moment is likely to end in divorce in the UK. This statistic varies between different western countries but hovers around a similar figure. That is a tremendous transformation. It is linked to but it is not, of course, wholly caused by, the increasing emancipation of women. Women have more power in relation to family life than they ever had before, in law until about 20 or so years ago women were legally chattels of men in Britain and this has been true of most traditional cultures. That is women were legally the possessions of men, which meant if you were a married woman you had very few rights to divorce for instance and you lacked rights over your body and indeed over your sexual life too. The last residue of legal position of women as inferior to men in the UK was the legal impossibility of rape during marriage. In law a woman was her husband's possessions sexually, rape was not legally recognised as a phenomenon in marriage that was changed about twenty-five year or so ago only, it was as it was the last legal residue of the dominance of men over women.

It is a structural transformation which is global. If you look at the roots of fundamentalism around the world, they are indeed related not just to changes in the family, which many people find threatening but especially to the increasing emancipation of women, economically, culturally, politically. A striking feature of many forms of fundamentalism, I don't say all, but many forms of religious fundamentalism is hostility to women and radical rejection of the idea that women should be equal to men either inside the family or outside the family.

Fourthly, the position of women as the chattels of men was reflected in attitudes towards sexuality.

I think the big issues involve changes in family life centred upon the emotions associated with sexuality, where sexuality is understood in its broadest sense, not just sexual acts as such, but our relationship to what we are as sexual beings and in the context of the meetings and encounters that we have with others. Again, to put it somewhat too crudely, in most traditional cultures and in this culture, until recently (still persisting in its core aspects), there was a dualistic view of women which strongly impacted upon the sexuality of both sexes. This dualistic view of women was closely related to the legal status of women as inferior to men, division between the virtuous woman on the one hand, the well-behaved woman sexually if you like, who respects modesty and discipline in sexual life and the whore, the courtesan, the prostitute on the other.

Both sexes, I think in western culture and in many other cultures too, came to internalise this and it has a strong emotional impact, not just on the sexuality of men but on the sexuality of women too. What it meant essentially is well known, it is connected with double standards in Victorian times which meant that many men, especially actually lower class and upper class men particularly, it could be sexually relatively free, certainly in their sexual behaviour with fallen women, whereas women could not because if they did so they fell into the category of women who were outside the pale. That kind of division is something we are still struggling with, it is very much related to two forms of sexuality which you see so clearly among men and women. Conquest sexuality, serial sexuality of men, I suppose famously sort of James Bond in the early films type sexuality, is serious business because quite closely to the sexual violence of men against women. I think the attempt to control women sexually is still a very important part of the psyche of many men in our culture. Of course, women also seek to control men sexually and this is also very much bound up with the dualistic view of sexuality which is still deeply ingrained in spite of the fact that most of us declare it in principle to be wrong.

What do you make of all this? Well, I think what you make of all this, is that neither of the two views which I mentioned at the beginning, is wholly acceptable. Certainly if you have a liberal view of the world you have to say that it is important to recognise that there is a proliferation of ways in which people now live their lives and this has to spread into sexual relationships. Certainly this has to involve rights for gay people to form relationships, to have children, and to have legally recognised forms of marriage; I think that will almost certainly come in most western societies.

It does not follow from that I think that you would necessarily then endorse an open liberal view, with no morality of the family or that you simply let people do what they want in the sphere of family life. I think that makes no sense. Now it is just one way of grasping what is going on in the political and policy ramifications of it in the area of family life and sexuality is the emergence of what I have called a democracy of the emotions. Emotional democracy, is an implicit outcome of the changes I have described, which Susie has written about to some extent in different terminology, that of emotional literacy which she also relates to wider political issues. I originally got the idea just by chance. I had David Held's book *Models of Democracy* on my desk when I was writing about sexuality. I was reading books by therapists about what a good relationship was like and David has a list of the traits and characteristics of democracy in his book, which was open on the desk as well and it just struck me how similar they are. That is, the characteristics of a good relationship described by therapists actually very similar to the characteristics of democracy as identified in completely differently literature of political theory. Let me just list what they are:

In a democracy as in a good relationship you have equality. Well that means for a start to have a strong family, which is also a democratic family you have to escape from core characteristics of the traditional family where men and women were never equal, by and large it was never true that men and women were equal in a traditional family. So equality is something we need to work towards in our emotional lives as well as in the formal sphere of politics.

In a democracy you have communication, you are able to talk to other people, discuss issues with them in the public domain. Well, the same thing applies to a good relationship.

In a democracy you have trust in leaders, you have trust in your fellow citizens, well the same thing applies in a good relationship. In a good relationship you have to open yourself to the other person. In a contemporary relationship you do not just get the trust of the other person, you have to show yourself worthy of the trust of the other person. You have to display aspects of yourself, your feelings, your ideas if a person is to trust you. This is problematic for many men who are not used to that kind of intimacy as a means of forming relationships, women are actually more used to it than most men are.

A democracy is a political sphere where decisions are not taken through violence and this surely also has to be a minimal demand of a good relationship.

What I am saying here in summary is that there are many problems produced in our lives by these changes there are problems of the self, the problems of obsession, there are problems of compulsiveness. If you have more freedom to form your own personal identity, your life can be invaded by a kind of compulsive attitude towards that project if you can't master it properly, in eating disorders, such as Susie discusses. Young women have to manage a change power relation in relation to their physical identity in a world where women are still subject to the gaze of others and are judged by their appearance much more than men are. They have to manage all that in a very difficult, conflicting, changing personal and wider social environment and if you cannot manage it you can often adopt rigid behaviour patterns which then, as it were, dominate your life rather than you dominating them. You can say that in some aspects of our lives when things go wrong compulsiveness has replaced tradition. You have a kind of frozen relationship to your past which you cannot really manage.

I think you need strong families to have a solitary society, but strong families now, I think, must be built upon equality of the sexes and they must be built upon the other characteristics I just mentioned. I don't say that they are because in many cases so plainly they are not. But you should remember that democracy in the public sphere does not describe what happens in the public sphere, it describes a series of ideals about how the best kind of participatory public system of power could be organised. The same thing applies in family life. We can see how you can get a legal moral framework for a decent family life where families would again be strong where you could rely on other people, but they wouldn't look simply like traditional families. They would conform to the norms I just identified.

Finally, mustn't be too serious about all of this and would just like to finish with bon mot of Woody Allen, because Woody Allen says more about these things than I could ever do, in spite of all I have said about democracy and sexuality and so forth. Among his bon mots is the following: "Sex without love is an empty experience, but as empty experiences go, it's one of the best!"

### **Susie Orbach**

Thank you, Tony. I was meant to give a ravishing introduction to Tony but actually his talk as usual has been...

### **Anthony Giddens**

Hope you recognise "ravishing" is an ambiguous term.

### **Susie Orbach**

No, no I meant beautiful. I have got all these notes about what a brilliant speaker and what an important person he has been in terms of bringing something about the politics of intimacy into

public discourse from a sociological perspective and how critical that has been in allowing issues that have been raised by feminism and issues raised by psychoanalysis and ordinary people to be taken up. So let alone all his other accomplishments I am very grateful for him to have done that, but I actually wanted to start with your last comment, because I wonder if that last comment cute as it is...

**Anthony Giddens**

I knew I should never have said it.

**Susie Orbach**

Goes to the heart of...

**Anthony Giddens**

It reflects my own inability to live up to the sorts of things I was describing.

**Susie Orbach**

No, no, come on, don't be defensive I haven't discussed your belt, I haven't analysed it, I haven't done anything like that. I am just wondering whether one of the issues that is still, in fact has got hyped in the recent period, is that although there is greater egalitarianism or equality between women and men there is a kind of sexualising of relationships. Don't get me wrong I like sex, so it is not about extracting sex from it. There has been something that has happened it seems to me in the last ten years where the notion that sex is great, even if it is divorced from relationship, is something that women are really having to struggle with and being quite unhappy with, even if they are involved in it. I wonder whether one of the things that really needs to be on the agenda which would be a way of struggling around the pool to fundamentalism that is produced by the changes between women and men is if we looked at the issues of emotional dependency rather than simply looked at issues of equality and economic equality and identity. Because I think what one of the things that women have been running out of relationships for over the last twenty-five to thirty years is that men simply don't know how to deliver emotions, they might know how to fuck but they don't really know how to...

**Anthony Giddens**

[INAUDIBLE]...on the world wide web so now we are in trouble.

**Susie Orbach**

In one of the few ways that men were able to express their vulnerability was in this very tricky moment where they were also expressing their power around their sexuality and the idea that men's vulnerability and their own acknowledgement of their own need and desire and emotional connection and their own capacity to give has some how been absent except through – I mean once you take away money which was the way that men gave in the old ways and women gave emotionally, it wasn't simply about domestic labour it was about the reproduction of emotional life, wasn't it. It seems to me that puts a real challenge to this generation of men across the world and your comment about sex at the end, or Woody Allen's, it goes to the heart of one of the areas of difficulty. Is that going to be a good enough area for contact, because if we need families we also need attachments and we need a kind of containing situation in which not simply people's sexual desires can be recognised but their emotional needs too.

**Anthony Giddens**

Yes, I must say I think that is a very profound comment and I wish I could answer it the depth that it needs really. I mean when I wrote this book, you remember, Susie, on transformation of intimacy I suggested that the normal kind of adage about men and women, men want sex and women want love, that it might be interesting to suppose that the opposite is true and that if you think of the

opposite being true you get an interesting twist on dependency and relationships. I think the truth is there are ambivalences around both of these for both sexes. It is completely right that dependency is a negative way of putting it, but you have also got an emotionally satisfactory way of relating to another person that sustains a relationship across time and also delivers quite a lot to yourself personally. I think that it is one of the big tests of living with all of this now really and I think that is really edged with compulsiveness...

### **Susie Orbach**

Can we deconstruct the notion of dependency, because I think this is one of the problems where it has been a dirty word and we really need to rehabilitate the notion of it because we have got a confusion between emotional dependency and attachment and economic dependency which is something that nobody wants to be. I am not sure that I bring the connotation although I think that women have had to struggle very hard to get away from it having a negative connotation that dependency has actually. I think dependency is central to the human project and it is only through dependency that one can actually feel autonomous, that the whole problem of independence is that one is disconnected. Where one acknowledges the nexus of relationships that one is embedded in, takes them seriously, and honours them, then it is possible to create some kind of self that is separate and underpinned.

### **Tony Giddens**

I agree with that except I think it would be very hard now to free the notion of dependency from its negative connotations because in the welfare state debate you have got a whole literature of cultural dependency and economic dependency and so on, it is now hedged around with the idea that it makes you in some sense impotent, whether sexually or otherwise I don't know, but certainly in a welfare state debate, if you are dependant you are treated as someone who doesn't have enough autonomy. So, maybe the thing is to invent another word or certainly to turn the word around because, it just seems to me that so much of our lives is now bound up with negotiating this series you have written about so well: self identity; sexuality; emotions and the trade offs of trust and mechanisms of trust and risk which I've discussed quite a bit in relation to more general institutional issues to do with, for example, financial markets.

But I do agree with what you are saying.

You could see the emotional mechanism of dependency as a very positive thing, because it is somehow the centre of it all, isn't it?

### **Susie Orbach**

Well, that goes to the heart of what you see the human project as being a battle, how human beings come to be human, what distinguishes them from others. But that is a whole other question.

Let me just go to the issue of trust, because I think that is another interesting thing that you have touched on and from my discipline. In psychotherapy and psychoanalysis you are always working on the impediments to trust, that people say, "I just want to trust somebody" but actually their unconscious experience is of not being in a position where they feel safe enough to trust and so one is looking at the shadow of trusting, if you like, and the impossibility of trusting. Part of the project of what I am doing is looking at dare somebody trust, dare somebody take the risk to trust and yet the world operates as though trust is an entirely unproblematic phenomena and that trusting is kind of a act of will. Trust in a way it is another one of those questions that I would like to see you interrogate in a slightly more complex way in relation to both financial markets but also interpersonal relationships and our understanding of what the contract is about trust, because I am not sure trust is the right word, I think when you are talking about opening up and engaging, you are actually talking about taking a risk you are not really talking about trust.

### **Anthony Giddens**

I would say I am talking about trust, because I think you only need to trust when you have got uncertainty so trust intrinsically related to risk and uncertainty. Where you are 100% confident of either another person or of a system I don't think you would be said to trust them because there is no mechanism for trust there. You only need trust when things could happen to you or the other person, you use trust to get over those uncertainties, that is what trust does for you. But whether you call it trust or not ... I think, the psychodynamics of trusting the other person are so complicated. One of the things that we have discovered in personal life and in larger forms of institutional trust is that it takes quite a while to build up trust, whether with another person or in a system, for example peasants in southern Italy still won't trust banks and they keep all their money in the form of gold bars under beds. People in large chunks of Russia won't trust banks with their money. It is an extraordinary thing to do actually, to trust a bank with your money and we just more or less now do it as a matter of course. That is something that has to be built up, but what literature shows is that although it takes a long while to build up trust, trust can be destroyed very quickly. So a single act of infidelity, for example, can take ages to re-establish trust, you might never ever recover from that. All sorts of really interesting frailties and to some extent positive emotions are built around that relationship between trust, risk and uncertainty I think in emotional life as well as elsewhere.

Right, well thanks for that. We have only got time for one question from the audience so it had better be a good one!

### **Audience Question**

One of the biggest changes it strikes me looking at the family is privacy and how our attitudes to that has changed and how on all levels it seems now that you need to conduct relationships in the public gaze so to speak, the family life has been very much opened up to intervention and discussion by governments, therapy, even the media and I just wondered if you think that the fact there is now this imperative to conduct personal relationships in the public gaze provides a barrier to true intimacy which it would seem to me is by its own nature private.

### **Anthony Giddens**

I think that is also a really interesting question, but I think it is a bit more complicated than maybe you were implying because if you look at the rise of privacy, privacy is something which more or less in western cultures came into being from the late 18<sup>th</sup> century onwards. I don't know if you have heard of Norbert Elias who is a famous sociologist of civilisation and he shows in medieval times there were no corridors, for example, in houses so that everyone could see even in aristocratic homes, if you go into an aristocratic home you will see you go directly from one room into another. So many things including sexual activity seemed to be much more visible and the idea of privacy seems to be in some part a cultural creation of the rise of bourgeois society and the rise of modern individualism.

But I do agree that now there is a new form of spectacle and Michel Foucault has analysed that I think rather well because it is no longer just a simple movement to increasing privacy, there is an opposite movement towards making a spectacle of one's life, that is opening out to the gaze of others. I don't think it is just true the state plays a role in it, the state plays a role in that is clear and that is a sort of disciplinary role so that if you want to get benefits you have to disclose large aspects of your life for example to the welfare officer so they become public. I think there is a sort society of the spectacle emerging and that is probably from many causes but one is the role of the media because the role of the media redefines the nature of relationship between public and private and hence you get the rise of people going on these shows and saying what to most of us appear the most extraordinary things about their personal lives and things which we would normally think to be private, become on public display. I think in our own lives there is much more of a mixture

though you would find quite strong aspects of culturally created privacy in our own lives and a refusal to speak often. For example, if you are a man and you have male friends I can tell you you do not know what most of your male friends do in bed, you know nothing about their sexual lives. This is not true I believe of most women and so privacy is a complex thing and it is sexually or it is gender structured and so there is not a simple movement in that way I think as you were implying, but it is a very interesting observation though.

Well, thank you all for coming, hope to see you next week.