I am most pleased to introduce The Men’s Studies Press’s fifth scholarly periodical, entitled Culture, Society & Masculinities. CS&M proposes a wide angle focus on men and masculinity, engaging with the full spectrum of social, cultural and international studies. The Men’s Studies Press specifically invites papers discussing questions and problems of scale and context in research and theory formation. This purview is to resonate with the endurably transdisciplinary as well as increasingly cross-contextual scope of “men/masculinities” as a research area. Indeed this resonance is likely to partake in the area debate that has characterized the theme from the late 1970s to date, as well as in the qualitative, reflective, and critical momentum of most of its theorizing.

The nation state as well as international relations, particularly, have been central dimensions in the study of male genders. Specifically, social geography, transnational institutions, international conflict studies, and anthropology have become well-established academic frameworks within which the particulars of male genders have been pursued. This academic dispersion in part suggests, in part requires, that gender questions are to be asked across many different settings worldwide, if a healthy querying of the transatlantic genealogy of many of these questions is to be achieved. A recent bibliographic exploration (Janssen, 2008) suggests this critical work is now well under way. However, with transatlantic genealogy we do not mean to say that there have not been fundamental dissonances between and within West-European and American ways of thinking men; indeed, here lies an ongoing historical project falling securely within the scope of CS&M.

How questions of scale relate to theoretical mobility remains a highly interesting topic for discussion as well. Raewyn Connell, one of the leading theorists of masculinity as a plural formation, has proposed a macro-sociological appraisal that would have to move “beyond” what had been the field’s “ethnographic moment” in the 1990s, and “proceed” with increasingly global topographies of institutions and networks—exemplified by the transnational corporation of late capitalism. Yet globalization, or more broadly the worlding of ideas, narratives and opinions, continues to intrigue sociologists, anthro-
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pologists, and economists of gender, thus inviting ongoing dialogue and critique on how it should or may relate to theoretical ambition. Connell’s recent work on *Southern Theory* (2007) in fact caters very well to this question of theoretical plurality, and Connell agrees there is “no single formula that accounts for men and globalization” (2005, p. 1805). Others including Charlotte Hooper (2000) signal that internationalism necessarily translates to “multiple masculinities.” To anthropologists, moreover, “masculinity” pertains to profound as well as subtle variability in how local semantics of gender are thought to coagulate with global political discourses around and about genders. To *proceed*, then, may require an enduring attempt to map theory formation and mundane identity practices onto each other, to see at what scale both may (and perhaps: *should*) operate. That is to say, querying masculinity will refer as much to *theories of culture* as to *cultures of theory*. “Rather than assuming that universal theories can be translated across different cultures, we need to appreciate within a globalised world that we must engage with cultural, religious and spiritual traditions,” writes Victor Seidler (2006, p. 104).

Our inaugural issue lives up to CS&M’s internationalist scope, with contributions on Japan, India, Ghana, and Europe. Chris Forth, Romit Dasgupta, and Michael Meuser provide synoptic reviews of men/masculinities as a regionalized nexus of academic reflection and public concern: against the background of circum-Atlantic modernities, as challenged by the economic malaise of late modern corporate Japan, and within post-WW II German-speaking Europe, respectively. Akosua Adomako Ampofo, Michael P. K. Okyerefo and Michael Pervarah explore notions of biological paternity among urban Ghanaian men, relating ideas of manhood and virility to local metaphors and discourses of male performance, productivity, and ownership. Radhika Chopra explores why an analytic appraisal of the Indian figure of the *ghar jawai* (co-resident son-in-law) as a “househusband” is deficient, even though both are shamed figures of *ectopy*, of men out-of-place. Instead Chopra locates the *ghar jawai* within North Indian kinship and residence structures, but also examines how these structures hold up in migration communities. Her paper, thus, exposes translation problems at the level of sociological theorizing specifically where this theorizing is concerned with a mapping of gender onto other architectural elements of domestic sociality. Concluding this inaugural issue, Jeff Hearn and Keith Pringle sketch the contours of comparative critical research on men in Europe, with an eye on notions of “European-ness,” as well as on “continuities and discontinuities between cultural formations and (trans)national systems.”

To conclude, The Men’s Studies Press hopes CS&M will provide a stimulus to diverse and inclusive scholarship on themes involving men/masculinities. Moreover, we hope to honor research that engages critically with issues of “voice” and with the caveat of theoretical contraction, as briefly referred to above. Starting with two issues per year, we are looking forward to work with authors in sharing their research with their colleagues and wider academic audiences.
For formal instructions to authors, please refer elsewhere in this issue or visit http://www.mensstudies.com/content/121105.
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