Research Article

Ben Little, Alison Winch*

"just hanging out with you in my back yard": Mark Zuckerberg and Mediated Paternalism

Abstract: In a video that showcases a new Facebook feature, Mark Zuckerberg chats to his users, telling them that he's "just hanging out with you in my backyard." In this video—which is on his Facebook page—Zuckerberg discloses the domestic space of his backyard, revealing his interaction with family and friends. Depicted hosting a barbeque while watching the electoral debate, Zuckerberg performs an affective white postfeminist paternity (Hamad, 2014) by talking about hunting, eating meat, and being a father. This video is key in explaining how Zuckerberg affectively models patriarchal power. We argue that this PR exercise (for both him and Facebook which are portrayed as inextricably linked) functions to represent Facebook as enabling an empowered "community," rather than being just an instrument of data accumulation. In particular, Zuckerberg's affective paternalism is also a means to recoup and obfuscate patriarchal power structures. Zuckerberg's Facebook page constructs an intimate paternalism in relation to his domestic sphere, but also to his followers, and this works to legitimate his corporate and global paternalism. The ways in which he is portrayed through signifiers of an emotional fatherhood work to gloss his power as the third richest man in the world.

Keywords: digital, patriarchy, capitalism, Silicon Valley, masculinity

In this article we renew "patriarchy" as a key critical term to understand the structures of contemporary power and culture. More specifically, we examine what patriarchy looks like in the context of digital capitalism as this is the formation of cultural and economic power that is emerging as a dominant force in global politics and society. The American companies driving this change are owned by a small number of men who are also among the richest people in the world; namely, Jeff Bezos, Mark Zuckerberg, Larry Page, Sergey Brin. This is a timely intervention as Angela McRobbie reminds us that there is a taboo in an "outright critique of male domination," and "likewise a reluctance to resurrect and reinstate "old" categories such as masculine dominance, patriarchy or male power" (17). As this is an ongoing project that cannot be fully realized in a single article, here we will focus on Mark Zuckerberg's self-representation in order to investigate how he glosses patriarchal power through paternalist logics.

In an interview for CNN in June 2017, Mark Zuckerberg discusses Facebook's new brand strategy—or "mission"—which is to "bring the world closer together." Zuckerberg discusses how Facebook aims "to give everyone a voice" and "make people better connected, especially to friends and family"; this could be by giving internet access to communities in the global South, or by championing a closed women's group on Facebook that, according to Zuckerberg, can provide support to women facing domestic violence (Segall). With speculation mounting that he is about to run for president, as evidenced in the comments on Zuckerberg's Facebook page but also the mainstream and specialist business media (Bilton, Lafrance, Leswing), Zuckerberg offers CNN's audience a more liberal brand of politics than the one rolled out by Donald Trump. Zuckerberg denies his political ambitions (Kantrowitz and Tiku). However, his increasingly politicised posts as well as his commitment to visit every state in America and share meals with traditional

*Corresponding author: Alison Winch, Media Department, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK,
E-mail: alison.winch@uea.ac.uk
Ben Little, Politics Department, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK

Democrat voters who voted for Trump (Solon "Mark Zuckerberg's 2017 plan"), reveal that he is at the very least threatening an intervention into formal politics.

During the CNN interview, Trump is not mentioned, and Zuckerberg works hard to maintain a superficial emotiveness by invoking the intimate sphere of friends and family. Nevertheless, in making links between caring for loved ones and global change, he disseminates an alternative vision of capitalism; one which ostensibly celebrates diversity, democracy and feelings of intimacy—all of which can (handily) take place with and through his platform. The political nature of this interview is significant. But it is also significant that Zuckerberg is appearing on CNN. In contrast to celebrity CEOs who typically rely on the mainstream media (Littler), Zuckerberg usually spreads information via his own Facebook platform, which is then taken up as material for newspapers, blogs, online journals (which then recirculate through Facebook itself). The spat in July 2017 between Zuckerberg and Elon Musk over the future of artificial intelligence that was circulated in the press, for example, used a video that Zuckerberg made in his backyard while having a barbeque (Solon "Killer Robots?").

These casual encounters with Zuckerberg, where he smokes meats and answers questions from his followers are the equivalent within digital capitalism of F. D. Roosevelt's fireside chats and while irregular, they seem to be Zuckerberg's preferred means of direct encounter with his userbase. This article focuses on another of these backyard barbeque videos—"Grill Talk" (Zuckerberg's name)—that was made in October 2016. This video was created partly in order to promote Facebook's live video feature which was relatively new at the time. We can see how the video models Facebook's affective brand strategy, as it represents Zuckerberg sitting in the domestic space of his backyard with his wife, daughter and dog as well as two close friends, while talking to his global followers. The video was made during the presidential election, which suggests that Zuckerberg wants his platform to be a vehicle for discussing politics and elections. In addition, Zuckerberg uses this opportunity to talk about his philanthropic work in the Chan-Zuckerberg Initiative. It is important to note how he uses Facebook (both in terms of profits and reach) for his "philanthrocapitalism" (Edwards).

This video is pertinent because it predates Zuckerberg's more explicit intervention into political debates, as evidenced in the CNN interview. However, we can already see some of those later promotional strategies being seeded. We understand these promotional strategies to be a form of mediated paternalism. These techniques are harnessed to justify a public authority, whether this is in relation to his global network, philanthropy or ideological intervention. In this video—and on his Facebook page—Zuckerberg models Facebook's intimate connections via a paternalistic performance. This performance of fatherhood, barbequing in his backyard with family apparently like any ordinary American Facebook user, then functions to legitimate his status as the third richest man in the world and CEO of a corporation that has near monopolised social media platforms with a growing ability to control online public space. Using the work of Hamad on "postfeminist fatherhood" and Marshall on the paternalism of political leaders, we argue that Zuckerberg exploits his location in a traditional family structure to naturalise his masculine authority in the public realm.

Digital Capitalism

Representations of paternalism—as well as the emotions and intensities it invokes—can be articulated to the continued dominance of patriarchy as a structuring social system and framework for the distribution of power in the digital age. The shifting interrelations of politics, economics and culture in the wake of the transformations information and communication technologies have wrought on societies in the global North has given rise to a broad range of writing within cultural studies and other scholarly spaces that approach contemporary digital capitalism in a critical manner. Classic studies of digital technology and society by Castells, Barbrook and Cameron, or Manovich in the 1990s sought to understand the way ICTs were changing our society, ideology and textuality (respectively). These key early works have given rise to a broad literature on digital politics and culture that can be brought to bear on the study of Facebook and thus provide us with insight into the nature and reach of Zuckerberg's power.

One of the more significant recent arguments is from Shoshana Zuboff, who, focusing on law and surveillance culture, claims that (after Polanyi) we are entering a full digital enclosure of reality. Much as currency was an enclosure of human exchange, and real estate the enclosure of land, so is the digital revolution, through the commodification into data of every kind of human activity, an enclosure of the whole of human reality itself. The fear is that this "produces the possibility of modifying the behaviors of persons and things for profit and control" (Zuboff 85). This is, she argues, a major point of civilizational transition and Mark Zuckerberg as the founder-owner of the most valuable data-orientated social network is the largest individual economic beneficiary of that change as well the private individual most able to access these new technologies of control and with little democratic oversight.

Moreover political economy approaches see Facebook as an exemplar of critiques of capitalism's shift to platforms and thus monopolies (Srnicek; Williams) and its focus on algorithms as forms of labour (Terranova); perspectives which require new understandings of capital's social dominance. Approaches closer to the usual concerns of media and cultural studies include how digital technologies, and particularly social networking sites, are transforming identity and subjectivity (Papacharissi; Hearn), while attention is also paid to the way in which software shifts power relations in sophisticated ways (Goffey; Fuller and Goffey). These are a limited set of examples, but all are helpful for us to understand and describe Zuckerberg's power as inscribed in his platform and these arguments sit behind and alongside the analysis presented here.

Many starting points for critical investigations into digital domains look at what the novel affordances and features of the changes wrought by these technologies are and what remains the same. The classic example of this from media theory is the concept of "remediation" (Bolter and Grusin) that suggests "new media" largely represents a repackaging in digital form of old media. The email is a digital form of the letter, streaming of television and so on.

We are also looking at how the old is reformulated in the new, but with a different starting point. Rather than the technologies themselves, we're primarily interested in the manner in which the reproduction of patriarchy occurs in a society shaped by digital transformations. While there has been much written about gender and the digital looking at both feminine (Banet-Weiser), masculine (Hakim), trans and queer manifestations of gender (Farber), and the emerging digital manosphere (Ging), much less has been written about patriarchy as the dominant structure within which these gender identities circulate. Even less has been said about the way in which patriarchy is articulated to capitalism in the specific forms it takes in the network society (although see for instance Fuchs where the focus is on audiences and their commodification rather than our focus here on the dominant figures—the patriarchs themselves—in the industry). Our current project "The New Patriarchs of Digital Capitalism," of which this article presents early findings, aims to address that gap. The kinds of questions we are asking are: How do we make sense of these Silicon patriarchs, their power, their businesses and their wealth? How can we understand their influence politically, culturally and ideologically? More specifically in this case how can looking at a Facebook live video of Zuckerberg smoking meat help us address digital capitalist patriarchy?

Reading the Zuckerberg-Facebook Assemblage

Facebook is the most used social network in the world. With over two billion accounts connecting people to other accounts, businesses, media outlets and user-generated content it has attracted a lot of academic attention. As long ago as 2012, with a mere 845 million users, Chander declared that the corporation met at least two of the four requirements of being a nation-state (according to the Montevideo Convention on Statehood) and that Zuckerberg was remarkable as a CEO in that he effectively had set up a diplomatic core to represent Facebook's interest to various nation-states across the world. Partzch argues that through examples like Zuckerberg we can see that: "power has not only shifted away from state actors over the last two and a half decades. It is further increasingly concentrated on very few individuals with relevant resources, and this causes new problems of democratic accountability and legitimacy" (Partzch 6). This article departs from other important work that has been done on Facebook in media and cultural studies

and cognate disciplines, whether this is the sociological work in intimate life (Chambers) or case studies on Facebook. Instead, we understand the platform as being in a symbiotic relationship with its CEO and approach it as such. Due to its exotic stock classifications, Zuckerberg has a voting majority on a minority shareholding making Facebook legally a "controlled company" (i.e. one in which a single voice has sole decision-making power). With limited ways in which his authority can be challenged by his board, and little in the way of regulation to prevent him from shaping the company to his will, the relationship between the founder, his company and the forms of self-representation that take place on the company owned platform are of a very particular kind. This means that our analysis of his page cannot simply be that of an ordinary Facebook user or, indeed the publicity page of a corporate CEO.

In considering Grill Talk we are not just conducting a textual analysis of the material in the video, but considering it in light of the wider assemblage (Deleuze and Guattari; Delanda) that brings together a number of human and inhuman elements. Thus, the Zuckerberg we see in the video is not "merely" a man in his backyard, but a "more-than-human assemblage" (Renold; Braidotti; Massumi) that both incorporates textual elements available for analysis as well as contextual factors that shape how we approach the material. The Zuckerberg-Facebook assemblage includes (among other things): Facebook as a specific acquisitive corporation; Facebook as a platform (covering advertising, communications and e-commerce); as an entanglement of users' posts, relatedness, data collection, and self-narrativising; and Zuckerberg as mediated man producing an affective intimate and political paternalism. It's important to note that when we discuss Zuckerberg, we are locating him within this assemblage. Grill Talk is part press release, part interview, part social influencer "YouTube" video, part reality television segment, part home video, and part advert. Importantly, however, both for its function and our analysis of it, the video is located as part of Zuckerberg's Facebook page, and this has the same functionality as any other. What drives audiences to the page (including journalists who then report on the page) is the "institutional weight" (Marshall 216) that Zuckerberg has as the owner of the platform.

Some elements of the assemblage are more available to analysis than others. For instance, the breadth of its impacts and affects is apparent indexically through the comments, in that they demonstrate the range of concerns, interests and attachments that the video audience bring to its viewing. For ethical reasons, we have agreed it would be inappropriate to cite these comments directly as we cannot be sure if users are considering their posts on the video as public or private and anonymity cannot be assured (Townsend and Wallace). However, the themes in the comments are instructive: simple questions about the products being used; criticism of meat eating; pleas for money and/or support; simple "shout-outs" asking for recognition for a place or team; job requests; comments on the backyard setting and more. Zuckerberg responds to a (very limited) number of the positive comments in the manner of a town hall meeting.

While we cannot read this as an "ordinary" Facebook post, we can still deploy some of the same tools for interpreting it. We approach Grill Talk using textual analysis. This is a traditional way of making sense of the production of digital media. However, as Skeggs and Yuill point out, Facebook "works with traditional forms of narrative and discourse to produce a particular genre of self-revelation," as well as being a site of data accumulation (7). On Zuckerberg's Facebook page, there are many images of his domestic life whether these are of his dog, Beast, his wife Priscilla Chan or his daughter Maxima Chan Zuckerberg. Significantly, Zuckerberg is framed at the centre or head of the family. For example, he is located physically above his wife and daughter in a Halloween photograph posted on November 1, 2016. The relationship between Zuckerberg and Chan is also romanticised by photographs posted on Valentine's day or anniversaries. These images and posts work to reveal the Zuckerberg's strong family bonds and emotive structure. The posts—particularly after the election of Trump, follow a similar pattern: they promote a new Facebook feature, reveal part of Zuckerberg's intimate life; and make an ideological statement about American or global politics. These three formats are usually segmented into separate posts, but at key moments they merge together. It is one such example we look at here.

Grill Talk is a 30-minute video that was posted on October 10, 2016, and by July 2017 has had over 11 318 754 views. Posted next to the video is the text, "Live grilling in my backyard." The video starts with Zuckerberg sitting on one of two supermarket brand patio chairs, and the camera is angled so that we can only see the chairs and the barbeque equipment directly behind. His barbeque equipment includes the

brand Big Green Egg and The General by MakGrill which provide talking points with his friends, family and followers. As well as these brands Zuckerberg mentions Sweet Baby Rays Sauce, Volkswagen and AT&T. We cannot get a sense of how big the yard is and we cannot see the house, which downplays Zuckerberg's wealth and reinforces his ordinariness as does the choice of middle-market brands ("Volkswagen" or People's Car for instance). He begins the video by talking about smoking meats, the triathlon he started that morning, killing animals for food, and the Facebook company. About thirteen minutes into the video Chan and Max enter the screen and sit in the empty chair. Zuckerberg holds Max up to the camera for a few seconds and talks to Chan about their daughter eating her first rib. Chan and Max then inspect the smoking meats and stay off camera or in its periphery for the rest of the video. Subsequently, Zuckerberg picks up the dog Beast and talks about him briefly. Finally, his two friends—Sam Lessin and Joe Green—arrive. Lessin sits in the chair next to Zuckerberg and Green squats behind. During the rest of the video, they look at meats, talk about cooking, answer some of the comments' questions and drink beer. The video ends with Lessin, Green and Zuckerberg saying goodbye to the camera before Zuckerberg needs to take a call for work. The apparently everyday American heteronormativity of the scene—"there's nothing more American than a barbeque and a presidential debate," says Joe—including its gender division, is crucial for understanding the mediated paternalism being curated here.

Postfeminist Fatherhood and Work's Intimacy

Patriarchy is a social, sexual and political system where society, culture and individuals (including other men) are organised under male domination. This system is deemed to be the natural order; one that is maintained through hierarchy and "coercive authority" (hooks). hooks' full definition is worth remembering here too: "imperialist white-supremacist capitalist patriarchy," as it best describes "the interlocking political systems" that are the foundations of U.S. politics—and by extension the politics of most of the global North, as well as its imperialist impacts on the global South. Indeed, it is pertinent how this video – and the Zuckerberg-Facebook assemblage—enact an American imperialism, whether this is normalising American culture in a global context, the philanthrocapitalism of the Chan-Zuckerberg Initiative, or attempting to monopolise the world's social networking platforms. What is also productive about hooks' definition is that she makes links between how political patriarchal structures organise family formations, as well as performances of gender. What is key in terms of the emotional thrust of Grill Talk is the link that hooks makes between the patriarchal structure of the household and the nation-state, which in this case also includes the Facebook-Zuckerberg assemblage.

It is important to retain the connection with the father and with patriarchal capitalism (capitalism has of course always been patriarchal) because it demonstrates how patriarchal power can wield itself in different contexts, but also how capitalism and patriarchy reinforce and legitimate each other. The anthropologist, Sherry B. Ortner, gives a useful description of a patriarchal system. She argues that it is "organized around three dyads and their many kinds of interaction": "(1) the relationship between a patriarchal figure of some sort and other men; (2) the many homosocial but heterosexual relationships among the men themselves; and (3) the relationships between men and women" (532). This definition is productive because it demonstrates that patriarchal systems are also relations between men that are constantly being negotiated. That is, men compete and collaborate with other men, and men hold power over other men. We discuss this further in the next section when analysing the friends' interaction in the Grill Talk video as well as the various performances of hegemonic masculinity.

One of the ways that patriarchy is protected is through discourses of paternalism. It is a discourse in the Foucauldian sense, where the power of the father in the conventional heteronormative family sphere holds an affective sway when discursively constituted in other arenas. Paternalism has a significant emotional charge, that can be seen in the affective formation of postfeminist fatherhood as enacted by Zuckerberg in his Facebook page. In Grill Talk—and throughout the Facebook page—Zuckerberg harnesses a commonsense and heteronormative intimate paternalism by the way that he performs his interaction with his wife and daughter. We argue this intimate paternalism of postfeminist fatherhood functions to

legitimate his paternalist (and philanthrocapitalist) status at the head of his global network. Furthermore, Zuckerberg exploits the paternalism of postfeminist fatherhood as well as the paternalism of philanthropy to secure, reinforce and cement patriarchal power.

Patriarchy as a political critique has dropped out of fashion (partly because postmodernists regarded it as a totalising metanarrative), although it is still powerfully used by critical race theorists and feminist critics of capitalism. For the most part, the focus has shifted to gender. Part of the reason why patriarchy lost currency as a strategic part of feminist analysis is due to the pervasiveness of what Rosalind Gill coins "a postfeminist sensibility." This sensibility is entangled with neoliberal discourses so that femininity is constructed by capitalist practices, while still being interpellated as a naturalised category. In addition, feminist concepts such as choice, empowerment and agency are re-located or commodified as attributes of an aspirational lifestyle. According to Gill, within a postfeminist media culture, there are—among other descriptors—an increased emphasis upon self-surveillance, monitoring and self-discipline, as well as a focus on individualism. Recognising the intricate relationship between femininity, anti-feminism and capitalism, Angela McRobbie argues that in a postfeminist culture, young women are engaged in a "new sexual contract" whereby a critique of patriarchy—and a recognition that sexual relations are governed by power—is exchanged for opportunities in education and the workplace. In this context, feminism is "taken into account" and relegated to the past as no longer necessary.

Simultaneously, iterations of "slacker masculinity" in postfeminist media texts work to repudiate male power. This is reinforced by feminist ethnographic or journalistic texts like Hannah Rosin's *The End of Men* or Susan Faludi's *Stiffed* which suggest that feminism has contributed to the devaluing of male experience in America—rather than placing a substantive emphasis on the post-industrial patriarchal capitalism. They are not looking at the men in power; they are looking at the men who are the victims of globalisation, neoliberalism and indeed patriarchy. One of the problems with performances of postfeminist masculinity is that in McRobbie's words, "sexual politics is presented as irrelevant" (90).

Postfeminism is key to understanding the formation of these new patriarchs, including Zuckerberg because they do not enact a traditionally authoritarian patriarchy. Interestingly, they also cannot legitimately perform a typical postfeminist masculinity in the sense of the slacker male; postfeminist masculinities are a screen to the ways that some men shore up patriarchal power. Instead, Zuckerberg performs postfeminist fatherhood. This iteration of masculinity brings together heteronormativity and authority in the home while downplaying the monopolised power that is held. Writing about twenty-first century Hollywood films, Hamad argues that "postfeminist fatherhood has become normalized as the default position from which to negotiate hegemonic masculinity" (15). Moreover, paternity is an affectively charged and powerful discourse of masculinity because it is "universalising" and has "a high degree of cultural purchase that enables hegemonic commonality across a plurality of postfeminist masculinities" (1). This is key to thinking about Zuckerberg's self-representation as a postfeminist father because it works to bring together or cohere the other masculine performances—that of the alpha American male and the tech-geek, which we discuss further below. Photographs, videos and posts about Zuckerberg's relationship with his wife and daughter proliferate on his page. For example, there is a video of him working out in his home gym with his daughter in a sling on his back (31st March 2017); there is the open letter written by him and Chan to his daughter posted to his wall (1st November 2015); or a photograph of him hugging Max as they watch the 2016 presidential election results come in (10 November 2016).

Acknowledging that Chan is a successful professional in her own right—she is a trained paediatrician and heavily involved in the Chan-Zuckerberg Initiative, we explore the way that this domestic site is represented in this particular video. As stated earlier, Chan and Max are in a symbiotic relationship on the periphery of the camera whereas Zuckerberg is situated at the centre of the family arena, in the mise-en-scene but also in terms of dominating the narrative as well as the techniques of self-revelation. Whereas according to Zuckerberg, Chan has been preparing vegetables in the kitchen with Max, Zuckerberg has apparently been outdoors all day—whether this was linked to work, the triathlon or the smoking meats in the backyard.

His holding of Max and talking to her—"Yes Max, it's a screen"—generates considerable capital as can be noted by the comments ("Max says hi as well" notes Zuckerberg). Hamad argues that postfeminist

fatherhood is conventionally "emotionally articulate, domestically competent, skilled in managing the quotidian practicalities of parenthood" (2). Although Zuckerberg keeps his emotional articulation to a minimum beyond a general affective enthusiasm—instead, he keeps returning to alpha male catchphrases: "everyone likes ribs" and "smoking meats"—his interaction with Max reveals his participation in the domestic sphere and gives the impression of care. Moreover, the harnessing of this particular postfeminist masculinity does a lot of work in counteracting the portrayal of Zuckerberg in, for example, the "wildly inaccurate biopic," *The Social Network* (Smith).

What is also significant about this video is Zuckerberg's ability to demonstrate that he is, in Hamad's words, "adept at negotiating a balance and/or discursive confluence of private sphere fatherhood and public sphere paternalism" (2). As he sits in his backyard, he slips easily between the family dynamic and his work in terms of Facebook. In fact, his private sphere fatherhood is key to the way that he operates and legitimates his public sphere paternalism. This is not just because he cut short a triathlon for work or because he must take a 5-minute work call at the end of Grill Talk, but also because he is intimate with his family while doing this promotional work. Indeed, modelling this familial connection *is* his promotional work; it is what he wants his platform to be used for. Zuckerberg enacts what Gregg calls "presence bleed" where work and home life blur. And more than this, he is modelling digital capitalism's entrepreneurial and self-governing individuality where work life is rendered intimate (Moore and Robinson). As an assemblage, the affective shift that this blurring of work and private life produces filters through to comments, audiences and social media practices. Zuckerberg's performances of the private-in-public demand an emotional engagement with what is primarily a promotional activity. The assemblage manifest in the video shows him enjoying his life as he works and asks his followers to reciprocate that and reproduce it themselves in their own social media use.

Homosociality and Hegemonic Masculinities

Patriarchy and masculinity are mutually constitutive (Hamad). Hamad points out that postfeminist fatherhood connects various forms of hegemonic masculinities, and here we discuss further Zuckerberg's performance of alpha male American masculinity (Godfrey and Hamad), as well as geek masculinities. We link an understanding of these masculine performances with the other intimate relationship that is being enacted in this video: Zuckerberg's interaction with his two friends, Lessin and Green—both Harvard graduates. As Ortner and others have pointed out, homosociality is a key way that patriarchy recoups its power, and so looking at the relationships between men is crucial for understanding the way that patriarchy operates and how it is connected to male practices. Lessin was formerly a Facebook executive after his platform was bought out by Zuckerberg. He is now a CEO of Fin and a venture capitalist. Green helped Zuckerberg create Facemash at Harvard, and is co-founder of Causes, a Facebook app that encourages philanthropy. He has also worked with Zuckerberg on lobbying initiatives around immigration and education. The Harvard links, as well as the Silicon Valley contexts and connections to politics, give some insight into the homosocial networks of the digital capitalists, and the way they function around patronage as well as friendships that are both public and private. These personal-professional connections are both revealing of the wider hinterlands across the tech sector and into politics of the Zuckerberg-Facebook assemblage, and serve to mitigate the dominating role that the figure of Zuckerberg himself plays within it.

Lessin and Green arrive about halfway through the video, after Chan and Max have exited the frame. It isn't until they arrive that the negative comments are discussed; "there's a lot of anger out there" says Green. Before this Zuckerberg has been successfully performing what Gregg terms "deep acting" as he returns to stock phrases such as "everyone loves ribs" and "just hanging out with you in my backyard" rather than reacting to requests for money, revelations of personal trauma, or rage. The introduction of Lessin incites some sexual interest. Zuckerberg reads out: "who is the handsome guy in the blue shirt" and the friends share a laugh. Lessin and Zuckerberg banter about their sports achievements. Zuckerberg tells Lessin his new time for running, "down below a 5.30 mile"; "that's upsetting" says Lessin. Zuckerberg replies, "oh come on, come on, we're good." Indeed, Lessin asserts that "the best way to live life is as a

partner-competitor." This certainly seems to be true for the male entrepreneurs of Silicon Valley as they acquire, collaborate, compete, share knowledge and power.

"Grilling meats and racing cars are two of the most fun things you can do," Zuckerberg tells his followers. He spends a considerable part of the video talking about cooking meats and how to get "a good smoky flavor." He is eager to perform a quintessential alpha American masculinity by his insistent return to the topic of meat, as well as sport in the form of the triathlon. He also shares how he used to kill his own meat—"things taste better . . . when you've hunted the animal yourself." This, linked to the American nature of the occasion and context, work to present Zuckerberg as modelling American male values. His ordinariness is key to the affective power of postfeminist fatherhood which has considerable emotional traction. It glosses over his immense status and wealth while at the same time being an articulation of masculine hegemony. Mark Zuckerberg is not one of those men portrayed in the *End of Men* or *Stiffed* who struggle to adapt to postfeminist gender relations; he has benefited from the shift both to digital capitalism and postfeminist patriarchy, and because of this he can perform an authoritative and traditional hunter-masculinity with authenticity.

Zuckerberg might be adept at performing a traditional all-American masculinity; however, he reveals his tech geekery, not only through his somewhat awkward persona but also by saying things like "running a controlled experiment" with different sauces when he steps away from the camera to look at the meats. He also talks about the technical qualities of the barbeque equipment and gets especially animated about a device to regulate airflow to the smoker. These moments both undermine the smooth construction of a traditional alpha male and reinforce the emergent geek masculinity that is, increasingly, forcing out the hunter motif (Ging). That Zuckerberg manages to enact both masculinities, albeit perhaps unintentionally, alongside his postfeminist paternalism in a single live video is revealing about the ways in which hegemonic masculinity's articulation to patriarchy is in flux.

When we speak of hegemonic masculinity, we are not talking about an innate or essential maleness. Connell and Messerschmidt argue that hegemony is not fixed and has a number of different configurations. Indeed, hegemonic masculinity needs to fluctuate in order to recoup and reinstate power. In their words:

> [m]en can dodge among multiple meanings according to their interactional needs. Men can adopt hegemonic masculinity when it is desirable; but the same men can distance themselves strategically from hegemonic masculinity at other moments. Consequently, 'masculinity' represents not a certain type of man but, rather, a way that men position themselves through discursive practices. (Connell and Messerschmidt 840)

Debbie Ging's recent article on digital misogynies and geek masculinities is very useful in making sense of masculine practices and their intersection with power and hegemony. Ging uses the work of Angela Nagle to understand the ascendancy of geek masculinities. Nagle argues that in the information age "the tastes and values of geeks are elevated above the masculine virtues of physical strength and material productivity that preceded them." Kendall asserts that geek males embrace the privileging of mind over emotion, but do not embrace sporting prowess. However, we can see that in the context of Grill Talk, Zuckerberg manages to combine these conflicting but hegemonic masculinities by articulating them to postfeminist fatherhood.

Mediated Paternalism and Celebrity CEOs

P. David Marshall's work on celebrity and politics helps in understanding the wider implications of Zuckerberg's performance of postfeminist fatherhood. Marshall investigates the ways that politicians like Ronald Reagan and George Bush invoke the familial as a key component of their bid to legitimate masculine authority and leadership. Because masculinity "continues to connote power, control, and mastery" (217), political leaders must demonstrate these qualities in order to establish their legitimacy: "[l]ayered onto the construction of leadership as a form of masculinity is the division of power in the family itself. The political leader, then, is generally painted as the father figure for the nation and its people" (217). Marshall uses Bush's 1988 presidential campaign to illustrate the ways that representing a leader with his family "operates symbolically" (217) as an acceptable feminised version of masculine power. Because the "family

patriarch" (217) is depicted as benevolent as a consequence of his responsibilities or care for others, his power appears tempered. This is a technique that certainly seems to hold true for understanding Grill Talk. In the video, and throughout Zuckerberg's Facebook page, we can see how Zuckerberg's power is tempered through the depiction of his intimate role in the family. Indeed, his mediated fatherhood is crucial for understanding how his patriarchal power is naturalised. Zuckerberg's performance of paternity is the emotional glue which works to provide a common bond with his users.

Focusing primarily on the medium of the television as the site where this paternalism plays out, Marshall goes on to argue that:

> [t]he homologous relationship between the familial and the nation, the father and the political leader, is a form of affective transference: the acceptability and the "warmth" conveyed by a "good" and "strong" family structure become a legitimate model for structuring the organization of the political sphere. (218)

In this way, the "unknowness of the electorate" is shaped to a certain political meaning that is connected to the leader.

But can we exactly replicate this understanding for Zuckerberg? After all, he is not (yet) running for president, he is not bidding for an electorate, and his family is not represented on television in the same way as the politicians who are being examined by Marshall; rather Zuckerberg utilises his digital platform. We can see that by representing himself as part of an intimate sphere, Zuckerberg aims for a solidarity with the people; he is like them, he is part of a wider collective of "common" people (Marshall 220). This is the work the assemblage we've identified here is doing: bringing Zuckerberg and his users closer together to legitimate his role as the "leader" of Facebook. However, there are some key differences between Zuckerberg and political leaders like Bush. Unlike the formal, institutionalised power of politicians, who can make laws and issue directives, Zuckerberg's power as a leader is closer to the forms of soft leadership that circulate on social media. In these terms, exemplified by the sorts of online co-ordination that scholars of the Arab Spring have discussed at length, leadership is a case of choreography, suggestion and collective identification to encourage already sympathetic participants to take specific and collective forms of action (Gerbaudo). But while these examples work to think through how the Zuckerberg-Facebook assemblage can operate as a call to action (for example most recently by Zuckerberg on the Dreamers act), we can also look at Eric Guthey et al.'s discussion of business celebrities to further clarify the differences to traditional business or political leaders.

Typically, business leaders who become celebrities (e.g. Richard Branson) go through a process of celebrification (Driessens). The assemblage that must form around the CEO-turned-celebrity has certain standard features. These elements include "corporate representatives, cultural entrepreneurs and third-party go-betweens that include talent agents, managers, publicists, marketers and advertising executives, public relations departments, newspaper editors and journalists, television producers, book publishers, talk-show hosts, photographers, stylists, bloggers, and many others" (Guthey et al. 32). This is largely, as Guthey at al. note, a collection of gatekeepers, in house to the corporation the business person represents, but more so third parties who bring their own values and priorities to the practice of constructing celebrity businesspeople. Not so with the Zuckerberg-Facebook assemblage. Within the Zuckerberg-Facebook assemblage, the dynamics of control are simplified. Facebook eliminates many of the gatekeeping functions of the roles listed above. Certainly, there are publicists, PR and corporate intermediaries, but they carry the values and intentions of the Facebook brand rather than bringing their own agendas.

This direct access to the means of celebrification, while enabling a largely unrestricted space for public comments, gives this video the appearance of openness and intimacy that is lacking in more heavily negotiated and gatekept celebritized spaces. This bestows on Zuckerberg a different sort of authority to the politicians Marshall discusses whose paternalism is located within the distancing of filmic mediation (230-39) that helps to produce a heroic "star" effect (Dyer). Instead, the Facebook posts used by Zuckerberg offer a very different affect as they take place in a "participatory culture" (Jenkins) and in a widely available media form.

Unlike the political leadership Marshall looked at, we can understand Zuckerberg as standing not simply family to nation but family to global network. And as we noted at the start, Facebook meets at

least two of the four criteria to be considered a state: and at two billion users and rising it would be the most populous nation on the planet. Facebook is a virtual space with rules, laws, cultures and accepted practices. Zuckerberg and his team of advisers have a powerful say in how that space operates. Where users develop practices that are unwanted (say around terrorism, or using an alias online) they can be banned, surveilled inhibited and ultimately referred to law enforcement or military agencies. This authority, like any other form of social power, needs legitimating. Hence the need for Zuckerberg's presence within his network and his use of mediated paternalism to present his rule as benevolent.

"Everyone loves ribs" and "hanging out with you in my backyard" is Zuckerberg's attempt to perform not just an authentic, private insight into his domestic sphere, but to position himself within a positive affect universalised to his audience online and in the reporting media, that connotes the providing father, all American alpha male and enthusiastic social entrepreneur in a way that legitimates not just his business, but also his philanthropic role. And the Chan-Zuckerberg initiative competes directly with the UN and national governments in the provision of healthcare and education (Partszch 10). As Zuckerberg's focus becomes increasingly political, we can see how these performative rhetorics of social media use could easily be extended to the political realm proper. We cannot under-estimate Zuckerberg's power. Not only because of his immense wealth, not only because of the substantial work that his philanthrocapitalism does to the US education system and in directing research and health care initiatives, but also because patriarchy is shifting and reformulating under digital capitalism, and he is leading the way in legitimating those changes.

Works Cited

Banet-Weiser, Sarah. *Authentic: The Politics of Ambivalence in a Brand Culture*. New York: New York University Press, 2012.

Bilton, Nick. "Will Mark Zuckerberg be our next president" *Vanity Fair* (24 July 2017) Web. 13 January 2017 <https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2017/01/will-mark-zuckerberg-be-our-next-president>.

Bolter, J. D. and Richard A. Grusin. *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1999. Print.

Braidotti, Rosi. *The Posthuman*. London: Polity Press, 2013.

Barbrook, Richard and Cameron, Andy. "The Californian Ideology" (1995) <http://www.hrc.wmin.ac.uk/theory-californiani-deology-main.html>.

Castells, Manuel. *The Rise of The Network Society: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture Vol. I*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996

Chambers, Deborah. *Social Media and Personal Relationships*. London: Palgrave, 2013.

Chander, Anupam. "Facebookistan." *North Carolina Law Review*. 90 (2012) 1807-1844.

Connell, R. W., and J. Messerschmidt. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the

Concept." *Gender and Society* 19 (2005): 829-59.

DeLanda, Manuel. *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*. London: A&C Black, 2006.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Continuum, 2004.

Driessens, Olivier. "The Celebritization of Society and Culture: Understanding the Structural Dynamics of Celebrity Culture." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 16: 6 (2013): 641-657.

Dyer, Richard. *Stars*. London: British Film Institute, (1979) 1998.

Edwards, Michael. "Gates, Google, and the Ending of Global Poverty: Philanthrocapitalism and International Development." *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 15:2 (2009): 35-42.

Faludi, Susan. *Stiffed: The Betrayal of the American Man*. 2000. New York: Harper Collins, 2000.

Farber, Rebecca "'Transing' Fitness and Remapping Transgender Male Masculinity in Online Message Boards." *Journal of Gender Studies* 26: 3 (2017): 254-268.

Fincher, David, Dir. *The Social Network*. Sony Pictures Home Entertainment, 2011.

Fuchs, Christian. "Capitalism, Patriarchy, Slavery, and Racism in the Age of Digital Capitalism and Digital Labour." *Critical Sociology* (2017) DOI: <10.1177/0896920517691108>.

Fuller, Matthew and Andrew Goffey. *Evil Media*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2012.

Gerbaudo, Paolo. *Tweets and the Streets: Social Media and Contemporary Activism*. Pluto Press, 2012.

Gill, Rosalind. "Postfeminist Media Culture: Elements of a Sensibility." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 10:2 (2007): 147-166.

Ging, Debbie. "Alphas, Betas, and Incels" *Men and Masculinities*. (2017) DOI: <10.1177/1097184X17706401>.

Goffey, Andrew. "Algorithm." Ed. Matthew Fuller. *Software Studies: A Lexicon*. Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2008: 15-20.

Godfrey Sarah and Hannah Hamad. "Save the Cheerleader, Save the Males: Resurgent Protective Paternalism in Popular Film and Television after 9/11." (2012). The Handbook of Gender, Sex, and Media. Ed. Karen Ross, Oxford: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 157-173.

Gregg, Melissa. *Work's Intimacy*. Cambridge: Polity, 2011.

Guthey, E. and Clark, T. and Jackson, B. *Demystifying Business Celebrity*. London and New York: Routledge, 2009.

Hakim, Jamie. "'The Spornosexual': The Affective Contradictions of Male Body-Work in Neoliberal Digital Culture." *Journal of Gender Studies* (2016) DOI: <10.1080/09589236.2016.1217771>.

Hamad, Hannah. *Postfeminism and Paternity in Contemporary US Film*. London: Routledge, 2014.

Hearn, Alison. "Verified: Self-presentation, Identity Management, And Selfhood in The Age Of Big Data." *Popular Communication* 15:2 (2017): 62-77.

hooks, bell. "Understanding Patriarchy." *No Borders* (10 January 2017) Web. 2010 <http://imaginenoborders.org/zines/#UnderstandingPatriarchy>.

Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: New York University Press, 2006.

Kantrowitz, Alex and Nitasha Tiku. "Mark Zuckerberg Says He's Not Running for President." (2 July, 2017) Web. 24 Jan 2017 <https://www.cnbc.com/2017/01/24/mark-zuckerberg-says-hes-not-running-for-president.html>.

Kendall, Lori. "'White and Nerdy': Computers, Race, and the Nerd Stereotype." *Journal of Popular Culture* 44 (2011): 505–24.

Lafrance, Adriene. "Zuckerberg 2020?" *The Atlantic*. Web. 19 Jan 2017 <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2017/01/zuckerberg-2020/513689/>

Leswing, Kif. "There's an alternative theory about why Mark Zuckerberg looks like he's running for president." Web. 26 June 2017 <http://uk.businessinsider.com/mark-zuckerberg-presidential-trip-every-state-product-focused-ceo-2017-6>.

Littler, Jo. "Celebrity CEOS and the Cultural Economy of Tabloid Intimacy."

Eds. Su Holmes and Sean Redmond. *Stardom and Celebrity: A Reader*. London: Sage, 2006: 230-24.

McRobbie, Angela. *The Aftermath of Feminism: Gender, Culture and Social Change*. London: Sage, 2009.

McRobbie, Angela. "Notes on the Perfect: Competitive Femininity in Neoliberal Times" *Australian Feminist Studies* (2015) DOI: <10.1080/08164649.2015.1011485>.

Manovich, Lev. "Database as Symbolic Form." *Convergence* 5:2 (1999) DOI: <10.1177/135485659900500206>.

Marshall, P. David. *Celebrity and Power: Fame in Contemporary Culture*. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press, (1997) 2013.

Massumi, Brian. *Politics of Affect*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2015.

Moore, Pheobe and Andrew Robinson. "The Quantified Self: What Counts in the Neoliberal Workplace." *New Media & Society*18: 1 (2015): 2774- 792.

Nagle, Angela. "The New Man of 4/Chan." *The Baffler* 30. Web. March 2016 <http:// thebaffler.com/salvos/new-man-4chan-nagle>.

Ortner, B. Sherry. "Too Soon for Post-Feminism: The Ongoing Life of Patriarchy in Neoliberal America." *History and Anthropology* 25: 4 (2014): 530-549.

Papacharissi, Zizi. *Affective Publics: Sentiment, Technology, and Politics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Partzsch, Lena. "Powerful Individuals in a Globalized World." *Glob Policy* (2017) 8: 5-13. doi:10.1111/1758-5899.12367

Renold, Emma. "'Feel What I Feel': Making Da(R)Ta With Teen Girls for Creative Activisms on How Sexual Violence Matters." *Journal of Gender Studies* (2017) DOI: <10.1080/09589236.2017.1296352>.

Rosin, Hannah. *The End of Men: And the Rise of Women*. New York: Riverhead Books, 2012.

Skeggs, Beverly and Simon Yuill. "The Methodology of A Multi-Model Project Examining How Facebook Infrastructures Social Relations." *Information, Communication & Society* (2015) DOI: <10.1080/1369118X.2015.1091026>.

Smith, Zadie. "Generation Why?" *New York Review of Books* (24 July 2017) Web. 25 November 2010 < http://www.nybooks.com/articles/2010/11/25/generation-why/>.

Solon, Oliva. "Mark Zuckerberg's 2017 plan to visit all US states hints at political ambitions" *The Guardian* Web. 3 January 2017 <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/jan/03/mark-zuckerberg-facebook-2017-resolution-visit-us-states>.

Solon, Olivia. "Killer Robots? Musk and Zuckerberg escalate row over dangers of AI" *The Guardian* (25 July 2017) Web. 25 July 2017 <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/jul/25/elon-musk-mark-zuckerberg-artificial-intelligence-facebook-tesla>.

Srnicek, Nick. *Platform Capitalism*. London: Polity, 2016.

Segall, Laurie. "The Zuckerberg Interview: Extended cut" (22 June 2017). *CNN Tech*. Online Video. Web. 28 July 2017. <http://money.cnn.com/technology/zuckerberg-interview/>

Terranova, Tiziana. "Red Stack Attack! Algorithms, Capital and the Automation of the Commons." *EuroNomade Website* (2014) Web. 5 December 2017 <http://www.euronomade.info/?p=2268>.

Townsend, Leanne and Claire Wallace. *Social Media Research: A Guide to Ethics*. (online document) Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen, 2016 Web. 5 December 2017 <http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_487729_en.pdf>.

Williams, Alex. "Control Societies and Platform Logic." *New Formations* 84/84 (2015). DOI: <10.398/NEWF:84/85.10.2015>.

Zuboff, S. "Big Other: Surveillance Capitalism and the Prospects of an Information Civilization." *Journal of Information Technology* 30: 75 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1057/jit.2015.5>.