crossover conference

attack
networks of
power!

17. –20. january 2002, bremen

text

INHALT

♥ Workshoptexts ♥

♥ general texts ♥

Gender Binarism, Sexual Violence, the Military and War
<u>Antipatriarchal Perspectives Against Every War</u>

Our intention is to discuss antipatriarchal anti-war perspectives.

We ask you to give a critical evaluation of the discussion presented here of antipatriarchal perspectives on war. Our aim is to try and develop a way of political organising from this discussion, if possible. With the following text we want to present several ways of thinking without positing one of them as the absolute or one-and-only correct position. We do not want to and are not able to present an omnipotent analysis. But we believe that it is about time a strategy – or several strategies – and some practical starting points for action against war and domination was/were developed.

The development of such an approach is in its early stages, therefore critical additions and theoretical extensions are most helpful. Dogmatic positions and rigid, combative stances, on the other hand, are not very useful but would rather serve to block what we intend to do in this workshop, we believe.

We hope that at the crossover conference new experiences might be made.

Framework of the workgroup, preliminary considerations

Regarding the question why this discussion is not taking place in a women/lesbian-only setting, we have to mention our previous experience: For years now, transgendered people and their positions have been excluded consciously and consistently by parts of women/lesbian structures. They have been perceived as a threat and not as a valuable addition for feminist structures. As a consequence we need to talk about other structures. We want to develop a radical, antipatriarchal perspective of acting against every war, be it with women who can be unambiguously categorized biologically, or be it with transgendered people, transsexuals or hermaphrodites.

This could include the development of new spaces, antipatriarchal assemblies, the presence of new kinds of groups and what they have to say at demonstrations, as well as new, unusual cultural accents and subversive actions.

For Bremen we are considering a discussion in a mixed setting. To make a real discussion possible and truly open up a space for something new and good to happen, a clear framework has to be in place. This framework should be determined by political criteria. The work group will offer no space for patriarchal

behaviour and people who have no interest in dealing with antipatriarchal issues, nor for dominant behaviour or transphobic positions, whatever the gender of their proponents.

The mindless repetition of "politically correct" positions, by so called antisexistl men for example is something we can do very well without. We have made bad experiences in mixed settings, but we don't want to separate the discussion in advance into mixed and women/lesbian/hermaphrodite structures.

We'll do a brief check-in at the beginning to find out how people feel about being in a mixed setting. If there are problems, or in case there are too many participants we will divide the working group up after a common introduction (a talk and questions relating to it) and bring the discussions together again at the end.

The idea of this approach is that in principle we have to develop a common struggle but that we start from different positions.

Introduction

We want to try and organise the discussion around two main theses, of which we hope that they will have some practical effects. And we would like the following three questions to be taken into account.

1) What ccould be the orientation of a position on war that does not want to get crushed between the poles of "friend" and "enemy"? How can we reach a clear stance against war that enables us to remain unambiguous and differentiated in every phase of the war, even under circumstances where the war propaganda is very strong, in situations where many on the left are disoriented or even pro-war?

2) How and for what reasons do we act? Where is our place if we want to develop resistance beyond these poles of "good" and "evil"? And what could serve as orientation if our forms of resistance should be directed against militarisation, and be radical, but not militaristic?

3) HOW do we organise against war, how can enduring new spaces, structures, and discussions be created? Networks develop in interplay with resistance. Resistance can only be lived if it is bound up with a utopian vision, an orientation.

What do we mean when we say "patriarchy"? – a definition for the workgroup

We base our workshop on a definition of the term patriarchy and use this as a starting point for the discussion.

Patriarchy is a form of domination within which, in the course of history, two genders evolved along the lines of biological difference.

1. The most extreme way this gender order expresses itself is in the exercise of sexual violence by men, who use their bodies as a tool of subjugation. With the use of the weapons "body" and "gender", the domination of women is enforced and patriarchal claims of power and authority are renewed each day. There is no need for all men to be involved in the direct, repetitive enforcement of patriarchal domination. The "good" men benefit from the actions of the "bad" men, the latter guarantee, by threatening and exercising sexual violence on a daily basis, the continued existence of a form of domination and economic hierachy that has been burnt into people's minds to such a degree that they almost accept it as natural. In western societies sexist advertising and scenes of rape on television are open threats of patriarchal society against women and expresses patriarchy's claims of authority over them. Women are meant to be kept in badly paid wage labor, in precarious situations in the social sector and in invisible reproductive labor.

2. In capitalist patriarchy human relations are turned upside down. Reproduction of human life as a guarantee for the existence of every society does not determine society and relationships. Instead, production does, production with the aim of accumulation weath and power, that does not include the satisfaction of human needs and relationships. This splitting up of production and reproduction on the one hand and the positing of "production as allegedly maintaining society, as of the greatest, determining importance" and reproduction as a "natural sign of life, not societal, ranking below production" on the other hand is linked to a hierarchy in gender relations. While women are commonly associated with reproduction (housework, childcare, social work, subsitence), men are associated with production, which is usually based on destruction, on conquering foreign markets and on a war-minded relation towards their opponent that threatens their own power interests. The "white male" is the measure of all things and defines what and who is valuable. All relations are subject to these evaluations (e.g. the civilised world with valuable people in opposition to the barbarian world; the fact that refugees' and migrants' right to exist is linked to their usefulness in this country). The "white male" as a norm has been a great success, and this norm and related values have penetrated social relations to such a degree that even if women or people of colour cross

these boundaries, the norm is not called to question.

3. The social hierarchy in gender relations starts with the medical elimination of biological deviations of this assumed norm. For this reason, intersexuals have been wiped out or made invisible biologically as well as socially. The invisibility of other gender categories is a crucial means in the establishment of a seemingly natural social "order" on the base of a seemingly natural gender binarism. Already before birth, the most normal of all questions: "is it a boy or a girl?" determines socialisation and, with that, the child's life in all aspects. Not only that there is no space left for the child to decide – realities that could be situated beyond the categories "male" and "female" are not even thought of. Biological one-dimensionality – violently forced upon intersexuals – define personal status, the role taken up in society and life in hierarchical structures. The brutality employed when fitting an intersexual child into one or the other gender category demonstrates the importance of a bipolar gender order for the success of a gender hierarchy. Changes from one personal status to the other are regulated by law. Something in between is not provided for. The assimilation to the assigned role

permeates all people and is violenty enforced.

4. Patriarchy, as we understand it, is a racist form of domination. The white, able man, symbol of the so-called civilized world, constitutes the norm all others are measured against. The image of the white man as creator of value occludes the actual racist/colonial and sexist economic exploitation(Greencard, Fortress Europe, civilization and barbarism, the selection of more and less valuable life and the legitimation of killing). Antipatriarchal resistance against the power of the white man is focused not only on a sexist economy but also on the racist and colonial nature of exploitation. This war is marked, in a significant way, by colonial terms. The values of civilization against barbarism determine the battlefield of the crusade against the evil, islam, the arab world. And the war extends into the centers, in the fight against refugees, for example.This is our general understanding of the term "patriarchy". In what follows, we present some reflections on antiwar resistance, starting from two theses:

Thesis 1: Only a resistance that speaks out against every war, that wants to disarm the oppressors (Herrschenden) and that relates itself to other movements worldwide with

a similar idea of resistance, extricates itself from the logic of war. Every support of a state's or an armed anti-emancipatorian group's war-minded aggression is a support of war and cannot be a positive reference point for our resistance. Questioning the values of western civilisation is a prerequisite for this.

In connection with the 11th of September, "war" and "terror", from the mouths of the oppressors, are terms of propaganda! From our point of view, war and terror are two sides of the same patriarchal coin. It seems reasonable to us to avoid the discourse on the definition of terrorism. For years, "terror" has been used to bring resistance into disrepute, criminalise it and – depending on the particular circumstances – eliminate it. And so it is being used now, and extended to include anti-globalisation activists. Refugees are suspected to be terrorists because of their mere existence, and their intrusion into Fortress Europe is punished by confinement for deportation. "Terror" has become a synonym for threats to the interests of the elite and to the process of economic exploitation.

The attacks of 11th september were not state-legitimised acts of war in the sense of a patriarchal logic of war. They destroyed centres of power resp. their symbols. Civilian means were functionalised in a patriarchal logic of war, a situation was created that could only result in military escalation. The attacks consciously closed down political spaces. They were meant to polarise. They are not opposed to war, but escalate war. The holders of power find themselves threatened. Consequently, "civilisation" should be defended against "barbarianism". Crusades against Evil, holy war and clash of cultures, Christianity against Islam.

This was and still is in parts the use of language that has only changed for tactical reasons. If we consider "civilisation" as a model of domination which started its crusades 1,000 years ago and which still invades other cultures in a colonial way (sanctions/investions/World Bank dictates/subventions/war-minded interventions/starvation/epidemics etc.), we find ourselves on a new level of war. The attacks legitimise a new dimension, which lies in the monstrosity of the so-called anti-terror alliance and the announcement of a global 10year war and the eradication of everything which is defined as terrorism by the ruling elite. Either, emncipatory groups can find a way to create a free society or else we are looking into an abyss of hitherto unthinkable proportions. Democratic pretensions are fast disappearing, all bets are off and a big "tidy-up" of all movements that have, for whatever reason, been impediments to the smooth workings

of the process of economic exploitation is under way. The discussion about a military court and about the use of torture in England and the U.S.A., the implementation of anti-terror security measures by the German parliament, the EU-wide new definitionof terrorism and its elimination, the militarisation of minds and social politicies unfortunately just add to this.

Whether Al-Quaidah was really responsible for the attacks or if we will one day find out some other terrible truth doesn't really matter for the reasoning of our thesis.

We are supposed to sit in front of the tv and take part in the fight of Good against Evil as an audience. Even if Al-Quaidah were responsible, their origin and rise is just a confirmation of our thesis.

The Taliban were brought into position against the former Soviet Union as a fundamentalist patriarchal force by the west. It was assumed that a strong ideology was needed in order to pave the way for the banishment of the Soviets and free movement for western interests. The attack against women and emancipatory developments was a crucial part of the mobilisation of men's organisations. Equipped with a fundamentalist ideology against the occupants, independent and progressive leftist and social groups were

destroyed. The growth of warlord-structures is not a chance event. It is a strategy of reorganizing processes of economic exploitation in former states in the sense of global patriarchal interests of power. The result of the war in Kosovo shows this. (UCK build up as warlords, NATO-administered protectorate, militarised society, disrupted social structures, NGOs do "development work" and walk into the same brothels as soldiers, organisation and trading place for trafficking in women with the help of warlord-structures). Warlord structures and the structures of "free western civilisation" alike use the patriarchal logic of war.

Neither the attackers nor the attacked of 11th of september make fine distinctions when it comes to asserting their interests. It is merely a question of tactics where and and by whom how many deaths are "tolerated" or not. Neither the crusaders of western civilisation nor the conquerors of North America respected human lives, nor do today's new challengers.

War and terror are wrongly used by the ruling elite as if there was a fundamental difference in the meaning of the two terms. The word "terror" serves the oppressors to legitimise their unbelievable violence. From an antipatriarchal point of view, terror and war are the same! Both opponents try with their own measures and ideologies to polarise and to make their

cause seem holy. One of the logics of war is to only permit "Good" and "Evil" and to destroy all deviations. In the end, patriarchy wins.

If we manage to make the disarming of the ruling elite imaginable, we manage to get away from the polarised logic of war. This includes the disarming of leftist progressive modernizers, the small-scale patrarchal structures that pretend to be on the left, that are "drifting upwards" just like the generation of former student radicals from the sixties did. The "leftist, progressive" groups which have modernised structures of power again and again and which just wanted power never worked for a political principle that would disarm the ruling elite. German men and women who are organised as "Anti-Germans", who would like to be on the side of the goodies, who would like to be free from the deeds that their fathers and mothers are guilty of, reproduce positions that no-one can object to. As defendants of civilisation they profit from civilisation. They profit from a racist and sexist economic hierarchy. Consequently, they set up their position next to civilisation and western powers in order to eradicate the centres of Islam. Their position has nothing to do with an emancipatory point of view and moves within the logic of war.

But we can also look at the problem the other way round: If fascists had committed the attacks of the 11th of September, people on the left would have condemned the attacks. But the way it is, a position turns up that says: yes, it is the poor of this world, yes, it is globalisation and capitalism. These arguments would never have been accepted if fascists had been responsible for the attacks. The fact that parts of the left still stick to these arguments betrays them as people who adhere to values that separate them from us politically. Through traditional anti-imperialism, through secret sympathy for the lesser evil nothing can be achieved. The dead of one or the other side get functionalised, the doors are held open for anti-americanism. Other positions can be unveiled by looking at the Israel/Palestine conflict. The slogan "long live Israel" doesn't break down anything. Neither does a slogan like "all Jews into the sea" or "Israel, America's satellite" (this slogan denies the reason for Israel's existence: the worldwide persecution of people who define themselves or who are defined by others as Jews). These slogans reproduce and fix frontiers that actually need to be crossed and cry out for solutions that deconstruct oppositions. After all, what it's all about is the destruction of all forms of oppression and authority!

What this means for our fight against oppression is that we shouldn't just give people of Jewish confession tolerated niches, but that we should fight for spaces that are founded on equal rights for all and that have to be available for everyone, regardless of their colour, gender or political opinion.

It is an important question for our struggle to what extend we want to be armed against our opponent, to what extent we accept a militarisation of our struggle and thus are caught in a patriarchal logic, because then everything will be about "success, victory and conquering". Or if we should try to start social processes which undermine structures of power and define the question of violence and use of militancy this way. So, it's not about taking sides with one or the other power or strengthening one's own power which would then end up joining the logic of patriarchy. It's about the destruction and disarming of all patriarchal forms of power and - far away from the polarisations of war - the search for allies. But where are those powers that stand in opposition towards local or global power but that do not want to gain power?

Thesis 2: the bipolar gender model is a central institution for the construction of war-minded, militarised conditions. The current gender model produces sexist and violent relations as well as war-minded, militarised structures. An antipatriarchal position against the war should not only pull away from bipolar positions, but should also sabotage politically as well as practically the man/woman concept as a prerequisite for the ability to make war. Attacks against traditional gender relations undermine the armed forces, because they interfere with traditionally accepted values and cause desorientation on a front which is important for war.

Bipolarity and...

Pushing people into the categories "male" and "female" is the starting point for every-day role-assignment. This means sexist life and work conditions which have to be violently enforced. Bipolar thinking is a part of patriarchal oppression and important for war. Friend-enemy, man-woman, civilisation-barbarianism, German-foreign, healthy-ill, white-black form the prerequisite for societally legitimised murder. In fact, even leftist ideas failed that believed the solution to be in the opposition of working class against bourgeoisie. They didn't realise how far oppression reaches into individual people. For us this can only mean that we should come to a way of thinking and acting that

breaks the repeated war polarisations instead of letting us be pressed into bipolar structures.

Bipolar gender structures and sexualised violence...

We refrain from speaking about "the construction of gender". The talk about the construction of gender and its simple "deconstruction" doesn't see the violent production of gender.

The permanent threat with and use of sexualised violence guarantees the production of gender and gender-related roles. It guards the maintenance of power. The every-day intensification of sexualised violence makes men be men and women be women. Unclear positions are made female and thus, sexism can also be applied to "non-males". The weak, the drag, the cripple, the refugee, the underdog, the intersexual, the opponent – these threats, the Other is defined and thus attacked by the "healthy, white master". A resistance that is against sexualised violence but that still works with two biological sexes (or even two gender roles) will miss the goal. The "male/female" concept guarantees oppression. It will not be undermined by the "better man", the "gay", the "lesbian" or the "feminist", because the social role is already reproduced with the connection to a biological sex. The categories named

above don't destroy the violent frame, they just stabilise and veil it.

But we cannot expect to just leave this frame easily. The already existing niches where "deconstruction" is practised always move alongside the male/female boudaries. Neither have they developed a conscience for the fact that they reproduce gender cliches, nor do they have a considerable effect on the male/female model. This playground is irrelevant for society and in the best case it's a clown-style partygag or a sophisticated discourse in the academical circus, nice to look at, harmless as long as it has no practical consequences.

...and the structure and function of military

With the identification with the state (whose servants men should be) the prerequisites were created for the people to stand up for their nation. The lodging in barracks in military areas is a place where the patriarchal male is created, of course under exclusion of women. Nowadays, in the era of "modernised patriarchy", we don't need biologically defined criteria for their exclusion any more. The military has grown to meet the challenge of the presence of women in the armed forces. However, the pattern pink and blue, who's a man and who's a woman, prevails. Positions can also be taken up by a

biological woman – if she can stand her man. (Usually this is called: If she is better than a man.) Despite the presence of women there is a sexist structure which is the foundation for the development of a patriarchal-male identity. Sexual assaults against women are not in contradiction to this.

If female soldiers get harrassed or raped this will be interpreted as a failure of an individual. The function of the armed forces will not be called in question by the presence of women. Patriarchy merely gets modernised and legitimises its institutions due to new dynamics in society and new challenges. Similar to the fact that refugees are deported to death, torture and poverty by a racist state, while other migrants are called into the country with a greencard because they are useful for the economy, women are admitted to an institution that formerly was considered an exclusive men's club.

The only condition: To function according to patriarchal rules, obedience and order, hierarchies and the acceptance of violence and murder as means of resolving conflicts or pursuing power interests.

If the borders are made clear, the crossing of the borders can be generated by visa-conditions.

Women are not merely victims but become stakeholders in patriarchal oppression through their incorporation of relations of power. It seems "natural" that an institution which is based on bipolarity, hierarchy and and two-gender-poles, radiates bipolarity and sends it out as a "natural" message. Women are women, men are men, refugees again are women (or to be more precise: are associated with women).

Sexualised violence was, in this war too, merely a legitimisation for taking part in it. It was never called what it actually is, the most widespread kind of violence perpetrated by men!

And now?

How can we interrupt the program, how can we disable the gendered reference points on which the military's ability to mobilize society, a high-tech army or just a dumb platoon of foot soldiers is based? Regarding the Kosovo war we wrote: "The NATO war did not produce images of man-to-man combat, but the depiction of superior technology opposed to the 'barbarism, wildness and archaism' of those to be 'liberated' has become the extended possibility of identification for patriarchal male interests. We think it is an illusion and a dangerous political mistake to believe that patriarchy is dissolving because gender roles seem to be getting a bit confused here and there. They are less confused than they seem. A false analysis will lead us to false conclusions and underestimate the force of the current phase of patriarchal modernization. Even if this war does not require the kind of mobilization that entail 'man-to-man' images, even if there is suspiciously little vulgar patriotism visible on the street, this does not mean, that these elements are not potentially mobilizable. Computer

games and video rentals are full of man-to-man combatants, and kids still dream about being a hero. If need be, in the fight against barbarians, alien civilizations or technologically superior beings."

One look at the current depiction of elite soldiers demonstrates the availability of images of male fighting machines. War preparation is a social process in which many parts of society have to be involved, and we are in the middle of a great mobilization of society. The biological personae are interchangeable, as long as the patriarchal principle stays in force. The project "man-machine" creates new identifications, that celebrate "precise intervention" as a fantasy of omnipotence. NATO war technology is coded as masculine because it is strong, omnipotent and able to hit with great precision, the propaganda tells us. It is not cultivated transitions from a to b and from red to blue that we have to organize, but a kind of resistance that seeks to destroy the principle of gender binarism as a central foundation of patriarchal domination. In other words, an antiwar position that analyzes "only" the economic and geopolitical interests that play a role in war, does not touch the foundations of the system that enables the military. The patriarchal function "man" is integral to the military. Patriarchy, based on the social differentiation of the constructed genders "man/woman", still depends upon bipolarity. Biological difference is utilized to construct social hierarchy from a very early age on. It is enforced by violent means against the potential resistance of women as well as men. The means of enforcement, the types of violence brought to bear, are differentially organized according to the different demands made on women and men – the aim, the conservation of the binary gender order remains the same. What we need is the personal refusal of the categories man/woman and the creation of dissident spaces.

The dissident position does not seek a new home along the lines of the heterosexist normativity of man/woman, nor does it want social recognition and a piece of the pie: we don't want to wither away in government positions, corrupt NGO's and homosexual marriages. A dissident position does not want a new transsexual law and no hip new place under the transgender sun, it is dysfunctional because it is without location and relation. Any recourse to the concept of man/woman reproduces sexualized violence, supports patriarchal domination and does not sabotage the patriarchal logic of the military and war.

We need an aggressive attack on the foundations of heterosexist rule, so that through the practice of resistance spaces and alliances can unfold that have not been

able to flourish under the conditions of this bipolar logic.

AntiPatriarchalOrganizers (APO), an informal discussion network
Contact: apo@bamm.de

A new perspective on prostitution, the traffic in women and society
From the reinterpretation of prostitution to social critique.

Prostitution seems to be the last sector of society to remain in the background. We find it quite significant that the analysis of prisons, hospitals and the army are now recognised as important aspects of social critique, while sex – work and trafficking in women are still hidden behind a "curtain of ignorance". We feel that this state of affairs should be changed, because it is the only way to transform social theory from a theory speaking about male society (that does not exist !) into a theory speaking about social reality.

In the problematic of sex – work, gender relations are crucial and we think that we can look at society from the perspective of sex - work instead of looking only at prostitution.

The first part of the workshop will be a rather theoretical introduction, basically about the characteristics of the connections between the prostitution and society, especially about the relations between prostitution and :
- something that one could call "the women's world";
- individual men, clients and especially representatives of official institutions;
- society as a whole;
- cultural factors, the church included (in Poland it is important, actually the church could also be treated as an institution).

We plan to discuss this theoretical perspective and the differences between the "situation of prostitution" in Poland and in Germany, because we find it quite different.

In the second part we would like to organise a workshop on trafficking in women. We will try (if possible) to use some interactive materials from polish LaStrada, we will present:
- a definition of "traffic in women";

- the work and methods of some organisations working against the trafficking in women;
- present the economical, social and psychological factors, that make the trafficking possible;
- the specific elements of the situation in Poland;

and we will speak about "becoming a victim".

Because the second part will be more interactive (we will "work in group" rather than speak all the time, and there will be some presentations of material), we think there will be space for less than 30 people. In the first, there can be as many people as space allows, because it will be just a shitty boring lecture and discussion. We will speak about prostitution in general with some special emphasis on the problems in Poland, because we assume that you can never work on social problems without engaging with the details and specific factors of culture, society and history. We will also get to a critique of the state and institutions .

Joanna Garnier

Ewa Majewska

Gender beats Class
Or: In the Brothel all Men are Equal.
Workshop about Prostitution Clients

In this workshop we will mainly discuss the subject of heterosexual men who buy sexual services from female prostitutes. In brief: we will deal with clients of prostitutes (and in my eyes we will deal with a big, a very big sexist crap). Despite its quantitative importance – estimates of men with experience range from 18% up to 88% - neither in the social scientific, academic debate nor in general political discourse this problem is given much attention. Even less is there any debate on what a political-practical intervention could look like. This makes the subject difficult and interesting at the same time. On the one hand there isn't enough material to approach this subject in the usual way: reading books, searching for articles and journals, 'diving' into existing fields of discourse, working out one's own position or undertaking direct actions. (Even though you will find a lot of literature about prostitution, you will only find six or seven important studies focussing on customers of prostitutes in German). On the other hand, this problem offers the chance to free one's mind for one's own thoughts, speculations and considerations. What a luxury, really.

In the workshop, therefore, we will try to approach the phenomenon from various angles.We will surround it, grasp it and attack it if possible. Some questions to discuss could be:
(Note: How it goes exactly we will work out together. All this is merely a proposal):
- how many clients of prostitutes exist in general, what do they do; how often, where and when do they visit prostitutes,
- what are their reasons and motives for their visits with prostitutes and what are their impulses,
- how do they interpret their actions, what do they think about prostitutes and prostitution in general, where are their limits, or do (moral, emotional or sexual) limits not exist for them within the prostitutive setting?

Very important and central will be also to ask what enables men to desire in such a way and go through with such a practice as prostitutive sexuality, which is by no means natural or a matter-of-course. It is obvious that the contact between client and prostitute is mainly based on the (male) capacity to practise a kind of sexuality which can be discribed as egocentric, dissociated, commercialised, and characterised by the wish to push through exclusively one's own sexual desires and needs. That means we will have to find out what kind of attitudes, patterns of thinking, feeling and perception, what kind of bodyimages, conceptions of sexuality and images of gender can be found in clients of prostitutes and if it is possible to link them with different formations of masculinity or male identity patterns.

After working out all this we will be prepared to address the primary subject of the summercamp-project respectively the crossover conference: the interconnectedness of relations of power and domination and the discussion what kind of practical-political conclusions can be drawn from this.

Some of the following points and questions could be important for this task:
- how to conceptualize the relation between gender and class, as men of all class factions visit brothels and use prostitutive sexuality,
- how to deal with racism in view of a relatively high percentage of female migrants among prostitutes and referring to the many millions of men invading "third world" regions as clients of prostitutes.
- and how do the relations of power and domination work within the prostitutive setting? Is it in, mainstream terms, a 'normal', politically and morally harmless act of trade, which is only pushed into a marginal zone by hypocritical and discriminating laws and is it for these reasons that a lot of problems for prostitutes are created?. Or are we dealing

here with a central patriarchal problem of power and violence, which in its very normality, confronts us with the frightening picture of a maximally degenerated male physicality and sexuality, and the wish of men to dominate women?

And finally: how can we as a radical antisexist left deal with this phenomenon? What position should we take, what kind of alliances should we enter into (fight in critical solidarity with prostitution organisations or in fundamental opposition to all organisations who simply want to legalize prostitution); how do we deal with clients of prostitutes, how with those who do busines with prostitution or, speaking in global terms, how do we deal with social structures which produce such a desire for prostitution in the first place?

To come back to the beginning of this miniarticle: in my view there is no such such political practice within the spectrum of radical left, emancipatory forces, at least not any more. All the more reason to think and discuss about it all on the crossover conference.

If there should be any time left after discussing all these questions we could start up a utopian discussion about sexual relations in a 'liberated' society, however we might define that. For instance in relation to the question if there should exist a right of providing sexual basic needs or services for example for people who are phyiscally or emotionally not able to fullfil it in a communicative way. And if we think so how should this be organised?

Many questions. For a first orientation and as a preparation for the workshop it could be helpful to read a study about this subject (ok it is my own , it is written in German and it is a qualitative research project about clients of prostitutes, where you will find a lot of the questions listed above and a relatively up-to-date bibliography). If you want to have it you can order it directly from me (lippenstifte@gmx.de).

Looking forward to seeing you,

Crazy Horse, Bremen

Postmodernity, Bildungsbuergerlichkeit and Class Origins

When talking about the problem of class, modesty is a central concept. Not **the wrong kind of modesty** but **the right kind of modesty**.

No false modesty! An intense class struggle from above has been waged for years now without any counteraction worth mentioning. In 2001 alone, three reports with frightening results were published in Germany: The government's first wealth and poverty report, the student administration's 16th social inquiry and the first PISA-study. The poor are getting poorer while the rich are getting richer. In Germany, selection according to social origin has grown stronger than in most other countries. Whatever happened to resistance from below?

The right kind of modesty: The last 150 years were marked by the dominance of class. Other forms of domination and exploitation were not given enough attention. No wonder that nowadays the concept of class is considered antiquated. Thus, it is important to understand the concept of class as part of a network consisting of many different forms of domination. Within this context, though, class has its role to play, so no false modesty!

The preparation of the crossover conference showed that the term "class" is controversial. Classes exist because they are constructed. I don't insist on the term *class*. I refer to class as a way of speaking about a group of people with a specific, i.e. varying, way of existence in this society who, together with their children, are denied access to wealth, education and culture by other groups. Their mode of existence is permanently devalued.

Post-modern theory cannot do justice to this mode of existence with its talk of "play", referring back to Nietzsche, its blindness regarding violence, its overvaluation of language for the process of social construction and its perspectivism and relativism.

The de-thematization of violence - Judith Butler as an example.

In post-modern philosophy in the widest sense of the term, the concept of "play" is used as an allegory of power relations. What is usually a central idea of this philosophy is overlooked here: that the term "play", like many other terms, is part of a hierachic binarism, i. e. it only describes one part of an opposite while its "other" remains occluded. The opposite of play is seriousness. When talking about play, we also refer to seriousness, which does not appear in post-modern philosophy. It holds a marginal position.

At the beginning of the 70ies, Frigga Haug accused role theorists of being part of a bourgeois ideology that does not take itself seriously. The same could be said for today's post-modern theorists. Seriousness in the shape of *horrible violence* is taboo.

One of many examples is Judith Butler's latest book "The psychic life of power". Throughout 200 pages Butler manages to talk about power and subjection without ever mentioning violence.

Three examples show how violence is taboo. First she refers to Hegel's famous chapter about lord and slave in the "Phenomenology of Spirit" and criticises the lack of coherence with the following chapter about the "unhappy conscience". Like many readers of Hegel, Butler fails to recognise the *threat to kill* as a self-confidence-constituting feature. Next, she refers to Freud's "Three discourses about sexual theory". She should know that this is his second sexual theory. Originally, Freud assumed that lots of children have experienced sexual violence. He had to give up this position in order to become a respected psychologist. The basis of his sexual theory developed in these three discourses is the assumption that children only imagined this sexual violence.

Third, Butler refers to Althusser and examines his concept of "appeal":

"Take Althusser's concept of appeal or interpellation, which assumes that appealing, calling or naming somebody constitutes a subject. Obviously Althusser was convinced that this social demand, or let's call it a symbolic order, creates the subjects it names. He gives the example of a policeman calling somebody "Hey you!" and concludes that this call constitutes the person it refers to. This is clearly an attempt to discipline, the policeman's call is an attempt to discipline somebody." Butler, "The psychic life of power, page 91.

In the following, she asks herself why this call is paid attention to without considering the most probable answer: the policeman is armed (at least with a truncheon) and trained in using arms. The exertion of violence is tolerated or even expected by society.
With Foucault there is nothing left to be ignored by Butler because he already did the job himself. On the occasion of the last death penalty to be carried out in France in the beginning of the 70ies, he still equated the French system of legal punishment with a system of threats to kill. But in "Discipline and Punish" he considered death and torture as Middle Age features. Seemingly, today's prisons do not longer depend on death threats and torture as disciplinary measures.

Post-modern theory and post-fordism
Foucault's criticism of the economism of left theory was created when the prevailing mode of production had entered a state of crisis, which was in part what made his ideas so attractive: his theory swam with the tide of social development. The left models were thrown out because the old social conditions were thrown out, too. Today parts of Foucault's theory are mingling with the ideology of a new mode of production and the corresponding type of state regulation.

Post-modern theory goes along with the post-fordist closure of educational institutions. Access to education is almost exclusively reserved for people who pay more attention to the exchange value of education as symbolic capital than to its use value.

What do education / theory mean to us, what does this have to do with our origins? Social origin and class-specific habitus determines theory production: Middle and upper class students tend to be more oriented towards the demands of their parents, exams and career opportunities and have a greater distance to practical work. They adhere to a particular partition of seriousness and play: pressure by their parents or the next exam are serious matters whereas the contents, the theory are considered the playful side: "…there is no truth but that I have only one more year of financial support by my parents.." Education is considered as qualification, therapies are used to overcome the contradictions between everyday needs and the demands of careerism in favour of the latter. With Foucault, this could even be construed to be a progressive self-technique.
Foucault is too Nietzschean – at least in post-fordism.

Language and reality do not correspond ("Words do not kill hunger")

During the last five years several studies about class and gender proved that relations between men and women differ according to different social classes, concerning above all the perception of difference and masculinity / femininity as a practice.
Roughly spoken, in the middle class ther is a strong differentiation of sexes that is talked away on the verbal, playful level. Among working class people there is less differentiation ("pragmatic orientation / practical solidarity") but difference is performed on the verbal / playful level.

This means political strategies such as queering can be more or less successful depending on class. While they may cause real confusion in the middle class, in working class contexts cross dressing will probably not taken all that seriously because it is play and not in tune with the every day situation of workers – the space to play in is missing.

The radical left scene also has to deal with the question of "space to play in". The question of how one earns one's living has lost its importance as a political issue in the radical left scene as I know it, even though the social network in Germany has continually been cut back. This problem is solved individually. The question "How do I pay my rent?" does not fit as well into a Foucault- or gender discussion group as it does into a jobbers' initiative or a squatters' group – where, of course, other questions do not fit too well. But there is no use in exchanging one deficit with another.

Conclusion or What will happen in this workshop?

This text should be taken as a stimulus and introduction to the problem. I want to pick up class as a central topic *in* the left scene that will meet at the crossover conference. My preparation concentrates on different possibilities referring to both the context and the method. We could organise a demonstration against the elite-university in Bremen, for example, or discuss education in postfordism or both (in order to deNietzscheanize on all levels) or something totally different. To treat all ideas that may come up during the workshop in a constructive way, I will use some educational work methods. There will also be movement…

Erich Landrocker

Gay, or Queer, or ... ?
Questions from *Homoland*

The Presentation of a 10-Year-Old Project

Gay identity is an invention of the last 150 years, and it is restricted to European and US-American societies. Considering this, does it still make sense to define oneself as gay? Does the use of the term gay exclude non-white men-who-love-men? Does it lead to the exclusion of deviant sexualities (inter-, trans-, bi- or asexual) as well as to a limitation of the possibilities of one's own life? - Is the definition as queer (or the complete refusal to define one's identity) compatible with the commercialization of the gay community, which tries to be diverse but not really different from society? As long as there is compulsory heterosexuality, should it be obligatory to announce one's gayness? - Even today, can some of us already be unsure of what they really are? What does a queer identity imply for alliances between gay men and lesbians?

We would like to discuss these and related questions in our workshop.

We might answer the question of who we are differently. But from the possibilities - gay or queer or ...? - you can already see that we are neither lesbians, black women nor heterosexual men from Latin America. Though we disagree about the identity we share (or don't share), we nevertheless are involved in the same project, the *Homolandwoche*. There will be a short presentation of it in our workshop.

"Differences in Sexualities and Masculinities"

Preface

The following text is divided into 5 parts. These correspond to the structure we want to give the workshop:
After the introduction of the facilitators (see part 1) and the participants, we'll introduce a theoretical model by means of which we want to try and grasp some dimensions of identity and some of the psychosocial dynamics bound up with them (see part 2).
Then we'll split up into three or more small groups - depending on how many people we are all together - to continue talking. We propose that each group focus on one of the topics we have been working on: masculinities (see part 3), sexualities (see part 4) and sexual violence (see part 5).
In the last part of the workshop we want to address the question of how an emancipatory discourse about sexuality could be organized and what kind of political practice may be possible in this field.
We've tried to come up with a clear proposal for a structure. How the workshop is actually going to go will depend on the situation, the desires and interests of the participants, which we'll of course accommodate.

1. Introduction

We constituted ourselves as a group towards the end of the year 2000. Our motive to get together in this constellation was the new quality of the so-called "debate on rape" – a debate that has been going on in "radical left" circles in Germany for quite a while now.
We wanted to speak out clearly and publicly against the antifeminist tendencies apparent in many contributions to this debate.

Beyond and above that, our goal is to contribute to a fundamental political debate on sexuality and power, since we believe sexuality ought to be a central issue of radical left politics.

We discussed in what way the "debate on rape", as it is currently being conducted, can be understood as a symptom of an antifeminist backlash. By "backlash" we mean a political/economic/ideological…counterattack against women in general and feminists in particular, that should be seen in the context of the suppression of other emancipatory social movements since the seventies. This backlash is, in our opinion, not only evident in the fact that terminating a pregnancy has become more difficult in many states, or in the increase in the number of women out of wage labor, but also in the decreasing influence of feminists within the so-called radical left, at least that's the way we see it for the "west German" situation, and we think we can perceive similar developments in other western states.

Of course this discussion about a backlash implies the more general question of how to interpret political/social/cultural/ideological…developments of the last 15 or 20 years. There's been a backlash (and it continues), we are agreed on that, but many other things have happened as well and many processes don't fall into any simple pattern. The changes in feminist politics since the seventies for example cannot be adequately grasped with a notion of regression and progression.

The fact that some of the interventions into the "radical left" debate on sexuality which we find antifeminist (at least to a degree), use "deconstructionist" or "poststructuralist" vocabulary gave rise to a debate within our group on the political merits of deconstructive approaches in general. Regarding this point there are differences among us, although we do all

appreciate the value and importance of the "deconstructionist" critique of homogenizing categories of identity. We differ in how important we find the constitution of collective subjects on the one hand, the critique of identities as exclusive and homogenizing on the other.

In our conversations about sexuality etc in the workgroup, we certainly were not aware at all times where the ideas we were using actually come from. Retrospectively one could say that our theoretical background comprised, among other elements, fragments of Critical Theory (aka the Frankfurt School), versions of discourse-analytic thinking ranging from Foucault to Butler, as well as feminist psychoanalytic theories.

We consciously decided not to deal with texts very much in the workgroup: we did read a text now and then, but didn't work with them very much, speaking a good deal about our personal experiences, thoughts and feelings regarding sexuality, power and gender instead, trying to connect all this to the theoretical concepts we had read about or picked up some other way.

Because of this way of working, it took us a long time to come up with some kind of result. And, not for the first time, an opportunity for timely intervention into current debates was missed. But now we are doing this workshop instead.

2. Differences and Dynamics

For the workshop at the *Crossover Conference* we have tried to impose some kind of order on the jumble of ideas we produced in the course of our conversations. The result of our efforts – as we mentioned at the beginning – is a theoretical model by means of which we want to try and grasp some dimensions of identity and some dynamics associated with them. We'll sketch a rough outline of this model before going on to present the groundwork we've done for the three focuses we propose for the workgroups.

We wish to emphasize that we have not actually worked with this model very much yet, it came into being towards the end of our conversations, as an attempt to give the workshop a clear structure.

2.1. Differences

Some dimensions of identity that we want to keep in mind in our political analysis of sexuality are: body norms (health, ability, beauty etc.), age hierarchies (adults vs. children, young vs. old), gender, ethnicity, race, nationality (this includes positioning in north-south, east-west hierarchies), religion (including the formative religious influences in formally secular societies), urbanity (urban – rural, "modern" – "traditional"), aboriginality ("immigrant" – "autochthonous") and class (class origin, current class status). Our understanding of class is not purely economic, cultural resources, education etc are part of class.

S. Stanford Friedman (in "Mappings", 1998) has developed a useful "map" of six critical discourses of identity:
1. The discourse of multiple oppression focuses on oppression as the main constituent of identity and stresses differences among women.
2. The discourse of multiple subject positions theorizes identity as the intersection of different, often competing cultural formations, sees the self as multiple and attempts to understand how power and powerlessness may be combined in one identity.
3. The discourse of contradictory subject positions also sees the self as multiple, but emphasizes the contradictions between different components of identity. It sees contradictions as fundamental to the structure of subjectivity.
4. For the discourse of relationality, identity is not only multiple and contradictory, but, first and foremost, relational. In this discourse, identity is not imagined as stable but as mobile: it depends on a point of reference and always exists in relation to something else; as the

point of reference moves around, the contours of identity change.

5. The discourse of situationality stresses how identity shifts depending on the setting. In one situation the gender aspect, in another the ethnic aspect of identity may be foregrounded. So while the identity of a person is a product of multiple subject positions, not each "axis" of identity is equally salient in every situation.

6. The discourse of hybridity is associated with migration, exile, and borderlands. Identity comes into being as a cultural mixing through migration or the superimposition of different cultures in a borderland, it is not pure or authentic. This cultural mixing often leads to painful splitting, divided loyalties and disorientation.

We'd like to try and use this great reservoir of possibilities of thinking identity in complex and critical ways.

2.2. Dynamics

We want to "think together" structures of the individual psyche with larger-scale social processes without reducing one to the other. It's essential to analyze struggles for hegemony within discourse, without losing sight of non-discursive practices of violence and exclusion.

In the course of our conversations on the interaction of gender, class, etc and how this ties in with sexuality, we came up with some names for a few "ideal types" of psycho-social dynamics:

The struggle around images:
There are of course hegemonic images, for example that of the bourgeois male; on the other hand, subaltern groups try to put their own images into circulation, for example, working class men attempt to circulate derogatory images of bourgeois men, to counter their own devaluation by hegemonic images of themselves.

Attribution/ascription:
This struggle around images is a kind of conflict of attributions, where individuals and groups fight for power and self-esteem, by attributing stereotypes to others, ascribing particular characteristics to them, thus devalueing or overvalueing them, demonizing or idealizing them, calming their own fears or neutralizing their own emotional ambivalences and contradictions in this way, exalting themselves or denigrating themselves…

Out of these struggles a dynamic and contradictory, yet stable hierarchical structure (very stable at present, unfortunately) emerges that regulates the attribution of social value, the distribution of appreciation, that renders certain kinds of work, certain sufferings, certain wishes visible, others invisible.

Internalization:
Of course there is internalized devaluation, where people from underprivileged groups internalize the negative stereotypes about themselves in the form of shame and self-hatred.

Examples for this would be the negative feelings of many Afro-Americans about their hair, the fear of many women that they are too fat, or the sentiment of many people in East Asia, that their eyes are not round enough (a sentiment fueling a cosmetic surgery industry worth millions in some East Asian countries); it would be easy to fill many pages with further examples.

Abjection:
Our concept of abjection does not respect the boundary between the psychic and the social, but neither does it reduce all kinds of different phenomena to just one simple logic.

Abject **things** (domestic dirt), abject **physicalities** (the clitoris, menstrual blood) and abject **states** (bulimia, masturbatory fantasies, hysteria) are not the same as abject **zones** (prisons, women's shelters). **Psychic** abjection (disavowal, the uncanny) is not the same as **political**

abjection ("ethnic cleansing", mass removals, prostitute "cleanups").

What one is dependent upon is abjected: Domestic labor is made invisible, men disavow identification with their mother, prostitutes are confined to certain zones, etc…

Ambivalence:

Abjection produces ambivalence. No devaluation wihout fascination. To denigrate someone or a group means projecting some real or imagined negative attribute out of oneself or one's group onto others. In the context of the production of an "adult", self-controlled, bourgeois subjectivity, that denies some of the most elementary human impulses and disavows physicality, dependency and connectedness, this means that people obviously remain attached to these split-off, denied aspects of themselves – and the more energy gets put into the splitting-off process, the more intense the fascination with what one has split off.

Thus, for example, the - often denied - fascination of many (supposedly) sober, civil, middle class men with images of "raw" physical prowess, wild and animal masculinity etc. The fascination of many "decent" men with images of "bad" women, whores etc. (a fascination coupled with disgust and contempt, of course) would be another example.

Compensation:

If, as a male immigrant for example, I am devalued ethnically and in class terms, playing out my gender privileges seems an obvious solution; all the more so if images of animal hypermasculinity are foisted upon me from all sides.

Transformation:

Men who are the object of colonial or racist devaluation are symbolically feminized. A rape in a jail or a prisoner-of-war camp is, among other things, a symbolic feminization of a subjugated male.

Working-class women were racialized in the 19th century, i.e. imagined as "black" (the portraits of english working women by the Victorian writer Arthur J. Munby are an impressive example of this – see Anne McClintock: Imperial Leather. Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Imperial Contest, NY 1995, pp 105-112).

3. Masculinities

We use the plural of the term here because we believe it encompasses a host of different, sometimes even conflicting identities. That doesn't make it exactly easy to define what is meant by it.

One proposal (pretty close to the definition Robert W. Connell, a researcher in the field of critical men's studies, offers) would be:

Masculinity constitutes a position in a symbolic gender order, i.e. it always exists in distinction from femininity (on a hierarchical axis, on which it marks superiority, authority and the norm) and is thus not static but subject to historic and cultural processes.

At a social level, masculinity can be grasped only as a set of processes and practices that serve to constitute this position. These processes create conceptions of norm and essence, not the other way around.

Within a power structure, privileges are distributed according to different, but interrelating categories. Within Western societies, which may, without further ado, be characterized as patriarchal, gender is an essential criterion of distribution.

Attribution to a gender within this system of enforced binarism is tied to external, bio-logical "perceptible sex characteristics" – organs of reproduction; if these don't conform to the bipolar norm, they get operated on until "non-ambiguity" is reached (up till now, the guiding principle here is "it's easier to make a hole than to build a pole"). Thus, being biolog(ist)ically classified as male is the first prerequisite for the acquisition of positions of social dominance and initiates

a whole program of socialisation; a program that forcefully suggests certain behaviors to the subject, at the same time as it makes the subject an active participant in creating its own representations of identity, a process that is never completed. Here it's relevant how the subject is located on other axes of ascription: color, class, sexuality, ethnicity, physicality, position in the global order etc. Social masculinities are shaped by these categories; individual experiences of socialisation can be highly divers, but never independent of these factors.

Different conceptions of masculinity stand in a dynamic and dialectic relationship to one another. Besides defining themselves by differentiation from socially extant feminities, they produce themselves by differentiating from one another. Drawing upon Gramsci's theory of cultural hegemony*, masculinities may be understood as part of a dynamic structure. Hegemonic masculinity, that we would identify as white, bourgeois, heterosexual and "ablebodied", legitimizes dominance and the subordination of women. It is institutionalized in the economic, political and military elites. It also structures the options other masculinities have: identification, rapprochement, complicity, subordination, marginalisation, rejection, resistance – ignoring it is impossible.

Even different forms of hegemonic masculinity can diverge widely in what they "contain": the eloquent, dynamic, successful young manager, the German early evening tv-series model family daddy, the old boys on the golf course, Reinhold Messner** with his surly nature-conquering: they embody different constructions of hegemonic masculinity, emphasizing different values –self-assertion, responsibility, power, toughness – but there is no conflict between these values.
Decisive shifts start happening when masculinity has to contend with lack of privilege at other levels: working-class

masculinities often create themselves through a contemptuous rejection of middle class deportment (accusations of wimpishness), a strategy to cover up social subalternity. "Black" men are confronted with colonial attributions that depict them as both inferior (uncivilized) and a threat ("hypermasculinity", the competition for "white" women).

A lack of commitment to heterosexuality results in a sacking from masculinity; masculinity is denied those who break the basic rule "thou shalt desire a feminine object".
(One could think that in the symbolic order, gays should end up within "femininity", but, contrary to this pet prejudice of heterosexist society, they don't, just as lesbians do not successfully acquire masculinity; those who don't comply with the "natural" order of things get kicked out of the symbolic order as well. What is also remarkable is the perception of bisexuality in society at large: it is treated as almost nonexistent.)
Of course, nonetheless, gays exist as men, enacting all kinds of convincing masculine performances – except for heterosexuality. This introduces an element of permanent irritation into the framework.
To sum up: the picture before us is one of divers, even contradictory representations of masculinity, within which dichotomies, such as intellectual vs. animal, rational vs. reckless etc, correspond with attributions of class, race, ethnicity, etc.

What we believe all types of masculinity have in common is a consensual, not always explicit, devaluation of women and a feeling of competition vis-à-vis other men.

*)Hegemony is not static but something which prevails over competing models in a specific historical situation, that is mutable and, in contrast to pure despotism, is based on popular acclaim, or at least tolerance.

**) famous German mountaineer

4. Sexualities

These are our basic questions: What are the hegemonic discourses on sexuality in terms of structures of power and exploitation, and which institutions and which practices promote them? Which kinds of difference* are involved in producing different, sometimes contradictory sexualities? How does what is individually and subjectively experienced as "the sexual" come into being? What is the relation between (hegemonic) structures and discourses of sexuality on the one hand, subjective experience on the other? And: What are the possibilities of subversion, which practices are experienced as emancipatory, what is produced by these practices?

And here are some more questions and hypotheses (ones we talked about during preparations for this workshop), which we offer as suggestions for exchanges and debates:

- How and at what margins does the field of the sexual delimit itself from other fields, for example: the erotic, the physical, intimacy, tenderness, etc.
  - What intentions are bound up with the sexual? What wishes / needs / energies / motivations flow into it? What do subjects seek in sexuality?
  - What concept of social relations are connected to sexuality or are performed via sexuality? What gets communicated and appreciated through sexuality, what relationships include sexuality and which don't? What we are talking about here is sexuality as a structuring principle, which marks social relations, endows certain relations with certain meanings, thus producing marriages and "couples", for example.
  - What kinds of bodies are constituted through the discourses and practices of the sexual, "sexed bodies" in the sense of sexuality / desire as well as in the sense of sex/gender? In what way are bodies "hierarchized", divided into zones (genitalia, "erogenous zones", sexual signs) and how does this relate to the perception one has of one's own body (well-being, beauty, attributions of sensitivity etc.)? How do these bodies meet in a social context, how do they interact in terms of perception and in concrete contact (which looks go where, touchable and untouchable zones, the below and the above of the waistline, etc.)

- What's the relationship between the processes that, on the one hand, make sexuality "scarce" and, on the other, simultaneously stimulate sexuality?

On the one hand there is an enormous public/social presence of discourses on sexuality, as well as an omnipresent mediatic apparatus of sexualization. At the same time there is the disavowal and interdiction of many aspects of the sexual; "having sex" is generally clearly restricted to the private sphere and bound up with various feelings of guilt and shame. In view of the violent nature of social relations, one function of this "privatization" of the sexual is to try to protect the extreme vulnerability connected to sexuality; it is also a reaction to the omnipresence of (hetero)sexism and the contempt for non-heterosexualities. (In gay scenes, the relation of domination between men and women is not immediately present, and this is probably why new spaces appear here, and a more "public" sexual practice, in clubs, saunas, etc, becomes possible.)

To produce the sexual, certain aspects are withdrawn from general social contact and invested in the sexual field. Coded as sexual, these then suggest a way out of social isolation, and sexuality becomes the via regia towards the fulfilment of all wishes for physical contact, tenderness, intimacy, emotionality, empathy and ecstasy. Sexuality is endowed, charged with all this, it is problematic, vulnerable and hurtful, feeding on the deficiencies of

social interaction, often bound up with fantasies of exclusivity and salvation.

By naturalizing sexual perception and feeling, through the discourse of "drives" and "natural urges", etc, in short, by the positing of all humans as "sexual beings", sexuality is made compulsory. People disinterested in the sexual are either pathologized (frigidity, impotence, etc), disparaged as prudish or inhibited, or at least seen as carrying a profound problem around with them. Disengaging from the pressure for sexual performance and success entails a major assault on one's self-confidence, conjuring up images of being incomplete, of being wrong, of failing.

Since hegemonic sexuality is, first and foremost, heterosexual, gender, or rather, the binary gender order, is a central component of its structure. Heterosexuality's principle of genitality always emphasizes biological sex, in other words, continually reproduces the gender order. How does gender binarism inscribe itself into bodies, how are genitality and sexuality interlinked and what strategies could subvert these structures?

* difference in the sense of how we use the term in part 2 of this text

5. Sexual violence and violations of boundaries by heterosexual men

Continuing on from our discussion of sexuality, masculinity and domination, we want to deal with the question here, of whether boundary violations and sexual violence are constitutive elements of masculinity. We think it's important to look for the causes and conditions of development of sexual violence to enable us to begin to come up with counterstrategies.
Our hypothesis is that masculinity can only ever constitute itself by marking itself off from "the Other" (see above).

Sexual boundary violations or sexual violence – primarily perpetrated by heterosexual men – are, in this perspective, expressions of a hatred of women, of the contempt for and the devaluation of "the feminine" (in the sense of a social position in the ruling gender order), an act of subjugation, of establishing male control. The objects of these acts are mainly women, but men defined as "non-male" may also be targeted. The rape of a man can, for example, serve as an act of symbolic "feminization".

Binary attributes such as hard vs. soft, rational vs. emotional, mental vs. physical, autonomous vs. dependent, etc. are ascribed to the genders "man" or "woman" and materialize in the subject, i.e. they structure our ways of perceiving, feeling and acting. These attributions aren't universal, rather they are a set of traits that are variable yet normative. The male subject thus constitutes itself by marking itself off against the "feminine", defined as the "non-masculine".

One way of trying to understand the evolution of gender identity in Western heterosexual nuclear family structures that we find interesting is the feminist psychoanalytic approach to integrating the cultural with the psychic.

Jessica Benjamin, for example, in her book "The Bonds of Love", starts from the assumption that male gender identity is constituted in early childhood through dis-identification with the mother. Notwithstanding the real and the alleged flexibilization of gender roles, in Western capitalist societies the first and most important person for a child remains a woman – the mother. Thus the boy must separate himself from the person he is most dependent upon and deny any identification with her to construct a male gender identity. In the end, the male subject can desire the feminine, but can never be it, since this would put the

boundaries of his male identity into question.

With Benjamin, sexual violations of boundaries could be seen as a brutal act to get appreciation without having to give appreciation to an other, as the denial of dependency by the supposedly independent, rational male subject, an act which denies the subjectivity of the woman and thus turns her into an object.

From a structural point of view, sexual violence, for men, is a way of putting women (and feminized men) in their place in the ruling gender order - in a particularly forceful and brutal fashion, since the field of the sexual is highly sensitive.

Socially, sexual violence is simultaneously played down, placed under taboo and demonized; its causes are displaced from the average male, middle-class, heterosexual male and ascribed to "the Other" (black, working-class, perverse, etc.); even though it is - or rather, could be - well known that it is precisely within heterosexual couples and families that sexual violations of boundaries are commonplace, functioning to demonstrate male dominance and to reassure men of their dominance.

As we already noted above in part 2.2. ("Dynamics"), we assume that devaluation always goes with a fascination for the devalued "Other". This means that we see the devaluation of femininity and the hatred of women as bound up with a masculinity that is experienced as deficient. To put it more concretely, this masculine deficiency encompasses traits such as empathy, tenderness, caring, etc., that are split off from "the masculine" and projected onto "femininity".

- To what degree is this true only for heterosexual masculinity, or is the devaluation and simultaneous idealization of the feminine common to all masculinities (including gay, bisexual, and other masculinities)?

- How ist the hatred of the feminine interrelated with the structural relations of domination, what is the role of class and ethnicity – one example would be the image of the "black man" and his alleged particular sexual aggressiveness…?

We asked ourselves what an emancipatory discourse on masculinity, sexuality and violence could look like. We think it's important to mark the social positions from which people speak, and to pay attention to the feelings bound up with these positions. For the issue of sexual violence, this would mean acknowledging the differences there are, while attempting to develop common perspectives, where this is possible.

Conclusion

We don't want a purely theoretical discussion in this workshop, but we want to start with the concrete wishes and fears of the individual participants, so as to be able to speak about personal experiences, too.

We want to try to understand sexuality as a field of political struggle while at the same time respecting the complexity of individual experience.

We want to discuss how the antifeminist backlash could be countered and what strategies could be useful here.

The relation to the Other calls me in question

Since the end of the eighties, attention to cultural differences was vehemently demanded. Audre Lorde describes the facts of the case as follows:

"It wasn't enough to be women together. We were different. It wasn't enough to be lesbian women together. We were different. It wasn't enough to be black together. We were different. It wasn't enough to be black women together. We were different. It wasn't enough to be black lesbian women together. We were different.".(Audre Lorde: Zami)

By massive criticism, feminist practice and theory had to be brought to not only criticise the site from which men speak, but to also critically reflect one's own way of speaking and acting. However, in the beginning of the discussion, there were various reactions. For example, during the early nineties, in the prefaces of new publications one could frequently find the author taking her stand. This would sound approximately like this: "I am a white, christian, heterosexual, middle-class woman…" Now there's nothing more boring than this statement. Not because the

life of a white, heterosexual middle-class woman, may she be also lesbian or bisexual, is boring as such, but because setting such a premise right in the beginning shuts down every discussion about the categories mentioned above and fixes them in an unreflected way. Moreover, as some kind of a subtext, this confession about their identity suggests a trade that the reader or listener almost gets forced to accept. This trade can be described like this: "I only deal with myself and try not to touch anything that is different and won't cross the boundary between myself and the Other. As a reward, you will not attack the content of my statement."

Trinh T. Minh-ha, U.S. American theorist and film maker, talks about this phenomenon as a "politics of separate development" – a term loaned from the language of the apartheid regime in South Africa. She explains her choice by reasoning that the new colonialism wasn't out to destroy indigenous cultures any more, but that it kept an eye on the maintenance of the boundaries between differing cultures.[1] Underlying this "politics of separate development" was a history that exclusively dealt with the Other. Not with the aim of preserving it but, like in traditional colonialism, with the

---

[1] Trinh T. Minh-ha: Difference. A Special Third World Women Issue. In: Trinh T. Minh-ha: Texte,

aim of destroying it. Emmanuel Lévinas gives us the following description of the beginnings of the history of the occident:

"Occidental philosophy is coextensive with the unveiling of the Other. Through this, the Other (…) loses its Otherness. From its beginning, philosophy was seized by a horror of the Other, by an insurmountable allergy."(Emmanuel Levinas: The Trace of the Other)

According to Lévinas, occidental philosophy's project is obsessed with the Other, with the aim of its eradication. Related to the speaking Self, this means that the Other gets transferred into the identity of the Self while ignoring the Other's non-integratable aspects. By doing this, the knowledge about the Self gets transferred to the Other, not taking the differences between the Self and the Other into account. Underlying this procedure is the assumption, that the relation between the Other and the Self could be bridged by acts of imagination, sympathy and identification, obtaining a mirroring reciprocity. Lévinas disputes exactly this with the argument that the actual encounter calls the possibility of absolute understanding in question: "The relation to the Other calls me in question..."[2]

Nowadays, a serious feminist discussion cannot exist without hinting at the differences between women. But the comment on the significance of social and discursive boundaries like gender, race, class and sexual preference usually come to a sudden halt. These four differences became successfully introduced into the discussion, whereas criteria concerning the body such as *health*[3], *disability*[4] and *age*[5] are mentioned in very few publications. These criteria have not been taken into account by feminist discussions, although women with disabilities have been calling for a discussion concerning this topic since the early eighties. The impact of numerous contributions of women with disabilities and professionals scarcely reaches beyond the limits of their special field. Even in a discourse that explicitly pays attention to varying differences and their connections, ideas about illness, age and disability are not included. Birgit Rommelspacher's reflections about the "culture of domination", consequently reflecting on hostility towards disabled people, are but one exception.[6]

Speaking with Emmanuel Lévinas, I would like to name only one of the possible reasons for this persistent ignorance. As I have shown, Lévinas criticises occidental philosophy for creating a privileged

Filme, Gespräche. Ed.: Kunstverein München, Synema, Vienna/Berlin 1995, p. 19 - 36

[2] Ibid.: p. 219
[3] Judith Butler: Gender Trouble.
[4] Kader Konuk: Unterschiede verbünden. Von der Instrumentalisierung von Differenzen, p. 239. In: Brigitte Fuchs, Gabriele Habinger (ed): Rassismen und Feminismen. Differenzen, Machtverhältnisse und Solidarität zwischen Frauen.Wien 1996, pp. 233-239
[5] Mona Singer: Fremd-Wahrnehmung. Unterscheidungsweisen und Definitionsmacht, p. 55. In: Die Philosophin, no. 15/1997, pp. 44-56
[6] Birgit Rommelspacher: Dominanzkultur. Texte zu Fremdheit und Macht. Berlin 1995, pp. 55-79

position for the logic of the Self. On the intersubjective level, this logic shows in an act of identification: the Other is recognised merely in order to be transferred into an identitiy with the Self. Because the own identitiy is thought of as holisitic and closed, everything that cannot be integrated turns into a threat for the Self. Subjectivities that differ from the own subjective understanding (poeple with disabilities obviously belong to this group) interfere with the logic of the Self. A practice acting according to the logic of the Self, be it political, paedagogical or aesthetic, always stays related to the Self and cannot see what's different. I perceive the care not to talk about the Other, i.e. preserving the boundaries and accepting the Otherness without dispute, to be one of the mechanisms of the logic of the Self that guard the own closed Self. It cannot be an answer to the question if and how others can be spoken about.

Due to this lack of dispute, we have no theoretical tools for a discussion including ableism, illness and age. For example: the criterion "health" is often merged with the criterion "ableism", although most disabilities have nothing in common with illness. Anyhow, disability is a term that signifies a deficiency to a condition that is deemed the norm. A category which includes both ability and disability - as for example male and female are both included in "gender" – doesn't exist.

In the process of a discourse with the intention of drawing attention towards differences, exclusions have been made and categories were not accounted for. I want to stress that the enumeration of differences or categories of identity cannot be the answer to the question how the Otherness of the Other can be understood in a comprehensive way. On the contrary, this enumeration suggests the Self or the Other to be wholly understood and controllable. US-American philosopher Judith Butler believes the impossibility of entirely covering a subject to be a productive political approach:

"The theories of feminist identity that elaborate predicates of color, sexuality, ethnicity, class and ablebodiedness invariably close with an embarassed 'etc' at the end of the list. Through this horizontal trajectory of adjectives, these positions strive to encompass a situated subject, but invariably fail to be complete. This failure, however, is instructive: what political impetus is to be derived from the exasperated "etc." that so often occurs at the end of such lines? This is a sign of exhaustion as well as of the illimitable process of signification itself. It is the *supplement,*, the excess that necessarily accompanies any effort to posit identity once and for all. This illimitable *et cetera,* however, offers itself as a new departure for feminist political theorizing."(Butler, 1990, p 143)

Butler interprets the failure of the exact designation of the category "woman" in two ways. On the one hand it shows the limit of the concept of identity which can

never completely understand a subject. According to Butler, the attribution of meaning must be seen as a process that doesn't signify anything essential but makes a number of possibilities for being available. On the other hand (Butler defines this failure in a positive way) the objection of the excluded subjects refers to the missing and thus necessary direction for future research and practice.

Anja Tervooren

Exerpt taken from: "Die Beziehung zum Anderen stellt mich in Frage..." published by: ZE zur Förderung von Frauenstudien und Frauenforschung an der FU Berlin, 1997

Experiencing ableism
The unusual body as a sign of Otherness

1. Approaching ableism and the power of normality

In December 2001 a group of German disability rights activists celebrated an important anniversary. 20 years ago, they have set up the "Krüppeltribunal"of 1981, - a "court of cripples", collecting and presenting violations of human rights of disabled people in Germany. Why did they hold a "court"? What kind of human rights violations were they claiming?

One of the main discriminations they were protesting against was the fundamental segregation of people with disabilities from mainstream society. It is an expression of a deeply rooted prejudicial assumption: that people with disabilities are somewhat different, alien to able-bodied people; that they are even not quite human at all.

Additional to this fundamental doubt concerning the nature and value of disabled people's lifes, there is a widespread notion of suffering that disability supposedly is causing inevitably, calling for medical treatment and control, cure and prevention.

The treatment of the "alien" thus includes segregation in every sphere of societal life: Housing, working, education, leisure time, relationships and so on. Not just physical barriers such as inaccessible buildings leave some disabled people out, segregation is mostly fundamentally of economical nature: The personal assistance judged as being too expensive, forcing people to move into a nursing home, where a self-determined life style is almost impossible. The establishment of specially equipped and designed workplaces leading to the banning of some people with disabilities into highly exploitive "sheltered workshops". The judging of integrative schools as being too costly, preventing disabled students from attending a regular school. And above all, the economic logic of disability being a burden to society, calling for the prevention and elimination of disabled people, legitimated by specific "bioethics" or other philosophical, allegedly scientific ideologies.

Continuing the list, one would find that disability prejudice is so deeply entrenched in society that almost every interaction can be fueled by ideological assumptions about disability and thus is potentially segregative. In this, disability discrimination shares features of racism in its power to stigmatize and categorize humans as a – negatively valued - abberation from the norm, or as Robert Miles characterizes the function of racism as "the assigment of significations to specific phenotypical and/or genetic features in a way that it leads to an establishment of a system of categorizations, with assigning the persons subsumed under these categories additional (negatively valued) features" (Miles, R., 1991, p. 9).

Disability prejudice can not only be linked to race, but also to gender, obvious for instance in Simone de Beauvoir's notion of "Otherness". Foundational to her existentialistic concept is non-person status as a core symbolic category for marking a difference from the male, heterosexual white norm. In reference to Hegel's notion of the other as the marker of the self's boundaries, she introduces the idea into a feminist theory of women as the fundamental *Other* in light of the normative male. The differentness is, according to de Beauvoir, established and maintained through the objectifying, male gaze, serving males to set up own identity boundaries:

Once the subject seeks to assert himself, the Other, who limits and denies him, is none the less a necessity to him: he attains himself only through that reality which he is not, which is something other than himself. (de Beauvoir, 1976, 171).

The female Other thus is needed not only in economical and biological terms, but in a sociocultural way to establish and confirm male identity markers.

Parallel to de Beauvoir's comparison of the utility of women as being cast as the Other in order to signify gender and to the utility of Africans and African Americans to the establishment of a racial, white identity, Disability Studies scholar Tom Shakespeare (1994) is linking the concept to the social position of disabled people. He finds the commonality between the position of women and other disadvantaged groups especially striking in light of de Beauvoir's indication of the Other's body's link to *nature*, in order to set up a counterpart to the male dominated sphere of *culture*, while undermining the status of the Other. "I am", writes Shakespeare,

…suggesting that disabled people could be also regarded as Other, by virtue of their connection to nature; their visibility as evidence of the constraining body, and their status as constant reminders of mortality. If original sin, through the transgression of Eve, is concretized in the flesh of women, then the flesh of disabled people has historically, and within the Judeo-Christian theology especially, presented divine punishment for ancestral transgression. Furthermore, non-disabled people define themselves as 'normal' in opposition to disabled people who are not. (Shakespeare, 1994, p. 292).

With that, a definition of ableism as being a way of perceiving and categorizing certain kinds of physique as abnormal and –which is even more important – attaching a negative value to this category becomes comprehensable. Moreover, by being categorized as being a deficit to the bodily norm, certain bodily condition are judged to be burdensome, suffering, frightening and dangerous, or, awe-inspiring and heroic. Judgment of a person in an ableistic manner generally surrenders the regard of individual features and expressions to the sole regard of ideological, prejudicial assumptions about a person.

2. Perspectives on disability – a false thinking about the unknown body.

A big part of the knowledge about disabled people is the basis but also derives from the societal practices that are imposed upon them. Historically, these practices have been ones of exclusion and confinement, of pathologization and eradication. Their broad segregation from the able-bodied world denied disabled people a voice, which could make their experiences, thoughts and insights be heard. Though disabled people were largely out of the picture in the industrialized western cultures, their place in the belief system of able-bodied people was always secured. Everyone knew and knows that aberrations from the "normal" body occur, however, instead of a public, open and clarifying discourse of disability, the regular omission of the topic fueled false, mystified notions about the differing body. In addition, some of these notions had a great utility for the establishment and the maintenance of a capitalistic system and thus became ideologies of disability. Ideologies are a false but necessary thinking, they are taken up if the pursuing of an interest (as for example the placement of a "burdensome surplus population" in nursing homes or sheltered workshops) has to be legitimized. As Karl Marx and Frederic Engels write in their critique of contemporary German philosophy

The thoughts of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling thoughts, i.e. the class which has the material power of society is at the same time its power of mind. … .The ruling thoughts are nothing else than the idealistic expression of the ruling material conditions, the ruling material conditions put into thoughts; the conditions that turn one class into the ruling one, therefore the thoughts of their rule. (Marx and Engels, 1845,46, p. 46; transl.from german orig.)

I will now point to four of such frameworks of false thinking, which represent central, but definitely not all notions about disability. I found that most common notions can be connected to either

one of these, but the list could also be much longer and more detailed.

a) From the marvelous spectacle to the medical object –historical perspectives on disability

Since the beginning of human culture, man has attempted to interpret the unusual body. Testimonies of disability representation date back as early as to prehistoric Egyptian culture and to the Greek culture BC (Evans, 1983, p.157). Disability has historically been used as a symbol – with varying content. The dominant interpretation was thus contaminated with fear of the unknown body, naming it beast or monster. This term derives from the Latin verb *monstra*, indeed "simply" meaning to warn, to show or to sign, and led to the modern verb *to demonstrate*.

The fact that disability never stood for itself, and always had a – mostly dreadful – meaning attached to it, contributed to all kinds of treatments of disabled people, and the treatment itself influenced the production of the meaning. The most common one especially in the Middle Ages was the eradication of disabled people, or their confinement and sometimes display in specific public locations. Notable for instance is the "idiot's cage" in a tower of the city walls of Hamburg, Germany, where mentally retarded people were confined in 1376 (Evans, 1983, p.159). A small number though was "chosen" throughout the ages to entertain people – for example as court jesters.

After centuries' passing, in light of the onset of modernity, the mostly religious explanations were gradually replaced by a beginning scientific inquiry. "Teratology", "the study of monsters", presented its results in cabinets of human curiosities, which commercialized with the establishment of sideshows in the 19th and 20th century (Garland Thomson, 1995). Here, and especially in the popular American freak show of the 20th century's early decades, people with all kinds of bodily differences like missing or additional limbs, extraordinary growth, hermaphrodites, obese people, people with mental disabilities etc. were exposed to a paying, gawking audience, marveling at these wondrous "mistakes of nature". In order to achieve "freakdom", the mere fact of their bodily aberration had to be fused with a certain symbolic text, often their supposedly extraordinary biography narrated and presented by the showmen. As Robert Bogdan explains,

… .While being extremely tall is a matter of physiology, being a giant involves something more. Similarly, being a freak', a 'human oddity', or a 'human curiosity is not a personal matter, a physical condition people have. (Bogdan, 1996, 24)

So displayed disabled people – often cast as the "missing link", marked the boundaries of humanity and crossed them at the same time. It is this ambiguous state that both fascinated and abhorred the audience, as Elizabeth Grosz analyses:

The freak is an object of simultaneous horror and facination because, in addition to whatever infirmities of abilities he or she exhibits, the freak is an ambiguous being whose existence imperils categories and oppositions dominant in social life. Freaks are those human beings who exist outside and in defiance of the structure of binary opposition that govern our basic concepts and modes of self-definition. They occupy the impossible middle ground between the opposites dividing the human from the animal, one being from another [e.g. conjoined twins], nature from culture, .. ., one sex from the other,…, adults and children [e.g. dwarfs and "midgets"]…. . (Grosz, 1996, 57)

After the last flickering of mythology in the course of the American freak show, science gained firm hegemony upon disability knowledge and explanation. In this movement from the narrative of the marvelous to the narrative of deviant, medical science seized the abnormal body for scrutinizing investigation and pathologizing categorization.

"Genetics, embryology, anatomy, teratology and reconstructive surgery – the discrete, high scientific discourses that

now pathologizes the extraordinary body - were once closely linked with the showmen's display of the freak body", (Garland Thomson, 1996, 13)
asserts Garland Thomson.

Medical science declares every bodily difference from the norm as an affliction, as disease – whether it causes suffering or not – and sees its objective in finding the appropriate cure to it. By being colonized from medical science, bodily differences turn from a cultural to a medical curiosity that needs to be fixed and normalized. In order to perform the medical control of the condition, scientists have to take up a certain medical gaze (Foucault, 1963) by which they are able to abstract from any individual traits of their patients. It allows them to employ them as their "work-material", measurable and manageable in certain standards of bodily norms. The former subject of inquiry turns into the controllable object of scientific scrutinizing.

While some parts of medicine perform an important contribution to the well-being and range of motion of disabled people, this objective is only marginal within the greater goal of medical adjustment. Rehabilitation for instance, though stressing the reintegration of disabled people into society, has the primary goal of (re)gaining the workforce of their patients. Medical science can also be used to back up political and economic notions of disability as a burden to society that has to be avoided and eliminated. Hence medical science and theory played a major role for example in the
establishment of the Eugenics movement around the turn of the 19th century, which cast disabled people as a threat to the nation and its economic well-being.

In the medical gaze disabled people are first and foremost seen as suffering from their condition, and it is better for them and for society if their body becomes fixed and adjusted to normative standards. Disability becomes located within the body, which has to adjust itself to a standardized environment. The personal story and definition of disablement, as well as the disabled person's own knowledge and competence concerning the body are rendered insignificant.

b) Disability as a tragedy – the passively disabled, object of pity

A consequence of medicalized notions of disability is the attribution of suffering to disablement, or as social psychologists Dembo, Leviton and Wright call it, "the requirement of mourning"(Dembo, Leviton & Wright, 1975, p.32). Disability is frequently seen as a personal disaster, as a "fate worse than death" which has to be avoided at all costs. In connecting it to illness, it is seen as an affliction, of which the affected person wants to be healed and which is to be prevented in the first place. Accordingly, able-bodied people frequently react with pity when encountering a "victim" of a disability. Probably by imagining what kind of loss they would face if they would be "afflicted" with the same "ailment" themselves, they keep away from the encounter by this pretended empathy. At the same time this stance offers them protection from the prospect of acquiring disability themselves – and in this kind of patronization they are able to assert their superiority towards "suffering" and disablement.

The media provides ample witness to this common practice. Pity and charity narratives range from stories like "Whose life is it anyway?", in which assisted suicide is regarded as the best option for a quadriplegic adult, to TV shows such as the "Telethon", in which charity societies use a patronizing display of disabled people to raise money for their medical treatment and adjustment. Jack A. Nelson stresses the passivity and pathologizing view by which disabled people are portrayed in telethon shows, in which they were "usually depicted as childlike – as in Jerry Lewis's Kids – or as incompetent, needing total care, as nonproductive in our

society, and as a drain on taxpayers". (Nelson, 1988, p.5)

c) The disabled hero, the cheerful sufferer

As there seems to be a "requirement of mourning" for someone "fallen prey" to disability in common notions of disability, there is simultaneously a great astonishment about any disabled person not miserable or obviously suffering. Whether the disabled person is just "putting a good face on it" or is indeed not unhappy with her or his life – in the eyes of the able-bodied this must be a tremendous and extraordinary achievement of will. As it is supposedly "natural" to suffer from disease or disability it is consequently "natural" to be sad and depressed - or worse – bitter about it. Thus the "not unhappy" disabled person is ascribed a kind of supernatural quality, which turns her or him into a kind of super-human hero.

But this form of glorification yields something, which again does not serve the needs and psychological realities of the disabled person – but of the able bodied one. It is another means to set themselves apart from bodily aberration, this time not in a patronizing, dominating way, but from a standpoint of awe and admiration, which has the believe of "I am not like her/him" at its core.

At the same time that able-bodied people wonder why and how the disabled person "copes" and "manages" so well, they in fact expect the disabled person at least to strive for adjustment to his or her situation. While they want the disabled person to accept his or her role, they also acknowledge that it is actually "unfair" that not they but the other person became disabled. A cheerful disabled person therefore can relieve able-bodied people from their perceived guilt of being healthy, and it is the easiest way for them to deal with their own vulnerability to disability and illness. That the disabled person has to do most of this interactional management is a price most disabled people have to and are willing to pay in order to be accepted and tolerated in the able-bodied world.

The sociologist Talcott Parsons (1951) has initially theorized the privileges and duties connected to a certain bodily condition in his conception of the sick role. He argued that when being sick, a person's ordinary roles and duties are temporarily suspended in order for her or him to get well. The recovery, in turn, becomes one's new duty: one must make every effort to get well again, and surrender one's body fully to the hands of medical science. If one fails to do so, one has to face various judgments. It can be assumed for instance that either one complains too much and takes advantage of the "freedom" of the sick role, when symptoms are not obvious enough. On the other hand, one can also be found to be neglectful of oneself and one's social responsibilities, if the recovery is not proceeding fast enough. Thus, as Robert Murphy puts it, one can be good or bad at being sick, - and to be good at it implies a positive stance towards the healthy world:

A key rule for being a successful sick person is: Don't complain! The person who smiles and jokes while in obvious physical misery is honored by all. …. Hospital visitors also value cheeriness, and the sick person soon finds that he is expected to amuse them, and thus relieve their guilt at being well. (Murphy, 1987, p.20)

Thus "the hero" is one of the rare positive roles open to persons with disabilities. It is not surprising then that some of them not only avoid complaints about their situation and put their nondisabled peers at ease with a serene compliance, but also go beyond this by "overcoming" the odds of being disabled. The "supercrip" – the ambitious paralympics athlete, the paraplegic single mom working full time and volunteering for a charity organization, as well as the blind man climbing a mountain – is accepting the treatment imposed on him by an inaccessible and ableist world, but does not accept his own bodily limitations. He too plays into a socially desired role of the achiever, which

is, however, not only expected from disabled people, but from everyone in a capitalistic society. The ideology of the self-sufficient individual that is capable of "pulling himself up on his bootstraps" is a common legitimization for blaming failure, especially economical, on the victim. In societies where the responsibility for the well-being of its citizens is largely relegated to themselves, achievement and endeavor in the competition is expected.

Thus especially disabled citizens are expected to do their share, keep from being a burden on society and to view their bodily difference as a challenge to prove themselves even more capable than if they were able-bodied. Robert Murphy has identified these expectations already being effective in the Rehabilitation ward:

Ideally, [the patient] is active, not passive, and he must try continually to outdo himself. To a degree, the patient is responsible for his own recovery, and this has many positive aspects. The negative side, however, is that if his effort can yield improvement, then any failure to improve can be an indication that he isn't trying hard enough, that he is to blame for his condition. This load of culpability is often added to a lingering suspicion among family and friends that the patient was responsible, somehow or other, for what happened to him. And the patient, too, is often beset with guilt over his plight – a seemingly illogical, but very common, by-product if disability (Murphy, 1987, 51f).

Critics among the disability rights movement view the public portrayal of supercrips, as for instance the appearances of disabled actor Christopher Reeves, as damaging to ordinary lives of disabled people, because it fuels high expectations of performance in an ableist society. The ideology of overcoming disability once again individualizes disablement and also distracts from access and attitudinal barriers.

d) Disability as representation of evil – the "criminal", "bitter" and "manipulating" avenger

That disabled people have to pay a high social price for their acceptance by playing into the role of the "cheerful sufferer" already yields some information about the underlying suspicion towards disabled people. There are too many uncanny notions in cultural representations of disability – with reference to historic notions of "monstrous disabled people" as well as in actual portrayals of disability in media depictions - as that the idea of an unconditional acceptance of disabled people could be a realistic notion. As Paul Longmore illustrates in his analysis of disability stereotypes, the idea of evil is deeply tied to disabled people in historic as well as in actual media depictions, especially in crime and horror genres:

Disability has often been used as a melodramatic device… . Among the most persistent is the association of disability with malevolence. Deformity of body symbolizes deformity of soul. Physical handicaps are made emblems of evil (Longmore, 1987, p.68).

As a consequence of the disabled character's supposed resentment and hate towards the able-bodied, the dramatic pattern of crime genre stories such as Doctor No, Doctor Strangelove, The Hookman etc. and also historic dramas such as Richard III commonly includes an act of revenge on part of the disabled character. "Disabled villains, raging against their fate and hating those who have escaped such 'affliction', often seek to retaliate against 'normals'" (Longmore, 1987, 67). Such portrayals would allude to three common prejudices against handicapped people: disability is a punishment for evil; disabled people are embittered by their 'fate'; disabled people resent the nondisabled and would, if they could, destroy them.(Longmore, 1987, 67)

In addition to the notion of revenge, "evil" disabled characters are often also portrayed with an aggressive sexual drive, especially and nearly exclusively in men. The threatening obsession of, for instance Quasimodo, Dr. Loveless, The Phantom of

the Opera etc, often aims at women who the disabled character is supposed to be incapable of seducing other than in an aggressive manner.

Criminal disabled characters convey a kinky, leering lust for sex with gorgeous 'normal' women. ... 'Monster' disabled charcters menace beautiful women who would ordinarily reject them.(Longmore, 1987, 72)

states Longmore

But not only in crime genres notions of the aggressive disabled person can be found – literature on Rehabilitation Psychology for instance is full of notions of the "manipulating" disabled person, who wants to punish the able-bodied world for their "health" and normativity.

Fear of disablement can turn into anger and resentment – this psychological pattern, also described as the defense mechanism projection, can be found in various stances towards minority people, such as in racism towards ethnic minorities. By attributing the own revulsion and aggression to the object, it serves the subject to relieve itself from these emotions. Longmore sees these patterns at work also in disability depictions:

In historical and contemporary fact, it is, of course, nondisabled people who have at times endeavored to destroy people with disabilities. As with the popular portrayals of other minorities, the unacknowledged hostile fantasies of the stigmatizers are transferred to the stigmatized. The nondisabled audience is allowed to disown its fears and biases by 'blaming the victim', making them responsible for their own ostracism and destruction.(Longmore, 1987, 67)

3. Experiencing and making sense of ableism

Images and ideologies about disabled people have a significant impact on the self-concept of disabled people. They have to engage in a set of behavioral strategies in order to manage interactional strains. They are forced to react to prejudiced views about them, as they are highly dependent on the maintenance of (good) relationships with able-bodied people in an inaccessible world that is not controlled by people with disabilities. Even if they don't agree with and take on the disabling myths they are sometimes confronted with, they have to expect and deal with the fact that non-disabled people make certain assumptions about them that will have an impact on the way they interact with disabled persons. As long as false thinking about disability exists, they have to respond to it in a certain way, ranging from mere survival strategies in a hostile world to relaxed and laid-back indifference or superiority.

One of the basic shared experiences is described by Jenny Morris in her book "Pride against prejudice" (1991). She notes that apart from open hostility, which all disabled people experience at some point but which is still quite rare, it is rather the hidden negative assumptions about disability that underlie able-bodied people's stances toward disabled people that are "the iron fist in the velvet glove of the patronizing and seemingly benevolent attitudes we experience" (Morris, 1991, p.22). Therefore

> it is often difficult for us to identify why someone's behavior makes us so angry, or why we feel undermined. Our anger and insecurity can thus seem unreasonable not just to others but also, sometimes, to ourselves. (Morris, 1991, p.18)

And the biggest problem for disabled people with "*their* values about *our* lives" is, according to Morris

that these undermining messages, which we receive every day of our lives from the non-disabled world which surrounds us, become part of our own thinking about ourselves and/or other disabled people. (p. 22)

One might speculate if cultural traditions of objectification of "human oddities", i.e. disabled people, as it was evident in the freak show, are still influencing objectifying social treatment of disabled

people as well as the ways they are experienced by the "objects". Writer and activist Eli Clare connects the history of "freakdom" to her own history:

> For me, *freak* is defined by my personal experience of today's freakdom. Today's freakdom happened to me at Fairview State Hospital in 1965 when doctors first declared me 'retarded'. … Today's freakdom happened every time I was taunted retard, monkey, weirdo. It happens any time someone gawks, an occurrence that happens so regularly I rarely even notice. I don't see people – curious, puzzled, anxious – turn their heads to watch my trembling hands, my jerky movements. … . I only know it happens because my friends notice and tell me. Yet I know I store the gawking in my bones. (Clare, 1999, 94)

She also links the "freak show" to common, objectifying practices of medicine:

The end of the freak show didn't mean the end of our display or the end of voyeurism. We simply traded one kind of freakdom for another. Take for instance public stripping, the medical practice of stripping disabled children to their underwear and examining them in front of large groups of doctors, medical students, physical therapists and rehabilitation specialists. …. . Tell me, what is the difference between the freak show and public stripping? Which is more degrading? Which takes more control away from disabled people? Which lets a large group of nondisabled people gawk unabashedly for free? (p. 87f)

Even though in the age of Enlightment disabled people commonly don't inspire awe and wonder anymore, the aspect of exposition might still be lingering. Through staring or being asked intimate questions about the nature of the disability and the way the disabled person copes with and feels about it by entire strangers, as well as unsolicited advices, blessings or stories about own afflictions or diseases in the family it is powerfully demonstrated to disabled people that their private space does not count as much as the one of able-bodied people. The assumption that the disability and the "suffering" it is supposedly causing is as much on the disabled person's mind as it is on the able-bodied person's, as well as the profound sense of surprise and sensationalism leads to the regular invasion of privacy boundaries. A sense of exposure, insecurity, fear and anger is the result on part of the disabled person, when being patted on the head or stared at. Jenny Morris sums this up by stating:

Non-disabled people feel that our differentness gives them the right to invade our privacy and make judgments about our lives. Our physical characteristics evoke such strong feelings that people often have to express them in some way. At the same time they feel able to impose their feelings on us because we are not considered to be autonomous human beings. (Morris, 1991, 29)

Shame and the feeling of isolation is the consequence when the staring and objectification becomes internalized and taken for granted by the disabled person. Constant messages of devaluation may lead him or her to believe that it is in fact *him* or *her* and the body he or she possesses that is so repulsive and appalling to able-bodied people or at least causes their urge to respond to it. It can become so deeply entrenched in some disabled people's minds that it may lead to constant excuses and explanations, as an informant of Spencer Cahill and Robin Eggleston accounts:

If I'm in the grocery store, and I need something and I ask somebody to get it [I say] 'Oh, I'm sorry'. And I find myself making excuses, saying things like 'Oh, it's just not been my day' or 'it seems everything I want today is up too high'. I feel like I'm putting people out of their way. I feel like I'm imposing on someone to ask for help (Cahill and Spencer, 1994, p. 306).

Even if one feature of the common knowledge of disability is that disabled people "can't help", that it is not their fault of being disabled, it is at least striking that a lot of disabled people feel a sense of shame and guilt. The more obvious cause might be the "burden" that they supposedly become to their family and society by being disabled, but one might also speculate about a connection to traditional notions of sin and crime to which the disability is seen as a punishment – with the omission that it lacks the crime (Murphy, 1987, p. 93).

But being seen as a guilty "sinner" or a "bitter and sinister avenger", as portrayed in certain fiction genres described above, is sort of the worst thing that could happen to a disabled person. Not only because of the all too obvious dependency that most disabled people have on the help and assistance of able-bodied people, disabled people are forced to maintain good relationships to their social environment, if they don't want to become even more isolated as they already are. Being constantly on the edge of becoming an outcast, disabled people cannot afford too many risks of overstressing the boundaries of able-bodied's tolerance toward them. Thus, most disabled people don't see much alternatives for them apart from compensating and "overcoming" their disability, normalizing and adjusting themselves to society or even becoming a "supercrip" (who is, according to Murphy [1997, p. 95] "like anyone else, only better"). To achieve the able-bodied world's acceptance, they use various strategies, such as humor that resolves potential embarrassment on both sides. In order to even gain able-bodied's respect, disabled people have to strive for normality and fight against their disability (- not necessarily the disabling environment!). As Jenny Morris writes about the depiction of "overcomers" in the media,

Overcoming stories have the important role of lessening the fear that disability holds for the non-disabled people. They also have the role of assuring the non-disabled world that normal is right, to be desired and aspired to. … The status quo likes us to be seen 'fighting back', to resent and bewail the fact that we can no longer do things in their way. The more energy we spend on over-achieving and compensatory activity that imitates as closely as possible 'normal' standards, the more people are reassured that 'normal' equals right. If we succumb to their temptations they will reward us with their admiration and praise. At first sight this will seem preferable to their pity or being written off as an invalid. But all we will achieve is the status of a performing sea lion and not (re)admittance to their ranks. (Morris, 1991, p.101f)

If disabled people do happen to step out of their role of the thankful achiever, they indeed have to face irritated or angry reactions, and are usually seen as ungrateful, bitter or "having a chip on their shoulder". Cahill and Eggleston observed that

…wheelchair users who publicly express moral outrage at their treatment must be prepared to receive what they give. Their angry protest may be met with angry resistance, creating an embarrassing and sometimes alarming public scene that they must then manage or escape. (Cahill and Eggleston, 1994, p.305)

The frustration arising of such encounters is often difficult to understand for disabled people themselves, as it is stressed by Morris:

It is often difficult for us to understand why we feel angry when people offer us help – even when we sometimes need help with a physical task. Our anger then becomes undermining because we feel unreasonable. We can start to believe the 'bitter and twisted' stereotype so often applied to us. (Morris, 1991, p. 33f)

One could maybe judge it as a bad sign of the power of normalizing demands when looking at the broad willingness of most disabled people to accept the standards of a society they strive to become integrated into (working hard, marrying, being a good citizen etc.). Disabled people's whish to

"be just like anyone else!" is understandable, especially when facing their history of segregation, humiliation and discrimination, but it might also be an indicator of the powerful demands of a normalizing society, in which their social status still remains largely in question.

Thus, the ambiguity surrounding disability identity – as it is described by Goffman's terms of the "virtual" and "actual" identity (Goffman, 1963), as well as by Murphy and by the concept of Otherness, is imprinting itself on the core of the stigmatized's self. Difference and ambiguity are indeed the constituting factors of the meaning of disability – the socially imposed indefinition of the ones trapped in the "twilight zone" (Murphy) leaves them in constant doubt about what they are and imposes regular demands of interactional dilemmas upon them.

Therefore Disability Studies scholar Carol Gill is right when she summarizes the disability experience this way:

In certain ways, many disabled people are forced to lead dual lives. First, they are repeatedly mistaken for something they are not: tragic, heroic, pathetic, not full humans. Persons with a wide range of impairments report extensive experience with such identity misattributions. Second, disabled people must submerge their spontaneous reactions and authentic feelings to smooth over relations with others, from strangers to family members to the personal assistants they rely on to maneuver through each day. (Gill, 2000, p. 25).

However, more and more disabled people realize the vicious circles in which they are trapped. Some of them are not only refusing to see themselves as a burden or as suffering, they are even transforming the values of disability and reclaiming it to their own definition. As Blacks in the Civil Rights Movement once claimed that "Black is beautiful", disabled people now come to conquer the stigma and turn it into an asset they take pride in. Some of them even question the society, whose mechanisms lie at the heart of their discrimination, and refuse to be integrated into the mainstream. With their criticism used as arms they are attempting not to overcome their disabilities, but the devaluating notions imposed upon them.

Once we can put aside any need to prove ourselves equal to the able-bodied, cease to battle *against* ourselves, cease to be brave, stoic or resigned, we can then accept ourselves unreservedly as implicitly equal, able to go beyond the limits others impose on us. Once we cease to judge ourselves by society's narrow standards we can cease to judge everything and everyone by those same limitations. When we no longer feel comfortable identifying with the aspirations of the normal majority we can transform the imposed role of outsider into the life-enhancing and liberated state of an independent thinking, constantly doubting Outsider who never needs to fight the physical condition but who embraces it. And by so doing ceases to be disabled by it. (Morris, 1991, 188)

References

de Beauvoir, Simone, (1949, reprinted 1976), "The Second Sex", Harmondsworth, Penguin

Bogdan, Robert (1996) "The social construction of freaks", in: Garland Thomson, Rosemarie, p. 23-37, in Garland Thomson, Rosemarie (1996) "Freakery. Cultural Spectacles of the Extraordinary Body". New York: New York University Press

Clare, Eli (1999) "Exile and Pride. Disability, Queerness and Liberation", Cambridge, MA: South End Press

Dembo, T., Leviton, G. L., Wright, B.A.(1956) "Adjustment to misfortune. A Problem of Social-Psychological Rehabilitation"; reprint in Rehabilitation Psychology, 1975, (22), 1-100

Evans, D.P. (1983) "Historical Antecedents of Stereotypes about Mental Retardation", in Hey, C., Kiger, G., and Seidel, J. (1983) "Social Aspects of Chronic Illness, Impairment and Disability", p.157-196

Foucault, Michel, (1973) "The Birth of the Clinic. An Archaeology of Medical Perception" New York: Vintage Books

Garland Thomson, Rosemarie (1996) "Freakery. Cultural Spectacles of the Extraordinary Body". New York University Press, New York, NY

Gill, C (2000) "Divided Understandings: The Social Experience of Disability" in Albrecht et.al. (eds) (2000) "Handbook of Disability Studies", Sage, Thousand Oaks

Goffman, Erving, (1963) "Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity", Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Grosz, Elizabeth (1996) "Intolerable Ambiguity: Freaks as/at the limit", in Garland Thomson, Rosemarie (1996) "Freakery. Cultural Spectacles of the Extraordinary Body". New York University Press, New York, NY, p. 55-66

Longmore, Paul (1987) "Screening Stereotypes: Images of Disabled People in Television and Motion Pictures", in Gartner, A. and Joe, T. (Eds) (1987) "Images of the Disabled", p. 65-78

Marx, K and Engels, F. (1845/46),"Die Deutsche Ideologie", Marx-Engels Werke, 3, Berlin (East): Dietz, p. 46

Morris, J. (1991) "Pride against Prejudice. A Personal Politics of Disability", London: The Women's Press

Murphy, Robert F. (1987) "The Body Silent", New York, NY: Norton

Nelson, J.A. (1988) "Broken Images: Portrayals of Those with Disabilities in American Media" in Jack A. Nelson, ed. (….) "The Disabled, the Media, and the Information Age"

Parsons, T. (1951) "The Social System", New York: The Free Press

Shakespeare, Tom (1994), "Cultural Representation of Disabled People: Dustbins for Disawoval?" in Disability and Society, 9 (3): 283-299

Changing Perspectives.

Debates around Identity and Difference: Consequences for feminist and anti-racist agency
by Anette Dietrich and Andrea Nachtigall

> *"A woman is not born as a women; one becomes one."*
> *A black is not born as a black; one becomes a "Negro".*
> *A Turkish woman is not born as a Turkish woman, one becomes an oriental woman.*[7]

I. (War)

In the debate around the attacks on the WTC on September 11, the various positions taken within the Left have proven themselves irreconcilable and their analyses stand cemented in opposing corners. Throughout this debate, the extremely diverse worldviews of anti-imperialists/anti-Americans, anti-German leftists, critical theorists of value, peace activists etc. have been dissected and placed in opposition to each other according to the particular perspective, or, more pertinently, the ‚main criticism' prevailing. There have been few attempts to link these worlds and thereby do justice to this complex situation.

In feminist circles there have so far only been few visible attempts to take part in the debate and any engagement for women's intrests and rights must count on being appropriated by the ‚official' side. Just as, in the Yugoslav war, the mass rapes were used to justify the military intervention, women oppressed by radical Islamists are discovered in Afganistan in order to further legitimate the war against the Taliban and to portray it as a battle for human rights and democracy. The situation of women under the Taliban (and prior to the Taliban, the Northern Alliance) has been known for many years, yet no political will seemed to exist then.

Up till now, it has been a more middle-class sprectrum of women taking a stance in the public sphere on, not only the attacks, but above all, the war (for example, the feminist Heinrich Böll Institute, or the pacifist women's action group, Sheherazade, which originated in the Gulf war). These groups were primarily concerned with demonstrating against the war and advocating women's rights in Afganistan. However important aspects of the situation remain obscured in this perspective. The headline, "The history of Afganistan proves: purely male power structures deform a society, fundamentalism can only be defeated when women become stronger" signals a return to a feminism thought outdated. "Everything ambivalent and different becomes a threat to a shaky immature masculinity, which only knows how to stabilise itself through battle and warfare. Men whose mind and feeling have been clouded by other men, who have been cheated out of life, enthusiasm and happiness, can become killers, simultaneously victim and perpetrator. Bombs on two legs, ever ready to explode."[8] A further "gender specific" contribution is made by Klaus Theweleit, who sees the WTC twin towers as a twin phallus ("the twin prick, arising as mighty symbol") and describes the attack as a "kick into the balls"[9]. The question arises, if and how it is possible to form specifically feminist perspectives, while doing justice to a complex situation and not falling into binary ways of thinking, for it has become clear from the history of the women's movement and women's research, that the category of gender is insufficient as the sole factor in assigning social order and as the main category of analysis.

It doesn't require much analytic effort to recognise how polarised and steeped in stereotypes the discourse of the war is. With demands, for example, for a ban on Islamic associations or the call for tighter

---

[7] Lutz, Helma (1992), Rassismus und Sexismus, Unterschiede und Gemeinsamkeiten, in: Andreas Foitzik, Rudolf Leiprecht u.a. (Hg.): "Ein Herrenvolk von Untertanen". Rassismus - Nationalismus – Sexismus, Duisburg

[8] Ute Scheub für Sheherzerade in taz 29.11.2001
[9] Interview with Klaus Theweleit in taz 19.09.2001

internal security for protection against foreign ,sleepers' or the uncritical defense of western modern values, it's easy to fall into racist arguments of the war of the civilised world against barbarism. Stereotypes are reproduced, whose constructive character and sweeping statements have been exposed and criticised - especially by migrant groups - for years.

How can we, then, engage with the feminist experience, particularly the accusations of racism levelled against the white, middle class women's movement, whose ethnocentric eye has projected their own notions of emancipation onto the ,not yet as advanced' oppressed women of the Orient? Has not the category gender as sole category of analysis become redundant? How can the advantages of theories of difference or deconstructionist approaches be incorporated, without rendering mute? Are there positions outside of a constant oscillation from paternalistic victimisation to racist connotations of the Oriental woman and cultural relativist positions which ultimately paralyse the ability to act? Could the demand for universal human rights offer a way out of the dilemma?[10] These questions will not be taken further at this point, they could form part of our workshop discussions. There, using video, picture and text materials, we would like to discuss changing perspectives on the basis of current events and debates.

II. (The Scarf)

A good example for this - not new - problematic is the debate around the scarf. The characteristics of the dilemma of difference are recognisable in this controversy, which has continued for years in diverse contexts. As a symbol, the scarf is used by both sides in diametrically opposed arguments and has become current again through the debate around terror packages and internal security and the war in Afganistan, and especially through the media presence of the veiled women, or more to the point, the deveiled woman and through this, the "liberated" woman. The papers of full of pictures of "invisible" Afgan women, in need of liberation. However, which pictures are activated in us, when from under the *burka* a beautiful Oriental woman emerges?[11]

From an antiracist perspective the scarf can be interpreted as a possibility for resistance against assimilationist coercion by the dominant german white culture and as a possibility of liberation through resistance. Terkessidis sees the scarf as "the veil behind which exists the exoticised consumibility of the Other". The migrant women who wear the veil withdraw from visibility and the erotic connotations of the western male gaze and represent the dangerous 'foreign', that appears unable to be integrated. The integration "which is offered them by the apparatus of consumption of difference then becomes a detraditionalisation as sexualisation of the exoticised body."[12] The wearing of the scarf becomes an emancipatory act, that emphasises not a woman's external appearance, but her personality. Migrant women reclaim this symbol of foreigness

[10] In this way the claim to the universal applicability of international human rights discourses was criticised precisesly because its ethical foundation was based on western conceptions of morals, which is why these international norms should not form the basis for value judgements in other cultural contexts. See Bunting, Antje (1996), Zur kulturellen Verschiedenartigkeit von Frauen in internationalen Menschenrechtsstrategien von Feministinnen, in: Ilse Lenz u.a. (Hg.), Wechselnde Blicke, Frauenforschung in internationaler Perspektive, Opladen

[11] The veil is lifted: the secret and forbidden comes to light, and - what a surprise - a beautiful and in no way barbaric looking Oriental woman is under the veil. Here the emeshment of racist and sexist constructions becomes clear. The other becomes not only the fear evoking abject which threatens the Self, but also an exoticised and eroticised object of lust.
[12] Terkessidis, Mark (1999), Globale Kultur in Deutschland, in: Hepp, Andreas/Winter, Rainer (Hg.), Kultur – Medien – Macht. Cultural Studies und Medienanalyse, Opladen, S. 243ff

as positive and, according to Terkessidis, consciously demand an integration, for example, by demanding a place in the civil service. And in this respect - this is also proven by the shocked and agressive reactions - they produce "a crisis in the in the hegemonic representations, such as those current in the media"[13]. Viewing the scarf solely as opposition to and provocation of the German norm would fall short, though, since the veil, or rather, the scarf is not only a religous, but also a political symbol for a particular form of Islam, in which exists, despite the withdrawing of the female body against its sexualisation in the western culture, an extreme inequality of gender, where, for example, male polygamy is taken for granted, while adultry by women is subject to the death penalty. Further, only the female body is covered and through this again marked. Therefore the scarf becomes, on the one hand, a symbol of oppression, in seeing it in the context of the power interests of a traditional male society and as part of a patriarchal interpretation of the Koran, on the other it represents the "power of the oppressed"[14] who stand against the repressive policies regulating foreigners in Germany, as well as western modernity and create counter images. To what extent is the accusation of ethnocentricity a valid one here, or rather, is it legitimate to transfer western ideals of emancipation?

In the German context, characterised by the denial of the FRG's factual status as an immigration country, the 'foreign woman' is constructed by the german women's movement as lacking in opposition to the Self. The 'foreign woman' emerges from a seemingly factual bipolar difference, that is, by exclusion from the familiar, modern, emancipated, western woman, who is also a construction (recognisable, for example, in the image of the "oppressed turkish woman" who has to be helped by the social security system). The scarf is symbolic of this.[15]

III. (Difference and the Construction of the Other)

In current feminist and postcolonial theory, the place of difference is used against social discrimination and representations of foreigners. The place of difference becomes a means of resisting absorbtion into the hegemonic culture. Theories of difference are increasingly being discussed in relation to cultural and sexual identity as a political alternative to the equal rights demands that have prevailed up to this point. Difference though - for example, between the genders or between the cultures of "races" - was a category mostly used by conservatives as means of legitimating an unequal distribution of social power and resources. The political application of difference is therefore often repressive because it is seen as a deviation from a norm. The construction of the socially Other can legitimate inequality and discrimination, because this construction is often used as a ,negative'. Therefore 'difference' has great affinities with the cultural racism (culturalism) of the new right, which has superseded the biological/biologistic notion of different "races".

This paradox is described as the dilemma of difference: it expresses itself in that, the principle of equality always produces exclusions, because differing life circumstances and experiences are not accounted for or are excluded while on the

---

[13] ibid.

[14] Nilüfer Göle quoted by Berghahn, Sabine (2000), Die Lehrerin mit dem Kopftuch. Oder: Wieviel weibliche Devianz vertragen Schülerinnen, Schulbürokratie und die deutsche Öffentlichkeit? In: Bettinger,Elfi/ Ebrecht, Angelika (Hg.), Transgressionen: Grenzgängerinnen des moralischen Geschlechts. Querelles, Bd. 5/ 2000, Weimar, S. 222

[15] Here it is not about speaking for or against the wearing of the Headscarf, however the complexity and symbolism in the debate is deciding. Without the loaded meanings, the aversions created by the wearing of the headscarf would not be explainable. For an image of the headscarf as evidence of oppression in its entirety. See too the current edition of the newspaper Emma (Number 6/2001) or the book "Nicht ohne meine Tochter" (1988) by Betty Mahmoudy.

other hand, theories of difference fall in danger of cementing and legitimating existing inequalities. This difficulty in dealing with difference also becomes clear in the discussion around identity politics, in the manner it has increasingly been conducted since the beginning of the nineties. In movements based on identity politics - like the women's movement, for example – one's own identity was seen as the condition for emancipation, however the identity discourse, in the shape it took up to this point, was rendered problematic by the effects of more essentialist notions of identity, because this fixed, so-called natural category produced exclusion and domination mechanisms. Differences were masked in this imagining of uniformity (of identity categories, of subject, etc.), because "identity is constructed relationally through difference from the Other; identification with a group based on gender, race, or sexuality, for example, depends mostly on binary systems of 'us' versus 'them', where difference from the Other defines the group to which one belongs"[16]. The socially defined Other (the woman, the foreigner etc.) is part of the hierarchic binaries of the western cultural tradition.

Linguistic theories such as poststructuralism play an important role in the social sciences since the so-called 'linguistic turn'[17]. Here social structures (of dominance) are interpreted from linguistic structures and viewed as structural phenomena. In feminist theory, poststructuralist theories offered the 'tools' to criticise western metaphysics with its implied structures of domination. Under

this rubric fall the hierachic dualisms, which run as a red thread through the total thinking of Occident, like, for example, the relation between the genders. Central to this is the implied difference and the exclusion of the Other or those placed as Other. Tied to this identity-centred thought is a totalising universalism, which unites and categorises through assignment. A critique of identity-centred thought in western cultural history, and the related treatment of difference as a socially inherent oppression and exclusion mechanism, is possible in this linguistic space. The cultural tradition is marked by polarising dualisms of concepts such as body/soul, man/woman, culture/nature etc., which simultaneously maintain a hierarchy and as such are embedded in, and produce, a power and domination system. Division into clear dichotomies causes artificial divisions and obscures the integration of the vague. A critique of the notion of a unity of subjectivity therefore goes hand in hand with the critique of a universal categorisation in the name of feminism and its related representation. The categories, pursued through identity politcs in the name of the woman, the lesbian etc, include particular characteristics, while at the same time excluding contradictions[18]. The construction and exclusion of the Other serves first and foremost the construction and safeguarding of the Self.

Judith Butler writes in a critical discussion of feminist identity politics that, under the illusion of being able to grasp and represent the Self, or rather the Other, and fix identities. "The theories of feminist identity that elaborate predicats of colour, sex, ethnicity, class and ablebodyness

---

[16] Friedman, Susan Stanford (1998), Mappings: Feminism and the cultural geographies of encounter, Princeton, S. 19

[17] The ‚linguistic turn' is understood as a focus away from the analysis of social processes on an econmic level towards the importance of language and discourse in the process of constituting the subject: there is no thought independant of language. "The consciousness is no longer the trancedental place of the 'condition of the possibility' of sense, meaning and reference, but the sign." Frank, Manfred (1984), Was ist Neostrukturalismus? Frankfurt a.M., S. 282

[18] Therefore, in the feminist debate around Poststructuralism, the naturalness of gender relations was placed into question and gender was seen more as an effect of linguistically imparted discourse, rather than of the body. With this an understanding of gender, that is sexual difference developed that is not the result of biologie or socialisation but of signification and discursive effects. The naturalness of the two gender, that is, the binary division in the division of man/woman and the forced hetereosexuality tied to this, was also placed into question by this.

invariably close with an embarassed 'etc'. at the end of the list. Through this horizontal trajectory of adjectives, these positions strive to encompass a situated subject, but invariably faile to be complete. This failure, however, is instructive: what political impetus is to be derived from the exasperated 'etc' that so often occurs at the end of such lines? This is a sign of exhaustion as well as of the illimitable process of signification itself."[19]

Poststructuralist theories have been discussed from very contradictory perspectives, caused partially by fears that the capacity to act of subjects would be placed into question and no action would be possible. Many pose themselves the question why precisely at this time, when women and blacks are beginning to win for themselves the status of subject and a speaking position in society, the subject is eradicated. On the other hand, sceptics also see that poststructuralist theories have helped question limiting concepts of identity and their related mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion, which according to bell hooks have advanced racist structures through their essentialism. She demands a postmodern, anti-essentialist being-black, because only that will finally place racism in question[20].

The capacity to act of the subject is not made impossible by this, rather it exists, according to Butler, in viewing the subject as constructed through power and discourse, that is, through the linguistic system, in pulling it into the critique and not supposing it as autonomous of power. In this, the ability to act means reinterpretating and intervening in the discourse of power. "Thisimplication of critical terms in the field of power does not necessarily lead to a nihilist relativism which would be incapable of supplying

norms, but, on the contrary, is a precondition for a politically engaged critic. Because constructing a complex of norms which situates itself beyond force of power constitutes a powerful, strong conceptual practice itself, which sublimates, occludes, and extends its own game of power by falling back on tropes of normative universality.(…) The challenge is, rather, to ask what is authorized and what is excluded or abjected by the theoretical step of laying down foundations."[21]

IV (A retrospective on feminist theory and practice)

In order to make clear how important it is to view the concept of Identity and difference in its history of development and in the context of oppression, power and resistance, rather than seeing it as a so-called 'natural' development, the different positions and discussions of the Second Womens Movement and the women's research which have come from it will be traced, through which some of the above problems become clearer.

The argument about identity and difference is a central debate, which has run through feminist theory for a long time and in the diverse facets. The beginnings of the Second Women's Movement at the end of the 60s were linked to the extra-parliamentary opposition. Tied to it was a strong marxist direction and the writings of Simone de Beauvoir and the demands therein for equality and equal rights. "Since Simone de Beauvoir, it is agreed upon, at least in the modern west, that women were the Other in opposition to the Self of men. Feminism was a movement concerned with supporting women to become the Self and subjects instead of objects and the Other of men."[22] This was

[19] Butler, Judith (1991) Das Unbehagen der Geschlechter, S.210

[20] Hooks, Bell (1996), Sehnsucht und Widerstand – Kultur, Ethnie, Geschlecht, Berlin, S. 48f

[21] Butler, Judith (1993), Kontingente Grundlagen: Der Feminismus und die Frage der ‚Postmoderne', in: Benhabib, Seyla/Butler, Judith u.a. (Hg.), Der Streit um Differenz. Feminismus und Postmoderne in der Gegenwart, Frankfurt a.M., S. 36f

[22] Abu-Lughod, Lila, Gegen Kultur Schreiben, in: Lenz, Ilse/ Germer, Andrea/ Hasenjürgen, Brigitte (Hg.) (1996), Wechselnde Blicke. Frauenforschung in internationaler

supposed to be put in practice through the advancement of women and quota systems. The discourse of equality was criticised though, for having a picture of woman as lacking, who has to make up her backwardness to men, who are the yardstick in all matters; this image of the woman as lacking is to be found in Simone de Beauvoir's idealised, male-connotated notion of trancendence - in opposition to the female occupied space of Immanence - as the emanciapatory goal of the woman.

In order to separate from this image of the woman, difference-feminists demanded that the ‚feminine' be placed as a positive opposition to the patriarchally structured society. The reference to the woman should be a call for a utopian society: the goal of emancipatory, feminist politics should from now on no longer be an adaption to the 'male' system, which was tied to war, exploitation and alienation, but an emphasis on so-called 'female' qualities like care, peace and closeness to nature[23]. The central demand of difference-feminism was the building of a women's network in order to oppose patriachal structures. The related patriachy research should, for example, make visible the history and experiences of women, which had been excluded and discredited up to this point. "We emphasise the difference between the genders, in order to make ourselves visible and heard. The political and social identity created by the women's movement and feminism supported the personal development of our identity as women; they promoted the search for an ‚authentic female identity'"[24]. The drawing

on a natural, essentialist femininity was on the other hand critisised by supporters of equality feminism, that in this the otherness of the woman and her inferiority was further entrenched. The two positions both concerned themselves with the inequality between the genders, however the consequences for feminist politics and practice were different. While for equality feminists an integration into the current male dominanted social and political structures was central, difference-feminists placed importance on separatist political forms.

Both had as their starting points the reference to the so-called *sisterhood*, the thereby implied mutual experience of all women under patriachial oppression. This experience, life under patriachy, was seen as the central mechanism of oppression and exploitation and was accepted as universal scope of experience. In this sense the political practice of the union and solidarity of all women was to work towards destroying existing patriachial structures. This pledged *sisterhood*[25] announced a politics of identity in the name of all women.

The reduction of the feminist debate to one around oppression through patriachial structures provoked strong criticism from black women (black is here is used as political terminology with the regard the characterisation of a minority position, and not as skin colour), women of colour, migrants and lesbian women, who did not feel represented by this feminism. They criticised a racist and hetereosexist tendency in the women's movement, which they saw as acting in the interests of the

Perspektive, Opladen, S. 17. Dazu auch Rosenberger, Sieglinde (1996), Geschlechter – Gleichheiten – Differenzen: Eine Denk- und Politikbeziehung, Wien, S.46
[23] The alleged "female" characteristics were emphasised particularly by Eco-feminism and gynocentric feminism. For more on gynocentric femeinism in Mary Dalys' sense, see Meyer, Ursula I. (1997), Einführung in die feministische Philosophie, München, S. 75 ff und Weedon, Chris (1999), Feminism, theory and the politics of difference, Oxford, S. 192ff. Dort zu Ökofeminismus S.46ff
[24] Bilden, Helga (1999), Geschlechtsidentitäten. Angstvolles oder lustvolles Ende der Eindeutigkeit?

Vortrag im Rahmen der Vortragsreihe "Beriner Wissenschaftlerinnen stellen sich vor" der Zentraleinrichtung zur Förderung von Frauenstudien und Frauenforschung an der FU-Berlin, Nr. 37, S .5
[25] see Boetcher Joeres, Ruth-Ellen (1994), Sisterhood? Jede für sich? in: Feministische Studien 1, S. 10: "It was the feminists in the 70s, who really were not only white and middle class, but also spoke again and again of the global, or at least, the 'Sisterhood' at large; nowadays the word 'feminist' is used by some women of colour as an implied description for a white group of women."

white, western middle class woman. "As Third World women we clearly have a different relationship to racism than white women, but all of us are born into an environment where racism exists. Racism affects all of our lives, but it is only white women who can 'afford' to remain oblivious to these effects. The rest of us have had it breathing or bleeding down our necks."[26] The image of women that the women's movement had produced, in particular its placement of woman as the apparent sole central category, was criticised as ethnocentric and ahistorical. Ignorant of other structural characteristics such as, for example, class, 'race'/ethnicity, religion, these universalist tendencies were seen as an attempt to ,colonise and absorb, non-western cultures, by only representing clearly western concepts of oppression. These concepts at the same time tended towards constructing a 'third world' or an 'Orient', where gender oppression was subtly explained as symptomatic for an essentialist non-western barbarism.'[27]

The construction of this gynocentric and ethnocentric image of woman was seen as an expression of the hegemonic power of definition of white women. The western white view of the black 'sister' as victim of these conditions was felt to be paternalistic and discussed was the shared responsibility of white women in racist social structures. A purely positive reference to women masks the fact that women are themselves caught in mechanisms of social power and exploitation, that they can be perpetrators and profit from existing conditions of oppression. Racist or hetereosexist oppression was for many women more relevant than the universalist theory of patriachy, and coalition with white, heterosexual women was seen as a new attempt at colonisation, which they resisted: "Although we are feminists and lesbians, we feel solidarity with progressive Black men and do not advocate the fractionalization that white women who are separatists demand. (...) We struggle together with Black men against racism, while we also struggle with Black men about sexism."[28]

Therefore any kind of coalition politics meant a new battle for recognition, because neither the black liberation and civil rights movements, nor the - by white women dominated - women's movement did justice to the complex social conditions of oppression or took seriously its specific conditions for existence. "There was established within the oppositional movements a type of 'hierachy of oppression", which served as basis for political concepts and strategies. To put it starkly: the Left had declared capitalism as the enemy, the Black-Power-Movement, racism, and the women's movement, sexism, or rather, patriachy."[29] The existing multifaceted nature of experiences was barely acknowledged in the identity politics of the 70s/80s. Problematic was the one-dimensional and exclusionary way in which oppression was understood. Because being a woman, it became clear, offered no firm meaning and way of life, instead had in every context a different communal, historical and social connotation.

Meanwhile awareness of difference has become standard in feminist debates[30]. Analysis has shifted from considering only the differences between the genders, but

[26] Anzaldúa, Gloria/ Moraga, Cherríe (1983) (Hg.), This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Colour, New York, S. 23

[27] 27 Müller, Birgit (1998), Queer handeln! In Psychologie und Gesellschaftskritik 2-3, S. 44. For criticism to a construction of a static image of a third world, see Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1993), Outside in the teaching machine, New York, S. 278ff; Ebenso Mohanty, Chandra Talpade (1991), Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses, in: Dies./ Russo, Anne/ Torres, Lourdes (Hg.), Third World women and the politics of feminism, Indiana, S. 51ff

[28] Combahee River Collective quoted by Maurer, Susanne (1996), Zwischen Zuschreibung und Selbstgestaltung. Feministische Identitätspolitiken im Kräftefeld von Kritik, Norm und Utopie, Tübingen, S.79

[29] ibid.

[30] In the USA, this debate around differences was led significantly earlier than in Germany. The focus point "Geteilter Feminismus" appeared only in 1990, Number 27 in 'beiträge zur feminist theory und praxis', which concerned itself with racist tendencies in German feminism.

also the differences within the gender 'woman'. The universalism of the category 'woman' was placed into question; it became clear within the discussions about the mechanism of exclusion within the women's movement that the woman does not come alone from the category 'gender', but out of diverse, as well as contradictory, factors. "But the category ‚women' includes within it a variety of other social positions including black/white, lesbian/heterosexual and disabled/ablebodied. Therefore feminist research must involve challenging rassism(s), heterosexism(s) and the bias toward woman who are able-bodied and so on, as well as sexism(s). Any individual woman may be the subject of multiple, perhaps contradictory, positions in wider society. Consequently, identity – including feminist identity – is propably best discribed as plural, fragmented and with a propensity to shift contextually and over time."[31] It became clear that in the representational model[32] of feminist politics and in the category 'woman' itself, power and exclusion mechanisms come into play and mean a continuation of colonist, racist and heterosexist discourses.

"The battle around the power to define and the battle around 'identity', has a type of materialising or totalising function: Something 'is' (female), is 'other' (than male), is 'so' (in the attempt to create a clear definition) and therefore is 'not other'. As ‚identity' is tapered it tends towards exclusion, denial, division or the projection of difference - whether in reference to the 'Self', or in reference to the 'Other' or the 'Others'"[33]. Already in the thought of representation, this applies also to an identity politics for women, there lies a normative moment, in inclusions and exclusions are reproduced. The criticism levelled against these exclusion mechanisms, which enter into the discourses around identity and identity politics in the form of obtusion and normatising, are expanded upon as poststructuralist theories emerge and are applied. "In this respect, black and lesbian women are closely aligned with advocates of feminist poststructuralism who argue strongly that the category 'woman' must itself be deconstructed."[34]

V. (Summary/perspective)

Racism and sexism have several analogies in the production of the categories 'race' and 'gender' and have things in common in their legitimation, however there are also differences. As opposed to ethnic and cultural groups, women can not, for example, be presented as a natural 'cultural community'. In the former, collective differences between groups are of more importance, that is why gender differences can again be emphasised within the 'cultural communities'. Primarily attacked through the critique of Black women, Jewish women, migrant women and women of colour, the category 'race'/ethnicity was pulled into the analysis - in Germany only at the end of the 80s/beginning of the 90s - but usually in the form of an addendum.

The task ahead now is to thematise the mechanisms of oppression and construction in their intersections, overlappings, extensions and mutual reinforcements etc. An additive perception of gender and ethnicity is unable to realise the configurative cooperation of both in, for example, social divisions of labour or relations of domination. Additionally this assumption does not do justice to a fragmented and decentred Subject, whose

---

[31] Henwood, Karen L. (1994), Resisting Racism and Sexism, in: Bhavnani, Kum-Kum/ Phoenix, Anne (Hg.), Shifting Identities Shifting Racisms. A Feminism and Psychology Reader, London, S. 33
[32] The criticism of representation focuses on the notion of representation as a copy and a reference to something primordial, that means, culture is reproduced from nature and both are thereby separated categories. Questioning representation as direct reproduction has developed from linguistics, more specifically, poststructuralism amongst others. The notion that language is a reflection of reality or that it represents a nature before the system of Signs, is here placed into question.

[33] Maurer, Susanne (1996), a.a.O., S. 64
[34] Henwood, Karen L. (1994), a.a.O., S. 53

personal identity forms within a social, temporal and historical context, that is, out of different parts: therefore single aspects of gender roles, ethnic background or other social factors, etc., can be chosen, combined, prioritised or discarded, fractures can appear, but also new cultural ‚hybrid forms' (also ‚bordercrossers'').

In order to marginalise, oppress or even eradicate people on the basis of gender, ethnicity or 'race', other constructions of legitimacy are and have been used. As in the case of european Antisemitism, Christian, culturalist, nationalist, sexist and racist legitimations complement each other. The 'new racism', also Neo-racism, defines itself today more by cultural differences than by asserting the existence of biological races. The most important difference between the 'new' and the 'old' racism is that superior 'human races' are no longer constructed, instead it is assumed that people from other cultures differ from us, are simply 'different'. Etienne Balibar calls this new racism "racisme differentialiste"[35], because it assumes a difference between the cultures, which are seen as changeless, and where there exists a static and fixed ‚being-defined' of people on the basis of their origin. Through this, a clear division is made between 'our' western lifestyle and the lifestyle of the 'other'. Our lifestyle, the enlightened culture of the western occident is supposedly marked by its individualism and rationality. This is pitched against the lifestyle of the foreigner, particularly their collective organisational forms.

As critics have shown, the position of German feminists has also been defined and strengthend by the exclusion of the not as emancipated 'foreign' woman. The foreign woman as the 'other' is constituted or rather constructed by exclusion from the dominant self.
Defined as different, it is either appropriated in the name of the dominant self, is either produced as projection or mirror of the self, or is coded as other in relation to the self. Both alternatives offer the dominant self the power of definition over the other, or the supposedly different."[36] The status of object of the Black woman and the migrant woman in feminism was simultaneously entrenched by the denial of the german feminist movement. Their invisibility led not only to an ahistorical category of 'woman', but also to a decontextualising of gender relations. It is mainly migrants who have historically been and are now responsible for making racism an issue, the topic remains a 'special case' within feminist research. Publications which explicitly problematize the interweaving of sexism and racism appear mostly under a title which emphaises this theme.

Today 'otherness' is usually emphasised and used as a positive term. Recognition and tolerance of 'the other culture' is in the foreground, as in, for example, the concept of multiculturalism. However an insistence on 'cultural difference', whether meant in a positive or negative sense, offers few possibilities for overcoming cultural or ethnically determined categories and stereotypes, with which social groups can be described and discrimination legitimated. In the same way ethnic movements can arise from experiences of exclusion and discrimination as so-called reactions, in which the country or culture of origin plays a central role. In this it is important to consider the context: who is speaking from which position and to what purpose. It is, for example, necessary to distinguish whether it is the case of a consciously utilised 'essentialism' of marginalised groups in the sense of a strategic politics of identity, or whether it is about essentialist statements and ascriptions from dominant positions.

---

[35] see Balibar, Etienne/Wasllenstein, Immanuel (1990), Rasse, Klasse, Nation. Ambivalente Identitäten, Hamburg

[36] Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodríguez (1996), Frau ist nicht gleich Frau, nicht gleich Frau, nicht gleich Frau... Über die Notwendigkeit einer kritischen Dekonstruktion in der feministischen Forschung, in: Fischer/Kampfshoff (Hg.), Kategorie: Geschlecht?, Opladen

Analyses which attempt to do justice to the question of cultural difference through recognition, often stay stuck in culturalist patterns of interpretation. Above all it is important to consider that while the concept of multiculturalism - despite all 'acknowledgement' of different cultures - implies equality, the political and legislative foundations for equality, for example, equal access to social resources and achievements, are up till now missing in Germany.

Feminism must again be thought of more strongly in relation to the 'outside', away from an internal feminist debate and towards external discursive and social contexts. Differences do not exist in a vacuum, they describe structural (power) relations. It is appropriate to consider one's own interlacing of absorbed perspectives and formulated statements within an elevated social/economic, historical and temporal space and to acknowledge the intertwining of the processes of ethniticisation and genderisation.

Subjectivity/Subjectivities, Labor/Labors and Everyday Life

A workshop combination

We got together with the aim of trying to connect our workshops, to find, bind and knit political, personal and topical lines and central threads in a new way.

We are interested, in different ways, in the changes in, the creation and regulation of subjectivities under the conditions of a postcolonial globalized and globalizing neoliberalism.

We ask in what way gender and sexuality are involved in these changes and how they – could – play a queer-ing part in this new era of global capitalist social relations.

We will concentrate on the following aspects:

♦ queer politics – potentials, limitations and strategies of anti/normalization of emancipatory left conceptions of identity.
♦ between work and dance: subjectivity under neoliberalism
♦ from silence to speaking out: the gender relations of globalisation
♦ between east and west: greencard, sexual labor and work migration
♦ between representation and invisibility: postcolonialism, or: queering the queer

We have developed a schedule for our joint conception which relates somewhat queerly to the planned time structure of the crossover conference: our workshops will be 2 hours each, at night there will be time for discussion of the issues raised in the workshops of the combination.

Schedule:

Fri., 19.1.02
11.00 – 12.45 h   **Workshop 1**
Between Norm and Anti-NORM: Daily
Political Practices
Katharina Pühl/Heike Raab/Trixie
Schwarzer/Karen Wagels/Mica Wirtz/

12.45 – 13.15 h   Break

13.15 – 15.00 h   **Workshop 2**
Subjectivity under Neoliberalism: "Billy Elliott — I will dance"
Nancy Nüchtern/Peter Wagenknecht/

18.00 – 20.00 h   **Workshop 3**
Strategic Silence – Gender Relations of Globalisation
Ariane Brenssell

20.00 – 22.00 h   Discussion of
the day's program

Sat., 20.1.02
11.00 h – 12.45 h   **Workshop 4**
Reproductive Accounts Online Banking: Sexuality, Greencard and the Love of Work
Pauline Boudry/Brigitta Kuster/Renate Lorenz/

12.45 – 13.15 h   Pause

13.15 – 15.00 h   **Workshop 5**
Queering the Queer – Postcolonial Perspectives
Encarnacion Gutiérrez Rodríguez/

18.00 – 20.00 h   Final debate
on the whole workshop combination

Workshop 1

In this workshop we want to focus on practices of exclusion within "our own circles". The starting point is our own experience in everyday political work, where antiNORMS open up spaces for but also set limits to thinking and talking about gender/racism/politics. These limitations of political action appear in, at and around bodies.

For us, politicizing "bodies" means seeing them in the context of socially hegemonic discourses and images.

Here, power manifests in unquestioned ways of seeing and patterns of behavior:

"bodies" communicate social relations of domination.

Female masculinities/independent "disabled" people/self-confident migrants/gay men break hegemonic images and thereby reveal relations of dominance within "the left scene".

Politics of "lookism" - in terms of appearance, body language and behaviour - lead to increasing uniformity, assimilation to norms and a kind of "political correctness" that has more to do with reflexes than with reflection.

This does, on the one hand, help create protected spaces – in the sense of security and being among like-minded people, on the other hand this protection always works through exclusions.

Protected spaces are important, but so is the continuous reflection of those spaces and their limits/limitations – by traversing them (not fitting into the picture), transgressing them (cooperations) and negotiating them.

Considering different examples, we want to engage in a critical discussion about the motivations and consequences of dualisms in political action (such as, for example, divisions into "good" and "evil"), concentrating on the strategies of anti-/normalisation they result in. Our focus will be on the limits/limitations of this kind of politics. We want to try and find first steps that might lead out of these dilemmata.

think ! criticize ! and act !!!!!!!!!!!

workshop 2

"Always be yourself " is what Billy`s mother wrote to him before she died. Her sentence is the leitmotiv of the movie, that plays during the last big mine workers`strike in Great Britain. With its defeat the Thatcher government enforced a political reversal: it withdrew subsidies, broke the unions' neck, began a policy of redistribution from bottom to top and propagated forms of behavior according to which everyone is responsible for seeking

her/his own good fortune (men more than women).

With some examples from scenes of the movie, the radical economic and political changes will be illustrated: characteristics of the type of capitalism in the industrial countries up until the 1970`s - fordism - are just as identifiable as the changes connected to the new, neoliberal form.

How do these radical changes affect the "interior" of humans? What personality features does neoliberalism require, which ones does it constitute? What does it mean under these circumstances "to always be yourself"? This appeal is ambiguous, since individuality, self realization, freedom gain meaning only in the social context in which they are located. The non-interchangeability of an I-Self, called subjectivity, that is one possibility of happiness. Just as Billy Elliott is happy when he is dancing. But it also fits in perfectly with the world of consumption, of precarious working conditions and complete desolidarization. What are we to do, in order for our subjectivity to not be for sale, but militant? How do we understand and overcome the old and new stereotypes about genders and sexualities that are visible in the movie? How is it possible to regain solidarity and agency, in view of the huge differences among people?

workshop 3

Patriarchal gender relations in their different shapes and forms - the subjugation and exploitation of and the discrimination against women, rigid gender dualisms, etc. are neither side effects nor arbitrary attendant symptoms, nor mere effects of globalization. On the contrary, they are among its central preconditions. "Capitalism needs for its reproduction a back country, which is not regulated by the laws of capital." Rosa Luxemburg once wrote, and just this is true for neoliberal capitalist globalization: it needs a "back country", and this is constituted systematically –structurally and every day.

The silence about the importance of gender relations for globalization is not arbitrary, but an important aspect of domination. That is why feminists describe the usual - including left wing - discourses of globalization as "narratives of eviction", because a central moment of the new form of domination of the new global model of civilization is rendered invisible. In this workshop we will deal with the allegedly gender-neutral discourses of globalization and seek ways to oppose the prevalent reductive patriarchal perspective on globalization. That means, on the one hand: to understand the production of patriarchal gender relations as one moment of globalization, and on the other hand: to analyze globalization not only as a question of abstract processes and structural changes but to show how the processes of global entanglement that seem so abstract at first sight have very practical effects in terms of changes in day to day behavior and possibilities of agency; of changes in thinking and belief systems, the production of meaning and of self-understanding. In a nutshell: to make day to day life and everyday experience visible as a problematic of globalization. We want to discuss this issue by taking a closer look at examples which focus on the connection between globalization, gender relations and day to day life. We also want to discuss if and how critical perspectives can be expanded with a feminist and anti-patriarchal approach and if and how such a view on globalization can change strategies of intervention and resistance.

workshop 4

The green card ties migration to highly valued work. This tendency is continued as an enforced hierarchization of forms of migration in the planned new immigration law of the FRG.

First video footage for a planned documentary film will serve as a foundation for discussion in this workshop.

We have conducted several interviews with green card holders from Bulgaria, we have documented a work place and a home in order to get an impression of living and working conditions. Besides the formal working conditions we want to find out if and how the employed are confronted with ethnicisation in their workplace and how gender and sexuality appear in the home at work and in work at home. Another question we have is how the universality ascribed to the logic of computers – "gender, sexual orientation and background do not matter; it is important to be good at what you are doing" - plays into the social meaning of computer work and how it shapes today's notions and conceptions of what work is.

Vice versa it appeared important to us to not only develop a critique of the conditions of Bulgarian work migrants here, but to take a look at the history of working conditions and gender relations under socialism, the history of the cold war and the transformations of the 1990`s as part of German-Bulgarian relation in a broader sense. Thus we also have conducted conversations with IT-specialists in Bulgaria and did some research on the unusual history of Bulgarian hardware and software production. In our workshop we want to discuss if and how work migration has changed in relation to the recruitment of the 1950`s to 1970's and what a critique of its conditions could take as a starting point.

workshop 5
Queering the queer: Antiracist perspectives

Using poems by Audre Lorde, May Ayim, Crytos, and Gloria Anzaldua we will move towards an antiracist perspective within queer politics. Our aim will be to emphasize different forms of speaking and doing that are not represented in the dominant public sphere (including left and alternative media). How can these politics of representation be changed? What examples do we have? In this context we will talk about antiracist feminist groups and networks of women and queers from a

minority background like FeMigras, ELISA, AGISRA, MAIZ, LEFOE, LESBERADAS and AK WI(E)DERSPRACHE.

The strategic silence about gender relations does play a role in the current war against Afghanistan. Women and women's rights are merely a matter of negotiations. In order to make war seem a reasonable solution, feminist or antipatriarchal points of view - especially in this country – must be ignored, because this is the only way to maintain the conviction that the status quo of western countries can be perpetuated.(taz, 24.12.2001; woz 1st week of January 2002)

No accomplices
Ariane Brenssell / Waltraud Schwab

The correlation between war and gender-relations is complex. To reduce it to the slogan "war is masculine" doesn't pay tribute to the chance that an analysis of the gender-related aspects of the current political situation does offer. A deeply gender-biased view provides a critical perspective on the dominant argumentative context that professes that war is the only solution when it comes to responding to the terror of September 11th . What we should be thinking about however are alternatives to this assumptions.

War is the political response of some of the countries of the west to the terror-attacks in New York and Washington. Women like Susan Sontag, Arundhati Roy or Saskia Sassen who fairly immediately commented on the terrorist attacks put the events in a context beyond terror and retaliation. Instead they demanded, that the 11th of September should be read in terms of the politics of the countries of the west and the bloodletting that these politics do cause in most other countries. Thus they analysed the terror-attacks and the war, that was started on the 7th of October, outside of or beyond the context given by the countries of the west that is to say the USA. But whoever dismisses this given context, does not consent to war as a solution. The critical zone for demagagogues of war begins at this point, because nobody should ever doubt that war can solve problems. In visionary terms Susan Sontag commented on the impact of this in society when she wrote in her article of September 15th in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung: "Let's by all means grieve together. But let's not be stupid together".

Civilisation, barbarism and women

The USA did define the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon as a declaration of war. Aside from the power to define "when war begins", "against whom a war is fought", "when a war is a success" and "when a war is finished" the USA has also taken hold of the power of defining "why there is a war". A simple and comprehensive scenario is being laid out in which defining the good side automatically points at that party which stands for the bad side. Marianne Schuller, an academic of literature and her collegue

Volker Kaiser have found marvelously appropriate words for this dualism. Referring to the 11th of September they wrote: "Understood as an attack against the whole (western) civilization, this immediately demands a counterpart in form of the uncivilized. As a consequence of this, the USA does not only become an incarnation of the civilized world but at the same time it is forced and legitimized, to fight the war of civilization against counter-civilisation." Civilisation versus barbarism – this dualism lends plausibility to the idea, that war is a solution. Silvio Berlusconi, the Italian prime minister, pointed out who in this scenario holds the position of the good side and who the position of the bad side. On a visit to Berlin he publicly declared that the west is culturally superior to the islamic world.

There is one argument which guarantees broad approval among advocates of war but also among its sceptics for this dualism or division of the world into good and evil and the idea it entails of retaliation: It is the plight of women in Afghanistan. The circumstances of life of women in Afghanistan is deplorable. They were made prisoners in their own country just because of their female sex. Feminists wanted this to be put on the agenda already at the UN conference of women in Beijing in 1995. The breach of human rights on women by the Northern Alliance and later the Taliban has however never made western governments to feel compelled to intervene, neither politically nor militarily.

It causes some disbelief when politicians and journalists suddenly focus on the fate of the women of Afghanistan in order to legitimate the war based on the concept of human rights. Considering that 90% of the victims in a war are civilians, mostly women, children and elderly people shows that this argument may well be a farce. (UN figures of 1990)

War, women and everyday-life

It is in the interest of the politicians in the USA to maintain that their wars are clean wars and that in their wars almost no civilians are being killed. What about the refugees? In thousands they die of hunger, illness, failing hygiene, expulsion, injuries caused through explosions of mines, hypothermia. Are they no victims of war, because they are not hit by bombs directly? The USA has thrown scatterbombs in the thousands onto Afghanistan, although these bombs are internationally outlawed. Victims hit directly are considered ‚collateral damage‘. Victims who are going to be killed later when they step on duds, die in ‚accidents‘. The question must therefore be allowed, whether the concept of war has to be extended to where it has

so far not yet been applied to: That is everyday life.

Under genderspecific consideration the organisation of everyday-life and everyday-existence are major tasks of women worldwide. Women are responsible for the reproduction, education, and in many cases also the production or procuring of food, and the maintenance of family. "Economies of care" are the equivalent UN-terms. This is domain of women.

For women it is of utmost priority also in wartime to organize everyday-survival. With this however in mind women already act beyond all logic of war. From a female point of view neither terror nor war but a fair distribution and justice come into focus. But when you do not only look at distribution in gender-neutral terms but under gendered perspectives the injustice of the worldorder is further highlighted: Two thirds of the poverty of the world affects women. Two thirds of all analphabets are women. Two thirds of the work done worldwide is being done by women.

War and gender-hierarchies

Feminist sociologists of military issues like Ruth Seifert have pointed at the correlation between the ideology of the armed forces and the degradation of women in general. In this context the production of gendered stereotypes is of utmost importance. In military logic emotion is female, rationality is male. Emotion looses, toughness wins. This is a preliminary condition for hierarchies within military structures.

The German chanceller Schröder (male) and the chief of the Green Party Claudia Roth (female) had an encounter which shows clearly what is at stake. Like Mary Robinson, the High commissionar of human rights at the UN Claudia Roth demanded publicly that there should be a halt to the bombing in order to be able to care for the humanitarian needs of the Afghan people. Because of her intervention Schröder called her a "whiner". Because she was no military expert she couldn't make an informed judgement of what is necessary, he said. While Schröder was praised by the media as a real statesman when he showed his feelings at his visit at Ground Zero, Claudia Roth is being derided as woman because she is touched by the misery of the refugees plight.

The peace researcher Astrid Albrecht Heide proved in her work on the

correlation between military forces and gender, that military forces can be considered a "direct proof of patriarchal power relations". Linked with it is a "Ramboisation of everyday-life" as Maria Mies, a pioneer of the feminist movement in Germany said. The situation in Afghanistan serves as an example. The wars of the last twenty years in Afghanistan – representative wars of the super powers – provided the conditions for installing the rigid gender-hierarchies which deprived women of the rights of education, health care, and a self-supported existence. The "war against terror" may have as one positive result that the plight of the women in Afghanistan has become an issue of public interest to the media and the politicians in these parts. However only blind confidence in the logic of war will take a now unveiled face of a women in Afghanistan as proof that war in general liberates women.

War-business and the bodies of women

There are however even more genderspecific dimensions of war. The female body itself is an object of discussion. Theoretically the rape of women in war is now considered a warcrime and is prosecuted at the international court in De Hague. This impresses neither the Taliban nor the armed forces of the Northern Alliance as

the UN reports. In any case sex as a means to appease the soldiers will play a part in Afghanistan too. Rape is just one aspect. Prostitution is another one.

Take the prolonged presence of armed forces of the west in Indochina. It shows how prostitution and trafficking in women has created new local economies. The profits are enormous. They can be compared to the profits in drug-dealing. Women profit the least from it all. With the military presence of the West in Afghanistan there too such a new sex-market will get established. War is a platform for businesses, one of which is business with women.

Contradictions

Whoever analyses the events of September 11th and its aftermath under a gendered perspective will touch upon contradictions within the argumentative context of those governments which try to purvey the idea that war is a solution. These contradictions should not be revealed. They harm the image and self-image of the western countries and they unmask their mission.

Does this explain why feminists of the western countries whose analysis of the war and of the politics of the USA did not comply with the standard version of why war is an adequate answer to terrorism are

faced with prosecution like the Canadian professor Sunera Thobani? Does it explain why others are being ridiculed like the north-american writer Barbara Kingsolver? "I have already been called every name in the Rush Limbaugh handbook: traitor, sinner, naive, liberal, peacenik, whiner" she wrote. Still: "It is not naive to propose alternatives to war."

Does this also explain, why abortion clinics of "Planned Parenthood" have received anthrax-threats since 1998? The Boston Globe reports it on the 17th of October. Neither anti-terror-agents nor the media seemed to bother until after September the 11th. The sender of the letters may well spell his name as Christian Fundamentalist.

Does this also explain, why there is broad media coverage of the conference about the future in Afghanistan that was held on the Petersberg near Bonn, but no media coverage of a womens conference on Afghanistan in Bruxelles at the same time? Mary Robinson opened the conference. She said that without women there is no future in Afghanistan.
Does this explain, why members of the "Afghan Women Council" or "RAWA" have not appropriately been invited to participate at the conference in Bonn? These women's organisations, located in

Pakistan and secretly operating in Afghanistan, were the only opposition that stood for years against the Taliban. They organised clandestine schools for girls, they documented violence against women, they organised health care and other humanitarian relief programs.

The influence of women on the future political development of Afghanistan will have to be watched for carefully anyway. This is crucial because the members of the conference on the future of Afghanistan which was held near Bonn did not decide on whether the juridical system will be based on secular law or the sharia.

Alternatives

In the first government in Afghanistan after women were given parity of rights in 1964 women were represented in high positions . 20 years of war have obliterated the memory of those times. But why do the western governments still hang on to the misogyn and fundamentalist Northern Alliance as representatives in a new government even today? With the Northern Alliance come all the Taliban fighters who deserted to the Northern Alliance, too. Must we assume, that these groups do guarantee more reliably that the interests of the Western countries and Pakistan are met. Why? "To make sure that the international corporations and global

players do have access to the not yet exploited oil and gasfields on Afghan terretory" says Mariam Notten, a sociologist of Afghan origin who lives in Berlin.

Oil may not be the only reason for the war, that would ignore the terrorist attacks. At the same time anti-terror-action cannot be the only reason for the military intervention either. For that other measures would be more effective.

In order to understand terror and war it seems necessary to focus on the global world-order and its inherent injustice when it comes to access to ressources and standards of living. This fuels hate, says Fatima Mernissi, feminist, sociologist and writer from Morocco. In an interview shown on German television on the 4th of November she talks about a Mr Keller, representative of the transnational oil-company Unocal, which built pipelines in Afghanistan. Mr. Keller was happy, when the Taliban took over power in 1996, she says. Refering to the present situation she explains: "The attack, the violence against New York can be understood as follows: Mr Keller divided the planet in two parts. In one part of the planet women - such as his wife and his daughter - are protected through laws. In the other part of the planet Mr Keller supported criminals who attacked women and destroyed their laws. To him this boundary was something natural. In a bloodbath the terrorists showed, that this barrier which divides the world in two zones, one in which violence is legitimate and one in which it is forbidden, is no longer valid. This I think is the major lesson learnt", she says.

In the German parliament Joschka Fischer the exterior minister polemically asked how terrorism and the Taliban could be stopped other than with war. With that question he suggested, that there is no alternative to war and therefore no other answer than war is possible. Yet there is an answer to this question. Dialogue is an alternative, openly revealing the geopolitcal, strategic and economic interests is an other alternative, a radical change of perspective which takes into consideration the points of view of those who care of survival even under the severest conditions and politics that do not ignore all this are alternatives. In this context points of view of women do matter, because for gender-specific reasons women do until today hold all those positions in life that are most strongly affected by the negative consequences of the economic politics and the politics of war.

In order to have war seem a plausible solution, the above mentioned alternatives need to be ignored. Only then in a state of self-afflicted ignorance does the conviction that the status quo of the countries of the west must be continued make sense. Feminist economists therefore call this attitude a "strategic silence". This silence needs to be broken.

Epilogue

According to the German newspaper the "Tagesspiegel" of the 4th of November the former president of Italy Cossiga, not a spotless figure by the way, said, that polygamy could be helpful in the fight against terrrorism. He suggested that as a "necessary concessions" to the muslims they should be allowed to gain "legal authority" over more than one wife if this helped to shape compromises in negotiations. It can hardly be expressed more explicitly, that women are the assets that are being thrown into the arena without great regret and that women should tolerate this silently, not only in islamic countries but on the homefront, too. Once revealed however, it should become more difficult, to turn women into accomplices of the politics of war.

The queer theory has to discover its inner dark continent, the critique of capitalism.

By katharina pühl and nancy wagenknecht.

Some representatives and many opponents of Queer theories agree that they are not offering a pleasing critique of capitalist structures. Maybe this is a display of the results of a long overdue disciplinary division of labor.
The deconstruction of that division was part of the program, when in the early nineties the first institutions of queer studies were established in North America. Nonetheless research on sexuality beyond medicine has been and is conducted mainly in the realm of the cultural sciences and the humanities, and up until now that is where most of the queer theorists have come from.

But the lack of the connection between queer and anticapitalist reflections is neither mandatory nor acceptable. If the queer-political program is focussing its critique on the regulation of and by sexuality, then, besides heteronormativity and the interdependent articulations of racism and heterosexuality the relation between capitalism and sexuality has to be addressed.

The inscription of queer perspectives into the economy doesn`t start from zero. Within the scope of queer theory one can find for example work of research which has been focussing on pink economy, the capitalist constitution of sexual minorities. Thus the sociologist David Evans from Glasgow has examined how the moral regulation of the state has led to the establishment of amoral subculture markets, which are organizing the sexuality of its subjects in a commodified way.

These markets influence, according to Rosemary Hennesse who teaches Critical Cultural Studies in the USA, a consumer culture, in which the capitalist economy and the economy of yearning are entangled.
But it would be too short sighted, to blame only gays and lesbians for the capitalist formation of their sexuality.
Moreover the constitution of sexual minorities has to be read as a symptom of a specific form of capitalist socialisation. Consequently these deliberations result in the question of the formation of heterosexuality in capitalism.

Heterosexual ways of being have had and have multiple and historically varying forms. They can't be reduced to the cliche of the core family with the father as the wage laborer and the mother and housewife as the producer of subsistence - and neither to the modernized cliche of the neoliberal defamiliarisation.
But within the multiplicity of heterosexual models always only a few specific people are privileged, as -like the opposite of the happy normal family - examples of single child raising black women who live on welfare in the USA show.

The afro-american political scientist Cathy Coben has analyzed the discourse on the so called welfare mothers with regard to how the racist regulation is inscribed into the production of heteronormativity.
Well the economic prioritization of specific forms of heterosexuality by the state has been a recurrent topic for some time now. But what concerns us moreover is, in what way this prioritization corresponds to the economic rationality of companies/corporations. The classical answer usually is: gender specific division of labor is a core principle of capitalist socialization. But the division of labor is not bipolar, rather hierarchically structured along racist and sexual borders. Therefore the social division of labor is constituted in itself in multiple different ways and thus displays such various exploitable features as the friendliness of the gay seller and the absence of rights of the illegal immigrant charwoman.

Out of various forms of heterosexual ways of being and forms of relationships resulted just as different emancipatory strategies. Some of them deal directly with the entanglement of economy and sexuality - namely the campaigns "Lohn für Hausarbeit" (wages for housework), with which feminists of the seventies wanted to scandalize the unpaid emotional and reproductive work of women. In most of the economic struggles though, sexuality - and in some way gender - tends to disappear behind a order that is seen as natural.

Only when these dimensions will be reflected, the potential and the limits of social struggles can be estimated.
There`s hard evidence for the thesis, that heterosexual masculinity has played a crucial role in the classical work struggles and that within these struggles there has been a tendency from the very beginning towards the exclusion and the devaluation of women as well as the rejection of homosexuality. Among women, the rejection of prostitutes seems to have fulfilled a similiar normative function. That might be the reason why, strikes of women have hardly ever taken into consideration the demands of the movement of prostitutes for recognition and social security.

This devaluation keeps the heterosexual love ideal as an ideological fundament of almost all models of relationship alive and thereby disguises the economic aspects of intimate twosomeness. This ideal of permanent heterosexual couple relationships assumes in the social regulation a central position. That becomes evident due to it's economic prioritization and because of the enormous resistance against all attempts of its modernization, even if they are as harmless as the homosexual marriage.
Capitalism does not only constitute a specific form of heterosexuality but is itself in all the aspects pointed

out by Judith Butler organized as a heterosexual matrix: hierarchical order of the genders, an obligation to a coherent sexual selfdefinition and performance, heterosexualization of the yearning, which is commodified in the sphere of consumption. Since Butler does not make the connection between her theory with political-economic
reflections, the matrix is easily reduced to a system of distribution for different cultural positions.

But if we understand sexual relations and sexuality as a field, in which the economic regulation of life takes place, the queer view of the heterosexual matrix reveals those mechanisms of inclusion, exclusion and rejection, of disempowerment and empowerment, which establish and reproduce structures of expolitation. Or to put it in another way: the production of gendered, racist and sexual difference is a precondition and part of the distribution of unequal positions in the thread of social forms of production.

For the project of a queer critique of the economy a discussion about its most important terms and concepts is necessary, starting with the term economy. The hermetic stringency of the marxist conception is well known, it`s assumptions have been criticized a couple of times from a feminist perspective and first and foremost it has been extended to a different understanding of production. The concept of the economy of yearning that Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari have developed, with an anticapitalist intention against the psychoanalysis and the tendencies of normalization, tries to capture the interplay of psychic, mental, physical and economic mechanisms.

Certainly the feminist critique of capitalism has been taken into consideration only partly within the queer theory.And instead of the poststructuralist, the structuralist und speechtheoretical notion of an economy of yearning put

forward by Lacan is prevailing, whose capitalist-affirmative use has been criticized by Hennessy with strong emphasis. A notion of Yearning would be of great advantage, that adopts the perspective of Deleuze and Guattari and theorizes yearning as a non-subjective motor of historicity and sociability/social entities.

As "sexuelle Arbeit" (sexual work) the Berlin based feminists Pauline Boudry, Brigitta Kuster and Renate Lorenz describe the production and representation of a coherent gender and a specific sexuality, that is part of processes of work. With the use of that term it is possible to analyze the discrimination of transgender and transsexual persons at the labor market as well as the prioritization of certain sexual styles of expression within subculture-economies; the smile of a stewardess just like the heterosexist work order in a latin americam maquiladore industry.

The production and performance of gendered and sexual coherence within the work process is functional for the companies/corporations: it secures a hierarchical order of the work forces, whereas in services it is part of the sold product. Simultaneously, the need to offer sexual work coincides with the yearning of the subject to exist and be perceived as a coherent gender with an accountable sexuality.

The discovery of the connections between sexuality and economy turns those into an object of politicisation. Queer theory can therefore supply anticapitalist policies/struggles with several terms, concepts and analyses.
At the same time it only lives up to its self proclaimed strategy, to analyze the regulation of and by sexuality, if it puts a stronger focus on the capitalist formation of sexuality and its inscription into the economy than before.
Contradictions within the queer community emerge and at the same time new coalitions between marginalised people become possible. If queer has a political goal, it is this one.

Bram Stoker's 'Dracula'

A History-of-Ideas-Horror-Trip through the 19th Century (with exemplary film excerpts)
Friday. 18. january 2002, midnight

In principle it would be sufficient to deal exclusively with the vampire classic "Dracula" by Bram Stoker (which appeared in 1897 in England) at the conference. All imaginable relations of power and domination that the common lefty generally vehemently militates against are contained in this work.

It's worth a closer look. For example, the eurocentric adulation of the rise of the white male bourgeoisie, or the sexist images of women and men, the open antisemitism and the flagrant diffamation of roma and sinti, the patriarchal images of sexuality and bodies (the male struggle against the menstruating woman, for example) and much more.

Besides all these truly revolting aspects, the work has many other interesting facets: we could, for example, ask questions about the cultural meaning of the vampire motif, which is very popular worl-wide; we could ask whether vampires exist or not, how one can defend oneself against them and what attraction they exert on common mortals, what status vampires have in the cineastic world and a fair number of other gems of hyperintellectuality (such as "who's right? Foucault or Psychoanalysis?") could be brought into play.

Besides all this, the former or present pleasant horror shall have its more than legitimate place. And fun, of course (it's mandatory).

Looking forward to a bloody meeting at the witching hour

Crazy Horse, Bremen

,5th. antiracist bordercamp in thüringen. from white people's anti-racism to trans-identity mobilisation?!'

our plan is to give a short input what the cooperation between migrants, refugees, people of colour...and whites, germans, non-refugees...has been like in the former bordercamps. furthermore we plan a huge brainstorming which aims to look what the ,trans-identity-mobilisation' means practically and concretely in the context of the next bordercamp. regarding this important headwords are:

- structure of organisation: tent of information, press, peoples kitchen...
- communication: general meeting, meeting of deligates, moderation,languages..
- actions: lining up of contents, level of confrontation...
- diskussions on the camp: workshops, main topics...

the results of the brainstorming will be written down – and perhapes there will be some nice idea for our bordercamp-preperation-circle...
invited are all, especially those who plan to take part in the preperation of the next bordercamp.

responsible for the workshop are 5 people from bremen and berlin so far. the voice and the flüchtlingsinitiative brandenburg are also asked whether they want to join in.

as much...yours olaf

Colonial world of images and the subject

Or else: whiteness, blackness & gender: About the crossing of racism and sexism

From the 17th to the 20th january the first cross-over-conference will take place in Bremen – its subtitle: Attack power networks! It is the aim of this conference to examine the specific links between various relations of domination and power in order to meet a concern which may be voiced on a regular basis but is much too scarcely translated into action. That means: All the planned workshops are going to link two or more power relations, like for example heterosexism and capitalism or sexism and antisemitism. It is the aim of this text to illustrate - with a concrete example of such a link - the theoretical as well as practical use of such an approach.

Prologue: Colonial MCA (Maximum Credible Accident) at the 3rd + 4th anti-racist border-camp

' We have come to the conclusion that it is better not to address any white women on the camp; because otherwise we run the risk of being once again accused of being sexist.' This was formulated by two men from The Voice Africa Forum and the Refugees Initiative Brandenburg during a predominantly constructive discussion about racism and sexism, which took place during the last 3-4 hours of the final plenum of this year's anti-racist border-camp. The background for this almost serene assessment were not so much incidents at the camp itself, but rather numerous, now and again nerve-racking, discussions about sexism, which had been lead by representatives of The Voice, the Refugees Initiative Brandenburg and of other migrant organisations in the past 2-3 years – many of them having been with (white) Germans. One of the inglorious highlights regarding this was surely the debate on last year's no-border-camp in Forst. At that time the camp-publicity got

an e-mail from some participants of an Antifascist-camp in Weimar. In this mail, on the one hand they talk about a sexist encrouchment comitted by a man who had been mobilized for the camp by The Voice; on the other hand, they draw far-reaching conclusions from this: "We ask The Voice to not only make a statement on this incident, but to tackle the problem of sexist behaviour in their group and with those associated with it. We demand that they make sure that such encroachments will be impossible in the future, so that we can continue our common struggle against the racist state and the racist population."

These demands, which were directly addressed to The Voice resulted in bitter debates at the camp, especially because representatives of The Voice were hurt and in addition anxious, that this criticism could lead to the destruction of The Voice, even fearing that this could possibly be intended. In an inofficial camp-resolution, which was supported by the vast majority of campers, the camp-debates which had been going on for several days were finally summed up in two directions: not only was the sexist encroachment on the antifa-camp condemned and possible consequences of such encroachments were pointed out, the e-mail from Weimar was also harshly criticized: By marking the sexism of an inidividual, actually of an individual black men (not the sexist conditions in general), and by secondly holding The Voice particularly responsible for the avoidance of sexist encroachments (instead of reminding all men of their anti-sexist duty), the writers of the e-mail give the impression, that sexism is a special problem of black or rather migrant men. And this amounts to a racist ethnicization of the problem! It is also criticized that the e-mail from Weimar makes the resolute fight against sexist conditions as a requirement for anti-racist struggle. Because this is nothing else but playing one power condition off against another one, a procedure which inevitably ends in a

self-contradiction, as the debates on the camp have shown.

Back to the camp in Frankfurt: If one lets last year's and other, similar debates around sexism and racism pass in review, it should become understandable, why the two men from The Voice respective the Refugees Initiative Brandenburg came to the beforehand quoted assertion. Still: One should not be content with this. Because the fear which is voiced in the estimation "We as black men run danger to be accused of sexism by the whites" is more than this, it is the return of one of the most basic colonial classics ever, in which sexism and racism interlock indisdriminably. In the colonial everyday life as well as in the thousands of lynchings in the US-post-slavery-era, or in 1992 at the racist mob in front of a refugees home in Mannheim-Schönau, no matter where and when, there are always colonial worlds of images circulating, there are always sexist-racist regimes of representation at work. According to them, it's the black man – hypersexual, greedy and violent - , of which the white woman – worthy, week and asexuell – has to be protected, in fact by the white man, who is on his part rational, strong and disciplined, while on the contrary the black women is always already the morally fallen one – bestial, lascivious and bizarre, being at the mercy of male-white craving.

Keeping this colonial subtext in mind, it becomes obvious, why it is a political MCA when on a no-border-camp frequented mainly by white western europeans black men voice the fear, that they – as blacks – could be denounced as sexists. And this is not changed by the fact that most men are in one way or the other sexists anyway. Because in a society, in which the different relations of power are always already linked, and in which human beings are at the same time gendered, ethnicized and made to members of certain classes etc. , every reproach of sexism is always already ethnically charged, no matter if it addresses white, black or other

sexists, and regardless if these are out-classed, conservative bourgois or members of whichever class. That means: The fact that on the Frankfurt no-border-camp (certain) black men preferred it, to not or only defensively address white women is due to the circumstance, that the social basic power conditions along with their discursively founded regimes of representation were at work even in Frankfurt. This incident is not surprising, but still worth to be understood.

So who wants to comprehend how aforementioned race-gender-super-MCA could happen, has to investigate a couple of basic questions, for example: What is blackness/ what is whiteness/ what does ist mean, that blackness respective whiteness are historically-culturally produced identities – like gender as well/ how do these identities emerge/ why does blackness depend on whiteness/ what are fantastic-projective ascriptions (concerning lust, desire and fear)/ how and why do these ascriptions become internalized and therefore reality/ how are blackness, whiteness and gender (as well as other power relations) interlinked/ what means black, phallocentric hypermasculinity/ what white supremacy/ to what extent are blackness and whiteness reductionist polarizations (in view of Asian, Arabic, Eastern European … identities) etc. etc…?

This is certainly a host of questions. So the following notes shall be understood primarily as highlights; as highlights who have the purpose to indicate what happens as soon as light is not only thrown on the deep layers of racism (from which emerge – in turn – racism by the state, actions of the racist mob etc.); but when also links are established, particularly to sexism and heterosexism.

Blackness & whiteness : between construction and reality

As the gender-term aims at the heterosexist system of patriarchal dual sexuality, the double blackness & whiteness directs attention to the fact, that there is a multitude of ethnic identities in western societies, which have come out of processes of ethnic marking and self-marking, not least those of blackness and whiteness which are going to be addressed now.

The analytic focal point of the concept of blackness & whiteness is that blackness and whiteness have no such thing as a natural nucleus, quite similar to the fact, that the ideal of a naturally given biologically sexed body turned out to be a discursively produced misapprehension. It is rather to emphasize, that in the course of historical processes (that is due to colonialism and slavery, due to the development of capitalist-patriarchal nation-states, due to apartheid and racist discrimination etc.) skin colour and other physical markings were not only constructed as allegedly eminent orientations of distinction but also marked. It was on this basis that – by reverting to further actual as well as ascribed markings and features – it came to the formation of different identities, among them for example white and black ethnic identities. The concept of blackness & whiteness does not really tackle the question why this happened, that is which role such identities played respectively still play for example for the emergence of capitalist-patriarchal nation-states. But this matter isn't crucial, because any further attempt to tackle this complex would be beyond the scope of this article anyway. The concept of blackness & whiteness is instead interested in the how, that is the question, by means of which mechanisms – some of which being circular – ethnic identities are created. The core of this concept is therefore the treatment of the facts (known also from the debates about gender), that races or rather ethnicities are not natural but effects, that

is real starting- and ending points of socially regulated mechanisms of construction. Or put differently: Even though races or rather ethnic identities are no mere fantasies, that is that blackness and whiteness exist as real identities (each understood as specific ways of thinking, feeling and acting, which also have a physical dimension), it is true at the same time, that the fact of construction mechanisms, which are permanently at work, has to be kept in mind.

That means: If one wants to comprehend aforementioned mechanisms of construction, one has to deal with real racism – racist discrimination as well as racist privilege – whereby it should be clear that both, privilege as well as discrimination not only differ according to class, gender etc, but also entail different effects. On the other hand – as as direct countermove - it is important to throw light on the discursively founded regimes of representation, that is those 'image tanks', in which the material is assembled, of which components black, white and other identities are constructed; material, which comes out of the discursive sphere, that is which consists of visual images (in films and print media, in advertising etc.), of values and norms, of spoken and written expressions of any kind, of music etc..

The images of blackness and whiteness which are depicted within the ruling regimes of representation are directly referring to each other, even more: the principle of negative reflection unites them: that which one lacks, is a feature of the other, and vice versa. This principle is not balanced, though. It is the colonial look which dominates, and the images are constructed from a white view-point, and this is even true for a considerable part of the image material coming from blacks.

In practice the images of blackness and whiteness (and therefore of racist difference) are depicted by means of a multitude of opposingly structured pairs of concept (pairs of concept, which build the

spine of the discursive sphere, that is also of the ruling regimes of representation): It is grown-up whites who stand out due to work, mind and disciplin, which actively and diligently create culture, moral and civilisation, always in the light and visible, always dry, moderate and clean. On the other hand side the blacks are infantile, all body, emotion and idleness; they are passive, depraved and soft, close to the moist and dark nature, lacking history and culture, sunken into wild babarism, dirty, lazy and aggressive.

But this is not all, because the contrast between blackness and whiteness is a crossed one; crossed not least by the system of patriarchal dual sexuality. This is particularly piquant because of the fact that images of women and men (and therefore of sexist difference) are depicted by means of exactly the same pairs of concepts which are used for the difference between blacks and whites, whereby women hold the black and men the white position. This crossing of these two power relations has as a result, that there is only one ruler, if one takes stock: the white man – superior, and always calm and able to assert himself (white male supremacy). In contrast the white woman is only a limited ruler: She belongs to the side of civilized culture, but is at the same time muddled, she is soft, determined by feelings, her boundaries are blurred, even fluid. That renders her delicate towards the side of the natural, the blackness; it's only by the white men that she can be protected from this. On the other side of the bank are after all the black woman and the black man. The most important difference between those is that the black man, equipped with a huge penis, is insensible, dissipated and dangerous, while the black woman oscillates between sexually charged animality and the caring mother-position.

The conclusive question is now in which way the worlds of images, which are depicted in the ruling regimes of representation relate to actual blackness respective actual whiteness. Because the fact, that the subjects are produced by these worlds of images (always in interaction with the real living conditions as they result from the respective class-, gender-, ethnicity-, etc. position) does not imply at all, that this happens in an 1:1 proportion. And: However central this question is, it is impossible to briefly answer it. Therefore I want to once again try brief mentions.

Split whiteness: between controlled rationality and suppressed lust

I want to start with whiteness (not without mentioning that whiteness itself is always rugged depending on class, gender etc.): Of course, real whiteness is more than work, spirit and discipline. For even though the regimes of representation lead us to believe this: desire, feelings and impulses, in short body respective everything having to do with it, can be suppressed, can be modulated or directed into socially regulated paths, but they cannot be abolished, that is eliminated. Or put differently: It is true that the subjects are the product of socially regulated mechanisms of construction, but however: that, which is constructed is no creation out of nothing; at the beginning of their life human beings are an energetic bundle of bodily-affective needs, impulses and energies, nothing more and nothing less! And because of this, becoming a subject (at least in capitalist-patriarchal nation-states) is principally a painful process. Or in the words of two doyens: " Humanity had to bear horrible things until the self, the identical, purposeful male character of the human was created, and some of this gets repeated in each childhood." (Adorno/Horckheimer)
Being aware of this, one unterstands the true meaning of the negative mirror image: As within the patriarchal logic it's women, who personify the suppressed (sweet and dangerous as it is…), in the racist logic it's blacks who are the governors of the split, personifying from a white point of view

that which is fascinating and desirable, which gives pleasure, but also fear, and which is then persecuted with hate and disgust; because the split is as seductive as it is dangerous, threatening to blast one's own control: the painfully etablished heterosexuality, indeed the creation of sexes in general, the self-disciplin in order to labour etc. In other words: They, who want to unterstand the white ambivalence, the willingness to consumistic-relishing assimilation of black culture (including the fetishistic celebration of shiny-black skin) while at the same time not questioning one's own whiteness, should be referred to the splitness of white identity. That means, that the white subject in her/his heart wishes to be controlled rationality, but still cannot flee his/her body, with the consequence to again and again stagger with fear and relish at the same time towards what is embodied by blackness.

However: The white subject does not want to know anything of this, it wants to remain invisible within the representation regime, as well as that, which the split of is damned to invisibility. As they see themselves, whiteness is that which is normal, which is universell, that, which does not need to be addressed. It's blackness which is perceived as different and which therefore belongs in the limelight. It is as such difference that it shall be addressed, and that is for no other reason than the identical reinforcement of one's own, that is of white identity.

I want to take stock provisionally: regarding real whiteness the images depicted within the ruling regimes of representation have turned out to be ambiguous. On the one hand side they fade out body and affection and thereby constitute a wrong representation. On the other hand they are the substance out of which real whiteness is made. Because the split of white identity is no fiction, it is real! Whiteness really means control of one's own body and vitality as well as compulsory heterosexualisation, compulsory sexualization etc.. And in addition, whiteness means to cause (once again) racist difference by means of phantastic-projective ascriptions, as it means to have an outlet in order to reduce inner tension. Speaking with Toni Morrison, within the ruling regimes of representation the blackness-side is primarily a dream, a dream, which, like any dream, gives exclusively information about its dreamers, in this case: its white dreamers!

Split blackness: between subordination, self-hatred and resistance

It goes without saying: under these conditions the relationship between real blackness and those images depicted of blackness among the regimes of representation is tremendously difficult. Just as whites are not only controlled rationality, blacks do not take up with Körperlichkeit; it's also valid, that blacks, as well as whites, are subject to the requirements of capitalist-patriarchal nation –states, and therefore also have to control Körperlichkeit und vigour, develop heterosexuality and Geschlechtlichkeit etc…

That means: The black identity is structurally split, too: On the one hand side the people marked as black are subjugated to the same imperatives of subjectivation, which are ascribed to the white subject position within the ruling regimes of representation. On the other hand it's not possible for the people marked as blacks to avoid racist marking. No matter if they want it or not, they are subjectivated as black people, like whites are as whites as well. Therefore they are inevitably at the mercy of all those ascriptions, which the ruling regimes of representation hold at hand for blacks (that is for people marked as blacks). This and the structurally necessary subjugation under the white subject position result in two different things: On the one hand side the often quoted black self-hatred: "And they took hold of the ugliness, threw it round their

shoulders like a coat and went through the world." (Toni Morrison) On the other hand the aim to set something of their own against the self-hatred which is imposed on them from the outside, that is to meet this ethnization self-confidently and subversively. With the example of one certain variant of black masculinity I now want to show that this practice is inconsistent and does not always lead to an emancipatory blueprint.

In the course of the past 200 years a whole lot of black men in the USA and GB (who have not managed the still seldom plunge into the middle class) have developed a heterosexist, phallocentric hypermasculinity, that is a concept of masculinity, which is so extreme, that the black cultural historican bell hooks talks about a "highly dangerous stranglehold of patriarchal masculinity", with which many black men are mixed up.

This development started already at the time of slavery. At that time black men faced the humiliating experience to be subjugated and degraded in any possible regard and not having access to those attributes which commonly, that is in the frame of patriarchal relations, are linked with self-confident masculinity – among them being authority, being able to look after one's family or having private property. This experience of humiliation (which makes sense only again
st the background of a patriarchal code of honour) is continued by the personal and structural racism until the present day. Then as well as today, black men have defended themselves with the development of aforementioned hypermasculinity, have answered to violence and discrimination by their own cult of strenght. This includes the non-willingness of many black men to demystify the myth of their allegedly huge potency (which includes the white fantasy of the black monstrous phallus). At the opposite: The racist stereotypes were often absorbed, the myths continued. In sports as well as in rap-music - one works on one's

own body and tries to improve it. Pulsating liveliness, intensity and offensively displayed zest for live are one's programme - against the racist everyday life! This development escalated in the 80s and 90s. It was at that time, that the political ideas of liberation from the 60s and 70s were replaced by a "bio politics of fucking" (Paul Gilroy). The articulation of freedom, autonomy and power to act was more and more equated with heterosexual desire and expressive Körperlichkeit. This lead to the consequence, that the black community was sometimes made a place, which was represented mainly by outstanding (heterosexually marked) bodies like that of Michael Jordan.

These developments have often been addressed as problematic (especially from the black side), not least because of two reasons: On the one hand side because of the massive violence within the black community itself, violence among heterosexual men as well as misogynist respective homophobic violence. (It is until today among some blacks a standard quotation, that homosexuality is 'the white men's disease'.) On the second hand because of a fatal circle: The bodycentric and in addition sexually charged hypermasculinity among black men, which is always already an answer to racist oppression, has on its part often been perceived as the confirmation of white projections, even more: it has made the racist fiction real until a certain point – which can be seen for example at the predominance of black men in certain sports. To which dramatic consequences such a circle between reality and discursively founded regimes of representation can lead, this has shown the colonial MCA at the 3rd and 4th anti-racist-border-camp (referring to the colonial thoughtlessness, with which The Voice were attacked in the e-mail from Weimar). Therefore I want to emphasize here the following: Masculinity has many faces, two of which I have referred to (in passing): white male supremacy as well as

black phallocentric hypermasculinity. What they and further (white, black and other) masculinities have in common is that they all exercise personal as well as structural violence, none being better than the other. Therefore they should be fought against together (without however loosing touch with their respective different conditions of formation).

One more aspect shall be briefly mentioned: In the beginning it was said, that blackness & whiteness are reductionist polarizations which have to be differentiated. This should be taken to heart in any case. Who wants to seriously analyse racism, has to be a lot more precise than this article, for example by making different differentiations already within Europe, for example between eastern, western, southern as well as southerneastern european identities – and even this should not be enough… Still: No matter which racist relationship is investigated, the pattern is often similar, because the ethnization always follows opposingly structured concepts. How this works in practice could be recently once again noticed after the terrorist attacks in the US, when once again western-christian civilization was brought into position against arabic-moslem barbarism.

Conclusion: cross-over-conference in Bremen

I hope that I could make two things to some extent clear: 1. Racism is structurally inherent in each white marked person. So white anti-racists can therefore not limit themselves to attacking only the racism of the state. They should also bear the social racism and therefore themselves in mind. That means concretely: One of the central aims of white anti-racist politics has to be the smashing of white identity! Only if this happens there is a real chance that anti-racist border camps in the long term do not stay a predominantly white matter. 2. Sexism, heterosexism and racism are interconnected in such a way that it is only together that they can be comprehended and fought against – or not at all! This should be taken to heart – theretically as well as in practice.

One place, whrere these and other questions can be discussed will be hopefully the cross-over-conference in Bremen, taking place 17th to 20th january 2001 in Bremen.

Crossing Masculinities[1]

This text tries to place antisexist politics by men in a larger social context. It discusses men's groups and the issue of identity politics in general. It demands a "renewal" of antisexist politics by men and ends with a look at some attempts at realizing some of the ideas discussed in the text.

Part 1: In defense of the idea of antisexist men's groups.

I've defined myself as profeminist since the early eighties[2]. I am in critical solidarity with attempts by men of the radical left to organize in antisexist men's groups, to effect personal change and act politically, publicly, in antisexist ways.

The issue of antisexism is no less central for me today than it was 15 years ago. What's more, I am convinced that men's groups should be an essential element of any renewed antisexist political practice by men.

I find men's groups useful because they sustain processes of personal change, processes made very difficult in mixed groups by the fundamental conflict between men and women in a patriarchal society, the pain and anger associated with this conflict, and the difficulty of empathy between different social "realities". They constitute an alternative to the usual structures of emotional exploitation of women by men and create a space in which (heterosexual) men can learn to take care of each other more and engage with one another more fully than patriarchal norms usually allow for. Men's groups can release a great potential of wishes for

contact that don't conform to the norms of hegemonic masculinity; in this way, they can be instrumental in beginning to work through homophobia, one of the central structuring elements of patriarchal social relations. To avoid situations where women are obliged to "coach" men in feminist thought, where conventional gendered patterns of speaking and acting are reproduced, or the discussion becomes completely paralyzed for fear of emotional injury, it makes sense, I believe, not to debate certain (many) issues in mixed-gender contexts.

I interpret the decline (compared to the late eighties) in the FRG of this type of practice, "antisexist men's groups", as, **in part**, one effect of an antifeminist "backlash" within the left and in society in general. Within the "radical left", partial feminist gains have been taken as an occasion to relegate the issue of patriarchal domination and exploitation to somewhere near the bottom of the list of priorities; women have lowered their expectations and reduced their demands in private and in public; accordingly, particularly heterosexual men feel less pressure to question their masculine practices and privileges.

Today, "the men's movement"[3] has come to be identified, in mainstream media, with antifeminist father's rights groups, "wild men", and masculinist reactionaries of the ilk of Robert Bly. In most of the left-liberal men's group scene (counseling centers etc.) profeminism is seen as decidedly passe. Radical left men's group structures – that were hardly ever free of the desire for a positive masculine identity and antifeminist tendencies – are, by now, almost non-existent[4].

---

[1] The title alludes to the "Crossover Conference" in Bremen, Germany, 17.-20. January 2002, organized by the antiracist antisexist summer camp project. More about both in Part 3.

[2] What exactly I mean by that has, of course, changed considerably over time. And how much or how little I have put my ideas into practice at different times is yet another question altogether (one I don't deal with in this text).

[3] I always found the term "men's movement" embarassing; as far as I am concerned, the reactionaries can have it for free; I just wanted to show how, under the ideological hegemony of sexism, terms that used to be associated with "progressive" politics have become emptied of meaning / redefined.

[4] see "Geschichte der Maennergruppenszene in der BRD" in "Maennerrundbrief" Nr. 10/1997 and 11/1998

The "backlash" image is of course too one-dimensional, it fails to do justice to the ambiguities and contradictions in the development of social structures, including the development of social movements.

It's important to realize, in this context, that the proletarian-anticapitalist, antiracist, anticolonial, feminist and other struggles of the sixties and seventies were not simply defeated and extinguished, but have become, in a complex melange of repression and integration, part of a contradictory "modernization" of capitalist-patriarchal structures. As a result of this process, domination has - as social life, on a global scale, is increasingly penetrated by capitalist social relations – become, partly, unevenly, more flexible and virtualized[5]. Similar maybe to the way a culturalist "neoracism" appeared on the scene in many places - by the nineties at least - and coexisted with a more traditional racism of "heredity" and "blood", patriarchal structures in the past decades, in part, have tended to disengage from strictly biological definitions of sex/gender; the patriarchal "principles" of masculinity and femininity[6] function as ever, just their relation to the sorting of people into men and women according to

biologistic criteria is not as clear-cut as it used to be. Such "abstract-patriarchal" conditions, visible as yet only in outline, coexist with a renaissance of biologism in certain scientific discourses, with an intensification, the world over, of "classically patriarchal" violence against and exploitation of women (who are, in this process, very clearly defined by and reduced to their biology).

It is a contradictory development produced partly by the inner contradictions of the ensemble of dominant social relations themselves, partly brought about by the struggles of social movements.

On the one hand, there can be no question that, in relation to the aims of their more radical wings, the anticapitalist, antiracist, antisexist, gay liberation and other social movements have suffered one defeat after the other over the last 30 years (even though, of course, hosts of opportunistic renegades from the former critical intelligentsia try to make it look otherwise today). On the other hand, I do not wish to tell a one-dimensional narrative of corruption, into which the story of the decline of antisexist men's groups, for example, could then be neatly fitted.

This is because **firstly**, the development of social movements over the last 30 years is just as ambiguous and contradictory as the development of society as a whole, of which it is, obviously, a part. That is to say: there is amnesia and deradicalization in the history of social movements, but there is also the "dicovery" of types of domination that had not been problematized before, the development of new social practices and forms of political contestation, radical theoretical breakthroughs etc.

Secondly, antisexist politics by men had problems for completely different reasons. These I'll address briefly in what follows:

Point # 1:

From the very beginning, men's groups had a problem of legitimacy: Identity politics by members of privileged groups just is something completely different from identity politics by

---

[5] By virtualization I mean the tendency of social life to be determined less and less by, for example, material production, manual labor etc and the increasing role played by knowledge, information, signs, etc. The virtualization of gender becomes apparent in the tendency of (social) gender to separate from ("biological") sex, mostly in the states of the "first world", but not only there.

[6] To illustrate what I mean by this: as a result of the partial success of the liberal feminist strategy of increasing the number of female subjects occupying places in various patriarchal apparatuses of domination – take the Swedish parliament or the US Army as examples –women are increasingly taking over abstract-masculine functions and aspects of abstract-masculine subjectivity (which, of course, masquerades as universally human, adult, reasonable and self-possessed subjectivity and disavow its intrinsically masculine and bourgeois determination). Obviously this has some liberating aspects for the happy (?) winners, but that doesn't change the fact that the model of personhood, of adult, reasonable subjectivity that is being gender-democratiized here, remains true to the principles of patriarchal masculinity.

underprivileged/oppressed people. It was never possible to base men's group politics on an emphatic sense of one's own suffering and you were always confronted with the legitimate misgivings of women/lesbians towards this practice. You were always having to deal with the question of what exactly the difference between antisexist men's group and a "normal" league of males was supposed to be. Similarly, suspicions that the main intention of "men's group-men" was really to obtain an antisexist "clean record" by means of public penitence, or that the whole project was in fact a subtle or less-than-subtle attempt to usurp feminist positions, and in this way regain a dominant speaking position, now in the "field" of antisexism as well, could never be so easily dismissed. All this was reason enough for many men to give up on men's group politics or not even get started doing it.

Point # 2:

As social movements developed and differentiated – in a climate marked, but not simply determined, by the political defeat of emancipatory projects – the critique of certain types of identity politics (as it would later be called) intensified:
In the United States, Black and Latina women questioned the collective subject "women" as it had been constructed by the USAmerican women's movement in the seventies.
Divers struggles by lesbians within the women's movements of various countries for visibility and appreciation of their existence also worked to destabilize the category "woman".
As far as antisexist men's groups in the FRG are concerned, there was, for example, a wave of differentiation at the end of the eighties, beginning of the nineties, in which radical left gay men increasingly separated from radical left heterosexual men with antisexist ideas; many, especially the heterosexuals, only now began to realize and criticize the widespread and unwitting equation of "men" with "heterosexual men" in "men's movement" discourse[7].

Point # 3:

With the belated (compared to France, Britain or the USA, for example) reception of poststructuralism in the FRG, which by the nineties had increasingly filtered through the universities into the activist radical left, the feminist debates around J.Butler's "Gender Trouble" and the interest in queer theory that began to appear by the mid- to late nineties in parts of what was left of the left[8] …, a general scepticism concerning any kind of identity politics spread among many of those interested in "gender relations" – that's how it was called now, the term "patriarchy" being deemed "too monolithic" by many.

Although I do claim that there has been an extension and consolidation of a "sexist consensus" within the mixed left and that the decline of antisexist men's groups is somehow connected to this, I don't want to reduce this development to the effect of an antifeminist backlash (especially not if this concept is understood one-dimensionally). I take the fundamental problem of legitimacy of a politics of identity by privileged groups seriously (point # 1), as well as the critique of identity politics in general (point # 2 & 3).

I found attempts by men at antisexist politics back in the eighties pretty wretched already; therefore, I have no

---

[7] Of course I don't want to equate these social phenomena – feminist movement on the one hand, men's group scene on the other - or place them in a common category: given the small numbers and the political/theoretical feebleness of the mini-sub-scene "radical left men's groups", and the fundamental problem of legitimacy of an identity politics by members of privileged groups, this would indeed be truly bizarre. What I am trying to do is locate a politics I feel personally connected to in a larger political context.
[8] Even the left German weekly "Jungle World", which until now had not exactly made its mark as a champion of radical, feminist critiques, has recently produced a "queer-debate"…

reason at all for any kind of political nostalgia. Still, I find the situation today, as far as men and antisexism in this country are concerned, even worse than it was 15 years ago. I do not believe antisexist politics by men should be the same today as it was 10 or 15 years ago. But it should be.

Regarding the problems of antisexist practice by men, particularly men's groups, here's what I have to say:

Regarding **point # 1**, the fundamental problem of legitimacy of men's groups: I think antisexist politics by men is no less legitimate than "white" antiracism and I am frequently annoyed by the double standard that is often employed here. What's more, I believe that a politics that tries to get its motivation exclusively, or even mainly, from a sense of being the victim of or directly affected by something or other, is bound to fail. Such a politics has to disavow the complex situatedness of people in different networks of power and the non-unitary composition of subjectivity (which develops over time and may change depending on the situation) and is bound to hallucinate ostensibly uniform, unambiguous, morally good subjects. Now this is not at all to say you can't determine who is the perpetrator and who is the victim of a specific act or who is privileged and who is underprivileged in terms of a specific type of exploitation. On the contrary, you can and I think it's ultra-important you do. My point is, though, that, firstly, no subject is exhaustively determined by being victim or being perpetrator, being a man or being black (for example); no person is permeated in every fiber of her or his being by such determinations of identity. And secondly, the relations between what you could call "objective social situatedness" on the one hand and political motivation on the other are sometimes highly mediated, complex and opaque. I'm not trying to completely deny the link between "material conditions" and political consciousness (as

some post-marxist intellectuals do[9]). What I am saying though, is that it's necessary and legitimate for privileged people to politically address precisely those structures of domination that privilege them:

"Emancipation is not only the liberation from external, but also from internal constraints. It's not just about changing structures between people but also inside people (and distinguishing structures inside and outside individuals doesn't make sense anyway most of the time: it's a bourgeois illusion). Emancipation is also about liberating oneself from wishes that are part of the system (to put it bluntly: addictions) and unfolding wishes that exceed the limits of the system. That's the context for our assertion that what actually characterises left radicalism is acting **against** one's own interests – as men, as whites – while striving to fulfil our desire for autonomy and collectivity. We think it's important that men begin to see their masculinity, whites their whiteness, as a political problem; that, generally speaking, privileged people take issue politically with their, ostensibly normal and universal, unmarked difference."[10]

Regarding the issue of "usurpation" of feminist positions by antisexist men: I think this suspicion that that is what men's antisexism is actually about can never be entirely gotten rid of; for men with antisexist ideas there is no alternative to continually and critically questioning their motivations[11], preferably without

---

[9] See Laclau & Mouffe: "Hegemony and Socialist Strategy", 1985, for example

[10] From the manifesto for a – now deceased – coalition of men's groups in Berlin.

[11] By this critical questioning I don't mean a purely intellectual, cognitive kind of introspection, but a practice of honesty towards oneself, for which, I believe, a certain kind of sensitivity for one's own emotional and somatic impulses is of the essence.(This is something you can learn). Neither do I want "critical" to be understood as referring to some kind of self-tormenting practice of confession. The radical self-criticism that all radical people need to undertake can best succeed on the basis of a benevolent relation to oneself. It's essential to strengthen or develop such a relation to

completely losing the ability to act. In this context I'll return to the comparison of antiracism and antisexism: Racist as well as sexist attitudes are fundamentally ambivalent. Desire and disgust are as mutually conditional as slum and palace. "The Others" are just as much targets of projection of white desires as of white fears. It is not as easy to distinguish exoticism or racist romantisation/xenophilia from "truly" antiracist attitudes as one would like. What's true for the antiracism of whites holds just as well for the antisexism of men: The close connection between hatred and contempt for women on the one hand and (masculine hetero-)sexual desire and romantic idealization on the other is well known. And some forms of heterosexual male profeminism do, under closer scrutiny, turn out to be highly suspect variants of romantic idealization. To simply trust male protestations of profeminist solidarity would be naïve, to treat them, without further differentiation, as subtle sexism and purely tactical does not do justice to the complex realities. Real trust between privileged and less privileged people must remain a rare occurrence anyway, in a society structured by domination and exploitation, and can only exist between people who know each other a little better, I think.

Regarding point # 2 and 3, identity politics in general:
"It's necessary to develop a strategic identity politics that constructs unities across differences, without disavowing differences and without positing unities as natural; that remains conscious of the dangers of essentialising, naturalizing and homogenizing. This entails a pragmatic and flexible approach to identity-defined

groups, a ceaseless problematization of homogenization inside and boundaries to the outside."
And:
"Identity politics of priviledged groups raises completely different issues from that of underpriviledged/oppressed groups. Identity politics of priviledged people can be a progressive practice only as self-abolitionist[12] or negative identity politics. This means that the goal of abolishing one's identity should not only be present – as in any non-reactionary identity politics – but should be clearly in the foreground, in uncompromising antagonism to the propagandists of masculinity, home, the nation and the like."[13]

Regarding point # 3, identity politics and "postmodern thought":
"Radical left thought means, quite crucially, I believe, to try and reflect the social conditions under which one's own theoretical tools come into being. For me, radical left thought today means questioning classical left theories, using poststructuralist ideas and by way of postmodern critiques, discarding what is historically outmoded (and what was always false), whilst, at the same time and as part of the same process, attempting to grasp – our – "postmodern thinking" as an aspect of the ideology of the latest stage of development of global patriarchal class society, and trying to adopt a critical distance towards it."[14]

---

oneself, instead of superimposing political beliefs onto one's self-hatred. I'm not suggesting that the necessary personal changes can happen without pain or insult to one's ego. Nor do I want to promote some kind of "new male pride". The self-esteem I'm talking about is not based on an identification with masculinity.
Also see the notes on "abolition of one's own identity" in the next footnote.

[12] "'Abolition of one's own identity' in a 'negative politics of identity' is not about taking the construction in question, masculinity for example, as a whole, as it is, and demonizing it. Instead, the idea is to "unpack" a complex of symbols and properties in a way that would allow a recombination of the elements, in which the elements themselves would change their "hue". This one could maybe call "deconstruction" and on an individual level it suggests a kind of personal change beyond moralism and self-hatred, that is simultaneously dissolution and creation."
From: "Was heisst Linksradikal?" in Maennerrundbrief Nr 15, 2000
[13] From "Identity politics and political organizing", web journal of the antiracist noborder camp 2000
[14] From "Was heisst linksradikal", Maennerrundbrief Nr 15, 2000

I find sweeping and unequivocal assessments of poststructuralist approaches as being theoretical and political advances over "classical" left/feminist approaches problematic[15]; equally sweeping condemnations of "postmodern thought" as an expression of deradicalization and the decline of critical thinking strike me as absurd.

As always, it's important to look closely at which critiques are being employed when by whom and to what ends.

Anti-essentialist critiques of identity politics, for example, were used in debates within the German "autonomous left"[16] during the nineties to slander (pro)feminist politics as such. The new bogey(wo)man was the "identity feminist" and "identity politics" was recognized as the root of all political evil[17]. Generally, crypto-antifeminist discourses within the "radical left" have, in the last few years, shown a tendency to disfigure the concept of sexism in "pseudo-deconstructivist" fashion, ignoring the relations of domination of men over women, separating the violence of gender stereotyping from these relations of domination and making gender stereotyping out to be that which mainly and exclusively needs to be scandalized about the system of patriachal gender relations[18].

Now this is not at all to say that poststructuralist critiques of identity in and of themselves somehow further

[15] I do find a lot of the very critical things T. Eagleton has to say in "The Illusions of Postmodernism" (1996) quite convincing, for example.
[16] A subspecies of the German "radical left" whose name, and some elements of the very divers set of theoretical elements circulating within it, originally derive from the Italian Autonomia Operaia of the seventies.
[17] See "Die Geschichte von Paul und Paula" by "Die Ungluecklichen", in the "autonomous left" fanzine "interim" nr. 436, 6.11.1997.
[18] One good example for this is a text by two elder stateswomen of the "autonomous left" regarding conflicts around sexism at the antiracist noborder camp 1999, also published in "interim" nr. ??, which, in its last passages, frankly admits to finding organizing in identity-groups, such as women/lesbian groups, to actually be a mistake.

antifeminist tendencies. Certainly deconstructive feminism - a self-criticism of the feminist movement, undertaken with emancipatory goals - offers key words and figures of thought to people who were never in solidarity with feminism. But that's the disadvantage of self-criticism and unavoidable.

Part 2: Towards a critical renewal of antisexist politics by men

If antisexist politics by men is to have a future worth talking about it must, in my opinion, become part of a kind of organising that, on the one hand, takes constructions of identity seriously in their social reality and efficacy, and on the other, and equally, attempts to resist the excluding and homogenizing violence of identities. I refuse the dichotomous choice between "identity politics" and "critique of identity".

In practice, this could mean the simultaneity and overlapping of mixed and separate forms of organizing within an alliance network.

Critiquing the homogenizing and excluding effects of gender categories should become part of the "program" of men's groups much more than it has ever, to my knowledge, been in the FRG. In my eyes, this means first and foremost, dealing with the differences between men. When speaking of "men's groups, men's 'movement'", the term "man" calls up the association "white heterosexual man from the new middle classes" - this needs to be addressed as a problem and taken more seriously than it has been up to now. White bourgeois groups of heterosexuals should call themselves just that – or something else, but not simply "men's groups". The issue of class differences and the debate about different types of masculinity (subaltern, complicit, hegemonic…) needs to get more attention than it has. It's necessary to try and (re)start dialogues between straight, bisexual and gay left, antisexist men. And of course I think a debate on the political status of masculinity

among women/lesbians, intersexual, transsexual and transgendered people would be very valuable. But before anything of the kind could work out, many left men with antisexist ideas have some serious homework to do. To put it mildly.

Another huge issue, of course, is the narrowness of the "ethnic spectrum" of "traditional" men's groups and the sidelining of ethnicity as an issue in their practice. Masculinity is a resource that gets used, along with ethnicity, class etc., to gain status; different racialized/ethnicized identities include different kinds of masculinity. Differences among men of different ethnic backgrounds and the potential for emotional injury when communicating across such divides should be taken into account much more than they have ever been in my experience (or my own past practice, for that matter). One precondition for better communication between between white men of the majority population and men from a migrant background would be for the former to take a hard look at and and really deal with internalized racist and antisemitic stereotypes, images of "other men" and the tendency to project "bad", disavowed and split off aspects of oneself onto "other men".

The analysis of German antisemitism, be it in the mainstream of society or within the Left, has, up till now, largely remained the project of usually gender-blind male theoreticians. It is high time the connections between sexism and antisemitism, Germanness and masculinity were explored, by means of consciousness-raising as well as theoretically, and political practice was informed with this knowledge.

Regarding sexuality, too (a "classical" topic of men's groups), I would like to see some new approaches:

In view of the antifeminist offensive in the current debate over rape within the German "radical left", I consider a debate on sexuality, reaching as many people as possible, more urgent today than ever. I find many people on the left pretty

disoriented regarding this field in terms of theory; and, as far as I know, in terms of communicating about sexuality outside the classical private sphere, it's not looking any better: I haven't seen any kind of verbal and somatic communication about erotic wishes and boundaries - that's really different, in a positive way, from what's going on in the mainstream of society - establishing itself in any of the left subcultures I am familiar with.

I do believe men's groups can be **one** suitable place to talk about sexuality. But I absolutely do not think men should speak about sexuality only or mainly in men's groups. The argument that some proponents of men's groups have often used, that it is easier for men to talk about sexuality in such groups has always put me extremely ill at ease. For one, this implicitly defines a men's group as a desexualized and thus pacified space, because, it seems, it's supposed that all men involved are super-straight and totally not interested in each other anyhow, so that we can all finally have a good talk now, in peace and quiet, about our problems with women. I find this unspoken supposition annoying, and I'd consider a group that really did work like this quite a conservative institution in fact, and extremely boring, too. What's more, I find heterosexual men telling other men things about their sexuality that they're not telling the women they're involved with, for fear of conflict or shame or whatever, quite problematic. That may be acceptable, in particular circumstances, as an interim solution, but as a permanent practice what is this but masculine "solidarity" of the worst sort?

Another problem I see in men's groups' dealing with sexuality is the common tendency – shared by most discourses on sexuality – to narrow down the field of the erotic to gender. Whereas in fact, all kinds of difference, cultural, ethnic, what have you, are eroticized; sexuality is never just about gender but always about race, class,

ethnicity etc., as well[19]. If sexual politics is not to remain a field dominated by white middle class perspectives, it is, in my opinion, very important to work out the racist dimensions of sexuality, among others, and foreground them politically[20].

If I've created the impression now that I see sexuality mainly as an assemblage of relations of domination – this is not the case. It's true I don't think much of schematically separating out good sexuality from bad violence[21]: domination is not external to sexuality. Domination works within and through sexuality and helps constitute it. Yet I believe it's completely wrong to reduce sexuality to domination.

Certainly, as I see it, sexuality emerges when, in the socialization process, desires are forced under the primacy of genitality and heterosexualized. (A liberation from this sexualization would be a liberation towards other sexualities, or post-sexual practices - or whatever this might be called in the future – that would no longer have to bear the "burden" of being this secular religion that modern sexuality is, this only form of ecstatic satisfaction and energetic exchange[22] available to humans).

Yet the diversity of desires persists within the sexual, the conformist formation of sexuality fails just as necessarily as the construction of unambiguous gender identities must fail in the end. And this is why sexuality has its own "logic", that cannot be reduced to politics and discourse.

Part 3: A Look Forward:

Since june 2001 efforts are under way[23] to organize a larger, interregional meeting that is supposed to serve as a starting point for new antisexist politics by men. There's a text to go with it, "On the Disappearance of the Anti-sexist Men's Group Scene". If you're interested, e-mail sissies@gmx.ch or send regular mail to "sissies" c/o Infoladen Bankrott, Dahlweg 64, 48153 Muenster, Germany.

The Antiracist Antisexist Summer Camp Project, with which I've been involved since it started, is planning the "Crossover Conference", 17.-20. January 2002 in Bremen, Germany.

In a manifesto for the project, which we wrote in the spring of 2001, we say:

"Our starting point is the conviction that the different relations of power and domination are inseparably bound up with one another, permeating and stabilizing each other. We want to develop a practice that reflects this. Our aim is to contribute to the construction of a new constellation of political tendencies.

A "new constellation" would be one where, finally, antisexist positions would not have to be fought through by women/lesbians against the passive resistance of the majority anymore, but be a matter of course; and where, finally, men would, of their own accord, become active in the field of antisexist politics.

We want an end to the dominance of a heterosexual culture within the radical left, for which gays are good for adding color

---

[19] See "Desire and Difference" by Jonathan Dollimore, in: Stecopoulos/Uebel: Race and the Subject of Masculinities, 1997.

[20] See Kobena Mercer and Isaac Julien, "Black Masculinity and the Sexual Politics of Race" in K. Mercer: Welcome to the Jungle, 1994.

[21] That's why I continue to speak of sexual violence rather than using the term "sexualized violence".

[22] I believe that conceptions of vital energy, as they have been developed in various non-western traditions (chi in chinese medicine, prana in the yogic/ayurvedic tradition, etc.), but also exist on the margins of official biological-medical discourses in the West, correspond to real phenomena. I see the tendency in some left circles of unquestioningly taking over the dogmas of mainstream science and suspecting all divergent views of being politically suspect, esoteric, irrationalist etc. as a very regrettable kind of rationalist narrowmindedness. I recommend the study of the "Dialectic of Enlightenment" (1947).

My view that conceptions of vital energy, as well as practically and theoretically drawing on experiences and conceptions from various traditions of body therapy, can be invaluable for a critique of actually existing sexuality has not changed over the

last 20 years, except maybe that I am more convinced of it today than ever.

[23] In Germany

and entertainment to the serious business of politics, in which lesbians are nearly invisible and for which intersexual and transgendered people are, at the most, objects of scientific curiosity.

Such a new constellation would be one where the presence of migrant and jewish people, people of color….(no matter where they've grown up) would be a matter of course; where the manners and the language of the majority would not constitute the norm and where white antiracists would deal with their own racisms instead of only speaking for and about the "oppressed".

Last but not least, we want an alliance that would make it as difficult as possible for people from the middle classes to assert what they take for granted, feel to be normal or are interested in as the norm - that which is generally taken for granted, experienced as normal or seen as interesting."

These noble goals remain lightyears away.

I see the conference as a stepping stone on the way towards a camp in the summer of 2002 and towards new alliances and new campaigns.

The program of the conference is still being worked on, if you want to know more, e-mail summercamp@squat.net, or send regular mail to summercamp c/o A6-Laden, Adalbertstr. 6, 10999 Berlin, or visit our web site www.summercamp.squat.net.

Daniel Mang - danielmang@web.de

Antiracist antisexist summercamp project – "manifesto"

What we want:
Our starting point is the conviction that the different relations of power and domination are inseparably bound up with one another, permeating and stabilizing each other. We want to develop a practice that reflects this. Our aim is to contribute to the construction of a new constellation of political tendencies.

A "new constellation" would be one where, finally, antisexist positions would not have to be fought through by women/lesbians against the passive resistance of the majority anymore, but be a matter of course; and where, finally, men would, of their own accord, become active in the field of antisexist politics.

We want an end to the dominance of a heterosexual culture within the radical left, for which gays are good for adding color and entertainment to the serious business of politics, in which lesbians are nearly invisible and for which intersexual and transgendered people are, at the most, objects of scientific curiosity.

Such a new constellation would be one where the presence of migrant and jewish people, people of color….(no matter where they've grown up) would be a matter of course; where the manners and the language of the majority would not constitute the norm and where white antiracists would deal with their own racisms instead of only speaking for and about the "oppressed".

Last but not least, we want an alliance that would make it as difficult as possible for people from the middle classes to assert what they take for granted, feel to be normal or are interested in as the norm - that which is generally taken for granted, experienced as normal or seen as interesting.

Who we are:
Many of us know each other from radical left circles in Germany. Most of us have a German passport, not all of us are "white".

We have different "sexual orienations", the ratio of "men"/men to "women"/women fluctuates around 50:50. There are also differences concerning our social background and our current "class position".

How we organize:
Since august 2000 we have been meeting every month, in different locations; up to now only in Germany, (soon) possibly also in Poland, the Netherlands or whatever place we are invited to.

We are open to the idea of a separate but coordinated organization of migrants/people of color within the project network; we are just as open to any other kind of closer cooperation.

That women/lesbians in the project can organize separately also goes without saying.

In our concrete political practice, we attempt to bridge the differences between us. And despite the fact that we are not yet as divers as we would like to be, we've got plenty of work on our hands already.

How we treat each other is an important issue, we think, and we definitely want something other than the activist-macho posturing so familiar to us from our experience in many left circles. We must hasten to add that this is not the only type of male dominance – or dominance of any kind – that we see as a problem. We are not so naïve to think we've found "the answer" to this; that is to say, we are open to new ideas and ways of dealing with one another.

What is it going to be about?
Because we start from the assumption that all relations of power and domination are intimately bound up with one another and therefore always already refer back to each other, we are striving for a great diversity in the issues addressed. For us, this means dealing with sexism, antisemitism, heterosexism, nationalism, class exploitation and racism, among other issues. We think it's essential to draw structural links between different relations

of power and domination, or aspects of these relations, from the very beginning. For example, by bringing the intrinsic interrelatedness of masculinity, heterosexism and whiteness into focus. Which ones of the countless possible interconnections we will focus on at the camp crucially depends on your input. What all these catchwords refer to - in our understanding - is simply impossible to unfold in a short text such as this one. But we intend to put together a kind of reader with different types of texts.

We don't want the summercamp to be a kind of "field-and-meadow-university"! We want there to be offensive actions as well as discussion groups and we are planning a larger action in the context of the camp. We intend to give different thematic headings to the days of the camp.

Identity politics?!?
We want one of the major focuses of the camp to be theories and practices of identity and identity politics. Just as there are different constructions of identity, there are different politics of identity. That is why we distinguish "essentialist" politics of identity, which, in most cases, aim to gain or retain privileges or come to an arrangement with the given social conditions, from "strategic" politics of identity that function to sabotage relations of power and domination. By essentialist identity politics we mean politics that derive a common identity from a shared essence, for example, being female (understood as a "natural fact"). By strategic identity politics we mean politics that understand common identity pragmatically, as a constructed reality, as, for example, many women's/lesbian groups do. We don't want to reduce the complex discussions around identity politics to this distinction, though.

At the summercamp, strategic identity politics will be a major issue. Within this problematic, the question that concerns us most is if and how it is possible to create political alliances across major differences of experience. Finding this out is first and foremost a social question. The question of whether it is possible to bridge differences - bound up with relations of power and domination – in thinking, physicality, feeling and acting only gets answered in actual encounters: Is it possible to establish a truly respectful and equitable way of dealing with one another (which requires a lot of sensitivity for different experiences, realities and vulnerabilities) or not?

Camp Culture?!?
We hope the summercamp will be a venue for performances (film, music, acrobatics, for example), subversive culture and cultural subversion. Not just because it's fun – which would be reason enough – but because we see culture as a space in which society, in many different ways, some fraught with conflict, (re)produces its stocks of knowledge, its norms and values, its structures of thought and feeling. Radical resistance, therefore, must under no cicumstances neglect cultural space and should not fail to engage in its own cultural production – that the dominant modes of seeing, hearing and feeling may be subverted!

By now at the very latest, some will say that our program is definitely not realizable. We agree with this assessment insofar as we don't assume at all we will be able to realize everything we envision at the first summercamp already. We understand our undertaking to be a long-term project requiring some staying power, ample capacity to tolerate frustration and great persistence. Up to now, though, it's been fun, too.

We hope for lively transnational radical participation in the camp,
see you

The organizers

The minutes of our meetings are accessible on our web site in different languages. We can also send them to you by post, if you wish.

The address of our web site is: www.summercamp.squat.net. If you have access to the net, take a look at it, you'll find information there, the invitation in various languages and so on.
Our e-mail address is: summercamp@squat.net.
Please address regular mail to: summercamp c/o A6-Laden, Adalbertstrasse 6, 10999 Berlin, Germany.