EDITOR'S LETTER

Hej hej!

This issue has been carefully curated and edited by yours truly, Moa Persson and Ariadna Carrascosa, the new editors of UTBLICK magazine for this coming year 2018. We are very excited and glad to offer you this issue focused on feminism that we hope you enjoy as much as we did putting it out together!

So… a bit about ourselves. Ariadna has a background in law but just switched her path and started studying a masters in Global Studies. She loves second hand shops and probably likes fika too much. Moa has a background in journalism but is now doing her bachelor in international relations. If you catch her outside of school she is probably on her way to a concert or to meet up some friends for beer.

The idea is to match our first issue with the huge world event on the 8th of March, the International Women’s day. With this we wanted to explore the concept of feminism and a myriad of issues linked to it, while transmitting the idea that there is not a single feminism, but instead, there are many ways to be a feminist.

We want to thank all of the contributors, who took the time to write such fantastic pieces and also all the illustrators who have shared so many amazing images! We are also eternally grateful for our great graphic designer Ahyoung for the work with the magazine. This issue wouldn’t be half as good looking if it wasn’t for her. We are aiming for the next issues to always look this brilliant. In this issue you can find articles about the link between gender and nation, a call for reproductive justice, another about the lesbian breakfast that takes place once a month at Frilagret, two articles with very different views on the #MeToo movement and even a poem on self worth. Just to name a few.

Also, we want to take this opportunity to encourage all of you to be part of the magazine! So if you want to become a contributor, feel free to contact us with your ideas, we are open to suggestions in any forms and ways (e.g. articles, interviews, poems, illustrations).

All in all, this is the beginning of an incredibly exciting and promising year in UTBLICK magazine and we hope you will come along with us.

We wish you a pleasant, critical and feminist reading,

Moa Persson and Ariadna Carrascosa
moa.persson@utblick.org, ariadna.carrascosa@utblick.org.
WE HAVE A PODCAST!

FIND IT AND LISTEN TO IT ON ANY PLATFORM.

ITUNES / MIXCLOUD / ETC, ETC

“From Gods providence, to will of Man”
“European Elections 2017 - Germany”
“Extramaterial - Valanlys Tyskland”
“European Elections 2017 - The Netherlands”

The history of feminism is often divided in waves. The first Wave, which started in the beginning of the nineteenth century comprises the suffragettes, a group of women lead by Emmeline Pankhurst, Christabel Pankhurst and Annie Kenney, among others, who fought for their right to vote. The second wave started in the 1960s and focused on social and economic rights as well as reproductive rights for women. Then, in the 90s, a third wave appeared. The demands of this wave focused on intersectionality, micropolitics and the confronting of binary gender definitions. Since 2012, there is said to be a resurgence of feminism linked to social media, which has led to people starting to talk about a fourth wave.

Despite being the most common narrative, the division of feminism into waves has huge flaws. It is based on what is called ‘mainstream feminism’, which usually means a mainly white and western perspective, and contributes to silencing important events that happen outside this rhetoric. These events are very numerous so unfortunately I won’t be able to cover them thoroughly in this article.

Then, if we take a deeper look into the first wave we can find that some years before, in 1791, Olympe de Gouges wrote the “Declaration of the woman and the female citizen” as a counter reaction to the French Revolutionary “Declaration of the rights of the man and the citizen”. This happened one year before the British Mary Wollstonecraft wrote her ‘Vindication on the rights of women’. De Gouges was later murdered by the guillotine for being a supporter of King Louis XVI. This story gives us a hint of what feminism is, that is, a more complex movement than the waves division accounts for, with many different variations that do not fit in the mainstream wave story.

Ariadna Carrascosa

HISTORY'S HIDDEN FEMINISTS
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We can find early signs of feminism in Plato’s Republic, which already called for a more egalitarian position of women in society. Likewise, in the 12th Century the Islamic philosopher Ibn Rushd claimed that women were equal to men in all respects and possessed equal capacities to shine in both peace and in war. In 1507, Catherine of Aragon became the first official female Ambassador in Europe, and used her status to advocate for women’s right to an education. In the 18th century, Nana Asma’u worked towards increasing literacy and education of Muslim women. Also proclaiming women’s education was the Mexican nun Juana Inés de la Cruz (1651–1695) and the Chinese Yu Zhengxi (1775–1840), and Yuan Mei (1716–1797) openly advocated for the rights of women, opposing practices such as foot binding, female infanticide, widow suicide and widow chastity in the China of the Qing.

In the case of the US, the suffragettes are said to take off since the “Declaration of Sentiments” in Seneca Falls in 1848. However, this completely undermines the role of black women fighting against slavery which in many cases went hand in hand with the right to vote. As early as 1837, the Anti-slavery Convention already appealed to the women of the nationally free states. Later on, in 1894 Josephine St Pierre Ruffin started the newspaper “The Woman’s Era” and two years later, Ruffin, together with other women such as Harriet Tubman, Margaret Murray Washington, Frances E.W. Harper, Ida Bell Wells-Barnett, and Mary Church Terrell, formed the National Association of Coloured Women.

In the beginning of the twentieth century, there were many women movements fighting for equal rights. In the Islamic countries there were organizations such as the Women’s Rights Movement in 1910 in Iran or the Egyptian Feminist Union founded by Hoda Shaarawi in 1923. Nonetheless, Azerbaijan was the first country that introduced universal suffrage in a Muslim country in 1918.

In many other countries African countries, where there were liberation struggles such as those in Algeria, Mozambique, Guinea, Angola, and Kenya, women fought alongside their male counterparts for state autonomy and women’s rights. Some of these women were Wambui Otieno, Lilian Ngoyi, Albertina Sisulu, Margaret Ekpo Funmilayo Anikulapo-Kuti.

In Central and South America, we find that feminist movements emerged for instance, since 1890s in Argentina, in Mexico they came hand in hand with the Mexican revolutionary movement in 1910, Peru since 1914 or Brasil since 1919, to mention a few.

A while later, the “second wave” was said to start with the creation of National Organization of Women (NOW) in 1966 by Betty Friedan, author of “The Feminine Mystique”, and Paul Murray, Black Queer Feminist Civil Rights Lawyer and Priest, among other feminists. NOW basically ended up being a white, middle-class movement, which is the reason why numerous women’s groups organized independently, such as the Third World Women’s Alliance (TWWA) in 1968 lead by black women; Hijas de Cuauhtémoc, a chicana feminist group (1971) named after the Mexican women’s underground newspaper published during the 1910 Mexican revolution, as well as Asian Sisters (1971) and Women of all Red Nations Native (1974). All of them advocating for an intersectional approach to women’s oppression.

Also, the most conservative section of NOW left the group and formed Women’s Equity Action League (WEAL) due to disagreement on advocating for reproductive rights.

Since the 90s the rhetoric of the “third wave” set off. This wave is said to focus on the confrontation of gender, micropolitics and intersectionality. We can see numerous precedents of intersectionality in Maria Stewart’s speeches, Sojourner Truth’s ‘Ain’t I a woman’ speech, TWWA, Hijas de Cuauhtémoc, Alice Walker’s ‘womanism’ concept and many others. Likewise, post feminism has taken much of the spotlight in third wave feminism, receiving equal amounts of love and hate.

Finally, a fourth wave is in place. This one is a product of social media mass’ movements, that include “10 Hours of Walking in NYC as a Woman” the ‘Free the Nipple’, the 2017 and 2018 Women’s Marches and the #MeToo movement. It is said to be characterized by the use of social media and by an attitude of “how is this still happening”. It focuses on cultural behaviours and sexual conducts, but it has also been commodified, almost becoming a brand.

If you ask me, such focus on social media feminism takes away the spotlight from extremely interesting and relevant movements. For example, the mexican maquiladoras, the Rojava project of self-government and equality for all rac-es, religions and women and men; the indian female peacekeeper units, garifuna women in South America. But also awesome feminists such as Leymah Gbowee, Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Joyce Banda, Simphiwe Dana and Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie.

International Women’s Day takes place the 8th of March every year. The day commemorates the movement for women’s rights, nonetheless it is also a day for women’s rights advocates to call for change. The United Nations started to celebrate the day in 1975. Two years later, the General Assembly adopted a resolution proclaiming a United Nations Day for Women’s Rights and World Peace. However, few know that the origins of the day date back to the beginning of the twentieth century.

The call for advocating for women’s rights on one particu-lar day has roots in the Socialist Party of America, and was first suggested by American suffragist Theresa Malkiel. Surprising though it may seem, the Socialist Party of America enjoyed significant support from various groups in the early twentieth century, at least until Franklin D. Roosevelt introduced the New Deal. Malkiel was the first American woman with a working class background ever to assume a leading political role in the Socialist party. After migrating to the United States from contemporary Ukraine in the eighteen-seventies, she worked in a textile factory in New York while engaging in the socialist movement for labour and women’s rights. Malkiel truly believed that socialism was the only political ideology through which women could achieve true emancipation. Malkiel’s argumentation is quite similar to Mary Wollstonecraft’s. Though not an outspoken socialist, Wollstonecraft was convinced that one is only free when one enjoys equal opportunity, equal relationships between individuals are prerequisites for true freedom. Moreover, an individual cannot enjoy freedom in a hierarchically organised society. If the social group one belongs to is oppressed in any way, individual liberty is im-possible since social oppression implies being constrained by social classification.

- and some interesting sidetracks

Rebecca Hartill
The International Women’s Day in 1909, organised by Malkiel, is said to have had the purpose of showing respect for the 1857 New York women’s strike against the harsh working conditions in the textile industry, though this has been debated by prominent academics such as Temma Kaplan. A year later the Second International, an organisation which coordinated socialist and labour parties (without the anarcho-syndicalist movement the First International) held the Socialists Women’s Conference in Copenhagen. Though the overall class struggle was among the topics discussed, the main issue of the conference was achieving universal women’s suffrage. The conference has later been recognised as the popularisation of the International Women’s Day. The date, the 8th of March, comes from the Women’s day being a mechanism for protesting against the First World War. Some protests were organised as early as in the first months of the war, however the day is foremost recognised as a product of the female “Peace and Bread” strike in Saint Petersburg in 1917. The march, which started out peacefully, took place on the last Sunday of February in the Julian calendar, the Gregorian equivalent of the 8th of March. The march later descended into what became the Russian Revolution and the end of the tsarist imperial Russia. During the October Revolution in 1917, Alexandra Kollontaj, a Bolshevik revolutionary, pressured Vladimir Lenin to make the 8th of March an official state holiday. Though her political influence in the Kremlin was limited she later became one of the first female diplomats (along with Diana Abdgar, who was the world’s first female ambassador, from the Republic of Armenia to Japan). In fact, Kollontaj played a major role in preserving Sweden’s neutrality in the Second World War, first and foremost in its approach to the Soviet and Finnish population, a clear recognition and sets the standards for the next session of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women that will take place in New York from 12th to 23th of March 2018. The conference’s main aim is to discuss how to achieve gender equality by empowering rural women and girls.

The 8th of March is also a date for accelerating the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals. The day particularly sheds light on Goal number 4: Ensuring inclusive and quality education for all and promote lifelong learning, and Goal number 5: Achieving gender equality and empowering all women and girls. In summary, the gender equality goals to be reached by 2030 focus on ensuring that all girls and boys get completely free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education and that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development, care and pre-primary education.

So, does the International Women’s Day make any actual difference, or does the day create a cyclic attention span in which the same issues are addressed over and over again? The early suffragettes obviously thought of the day as important. Perhaps one could say that it is a day to consolidate future progress in the past accomplishments. However, I would personally argue that it is the everyday struggle one must dedicate time and attention to, for the habit is the sixth sense that dominates the other five. The habit is also the intelligence of the crowd and as we all know, old habits die hard.

Today the 8th of March is still an official state holiday in many former Soviet states, and has been celebrated all over the world ever since the United Nations’ declaration in the seventies. This year the day comes on the heels of a global movement against sexual harassment, marking an ever stronger dedication to change. Since 1996 the United Nations has had an annual theme for the day, and this year the theme aims to elucidate rural female activists. Though the MeToo movement has had a global reach, the United Nations emphasises that rural women are significantly stigmatised, suffering from double discrimination by being both female and economically disadvantaged. The theme gives these women, constituting over a quarter of the world population, a clear recognition and sets the standards for the next session of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women that will take place in New York from 12th to 23th of March 2018. The conference’s main aim is to discuss how to achieve gender equality by empowering rural women and girls.
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Varför finns det?
- Vi vill skapa ett tryggt rum där lesbiskhet står i fokus. En behöver vaken se sig själv som kvinna eller gay för att komma på frukostarna, huvudsaken är att en trivs i det lesbiska hänget och hjälper till att skapa en go stämning.

På frukostarna kan man pyssla, lära känna nya människor, lyssna på föredrag, bland mycket annat. Och så serveras det frukost, förstås.

Varför är du aktiv i lesbisk frukost?
- Jag kan inte tänka mig en bättre fritidssysselsättning. Jag har sjukt roligt, får göra något jag brinner för, träffar massor av nya människor och lär mig massor på vägen.

Lesbisk frukost finns nu lite överallt i Sverige, och inte bara i storstadsregionerna. Hur kommer det sig?

I nuläget finns Lesbisk Frukost på nio platser i Sverige och eventen i Göteborg är de i största. Men antal besökare är inte alls det viktiga, utan att sprida öppenheten och ge gemenskapen som Lesbisk Frukost medför, menar Linn.


Det jag vill säga med det här är att Lesbisk Frukost är min drömmyselsättning, som jag önskat mig sen jag var en liten nykläckt lesbisk. Mitt liv kretsar lite kring att arrangera frukostar, och jag är helt okej med det.

Lesbisk frukost finns nu lite överallt i Sverige, och inte bara i storstadsregionerna. Hur kommer det sig?

I nuläget finns Lesbisk Frukost på nio platser i Sverige och eventen i Göteborg är de i största. Men antal besökare är inte alls det viktiga, utan att sprida öppenheten och gemenskapen som Lesbisk Frukost medför, menar Linn.


Det jag vill säga med det här är att Lesbisk Frukost är min drömmyselsättning, som jag önskat mig sen jag var en liten nykläckt lesbisk. Mitt liv kretsar lite kring att arrangera frukostar, och jag är helt okej med det.

"Jag kan inte tänka mig en bättre fritidssysselsättning. Jag har sjukt roligt, får göra något jag brinner för, träffar massor av nya människor och lär mig massor på vägen."
Alarming statistics from the US show that compared to white women, black women are three to four times more likely to die of maternal death. In the UK, research has shown that foreign-born women are much likely to have unsafe deliveries, and maternal death rates are significantly higher. In Europe, undocumented migrants seeking gynaecological or maternal care, often risk submission to the authorities and deportation as a consequence. Transpersons’ reproductive self-determination is still hindered by an array of requirements before going through gender affirming treatment. These includes forced sterilization, diagnosis with a mental disorder or being either single or divorced. Race, citizen status, gender identity and class affect access and quality of the care one receives. Reproductive justice means addressing such structural and institutionalized inequalities.

There has been a growing trend in the US to convict pregnant women for fetal mistreatment, for example for drug use or “failing” to leave abusive partners to guarantee the safety of their unborn child. These measures generally end up targeting working class women and women of color. Instead, supportive care during pregnancy must be provided and the root causes of addiction, such as structural inequality, need to be addressed. Reproductive justice gives an imperative avoid reduction of maternal health to individual’s “bad lifestyle choices”, and pay political attention to issues such as men’s violence against women, poverty, homelessness and malnutrition.

In Sweden, the closing of the maternity hospital in Sollefteå raises questions regarding the disparities between city and countryside. After the shutdown, many women are forced to undergo dangerous deliveries as a result, for example giving birth in cars. Sollefteå is not a single case, however. A study carried out by the magazine Otta shows that between 2000 and 2017, nine delivery wards have closed in Sweden, and the distance has increased for those who have the furthest to travel. Reproductive justice necessitates safe reproductive health care, regardless of whether one lives in the city or in the countryside.

Austerity often hits women especially hard. Women’s health is already neglected in terms of funding. A study from the European Women’s Lobby shows that austerity usually leads to cutbacks in women’s health care and support services for survivors/victims of gender based violence, which is often underfunded to begin with. In the crisis years of 2011 and 2012, state funds to women’s shelters were drastically cut in Greece and Spain. Reproductive justice thereby requires radical redistribution of resources.

Polluted environments lead to greater dangers in bearing and raising children. As women carry the largest responsibility for the reproduction of their families, they are often at the forefronts of environmental struggles, for example in Japan after the Fukushima disaster. Reproductive justice is about being able to raise one’s children in a safe and unpolluted environment.

Militarisation, armed conflict and police brutality are connected to sexual violence. In times of conflict, maternal deaths peak - half of the world’s maternal deaths occur in countries that are in crisis or are fragile. Gender based violence, including sexual violence is exacerbated by the proliferation of small arms and guns – drawing from experience in South Africa, Canada and the US. Reproductive justice means demanding communities to be free from violence, and holding the arms industry accountable.

To see reproduction as isolated, simple relate to women’s right to choose, implicates a limited perspective. Reproduction is not only a matter of individual health and wellbeing. It’s a political concern, entangled in economic, environmental and social structures.

Talking about rights and talking about justice, doesn’t necessarily cancel out each other. The rights approach has an universalistic onset, while emphasising the individual. Knowing one’s rights can give a sense of recognition and empowerment. Still, universalism and individualism can mask inequality and do not give us tools to overcome the differentiation and exclusion that hinder equal access. Although there’s a normative function of rights, rights in themselves do not end sexual violence, or give women and non-binary persons reproductive and sexual freedom in practice. Especially in situations of vulnerability, it is more difficult to claim one’s rights. Political theorist Wendy Brown says that although reproductive rights are undeniable “goods”, they are more about milder the effects of patriarchy, than a way to abolish it. Thinking about reproductive justice enables making connections to other struggles for social justice - and demands calling for equal redistribution of resources.

"Reproduction is not only a matter of individual health and wellbeing. It’s a political concern, entangled in economic, environmental and social structures."
On Liberty Island, Lady Libertas stands proudly, raising the torch of freedom and democracy over the shores of the New Jerusalem, welcoming "the tired, poor, huddled masses yearning to breathe free" with open arms. "Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door" she exclaims with silent lips. In Franz Kafka’s retelling, she holds not a torch, but a sword in her right hand, morphing into a crusader rather than a beacon of hope and liberty in a sea of tyranny.

Marianne treads on a pile of corpses, bare-breasted and assertive, illuminated by a sun dimmed by gunsmoke and clouds. Raising the tricolor in her right hand and wielding a bayonet-equipped rifle in her left hand, leading the revolutionaries in their fight against tyranny and oppression. From fire and brimstone a new nation was born, from the ashes of the Ancien Regime it arose, hungry for new symbols.

From the 17th century and onwards, female figures such as these became representatives of the nation, embodying it in physical form. The nationalistic fervor, romanticism and development of biology during the 19th century gave further fuel to this discourse. The nation emerged from the womb of the mythological mother, merging the warm maternal embrace with the fierceness of the Amazon, and we are all her children in the eyes of the nationalists. On the path to war she marches armed with sword in hand. In her passive form she is a victim, a virgin subjected to male dominance and invasion. In the mind of the nationalist, any violation of territorial integrity is equivalent to rape of the body politic, a penetration of national sovereignty. Immigration and multiculturalism is conceived of as a bastardization of her body and offspring, a loss of her purity, health and innocence.

To the nationalist, you are tied to the heimat by an invisible umbilical cord embedded in the soil. To him, severing it entails a loss of belonging in the world, abandoned and alone, no longer knowing what role to play, lacking direction and comfort. He yearns for a return to the safety of the sheltered womb, feeling alien to his fellow siblings, brothers and sisters. Despite having lost a lot of their power, these organic metaphors still manage to appeal to segments of the population. Ilit nations are not mothers or maidens, despite the comfort these metaphors may provide. They are not corporate bodies, nor do they have a volksgeist, and foreign nations are not damsels in distress, waiting to be saved from savages and barbarians by white knights in shining armor.

Nation-building has often been described as a process of decoupling the individual from the family or tribe, and integrating him/her into a larger social entity. Political theorists such as Locke and Rousseau distanced themselves from premodern thinkers such as Robert Filmer.

He argued that the nation-state was nothing but an extended household, equating the sovereign to the family patriarch, endowed with absolute and unlimited power to decide over questions of life and death. Yet, the family lives on as one of the main metaphors we use in daily discourse when describing nations and their relationships to each other. We still - to some extent - use metaphors such as “birthplace” “motherland” “fatherland” and “mother-tongue” when referring to our native countries. Neighbouring or culturally similar countries become “brothers” “sisters” and “cousins” in the popular imagination. The national mythologies of a variety of states, ranging from Japan to Russia, all describe the nation as having been created by birth, and the history of nations is often framed in terms of biological development, from birth and childhood to eventual death. In fact, the word “nation” itself is derived from the latin word “nascor” i.e. “to be born”.

Evidently, the language we use to describe nations is closely connected to biological terminology. This phenomenon might be described in terms of “Conceptual Metaphors”. These are powerful devices patteming our thoughts by framing something abstract and vague in terms of something familiar and concrete. Our tribal minds are ill-adapted to the size and complexity of modern societies, making simplifying metaphors a necessity. In the realm of nationalism, the female figure - whether mother, virgin, or warrior - is of special importance, exemplified by the proliferation of female national personifications since the 17th century.

On Liberty Island, Lady Libertas stands proudly, raising the torch of freedom and democracy over the shores of the New Jerusalem, welcoming “the tired, poor, huddled masses yearning to breathe free” with open arms. “Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door” she exclaims with silent lips. In Franz Kafka’s retelling, she holds not a torch, but a sword in her right hand, morphing into a crusader rather than a beacon of hope and liberty in a sea of tyranny.

Marianne treads on a pile of corpses, bare-breasted and assertive, illuminated by a sun dimmed by gunsmoke and clouds. Raising the tricolor in her right hand and wielding a bayonet-equipped rifle in her left hand, leading the revolutionaries in their fight against tyranny and oppression. From fire and brimstone a new nation was born, from the ashes of the Ancien Regime it arose, hungry for new symbols.

From the 17th century and onwards, female figures such as these became representatives of the nation, embodying it in physical form. The nationalistic fervor, romanticism and development of biology during the 19th century gave further fuel to this discourse. The nation emerged from the womb of the mythological mother, merging the warm maternal embrace with the fierceness of the Amazon, and we are all her children in the eyes of the nationalists. On the path to war she marches armed with sword in hand. In her passive form she is a victim, a virgin subjected to male dominance and invasion. In the mind of the nationalist, any violation of territorial integrity is equivalent to rape of the body politic, a penetration of national sovereignty. Immigration and multiculturalism is conceived of as a bastardization of her body and offspring, a loss of her purity, health and innocence.

To the nationalist, you are tied to the heimat by an invisible umbilical cord embedded in the soil. To him, severing it entails a loss of belonging in the world, abandoned and alone, no longer knowing what role to play, lacking direction and comfort. He yearns for a return to the safety of the sheltered womb, feeling alien to his fellow siblings, brothers and sisters.
SELF WORTH: MOURNING AS I WEAR BLACK.

from the blog Serenity Motivated
http://shakiranmills.wixsite.com/serenitymotivated

Shakira Mills

Woman you are strong,
Beautiful,
Unique,
Full of curves in every angle of your world.

Do not let him abuse you,
Misuse you,
Disapprove of you.
You are you,
And only you.
Only you can approve you.

Woman,
Know your worth,
Understand your turf,
Move the earth,
Showing your growth.
Don’t let them hurt you,
Curse you,
Run over you like you aren’t perfect being you.
Only you,
Be only you.

Dressing up,
Make up,
Stepping up,
Stepping out of his car for him to undo you.
You.
Then stepping back into his car for him to drop you off after.
After,
After he screwed you.

Who’s you.
You.
Take control,
Make him know,
You are you,
And only you.
He can’t see your worth,
If you can’t see you.
Open your eyes,
Love what you see,
Love who you are,
Love who you be.

You.

Next time,
Time,
Time he won’t routine you.
You.
Because you are you.
You know your worth,
You felt the hurt,
You learnt the dirt.
Women,
Do you know you.
Your worth,
How much are you worth.
And then they think they own you.
Wanna negotiate to loan you.
Pull you in a dark corner.
And assault you.
You.

Capture,
Snatch,
Ransom you.
You.
Who are they.
They to think they can do anything they want with you.
Think they can do anything to women they knew.
Women they thought they knew.

Worth surpasses hurt.

Woman you are strong,
Beautiful,
Unique.
Let no one view you.
You,
You another way than you.

Women have it hard, I agree. But understand that you are in control of your life. Let no man, woman or child let you feel less than. Know your worth and live exactly as you are worth. Love yourself and appreciate all of the good things you have to offer and never ever settle for less than what you deserve.

'Self peace is key'

Let us stand together as women to fight the battle of today!
Let us be our sister’s keeper!
Let us stop judging and understand that we all make mistakes!
Let us help each other grow!
How subjective narratives created a transnational social movement

Lisa Sutton

During the last months of 2017, millions of people globally shared their experiences on sexual violence under the hashtag MeToo. These testimonies were shared on social medias and became part of a movement creating new identities and collectivities, illustrating how communicating subjective narratives can ultimately become a part of a powerful social movement.

The most referenced beginning of the movement was a tweet published by the actress Alyssa Milano on the 15th of October 2017. She encouraged victims of sexual violence to speak out on their social medias saying “If all the women who have been sexually harassed or assaulted wrote ‘Me too’ as a status, we might give people a sense of the magnitude of the problem”. The phrase of the movement was originally created by Tarana Burke, creator of a non-profit organisation that helps victims of sexual harassment and assault. She gave the movement the name “Me Too” in order to evoke empathy with those who have experienced sexual violence.

When the subjective narratives were collected under the movement, it elevated the legitimacy of the testimonies. The movement was therefore able to be politically effective by mobilising information on the targeted issue. We can see this for instance when people spoke up on the sexual violence perpetrated by the same individual, which made the narratives harder to disregard.

Within the movement, even if the target was the misuse of power of the perpetrators, power structures were still evident. This was witnessed in how the testimonies of women with a heightened level of power, for example celebrity status, were the ones who managed to get the most spread of their testimonies. There is also arguably a certain level of power needed in order to be able to publish a testimony of sexual violence. One can think for example of the reality that working class women could risk losing their jobs if they speak up, and undocumented women might be deported.

Inspired by the MeToo movement, a group of female television reporters in Afghanistan, spoke on strategies to combat sexual violence domestically. They pointed out that victims could expect even more violence if speaking out, therefore emphasising that confidentiality and anonymity is needed to protect women and girls who choose to speak out. So, even if the movement did have a transnational scope, the methods are not applicable transnationally.

If the goal of the movement was to stop sexual violence, I am, unfortunately, not predicting that the success of the movement will lead to a decrease of sexual violence to any recognisable extent. Still, if the goal was to cultivate new subjectivities, knowledge and legitimacy concerning the issue, it was highly successful. The effectiveness of the movement is found in seeing the individual behind the testimonies published, illustrating how the subjective, particular stories can be a part of a powerful collective.

"The new networks formed around social movements can create a structural transformation, aiding to construct our identities and subjectivities."
Reflections on Postmodern Feminism and Social Media

Reka Paul

On the 6th of February this year Great Britain celebrated the 100th anniversary of women’s suffrage and my thread on social media was littered with amusing and informative posts concerning the fight of the Suffragettes in Great Britain, including some very morbid details on how women who went on a hunger strike were force-fed through their noses.

My first thought filled with stirring emotions was one concerned with historical time spans; how short of a time ago women were still in many ways legally considered second-class citizens in Western Europe. Suddenly, though, doubt started to grow inside of me, and the question arose, since when was there suffrage for men? The truth is, I figured out shortly after my first epiphany, men’s suffrage until 1918 in the United Kingdom was highly limited due to property restrictions which were only lifted in 1918, but again only for men. Only 40% percent of women were able to vote from 1918 onwards - again, due to property restrictions. Which in fact means the real centenary then for female suffrage would not be in another ten years, since it was introduced in 1928 for all women. Are we then still talking about the progress of women’s rights here? Or are we merely seeing development of citizens’ rights? Which historically were delayed for the female population, by ten years in this particular case which is still slightly faster than a postnord delivery. Nevertheless, the media hype on the celebratory event seemed a bit over-stimulated when taking into account that the majority of males were also not able to vote before 1918 and the majority of females not until 1928. What exactly were we celebrating then?

I would even go a step further and claim that the celebration of the suffragettes and their achievements is a necessary part of the postmodern feminist narrative we are conscripted to, daughters of the fighter suffragettes. Instead of historical and political fineness all we have are polished images of strong beautiful Wonder Women that are the ideals of what we have achieved, the sexy but polished images of strong beautiful Wonder Women that is then shared and hyped with strong images and stories, ‘voices’ that are raised and people that ‘come forth’ to ‘tell their story’. Where do these people belong that are not included in the movement? Isn’t it just Hollywood-like staging? How is the actual effectiveness, and its durability?

Since I can say from my own experience the #MeToo movement has become at least to a certain degree part of everyday popular culture, up to the casual frivolous drops of hashtag-me-too jokes by male colleagues. But what that leaves us with, is actually much saddener than you might anticipate. If the name of a campaign that raises awareness of sexual assault against women has become the sexist joke of a male colleague, how much have we overstretched the original issue for the cause of representation? Have we sold our souls in order to become attractive to the media and to be shared and heard for the infamous 15 minutes of fame we were promised by the likes of Andy Warhol? And don’t we all agree we cannot have reached much if the women representing the #MeToo Campaign still have to look pretty and sexy on the Time Cover? Haven’t we actually regressed instead?

The general understanding that women can be more at ease talking about these issues, expressing themselves clearer about the dangers and requesting more male responsibility are all great advances. However, I never believed that the means always justify the end. I am not quite sure that I would not have preferred the nose-fed Suffragettes over kinky Taylor Swift. Will the movement end like the ice bucket challenge and so many other internet phenomena and hypes, just die a quiet death and be forgotten. But then again, who am I to judge, torn between wanting to criticize but feeling that it is inappropriate. Especially in our Facebook driven time, where the narrative of a certain reality is related to the experience of people that is then shared and hyped with strong images and stories, ‘voices’ that are raised and people that ‘come forth’ to ‘tell their story’. Where do these people belong that are not part of it? Do I share everyone’s anger if I don’t share everyone’s experience? Do I feel the fight for voting rights costed women more physically, but feels more satisfying for me than the one currently ongoing? Would I have preferred to be forced-fed through my nose rather than writing on Facebook about the time this guy grabbed me by the pussy? I don’t know, I am one of the daughters of the women fighters but I am a #MeNot one, I have nothing to tell at this point. Honestly, if I had, maybe I would not want to, and then where would I stand? Would I have to feel overwhelmed by this movement or underwhelmed by my preference for privacy? I don’t know anymore who fights and how and what for. I guess Taylor Swift is the better fighter than me after all, I mean she had seen it coming with all the bad blood.

So let’s rewind, some of us are not a #MeToo, but a #MeNot and that is totally okay. Whether because you have not been assaulted or not felt the necessity to identify with the movement just because you have, doesn’t matter. Maybe, and that is just a theory, in the Western hemisphere the USA are still somewhat of a Wild West, where these miserable things happen in greater numbers and are more overlooked than in certain European countries, so in this case the movement would not be any less valid but maybe should be seen of somewhat higher importance in its country of origin.
"Would I have preferred to be forced-fed through my nose rather than writing on Facebook about the time this guy grabbed me by the pussy?"

Does it make one wonder then that women in the USA go on the streets to protest being defined as sexual objects by their president and fight for the minimum dignity. In Iceland for example women went on the street to fight for absolute equal pay (which they now have)? I admit the comparison is not quite fair but then also most Western countries don’t have to discuss whether more guns cause more gun related violence, or less money causes more poverty or 1+1 causes 2 and so on, you know the story. I mean, it is great these ladies (and gentlemen) put on their pink hats and march for the minimum. It is just sad that this is still where it is at. Where I actually wanted to get with this is in fact the proneness of the US society to social media hype, and this common understanding that everyone online would like to be a part of it, somehow the words ‘me too’ come to my mind now.

We don’t even have to go as far as across the Atlantic. We see all these celebrations and wonder how far we have come and we are still fighting for seemingly self-evident issues in many European countries. Such as equal pay for equal work (preferably in a legal framework and not solely as a political agenda) or the right to be taken seriously when reporting assault. Or as a personal matter just the right to be free from sexist jokes (try to google sexist jokes towards men and you won’t really strike it rich so don’t tell me this goes both ways) or to go smaller even, at least the freedom to comment on your negative sentiments about sexist jokes without being called a buzzkill. So where does that leave us? In the end, as a semi-privileged white woman from Western Europe I often feel like I should not complain too much or at all. Haven’t I got a lot already? Many people even believe feminism is dead or not very important anymore and still I share these stories on Facebook, hoping someone will read them and maybe actually do something about it.

The possibilities of social media use are grand, the audience vast but the attention span short and the cause too often hooked on imagery and narratives. However, as long as there are women in this world (as predicted at least until the year 2525), I do pray there will be feminists, although I would prefer to be able to choose my own ambassador of the female cause, which in fact would be Emmeline Pankhurst over Taylor Swift, the nose-fed Suffragettes over the pretty pop singer. Although, I would argue people do know Meryl Streep better than Pankhurst, even though Pankhurst fought for suffrage an Streep plays someone fighting for suffrage. But rather Streep than Swift, so enough of my complaints.

Is the social media a curse or a blessing for the feminist cause? It is too soon to say. Maybe in 100 years the CNN will share somewhere on a future version of social media the story of the MeToo movement and celebrate its centenary. Some random university kid will write a disillusioned sarcastic article about it and the cause has been served a little bit more when the truth has been spoken. The actual anniversary should not be before another ten years have passed, but it would matter all the less since enough people have been reached through their news feed and liked and shared the shot out of it.
Of course, a share of politicians regarding gender within parties and parliaments is not reducible to quantitative measurements and comparison of numbers in terms of equality, even if a symbolic order might be inherent in these. Still, it reflects and neglects historically produced differences, if not questions of power. AfD parliamentarian Nicole Höchst knows this and when asked if the exceptionally low share of women and men since the 2017 elections makes ‘a difference’, she replies: “No, because I think that men whom are here, have an interest in representing the interests of their wives, daughters and grandchildren in accordance.”

At first, it invokes a relation of ownership by the use of “theirs” (read: the men’s), creating a claim over wives, daughters and grandchildren, which are possessed by the male politician. Political matters are therefore familialized and only expressible through the family owner: the man. This raises the question, do male AfD politicians represent the interests of ‘other’ wives, daughters and grandchildren whom are not part of ‘their’ family? If ‘women’ and ‘men’ are different by nature, how does it come that men represent the interests of women? This is possible if women are downgraded to be an object. Another explanation would be, that men and women are actually not different by nature, paradoxically giving the AfD argument a touch of universal anti-essentialism, where gender roles are already dissolved. But the idea of third generation feminism seeing gender and sex as a socio-historical construct, neglecting quotas and other means of differentiation, still does not apply here.

Further, the paternalistic and patriarchal point of view of Nicole Höchst and the AfD defining the ‘nature’ of ‘women’ as unpolitical, is never explained or justified. What does the metaphysics of nature know about the 21st centuries political configuration? What happens if interests of men and women, as competing universalities, are opposed, which they must be, if ‘men’ and ‘women’ are different? Still unanswered is Nicole Höchst’s question of who represents the idea of subjects out of a family realm? It needs to be beared in mind that the implicit ideology of the AfD must be encountered with the important question of who is entitled to be a ‘woman’ and subsequently, who is left out.

Regarding the AfD’s stand on cultural racism and their anti migration ideal, it is questionable if male politicians also represent the interests of non-citizens of Germany. Is the hierarchy of power the same as a colonialistic one: white men, white women, black men, black women? Not necessarily. As argued in the AfD election program, the interests of ‘muslim women’ need to be defended towards the “muslim man”, oppressing the first. But assuming this, the former doxa of colonialism is shifted: ‘german men’, ‘german women’, ‘muslim women’, ‘muslim men’, are then the ideological hierarchy of value.

Still, this means that othered groups (e.g. anybody who is constructed as others on national, ethical, cultural, religious or racial grounds) are neither formally nor substantially situated as a subject of politics within the election program of the AfD, but are indeed ideologically instrumentalized.

The constructional mechanisms of the categories ‘men’ and ‘women’ are – according to the AfDs election program – framed by natural and historically established presumptions. Production and governance as the realm of men and reproduction and be governed as the realm of and for women. The construction of equality grounds on this doxa, as long as everybody fits in the assumed natural order it produces equality, according to the AfD. In other words, as equality for the AfD is based in different ‘natural gender roles’, then unequal social positions seem normatively legitimised, therefore making the unequal positions look equal.

The construction of justice further grounds on this ‘equality’, since the relation of male and female inflicts into the discourse on what can be called justice. Competing universalities are neglected because they are not seen as universalities but particularities. For instance, in terms of political influence, as men and women want different things (particularity) instead of the same things (universality), because they are framed as different by nature. Therefore, the AfD argues that it is okay if there are no women in the Parliament because ‘they’ do not want to participate.

Interestingly, AfD’s essential position on sex is similar to what they project into ‘muslim men’: a subordination of ‘women’. As presented, this is contradictory. If the political agenda is not one of differentiation: besides white, german, christian men, no one shall govern. White men can only govern if they identify who shouldn’t, creating ‘others’ and ‘us’ dialectically. The legitimacy for this is difference and hierarchy, producing the subject of governance through others and vice versa.
Viola Davis said in the last Women’s March that took place in late January, 2017, “your job as a citizen is not just to fight for your rights, it is to fight for the rights of every individual that is taking a breath, whose heart is pumping, breathing on this earth”. This was not a belief held when the first set of women decided to rise up and take a stand for what was right. These women thought not of women far from them experiencing the same things; these women thought only of themselves. They were white, middle class women from the Western world. They only represented one race of women, one class of women and one location of women on the globe. So, then could they have understood or even thought about all the perspectives of challenges women globally would face? Feminism is about establishing rights for women; but which women are we talking about? And do all these women need the same ‘rights’?

Culture, as well as history, allows every woman’s experience to be different. This is because the meaning of masculinity and femininity, are based upon the society in which one is socialized. These are simply just concepts based on traits that are learnt; it is a social construct. Hence, they are learnt behaviours and roles that we act out because we have been educated by our parents, schools and communities to believe that they are appropriate behaviours for each sex. Therefore, if one society says that it is okay for men to wear skirts, then all men in that society would wear skirts or dresses. This is evident in an Scottish society where men wear kilts or in an Arab society where men wear the dishdasha. This would be opposite from a society that states only women should wear skirt-like clothing, like the very Westernized world. Wearing these traditional clothings that resemble skirts and dresses, would then be a feminine act in one culture and a masculine act in another. The whole concept of gender is then determined by variations of different cultures and how these cultures associate men different from women. That being established, the issues women face would be based on what is seen as “feminine” in a specific culture. These issues will differ based on the norms and beliefs a culture holds to be true; and as the world evolves we see on a daily basis that what is the norm for one woman is not a normal experience for another.

When placed side by side, women are viewed as inferior to men. There is now a description to the difference. Is it the same when it comes to races? Are Black women viewed as inferior to Asian women? Are lower class women viewed as less influential than upper class women? Are Jewish women viewed as more intelligent than Native American women? Are prostitutes viewed as more sexual than married women? It is this description of the difference that allows for more than one feminism to be needed; because as Black, middle class, third world, single females you may not understand who I am or the issues that are individual to me as a woman because of my race, class and status. That is simply because I am different from you and you are different from me. This theoretical concept of difference has females all over the globe facing unique issues. So we are here left to ponder, should we then as a global world have several versions of feminism?
EN HYLLNING TILL SPRÅKET AV EN OTILLRÄCKLIG APA

Viktor Warg

EU-parlamentarikern Soraya Post (Fj) ställer sig i en in
tervju till SVT (26/1) frågande till varför EU:s säkerhets-
politiska agenda inte inkluderar våld i nära relationer
(läs: mäns våld mot kvinnor): “det är ju den största ter-
ors som medborgarna utsätts för här i Europa”. Att be-
grepp och discipliner ändrar innehåll är inget nytt eller
för den delen nödvändigt ont, ofta tvärtom. Men vad blir
konsekvenserna för språkets och ordens användbarhet
om laddade begrepp som terror, våld eller makt helt plöt-
siktigt att för att beskriva allt mer av verkligheten?

Finns här inte en risk för ett urholkande av våra ords
användbarhet och i förlängningen den samhälleliga
debatten? Är det användbart att i ett samtal om EU:s säk-
erhetspolitiska agenda inkludera en diskussion om våld i
nära relationer bland europolar?

Med aktning för ord och idéer som verktyg oberoende av
vad eller vem som ligger bakom dem, ställer jag mig all-
mänt sett skeptisk till allomfattande förklaringsystem
(ideologi om man vill) och i synnerhet de som ger alter-
nativa tolkningar av språket och den fria tankens int-
stegar efter eller inom ett språk. Med andra ord är det som
leder mig på dagens femtiofem, eller rättare sagt de underbyg-
gda idésystem som lagt beslag på en annars progressiv
rörelse och som underblåser begreppsliga expansioner på
allt fler områden. Denna tendens tycker jag mig se i Posts
uttalande både när det kommer till hur hon använder sig
av “terror” och den bild hon verkar ha av EU:s säkerhets-
agenda. Dessa idésystem, grundade i postmodernas te-
orier har kommit att genomkyla akademien och påverkat
delar av den feministiska uppfattningen av vad språk och
ord fyller för funktion i vår verklighet och vad man bör
sträva efter i den.

Det som utmärker idéerna som denna typ av feminism
bygger på att ett utprågat fokus på vårt språk och en syn
på ord som främst ett maktmedel. Mer specifikt, ser man
på konsekvensen som konstituerad av disciplinerade makt-
mekanismer höjt i vårt språk. Med andra ord möjliggör
språket vad vi kan veta respektive göra i vår verklighet. Den
ämndes påföljd och logiska uppmaningen blir att föran-
dra verkligheten genom att syna, avslöja och rekonskra
det enligt teorin patriarchalit normerande medlet. För om
de kategorier som vi slutar om verkligheten (man/kvinna,
kultur/natur, krig/fred) också skapar begränsningar för oss
själva och andra, då bör vi dessa begränsningar också de-
begränsas, modelleras eller rivas ned? Ordet “bästs” är ju
exkluderande, förbjud att det förberinner all de bästisar och
med dem utförs. Det genera principen ”man” är en
symbol för patriarkatet, ersatt det med ”en” så är ett slag
vunnet. Det realistiska antagandet om det beskymmande
stallet i ett i anarkistiskt internationellt system är också det
ett patriarkalit betingad orde i syfte att legitimeras stat-
ligt förtryck, lägg försvarsutgifternas i en jämställdhets-
fond istället. Enligt samma logik kan säkerhetspolitik och
terrorism som ord/discipliner anses exkluderande då de
på EU-nivå inte innefattar våld i nära relationer och i sam-
ma ingörjömbästiga andar av där en utslagning av dess
be tydeligen på plats här? Terrin finns ju overall!

Jag själv förunders och gläds över ordets vardagliga funk-
de knappare nämligen som dess storslagna effekter. Sanningen är den
att det vi bevisat och att vi är en del av vår dagliga interaktion
med andra på många sätt är ett mirakel, ett högteknolo-
giskt samspelet mellan vår biologi och vårt kulturelle sam-
manhang. Senare års framsteg inom Artificial Intelligence
har utöver ny teknik också bekräftat just detta när det
kommer till språket. Att konstruera en mjukvara som likt
människans kan erfara omvänd och sedan agera och
kommunicera i enlighet med intygen, för att inte tala om
utvecklingen av mekanismer för lagning och rangord-
ning av dem, har visat sig vara ett projekt för Gud. Att ens
påbörja en analys om varför och med vilken målsättning vi
använder våra ord tycks därmed ytterst komplicerat och
att beskriva dem som maktmekanismer en enorm reduc-
ering. Att ta sig friheten att förändra dem utifrån ett ideal
skulle kräva en enorm insats och därmed en enorm statlig
byråkrati. Men EU då? EU bör väl sträva efter en så inkluder-
erande agenda som möjligt?

EU:s säkerhetspolitiska agenda inkluderar numera allt
från försvarssamarbeten med härda maktmedel till
fredsbyggande biståndsarbete med bland annat
järnställighetsarbete som en avgörande komponent. Likväl
som dessa former av säkerhetspolitik fyller flera olika funk-
tioner och därmed är viktiga att separera, bör vi också
vara glada att det görs en åtskillnad mellan de medel som an-
vänds utåt sett från unionen och de medel som används
intemt, mellan medlemsstaterna. Precis som vi i Sverige
inte använder militära medel i polisiära ärenden bekämpar
EU alltså inte ett terrornätverk i Afghanistan på samma
sätt som gängkriminalitet i ett utsatt område i Belgien. Nu
tror inte jag att Soraya Post vill använda de medel som an-
nars fyller en extern funktion till bekämpningen av interna
problem såsom våld i nära relationer. Oavsett syfte är dock
ordvandringen av vikt, åtlöshet när orden kommer från en
everytig obehagliga politik. Ett östligt förtryck, lägg försvars-
utgifterna i en jämställdhetsfond istället. Enligt samma logik kan säkerhet-
politik och terrorism som ord/discipliner anses exkluderande då de
på EU-nivå inte innefattar våld i nära relationer och i sam-
ma ingörjömbästiga andar av där en utslagning av dess
be tydeligen på plats här? Terrin finns ju overall!

Jag själv förunders och gläds över ordets vardagliga funk-
de knappare nämligen som dess storslagna effekter. Sanningen är den
att det vi bevisat och att vi är en del av vår dagliga interaktion
med andra på många sätt är ett mirakel, ett högteknolo-
giskt samspelet mellan vår biologi och vårt kulturelle sam-
manhang. Senare års framsteg inom Artificial Intelligence
har utöver ny teknik också bekräftat just detta när det
kommer till språket. Att konstruera en mjukvara som likt
människans kan erfara omvänd och sedan agera och
kommunicera i enlighet med intygen, för att inte tala om
utvecklingen av mekanismer för lagning och rangord-
ning av dem, har visat sig vara ett projekt för Gud. Att ens
påbörja en analys om varför och med vilken målsättning vi
använder våra ord tycks därmed ytterst komplicerat och
att beskriva dem som maktmekanismer en enorm reduc-
ering. Att ta sig friheten att förändra dem utifrån ett ideal
skulle kräva en enorm insats och därmed en enorm statlig
byråkrati. Men EU då? EU bör väl sträva efter en så inkluder-
erande agenda som möjligt?

EU:s säkerhetspolitiska agenda inkluderar numera allt
från försvarssamarbeten med härda maktmedel till
fredsbyggande biståndsarbete med bland annat
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