

GEXcel Work in Progress Report

Volume IX

Proceedings from GEXcel Theme 10:
Love in Our Time - A Question For Feminism
Conference of Workshops
2–4 December 2010

Edited by
Sofia Strid and Anna G. Jónasdóttir

Centre of Gender Excellence – GEXcel

Towards a European Centre of Excellence in
Transnational and Transdisciplinary Studies of

- Changing Gender Relations
- Intersectionalities
- Embodiment

Institute of Thematic Gender Studies:

Department of Gender Studies, Tema Institute,
Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Linköping University

Division of Gender and Medicine,
Faculty of Health Sciences, Linköping University

&

Centre for Feminist Social Studies (CFS), School of Humanities,
Education and Social Sciences (HumES), Örebro University

Gender Studies, School of Humanities,
Education and Social Sciences (HumES), Örebro University

March 2011



The publication of this report has been funded with the support of the Swedish Research Council: Centres of Gender Excellence Programme

GEXcel Work in Progress Report Volume IX:
Proceedings from GEXcel Theme 10:
Love in our time: A Question for Feminism.
Conference of Workshops 2–4 December 2010
March 2011

Copyright © GEXcel and the authors 2011

Print: LiU-tryck, Linköping University
Layout: Tomas Hägg

Tema Genus Report Series No. 13: 2011 – LiU
CFS Report Series No. 15: 2011 – ÖU

ISBN 978-91-7393-193-9
ISSN 1650-9056

ISBN 978-91-7668-788-8
ISSN 1103-2618

Addresses:

www.genderexcel.org

Institute of Thematic Gender Studies, LiU-ÖU
– an inter-university institute, located at:

Department of Gender Studies
Linköping University
SE 581 83 Linköping, Sweden

Division of Gender and Medicine
Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine
Faculty of Health Sciences
SE 581 85 Linköping, Sweden

&

Centre for Feminist Social Studies (CFS)
School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences (HumES)
Örebro University
SE 701 82 Örebro, Sweden

Gender Studies
School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences (HumES)
Örebro University
SE 70182 Örebro, Sweden

Contents

CENTRE OF GENDER EXCELLENCE GENDERING EXCELLENCE – GEXCEL <i>Nina Lykke</i>	9
INTRODUCTION <i>Anna G. Jónasdóttir and Sofia Strid</i>	17
CHAPTER 1 MAPPING AND MAKING/RE-MAKING LOVE STUDIES AS A FIELD OF KNOWLEDGE INTERESTS <i>Anna G. Jónasdóttir</i>	21
CHAPTER 2 BREAD AND ROSES IN THE COMMONS <i>Rosemary Hennessey</i>	31
CHAPTER 3 LOVE, SOCIAL CHANGE AND HETEROSEXUALITY <i>Stevi Jackson</i>	35
CHAPTER 4 A RETURN TO LOVE: A CARIBBEAN FEMINIST EXPLORES AN EPISTEMIC CONVERSATION BETWEEN AUDRE LORDE'S 'THE POWER OF THE EROTIC' AND ANNA JÓNASDÓTTIR 'LOVE POWER' <i>Violet Eudine Barriteau</i>	39
CHAPTER 5 LOVE, SOLIDARITY AND A POLITICS OF LOVE <i>Ann Ferguson</i>	43

SUB THEME 1: Gendered Interests in Sexual Love, Care Practices and Erotic Agency

REPORT FROM WORKSHOP

51

Sofia Strid

CHAPTER 6

LOVE IN TIMES OF PRISON

53

Estibaliz De Miguel Calvo

CHAPTER 7

ARE DISCIPLINARY BOUNDARIES GONE? EVOLUTIONARY

PSYCHOLOGY AND LOVE RELATIONSHIPS

57

Adriana García Andrade and Priscila Cedillo

CHAPTER 8

LOVING HIM FOR WHO HE IS: PINPOINTING THE MECHANISMS
OF FEMALE SUBORDINATION IN HETEROSEXUAL COUPLE LOVE

61

Lena Gunnarsson

CHAPTER 9

'FORBIDDEN LOVE' – NARRATIVES OF LOVE, BELONGING AND
DEVIANC E IN ADOLESCENCE

65

Susanne Offen

CHAPTER 10

ALL IN THE FAMILY: PATRIARCHY, CAPITALISM, AND LOVE

71

Alyssa Schneebaum

CHAPTER 11

SEX AND/OR LOVE?

75

Silvia Stoller

CHAPTER 12

EVERYDAY LIFE ROMANTIC DISCOURSE IN RUSSIA: STABILITY
FOR WOMEN AND STATUS FOR MEN

79

Anna Temkina

SUB THEME 2: Temporal Dimensions of Loving and Love Activities

REPORT FROM WORKSHOP <i>Valerie Bryson</i>	85
CHAPTER 13 TIMESCAPES OF LOVE AND MARGINALITY <i>Asma Abbas</i>	89
CHAPTER 14 TRUTH BEYOND TIME: LOVE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF KNOWLEDGE IN MARGARET MAZZANTINI'S <i>DON'T MOVE</i> AND JOHN LE CARRÉ'S <i>THE CONSTANT GARDENER</i> <i>Barbara Alfano</i>	93
CHAPTER 15 LOVE, WORK AND FAMILY IN EARLY NORWEGIAN FAMILY RESEARCH AND TODAY <i>Margunn Bjørnholt</i>	95
CHAPTER 16 TIME TO LOVE <i>Valerie Bryson</i>	99
CHAPTER 17 'NOT SO MUCH LOST BETWEEN ME AND MY HUSBAND': LOVE IN ESTONIAN WOMEN'S LIFE-STORIES OF THE SOVIET PERIOD <i>Leena Kurvet-Käosaar</i>	103
CHAPTER 18 RECOGNISING LOVE, CARE AND SOLIDARITY: CHALLENGING (RE)DISTRIBUTIVE, RECOGNITION AND REPRESENTATIONAL MODELS OF SOCIAL JUSTICE IN THE WORK OF NANCY FRASER AND OTHERS <i>Kathleen Lynch</i>	107
CHAPTER 19 THEORIZING LOVE IN FORCED/ARRANGED MARRIAGE: A CASE OF 'LOVING TO SURVIVE'? <i>Kaye Quek</i>	115

CHAPTER 20	
THE GENDER POLITICS OF ‘THE POLITICS OF LOVE’: IRIGARAY, ETHICS AND THE SHADOW OF HEGEL’S ANTIGONE	119
<i>Margaret E. Toye</i>	

SUB THEME 3: Love as a Multi-Dimensional Cultural
Construction and/or a Useful Key Concept for a New Political
Theory of Global Revolution? Feminist Perspectives

REPORT FROM WORKSHOP	125
<i>Kathleen B. Jones</i>	

CHAPTER 21	
REPRESENTATIONS OF (TRUE) LOVE? A CRITICAL READING OF THE MEDIA COVERAGE OF THE CROWN PRINCESS ENGAGEMENT AND WEDDING IN SWEDEN, 2009 – 2010	129
<i>Anna Adeniji</i>	

CHAPTER 22	
LOVE, RELIGION AND MODERNITY: AN ANALYSIS OF HISTORY OF DESIRE AND SIN IN <i>FIN DE SIÈCLE</i> OTTOMAN EMPIRE AND MODERN TURKEY	133
<i>Çiğdem Buğdaycı</i>	

CHAPTER 23	
A LOVE LIFE IN A SEXLESS CONDITION. THE CHALLENGE OF CHASTITY IN THE CATHOLIC PERSPECTIVE	135
<i>Vera Fisogni</i>	

CHAPTER 24	
‘LOVE’ IN NEGOTIATIONS OVER YOUNG MUSLIMS’ FUTURE MARRIAGES	139
<i>Pia Karlsson-Minganti</i>	

CHAPTER 25	
REVOLUTIONARY LOVE: FEMINISM, LOVE, AND THE TRANSFORMATIVE POLITICS OF FREEDOM IN THE WORKS OF WOLLSTONECRAFT, DE BEAUVIOR, AND GOLDMAN	143
<i>Leyna Lowe</i>	

CHAPTER 26	
LOVE IN TRANSLATION. NOTES FOR A MATERIALIST FEMINIST	
CRITIQUE OF NEOLIBERALISM.	145
<i>Ewa Majewska</i>	
CHAPTER 27	
‘MOVED BY LOVE’: HOW LOVE RESEARCH CAN CHANGE OUR	
DEEP-ROOTED EMOTIONAL UNDERSTANDINGS AND AFFECTIVE	
CONSCIOUSNESS	149
<i>Rosa M. Medina-Doménech, Mari Luz Esteban, Ana Távora-Rivero</i>	
CHAPTER 28	
FROM VEILED TO UNVEILED: A LOOK AT DISCURSIVE	
REPRESENTATION OF BODY IN IRANIAN LOVE BLOGS	153
<i>Maryam Paknahad Jabarooty</i>	
CHAPTER 29	
REVOLUTIONIZE LOVE? A QUEER-FEMINIST CRITIQUE OF LOVE	
AS A POLITICAL CONCEPT	155
<i>Eleanor Wilkinson</i>	

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

- APPENDIX 1: ACTIVITIES AND VISITING SCHOLARS 2010
- APPENDIX 2: CONFERENCE CALL FOR PARTICIPANTS
- APPENDIX 3: CONFERENCE PROGRAMME
- APPENDIX 4: WORKSHOP PROGRAMMES

Centre of Gender Excellence Gendering Excellence – GEXcel

Towards a European Centre of Excellence in
Transnational and Transdisciplinary Studies of:

- Changing Gender Relations
- Intersectionalities
- Embodiment

Nina Lykke
Linköping University, Director of GEXcel

In 2006, the Swedish Research Council granted 20 million SEK to set up a Centre of Gender Excellence at the inter-university Institute of Thematic Gender Studies, Linköping University & Örebro University, for the period 2007-2011. Linköping University has added five million SEK as matching funds, while Örebro University has added three million SEK as matching funds.

The following is a short presentation of the excellence centre. For more information contact: Scientific Director of GEXcel, Professor Nina Lykke (ninly@tema.liu.se); GEXcel Research Coordinator, Dr. Ulrica Engdahl (coordinator@genderexcel.org); GEXcel Research Coordinator, Dr. Gunnel Karlsson (gunnel.karlsson@oru.se); or Manager Gender Studies, Linköping, Berit Starkman (berst@tema.liu.se).

Institutional basis of GEXcel

Institute of Thematic Gender Studies, Linköping University & Örebro University

The institute is a collaboration between:

Department of Gender Studies, Linköping University;
Division of Gender and Medicine, Linköping University
&
Centre for Feminist Social Studies, Örebro University;
Gender Studies, Örebro University

GEXcel board and lead-team

- a transdisciplinary team of Gender Studies professors:
- Professor Nina Lykke, Linköping University (Director) – Gender and Culture; background: Literary Studies
- Professor Anita Göransson, Linköping University – Gender, Organisation and Economic Change; background: Economic History
- Professor Jeff Hearn, Linköping University – Critical Studies of Men and Masculinities; background: Sociology and Organisation Studies
- Professor Liisa Husu, Örebro University – Gender Studies with a Social Science profile; background: Sociology
- Professor Emerita Anna G. Jónasdóttir, Örebro University – Gender Studies with a Social Science profile; background: Political Science, Social and Political Theory
- Professor Barbro Wijma, Linköping University – Gender and Medicine; background: Medicine

International advisory board

- Professor Karen Barad, University of California, St. Cruz, USA
- Professor Rosi Braidotti, University of Utrecht, The Netherlands
- Professor Raewyn Connell, University of Sydney, Australia
- Professor Emerita Kathleen B. Jones, San Diego State University, USA
- Professor Elzbieta Oleksy, University of Lodz, Poland
- Professor Berit Schei, Norwegian University of Technology, Trondheim, Norway
- Professor Birte Siim, University of Aalborg, Denmark

Aims of GEXcel

- 1) To set up a temporary (five year) Centre of Gender Excellence (Gendering EXcellence: GEXcel) in order to develop innovative research on changing gender relations, intersectionalities and embodiment from transnational and transdisciplinary perspectives.
- 2) To become a pilot or developmental scheme for a more permanent Sweden-based European Collegium for Advanced Transnational and Transdisciplinary Gender Studies (CATSgender).

A core activity of GEXcel 2007-2011

A core activity will be a visiting fellows programme, organised to attract excellent senior researchers and promising younger scholars from Sweden and abroad and from many disciplinary backgrounds. The visiting fellows are taken in after application and a peer-reviewed evaluation process of the applications; a number of top scholars within the field are also invited to be part of GEXcel's research teams. GEXcel's visiting fellows get from one week to twelve months grants to stay at GEXcel to do research together with the permanent staff of six Gender Studies professors and other relevant local staff.

The Fellowship Programme is concentrated on annually shifting thematic foci. We select and construct shifting research groups, consisting of excellent researchers of different academic generations (professors, post-doctoral scholars, doctoral students) to carry out new research on specified research themes within the overall frame of changing gender relations, intersectionalities and embodiment.

Brief definition of overall research theme of GEXcel

The overall theme of GEXcel research is defined as transnational and transdisciplinary studies of changing gender relations, intersectionalities and embodiment. We have chosen a broad and inclusive frame in order to attract a diversity of excellent scholars from different disciplines, countries and academic generations, but specificity and focus are also given high priority and ensured via annually shifting thematic foci.

The overall keywords of the (long!) title are chosen in order to indicate currently pressing theoretical and methodological challenges of gender research to be addressed by GEXcel research:

– By the keyword ‘transnational’ we underline that GEXcel research should contribute to a systematic transnationalizing of research on gender relations, intersectionalities and embodiment, and, in so doing, develop a reflexive stance vis-à-vis transnational travelling of ideas, theories

and concepts, and consciously try to overcome reductive one-country focused research as well as pseudo-universalising research that unreflectedly takes e.g. ‘Western’ or ‘Scandinavian’ models as norm.

– By the keyword ‘changing’ we aim at underlining that it, in a world of rapidly changing social, cultural, economic and technical relations, is crucial to be able to theorise change, and that this is of particular importance for critical gender research due to its liberatory aims and inherent focus on macro, meso and micro level transformations.

– By the keyword ‘gender relations’, we aim at underlining that we define gender not as an essence, but as a relational, plural and shifting process, and that it is the aim of GEXcel research to contribute to a further understanding of this process.

– By the keyword ‘intersectionalities’, we stress that a continuous reflection on meanings of intersectionalities in gender research should be integrated in all GEXcel research. In particular, we will emphasise four different aspects: a) intersectionality as intersections of disciplines and main areas (humanities, social sciences and medical and natural sciences); b) intersectionality as intersections between macro, meso and micro level social analyses; c) intersectionality as intersections between social categories and power differentials organised around categories such as gender, ethnicity, race, class, sexuality, age, nationality, profession, disabledness etc); d) intersectionality as intersections between major different branches of feminist theorising (e.g. queer feminist theorising, Marxist feminist theorising, postcolonial feminist theorising etc.).

– Finally, by the keyword ‘embodiment’, we aim at emphasising yet another kind of intersectionality, which has proved crucial in current gender research – to explore intersections between discourse and materiality and between sex and gender.

Specific research themes of GEXcel

The research at GEXcel focuses on a variety of themes. The research themes are the following:

Theme 1: Gender, Sexuality and Global Change

On interactions of gender and sexuality in a global perspective.

Headed by Anna G. Jónasdóttir.

Theme 2: Deconstructing the Hegemony of Men and Masculinities

On ways to critically analyse constructions of the social category ‘men’.

Headed by Jeff Hearn.

Theme 3: Distinctions and Authorisation

On meanings of gender, class, and ethnicity in constructions of elites.
Headed by Anita Göransson.

Themes 4 and 5: Sexual Health, Embodiment and Empowerment

On new synergies between different kinds of feminist researchers' (e.g., philosophers' and medical doctors') approaches to the sexed body.
Headed by Nina Lykke and Barbro Wijma.

Theme 6: Power Shifts and New Divisions in Society, Work and University

On the specificities of new central power bases, such as immaterial production and the rule of knowledge.

Headed by Anita Göransson.

Themes 7 and 8: Teaching Normcritical Sex – Getting Rid of Violence.

TRANSdisciplinary, TRANSnational and TRANSformative Feminist Dialogues on Embodiment, Emotions and Ethics

On the struggles and synergies of socio-cultural and medical perspectives taking place in the three arenas sex education, critical sexology and violence.

Headed by Nina Lykke and Barbro Wijma.

Theme 9: Gendered sexualised transnationalisations, deconstructing the dominant: Transforming men, 'centres' and knowledge/policy/practice.
On various gendered, sexualised, intersectional, embodied, transnational processes, in relation to contemporary and potential changes in power relations.

Headed by Jeff Hearn.

Theme 10: Love in Our Time – a Question for Feminism

On the recently arisen and growing interest in love as a subject for serious social and political theory among both non-feminist and feminist scholars.

Headed by Anna G. Jónasdóttir.

Themes 11 and 12: Gender Paradoxes in Changing Academic and Scientific Organisation(s).

Theme on gender paradoxes in how academic and scientific organisations are changing and being changed.

Headed by Liisa Husu.

In addition, three cross-cutting research themes will also be organised:

- a) Exploring Socio-technical Models for Combining Virtual and Physical Co-Presence while doing joint Gender Research;
- b) Organising a European Excellence Centre – Exploring Models;
- c) Theories and Methodologies in Transnational and Transdisciplinary Studies of Gender Relations, Intersectionalities and Embodiment.

The thematically organised research groups are chaired by GEXcel's core staff of six Gender Studies professors, who together make up a transdisciplinary team, covering humanities, the social sciences and medicine.

Ambitions and visions

The fellowship programme of GEXcel is created with the central purpose to create transnational and transdisciplinary research teams that will have the opportunity to work together for a certain time – long enough to do joint research, do joint publications, produce joint international research applications and do other joint activities such as organising international conferences.

We will build on our extensive international networks to promote the idea of a permanent European institute for advanced and excellent gender research – and in collaboration with other actors try to make this idea become real, for example, organisations such as AOIFE, the SOCRATES-funded network Athena and WISE, who jointly are preparing for a professional Gender Studies organisation in Europe.

We also hope that a collaboration within Sweden will sustain the long-term goals of making a difference both in Sweden and abroad.

We consider GEXcel to be a pilot or developmental scheme for a more long-term European centre of gender excellence, i.e. for an institute- or collegium-like structure dedicated to advanced, transnational and transdisciplinary gender research, research training and education in advanced Gender Studies (CATSgender).

Leading international institutes for advanced study such as the Centre for the Study of Democracy at the University of California Irvine, and in Sweden The Swedish Collegium for Advanced Studies (SCAS at Uppsala University) have proved to be attractive environments and creative meeting places where top scholars in various fields from all over the world, and from different generations, have found time for reflective work and for meeting and generating new, innovative research. We would like to explore how this kind of academic structures that have proved very productive in terms of advancing excellence and high level,

internationally important and recognised research within other areas of study, can unleash new potentials of gender research and initiate a new level of excellence within the area. The idea is, however not just to take an existing academic form for unfolding of excellence potentials and fill it with excellent gender research. Understood as a developmental/pilot scheme for CATSgender, GEXcel should build on inspirations from the mentioned units for advanced studies, but also further explore and assess what feminist excellence means in terms of both contents and form/structure.

We want to rework the advanced research collegium model on a feminist basis and include thorough reflections on meanings of gender excellence. What does it mean to gender excellence? How can we do it in even more excellent and feminist innovative ways?

Introduction

Anna G. Jónasdóttir and Sofia Strid

This work-in-progress report comprises short summaries of most of the presentations given at the GEXcel research conference, which took place at Örebro University 2-4 December, 2010. The conference rounded off the main activities of GEXcel's Research Theme 10, *Love in Our Time – A Question for Feminism*, which ran from January through to December 2010. The conference was organised in a workshop format around three subthemes: 1) *Gendered Interests in Sexual Love, Care Practices and Erotic Agency*, 2) *Temporal Dimensions of Loving and Love Activities*, and 3) *Love as a Strong Force in the Intersection Between Politics and Religion and as a Useful Key Concept for a New Political Theory of Global Revolution*. Each workshop/subtheme gathered around ten senior and junior scholars from many different countries and parts of the world.

This report is of a work-in-progress character, and thus the texts presented here are to be elaborated further. The reader should also be aware that due to the fact that this is a report of working papers, the language of the papers contributed by non-native English speakers has not been specifically revised.

As mentioned above, this conference was organised as a conference of workshops, but plenary speeches were given in between the discussions of papers in parallel groups during the first two days. On the third day, a plenary session ended the conference. The whole arrangement was an integral part of the work on the tenth Research Theme, carried out within the two-campus Excellence Centre GEXcel. The visiting scholars, who were selected as Fellows – either through application (in international competition) or by direct invitation – played an important role in the development of the research theme.

The Fellows were *Eudine Barriteau*, Professor of Gender and Public Policy, the Centre for Gender and Development Studies, University of the West Indies, Cave Hill Campus, Barbados; *Ann Ferguson*, Professor Emerita of Philosophy and Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies, University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA; *Stevi Jackson*, Professor of Sociology and Women's Studies, University of York, UK; *Kathleen Lynch*, Professor of Equality Studies, University College, Dublin, Ireland; Dr. *Anna Adeniji*, Lecturer in Gender Studies, Södertörn University College, Sweden, Dr. *Ewa Majewska*, Senior Lecturer at Cracow University, Poland; *Maryam Paknahad Jabarooty*, PhD Candidate in Linguistics and English Language, Lancaster University, UK; *Kaye Quek*, PhD Candi-

date in Politics, University of Melbourne, Australia; *Alyssa Schneebaum*, PhD Candidate in Economics, the University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA and *Eleanor Wilkinson*, PhD Candidate in Geography, University of Leeds, UK. In addition, *Kathleen B. Jones*, Professor Emerita of Women's Studies, San Diego State University, USA, participated in the conference. She is also member of GEXcel's International Advisory Board. See appendix 5 for a full list of conference participants.

The fellows first joint gathering at Örebro University took place in May 2010 (see *GEXcel Work in Progress Report*, Volume VIII, October 2010). Then, the main period of activities were carried out in the Autumn the same year, when all the Fellows returned to work for shorter or longer periods of time, also giving seminars or discussing in both formal (roundtables) and informal meetings (cf. Appendix 1). Two external visiting scholars, Dr. Janet Fink and Dr. Jacqui Gabb, from the Open University, UK, contributed to these activities.

The purpose of arranging the December Conference of Workshops was to invite more people to contribute to the current research theme, and to join us in one or another of the three workshops. The call for paper proposals for this final Conference of Workshops, which was sent out in 2009, had resulted in the selection of around 20 external participants, from 13 different countries. All in all, then, the conference was attended by citizens/participants from Australia, Austria, Canada, England, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, USA and the West-Indies/Barbados.

Anna G. Jónasdóttir, who opened the conference, had the pleasure to greet all the participants coming to a very cold but beautifully white Sweden. This included of course the GEXcel Fellows who had endured the coldest November in Sweden in 100 years! Particularly welcomed was the specially invited plenary speaker, *Rosemary Hennessy*, Professor of English and the Study of Women, Gender and Sexuality, Rice University, USA.

Jeff Hearn, Professor of Gender Studies, Linköping University, and Co-director of GEXcel, presented briefly the Excellence Centre and its main activities. In addition to Prof Hennessy, four of the GEXcel senior scholars acted as plenary speakers: Eudine Barriteau, Ann Ferguson, Stevi Jackson and Anna G. Jónasdóttir. Short summaries of all speeches are included in this volume. The visiting plenary speakers participated also in the workshops.

Prior to the Conference of Workshops, all papers were distributed to the workshop participants. Each paper was commented on by an appointed discussant followed by a more general discussion. Each work-

shop was chaired by one person whereas another took notes for a report to be read out at the last day's plenary session. In addition to the Co-editor of this volume, Sofia Strid, who reported from Workshop 1: Valerie Bryson, Jeff Hearn, Liisa Husu, Kathleen B. Jones and Gunnel Karlsson, thank you all for taking on these tasks and performing them excellently. All three reports are included in this volume.

The conference expanded and strengthened the foundation for future collaboration and further research on the subject of *Love*, as laid out in 2007-08 through the work on the GEXcel theme 1, *Gender, Sexuality and Global Change*, where love was a partial topic. One output of the work on that theme, the edited volume *Sexuality, Gender and Power. Intersectional and Transnational Perspectives*, was released by Routledge at the very moment of the December Conference. Similarly, a collection of essays coming out of the Research Theme 10, is already in process, edited by Jónasdóttir and Ferguson. A number of papers from the conference sessions have been selected to be considered for this publication.

The contents of this report is organised thematically and alphabetically. After this Introduction, the summaries of the five plenary speeches follow. The chapter order is the same as their chronological order in the conference programme. Then, the main part of the volume is divided in three sections based on the three subthemes, each containing the summaries of the papers presented, here in authors' alphabetic order. Each section begins by the workshop report.

We would like to thank Mia Fogel, Lena Gunnarsson, Gunnel Karlsson and Monica Wettler for all their assistance in the management of GEXcel at Örebro during the Autumn, and in particular the arrangements of the December Conference. Special thanks to Kathleen B. Jones for her invaluable advice on the external applicants for the conference. Thanks also to the colleagues in the Centre for Feminist Social Studies (CFS), Örebro University, and our GEXcel partners at Linköping University for all their support and more or less active participation.

Chapter 1

Mapping and Making/Re-making *Love Studies* as a Field of Knowledge Interests

Anna G. Jónasdóttir

Successively through the 1990s and specifically since the millennium shift a growing interest in the subject of love can be seen in various scholarly disciplines and multi-/interdisciplinary areas, among them areas where love as a topic would not be expected (e.g. economic theory and management philosophy, feminist theory and gender studies, history, neuroscience, philosophy, political theory/philosophy, psychology, sociology, theology). Recent arrangements such as research networks and conferences focussing on love themes indicate a changing attitude towards love as a significant subject in its own right. Among publishers of academic works, previous reluctance to accept the word ‘love’ in titles of books and articles seems to have not only disappeared but even turned to the opposite. In sociology, and social theory more generally, where love has been seen (if seen at all) as, at best, of marginal interest but otherwise considered ‘awkward’ and ‘impossible’ to approach without translating it into other terms, a noticeable shift in attitudes has occurred. In psychology, where love has been a subject of considerable scientific interest for longer than in most other disciplines (except in literature and some other fields of cultural studies), feminist influence has been surprisingly weak.

Among feminists love, especially sexual love and maternal love, has for a long time been a burning (political) issue. Consequently, love as such has been even more difficult to deal with seriously in feminist theory and research than in non-feminist fields. Yet, even in feminist theory and practice, love has become visible (again) as a theoretical problem and political issue. *Why? What is this new research interest in love about? Why is it arising now, and why seemingly more so, or at least differently, in non-feminist than feminist circles? How are feminist theorists dealing – or not dealing – with love today?* A general assumption here is that the increasing scholarly interest in the phenomenon and concept of love has to do with contemporary social (socioeconomic, sociosexual and sociocultural) and political actualities that need to be understood



and approached theoretically, historically and politically – in particular by feminist researchers.

An overall aim of the research theme, ‘Love in Our Time’, is to investigate the growing attention to love as a subject for serious social and political theory among both non-feminist and feminist scholars. In particular, it invites studies that investigate this emerging, heterogeneous field of *Love Studies* through feminist lenses, locating love historically and discussing its theoretical and political significance. When I say ‘historically’ I imply both time and space.

More concretely, the research programme put forward here as Theme 10, ‘Love in Our Time – A Question for Feminism’ has two partial aims. One seeks to map the emerging field of knowledge interests in love and, thus, to promote various feminist ways of analysing love critically and constructively. The other is to contribute substantially to the making and remaking of this field by inviting scholars to approach specifically one or another of the three subthemes outlined below.

In my plenary talk at the conference in Örebro in December 2010 I addressed the ‘love question’ in two ways. Firstly, I described and characterised, broadly, the field I have named *Love Studies*. I see it as a heterogeneous and tension-ridden field of conflicted knowledge interests, a field that to some extent and in a certain sense is a new field. Assuming that to evoke a field of study as in some sense ‘new’ is not to say that there is no continuity with previous studies. I underpin my view by a set of at least four (empirically observable) criteria:

1. There is a **quantitative growth** in the use of the term love in academic activities (projects, conferences, networks, publications).
2. Love as a topic addressed in its own terms is **extending** to many more disciplines and fields than it used to be before 1990.
3. Love is being seen, increasingly, also among feminist theorists, as a **productive force with (at least a potential) positive value**, which means that love must be conceptualised and theorised also beyond the constraining power of a delusion called ‘romantic love’.
4. Both among anarchist political philosophers interested in **revolution and** social and political theorists aiming rather to help **maintain social order**, love is invoked as a specifically interesting key concept.

Secondly, I commented briefly on each of the three subthemes that make up this research programme and which the conference was organised around.

1. Gendered interests in sexual love, for instance how (if at all) care practices relate to erotic agency.
2. Temporal dimensions of loving and love activities, preferably as compared with temporalities of working, or labour activities; or with thinking and action time. Is there a philosophy and politics of time that should be distinguished and developed about love, to understand better the social conditions, cultural meanings and political struggles of/over love in our time?
3. Love as a strong force in the intersection between politics and religion and also as a useful key concept for a new political theory of global revolution [and/or for a new theory of social order]. What is to be said and done from feminist points of view about postmodern revitalising of pre-modern ideas of passionate love?¹

By anticipating certain critical questions that each subtheme is begging, I framed this part of my talk as answers to some such questions. The following offers a short summary of my comments. In this research programme, ‘gender’ is not limited to a binary concept including only women and men seen as two closed and homogeneous categories of masculine and feminine identities or subjectivities. Rather gender is used as an inclusive, relational concept: relations between women and men as well as between/among women and between/among men. Furthermore, women-men, women-women, men-men – or whatever queer constellations of subjectivities and sociosexual relationships we are interested in and identify for further study – are always, in the concrete, made of and are making various intersectional ‘wholes’ or open-ended complexities. Gender is also used as a link concept (Connell 1987) and as a short name for a multi-level and multi-dimensional framework to approach whole societies or social formations. Moreover, gender can be used as an empirically open concept when it comes to inequality, which means that gender relations are not necessarily, not simply by definition, a hierarchy.

‘*Gendered interests in sexual love*’, then, can refer to *different* sociosexual interests in sexual love, not only heterosexual ones. A further implication is that the notion of ‘gendered interests in sexual love’ has a (theoretical, conceptual) room not only for oppressive or exploitative interests but also for non-oppressive, non-exploitative possibilities. Finally, as to subtheme one, ‘sexual love’ should not be conflated with ‘romantic love’. Sexual love is taken here as a wider concept, of which romantic love can perhaps be seen as a variant. What distinguishes romantic love,

¹ I modified this original formulation of subtheme 3 when preparing a roundtable discussion in November 2010 (see Appendix 1). The modified version was also used in the programme for workshop 3 at the December Conference (see Appendix 4 C).

however, according to its conceptual history (Luhmann 1986), is that it does not refer to love as a relational activity, something that is felt and practiced in existing lived relationships between people. Rather, it refers to *imagination* in individuals, imagination *about* a love object, and about one's own relation and position to that object. An interesting question is, how it comes that in contemporary gender studies and feminist theory, the phrase sexual love is hardly used anymore, whereas romantic love seems to have taken its place.

The questions raised about time in the second subtheme, '*Temporal dimensions of loving and love activities*' open up a potentially huge area (as do all three subthemes in a way). Here I will just mark a few of my points. In order for time to be an interesting subject, space is/must be somehow connected to or integrated in it. 'Time' is, in a sense, an empty concept, it refers to or implies one or another material process, physical or social, such as human powers/energies/capacities, used and consumed in the production of life, the means of life and living conditions. Hence, what is being consumed in more or less 'time-consuming' social activities is human labour power, love power or other 'enminded' bodily energies (Jónasdóttir 1994: 219-21). Rather than (or in addition to) asking questions about women's *vs.* men's time, we can approach time as a dimension of the various activities and fundamental productive/reproductive processes in which people are involved when making their living and themselves. Whether, to what extent and how women and men actually do live/experience different times (*Eigenzeit*), when practicing these activities, then becomes empirically open questions resulting in historically and culturally varying answers. Such questions can/will be put differently dependent on which specific theories are employed to generate and frame them.

A critical point of departure in the subtheme three, '*Love as a Multi-Dimensional Cultural Construction and/or a Useful Key Concept for a New Political Theory of Global Revolution? Feminist perspectives*' is the fact that a number of grand old men among leftist intellectuals (anarchist philosophers, literary scholars as well as sociologists) have recently put love at the centre of their political vision for a better (future socialist) world, to be reached through a global revolution (Hardt and Negri, see bibliography) or otherwise. These politics of love programmes translate love into pleasure, joy and fun, and a key idea is the 'universal'. The importance of 'universal pleasure' and '[s]ensual festivity' is underlined, as opposite to segregated struggles of different groups of people (cf. e.g. Therborn 2008: 64-5). What I think feminists should pay attention to here is, firstly, that radical, revolutionary, reformist, even reactionary thinkers are often playing around on the same battle-ground. Secondly,

it seems that the intellectual forces employed by managers of global capital always are ahead of other institutions and movements in making use of ideas and efficient techniques to reach, ‘tap into’, and manage human affects including love.

Finally (and to be elaborated later), I brought in two other ‘radical’ men (Karl Marx and Jeffrey Weeks 2007) and their understanding of the revolutionary potential of sexual love; its significance for realistically envisioning social equality among people, and how vital ‘the full human equality of men and women’ is thought to be for a further progress towards other forms of equality and for winning the many ‘unfinished revolutions’ going on in the world (cf. Jónasdóttir 1994: 210-11, 2009a: 73-79, 2011: 45, 57).

Selected Bibliography

- Akerlof, George A. and Shiller, Robert J. (2009) *Animal Spirits. How human psychology drives the economy, and why it matters for global capitalism*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Axelsson, Jonas (2009) *Dominanser – En utveckling av den realistiska livsformsteorin* (with English Summary). Karlstad: Karlstad University Studies 2009: 6.
- Barriteau, Eudine (2008) ‘”Coming, Coming, Coming Home”: Applying Anna Jónasdóttir’s theory of “love power” to theorising sexuality and power in Caribbean gender relations’, in Lena Gunnarsson (ed.) *GEXcel Work in Progress Report, Volume III. Proceedings from GEXcel Theme 1: Gender, Sexuality and Global Change*, Linköping: Tema Genus Report Series No. 7 and Örebro: CFS Report Series No. 9.
- (2011) ‘Theorizing sexuality and power in Caribbean gender relations’, in Anna G. Jónasdóttir, Valerie Bryson and Kathleen B. Jones (eds) *Sexuality, Gender and Power. Intersectional and Transnational Perspectives*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (2003) *Liquid Love. On the frailty of human bonds*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, Ulrich and Beck-Gersheim, Elisabeth (1990/1995) *The Normal Chaos of Love*, trans. M. Ritter and J. Wiebel. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Cixous, Hélène (2005/2008) *Love Itself in the Letterbox*, trans. P. Kamuf. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1987) *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Douglas, Carole Anne (1990) *Love & Politics. Radical Feminist and Lesbian Theories*. San Francisco: ism press.
- Duncombe, Jean and Marsden, Dennis (1993) ‘Love and Intimacy: The Gender Division of Emotion and “Emotion Work”. A neglected aspect of sociological discussion of heterosexual relationships’, *Sociology* 27(2): 221-241.
- Evans, Mary (2003) *Love. An unromantic discussion*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Featherstone, Mike (ed.) (1999) *Love & Eroticism*. London: SAGE.
- Ferguson, Ann (1989) *Blood at the Root: Motherhood, Sexuality and Male Dominance*. London: Pandora/Unwin & Hyman.
- (1991) *Sexual Democracy: Women, Oppression and Revolution*. Boulder: Westview.
- Giddens, Anthony (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity: self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (1992) *The Transformation of Intimacy: sexuality, love & eroticism in modern societies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gunnarsson, Lena (forthcoming 2011) ‘A defence of the category “women”’, *Feminist Theory*.
- Grenholm, Cristina (2005) *Moderskap och kärlek. Schabloner och tankeutrymme i feministteologisk livsåskådningsreflektion*. Nora: Nya Doxa.
- Haavind, Hanne (1984) ‘Love and power in marriage’, in Harriet Holter (ed.) *Patriarchy in a Welfare Society*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio (2009) *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- (2004) *Multitude. War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: The Penguin Press.
- (2000) *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hendrick, Susan S. and Hendrick, Clyde (1992) *Romantic Love*. Newbury Park: SAGE.
- Hesford, Victoria (2009) ‘The Politics of Love: Women’s Liberation and Feeling Differently’, *Feminist Theory* 10 (1): 5-33.
- Hochschild, Arlie R. (1983) *The Managed Heart*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- hooks, bell (2001) *All About Love. New visions*. New York: Perennial.
- Irigaray, Luce (2002) *The Way of Love*. Trans, H. Bostic and S. Pluhá ek. London/New York: Continuum.

- Jackson, Stevi (1993) 'Even Sociologists Fall in Love: An Exploration in the Sociology of Emotions', *Sociology* 27(2): 201-20. Reprinted in Jackson, Stevi (1999) *Heterosexuality in Question*. London: Sage.
- Jakobsen, Liselotte (1999) *Livsform, kön och risk. En utveckling och tillämpning av realistisk livsformsanalys* (with English Summary). Lund: Arkiv.
- Jakobsen, Liselotte and Karlsson, Jan Ch. (1993) *Arbete och kärlek. En utveckling av livsformsanalys*. Lund: Arkiv.
- Johnson, Paul (2005) *Love, Heterosexuality and Society*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Jónasdóttir, Anna G. (1991) *Love Power and Political Interests: towards a theory of patriarchy in contemporary western societies*. Örebro University: Örebro Studies 7.
- (1994) *Why Women Are Oppressed*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- (2003) *Kärlekskraft, makt och politiska intressen. En teori om patriarkatet i nutida västerländska samhällen*. (Swedish translation of *Love Power and Political Interests* 1991/*Why Women Are Oppressed* 1994) Göteborg: Daidalos, 2003.
- (2009a) 'Feminist questions, Marx's method and the theorisation of "love power"', in Anna G. Jónasdóttir and Kathleen B. Jones (eds) (2009) *The Political Interests of Gender Revisited. Redoing theory and research with a feminist face*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- (2009b) 'Gender relations and historical materialism – still a contested connection: a critique of Frigga Haug', in Cecilia Åsberg, Katharine Harrison, Björn Pernrud and Malena Gustavson (eds) *Gender Delight: science, knowledge, culture and writing ... for Nina Lycke*. Linköping: Tema Genus Series of Interdisciplinary Gender Research in progress and Transformation, no 1.
- (2009c) 'Is exploitation only bad – or what kind of power is love power?' (also in Spanish translation) in *Poder, poderes y empoderamiento... ¿Y el amor? ¡Ah, el amor! Actas 5º Congreso Estatal Isonomía sobre Igualdad entre mujeres y hombres*. Available Online at HTTP: <www.uji.es/bin/publ/edicions/iso5c.pdf> (accessed 11 April 2010).
- (2011) 'What kind of power is "love power"?' in Anna G. Jónasdóttir, Valerie Bryson and Kathleen B. Jones (eds) *Sexuality, Gender and Power. Intersectional and Transnational Perspectives*. New York and London: Routledge.

- Jónasdóttir, Anna G. and Jones, Kathleen B. (eds) (2009a) *The Political Interests of Gender Revisited. Redoing theory and research with a feminist face*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- (2009b) ‘Out of Epistemology: feminist theory in the 1980s and beyond’, in Anna G. Jónasdóttir and Kathleen B. Jones (eds) (2009) *The Political Interests of Gender Revisited. Redoing theory and research with a feminist face*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Jones, Kathleen B. (2000) *Living Between Danger and Love: The Limits of Choice*. Rutgers University Press.
- Jones, Kathleen B. and Karlsson, Gunnar (eds) (2008) *Gender and the Interests of Love. Essays in honour of Anna G. Jónasdóttir*. CFS Report Series 8, Örebro University, www.publications.oru.se
- Kipnis, Laura (2003) *Against Love: a polemic*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Kristeva, Julia (1987a) *Tales of Love*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.
- (1987b) *In the Beginning Was Love*. Trans. A. Goldhammer. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Langford, Wendy (1999) *Revolutions of the Heart: Gender, power and the delusions of love*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Luhmann, Niklas (1986) *Love as Passion: The Codification of Intimacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lynch, Kathleen (1989) ‘Solidary labour: its nature and marginalisation’, *Sociological Review* 37(1): 1-13.
- (2007) ‘Love labour as a Distinct and Non-Commodifiable Form of Care Labour’, *Sociological Review* 54(3): 550-570.
- Lynch, Kathleen, Baker, John, and Lyons, Maureen (2009) *Affective Equality: Love, Care and Injustice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mackay, Fiona (2001) *Love and Politics. Women Politicians and the Ethics of Care*. London: Continuum.
- Simmel, Georg (1984) *Georg Simmel: On Women, Sexuality and Love*, ed. Guy Oakes, London: Yale University Press.
- Singer, Irving (2009) *The Nature of Love*, trilogy with new prefaces. Cambridge Massachusetts and London: The MIT Press.
- (2009) *Philosophy of Love. A Partial Summing-up*. Cambridge Massachusetts and London: The MIT Press.
- Sjöholm, Cecilia (2005) *Kristeva & the Political*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Smart, Carole (2006) 'Paul Johnson, *Love, Heterosexuality and Society. A Book Review*', *Sociology* 40(5): 973-974.
- (2007) *Personal Life. New Directions in Sociological Thinking*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Soble, Alan (1990) *The Structure of Love*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Solomon, Robert C. (1994/2006) *About Love. Reinventing Romance for our times*. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett.
- Sternberg, Robert J. and Karin Weis (eds) (2006) *The New Psychology of Love*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Strid, Sofia and Anna G. Jónasdóttir (eds) (2010) *GEXcel Work in Progress Report, Volume VIII. Proceedings from GEXcel Theme 10: Love in Our Time – A Question for Feminism, Spring 2010*. Linköping: Tema Genus Report Series No. 12 and Örebro: CFS Report Series No. 14.
- Therborn, Göran (2008) *From Marxism To Post-Marxism?* London and New York: Verso.
- Toye, Margaret E. (2010) 'Towards a poethics of love: poststructuralist feminist ethics and literary creation', *Feminist Theory* 11(1): 39-55.
- Wagner, David (2000) *What's Love Got to Do with It? A Critical Look at American Charity*. New York: The New Press.
- Weeks, Jeffrey (2007) *The World We Have Won. The Remaking of the Erotic and Intimate Life*. London and New York: Routledge.



Chapter 2

Bread and Roses in the Commons

Rosemary Hennessey

'Love' is a strong cultural attractor, ideologically and historically freighted with an array of normative romances that have recruited affective investments into commodified forms of value and mystified the pleasures of the labour that ensures our collective wellbeing. Yet we harbour a loyalty to love, a sense that the positive social bonds that love conjures are necessary to human survival, tied to a fundamental human condition of dependency on relations of care that sustain life and to the passions that motivate action on behalf of others and for a better world.

In this essay I consider Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's recent political re-narration of love as a political value and a material force fundamental to the constitution of the common and I consider its relevance to the question of love for feminism. In the essay's second part, I outline what an alternative materialist and feminist approach to the body and affect might entail and its implications for a radical politics of love. In the essay's final section, I place alongside these arguments some love stories from the organising struggles to reclaim the commons led by women workers in grassroots communities in northern Mexico. I turn to these instances of women organising not as models, but in order to address the possibilities and problems they pose in the practice of love, both of which are instructive to consider as we puzzle through the difficult articulation of surplus love in the affective cultures of labour and community organising.

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's recent book *Commonwealth* (2009) highlights the concept of love as a bio-political value and a material force fundamental to the constitution of the commons. Hardt and Negri are interested in the fact that capital accumulation appropriates common forms of knowledge, social relationship, and affect in order to generate surplus value. This 'common' of cooperation extends across social and cultural practices and does not lend itself to the logic of scarcity. It is, they argue, an 'externality' for capital. Cesare Casarino elaborates on Negri's concept of the commons. He reminds us that the capitalist may discipline bodies to ensure cooperation on the job, but he or she does not completely expropriate the common resource of cooperation. This excess, or what Casarino calls a 'surplus potential', lies at the heart of the commons in that 'solidarity, care for others, creating community, and cooperating in common projects is an essential survival mechanism'



(180). Surplus value is accrued through the violent separation of labour power from all of its products – including the physical form and living personality of human beings. But surplus common is an unexploitable surplus, a potentiality that remains and is lived and incorporated in our bodies. As a name for the affective capacity accompanying the labour of cooperation and care that builds and nourishes this common, we might call the outlawed surplus that is both immanent to capitalist social relations and outside it ‘love.’

While the Mexican factory workers involved in organising campaigns may not use these terms, their activities aim to transform the unmet or surplus needs capitalism produces – its outside – from a surplus potential immanent to it. I am interested in whether love can serve as a name for affects that are made meaningful in that process, whether we might conceptualise this fragile and fraught potential as a ‘surplus love’ that propels a desire for the commons and the political subjectivity that accompanies it.

I reflect on some of the narrative evidence from workers and from feminist scholarship that has recognised this surplus commons. As both the medium for social movement and a site of struggle, this capacity for cooperation clings to aspirations for revolutionary change and is eroded by emotions that cloud our understanding of the material relations in which we live. The labour of organising in all of its negotiations of knowledge and passion attests that if we choose ‘love’ as the name for the affect-laden surplus common, we will have to grapple with its demanding and dangerous pleasures.

References

- Ahmed, Sara (2004) *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Babb, Florence (2007) ‘Queering Love and Globalization’, *GLQ* 13(1): 111-123.
- Breines, Winnie (2002) ‘What’s Love Got to Do With It?: White Women, Black Women, and Feminism in the Movement Years’, *Signs* 27(4): 1095-1133.
- Caffentzis, George (2010) ‘The Future of “The Commons”: Neoliberalism’s “Plan B” or the Original Disaccumulation of Capital?’ *New Formations* 69(1): 23-41.
- Casarino, Cesare and Antonio Negri (2008) *In Praise of the Common*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Dalla Costa, Mariarosa and James, Selma (1972) *The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community*. Bristol, UK: Falling Wall Press.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara and Arlie Hochschild (eds) (2004) *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers*. New York: Holt.
- Federici, Silvia (2004) *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body, and Primitive Accumulation*. Brooklyn, NY: Autonomedia.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri (2001) *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- ____ (2005) *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- ____ (2009) *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hennessy, Rosemary (2000) *Profit and Pleasure: Sexual Identities in Late Capitalism*. New York: Routledge.
- Hemmings, Clare (2005) 'Invoking Affect: Cultural Theory and the ontological turn', *Cultural Studies* 19(5): 548-567.
- Hesford, Victoria (2009) 'The Politics of Love: Women's Liberation and Feeling Differently', *Feminist Theory* 10(1): 5-33.
- Hochschild, Arlie (1985) *The Managed Heart: The Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Klein, Naomi (2001) 'Reclaiming the Commons', *New Left Review* May-June: 81-89.
- Lutz, Catherine (1998) *Unnatural Emotions: Everyday Sentiments on a Micronesian Atoll and Their Challenge to Western Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mies, Maria and Veronica Bennholdt-Thompson (2000) *The Subsistence Perspective: Beyond the Globalized Economy*. London: Zed Books.
- Nonini, Donald M. (ed.) (2007) *The Global Idea of the Commons*. NY: Berghahn Books.
- Reddy, William M. (2001) *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reid, Herbert and Betsy Taylor (2010) *Recovering the Commons: Democracy, Place, and Global Justice*. Bloomington, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Saleh, Ariel (ed.) (2009) *Eco-Sufficiency and Global Justice*. London: Pluto Press.
- Schepper-Hughes (1993) *Death without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Secombe, Wally (1995) *A Millennium of Family Change*. New York: Verso.
- Shiva, Vandana (1995) *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology, Development*. London: Zed Books.
- Solomon, R. C. (1995) *A Passion for Justice: Emotions and the Origins of the Social Contract*. Lanham: Rowman and Middlefield.
- Weeks, Kathi (1998) *Constituting Feminist Subjects*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.



Chapter 3

Love, Social Change and Heterosexuality

Stevi Jackson

Heterosexuality may seem, in most Western societies, to be less securely entrenched than it once was, with the increased visibility of same-sex relationships and advances in citizenship rights for lesbian and gay individuals and couples. I contend, however, that while heterosexuality may not be as compulsory as it once was, it is still institutionalised (Seidman 2010). Love is a key ideological element in this institutionalisation, but has also been used in the legitimisation of same-sex partnerships, in justifying claims to rights and protections similar to those accruing to heterosexual couples.

I argue for the need to revisit and revive critical feminist perspectives on love while not denying that it is highly valued by many women. I take it as axiomatic that love is a social phenomenon and in mapping its social parameters I draw on the framework I have previously applied to heterosexuality (Jackson 2006; Jackson and Scott 2010). I suggest that the social should be thought of as multi-dimensional, comprising four interrelated, cross-cutting dimensions: structure, meaning, practice and subjectivity. Structurally love is socially ordered and has material underpinnings and effects; it is implicated in the maintenance of gender division and institutionalised heterosexuality as well as being caught up in the demands of consumer capitalism. The meanings of love are constructed and elaborated through discourses and representations within our wider culture and also though the ‘commonsense’ assumptions of day to day interaction. These everyday meanings of love link it to practices of love and to its subjective, personal meanings. Love is thus produced and reproduced through socially located interactions and practices, through the ‘doing’ of love in given relationships. Finally, love is subjectively felt as an emotion – indeed this is what, for many, love is. It should not, however, be assumed that this emotion is natural, that it is unaffected by the social – on the contrary what and how we feel is always socially mediated. All of these aspects of love are social, and all interrelate and impact on each other, but not always predictably, giving rise to contradictions, tensions and dissonances.

If love is wholly social, this raises the issue of its cultural and historical specificity. There has been much historical and sociological work

charting changes in the conduct of love relationships. There are differences, however, in the degree to which the emotion of love is itself seen as variable. Whereas some historians and sociologists suggest only shifts in the regulation and practice of love resulting from the progress of modernity, others make claims for more fundamental transformations at the level of subjective feeling. Arlie Hochschild, for example has emphasised that culturally and historically variable ‘feeling rules’ shape what it is possible to feel; of love she says: ‘people in different eras and places do not just feel the same old emotion and express it differently. They feel it differently’ (Hochschild 2003: 122).

A persistent feature of heterosexual love (and increasingly of couple love in general) is its exclusivity. ‘Like so much butter, romantic love must be spread thickly on one slice of bread; to spread it over several is to spread it too thinly’ (Comer 1974: 219). Yet no one thinks a woman with several children is spreading her love more thinly than a mother of an only child. We may love friends but here, too, love can be spread around. Serial monogamy may be widely practised, monogamy may be threatened by ‘infidelity’, but the ideal of monogamy persists and has barely been dented by a century of feminist critique. Feminists have questioned the use of (unequally enforced) monogamy to secure men’s exclusive rights over individual women and the immorality of treating one’s lover as a possession. They have pointed to the dangers of investing too much emotional energy in loving an individual man and becoming ensnared into an oppressive heterosexual relationship: ‘it starts when you sink into his arms and ends with your arms in his sink.’ Looked at structurally, men continue to appropriate women’s bodies and labour, their whole persons, their ‘love power’ (Delphy 1984; Jónasdóttir 1994). Love becomes a means by which women’s caring is secured, but this is not generally reflected in its subjective meaning; because women care *about* those they care *for*, care is often highly valued as central to the practice of love.

There was another, and important, reason for earlier feminist scepticism about monogamy and the forms of family life built upon it – that it impoverished and devalued relationships outside the monogamous couple and their family (Firestone (1972; Barrett and McIntosh 1982). The privileging of coupledom is as entrenched as ever and now, in many western countries, it is extended to lesbian and gay couples. Here love may now be legally and socially validated in both its heterosexual and homosexual forms, but the normalisation of homosexuality creates new exclusions (Seidman 2005; Richardson 2004), reinforcing the ideal of the monogamous couple as the normative basis of adult life. We should maybe heed the warnings of those earlier feminists on the consequences

of concentrating of love and care into couples and families and think critically about the ways in which the boundaries of the normative are being redrawn..

References

- Michelle Barrett and Mary McIntosh (1982) *The Anti-Social Family*. London: Verso
- Comer, Lee (1974) *Wedlocked Women*. Leeds: The Feminist Press.
- Delphy, Christine (1984) *Close to Home*. London: Hutchinson.
- Jackson, Stevi (2006) 'Gender, Sexuality and Heterosexuality: The Complexity (and Limits) of Heteronormativity', *Feminist Theory* 7(1): 105-121.
- Jackson, Stevi and Scott, Sue (2010) *Theorizing Sexuality*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Firestone, Shulamith (1972) *The Dialectic of Sex*. London: Paladin.
- Hochschild, Arlie (2003) *The Commercialization of Intimate Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jónasdóttir, Anna G. (1994) *Why Women Are Oppressed*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Richardson, Diane (2004) 'Locating Sexualities: From Here to Normality', *Sexualities* 7(4): 391-411.
- Seidman, Steven (2005) 'From Polluted Homosexual to the Normal Gay', in Chrys Ingraham (ed.) (2005) *Thinking Straight*. New York: Routledge.
- Seidman, Steven (2009) Critique of Compulsory Heterosexuality, *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*. *Journal of NSRC* 6(1): 18-28.

Chapter 4

A Return to Love: A Caribbean Feminist Explores an Epistemic Conversation Between Audre Lorde's 'the Power of the Erotic' and Anna Jónasdóttir 'Love Power'

Violet Eudine Barriteau

In a 1978 essay, Black Lesbian Feminist philosopher Audre Lorde crystallised two decades of work to offer feminist scholarship the theorisation of the erotic as power, 'as the nurturer or nursemaid of all our deepest knowledge' (Lorde 1984: 56). In the process of her theorising Lorde links love to epistemology and ontology. Beginning in 1980, Nordic feminist philosopher, Anna Jónasdóttir constructed a complex and sophisticated theoretical examination of why, patriarchal relations of domination, specifically, male dominance over women, continue to persist in contemporary Western societies (Jónasdóttir 1994). Jónasdóttir's contribution to feminist epistemology is often referred to as her theory of love power, because, in answer to the question she poses on what is being done to women who are perceived as free and equal, in yet still patriarchal Western society, she answers, 'men exploit a certain power resource in women, namely the power of love' (Jónasdóttir 1994: 214). Kathleen Jones maintains that Jónasdóttir's theory is 'rooted in a materialist analysis of the political conditions of sexual love' (Jones 1994: xiii).

In this research, I prioritise investigating the erotic ecstasy of love power in the lives of Caribbean women by putting the theories of Anna Jónasdóttir and Audre Lorde in conversation with each other. I intend to use the outcome of that conversation to advance an understanding of women and heterosexual loving. My work underscores the centrality of love in women's lives while seeking to create strategies to delink heterosexuality from heterosexism in Caribbean societies.

The seed of this epistemic conversation was probably first planted in 2006, even though it is only recently I became conscious of its germination. In October 2006, I presented a paper at the twenty-fifth anniversary celebratory symposium of the Women's Research and Resource Center at Spelman College, Atlanta, USA, dedicated to honouring the

life and work of Audre Lorde. In my paper I stated, ‘Audre Lorde led the way in theorising sexuality as a source of power, exposing homophobia and heterosexism within black communities especially towards black lesbians.’ Even though I had asked then, ‘How much of Audre Lorde’s path breaking work in theorising the range of women’s sexuality, has informed work on women’s sexuality in the Caribbean or elsewhere?’ (Barriteau 2007; 2009), it is not until I received an invitation from GEXcel to participate in research on Theme 10, did I consciously think of exploring the possible intersections of Lorde’s and Jónasdóttir’s work.

Lorde’s reclaiming of the sexuality of black women, affirming black women’s erotic agency is very significant. I come from a region marked by abuse, desensitisation and demonization of the sexuality of indigenous, African and Indian descended women.² To have our sexuality reaffirmed and infused with subjectivity, sensuality and erotic pleasure I find very empowering. More critically I see the potential for devising strategies for women to embrace the power of the erotic in their lives.

The anomalies and asymmetries around Caribbean women and economic autonomy, political participation and leadership, educational achievement, survival strategies, differing family forms and socio-sexual unions are well documented (Barriteau 2011). They parallel and compare with what Jónasdóttir has noted about the persistence of men’s power position over women in contemporary Western societies including Nordic countries. In the Caribbean, what are less well known are explorations into the intimacies of women’s socio-sexual unions and their sexual relations from their subjective locations. Producing knowledge on Black women and sexuality has been a contested project for some time. For Caribbean women, the majority of whom are African-descended, that knowledge has been generated in the context of conquest, slavery, colonisation and ongoing permutations of racist legacies and ideologies, if not racism. I agree with the researchers who have noted in popular and academic discourses, Black women’s sexuality has been objectified, commodified, made pathological, and imbued with a higher sex drive. Black women are supposed to have an unbridled, wild, sexual passion. When this unbridled sexuality was not the focus, then black women have also been presented as unsexed, having no sexuality; again a sharp bifurcation, whorish or Mammy, Nanny or Jezebel (Hammonds 1993;

2 I do believe there is a certain commonality across cultures and geographic spaces to the abuse and denigration of women’s sexuality. However, when this abuse intersects with the absence of political, economic and cultural freedoms, and that sexuality is simultaneously desired and denigrated, consumed and condemned, then what is produced is a perversion of the sexual subjectivities of African descended women in the Caribbean, North and South America, the African ‘New World’ Diaspora.

Hill Collins 2005). As a result, a focus on the erotic and the erotic as an explicit aspect of sexual love and love relationships became increasingly important to how I engaged simultaneously with Jónasdóttir's theorising and Caribbean women's complex heterosexual unions experienced in a range of family forms and relationship types.

Even though Jónasdóttir's work is theoretically more sophisticated in its structural presentation and development, I argue Audre Lorde's thesis is more compelling for Caribbean feminists, and offers powerful epistemological and methodological openings that illuminate what is simultaneously possible and problematic in apprehending the phenomenon of love power as theorised by Jonasdottir. Jónasdóttir's theory is equally powerful but seems to anchor 'love power' in only a materialist explanation. Lorde's definition of the erotic as a life force widens and reconceptualises the epistemological base for theorising love, passion and desire in women's lives. According to Lorde, love power or the power of the erotic is also ontological; it is a condition of being.

Because both Lorde and Jónasdóttir emphasise the particularity and historicity of their locations, their ideas and assumptions are better suited for intellectual travelling. They both avoid the dangers of theoretical frames that originate in assumptions grounded in particular cultures, space and time but are presented as universal and a-historical. Both Jónasdóttir and Lorde historicised their theorising. Lorde repeatedly stressed how the events of her personal life and the events of the period in which she grew up in the United States defined her politics, her relationships, her child rearing practices, and her view of what should be done (Byrd, Cole and Guy-Sheftall 2009). Jónasdóttir has also set out how she theorised love power in an attempt to deal with contradictions in contemporary western societies, (especially Nordic ones) in which all the legislative, political and economic trappings of women's equality exist but men's power prevail. Both women questioned gender inequalities at a systemic or context level even though they used a different vocabulary to do so. As a scholar in the academy, Jónasdóttir uses the language of feminist political analysis and political economy. Trained as a poet, Lorde uses the language of the Arts and the language of protest by infusing her personal, subversive style with a literal and figurative commitment to rupturing silence.

The outcomes of this conversation are several and yet ongoing. By examining the questions implied by the implicit or explicit assumptions of the two frames, I expand my ongoing theorisation of women's sexualised power in the contemporary Commonwealth Caribbean. The research advances my ongoing project to centralise a study of women's heterosexual relations as yielding knowledge about relations of domi-



nation in women's public and private/intimate lives. I produce greater insights about women and heterosexual loving even as it underscores and prioritises the centrality of love and erotic ecstasy in women's lives. It offers initial strategies to delink heterosexuality from heterosexism by deploying Lorde's lesbian feminist theorising. Finally the work enables new questions to be asked of old phenomena, specifically by utilising Lorde's emphasis on the 'uses of the erotic'.

References

- Barriteau, Eudine (2011) 'Theorizing Sexuality and Power in Caribbean Gender Relations', in Anna G. Jónasdóttir, Valerie Bryson and Kathleen B. Jones (eds) (2011) *Sexuality, Gender and Power*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Barriteau, Eudine (2009) 'The Relevance of Black Feminist Scholarship: A Caribbean Perspective', in Stanlie M. James, Frances Smith Foster and Beverly Guy-Sheftall (eds) (2009) *Still Brave: The Evolution of Black Women's Studies*. New York: The Feminist Press.
- Barriteau, Eudine (2007) 'The Theoretical Strengths and Relevance of Black Feminist Scholarship: A Caribbean Feminist Perspective', *Feminist Africa* 7(1): 9-31.
- Byrd, Randolph P., Cole, Johnetta Betsch and Guy-Sheftall, Beverley (eds) (2009) *I am your Sister: Collected and Unpublished Writings of Audre Lorde*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hammond, Evelyn M. (1993) 'Towards a Genealogy of Black Female Sexuality and the Problematic of Silence', in *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*. Eds. Jacquie Alexander and Chandra Mohanty, Routledge: New York.
- Hill Collins, Patricia (2005) *Black Sexual Politics: African Americans, Gender and the New Racism*. New York: Routledge.
- Jónasdóttir, Anna G. (1994) *Why Women are Oppressed*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Jones, Kathleen B. (1994) 'Foreword', in Anna G. Jónasdóttir (1994) *Why Women are Oppressed*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lorde, Audre (1984) *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Berkeley: Crossing Press.
- ____ [no date] 'Anthology of Erotic Poetry', Correspondence [n.d.] Audre Lorde Collection, Box 14, Spelman College Archives.
- ____ [no date] 'The Erotic as Power.' Audre Lorde Collection, Box 18, Spelman College Archives.



Chapter 5

Love, Solidarity and a Politics of Love

Ann Ferguson

In this paper I will outline a feminist radical politics of Love that stems from a materialist feminist analysis of the contemporary patriarchal affective economy in its relation with white supremacist capitalist globalisation. As I have argued in my earlier books *Blood at the Root* and *Sexual Democracy* (Ferguson 1989, 1991) the relationships that are formed in the creation and exchange of emotional, sexual, and affectionate energies and pleasures form a semi-autonomous system of meeting these human needs necessary for human well-being. This system, which I have called ‘sex-affective production’ and now the ‘affective economy’, is a bodily-yet-social exchange of energies and pleasures that overlaps with the biological reproduction of new human beings as well as the reproduction of those who are involved in the material economy of production of goods (what economists think of as the Economy proper). Social domination systems, such as male, racial, ethnic and national domination, are importantly embedded in the processes of the affective economy while at the same time preserving or undermining economic class power in material economic systems such as slavery, feudalism, capitalism and certain types of totalitarian state socialism.

The theory is materialist feminist because it assumes that social power relations are built around meeting life needs related to the body, such as the material needs for food, water, shelter and health, but also social needs for love, affection, sexual connection, and a sense of belonging in relation to social groups (cf. Ferguson 1989, 1991, Hennessy 2000). My approach has much in common with other Dual Systems theorists (Rubin 1975, Mitchell 1974, Jónasdóttir 1994, 2009) that conceive of social domination as involving several overlapping systems in the contemporary world, not only capitalism, but patriarchy as a semi-autonomous system. As does Maria Lugones (2007), I add to my analysis a third system of domination, the institutionalised racism and ethничism inherited from Western imperialism and systems of slavery, but unlike her integrated world systems theory I see institutionalised racism and ethничism as a semi-autonomous system organising community self-understandings that sometimes support and sometimes are in tension with capitalism and patriarchy.

The affective economy, which in capitalism is managed not only in the production of individuals in family households but also in public

institutions, meets the needs for sexuality (erotic love) and affection of partners, children and elder kin by the production and exchange of caring/affective energies and labour. The exchange of love and affection, though it is usually pleasurable for the giver as well as the receiver, is motivated ultimately not by profit or self-interest but is sought as something intrinsically good. In this way, the logic of the affective economy differs from the capitalist and other material economies involving private property. This is not to imply that there are not domination relations in the affective economy; indeed there are, not only between individuals, but also between social groups organised by race/ethnicity, nationality and gender, among others.

Although the power logic of love relationships has empowered men in general more than women in general in patriarchal affective economies, it has not always been about individual exploitation by men of women in the family household. Indeed it can be argued that in advanced capitalist countries there has been a shift from private to public patriarchies (cf. Ferguson 1991, Walby 1990). In the present, although individual men often retain erotic and familial power over individual women, it is at the macro level in public institutions (the wage economy, politics and the state, religious organisations, the military) that patriarchy is perpetuated in the generalised social power and status of men over women. This is because women continue to be denied access to economic and political power due to the solidarity of men in public groups. The gendered division of labour in the public sites of the material economy and political state power allows for ongoing homoerotic relations between men in labour and political networks, who deny women easy access to better paying wage and salaried labour, corporate managerial power and state political power which are typed as men's work and social spaces. Thus, even though some women now escape exploitation in individual heterosexual love relations, the continuing gender divisions of waged public labour and unpaid private labour in family and community continue to distribute greater status, love and affective energy to men in the affective economy.

I will analyse the social contradictions developing because of the logic of neo-liberal capitalist economic production which presupposes social cooperation but operates through promoting the motive of individual self-interest and the goal of economic growth for private profits, a process which ignores the human and environmental costs of such an economic system. Capitalist production also conflicts with the logic of the affective economy, which involves caring labour and motivations directed to the good of particular others. To understand these social conflicts I will argue that there are new developing productive forces of love

(cf. also Lynch 2010) which contribute to what Che Guevara, Hardt and Negri (2004) and Hennessy (2000) call ‘revolutionary love’, that is, the solidarity love in social justice movements which creates a radical biopower of resistance to the political tactics of contemporary governmentality (Foucault 2008) supporting various forms of national and global biopower. Such a claim takes up threads suggested by anarchist theories, from Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari (1988), Hardt and Negri (2004), and the post-Marxist theory of J.K. Gibson-Graham (2006).

With them I start from the ontological perspective that the energies produced between people by active love practices are key to understanding the new autonomous social movements from below challenging corporate globalisation. But unlike them, I theorise two sorts of power involved in love practices, those which promote *power-over* relations (in hierachal domination structures), vs. those producing *power-with* relations in couple or group horizontal empowerment relations that provide a new ‘commons’ challenging possessiveness and private property. What these social movements have in common is a project to ‘take back’ or recreate ‘the commons’, that is, natural or human resources that are common goods that can be shared but now are either privatised or denied or ‘outlawed’ by neoliberal capitalist globalisation (For social movement examples, see Monteagudo 2011).

I will modify the anarchist theories which have theorised anti-capitalist movements, and will do so from a feminist perspective which critiques their masculinist assumptions about a politics of love (cf. also Wilkinson 2010). This requires theorising the ongoing conflicts between and within various forms of personal and political love relations that need to be taken into account in order to develop and apply alternative practices of conflict resolution in such radical social movements, including autonomous women’s and feminist movements, both at the individual couple micro-level and at the group macro-level (cf. Moreno and Sastre 2010). Feminists need to analyse and challenge oppressive types of love which may be at work, for example, the romantic love model that historically promoted male domination (Giddens 1992; Langford 1999), and group solidarities within which certain hierarchies of power are maintained and other groups marginalised. We can see such hierarchies operating in various ways that marginalise members because of gender, racial, ethnic, or sexual discrimination (Wilkinson 2010). Further, within social movements there remain certain kinds of couple conflicts, for example, those between men who don’t want their wives or woman partners to engage in group politics because it takes energies away from their private sexual, affective and caring relations in the couple or for children. Also groups need to find ways to deal with envy, jealousy and competition for power

at the individual level. These are key conflicts that social movements need to resolve to promote gender equality but also to augment their own group energies by supporting processes and practices that promote power-with (cooperative power) rather than power-over relations between individuals or sub-groups.

Feminist tactics toward this goal can involve, among others, autonomous feminist cultural processes of consciousness-raising, feminist therapy, feminist gender egalitarian conflict resolution practices taught by educators to the next generation (Moreno and Sastre 2010), or other experiments like feminist and queer polyamorous practices. This new feminist politics of love assumes an inclusive feminist standpoint which has an intersectional analysis of the social domination relations of capitalism, patriarchy, racism and neo-imperialism and heteronormativity, and therefore seeks to 'sidestream' (Alvarez 2009; Monteagudo 2011) feminist consciousness into social movements directed toward other radical social justice goals that seek to reclaim the commons (that is, the sharing of natural or human resources and common goods), and to eliminate the privatising forces of neoliberal global capitalism.

References

- Alvarez, Sonia (2009) 'Beyond NGO-ization?: Reflections from Latin America', *Development* 52(2):175-184.
- Ahmed, Sara (2004) *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York: Routledge
- Deleuze, Giles and Guattari, Félix (1988) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Ferguson, Ann (1989) *Blood at the Root: Motherhood, Sexuality and Male Dominance*. London: Pandora/Unwin & Hyman.
- (1991) *Sexual Democracy: Women, Oppression and Revolution*. Boulder: Westview.
- (2009) 'Feminist paradigms of solidarity and justice', *Philosophical Topics* 37(1): 161-177.
- (2011) 'How is global solidarity possible?' In Anna G. Jónasdóttir, Valerie Bryson, and Kathleen B. Jones (eds) (2011) *Sexuality, Gender and Power*. New York: Routledge.
- Foucault, Michel (1980) *The History of Sexuality, vol. 1: An Introduction*. New York: Random House.
- (2008) *The Birth of Biopolitics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2006) *A Post-Capitalist Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Giddens, Anthony (1992) *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love & Eroticism in Modern Societies*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri (2004) *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin.
- Hennessy, Rosemary (2000) *Profit and Pleasure: Sexual Identities in Late Capitalism*. New York: Routledge.
- Jónasdóttir, Anna (1994) *Why Women Are Oppressed*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- (2009) ‘Feminist questions, Marx’s method, and the theorization of love power’, in Anna G. Jónasdóttir and Kathleen B. Jones (eds) (2009) *The Political Interests of Gender Revisited*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Langford, Wendy (1999) *Revolutions of the Heart. Gender, Power and the Delusions of Love*. New York: Routledge.
- Lugones, Maria (2007) ‘Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System’, *Hypatia: Journal of Feminist Philosophy* 22(1): 186-208.
- Lynch, Kathleen (2010) ‘Affective equality: Love, care and solidarity as productive forces’, in Sofia Strid and Anna Jónasdóttir (eds) (2010) *GEXcel Work in Progress Report v. VIII, Proceedings from GEXcel Theme 10: Love in Our Time –A Question for Feminism*. Örebro, Sweden: University of Örebro.
- Mitchell, Juliet (1974) *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*. New York: Pantheon.
- Monteagudo, Graciela (2011) ‘Politics by other means: Rhizomes of power in Argentina’s social movements’, PhD thesis. Anthropology Department and Center for Latin American, Latino and Caribbean Studies, UMass Amherst, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, Dartmouth College.
- Moreno Marimón, Montserrat and Genoveva Sastre Vilarrasa (2010) *Cómo Construimos Universos: Amor, Cooperación y Conflicto*. Barcelona: Editorial Gedisa S.A.
- Rubin, Gayle (1975) ‘The traffic in women’, in Rayna Reiter, (ed.) (1975) *Toward an Anthropology of Women*. New York: Monthly Review.
- Walby, Sylvia (1990) *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Wilkinson, Eleanor (2010) ‘Revolutionize love? A queer-feminist critique of love as a political concept.’ Paper presented at the *GEXcel conference Love in Our Time – A Question For Feminism?* Örebro University, December 2-4, 2010.

SUB THEME 1:
Gendered Interests in Sexual Love, Care
Practices and Erotic Agency



Report from Workshop

Sofia Strid

Even Feminists Fall in Love

The theme of the workshop, chaired by Liisa Husu, enabled a rich and diverse plurality of topics and perspectives, where the predominant academic focus allowed room for lived experiences and intriguing anecdotic references. Often theoretical points of departure and theoretical critique were illuminated by empirical research and examples, and abstract questions pinned down to what eventually emerged as a key issue and core focus: what *is* love?

The group, comprised of researchers from eleven different countries and diverse disciplinary backgrounds, spent two days engaging in lively and critical discussions on the potential lack of love in feminist theory; the mistaken view about the lack of love in feminist theory; the boundaries of academic disciplines and their rigidity and/or fluidity; polyamory as a discourse of love, its emphasis on community building and its difference and similarities to early feminist critique of monogamy; gendered power in heterosexual love and the need to love and to be loved (although the concept of need turned out to be contested). The group continued to engage in the discussion about exploitation of love and care labour in gay and lesbian couples, where issues of multiple inequalities and intersectionality were raised.

Women in prison, situated ideology around romantic love and sexuality and the reference to an object of and for love; the invocation of true love as a vehicle for considerations of heteronormativity among adolescents; the age of love and love in various life stages; the manipulation of jealousy and desire, what constitute desire and jealousy and the sexualisation and sociologisation of love and not least: love power as care and erotic ecstasy; the position of the experiences of love, love understood as something other than sexuality, in academic research, were all themes covered by the workshop. The latter theme to the discussion on a theoretical journey of gendered jealousy, and the possible different experiences men and women have of jealousy: on the one hand as a breach of trust and betrayal, the loss of security and on the other as a loss of possession. Somewhere here, the group may have agreed that insecurity in love is indeed produced by the ideal of monogamy itself.

The latter theme, the issue of researching the experience of love understood as something other than sexual desire, became an underlying focus of the two days, that is, the potential conflation of love and sexual-

ity or the reduction of love to sex or sexual desire. The extent to which love can or cannot be conceptualised and measured was offered as a preliminary explanation to why sexuality rather than love as such has become the focus of research.

In the end, it may be concluded that although we are slightly confused about what love is, feminists do love, but might not always write about it.



Chapter 6

Love in Times of Prison

Estibaliz De Miguel Calvo

This paper aims to show some provisional results about the partner relationships of women in prison, based on in-depth interviews conducted in the ‘Nanclares de Oca’ prison (Basque Country-Spain) in 2008, and focusing on partner relationships along their life paths – that is, before being sent to prison and while doing time. The questions leading the analysis are: How does the (lack of) social support affect the decision-making process of choosing a partner?; How do questions of autonomy, care (for others) and intimacy influence the partner trajectories?; and lastly, how do the women position themselves in the negotiating process of the conditions (and outcomes) of the relationships and, specifically, how does imprisonment affect this? I focus on some common features, beyond the wide variety of layers that shape their particular experiences, such as socio-economic status, drug use, migration, ethnicity and/or level of criminalisation.

Women in prison are interesting in the research context because, I suggest, they illustrate women’s and gender issues crosscut with social exclusion and stigmatisation. There is research literature about the links between poverty, criminalisation and prison, on the one hand; and new feminist reflections about love, on the other. But the circumstances, features and consequences of love and sexual relationships in the lives of incarcerated women have not yet been explored. The scarce, often descriptive, Spanish research on the topic has suggested links between life paths of women in prison and their relationships (Almeda 2003; Arostegi et al 2008), but it is a challenge to find theoretical grounds to shed light upon the issue. I propose Jónasdóttir’s theory of exploitation of women’s love power and Lagarde’s women’s ‘captivities’ as a sociopolitical and cultural feminist framework.

Anna Jónasdóttir (1991) argues that love is a fundamental power that can be exploited and that, in contemporary formally equal societies, men tend to exploit women’s love power. Thus, sexual exploitation is not only related to the gendered division of labour or to socialisation, but especially to human love as caring and ecstasy.

Marcela Lagarde (2005), a Mexican anthropologist, developed a cultural theory in which the patriarchy describes women as ‘being-for-others’, affectionately dependent and lacking in freedom (Lagarde 2005). Captivity is a ‘summary of the cultural fact which defines the state of

women in the patriarchal world', characterised by lack of freedom and oppression (2005: 37). Thus, every woman lives in captivity in her body-for-others (procreator and erotic) and in her being-for-others, 'lived as a necessity for setting relationships of vital dependency and submission to other's power' (2005: 41).

In my research, the study on the data about women in prison has shown three key elements in their partner relationships: fear as a gendered emotion, motherhood as an attachment to the partner, and last, the personal trajectory related to social exclusion/inclusion. I take three case studies to illustrate these findings.

Firstly, fear appears as an important element in the account of some respondents, specially the fear of being alone. In Manuela's narrative (50 years old, 4 children, cocaine user), she recounted her fears of being alone and how fear led her to bear non satisfactory, even violent relationships:

Because I felt very alone, I felt very lonely, I needed (...) I do not know, I did not like being alone. More than anything I was feeling crushed by solitude, loneliness (crying) I've always been crushed by loneliness. And though things were bad I would rather be with someone to being alone.

Secondly, children appear as a strong attachment to the father, as is the case of Ángela (46 years old, immigrant, two children). She reported that her ex-husband battered her since the beginning of the relationship but she felt she could not split up because of their children:

He came and said: 'I will take my children. If you want to stay, stay'. I couldn't be taken apart from my children, they were very small. I went back again with him and I stayed there.

Finally, the case of Oihane (40, divorced, no children), one of the exceptions in the general pattern of prison, who shows some links between a less socially excluded life path and a lower attachment to a relationship. Oihane held a job until she was sent to jail, had an education and did not have a criminal trajectory, this being her first time in prison. During the interview, she spoke about having some conditions for a relationship. If she did not find what she was looking for, she preferred to be alone:

I am not, I don't want a lazy man. I look very much who I am with, I look very much at who I am with (...) Because I don't clutch at straws, to not be alone I don't clutch at straws. I prefer to work by myself. I am alone, so I am alone (...) I do what I want, what I like and that's all.

By contrast, it is reasonable to presume that women who were more excluded at the moment of being sent to prison had experienced more dependent partner relationships, sometimes damaging and negative for their interests, needs and desires. Their time behind bars might have also have had a negative impact on their decision making about partner relationships.

References

- Almeda, Elisabeth (2003) *Mujeres encarceladas* (Incarcerated women). Barcelona: Ariel.
- Arostegi, Igone et al (2008) *Prisión y género* (Prison and gender). Bilbao: Zubiko.
- Jónasdóttir, Anna G. (1993) *El poder del amor ¿le importa el sexo a la democracia?* Madrid: Cátedra
- Lagarde, Marcela (2005) *Los cautiverios de las mujeres: Madresposas, monjas, putas, presas y locas.* (The captivities of women: Mother-Wives, Nuns, Whores, Prisoners and Madwomen). México: UNAM.

Chapter 7

Are Disciplinary Boundaries Gone? Evolutionary Psychology and Love Relationships

Adriana García Andrade and Priscila Cedillo

There has been an overwhelming discussion about disciplines, inter-disciplines and trans-disciplines in the social sciences. This discussion acquires particular relevance in the case of objects such as ‘love’, whose recent emergence (or re-emergence) can be seen as a by-product of the crossing of disciplines. That is to say, the study of love can be seen as a scientific object that shows how both society and the social sciences have changed. Bearing this in mind we asked if it was possible to find in the study of ‘love’ distinct ways of observation that showed this change in society. In the analysis of the articles included in our database we found that there still are researches on the object of love ‘done’ from and within a discipline. More specifically, researches from what Dogan and Pahre (1993: 137) have categorised as mono-disciplinary specialisation.

The case study presented here is a trend in psychology specialised in couple election and love relationships. To trace the discipline we have explored the following: (1) institutional indicators (the Journal’s disciplinary adscription, and the shared bibliography of the published articles) and, (2) indicators that correspond to what Ian Hacking has called ‘styles of reasoning’³ (Hacking 2004), namely, methodology and certain underlying ideas that conform a way of observing, interpreting, and objectifying reality. The case we analyse, which we name ‘evolutionary psychology’, shows not only that the study of love is still developed from within disciplines in a traditional sense but also that its results – objectified and validated by the style of reasoning – can contribute to a ‘naturalisation’ of society, (and not necessarily show or promote social change).

3 The idea of ‘styles of reasoning’ is more comprehensive than that of discipline. In fact, Hacking – using the typology of A.C. Crombie – defines only six styles of reasoning. We share Hacking’s basic assumptions in spite of his more general definition of style of reasoning. For Hacking, styles of reasoning ‘have settled what it is to be objective (truths of certain sorts are what we obtain by conducting certain sorts of investigations, answering to certain standards)’ (2004: 181). In that sense, we could say that Hacking’s definition is simply more general and abstract, and what we’re doing here is an observation of a discipline, which is more detailed and specific, but nevertheless compatible with the premises of a ‘style of reasoning’.



Our database includes all the articles published between 1989 and 2008 in 230 Social Science Journals. The inclusion of the word *love* in either the title or the abstract of each article worked as our selection criteria. From this selection we obtained a total of 500 articles. From this we made a random sample of almost 10% (48 articles out of 500). In this sample we found seven different ways of approaching love as a subject. The mainstream way of approaching love was the theme centred in ‘love as practices and discourses differentiated for men and women’ (16 articles out of 48). In this approach, eight out of sixteen articles were published in psychology journals (using the editorial’s classification). As 30% of the articles in our database belong to this discipline we decided to select them for a more detailed analysis. Only six of the eight articles fulfilled our second institutional indicator (i.e. shared bibliography).

In those six articles we found a common ‘style of reasoning’ which includes a methodology and similar points of departure. The common methodology found was quantitative and used *scales* mainly. Typologies of love, commitment, couple election were proposed through the use of scales –which worked as validity criteria. The articles also shared similarities in the samples chosen for the studies: they were recruited in colleges and with similar socio-economic characteristics.

Furthermore, a common perspective could be traced through two key premises which hid – in some cases – specific ideas. The key premises were stated in all the cases: heterosexuality as the only frame for couple election and, gender identification – if mentioned – as a particularity of (biological) sex. The implicit ideas found, involved analysing couple relations and mating experience through a biological and evolutionary perspective. By the latter we mean a perspective where human beings were observed as –and acted as – members of a species and its reproduction. These premises – along with the implicit ideas – left out the possibility of thinking of the relations between the sexes as asymmetrical and merely presented them as different for men and women. Validated by the style of reasoning, the results posed by this specialisation in Psychology were presented as scientific and objective. But this is only a ‘self-authentication’ as Ian Hacking acknowledges (2004: 191). Therefore a possible critic to these results has to go beyond the theories and methodologies used, it has to go to the point of departure of the ‘style of reasoning’ (or, in other words, of the discipline of origin). By

clarifying this *blind spot*⁴ it is possible to understand what has been left out: power, culture, and gender. In that way the critique is not ideological (in a political sense) but it goes into the core of Science as a discourse.

References

- Aron, Arthur and Lisa Henkemeyer (1995) ‘Marital Satisfaction and Passionate Love’, *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 12(1): 139-146.
- Basu, Jayanti and Rajyasari Ray (2000) ‘The Three Faces of Love: College Students’ Perception of the Spouse, Date and Cross-sex Friend’, *Psychology and Developing Societies* 12(2):177-213.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (2001) *Science de la science et réflexivité*. Raisons d’agir éditions, Paris.
- Dogan, Matei and Robert Pahre (1993) *Las nuevas ciencias sociales*. Editorial Grijalbo, México.
- Grote, Nancy and Irene H. Frieze (1998) “”Remembrance of Things Past”: Perceptions of Marital Love from its Beginnings to the Present”, *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 15(15): 91-109.
- Hacking, Ian (2004) *Historical Ontology*. Harvard University Press, London.
- Khallad, Yacoub (2005) ‘Mate selection in Jordan: Effects of sex, socio-economic status, and culture’, *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 22(2): 155-168.
- Luhmann, Niklas (1990) *Die Wissenschaft der Gesellschaft*. Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main.
- Roese, Neal et al. (2006) ‘Sex Differences in Regret: All for Love or Some for Lust?’ *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 32(6): 770-780.
- Squire, Corinne (2003) ‘Can an HIV-positive Woman Find True Love? Romance in the Stories of Women Living with HIV’, *Feminism and Psychology* 13(1): 73-100.
- Walzer, Susan (2008) ‘Redoing gender through divorce’, *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 25(1): 5-21.

⁴ Here we are implicitly using Niklas Luhmann’s epistemological proposition (Luhmann, 1990). For this author, all observations depart from a difference: what is delimited as an object (indication) and what it’s not the object (distinction). Then, observations always start from that blind spot: one can see the object but not the analytical differentiation used to ‘see’ the object.

Wiederman, Michael and Catherine Hurd (1999) 'Extradyadic Involvement during Dating', *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 16(2): 265-274.

Chapter 8

Loving Him For Who He Is: Pinpointing the Mechanisms of Female Subordination in Heterosexual Couple Love

Lena Gunnarsson

In this paper I theorise the tension inherent in contemporary western heterosexual love between, on one hand, norms of gender equality and freedom to choose and, on the other, persisting gender inequality. Focusing on the empirically documented asymmetry in the love exchanges as such between women and men, I ask: *How does it come about that women tend to give more love to men than men give to women, when mutual love is (supposed to be) the very raison d'être of the relationship, when the ideological context prescribes gender equality and when there are no salient external factors that stop women from breaking up in case they are not satisfied?* By 'giving love' I mean recognising and affirming, in practice, the other person and her/his needs and goals as valuable in their own right, in a way not directed by one's own needs and goals.

I set out from Carin Holmberg's (1993) detection of a pervasive asymmetrical tendency concerning the extent to which the allegedly 'equal' heterosexual women and men she interviewed would empathise with the point of view of their partner. While the women tended to see situations from the point of view of the man while relativising their own, the men tended to take their own perspective as the neutral ground from the point of view of which the perspective of their female partner was judged.

How do we explain this gendered pattern? What is the causal link between a person's gender and her/his way of loving and not loving? Following Hanne Haavind (1984) Holmberg emphasises that the mutual confirmation of gender identity is a crucial driving force in heterosexual love. In this sense, to the extent that femininity is in great part constituted by a more caring attitude towards the needs of others than masculinity, women will tend to voluntarily subordinate their own needs and goals to the needs and goals of men. I would however argue that the primary motivating force for people in love relationships is not the wish to have one's gender identity affirmed but to be loved. It is only because

gendered expectations mediate our possibilities of being loved that the wish to be affirmed as woman or man becomes such a force.

If, then, the link between gender identity and the way we tend to love is mediated by gender-differentiated expectations, it is of crucial significance that our expectations very much organise – and produce – the experience of love as such. As Arlie Hochschild (1989) argues, the *gift* and its inducing of gratitude and goodwill is an essential part of love and the experience of being offered a gift stems from being treated in ways that one feels one cannot expect or demand from someone. In the sense that what we expect from women and men differ, what is experienced as an expression of love will thus also be gendered. A consequence of this, I argue, is that a symmetrical subjective experience of being loved may co-exist with an objective asymmetry of giving or loving. For example, when a woman who does not expect her man to listen to what troubles her for once is listened to, this really *means* something to her. By contrast, in order for him to feel that she really offers or sacrifices something for him, she will generally have to go to greater lengths in her care, since her being there for him is just the normal way things are. In a sense, then, a symmetrical experience of being loved may be based on an asymmetry regarding what the woman and the man actually do for one another. Relating to Anna G. Jónasdóttir's thesis that love is what empowers us as persons, as 'socio-sexual individuated and personified existences' (1994: 221), I argue that the subjective experience of being loved is not a sufficient condition for being thus empowered. If this experience is not based in *actually* having one's needs continuously cared for but by a lack of expectations to receive such concern, the feeling of being loved will not empower one's worthiness as a person very efficiently.

I also seek to pinpoint how these contradictions produce different kinds of risks and possibilities depending on which strategy women choose as a means of satisfying their need for love, arguing that there are costs and benefits involved both in conforming to and in resisting gendered expectations. I contend that even if an individual woman is *lucky* to find a particular man who cares for her needs as much as she does for his, she will still be structurally subordinate to him by virtue of his very status of rare exception. Both know that he could get a better deal, so to speak, but through his love to his particular woman and to the cause of equality he has chosen not to. As Hochschild notes, gendered norms about what to expect and what to be grateful for are not only matters of ideology, but also grounded in what she calls a 'pragmatic frame of reference' deriving from comparisons between what one has and what other options there are 'out there' (1989: 108). When unusually equality-oriented men are not especially appreciated for being more

considerate than one could generally expect from men, they might thus feel unjustly treated and unvalued. Paradoxically, then, their letting go of their privileges – or, rather, their abstinence from taking advantage of them – is likely to be connected to a remaining feeling of entitlement, which actually undermines the equality that was intended. For what is at stake in these negotiations is the exchange of love and recognition as such, and if men expect more love and recognition than women for their being equally loving and full of recognition as women, we are back where we started.

In order to change the *structure* producing these individually and painfully lived contradictions, women must gather collectively so as to be able to coordinate their relative withdrawal of their love from men. It is only when men are indirectly *forced* to be more caring if they are to be loved by women that we can count on change on a collective level. For rosy norms of equality and mutual love are not much worth if men can enjoy women's love and esteem even if they do not live up to these norms.

References

- Haavind, Hanne (1984) 'Love and power in marriage', in *Patriarchy in a welfare society*, edited by H. Holter. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Hochschild, Arlie (1989) 'The economy of gratitude', in D. D. Franks and E. D. McCarthy (eds) (1989) *The Sociology of Emotions: Original Essays and Research Papers*. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI.
- Holmberg, Carin (1995) *Det kallas kärlek*. Stockholm: Månpocket.
- Jónasdóttir, Anna G. (1994) *Why Women are Oppressed*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Chapter 9

'Forbidden Love' – Narratives of Love, Belonging and Deviance in Adolescence

Susanne Offen



Introduction

Based on focus group interviews with boys and girls in German secondary schools my contribution dealt with the invocation of 'true love' as a vehicle for considerations on heteronormativity among adolescent girls.

Adolescent conceptualisations of love may be seen as both strengthening and challenging heterosexual assumptions and frameworks.

Gender sensitive political education may take the ambiguities of love stories concerning gender, identity and sexual orientation into account to extend their clients abilities to think, talk and reflect about love and agency beyond heteronormative visions of life.

Imagine you'd wake up in the morning being a boy/ a girl...

In my contribution to the conference i tried to outline questions and challenges for gender sensitive political education in dealing with narratives of love.

Mandated to promote gender equality and to expound the problems of gender gaps while supporting their clients access to participation, this pedagogical approach has to find creative ways to enable people in gender, queer and interrelated social studies literacy while at the same time encouraging them to extend their self-concepts beyond the firm set of gender binary and heteronormativity – while acknowledging specific persons with their own specific experiences and identities rooted in their specific social contexts (Anthias 2002).

During the focus group interviews providing the data for my presentation i thus tried to identify ways to pose puzzling but intriguing problems to adolescent boys and girls. This problem was staged by the invitation to imagine oneself as inhabiting the other gender and thinking about different spheres of daily life and social positions from this perspective – in an otherwise sadly fixed and unquestioned attitude towards

the social as heterosexual and bi-gendered, all this in order to achieve chances for an reflexive challenge, an ‘educational momentum’.

While the interviewees invested a lot of time and energy in re-instating gender binary and heterosexuality in their arguments, they used the possibility to luxuriate in ambiguity as well.

Education to the core, by content and purpose, is compulsorily bound to the critique of the constraints on social participation and bound to a basic supposition of individual agency and social alterability

In gender sensitive pedagogy, from counselling to political education, educators move on a very narrow path: acknowledging/recognising contextualised interpretations of the self, the situation and the wider context on the one hand – challenging obstacles and attitudes on the other hand.

Obviously, it goes down very deep beyond both sides of the road: acknowledgement may become prescriptive and stress the idea of a gendered core personality in need to be cherished and supported or, on the other side of the road, challenges and irritations may overwhelm the clients, hurt the pedagogical relationship and get people insecure – or just loose them as clients. All this happens in the general paradox of pedagogy: how to support the extension of maturity while at the same time claiming it as already there – and following educational goals as for example inviting to an educational setting which may tend to offer the chance for a shifting awareness of the self and the social (Scherr 2008).

Talking about love and ambiguity

Persisting gender gaps in power relations as well as in subjectivities/spaces of possibilities (*Möglichkeitsräume*, Holzkamp 1995) form the frame of reference for talking about love among adolescents.

Heterosexual love is mostly devastating thing for young women’s self-esteem as achievement in this field is so closely linked to performing legitimate femininity – or failing to do so, and as achievement is commonly connected to getting rewarded for socially requested gender performances, in this case meaning: being attractive. A similar problem arises for the non-hegemonic masculinities (Hackmann 2003).

So, how do we get to talk about love and ambiguity?

The idea of talking about love in some sort of *Gedankenexperiment* (translation may be: thought experiment, meaning: ‘An experiment only performed in the imagination, used to test logical consequences of a hypothesis’ or ‘an experiment carried out in thought only’) is assumed to be a helpful tool in creating stories and tales beyond the ordinary ways of talking generated if asked directly and unsubtle: what do you think about love and gender in heterosexual and in non-heterosexual contexts?

The general idea of a thought experiment is to explore the potential consequences of the principle in question – and, in this case, to relate the own person to these consequences in order to push the boundaries that usually prevent young people from including their own life in potentially difficult questions, if they don't like this to be made an issue. In this case the principle in question is supplied by the commonsense knowledge of stable gender identity linked to heterosexual assumptions – this, as Stevi Jackson put it in her lecture in the conference proceedings, gets renegotiated through interaction, and by challenging the factor 'gender identity' through the request to imagine oneself as inhabiting another gender, the focus groups provide an opportunity to make sense of gender and sexual orientation from an imaginary other point of departure, the chance to develop a story about oneself beyond the everyday life gendered situation.

Although doing otherness is a central part of adolescence, conforming to norms is as well. Identity – described a concept of the self as well as described as a tool to mark spaces of belonging and distance, of inclusion and exclusion, inlining and outlining oneself and others, plays a pivotal role in this process of negotiating social positions, attitudes, space and symbolic meanings (Ahlheit 2010; Hammack and Cohler 2009; Müller 2011; Offen 2010; Renold 2005).

Central tenet in gender sensitive political education is to hold the clients capable of thinking, addressing them as experts of their own life and drawing on resources more than on deficits.

Therefore a lot of conceptualising has been done around social justice or citizenship education, in this course tackling intersecting social categories, inequalities and personal experiences in being positioned and addressed by supporting growing awareness for privileges and hierarchies as well as questioning the legal and political gaps concerning equal rights or addressing formal aspects of citizenship or examining the effects of regulations against discrimination. All of these approaches produced some very valid and qualified concepts (Timmermanns and Tuider 2008; van Dijk and van Driel 2008).

But there remains a lack in offering clients' good and valid starting points to think themselves differently and to reflect on the permanent process of doing and contextualising identity. As Johnson (2005) found, adolescents tend to express liberal and tolerant views if cornered enough to do so, while resolutely rejecting non-heterosexual possibilities for themselves. I would add the likewise tendency to offer openly homophobic statements if the context allows for that. It is a tough mixture to deal with in education.

My research calls for acknowledging existing ambiguities in adolescents' narratives and negotiations on love and gender and by this approach to reedit thinking about gender sensitive political education (Busche et al 2010) towards questioning the narratives on gender, sexuality, desire and emotions and accordingly the possibilities to shift these – or at least to think about felicity conditions for this.

Conclusion: a call for enhancing narrative agency in gender sensitive political education

Love is an important issue among young women and young men, an issue that is gendered through and through: who is allowed to love whom and who has to attract suiting is heterosexualised to the core and produces a huge dramatization of gender issues in its wake in adolescence.

From an educational point of view this marks an argument to let this description become a topic in the educational processes with same young women and men themselves as to find a way for a participatory approach in dealing with it.

Enhancing narrative agency (Mackenzie 2008) in the discourses on love may be one of it.

References

- Ahlheit, Peter (2010) 'Identität oder "Biographizität"? Beiträge der neueren sozial- und erziehungswissenschaftlichen Biographieforschung zu einem Konzept der Identitätsentwicklung', in Griese, Birgit (Hrsg.) *Subjekt – Identität – Person?: Reflexionen zur Biographieforschung*. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.
- Anthias, Floya (2002) 'Where do I belong?: narrating identity and trans-localational positionality', *Ethnicities* 2(4): 491-515.
- Busche, Mart, Maiakowski, Laura, Pohlkamp, Ines and Wesemüller, Ellen (Hrsg.) (2010) *Feministische Mädchenarbeit weiterdenken. Zur Aktualität einer bildungspolitischen Praxis*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Hackmann, Kristina (2003) *Adoleszenz, Geschlecht und sexuelle Orientierungen. Eine empirische Studie mit Schülerinnen*. Opladen: Leske+Budrich.
- Hammack, Philipp L. and Cohler, Bertram J. (2009) *The Story of Sexual Identity. Narrative Perspectives on the Gay and Lesbian Life Course*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Holzkamp, Klaus (1995) *Lernen: subjektwissenschaftliche Grundlegung*. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus.

- Johnson, Paul (2005) *Love, Heterosexuality and Society*. London: Routledge.
- Mackenzie, Catriona (2008) ‘Introduction. Practical identity and narrative agency’, in Kim Atkins and Catriona Mackenzie (Hrsg.) (2008) *Practical Identity and Narrative Agency*. New York and London: Routledge..
- Müller, Bernadette (2011) *Empirische Identitätsforschung: Personale, soziale und kulturelle Dimensionen der Selbstverortung*. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.
- Offen, Susanne (2010) Von Alltagspraxen, Aushandlungen und Irritationen: Lebensentwürfe und prekäre Verhältnisse in der geschlechtersensiblen Bildungsarbeit, *Gender. Zeitschrift für Geschlecht, Kultur und Gesellschaft*.
- Renold, Emma (2005) *Girls, boys and junior sexualities: exploring children's gender and sexual relations in primary schools*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Scherr (2008) ‘Subjekt- und Identitätsbildung’, in Thomas Coelen and Hans-Uwe Otto (Hrsg.) (2008) *Grundbegriffe Ganztagsbildung*. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.
- Timmermanns, Stefan and Tuider, Elisabeth (Hrsg.) (2008) *Sexualpädagogik der Vielfalt. Praxismethoden zu Identitäten, Beziehungen, Körper und Prävention*, Weinheim: Juventa.
- van Dijk, Lutz and van Driel, Barry (Hg.) (2008) *Sexuelle Vielfalt lernen - Schulen ohne Homophobie*. Berlin: Querverlag.

Chapter 10

All in the Family: Patriarchy, Capitalism, and Love

Alyssa Schneebaum

This full version of this paper explores several questions: why feminists have considered marriage a patriarchal institution; why women, and even feminists, continue to get married and have children, despite the patriarchal nature of marriage and the nuclear family; why gay and lesbian couples want to participate in these institutions; the implications of the ‘gay marriage equality’ battle for feminist politics; and the relevance of capitalist relations of production in the family. The theoretical background of the discussion is one that considers how relations of domination in patriarchy and relations of domination in capitalism are connected to each other and mutually support each other

The topic of the relationship between capitalist and patriarchal relations deserves several volumes of explanation, but this analysis focuses on just one aspect of it: the sexual division of labour. In short we can say that the capitalist drive for profit motivates an endless push for efficiency, and the desire to be the most productive in the least amount of time is used to justify the sexual division of labour that relegates women’s labour into household and caring work, as women supposedly have a comparative advantage in that work. Popular culture, much of which comes in the form of social media such as films and magazines and is produced for the sake of profit, has also prescribed nurturing and submissive roles to women, which encourages women to think that they *ought to* do all of the caring and household work. This work is not monetarily compensated and women’s disproportionate participation in that labour therefore puts them at a financial disadvantage to men, subsequently giving men power over women. The more power men have over women, the more they are able to persuade them to do the household and caring work, creating a circle that deepens women’s dependence on men. In this conceptualisation of how both patriarchy and capitalism set up and reinforce the sexual division of labour in the household, we see

that this issue is a main site of male domination (and one that supports capital, as well⁵).

Given the patriarchal sexual division of labour in nuclear families, why do women continue to enter into these arrangements? It is no secret that there are many wonderful, fulfilling qualities to loving romantic relationships. Having a partner can bring joy and happiness into one's life, and also offers stability, security and support. Caring for others and being cared for are very positive human experiences whose redeeming qualities should not be denied. Further, the feminist movement has indeed been successful in some ways; we should not overlook the possibility that there are some egalitarian relationships and partners who care about justice and equality. In these senses, it is quite clear why women are interested in pursuing loving relationships.

However, there are other influences that contribute to women's desire to get married. Christine Delphy and Diane Leonard (1992) said that 'women enter marriage 'freely' in the West, persuaded (or pressured) largely by love for their partner' (p. 265). While Delphy and Leonard continue the thought to assert that 'behind that [love] lie the social and economic advantages of conforming to the norm and of allying oneself with a member of the dominant groups: sharing his income and getting his protection' (p. 265), with which we agree, we add that we need to examine more closely the creation of the 'love' that entices women into marriages. In other words, we recognise that the *ideology* of love plays a fairly large role in women's desires to get married, even when we know that ideology is not the reality. Gendering practices imposed on the young girl and grown woman teach her that finding a 'loving' romantic partnership is her most important goal. As Emma Goldman (1911) put it, 'from infancy, almost, the average girl is told that marriage is her ultimate goal; therefore her training and education must be directed towards that end' (p. 236).

More recently, we see the ideology of love being employed in the fight for same-sex marriage rights. The question of same-sex marriage has been a source of contention among feminists: to many, marriage is an institution plagued by male domination; even so, if straight people get legal, economic and social benefits from it, then from a social justice perspective lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people should have access to it as well (Ferguson, 2007). But there is not much convincing proof that the content of same-sex relationships is much different than that of different-sex couples; one person could still be doing

5 The household work supports capital by caring for the current labor force through tending to its everyday needs (preparing food, clothing, etc.) and it reproduces the labor force by raising and conditioning the next generation of workers.

the majority of the unpaid household labour (see Schneebaum 2010 for a full discussion). If it is the case that same-sex couples also have one person doing most of the undervalued and monetarily uncompensated work, then we can say that these couples also display the type of exploitation and dominance that different-sex couples do.

In this case, we need to reconsider what we mean by ‘patriarchy’: we can no longer think of ‘patriarchy’ as just referring to a ‘man’ exercising power over a ‘woman.’ Instead, we are compelled to think about how the notion of ‘love’ and its role in marital relationships and in the formation of nuclear families has helped patriarchal and capitalist relations evolve into an oppressive set of relations that might be based more on gender performance than on biological sex.

References

- Delphy, Christine and Diane Leonard (1992) *Familiar Exploitation: A New Analysis of Marriage in Contemporary Western Societies*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Polity press.
- Ferguson, Ann (2007) ‘Gay Marriage: An American and Feminist Dilemma’, *Hypatia: Journal of Feminist Philosophy* 22(1): 39-57.
- Goldman, Emma (1911) ‘Marriage and Love’, *Anarchism and Other Essays*. Second Revised Edition. New York & London: Mother Earth Publishing Association.
- Schneebaum, Alyssa (2010) ‘The Division of Labor in Same-Sex Couples’, Unpublished Manuscript most recently presented at the Historical Materialism Conference, Toronto, 17 May 2010.



Chapter 11

Sex and/or Love?

Silvia Stoller

In my paper, I argued that a respectable number of contemporary feminist theories on *love* concentrate on *sexual* love or *sexual* desire, if not to say on *sexuality* itself. I consider this equation of ‘*love*’ with ‘*sex*’ or ‘*sexuality*’, whether it is explicit or implicit, conceptually confusing and theoretically problematic. Though it is not easy to draw a sharp distinction between love and sex, I maintain that these two concepts need to be separated.

In part one (‘Selected Readings’), I referred to a couple of examples taken from feminist philosophy, in order to show a) what I mean by the identification of love with sex or sexuality, and b) that a large number of theories of love only indirectly refer to love in the narrower sense. (1) My first example was taken from a respectable course reader mostly used at US-universities: *A Passion for Wisdom: Readings in Western Philosophy on Love and Desire* (Feder, MacKendrick and Cook 2004). Part VI ‘Contemporary Philosophy’ includes four *feminist* theorists of five representatives from the United States: Judith Butler, bell hooks, Martha Nussbaum and Eva Feder Kittay as well as Alan Soble. I have shown that a variety of topics addressed in these selected texts are subsumed under the topic of ‘*love*’: the topic of sex (Butler), sexual offensive policies (Soble, Kittay), the role of passions in academic discourses (hooks), and the construction of erotic love (Nussbaum). ‘*Love*’ only *indirectly* in these texts, if at all, becomes an object of consideration. Either love is fully missing (Butler), or it is subsumed under the issue of sexual intercourse (Soble, Kittay), indirectly addressed by asking for the institutional conditions for a philosophy of love (hooks), or love seems to receive merely the status of a sample (Nussbaum). In conclusion, there is an obvious tendency in contemporary literature on love to subsume the concept of ‘*love*’ under the concept of ‘*sex*.’ This can be called a conceptual reduction. (2) Eva Feder Kittay’s famous study *Love’s Labor* was my second example (Kittay 1999). In her own words, ‘*Love’s Labor* explores the relations that dependency work fosters between women and between men and women’ (Kittay 2002, 237). One can hardly find a sentence in which love is explored in any more elaborated terms. Instead it turns out that ‘*love*’ is interchangeably used for ‘*love’s labour*’ (129), whereas ‘*love’s labor*’ is another name for what Kittay calls ‘dependency work’, a work that parents provide for their disabled children (174). Conse-

quently, Kittay's book is more about dependence and interdependent relations than on 'love.' And although 'care' can be interpreted as a form of love, this 'love' is discussed in terms of work respectively labour only. I argued that in order to get back to love again it is necessary to keep the two concepts of 'care' and 'love' separated. (3) Finally, I turned toward Judith Butler's gender theory, arguing that her *Gender Trouble* (1990) first and foremost is on *sexual* desire. Talking about 'desire', she is much more interested in why a person desires a person of a certain *sex* than in why somebody 'loves' somebody. I then put attention to 'Zweifel an der Liebe' ('Doubting Love') (Butler 2007). In this article Butler's personally admits that she always feels seriously troubled if she was asked to speak about love, and for this reason refuses to work on love. Her personal remarks provide evidence of the fact that her work is not on love but on something else; as I would say, it is more on sex and sexuality.

In the second part ('Philosophy of Love vs. Philosophy of Sex') I introduced Foucault's history of sexuality (1978), in order to make us remember that 'sexuality' and 'sex' came along with the so-called 'scientia sexualis' in the 17th century, and thus represent only late discourses. In following him in this respect, I suppose that contemporary discourses on love still suffer from the influence of such a 'scientia sexualis.' Put differently, the focus on sex and sexuality in contemporary feminist theories of love are the after effect of these scientific discourses.

In the final part 3 ('Eros, philia, agape') I shortly introduced three well-known classic types of love Western culture has generated. (1) The first one traces back to Ancient Greek philosophy and is identified with Plato's concept of 'eros' as a sort of desire. Contrary to modern understanding of eros and desire, this co-called 'Socratic eros' is not primarily about *sexual* desire, rather it is concerned with the 'idea of the beautiful' which has less to do with sexuality. (2) The second concept is called 'philía', and in Aristotle's philosophy it is another name for *friendship* in a broad sense: The term incorporates not only life-long friendships or the relation between parents and their children but also, for example, business partners or members of the same society. (3) The third concept of love is called Greek 'agape' (Latin: 'caritas') and characterises a) the paternal love of God for human beings (Latin: *Deus est caritas*), b) the love of humans for God (Latin: *amor Dei*), and c) finally charity, the loving of one's neighbour (Latin: *caritas*). The absence of sexuality in Christian culture is obvious and well known. I concluded that contrary to our modern understanding of love which is shaped by the idea of sexual desire, such a historic view demonstrates the ongoing hegemonic force of sex and sexuality in contemporary feminist discourses on love.

In my concluding remarks, I called for a return to love as ‘experience’ by way of *phenomenology*. Along with Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1962), I argued that from the perspective of experience, love cannot be reduced to the love of a certain ‘gender’ or ‘sex’ (in quotation mark!) since they result from a separate act of judgment that, strictly speaking, is not an intrinsic part of the very experience of love in the moment of experience. The same is true for the ‘lover’ and the ‘beloved’ who are not yet determined in a strict sense. According to phenomenology such acts of determination are later acts in that they come after the acts of experience (see Stoller 2009). Thus, what phenomenology brings to light is that below the level of judgment and thought there is a sphere of anonymity and indetermination that resists determination. If we are going to acknowledge such a sphere of ‘anonymous love’ then we have got a good starting point to think about ‘love’ as a subversive act that always already resists given norms and pre-determined genders.

References

- Butler, Judith (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- (2007) ‘Zweifel an der Liebe’, *Das Argument. Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Sozialwissenschaften* 5/6(49): 13–30.
- Feder, Ellen K., MacKendrick, Karmen, and Cook, Sybol S. (eds) (2004) *A Passion for Wisdom: Readings in Western Philosophy on Love and Desire*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Foucault, Michel (1978) *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon.
- Kittay, Eva Feder (1999) *Love’s Labor. Essays on Women, Equality, and Dependency*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Maurice, Merleau-Ponty (1962) *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. Colin Smith. London, New York: Routledge.
- Soble, Alan (1998) *The Philosophy of Sex and Love: An Introduction*. St. Paul: Paragon House.
- Stoller, Silvia (2009) ‘Phenomenology and the Poststructural Critique of Experience’, *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 17(5): 707–737.



Chapter 12

Everyday Life Romantic Discourse in Russia: Stability for Women and Status for Men⁶

Anna Temkina

This paper is devoted to the analysis of representation of love in biographical narratives in the young Russian generation. I will analyse ‘the rules of love’ which are represented through temporal and processual dimensions, then I will describe the contexts in which love is represented with instrumental sense. And after this I will summarise the ‘gendered love’. I will refer to generational differences based on my previous research on sexuality and private life (Temkina 2008). I will take into account both women and men perspectives, though the women’s perspective is basic for this research and the men’s is just additionally studied.

The situation of the young generation in Russia is under my consideration, based on research of cohabitation in young cohorts, 20 individuals (10 couples), ages 23-27 (2009) St. Petersburg⁷ and research of gender arrangement in Russian regions, 47 individuals (32 women and 15 men) age 17-28, (2009), Kazan, Arkhangelsk. Samara⁸. The rules of love’s expression in everyday life in Russia are unclear (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 1995, Bauman 2003), love became more rationalised and less romanticised in this generation, and cultural models do not provide the means for the description on this ‘new’, rationalised and sexualised love, which orients neither towards romantic utopia and mass-culture (Illouz 1997), nor to ‘new secular religion’ (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 1995) (though some elements of them could be presented). Nor this is the ‘ideal type’ of ‘pure relationships’ (Giddens 1992) with gender equality and transgression of heterosexual matrix (Butler 1990).



⁶ I am very thankful to all participants of the seminar of gender program in St. Petersburg for the group discussion of the texts and especially to Katya Borozdina for its’ organisation and discussion

⁷ Supported by Boell Foundation, supervised by A. Temkina and E.Zdravomyslova, coordinator L. Shpakovskaya

⁸ Supported by Ford Foundation, supervised by A. Temkina and E.Zdravomyslova, coordinator O.Tkach

Rules of love: age and stages in the life course

It is not surprising that love is described in interviews through different categories. It serves as an umbrella for the description of emotional involvement, game, care, sex, respect, friendship, leisure, exchange, etc. Love in the stories has a temporal dimension as well as stages (progress), though boundaries of them are uncertain. Women of the young generation describe love in their life beginning from the kindergarten and school. The age of love became younger in comparison to previous generations. Women ‘fall in love’ without sexual intention in a younger age. Often they describe this stage with humour and oppose love to a ‘more serious’ sexual relationship in their adult life. Sexual love is described as a process which has stages: sympathy, fall in love, sex (if age is appropriate) – ‘true love’ – routine and habitual love (or decline of feelings) – child and marriage as the expression of love, though boundaries are uncertain and could be transgressed on every stage. Love could be oriented towards a long-term perspective, though not necessarily forever. The general script of love has similarity with the previous romantic script of the Soviet generation, though there are much less descriptions of emotions, uncontrolled passions and romantic attributes.

Some men do not speak about love at all, however, surprisingly many men’s stories include a more romanticised description of love, and sometimes they look more reflexive than women. Men speak about the similar stages in love, however, many of them tell about ‘great love’ as a turning point in their biography. Such relationships are considered as serious and exclusive. They take initiative in courting, though they tell about themselves as leading by passions in the case of ‘serious love’. Love indicate the boundary with all other relations in the life course, though in the women’s biographies the boundary is not very clear, while in men’s story the boundary is strictly emphasised.

Love as instrument of stability and durability

In women’s stories love is mostly described not as passion which leads a person and which could not be controlled, but as the instrument to achieve (at least in the ideal case) quality, stability and durability of relationships. Love is understood as the practice of commitment, fidelity, care, and exclusiveness of relations. Orientation towards future is important in the description of love. Though love is related to marriage in a contradictory way. From one side, love is the main reason to marry. From the other side, marriage is not important, if the love exists. Though love gives the hope for safety of relations, such relations are very fragile under the lack of guarantees, under decline of traditions and uncertainty

of institutional rules. Neither marriage, nor love itself creates reliability of relations. After disappointment in love and relations some women try to rule their emotions and ‘refuse’ love as the reason for cohabitation

Threat and risks for love relations are expressed in the narratives about jealousy. These fragments of the stories are full of dramatic feelings, feelings of risk and insecurity, and the lack of trust.

In fragile relations jealousy is a strategy of control. Women try to rule the situation: avoid communications of their partner with ‘risky’ female friends, check partner’s SMS and Facebook messages, etc. Women evaluate risks and try to prevent them. Control of feelings serves as a mean to reach some stability and safety. Relations and commitment are based mostly only on themselves, and there is a lot of risks, insecurity and lack of trust – ‘hunters’ are around, who could destroy the exclusiveness. For men, who also speak a lot about jealousy, not stability, but status and competition with other men are important

Gendered love: agency and gender boundaries

The position of young middle class women within love relations in our research is characterised by heteronormativity. Women are mostly oriented towards stable monogamous relationships. Free choice and multiple partners are legitimate for young Russian women. Interpretation of gender roles is characterised by decline of double gender standards, but simultaneously by preservation of gender boundaries. Nevertheless, women represent themselves as agency in love relationships, they are agents of free choice of partner and relations. They are not so dependent on men if compared to previous generation. They do not position themselves as scarifying victim of relations for the sake of love. Under the process of individualisation women’s activity, agency, and pleasure are recognised by both partners. But there are hardly many signs of egalitarianism in relations. Gender boundary exists between partners. Under the process of autonomisation both of them want to be the subject and rule other as the object (de Beauvoir 1949). There are not a lot of signs of negotiation, but more symptoms of struggle for power and domination. Women position themselves as the subject of jealousy. Men sometimes are represented as the object of manipulation and control, whom women try to rule.

Conclusion

Love and jealousy in women’s stories have an instrumental sense in the contest of *individualisation*, fragility of intimate relations and relative lack of institutional rules. Love is evaluated as a basis (at least ideally)

for stability and durability of relations, and for safety. For men love as serious relation constitutes status. Under the process of *autonomisation* gender double standard declines, women express subjectivity and agency, tradition is broken, but there hardly many signs of egalitarianism and negotiations.

References

- Bauman, Zygmunt (2003) *Liquid Love: On the Fragility of Human Bond*. Polity Press.
- Beck, Ulrich and Beck-Gernsheim, Elisabeth (1995) *The Normal Chaos of Love*. Polity Press
- Butler, Judith (1990) *Gender trouble Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge
- De Beauvoir, Simone ([1949]1972) *The Second Sex*. Tr. By H.M. Parshley. Penguin.
- Giddens, Anthony (1992) *The Transformation of Intimacy. Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Jackson, Stevi (1999) *Heterosexuality in Question*. London: Sage Publications.
- Illouz. Eva (1997) *Consuming the Romantic Utopia Love and the Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. Berkeley: University of California press.
- Temkina, Anna (2008) Сексуальная жизнь женщины: между подчинением и свободой. СПб: ЕУСПб (*Sexual life of women: between subordination and freedom*). St.Petersburg: European University at St.Petersburg

SUB THEME 2:

Temporal Dimensions of Loving and Love Activities



Report from Workshop

Valerie Bryson

Unsurprisingly, this workshop raised many questions and it provided few, if any, answers. We came from diverse disciplinary and national backgrounds, and only a small minority were able to use their first language in the discussions. We became aware that the significance of the word ‘love’ is very variable, and that while it can be used quite widely and readily in English (as in ‘I love this apple’), in some other languages it is much ‘heavier’ and more significant. Although all debates were lively and stimulating, in some sessions our lack of shared knowledge base meant that some of us (I include myself here) did not fully understand all that was being discussed. This report is framed by these considerations, and we debated more than it could possibly include. The report should therefore perhaps be seen as an inevitably selective account by a particularly unreliable narrator.

Our discussions went well beyond the workshop title. Rather than summarising each debate in turn, I have attempted to tease out key recurrent themes under the headings of ‘temporal dimensions’, ‘love and care’, ‘the nature of love’, and ‘methodological issues’.

Temporal dimensions

We identified a set of interconnected issues around our human need for love and care

- We all need love and care at some stage in our lives (we would die at birth without it). However, love and care take time, and this is usually women’s time, either unpaid in the home or as part of paid employment. This time is often unrecognised, and is increasingly squeezed out by other demands. In particular, government policies assume that the primary responsibility of citizens is to work for money, while career advancement, including in the academy, assumes that good workers are *careless*, so that their time is available for their employer and they can work long hours without notice.
- The ever-increasing time squeeze on loving activities, on looking after others, on time ‘to be’, and on time to appreciate nature is having deeply damaging effects on us all, denying our nature as sentient, relational and inherently vulnerable beings and subordinating human needs to the commodified time-is-money logic of capitalist society.

- It is not just a matter of hours, but the kind of time that love and care involve that is unrecognised as the often slower, repetitive, relational time or caring activities, or the apparently stagnant time of unrequited love clash with and are subordinated to the remorseless demands of the clock.

We also discussed the ways that individuals, ideas, identities and generations move and develop through time, and the intersections of personal/biographical and historical time.

- As ideas around love develop over time they are informed by or dependent upon both the discourses and the material circumstances around love and marriage which themselves change over time (for example, the prohibition or acceptance of same-sex marriage; the economic dependency or independence of women).
- Experience and behaviour change over generations, but what kind of evidence might reveal this (official documents? time-use diaries? life accounts?)
- Identities change and develop through individual and historical time.
- As researchers, we undergo personal and intellectual journeys.

Love and care

We debated:

- The ways in which love and care are related, and how they are different. Several participants argued that while care can be commodified, love cannot.
- Whether love labour or care can or should be paid, and whether payment necessarily involves commodification. Some argued that those whose time is taken up with loving activities should be economically supported. Others saw love as a gift, a retreat from consumer society and the exchange economy; this gift would be polluted if payment were involved.
- The role of the state in regulating personal life and recognising rights: we discussed how some states extended marriage rights and protections to homosexual marriage, and whether this could be extended to recognise rights in other forms of households, for example of siblings or friends.

The nature of love

We did not seriously seek to define this. However, our discussions were often informed by our implicit, and sometimes contradictory, assumptions about what love ‘is’; we need to make these more explicit.

We regularly mentioned or acknowledged that there are many different kinds of love – of a sexual partner, of children, parents and siblings, of friends, of knowledge, of the aesthetic, of nature... We also accepted that most people don’t live in couples, and that we should think outside dyads (man/woman; mother/child etc). Nevertheless, our discussion tended to drift back to heterosexual love and coupledom.

Largely in relation to heterosexual couples, we discussed:

- How and whether heterosexual love oppresses women
- Whether heterosexual love can be detached from power
- What love has to do with marriage, and how love might or might not grow in forced or arranged marriages.
- Why in one study women reported love for their children or work rather than their husbands (we generally saw this as an anomaly to be explained).
- Whether couples in western societies are becoming more equal

We also discussed (and these points are interconnected):

- Love and the aesthetic, love as a draw to the beautiful
- Love as an ideal, a perfect human condition that can never exist
- Love as the material equivalent of hope that is also bound up with suffering – we always want something that isn’t there, so we suffer
- Love as the merging of politics and ethics, as poethics
- Love as a force that can change lives, whose transformative effects reveal the world and its beauty
- The relationship between the particular and the universal, and whether love for one individual – a partner or child – can lead to love of humanity and new ways of knowing the world
- Love as a gift to be given or received
- The possibility of love across academic disciplines

Methodological issues

Our discussion raised a number of general issues and some that are very specific to research on love. We debated:

- The relationship between researchers and the people whose lives we are researching
- The need to locate ourselves in relation to our ‘material’
- The extent to which the material we discuss is culturally specific
- The contradictions between how we intellectualise and research love and how we live our lives; it can be painful and tiring to think about love all the time.

More generally, we discussed our role in knowledge production and the context in which we work. We identified pressures on academia, particularly the drive to publish, and related this to hierarchies of knowledge, through which some languages, methods and areas of research are privileged and others are others marginalised or silenced; we linked this in turn to the controlling role of the giant publishing houses at the heart of global capitalism. In the light of this, it is perhaps worrying to note the extent to which our own discussions tended to focus on heterosexual coupledom in western societies.



Chapter 13

Timescapes of Love and Marginality

Asma Abbas

Following Kristeva into Proust's invocation of love as that which makes space and time perceptible to the heart, it could be said that different loves, and different modes of loving, make *different* spaces and different times *perceptible* to the heart, and also that they make space and time *differently* perceptible to the heart.

The reverse is conceivable too: different experiences of and approaches to time and space nourish loves various in form and content. Practices and modalities of love are related to the manner in which bodies and subjects manifest varying ontological and experiential configurations of time and space depending on their location within social orders. This is a grounding premise of the project to which this paper belongs – a project moved by the intermaterialities of *marginality* and *love*: the former an experience of inclusion and exclusion that begs to be looked at beyond the frameworks provided by the homogeneous time and space of a liberal capitalist politics and metaphysics; the latter a force that constitutes and is constituted by the presence and absence of proximity and beauty along the multiple spatiotemporal planes of the personal, political, interior, and exterior of lives within and beyond dominant structures. An articulate relation to time and space, love connects to marginality in more nuanced ways than merely in the outsider's relation to futuristic desire, utopic or dystopic. My interest is in how various modes of love shape the politics of the margins, and how one's coordinates in the social order determine the varieties of love that make and unmake subjects and their relations to each other.

In order to treat love fully politically requires treating it as a presupposition of materialism that acknowledges conflict, force, and a draw toward the beautiful, and that deems history and philosophy, and the methods of politics and inquiry, to be inseparable. It also requires questioning both the safe transcendence of love as an ethereal or sacred concept beyond reach, at the same time as it must make us wary of venting a community of thought based on giving full character to, prescribing, elevating, and filling content into a new redemption in the study of 'love', lest we are remiss in noting the difference in the political character of love as presupposition and love just an object. Rather than just seeing love as a solid body moving, manifesting, and occupying space and time as exteriorities, turning to love as presupposition involves addressing the

spaces and times in which relations happen that get contingently bound into certain forms called love, as well as the internal temporal structures of these forms that subtend different subjects and their politics.

Just as the relations of love impact experiences of time, reimagining and reconstructing the experience and the nature of time, and ourselves in it, has the promise of effecting some change in the ways bodies relate to each other. Thus, in the realm of working on and rethinking time and its politics, we might have to learn from the kinds of work that is done with spaces and environments – their architecture, design, builtness, sustainability. Changes across difference times in history ultimately relate to variations in the instituted, embodied, temporalities internal to the lives and spaces that were allowed to live and those that were made extinct – thus the story of where time lives in forms of life and of how life happens in different forms of time is no less important than the (hi)story of how lives are lived over and across time.

Thus do love and the aesthetic remain tied together at the most fundamental level of the poesis of these forms as well as more phenomenological level with it comes to the character of politics contingent on different space and times and the love they afford. This essay triangulates the consideration of love, time, and marginality within a capacious frame of the aesthetic, and performs some very initial forays into approaching the sensuous and temporal imperatives of a materialism that takes love to be a presupposition. First, I probe the directionality of imperatives and effects between love and time, using a ‘love song’ to drive this reflection. Next, I examine love as a *timescape*. Drawing out some of the determinations between time, sensuousness, and the body as location and dislocation of time and sense, facilitates an instinctive, even inevitable, gesture to the unrequited. The unrequited – the unnamed presence of the love song and of Jacques Ranciere’s metapolitics – twins the questions of love and marginality. In the third section, I move to a timescape of marginality. I work through and depart from Ranciere’s political aesthetics, augmenting it with a needful temporal infusion that surprisingly unsettles and reimagines the presuppositions of politics he puts forth. The full force of the relation between love and time can be felt in the attempts to recast sensuous existence that ensue from marginal sensuous worlds of suffering and love, and from those to whom the presupposition of equality is not available or desirable. In search of new presuppositions that rely on the dissensus of, and refuse to abstractly equalise or reconcile, different modes of loving and suffering, the entire legacy of the aesthetic and its politics begs to be refreshed and redirected.

References

- Appadurai, Arjun (1996) 'Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy.' In *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, 27-47. University of Minnesota Press.
- Bergson, Henri (2007) *Matter and Memory*. Cosimo, Inc.
- Bhardwaj, Rekha (2005) Vishal Bhardwaj, and Gulzar. *Ishqa Ishqa*. CD. Music Today.
- <http://www.ilike.com/artist/Gulzar/album/Ishqa-Ishqa?src=onebox>.
- Bhardwaj, Vishal (2007) *Tere Ishq Mein – Video*.
http://www.metacafe.com/watch/2123734/tere_ishq_mein/.
- Breithaupt, Fritz (2005) 'The Invention of Trauma in German Romanticism', *Critical Inquiry* 32(1): 77-101.
- Dinshaw, C., L. Edelman, L., Ferguson, R. A., Freccero, C., Freeman, E., Halberstam, J., Jagose, A., Nealon, C. and Hoang, N. T. (2007) 'Theorizing Queer Temporalities: A Roundtable Discussion', *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 13(2): 177-195.
- Edelman, Lee (2004) *No Future: Queer Theory and The Death Drive*. Duke University Press.
- Edensor, Tim (2005) *Industrial Ruins: Spaces, Aesthetics and Materiality*. Berg Publishers.
- Goldberg, B.Z., Carlos Bolado, and Justine Shapiro (2004) *Promises*. New Yorker Video.
- Harman, Graham (2005) *Guerrilla Metaphysics: Phenomenology and the Carpentry of Things*. Open Court.
- Keller, Ed (no year) 'Active Time in Architecture, Landscape and Cinema.' <http://www.basilisk.com/academic/timescape/timescape.html>.
- Kristeva, Julia (1996) *Time & Sense: Proust and the Experience of Literature*. Columbia University Press.
- Livergood, Norman D. and Marx, Karl (1967) *Activity in Marx's Philosophy*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Marder, Elissa (2002) *Dead Time: Temporal Disorders in the Wake of Modernity*. 1st ed. Stanford University Press.
- McGurl, Mark (1999) 'Social Geometries: Taking Place in Henry James', *Representations* 68(Autumn): 59-83.
- Pente, Patti (2010) 'Soil: Threshold Spaces of Subjectivity, Pedagogy, and Place in Landscape Art', *Visual Arts Research* 36(1): 35-43.
- Ranciere, Jacques (2006) 'Democracy, Republic, Representation', *Constellations* 1(3): 297-307.

- ___ (1998) *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- ___ (2010) *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*. Continuum.
- Ranciere, Jacques and Gabriel Rockhill (2006) *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Sharoni, Simona (1995) *Gender and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: The Politics of Women's Resistance*. Syracuse University Press.
- Tiffany, Daniel (2008) 'Club Monad', *Philosophy and Culture*. Romantic Circles Praxis Series. (June 2008).
<http://www.rc.umd.edu/praxis/philcult/tiffany/tiffany.html>.





Chapter 14

Truth Beyond Time: Love as an Instrument of Knowledge in Margaret Mazzantini's *Don't Move* and John Le Carré's *The Constant Gardener*

Barbara Alfano

This essay explores the significance of passionate love as a revolutionary tool that achieves a deeper understanding of social networks, human relationships, and life itself. It focuses on two novels from different cultural traditions, the Italian *Don't Move*, by Margaret Mazzantini, and the British *The Constant Gardener*, by John Le Carré. In both novels love is represented as a revolutionary force that not only pushes the protagonists into a position of displacement from their social network, but that becomes a crucial instrument of knowledge. The meaning of life, and of social and labour relationships is changed by the experience of the love relationship that crosses different sorts of boundaries and opens the way to the creation of heterotopic spaces. These are spaces of the mind where elements from different places and times, which could never come together otherwise, harmonise to reveal for the individual a different and deeper understanding of life itself. For the protagonists, the experience of love achieves a deeper understanding of the kinship of humanity, whereas social and political networks have failed.

Issues of temporality, in both narrative discourses, are key to the development of love as a tool of knowledge and even as a tool for conflict resolution. In *Don't Move*, the suspension of linear time and of the consequential evolution of events, as the title suggests, becomes essential to the development of that creative, heterotopic love zone evoked for conflict resolution. Furthermore, the extramarital love relationship between the narrator, Timo, and Italia, which Timo describes as true life in opposition to the phony, upper-middle-class existence he lives as a successful and accomplished surgeon, happens against and in between the chronologies of his duties as physician, husband, and father. Love is where normalised life is not. The same happens in *The Constant Gardner*, where, while trying to discover what happened to his wife, Justin Quayle not only finds out the truth about the distribution of supposedly life-saving medicines in Africa, but he also and foremost comes



to a deeper understanding of love at the expenses of his professional life (the love of his wife for him, and Tessa's love for Africa), and, in the end, at the expense of his own life. His dialogue with Tessa about the truth of love begins after her death, in a zone of communication that breaks the spatiotemporal dimension of linear time as we usually perceive it.

The aspect of these two stories that interests me is how romance shapes the ethicality of the individuals involved in it, and how it inflects their agency. I am looking at romance as a set of emotions and desires grounded and housed in an individual and it is not my intention to alienate romance from the individual in order to discuss it as a transcendent power. Romance is indeed that area of human relationships that cannot be investigated satisfactorily by approaches that disregard either individuality, or the self. I keep in mind the question that Michel Foucault put on the table: what work should one do on oneself? Through romance, Timoteo and Justin Quayle revisit their being part of humanity and their being ethical. Timoteo, who discovers his primordial instincts through his sentiments for Italia, admits to have learned not only how to love, but even how to smell beings and things around him, which has changed his weltanschauung. Justin has become the man he never even dreamed he could be, passing from being amused by Tessa's idealism, to completing her highly idealistically job. And while romance certainly does not change the world in either novel, it does affect the protagonists' understanding of human relationships in a way that could not be satisfied by social and political networks. Because romantic love may require the complete commitment of an individual to his own feelings, it may change the way in which this same individual relates to the world and to life.

References

- Le Carré, John (2001) *The Constant Gardner*. New York: Scribner.
Mazzantini, Margaret (2001) *Don't Move*. Trans. John Cullen. New York: Anchor book.



Chapter 15

Love, Work and Family in Early Norwegian Family Research and Today

Margunn Bjørnholt

Erik Grønseth: love distorted by the male breadwinner model

Erik Grønseth was the first Norwegian sociologist to theorise the relations between work, family and gender relations. Love and the conditions for love were central in Grønseth's theoretisation of work/family and gender equality. According to Grønseth (1956, 1970), the separation of men's and women's life spheres as well as women's dependency and subordination within the traditional male provider arrangement was detrimental to love, jeopardising the personal development of both men and women, strengthening patriarchal dominance in the family and having an alienating effect on men (1956, 1970). Following Bonnevie (1932), who argued for married women's right to paid work, Grønseth saw women's financial and personal autonomy as the prerequisite of authentic and fulfilling heterosexual love relations. Only when meeting as equals, unburdened by the patterns of subordination and dependency resulting from the male breadwinner system, men and women could love on equal terms, in an authentic way, as free and independent individuals.

Today, the male breadwinner model has been substituted with a dual earner model, and Norwegian women have a stable relation to the labour market, but they work fewer hours and earn less than men. Men are more involved in the everyday care of their children, but family responsibility remains gendered, and many couples live in what I have called neo-traditional work/family arrangements: both have paid work, but he works more and she slightly less, and both care, but she more and he slightly less (Bjørnholt 2010).

What would Grønseth and the second wave feminists have made of the current situation? Would they perceive the male breadwinner model to have been sufficiently modified for authentic love to unfold? Or is the contemporary 'neo-traditional' work-care arrangement just a modified version of the male breadwinner model, still generating patterns of female subordination and male superiority? Following this line of reason-

ing, is exact numerical parity and life course isomorphism between men and women the necessary prerequisite of egalitarian gender relations? This seems at least to be the underlying hypothesis of contemporary Scandinavian family policies.

Hanne Haavind: love and power in marriage

Hanne Haavind's theorisation of love and power in marriage is probably the most influential Norwegian contribution to the theorisation of love and gender relations (1982/1984). Haavind's starting point was to see gender as a social relation in which femininity and masculinity are defined in relation to each other and women's relative subordination and men's relative superiority within marriage as part of the production of gendered subjectivities and identity formation. Within marriage, men and women exchange confirmation of their gendered identities based on a hidden 'marriage contract' with different standards and expectations as to what to feel, what to give and what to expect for 'her' and for 'him'. While her relations to 'him' are assumed to be more important to her than anything else, his relations to work are more important than his relation to 'her'. In this way marriage empowers him and disempowers her. The key problem is that heterosexual love is based on the two partners in a couple exploiting and transforming the power relation between them into a relation of desire and that what women desire in men is also what make them complicit in their own subordination. By relating power to love and claiming they were two sides of marriage, Haavind attracted a lot of attention.

Today there is a general tendency by other Norwegian researchers into love work and family to distance themselves from both Haavind's and other feminist theorisations that link love to power (Aarseth 2008a, 2008b).

Helene Aarseth: re-romanticised domesticity through de-gendered projects in the home

In her doctoral dissertation Helene Aarseth (2008) concluded that the highly educated, two-career, couples in her study had succeeded in achieving a high level of gender equality through a strategy of concerted self-development and common, de-gendered projects in the home and a task-sharing based on individual desire. Aarseth sees this re-romanticisation of the domestic sphere through common life-style projects as an indication of changing gender relations based on a new will by men to

invest in the family as a common life-sphere, thereby transcending previous gendered patterns of work and care.

Aarseth positions herself against Haavind and other theorisations of couples, work and family, which, she claims, have failed to discover these new developments towards more egalitarian patterns. She claims that analytical perspectives that focus on gender dichotomy, hierarchy and power, are unsuitable in uncovering as well as explaining change. Aarseth concludes that desire and self-development are important, while appeals of gender justice and equal task-sharing are seen as counterproductive.

This leaves us with a number of questions: Is a focus on persisting inequalities and structures of domination contra-productive in producing change? Should researchers rather focus more on signs of positive change, or should feminist researchers remain disturbers of the peace, aiming at disclosing patterns of inequality below the surface of assumed egalitarian couple relationships and societies?

References

- Aarseth, Helene (2008) *Hjemskapingens moderne magi*. Doktorgradsavhandling, Institutt for sosiologi og samfunnsgeografi, Universitetet i Oslo.
- Bjørnholt, Margunn (2010) 'Like Father, Like Son? The Transmission of Values, Family Practices, and Work-Family Adaptations to Sons of Work-Sharing Men', *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers* 8(3): 276-299.
- Bonnevie, Margarete (1932) *Ekteskap og Arbeide*. Oslo: Some.
- Grønseth, Erik (1956/73) *Seksualitet, Sosialisering og Sosiologisk Teori: Betrakninger over Parsons Analyse av Sosialisering og Samfunn i Lys av Reich*. Oslo: Institute of social research/Department of Sociology University of Oslo.
- Grønseth, Erik (1970) 'The dysfunctionality of the husband provider role in industrialized societies'. Paper presented at the VII World Congress of Sociology, 1970, Varna, Bulgaria.
- Haavind, Hanne (1982/84) 'Love and power in marriage', in H. Holter (1982/84) *Patriarchy in a Welfare State*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Chapter 16

Time to Love

Valerie Bryson

This paper focuses primarily on the caring and nurturing aspects of love. I argue that although good care is essential to the wellbeing of any society, its importance is often forgotten by policy makers, who fail to understand its time-consuming nature, the kind of relationship with time that it involves and the link between gendered caring responsibilities and ongoing inequalities between women and men in contemporary western societies.

My arguments draw on Anna Jónasdóttir's work on 'love power' (2010), my own attempts to develop a materialist analysis of (re)production (2004) and the work of Kathleen Lynch and others (2009). I see love and care as necessary foundations of human society that involve a gendered and highly unequal distribution of benefits and burdens, and I agree with Lynch and her co-writers that while both love and care require active work, only the latter can be bought. I argue that time today is organised and understood in ways that are deeply damaging to both primary loving care and paid care work, and that ensuring that the work of love and care is appropriately rewarded, supported and equitably distributed involves a radical challenge, not only to dominant economic and gender rationalities, but also to dominant *temporal* rationalities.

Here there are three key interconnected points that need to be recognised by policy makers. First, access to disposable time is a scarce resource. This means that if, for example, parents are expected to work long and/or unpredictable hours they will have less time for their children or for community involvement, and they cannot also take care of their elderly parents. Seeing time as a scarce resource reveals the contradictory imperatives of the market economy, which relies on unpaid family work while increasingly expecting all able-bodied adults to be economically self-sufficient through paid employment.

Second, this scarce resource is unequally and inequitably distributed. In particular, the growing evidence from time-use studies throughout the world demonstrates both the time-consuming nature of the work involved in love and care and women's disproportionate responsibility for it (Bryson 2008). This socially essential work is usually either unpaid or badly paid, and men's failure to do their share acts as a key source of wider political, social and economic inequalities. Redistributing disposable time requires that caring responsibilities should be both publicly

supported and more equitably distributed; this in turn requires radical changes to conditions of employment, better state support for unpaid carers (including paying them for their work), and state provision of good quality caring services.

Third, we need to challenge the ubiquity of the future-oriented, ‘time is money’ logic of the capitalist economy and the workplace. This ‘temporal rationality’, with its insistence on cost-efficiency, time management and quantifiable results, is geared to the maximisation of profit rather than attention to human needs, and it assumes that the time of ‘normal’ workers will not be constrained by family responsibilities. However, it is often inappropriate and counter-productive when applied to the provision of love and care: these require a much more fluid, open-ended and process-oriented sense of time that attends to present moments, natural rhythms, unpredictable needs and the intangible processes inherent in interpersonal relationships. Given the ongoing gender division of labour and privilege, I find that contrasting the ‘men’s time’ of the workplace with the ‘women’s time’ of love and care work provides a useful (although not unproblematic) shorthand that highlights the gendered power relations that different kinds of time involve (for discussion and references, see Bryson 2007).

By the end of the twentieth century, western societies had to varying degrees acknowledged that employees, men as well as women, will at times have responsibilities outside the workplace; family leave and state support for childcare is generally most generous in the Nordic nations and least generous in the US. However, in many nations job insecurity and a rigid stress on efficiency and targets are now increasing time pressures at work, while neo-liberal ideology and recession have combined to reduce welfare benefits and require lone mothers of small children to be in paid employment. The time needed to create and sustain loving relationships is increasingly squeezed, while paid care is treated as a source of profit, with workers expected to ‘process’ the maximum number of clients rather than building human relationships with them.

Against this tightening grip of ‘men’s time’, we need to assert the value of time that cannot be measured by the clock. Because the hegemony of work-time logic is bound up with other dimensions of men’s power, challenging ‘men’s time’ and the rewards attached to this also means challenging their economic, social, political and cultural ‘normality’. Although many men will be unwilling to see, let alone surrender, the privileges that this involves, they too often suffer from the inappropriate dominance of the ‘time is money’ culture in all areas of life. The damaging effects of this are part of an increasing conflict between the productive and (re)productive needs of society which makes the inability of the

market economy to satisfy many human needs increasingly apparent. While the economic crisis that threatens many western economies seems likely to undermine the temporal logic of care even further, it also destabilises ‘men’s-time’ temporal assumptions around life course and career trajectories, strengthening a shift from the certainties of ‘modern times’ to chaotic, jumbled, disorienting ‘post-modern times’. As old temporal patterns and identities become increasingly untenable, new possibilities may therefore emerge

References

- Bryson, Valerie (2004) ‘Marxism and feminism: can the “unhappy marriage” be saved?’, *Journal of Political Ideologies* 9(1): 13-30.
- Bryson, Valerie (2007) *Gender and the Politics of Time. Feminist Theory and Contemporary Debates*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Bryson, Valerie (2008) ‘Time-Use Studies: a potentially feminist tool?’, *International Journal of Feminist Politics* 10(2): 135-53.
- Jónasdóttir, Anna G. (2011) ‘What Kind of Power is “Love Power”?’, in Anna G. Jonasdottir, Valerie Bryson and Kathleen B. Jones (eds) *Sexuality, Gender and Power, Intersectional and Transnational Perspectives*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lynch, Kathleen, Baker, J. and Lyons, M. (2009) *Affective Equality. Love, Care and Injustice*. Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke.





Chapter 17

'Not so Much Lost Between Me and My Husband': Love in Estonian Women's Life-Stories of the Soviet Period

Leena Kurvet-Käosaar

My project focuses on the representation of love in Estonian Post-Soviet life writings by women that deal with the experience of the Soviet period. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the period of regaining independence, life story became an important vehicle of the emergence of 'a memorial framework' as a central 'mode of interpreting the past' (Hamilton 2003, 136) in Estonia. During this period numerous nation-wide public calls for submitting life stories were issued that resulted in an extensive corpus (in the format of both published collections and archival collections) of personal narratives. The ways in which it has shaped an understanding of both public and private modes of engagement with memory and history, allows to talk about a specific memory culture in Estonia. The life stories of women's experience and perception of the role of love and sexuality that form the basis of my research belong to larger Estonian memorial frameworks, often employing similar narrative and tropic strategies and modes of identification.

Within the framework of the current project I have focused on two published collections of Estonian life stories in particular: a volume that focuses on love and sexuality (*Kured läinud, kurjad ilmad*, 1997) and a volume on women's life experience (*Naised kõnelevad*, 1997). My aim has been to do a cursory mapping of the textual representation of love, seeking answers to the following questions: What is the role that love plays in women's lives, in particular in relation to men? Is it possible to trace 'love plots' in women's life stories and how do they interact and intertwine with other interests? What are the dynamics and characteristic features of love interests/ investments in the stories? What is the interrelationship between love and the desire of attaining full personhood and its realisation?

Love (or romantic love) is a phenomenon that is considered to be of central importance in contemporary Western society (Bauman 2003; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 1995; Shumway 2003), often viewed as deep-

ly embedded in structures of mass media and consumer culture (Berlant 2008; Illouz 2003; Pearce and Stacey 1995). While I have found in many insights provided by feminist research on love (e.g. Bartky 1990; Jónasdóttir 2009; Jackson 1995) valuable for my work on Estonian women's life stories in general, many aspects of love research, in particular its emphasis on the modes of the operation of consumer culture as well as the nature of the relationship between the individual and the society, can be applied only with reservations due to context differences.

With keeping the above mentioned aspects in mind, my analysis of the narratives has been influenced by Lauren Berlant's elaboration of the concept of the intimate publics as a 'culture of circulation' (2008: 10) based on an perception of 'the social world as an affective space' (2008: 2). According to Berlant, the 'reproduction of everyday life' is dominantly identified with women *by* women, thus constituting an important foundation of women's culture (the intimate publics Berlant focuses on) (2008: 170). An important component of this process (and of forming the intimate public) entails multifaceted management of 'affective and emotional intimacy' (2008: 170). In my analysis of the life stories of Estonian women, I have tried to trace the textual evidence making visible the operation of an intimate public that testifies to the processes of management of affective and emotional intimacy via a display of emotional and affective experience, expertise and ethics (cf. Berlant 2008: 170).

Highlighting the categories of 'ordinariness' and 'the everyday', the life stories make visible the accumulation and application of practical knowledge and the affective economies relating to the flow of everyday life. Representation of love and intimate relationships provide valuable insights about Estonian gender relations during the Soviet times and makes visible daily negotiation processes of the Soviet gender ideology (see, e.g., Rotkirch 2000: 10). Women's descriptions of the processes of balancing paid work and family life, the distribution of duties and responsibilities within the family, conceptualisations of the role and relevance of intimacy, both with regard to their partners and within larger 'communities of intimacy' including children, parents and siblings, etc., offer a nuanced picture of the operation patterns of Soviet ideology of gender equality and the gender system during the Soviet period as an interrelated web of values and practices inherited from the previous times (most importantly the period of independence between the two world wars) and the assimilation of the norms and values of the Soviet regime.

(Romantic) love is not depicted as playing an important role in Estonian women's life stories that focus on the Soviet period. The importance of marriage/long term partnership or romantic experience in general is not particularly high. The preferred 'ideal' here is not staying single but

adopting the role of single mother and sole breadwinner for the family, a life pattern not followed consciously but employed for solving the problem of failed relationships/marriages (due to partner's infidelity, alcohol problems, neglect of familial/spousal duties, sometimes domestic violence. Such solution, however, is not rendered as considerable loss; rather women celebrate motherhood, work achievements and greater personal freedom.

References

- Bartky, Sandra L (1990) *Femininity and Domination*. New York: Routledge.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (2003). *Liquid Love: On the Frailty of Human Bonds*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Beck, Ulrich and Beck-Gernsheim, Elizabeth (1995) *The Normal Chaos of Love*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Berlant, Lauren (2008) *The Female Complaint. The Unfinished Business of Sentimentality in American Culture*. Durham and London: Duke UP.
- Cranny-Francis, A. et al (2003) *Gender Studies: Terms and Debates*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hamilton, Paula (2003) 'Sale of the Century? Memory and historical consciousness in Australia', in Katharine Hodgkin and Susannah Radstone (eds) (2003) *Contested Pasts. The Politics of Memory*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Illouz, Eva (2003) *Consuming the Romantic Utopia: Love and the Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Jackson, Stevi (1995) 'Women and Heterosexual Love: Complicity, Resistance and Change', in Lynne Pearce and Jackie Stacey (eds) (1995) *Romance Revisited*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Jónasdóttir, Anna G. (2009) 'Is Exploitation only bad? Or what kind of power is love power? Alicia Gil Gómez, Gemma Escrig Gil and Águeda Forcada Martínez (eds) (2009) *Poder, poderes y empoderamiento ... ¿Y el amor? ¡Ah, el amor!* Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume.
- Rotkirch, Anna (2000) *The Man Question. Loves and Lives in Late 20th Century Russia*. University of Helsinki, Department of Social Policy Research Reports 1/2000.
- Pearce, Lynne and Stacey, Jackie (1995) *Romance Revisited*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Shumway, David, R. (2003) *Modern Love. Romance, Intimacy and the Marriage Crisis*. New York: New York UP.

Chapter 18

Recognising Love, Care and Solidarity: Challenging (Re)distributive, Recognition and Representational Models of Social Justice in the Work of Nancy Fraser and Others

Kathleen Lynch

Egalitarian Theory and the Denial of Affective Relations

Political theory has tended to define the human person in three distinct ways, first as a public persona, second as an autonomous person devoid of relationality, and thirdly as a self-sufficient rational (cerebral) being, exemplified in the Cartesian assumption, '*Cogito ergo sum*'. Most branches of political egalitarian thinking have been concerned with the more 'public' spheres of life, namely the political relations of the state, the economic relations of the market, and the cultural relations governing social recognition. The preoccupation has been with inequalities of income and wealth, status and power. Rawls's *A Theory of Justice*, which has been the dominant work in Anglophone political theory since its publication in 1971, is a clear example of a text that gives primacy to the public sphere.

Those coming from a socialist and feminist tradition (Young 1990, 2000; Fraser 1995, 2008) also frame egalitarian questions in terms of the economy, polity and culture. While some feminist political theorists (Tronto 1993; Jonasdottir 1994) have recognised the importance of care as a form of work, and a discrete site of injustice, this is the exception rather than the rule. Fraser, who is one of the most influential contemporary political egalitarian theorists within the critical theory tradition, while giving attention to care work (Fraser and Gordon 1997), has not recognised the affective domain as an independent site of injustice. She has argued in most of her work for a perspectival dualism, a two-dimensional conception of justice. She identified redistribution and recognition as the two fundamental and mutually irreducible dimensions of social

justice, although acknowledging the discrete ways in which the political sphere generates injustice in her recent work (Fraser 2008).

The debate in political egalitarian theory, most especially between Fraser and Honneth (2003), as to the relative merits of the redistribution and recognition frameworks is centred on established intellectual territory. Honneth (1996) claims that recognition is the fundamental and overarching moral category and that the distribution of material goods is a derivative category. Fraser's response is that Honneth has psychologised the problem of injustice, and is treating social justice as primarily an issue of self-realisation, a subjective identity problem (via loss of self confidence, self respect, self esteem), thereby ignoring the deeply structural aspects to this type of injustice. In neither case are care relations, nurturing and dependencies, deriving from the inevitable vulnerability of the human condition, entertained as a site of injustice, except in a derivative or secondary sense.

While there has been an intense debate about care and its implications for gender justice, this has taken place largely outside the domain of mainstream egalitarian theory, operating mostly among feminist economists and sociologists (Folbre 1994, 2001, 2009; England 2002, 2005; Himmelweit 2002; Hochschild 1989, 2001; Gornick and Meyers 2003). Some philosophers (Kittay 1999; Nussbaum 2001) and feminist legal theorists (Fineman 2004; Fineman and Dougherty 2005) have also drawn attention to care as a site of injustice, although the reigning preoccupation in political egalitarian theory is with redistribution or recognition and, but to a much lesser degree, with the equalisation of power.

The Relational Realities of Caring and Loving: their implications for Justice

Love, care and solidarity⁹ are productive forces not only emotionally but also materially and politically (Hardt and Negri 2009). Studies of countries operating public polices involving the equalisation of wealth and income show that people are healthier and have higher levels of well-being in more equal and solidarity-led societies (Wilkinson and Pickett 2009; Dorling 2010). Equally, we know from psychology, that experiencing love and care at the personal level is vital for producing emotionally and mentally healthy persons, and that the latter, in turn, influences physical health and well-being enabling people to work and function more effectively in all areas of life. Given the primacy of love, care and solidarity for human well being, it is important to comment on them further here (see Lynch 2007 for an in-depth analysis).

Human beings are ethical, committed and emotional, as well as economic, political and cultural; the sets of values that govern people's actions in everyday life and the emotions that accompany them are central to how people live and define themselves (Sayer 2005: 5-12). People struggle in their choices between what is good and the not-so-good; their

9 Love relations refer to relations of high interdependency where there is greatest attachment, intimacy and responsibility over time. They arise from inherited or contractual dependencies or interdependencies and are primary care relations. Secondary care relations are lower order interdependency relations. While they involve care responsibilities and attachments, they do not carry the same depth of moral obligation in terms of meeting dependency needs, especially long-term dependency needs. There is a degree of choice and contingency about secondary care relations that does not apply to primary relations. Solidarity relations do not involve intimacy. They are the political form or social form of love relations. Sometimes solidarity relations are chosen, such as when individuals or groups work collectively for the well being of others whose welfare is only partially or not immediately related to their own, or solidarity can be imposed through laws or moral prescriptions that are collectively binding. While most people can readily identify the value of love and care at the personal level, there is less understanding of solidarity. Solidarity is the more political or public face of affective relations. It finds expression in the values a society upholds in support of others who are not autonomous. It is both a set of values and a set of public practices. It connotes the work that is involved in creating and maintaining local communities, neighbourhoods on the one hand, and the advocacy work in civil society for social justice and human rights at local, national and global levels at the other. It finds its expression in people's willingness to support vulnerable others within their own country or to support to peoples in other countries who are denied basic rights and livelihoods to live a life of dignity. The levels of solidarity in a given society are reflected in everything from the vibrancy of its community activities to the taxes people are willing to pay so as to fund and support vulnerable members of their own and other societies. It is where the moral, the affective and the political systems overlap in public life.

lives are governed by rules of lay normativity in much of their social action (*ibid*: 35-50). Because human beings live in affective relational realities, they also have emotional ties and bonds that can reinforce their motivation to act as moral agents, to act ‘other wise’ rather than ‘self wise’ (Tronto 1991, 1993). To say this is not to deny the fact that people can and do disregard feelings for others in all relations; they can and do behave indifferently, neglectfully and abusively. One of the defining struggles in the lay normative world is the struggle over how to balance concerns and commitment to others with self-interests tapping into and managing corresponding emotions.

Given the complex character of human relationality however, social actions are not simply interest-led in the economic, power and status sense (Sayer, 2011). While interests do play a role in framing choices and actions, people are evaluative; they make moral judgements about what matters to them in terms of their relationships, money, work and/or leisure. Because people have relational nurturing (nurtured) identities as carers and cared-for persons, their decisions are influenced by their love, care and solidarity priorities and values (Lynch et al 2009). Recognition of their vulnerability as human beings undoubtedly drives self-interest in the traditional economic sense, but it also drives people as moral and relational agents. In recognising the vulnerability of themselves, people can come to see the vulnerability of others.

Relations of love, care and solidarity matter not only for what they can produce personally (or what their absence of abuse can do negatively to persons, communities or societies) but for what they might generate politically in terms of heralding different ways of relating beyond separatedness, competition and aggrandisement. Grounding politics in the ethics of love, care and solidarity rather than the ethics of competition and self interest alone (I am not suggesting that self interest is not desirable or that it cannot at times work in the service of others) has the potential to help generate the type of egalitarian-driven societies that would be so beneficial to the well-being of humanity (Wilkinson and Pickett 2009). It would enable the principle of other-centredness to manage and contain the principle of rational economic interest, thereby driving economic and social policy in a way that is ethical in the sense that is it always two-dimensional in focus; it is not just focused on simple economic self interest or advancement (growth for growth’s sake) but is also focused on the care-of-the-other in the context of caring of the self.

Conclusion: The Normative, Positivism and the Neglect of the Affective in the Social Sciences

To move beyond the narrow definition of the human person as a public, rational and cerebral actor, one needs to address a major tension in contemporary sociological theory, namely the tension between the normative and the analytical within positivist led social science (Sayer 2011). While maintaining the separation between the positive and the normative is vital to avoid representing *a priori* assumptions and values as empirically valid ‘facts’, the dichotomy also presents us with unique problems of analysis. One of the issues is that it generates disinterest in the role of the normative, and relatedly that of affective relations in social life. Yet, as observed by Sayer in his analysis of social class and related inequalities (2005, 2006), human beings are not emotionally and morally detached entities. Social actors are not only interest-led, power-led or status-led. They can and do make moral choices. These choices are often driven by their relationality (Lynch, Baker and Lyons 2009).

Humans are not objects devoid of vulnerability; they have a susceptibility to loss and injury emotionally, physically and mentally (Fineman 2008). Their vulnerability grounds their relationality no matter how complex and conflict-laden these relations may be. A political space for new modes of political engagement, redefining the public from the inside out rests in that relationality. There is scope to direct political desire towards an admission of vulnerability and othercentredness. While economic and other self interests will inevitably play a role in desire, there is scope to define desires relationally not least by naming and recognising the collective (and ultimately individual) benefit of solidarity.

To recognise the salience of relationality for human choices and actions is not to suggest that relationality is disinterested or driven by simple altruism. Relational beings are simultaneously living in an autonomous space; they are both self-interested and relational simultaneously. People are individuals-in-relation, not separate and soluble persons (England 2005). And being self-interested in the classical economic sense may indeed be what enables people to be other-centred in other spheres of life; autonomy is not the enemy of relationality. Neither is relationality the enemy of autonomy; people who are engaged with the interests of others are more sensitive to their needs and desires and this knowledge of others gives one power to service the other and to be rewarded in turn by reciprocal appreciation and action.

References

- Baker, J. Lynch, K., Cantillon, S. and Walsh, J. (2004, 2009 2nd ed.) *Equality: From Theory to Action*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dorling, Daniel (2010) *Injustice: Why Social Inequality Persists* Bristol: The Policy Press.
- England, Paula (2005) ‘Separative and Soluble Selves: dichotomous thinking in economics’ in Martha Albertson Fineman and Terence Dougherty (eds) (2005) *Feminism Confronts Homo Economicus: Gender, Law and Society*. Cornell: Cornell University Press. (reprinted from M. Ferber and J. Nelson (eds.) 2003 *Feminist Economics Today*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Ferber, Marianne and Nelson, Paula (eds.) (1993) *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Finch, Janet and Groves, Dulchie (1983) *A Labour of Love: Women, Work, and Caring*. UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Fineman, Martha A. and Dougherty, Terence (eds) (2005) *Feminism Confronts Homo Economicus: Gender, Law, and Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University.
- Fineman, Martha (2004) *The Autonomy Myth: A Theory of Dependency*. New York: New Press.
- Fineman, Martha (2008) ‘The Vulnerable Subject: Anchoring Equality in the Human Condition’ *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism* 20(1): 1-23.
- Folbre, Nancy (1994) *Who Pays for the Kids? Gender and the Structures of Constraint*, New York: Routledge.
- Folbre Nancy (2001) *The Invisible Heart: Economics and Family Values*. New York: New Press.
- Folbre, Nancy (2009) *Greed, Lust and Gender: A History of Economic Ideas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fraser, Nancy, (1995) ‘From Redistribution to Recognition: Dilemmas of Justice in a ‘Post-Socialist’ Age’, *New Left Review* 212: 68-93.
- Fraser, Nancy (1997) ‘Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics’, in G. B. Peterson (ed.) (1997) *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Fraser, Nancy (2008) *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Fraser, Nancy and Gordon, Linda (1997) ‘A Genealogy of “Dependency”’ in Nancy Fraser (ed.) (1997) *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the ‘Postsocialist’ Condition*. New York: Routledge.
- Fraser, Nancy and Honneth, Axel (2003) *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange*. New York: Verso.
- Gornick, Janet and Meyers, Marcia (2003) *Families That Work*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio (2009) ‘Of Love Possessed’, *Artforum International* 48(2): 180-264.
- Himmelweit, Susan (2002) ‘Making Visible the Hidden Economy: The Case for Gender-Impact Analysis of Economic Policy’, *Feminist Economics* 8(1): 49-70.
- Hochschild, Arlie (1989) *The Second Shift*. London: Penguin.
- Hochschild, Arlie (2001) *The Time Bind: When Work becomes Home and Home becomes Work*, 2nd edition. New York: Owl Books.
- Honneth, Axel (1996) *Struggles for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Honneth, Axel (2003) ‘Redistribution as Recognition: A response to Nancy Fraser’ in Fraser, N. and Honneth, A. (eds) (2003) *Redistribution or Recognition*. London: Verso.
- Jónasdóttir, Anna G. (1994) *Why Women Are Oppressed*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kittay, Eva Feder (1999) *Love’s Labour*. New York: Routledge.
- Lynch, Kathleen (2007) ‘Love Labour as a Distinct and Non-Commodifiable Form of Care Labour’, *Sociological Review* 54(3): 550-570.
- Lynch, Kathleen, Baker, John, and Lyons, Maureen (2009) *Affective Equality: Love, Care and Injustice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nussbaum, Martha (2001) *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Phillips, Anne (1999) *Which Equalities Matter?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Rawls, John (1971) *A Theory of Justice* Revised Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sayer, Andrew (2005) *The Moral Significance of Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sayer, Andrew (2006) ‘Language and Significance or the Importance of Import’ *Journal of Language and Politics* 5(3): 449-471.
- Tilly, Charles (1998) *Durable Inequality*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Tronto, Joan C. (1991) 'Reflections on Gender, Morality and Power: Caring and moral problems of otherness' in S. Sevenhuijsen (ed.) *Gender, Care and Justice in Feminist Political Theory*. Utrecht: University of Utrecht.
- Tronto, Joan C. (1993) *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. New York: Routledge.
- Wilkinson, Richard and Pickett, Kate (2009) *The Spirit Level: Why More Equal Societies Almost Always do Better*. London: Penguin.
- Wright, Erik Olin (2010) *Envisioning Real Utopias*. New York: Verso.
- Young, Iris Marion (2000) *Inclusion and Democracy* Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Young, Iris Marion (1990) *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.



Chapter 19

Theorising Love in Forced/ Arranged Marriage: A Case of ‘Loving to Survive’?

Kaye Quek

The aim of this work is to critically examine discourses of love that exist in relation to the practice of forced/arranged marriage, in order to develop a gendered account of the loving relations that are constructed in this form of marriage. Feminist theorists have long pointed out the role of love, as an ideology, in upholding and concealing the structural nature of women’s oppression in heterosexual relations with men (Atkinson 1974; Delphy and Leonard 1994; Firestone 1972), however a conception of love that has been less well-examined is the notion of ‘love developing over time’, associated with customs of forced/arranged marriage. This paper draws on feminist use of the concept of Stockholm Syndrome¹⁰ and on the notion of ‘loving to survive’ (Graham 1994), in an effort to complicate commonly held notions about love in forced/arranged marriages and to extend to a new area, feminist concerns about the role of love in obscuring gender inequalities. It focuses on the practice of forced/arranged marriage in the UK as the basis for analysis.

The lack of interest shown by feminist scholars in the question of love in forced/ arranged marriage is noteworthy in view of the way in which the notion of ‘love developing over time’ is called upon in cultural defences of the practice, and outlined in sociological and anthropological studies on the custom. This is the idea that love in family-arranged marriages is different to western notions of love in that, rather than occurring before marriage, love is considered to ‘develop over time’ (Dion and Dion 1996; Gagoomal 2008; Gopalkrishnan and Babacan 2007: 518; Madathil and Benshoff 2008; Netting 2006; Pasupathi 2002). Such a conception of love is contrasted in the literature with ‘western’ ideas of love (Madathil and Benshoff 2008: 223); love between a husband

¹⁰ The term ‘Stockholm Syndrome’ originates from a bank robbery that took place in Stockholm, Sweden in 1973, in which four bank employees, who were held hostage for six days, developed positive feelings of loyalty and affection toward the robbers who were holding them prisoner (Graham 1994: 1). Following from this, scholars have used the term to explain how victims come to bond with their captors by responding gratefully to small acts of kindness (Moschetti 2005: 268).

and wife is conceptualised primarily in terms of a fondness and rapport that develops as spouses learn more about each other over the course of a marriage (Gopalkrishnan and Babacan, 2007; Madathil and Benshoff 2008: 223). The gendered implications that such a conception of love might entail, however, are issues that, for the most part, are not considered in these works. For instance, questions of who is required to compromise and adjust, and in what ways in order for a marriage to ‘succeed’, are concerns that are often not raised in relation to the discourse of ‘love developing over time’.

In an effort to theorise relations of love in forced/arranged marriages, the paper draws on feminist use of the idea of Stockholm Syndrome, and more specifically on the work of American feminist psychologist Dee Graham and her concept of ‘loving to survive’ (Graham, 1994). In the conceptual framework put forward by Graham, love, or more specifically women’s love for men, is theorised as a manifestation of women’s societal Stockholm Syndrome, that is, women’s love for men, Graham argues, ‘grow[s] out of needs for protection and safety resulting from a deep-seated fear of male violence’ (*ibid*: 200). Through love, she explains, women not only seek to ‘recoup our losses’ by aligning with those more powerful in society, but ‘hope to *persuade* men to stop their violence against us’ (*ibid*: 209). The paper makes reference in particular to four categories identified by Graham as factors conducive to the development of Stockholm Syndrome, which are: threats to survival, isolation, inability to escape, and small acts of kindness from those more powerful. Drawing on the body of scholarly, governmental, and non-governmental reports from the UK on forced/arranged marriage (for example, Brandon and Hafez 2008; Gangoli et al. 2006; HAC 2008; Hester et al. 2007; Khanum 2008), it suggests that women’s experiences of the custom indicate conditions conducive to the development of Stockholm Syndrome, and that therefore, in theoretical terms, the development of women’s love for men can be complicated as an attempt to maximise their options in context of a patriarchal society. It concludes by signalling the potential for love in forced/arranged marriage to be conceived as a ‘flipside’ to romantic love that forms the basis of ‘choice’ marriages, as both can be seen to play a role in upholding gender inequality.

References

- Atkinson, Ti-Grace (1974) *Amazon Odyssey*. New York: Link Books.
Brandon, James and Salam Hafez (2008) *Crimes of the Community: honour-based violence in the UK*. London: Centre for Social Cohesion, Civitas.

- Delphy, Christine and Leonard, Diana (1992) *Familiar Exploitation: A New Analysis of Marriage in Contemporary Western Societies*. Cambridge, Mass: Polity Press.
- Dion, Karen K. and Dion, Kenneth L. (1996) ‘Cultural Perspectives on Romantic Love’, *Personal Relationships* 3: 5-17.
- Firestone, Shulamith (1972) *The Dialectic of Sex*. London: Paladin.
- Gagoomal, Prashina (2009) ‘A “Margin of Appreciation” for “Marriages of Appreciation”: Reconciling South Asian Adult Arranged Marriages with the Matrimonial Consent Requirement in International Human Rights Law’, *Georgetown Law Journal* 97(2): 589-620.
- Gangoli, Geetanjali et al (2006) *Forced Marriage and Domestic Violence Among South Asian Communities in North East England*. Bristol: School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol and Northern Rock Foundation.
- Gopalkrishnan, Narayan and Babacan, Hurriyet (2007) ‘Ties that Bind: Marriage and Partner Choice in the Indian Community in Australia in a Transnational Context’, *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 14: 507-526.
- Graham, Dee L.R (1994) *Loving to Survive: Sexual Terror, Men’s Violence, and Women’s Lives*. New York and London: New York University Press.
- HAC (Home Affairs Committee - Commons) (2008) *Domestic Violence, Forced Marriage, and ‘Honour’-based Violence*. Sixth Report of Session 2007-8, Vol. 2, London: the Stationery Office.
- Hester, Marianne et al. (2007) *Forced Marriage: The Risk Factors and the Effect of Raising the Minimum Age for a Sponsor, and of Leave to Enter the UK as a Spouse or Fiancé(e)*. Bristol and Manchester: School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol and School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Work, University of Manchester.
- Khanum, Nazia (2008) *Forced Marriage, Family Cohesion and Community Engagement: National Learning Through a Case of Luton*. Watford: Bartham Press.
- Madathil, Jayamala and Benshoff, James M. (2008) ‘Importance of Marital Characteristics and Marital Satisfaction: A Comparison of Asian Indians in Arranged Marriages and Americans in Marriages of Choice’, *Family Journal: Counselling and Therapy for Couples and Families* 16(3): 222-230.
- Netting, Nancy S (2006) ‘Two-Lives, One Partner: Indo-Canadian Youth between Love and Arranged Marriages’, *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 37(1): 129-146.

Pasupathi, Monisha (2002) 'Arranged Marriages: What's Love Got To Do With It?' in Marilyn Yalom and Laura Carstensen (eds) (2002) *Inside the American Couple: New Thinking/New Challenges*. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Chapter 20

The Gender Politics of ‘The Politics of Love’: Irigaray, Ethics and the Shadow of Hegel’s Antigone

Margaret E. Toye

Antigone, the antiwoman, is still a production of a culture that has been written by men alone. But this figure, who, according to Hegel, stands for ethics, has to be brought out of the night, out of the shadow, out of the rock, out of the total paralysis experienced by a social order that condemns itself even as it condemns her.

Irigaray 1984: 118-119

This paper explores the implications of a stumbling block that has emerged in my project on feminist ethics of love. In an article in *Feminist Theory* (Toye 2010), I suggest that feminist theory approach the subject of love in terms of a theory/methodology of ‘poethics.’ I use the term ‘poethics’ slightly differently than others’ present employment of the term. A number of theorists limit their use of ‘poethics’ to a combination of various understandings of aesthetics and ethics; instead, I argue that because feminist theory is always political theory, the ‘po’ in ‘poethics’ needs to refer to politics and that, therefore, poethics be a consideration of the mutually implicating discourses of politics, ethics and aesthetics. The ‘po’ also points to the specifically poststructuralist theoretical approaches that inform both my understanding of these individual areas of thought and the ways in which they are intertwined. Further, employing a theory/methodology of ‘poethics of love’, rather than ‘theories of love’, foregrounds creative and literary texts as well as theoretical narratives as places to investigate these questions that also provide sites of *embodied* theories of love. These elements help to stress creative and positive engagements with the subject of love – especially in the sense of the posit-ing of new concepts – rather just a focus on negative analyses of love through a privileging of critique and detailing the problems with current concepts.

However, it is the attempt to think through the specific strand of the ‘politics of love’ that is giving rise to the stumbling block in the larger project and more specifically, it is the challenge of thinking through the

implications of the politics of love as a gendered concept that is causing the trouble. While I am calling for poethics as a theory/methodology which foregrounds the interrelations among ethics, politics and aesthetics in which I have always engaged, my projects, including that on love, have nevertheless been rooted in ethics. Departing instead from the question of the politics of love has challenged me to rethink this work. In the first part of this paper, I reflect on a series of questions surrounding the subject of ‘the politics of love’ in recent contemporary theory, which came into focus for me after attending two conferences on the subject (at Syracuse and York Universities), and which have led me to question the adequacy of contemporary theory that seems to be covering over the politics of love as a gendered scene. I note how often the figure of Antigone seems to be invoked implicitly or explicitly in this rethinking and contemplate the role she plays in much contemporary theory. I then reflect on how feminist contemporary theorists are rethinking the politics of love and I question how much they need to ground their work in historical approaches to this question and how much they need to consider the problem in new ways, or whether that activity is possible.

One of my queries has to do with why so many feminists as well as non-feminists do not foreground the work of Luce Irigaray, given that she is the philosopher who has probably given both theories of love and the figure of Antigone the most sustained and repeated attention throughout her career. (The continual return to the figure of Antigone is notable. See McCance, Walsh and Söderback on contemporary shifts in Antigone criticism).

The second part of the paper turns to Irigaray’s work, and examines how it connects with her lifelong interest in the topic of love. I foreground the difficulty of trying to define Antigone’s relationship to the political and then indicate how important her concept of love has been for my own work in rethinking love along the lines of love as ‘proximate distance.’ However, in relation to this conference to topic on temporality, I have come to realise that in theorising the concept of love as distance, I have limited my thinking to a spatial dimension. I therefore return to Irigaray’s larger project, as articulated in her *Ethics*, in which she encourages us to reconceive the world (including ethics and love) in terms of not one, or even two but three dimensions of: space, time and desire. This last category of ‘desire’, which I consider in my larger project in terms of ‘affect’, is a very important dimension, but because of the focus of the panel session, I will foreground the importance of time, while also stressing the importance of the interrelations among the three dimensions. I believe Irigaray’s citation of Hegel in her volume *I love to you* as the only philosopher who conceptualises ‘love as labour’ is an

important starting point for thinking through the question of the politics of love and temporality as well as in terms of the interrelations among the three dimensions. I point to a few ways in which I want to expand this concept.

References

- Irigaray, Luce (1984) *An Ethics of Sexual Difference*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
____ (1996) *I love to you*. New York: Routledge.
- McCance, Dawne (2008) ‘Introduction’, Special Issue: Antigone, *Mosaic* 4(1/2): v-vi.
- ‘The Politics of Love.’ Postmodernism, Culture and Religion 3. Coordinators Linda Martin Alcoff and John Caputo. Syracuse University. 16-18 April, 2009.
- Söderback, Fanny (2010) ‘Introduction: Why Antigone Today?’, in Fanny Söderback (ed.) (2010) *Feminist Readings of Antigone*. Albany: State University of New York.
- ‘Strategies of Critique XXIII: LOVE.’ Graduate Programme in Social and Political Thought. York University, Toronto, Ontario. 8-9 May 2009.
- Toye, Margaret E. (2010) ‘Towards a “Poethics of Love: Poststructuralist Ethics and Literary Creation”, *Feminist Theory* 11(1): 39-55.
- Walsh, Keri (2008) ‘Antigone Now’, Special Issue: Antigone. *Mosaic* 4(1/2): 1-13.





SUB THEME 3:

Love as a Multi-Dimensional Cultural
Construction and/or a Useful Key Concept
for a New Political Theory of Global
Revolution? Feminist Perspectives



Report from Workshop

Kathleen B. Jones

What We Talk About When We Talk About Love

I have borrowed title for my report from the American short story writer, Raymond Carver, whose dark edged stories about love's complexity in the human experience – its power to beguile us into both self-destruction and transcendence – form a haunting, though apolitical, fictional narrative about why love is, indeed, a question for feminism. The title could certainly have been the sub-title of our conference of workshops. Indeed, the scope of what we have talked about during these days has been broad, although its boundaries are more than a little difficult to clarify.

In workshop three, chaired by Gunnar Karlsson, our discussions of love's questions for feminism turned around the sub-theme of love's conceptual utility as a 'multi-dimensional cultural construction or key concept' for the development of a 'new political theory of global revolution'. This complicated matters even further because, while there was no fixed agreement on how to define love, there also was no consensus on what 'global revolution' means, though there may have been a presumptive understanding that this revolution would be both 'anti-capitalist' and 'feminist', whatever that means.

Presentations from panelists and our discussions of them covered several aspects or connotations of love and sometimes more than one in the scope of the same paper—

- Love as a power, capacity, or productive force, or as a kind of substance or e-motion (motion toward) that moves us toward and attaches or glues us to another or others, even to 'the divine'. (Eleanor Wilkinson, Rosemary Hennessy, Ann Ferguson, Cigdem Buğdayci, Vera Fisogni, Pia Karlsson-Minganti, Ewa Majewska, and Leyna Lowe all touched on this subject in one way or another).
- Love as divergent and conditioned individual (and perhaps group??) emotional experience of attachment to or connection with another or others. (All of the papers touched on this in some way).
- Love as human need – sometimes 'naturalised', but always conditioned. (Especially in Hennessy, Ferguson, Jabarooty, and Lowe)
- Love as a kind of (perhaps problematic) social relationship, whether intimate/familial, work-oriented, or contextualised in a political movement. (especially discussed in Ferguson, Hennessy, Lowe, Wilkinson).

- Love as episteme or way of knowing self and other. (Especially in Majewska)
- Love as secular, political-cultural symbol or religious icon. (Especially emphasised in the papers of Adeniji, Fisogni, Buğdayci, but also in Wilkinson).

The underlying, implicit question in all our discussions was which understanding of love could be useful for the development of a new political theory of global revolution, a question that was haunted by the spectre of Hardt and Negri's analysis of love as revolutionary force. To which Eleanor Wilkinson tentatively replied, perhaps none at all.

What primary themes and enduring questions emerged from these papers and discussion:

- Can love as a power or force act as limit or counter-force or critical practice to a capitalist ethos of market values, a kind of counter-narrative to the logic of accumulation?
- How would our understanding of love need to be transformed in order for this to happen?
- In what ways are contemporary conceptualisations of love, even romantic love, critiques of or supports for particular political regimes of power?
- What conflicts/privileges does a discourse of love elide or obscure that need to be articulated and kept in focus in relation to political theories of global revolution?
- Despite the real problems in actualising love, what is the role for a conceptualisation of love in 'utopian' terms, or in feminist narratives of social change?
- How is the researcher of love implicated in the research? (In terms of, for instance, the researcher's positionality; standing inside/outside the subject; as witness/translator; and connection to the question of the relationship between the author's biography and the author's work).
- What is the relationship between love and religion, even in fundamentalist or orthodox systems of religion or politics?
- Finally, what are love's limits? Must the global revolutionist be expected to love the group, multitude or movement?

Ciğdem Buğdayci's analysis of the novel, later transformed into TV series, *Forbidden Love*, undertook an analysis of love as political cultural trope in the context of Ottoman and modern Turkey, demonstrating a shift in the discourse of love from its more transcendent, 'divine' qualities as in Sufism to a more Westernised, romantic concept of love. Neither

east nor west, contemporary discourse on love in Turkey demonstrated a hybridity, a transformed conceptualisation of love whose potential as a revolutionary concept had to be contextualised in the contemporary political history of Turkey.

Chapter 21

Representations of (True) Love? A Critical Reading of the Media Coverage of the Crown Princess Engagement and Wedding in Sweden, 2009–2010

Anna Adeniji

This paper analyses the national and local daily press material from February 24, 2009, when the Swedish crown princess Victoria and Mr. Daniel Westling, announced their engagement, until June 20, 2010, the day after they got married. The aim is to outline some of the narratives, themes and consequences that are prominent in the material, with a special reference to how the word ‘love’ is used.

I want to stress the importance of understanding ‘love’ as a sign that does not have an essential meaning, but rather is given meaning within a certain context. This specific context shows how a discourse of love may invoke conservative attitudes towards heteronormative family ideals, but also to normalise the presence of the royal family in the everyday life of people and justify the monarchy as such.

Representations in the media are important instances to understand how the sign ‘love’ is being filled with meaning, and how it works as emotional politics (Ahmed 2004). How can we understand this as a collective emotional work, and what are the political implications of this? What are the consequences of the underlying connection between love and marriage that is being addressed in the media? What are the consequences of the underlying connection between love, the royal family and the people? How is Sweden as a nation conceptualised around notions of love, and more specifically around an understanding of gender equal or even democratic love?

I am influenced by the critical discourse analysis that follows Norman Fairclough’s model (1992). This approach understands discursive events as ‘simultaneously a piece of text, an instance of discursive practice and an instance of social practice’ (1992: 4). In this case, it means that I consider the media texts as part of an ongoing social construction of ideals of love, and more specifically how love is placed within a heteronorma-



tive kinship/power structure, linking the royal couple to the ‘people’ and the unification of the nation.

The narrative that dominates the story of crown princess Victoria and her husband Daniel Westling is the fairy tale narrative, although a modern version of it. In the media material concerning the royal wedding, this narrative is portrayed in different ways. Mostly there is the uncritical reference to the fairy tale. In these representations it is Victoria and Daniels previous story together that is the engine of the narrative: How they met and who they were when they met (a princess and a common man met in the gym); their trials (neither the media nor the king believed that Daniel was ‘good enough’); their journey for acceptance (her fight for love and his change from a common man to a man being worthy to become a prince); and finally the grand finale (their love conquers all: the people love them because of their love and they finally get to marry in front of everyone, with the king’s blessing). Although the fairy tale narrative is mostly used in a positive sense, as a way of supporting the love story, some journalists also exposed the narrative with a critical analysis. One example is a satirical reflection on the official video that was broadcasted from the court, when Victoria and Daniel was engaged. The writer describes the video as a traditional ‘court theatre’ with the royal family as actors playing the parts of superiors in need of loving subordinates to be able to rule (Wahlin 2009). In this article, it becomes apparent that the fairy tale narrative in itself serves the function of connecting this particular event into a timeless story of kings, princesses and the people that are their loyal subjects.

The last part of the fairy tale narrative, the part where love prevails everything else (over tradition, over social class stratification, over the king himself) is represented strongly by the Prime Ministers press conference after the engagement. ‘Love has prevailed!’ was the one quote that also functioned as title of an article (TT 2009), and this quote was repeated extensively.

One important element in the press material is to explain to the people how the princess and her prince love each other, and how much they love each other. First we can read how they describe their love for each other, in words. We are told that Daniel is ‘wise’ and ‘stable’ although ‘energetic’ and ‘ambitious’, whereas Victoria is ‘caring’, ‘genuine’ and ‘down to earth’. We also learn that their love grew from a friendship, as a contrast to a passionate stormy love affair. This description is gendered, but in a modern and equal sense – much similar to how Swedish gender equality work is understood (cf. Dahl 2005). Second, the description of their love is narrated by journalists as ‘true’ because of the long time they spent together and had to struggle for their relationship. This gives the

reader a sense of stability and trustworthiness. Third, we are constantly flooded with descriptions of how the couple touches and looks at each other. We are told that we can ‘see’ how much in love they are. If, by chance, ‘we’ cannot ‘see’ that in the pictures, the journalists tell us what to ‘see’. This element of seeing love, as a physical evidence, seem crucial for the understanding of true love.

I end the paper with an analysis of how all these themes are represented in the media material in order for ‘the people’ to understand the royal couple’s love, and to feel engaged in their love story. Through the discourse of love we are told that the crown princess and her husband are like everybody else, and that ‘we’ should be happy for them. Representations of love is a crucial element to link the monarchy to the people and helps to solve the impossible task of justifying the very undemocratic royal power in an otherwise democratic society.

References

- Ahmed, Sara (2004) *The Cultural Politics of the Emotions*. New York: Routledge.
- Dahl, Ulrika (2005) ‘Scener ur ett äktenskap. Jämställdhet och heteronormativitet’, in Don Kulick (ed.) (2005) *Queersverige*. Stockholm: Natur & Kultur.
- Fairclough, Norman (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- TT (2009) ‘Reinfeldt: “Kärleken har segrat”’, in *Dagen*, 2009.02.24.
- Wahlin, Claes (2009) ‘(För)lovande kärlekssaga’, in *Aftonbladet*, 2009.02.26.

Chapter 22

Love, Religion and Modernity: An Analysis of History of Desire and Sin in *Fin de Siècle* Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey

Çiğdem Buğdaycı

This paper discusses how the Christian notion of ‘guilt’ appears in the Turkish modernisation through shifting definitions of the concept of love. The history of desire and sin in Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey are analysed through a novel, *Forbidden Love*, written by Halid Ziya Uşaklıgil in 1898 and its adaptation into a television series broadcast in 2008-2010. The objects provide a concrete ground for the arguments since the mentioned novel is accepted to be the first *real* example of the aspired Western modernity and offers insights into love and sexuality. Love, in these products, is observed as the example of two different worldviews since the previous notion of love considers sexuality as a natural counterpart while the later one constructs it in the realm of ‘Christian sin’ and passion. Therefore, the paper discusses the historicity of love and its impact on the present non-Western cultures, specifically through the Turkish experience, and questions the relation between modernity, the religions and patriarchal perspectives.



Chapter 23

A Love Life in a Sexless Condition. The Challenge of Chastity in the Catholic Perspective

Vera Fisogni

Chastity in Wojtyla's catholic perspective and sexual orientation in Melchiorre's thought

The deliberate choice of living a sexless life seems to deny the fulfilment of the human subject. The problem is at the origin of the 'resentment about chastity' that phenomenologist K. Wojtyla, then Pope John Paul II, underlines in his essay *Love and Responsibility* (Wojtyla 1993). Assuming that chastity is a virtue – 'a matter of efficiency in controlling the concupiscent impulses' – he gets the following conclusions: 1) chastity orients ethical conduct; 2) chastity's function 'is to free love from utilitarian attitudes'. Wojtyla's thought presents at least two aspects of criticism: it deals with a concept of chastity similar for both men and women; secondarily, chastity 'prevents' love (sinful love) or 'prepares' to live the sexual partnership of married love.

Only if one can prove that a peculiar sexual orientation pertains to women and men, it is possible to argue that their attitude towards chastity differs in some way. Italian philosopher Virgilio Melchiorre has provided a theoretical argument about this topic. The sexual component plays a main role in structuring a person and it has to be taken in consideration as a relevant part of the individual 'perspective' on the world of life. Although Melchiorre argues that it is impossible to make a sharp distinction between male and female sexual intentionality and the variations within each gender is far larger than what one can say, it nevertheless indicates two main patterns of it. He assumes that male sexuality plays a mobile, intrusive role, when female sexuality is receptive, vowed to hospitality. Melchiorre goes further Wojtyla's idea of disembodied subjects. However, his distinction between the two sexual orientation seems deterministic, because of its essentialism.



The role of sensing in the making of the sexual difference

Phenomenology of person has deeply investigated the human act of sensing (*fühlen*), from Munich and Gottingen philosophers such as Scheler, Pfaender, Stein. Sensing is the an act that, bringing human beings in *rem exteriorem*, ‘towards the external things’, activates the will. On a metaphysical level, we couldn’t understand why ‘willing is a movement that brings about a change in our active relationship with a world’ (Wang 2007: 92), if we wouldn’t understand the role of sensing in the dialectic of the human act, precisely, in focusing the object of will and moving the will to it (intentionality). According to the *Quaestio 15* of the Saint Thomas Aquinas’s *Summa Theologiae*, sensing makes two movements: it indicates the end of an action and it let the will have a ‘taste’ of the object itself.

Moving from the theory of sensing as a component of the will, I can hold that the female or male embodiment is not a condition, but *a source of a peculiar way of being involved in reality*: it depends, of course, on the physical and physiological component of the person, but at the same time it transcends the embodiment in a more comprehensive perspective dealing with the dynamic of the free will. The receptiveness of the female body, described by Melchiorre, from this point of view, cannot be seen as a sort of anthropological schema. As a source of sensing, on the contrary, the embodiment provides something specific: *a female taste in relating to reality*. The attitude to encounter seems to prevails on conflict, because willing deals with a sensing component more affected by openness to reality. On the opposite, the male person reveals, on a phenomenological ground, a predominant attitude to explore reality than to encounter reality. For having an encounter the basic requirement is to stand one in front of the other and to stop, in order to have at least a glance of the other. The mobile, intrusive being of the male body orientation (Melchiorre) means, on the realm of sensing, a less intense involvement in the natural good provided by things and relations. On the opposite, a female body seems to be more implicated in them: it embrace reality. Here comes the final part of this investigation.

Chastity is – phenomenologically speaking – first of all an exercise of love and relation, for whom deliberately choose to address their life to a sexless condition. It is an already a full experience of love, at the native state (sensing and experiencing proximacy are archetypical experiences of being-in-the-world). It is not primarily the denial of a sexual life; on the contrary, chastity, whenever is the consequence of a full grown choice, deeply assumes that the experience of good and the attitude to relation are inscribed in the human condition. Because of the fact that

chastity offers a more comprehensive openness of the person to the others. It prepares to an encounter. For a woman, chastity reveals a deep experience of freedom because, in virtue of her proper way of sensing the world, comprehensive and receptive, she has more chance to deliberately orient her conduct to tender and respectful loving relations toward the others. I don't say that a woman is naturally good: I simply states that the female person has more chance to make the experience of the good and because of this, she keeps more responsibility, in deciding herself for the good.

References

- Alcoff, L. M. (2006) *The Metaphysics of Gender and Sexual Difference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blyth, I. and Sollers, S (2004) *Hélène Cixous. Live Theor*. New York: Continuum.
- Cavarero, A. (1999) *Le filosofie femministe*. Torino: Paravia.
- Fisogni, P (2010) 'Casti pensieri', in *Geniodonna*, giugno.
- ___ (2006) *Incontro al dialogo*, Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Irigaray, L. (2004) *Key Writings*. New York: Continuum.
- Wang, S (2007) *Subjective objectivity in Aquinas*, in *Acta Philosophica*, I (16).
- Melchiorre, V. (1993) *Corpo e persona*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero.
- Wojtyla, K. (1993) *Love and Responsibility*. New York: Ignatius Press.



Chapter 24

'Love' in Negotiations Over Young Muslims' Future Marriages

Pia Karlsson-Minganti

In today's Europe Muslim family formation has become central to arguments about the rights and wrongs of living in multicultural societies. Polygamy, arranged or forced marriages, and other practices believed to be characteristic for Muslims, are feared to result in parallel lives and jurisdictions (Grillo 2008). This paper illustrates how the critical view on arranged marriages is linked to a normative notion of love. It defines the 'normal' marriage in a modern democracy as a contract between two autonomous individuals based on mutual feelings of romantic love (Evans 2003; Giddens 1991, 1992). The paper further illuminates how this normative definition of love disqualifies arranged marriages, and Muslims who insist on such a practice as proper citizens. Moreover, it examines how the young Muslims themselves relate to 'love'. The results point to the fact that notions on romantic love are not alien to the youth, but already part of their narrations, while constantly renegotiated and transformed under the influence of various cultural, social, economic, and political circumstances in their everyday life. The analysis takes account of more than 'romantic' love between spouses, and includes the youths' relation to kin in former home countries, the Muslim community (*ummah*) at large, and ultimately God. In this, love is not only seen as a normative, potentially exclusionary force, but also as productive and empowering.¹¹

In 2008 The Swedish National Board for Youth Affairs was commissioned by the Government to survey the incidence of forced marriage. In their final report the commissioners recommend the criminalisation of the practice, a recommendation based on the recognition of the around five percent of 16- to 25-year-olds in Sweden, who allegedly feel that they are unable to freely choose whom to marry. The report simultane-

¹¹ The paper draws on an ongoing qualitative fieldwork-based research project, supported by the Swedish Research Council. It deals with marriage negotiations among members of the national youth organizations Sveriges Unga Muslimer (Sweden) and Giovani Musulmani d'Italia (Italy). Here the focus is on the Swedish part of the investigation, that is on members of Sveriges Unga Muslimer [SUM, i.e. Sweden's Young Muslims], which has an estimated 3,500 members and Sunni Islam as its general confessional orientation.

ously recognises the blurred line between arranged and forced marriages, and the ethical dilemma of whom is to define such a line: the individual, the parents, or an outsider. This paper elaborates on the asymmetrical power relation between minority and the state with its obvious risk of governmentality. For instance, the Danish state claims that strict condition for marrying foreigners is a successful means for combating forced marriages. The regulations coincide with another priority of the Danish government, namely the wish to decrease immigration, whether in shape of family reunion or arranged marriages for the purpose of gaining legal residence.

The young Muslims in this study argue that Islam encourage people to marry. Marriage is the legal frame for sexual activities and family is the basic foundation of society. Yet, they also claim that Islam prescribes for both parties to enter marriage voluntarily. As participants in the contemporary Islamic revival, the youth activists draw on a prevailing discourse about individual responsibility before God, and the importance of conscious and voluntary intentions. The idea of free choice as a moral category in Islam is important for the youths' perception of being autonomous and for their urge to be recognised as modern citizens.

I introduce the concept of *transcendental love* in order to better understand the youths' simultaneous experience of adoration and autonomy. God is love and Islam is his loving plan for human beings to live their worldly lives in such a good way as possible. It makes piety the first quality to look for in a future spouse, even if both popular and expert narratives have it that romantic feelings could, and should, develop by time. The couple's devotion includes their common struggle for maintaining faith and piety, to the benefit of the individual, the nuclear and extended family, and society at large. Here I introduce the concept of *love as moral co-responsibility*. It stretches beyond the piety of the individual and the couple, to the benefit of fellow-Muslims in former home countries and around the globe. In fact, it may constitute the base for voluntarily entering an arranged marriage.

Within the Muslim youths' associations as well as their families, one maintains the ideal of collective involvement in marriage planning. At the same time they are presented to the opportunity to look for support outside the families' direct control. New patterns are established, with marriages over conventional boundaries, such as 'race'/ethnicity or clan, and with young women taking initiatives to link up with future husbands on internet. As any other young adults they are consumers of *romantic love* disseminated within traditional and contemporary popular culture. These new patterns are further aspects for understanding the young Muslims' experience of autonomy. They are part of late moder-

nity as anyone else. They struggle for piety in conflict with both non-Muslims and conventional Muslim authorities (parents, elder scholars). They perceive themselves as groundbreaking, independent, and strong. In several ways their thinking on love and marriage coincides with Giddens' autonomous *pure relationship*.

Contrary to essentialist and exclusionary discourses one can choose to highlight the young Muslims as any partakers of late modernity. Similarly, one can choose to displace the image of a homogeneous West with an essentially democratic approach to love. Many ideals coexist, coincide, or conflict. They vary in practice and with the subject position inhibited by the individual actors. Likewise, perceptions of citizenship vary due to subject position. Muslims' difficulty to be recognised as full citizens is shared with those who are categorised as 'women' and ascribed with less rationality and autonomy than emotion and dependency (Young 2005; Evans 2003: 8). Love intertwines with notions of autonomy, which in turn intertwine with perceptions of belonging. The stigmatising and exclusionary effects of these normative chains of thought are important to recognise and scrutinise.

The concept of love turns out to be a fruitful analytical tool for better understanding complex relations linked with gender, migration, politics and religion. This paper gives at hand the complex and agonising tensions between minority rights, women's rights, and individual rights. It calls for an approach which is both intersectional and genuinely self-reflexive about asymmetrical power-relations and governmentality.

References

- Evans, Mary (2003) *Love. An Unromantic Discussion*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, Anthony (1992) *The Transformation of Intimacy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, Anthony (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Grillo, Ralph (ed.) (2008) *The Family in Question. Immigrant and Ethnic Minorities in Multicultural Europe*. Amsterdam University Press.
- Young, Iris Marion (1990) *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chapter 25

Revolutionary Love: Feminism, Love, and the Transformative Politics of Freedom in the Works of Wollstonecraft, de Beauvoir, and Goldman



Leyna Lowe

Historically, love has posed a problem for feminists. Controlled by the church and state and subject to the tyrannies of capitalism, love is a deeply personal relationship embedded in institutional structures that often prove to be oppressive to women. In the relations of love we find women bound by marriage, housework, family, children, sex, violence, and femininity, and it is the oppressive nature of these relations that compelled the feminist critique of love. Hardly capable of being ignored, the feminist critique of love rises to the challenge of collapsing the personal and the political, as it is here that feminist theory intersects with practice and where love and sexuality, hitherto considered ‘private matters’ dismissed by the most ‘revolutionary’ of groups, becomes a political issue.

This paper explores the revolutionary ideas of love proposed by three influential feminist thinkers: Mary Wollstonecraft in *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (2001), Simone de Beauvoir in *The Second Sex* (1957) and a selection of essays by Emma Goldman which include ‘Marriage and Love’, ‘Jealousy’, ‘Marriage’, and ‘Was My Life Worth Living?’ (2005, 1972a, 1972b, 1897). Using the close reading method, this paper discusses how, in each of their works, these feminists offer divergent critiques of sexual love. While Wollstonecraft argued for ‘rational’ love, or a love that is quiet, mature, and platonic, and called for the education of women in order for them to be capable of such love, Beauvoir offered an existential analysis that demanded that women shed their embodied, ‘inessential’ existence in order to achieve a transcendental kind of love. Goldman, on the other hand, preoccupied with the intrusion of the church and state into the love bond, argued for a love based in freedom and anarchy. In each of these feminists’ works, we encounter love in its most abstract and concrete forms. While Beauvoir, for instance, is a

feminist who favoured a philosophical analysis that is highly theoretical, it is clear that others such as Goldman grounded their texts in the theoretical underpinnings of contemporary social movements and their activist work. These differences represent how love and sexual relations can be differently interpreted even among feminist women, who, belonging to varying social classes and practicing divergent forms of work and politics, find new and unique ways to combine personal experience and political ideals.

Yet, for all their differences, the themes presented by the feminist theorists are shockingly similar, for they tackle the core issues of women's oppression. Wollstonecraft, Beauvoir, and Goldman all offer their readers a critique of marriage and motherhood, and a theory of women's oppression rooted in love and sexual relations. They vehemently attack the sexual double standards imposed on women, and chide men for treating women as private possessions in the love union. They argue for the necessity of women's economic independence and for their ability to freely choose their engagements and pursuits. Finally, they envision for women a perfect union based in love, comradeship, mutual respect, and friendship, where love is not the sole aim of existence, but a pleasurable enhancement to a meaningful life. Indeed, this paper concludes by arguing that these feminists are not only united in their insistence on the compatibility of love, politics, and intellectual work, but that love is important to their politics and work because it is intimately tied to their revolutionary visions of human freedom.

References

- De Beauvoir, Simone (1957) *The Second Sex*. Tr. H.M. Parshley. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Goldman, Emma (2005) 'Marriage and Love', in Emma Goldman (ed.) (2005[1910] *Anarchism and Other Essays*. Filiquarian Publishing.
- ____ (1972a) 'Jealousy: Causes and a Possible Cure' in Alix Kates Shulman (ed.) *Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings and Speeches by Emma Goldman*. New York: Random House.
- ____ (1972b) 'Was My Life Worth Living?' in Alix Kates Shulman (ed.) *Red Emma Speaks: Selected Writings and Speeches by Emma Goldman*. New York: Random House.
- ____ (1897) 'Marriage', *The Firebrand*, July 18, 1897. *The Emma Goldman Papers*. <<http://jwa.org/exhibits/wov/goldman/love.html>>.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary (2001) *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman with Strictures on Political and Moral Subjects*. New York: Random House.

Chapter 26

Love in Translation. Notes for a Materialist Feminist Critique of Neoliberalism.

Ewa Majewska

These Berliners do not regard themselves as *men* who *criticize*, but as *critics* who, *incidentally*, have the misfortune of being men. Love, for example, is rejected, because the loved one is only an '*object*'. Down with the object. It is therefore regarded as the greatest crime if the critic displays *feeling* or *passion*, he must be an *ironical ice-cold sojov*. [Sage].

Marx 1848: xx

In neoliberal societies primarily focused on effectivity and product, love as we remember it from its romanticised interpretations, seems to be hunted away rather than occupy the main place, at least within relations. This affect, which is not oriented on any direct income or profit, seems to be gone from people's practices, which might be one of the causes for its great revival in popular culture. It might seem that for neoliberal individuals it is a completely dated, old fashioned notion, especially if they do, as they are supposed to, perceive their lives as 'projects' (see Giddens 1992; Bauman, 2003). Two kinds of narratives seem to dominate here: the conservative revival of traditional values and procreative preoccupation as duty towards God or the nation and the market oriented narrative of profitability, which excludes love as not bringing any precise and fast income. These positions provoke reactions – sentimental (see Bauman 2003) and critically feminist (Butler 2004; Duggan 2003).

I would like to argue, that neoliberalism excludes love. It can appear either as an element of neoliberal commodified production or in revitalisations of ultraconservative family visions, and in both cases it is not love that we talk about, but colonised affective labour. Secondly, I would like to claim that – as Foucault argued at length, wherever there is control, there is resistance. Love does have some critical value due to its non-profit orientation. Even when employed for the service of capitalist income generating, it can still inspire a search for alternatives to the mainstream marketised worldview.

Many Latina, Chicana and Black feminist authors have been arguing, that love is a ‘methodology of the oppressed’ (Sandoval 2000), ‘strategy of radical pedagogy’ (hooks 1984), alternative to ‘arrogant looking’ (Lugones 2003) or ground for a community of the excluded ‘mestiza’ (Anzaldua 1983, 1981). I would like to read these authors claims in search for strategies of resistance/critical practices, but I would also keep in mind what other feminist theorists elaborated on while writing on ‘love-power’ (Jónasdóttir 1991) and ‘sex-affective production’ (Ferguson 1991). ‘Love production’ became a necessary element of many work environments (Harvey 2005). Neoliberalism has pushed this tendency to an extreme – although the regeneration of labour forces was present in previous versions of capitalism too, now it is work itself that often replaces the ‘wife figure’ and provides loving labour would not like to loose from sight the colonisations of love labour that happened in capitalism, which has been pushed to an extreme within the neoliberal societies. However, I would like to suggest, that love can still be a good inspiration for a materialist feminist critique of neoliberalism and that we might need a critical feminist position on it.

There is another important context where love seems indispensable, which is translation. From Benjamin already we have learned, that the translator should ‘lovingly and in detail incorporate the original’s mode of signification, thus making both the original and the translation recognisable as fragments of a greater language, just as fragments are part of a vessel’. (Benjamin 2004). Gayatri Spivak suggested, that the erotic strategy is maybe better when it comes to translation, that the ‘merely ethical one’, when the translator thinks ‘she is just like me’ (Spivak 1993). Yet, there is also a big risk of violence in translation, as Derrida argues in his reinterpretation of Shakespeare’s *Merchant of Venice*, where he claimed, that translation can also be a brutal imposition of translator’s norms (Derrida and Venuti 2001). The presence of love in translation seems to be similar to the situation of imagination in Kant’s epistemology, which he himself called ‘a blind but indispensable function of the soul’ (Kant 1895, 62). In the globalised world filled with promises of accessibility we might think, that everything is easily translatable, that – as for capital (see Marx 1848), there are no limits of translation and everything can be accessed, yet still – the love component in translation might exactly be about it – about the limits within communication and accountability of us and others – we might not be able to translate everything, at least – not at once and not immediately. Love as a limit to the overwhelming capitalist availability and love as a background for any communication with ‘Other’ understood as translation seems to be one and the same

thing. I would like to see, how it can inspire a feminist materialist critique of neoliberalism.

References

- Anzaldua, Gloria and Moraga, Cherrie (eds) (1981) *This Bridge Called My Back. Writings by Radical Women of Color*. Watertown, Massachusetts: Persephone Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (2003) *Liquid Love*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Benjamin, Walter (2004) ‘The Task of Translator’, in Lawrence Venuti (ed.) (2004) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith (2004) *Precarious Life*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques and Venuti, Lawrence (2001) ‘What is a Relevant Translation?’, *Critical Inquiry*, 27(2): 174-200.
- Duggan, Lisa (2003) *Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics and the Attack on Democracy*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Ferguson, Ann (1991) *Sexual Democracy. Women, Oppression and Revolution*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Giddens, Anthony (1992) *The transformations of intimacy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Harvey, David (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jónasdóttir, Anna G. (1991) *Love, Power and Political Interests. Towards a Theory of Patriarchy in Contemporary Western Societies*. University of Orebro.
- Lugones, Mara (2003) *Pilgrimages/Peregrinajes: Theorizing Coalition Against Multiple Oppressions*. Oxford: Rowman & Little Field.
- Marx, Karl (1948) *The Communist Manifesto*.
- Moraga, Cherrie (1983) *Loving in the War Years: Lo que nunca pasó por sus labios*, Boston: South End Press.
- Sandoval, Chela (2000) *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Spivak, Gayatri (1993) *Outside/in the Teaching Machine*. New York: Routledge.





Chapter 27

'Moved by Love': How Love Research can Change our Deep-Rooted Emotional Understandings and Affective Consciousness

Rosa M. Medina-Doménech, Mari Luz Esteban, Ana Távora-Rivero¹²

We have faith in love. We have a blind faith in love. Because of this we see love as a means of salvation without noticing how it is a form of re-becoming

Langford 1999: 152

In 2006 we initiated interdisciplinary research on 'Love, Health and Inequalities: Gender Identities and Women's Experiences'. We focused on love as a cultural ideology crucial in the construction of heteronormativity, which leads to the submission of women. Using ethnographies of feminist women and their partners, anthropologist Mari Luz Esteban explored the feminist understandings of love itineraries – contradictions as well as critical readings – and the embodied practice of sexual love in contemporary Spain and the Basque Country. Ana Távora, a feminist therapist working with therapy groups in the Spanish National Health Service, looked at the relation between women's affect, love affairs and psychic suffering. Rosa M Medina-Doménech, a historian of science worked on the culture of romantic love in the historical context of an authoritarian regime (Francoism in the mid Twentieth century in Spain), exploring scientific views (bio-deterministic understandings of love and attempts at psychologisation) as well as women's local knowledge developed through advice columns in women's magazines, feminist works, and novels.

In our paper we present our research journey in two ways: looking for the ideas about love that changed through the research project and, also, analysing the methodological transformations that happened through this journey. In a certain way we tell the story of three forms of re-becoming.

¹² Our research was funded by the Spanish government (Women Affairs Office)

For the anthropologist her re-becoming entails the loss of nostalgia of being coherent, she renounces using anthropology as a way to re-organise in a perfectly articulated narrative her findings on love. She humbly assumes the impossible task of a comprehensive theory of love and the tension between theorising (explaining) or, either just vividly showing her findings to avoid the risk of drowning out the vital flux of love. Her writing become canalised through the inspiration and use of fiction but interweaved with academic pieces as in a fluid and multifaceted puzzle to construct a choral ethnography. This ethnography consciously works with the premise of not inadvertently producing *women*, and it is founded on an anthropology against love as a human solution for completeness. More importantly, this ethnographic work has made things happen, fostering a certain kind of somatic awareness which has been a component of her re-becoming, which previously required being a stranger to love. This ethnography deeply engages the ethnographer with her informants helping, through the course of the research, to construct just one mingled knowledge.

For the psychologist her re-becoming entails a de-centring of the heterosexual couple as the privileged location for obtaining meaning in life or for taking care of personal needs. The couple would be one choice in life not ‘the choice’. This re-centring entails – for her patients and her self-, a way to improve relationships with the self and with others as well. Inside the relationship this becoming also includes practices of separation to give room to one’s own psychic space in order to improve the relationship with your-self. This separation requires dealing with fears and mourning the loss of the fantasy that others can give you what you need. Through a strengthening of women’s subjectivities and individuality, the psychologists suggests that relationships will be transform – for both women and men – once women reinforce their own psychic space relinquishing to replace the emotional awareness of their male-partners. In this way, the encounter will be based not so much in being loved as in being recognised.

The historian explores how new ideas about subjectivity and love emerge once that we move on from the ambiguous complementary ideal of love of the opposites, and its corollary, the belief in a female incomplete subjectivity (‘a subject of lack’). Even preserving a sense of integrity and self care, female subjectivity can be understood as a more fluid phenomenon, a dynamic universe of diverse consciousness, not always fully mindful of their multiple awareness components. These historical explorations require a reconsideration of the archive to explore through interstices new ways of thinking about subjectivity as well as to find emotional knowledge in the in-between. In this way, the historian aban-

dons any attempt to build linear narratives and creates a conversation between subjects and their spaces and through time.

As a collective we stand from a feminist point of view which in our view entails a politicised academic practice where we include ourselves, as women researchers, in the entanglement of femininity. In this way we look at love as a site to explore the fluidity of gender identities and to develop a discomforting gaze at the complacent nest provided by the hetero-normative-couple. We also call for a displacement of the centrality of love to unmask all the histories it carried with it, keeping in mind the generous proposal made by Lorde, of learning ‘to savour the sweetness of who I am.’

References

- Abu-Lughod, Lila (1986) *Veiled Sentiments*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Abu-Lughod, Lila (1991) ‘Writing Against Culture’, in Richard G. Fox (ed.) *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, pp. 137-162.
- Ahmed, Sara (2004) *The Cultural Politics of the Emotions*. Routledge: New York.
- Baker Miller, Jane (1992). *Hacia una nueva psicología de la mujer*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Benjamin, Jessica (1996). *Los lazos del amor*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Butler, Judith (2006 [2004]) *Deshacer el género*, Barcelona: Paidós.
- Deleuze, Gilles; Guattari, Félix (1990 [1975]). ¿Qué es una literatura menor? In: *Kafka. Por una literatura menor*, Ediciones Era: Mexico DF.
- Estebarán, Mari Luz (2011) *Crítica del pensamiento amoroso*. [Forthcoming]
- Irigaray, Luce (2002) *The Way of Love*, London; New York: Continuum.
- Jónasdóttir, Anna G. (1993). *El poder del amor ¿Le importa el sexo a la Democracia?* Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra.
- Langford, Wendy (1999) *Revolutions of the Heart: Gender, Power, and the Delusions of Love*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Lorde, Audre (2003) ‘Lo erótico como poder’, in *La hermana, la extranjera: artículos y conferencias*. Madrid: Horas y Horas.
- Lutz, Catherine and Abu-Lughod, Lila (eds) (1990) *Language and the Politics of Emotions*. Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press.

- Medina-Doménech, Rosa M^a (2011) *Ciencia y sabiduría del amor.* [Forthcoming]
- Schiebinger, Londa (2004 [1993]) El triunfo de la complementariedad. In Schiebinger, Londa, (ed.) *¿Tiene sexo la mente? Las mujeres en los orígenes de la ciencia moderna.* Madrid: Cátedra, Feminismos.
- Steedman, Caroline (1999) ‘A Woman Writing a Letter?’, in Rebecca Earle (ed.) *Epistolary Selves. Letters and Letter-Writers, 1600-1945.* Aldershot Hants England; Brookfield Vt.: Ashgate.
- Whatley, Patricia; Brown, Caroline (2010) ‘Along and against the grain: The philosophy of the archive: Papers from the first international conference of the Investigating the Archive project’, *Archival Science* 9 (3), 127-131.
- Wittig, Monique (2006 [1992]) *El pensamiento heterosexual y otros ensayos.* Madrid: Editorial EGALES.



Chapter 28

From Veiled to Unveiled: A Look at Discursive Representation of Body in Iranian Love Blogs

Maryam Paknahad Jabarooty

In this study, love is approached as a strong force in the intersection between politics and religion and also as a useful key concept for a new political theory of global revolution. It will lend critical understanding to the relationships between technology and politics and culture in terms of love. Additionally, this paper is focused on discourses of couples love through construction of virtual body. Then the *expression* of attached or surrounded relations as well as the concept of love as an emotion is important.

In current Iranian society there are a number of restrictions on the ways that gender, sexuality and desire can be expressed. Homosexuality is criminalised and though heterosexuals do not face the same stringent measures, sexual relationships or even friendships between un-related men and women prior to or after marriage are forbidden by the government (although such relationships still occur). Simultaneously, the representation of the body and discourse of love through the language used in Iranian love blogs show that the images of body in this context are expressed in a new form indicating an ongoing change in couples relations, while love is politicalised under the dominance of a theocratic regime.

In Iran, desire, sex and sexual behaviour are separated from the concept of love, while the concept of ‘shame’ is a central component of ‘love’. Therefore, ‘love’ is aligned with family and private relations, while the body and physical contact is marginalised or tabooed. This situation is highlighted in digital media by imposing sever governmental web filtering. Therefore, people who write love blogs attempt to represent their body by applying different discursive strategies leading to subversion of some pre-made gender identities. A love blog seems to be a phenomenon distinct to Iran. People write about the concept of love or the progress of a relationship in a blog, because such expressions are forbidden in many other contexts.

The employed methodology in this study is based on a post-structuralist discourse analysis of gender and sexuality. In line with the policy of FPDA (Feminist Post-Structuralist Discourse Analysis) as a feminist ap-

proach, I try to analyse ‘the ways in which speakers negotiate their identities, relationships and positions in their world according to the ways in which they are located by competing yet interwoven discourses’ (Baxter 2003: 1). Therefore, I have tried to answer three specific questions in this paper. *Firstly*, what is the role of the body in the on-line discursive representation of love? *Secondly*, how does censorship (political (legal), cultural, or digital) affect this kind of representation? And *thirdly*, what is the role of love blogs in responding to the way that love is discursively constructed via hegemonic power?

In particular, this research leads one to conclude that although ‘the “democratic” perception of CMC is seriously flawed’ (Yates 2001: 32) because there are some other social and cultural variables needed to be included in the study of gender issues within the blogs, the CMC through blogs makes it possible to make a more *democratic* society. As in discussed context expressing emotions and attitudes toward love relations by the bloggers increases the competing discourses of love which leads to a more democratic perception of love relations in the day-to-day life. Therefore, it might be possible to claim that, in Iranian society, the body-respected love is being unveiled gradually by the help of digital media.

References

- Baxter, Judith (2003) *Positioning Gender in Discourse: A Feminist Methodology*. Basingstoke. Hants: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Yates, Simeon (2001) ‘Gender, language and CMC for education’, *Learning and Instruction* 11: 21-34.



Chapter 29

Revolutionize Love? A Queer-feminist Critique of Love as a Political Concept

Eleanor Wilkinson

This paper reflects upon some of the potential perils of acting out a transformative political project in the name of love. In particular, I take a critical look at recent attempts to romanticise politics *as a form of love*. This paper asks what this rhetoric of love might shut down or exclude. In recent years we have seen a turn to love in a number of political projects on the left. In this paper I focus specifically upon the ways in which Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri depict the political function of love in their work *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (2005). The paper begins by outlining how Hardt and Negri have tried to distance their form of love from some of the previous ways in which love has been used in political projects. According to Hardt (2007), love has been ‘corrupted and destroyed as a political concept’. However rather than abandoning the concept entirely, Hardt claims that we must instead ‘insist on the concept’ as love, he argues ‘has a great heritage that is worth struggling over’. Having outlined Hardt and Negri’s understanding of the political function of love, I then move on to provide a specifically queer-feminist critique of their theory of love, in particular, the normative way in which they envision the connection between Eros and Agape, between the private and the public. I argue that there needs to be caution in presuming a continuum about how love works in the intimate sphere and how love works in the public sphere. By drawing upon these feminist-queer critiques I hope to demonstrate that political projects need not necessarily be founded in the name of love, and that in fact this may be a politically problematical and dangerous move to make.

Hardt and Negri’s work seeks to rediscover the joys of political action, and depicts love as a vital part of politics. *Multitude* can therefore be read as an attempt to counter the supposed current melancholic state of the left (Brown 1999). Warren Montag, for example notes that Hardt and Negri are attempting to ‘recover the productive or constituent power of the multitude at the very historical moment that the fear of the masses had reached its theoretical peak’ (2005: 657). Hardt and Negri claim that diverse social struggles on the left can come together across differences in gender, sexuality, race and nationality, as we are all united in our struggle against the global neoliberal empire. This mass of people united

in opposition to the capitalist empire is what they term ‘the multitude’. Hardt and Negri feel that they have overcome the dangerous ways in which love is so often used in politics by founding their political project, not on love for the same, but on a love of difference. However, I want to explore whether a benevolent form of politics based upon love for difference, might still be at times a form of violence and exclusion. I argue that the idea of politics *as* love might lead to the creation of a new emotional ideal which others might fail. Hardt even argues that ‘love could be a process, or even a field of training, for constructing a democratic society’ (2007). This idea that love could be a ‘field of training’ seems to present a rather worrying and almost totalitarian notion of affect and emotion, where we can be taught to love in the ‘right’ way.

This paper is not necessarily against love per se, simply that caution is needed when we attempt to use love as the basis of political action. It is important to acknowledge the ways in which it might be even harder to see how love, even in its seemingly most benevolent and well-intentioned forms can still be a form of exclusion, and as Michael Cobb (2007: 448) notes if queer theory has taught me anything; it is that I should be vigilant about the rhetorics and politics of connection’. This is not to say solidarity and love for the Other cannot happen, or that politics cannot, or is not, about love. Simply that we must be aware of the ways in which love for the Other can still mask hate, exclusion, and can lead to the creation of a new ideal which others might fail. As Ruddick (2010: 34) argues, Hardt and Negri do not ‘address the ambivalence of the multitude nor the challenges presented when one is confronted with difference that unsettles’. Furthermore, are there limits on how far we can take this love for difference before it falls into love for servitude, and love for our oppressors?

In this paper I want against founding political projects in the name of love. Partly this caution comes from my own experiences of what Sara Ahmed terms ‘falling out of line with the affective community’, when I have felt a mismatch between rhetoric and reality within some of the newest social movements. However, I want to end this paper by arguing that falling out of line with the affective community can potentially be politically productive. To conclude I want to draw upon Ahmed’s figure of the ‘feminist kill-joy’, who is said to kill joy, ‘precisely because she refuses to share an orientation towards certain things as being good, because she does not find the objects that promise happiness to be quite so promising’ (2007: 127). Therefore might it be productive if we refuse to fall in line with this orientation towards politics *as* love? To call to attention some of the inconsistencies and the dangers of acting out a politics in the name of love. Therefore at times it might be important to actively

try and stand in the way of this emotional tide of love and the supposed affective joys of politics. To stand up and claim our status, not as loving revolutionaries, but instead awkward revolutionaries, who might not want your love, and might not love you back, who refuse to be trained in how to love the ‘right’ way, especially by an all-male cast.

References

- Ahmed, S (2007) ‘Multiculturalism and the Promise of Happiness’, *New Formations* 63: 121–137.
- Brown, W. (1999) ‘Resisting Left Melancholy’, *Boundary 2* 26(3): 19-27.
- Cobb, M. (2007) ‘Lonely’, *South Atlantic Quarterly* 106(3): 445-457.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2005) *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Hardt, M. (2007) ‘About Love’, presentation for the European Graduate School.
- Montag, W. (2005) ‘Who’s Afraid of the Multitude? Between the Individual and the State’, *South Atlantic Quarterly* 104(4): 654-673.
- Ruddick, S. (2010) ‘The Politics of Affect: Spinoza in the Work of Negri and Deleuze’, *Theory, Culture & Society* 27(4): 21-45.

Notes on Contributors

Asma Abbas, Associate Professor of Politics and Philosophy at Bard College at Simon's Rock, Great Barrington, USA.

Anna Adeniji, Lecturer in Gender Studies at Södertörn University College, Sweden.

Barbara Alfano, Professor at the Isabelle Kaplan Center for Languages and Cultures, Bennington College, USA.

Violet Eudine Barriteau, Professor of Gender and Public Policy Deputy Principal at the University of the West Indies, Cave Hill Campus, Barbados.

Margunn Bjørnholt, Independent Researcher, Oslo, Norway.

Valerie Bryson, Professor Emerita of Politics, University of Huddersfield, UK.

Çiğdem Buğdayci, PhD Student at the Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

Estibaliz De Miguel Calvo, PhD Student in Sociology at the University of the Basque Country, Spain.

Priscila Cedillo, Researcher in Sociology at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México.

Mari Luz Esteban, Senior Lecturer UPV/EHU, Philosophy and Social Anthropology Department at the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), Spain.

Ann Ferguson, Professor Emerita of Philosophy and Women's Studies at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA.

Vera Fisogni, PhD in Metaphysics at the Pontifical University of the Holy Cross in Rome; journalist and responsible editor at La Provincia, Italy.

Adriana García Andrade, Professor at the Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, México.

Lena Gunnarsson, PhD Student in Gender Studies at Örebro University, Sweden.

Rosemary Hennessy, Professor of English and the Study of Women, Gender and Sexuality, Rice University, USA.

Stevi Jackson, Professor and Director at the Centre for Women's Studies, University of York, UK.

Anna G. Jónasdóttir, Professor Emerita of Gender Studies at Örebro University, Sweden; co-director of GEXcel and theme-leader of GEXcel Theme 10.

Kathleen B. Jones, Professor Emerita of Women's Studies at San Diego State University, USA; member of GEXcel's International Advisory Board.

Pia Karlsson-Minganti, Postdoctoral Researcher at the Department of Ethnology, History of Religions and Gender Studies, Stockholm University, Sweden.

Leena Kurvet-Käosaar, Associate Professor of Comparative Literature, Estonian Institute of Humanities at Tallinn University, Estonia.

Leyna Lowe, PhD Student in Women's Studies at York University, UK.

Nina Lykke, Professor of Gender Studies at Linköping University, Sweden; director of GEXcel.

Kathleen Lynch, Professor of Equality Studies and Senior Lecture in Education at the University College Dublin, Ireland.

Ewa Majewska, Senior Lecturer in Cultural Studies at Cracow University, Poland.

Rosa M. Medina-Doménech, Senior Lecturer at the History of Science Department, peace and Conflict Research Institute, University of Granada, Spain.

Susanne Offen, PhD Student in Political Education at the Institut für integrative Studien at the University of Lüneburg, Germany.

Maryam Paknahad Jabarooty, PhD Student in Linguistics and English Language at Lancaster University, UK.

Kaye Quek, PhD Student in Politics at the University of Melbourne, Australia.

Alyssa Schneebaum, PhD Student in Economics at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA.

Silvia Stoller, Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy, University of Vienna, Austria.

Strid Sofia, Lecturer in Gender Studies, Örebro University, Sweden; Senior Research Associate, Lancaster University, UK.

Ana Távora-Rivero, Chief Clinician, Mental Health Unit Santa Fe (Granada) National Health Service; Assistant Professor Psychiatry Department and Women Studies Research Group, University of Granada, Spain.

Anna Temkina, Professor and co-director of the Gender Programme at the European University, St. Petersburg, Russia.

Margaret E. Toye, Professor at Women and Gender Studies, Wilfrid Laurier University, Ontario, Canada.

Eleanor Wilkinson, PhD Student at the School of Geography at the University of Leeds, UK.

Appendix 1: Activities and Visiting Scholars 2010

A. Theme 10 Seminar and Round Tables

Tuesday 18 May

Seminar

Bob Pease, Professor in Social Work, Deakin University, Australia.
Undoing Privileges.

Wednesday 19 May

Seminar

Bob Pease, Professor in Social Work, Deakin University, Australia.
Recreating Men.

Thursday–Friday 20–21 May

Conference

GEXcel Mini Conference Theme 10: *Love in Our Time – A Question for Feminism*

Monday 27 September

Seminar

Dr Ewa Majewska, University of Warsaw, Poland

Love in translation. Towards an emancipatory politics of Otherness

Wednesday 3 November

Seminar

Lena Gunnarsson, PhD student, Örebro University

Between Freedom and Compulsion: Theorizing the structural forces of gendered sociosexuality.

Dr Ewa Majewska University of Warsaw

Love in Translation. A proposal for feminist critique of neoliberalism

Discussants: Dr Janet Fink, Open University, Milton Keynes, UK and

Dr Jacqui Gabb, University of Leeds, UK.

Thursday 4 November

Seminar

Dr. Janet Fink and Dr. Jacqui Gabb: *Enduring Love? Working on Long-Term Adult Couple Relationships.*

Discussant: Prof. Stevi Jackson, University of York, UK.

Monday 8 November

Roundtable 1

GEXcel Theme 10, Love in Our Time: Aim and the overall questions.

Prof Em Anna G. Jónasdóttir, Örebro University opens up the discussion. (Literature: the GEXcel Work in Progress Report, Volume VIII, October 2010.

Monday 15 November

Roundtable 2

Temporal Dimensions of Loving and Love Activities: Is there a philosophy and politics of time that can be distinguished and developed about love, in particular about 'love in our time'?

Prof Em Anna G. Jónasdóttir, Örebro University, and PhD Student Kaye Quek, University of Melbourne, Australia, open up the discussion

Thursday 18 November

Roundtable 3

Gendered Interests in Sexual Love and the Marriage Institution: Care Practices and Erotic Agency.

Prof Eudine Barriteau, University of West Indies, Barbados, and PhD Student Alyssa Schneebaum, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, USA, open up the discussion.

Monday 22 November

Roundtable 4

Love as a Multi-Dimensional Cultural Construction of Constraints and/or a Useful Key Concept for a New Political Theory of Global Revolution? Feminist perspectives.

Prof Em Ann Ferguson, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, USA, and Dr Anna Adeniji Södertörn University College, Sweden, open up the discussion

Thursday – Saturday 2-4 December

Conference of Workshops

Love in our time – a question for feminism?

Plenary speeches: Anna Jónasdóttir, Rosemary Hennessy, Ann Ferguson, Eudine Barriteau, Stevi Jackson.

Presentations of papers in Workshops.

B. GEXcel Visiting Fellows Örebro University 2010

Fellows

Adeniji, Anna, Postdoc
Södertörn University College, Sweden.

Barriteau, Eudine, Professor
University of the West Indies, Barbados.

Bryson, Valerie, Professor Emerita
University of Huddersfield, UK

Ferguson, Ann, Professor
University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA.

Jackson, Stevi, Professor
University of York, United Kingdom.

Jones, Kathleen B, Professor Emerita
San Diego State University, USA.

Lynch, Kathleen, Professor
University College Dublin, Ireland.

Majewska, Ewa, Postdoc
Cracow University, Poland.

Paknahad Jabarooty, Maryam, PhD Student
Lancaster University, United Kingdom.

Quek, Kaye, PhD Student
University of Melbourne, Australia.

Schneebaum, Alyssa, PhD Student
University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA.

Wilkinson, Eleanor, PhD Student
University of Leeds, United Kingdom.

C. Other Visiting Scholars – Short Visits Autumn 2010

Visiting Scholar

Asma Abbas

Associate Professor, Bard College at Simon's Rock, Great Barrington, MA, USA.

Andrea Baldwin

PhD Student, University of West Indies, Barbados.

Janet Fink

Senior Lecturer, Open University, Milton Keynes, UK.

Jacqui Gabb

Lecturer in Sociology at The Open University, Faculty of Social Sciences, UK.

Bob Pease

Professor and Chair of Social Work, School of Health and Social Development, Faculty of Health, Medicine, Nursing and Behavioural Sciences Deakin University Geelong Waterfront Campus Geelong Victoria Australia.

Appendix 2:

Conference Call for Participants

GEXcel Conference of Workshops Research Theme 10: Love in Our Time – A Question for Feminism

Örebro University, Sweden, 2-4 December 2010

Supported by a grant from the Swedish Research Council Centre, Örebro University and Linköpings University launched a project to establish a European Centre of Gender Excellence based in Sweden – *Gendering Excellence (GEXcel): Towards a European Centre of Excellence in Transnational and Transdisciplinary Studies of Changing Gender Relations, Intersectionalities and Embodiment*. During 2010, one of the research themes sponsored by GEXcel is ‘Love in Our Time – a Question for Feminism’ directed by Anna G. Jónasdóttir, Professor of Gender Studies at Örebro University. (For a full description of the theme, see <http://www.genderexcel.org/node/220>)

We invite applications for this conference of workshops from junior and senior scholars whose research directly addresses one or more of the topics presented in the two main parts of the theme description: I. Love Studies – mapping the field; or II. Love Studies – remaking the field. For the latter, we invite contributions, both critical and reconstructive, that specifically approach one of the following three sub-themes:

1. Gendered interests in sexual love, for instance how (if at all) care practices relate to erotic agency;
2. Temporal dimensions of loving and love activities, preferably as compared with temporalities of working, or labour activities; or with thinking and action time. Is there a philosophy and politics of time that should be distinguished and developed about love, to understand better the social conditions, cultural meanings and political struggles of love in our time?
3. Love as a strong force in the intersection between politics and religion and also as a useful key concept for a new political theory of global revolution. What is to be said and done from feminist points of view about postmodern revitalising of pre-modern ideas of passionate love?

Conference Workshop Format

The conference will begin on Thursday morning (2 December 2010) with three keynote addresses from leading scholars in the field (to be announced), followed by workshop meetings in the afternoon. Friday (3 December 2010) will be organised similarly with both plenary sessions and parallel workshop meetings. A final plenary will be held on Saturday morning (4 December 2010), where summaries of major research and discussion themes will be presented.

Workshops are designed to be a forum for discussion of research in progress precisely related to the conference sub-themes and to facilitate collaboration among junior and senior scholars. Each workshop will go on for two days and involve ten participants from several institutions. Only those scholars currently working in the field addressed by the workshop will be accepted to participate.

The workshop format is intended to enhance participation in a collegial atmosphere. Each participant presents a paper or research document for discussion, and takes part in the discussion of the other sub-theme papers presented. In addition, each sub-theme participant will be assigned the role of formal discussant on one paper. Each sub-theme will be assigned a coordinator, whose tasks will include maintaining the group's schedule of presentation, summarising research and discussion themes and presenting these summaries at the closing plenary.

We expect these workshops to lead to publications, as well as to continued collaboration between members.

Application Requirements

Send an abstract of the proposed paper demonstrating how your research specifically connects to one of the sub-themes. Include a brief biographical note of no more than 250 words outlining your current research interests, most recent publications, academic affiliation and status.

Address for Applications

GEXcelTheme10@oru.se

Application Deadline

May 10, 2010

Notification

A committee will review applicants and notify candidates selected for participation by mid-June 2010.

Appendix 3:

Conference Programme

GEXcel Conference of Workshops Research Theme
10: Love in Our Time – A Question for Feminism

Örebro University, Sweden, 2-4 December 2010

Programme

Thursday December 2nd

10.00–11.00 Registration
Location: BIO, Forumhuset

Plenary Session

11.15–11.30 Welcome
11.30–12.15 ‘Love Studies in Our Time – Mapping the Field’, by Anna G. Jónasdóttir, Professor Emerita, Gender Studies, Örebro University
12.15–13.30 Lunch
13.30–14.15 ‘Bread and Roses in the Commons’, by Rosemary Hennessy, Professor, Department of English and Director, Center for the Study of Women, Gender and Sexuality, Rice University, Houston, Texas, USA
14.15–15.00 ‘Love, Social Change and Everyday Heterosexuality’, by Stevi Jackson, Professor, Centre for Women’s Studies, University of York, UK
15.00–15.30 Coffee

Workshops

15.30–18.30 Workshops in three groups arranged by sub-theme
Location: Room F 108, F 109 and F 110 *Forumhuset*
19.00 Dinner at the Faculty Club, Örebro University

Friday December 3rd

Workshops

- 9.15–11.15 Workshops in three groups arranged by sub-theme
Location: Room F138, F206 and F208, *Forumhuset*
11.15–11.30 Coffee

Plenary Session 1

- 11.30–12.15 ‘A Return to Love: A Caribbean Feminist Explores an Epistemic Conversation between Audre Lorde’s “the Power of the Erotic” and Anna Jónasdóttir’s “Love Power”, by Violet Eudine Barriteau, Professor of Gender and Public Policy, University of the West Indies, Barbados
- 12.15–13.30 Lunch

Plenary Session 2

- 13.30–14.15 ‘Love and the Issue of Solidarity’, by Ann Ferguson, Professor Emerita, Philosophy and Women’s Studies, University of Massachusetts, USA
- 14.15–14.30 Practical matters

Workshops (coffee break included)

- 14.30–18.00 Workshops in three groups arranged by sub-theme
Location: Room F108, F109 and F110, *Forumhuset*
- 19.30 Dinner (‘Smörgåsbord’ in Swedish Christmas style), Wadköping.

Saturday December 4th

Plenary Session 3

- Location: BIO, Forumhuset
- 10.00–11.00 Reports from workshops
- 11.00–12.00 Discussion
- 12.00 Lunch

Appendix 4:

Workshop Programmes

A. Time schedule Workshop 1: Gendered Interests in Sexual Love, Care Practices and Erotic Agency

GEXcel Conference of Workshops 2-4 December 2010,
Örebro University

Research Theme 10: Love in Our Time
– a Question for Feminism

Workshop Meetings 2-3 December

Workshop 1: Gendered Interests in Sexual Love, Care Practices and Erotic Agency

Coordinator: Liisa Husu

Reporter: Sofia Strid

Thursday 2 Dec Room F 108

Time	Participants	Paper	Discussant
15.30–15.45		Introduction	
15.45–16.30	Andrade	Love and the social sciences. Are the disciplinary boundaries gone?	Stoller
16.30–17.15	Stoller	Sex and/or love?	Andrade
17.15–18.00	Klesse	Notions of love in polyamory. Elements in a discourse on multiple loving	Barriteau
18.00–18.30		General discussion	

Friday Morning 3 Dec Room F 138

9.15–10.00	de Miguel	Love in times of prison	Gunnarsson
10.00–10.45	Gunnarsson	Pinpointing the mechanisms of female Subordination in heterosexual love	de Miguel
10.45–11.15		General Discussion	
11.15–11.30		Coffee	

Friday Afternoon 3 Dec Room F 108

14.45–15.30	Schneebaum	The relevance and use of ‘love’ in feminist criticisms of marriage under capitalism	Offen
15.30–16.15	Offen	‘Forbidden love’ – tales of love, latitudes and deviance in adolescence	Schneebaum
16.15–17.00	Temkina	Everyday life romantic discourse in Russia	Jackson
17.00–17.20	Jackson	Love, social change and everyday heterosexuality	Temkina
17.20–17.40	Barriteau	A return to love: a Caribbean feminist explores an epistemic conversation between Audre Lorde’s ‘the power of the erotic’ and Anna Jónasdóttir’s ‘love power’	Klesse
17.40–18.00		General Discussion on subtheme 1.	

B. Time schedule Workshop 2: Temporal Dimensions of Loving and Love activities

GEXcel Conference of Workshops 2-4 December 2010,
Örebro University

Research Theme 10: Love in Our Time
– a Question for Feminism

Workshop Meetings 2-3 December

Workshop 2: Temporal Dimensions of Loving and Love activities

Coordinator: Jeff Hearn

Reporter: Valerie Bryson

Thursday 2 Dec Room F 109

Time	Participants	Paper	Discussant
15.30–15.40		Introduction	
15.40–16.20	Bryson	Time to Love	Andersson
16.20–17.00	Andersson	Love in the time of coupledom – state regulations of intimate relationships	Bryson
17.00–17.40	Quek	Theorising love in forced/arranged marriages: a case of Stockholm syndrome	Kurvet-Käosaar
17.40–18.20	Kurvet-Käosaar	Love, conflict and camouflage in Post-Soviet Estonian women's life-writings of childhood	Quek
18.20–18.30		General discussion	

Friday Morning 3 Dec Room F 206

9.15–10.00	Bjørnholt	Love, work and family in early Norwegian family research and today	Lynch
10.00–10.45	Lynch	Affective equality: love, care and solidarity as productive forces	Bjørnholt
10.45–11.15		General Discussion	
11.15–11.30		Coffee	

Friday Afternoon 3 Dec Room F 109

14.30–18.00 (Coffee break included)

14.45–15.30	Toye	It's about time! Irigaray, Hegel's Antigone and the politics of love	Abbas
15.30–16.15	Abbas	Love and the timescapes of marginality	Toye
16.15–17.00	Alfano	Truth beyond time: love as an instrument of knowledge in Margaret Mazzantini's <i>Don't Move</i> and John LeCarré's <i>The Constant Gardner</i>	Doménech
17.00–17.45	Doménech	'Moved by love'. How far love research can change our deep-rooted emotional understandings and affective consciousness	Alfano
17.45–18.00		General Discussion on subtheme 2.	

C. Time schedule Workshop 3: Love as a Multi-Dimensional Cultural Construction and/or a Useful Key Concept for a New Political Theory of Global Revolution? Feminist perspectives

GEXcel Conference of Workshops 2-4
December 2010, Örebro University

Research Theme 10: Love in Our Time
– a Question for Feminism

Workshop Meetings 2-3 December

Workshop 3: Love as a Multi-Dimensional Cultural Construction and/or a Useful Key Concept for a New Political Theory of Global Revolution? Feminist perspectives

Coordinator: Gunnar Karlsson

Reporter: Kathleen B. Jones

Thursday 2 Dec Room F 110

Time	Participants	Paper	Discussant
15.30–15.40		Introduction	
15.40–16.20	Buḡdayci	Love, religion and modernity: An analysis of history of desire and sin in <i>fin de siècle</i> Ottoman empire and modern Turkey	Lowe
16.20–17.00	Lowe	Revolutionary love: feminism, love, and the transformative politics of freedom in the works of Wollstonecraft, de Beauvoir, Goldman and Kollontai	Buḡdayci
17.00–17.40	Adeniji	The royal wedding as true love story. Emotional political intersecting culture, nationalism, modernity and heteronormativity	Wilkinson
17.40–18.20	Wilkinson	Equalize Love! Intimate citizenship beyond marriage	Adeniji
18.20–18.30		General discussion	

Friday Morning 3 Dec Room F 208

9.15–10.00	Paknahad Jabarooy	Veiled bodies: shouts or whispers? Discursive – representation of body in Iranian love blogs	Karlson-Minganti
10.00–10.45	Karlsson-Minganti	Love and Muslim youth's negotiations on marriages	Paknahad Jabarooy
10.45–11.15		General Discussion	
11.15–11.30		Coffee	

Friday Afternoon 3 Dec Room F 110

14.30–18.00 (Coffee break included)

14.45–15.30	Fisogni,	A love life in a sexless Life. The challenge of chastity in the Catholic church	Jones
15.30–16.15	Majewska	Loving incorporation or neoliberal <i>jouissance</i> ? Love as inspiration for a materialist feminist critique of neoliberalism	Hennessy
16.15–16.45	Hennessy	Bread and roses in the commons	Majewska & Ferguson
16.45–17.15	Ferguson	Love and the Issue of Solidarity	Hennessy
17.15–18.00		General Discussion on subtheme 3	

Appendix 5: Conference Participants

Asma Abbas, Associate Professor of Politics and Philosophy at Bard College at Simon's Rock, Great Barrington, USA.

Anna Adeniji, Lecturer in Gender Studies at Södertörn University College, Sweden.

Barbara Alfano, Professor at the Isabelle Kaplan Center for Languages and Cultures, Bennington College, USA.

Catrine Andersson, PhD Student in Sociology at the Department of Sociology and Institute for Housing and Urban Research, *Uppsala University, Sweden*

Tobias Axelsson, PhD Student in Gender Studies, Örebro University, Sweden.

Andrea Baldwin, PhD Student, University of West Indies, Barbados.

Violet Eudine Barriteau, Professor of Gender and Public Policy; Deputy Principal at the University of the West Indies, Cave Hill Campus, Barbados.

Alp Biricik, PhD Student, Tema Genus, Linköping University, Sweden.

Margunn Bjørnholt, Independent Researcher, Oslo, Norway.

Valerie Bryson, Professor Emerita of Politics, University of Huddersfield, UK.

Çiğdem Buğdayci, PhD Student at the Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

Estibaliz De Miguel Calvo, PhD Student in Sociology at the University of the Basque Country, Spain.

Ann Ferguson, Professor Emerita of Philosophy and Women's Studies at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA.

Vera Fisogni, PhD in Metaphysics at the Pontifical University of the Holy Cross in Rome; journalist and responsible editor at *La Provincia*, Italy.

Mia Fogel, Research Administrator, Örebro University, Sweden.

Adriana García Andrade, Professor at the Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, México.

Lena Gunnarsson, PhD Student in Gender Studies at Örebro University, Sweden.

Jeff Hearn, Professor Tema Genus, Linköping University, Sweden.

Rosemary Hennessy, Professor of English and the Study of Women, Gender and Sexuality, Rice University, USA

Ulla Holm, Professor Emerita of Feminist Theory at the Department of Gender Studies, Gothenburg University, Sweden.

Anna Hoyles.

Liisa Husu, Professor of Gender Studies, Örebro University, Sweden.

Stevi Jackson, Professor and Director at the Centre for Women's Studies, University of York, United Kingdom.

Anna G. Jónasdóttir, Professor Emerita of Gender Studies at Örebro University, Sweden; co-director of GEXcel and theme-leader of GEXcel Theme 10.

Kathleen B. Jones, Professor Emerita of Women's Studies at San Diego State University, USA; member of GEXcel's International Advisory Board.

Gunnel Karlsson, Senior Lecturer in Gender Studies, Örebro University.

Pia Karlsson-Minganti, Postdoctoral Researcher at the Department of Ethnology, History of Religions and Gender Studies, Stockholm University, Sweden.

Christian Klesse, Lecturer in Cultural Studies at *Manchester Metropolitan University*, UK.

Leena Kurvet-Käosaar, Associate Professor of Comparative Literature, Estonian Institute of Humanities at Tallinn University, Estonia.

Leyna Lowe, PhD Student in Women's Studies at York University, UK.

Kathleen Lynch, Professor of Equality Studies; Senior Lecturer in Education at the University College Dublin, Ireland.

Ewa Majewska, Senior Lecturer in Cultural Studies at Cracow University, Poland.

Rosa M. Medina-Doménech, Senior Lecturer at the History of Science Department, peace and Conflict Research Institute, University of Granada, Spain.

Pooya Mehrpooyan, Freelance writer, Uppsala, Sweden.

Susanne Offen, PhD Student in Political Education at the Institut für integrative Studien at the University of Lüneburg, Germany.

Maryam Paknahad Jabarooty, PhD Student in Linguistics and English Language at Lancaster University, UK.

Ingrid Pincus, PhD in Politics; Chairwoman of UNIFEM Örebro, Sweden.

Kaye Quek, PhD Student in Politics at the University of Melbourne, Australia.

Alyssa Schneebaum, PhD Student in Economics at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA.

Silvia Stoller, Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy, University of Vienna, Austria.

Strid, Sofia, Lecturer in Gender Studies, Örebro University, Sweden; Senior Research Associate Lancaster University, UK.

Anna Temkina, Professor and co-director of the Gender Programme at the European University, St. Petersburg, Russia.

Barbara Tomaskovic-Devey, Professor of Sociology at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, USA.

Margaret E. Toye, Professor of Women and Gender Studies, Wilfrid Laurier University, Ontario, Canada.

Eleanor Wilkinson, PhD Student at the School of Geography at the University of Leeds, United Kingdom.

Berit Åberg, Senior Lecturer in Gender Studies, Örebro University.