

1.4. Філософія гендера, раси й етносу

Orlenko Olena

orlenkoolena@khdafk.com.ua

PhD, Associate Professor of the Department of Humanities

Kharkiv State Academy of Physical Culture

Kharkiv, Ukraine

TRANSBORDER FEMINISM OF CONTEMPORARY TIMES

Internationalism challenges the boundaries of the nation-state, both geographically and organizationally, and is characterized by transborder alliances. The perspective of transborder feminism includes an analysis of the counter-offensive of a wide range of reactionary responses to the mass feminist uprising, which is intensifying and extending beyond the nation-state, focusing on various transnational institutions. In the current political situation, the notion of «anticipatory-utopian» thinking comes to mind, referring to a practical space of intervention to facilitate a radical transformation of the present towards an alternative future. By limiting oneself to condemnation, an individual limits their politics in several ways: firstly, by making it impossible to understand how the violence they protest against is organized and how it operates; secondly, by failing to reflect on what form of social life can free us from the state of war and violence; and finally, by reducing their ethical position to anger and condemnation, based solely on a sense of their own rightness and the opposition's wrongness. M. Foucault notes that a truly non-fascist ethics, exemplified by J. Deleuze and F. Guattari's "Anti-Oedipus," is not limited to criticizing historical fascism in others, but is always focused on criticizing internal fascism—"fascism in all of us, in our heads and in our everyday behavior, fascism that makes us love power, desire precisely that which dominates us and exploits us" [3]. Judith Butler distinguishes between the fascism of the mid-twentieth century, which exploited the frustrations of the petty and middle bourgeoisie to direct their hatred towards the proletariat, and the new «liberation» fascism or neo-fascism, which allows people of different strata to hate people of other strata without shame for their racism [2]. Why is transnational feminism methodologically and politically more effective than nationalist feminism, which

focuses only on the interests of one's own nation? Firstly, it is not simply a set of arguments but a framework within which one can engage in a wide range of intellectual research and political projects. It is a method that emphasizes establishing connections and marking the gaps between different social phenomena and political struggles. Secondly, it is an approach that integrates the perspectives of many feminists and non-feminists who are inspired by various feminist methodologies. Thirdly, it meaningfully acknowledges and affirms the pluralism associated with feminist work of all types. While addressing a complex reality, it recognizes that even within specific feminist movements there may be disagreements and differences between people with different views and values, which does not preclude their solidarity. In other words, transnational feminism is not afraid of conflict, allowing us to think of feminism as a political practice that can be developed in any social space and political project. Veronica Gago writes about the «feminist International» and notes that «not Europe or the northern countries, but the global South, in particular Latin America, has nurtured an internationalism that disrupts the scale, scope and forms of coordination of a movement that nevertheless continues to expand without losing its strength and anchor» [4]. V. Gago's observation that «poor women migrants from the South fill the gap in the departure to the North, where women devote themselves to their careers» draws attention, and she criticizes this as «progressive neoliberalism», not considering it emancipatory. Reflecting on the genealogy of modern feminism, can we assume that feminist criticism of patriarchy is determined not by hatred of the present, which presupposes traditional insurmountable oppositions of «us-them», but by love for a bright future? Feminism within the discourse of liberal democracy initially placed its emphasis on the individual against imposed collectivism, without considering that the ontology of the individual has a connotation of individualism. Is this not the source of the paradox recorded today, when, on the one hand, feminism, by definition, is a social democratic social movement, and therefore initially and continuously requires an ontology of the collective and a passion for action in social movements to transform the patriarchal collective society, while on the other hand, being initially determined

by the ontology of liberal individualism, it is now forced to desperately record the absence of this very social movement as a practice of collective female solidarity? [5]

In social networks during «extermination wars,» feminists are angry and fighting for primacy. Social networks today are overflowing with insults, threats of revenge, and even threats of literal murder. To calm those who enjoy anger at national «Others» and those who glorify anger, if the «Other,» as a person, has formed an affect of anger, it is necessary not only to complain, but to translate grievances into a problem that needs to be solved, into an experience that teaches and cultivates a questioning attitude of listening and answering, as an interaction with fundamental and structural violence.

One of the paradoxes of modern Ukrainian female political subjectivities is that, unlike the sacrificial subjectivities of the 19th century, sympathetically portrayed by T.G. Shevchenko, the new nationalistic female subject's desire to sacrifice life is irrelevant to the situation of existential choice. The paradox of this choice is that the new Ukrainian female subjectivity, rejecting the status of a victim, must in one way or another realize not a sacrificial, but a militant attraction to the Motherland and must be ready to sacrifice her life at any moment. But if the subject must, then what kind of existential choice is this?

Antonio Gramsci wrote that under conditions of hegemony, any consent, including sexual freedom, is produced and organized by the authorities. At the same time, the legal semantics of sexual consent as a form of sexual freedom is most often advocated by adherents of sexual tourism and gay-libertarian movements directed against Muslims. Obviously, as soon as feminist relocates, tragically positioning themselves as victims of new imperialisms and wars, allow the comic modus into this dimension of glorifying their own sacrifice, the idea of themselves as existentially tragic subjects must fundamentally change. In any case, they will no longer be able to perceive themselves as subjects «better than they are» due to the suffering they have endured [6]. Wendy Brown has made an unexpected diagnosis, fearing to use affects, the affective dimension in politics, and also fearing to rely on charismatic leadership, as it carries the threat of «usurping representation», i.e., the threat of despotism, and the legitimization of uncontrolled power. «Our task is to use «charisma with its ability

to initiate, excite, inspire and mobilize» [1]. In the modern world, the left and feminists need to borrow political strategies and technologies from the right, including neo-fascists. The left is generally afraid of everything and, above all, any politics of representation, which, while understandable, leaves them far outside the realm of politics. The official political mainstream is dominated by the symbiotic relationship between the state and war, which constitutes one of the constitutive ontological concepts of the political mainstream. Apparently, this political state mainstream is opposed by the discourse of leftist feminism, which is united by a chaotic mixture of longing for the so-called democratic West and peculiar anti-capitalist Marxist utopias associated with the economic equality of people.

References:

1. Brown, W. *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. New York: Zone Books, 2015, 296 p.
2. Butler, Judith. *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 2015, 248 p.
3. Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (R. Hurley, M. Seem, & H. R. Lane, Trans.). New York: Viking Press, 1977, 423 p.
4. Gago, Veronica. *A Feminist Internationalism: Global Struggles and Politics of Solidarity*. In *Global Feminisms: Perspectives from the Global South* 2019, 248 p.
5. Gago, Veronica. *Feminism and the Politics of the Common*. *Feminist Theory*, 2017, 47p.
6. Gramsci, A. *Prison Notebooks* (Vol. 1). Edited and translated by J. A. Buttigieg and A. Callari. New York: Columbia University Press. 1992, 1344p.