

Katharina Rutschky

Emma und ihre Schwestern

Ausflüge in den real
existierenden Feminismus

Hanser

an informed one. Razor-sharp diagnosis of the women's movement in Germany. Against feminist dogmas of all kinds, Katharinarutschky argues that women's affairs are slipping into yesterday's bourgeoisie or into a new fundamentalism.

Feminism is the answer — but to what question? • How a tomato made history—and which • do women believe women exist? •

Children or career? The so-called compatibility problem • The incompatibility problem: mother and modernity • Women clean - men make dirt • The sexual revolution disappoints their children • When women do research • The image of men in the women's movement • From rebellion to reaction: a question disappears



Katharina Rutschky

Emma und ihre Schwestern

Ausflüge
in den real existierenden
Feminismus

Carl Hanser Verlag

1 2 3 4 5 02 01 00 99

ISBN 3-446-18766-9

All rights reserved © Carl

Hanser Verlag Munich Vienna 1999 Sentence:
sentence by sentence. Barbara Reischmann, Leutkirch

Printing and binding: Clausen & Bosse, Leck

Printed in Germany

elperegrino@rocketmail.com v1.0 FR11 05/30/2015

Contents

Feminism is the answer — but to what question? 7 2	How a
tomato made history — and which ones 14 3	
Do women believe that there are	
women? 41 4	children or a career?
The so-called compatibility problem 61 5	
The problem of incompatibility: mother and modernity 75 6	
Women clean - men make dirt 86 7	
The sexual revolution disappoints her children 100	
Excursus I When women do research 113	
Excursus II The image of men in the women's movement 122	
	8
From Rebellion to Reaction: A Question Disappears 128 9	
Resolution	
141	
Postscript 146	
Remarks	

Feminism is the answer — but to what question?

Nobody likes to hear criticism. If I reveal at the outset that I wasn't even there when it all began, that I never revised my skeptical disinterest in the years that followed and only gave it up in recent years, then the question naturally arises as to where my interest came from change of heart. The next question is even more important: whether I am even entitled to make an assessment of the women's movement and feminism today. I could at least derive the courage to do this from the observation that the FRG did and is still doing the same thing with the GDR, a state and community that lasted four decades and had sixteen million participants who are suddenly being evaluated or it is being evaluated with regard to them lived life have to do themselves. The fact that I am listed as a woman or "female" speaks fundamentally in my favour; because women are allowed to talk about women and even criticize them. Women are also allowed to talk about men and even have to criticize them. Men, on the other hand, have no right to speak when it comes to women's issues - and women also decide what that is - and have prudently never attempted to enforce it. If they do open their mouths to the decisions of the Federal Constitutional Court on § 218, then one had to learn later that there are many women who support them out of conviction.

The fact that this paragraph is

not intended to regulate abortion and the woman's self-determination over her life and her body, but to serve the "protection of unborn life" is now fluently flowing from everyone's lips. Nevertheless, it turns out again and again that there are women and others who, as alibi women, male-identified careerists or in the more subtle form of accomplices, pursue the cause of the enemy, who just builds his bastions not only outside but also inside

has. »In a patriarchy, women are often themselves - and self-destructive! — the female executors of male rule,» Alice Schwarzer warned in 1984, when the heyday of the women's movement, numerically speaking, was already over and the

Dropouts and dissidents multiplied. ^[1] The rumor of the »backlash« is a stereotype of the women's movement and was around long before Susan Faludi's bestseller in the nineties

^[2] literally made. — Schwarzer wrote as early as 1984: "A decade and a half after the start of the women's movement, we women are reaping not only the fruits of our revolt but also the consequences, the reactions of the other side." The number of working women has risen continuously, and more and more women exist alone or even "in life partnerships with men on an independent existence" - at the same time, however, it is also true that the fear, "the fear of losing love, the fear of male violence, the fear of unemployment - so many women return to self-deception, to retreat, in the women's corner«. That's bad, but can't irritate Schwarzer when pursuing the just cause: "The radical feminists feel like all radicals: They are the most uncomfortable and therefore the most ostracized." Outlawed by the men for whom they spoil the soup, but also uncomfortable for them the women who are too shy, too cowardly or too corrupt to suffer the consequences of Schwarzerian feminism. The strange self-assessment of a successful journalist and author would indicate a lack of contact with reality if it weren't obvious that Schwarzer chose the role of the feminist Bravada himself and thus found a lot of encouragement from supporters and opponents alike. As a person, she made feminism popular - but that doesn't decide its meaning, let alone its subversive radicalism.

What does it mean for pop feminism to name conditions unvarnished and »get to the root of things«? There are women. And there are women who are understandable or

suspicious reasons nor the insight that her closest man is her worst enemy. Thirdly, women also exist in the form of a patent procedure with which complicated political, cultural and economic conditions worldwide can be reduced to the level of evident moral scandal. As easy as it is to trigger outrage and horror, the concepts that are supposed to be used to remedy the situation are so simple — if you can even think about them at all. The most popular rhetorical device for generating moral evidence is the use of apparently objective figures and statistics, which, on the basis of individual human rights interpreted by the welfare state, convince even the most stupid of women and children. Under the heading "The other opinion", Britta Steilmann, for example, a young entrepreneur, spread about "The misery of women", their worldwide disadvantage and the dominance of the male world with an emphasis as if her insights had not been part of the commonplace for years. Feminism, its radicalization to global women's liberation

and Kinderrettung only helps to cover up the failure on site. 640 million ^[3] women are illiterate; 114 million had their clitoris circumcised — a blemish that is not mentioned — by women. The world is missing 200 million women because female fetuses are aborted and female babies are abandoned in India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. Women do two-thirds of the world's work, but receive only a tenth of the world's income. If you, as an economist, sociologist or cultural scientist, have checked the milkmaid calculations that are usual in this country with regard to female housework and child-rearing performance, you will take such extrapolations with skepticism — the reader, and especially the reader, are impressed by the so-called facts. Of course, child prostitution in Thailand, the stoning of adulterous women in Iran and the epidemic of sexual violence against women and children in the western world, especially where they are

should feel safe and protected — with family.

If clever social workers in Berlin, Cologne or elsewhere do not even succeed in "doing away" the comparatively few street children, streetwalkers and young rent prostitutes, and if the humane resignation of the helpers is limited to offers to drop out and to palliative care for the larger remainder, then it should be a reminder to everyone to be more down-to-earth. Even after the end of the women's movement, which many veterans regret but admit, women have remained a patent process for reducing world complexity. Everywhere you look, whatever problem areas crop up, from unemployment to university reform to the struggles in the former Yugoslavia, it's being used non-stop. One does not do this in order to represent the interests of one's specific clientele as a lobby in competition with others, but rather to reaffirm the dogma that a teetering male world without prioritizing the treatment of the women's question is not on course for a peaceful and just future for all is to bring. In any case, it differs from the Marxist workers' movement, which the women's movement had already inherited in some respects before the collapse of the Eastern bloc, by the lack of a plausible scheme of whence and whereto. Aside from the moaning and complaining mode, combat strategies are also lacking. The prospect of women finally having a chance to change society after the end of patriarchy because they do business, research, administer and govern differently and perhaps even better is more than vague. Sunday speeches often claim that no society can afford to forego the creative potential of its female half, but there are doubts. Women are irreplaceable as lovers, mothers, housewives, subsistence farmers and providers of social services of all kinds, and they are not affordable in any of these functions. On the other hand, these functions are in less and less demand or are not traditionally rewarded under modern conditions. The example of Indian gender statistics

it's awesome, but instructive. Can one say that 200 million women are "missing" there, or should one not rather say that they were "superfluous"? We look with horror at the gender economy of other, underdeveloped societies and remain blind to our own. The women's movement and feminism in its many forms have not been able to open our eyes.

All talk of disadvantage and gender-related social constructions to the detriment of women ignores the fact that women live in limbo. According to Catholic teaching, limbo, along with heaven and purgatory, is a place where children who died without being baptized and those righteous who lived before the sacrifice of Christ and the Ascension exist. They are handed over to a strange in-between world that keeps the question of recognition and non-recognition in limbo. Modernity catapulted women onto the historical stage without telling them what to do there.

The history of the past two hundred years can be interpreted as a history of losses as well as a history of unprecedented successes, and depending on one's mood one can take sides one way or the other. Women with equal rights are a modern phenomenon, and in this respect women can be considered the real winners of modernization in Western industrial societies. Indicators can be found for this: in the area of law, the world of work, education and the often improved quality of life, which has led to a noticeable increase in female life expectancy. Equally plausible are the indicators that identify women as victims of semi-modernization that has done little to change age-old gender inequality. Power and wealth are still in the hands of men.

The new women's movement since the 1960s, unlike that of the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th, is a symptom of a radicalized unhappy consciousness in which women are locked up more clearly than ever before. Not freedom, justice

and emancipation, but concern and self-realization have therefore become the favorite words of the movement.

For many years now, it has been oscillating between ever more difficult suffering and complaints on the one hand and claims that are just as comprehensive on the other. There is no end in sight, and there is no sign of progress either. A Hamburg women's project, the »Women's Week«, resigned after fifteen years and presented its last event in 1996 under the apt headline »The answer is feminism - and how it was

[4] the question

again?' When it's all over, you're always wiser. A critical examination of the women's movement can only have the aim of reopening this question in the course of its history, its theories and projects. What might discourage you in this attempt is not so much the fear of not being taken seriously as a late feminist lateral entrant, but rather the fear that somehow and somewhere everything has already been said. Because the women's movement has arrived back where it started a hundred or two hundred years ago, on paper. Today, however, it is written by women themselves in the vicinity of the universities. That is new, even if the movement has remained attached to its original milieu, the bourgeois middle class, to its disadvantage, which thinks morally and acts pedagogically.

How a tomato made history — and what kind

If you consider the average life expectancy of women in our society — it is eighty years and thus a lot higher than that of men, then Sigrid Damm-Rüger died in his mid-fifties, much too early. When I read the death notice in January 1996, I remembered a likeable, intelligent and remarkably pretty young woman whom I met in the Berlin SDS in the 1960s but later completely lost sight of. In its own advertisement, the Berlin Women's Group took the death as an opportunity to remind itself and us of something else. "We thank Sigrid Damm-Rüger for her courage," it said. "By throwing tomatoes at the last SDS congress in 1968, she gave the new women's movement a decisive signal to start up." themed«. »The Subjective Factor« was shown by Heike Sander, another pioneer from those now almost legendary beginnings and origins of the new German women's movement.

At the same time, this same women's faction announced in the *daily newspaper* that a media-critical initiative would be set up and invited all women who were »dissatisfied« with their daily newspaper to help prepare a larger forum. »We are preparing a survey of the editors-in-chief of taz, Tagesspiegel, Junge Welt, Neues Deutschland and Berliner Zeitung. How important is anti-sexist, anti-racist and social ethics in reporting to you? How seriously will they have to take our claim as subscribers and consumers of their newspaper?" Between 1968 and 1996 lie twenty-eight eventful years. The question of what became of the tomato and the women's movement can be answered without much ado by comparing the two events. Which premises
and strategies

determined the beginning and which the provisional end on the tribunal of the women's group for the Berlin editors-in-chief of left-wing and liberal newspapers?

Bottom line, the constants impress more than the progress. From which one can either conclude that little has happened in twenty-eight years or that the women's movement has not got any smarter in these years. I favor the thesis that the women's movement got stuck in the beginning, has proved incapable of learning and therefore ends today in the canonization of reactionary and restorative politics.

The tomato throw of 1968 is part of the proverbial commons, but one thing is certain: it took place on September 13 in Frankfurt am Main at the penultimate conference of delegates of a left-wing student association and that Sigrid Damm Rieger was the thrower. Even whether she threw one or three tomatoes is controversial; why and why anyway. The media effect of the tomato(s) in general and their signaling effect on women in particular are another area that women's research should illuminate.

From the numerous representations of the mythical beginning I choose the last one for the time being, also because of its attempt to harmoniously fit much later developments in the women's movement. A lot of time has passed, many protagonists have disappeared and been replaced by others, but the basic pattern of their historiography has remained the apology. Psychoanalytic group theory speaks of "bible making," an attempt to suppress conflicts that endanger the cohesion of the group by invoking the common history.

»After the assassination attempt on Rudi Dutschke, the extra-parliamentary opposition lost its power and got bogged down in internal cockfights. An appearance by today's filmmaker Heike Sander broke into the debate about self-dissolution, which was only contested by men. As a delegate to the Action Council for the Liberation of Women, she loudly demanded one

Consideration of the 'interests of women and mothers' and demanded from the men that 'the content of our problems is discussed'. But they didn't even want to listen. The listener Sigrid Damm-Rüger, who was very pregnant at the time, was eating tomatoes when she became angry. She wanted to land a tomato on the unmoved face of the then SDS national chairman Schauer, but because it was a spontaneous act, she hadn't practiced beforehand. The first feminist projectile in modern history landed with a smack on SDS leader Hans-Jürgen Krahl. But he was gay and anything but a misogynist. ›In the evening, Krahl lay in the bathtub and cried‹, Tilman Fichter remembers. 'Then Sigrid came and comforted him.' That was how she was. ›Even if she hit the wrong person, it was still the best-placed tomato in world history.

The SDS resigned, the women appeared.'« [\[5\]](#)

In the correct feminist paraphrase of the event, a left-wing student club appears as a male gang engaged in ridiculous cockfights. Insofar as the participants were regarded as heterosexual in terms of their orientation, there was a reasonable assumption, which they confirmed through their specific behavior, that they were misogynists. Gay men are exempt from this assumption - for whatever reason. The end of the SDS was deserved and was not long in coming.

On the other hand, the abuse of men corresponds to the idealization, even heroization, of women. They burst into a men's debate, which can only be wrong per se, and loudly articulate the actually important questions that belong on the political agenda and that the men overslept because of their glass bead games. They remain as unperturbed as one might expect from a run-down caste. Life and passion are on the women's side, law and justice anyway.

Myths may be effective, but their long-term maintenance is not clarifying and enlightening. A radical students' association, which nonetheless operated in a very traditional way for many years, was at the sudden discovery of the women's question as one of the main — not just

Secondary contradiction, not at all prepared in their own ranks. The astonishment of many of its female members was great, and the astonishment at the form of personal attacks by one sex on the other sex was fairly general.

In fact, it took many more years before the sexualization of society on a large and small scale, in private and public life, became a practical method for structuring political, educational, aesthetic, etc.

perception could prevail. The observation that as a gay man Krahl could not be a misogynist could not have been made in 1968; Just as there were few gay people at that time, from a political point of view, so little was known about the misogyny of heterosexual men, let alone the enslavement of women through so-called forced heterosexuality in the patriarchy. If the sexualization of society—a historically and sociologically interpretable phenomenon in modern societies—brought liberation to those who would later become gay, women do not seem to make any headway. If one hears little from the gays and today only the legal recognition of their cohabitation is pending, then more and more sophisticated explanations are made by women and more and more radical measures are demanded. Your anxiety has remained.

It is necessary to distinguish general sexualization as a central aspect of individualization in modern societies from feminist women's movements. So little has been explained why the little myth of the origin of the tomato is so popular, just as it remains unclear what really happened back then. The impression that Heike Sander was unable to give her speech can easily be refuted. As a delegate of the Berlin SDS, she was allowed to speak on behalf of her autonomous women's group, the »Action Council for the Liberation of Women«. Essentially, it amounted to an offer of alliance on the condition that the student union adopt and seriously discuss its program and analysis of the situation.

In terms of content, the speech is still today, after twenty-eight years,

not outdated and offers a summary of all women's complaints about exploitation in the reproductive area (as mothers and wives), exclusion from male-centric politics and organizations that do not take into account the specific needs of women who cannot or do not want to adapt to male pressure to perform and competitive behavior and therefore doomed to a life of private frustration and public invisibility. The few women in higher posts, in the SDS and elsewhere, owed their questionable success to an expensive adjustment, self-denial as a woman. As a dowry, the Action Council promised to bring into the alliance those women with children who were assumed to be particularly angry, particularly articulate, and therefore "easiest [6] to politicize . "

It is not surprising that this speech met with a lack of understanding and was accepted without discussion. Students rarely have and never had children, nor a deplorable wife. As an association, the SDS was about to be dissolved in order to release its members to the diversifying APO. After the universities, schools, trade unions, the junior organizations of the established parties and church groups were caught up in the anti-authoritarian movement. The time for a theoretically working circle of left-wing intellectuals had expired. His male and female protagonists (a distinction that had not been made before) went their own very different ways.

Where was the place for the famous tomatoes in the course of events? In contrast to the 1996 retelling, another claims: After the end of the speech, Rürger threw three tomatoes at the smugly grinning men at the board table, outraged that the comrades passed over the speech in silence

[7] wanted. « Instead of indifference, clearly displayed arrogance. Be that as it may, Sander's ultimatum at the end of her speech might arouse personal resentment. She concluded: 'Comrades, if you have led to this discussion, the content

must be, are not ready, then we have to admit that the SDS is nothing more than an inflated counter-revolutionary yeast dough. The comrades will then know how to draw the necessary conclusions.« This version also contains a factual error. With the sociologist

Heide Berndt, a high-profile comrade sat on the podium as a "woman". What would have become of the little origin myth of the tomato if the inexperienced thrower had hit the tomato and not Krahl, who was later rehabilitated as a gay man and woman-lover? A witness who was at the scene at the time as a comrade and activist of the Frankfurt "Women's Council" shared another version of the event in 1996, which at least has the advantage of being consistent. At the time, a group of women followed the negotiations in the background and exchanged comments and jokes among themselves, but clearly. Chairman Schauer asked her to be quiet in a rather pedantic manner and Rürger responded by throwing the tomato that she was about to eat.

If that's the case, you understand better why she comforted Krahl, who had been accidentally hit, in the evening. It's also easier to understand why she made so little of having placed a tomato as the first feminist toss in history in the aftermath. »The SDS spokeswoman, who was so well known at the beginning, receded into the background of the story. However, the Berlin feminist Halina Bendkowski did not want her actions to be forgotten and invited her to an event dedicated to her in 1988.

Rürger reported very modestly. The co-founder of

The women's movement has long since devoted itself to other issues.« ^[8th]
Unfortunately, it is not reported whether Rürger was once asked at the anniversary event why the co-founder of the women's movement did not become a feminist. Myth cultivation replaces researching all the women who have been lost to the movement and feminism over the years and thinking about why no tradition was formed. One gets the impression that he can

only the memory of the heroic times will be handed over to the next generation of women as the most precious legacy. What has actually been achieved is far too little, according to many of today's women's politicians and women's researchers, and even what little has been done, one continues to complain, is not appreciated by young people. He takes the hard-fought advances for granted, and instead of carrying the torch, he stays out and about. The women's movement has not only shrunk to almost zero in numbers, it has also literally entered the menopause without having daughters to follow.

Self-enquiry would be indicated. The gap of the years, accumulated experiences and endured disappointments have not led to the wild beginnings being critically scrutinized and examined whether, in addition to the right ones, one has also asked the wrong questions and answered the wrong ones. The mythical tomato throw was understood as a most necessary declaration of war by the female sex on the male sex. Right from the start, that was less of an act of self-determination and sovereignty than it might seem at first glance; because the declaration of war, of all things, in the circle of a left-wing student association constituted the opponent in a specific, hopeless way in the act.

You can't hurt anyone with a tomato, but you can offend, soil and ridicule them. The throw appears as an offer to clinch male-female protagonists according to the old pattern of marital and domestic warfare, which at best can end in divorce or death. Even then, the ambiguous silence with which the men commented on the first declaration of war (and all those that were to follow) was deliberately overlooked. An opponent who refuses causes the attacker to get bogged down in increasingly absurd provocations, which ultimately many women are no longer able to follow. But such failures did not prevent the warlike dialogue, which did not even come about directly in the form of serious political or scientific debates, from being preserved as a concept. Fixated on a powerful but invisible enemy, one easily falls for the way out of the

gunman. In addition to being affected, the proverbial "courage to be angry" is the affective basis, the women

[9] need and need to learn. —

With the transfiguration of the tomato thrower of 1968, who could express her anger spontaneously and in unconventional ways, the cheeky, rebellious and unpredictable woman was created as a prototype of the movement. Alongside the model victim and the brave victim, this type is favored by women because he promises to fight the tough battle with an unwavering good humor. But he is also applauded by men and the media. In Hamburg there was a "cheeky" women's faction in the citizenship, which attracted a lot of attention. And not a season goes by without someone discovering a cheeky female rock band or a generation of girls who delight everyone with their aggressively displayed self-confidence.

This success with all parties should make us suspicious. The cheeky woman, no matter what age, is the "unfeminine" woman. That's fine with the women who recognize the corset of patriarchy in their gender stereotyping: "Good girls go to heaven - others go everywhere" is the motto. The cheeky girls spare the others the confrontation with the menacing adult women. If impudence is not simply bad behavior, then it is a high-spirited arrogance of children and young people who do not quite know who they are and what they can do. Some talk too loud and mouth too much, others take hair-raising physical risks. Forbearance is called for here, because everyone knows that behind the phallic bravado of adolescents there is just as much insecurity and discouragement that will then have to come into play some other time. In other words: You should not rely on the cheeky and rebellious woman, the good-humored fighter who fearlessly goes into every battle. Unless she has the robust constitution of an Alice Schwarzer, the facade will always crumble and the depression will surface.

There is another concern. As little as one clever

Creativity can demand from children, just as little is the cheeky woman as the eternal tomboy on the borderline between child and girl able to deliver more than refreshing polemics and enjoyable crocheting and slapstick (preferably on television). The canonization of this type suggests that the women's movement, to its detriment, favored psychic infantility. In her repertoire of types, neither the grown-up woman nor the ironically broken woman has a chance, not to mention real personalities who, one after the other, were eliminated or fled themselves, exhausted by merciless criticism. It was never considered that the new women's movement presupposed equal rights and that countless women had long risked more than losing their chains... The rare interpretations of these processes from the women's movement itself are of course different.

A flyer published at the same time was less suitable for creating myths than the Tossing Tomato. From today's point of view, what was only meant as a cheeky provocation at the time was prophetic. A flyer was circulated in Frankfurt for the slogan and the text "Free the socialist eminences from their bourgeois cocks," which showed this appeal implemented in purely graphic form.

Depicted in the manner of hunting trophies were six eminent penises marked by name (including one named "Krahl"), under which a naked woman, wearing only a hat, was lying on a bed - her right hand still holding the cleaver.

The model for the leaflet was a drawing by the Provos from the Netherlands, a Frankfurt women's councilor recalled in an interview. They wanted to shock and provoke the men - although today (1996, married, two children) she can no longer quite understand that. As early as 1984 she renounced feminism as a "perfect delusional system" and warned newcomers. Anyone who had kept their distance back then is even more shocked today when they read their Florilegium of feminist philosophemes from [10] the current literature.

If patriarchy also constructs reality as language, then women only have the option of choosing between their linguistic

and choose physical rape. "Even if a woman had a stronger response at hand, in most situations she cannot utter it because of the expected physical violent reaction of the man or men who must reestablish their superiority," claimed one linguist.

»The verbal rape of women therefore always succeeds in principle; knowing that violence is possible, men can be as aggressive as they like. We women are always in the situation of potential rape." The persecution of women is often compared with the persecution and extermination of the Jews in the Third Reich, or even lumped together: "The strength and energy of half of humanity is restricted or completely wiped out. Girls who could become artists, scientists, composers, Nobel Prize winners have to be content with intellectually and socially lowly professions, if they have any profession at all.

In this I see the parallel to the persecution of the Jews, which ended in extermination: the killing of those capable of development, the killing of creative things, the destruction of spiritual things, the extermination of the living in millions and billions of women today and throughout our history." Or: " In a male society, the portrayal of women is an ideological weapon, a preparation for their treatment. Just as in the Third Reich the physical annihilation of millions of Jews was preceded by propaganda that showed Jewish ›Untermenschen‹, so the exploitation and desecration of women in a patriarchal society is preceded by their representation as an object: the always usable, available, abused sex." Let these few examples suffice. That ideologies of this sort cannot be refuted by argument at all and that reason has to adapt to them in practice has been known at least since the historical experience of National Socialism, from which, confusingly enough, evidence is to be drawn here.

It remains astonishing why neither such nor other ideological rampages were able to break out of the Cold War of the

Making patriarchy a hot feminist. Is patriarchy too smart, are men too reasonable, or don't they think women are capable of satisfaction? From the silence of the men, the women's movement has drawn the only wrong conclusion, that the enemy who does not show himself openly is the most dangerous and must be suspected everywhere.

Less loud and provocative than in the beginning, a more tenacious and grumpy column in the Berlin magazine *Argument*, entitled "Notes from the Patriarchate," cultivates the image of the enemy, in which no one wanted to recognize themselves. A comment on the legal dispute over the women's quota ends almost elegiacly: "Gender specifics is not a problem that men have to deal with, who are powerful in the communication media of power, money, and love. Women must compete to be seen as individuals and not as gendered beings. A squaring of the circle, since experience has shown that the perception of women as individuals runs at most via a category that has become residual in this world, the third of the

[11] the aforementioned media. « In plain language, this probably means that love is dying out and with it the woman's only chance of being recognized, even if only as a randomly individuated female gender, is disappearing.

If so, which is unlikely —, then the women's movement has at least tried to the best of its ability to discredit heterosexual love; You don't have to think of the politically justified and therefore naturally failed movement lesbianism or the rude talk of penetration because of male cock fixation to identify a self-blockade here that has hindered reflection on female existence from the beginning and to this day. A movement that actually wanted to take care of the precarious situation of women has proven to be fixated on men. With formal equality, they have been given tasks that they try in vain to avoid in the long run by accusing and appealing to others. People who use the communication media of

From a biological point of view, men may be in possession of power, money, truth, etc., but as functionaries in differentiated societies they have long been interchangeable, their gender irrelevant, their individuality adornment and bonus. Women are still faced with the experience of the de-dramatization of old roles in societies that derived their social wealth from the procreation of new people. The women's movement has so far ensured that this insight is drawn out and prevented - it is not surprising under the circumstances that future-oriented projections are missing here or do not exceed the character of socio-pedagogical fantasies about a decent world kindergarten.

The leaflet already mentioned, concerning the socialist eminences with their bourgeois dicks, was taken more literally than the Frankfurt Women's Council might have meant.

I take the following information from one of the few attempts to critically reflect on the beginnings of the women's movement from a distance over the years.

In Berlin it was decided to take action against the humiliation of women as sex objects in advertising. A project that has been repeated since then and has now also been approved by the Pope. "We found the corsetry industry to be particularly misogynistic," wrote Frigga Haug in 1986 in her review —

Feminist from the very beginning and still there today.

[\[12\]](#)

“A public

brassiere burning should set a sign against them.

For ourselves, we envisioned Mao jackets as uniforms to eliminate competition over male looks. Finally, the idea of parading particularly oppressive husbands (of ours) in chains across the Kurfürstendamm seemed appealing to us at the same time as being problematic - after all, each of us had to expect that it would be her own husband's turn and the question of where from now the oppression of women would actually come, became a research task, that should precede an appropriate strategy.« Regardless of the research results in detail, one can

claim that it always resulted in the oppression and heteronomy of women by men, only marginally qualified by the thesis that they had infamously succeeded in turning women into accomplices again and again. The flavoring of the analyzes by Marxist-economic and sociological perspectives became weaker and weaker over the years, so that left-wing and socialist feminists finally arrived where the autonomous ones had been for a long time, with gender antagonism and political separatism under the sign of patriarchy. Later, but not too late, they too discovered that their critique of the gendered division of labor had remained superficial and that they had not duly appreciated sexual violence as a systematically employed strategy of domination and intimidation. Today the obsession with ethical and moral questions, which was already widespread in the bourgeois women's movement around 1900, has become so general that criticism of this development is hardly possible.

One could think back to the many crazy ideas and abstruse projects from the early years with amused, sometimes a little embarrassment, if they hadn't survived to this day as archaic explosives. Apparently the women's movement cannot afford a story that goes beyond the harmonizing retelling and the chronicle. As a result, no matter how old feminists themselves have become, they remained stuck in the infancy of the 1968 revolt. Why shouldn't young women - and at that time the reporter Frigga Haug was as young as all of us - not be "sex objects" whose desire was directed towards the desire for "male looks"? Incidentally, without a brassiere much more concisely than with one, as a scene in Verena Stefan's bestseller for women, *Skinning*, proved quite involuntarily — if such a thing has to be proven at all. Stefan was outraged by the reaction of construction workers to her untied breasts, which were only covered by a T-shirt. Of course you can men, especially young men — their individual willingness to adapt is at the service of their longer-term

Force interests to ignore a woman's breasts and everything else that goes with them. Apart from phases of youthful insecurity, which everyone goes through, there will only be a few women in the long run who really appreciate this blindness. Mao jackets as standard clothing would hardly have contributed to the leveling of female attractiveness in the higher service of sisterly solidarity; because oddly enough, strict uniforms on women are always sexy and on the other hand, the purple baggy look of the seventies, which then really caught on, emphasized the injustices of nature rather than made them disappear.

How does Frigga Haug comment on the youth puritanism of that time? Not at all, so it remains open whether the execution was naive or the idea of taking women out of circulation as sex objects was bad. One would only have to take a cursory glance at the vast array of women's magazines and their almost timeless themes to see that aesthetic puritanism is the wrong lever to liberate women to their freedom. But even such corrections and reflections, which appear harmless to outsiders, are omitted, so that one no longer has to wonder why sexual Puritanism as an ideological core could never be critically worked on.

Anyone who speaks of patriarchy should have asked themselves later on whether the project of leading oppressive partners in chains across Kurfürstendamm wasn't itself very patriarchal. The project was not realized because the debate about it led the Berlin scene to divide between autonomous and socialist women for many years. It is reminiscent of the pillory and the Haberfeld raids, of vigilantism in the village, if not worse. Images come to mind that cannot be transfigured into folklore because they come from the recent and modern past.

But women, as the potential Jews of men's history, are probably allowed to do anything. In her attempt at history, Haug does not go so far as to go to such ideological excesses; but indirectly justified

them each in a blur fashion. The demonstration of the bad men on the Kurfurstendamm seemed "appealing" but also "problematic." The latter, because it could be your own friend's turn. Well, what now, the reader asks herself in 1986, if attractive, then why problematic or vice versa, if problematic, then why attractive? Because Haug gives no answer here, one has to conclude that even then the slogan of what is private and what is political had been reduced to absurdity. Instead, a vague idea of the citizens' terror provides the absolution of any nonsense. »The women's movement began deliberately hostile to men. The terrifying character that this has for the patriarchal structures to this day, quickly helped it to get support from the media.« It's strange when not only Luhmann's media have power, money, love, etc., but literally the press, television controlled by men, of which there is no doubt. Haug doesn't care whether this is a case of commercial appropriation or male masochism. One would have to turn inside out the criticism of capitalism as well as the presumption of patriarchy. "The fright of the citizens was always simultaneously both a departure and breaking out of the familiar and the danger of isolating oneself. Since inconspicuousness is expected of women as a virtue, for them the form of scaring the citizens is probably a necessary step on the way to politics.« After all, who would have been really scared in 1968 apart from their own friends, husbands and lovers? The patriarchy's Kudamm performance would have only persuaded the Berlin public of the time, male or female, to exhort the state authorities to finally do their duty and to feel confirmed once again in their view that the students were turning a wheel have. On the other hand, it is uncanny and, from the point of view of the women's movement, in need of explanation, why the early media success was followed by the political one. Haug describes the end of the women's movement and its transfer into the administration as "ubiquitous lack of place" and "successful defeat," without giving any thought to how this strange situation could have come about. Judging by the

Demands made by the women's movement and which are the premises of women's politics to this day, the record of success that Haug drew up in 1986 was meager and ten years later it would have to be even poorer. »The movement was successful, among other things, because the state accepted the women's question, had to accept it: legally, financially and symbolically. By this I mean, for example, language regulations such as the bisexual job advertisements that are slowly gaining ground; the name question in marriages; setting up pilot projects for women in male occupations; Women's shelters and their — albeit always controversial — funding; the abolition of the paragraph that made a woman's employment dependent on her husband's consent; the establishment of women's control centers, etc.' The women have disappeared - that's a more plausible way of summing up the women's question was handed over to the state, which essentially dealt with it as social policy in accordance with its possibilities for action and financing. However reasonable individual measures of correction and tutoring may be, the unhappy consciousness of the helped in ~~the long, which has been the~~ expression of the long revolt, cannot be. Moreover, the nationalization of the women's question has favored its transformation into an ideological fundamentalism to which every single debate appears as an attack and a betrayal. In her *preliminary farewell to the women's movement*, Cora Stephan even claimed in 1993: »The women's movement, which is said to encompass and represent all women, has, comparable to the Greens, only benefited its functionaries to any significant extent. The institution of the women's representative has increased the number of women's jobs by one, politicians are, no matter what else they have to say, awarded a label of progress simply because of their gender.

Women's chairs do not serve to promote a broad spectrum of female teachers at the male bastion of the university, but self-proclaimed women researchers with sometimes selected theses that are far removed from everyday life. The linguistic consideration

of women, even in places where they still do not appear at all or only rarely, at least provides linguists with wages and bread [13] for sifting through administrative

regulations.« The examples could be multiplied endlessly, —

including those institutions that today call them "autonomous" even though they have been dependent on public funds for years. Research that underpins and popularizes eccentric constructions of reality is now commissioned and funded by government departments. Parties that used to be classified as conservative have taken on the women's question as if, at least with regard to her concerns, there were no longer any parties at all, only partisanship for the good cause as such. In view of such developments, Stephan's critical dismissal of the illusions of the women's movement is just as ineffective as Haug's whitewashing. The two most important ones are for Stephan: The women's movement tried to constitute a collective that does not exist with regard to the different interests of specific women; and on the other hand, the feminist promise of salvation to society as a whole has been discredited because women, neither as a biological nor as a cultural gender, have anything ahead of men that could qualify them as saviors.

Disillusionment may be a prerequisite, insights look different. The next illusion has already been formed, even if this time it appears as a pessimistic diagnosis with no discernible therapy. If it is no longer the male world that needs women for improvement, the belief is now cultivated that society as a whole is rapidly disintegrating because the social integration of individuals in families, neighborhoods, socio-cultural milieus, etc. is decreasing. The specters of right-wing radicalism and xenophobia as the last possibility of a pseudo-socialization in evil arise from the threatening social void. Youth is their preferred symptom carrier.

No one notices that such warnings and prophecies have accompanied the long process of women's emancipation down to recent times. However, it was reactionaries and conservatives

who did not trust the working mother and saw social and national cohesion threatened by female self-determination (like everyone else). If one does not want to agree with them sheepishly now, one would have to think about the new in a new way and resist the temptation to edit it regressively as melodrama. The disintegration is such a melodrama, and even if the women are not partly to blame for it, as conservatives suspect, the women's movement, due to their self-misunderstandings, diligently helped to write the plot. "When it comes to the question," Cora Stephan concludes her preliminary swan song, "how this society could reconnect in the future, the previously rampant imagination of the women's movement might be quite helpful after all."

We had and still have plenty of that. As luck would have it, on this very page of the Berliner *Tageszeitung*, which reminded me of Sigrid Riiger and the tomato throw, there was an example of rampant imagination to study. Below four bold dots and similar crosses I read the names of "Jens, four years, Anna, seven years, Nicole, two years, Nadine, nine years." Below the text: »Sexual abuse of children is murder of children's souls. Help us against child abuse and child pornography.' This was followed by the number of the donation account for a Hamburg association, 'Dark Digit eV - Help for Abused Children'. What began in the mid-1980s in the women's movement has meanwhile become fashionable in all Protestant-Calvinist western societies, not just ours. As any attentive newspaper reader can easily check for himself, a rather eccentric notion of epidemic, yet invisible sexual violence has been helped to gain social acceptance. Since external reasons, such as startling revelations about organized sex rings and other conspiracies, suddenly apparent numbers of victims and an enormous volume of reports cannot be the cause, one can probably speak with Wilhelm Reich of a "slump in sexual morality". [14]

Had the previous denunciation of sexual violence

against women have been adapted to reality by the women's movement since the late 1970s - what remains is "marital rape" and the diffuse "sexual harassment in the workplace" Alice Schwarzer's anti-porn campaign could no longer undo the liberalized laws, that's the way it is Totalization of suspicion with children as victims succeeded.

While otherwise every form of expression of human sexuality is approved, normalized in public debates and not infrequently idealized as subversive — bisexuals, transsexuals, transvestites and S/M practitioners have joined gay men and lesbian women — the sexual self-determination of the child appears today solely from the point of view of its endangerment, primarily in those intimate relationships and four walls that have still eluded public control and preventive insight. However, some incursions of the political into the private life of the citizens have already been enforced and justified with the greater interest in child protection. As is well known, a new law already criminalizes the possession, not just the production and distribution, of "child pornography."

In doing so, one let oneself be guided by the assumption that the criminalization of the consumer was the best way to dry up the market and production. But that is less likely than the case-by-case persecution of otherwise unpopular people using the [15] well-known methods of sexual denunciation. — In the zeal against child pornography, however, one could also recognize the victory of the feminist short-sightedness that pornography is the theory and rape is the practice. The cleansing of our world of ideas and images would then be a necessary step in order to stop the sexual abuse of adolescents. Child molesters and the group of people who are described as pedophiles and who are comprehensively demonized must embody evil, including the uncanny, that of sexuality as such under the sign of trivializing self-realization and feminist partnership ideology

[16] should be driven out. —

Is the diagnosis of sexual paranoia, which has migrated from the feminist fringes to the center and long since taken hold of politics, not only at the municipal level, but also at a higher, even at the federal level - like the conscientious pursuit of so-called sex tourists in foreign countries, but isn't it association has —, still an exaggeration? The fact that the Hamburg chosen the notoriously obscure number as its name seems to me to speak for my realism, in the sense of a Freudian slip. Anyone who relies on the number of unreported cases also reveals that anticipatory commitment is still looking for a reason. Money is tighter than it has been for a long time, but problem-solving capacities without problems are in abundance. Every look at the labor market shows this, especially for social and therapeutic professions. A lack of use of lawyers, doctors, psychologists and pedagogues on the one hand, victims who do not want to appear on the other hand - this is the social background for ideological developments of all kinds, to which the women's movement contributes its good part. Science, professional ethics and professionalism have so far proven to be ineffective in containing them.

If the victims hidden in the dark figure remain silent — years of educational efforts and constant media exposure have not been able to illuminate the dark field even centimeters more than before, then their advocates must become all the louder. If they don't come, you go to them and spread the paranoia under the philanthropic heading of prevention and prophylaxis, preferably among elementary-school children who haven't even had the benefit of elementary sex education. Even less suspicious are excess capacities in the further education sector, where everyone can then learn in the name of the unreported number to allow suspicion of others, but also of themselves.

What the slogan of the private, which is political, which shimmers between celebration and denunciation, leaves undecided, is decided in paranoia in favor of the celebration. When reading relevant tracts, but also handouts from the criminal police,

one gets the impression that the time is not far off when everyone will have to account to themselves and others that they themselves have not been sexually abused and that, to their knowledge, they have not abused anyone, even intentionally. But who will be able to say with certainty what was once assumed to be normal? As more and more people have embraced sexual abuse, ideas about its content and its consequences for victims have escalated. You can't rely on their memories, because it is said that those who have been severely traumatized for years have forgotten, split off and repressed the trauma.

Actually, only women would be exempt from examination and self-examination. On the one hand, they almost never appear as perpetrators; on the other hand, their victim status is established anyway. Because, as was recently read in the commemorative publication of a pioneer organization, all women without exception are affected by violence, as women, and therefore by sexual violence directed against their gender.

It is never possible to foresee where the paranoia will become acute, which children will be suspected as victims, which people will be suspected as perpetrators. Everyone is well advised to take on the persecution and not the enlightenment. Every society struggles with delusion, which is all too well suited to it, because its elements are difficult to distinguish from the good intentions that otherwise inspire moral and responsible people. Therefore the hope is that historically well processed delusional systems as

admonishing example do good, very weak. [\[17\]](#) It would be wrong to blame the women's movement as a whole, or even individual groups or individuals, for the backlash in sexual politics, which no longer wants to protect us from devilish debauchery, fornication and racial poisoning, but from the murder of children's souls. It cannot be denied, however, that she opened the door to a future full of all-too-familiar scenarios of persecution and never practiced self-criticism, perhaps knowing that little would remain of our feminism without the obsession with sexuality, which always creates loyalty, public

Attention, political influence and of course money can be gained.

Ever since the tomato throwing in 1968, the women's movement, or what's left of it, has come forward with accusations and demands. These, too, have essentially remained the same. The role of the complainant in a just cause is as fresh as on the first day and is therefore filled out as if it weren't one and as if one had never had the opportunity in between to lose one's innocence as a responsible agent. However, as the abuse debate proves in its real consequences, this is far removed from reality. It is true that the movement has often demanded that women, neither in real nor in theory, should take on the role of victim. There was a dispute as to whether women should be held responsible or complicit in the crimes of National Socialism. Only a few might decide to do so because, like the Frankfurt sociologist Karin Walser, they have a clear concept of female power among the

conditions of patriarchy decreed. [\[18\]](#) The rejection of the victim role was less a result of deeper insights than a reaction of displeasure. The women's unhappy consciousness would have been most sensitively touched by their impertinence and would have become visible to some extent. So it remained the case that the victims, as model victims, were always other women and one was only allowed to appear as a brave, former victim. Beyond that, however, the victim discourse continued in the process of constantly discovering new victims who could take the vacated places of the former. So women learn today that children and the handicapped, white women, black women, German women, Turkish, European, Indian, etc. etc. are still on the waiting list of a well-understood feminism.

It seems to me that being affected across society and applied worldwide is a sign of powerlessness, also from Immaturity begets, comparable to the moral rigor of some adolescents

No matter how much the women's movement has remained a youth revolt Knowledge accumulated, no tradition has formed in which women

The event of the Berlin Women's Group mentioned at the beginning proved to me that I can move politically, practically and intellectually. After so many years, the freshness with which she found herself in the role of complainant and, worse still, potential censor of unpleasant facts was really worrying. As heard there, some preparatory meetings attracted keen interest from women and feminist journalists. It could have been about the question of what impression feminism and the women's movement made on the daily press. The invitation to the editors-in-chief of the left-wing and liberal Berlin newspapers, however, restricted this question in the sense of mere moral-political correctness. I was curious to see whether at least the ideas of the women involved about anti-sexism, anti-racism and social ethics (this is a feminist novelty) have now been clarified so well that a willing censor can also work with them. In Hollywood, for example, everyone knew that a close-up of a woman's breasts could appear on screen, no matter how huge—the nipples had to remain taboo. Or one remembers the kissing rules, which knew how to keep every passion at least optically sterile in the interests of youth protection, family values and public order. No French kissing! Every moviegoer since the 1950s has seen them thousands of times and deciphered them, those breathtaking shoots, more like turning away exercises by experienced stars, who were finally allowed to find each other in the great love of the script and in the kiss — the cohabitation came much later. The moral judges of the 20th century knew what they had to do just as well as the political ones of the 18th and 19th—even if their convictions were quite different and liberal. However, no one seems to be thinking about a new set of rules today, perhaps because everyone today, and above all every woman, is so sensitive that she recognizes sexism when sexism is present. This is how it works in practice: If I recognize myself, my foresight and my wishes in a 1:1 ratio and find them reproduced, then everything went right; if I have to get angry, there is a case of sexism.

Decollaged posters with written comments in every urban landscape prove that for some even a bare female breast or a model in lace underwear is sexist.

It's strange, but with this form of wild criticism it's unavoidable that the intended denunciation of male sexism then reaches the female body as demolition and destruction.

The well-attended event was opened by a woman [19] who presented the results of her relevant doctoral thesis. She had found that on the major political pages of various daily newspapers, for every hundred male names, there were only about fifty female names. She did not accept the objection that men were overrepresented in politics to exactly this extent, no matter how much one regrets that and sees a need for action for the future. Even at the time of a red-green coalition in West Berlin in 1989 with a high proportion of female senators, they were badly treated in the media in terms of percentage. With one exception: the green women's senator had a lot of publicity, but unfortunately and of course typically for the wrong reasons. The press was primarily interested in their role in a dubious chain letter campaign in the past, not in their political plans. Further examples of the outrageously personalizing, even sexist reporting were given so innocently, as if we were not just as informed about the Federal Chancellor's weight problems or the divorce of the SPD chairman. The premise of this performance from the world of women's studies was nothing but a watertight self-righteousness that wrongly claims to be women's analysis of women.

In addition to the scandal that women were not represented enough in the newspapers and also tended to be presented incorrectly, there was the second that far too few work there and therefore cannot bring in the relevant women's point of view at any time. Halina Bendkowski from the

women's group is already taking it to the next level. The experiences with the *daily newspaper*, which has long been half-way quoted, have taught us that the quota alone does not lead to the silver bullet of an anti-sexist etc. newspaper business. It happens all too often that the wrong women are quoted. The published editors-in-chief were advised not only to privilege gender, the female, when hiring equally qualified employees, but also to make sure in every case that the woman who has it also has the right feminist extra qualification. Yes, once you have started soldering distinctions to monopolistic claims - only women can and are allowed to talk and write about women - then you quickly end up where the censorship begins. A world that falls apart into men and women will soon fall apart into women and real women — even if the real woman today looks very different from the ones that the patriarchy offered to older generations.

The newspapermen who dutifully appeared at the tribunal - one woman among all the men - showed so much understanding and sympathy for all complaints and concerns of the women; but then they also appealed to our sympathy because of the precarious financial situation of their papers (the more affluent and conservative ones hadn't even been invited), so that I began to get bored. Hearty attempts by Georgia Tornow to present her experiences in the women's movement and in the editorships of two daily newspapers and to explain the pragmatism she adheres to today met with no response from the assembly. After an hour and a half I left. The others stayed. Whether out of interest or habit, because we knew each other and liked to get together, whether for some feminism was a leisure activity or a professional duty — I have no idea.

Do women believe that there are women?

When it all started, no one had any doubts about it. The women in the SDS who separated from the comrades and the others who joined them initially pursued the goal of making themselves visible again as women. With their exit from the left, which was hypocritically conceived as asexual, and from the society of formally and legally equal citizens, they wanted to expose equality as a fiction and disavow its male beneficiaries. Socialized prematurely as individuals without gender, women now had to organize themselves if they did not want to continue compensating for their ongoing structural disadvantage with hopeless private adjustments. In the self-experience groups, the frustration of each individual who felt completely overwhelmed by work, studies, raising children, female role expectations with regard to success in heterosexual relationships and much more was articulated. Anyone who had previously looked for faults and weaknesses in themselves learned that things were going just as badly for others. The women's movement undertook to socialize the self-doubt and self-criticism of the individual and, after the end of the self-awareness groups, to absorb them in large projections. She did that almost all too well. When experts are gathered today, wherever and for whatever reason, all it takes is a voice pointing out the absence of women for an echo to arise and for those involved to launch lengthy explanations and apologies. Whereas we used to be used to neutralizing people as bearers of a function, today we have learned to sexualize them. In the case of men, who are still more the norm, this tends to be done more generally, disregarding their specific masculinity; in the case of the rarer women, femininity is taken into account and valued. Whether this points to the future or, as is often claimed, is another attempt to make public life difficult for women by any means necessary is unclear

not clear. Anyone who misses women and everywhere complains about the unequal distribution of power between the sexes needs women whose appearance is not immediately linked to their disappearance. The women's movement has hitherto decided the question of the meaning of gender in a political-strategic and opportunistic manner, and has also developed revealing utopias and fantasies which, no matter how complicated they may be formulated, provide the question with two answers. The first responds to the false and unjust neutralization of persons with a reconstruction of archaic femininity. The second, more influential today, wants to unmask gender as a construction that is imposed on individual bodies like a corset on the basis of minimal biological differences that are also reversible at will. The deconstruction of the 'other', namely the female sex, began in the 1970s and continues today with the critique of the category as such. Masculinity is also a corset that one can and must get rid of. But the deconstruction of gender not only gives back to individuals their bodies and their lusts, as Foucault once prophesied; it also enables a critique of domination as such. Based on the question of women and gender, all major and minor adversities of the present should be explicable in the concept of »dominance culture« and reframed after the end of the big narratives.

Destruction of the environment, readiness to use violence, right-wing extremism, racism, hostility towards the handicapped — the list can be extended at will — are the consequences of a mechanism of identifying discrimination apparently inherent in our culture (one speaks less often of capitalism). As a moral gender, women are still unable to speak for themselves without eventually saving the world.

Compared to this, the attempt to reassert archaic femininity under the conditions of modernity is touchingly naïve. For years, a Berlin self-help project has been dealing with the topics of ovulation, menstruation,

Menopause, pelvic floor and belly dance. It has the name [20]

"Thirteenth Moon" given.

»A lot of a woman's life revolves around her menstrual cycle, around her middle — ovulation, contraception and the desire to have children on the one hand; retreating on itself, the bleeding on the other side. Our birthing, creative power comes from here. We need them for work as well as for the actual birth. From here we measure the time. Earlier, when the moon determined the length of the month, there were years with 13 months - according to the women's cycle.« In the events, the women are instructed in training their body awareness and biological processes that they have previously experienced as disturbing or disturbed, to be considered positive and, if necessary, to be better regulated with ritual-like exercises. It is a rejection of the "illness of women" (Esther Fischer-Homberger) as a field of medical gynecology and at the same time an attempt to reinvent women on the basis of their biology. However, the new comes in an archaic guise, disguised as a return to and recourse to suppressed traditions and reactionary terms: »Labyrinthine games. For several years we have been doing yoga exercises and belly dancing on menstruation and ovulation. We have a lot of fun and experience our pelvis and our body in a completely new way. The blood circulation is stimulated, the menstrual pain subsides. Back pain and cramps in shoulders and neck dissolve. Since 1990 we have been staging the labyrinth games based on the pattern of the old labyrinth forms in order to live out one's own body and fate experiences with music, dance, magic and spirituality, but also with role-playing and psychodrama. We descend into the interior in seven steps, in order to then climb up again and make a new beginning.« If the criticism of so-called conventional

medicine has also prevailed among many physicians and has led to the revival of »holistic« and naturopathic therapeutic approaches, the circle even of the women-moving women, who in the "Thirteenth Moon" re-establish their womanhood with the lower body, can be very small

want. As soon as one leaves the terrain of medical criticism and its counterpart, natural health promotion, and starts talking about the biology of the sexes, resistance stirs everywhere. One is immediately made aware of the historically easy to prove connection between misogyny and oppression and discrimination against the female body. Ever since Aristotle, his differentness has been exaggerated, and his uniqueness has been misconstrued against women. Physically reduced to the uterus, on this basis and no other weighed into the twentieth century a vast superstructure of philosophical, political, and psychological rationalizations, all fit only to classify women as second-class citizens. Even the bourgeois revision of the gender hierarchy in favor of a gender polarity was still based, albeit veiled, on the dominance of biology. The poles of male and female were related to other, but no longer weighted. The family gave expression to the natural division of labor between the sexes: the man's job, the world of work and the public sphere, the woman's house, children and upbringing. Apart from the fact that this regulation of gender difference all too often failed in reality - for example because the father failed to provide breadwinner, because he died or because women did not want to or could not marry, this model also reduced women to the area of direct reproduction, glorified in the cult of mother and motherhood.

Seen in this way, it is not surprising if the keyword "mother" is missing in a »Women's Handbook — Keywords for Self-Determination« and »motherhood« is understood on the one hand as a stuck convention of the silent, still unenlightened majority, on the other hand as a social function that men in the future as well as women will have to fill in and

can. [\[21\]](#) The relationship between "mothers and daughters" is also examined with regard to the particular difficulties faced by mothers in finding the right balance between individualizing recognition and secure attention - difficulties that mothers

Apparently boys don't have or whose processing is not in the well-understood interest of women who are passionate about women. Another keyword deals with »mother centres«, again quite critical of mothers in the implicit reference to the old mother ideology that tied women to the house and children. The »mother centers« want to break through the old division of labor between the sexes, which has been interpreted as social isolation, and at the same time prepare women for their return to real life, the world of work.

As reasonable as the concept sounds and may work in practice, the affective, mother-critical excess that supports it is clear. As a real remnant of a hated gender ideology, the mother is in itself a dangerous and seductive figure and, in order to prevent one's own relapses, is basically best ignored in silence if she cannot be regarded as a victim in need of help. Once the silence is broken, as happened in the "Mothers' Manifesto" of some "green" women in 1987, the excitement is great. In the name of one common cause, it deplored the misalignment of mothers with other feminists who had focused on the world of work. But others were appalled by the conservative backlash from within their own ranks. To the advanced consciousness, mother appears as a function that, apart from a commitment that is still unavoidable (pregnancy, childbirth, breastfeeding), can also be fulfilled by men and, for reasons of justice, must also be fulfilled in the future.

The »Mothers' Manifesto«, as well as everyday empiricism, teach that this concept overtaxes the reason of many women. A small but symptomatic group of women endure adversity of all kinds in order to fulfill their wish for a child—but hardly because they want or have to fulfill a social obligation. Some surrender themselves again to men's medicine, whose hour should have come long ago.

Others accept the politically correct role of the single parent when the biological clock is ticking and a viable life partner is missing. Some also acquire children

where they are still born in abundance, for example in South America, in order to finally become and be a mother in this way. The loud and well-crafted lamentation about the pressure that is so fatal for women to give reproduction a certain priority over other life options is still being studiously ignored by many, and its consequences are circumvented with cunning and malice. Mothers conceal themselves and are concealed.

Thus the "single parent" — an established category — can now be sure of the benevolent respect of others, but she enjoys it not as a mother but as a moral agent whose grievances and grievances we all the more willingly listen to and make our own.

Mother is taboo and even in »Thirteenth Moon« she, let alone motherhood, is not an issue. Menstruation and menopause, pelvic floor and ovulation are revived and explored as a constitutive female experience, but these preparations and follow-ups of a peculiar creativity end, at least in the program, in nothing, that is: in the soul of the participants, who after the completion of all the Exercises and collective affirmations presumably subjectively lifted and made you feel better. Self-examination of the genital apparatus with a speculum, which was almost a fashion in women's circles in the 1970s, is still practiced today in The Thirteenth Moon: "We women discover during self-examination that we are beautiful from the inside too." That's true more than anyone who spends a lifetime criticizing her appearance can expect. Her menstrual research divides the cycle into four experiential phases, which are named after four Greek goddesses: Artemis, Athena, Psyche and Persephone/Demeter... In a "menstrual hut" you can experience the cycle with others; a mother wishes to experience the bleeding together with her little daughter before the menopause threatens.

One is shocked, and the door is wide open to defensive criticism of this attempt to cultivate physiological processes and thus to culturalize them. Even if one denies any future to the hopelessly reactionary attempt,

Defiance, yes, as resistance to the progressive marketing of femininity, it deserves attention. Thanks to offensive advertising on television, menstruation is no longer an embarrassing secret for those affected and their friends and lovers who are in the know, but a public fact. As before, and to an increasing degree, it is seen as a temporary handicap that needs to be minimized and made invisible by all means. Although it still exists, it is still considered an important indicator that one is okay "as a woman" and must therefore be checked. In contradiction to this is their treatment as a hygiene problem. Anyone who doesn't find their way into the "Thirteenth Moon," and that's almost everyone, will find a highly differentiated range of articles in every supermarket that allows every woman to give any idiosyncratic expression to the periodically recurring embarrassment. There are natural and technical concepts of menstrual hygiene, those where you have to touch yourself for the robust, others where you can avoid touching yourself; there are remedies for beginners and advanced users and recently one that gets to the heart of the problem that women really are facing, today much more helpless and insecure than ever before. »Always Ultra« conceives the female genitals, not metaphorically at all, but actually as the always open wound that has to be treated daily and at the same time promises to make the verifiable secretion disappear into invisibility. The practical ink eradicator is also responsible for blood.

Only at first glance does the industrially produced menstrual culture of the supermarket differ from the offerings of the therapeutic menstrual cult in The Thirteenth Moon. Behind the facade of hygiene and cleanliness there, the promise of deep health and spiritual elevation here, both are reacting to an epochal change in modern societies that has been apparent for a long time, but has only now become radically acute for every woman to experience. The women's movement is less than it is with its historical calculations and

seeks to make current lists of complaints plausible, spokesman for a just cause as a symptom of precisely this changeover.

To put it mildly, modern societies do not have the notorious tendency to discriminate against women, but rather to make them redundant. Today there is not a woman who in her life has not spent more thought and effort, money and time on contraception, birth planning or abortion than on the rare events of conception, pregnancy and childbirth. The pathetic staging of such events in individual cases speaks an eloquent language and documents the loss of power and importance that women have suffered and that they have to come to terms with today. All complaint scenarios obscure this fact, and one can at best recognize the pain and suffering that the devaluation of female creativity has experienced in the monotony of the victim discourses. Only in individual cases does professional or artistic self-realization offer a substitute. Today you only see one side if you emphasize that women no longer have to have children and can no longer be reduced to the status of the birth machine, the self-sacrificing mother and narrow-minded housewife etc. — they can and should do that no longer either. Incidentally, only the general and also technically unproblematic separation of procreation and sexuality turns all women into those naked sexual objects for which, according to the prevailing convention, they are "still" held.

Historically and fundamentally, however, women have never been, and we really do not yet know who they will be as subjects of their sexuality — no longer objects of male lust, but also of unavoidable guilt.

The process of devaluing genuinely female creativity is irreversible and the crude compulsion to limit population growth through birth control is arguably inevitable worldwide; because the decent life that we want to make possible for everyone is extremely expensive. Who is paying? First of all, the women facing the loss of their old function with the promise in cash

to be made palatable for an uncertain better future. It is understandable that they are reluctant and therefore often appear as a resistant, conservative element, as at the UN population conference in Cairo or the women's conference in Beijing, where they preferred to talk about mothers and family support over birth control and discrimination. Nevertheless, China's one-child policy shows which way all societies have to go if they want to give their members work, food, education and health, precisely the decent life that the world community also has in countless resolutions and conventions of the UN and its raised sub-organizations to the norm and brought it to the attention of all.

When many children represent a danger and mothers are therefore needed less and less, the reconstruction of archaic femininity cannot succeed. The modern menstrual cult, which already takes strict birth control into account, ends in mere care of body and soul. Unintentionally, the women join him again in a tradition of hysterical-hypochondrial self-thematization, a cul-de-sac that used to be driven by the masses, which emancipation wanted to open after all. Not a nice perspective, as a glance at the 19th century shows.

Throughout their lives, the Fontane couple struggled with depressive moods and migraines — the woman whom the writer “had bought for being witty, esprit, clever and prudent” (letter dated

^[221]
September 18, 1857). "She really is funny, but at the same time she's so scurrying about everything she says, so haphazard, so dependent, so dependent on the moment and on every new idea that goes through her head... I may often be harsh and unfair, but the reason is au fond flattering to Emilien and is that I have too good an opinion of her faculties.' its costliness and the hardships of pregnancy and childbirth. After the third, in 1853, Fontane decided to close the "shop" out of pity and

Sympathy for Emily. It doesn't work out and three more children are born. Again and again the woman lies "head blown off" on the sofa. The question of how serious or not the situation is, comes up again and again and cannot be answered medically: »Emilie has been ill for more than eight days, the first three of which I took as one of those common annoyances that no longer pierce the crocodile armor of my indifference , until on the fourth day I became aware that the wind was blowing more seriously. So I undressed my husband and put on my doctor, and today, with the help of 'hellish eldermen', I have finally mastered the evil enemy. But she is still under attack, real and real. This must be emphasized, for it is one of the oldest areas in which the struggle between idealism and realism is raging. Poorly calculated, there are just as many false migraines as false pigtales. And that means something" (letter of August 9, 1874).

It is tempting to consign such tales of bourgeois married life in the age of gender polarity, before the birth of the pill, women's college and other advances, to history. At best - and the women's movement has done this extensively - fuel for current outrage could be drawn from the past. On the other hand, the women's movement proves by its very existence that changed and improved conditions do not eliminate the problem at hand, but only radically exacerbate it to the point of recognition. What is the significance of the two-sexedness of humans and, since, as is well known, anatomy was not destiny for men, what significance do women want to give it if destiny simply falls away? Certainly men like Fontane were also lovers, husbands, and householders who were willing to pay their price for a morally acceptable sex life, happiness, and family comfort—but they did not have to be absorbed in this existence like women. Their transition problems are minimal compared to theirs and almost have to be forced on them and talked into them. Fontane would simply have had it easier if his Emilie had fewer migraines and a job instead

would have had outside the house. Her dependency made her anxious and insecure when Fontane placed his literary ambitions above the security of earning a mediocre income.

The letters give an idea of the relationship work it cost him to make Emilie plausible about saying goodbye to earning a secure living at the Kreuz-Zeitung.

The emancipation of women is therefore not only part of the historical trend of societies with ever lower population turnover, it is also in the direct interest of husbands and fathers, in short men. While this did not always prevent their vehement resistance, it explains why it was abandoned point by point. Their gains were soon obvious, and those of the women always had to be weighed against the losses. Losses are concrete, rights are options for a future. The women's movement is still active today in the bright field of retrospectively evident injustice and the dark field of its future, and it is reacting to the fact that women have lost something in the process of emancipation without having been adequately compensated for this loss. Or, one could also characterize the current situation in this way, without the women's movement having succeeded in formulating a point of view beyond the culture of complaints, from which women can confidently articulate themselves. This is due to the fact that she never presented herself as a service provider in times of upheaval, but always as a plaintiff for what was supposedly taken for granted. If there were another history beyond women's history, based on the pattern of oppression, struggle and progress that has long been obsolete elsewhere, which would take account of the historical break that took place around 1800, then one would know better what impositions women have to cope with.

One might think that the deconstruction of the category Gender, as suggested by Judith Butler, implicitly the Devaluation of femininity takes into account and explicitly that

[23] offers a way out of the unhappy consciousness of women. Butler doesn't just want the political interpretation of the sexual

Criticizing and changing dimorphism in the interests of women. Proof that women don't (yet) exist because the ones that are there are just reflecting the desires of men and the interests of power is continued to the at least logical conclusion that there can then probably no longer be any men. The end of their power of definition gives women freedom; they themselves, as historical culprits, inventors and beneficiaries of difference and a rigorous identity politics, have the embarrassing task of penitently disposing of the ruins of their rule.

Now, the idea that gender identity—not just the bad female—is taught and learned and reproduced in the most varied ways in everyday life is not new. Socialization research on the one hand and sociology with many variants on the other have sufficiently demonstrated that reality is socially constructed, that the subject is not a monad and that down to its most subtle impulses and perceptions it only exists as an interacting entity. What is new about the feminist adaptation of constructivism and its successors is the enthusiastic belief that it can be put at the service of a sexual and political utopia that, along with the insult of being born a woman, also promises to eliminate all other injustices in this world .

If gender identity and gender difference fall, then other bad identities and differences also get into trouble, marking, excluding, oppressing and exploiting people, robbing them of their potential and freedom.

It is striking that other Constructivists, admittedly male, do not share the belief in the reversibility of social constructions of reality. The more subtle the analyzes turn out to be, the tougher and more survivable the constructions turn out to be. As a radical interactionist, Erving Goffman, who, as a radical interactionist, is not suspicious of any form of substantialism and essentialism, has repeatedly examined how gender is constructed and, above all, why, despite all criticism, it has become popular in modern societies with their ideal of equality

had to become a hit. [\[24\]](#) He sees gender as a social resource, a mode of socialization of the literal

available to everyone, whether poor or rich, young or old, sick or healthy. As other modes become more irrelevant, it gets returned with more vigour, day after day. Anyone who observes the pop music in image and sound, which is aimed at an international, socio-culturally completely heterogeneous audience, cannot contradict Goffman. All possible other identities are thwarted and pluralized, the gender is not shaken.

In fact, Goffman, in an analysis of white middle-class American patriarchy, argues that even its rigid heterosexual construction, from the interactionist's point of view, offers such great merits that it can hardly be considered obsolete. The heterosexual couple offers each participant the unique opportunity to be an actor of himself and an audience for another at the same time. This interactionist condensation and duplication is unbeatable, and not just for the sociologist, who need not use a single syllable on biology, sexual needs, or even love to reach this conclusion. In addition, one could even assume that only the sharp accentuation of gender and gender identity in the sign of heterosexuality thoroughly promotes tolerance for those minorities who have another. The more expensive some have become under modern conditions, the more they can respect that others with the same goal have to fall back on other resources and can no longer be prevented from doing so.

Seen from a distance, Butler's deconstruction of gender, difference and identity reveals itself to be yet another chapter in the book of insults that continues to record that it would be better to have been born male. To this day, men, not even the gay movement, give a damn about the utopian chaos that feminist deconstructivism promises to wreak.

Transsexuals of both sexes pay homage to anatomical realism and, for a great deal of money and at the expense of health insurance companies, which have long been enlightened, allow themselves to be transformed into the sex to which they belong mentally. Transvestites remain "male" and

flirting with the penis, which they always know to be safe under the hybrid femininity they stage. Why are there no female transvestites who can captivate TV audiences? Women who disguise themselves as men reinforce their feminine erotic appeal or cause offense as usurpers of the male role that is not theirs. Many historical examples show that the women who nevertheless slipped into the male role were by no means vagabonds in the system of rigid gender segregation and opposition that women today would like to think of them as. [25]

— On the contrary, the woman as man reinforces it by occupying a hierarchically higher position, mostly for quite understandable reasons, and benefiting from male power. The transvestite fascinates because he does not connect any plausible social motives, let alone progressive or political intentions with his actions. If one does not want to assign him to psychopathology as a disturbed person, then he is best understood as a religious person who has to banish the threat of the feminine in fetishistic ceremonies. This fear is not alien to male viewers and is flattering to female viewers, who see their power mirrored.

Women's hopes of escaping their gender have repeatedly driven the women's movement to radical measures and to the dead ends of theories that have proved impractical. While the exclusion of men on pedagogical grounds has often been useful, their existence in the lives of the vast majority remains an annoying fact. In her bestseller "Small difference and its big consequences," Alice Schwarzer failed to explain to herself and to the readers what women see in men who play them so badly all their lives. The riddle of gender relations and their persistence cannot be solved with a sarcastic look at the penis - the female equivalent does not seem to exist at all. "Women are demoted to women in the name of love," claims Schwarzer ambiguously, as if women didn't exist or shouldn't exist if everything went right. 'In the name of love they have no right to their own

Existence and independence, if you are a friend/wife/mother of, if you are an object instead of a subject, content yourself with a place on the edge of the (men's) world.« A woodcut that no longer depicts anything, if it ever did . Schwarzer reveals a gross underestimation of the power that women have exercised as wives, mothers over men and children in a divided world. But she also fails to recognize - a systematic mistake made by the women's movement in general - that the satisfaction of an existence in the second limb (from the point of view of an ambitious journalist, a childless and unmarried professional woman) was never so bad and still finds enough supporters today. Apart from the culture of complaints and their short-term relief experiences, nothing has developed in many years, either socially or ideally, that would make it easier for women to deal with their conversion problems appropriately and help their justified conservatism.

Lately we have heard more and more often about the lack of or disappointing results that women's politics, initiated and supported by the women's movement, have brought about. The denial of gender and the compensatory cultivation of a highly sexualized male enemy image certainly contributed to false concepts.

Early on, a paper from the United States made in the Women's movement furore, the myth of the vaginal orgasm exposed as such. [\[26\]](#) Criticism of the man's fixation on "penetration" began. The sexual revolution of the sixties suddenly appeared as a staging by men for men. From the women's point of view - this is how the message from America was interpreted - they overestimated their small difference in gaining pleasure. They were superfluous, or at least easily replaceable.

Therefore, but also for the purpose of effective liberation work, the slogan was given that women should relate to women, including sexually. One became a lesbian out of conviction, an option that, of course, was only temporary for most. Others cultivated the idea of androgyny. The men became

asked to develop their feminine parts, the women should become more demanding and aggressive. The philosophical and religious-mystical tradition of this idea of abolishing gender polarity in the heaven of harmony and reconciliation played no role here. The women tended to pursue the idea of an immediate equalization and equalization of gender differences in their presumed favour. It is amazing what battles of letters to the editor can still be set in motion today when it comes to the question of whether men are allowed or should pee standing up. It seems that women-moving women are more offended here than others. One hardly dares to claim that they have remained envious and sadly fixated on the supposedly small difference, even after years of raising awareness. They themselves assert hygienic and socio-political reasons for their demand for the conversion of male pee traditions. When men follow them, they create dirt. Dirt has to be removed by women, possibly cleaning women, in an already pitiable female work context. Physicians favor male voiding while standing.

Many men, on the other hand, have yielded to the preaching of women, whose castrative intent they choose to ignore because they are trained to accommodate woman's madness in pursuit of their own interests.

In the long run, male diplomacy cannot replace female self-reflection. If a certain partisanship for women is part of the basic consensus of society, the movement has petered out. As a theory, feminism exists in the vicinity of the universities (the parallel to Marxism in the 1970s is obvious), where the old fantasies are dogmatically sharpened at green tables, which in the political practice of earlier years have already led to nothing.

If the potential of the classic emancipation policy seems almost exhausted, it may be necessary to switch from equal rights to privileges, the old annoyance of disadvantage is followed by the new one of discrimination. Basically yes

The simple message is: only when women are no longer discriminated against as women, i.e. can, must and may be distinguished from men, because all myths have now been debunked and constructions are just constructions, will the women's question be answered. In everyday life, discrimination against women works like a paranoid expectation that can find subjective confirmation at any time. In theory, one can understand the evil of discrimination as the sin of differentiation and finally get to the root of it. With the reference to marginalized and persecuted minorities of all kinds, to races, ethnic groups and other cultures, the approach gains a politically progressive meaning. Women, the actual starting point, suddenly appear to be nothing more than a special case in a logic of domination, from which they benefit if they are white and wealthy.

The thematization of a hitherto unconscious white racism and Eurocentrism in the women's movement, the admitted overlooking of the inequality between women, impresses less as progress than as flight of thought. In the sea of new problems and differences, the gender difference disappears. It reappears under the label »forced heterosexuality« and, to her shame, is contrasted with the theoretically subversive and politically correct, limitless possibilities of sexual self-realization beyond patriarchy. The following short biography of a singer and poet could serve as an almost perfect example of female identity in the non-identical: »Storme Webber is a woman with many identities. She is of Afro-American and Native American descent, a lesbian, and from a lower-class family. The daughter of a lesbian mother and a bisexual father left home at the age of eleven

[27] left and was placed in a foster family...” Further passages of the text make it clear what to make of the promise of a self-sewn patchwork of pluralized identity and the transcending of aristocratic gender dichotomy. »Storme Webber draws her poems from life. She makes fun of white men who have dreadlocks

wear and want to curry favor with the blacks, it tells of love and violence in the big city (...) Sensual stories full of boldness and love of life. ›I think lesbian sex should be celebrated. If only because lesbian sex is so often kept secret.« Making fun hardly means »drawing from life«. The demarcation of white men by the rest has long been a convention: their appropriation of foreign symbols (dreadlocks) can only be disapproved of; their need for transformation and adaptation is rejected (ingratiation).

If they are the right ones, differences and identities do not become liquid, but become jealously guarded and self-administered possessions. One is born a hybrid of identity, as Webber's family history shows, and from that birthright derives no fewer (or none) but more privileges to truth and validity, always in distinction to those who are white and male or at least white, female and are "born" heterosexual. The celebration of lesbian sex, which until now has been denied by the lesbians and silenced by the others, is aimed at recognition. Who can grant it if not the heterosexual hegemonic culture, which has long been geared towards tolerance and, even worse, indifference, which one actually wanted to question in the interests of women-lesbians(!)?

The women's movement and its academic continuation did not answer the question of what meaning women want or should give to sexual difference under dramatically changed conditions. To the insult of being born a woman, came the next step, that of becoming superfluous as a woman. Biology and the body have not proven to be resistant to adaptation — think of the advances in reproductive technology and the possibility of surgical sex reassignment — no, the culture, the society, is resistant. She elevated difference to the central operator of the socialization of the individual, of socialization in general. Why should she renounce the gender difference?

Wherever you look, at the TV screen, the street, the supermarket or the newspaper - this decision does not stand up

the agenda of the present.

children or career? The so-called compatibility problem

The goal to which the old women's movement, supported by quite a few male assistants, was striving for decades was called "Equal rights". There was a need to change laws that barred girls and women from secondary education, university studies, and virtually all skilled jobs. The active and passive right to vote, the right of married women to continue their professional activity, to the power to act and make decisions in all possible matters of civil life had to be enforced. For a long time, women's rights were no more and no less than lifting bans.

Whether one could or wanted to use gender-neutral rights was up to the individual woman.

Although people still talk about equality today, it actually means something completely different for a long time.

At least one thinks of equal opportunities, a term popularized by educational reform in the 1960s and 1970s. Whoever wanted to release reserves of talent had to doubt that intelligence could be so neatly sorted and sorted out along the boundaries of classes and strata, as the three-tier school system quite naively depicted. For example, assumes a child, preferably a female, in the rural Catholic milieu of Bavaria and who is also married to a working-class father, has the same talent, the same educational opportunities as a male in secular Hamburg, whose father is a lawyer or doctor or at least works in the middle service ? At that time, the question was asked rhetorically and then the answer was financial incentives, school reforms, teacher motivation and compensatory education. Attempts were also made to do something good by breaking down prejudices about a strongly middle-class ideal of education and language. More education for more

Adolescents, measurable by the proportion of each school year in higher educational qualifications, also by the number of students, but also by the popularization of ambitions among all parents for their children - these were the results. The fairness at the start that seemed promised in the concept of equal opportunities could not be the end. In a society in which socio-cultural capital is also very unequally distributed, this does not have such a massive impact on ten or nineteen-year-olds as it used to - at the latest during their studies, after their exams and when they start work, old handicaps and just as old privileges then win but again meaning.

With regard to women, even equal opportunities are not enough for many. The new goal is a material, statistically verifiable equality. Almost more implicitly than explicitly, a fair distribution of power and wealth, but also of certain burdens and plagues along the gender lines, is thought of as the goal of women's politics. In analogy to the Catholic worker's daughter from Bavaria from the times of the educational reform, the example could be constructed: With a proportion of women of 50 percent of the adult population and 55 percent of the concert visitors, the proportion of female chief conductors of large symphony orchestras is zero. Or: Despite the fact that primary school teachers are predominantly female, school principals are predominantly male. Or, thinking about the future: After Messrs. Heuss, Lübke, Heinemann, Scheel, Carstens, Weizsäcker and Herzog, don't we finally have the right to a female Federal President, and shouldn't we close the ranks of women very firmly again in the near future to round him up? or to get them too?

Of course, if you want to put the idea of statistically demonstrable justice into practice, you have to deal with the fact that women have done so little with equality. One explanation for this is that women not only have children, but are also burdened with their care and upbringing, so that they are only half-represented in professional life

can. It is also tacitly assumed that men, unencumbered or released from good wives, enjoy coveted privileges through their professional and political commitment, while women bear the burdens and toils without being rewarded accordingly. Many years ago, when working wives and mothers were not so widespread in better circles and were certainly not considered ideal, people spoke compassionately of double burdens. Here she earned money and supported her husband in professional life, there she had to cook, clean, bring up children and otherwise keep the family together. But both counted as decent work. Today, when decently paid work outside the home is unattainable for many, gainful employment suddenly counts as a »part of quality of life« for women, while so-called family work, whose social relevance is nevertheless emphasized, is not personally believed by any emancipated women's politician [28] seems to make sense.

— So what could be more obvious than to promote the good, women's work outside the home, and to ensure that the bad, family work, is shared between the sexes in the future? That has top priority for her, said the SPD shadow minister for family policy. In public service, where the proportion of women has traditionally always been high, one can continue to promote the advancement of women and distribute benefits that other workers have always envied them - but whether this model can be transferred to the rest of economic life and to the extent it has been up to now in the

public service must be doubted. [\[29\]](#)

However, we grope completely in the dark when it comes to ways and means of dividing »family work« fairly between the sexes. If it is true, as claimed, that family work prevents women from pursuing a career with determination, then baby years, job guarantees and new pension formulas for mothers are hardly the right way to change anything about this scandal. Basically, fathers should be forced to do their half of the family work. Only half jokingly suggested the Saarland

Minister for Women proposes splitting parental leave instead of the expensive and unfair spouse splitting in taxation. The mother is to provide education for a year and a half and the father for a year and a half. If the man [30] refuses because of his career, the time expires without replacement...

It is strange that political factions that see nothing good in the neoliberal modernization of society should give credit to it in the realm of private politics.

Presumably we are dealing here with a long run of the questionable motto which has asserted that the personal is political. If that's the case, the inhibition threshold of authoritarian people's educators naturally drops considerably. Why not force people to do a little good?

Well, the division of family work in favor of female careers, »top priority« or not, is unlikely to be a forward-looking project for a number of reasons. Two of them should be considered. It looks as if women actually value work as a "quality of life" and go to earn money even if they are not in need. This propensity expands the female labor market to include childminders, educators, and other service workers who act as "professionals" to relieve working mothers and family women of jobs they can no longer do. Preferably all women, especially those with smaller children, but also otherwise, work part-time if they can afford it financially. For example, it has been found that in Baden-Württemberg, for example, the number of employed women has increased significantly, but the volume of work they have done has increased

[31] remained the same. Well-behaved women politicians keep telling us how seldom women reach top positions, and draw conclusions about their importance and the need for help of the clientele they represent. Can't one also ask whether many women do not have other priorities than sharing family chores and pursuing a streamlined career? Maybe you should

The totality of women should not be blindly used for the interests of a minority, which believes they have a right to more female executives, female chief conductors and a female Federal President... What is more remarkable is the fact that female employment outside the home goes hand in hand with a redistribution and professionalisation of »genuine« female work.

However, in social professions, especially on the basis of part-time work, money and fame cannot be won. If women nevertheless stream into these professions en masse, then the thought must be allowed that they set different priorities here than the women's minister or women's politician, who weaves and lives entirely in the spirit of the women's movement, and disapproves of such decisions and ultimately blames them on patriarchal ones. Stupidity sets in, which unfortunately women still cannot escape. Perhaps it would be good if one were to stick to superficial observations of female behavior with regard to gainful employment, part-time work and family responsibilities and not always have to become fundamental.

But it is not only the stupid empiricism that makes the women's projects of current women's politics dubious. You're really really confused. How should family work be divided fairly when family is defined so liberally as with the SPD shadow minister for family policy? "We don't want to promote marriage, we want to promote the family and raising children." According to Christine Bergmann, family for her is "the coexistence of adults with children, whether they are married or not, whether they are single mothers or single fathers. Not only should illegitimate partnerships be given the same legal status as marriage, but also homosexual couples. These are partnerships just like any other.«

Good, good, one would like to exclaim regarding the last point — otherwise only the question marks can be multiplied. Do the couples who don't marry today want to be recognized? Or is there something going on that we haven't quite grasped yet? A hundred years ago, an undogmatic policy of recognition could have been meritorious. Because there was

Anti-marriage laws en masse, affecting the lower classes, especially children and women. Today anyone can marry and the recognition of unmarried couples with children has more to do with incorporation than with unprejudiced recognition. Whereas many couples who didn't march to the registry office are now expressing something that hasn't really arrived yet. You don't know it yourself either.

They value real feelings and personal, authentic relationships and despise laws and rituals that interfere with their private lives. A possibly legally regulated division of family work is not what they are striving for. Her anti-institutional stance alone should caution women politicians.

But it doesn't. If what is left of the women's movement is what is left of the women's movement, which ignores empiricism, then one need not be surprised at its dogmatic conservatism. Because the abhorrence of housewife marriage and "family work", interpreted as dependence and dependency on the man, is the maternal heritage of the generation that set the new women's movement in motion. The regularity with which middle-class women who were born between 1900 and 1920 and married in the corresponding years, then had to retire, give up their studies and devote themselves to children and the kitchen, was felt painfully in many cases and led in not a few Falls to ever festering wounds. The young women of 1968 inherited it as a mandate to do things better and completely differently. Well-behaved girls, who wanted nothing more than to make their dissatisfied and ambivalent mothers happy, decided to tightly control their femininity as a dangerous temptation. Love was a dangerous trap, marriage and having children was a black hole that it was better not to fall into. The "new" women's movement of 1968 is probably one of the reasons why it is so passé, has not produced any offspring and only survives in politics for women, because it was primarily a matter for maternal delegations that were not enlightened and

open discussion about the "new" woman could be transformed.

So if you talk today about gainful employment for women as a quality of life and about family work as a burden and a nuisance that finally has to be shared, as the 58-year-old senator does, then you are mostly speaking as the ventriloquist of a generation of mothers and forgoing your own voice. The voice of mothers is loud in politics for women, and daughters seem to have had no experiences, good or bad, in fulfilling their mission in the past thirty years.

The now almost conventional criticism of men, marriage and family is an echo of days gone by and therefore today leads to unbelievable constructions of reality and bad projects. How forward-looking is the transition from traditional family policy to one that consistently only wants to take into account the interests of women and children? If the only thing that smolders at the bottom is the fear of dependencies in barter relationships that cannot be calculated, especially not by outside impartial, then skepticism is appropriate. Today, there are many calls for the abolition of spouse splitting in favor of individual taxation.

The Berlin senator and shadow minister suspects a "conservative family image" behind this tax advantage for married people. Splitting should not encourage marriages in which the man works but the woman does not and children do not exist. It is claimed that a lot of money can be saved (more correctly: earned), but numbers are not given. How many women are there who let their working husbands put up with them as luxury women? In the majority of cases, couples whose income varies greatly should benefit from the joint tax return, for example those in which one spouse works part-time. In addition to the affect against marriage, the tendency of a caring, patronizing women's policy to push their reluctant clientele in the direction of a lifelong full-time career, which should at best be interrupted by well-ordered and divided "childhood" becomes clear.

The question is not only whether working outside the home is sufficient and affordable for this unified equality policy; It is also doubtful whether all women want them or whether other options are still or will again be observed below the official language rules. Because this policy has so far been and still is characterized by catch-up justice in favor of women, no one thinks about how it could affect the male half of society who is indirectly affected. Demands and appeals here, insight and feelings of guilt there are probably not enough to cushion the change from traditionally male responsibilities and duties to *their* equality.

For this reason too, the indifference of women's politics towards marriage is at least frivolous. It was and still is a protective institute, not just a purely private romantic connection. Some of the obligations for each other are regulated by law and probably for a long time, most of them, which are no less important, are not. That's why the demand of many same-sex couples for their right to marry is obvious to anyone who thinks cheaply. The shadow minister speaks only of "legal equality" with marriage, but that does little to lessen the confusion being stirred up here. True to the mother's inheritance, one is critical of marriage, but homosexuals, who, like women, are regarded as a discriminated minority, cannot be denied any measures that reduce this discrimination. Only those who think of the maternal inheritance can understand why the devaluation of family and marriage should go hand in hand with the appreciation and seemingly generous recognition of relationships, which have nothing else in mind than presenting themselves in front of the altar and at the registry office in to register this very tradition, which thus also proves to be capable of renewal and alive. To put it another way, and to put it more generally, women's politics, as left to us by the women's movement, constantly leads to relationship problems between couples and relationship tasks

between adults and children, to the whole complex of intimate sociality, but without betraying sufficient knowledge of it.

Anyone who defines paid work as a quality of life and family work as a nuisance must of course deal with a labor market in which millions of women cannot find a job either. Nobody knows how and when that will change. If it should be the case that equal rights for women depend to a very decisive extent on professional work and career opportunities, as we have learned, then we are facing dark times. Against such fear, the little song about the "soft skills" of women, which should be particularly needed in the future, is often blown at the appropriate congresses.

"Integrative powers, communication skills, decisiveness, result orientation, team awareness, planning reliability, pragmatism are credited to the [32] female account with unexpected (male) magnanimity ,"

wonders one listener.

Such theses thrive particularly in the circle of management philosophers and in the consulting industry, which is experiencing a real boom in these times. Women who are looking for work are endlessly qualified and further qualified and at least offer their teachers work in this way. Nothing suggests that Women bring skills to the economy of the future that men do not have. And if they have deficits, you can be sure that they will iron them out in no time. From a statistical point of view, it will probably remain in second place for the opposite sex on the social winners' podium, and to explain it we can only refer to the well-known handicaps of women. In addition to having children and family work, which they demonstrably do almost alone, one could also talk about working hours that are hostile to families, a lack of day schools and, last but not least, the fatal after-effects of the mother mythology in the minds of the women themselves. It seems that even if they don't go to work solely to improve their quality of life, many feel guilty about doing so

leave children somewhere. An older study found that daycare teachers approved of mothers' self-criticism. Most indicated that they had children of their own (whom they did not yet have), not so young, and not so many hours

[\[33\]](#)
would find third-party accommodation.

Should we now hope that if the mother myth dies away through education, a society orientation that is fair to women and children and, above all, an obligation for men to do half of the family work, there will finally be a remedy? Will our granddaughters and other descendants, if not we, see that women have equal opportunities, even equality, whether as individuals or as a group? A women's policy that is no longer fresh and has followed the stated goals and interpretations of reality has only achieved disappointing results in many ways. Maybe the goal is wrong and should be rejected as a mother's legacy that has been accepted too well?

Maybe it's too modest? But that is speculation, because after all, equality contains the idea of increased justice, which is not easily denied. On the other hand, the failure of a policy that only works with two options, which also cross each other, needs to be explained.

On the one hand, one does not want to know anything about gender differences, be they physical, psychological, historical or socially "conditioned", and digs for the human being under the heap of false attributes.

On the other hand, people cling to women as the sex that needs help and tutoring with a dogged determination that cannot only be explained by the growing interests of the women's lobby. The image of women in the women's movement and in today's women's politics contains so many blackened passages, so much denied reality, that anyone who takes part or even wants to get involved must show a sacrificium intellectus if they don't have a talent for fanaticism. Internally, towards their presumed clientele, women's politics appears authoritarian and patronizing, externally, the style of maudlin aggressiveness prevails, which impresses nobody but repels many.

When Berlin Senator Bergmann, whose statements are seen here as representative of the women's political assessment of marriage, family and work, was introduced by Gerhard Schröder as shadow minister, he did so with the words: "She is responsible for women and all that other nonsense. « It is not known how Bergmann, a doctor of medicine from the former GDR, reacted to these flippant words. Did she grit her teeth and think her part? For example, that a woman politician just has to swallow toads and a male society also extends into her own party? It's a tried and true practice in modern patriarchy to blame men for everything — and oddly enough, men don't deny that. It would probably be easy to motivate Schröder to make an apology, i.e. »correction«. He would then go on and on about the social guilt that still has to be paid to women — no problem! When it comes to women's politics, we are dealing with a specific combination of accommodation, compliance and ironic condescension. It is not taken seriously by men, and women tend to raise concerns before expressing sympathy.

Perhaps this assertion could be made more precise: men follow the model of love service, and that practically means a strategy of non-interference, even of unqualified, simple affirmation. So, despite all the talk about male society, male culture or conspiratorial networks, politics for women lacks an opponent. In the meantime, however, people are looking for him - strangely enough precisely in those places where women are not only generally disproportionately represented, but have also been promoted in terms of their careers for a long time, in the public service. Successes by women and for women, given the way women's politics are constructed today, can only be seen in the reactions of the opponent. If public service statistics are showing women their favor, one can still fathom whether men pay not just lip service to the advancement of women, but whether they do so in their hearts or minds

unconscious are truly purified: »How does the advancement of women go down with the men? To find out, the social scientists Höyng and Puchert conducted in-depth interviews with 50 male employees of the Berlin Senate Departments for Labor and Women's Affairs and for Urban Development and Environmental Protection. Surprising result: The interviewees assessed gender equality positively throughout, there was not a single opponent of the advancement of women. But there were numerous men who simply discriminated against women in their working environment

[34]
negated.« Here one would have to ask the researchers whether they now have a calibrated discrimination barometer for all environments or whether they can even imagine an environment free of discrimination against women today or in the future. Anyone who is not yet well versed in women's political rhetoric could also naively remark that one cannot negate what perhaps is not there. Our superior researchers, men, are different, as are most of those who, in the past years and decades, have taken the complaints of women to heart and transformed them into laws and projects. »The researchers called this phenomenon interest-driven non-perception (negated discrimination in the environment). The result, according to Puchert: ›A culture where men no longer have to do anything to ensure that women are marginalized.« In addition, there are still men's associations in a modern guise that prevent women from rising.« At the end, the probing question : »How can this male culture be changed? About a reduction in men's working hours in the course of administrative reform, the researchers propose.« The following is the example of a group of civil servants who gave up money and work in favor of a job for a colleague in exchange for more free time.

Presumably, such idylls can seldom be staged outside of the public service, and there is little willingness within, either, as experience with teachers shows, who are seldom willing to forego anything in favor of young teachers.

The appeal to save and do without has probably never been forward-looking. Changing men's culture through women's politics is unlikely to take place if, to put it bluntly, men are asked to tail their tails, drive at half speed, and share in a burden that women are said to be reluctant to carry. Presumably, discrimination ceases to be a viable concept when it has to be refined with in-depth interviews. And for women in working life, who should be affected by such unconscious discrimination by men who are willing to help, the saying applies that one should not carry dogs for hunting...

The problem of incompatibility: mother and modern

The stories of Nina Schmitz (35) and Diana Holzhütter (23), both Berlin mothers of four illegitimate children, both of whom earn their family living mainly (Diana) or exclusively (Nina) with welfare state benefits, and have done so for a number of years years, are likely to be received more ambivalently in Great Britain or the United States than here. [35]

There, one suspects connections between the shrinking labor market for low-skilled workers and high crime rates among men, but also those between charitable generosity, paternal irresponsibility and an enormous rate of illegitimate births. The phenomenon of mothers in their teens, without school qualifications and job prospects, is also worrying with regard to the fate of their children, who also find it difficult to break out of the cycle of economic stress, family insufficiency, illiteracy and dependency into which their mothers have fallen.

Every now and then, to document society's hostility towards children and the hidden social misery, horror reports are spread that about every seventh child is dependent on welfare, we hear from the United States that about 25 percent of all children there in benefit in any way from public grants. This rate is 66 percent for "African Americans" and generally over 50 percent in the inner cities of large North American cities. The proportion of children who grow up in incomplete families is about as high - here too [36] the high proportion of black children gives rise to much debate.

While a few warm up to the idea of the lower black intelligentsia, which in hindsight might as well justify the slavery with which the land of the brave and free contends

destructive effects of the welfare state on the moral and institutional pillars of society. Instead of doing good, the expensive welfare state encourages the dismantling of individual responsibility, downright provokes men not to take care of their families and mothers in turn to not give a damn. To put it bluntly, he himself increasingly provokes conditions that he has set out to abolish.

I expressly do not want to analyze the stories of Nina Schmitz and Diana Holzhütter in the context of neoliberal criticism of the welfare state. Whatever misery may arise in social welfare offices in Berlin, Leipzig or Anklam and Baunatal, whether it is caused or not, we are still a long way from the situation in some districts of New York, Chicago or Milwaukee. Perhaps it is only a matter of time, however, before the financial difficulties of the local authorities, following the example of the problem of refugees and asylum seekers, lead to the fact that the quite acceptable alimony for women like Nina Schmitz and Diana Holzhütter and their four sons and daughters is questioned. The time has not yet come, and so we can afford to discuss their behavior in any other way than with pen in hand and caught between ideological fronts, where the only choice is between unreservedly acknowledging these mothers or condemning them.

As far as I can see, criticism of one form or another prevails in the United States. That children bring in money through welfare is the only attempt to explain why many women, or even teenagers, go this route. One likes to pretend that they make a rational choice and take the most convenient path that the social system suggests to them.

If that common sense were actually in play, American mothers, just like theirs here, would have to make different choices. No amount of money from the agency, however generously distributed, is sufficient to cover the actual costs incurred by children, both in the short and long term. It starts with the physical

exhaustion through pregnancy and childbirth and does not end with interrupted sleep at night and reduced mobility during the day. Children definitely don't pay off, even if the office pays a lot and the mother's educational efforts should approach the border of neglect. People like to calculate how expensive children are, although the scandal is said to be that private investments (i.e. parental sacrifices) in the future do not only benefit the investors, but also those who do not invest (i.e. victims refused) have.

While some may still be aware that the argument about the gap between private investment in public children and social rewards is a purely strategic argument, others actually believe it. It seems to me that children have no place in the social economy and therefore cannot seriously be accounted for in an individual economy related to the latter. Here, the longer, the more clearly two systems collide that no longer have a common denominator. If they did, we would not only have to ask whether enough is being done for single parents and their children (formerly: unmarried mothers, illegitimate children), but we could also ask what responsibility the future or current single parent assumes for themselves. It is no longer the case that pregnancy is an unavoidable risk in every love life, which until a few decades ago was also completely subject to patriarchal double standards - at the expense of mothers and children. The fight for the abolition of § 218 was—this idea seems to have been pushed very much into the background—after all a fight that was waged for female autonomy. Perhaps many do not want to live it at all as it was originally conceived: they reserve the right to decide about a pregnancy, but they reckon with an almost archaic trust that when they decide to become a mother, they have claims that others are responsible for fulfilling are. The old tragedies of seduced girls and illegitimate mothers become women's political melodramas. none

No man, no seducer, no hypocritical society is brought to trial, but the state, which neither sufficiently recognizes women's achievements nor distributes achievements, understood as burdens, more fairly. If one regards children as a personal option, which under the circumstances indicated there is much to be said for, the lament is not very convincing.

Let's take a closer look at Diana Holzuter and Nina Schmitz, the way they are presented to us in benevolent reporting. Diana, it is said, became pregnant for the first time at the age of 16. The father (there is no mention of a mother) wants to persuade her to have an abortion, but Diana refuses, even though training to become a business manager is at stake.

»But Diana Holzuter carried the child and soon became pregnant again«, the text continues and gets deeper and deeper into the sentimental waters in which a courageous girl, a brave mother who sacrifices herself for her children, copes with adverse blows of fate will, sail along. The subtitle reads: »Children instead of a career«. So the second child comes at eighteen, and now Diana has to give up her apprenticeship. But even with two girls so young, Diana sticks to the task of taking care of her children and herself. Traces of sacrifice and suffering can no longer be overlooked, whether from the point of view of the newspaper that chose Diana's story for its Christmas calendar or from the young woman must remain an open question. So she stopped her developing career as a hotel manager and got a job as a waitress instead. Because she had to carry 25-pound trays, her hips and discs suffered so much that she had to give up the job. In the meantime she was pregnant again, the third daughter was born when she was nineteen. The fourth is eight months old at the end of 1996.

Let's trust the text and leave the questions for later. We recognize a good mother by the fact that she has a lot of motherly love, does not want to do without any of her children and does not make any heavy sacrifices that life demands of her, which is why they are not really sacrifices. Surely she could be a chef somewhere now or train hotel apprentices; certainly,

Traveling to the Caribbean, like some friends do, is out of the question. Nevertheless, she herself is satisfied, expresses a wish only in favor of her girls. If it's not even enough for winter clothes, then certainly not for Barbie dolls and parlor games, which she would like to put under the tree for her children at Christmas.

When her youngest daughter is older, Diana Holzhuter wants to go back to work, perhaps in home care. This should make it clear to the reader that this young mother of four daughters is a basically emancipated woman who, although unable to avoid being dependent on her daughters' welfare, is actually an abomination to her. A beautiful story in which the song of praise of the single mother is sung, who is no longer discriminated against today, but should be idealized a little. But too much of a good thing has been done here, so that the story takes on almost satirical and parodic traits. Not a single syllable is mentioned of one or more fathers for the girls, giving the impression that Diana Holzhuter gave birth not just once but four times like the proverbial virgin. Did the men seduce her, make false promises and then abandon her with the children? And don't the girls ask for a father, whom they must have as well as others and who didn't die and made Diana a single widow?

Even if, of course, I have to owe proof, I suspect other forces at work in the story of this young mother than the interdependencies of fate mentioned. She may have noticed quickly, but she must never say it out loud, the reporter might studiously ignore it, that caring for and bringing up small children makes her far more satisfied and happier than working in a hotel, especially as an apprentice. She didn't have to learn to give birth to one healthy and pretty child after the other, nor did she need to learn the role of a child-loving woman who has little money but can manage and rule within her own four walls like only a boss ever could. I'm sure they are the children's fathers

made an effort, but partly met with little response from them with their "kid tick" and partly had to realize that they would not like to share their empire...

Many a person who reads her story could file Diana Holzhter under the heading that she is one of the cases for which social work was invented. As an 18-year-old mother of two small children, she certainly received advice and support; There was probably no shortage of offers of help later either — it was just that the welfare recipient did not feel in need of help at all. The last guess is that she's also a bit stupid and has therefore made herself comfortable on her mother's laurels.

The fact that you can't do it that easily can now be explained by the story of Nina Schmitz, which has amazing parallels, but is about a woman of a completely different type.

She has four sons between the ages of seven and one. She lives with the father of the youngest twins, an Egyptian who only recently got a work permit. Incidentally, for seven years, since the birth of her first child, out of conviction she has been supporting herself and her children with funds from the social security office.

After training as a paralegal, which she had started and completed with the ulterior motive that she needed a solid bread-and-butter job in order to be able to support herself and possibly also children alone and without a husband, she began training as a social worker. During the last months of her year of recognition, she suddenly became pregnant, and now the coincidences and small strokes of fate that we already know from Diana Holzhter began to accumulate in Nina Schmitz's case.

Unlike them, however, Nina Schmitz was not 16 at the time of her first pregnancy, but 27 years old, and there can be no question of naivety, clumsiness and lack of education in the social worker.

What are the strokes of fate that make you a single mother, but also a recipient of social assistance? A fate, the hardships of which the newspaper sympathetically puts in the foreground: Another mother who made it through

Love and sacrifice ennoble. Nina Schmitz, who was somewhat surprised by her pregnancy, knew from the start that she would have to raise her child alone, worse still, the father of her eldest would not even pay the prescribed maintenance. At first she received unemployment benefits, then social assistance. She actually wanted to go to work, but she couldn't find a place in kindergarten for Tom. When she had it, the child didn't want to stay there. She trains him with great effort so that he can be placed in a children's shop for at least four hours a day. She finds a part-time job in a law firm — then, an hour before she signs the contract there, she finds out that she's pregnant again... Gianni is three years old today. His father is also unwilling or unable to pay child support for him. The youth welfare office jumps in with Tom and Gianni with so-called maintenance advances.

Nina Schmitz stays at home and devotes herself to her children.

»Actually, conservative family politicians want women like her. She made a conscious decision to have her children. She wants to be there for them in the first years of life. So far she has not claimed any job other than at home. But she raised Tom and Gianni alone. This made Nina Schmitz a social case,« the newspaper tries to get the tricky situation under control. The birth of the twins and the moving in of her father, an Egyptian without a work permit, hasn't made her any easier. The six people in the three-room apartment — the office pays the rent — have to make do with 3,300 marks, three quarters of which is made up of parental allowance, child benefit and maintenance payments. That doesn't sound so bad; because the family had to borrow money in an emergency situation, which now has to be repaid, only 2,200 of the 3,300 marks remain at the moment. Of this, in turn, you have to account for 800 marks, which are planned for fixed costs, including after-school care and kindergarten fees. That leaves 1400 of which they have to pay for everything else.

Under these circumstances, everyone has to cut corners. Nina Schmitz herself doesn't seem to lack anything, but she knows that one

Shadow falls on the present and the future of the four sons. You have to live with the feeling of being disadvantaged compared to others. The eldest recently didn't want to go to carnival because he thought he couldn't keep up in the competition for the most beautiful costume. The mother also doesn't believe that later on she will be able to finance all four of them for an education. Despite all this, lack of money is not the problem Nina Schmitz is struggling with. She sums up what she really misses in one word: respect.

When she had to go to the welfare office because of the oldest child, they were very nice to her. At the second she sensed "clear disapproval." With the twins, you gave her the feeling: "You're antisocial with four children." Her life has become a struggle, not least for her own dignity. She is distrusted ex officio, in order to prevent abuse of social assistance. Months pass before she gets new furniture or a washing machine, and a social worker has the right to inspect her home. Once or twice a month she has to go to the welfare office with the twins in tow and wait for hours in the smoky corridors to finally get her money. The Office also has the right to check your checking account at any time; She is not allowed to own assets, not even in the form of a practical car. Did Nina Schmitz deserve disapproval, distrust and scrutiny? "What she wants is a community where her work is recognized as work and paid for."

According to this view, "mother" - not uninteresting in the development of the labor market - would be the job that women set up and fill on their own initiative. I take the idea seriously, in all its radical nature, and ignore the watering down that has been implemented in social policy for years in small support measures in favor of mothers. The first question that arises is whether the new jobs, "mothers," can assert themselves; it ultimately depends on the demand for their product. How many children does society, pension insurance, the economy, even Germany, need? The second question will not change in the long run either

be avoided: are all women equally qualified to fill this job as a mother, or does it have to be selected, trained and tested? Finally, thirdly, there will be more, not less, control associated with the recognition of the mother as a workplace; because the good or bad quality of their products cannot remain without an influence on the salary. One or the other mother will probably have to have her license revoked...

In other words, it seems to me that the short-term political gain associated with the economic interpretation of having and having children was (and still is) bought dearly with large gaps in thought and deficits in perception. Basically, it's not as modern as it pretends to be, but draws on pre-modern, even seemingly archaic emotional stocks. How long ago was it that women, as it was later polemically called, had to serve as "breeding machines" and that many children were a valuable asset as heirs, workers, etc., etc.? Even today there are still enough areas in the world where women have no choice but then enjoy the recognition of their community as mothers, yes, only as mothers. They fulfill their destiny as women and, especially in patriarchal societies, also have the right to be protected and cared for together with their children. Wouldn't Diana Holzuter fit better into such a world and wouldn't Nina Schmitz also dream of such circumstances without knowing it? In any case, they behave as if women were unquestionably responsible for children whose subsistence, along with their own, is the responsibility of the male part.

The place of patriarchy, including the begetter of the children, has now been replaced by the welfare state, the begetter is a decoupled function that is pale in our cases. This failure of the couple with their love and possible disappointment in love is not modern either, but is reminiscent of relationships in which marriage served procreation within the framework of larger groups, clans or tribes, and not personal fulfillment in the nuclear family. A woman's closest relationship was with her children, perhaps with the eldest son, and not with her husband, as is demanded today. sexuality

was a means to an end, not an end in itself.

Our two single parents, two women from my point of view with a by no means repulsive childish habit, can not help but present themselves as brave women who have gotten themselves into trouble by various coincidences and strokes of fate, but are otherwise very modern women. Of course, at the end of the article about Nina Schmitz, she too is planning to go back to her job as a social worker.

We have learned that gainful employment is the royal road to emancipation, and women's policy is making every effort to upgrade family work by making it equal to gainful employment, at least in the theoretical constructions of equality policy.

Conservative family politicians would not be very happy either with Diana Holzuter or with Nina Schmitz. Of course, the mothers stand by their children, no one thought of an abortion, but unfortunately they didn't think that one should only be able to have children with one man. Modern interpreters point out that women still have children and men can escape their responsibilities and, of course, their family work. If that were different, Diana Holzuter could be business manager, Nina Schmitz could be something else, they would also have money. Faced with the choice between mother and modernity — and that is a choice, they both decided in favor of their mother as best they could. —,

It was a choice and not fate that befell them.

Modernity first privileged women with this right to vote - to interpret it as a historical burden and curse is only misleading, creates confusion in the minds of politicians and women themselves.

It is wrong to complain that only women are expected to make choices between children and careers, or to make painful compromises that both suffer; because men do not have this choice in the true sense and remain dependent on a woman if they do want to complete a year of education.

Women clean - men make dirt

One of the truly original demands of the new women's movement is the abolition of gender

Division of labor, in terms of the so-called reproductive sphere, today the expression "family work" has prevailed, is not yet one because women are as good as alone

perform. [37] No one can deny that this demand is very reasonable, especially since most partners, wives or mothers have long been working just as much as their husbands. And if they aren't, then they want to be or, according to the conviction of progressive women's politics, they should finally be.

The only question now is whether this original and reasonable demand is really supported by the empirical women or whether it is not only used again and again to bring up asocial men at home who want to spend their leisure time comfortably at home. It really doesn't do any harm if it is often pointed out that women do not take it for granted that they cook, clean, shop and wash and also think of all sorts of conveniences. Even these women, who perhaps do not care so much about a fair division of housework and a division of their domestic domination, benefit from the public debates on this problem and the convincing evidence from survey research and more differentiated time budget studies in a roundabout way.

In black and white, they can demonstrate the value and scope of their work to the parasitic being at their side whenever they choose. The others, whose well-understood interests are represented by a caring women's policy, are left with the bitter insight: "The division of housework between men and women has remained a utopia." back up black work. The hope that these jobs will

private households somehow turned into legal employment relationships is vain. What remains, then, to present as many as possible with their share of the coveted pie of paid and insured gainful employment and finally to make men elsewhere responsible? »From the point of view of women's politics, there is only one way out of the crisis: the radical reduction of gainful employment and the merciless division of private work. Everyone works 25 hours in their

At work and at home.« [\[38\]](#) Since the introduction of time clocks is not planned, one can only hope that women will then refrain from working overtime at home and men will not simply call in sick.

In addition to this reasonable, but very radical proposal, there are others that want to drive the gender-specific division of labor into illegality, so to speak. From the SPD comes the proposal to change § 1356 of the Civil Code. So far it says: »The spouses regulate

running the household by mutual agreement." But it could be more correctly: [\[39\]](#) "The management of the household, the upbringing of the children and the care is a joint task of the spouses." In my view, it should be added: "The same applies to non-marital partnerships with equal status .« The numerous single parents, mostly women, could be assigned a male assistant, a reproductive civil servant, so to speak, someone who, out of fear and disgust at washing dishes, does not want to take part directly in the project to abolish the gender-specific division of labor.

The current conservative CDU Minister for Family Affairs has spoken out against the change in Section 1356 of the German Civil Code, which in itself testifies to a nice belief in the fact-creating power of a promulgated norm. As expected, she sees the SPD women's proposal as the state on the way to intervening in marriages and families. Surprisingly, however, she wants to rely more on insight and reason, i.e. enlightenment, to improve the partnership - a trust that was previously more widespread on the left spectrum.

Still other proposals are being discussed in Austria, after the Central Statistical Office there also presented figures showing that the traditional distribution of roles in housework - she toils, he doesn't - has proven to be a resistant obstacle on the way to true gender equality. The startling set of figures not only provides information about the exploitation of women and the casualness of men, but also about the continuation of the malaise among today's offspring. Daughters have to help around the house twice as long as sons! In this situation, the women's minister from the SPÖ is considering a quota for households by law, especially if the women are also employed. Even more sophisticated is the suggestion made by a politician from the ÖVP. She imagines that marriage contracts could be helpful in which those willing to marry specify before going to the registry office to what extent the man wants and should participate in the family work that is later due. However, if you take into account how many marriages today come about by sneaking into relationships lasting several years and sharing a flat, then the contract may come too late before the legal act. Well, the last word has not yet been said on this, and there is still plenty of room for other sensible proposals to end the gender division of labour.

Once it has been established that women from all parties see the problem, even if they make different proposals for solving it, there is still room for assumptions that point in a completely different direction. Could it be that the division of housework between men and women together with the overarching idea of abolishing the gender-specific division of labor is not at all a nice utopia, but an unrealistic and misogynist nightmare, created out of distrust, resentment and administrative delusions of omnipotence, of which women's politics is a relic of the women's movement the longer, the more clearly past the base, is affected? There is some evidence that even the word "gender-specific" should be interpreted differently than as a trigger for helpful or accusatory reactions. It's definitely about the two

In the last chapter, mothers with four children without fathers and caregivers deal with extreme examples of a »child tic«, which in this form is, however, reserved for women and was also realized by them in a manner that defied all prevailing common sense. It is wrong to pathologize the two, just as it is wrong to patronize, pity and want to guide the resistant base of women's politics instead of looking and listening. Without ever noticing or reflecting on it, the women's movement has not only seen itself as an avant-garde, but on its way into the institutions has also adopted a Leninist concept of a party without a party, which allows women politicians to be partisan for women, even if these resist. When it comes to housework, however, everyone agrees: the women do it, the men know it, the women are allowed to complain, and the men never lose the awareness that they always owe the women something.

How priceless women are is calculated again and again. The Federal Statistical Office asked 7,200 households what their adult men still do after work, in what is known as free time. While in 1992 they all worked a total of 48 billion hours, unpaid work totaled 77 billion hours. Two thirds of these are women. If one calculates the net hourly wage of 11.70 DM for them, in the old federal states alone 897 billion marks would have to be paid annually for unpaid housework to women.

So much for the monetary value of the work done on the side, mainly by women — now for the time involved. »Regardless of whether they are employed or not, women work about twice as many hours per day without pay as men, with five hours a day. At 76 percent, the lion's share is accounted for by the household. Tablecloths and sinks are listed in the study, as well as plant and animal care, shopping or visits to the authorities. When it comes to caring for old or sick relatives and raising children, women are also ahead with 37 minutes a day. are particularly burdened

working wives with children. They add up to five hours, twenty-six minutes of housework—the men help with it

just under an hour, twenty minutes. « Can one ^[40] treat figures like facts and facts like arguments? The question is pointless because one has become accustomed to it for a long time. But it should be asked anyway. The regulatory of time and money, which is fairly widespread in economic life, is also transferred to an area that is organized according to other modes. The statistical man, man or woman, while memorable, does not exist. Anyone who wants to draw conclusions of a political nature from the average, the extrapolation or the number of unreported cases confuses the artifact of statistics with life. Women should spend 40 minutes a day on laundry care, men only a scandalous three minutes. It is even more astonishing that women spend 40 minutes on doing the laundry but only 37 minutes on "caring for the elderly and sick relatives and raising children." Shouldn't we take a critical look at the value hierarchy of children, sick people and laundry on the part of women? The burden on women from unpaid work, which has been proven by the Federal Statistical Office, should not be concealed either, also reveals deficits in rationalization. There is talk of "setting the table"—can't supper be served by hand next to the refrigerator? Like MacDonald's? And completely »plant or animal care«! Sheer nonsense and no wonder that only the statistician would pay money for it. At least he calculates the male debt in enormous pennies and hellers.

Elsewhere, institutions such as marriage, and women in general, have been found to be stumbling blocks to modernization.

Quite differently than expected, married couples turn out to be the protagonists of a gender dichotomy that also makes use of housework.

The longer they are together, the more young married couples smooth out differences in how they spend their free time. If there are children, the differences become even clearer. It also seems as if women share the reproductive labor fairly, which yes too

would turn out in their favour, would be more likely to offer resistance, or at least indifference. When you consider the sacrifices of free time they make here, you can't really be surprised enough. "Maybe this is one

Modernization residue in the female consciousness?" Other researchers consider marriage to be the "conservative, retarding [41] [42]

Structural element versus social change«. — Since criticism of the patriarchal nuclear family already has a long tradition, counter-questions may lead to approval.

It should be examined whether the gender-specific division of labor in private households means something other than female exploitation and male domination. One question is whether the world of work, in which women are increasingly involved, provides the standards by which private households, modern marriage and family life should and can be organized. It is only recently that people are asking in the opposite direction and expecting a reorganization of the world of work, and even of public life, according to the needs and rhythms of life of families, children and women. This begins with the provision from the "Women's Promotion Guidelines" of some Berlin universities that

Committee work should not take place after 6 p.m. and changes to appointments must be announced eight days in advance, and may end in the future with the establishment of lifetime work accounts, on which the income from alternately performed professional and family work with regard to the pension or

other claims are accurately accounted for. [43] It is hoped that the married male employee, who has so far dominated social policy and public life as normal fiction, will disappear.

In order to answer the older question about the astonishing lack of modernity in private household management, there is already empirical material that really only needs to be raised. The history of housework and private household management is available at least in fragments, although it is more recent

For obvious reasons , women's research has paid little attention to this central chapter in women's history .

Why bother with housework when women were denied formal education and employment? Everything that was good and progressive is so closely associated with both of them that no scientific effort has been made about housekeeping.

Few attempts suffer from the suspicion of wanting to drive women back to the stove and sink so that the increasingly rare jobs are available for men. The everyday experience that women cope better than men with unemployment just as well as with the pension shock is being implemented here in a strange way; because, as the Victorians knew, »a woman's work is never done«. Whether unemployed or retired, women always have something to do and slip much less often and more slowly in such situations than men, whose routine breaks down with work.

It is also strange that today of all times, when private household management can no longer find any rational justification, a complaining women's policy in the household is based on a reasonable, politically correct division of labor between the sexes. Equal pay for equal work is a legitimate requirement in the world of work - the idea that whoever wants breakfast must also prepare it every other morning in order to serve the higher justice between the sexes, which is actually called equality - this idea is incorrect. Today it would be really modern to realize that the differences between the world of work and private life could not be greater.

A bourgeois household in the 18th and 19th centuries was completely equal to a demanding, then purely male professional life, regardless of whether the man was a teacher, priest, judge or poet. A good housewife was - like many scholars - a universalist. She was up to date and competent in a variety of areas. Stocking up through winter and poor harvests meant more than the ability to track expiration dates on the bottom of the can.

Personnel management meant dealing with girls and women who had to be trained and belonged to a hostile class. No comparison with the handy black worker today who comes to the apartment for a few hours. The housewives of our time mastered gardening, nursing, tailoring, the art of washing and bringing up children - quite incidentally they were also mothers and wives. Anyone who has memories of the post-war period, when there was "nothing" and women still knew how to conjure up edible soups, cakes and also clothes and toys and the appropriate ambience out of nothing, can perhaps best imagine how so many women did two hundred years ago have worked. As late as the 19th century a good housewife could rival any professor of medicine or anything else for knowledge, skills and technique.

The pressure to run a household rationally and the extensive demands placed on female intelligence by the roles of housewife and mother did not in the long run prevent many women from recognizing that the reason for their depression and unhappiness had something to do with being forced into this role and no other. Added to this were the advances of inventive genius and industry, the longer, the clearer. Canned food was added to ready-made clothing, the kindergarten to the hospital... From a technical point of view, the housewife and mother were devalued, politically the hour of equality had come. The domestic enslavement of women became superfluous, quite objectively.

In the 1920's, then again in the 1950's, a great many attempts were made to streamline and modernize housework and family chores to bring them up to the standards of the world of work that ruled all lives. The Russian Revolution of 1917, the kibbutzim in Israel - pars pro toto they wanted to liquidate the household, the nuclear family as a refuge for reactionary human production. The idea that cooking the meals in millions of private households and caring for the children meant an enormous waste of time, money and women's power was also applauded. Political and progressive, that is, practical

and reasonable: collective child-rearing, laundry room and communal catering. The world of work colored the imaginary world of the utopians with such ideas - bourgeois people were content with the acquisition of countless machines.

None of the technical inventions made families or women superfluous as quickly as once thought. This fact did not lead to the conclusion that there was a contradiction, as I do today, but that there was a need to catch up. Men and especially women are not yet behaving at the height of evolution. Attempts to rationally organize the household and adapt it to the world of work are legion. On the one hand, attempts were made to comfort and calm frustrated women through the input of economic rationality and efficiency. The message was: you participate in progress, its laws are also your laws. In the 1920s, for example, the kitchen became a tiny, ergonomically chilled workplace that every Refa computer should have enjoyed. The mother and housewife, more of a houseworker, avoids superfluous routes and turns on her toes between stove, work table, pantry and window. From here she looks at the playground where her children are romping... The tablecloths, which the Federal Statistical Office did not fail to pay attention to in the study referred to above, seem to have been outdated in the 1920s. Well, maybe not the tablecloth, but the tablecloth. Decorative plastic panels eliminated the hassle of a blanket that was on from Monday to Saturday and always stained

became. How unaesthetic these, how proper the Resopal. [\[45\]](#) Today we know that neither this idea nor the ergonomically calculated mini-kitchen, together with the housewife dedicated to it and appropriate movements, had a future. If the so-called eat-in kitchen was still considered an emergency solution in the 1950s, the spacious, technically extensively equipped, but also inviting luxury kitchens of the following decades still have any reasonable explanation to offer. A large, expensively equipped kitchen with the latest appliances is the pride

many women, and men recognize women's right to such actually superfluous cooking facilities. Observation over many years also teaches that the kitchen, never the fine living environment, tends to become the focal point of pleasant conviviality at parties of all kinds. Actually, one can only conclude from this that people like to gather around fire and food, even when they are not cold and not starving; also, that women continue to tend the fire that comes out of the socket today, and to prepare and serve food, even though more practical and time-saving solutions are at hand.

With the transfer of rationalization discourses to private households, calming effects were achieved on the minds of frustrated housewives, but consciously pursued very honorable goals. The aim was to make life easier for the housewife, wife and mother, because her achievements were always recognized, almost feared, but no man ever envied his wife her fate. The bourgeois ideal of the family generally prevailed, while the standards of housekeeping remained high, although only a tiny minority could afford a maid after the First World War. Therefore, in the 1920s, the mechanization of the household began with great force. In the beginning there were vacuum cleaners, refrigerators and electric or gas stoves and central heating, today running cold and warm water, washing machines, dishwashers, steam irons, microwaves and many other things are part of the equipment of normal households.

One might actually have expected that women's studies would give these processes a main focus. After all, housekeeping was the most important field of work for women and, if you can believe the statisticians, still takes up a large part of their time, even their free time after work. That didn't happen, the women's movement and today's women's politics have limited themselves to deploring the obvious female commitment as outmoded exploitation and making them responsible for all possible emancipation residues. Painful

is there no explanation as to why the radical proposals to abolish small family households could not be implemented anywhere in the long term; and up to now one has remained dependent on intuition if one wants to understand why neither entire machine parks in small apartments, nor supermarkets and pizza services have reduced housework and made housewives virtually superfluous. The suspicion that domestic economy is unreasonable and serves purposes other than the reproduction of labor power, more clearly today than it did in the nineteenth century or even a few decades ago, and that it does so according to the laws that also apply to production, would still be worth examining.

Two hypotheses about these other and unreasonable purposes suggest themselves. On the one hand, housework is the field in which every couple negotiates their gender difference, updates and exchanges them every day. Second, the private household serves the family cult. The stereotype of the family's loss of function and its shrinking to a consumption and leisure event steers past the perception that consumption is a highly social event and that the household provides first-rate terrain for it.

The first hypothesis is, after all, already replaced by a sociological one
Research supported from France. ^[46] For two years, Jean-Claude Kaufmann has followed the development of new couples by asking nothing but how they handle their laundry. Its participants were students, workers, police officers and educators. Their ages varied between nineteen and fifty-five.

Kaufmann wanted to use a banal problem that would not immediately lead to tirades to study the process by which lovers become a couple. When is laundry considered dirty?

What should be ironed and what not? Precisely because the household today is hardly a field of work whose tasks are obvious (if that was ever the case), the negotiations about laundry, for example, can be used to study the importance of the common household, gender differences and their marking in everyday life . Precisely because little men and

If women favor the idea of equality, it is all the more impressive how much inequality is produced and how those involved then interpret it. When women move in together, they tend to give in to a "household mania" that they often later regret. They set standards, take on tasks as if the doll mother in them was just waiting to get started. When it comes to laundry, they have a passion that can only be understood by knowing the long history of women working in the home. Generations were proud of their laundry treasure, which rested white, in order, and decorated with ribbons in the closet. Such obligations, but also joys, do not die out so quickly. But women also take on the laundry because they inherit their mother and have to dethrone the mother of the male part, who likes to keep the sons on a leash with laundry packages for a long time. With regard to the shared household and its duties, Kaufmann found out that men are well-intentioned, but in practice they only bring concepts with them on how everything can be arranged. They lack what can be called the household gene. They like to subordinate themselves to women, become mere followers of orders and, of course, are deprived of any chance to develop this gene later...

On the other hand, men do a great deal in the field of technical installations and repairs, entire apartment conversions and thus participate in nest building in their own traditional way.

Kaufmann is a supporter of modernization, equal rights and equality. However, he predicts that the process will slow down because, for example, the couples examined have a concrete resistance that the law can no longer influence. Deviating from Kaufmann, however, one could also think in a different direction: only when equality and equal rights are politically and legally enforced and generally accepted can the desire for difference be seen and taken seriously. This desire is at the beginning of a love relationship, the formation of a couple and

Marriage - and it needs to be made concrete in everyday life, whether at the stove, the washing machine or in the workshop basement. If women and men fall back on traditions that are dubious, then one should not assume that their elimination will bring us any further. Justice and equality are extremely important corrective ideas—they are not productive.

In other words, the fair division of housework is not a utopia for which anyone should bow. On the one hand she has no real chance, on the other hand the fantasies she has produced are more than dubious. Anyone who wants to transfer the slogan "equal pay for equal work" into private life will never have one. In this context, Kaufmann's discovery that couples talk about many things continuously, but are silent about important things, is interesting. They only come onto the table at the time of separation. It is wrong to conclude from this that people have yet to learn how to talk about everything. What is important in public life does not have to be important in private life, and in this respect the famous slogan of the women's movement that the private (personal) is political is simply wrong and comes a hundred or two hundred years too late. Today, people, including women, live differently than they did back then, in several worlds, and that every day...

The second hypothesis, concerning the family cult via housekeeping, women's work and consumer terrorism, is being worked on very carefully by ethnologists and cultural anthropologists. Consumption is an act of ritual sacrifice. Men's money transform women who use it

spend in a meaningful action. [\[47\]](#) The transcendental object of cult is the family, suggest Mary Douglas and her successor in the London professorship, David Miller, to an audience that has made the abolition of the gendered division of labor a point of honor. Quite wrongly, say the anthropologists: in modern societies, too, it is up to men to earn money - it is up to women to turn money into love.

The sexual revolution disappoints its children

There are two elementary schools in my neighborhood in Berlin. That's why I often have the opportunity to see girls and boys between the ages of six and twelve on their way to school. The super drastic tone, peppered with blatant swear words, which they utter without intimidation, even when adults are around, impresses me just as much as the quieter psychological conversations in which friends exchange consolation and advice about bad grades, insults and other worries. Compared to my early school years, the Berlin children seem to me to have become both more expressive and smarter. Recently, however, I witnessed a scene that took me straight back to my childhood in the 1950s. A girl and a boy had become fistfights. I do not know why. After they broke up, the boy's friend said a quietly reproachful sentence that I also know very well: "You don't hit girls!" that rules of conduct already apply between elementary school students of different sexes long before explicit amorous interests come to life which state that

Women have a free hand, while men... They are allowed to be violent without damaging their image, they are also allowed to become violent because of women - but not against women. No rule is without exception and without gaffes: in war, the enemy's wives are not taboo - although one has to know that the distinction between military and civilian population is a modern achievement anyway and was not actually made in the period between Homer's Iliad and Napoleon's wars of conquest will, not even theoretically. That it has been hit since may be a moral advance, but as the casualty statistics of two world wars and countless smaller wars show, this progress has not changed the fact that unarmed civilians are the majority of the helpless victims. It even seems like their share of dead and

Injuries steadily increasing compared to that of soldiers.

The Criminal Code is for slip-ups: Physically sexual assaults on women (and children) are often not punished as severely as property violations in civil society, but the general revulsion of these acts and these perpetrators has more than made up for this shortcoming.

Perhaps indignation and the need for revenge against men who break the rules of male-female interaction should also be clarified by anthropologists rather than by lawyers and sociologists. The difference between legitimate and illegitimate violence, divided between the sexes, partly as a duty, partly as suffering, partly as a right, partly as a right to protection, is in our bones. The women's movement and today women's politics feed on this evidence from the patriarchy, which they supposedly despise so much because it is responsible for all the suffering of women.

Violence, let alone sexual violence, was not an issue for the women's movement from the start. In 1968, women complained about the burden of reproductive work left to them alone while men lived out their fame and careers. Her ambition and need for recognition were frustrated. There was also the big problem that the ideal of free sexuality did not eliminate young women's worries about an unwanted pregnancy overnight. If addresses of gynecologists were still circulating in West Berlin in the second half of the 1960s who were willing to issue prescriptions for the pill to unmarried female students, then one can imagine how bad the chances for decent girls looked elsewhere, not just with themselves a higher educational qualification, but also to emancipate in terms of love and sexuality. The danger that one might be forced to marry the first sweetheart that came along was perhaps not all that great, but it hung over one like the well-known sword of Damocles—by a thread. I don't want to say anything against the young men of that time, who were already in the

were much more adventurous and willing to take risks; because as a rule they stood by their responsibility if necessary and also married. Not all marriages that came about in this way were bad, but it was not part of the dream of young women to be married mercifully and made honest in this way.

With the Abitur, so to speak, the female demands had increased a lot. Few of those who support the women's movement and today women's politics have escaped the pinch between intellectual and professional emancipation and an anxious sexual coming out. Especially the mothers who, out of their own disappointment in married and housewifely life, gave their daughters the task of doing things better one day, and that always means doing things completely differently, were not very disposed to bless their sexuality.

Anyone who received enlightenment as an introduction to the art of women's suffering between menstruation and migraine, and that was the fate of most in those years, had to deal with the contrast between inherited female fear and the desire for freedom.

Looking back at the 1960s, however, it can also be stated that sexual liberalization was better aimed at male offspring than at female. That is why Oswalt Kolle's explanations in popular magazines and the teachings of capitalism critic Wilhelm Reich, who himself traced fascism back to the unresolved sexual question, met with enthusiastic recipients from men who ultimately also had to carry a legacy of sexual frustration. For them, the path from theory to practice was never far. Kolle supported and educated the sexual craft and, above all, the idea that sexual pleasure was never a bad thing and that sexuality was never a dangerous matter, as which religious and secular authority they had demonized. Reich, on the other hand, provided all those who wanted to give their instinctual life a higher meaning, the intellectual consecration and in addition a lot of argumentation aids for influencing female fellow students. Anyone interested in politics was in particular danger of prematurely giving up their suspicions, and again and again

to be disappointed.

Yet there is no connection that leads from such constellations of female self-discovery in the era of sexual liberalization to what one might call the sexualization of the women's question. How many sexual violence scenarios have been more or less plausibly constructed and presented in a way that promotes women's politics in the past few decades! Sexual violence, actual or merely threatened, is considered the paradigm that patriarchy envisions for women. If every man is a potential perpetrator, few who really are are enough to make this theory watertight. Without contradicting this theory, female politicians prefer to stick to empiricism, which is to be presented briefly and concisely in figures. Criminologists, social researchers and statisticians try again and again to develop an awareness of the problem of numbers, but they rarely succeed; when it comes to sexual violence, never. Perhaps one is also entering the field of an anthropology of modernity when one seeks explanations for why, when it comes to sexual violence, fears of the worst kind in general, the numbers cannot be high enough if they are to inspire confidence. Perhaps one has to live in pacified, civilized societies to develop the right taste for diagnostics of horror. In 1993 the Federal Criminal Police Office claimed: »Violence against women has decreased. A long-term study for West Germany has shown that reported crimes against sexual self-determination fell by a total of 13.2 percent between 1980 and 1990. The BKA summarized sexual abuse, rape and sexual coercion under this term. In

contrast, in the same period, 16.8 percent more crimes were reported in the area of general crime and 10.5 percent more in the area of violent crime

[48] .« As the reason for this development in crime statistics, the responsible department head in the BKA, Michael C. Baurmann, the stronger self-confidence of women. If he is right, this development can hardly be attributed to the women's movement

or reduce women's politics, because the scenarios they circulate are more likely to teach women to fear. Six weeks later, another newspaper report read: »In the first three months of this year, around 180 reports of rape and sexual assault were made to the Berlin police. This number is roughly identical to the comparable months of the previous year. But the number of unreported cases of these crimes is increasing from year to year, said the [49] chief inspector responsible for sexual offences.' They probably also distrust a constitutional state that provides for a maximum sentence of 15 years in prison for rape, but actually only imposes an average of two years at most, because rape is still considered a trivial offense by the perpetrators and the courts.

Six weeks later, a third newspaper reported something even more horrid: Rape: up by leaps and bounds. In Germany, every third woman is raped at least once in her life, estimate the counseling centers for raped women. Almost 80 percent of the perpetrators are acquaintances of the women, reported employees of counseling centers who came together at the weekend for a federal meeting in Frankfurt am Main. The participants said that the number of raped women who seek help from the 130 or so advice centers has skyrocketed

Numbers to name. « [50] Four years later, the Berlin Senator Bergmann also shared this in mind when presenting a brochure accompanying the Berlin model project against domestic violence

that every third woman is affected by it. [51] If you take into account that she is also likely to be raped and sexually harassed and discriminated against in public and at work, in the proportions outlined, then we women would have to live in hell. Those who are not being mistreated live in the realistic

anticipation of an attack. Corresponding to the belief that men are potential perpetrators is the second belief that women are potential victims.

Anyone who can then evade this scaremongering after a scrutinizing look at their surroundings will have data prepared for them that can now completely evade assessment. But here, too, the well-established pattern is followed that the news cannot be bad enough if it is to be believed, and the figures, in their function as proof of reality, are also mixed into an appealing salad. Even short reports often contain so many different number constructions that the Abitur is not enough to arm the reader with understanding. This applies to an even greater extent to other constructs, in particular the central theme of violence and sexual or sexually connoted violence, which were invented worldwide to illuminate the misery of women. Just look at the following dpa report from Geneva: "According to the UN reporter Radhika Coomaraswamy [52], violence against women within the family has reached alarming proportions worldwide." No reason for this development is given, not even an assumption .

Not unlike the announcements from the women's political scene in the Federal Republic, which have turned out more and more catastrophic for years, although the corrective efforts have been going on for years, one is dependent on one's own ideas. If my name was Susan Faludi, I would refer to the »backlash«. In any case, it looks to them as if there were a law according to which hard-won advances by women would alarm the patriarchy, which was all too sure of its rule, and motivate nuclear counter-attacks. No sooner have a few women successfully entered the academic world than men and their henchmen start the rumor that intelligent, successful women past thirty have no chance of getting husbands. Comfortable shoes and trouser suits have hardly caught on when the fashion designer preaches in the service of the

patriarchy the return of the stilettos, the corset, the lingerie and [53] other obstacles to female emancipation... — I doubt that progress and women will be tamed by such trifles. On the contrary, the passion with which some misogynistic reactionaries of the 19th

Century popularized by extensive quotations does not make the backlash credible, but the need of the women's movement for an enemy who fills the void that comes with female freedom. The historical trend was toward equality, not toward the "physiological."

[54]
Nonsense«, which Paul Möbius thought he had discovered. Rehashing all kinds of chilling nonsense, the women's movement has shied away from the task of saying who we are or want to be when we're not being reviled, persecuted, or abused.

Back to the dpa report from Geneva: A reasonable person could also put the frightening increase in violence against women into perspective with the argument that there are no studies that allow a comparison between the past and the present. It is therefore simply not possible to speak of a frightening increase. Others might point out that the use of the term "family" in the report to the Human Rights Commission is tampered with.

If we readers think of the family of Western tradition in the same way as the reporter does, the horrifying findings refer to relationships that in no way resemble our image of mom-dad-child. Certainly, in sociology studies in the 1960s, one learned that the "nuclear family" is widespread all over the world. Today we know that the insistence on the nuclear family had something to do with sociologically modernized educational fantasies, which were no longer aimed at the child in general but at the socially deprived child. The constellation of the nuclear family and its intimate relationships was illuminated by the socialization theory. The report from Geneva feeds on the shock that women are extremely endangered in these matters, just as children were with them back then

wrong parents were deprived of all development opportunities.

»In her report to the UN Human Rights Commission, Radhika Coomaraswamy calls for better protection for tortured women and stricter laws against violent criminals. In the USA alone, two million women are beaten by their male partners every year, and half have to seek medical treatment.

Up to forty percent of battered women in the United States attempted suicide. Studies in India, Bangladesh, the USA and Peru have shown that the number of suicide attempts by abused women is twelve times higher than that of women who are not subjected to physical violence.« Here too, stricter laws are the means of choice when it comes to combating it of male violence. Should one contradict the UN lady with the argument that social relationships are protected by law but can never be initiated? The tendency to commit suicide is, clever as we are these days, an artifact of a particular culture. Is it then possible to blame violent men for women's attempted suicides? The well-intentioned human rights universalism is also completely at odds with knowledge of different cultures, which is also one of the goals of UN universalism to respect. Anyone who thinks about the dpa report for a long time - of course that's not planned - is sure to ask themselves what connects a woman in the USA with a woman in India.

Is it really male violence against women? If, as reported, many divorces are pronounced in China and Japan because men are said to have been violent, then one could also draw hope from this fact, contrary to what the UN rapporteur suspects here. For her, the divorce statistics are evidence of men's violent tendencies, and that applies worldwide, because Ms. Coomaraswamy works for the UNO. On the one hand it is committed to the universalism of human rights, on the other hand it must accuse all states and cultures indiscriminately so that no discord arises in the international community. So it comes to a strange place and

timeless picture of male perpetration and female suffering and the helpless call for stricter laws which we know do not help even where the police and the judiciary work.

Divorces and divorce rates not only require interpretation like all statistics, they can only make sense if you know the respective socio-cultural context. But that is never the case and should probably stay that way: "In Japan alone," reports from Geneva, "11,000 women get divorced every year because they were exposed to violence in their marriage. In the People's Republic of China, around a quarter of divorces can be traced back to domestic violence.« For newspaper readers who want to keep a cool head, there are many possible interpretations. It could be, for example, that every single one of the 11,000 Japanese women is happy that, unlike their grandmother, she is able to divorce a brutal husband. Then the number would not be frighteningly high; maybe too low. Because if every third woman in Japan were to become a victim of domestic violence, then with a population of 113 million (1977) and a marriage rate of almost one hundred percent, there would still be completely different horror reports. And now China! It would also be possible that in both countries violence, along with two or three other allegations, is the only legal and cultural reason for divorce, while the multitude of other reasons may not be named, although everyone knows about them. After all, it wasn't long ago that people who decided to divorce had to tell the strangest things in court, often completely ignoring the facts. A guilty verdict was to be reached, and in the majority of amicable divorces, the men took the blame. Not violence, but sexual infidelity was the main reason for the divorce. When divorces were not agreed behind the scenes, a lot of dirty laundry had to be washed in public and the court then had to decide whose behavior had ruined the marriage. The reform of the divorce law of 1977 undoubtedly belongs in the context of »sexual

Revolution". By replacing the principle of guilt with the principle of disruption, the state withdrew from the role of arbiter in the tangled mess of relationships and limited itself to clarifying property issues and maintenance claims. Unlike in Japan and China, we can no longer have official statistics on the reasons for divorce, real or false. A guilty verdict will no longer be passed.

While women politicians of all persuasions, mostly in the name of the affected children, often also of the women who have been economically damaged by divorce, complain about the high degree of instability in marital relationships, nobody is demanding a return to the old divorce law. Why not? A guilty verdict should, as a rule, be at the expense of the man and the woman, who just as regularly sacrificed herself to the limits of her strength and patience for the relationship, the children, the family work, at least give moral satisfaction. The men benefit from the abstinence of the judiciary.

This calculation is still my mind game - but with regard to other changes in the law in the context of the "sexual revolution" and their deplorable consequences, they have been made by women politicians for some time. That the spread of contraceptives and the reform of the abortion law has not only freed women for self-determination, but has also increased their risk-free availability as a sexual object for men, is a thought that is not alien to Catholics and feminists.

According to the Bavarian Minister of Social Affairs, Barbara Stamm (CSU), the lifting of the ban on pornography in 1973 led to a decline in morals and values, which has now led us to the swamp, where child abuse and child pornography seem to exist

have become a tolerated mass sport on the Internet. [\[55\]](#) In the mid-1980s, Alice Schwarzer initiated the "Por-No" campaign with her magazine *Emma*, a takeover from the United States and not without controversy in the women's movement at the time. I didn't know that in 1973 anyone protested against the change in the law. But why then ten or fifteen years later, so today?

under the guise of child protection and fear of a new, difficult-to-control technology, the whole "Sexual Revolution" can be questioned?

If one considers the sex-political development of the past three decades, in which the women's movement played a major part and in which it is almost solely decisive, then one has to doubt very much whether the genuine liberalization of the 1970s, the switch from conventions protected by criminal law to individual responsibility and decision that has been coped with by society and by women in particular. While the fight against § 218 and the patronizing male medicine at times formed the organizational and ideological backbone of the women's movement and self-determination seemed to take a real leap forward, after a few years something began that can only be seen as passionate victim advertising.

Women who were willing to exercise sisterly solidarity but personally denied any experience of sexual violence were pressured to remember better. Anyone who even expressed doubts about the reality of some constructions was suspected of dirty motives and isolated. Ever new, outrageous scenarios of sexual violence have been developed over the years and carried into society far beyond the narrower women's scene [56] and

popularized. — If a supernatural being came to us today and could at least read newspapers and decipher television pictures, he would have to be convinced that the situation of women has been steadily deteriorating for years, in strange step with the women's movement and women's politics, with the establishment of women's research at the universities, with the establishment of rescue centers of all kinds. There can no longer be any question of self-determination, unless in the new conception of it. According to this, the woman would be self-determined, who accepts her role as a victim but does not keep it to herself, but delivers her complaints and grievances where the place is already reserved for

All sexual developed in the past decades have violent scenarios, even if they are sometimes very popular

have become a disadvantage. They do not match the stagnation of the numbers reported by crime statistics; It is even more worrying that the victims who don't show up there don't come out as victims anywhere else either, and if they do, then go other ways than the prescribed ones in order to help themselves. There is still work to be done on the methods of bridging the gap between well-founded diagnostics and the actual course of the disease in women in patriarchy. What is certain is that this gap poses a problem in all sexual violence scenarios, whether it is dramatic rape (in close social circles, in marriage, in war) or comedic harassment (at work or university, on the street or in in public transport). Those who cling to them uncorrectably place truth above reality, feminist claims above women. It has to do with feminism's bourgeois roots in the student movement that its truth has always come in the language of the institution where it was and remained at home, the university. The adoption of academic jargon and scientific ritualism has done much to make post-equality research into female existence an unlikely project. With the unhappy consciousness that stands at the beginning of the women's movement, she did not react to the old patriarchy but to a new situation, even if efforts are still being made today to prove the opposite with scientific methods that are already parodying themselves.

Excursus I

When women do research

In the beginning was the dogma. At an international tribunal in Brussels in 1976, all forms of violence against women were still addressed; the definition that was found for her there already pointed to the career of sexual violence in the following years: »Violence is any attack on the integrity of the woman's body and the freedom of her decisions. The position assigned to women in all societies is a unified complex of psychological, physical, social and economic violence. Every woman is at her mercy every day. Physical violence takes an important form. There is a close connection between the extreme forms of the physical and the more subtle psychic and social. It is a form of disrespect for women that is socially accepted to such an extent that it is completely ignored by men and accepted by women as a necessary evil of being a woman or as a biologically legitimate form of sexual relations between men and women. In most cases, physical violence is directly related to the female body, the woman's reproductive capacity and her sexuality. It is thus the most extreme form of hatred of women present in all societies, as an expression of patriarchal rule. The other forms of violence are based on this contempt for the female body, on women's fear of punishment for breaking out of their prescribed role. Fearlessness is understood as a provocation against men and sanctioned accordingly. Rape can be seen as the classic act of oppression through which the appropriation of someone else's property is sexual

is illustrated and carried out.« [\[57\]](#) One could use this example of feminist dogmatization in the

File the archive under the general heading "political sectarianism of the 1970s" if it hadn't, in contrast to left-wing theories, kept it fresh. Feminism hit and still hits something that couldn't be done with growing up. But what? Better than the left-wing sects, feminism was and is immune to disappointment in the everyday lives of its numerous, informally registered members. Other worldviews based on dogma also retain their utility insofar as they cannot be refuted. However, their application is limited, often to inner monologues without an audience. With feminism, on the other hand, you can always do something, loudly or quietly. Should women ever oppose a sister, then the men are still the addressees, who remain ambiguously silent. It's always the same as on the way to school: aren't girls beaten out of respect or disregard? Does not contradicting women mean agreeing with them, declaring oneself incompetent, disinterested, or refraining from contradiction out of a vague sense of guilt that has accompanied men since they left their mothers? A thought is mentioned in passing. Hatred of women and contempt for women in patriarchy are in conflict with the fact that the first and certainly the most important woman in a man's life is his mother. If worldviews could be refuted, wouldn't this be a good point to start with...

I refrain from doing this because I consider it not only a mistake, but to a certain extent the original and original sin of the women's movement to still see itself today as merely the "other," the second, dependent sex, as Simone de Beauvoir us as astutely described in 1949, certainly not with the intention of fixing us in that position qua analysis. So it is not interesting what is scientifically, historically, politically tenable or meaningful about the definition of male violence against women at the Brussels Congress of 1976, what seems ridiculous and silly, even delusional - at least to me and other outsiders. Rather, what is interesting is the enduring mood of the female soul that is struggling to find the right expression here.

It is striking, it is striking in general when looking at the history of the women's movement, that the wildest analyzes and denunciations of male rule, including provocative actions and demonstrations, have never resulted in feminist activists being subjected to any form of persecution that even remotely resembles the persecution of, say, »RAF Sympathisanten« or DKP members in connection with the radical decree of 1972 and so forth and immediately resemble. Did the theses in Brussels, did some shrill accusations by Alice Schwarzer — one for all — call the patriarchate's intelligence agency into action? Nothing and zero.

I take note of this and try to put myself in the mood of the women who defined male tyranny in Brussels in 1976. Actually, the situation of all women in all societies is not only catastrophic, it is also hopeless.

Violence based on hate and contempt is so common that men ignore it and women take it as their natural destiny. Also, fear keeps them in place. Anyone who resists will be punished.

This depressing analysis applies to women per se in the fabulous function of the persecuted innocence, the captive virgin, not the women in Brussels who write such analyses. Fearlessly throwing down the gauntlet at the man's world, they are ready to go to war and test their strength against the enemy. It can really be assumed to be everywhere, can transform itself like a chameleon and is therefore also spooky. The idea of male tyranny, which leaves only a few escape routes open, meets a great need for black romance, in which evil unfolds its magic powers. The flowers are poisoned, the happy escape leads into a trap, the rescuer in need turns out to be the ogre... The motto of black romanticism is: Everything (evil) is possible. It is not absent from any utterance, no matter how banal, about male violence. The argument, adorned with huge, always estimated and extrapolated numbers, sets the

Imagination in motion, then she sits down with holy shudders
image of the dangerous man who might be upon us
has refrained. »According to estimates by the Federal Ministry for
Youth, Women, Family and Health from 1989
four million women and 500,000 children of men every year
abused. (...) It's not just drunk men from the
lower class who take out their aggression on their wives and children,
but also men from the best circles - no matter how
old a man and how educated, there is no guarantee that he
does not become violent.« [58] Everything is possible, every man one
potential perpetrator, every woman a potential victim.

Because just about everything about violence comes from the feminist movement too
is experienced, consists of imaginatively written paper, one does
no real victim wrong with a critical interpretation. Two
Options are attractive: the belligerently aggressive and the hysterically
educational. There, women want to unlearn their role as victims and
if necessary be able to retaliate against men in their own coin.
That happens and by means of Rhetoric Seminars
self-defense courses. Movies like *Thelma and Louise* can take courage
make, even if not an imitation of murder and manslaughter
is recommended. Anyone who relies on the hysterical-pedagogical option
does not brace itself in anticipation of an attack, but deepens
on the contrary, in the slime trails of violence: register them, name them
them and sensitizes victims as well as perpetrators in the hope of improvement.
Research is followed by prevention programs
Further training of relevant professions, edition of ^{to the}
therapy offers.

Politically, »sexual violence« is a success story
and has with some of its sub-forms from the women's movement
found its way out to the general public. But that doesn't change anything
because this is a mere ideological offer
acts to reaction, imagination and wishful thinking under the
Enlightenment heading. The role of social science in this
played is pretty inglorious. On the one hand have, with the best
intentions, and no doubt out of feminist conviction,

Written strange research and reports by women that would not normally have been accepted and passed without any criticism from the scientific community. This applies to large studies and project reports paid for by federal ministries as well as countless smaller ones commissioned by state ministries, parties or associations

have. [\[59\]](#) Women still seem unbeatable when it comes to specific women's issues, to which sexual violence becomes exquisite.

counted The social scientists remain staunchly silent, just like schoolboys stick to the rule: you don't hit girls! They may have kicked her and severely insulted her... On the other hand, one wonders whether it helps the cause of women if one sets no limits on their advocates - whether out of indifference or generosity, it is also open to question.

An early bestseller claimed, "Girls are not born," they are made through gender education. What they would be without these - a neuter person perhaps remained open. —,

Heterosexuality is learned, it was also claimed at times in the women's movement; Therefore, the politically opportune lesbian way of life could also be acquired if desired and required. Long before Constructivism or Deconstructivism became fashionable, it had adherents in the women's movement. If something is socially 'conditioned', it is only relatively valid and can possibly be changed. Role theory suggested that what you had learned and were now constantly "playing" could be replaced with new and better scripts. The attractiveness of this approach, right down to Judith Butler's assertion that not only social («gender»), but also biological sex («sex») is the result of arbitrary processes and that the travesty of the sexes leads to the higher, power-critical truth not only on dissatisfaction with oneself and the desire for change, but also on the denial of a difference that only women seem to suffer from. For obvious reasons, Butler's deconstruction is prevalent among lesbian feminists

been recorded. Anyone who has opted for heterosexual and thus also hysterical pedagogical education can do more with "discrimination" in all its variants. Discrimination is at least as subversive as gender travesty and, in contrast to this, easier and more effective to handle in everyday life as a deconstructive practice. One is namely not discriminated against by any man, as it seems superficially. Rather, it's the case that only women can identify discriminatory acts, always according to the motto: I'm not who I seem to be, I'm different. In 1993, a purple notice from the Women's Representative could be seen at the Freie Universität Berlin: "For a study, we are urgently looking for female students who

are/have been sexually harassed by lecturers and are willing to be available to us for an approximately one-hour interview." One stumbles over the word "urgent." Is the hard-won Office of Women's Representative at a loss for clients? Because even in 1993 women were insufficiently informed about their problems, the notice explains what is meant by "sexual harassment" today. It is well known that not only men but also women are ignorant of the facts of life in the patriarchy.

"By sexual harassment, we mean, among other things, joking or 'teasing' with sexual innuendos; a belittling, non-serious, disenfranchised treatment of women; lewd remarks about appearance, shape, or clothing; Attempts to flirt when objectivity is the order of the day; use of educational materials or case studies that contain sexual innuendos; indications that sexual accommodation could have a favorable influence on study situation and professional advancement; physical

Overtures...« This generous [\[60\]](#)

offer, which gave the hysterical-pedagogical faction enormous freedom and opportunities for complaints, resulted in nine cases, which did not harm the nationwide application of the results. The question is: does one have under the

many thousands of female students in Berlin who, in principle, would have to sigh under the violence of men, who found out, who are smart enough and brave enough to recognize this and put it on record — or are we dealing with the nine with the type of troublemakers who find each other at any time when a complaint option is offered? And if need be, do you do it without?

In 1995, one of the Berlin researchers was allowed to give a lecture in Munich. At the university there there is also a women's representative, at that time by the name of Hadumod Bußmann. In the face of enormous resistance, she managed in the senate of her university to include a paragraph in the plan for the advancement of women that expressly mentions the protection of women from violence. Bußmann and the Berlin researcher explain the resistance in the Senate and the low number of cooperative victims with a rather strange argument. One of them explains that it is a taboo. Precisely what supposedly does not exist is the main problem. The Berliner with her nine cases also has a compelling explanation ready. The fear of the perpetrators is so great that only nine women were brave enough to face the risk of their revenge. »All nine examples reported by Claudia Toelle from Berlin involved verbal, sometimes also physical discrimination, which resulted in the participants changing chairs or

immediately gave up their studies.« [\[61\]](#) Cynics could warn against the »verbal«, »partially« also physical attacks on female students that the health insurance companies would have to pay for therapy here, if you please. Perhaps it should be demanded that only specially trained female psychologists should be entrusted with dealing with students who have been verbally or "partially" violently discriminated against?

Cynics have nothing to say when it comes to discrimination. Anything they could ever imagine is already a reality in the world of women's representatives. Nine female students, completely disregarding all the rules of even the simplest social research, have to be used to make the sexual violence at the university plausible. Then a next study shows that Berlin examinees are discriminated against

feel, but rarely prove it. [\[62\]](#) The Women's Representative at Freie Universität Berlin had 700 female graduates contacted. Fifty responded — twenty of whom were chosen, for whatever reason, to share news from the world of discrimination. »Women often complain about the disinterest shown by examiners... Several women get to hear from their examiners that they are only expected to perform very poorly anyway, or that they should get married right away, since there is no place for women in the academic world anyway may be."

Here nine women who are bothered by lecturers, there twenty who seem to be able to follow up on their exam situation in a feminist way - the refusal of women towards the women's representative and her researchers cannot irritate them. In 1997, a series of lectures at the Berlin Free University was dedicated to sexual harassment and its consequences, which is not surprising given that relevant research has been carried out for many years. The opening lecture focused on the [\[63\]](#) psychological consequences of sexual harassment.

— “Those affected, characterized by the speaker as thoroughly self-confident and normally insecure, felt deeply offended and ashamed by the teacher's abuse of power. Only those in power viewed the reactions as sensitivity and prudery.' Why a young woman should be 'deeply offended and ashamed' by an unwanted approach is probably only understandable spontaneously to those who have long been at home in the world of hysterical-pedagogical sex research. One is completely confused by the generous permission for "eroticism, flirtation and love also between the status groups of a university", which the speaker gives at the end, but one had previously assumed that a strictly objective atmosphere was being called for, in which women were not seen as sexual objects should be targeted by male desires. If only the urgent inquiry brings those affected and their alleged perpetrators to light on a microscopic scale, then one can probably get away with it

It can be assumed that the male and female people at the university are not dependent on this permission or on new, sensitive reinterpretations of their relationship life.

A tank for the Bundeswehr probably costs more money than is shown in the budget of a women's representative on the subject of sexual violence for research and lecture series, books and brochures. That alone puts the criticism into perspective, even if

the damage, which is deplorable from time to time, can be high.

[\[64\]](#)

Excursus II

The image of men in the women's movement

There are several reasons for the ongoing sexualization of the women's question, which has paralyzed all development over the years. One of them lies in the political inability of the women's movement to distinguish between feminism and lesbianism. A certain group of lesbian women used and still uses women's political commitment to live out their personal sexual fantasies.

The second reason is to be found in the success that scandalized sexuality has found in the media. Sexual violence, or what has been explained about it, is the pass on the way to the public not only for women ministers, but increasingly also for other politicians, whose expertise in this area is inversely proportional to their need to risk-free moral profile. Thirdly, the idea of heterosexual relationships, the self-image and ideal images of femininity, in short, the whole feminist conception of sexuality, originate biographically in adolescence, which is known to be renewed with every year. On the other hand, since the women's movement has only come to an end, its protagonists have only grown older, not smarter or wiser and have not established any tradition, even the most transparent errors retain their timeless, sterile freshness.

The whole misery of stagnation can at least be sketched with a few observations on the work of Alice Schwarzer. Like no other woman, she shaped the West German women's movement with her initiatives, books and public appearances and made feminism popular far beyond the movement. This situation does not rule out hostilities, but now also includes the Federal Cross of Merit. In her biography, Bascha Mika, a younger journalist and winner of the »Emma« prize for female journalists in 1994, devotes a number of pages to the question

why Alice Schwarzer has not identified herself as a lesbian to this day. [\[65\]](#)
She was and is resented for this by many other women who are politically active in feminist and minority politics. If the fate or, less pathetically, the quality of life of discriminated minorities also depends on their visibility, which normalizes them, then the disappointment with Schwarzer's behavior is understandable. For the early years, Mika accepted Schwarzer's silence; it would probably have done more harm to women's affairs in general if a lesbian woman had been expected of the public alongside the radical feminist. Despite the slogan of the private, which is political because women experience their specific oppression through the exclusion of the private, a slogan that Schwarzer has publicly spread again and again, despite these and other contradictions, one could still assert the rights of Schwarzer beyond the ideological consistency conceded on private life. As a biographer who has to portray a public person in action with a human being and probably also as a convinced feminist, Mika leaves the answer in limbo.

But if one also attributes the sexualization of the women's question to the bad politicization of a partly lesbian, partly youthful caricature of heterosexual relationships, then one cannot avoid interpreting Schwarzer's silence. Anyone who is as quick-witted as she is and so little at a loss for many, many words that contradiction is pointless because even a 'but', let alone a 'maybe' only proves his weakness, should be able to formulate a position that can be communicated here too.

A look at the history of the gay movement is instructive. For a short time there was an attempt to make politics here with horrendous figures about "actually" homosexual or at least bisexual men. How many should languish in the chains of socially ordered compulsory heterosexuality! The gays were able to say goodbye to the transparent attempt to normalize themselves through the constructed masses all the more quickly as sexual liberalization was successful for them

went. Many of their theatrical productions now amuse even a timid, petty-bourgeois audience, from which the worst persecutors and informers are otherwise recruited. The lesbian women do not have such spectacular successes - this is not a criticism but an observation. Presumably gays and lesbians have nothing more in common than their perception as a sexual minority by the heterosexual majority.

But that doesn't explain why lesbian women — the range between Alice Schwarzer, Andrea Dworkin and Judith Butler is wide — didn't withdraw from feminist sexual politics, but on the contrary made it their specialty. Just imagine gay men rambling on about the importance of women's primary and secondary sexual characteristics—then we have an equivalent of Andrea Dworkin's or Schwarzer's discussion of the attractiveness of the so-called tip and its penetrative potency.

With their liberation from the pressure of the law, gays have lost the opportunity to exaggerate their sexual orientation in a politically progressive manner. This distinguishes them from the feminist-dressed lesbians who, instead of developing their practice and theory further, embody the sad remainder of the women's movement as »women-lesbian associations«. Perhaps there is no need for it, because being a lesbian — to paraphrase Max Goldt — is in no way full-length, any more than being heterosexual is for women. Only Alice Schwarzer believes that. For example.

If you read Schwarzer's bestseller *The Little Difference and Its Big Consequences* from 1975 today, which is generally acknowledged to have been very, very important at least back then, then you are over the amazed at the naive radicalism of his concepts. [\[66\]](#) The book has three main parts. The first, entitled "Protocols," takes us to a feminist clinic, where a demigod in white introduces us to her patients, all of whom suffer from the disease of "patriarchy," embodied primarily in their husbands and other men. Part two explained, questions superfluous, contradiction futile, in a manic manner

Prose, which is Schwarzer's specialty, how women are specifically oppressed by "liberated" sexuality. Part three sings the praises of gainful employment for women, without whom individual emancipation is unthinkable.

In my context, the following topics are interesting: 1. The "Zipfel" does not justify "that people are not just made people, but men and women".

2. »It is not the penis and uterus that make us men and women, but power and powerlessness.« 3. Pleasurable sexuality does not need a penis.

4. Penetration is only necessary to produce children. Thanks to medical progress, this concession to the two-sexedness of humans could also be dropped today.

It is evident that some lesbian women differ from all gay men in that they do not have an adequate, and certainly not a positive, idea of their gender. Then all that remains is the pale utopia of the "simple human being" who has no gender at all - like an angel. The border to childish wishful thinking, to denial, has already been crossed. The misinterpretation of power and powerlessness in gender relations points to an immature idea of the act of love as rape. In men it leads to impotence because it mobilizes the fear of castration before the feeling of guilt. The malice that is poured over the "tip" also fits very badly with the acts of violence in which the penis is imagined as the sword Excalibur: "The psychological significance of this violent act of male penetration should also not be underestimated (...)

In addition, for many men, violence will be a pleasure, and that is why penetration is perhaps the most pleasurable thing today.« On the part of the woman, the violence of the penis corresponds to the condemnation to passivity during coitus.

Now I come to the saddest part of this sexology, the generation of pleasure between humble people. Here the »Sexual Revolution« left bad marks. Basically, Schwarzer proves that women are at least as good at pressing the crucial buttons when it comes to generating pleasure as they are

Men who are more likely to be prevented from using the right strategies by their penis. What might have passed as youthful rebellion against outdated moral concepts in terms of crude and rude behavior later did not prevent most of them from understanding the difference between masturbation, sexual masturbation and a love affair, between seduction and rape, between misunderstandings and abuse. But these learning advances in life have not been incorporated into women's politics.

There, just as in Schwarzer's head, the man remained the potential perpetrator, the cock-fixated macho, like her comment on

Potency pill »Viagra« [\[67\]](#) shows.

There is no need to wait for Alice Schwarzer to come out. It would not change the link between feminism and lesbianism. When it comes to sexuality, some lesbian women and some women politicians meet forever where they once were twelve years old. Some were scared and reveled in scenarios of violence and persecution - the others were scared too, but they never showed it, but knew better than a guy how to defy puberty and the men who, to be fair, were also afraid or denied this fear...

Schwarzer never gave up the gesture and intonation of the phallic bravado of pre-puberty, cultivated it and made it her trademark. Should it ever be about women's solidarity, about common female interests, about truth and politics, then, I have to admit, I'm ashamed of them.

But, thank God, that's not the point; because black is black and nothing else.

From Rebellion to Reaction: A Question Disappears

There really is no lack of beautiful tributes to the women's movement. At every appropriate opportunity, the women pat themselves on the back. But men's moral support for our cause has long been obligatory. Self-praise and unanimous approval contrast strangely with the sense that the obstacles looming in the way of the paradise of equality, gender democracy, or whatever you want to call that utopia have not diminished over the years, but have mysteriously multiplied.

Real success doesn't even exist where unsuspecting people think they can see it with the naked eye.

For example in education. The admission of girls to the Abitur and university studies before World War I increased their participation almost instantaneously. The falling class and money barriers after World War II brought their share of the high school graduate and student population to fifty percent. Feminist agitation had the least of the credit for this, as anyone who has enjoyed girls' education in the decades since 1908 can attest; for the teachers at the Realschule and Oberschule were quite conservative—as was the curriculum. As late as the 1950s, compulsory subjects were needlework, home economics and even horticulture! Rather, the rapid increase in girls' participation in education is a result of demographic developments. When the number of children falls, investments are also made in the education of daughters: the motto is a job instead of a dowry. But that's not all: The girls quickly turned out to be the better pupils, the better students and more successful university graduates. It only took a little while, in the years since 1968, for critical women to spot the many hairs in the ointment.

It was found that the co-education that was finally enforced benefits the boys, but demands free social work from the girls, for which they are not even praised. The teachers, although mostly female, seem to care much more about the loud boys than the good girls. Coeducation encourages gender polarization that limits women's career opportunities. It has been found that girls do not develop their talents in the future-oriented subjects (mathematics, computer science, technology) in the presence of boys because these subjects are considered unfeminine. School researchers have also noticed badly in recent years that although there are plenty of women on the teaching staff, there are hardly any of them at management level.

For years, a feminist educator has also specialized in proving that our school system would collapse if mothers didn't have free homework help and tutoring

would be used to tutor their children. [68] It was recently reported from the United States - and this is of course also relevant for gender democracy and feminist pedagogy - that girls' self-confidence takes on a mysterious dampening effect at the onset of puberty.

Elsewhere, many are offended that women have a fatal tendency to prefer colleges and careers that don't bring much money and fame. It seems as if the expansion of the labor market for middle-class daughters coincides with the expansion of the social and welfare state, where they enter the

new and old teaching and social professions could flow. [69] It has not yet become known that officials or employees in the public sector have starved to death, but compared to the chances of an engineer, a social worker also annoying for kindergartens, even if she does an excellent job. It is work part-time, especially when they have small children. They exhaust the parental leave that the fathers exhaust

For career reasons or because of disgust at the changing table, they hardly use it at all. That's why the assertion that it's common practice to say that women are still faced with the alternative »child or career?«, while men undoubtedly have a career. The success of the word "career" in the context of family and work is, incidentally, indicative of the average feminist's fixation on competition and equality. Of the countless men who are probably trying, how many men are doing what the word "career" is actually reserved for? Working your way up a bit and working your way up the ranks, no matter what the job or what product — is that a »career«?

So if women, as is often said, have to sacrifice their careers for their children, then please take a look at the conditions in which large companies and corporations issue obituaries for their employees, in which the expensive dead person is given the opportunity to set up a distribution system in South America or thanks to an innovation that is both as banal as it quickly becomes obsolete. It is true that the great bosses receive many swansongs when they step down - but on average obituaries for humble mothers, wives and housewives are no smaller and shorter than those for their husbands who preceded them by many years.

If no one can be considered happy before their death, then the equality of grief actually speaks volumes.

The very worst thing that worried women report, for last. The proportion of women who hold a C4 professorship is still quite negligible, despite the many years of support measures at a classic male institution such as the German university. In the past, one often heard the saying that people in this country only start with their Abitur. Today, we should probably continue, it culminates in Professor. The women's movement since 1968 cannot deny its origins in the bourgeois and academic milieu.

All statistically proven obstacles of the
Gender democracy actually prove only one thing: that the

women's movement is speechless. She should, but cannot, finally explain why the idea and the practice of equal rights had such confusing consequences. The women behave differently than expected. Is that because they don't dare and have to be guided and led further by their feminist guardians, or do they have to rethink?

The political and media presence of the women's question is in stark contrast to the silence of women in general. They can no longer be mobilized for anything. The book market tells us better than the feminist statistics that something is boiling and bubbling underground. Certain bestsellers, which are guaranteed not to be read by any man, produced and given away as soon as possible, prove that our problem is not the backlash that men initiate, but our own limitations, which the women's movement has by no means removed.

Without any claim to completeness in the [70]

I remember the successes of Benôit Grôult in symptom research. — This lady, at her own menopause, invented the passion between a Parisian intellectual and a rude fisherman—as if we women needed to imitate the nonsense of a 1920's Lady Chatterley. Was it DH?

Lawrence at the time was concerned with the erotic gradient created by class differences (after all, he was a poor child and had certain ambitions), so today we women should put our age problem into perspective. Grôult explained to a huge female readership that women must or can remain sexually attractive and alive after forty... Now there is no question that women of older age can remain active in every relationship and historically verifiable often have remained so. But another question seems to me about the success of Grôult's Schmonzetten: the enthusiasm of buyers and readers points more to the fixation of many women on the youth role than on the actual female task. Grôult's thesis, enthusiastically received by the readers, is: We are always beautiful and desirable, regardless of the reproductive cycle... The

Despite is sad, with which aging and growing old are supposed to be ignored here. The women's movement since 1968 has failed, one may conclude, to endow women with the authority that comes their due as age and experience gather. The women's movement, feminism, they haven't gotten any older, in the name of sisterhood they haven't differentiated between individuals, not between generations. The appeal to the sister's solidarity, still not out of fashion today, is based on anxiety, not security. If even one of them swerves, that's how you've behaved for years, nothing threatens.

Another typical success on the book market, from which the emotions of the female audience can be read better than from the number of participants on International Women's Day in March, Walpurgis Night on the eve of May 1st or other demonstrations of female presence. If the numbers there approach lower limits, which are already embarrassing, Ute Ehrhardt's training course for power women should *go to heaven, bad girls everywhere*.

Have found hundreds of thousands of buyers and readers. [71]

Her recipe is simple, but varies widely and is that Women have to learn better than before how to clarify their interests, make investments in a targeted manner, and accurately balance gains and losses — whether in professional or private life makes no difference. The recipe, which Ehrhardt also successfully sells to women in seminars, is not aimed at those whose ambition is aimed at a "career," but at everyone who wants to make more of themselves because they are dissatisfied and unhappy with themselves. If the call to stop sulking, complaining, and grieving finds so many takers, then we can probably draw conclusions about the spread of the depression that Ehrhardt wants to arm her clients against in a post-feminist manner. Even more blatant is the cure for despair through the offer of temporary mania from a successful author like Hera Lind. She, too, is a post-feminist insofar as she presents all the demands that the women's movement has ever made as fulfilled and achievable.

Sexual freedom, sexual happiness, entertaining disasters, children

and career, plus beauty, charm and money - the woman as a whole guy in the edition totally female...

Grôult, Ehrhardt and Lind weave the daydreams of the women's movement, which permanently ask the rebellious girl who denies her femininity. The night side, on the other hand, dramatizes femininity in the context of sexual violence, which is not only wrongly marketed in modernity, but also much too cheaply. I also conclude from this that the women's movement has not managed to even put into words the current and historically unprecedented situation of women.

As is well known, the renewed fight for the abolition of Section 218 played a major role in the early days of the women's movement after 1968. The slogan "My belly belongs to me" had to mean something different at the beginning of the 1970s than it did during the Weimar Republic. The pill had been invented, sex education was introduced in schools, a fulfilling sex life became a civic duty instead of fatality. The demand for the deletion of the ominous paragraph was by no means aimed at empowering women to commit infanticide according to their taste, but at recognizing female freedom, which must include the power of procreation. After the end of patriarchy, the decision for or against pregnancy belongs primarily in the hands of women. She is neither the birthing machine nor the vessel, but the actual guardian of life. She must choose a child and a father, or a man versus a child, or a child without a father. The recognition of woman as a moral subject, even as a citizen, depends on not only allowing her that choice, as the abortion discourse suggests, but on giving her that choice. Even more crass: the constitution of the woman as a powerful, responsible subject depends on the recognition of this peculiarity, which identifies her as the "child bearer".

The disaster of the women's movement can be illustrated by the way it dealt with this central question. Burdened with historical reminiscences and out of girlish defiance, § 218 and

its abolition on the Golden Question in women's quiz for their place. On the one hand, women did not dare to blame women who had become pregnant unwillingly.

Nowhere was there a sincere debate about their new power and responsibility to themselves, which should finally replace patriarchal tutelage. The silence was fatal and certainly contributed to the fact that the constitutional court could not deal exclusively with women's freedom but with the protection of "unborn life."

Embarrassing the rabula of a counseling law that women politicians from all parties ultimately have to take credit for.

If there hadn't been stonewalling in solidarity beforehand and the conditions surrounding the unfortunate paragraph had been researched with the same commitment as the "sexual violence" of men, then there would not have been a lack of arguments. His deletion without replacement would then really have become the point from which women could have spoken on an equal footing, but not equally.

It is indeed the case today that in the majority of cases women advise other women who, after pregnancy, are not sure whether a child should actually be born; they do so not as girlfriends, sisters, mothers, or qualified "wise" persons, but as state-appointed guardians of "unborn life" and controllers of female morals. Of course, behind this regulation there is still the old patriarchal fear that women could do with the gift of life (ie the male "seed") as they see fit. The implicit suspicion of the careless handling of the "unborn life" does not refer to the woman as a potential murderess of a small human being, but to her power to say no and thus to reveal male potency as a dependent entity.

Because the pattern of the debate about § 218 was adopted from the older debates in the Weimar Republic, and also from the older socio-political and medical circumstances, the reform remained half-hearted, is increasingly endangered and has the

women's freedom disappear in the fog of a more than strange advisory law. The assurance of impunity if one has submitted to one's procedures is a miserable result in view of all the discussions and demonstrations that we experienced in the 1970s and again after reunification, because in the old GDR a schematic time-limited solution was available was standing. Perhaps it is only today that we can see that the fight for the abolition of Section 218 was only superficially the fight for women's right to use abortions under certain circumstances for birth control.

It was more about the first possible appropriation of the ability to procreate as the core of female power that becomes visible in modernity. The line of defense against the invasion of the female body, which is now becoming historic, was certainly once again taken with the slogan "My stomach belongs to me"; on the other hand, she expresses an unprecedented self-confidence that goes far beyond the pride of perhaps actually giving birth to a child. Unfortunately, female self-confidence and pride have not caught on so well, and the tendency to dwell on inherited resentments and make oneself comfortable in the patriarchal culture of complaints introduced on the model of marital warfare, all the better for it.

If one understands the campaigns for the abolition of § 218 as a fight for the right to abortion, then conservatives, Bavarians and Catholics have long had the better cards. They are convinced that the abortion of a fertilized egg is legally, philosophically and ethically unjustifiable. These puns may remain incomprehensible to most people - but what they can understand are the arguments in detail. In a rich and well-organized country like Germany, poverty shouldn't be an argument for an abortion - that's the end of the social indication of the older counseling practice. If men are also indirectly involved in abortions, they should be advised and held accountable... The illegitimate nature of a child does not speak either

against his existence — the single mother is no longer exposed to discrimination and legitimate children are no better off than illegitimate ones. And so forth! What would a women's politician and feminist have to counter such claims? Nothing at all.

But it gets even worse. The Federal Statistical Office reported that the number of abortions had risen by about 16 percent within a year. In the first quarter of 1998, 35,479 abortions were registered, around 5,000 more than in the first [\[72\]](#).

quarter of 1997. — Elsewhere one read that an improved reporting practice was to blame for this apparent increase. That may well be so, but the approximate fact remains that for every one million births a year (broadly estimated) there are 140,000 abortions. There are very few women who find abortion to be a normal medical procedure, about as uncomfortable as removing tartar, that's one thing. Years ago, the American sociologist Carol Gilligan tried to base a specifically female morality on this observation. Among other things, she asked women who had had an abortion about their motives and considerations.

The bottom line was that the women who had decided to have an abortion, in modern terms, think in a morally networked manner - while men, as has been known since Lawrence Kohlberg, tend to progress from fear of punishment via pragmatism to higher human universalism. Gilligan wanted to prove that girls' underperformance on the Kohlberg six-point moral level scale had something to do with gender difference and not with our lagging behind. The discussion of this problem has filled many books.

On the other hand, I missed research, feminist or otherwise, that would explain the high number of abortions. By no means are young, stupid things responsible for them: only 4.2 percent of those who had abortions were minors. In 3.3 percent of the cases, medical and psychiatric reasons for the abortion were claimed

made. In contrast, more than half of the women who received the counseling certificate were married.

Since science, especially feminist science, leaves me at a loss on this important point, I have to speculate.

I contend that many women become pregnant despite knowledge of contraceptives because they want to know who they are.

Equality, which everyone takes for granted, does not teach that. One learns who one is in the difference to another. Since 1968, however, the women's movement has declared the difference between the sexes to be obsolete. If difference becomes visible, as every woman should have understood by now, then we are dealing with an act to the detriment of women — commonly known as discrimination.

Women also become pregnant, not because they want a child, but because they are completely unclear about their potential and their kindness. How many thoroughly modern men are left baffled by their girlfriend's question: Why do you love me?

Here there is evidence, there a doubt that cannot be allayed by anything. In addition, modern life with its rewards for professional and financial success severely irritates women who come from family traditions. There is always a way open for us to go backwards. After all, men have known for a while that the way forward is rocky and doesn't lead everyone to the top.

The high number of abortions is probably also due to the fact that women want to be sure of their female potency. They are the equivalent of the men who, in old age, hunt very young women...

Maybe it's all just speculation, and unfounded at that. But what other explanations are offered for this phenomenon? As was the case with the Federal Constitutional Court, here too we could leave the field to conservative Bavaria. There one does not shy away from the thoughts that others refrain from the outset for fear of betraying female solidarity or provoking a backlash with unfortunate insights. In Bavaria one left

explored what made so many women (even married ones) consider abortion, and found that in many cases the potential but unwilling father was the pressing part. One concluded from this that men should also be ordered to counsel, which would complete my nightmare of well-meaning state feminism. Well, by disclosing intimate relationships and entanglements and their feminist censorship, women still hope to make a breakthrough in other places. Laws, especially penal laws, should help and protect women — if necessary even against their accidental and negligible will. Symptomatic is the innovation of "marital rape" (previously coercion or bodily harm — the cases are extremely rare) and the recognition of the crime as an official offence, which our women politicians pride themselves on. This practically means that a woman who reports her husband can no longer withdraw this report. This paternalism of women (the fact that they generally belonged to less well-to-do classes makes the process easier) was justified by women with the argument that they could otherwise be blackmailed by their husbands with promises and threats. Finally, one of the great disappointments of the women who set up the women's shelters is that the individual to be rescued often returns to the perpetrator of violence after a reasonable period of time. Not out of need or hunger or a loss of social prestige, but out of the realization that talking to a dear social worker can lead to a chaotic relationship with you in the long run

meaningful character.

[\[73\]](#)

But I leave the broad realms where modern social work is supposed to be classified politically and ideologically, and turn to the quota, which, as is well known, does not affect the cashiers in the supermarket, the cleaning ladies and hairdressers. Only highly qualified women who are very advanced in terms of career can benefit from the quota system. They should already have studied and the first career steps should also be behind them so that they can be considered. Strange, but here, too, the advancement of women is like the rescue of women: the women

somehow don't want to be like the petrified remnants of the women's movement decided for them. No woman wants to be seen as a quota woman - everyone who has made it to something indignantly rejects the suspicion whether rightly or wrongly remains an open question. Young women, perhaps the daughters of the women of 1968, would rather be modest, prefer to hide their light under a bushel or underprice their achievements than become objects of a women's policy that favors them. You're right; because in the long run neither paternalism nor favoritism will help women. Actually everything is open.

Decision

Unfortunately, a social movement like the women's movement is not as easy to review as a book. Once you have read this, you can inform the potential buyer of the design, the insights gained, but also the shortcomings of the text and at the end give a vote according to your taste. Can one recommend the women's movement or what is left of women's politics in parties, committees and bureaucracies? Thanks to women's research and gender studies, do we know better about ourselves today, and are we happy about the nice support that the women's representative of our municipality (our authority or institution) has given us on our life path? And finally, apart from the immediate benefit, the question: Is the women's movement interesting? By that I mean whether there are exciting, inspiring thoughts that are being thought about somewhere and with which the youngsters who only know the feminist Stone Age from hearsay can make an impression. In fact, there are such attractions around the universities. It is about forced heterosexuality and its consequences in the form of sexism, racism and other evils, which can be found under the heading »Queer Studies« or

»Cultural Studies« or similar attracts female students in particular. With all tolerance towards youthful insanity and the dissidence mania that goes with it, I take the liberty of considering this matter, which is fortunately limited to seminars, to be a mistake.

Just as women after equality would have been well advised to think more about themselves than about patriarchy, one would like to suggest to lesbian professors not to look at heterosexuality as a special field and to brush up on its deconstruction as theory, possibly even as politics.

Haven't we made fun of male professors enough - pars pro toto I remind you of Paul Möbius to see through this fuss and fear and insecurity today? — to now If I in any case Möbius, Nietzsche or

When I read Weininger, I clearly hear the child whistling in the woods, just as I hear Butler and others purposefully devaluing sexual difference. Oddly enough, the deconstruction of biological and cultural sex is always aimed at women — as if women really didn't exist and were a malicious invention of patriarchy...

Despite this criticism, I like the successful avant-garde artists from the literature seminars and their excited audience as symptomatic evidence for my thesis that the women's movement has not succeeded in reconciling women with themselves. One is still on the run, often enough on the flight of thoughts. If the local misery is not enough to be used as a politically credible projection screen for hatred, the rescue squads just swarm out. If equal rights for women-lesbian relationships are a fact, then their explicit promotion is demanded. Then so-called sexism takes on the character of a social poison that has to be eradicated from the last pores of the social body, following the model of the Inquisition, which

[74] "Sexism"
Heresy could also be smelled in children's play. will hardly cause as much damage as some other historical paranoia, but it has already sufficiently demonstrated a certain socially destructive potency in superfluous scandals and lawsuits.

The inheritance of the bad mothers was too heavy for the daughters to struggle with. The mothers had reasons to be angry, but hate and self-hatred only surfaced in the daughters, who were much less so. They were particularly ill-equipped for the task of avenging and rescuing the mothers. They didn't just need two heads, four arms and a double life, but above all courage and self-confidence. Where to take and not to steal? From the beginning, the women's movement suffered from an affective imbalance that was easy to overlook as long as the protagonists were young. This did not harm many because they saw the years in the women's group as a rite of passage from youth to youth

could use adult life. For those who stayed with it, feminism was unmistakably bought, the longer, the older, the more with the psychological fixation on raging puberty, sacrifices in intelligence and integrity.

Nothing characterizes the emotional imbalance of the women's movement of 1968 more than the false naivety with which it favored sisterhood, at least conceptually, in analogy to the fraternity of the French Revolution, as the source of unbreakable female solidarity. This couldn't go well! The sister relationship in patriarchy is filled with an almost hopeless envy, with hatred and jealousy... Furthermore, female solidarity is not based (as mother-daughter relationships also teach) not on positive goals, but on a community of suffering from which one veer very much

[75] is made difficult. — On the one hand, the women's movement dried up because that is the fate of social movements; but other decimations were also the result of their inability to think instead of stonewalling. What is left of the women's movement today and has been preserved in the institutions of the welfare state, in parties, associations and trade unions can also be appreciated in other ways. The women's movement is the only K-group from the 1970s that has survived. It survived because men are basically nice to women and smart enough to keep them happy as consumers and voters, as mothers, girlfriends and wives. If the women's movement, if feminism, wanted a revolution in gender relations, did they ever consider the absurdity of appealing to men to shed their pig character and slip from the role of oppressor to the role of altruistic helper?

"Women are people too!" Or similarly plausible: "Rape is not a trivial offense" — or "Abusing and murdering children is a hideous crime" — one could read and hear that often enough, literally or analogously, in recent years. Whence comes the pathos with which such

platitudes can be presented?

Two things have not been understood in the women's movement. First, that women are human. This insight is quite unoriginal and would not even meet with the Pope's objection — *pars pro toto*. What is new is the idea that people only appear as women (or men). As long as women are running away from themselves into a false universalism, there is still a lot to be done. Secondly, that parting from patriarchy also requires women to have sex no more than being convertible at any time

view currency. When, in 1993, a district court in Munster denied a young woman a right to compensation for the loss of her virginity, emancipation had taken a giant leap forward (which incidentally all campaigns against "sexual violence" want to reverse); because from this day on sex is by no means free, but it is up to every single woman, completely independent of prejudices and social conventions, to use her values and her wishes self-confidently. The deeply conservative character of the women's movement of 1968 can be seen in the fact that it did not understand this break with patriarchy but, on the contrary, would like to have the price of innocence collected from the father, namely from the father state. ^[76]

What would the world actually look like if there had been no women's movement? I don't claim better, but I don't claim otherwise either. It boils down to a plus-minus-zero. Many menopausal women today have had an instructive youth; others have somehow got stuck and still gotten older. Generally speaking, the wind is blowing under the girls and women's wings - but if you look more closely, the women's movement and feminism have also ensured that the topic (let's say "What does the woman want?" with Professor Freud) will continue to spread for a long time will be away from the window.

This is a pity. Clever women in science and politics have long since said goodbye to the women's question or are doing it on

edge, as it were dutiful. Just like men, women don't want to come across as unfriendly to women. That's basically all that's left. The post of women's minister is by no means coveted. The woman in this position or in another comparable women-specific department doesn't know what to do. She can't respect herself. She has no fans. There is a lack of ideas. I advocate a long break.

Post Scriptum

An anti-discrimination law in favor of the disabled is widely advertised on Berlin billboards. Coincidence or not, with the same thesis that can be found in the coalition agreement of the new red-green government with regard to women. Here we should not be able to do without the social participation of the disabled without harm; There it says literally: »Our country will only meet the challenges of the future if the intellectual potential and creativity of women in business and society can fully develop.« In general, people are actually convinced that women and disabled people have something in common . They are "discriminated against," and only anti-discrimination laws or "equality" policies that

minimize, even eliminate, the consequences of discrimination can help. For a long time now, the word itself has undergone a narrowing of its meaning that provides information about the precarious relationship between reality testing and engaged moralism. The fact that disabled and non-disabled, women and men differ and are also differentiated from everyone else - for whatever reason - is not accepted as a fact and starting point for further decisions, the distinction as such is supposed to be bad. It is true that excesses of *political correctness* that are hardly satirical have taken place in the United States and are only reported to us in the Miscellaneous News to arouse pleasant shudders - that disabled people are "people like you and me" or that "girls are not born" but "made". and finally that women "are human beings too" and not women, but such admissions are also expected in this country. Red-Green and its constituency are committed advocates of this strategy of denial with good intentions. A blind student, a spastic handicapped child in the programmatically integrated elementary school - should they really teach the others to problematize their normality? I give

—,

nevertheless the hope that empathy with people who have been struck by fate, humanity and intelligence can one day be united.

Yet it is not so far. Red-Green sees bleak prospects for the future if women and their intellectual potential and creativity cannot "fully develop" — but the harsh announcements that they are finally going to help out by law and from above, by the state, prove that we have so far been able to do without the services of equal women. If the bottom line when it comes to integrating women into the work process is nothing more than the realization that women can do what men can do - then one naturally asks oneself why women then still need a women's representative, which men can do without.

I fear that in the coming years red-green will cement an equality policy that has long been spinning in an impasse. It has not been understood that equal rights (with the accent on the automatic exercise of rights) with its unsatisfactory results cannot simply be compensated for by a policy of bureaucratic-legal equality (by means of women's representatives).

For a long time now, women have been degraded to being completely unscrupulous beneficiaries or passive wards of a women's policy that only makes people gloomy. On all floors, in parties and institutions, women have established themselves who want to translate the bitter legacy of their mothers into law and order, into reproach and claims. However, equal rights and equality for women have long been exhausted as the engine of progress. It would really be high time to understand the difference, including that of the genders, as a factor of innovation. Disabled and non-disabled, women and men, children and adults must be allowed to "discriminate"; for even a well-intentioned denial of reality is a denial. Anyone who wants to take seriously why women have been oppressed and misjudged for so long will not allow themselves to be dealt with by gender equality policies. she is

not new, it has brought almost nothing in the past apart from disappointing shifts in the decimal area after the point; it is expensive and legally problematic insofar as it seeks to directly privilege women. The distribution of lucrative and prestigious work involving care of all kinds along the lines of paternal public service is an illusion that is better not allowed to flourish in the first place.

But because for many years today's Red-Green participants in particular have relied on nothing but paternal care as the means of choice to lead women out of the valley of discrimination to the heights of equality, they will not deviate from it now. And if it doesn't work again, what will be the reason? Perhaps we still have to go through this before we can think unrestrictedly about us, the women, beyond the bans on thinking that have accumulated over many years.

Berlin, November 1998

[1] Alice Schwarzer, *The small difference and its big consequences*, expanded and updated edition with a foreword from 1984, Frankfurt/M. 1994. The book first appeared in 1975. [2]

— Susan Faludi, *The Men Strike Back*, Reinbek 1993. [3]

— Britta Steilmann, *The misery of women*, in: *Die Welt*, June 15, 1995. [4]

— Bärbel Sunday, *Feminism is megaout*, in: L4Z from July 3rd, 1996. [5]

— Ute Scheub, *The woman who threw the tomato*, in: *TAZ* of January 12, 1996.

[6] A "chronology of past events", in: Ann Anders, ed., *Autonome Frauen. Key texts of the new women's movement since 1968*, Frankfurt/M. 1988. There also the speech by Heike Sander. [7]

— Scheub, loc. cit.

[8] This is also the title of Roswitha Burgard's book, *courage to rage*.

Liberation from violent relationships, Berlin 1988. Courage to be angry is the goal of therapeutic work with women who have sought refuge in women's shelters. But every woman needs the courage to be angry, because: "All men are potential abusers" (p. 9). [9]

Monika Steffen, *What is Feminism?* in: *Neue Gesellschaft* 31, 1984, p. 1176 ff. There also the sources for the following quotations. [10]

Regine Othmer, *On the Adversity of the Women's Quota*, in: *Argument* 37, November/December 1995. [11]

Frigga Haug, *Perspectives of a Socialist Feminism. 17 years of the women's movement in West Germany and West Berlin*, in: *Argument* 28, September/October 1986. There is also a reproduction of the flyer. [12]

Cora Stephan, *Emma in the menopause*, in: *Süddeutsche Zeitung* from 16./17.01.1993. [13]

Attempts to counter the phenomenon defensively with information about the sexual development of children, the number of victims, diagnostics, the practice of suspicion and the consequences for child protection, in: Katharinautschuchky/Reinhart Wolff, eds., *Handbuch Sexualer Abussung*, Hamburg 1994 .
On the history of sexual denunciation before child abuse came to the fore as a fear scenario: Friedrich Koch, *Sexual Denunziation. Sexuality in political debates*, Hamburg 1995. [14]

The necessary trivialization of the child molester is undertaken by means of empirical research as part of a DFG project by Rüdiger Lautmann. First results in: Rüdiger Lautmann, *Die Lust am Kind*, Hamburg 1994. [15]

Especially for the instrumentalization of children at the time of the witch craze, which the women's movement likes to refer to as an exemplary outbreak of patriarchal misogyny: Hans Sebald, *Hexenkinder. The Fairy Tale of Childish Sincerity*, Frankfurt/M. 1996

[16] Lerke Gravenhorst/Carmen Tatschmurat, eds., *Questions about daughters. NS Women's History*, Freiburg 1990. In it also Karin Windaus-Walser, *Women in National Socialism. A challenge for female theory formation*. This., *Women as victims. Denying gender differences and avoiding confrontation with female power*, in: Susanne Heenen, ed., *Frauenstrategien*, Frankfurt/M. 1984. [17]

— See also the impression of Petra Welzel, *With Suspenders in the Newspaper. About readers who don't know what they want and editors-in-chief who don't know what they should do*, in: *TAZ*, March 27, 1996. [18]

— The footnote is missing in this edition.

[19] The footnote is missing in this edition.

[20] Women's self-help shop in the 13th moon. Program Summer 1995. [21]

— Johanna Beyer/Franziska Lamott/Birgit Meyer, eds., *Frauenhandlexikon. Keywords for self-determination*, Munich 1983. [22]

— Theodor Fontane, *letters in two volumes*, selected and explained by Gotthard Erler, Munich 1981. [23]

— Judith Butler, *The Discomfort of the Sexes*, Frankfurt/M. 1991. [24]

— Erving Goffman, *Interaction and Gender*, Frankfurt/New York 1994, ed. and introduced by Hubert A. Knoblauch, with an afterword by Helga Kotthoff. [25]

— Rudolf Dekker/Lotte van de Pol, *Women in men's clothes. Female transvestites and their history*, Berlin 1990 [26]

— Anne Koedt, *The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm*. German first 1973. Reprinted by: Ann Anders, ed., *Autonome Frauen. Key texts of the new women's movement since 1968*, Frankfurt/M. 1988. [27]

— Dorothee Winden, *Celebrating Lesbian Sex: Storme Webber in Pfeferberg and on tour*, in: *TAZ* of June 25, 1996.

[28] Werner Kolhoff, *Christine Bergmann's model is the GDR women*, in: *Berliner Zeitung* of June 15, 1998.

[29]

Compare some figures from Berlin: Between 1988 and 1996 the proportion of women in the "state service" rose from 45 to 55 percent. There has also been an increase in the number of civil servants and employees in the higher and higher civil service. In 1992 there were 46, 1996 52 percent civil servants and 1992 51 percent employees, 1996 68 percent.

In the higher service in 1992: 21 percent civil servants, 38 employees — 1996 35 and 43 percent. Of 123 management positions, 21 are held by women.

However, these increases are mainly attributed to the retirement of many men from the public service in East Berlin, which allowed women to move up.

Women are mainly concentrated in the Senate Departments for Justice, Women and Labour, Health and Youth. After: Ute Scheub, *women are great! Or?* in: *TAZ* of June 23, 1998. [30]

Of course, one can also say: Barbara Wackernagel Jacobs, Minister for Women, Labour, Health and Social Affairs, half-seriously had this idea tested (on May 27, 1998, Evangelische Akademie Berlin-Brandenburg). [31]

Hans Bertram, *Families live. New ways to flexibly shape your lifetime, Working time and family time*, Gütersloh/Darmstadt 1997 [32]

Verena Auffermann, *The Gentle Wave. Germany in need, women please forward!* in: *Süddeutsche Zeitung* of June 17, 1998.

[33]

Siegfried Keil/Rita Süssmuth, *qualification of educators for parent work from the elementary area*. BMJFFG publication series volume 191, Stuttgart 1986.

[34]

after Ute Scheub, *women are great! Or?* in: *TAZ* of June 23, 1998. [35]

I took the information about Nina Schmitz from Silke Lambeck's contribution, *You are antisocial with four children. The Berliner has been living on state aid for seven years — her life has become a struggle*, in: *Berliner Zeitung*, March 6, 1995.

Uncredited the report on Diana Holzwarter, *Four girls need winter clothes and games. The 23-year-old Diana Holzwarter is a single mother and lives with her daughters on welfare*, in: *Berliner Zeitung* of December 23, 1996. [36]

See Daniel Patrick Moynihan, *Congress Builds a Coffin* (on welfare reform in the USA), in: *New York Review of Books* of 11.1.1996; Michael Massing, *The Welfare Blues*, *ibid.*, 24.3.1994; Andrew Hacker, *The War Over the Family*, *ibid.*, 1997-12-04; David Piachaud, *Down but not out - Why the term*

"underclass" is no help in understanding social ills, in: *Times Literary Supplement* of January 24, 1997.

[37] An overview of this complex of topics in Herrad Schenk, *The Feminist Challenge. 150 Years Women's Movement in Germany*, 4th, unchanged edition, Munich 1988, p. 118 ff. [38]

— This and the previous quote are from a Congressional report by Petra Welzel, *Why Women Still Need Pearls Today*, in: *TAZ*, July 5, 1996. [39]

— *Half the dishes for everyone*, in: *TAZ* from 25.8.1995.

[40] *Value of unpaid work reaches trillions*, in: *Süddeutsche Zeitung* of November 16, 1995.

[41]

— Hans Bertram/Renate Borrmann-Müller, *From housewife to professional woman? The influence of structural changes in being a woman on family life*, in: Uta Gerhardt/Yvonne Schütze, eds., *Frauensituation*, Frankfurt/M. 1988. [42]

— Victor Thiessen/Harald Rohlinger, *The distribution of tasks and duties in the marital household*, in: *Cologne journal for social psychology and sociology* 40, 1988.

In addition, the proposal to rationalize the budget from today's scientific perspective; Claus Offe/Rolf G. Heinze, *Past the labor market. Reflections on the redefinition of "household" welfare production in its relation to market and seed*, in: *Leviathan* 14, 1986. [43]

— Synopsis of the women's promotion guidelines of the ASFH, FHW and the Free University of Berlin,

undated [44]

However, the Frankfurt dissertation from 1934, which was made accessible again in 1986, is very instructive: Margarete Freudenthal, *gestalt change of the urban, bourgeois and proletarian household economy*, Berlin 1986. [45]

— See Margarete Sallis-Freudenthal's memoirs: *I have my country found*, Frankfurt/M. 1977. [46]

— Jean-Claude Kaufmann, *Dirty Laundry. On the marital construction of everyday life*, Konstanz 1994 [47]

— Adam Kuper, *Objects of Desire*, *Times Literary Supplement*, May 8, 1998. [48]

— *BKA: Violence against women has decreased*, in: *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, February 17, 1993. [49]

— *Rape: many women say nothing*, in: *Berliner Zeitung* vom April 1, 1993, p. 1 and p. 19, *ibid.*: *Women often blame themselves*. [50]

— *Rape: increased by leaps and bounds*, in: *TAZ* of May 17, 1993.

[51]

Brochure against violence, in: *TAZ* of November 27, 1997. This brochure is the third that the »Berlin Intervention Project Against Domestic Violence« has produced since it was founded in autumn 1995.

The project, financed with funds from the Berlin Senate Women's Administration and the Federal Ministry for Women, is also dedicated to the networking of protective, intervention and punitive measures in individual cases. There are also social training courses for perpetrators. "The goal is to improve counseling and protection for women and children affected by male violence and to help reduce violence." There is even talk of preventing violence.

Cynics might suspect otherwise. The talk of »male violence«, which is not a trivial offense and should finally be outlawed, prepares the expansion of the area of responsibility for (welfare) state violence against certain groups of people whose conflict situation has previously been coded as feminist-bourgeois and thus defused: domestic violence is physical violence, usually perpetrated by men.

Women are helpless and powerless. Domestic violence is not a private matter, and if the women affected see it differently, it is a question of a deficit in their political awareness. In principle, there is a public interest in the prosecution of »violence in relationships«. The subtlety of the concept of violence - away from the physical to the psychological and structural etc. - and the sensitization of the perception of acts of violence in general, which feminism constantly struggles with, have not grasped their own ambitions to use violence. The five employees of the Berlin project, fully occupied with brochures and networking, will not change anything.

»In Berlin alone there are tens of thousands of perpetrators who beat their wives at home. Because many victims do not report their abusers or withdraw the reports under pressure, because police officers and public prosecutors often rate acts of violence as family quarrels and trivial offenses (...), most perpetrators go unpunished.

But if they are convicted, they will be completely de-socialized in a men's prison and continue to rage after their release.« See Ute

Scheub, *The Invisible Perpetrators*, in: TAZ of October 7th/8th, 1995.

The prejudice that violence only occurs in certain strata is also repeatedly refuted. "Violence within the family occurs regardless of income and level of education." Cf. Jens Anker, *Violence in marriage: more cases than expected*, in: *Tagesspiegel* of February 11, 1997. Who can believe that? Even if that were true, a teacher would not be dependent on the help of »BIG«. Children of lawyers and wives of civil servants are not to be found in homes or in women's shelters. What is happening here and there is social work for the lower class. If one dispenses with the feminist pathos of "male violence," one encounters unemployment, illness, and socio-cultural deprivation.

Even deadly relationship crimes are clearly socially conditioned, as a sociologist found out. 200 murders that he checked in Berlin took place in the context of poverty, small housing, unemployment, lack of education and alcoholism. »One always says«, explained a young judge, »that domestic violence cuts across all social classes; but I have not had this experience in my practice. Once I had an academic as a perpetrator. Most of the time, it's the unemployed or those on welfare who strike out of desperation. Another large group of perpetrators are men from other cultures who claim that their society allows them to hit their wives.« Barbara Bollwahn, *Many show themselves to be insightful*, in: TAZ of July 19/20, 1997. [52]

Violence against women is increasing at an alarming rate, in: *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, March 1, 1996.

[53] Susan Faludi, *The Men Strike Back*, Reinbek 1993. The American original entitled *The Undeclared War Against American Women* was published in 1991 and won the author the Pulitzer Prize. Were there feminists on the jury, or is patriarchy masochistic? [54]

Paul Möbius, *On the physiological feeble-mindedness of women*, Halle a. p. 1900. In addition to Nietzsche, Theodor Bischoff, *The Study and Practice of Medicine by Women*, Munich 1872, and Otto Weininger, *Gender and Character*, Vienna 1903, were honored similarly to Möbius. [55]

This is what Ms. Stamm said on Sabine Christiansen's talk show: ARD on July 26, 1998. [56]

At the end of the 1970s, Alice Schwarzer tried against a

Cover picture of *Stern* a lawsuit in the name of offended women

enforce, but the keyword pornography was still missing. The picture showed a dark-skinned naked woman, encircled by iron chains, not distorted by pain, rather dreamy and contemplative. The subject of the lawsuit was the degradation of the woman(s) as a sexual object. [57]

Quoted from Annette Menzel's generally instructive essay, *Sexuality and Women's Liberation*. In: Inge Baxmann et al., *Texts - Actions - Dreams. What next for the women's movement?* Cologne 1984, p. 160 ff. [58]

In 1993, the *Badische Zeitung* in Freiburg dedicated an extensive print and sound series to the subject of "women". This quote is taken from Ursula Nuber's contribution, "*Men's violence and women's obedience*" dated May 14, 1993. In keeping with Black Romanticism, the author begins with the assertion: »Tens of thousands, yes, maybe hundreds of thousands of women and girls were and are being raped in the war in former Yugoslavia.« Are we dealing with a state of emergency here? Not at all, because studies (?) show that even here in normal times "two thirds of all men must be classified as more or less violent." "In war, they have something like official permission to act out this willingness." The victims probably know the difference between violence and "prone to violence" best. Who wouldn't prefer the millions of "violent" perpetrators to the violent few? [59]

Has anyone but me read the study by Monika Holzbecher, Anna Brazeit, Ursula Müller and Sibylle Plogstedt: *Sexual Harassment at Work ?* (Series of publications by the Federal Minister for Youth, Family, Women and Health, Volume 260, Stuttgart 1991) This caricature of social science research is only surpassed by the report on a model project in Berlin concerning the sexual abuse of female children. See Karin Walser, *Sexual Abuse and Female Consciousness. A critique of the "wild water" model*, in: Katharinautschuchky/Reinhart Wolff, eds., *Handbuch Sexualer Misbrauch*, Hamburg 1994 and 1999. The project report was published in 1993 in the already mentioned series of publications by the Bonn Ministry. The »stock analysis of the

Helper system in the field of violence against women and girls in Lower Saxony«. The appraiser, who worked on behalf of the Lower Saxony Women's Ministry in 1992, is a notorious feminist. Why wasn't the Kienbaum company commissioned so that at least the appearance of an evaluation was preserved? On the one hand, Carol Hagemann-White dutifully reproduces the specifications of feminism with regard to male violence, beyond any halfway reasonable empiricism. On the other hand, it produces a lot of fog where we would expect affected women to give information about themselves. We are informed precisely as a percentage of how many advice centers are working with which ideas in villages, small towns and large cities. We are not informed about how few and which women audition or are sent at all. [60]

— Notice owned by the author. [61]

— Christine Burtscheidt, *When lecturers sexually harass students. Information day about a taboo topic*, in: *Süddeutsche Zeitung* from 13.2.1995.

[62] Gerlinde Unverzagt, *When couples milk holy cows...* in: *Süddeutsche Zeitung* from 19./20.02.1994. [63]

— Anja Kühne, *The unwanted look at the breast. Sexual harassment at the university*, in: *Tagesspiegel* of January 21, 1997.

[64] A report, reproduced in all the media, claimed that the Fulda University of Applied Sciences would issue seminar certificates in return for sexual services in a nearby hotel. This false report, which is easy to prove, with its complicated extensions in the body of the teachers and students, resulted in committee meetings, plenary assemblies and lecture events, the costs of which no audit office will ever determine. A brochure was also published about the events of 1992. [65]

— Bascha Mika, *Alice Schwarzer. A critical biography*, Reinbek 1998, there Chapter 4: »There is no private life«.

[66] Alice Schwarzer, *The Little Difference and Its Big Consequences*, Expanded and Updated Edition. I have the paperback edition Frankfurt/M. 1994 before. All quotations from the second main part on the »function of sexuality in the oppression of women«. [67]

— »The feminist Alice Schwarzer gives the potency pill Viagra

bad notes. (...) Such a sexual enhancer fixes the men again on a ›dull clean out‹ (...) The pill will definitely bring new problems, ›because women are not interested in this kind of quick-fix sex... Viagra only promotes it male narcissism: every sausage a Tarzan'. If a man is stressed, he should stop and think about the stress. ›Then it might be better to just relax instead of banging.‹ Schwarzer also sees a danger for young people. ›The young men are already victims of omnipresent pornography, which is not about love and lust, but about violence and power. A mechanical amplifier like that would probably fall on fertile ground.‹ Mothers, warn your daughters!

I haven't read anywhere else that Viagra is also an option for women, but that can probably be explained by Schwarzer's theory of simple people for whom the differences between men and women have become unimportant: »The pill is not very suitable for healthy women. ›Although the bodies of men and women are very similar: women also have erectile tissue and a kind of penis, the clitoris.‹ But the same applies here as for men: ›Sexuality is much more than a stasis of blood.‹« In: *Berliner Zeitung* from 27.5.1998. [68]

Referring to this and summarizing, Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, *Gender as a category in educational science*; Heiner Drerup, *The recent coeducational debate between scientific claims and the need for political and practical orientation*, and Juliane Jacobi, *Modernization through Feminization? On the history of the teaching profession*. All in: *Journal for Education*, Issue 6, 1997. On the feminist version of the relationship between school, child and mother, especially Ute Enders-Dragässer, *Frauen und Schule*. Report commissioned by the BMBVV Bonn 1982, and many other publications. [69]

Thomas Rauschenbach, *The New Generation Contract: From Private Education on social services*, in: *Journal for Education*, Supplement 32, 1994, p. 161-176. [70]

Elke Schubert has compiled beautiful preparatory work on the topic »Women dream, women buy and read and keep dreaming«, cf. *Wenn Frauen zu write too much*, Berlin 1998. There analyzes and satires on Grôult, but also Toni Morrison and Hera Lind. [71]

Ute Ehrhardt, *Good girls go to heaven, bad girls go everywhere. Why*

Being good doesn't get us anywhere, Frankfurt/M. 1994. This., *And a little badder every day. The Handbook*, Frankfurt/M. 1996. A little more detailed about this from me: *farewell to the baked fish. Evil in three days: Ute Ehrhardt's female self-education*, in: *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, February 28, 1997. [72]

Report in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* on September 8, 1998.

[73]

Petra Schnelzer, *Ten Years Women's Refuge*, in: *Frankfurter Rundschau* of November 29, 1997. It says: »For women who are victims of male violence, the association »Women help women« founded the Wetterau women's shelter in 1987. After ten years, the employees took stock: Social work is becoming more and more important. So far, the women's shelter movement hasn't been able to change much socially.« In this context, the report in a Berlin newspaper is also cute: »Girls are striking more and more often. Increasing willingness to use violence.« The number of female suspects up to the age of 21 rose from 458 to 850 between 1991 and 1996. On the one hand this is an enormous increase, on the other hand this number is negligible compared to the male suspects of all age groups. Should there also be an equal opportunity mandate here or should the quota become obligatory? in: *Tagesspiegel* of December 4, 1997. [74]

— The trivialization of "sexual violence" in this country by the mass media drove women into foreign countries or history. Heike Sander clung to the myth of the raping Russians; others fanned out into the culture of prostitution in Thailand; still others discovered the trafficking in women or the scandal of circumcision of the clitoris. A list without end.

At the beginning of October 1998, the professor for lesbian and gay theory at New York University, Lisa Duggan, appeared in Berlin at the invitation of the Heinrich Böll Foundation (in the case of the Greens, the equivalent of the Adenauer, Ebert or Naumann Foundation). It is not enough for her that sexual minorities can no longer be persecuted by the police or discriminated against. As with equal rights for women, this is not the gateway to the desired freedom, but provides the license for paranoia. She doesn't give a damn about the hard-earned tolerance of heterosexuals (police, churches, conservatives...), 1. Ms. Duggan fundamentally questions the "heterosexual legal structure" that recognizes lesbians and gays. 2. She is determined to "address" even the most subtle sexual racisms...It's like some feminists: Ms. Duggan doesn't want to win, she wants to be right and hate. See *TAZ* of October 6, 1998: Jan Feddersen, *Jour fixe - Lisa Duggan criticizes heterosexual legal structures*. [75]

— See my reflections on the topic "My foreign body", in: *Merkur* 38, 1984, H. 2. [76]

— *Der Spiegel* of July 19, 1993: »Lost rarity«.