



FACULTY OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL SCIENCES

Problems of Positioning

A qualitative study of narratives in a debate

Maja Östling

Thesis: 30 hec

Program: Gendering Practices Master's Programme

Level: Second Cycle

Semester/year: St/2019

Supervisor: Lena Martinsson

Examiner: Hülya Arik

Report no:

Abstract

This thesis aims to explore how positions of oneself and others are constructed in a debate, how these positions also construct the debate, and how this could have performative effects on the reader. The particular debate analyzed here is one between Sara Edenheim and Nina Lykke, and published in *Tidskrift för Genusvetenskap* in 2010-2013. Through a combination of close readings, autoethnography, and writing as a method of inquiry I strive to answer questions regarding three main aspects of these articles: 1) temporality 2) affect and 3) in/direct referencing. I use a theoretical apparatus built on diffraction, emotion, and citation politics, and further follow how the process of this analysis affects me, as a reader-student-researcher. Finally, I conclude that feminist historiography is often written through metaphors of time, that the affection visible in these texts are performed through narrative positions but also define these positions, and that citation can be a tool for building alliances which too creates or connotes certain positions. Put together, I try to make visible narrative position making in a debate, and analyze how this could have performative effects.

Keywords: positioning, diffraction, affect, citation, Sara Edenheim, Nina Lykke, *Tidskrift för Genusvetenskap*, autoethnography.

Acknowledgements

I could never have written this thesis without my academic support group. Lena, my not-mother but my critical friend, thank you for guiding me through my thoughts and always telling me what I needed to hear. I am also very grateful for the feedback and ideas given by my examiner Hülya and my opponent Maria. You both helped me find inspiration to write in just the right time. And of course, the rest of my lecturers and fellow students at the Gendering Practices Master's Programme. I look forward to see what we will do! Thank you Hedvig, Olivia and Lovisa for all your encouragement in times of panique and thank you Jonathan for everything. Most of all, I want to thank Sara and Nina for publishing your amazing articles that made me think, made me feel, made me become. Thank you!

Table of contents

Becoming-with my thesis	3
Purpose	6
Research questions	6
Material	6
Methods	8
Positionality	10
Tying knots with other wire ropes	13
The ocean in which these waves take part	18
Diving further into the ocean	25
Temporality and its constructions	28
Affections and their effects	36
Placing oneself in the field of citation	40
Controlling the waves from my lifeboat	46
References	50

Becoming-with my thesis

This paper starts out in the middle by going forward to the past.

Barad, 2014:184

Being a feminist in gender studies, you meet all kind of problems. When starting out, you expect the older feminists-researchers to have all the answers, you believe others to have been paving your way, you think you are handed a torch that you will later pass on. Of course, these are my own experiences, though I have heard similar accounts from others, but the further I went into the world of gender research, the more I started questioning everything around me and especially questioning the impression I had somehow gotten of what gender studies is, what it could be. Now, that I am becoming toward an end of the writing of this project, I am beginning to realize what I have been analyzing and trying to grasp during the seven months that have been my term of writing a Master's thesis. I see a clearer problem which I want to explore, and so the main idea of this thesis is to scrutinize how we (as feminists, as researchers, as entities) position others and ourselves in certain time-space-matterings. I have seen how this is done in many ways and in many places, but I have chosen to limit the scope to regard temporal positionings, in combination with affective modes of discussions and politics of citation. Since the world of gender research is extensive, I had to limit my material as well. I decided to focus on a conflict which I, in my first readings, had felt resonated with me and in many ways embodied the problem I had sensed: how do we place ourselves and others in certain positions that connotes certain ideas?

When I started working on this project, I had a completely different but thematically similar idea on what I wanted to do. I wanted to research conflicts between feminists of different generations, of different 'waves', of different ages, because I felt I had been part of so many discussions where this had been the main problem. Though excited and curious, I was never sure of how to use the concepts of generations, of waves, of age, while at the same being critical against the use of them. The mere action of writing them, of others reading my writings of them, would have performative effects that I could neither anticipate nor be responsible for, and so I found myself floating in a mental space of vacuity where I couldn't

start doing more extensive readings (what if I read the wrong things?), start writing (what if I wrote something I would have to throw away? I wouldn't wanna waste my time like that...) or ask for help (I had been so confident when presenting my subject, how could I go astern from that?). To paraphrase Karen Barad (2014:177), the indeterminacies of my existence while standing on the stepping stone of this project have been, are, and will be constitutive of the very materiality of both me and this text's being. Adding to the feeling of indetermination, it took me a while to be able to meet with my supervisor which made me even more paralyzed intellectually. However, when I finally did, I got the guidance I needed to accept that I had to leave 'generations' behind, and start somewhere else. My document with until then useable quotes from texts I had read was 24 pages long, and from that I described the texts that made me *feel* the most to my supervisor whereupon she asked me "why don't you focus on those texts? Why assume the trueness of 'generations' when you can, instead, scrutinize what seems to be your real interest here: the conflict in these texts, and the use of temporality in them? Why not?"

why

why

why?

But I have already read so much.

But I have already started writing.

But I have already presented the subject to everyone.

But I suddenly heard myself answering that, yes, you are right, that is exactly what I want to do. Thus, I followed what my voice had said, what my body had realized long before my thoughts caught up, what my supervisor advised me to do, and began reading Edenheim (2010) and reading Lykke (2012) and reading Edenheim (2013) and reading Lykke (2013). I left my old documents with quotes and a reading list behind, and read the same four texts again and again and again. Often, I had to stop myself not to continue the Googling, the Scopusing, the reference jumping between books, but to stay with my trouble. Often, I imagined myself at the threshold, peeking into the academic feminist world of gender studies and reading it through a prism, opening up a spectra of possibilities. Often, I wanted to leave the thesis behind, and just as often, I wanted to pour my whole bodymind into it.

It is a myriad of thoughts, a myriad of ideas, a myriad of theories and entanglements that I have wanted to use and think *with*. Nothing in this process strives to be linear. However, a line has to guide you, the reader, through this text. It is therefore now time to further explain that in this thesis, I will scrutinize four articles published in *Tidskrift för Genusvetenskap* between 2010-2012. They are written by Sara Edenheim and Nina Lykke, two each, and they are corresponding to each other. The themes in my analysis concerns 1) temporality and constructions of it, 2) how emotions work in this exchange of ideas, and 3) in/direct citations and how they work as to create alliances. The three of these combined create certain performative effects that the texts hence have, and these effects are what will be my conclusions. I believe using conflict as a starting point for analysis to be fruitful since where there is conflict, there is tension, there is problem. Even though conflict might seem like a place where only difference exist and no sameness, I see conflict as an entanglement of many things. It is crucial that we see conflict in this case in similar ways in that which Trinh T. Minh-ha views difference: as “not opposed to sameness, nor synonymous with separateness. Difference, in other words, does not necessarily give rise to separatism. There are differences as well as similarities within the concept of difference” (1988). Conflict then becomes a place where there is tension, where consensus neither could nor should be reached, but where there are differences and samenesses that intra-act and are both constituted by and constitute that entanglement that is that particular conflict.

I chose this particular conflict as my material because it resonated with me in my first readings, because I swayed between agreeing with one author one day and the next the other author, and because I felt these texts meant something to me - I felt they got stuck within me. All text (in a broad sense) have performative effects of course, but I believe texts which stick with you have bigger chances of effecting you, and are therefore important to scrutinize. Adding to this, my body has been a tool for me in this project. As a student within the humanities, I believe these embodied knowledges to be valid and important, and I therefore also carry with me the question of how these performative effects affect me by using autoethnographic approaches.

This is an attempt on an affirmative close reading of a contemporary past, that is, a part of the diffractive wave - not one that smashes against the beach and breaks, but one that comes and goes in a non-teleological or linear order. The discussion itself, though not really the focus here, is part of the diffractive wave as well. It is recurring, it is part of a bigger picture, it does not break but is constantly existing and understood in different ways in different times.

Purpose

My purpose with this thesis is to explore feminist storytelling through scrutinizing the performative effects four corresponding articles from *Tidskrift för Genusvetenskap* could have on the reader in general, and me (as a student) in particular. I want to find myself and others in the performative borderlands of temporality, affects, and citations, and to explore how we place ourselves and others in certain positions which connotes certain ideas.

Research questions

- How is time constructed in these texts, and what performative effects could this have?
- What affects become visible in the scrutinization of these articles and how are they performed through the texts?
- How do the authors construct themselves and each other as agents on certain fields/in certain groups through citation?

Material

This thesis is based on close readings of four texts, published in *Tidskrift för Genusvetenskap* (hereon abbreviated as TGV). TGV is the biggest Nordic peer-reviewed journal within the field of interdisciplinary Gender Studies and has been published four times annually since 1980 (TGV, n.d.). It is also one of few scientific journals in Sweden where gender researchers have a space to write and expect the reader to be already informed in the topic discussed. As Sweden's only scientific journal in Gender Studies which is written mainly in

Swedish, TGV has a certain status within the Nordic field of gender research. The debates held there are hence probably read by a majority of the authors' colleagues and are so very public in the sense that they are well-known in the community. The authors in this case are Sara Edenheim (Associate professor in History and Senior lecturer at Umeå Centre for Gender Studies) and Nina Lykke (Professor in Gender Studies at Linköping University), who in the years of 2010 to 2013 published four corresponding articles in the journal, two each. The first two are published under the headline "Open arena" (a.t.) [Frispel], which is a place in the journal where the texts are not peer-reviewed but where articles have a more essay-like format and where you do not necessarily have to be a researcher to be published (A. Bark Persson, editorial secretary at TGV, personal communication, 2019-06-04). It is also, according to L. Martinsson (Professor in Gender Studies at University of Gothenburg) a place "where we can be free to speak whatever we want" (personal communication, 2019-02-27, a.t.). The first text, written by Edenheim (2010), deals with how some well-known older Swedish feminists construct a false image of conflicts between generations, which are actually about ideology, and that these conflicts should be allowed to co-exist within a diverse movement. The second text, written by Lykke (2012) responds to this by agreeing with a lot of Edenheim's points, but also states that Edenheim, although her several disclaimers against it, through her writing also constructs 'older feminists' (such as Lykke) in fixed positions of opinions and ideology. In what I imagine is an attempt to end the discussion, the editors then publish the last two responses in a part of the journal called "Retorts" (a.t.) [Genmälen]¹, in the first issue of 2013. Here, Edenheim (2013) continues to write about consensus and her beliefs that feminists shouldn't strive for it, in combination with psychoanalytical readings of how she views the feminist debates in Sweden today. Lykke (2013) thereby gets the last word, and ends the discussion with a text where she "needs to comment on a few things" (ibid.:145, a.t.) and thus shortly responds to the things in Edenheim's last text that Lykke felt Edenheim had misunderstood. The four articles cover 26 pages in total, of which 18 are written by Edenheim (in Swedish) and 8 by Lykke (in Danish).

¹ An old-fashioned term for responses, which signifies a more aggressive or passionate answer than just an answer. It can also be translated into both objection and answer ("Genmäle", n.d.).

Methods

Just as transcription is an analytical act (cf Klein, 1990), so is reading (cf Sedgwick, 2003) and, in this case, especially writing (cf Richardson & St Pierre, 2005). The material from my default method of choice, the one I first planned to use in this project - semi-structured in-depth interviews - would have been transcriptions. This time however, after re-evaluating why and how I had chosen that method, the material became already written texts from which I cannot access more than is written. The positions of the authors are hence always already fixed in a certain time and place. I have worked with the material in the same way I would with transcriptions: reading until I recite them in my sleep, thematizing, contextualizing, summarizing. And, following Richardson's call for creative analytical processes, constantly writing. Taking 'fieldnotes', even when I'm taking study breaks, on vacation, or just woke up from a dream: "[t]hese data were neither in my interview transcripts nor in my fieldnotes where data is supposed to be [...] [b]ut they were always already in my mind and body" (Richardson & St Pierre, 2005:970). This is not something I recommend. If there had been a way for me to bathe in the diffractive waves instead of drowning in them, I most certainly would have preferred that. Though I have felt overwhelmed by the diffractive affects I got from being part of a politics of citation, writing un/regularly (that is, all the time) is what have made this process bearable. Writing whenever I could about everything mildly interesting have been my lifeboat in making sense of this project.

Methodologically speaking, I have chosen to look at my method of choice in this project as CAP [creative analytical processes] ethnographies, which Richardson defines as "creative *and* analytical" (emphasis mine), "display[ing] the writing process and the writing product as deeply intertwined", and "engag[ing] intertwined problems of subjectivity, authority, authorship, reflexivity, and process,[...] and of representational form" (ibid.:962). Standing under this umbrella term, I have looked at this thesis through three different methodological lenses: close reading, autoethnography, and writing. Close reading is surely a well-established way of doing qualitative research which "investigates the relationship between the internal workings of discourse in order to discover what makes a particular text function persuasively" (De Castilla, 2018:136). Using close reading as a method allows the

reader-researcher to focus specifically on textual dynamics or tensions within the text, and explanations for initial feelings toward it, through analyzing what makes one feel that way. Further, this is a method that urges us to read texts several times, which also invites texts, and our first impression of them, to be unclear and ‘hard’. St Pierre argues that “the idea that language should be clear is not only deeply embedded in our anti-intellectual culture but also in positivism” (2011:614), which is a strand far away from the philosophy of science that I, and I believe many other researchers within the humanities, adhere to. Hence, through close reading, we allow the texts to be deep and perhaps unclear at first sight, while also allowing ourselves to truly scrutinize the texts and put time into really reading and feeling them.

Autoethnography might be a bit less established than close reading, but I believe still well-integrated in interdisciplinary research, and perhaps especially within the humanities. As I strive to do embodied, critically reflexive research that demands the reader to feel and engage with the text, I have chosen to embrace my almost automatic autoethnographic writing. To research with autoethnography means to “systematically analyze (graphy) personal experience (auto) in order to understand cultural experience (ethno)” (Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011:1). Ergo, it allows us to use our partial perspective to further see how the world works; it is a way to use the small piece of puzzle to see the bigger picture, and disrupt the constructed boundaries between those jigsaw pieces. Departing from an idea of science as neither objective nor neutral, autoethnography further “expands and opens up a wider lens on the world, eschewing rigid definitions of what constitutes meaningful and useful research” (ibid.:3). I also believe that writing autoethnographically in combination with writing to inquire what you do not already know is a match made in heaven which allows the text to become truly embodied and engaging.

Contrary to the well-established methods of close readings and autoethnography, I believe writing as a method of inquiry to be a bit more frowned upon. I have learnt to not write until I know, to be sure of what I write, and to write only truth (whatever that is). However, having read Haraway (1988) and other feminist philosophers of science, we know that the objective truth claim is neither desirable nor achievable, and so, neither should writing only after we know be. Writing as method is hence one that allows the writer-researcher to “[find] the language that crystallizes their thoughts and sentiments” (Pelias, 2011:660), which to me

seems impossible to do without writing. My thoughts and sentiments, my analysis, my ‘main findings’, become together in the process of writing, I could not write it without not-knowing what to say. By being allowed to write to investigate, I no longer feel neither restrained nor bored by writing: writing before I know what I will write is what makes writing a joyous practice, and is thus what makes texts written in this sense worth reading again and again. Writing as a method of inquiry opens up new spectras in our material, it guides us “across our thresholds, toward a destination which is unknown, not foreseeable, not preexistent” (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987:524, as quoted in Richardson & St Pierre, 2005:972). To investigate by writing and so, to write before we, as if we could ever, already know everything allows us, me, to be truly “feminist objective”, to have faith in our “partial perspective”, and to disavow ourselves from the “god trick” (Haraway, 1988). I believe these three methods to be fruitful in relation to my research questions since they, combined in an entanglement of beliefs, ideas, and practices, allow me to give the analyzed texts the time they need to grow and develop within me, they give me the space I need to write to explore, and the freedom and power that lies in seeing your experiences as valid productions of knowledge: a part of the bigger picture.

Positionality

Speaking of Haraway, I believe it is time for me to position myself in this field. As I have chosen to write partly autoethnographically, I am trying not to distance myself from this text too much. However, perhaps some clarifications can be made to be even more open. I am a Master’s student in Gender Studies at the University of Gothenburg. I have earned my Bachelor’s degree with a major in Gender Studies, and a minor in Cultural Analysis and Music from the same department that I am currently enrolled at. I have spent the last four years being part of a context that is in many ways the same I am analyzing here. However, I am still new to and unestablished on this field, at least CV-wise, and so, I am still learning (as if you ever stop) and, in some way, distant from the conflict as I am not (yet) part of the gender research community. I believe what I am trying to say is that I am positioned somewhere between newbie and establie. It is, according to my experience, also fairly uncommon to stay in the lane as I have done and earn both your Bachelor’s and your Master’s in Gender Studies, since it is such an interdisciplinary discipline (I am the only

person who have done so this term at this department at University of Gothenburg). This means that I, as the reader of these articles and producer of this thesis, have tried to position myself as both the newcomer to and the established person on the field that they exist in, as well as positions between those two. I have done so to try to see the spectra of performative effects these articles could have, and to practice a diffractive approach. I am also aware that I, as many others, have been unknowingly influenced by what I have read through the years, and that therefore there might be textual references (like metaphors or choice of words) in this thesis that are not stated in the bibliography. I have tried not to make these sort of presumptions that the reader, you, will have the same horizon of understanding as me, but at some points, I have decided to let this be. Hopefully, this does not work in a diminishing way toward the reader, you, but can help to inspire a colorful language and push the boundaries for what 'academic' writing can be. Says Braidotti: "I think that many of the things I write are cartographies, that is to say a sort of intellectual landscape gardening that gives me a horizon, a frame of reference with in which I can take my bearing, move about, and set up my own theoretical tent." (1994:16). I think it is important to take great care of, to be aware of, these cartographies, and I have tried to do this. I have also tried to handle my material with care. Since the articles that are my primary material, and some others I have chosen to reference as well, are written in Swedish and Danish, I have translated big parts of the material used here. To avoid taking up too much space with writing "my translation" after each citation, I have chosen to use author's translation, abbreviated as a.t., after every translation that is mine instead. When translating text, and especially text that you're analyzing too, you also need to be very careful, that is: full of care. These texts speak in their language, they are written in that language for a reason, and meaning can very well get lost in the work of translation. Because of this, translation is not something done by default. It must be given time and space and thoughts and embodiments. Not once have I felt numb or neutral toward these texts (even though I tried when describing them during the *Material*-part), but I have allowed them to become-with me, as a strategy to make translation natural. I have decided to feel with the texts to be able re-present them in a fair way. Further, Swedish is my first language while Danish is not. When struggling with differences between the two, I have asked for and gotten help from people who are fluent in Danish to be able to understand and translate the texts written by Nina Lykke. In addition to this, I am writing in a language which I suppose one could say I am fluent in (at least my CV does), but it is not my mother

tongue. I have sincerely tried my best to read and translate these texts in an affirmative way, to truly understand what they are saying, and to re-present that in my translations.

To wrap this up, I will briefly return to Donna Haraway, but as *Situated Knowledges* (1988) is my without-thinking-go-to in topics concerning positionality, I will try to think-with and turn to something else. In this project, I have strived to not flee from that which scares me, but to be intrigued by it instead: that is, conflict. I have tried to be dedicated and stay with the trouble and the tension, and to make kin with my texts and their authors, as we are all entangled in these material-semiotic practices that are “entwined in myriad unfinished configurations of places, times, matters, meanings” (Haraway, 2016:1).

Tying knots with other wire ropes

In my theoretical approach to this thesis, I have been inspired by Jackson & Mazzei (2012) and how they, with a little help from Deleuze & Guattari's *A Thousand Plateaus*, use the process (not the concept, which is a constant rather than something that does something) of "plugging in". According to Jackson & Mazzei, "plugging in involves at least three maneuvers" (2012:5) which are 1) showing how theory and practice create each other by "putting philosophical concepts to work" (ibid.), 2) being clear with what research questions become possible when working with specific theoretical concepts, and 3) staying with the data, working with it as to make it work in itself. That is, standing at the threshold between theory and practice with your data and seeing it through the eyes of the prism, because "[o]nce you exceed the threshold, something new happens" (2012:138). Perhaps I could even translate it into my own metaphoric language: swimming on the top of wave (threshold), holding onto your lifeboat (data), and deciding which way the beach may lie (prism). Maybe this metaphor is in fact even more comprehensible because of the optical obviousness of something new becoming when you swim in the ocean: the waves *do* something and could create change, even if the swimming stroke is only a very small movement.

I realize, having been part of the gender research community as well as having read a lot within the discipline, that parts of what I write might be influenced by things I have read, discussed, or thought about before this writing/working process. Sometimes, I have even noticed I subconsciously almost-quote someone else, because I have internalized these thoughts and made them my own too. Even though this might now sound like a given truth, that this is just how knowledge processes work, I cannot remember ever reading someone putting a disclaimer about this anywhere, though I *can* remember noticing subtle, not properly referenced, references throughout texts, which made me think I should know about this and that. Because of this, I wanted to give some space of this thesis to reflect upon how theory has become within me, and how this can manifest itself through the writing of this thesis.

Going back to my deliberate and conscious sources, Jackson & Mazzei work with the process of plugging in, not only with the help of Deleuze & Guattari, but also with guidance from

Barad and her developments on the concept of diffraction as method. A diffractive methodological approach consists of “reading insights through one another in attending to and responding to the details and specificities of relations of difference and how they matter.” (Barad, 2007:71). As I am inspired by plugging in (which I see as a paraphrase on diffraction-as-method), I have too chosen to work with Barad and diffraction in my theoretical-methodological approach. My main idea from the beginning of this process was to analyze conflicts between generations which then partly turned into analyzing time metaphors in a specific conflict which touches the concept of generations, and is now an entanglement of those and other things. These changes in interest made me consider how I formulated myself and thought about these time metaphors: I have tried to see them through the diffraction of the prism, as phenomena, as to ”understand diffraction patterns - as patterns of difference that make a difference - to be the fundamental constituents that make up the world” (ibid:72). Take the concept of generation, for example. For me to be able to see it as a phenomena, I needed to see how it is put to work, how it works in practice. How is this word being used? What is expected to be known by the receiver of this word? Where does it come from? Where can it go? What can it do? What performative effects could it have? The main question for me, regarding time metaphors, became: What’s in a concept? As “there is no mystery about how the materiality of language could ever possibly affect the materiality of the body.” (ibid:211), or that ontology changes with epistemology and is not constant, using a diffractive approach demands constant vigilance and attentiveness to change, difference, and effect in material-discursive movements. Thinking diffractively becomes “a way to figure ‘difference’ as a ‘critical difference within,’ and not as special taxonomic marks grounding difference as apartheid” (Haraway, 1992:299), because “diffractions are attuned to differences - differences that our knowledge-making practices make and the effects they have on the world.” (Barad, 2007:72). Thus, my diffractive approach is built on 1) accepting and approving difference as something that changes that which it is part of, 2) being attentive to those differences, and 3) not shy away from them. Put together, this is why, with diffraction, I am able to ask the question of how time is constructed in these texts, and what performative effects this could have.

When I had started working on this project and been on it for a while, I realized that analyzing these discussions based on temporalities within them was not enough. Because of

this, I continued reading the four articles to find what more made them resonate with me, what more made me become interested in them in particular, and why they had made me *feel* something. Through the readings done in this way, I realized how my interest also lay in how this conflict becomes through affection. Hence, I turned to Sara Ahmed whom I have learnt is relevant in these questions, whom I have read several times, and whom have inspired me not only through academic writings but on social media or more essay-like texts as well. In *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (2004), Ahmed describes how emotions and affects “work to shape the ‘surfaces’ of individual and collective bodies” (ibid.:1), especially in relation to right-wing extremism and thus, how bodies that are codified as non-white and non-belonging to the national state are also codified as bodies of pain, hate, fear, and disgust. Ahmed continuously through the book asks “What sticks?” which “is not simply a question of how objects stick to other objects, but also about how some objects more than others become sticky, such that other objects seem to stick to them.” (ibid.:92). When speaking of someone as an “older feminist” (Edenheim, 2010:109, a.t.), in combination with something that has negative connotations, however you use a disclaimer, that is a performative act in which the words stick to the other object, or in this case, person. “It relies on previous norms and conventions of speech, and it generates the objects that it names” (Ahmed, 2004:93), just as Barad’s phenomena, Ahmed’s use of stickiness is built on the idea that ontology changes with epistemology.

While Ahmed writes about the nation and debates on Other racialized bodies, terrorism, and migration, I am taking these ideas and plugging them into my chunk of data (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012:3) in which then the nation becomes the discipline of Gender Studies, and the Other becomes the other generation, although somewhat hidden between the lines. The interdisciplinary field of Gender Studies is constructed as always already feminine, with a soft touch, just as the nation which is named in a motherly way (Britannia, Moder Svea, Mor Danmark...) and expected to take care of its inhabitants (and being ‘too nice’ toward the dangerous Other). The Other comes from the outside, from another nation/generation, as to destroy the own field. The Other can interpret it in another way or to demand domination over it, which will destroy the common feeling of belonging. In this, certain affections get stuck to the Other body and create the affection felt by the first - since the first would in some way be affected by the Other’s intrusion of the first’s position on the field: the affection

(pain, hate, fear...) is relational and becomes in the encounter. These entanglements of affections and new differences within are why, with politics of emotion, I am able to ask the question of what affects become visible in the scrutinization of these articles and how they are performed through the texts.

Finally, to be able to connect the differences that is the phenomena that is this thesis, I have chosen to scrutinize how in/direct citations work as tools for positioning in these articles. Doing this, I will follow the works by Clare Hemmings (2005; 2011) and her belief that “[i]f Western feminists can be attentive to the political grammar of our storytelling [...] then we can also intervene to change the way we tell stories.” (Hemmings, 2011:2). While Hemmings builds a theoretical base on which she analyzes how feminist historiography is told according to certain frames of loss, progress, and return narratives, her main aim is to see how “feminist stories connect with one another” (2011:131) through citation. Because when being attentive to how and when and where we cite whom, we acknowledge how we are imprinted by the stories previous told to us and only then can we see if these stories might be imprinted by current streams of thought or discourses that could not have been seen otherwise. These writings have also been important parts of my coming to realize how not properly referenced references can work discouraging and, most of all, that citation is not unpolitical, but rather part of a practice that *does* something. Just as Barad and Ahmed argues that entanglements of emotions are both constructed by and construct what they are, Hemmings says that “[these citation practices] are productive rather than descriptive narratives of the recent past” (Hemmings 2011:162): they are *doing* something in their being and as such they have performative effects. The scrutinizing and analyzing of citation and reference lists thus too become a political practice since these performative effects, just as everything else, are not private but political. This is why, with citation politics, I am able to ask the question of how the authors construct themselves and each other as agents on certain fields/in certain groups through citation.

These theoretical approaches, put together, is my theoretical apparatus. With it, I am able to ask the questions relevant to what I have felt is my problem, and to truly scrutinize the different entities that take place in the entanglement of this chosen conflict. I am reading the chosen chunk of data, the articles, *with* this theoretical apparatus as to understand what I am

troubled by, as to be able to answer question that come up, as to think *with* theory rather than simply applying it.

The ocean in which these waves take part

The field covered in this thesis could be seen as un(der)theorized, sine there have not to my knowledge been much written on embodied problems in relation to how we position ourselves, and others, how this is reified and what effects that could have. However, others have of course touched upon similar themes that I am interested in, and themes that where my springboard to this project. To start with, there has been a text (Lindén, 2012) written about the same conflict Edenheim (2010) discusses and is part of. In this article, which was also published in TGV, Claudia Lindén explores how feminist storytelling, or historiography, is constructed partly through time and temporal structures in texts² that (claim to) portray a feminist past. She starts off by scrutinizing two conflicts held in the Swedish interdisciplinary discipline of gender studies. The first is the supposed generational conflict that also provoked Edenheim to write her piece: a conflict involving mainly Ebba Witt-Brattström, as a well-known Professor in Nordic Literature at University of Helsinki and active member in 1970's activist group Grupp 8 (Witt-Brattström, 2010), and Yvonne Hirdman, as a well-known Swedish gender historian and author of *Genus: Om det stabilas föränderliga former* (2001), a book that is widely used in foundation courses in Swedish Gender Studies (Östling, 2017). These two feminists, often visible in Swedish media, had, for a few years, been criticizing 'contemporary' feminism for not being thankful enough toward the feminist legacy of "classical gender theory" (Lindén, 2012:12, a.t.), and blaming "gender researchers and queer activists" (ibid.:14, a.t.) for being "daddy's girls who rebels against their mothers" (ibid.:13, a.t.). Lindén, inspired by Hemmings (2011), concludes here by stating that this generational conflict indeed may seem to be part of a loss narrative, but is insufficient as a theoretical tool and rather is a story about a post-structuralist paradigm.

The second conflict being scrutinized is based on two articles published in NORA, Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research, between Mia Liinason (2010), as Associate Professor in Gender Studies at University of Gothenburg, and Lena Gemzöe (2010), as Professor in Gender Studies at Stockholm University. Liinason's position paper discusses how feminist historiography based on ideas of essentialism is reproduced in undergraduate courses, and how this is an effect of the institutionalization of the discipline. In doing this,

² In a broad sense, that is.

Liinason among other things emphasizes the use of Lena Gemzöe's book *Feminism* (2002) and "constructs Gemzöe as a feminist essentialist who does not acknowledge differences between women, but rather see woman as a universal category" (Lindén, 2012:16, a.t.). Gemzöe, of course, responds to this by saying that Mia Liinason "repeatedly conflates theoretical understandings of gender with political strategies for feminist action" (Gemzöe, 2010:127), and so has simply misunderstood Gemzöe's vision of what her book would be. Lindén closes this segment by stating that "though her critical suggestion to create 'counter-stories', Liinason produces a historiography built on irreversibility" (Lindén, 2012:17, a.t.) which, from a post-structural perspective reproduces a difference between genders on a temporal level, a difference that it in itself is trying to deconstruct. After these analyses, Lindén further concludes that these conflicts is not actually about generation or a textbook at all, but rather, it is post-structuralism who is the center of attention here, and continues by reading this with Elizabeth Grosz and Jacques Derrida to make sense of it with the help of untimeliness, hauntology, and ghosts that are always already *there*. She finally urges 'us' to continue the task to set time out of joint, as to be able to do untimely work.

I have been contemplating how to handle this article since I first read it. At first, I thought that the mere existence of this text would make me look like I was plagiarizing it, and I actually thought that using Derrida, using hauntology, and imagining feminists 'of older generations' as ghosts was what I wanted to do in my thesis (as you may notice, temporality was clearly my interest here...). But as I continued reading and thinking about it, the text seemed to become more of a ghost in itself: it haunted me and I felt as if Lindén was in some way my ghostly companion down this road that I felt I knew nothing about, a road of temporal constructions, of post-structuralism as the breaking point of the paradigm shift. But I also realized that I would most definitely object to being called a ghost, so why would I continuously call other people just that³? What would make the position of the ghost any better than that of a foremother, which would position me as a daughter? I was just changing words, but my actions' performative effects would have been the same. Hence, I tried to distance myself from the text (which I never thought I would neither do nor recommend) and see what I wanted to do differently from what it did. Unlike Lindén, I am not actually interested in what the core of the conflict is, or how to deal with previous feminist theories,

³ Claudia, I am sorry for doing this to you a few moments ago.

but rather to explore how temporal metaphors are used in relation to emotions, and how these are combined in citation practices and positioning oneself or another. I am curious of what performative effects this could have.

Relating to my earlier ideas about generations in this process, conflict as a place for investigation, and writing as a method of inquiry, Braidotti (1995) has written about generational conflict departing from an academic symposium, *Gender and Generations*, held at The City University of New York in March 1995. In this article, Braidotti together with her then current graduate students eloquently writes about generation as a false and constructed category which produces images of feminists as “dutiful daughters, who either execute Mum’s will - pursuing the modernist project of empowering females against all Thatcherite odds - or alternatively, give in to mourning the decline of the paternal metaphor and the crisis of the nation-state, thus getting lost in postmodern melancholia.” (1995:57). It seems however like Braidotti believes this topic to be a bit apolitical and of little importance to feminists when she, toward the end of the paper, states that “while we fill our time with academic disputes over essentialism and the mother-daughter metaphors, our political opponents are waging national campaigns against intellectuals and the autonomy of the universities.” (ibid.:59). However, with this sentence, she opens up the floor to others, because following this article in *Found object*, graduate students at the CUNY who had had Rosi Braidotti as a lecturer, published short responses, also departing from *Gender and Generations*, and also discussing the concept of generation. Some, ironically, embraces the position given to them - the one of the postmodern, disobedient child who craves her institutional mother’s approval - while some goes into Greek etymology for answers and find Oedipal dramas. They are allowed to make visible a range of feminists ideas that spring from the same generation, but are multiple rather than singular: the story that becomes told about the ideas of their generation becomes multilateral. Thus, this becomes a conversation about generations between teacher and students, between possible future colleagues, where they analyze their own conflict. In doing this, I believe they have also practiced writing as a method of inquiry, where we can use the practices of writing to further understand what we think or believe in and deepen our knowledge on relevant subjects.

I am thankful for this piece and a lot of what it gave me, but believe it could have included a part on affects as well. Braidotti starts off her article by saying "[i]t's strange how quickly one ages within feminism; here I am: barely 40, still sexually active but having to represent the 'older' generation - how did this happen?" (1995:55), to which Elizabeth Hollow in her response says "I woke up this morning and tried to feel postmodern - decentered, discontented, always already out there. [...] After all, this is my generation, born into the age of virtual simu/simulation, too lax to learn the history passed down by our elders, and too late for any memory of a time outside." (Braidotti, 1995:63). Reading this, I realized how others have felt similar things that I feel, and primarily how this conflict I am sensing cannot be 'objective' or unaffected by personal experience, since it is deeply embedded in our bodyminds and intertwined with our entities: certain generational stickers get stuck on certain bodies, and thus become part of those bodies.

Going further into my themes, van der Tuin (2011) writes about time metaphors in feminist storytelling in general, and 'waves' and the effects of using them in particular. Even though van der Tuin in the beginning of her introductory book chapter states that "despite the continuous movement suggested by the metaphor itself, waves become locatable in time and space" (ibid.:16), she further argues that this is more of a common misuse of the metaphor than a problem in the model itself, and states her belief that the waves metaphor can be used as a neodisciplinary apparatus, but of course with some considerations. This changed way of using the waves metaphor is possible through imagining the 'new' not as part of a linear timeline, but as a "continuous rethinking of (feminist) revolutions in thought" (ibid.:17), and by using the concept of dis-identification, which "allows for thinking through the wave as a notion that involves neither sheer rivalry [...] nor uncritical continuity between generations" (ibid.:25) and therefore is what could help release the full potential of the waves metaphor. This is because to be able to dis-identify yourself from something you have to know it intimately, thereby creating a relation to it that acknowledge it but does not mean it is "accepted as desirable" (ibid.). The practice of dis-identification hence becomes one that demands close attentiveness to what is dis-identified from, and therefore a practice filled with affirmational reading.

Apart from our interest in time metaphors, another similarity is unpacked when van der Tuin briefly uses affects in her text and describes the naming of contemporary feminisms as postfeminist as narcissistic (because of *postfeminism*'s prerequisites of it as transcended from the necessity of feminism) and the naming of previous feminisms in general and the 1970's in particular as the archetypal feminist times as nostalgic (because this is one of the ways in which second-wave feminism is translated into The Real Feminism). These affects and their effects are, according to van der Tuin, what "[cuts us] off from feminism in the here and now" (2011:17). Just as I felt like an idiot copycat while reading Lindén (2012) in the beginning of this project, I have had the same feelings toward Iris van der Tuin. She has written extensively on time metaphors, generations, and new materialisms, and instead of seeing her as an inspiration, I started constructing her mentally as my greatest rival, as if there could only be one person writing about these subjects in all of the feminist world. I feel embarrassed to admit this, but the inherent neoliberal idea of competitiveness as a foundation for human relationships had thus made me a worse researcher, a bitter student, and an angry (in a non-productive way) feminist. However, after I had felt all this, I started feeling comforted instead, comforted that I had someone to turn to, that I wasn't being silly with these ideas, that they were actually valid. I had, to paraphrase Clemens Andreasen (2019), seen myself as a knowledge producing entrepreneur with a sole responsibility for my thesis, but with a little help from my (academic) friends⁴ I crawled out of the pit that is the competitive neoliberal part of my brain, and found a better place to write from.

Another way in which van der Tuin inspired me was when writing about how the assumed distinction between academic and activist feminism "implements a split between the academic and the activist sphere" (2011:22), thus not only creating academic feminism as a non-feminist activity (because of the connotations between activity and activism) but also constructs activist feminism as non-academic and therefore non-reliable or non-true (because academic knowledge production is the only real knowledge production). This leads me to introducing the next part on feminist conflicts, since the subject of writing about conflict is not exclusive to the academic feminist world. The Swedish feminist cultural journal *Bang*,

⁴ A huge help for me coming to this realization was the last part of Karen Barad's (2014) article on diffraction, in which she lets theorists from different fields literally come into conversation with each other, through using quotes only.

named after Swedish journalist Barbro Alving, is one example of this. Each issue of *Bang* has a special theme, and the first issue of 2006 had the literal theme of conflict. In this issue, the editors state that “feminism is marked by a proud and rough tradition of generational conflict” (“Tema: konflikt,” 2006:8, a.t.) which is perhaps something I would have agreed with in the start of this project but am becoming all the more sceptical toward at this middle point of it. Of course, this issue regards many other conflicts within feminism (how the political party Feminist Initiative was treated by other feminists when starting, being a stripper and a feminist, appreciating how feminist art is exhibited in big museums while being critical of the commodification of struggle...) but still puts a special focus on generational conflict. With one feminist from each decade (1980’s to 1940’s⁵) writing their own piece of feminist historiography, *Bang* here constructs a timeline that is on one hand going backwards toward the future and disrupting teleological ideas, but on the other hand reproducing images of mother-daughter-figures, of ‘passing the torches’, of the 1970’s as the times of Real Feminism, and of generations. Because even though authors such as Ulrika Dahl writes that “anything said about something as non-homogenous as a ‘generation’ will be at most an understanding on what is reproduced and what is renegotiated in a certain time in a certain place” (Dahl, 2006:24, a.t.), and Paulina de los Reyes⁶ asks “what is meaningful about contrasting different generations against each other?” (de los Reyes, 2006:58, a.t.), this issue of *Bang*’s use of generation as ontologically true puts it in the same position I was standing at in the departure point of this project. Consequently, I have read it, felt it, believed it: I have created intimate relations to it. But it also made me feel sad, angry, and disappointed, and so I decided to acknowledge it, but not accept it as desirable. I practiced dis-identification with it, because of its use of generation as a concept in a way I can neither stand behind, nor think of as desirable.

Finally, I want to finish this part of this thesis on temporality, affect, citation, and conflict with a last quote from *Bang*, where once again Sara Edenheim’s “dearest beloved sister”

⁵ Sanna Berg (radical cheerleader and creator of fanzine *SannaMinaOrd*), Ulrika Dahl (now Professor of Gender Studies at Uppsala University), Ulrika Milles (writer who co-authored a book on practicing feminism together with Claudia Lindén), Paulina de los Reyes (now Professor of Economic History at Stockholm University and introducer of intersectionality in Swedish feminist studies), and Gunilla Thorgren (journalist and prominent member of *Grupp 8*).

⁶ Both of these authors have also been published in *TGV*, which is a further example on how academic/activist feminism are non-separable.

(2010:111, a.t.) Ebba Witt-Brattström expresses her opinion on gender researchers and queer activists: “Now, it seems like the soft times are over, at least in the small but well-organized world of gender studies, where conflicts between women are put on top of the agenda.” (Witt-Brattström, 2006:74, a.t.). I will embrace this sarcastic remark and stay with the trouble that is tension that is conflict.

Diving further into the ocean

I will start this part of my thesis by once again describing my material in chronological order, but with a little more depth this time. After that, I will divide my analysis into the theoretical themes I have chosen, according to what I believe to have been important in this conflict. I hope this structure will give you, the reader, a clearer idea of what the entanglement that is this thesis will be.

The discussion analyzed here sparked in TGV when Sara Edenheim (2010) wrote a piece dedicated to her “non-existing dearly beloved mothers” (2010:109, a.t.), in which she speaks directly to them. The text is written in Swedish and has a volume of 10 pages. In it, Edenheim argues that these ‘mothers’ implicitly as well as explicitly have been criticizing younger feminists for not acknowledging their work enough, for not doing enough work in the same ways they did, for working only as careeristic faux feminists in patriarchal academia. Further, Edenheim discusses how ‘they’ - the mothers - willingly misinterpret ‘us’ - the daughters - and how this relates to their “tendency to confuse ontological claims with epistemological [such]” (2010:112, a.t.). However, Edenheim also clearly states that this does not regard *all* ‘older feminists’, and that she does not speak for *all* ‘younger feminists’⁷, and therefore she mainly analyzes statements from “two central and in different ways influential feminists” (2010:110, a.t.): Ebba Witt-Brattström and Yvonne Hirdman. Witt-Brattström, born in 1953, is a famous Swedish feminist and Professor of Nordic Literature at University of Helsinki. She has, among other things, been an active member of feminist activist group Grupp 8 during the 1970’s, written books about Moa Martinson (Swedish proletary author) and Edith Södergran (Finno-Swedish modernist poet), and been a board member of the association for Feminist Initiative (“Ebba Witt-Brattström”, n.d.). Hirdman, born in 1943, is a well-known Swedish feminist and historian. She has, among other things, been Professor in Women’s History at University of Gothenburg, written books about Alva Myrdal (Swedish social democratic politician) and the Swedish Communist Party during the Second World War, and introduced a theory of gender systems in Sweden (“Yvonne Hirdman”, n.d.). Edenheim hence uses quotes from texts these two women have written to make her point clear that it is they

⁷ In a footnote, Edenheim states that her use of ‘us’ is defined rather by how they have been interpellated by older feminists as the lost generation, and by their explicit post-structuralist beliefs, than by age per se.

who makes this a question of generations and that this assumed difference between them because of age is a false construction: “our common experiences are not actually that unique.” (Edenheimer, 2010:110, a.t.). To conclude, Edenheimer further states that this conflict is not actually about generations at all, but about ideology, and asks rhetorically what is beneficial with representing it as such: such a representation makes way for a feminist melancholy where the future becomes apocalyptic and nostalgic only. This can, according to Edenheimer, be prevented by allowing “contradictory ideologies to co-exist, without a forced common past or an urge for consensus.” (2010:117, a.t.).

Nina Lykke (2012) responds to this by writing an article called *Generational feminism - no thanks!* (a.t.), which is written in Danish and has a total of 7 pages. The text starts off by stating that Lykke agrees with Edenheimer regarding the problematic effects that comes with using mother-daughter-metaphors while writing feminist historiography, and that we should stop interpreting ideological differences as generational differences. Lykke then continues with unpacking other ways of writing feminist histories, with references to Hemmings’ (2011) model of narratives of loss or progress, and the feminist waves metaphor and its relation to generational metaphors, and concludes that she, with references to Judith Butler, believes in dis-identification as a tool to figure out how to do feminist intra- or intergenerational work. Further, Lykke describes her personal need to dis-identify herself from where generational and waves metaphors situate her: “in the sisterhood of mothers’ [mosterskabets]⁸ maternalistic collective built on consensus, imaginary united under banners such as ‘the mother-generation’ and ‘second wave-feminism’.” (2012:31, a.t.), and ultimately asks “Can we be critical girl/friends [ven/inder⁹], Sara?” (ibid.:32, a.t.).

The third text in which Edenheimer (2013) retorts to Lykke is written in Swedish and consists of 8 pages. In this, Edenheimer claims that there is a “total consensus concerning critical research” (ibid.:138, a.t.) within academia but rhetorically asks if we are actually agreeing on what critical research is, or if we rather only suppose that we agree. She does this to be able to discuss what “critical” means when Lykke (2012:32) says it: “Does this then mean that I

⁸ The word *mosterskabet* is a wordplay on motherhood, *moderskab*, and refers to a motherhood of sisters: aunts on the mother’s side, *mostrar*.

⁹ *Ven/inder* includes both the feminine and masculine variants of the word friend in Danish, although it is not as explicitly gendered as girl/friends.

view myself as a ‘critical friend’ [NB the not exact quote] to everyone within this field? That I merely mean well, in all good sense, and point to flaws only when I find it justified? No, it means that I am critical. Not friend.” (Edenheimer, 2012:139, a.t.). Further, Edenheimer describes how critical friend is a concept with its roots in Educational Studies and as such is un-transferable to the field of research. While critical friends is an idea built on trust¹⁰, a research situation demands a decent behaviour, regardless of if you know the other person or not, and because trust can only exist after you know someone personally, there is, according to Edenheimer, an implicit demand for consensus in the use of the word friend in this context. In addition to this, Edenheimer argues that Lykke, in her defining Judith Butler’s research as intersectional, strives to combine two ontologically different ideologies (intersectionality and post-structuralism) because of her wish for consensus rather than “a stringent argument grounded in a research-based need” (Edenheimer, 2013:140, a.t.) for the combination of the two. In this segment, Edenheimer also returns to the idea of friends and states that she “considers everyone who wants to join the struggle of what feminism *can be* as feminists, regardless of if they are my friends or not and regardless of if we share opinions or not.” (ibid.:141, emphasis in original, a.t.) and sees a need to clarify one’s ontological standpoint rather than dis-identifying yourself. She then does so by stating her idea of how “[t]he non-identical feminism is hence only interested in kinship such as mothership and sisterhood in terms of *objects of study*” and how kinship, used in the another, worse way, “represses fundamental conflicts in order to maintain an imaginary dream of the perfect and hospitable feminist family” (ibid., emphasis in original, a.t.). Returning to concepts of criticism, friend, and dis-identification, Edenheimer concludes by stating that she observes the use of them as a de-politicization according to liberal assimilation within the field of gender studies, which even though we neither want it nor have it as an explicit aim, cannot get away from, and finally asks “[w]hat do we think should happen?” (ibid.:144, a.t.).

To wrap the discussion up, Lykke (2013) gives her retort to Edenheimer and writes 1 last page in Danish. Starting off on a first name basis where she writes “Hello Sara.” (ibid.:145, a.t.)

¹⁰ According to Edenheimer (2013:139), it is an exercise where a teacher asks a colleague they *trust* to observe and criticize an educational situation. Important in this exercise is *commensurability*, that the ‘friends’ understand each other well, and that the focus is on the students’ learning processes rather than the teacher’s performance.

and thanks her for her response to the first article, Lykke states that she does not recognize Edenheim's interpretation of it since Lykke's "suggestion to understand the relationship between differently situated feminists as 'critical girl/friendships [ven/indeskaber]' has nothing to do with the Swedish educational tradition [Edenheim] speak[s] of. Neither is it sprung from the Swedish fetishism of consensus, which works exotifying on [Lykke] as non-Swedish." (ibid., a.t.). Partly agreeing with Edenheim, Lykke continues: "I (suppose I) agree with you that consensus politics are problematic." (ibid., a.t.) and that her "modest" suggestion of a critical girl/friendship was rather one of an alternative political feminist figuration to be able to escape from the metaphor of 'sisterhood' and both its connection to standpoint feminist identity politics and "unfortunate" associations to biological kinship. That We, the "us, who in many different ways are interpellated by the signifier 'feminist'" (ibid., a.t.), could use words for the alignments that stretches and mobilizes us over differences. Once again using Edenheim's first name, Lykke states that there is actually no room for a discussion on Judith Butler and intersectionality in this fora and shortly says that she disagrees with Edenheim's "canonical reading of Butler's criticism" (ibid.:146, a.t.) regarding intersectionality, and lastly ends this whole discussion with a seemingly simple "Best regards, Nina Lykke" (ibid., a.t.).

Temporality and its constructions

'Your time ain't long, you don't belong'
Maybe so but you hope that they're wrong.
[...]
Here it comes, here it comes, feel it comin'.
backlash,
backlash,
backlash.

Jett & Westerberg, 1991

The use of time metaphors and writing forward temporality is not uncommon within feminist history, culture, or theory. Most commonly used is probably the metaphor of the wave, one that I have myself taken a spin on here. With the use of this, you write the history of

feminism according to the splitting of it into three established¹¹ waves where the first is the wave regarding women's suffrage, the second is regarding private issues (such as family, sexual, or reproductive questions) as political, and the third is regarding intersectional questions, internet-feminism, and riot-girls. Related to the waves-metaphor is also the use of the word backlash, which is seen as a current that works as a negative reaction toward developments in equal rights. Other writings in feminist history according to temporal states are the ones that demands that "It is 2019, we should have come further...", "Time is catching up", or "Now is the time of...". In *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* - for example, there have been texts published on the theme *The Un/Timeliness of...* under the headline *Taking Turns*, which they explain as "an open forum for brief and rapid assessments of changes emerging in the field, and its discontents" (Rönblom & Åsberg, 2010:48). Three articles are written on this theme, one by Harriet Silius (concerning a social turn in feminist studies), one by Nina Lykke (concerning post-constructionism), and one by Elizabeth Grosz (concerning feminist theory and time). It is in this piece Grosz demands her readers, us, me, to take seriously the question of time within feminist research and even states that "our very object and milieu is time" (Grosz, 2010:51). This is also a foundation in the previously mentioned piece by Lindén which in the summary says its aim is to "explore some of the ways that time constructions and time metaphors attain significance in contemporary feminist theory" (2012:5). Following these two researchers, I here want to further examine how time is constructed and how temporal metaphors work in these articles.

The choice to examine this is based on the belief that words have impact and effect the world they also are effected by. They are both performative and representing: the material world is understood through those discursive practices that exist within it but that can also change it, as "subject and object do not preexist as such, but emerge through intra-actions" (Barad, 2007:89). Writing feminist history according to time metaphors such as waves also writes feminists into the connotated positions of that wave which hence reproduces itself as a regulatory ideal (cf Butler, 1993:3): I, as born in the 1990's, raised in 'the third wave' and grown up in a 'backlash', am supposed to think certain things, believe in certain philosophies, and practice feminism in certain ways. In Edenheim's text it is ironically formulated as

¹¹ Some might say we now work in the fourth wave and some might say we are now in a post-feminist state. This is however still debated and therefore not established.

“building our career within the patriarchal academy, throwing away sisterhood together with the unborn child, and thresh incomprehensible theory in a yoga studio, far away from reality” (2010:109, a.t.) and in Lykke’s it is ironically said that “the daughters only sit with their books instead of going out and fight to improve the world for all women” (Lykke, 2012:28, a.t.). So, when we write history or describe something according to temporal metaphors or even divide time into then and now, we are doing something - we are not passively writing or simply describing reality: we are reproducing, and/or perhaps transforming it. The words used in doing this can be different, may it be generations, waves, paradigm shifts or others, but they do have performative effects that influence the way we think about time and history and people in relation to those too. Thus, words relating to time are important (I suppose one could call them nodal points in this case, would one want to use terms of discourse analysis) to scrutinize to be able to notice what performative effects they could have.

The article that sparked the discussion I am analyzing is called *A few words for my dear mothers, if I had had any* (Edenheim, 2010, a.t.), and it is also what made me interested in those generational temporal descriptions of other feminists. This is hence where we will start: in the articles written by Sara Edenheim. In the first text of the four, Edenheim writes in an appeal toward a “you” that are called mothers, and even starts off by saying that they have asked her and others of her group not to throw away their legacy and commit matricide as a teenage riot. The metaphors relating to terms of family are recurring throughout this article, and follow us in the continuance of this discussion. Sometimes it is more explicit than others, like when Edenheim states that relationships as metaphors such as mother- or sisterhood at worst “suppress basic conflicts to enforce an imaginary dream of the perfect and hospitable feminist family” (2013:141, a.t.), and sometimes more implicit as in Lykke’s answer, where she writes that her idea of a critical girl/friendship is based on the prerequisite that we, as feminists, are in need of “figurations that in an affirmative way map both the intellectual and embodied/affective relationships that mobilize us across differences” (2013:146, a.t.). These metaphors, however, is not taken out of thin air. Not only are, as described above, time metaphors in general common when writing feminist history, but family metaphors in particular are common as well.

When writing this, I have occupied a classroom on the fourth floor of the Department of Cultural Sciences at University of Gothenburg. It is not nearly my first time being here, I have had my fair share of exams, seminars, group discussions, and hangouts here during my time of study. However, today, while on a break, I notice a sticker in the bathroom which says “we carry on, sisters” [vi tar vid systrar, a.t.] and displays a drawn picture of women demonstrating for bread and roses, dressed in clothes with connotations to the early 20th century, and so seems to say that we should remember our supposed ‘sisters of struggle’ and continue on the fight they started. While this could be viewed as a transformation of the idea of time as linear (as someone demonstrating in 1912 could hardly be someone studying at this department in 2019’s sister by blood), this also reproduces the image of feminism and alliance based on an assumed unconditional, family-based love and responsibility. It is further acknowledged by Edenheim on several occasions that this could be harmful, e.g. when she promotes a feminism that is “only interested in kinship such as mother- and sisterhood as *objects of study*” (2013:141, a.t.) rather than one that strives to position each and every feminist (and in extension, woman) as either mother, daughter, or sister. Because these metaphors are not only not taken out of thin air in a historical or metaphorical perspective, they are also closely related to at least one of the defendants of Edenheim’s first article: Ebba Witt-Brattström.

As mentioned earlier, Witt-Brattström was part of 1970’s feminist activist group Grupp 8, and has written her memoirs on the theme. These memoirs are called *Oh, all dearly beloved sisters: the story about my 1970’s* (Witt-Brattström, 2010, a.t.), the title in itself a reference to a musical number from the theatre play *Jösses flickor!*, written in 1973. The play deals with the history of the women’s rights movement, and the song quoted is called *Befrielsen är nära* and goes partly like this: “Oh, all dearly beloved sisters, the day is finally here when we give each other our support. [...] And some day the children will say: thank you, mothers, you did well.” (Edander, 1973, a.t.). Since “matter is enfolded into itself in its ongoing materialization” (Barad, 2007:180), these family-related metaphors exists as a matter in the materialization of what is supposedly the Swedish feminist history, and since “[t]he dynamics of mattering are nonlinear” (ibid.), we cannot and should not strive to separate that which was before and that which became later - the ontoepistemological are entangled. But as these metaphors get to work, are put in process, they re-produce a narrative of a supposed ‘mother’

that can only teach the ‘daughter’ to not make the same mistakes she did, that cannot remain in the discourse but is forever stuck in that time when she herself was a ‘daughter’, the one position of these that can be truly subversive and create change. These metaphors in family terms are hence closely connected to the Older feminists Edenheim directs her first article to, as well as to the 1970’s and the ‘second-wave feminism’ that supposedly took place then and consisted of certain things. Perhaps this is why these concepts are too very present in Edenheim’s writings. Throughout the first article, Edenheim mentions several things that connotes ‘what they did back then’: “Many of us have ourselves lived in collective houses, eaten lentil stew, and organized separatist women’s cafés.” (Edenheim, 2010:110, a.t.) and “We *know* Grupp 8 successfully implemented a big number of reforms through eager demonstrating and referral writing” (ibid.:111, a.t.). She also asks what ‘they’ expect ‘us’ to do with ‘their’ history: “Build altars and write epinicions? Dress in Mah Jong¹² and demonstrate for daycare for all?” (ibid.:114, a.t.). This constructs feminism (singular, not one of many) that belongs in the 1970’s - if these are the things that signify feminism and feminists, and those things were done in ‘the second wave’, the 1970’s, since we are now in 2019 we have supposedly moved beyond these things. Through these writing, one performatively creates the idea of ‘us’ existing in a post-feminist state and so, in part, continuing the “post-feminist habit of critiquing women who have come before us (and as a consequence repeating the patriarchal concept of Oedipal generationality).” (van der Tuin, 2009:23).

Through those sticky, affective objects (I will come back to this) that are connotated to a certain time and place, Edenheim places the Older Feminists as well as their practices there: in that temporal condition which is ‘the second wave’, constructing Them (the Other, the Older Feminists) as left behind, as still living in a world where their way is the right, the only, way of practicing feminism. However, Edenheim also disclaims this process of Othering several times. In the first footnote, two paragraphs into the article, she writes: “The ‘us’ I use here is not necessarily de facto the younger generation of feminist researchers, but those of us who (against our will) have been interpellated by some older feminist researchers as the *lost* generation” (Edenheim, 2010:118, a.t.). Supposedly, this would mean that it the ‘us’ is not set

¹² Mah-Jong was a Swedish fashion company active in 1966-76. They produced an ‘anti-fashion’ with political connotations (Mah-Jong, n.d.).

in stone, neither is the ‘them’, which is explained a few rows further down: “not all ‘older feminists’ express these opinions” (ibid.:109, a.t.). Edenheim even goes on to explicitly name ‘older’ feminists who are in her bookcase to show her standpoint: that this conflict is in itself not generational but ideological, which also “affirms the importance of these writers’ work, so as to reinstall continuity between women” (van der Tuin, 2009:23) without falling into the trap of mother-daughter-sister. Despite this, and her ambition of “avoid[ing] a reproduction of the politics that materialized this body” (Edenheim, 2013:142, a.t.), for me these texts reproduce ideas of generational conflict as actually built on generation, and that itself as ontologically true. When reading the texts in the beginning of my research process, I truly felt her anger toward these Older feminists, I felt it too, I felt it with her.

Thus, in Edenheim’s articles, the Other is created as a feminist of a different, older generation. Her writings, though thoroughly disclaimed several times throughout the texts, performatively construct those Others almost as 1970’s ghosts, as people whose criticism is “not always easy to grasp; it is more feelable than visible. It sneaks around seminar rooms, embodies itself in sighs and looks, or is hinted about in media” (Edenheim, 2010:109, a.t.). They are constructed as ghosts that are always already whispering behind her back. In the words of Derrida, the older feminist becomes a ghost that “[...] never dies, it remains always to come and come back.” (Derrida, 1994:99).

As Nina Lykke enters the discussion with her piece *Generational feminism - no thanks!* (2012, a.t.), she continues the use of family and time metaphors, or at least she uses them. Because when reading this article, I get the feeling Lykke does not actually want to write it, I feel like she is put in a position from which she needs to respond, as a supposed Older Feminist. However, she does use them and is therefore part of this narrative. Just as I mentioned before, Ebba Witt-Brattström wrote her memoirs regarding her 1970’s, a move which Lykke chooses to do as well. She writes “I am happy to stand for my individual feminist history and the moment of my entrance into the stage of the feminist movement.” (Lykke, 2012:30, a.t.) and continues to write about demonstrations in Copenhagen during the 1970’s with intersectional parols about class, gender, and sexuality while also stating that she has “during this journey disidentified [her]self with [her] own earlier standpoints” (2012:31, a.t.). This is done partly because of Lykke’s belief in a “politics of localization” (2012:30,

a.t.) but I also believe it to be a strategic decision to do it. Since Edenheim (2010) constructs the Other Older feminist as one that can only have been active in the “second wave”, one that sees the Younger as unwilling to create practical - real - change, one that views a feminism that takes into consideration other power hierarchies than gender as identity politics, this supposed Other Older feminist is put into a position from where she must respond: if she does not, perhaps it would seem like she agrees. And she does not. Thus, Lykke tells us, or Edenheim, about how she indeed did disidentify herself with the older feminists then, the bourgeoisie ones that stood for the first feminist wave and women’s suffrage, and thereby continues the creation of waves as inherently natural and different, even though she finishes off with explaining how she believes feminist history needs to be understood through inter- and intragenerational perspectives, just as Edenheim seems to think.

During the time of writing this thesis, I receive a novel from someone close to me. It is a “Generational novel of superb class”, according to the blurb on the cover and tells the story of three women, a grandmother, a mother, and a daughter, living in Stockholm in different times during the 20th century. Another blurb on the inside of the cover says the novel is a “feminist feel bad-novel”, yet another calls it “the female generational novel 2.0”, according to a third it regards “a hundred years of women’s lives in a generational novel”. I am an avid listener to the author’s podcast, in which she has stated that she considers herself an artist. Not a professional feminist, but an author-artist that wants to create good art. Being in the middle of the writing/reading/thinking-process while listening to this, I cannot help but wonder if Ebba Witt-Brattström actually made a valid point in Bang (2006): maybe I *am* just obsessed with conflicts between women? If it is so, why is that? And further, why am I so stuck on the process of generation? Am I too only reproducing a harmful image of women, feminists, gender scholars being so busy with our own problems that we don’t see the real problems going on the real world? Why are women’s stories connected to generation, to family, to what their (fore)mothers did? Is telling other women’s stories a demand for acknowledgement of the work women did, the emotions they felt, the wrongs that were done to them, or does it become The Only Story? When looking for a good translation of generational novel from Swedish to English, I come across an explanation which gives examples of the genre: out of four, three are written by men, and one by a woman. That novel too concerns a woman in Stockholm during the 20th century, and her family-related

relationships while the ones written by men tell stories of coming of age or finding yourself, the focus lies on the individual man rather than the individual woman-in relation to her relations. In these supposedly universal novels, there are often statements such as “you know *this* if you are a woman” or “being a woman means *this*”. I do not mean to sound like someone who has “never experienced patriarchal structures” or who think “women should tell their own stories, not just listen to *feminism*”, but when these statements are being reproduced into me, when they are being drummed into my head, the performative aspects of my womanhood become easier to perform. I internalize the wrongs that were done to my (fore)mothers and believe them to be mine to act on. I become a *better* woman, performancewise, by reading such statements, it becomes easier to play a convincing role. In the theatre that is life I dress up as generations and generations of women, I fall into the patterns they tell me I should not fall into, because by telling me what it means to be a woman, what it means to be hurt by patriarchal men, I internalize the wrongs that have been done to them. Through this, I am unable to speak outside the generational framework: I have been too imprinted by the luggage I am carrying.

As I mentioned before, when using time metaphors such as waves to write feminist history, one also writes the people of those waves, feminists of different time-space-matterings, into the connotated positions of that wave: positions that are expected to have certain feminist questions at heart, and that are expected to (in a progress narrative, which I will return to later) have done certain things wrong. This position making through time metaphors is done both by each own to themselves, but also to one another in this discussion. In some of my readings of these texts, I felt the authors were trapped. Trapped in positions of expected opinions, generations, ideologies... I felt that they were trapped in a narrative which they could not flee from, one that both made them the feminists they wanted to be and the feminist they expected the other to be, but that they also were part in constructing this same narrative through it. Through considering how time and the authors in relation to temporality are constructed in these articles, I came to see the differences and samenesses that lay within this conflict-entanglement. Perhaps, neither Edenheim nor Lykke actually wanted to write in these time metaphors, but were put there and expected to stay there. This is the recurring aspect of this discussion: the positions with their belonging frames are there, empty, but become filled by different feminists in different time-space-matterings. Things I believe can

differ in this mode of discussion however, is how the argument is put forward. I will elaborate on this in my next chapter.

Affections and their effects

Related to differences within and entanglements between subjects, objects, or abjects, are of course emotion and affect. This conflict, these articles, consists of words of emotions (as do everything) and since the “phenomenon ‘includes’ the apparatuses or phenomena out of which it is constituted” (Barad, 2007:217), I believe emotion, or perhaps the presumed lack thereof, to be equally important to scrutinize when attending to a diffractive approach in this conflict. When thinking of and working with emotion and affect, my gut reaction as a student in Gender Studies, is to turn to Sara Ahmed. In this particular context, this have might be even more effective than I realized from the beginning since affections are part of the entanglements which are positioned in alliances through citations. This is because you cite out of reason, you cite out of emotion. When you cite, you ally yourself with a certain crowd, research community, theoretical strand - those alliances are not always rational. I will return to the topic of citation later on, and will therefore, for now, conclude that affections, positionings, and citations are inseparable and as such, all part of the phenomena. Emotions also “tell us a lot about time; emotions are the very ‘flesh’ of time. [...]. Through emotions, the past persists on the surface of bodies.” (Ahmed, 2004:202). In this fashion, the phenomena equals the body equals the emotions equals the entanglements in the specific time-space-matter. But hold on now, let’s not float away in this ocean of theory, let’s instead swim toward the beach that is the material of this thesis.

When reading these four articles, you will immediately notice that Edenheim and Lykke have used very different writing styles. Edenheim writes long sentences with complicated concepts from several different disciplines, references things the reader supposedly ‘should’ know¹³ (she does not have them in the bibliography, that is), and have in total written 10 more pages than Nina Lykke in this exchange of ideas. Lykke on the other hand uses a different storytelling technique: she often writes from her own perspective through the use of Me, Mine, My or I, uses a direct appeal toward Sara, whom she calls just that, Sara or You, rather

¹³ Which I am aware I sometimes do too, and it is a slippery slope to fall on.

than Edenheim, and seems to write much shorter, in an almost reserved way. It seems to me, that even though it is Edenheim who published the first article and therefore, perhaps, would have the advantage to have chosen the topic, the format, and so on, it is Lykke who has the upper hand. In contrast to Edenheim, I sometimes felt like Lykke's calm and almost compliant voice worked as a way to keep the social hierarchy in which Lykke, the older feminist who has been through things, who have experienced things, and who is a Professor of Gender Studies, is constructed as the queen of the hill. This position in the discussion is one which is characterized by the lack of emotion rather than explicit such: since you are already put in the "higher" position, you do not need to get emotional, you can use whatever technique you would like, you can even be passive-aggressive or use a direct appeal. You do not need to be bothered that other people will read, think, or analyze your text, because you are already put in a position from which you are free to speak. This position might be one of a 'ghost', or one of an established person versus someone less established; in whichever case it is untouchable.

Sticky objects/signifiers stick to certain bodies. An example of this is from the same quote used in the previous chapter: "Many of us have even ourselves lived in collective houses, eaten lentil stew, and organized separatist women's cafés." (Edenheim, 2010:110, a.t.), and asks what 'they' expect 'us' to do with 'their' history: "Build altars and write epinicions? Dress in Mah Jong and demonstrate for daycare for all?" (ibid.:114, a.t.). As mentioned before, this constructs a feminism that belongs in the 1970's. So how do these affective signifiers get stuck to the Other-Older feminist? When Lykke, here taking the role of the Other-Older feminist, describes her 1970s, she does so by trying to explain that she actually have no interest in being discursively put in a "sisterhood of mothers [mosterskab]" (Lykke 2012:30, a.t.), but rather wishes to put forward her *own* 1970s, her *own* time in the "feminist demonstrations on the streets of Copenhagen" (ibid.), where they had intersectional parols: hence trying to broaden the image of the 'second wave feminist'. The point here is not to once again explain how time is constructed in this passage, but to make visible how the connotations to certain time-space-matterings are imprinted by emotions, which make affect an important part of these articles. Lykke here becomes put in contrast to the, also previously mentioned, affirming of other Older feminists, feminists born around the same time as the constructed Other-Older feminists, but who Edenheim and her 'we' "read and refer to"

(2010:115, a.t.) rather than fight against. The positions in the discussion thus become characterized by that which, through its stickiness, connotes a certain time-space-mattering, that is, a certain 'wave'. When Edenheim then puts these sticky objects on those certain bodies that are already expected to have relations to those objects, she does it with a disidentifying purpose: she shows that she is familiar with the objects and since "the negative gesture in disidentification is always already driven by a sometimes-disturbing or at-least-surprising affirmation." (van der Tuin, 2015:101), she also puts herself in a position from which she can only be affected, from which she will have to respond, because her disidentification calls for a reaction that cannot stand for itself - it needs a counter-reaction.

Further, Edenheim builds some straw/wo/men by what she imagines 'they', the Other-Older feminists, don't like about 'us'/'our' feminism. I have previously mentioned the ironic use of yoga or careering as feminist self realization, but this is also done through the use of what the 'ghosts' would be expected to say. Facebook-activism, for example, is not explicitly mentioned in any quote from neither Ebba Witt-Brattström nor Yvonne Hirdman, but Edenheim brings it up (2010:113) when comparing what methods for change were supposedly used in the 1970s and what methods for change are used today. This can of course have been done for many reasons, but for me it seemed like a way to ground the idea of difference, as the absence of sameness (Minh-ha, 1988). As Edenheim, as well as Lykke, believes alliances should not have be built on consensus but rather on differences, differences need to be put forward. Since Edenheim believes that "the demands for solidarity between and within generations is not only incomprehensible but in some cases directly harmful since it requires similarity and recognition" (Edenheim, 2013:144, a.t.) but at the same time, in the beginning of her first text lists things many feminists of 'her generation' did, i.e. eating lentil stew, organizing separatist women's cafés, and reading feminist theory outside academia, which were the same as those practices of an Other-Older Generation, she puts herself in a position from which she must emphasize differences between them: she needs to position herself and them in the positions given from the narrative. So even though Edenheim seems to strive to not being mixed up with these Other-Older feminists (difference), she simultaneously, perhaps subconsciously or perhaps as a strategy to dismantle the framework she is in, deconstructs the binary opposition of difference, or conflict, meaning the absence of sameness.

It seems Edenheim has been positioned as the main lead when accusations of bringing feminism to becoming all about what they call identity politics, rather than recognition politics which gives the term more negative and shallow connotations, are being formulated by the Other-Older feminists. When Edenheim writes about this, she becomes very textually emotional: “It was *you* who believed in a universal revolution which would change everything from the ground, while it is *us* who believe that even if a revolution in the unlikely would be possible, it would still be packed, copyrighted, and sold out on a contract to the lowest bidder. You created identity politics (“sisterhood”) with its blind alleys and marks of territory - not us.” (Edenheim, 2010:116-117, a.t., emphasis in original). This outburst of affect is not surprising from a theoretical perspective, since Ahmed (2004) describes that affections come from the expected effect the relation between subject and object will have. Ahmed exemplifies with a bear and a child: the child is afraid of the bear, even though it has never before encountered one. This fear is imprinted in the child’s body but only in relation to the bear because it “shapes the surfaces of bodies in relation to objects” (ibid.:8), hence affect is relational. If Edenheim has previously been hurt, misquoted, and misunderstood on purpose by those she categorize as Other-Older feminists, that hurtfulness, that pain, will always already be *there* when that relation comes back to ‘haunt’ her. As I said before, the Other-Older feminists are constructed as ‘ghosts’, following closely behind Edenheim, ready to chop down anything she says, as they are positioned in a safe position, higher and indisputable in the hierarchy of gender research. Perhaps they actually are present, perhaps they are whispering behind her back, and misquoting her in front of her, constantly trying to blacken her name. Can we then blame Edenheim for her affect? If she is put in the position of a newbie by others, more established gender researchers, she is forced to talk from that position even though she might not believe they will even listened. Perhaps then the only way to speak is in affect.

The authors are both using this fora, this open arena, to, as I stated before, write in a way that expects the reader to know what they are writing about, they are offered the chance and they take it. When writing in such a context, I believe it to be especially careful with one’s references and to be transparent in your writing. I will explore this theme and continue these thoughts in the next chapter.

Placing oneself in the field of citation

As I have mentioned before, TGV has a status as the only Swedish-written scientific journal in Gender Studies. Hence, the articles published within it will reach many people who are active in the discipline, and so it works authoritatively toward its reader. As a somewhat experienced student in Gender Studies with a Bachelor's degree and as a current Master programme's student, I consider myself aware of how to read critically, how not to expect a text to tell me the Truth, how to work with the texts I read instead of believing them to do the work for me. Still, I have a lot of faith in TGV and trust that what they publish is readworthy and, in some way, an authoritative voice telling me that 'what is published here is believable'. The confidence capital in relation to me, as a student, reading it is hence big. When writing and publishing on such an arena, you therefore create certain alliances through your citations. You might have a co-worker, a friend, an acquaintance that you have read because of your personal relationship, and you choose to cite to help them. It might be a supervisor that you cite because you know their texts intimately. It might be a random source that you found while reading references and jumping forward from there. The reasons you cite the way you do though, is not visible to the reader (especially if that reader is new to the field), and however you choose your references, they place you in a certain company. Therefore politics of citation becomes extra important to scrutinize in a field like this, where a discipline's knowledge is concentrated and recognized as high up in the hierarchy. Says Hemmings: "If Western feminists can be attentive to the political grammar of our storytelling, if we can highlight reasons why that attention might be important, then we can also intervene to change the way we tell stories." (2011:2). Since we can never be objective, and we always write from a certain position, we always write ourselves into a position and therefore into a group, an alliance. We cite some, fight some, we dis/identify ourselves textually. So how do the authors of these texts do this?

Since this part of the entanglement that is this thesis regards citations, I have looked into the explicit references in all four texts, and will discuss the things I found interesting. To start with, Edenheim's only theoretical explicit reference in her first article is a text by Robyn Wiegman called *Feminism's Apocalyptic Futures* (2000). However, Edenheim have chosen to

quote the translated version in Swedish, and to reference that one instead. This is one of my earliest thoughts on citation in this project: why? Perhaps I am mistaken, but I believe I have learnt quite early on in my studies to quote the original if possible. While this might not be a problem, I found it interesting to look into the journal in which the article was published in Swedish. It is called *Fronesis*, and the particular article was published in an issue called *Feminism and the left* (Feminismen och vänstern, 2008, a.t.) under a segment called *Feminist becomings* (a.t.). The text was translated by Sofi Hjalmarsson and fact-checked by Anja Kristiansson, but it also was shortened from the original (Feminismen och vänstern, 2008:251). Beverly Skeggs, whom Edenheim (2012) quotes, is published in the same issue under another segment and other than Robyn Wiegman, translated versions of texts by Sara Ahmed and Wendy Brown were published under the same segment. The segment itself was introduced by a text called *Out of joint is the time of feminism!* by Sara Edenheim, that is, the same title Claudia Lindén (2012) used in her article which concerns a conflict in which Edenheim was involved. I am telling you, the reader, this because I want to show how citation relates to emotions, to familiarity, and to ambiance. Edenheim writes an introduction to these three translated texts, thereby she becomes intimately familiar with them: just as I quote who I know have written on the topics, so does Edenheim. Thus, when writing, citing, and referencing, you are placing yourself in theoretical community, which might not only be based on merits. And even if it is, citation is a merit that require friendship. Further, when explaining to the Other-Older feminists that the conflict between them is purely ideological rather than generational, Edenheim mentions six feminist theorists, without referencing them (and without telling the reader anything about them but their birth year). Further, she tells an anecdote in which she and a colleague have been reading Virginia Woolf and Simone de Beauvoir, respectively (Edenheim, 2010:115). After this story, she again turns to the Other-Older feminists and states that they did not actually read the version she believed them to be happy they had read, the “censored”, translated version of *Le deuxième sexe* from 1973, and continues with an ironic comment toward the (assumed) translators: “thanks for that, Bjurström and Pyk” (ibid., a.t.). This edition is not properly referenced, neither is it explicitly told who Bjurström and Pyk are.

Moving on to Lykke, her main reference goes out to Clare Hemmings and her works that I too have chosen to think with here. In her first text, she dedicates two and a half page out of

six to describe the theories of loss, progress, and return narratives in feminist storytelling. Because Lykke has a direct appeal toward Edenheim throughout both her texts, when reading this I sometimes felt like she was explaining Hemmings' theories to her, as a strategy to at the same time position herself as informed on the topic, and position Edenheim as not having thought her article through the whole way. By explaining how time metaphors such as waves are part of a return narrative which is damaging to the movement (Lykke, 2012:28-30), Lykke hence creates an alliance with Hemmings, one that Edenheim is not part of. Of course, I believe Hemmings' theories to be fruitful in relation to these topics of generation, time, and feminist storytelling (otherwise I would not have used them myself), and I suppose that in a shallow reading it could be seen as if Lykke is only trying to broaden the discussion, trying to contextualize it, trying to theoreticize it, but in the entanglement that this conflict and discussion is, I believe to be a way of positioning yourself as one that is more knowledgeable and more established: one that can hold a distance toward the topic discussed and still be textually rational, even though it is indeed personal. One action can also have several effects: the spirit of Lykke's choice to write in this sense might have been one of these ideas or something completely different, but to me it seems as both a positioning statement and a way to enhance the discussion to become something more than stuck on harmful terms of generations and waves.

Reading the two authors together, I realized that the main issue I had in regards to citation was how they spoke about Judith Butler. In some readings of these texts, I felt like the authors were having a competition on who knew Judith Butler's opinions best and that I was only an ignorant bystander, trying to keep up with the discussion of the elite. This Butler Competition continues throughout all four articles and each author creates the other one as less knowledgeable around her writings, and hence positions the other as less belonging to the field, since the field expect the participants to be knowledgeable on Butler's ideas. In my Bachelor's thesis (Östling, 2017), one of the participants said "I believe Butler and her books and theories about relations between sex and gender to have the most prominent position [on the field of Gender Studies]. As the acme of a feminist theoretical progress. As if Butler is the one who 'organized everything'" (ibid.:26, a.t.). This quote has stayed with me, as it points to how I have experienced Butler being talked about in my education in Gender Studies. She has been seen as some kind of, almost moral, higher ground, who truly organized everything and

in some ways ‘finished’ the assumed work an assumed feminism had been about. As if performativity were the only word we needed to learn to be able to talk about sex and gender. That these authors have a discussion around whose interpretations are the most “right” are hence not a coincidence, and has an effect on me that I believe them to be knowing in this field - not only about Judith Butler and her theories, but in the field as such. The discussion ends when Lykke, from the position of an established Other-Older feminist states that they do not have enough space to have that discussion here, and finishes off with a quote to make her point. Throughout the discussion on Butler’s actual opinions, both authors go referencing away without actually referencing: they simply expect the reader to understand what they are talking about. This is done in more places than regarding Butler too. Edenheim, for example, states that “[f]eminist is a floating signifier - not a nodal point” (Edenheim, 2013:141, a.t.). I haven’t myself read a lot about discourse analysis, never used it properly in a project, but am only aware that these words cohere to this methodology. This, perhaps unaware, perhaps ironic, use of technical terms works really discouraging for me as an aspiring PhD student, scaring me away and most importantly, the non-referencing makes me unable to actually check the sources and learn more. At the same time, the authors are writing in a context where they probably expect the reader to be in the same field as they are, and to understand those references without problems, which I also believe to be important. Every text you publish can perhaps not be understood by everyone: if you always have to explain the same things, how can you ever think deeper on those matters? Simultaneously I felt a desperate need to have the possibility to learn what these writers new, in some perspective I believe I do see them as authorities, perhaps not as mothers, sisters, aunts, but as guiding friends that can help me in my interest of becoming more knowledgeable.

Working autoethnographically, and wanting to be transparent about my positions, I find it important not only to scrutinize the citation practices in the material but in my own work as well. Many of the things I cite are works from the literature lists of the courses I have taken. Others are pieces written by people I know (or myself), and some are texts I have only scrolled through or found one quote from. As mentioned before, I believe citation to be a merit which requires friendship - citation is not ‘unpolitical’ or ‘unemotional’. ”Citation practices produce consensus on the difference between eras of feminist theory, however these are valued, and they allow the narrator to remain the subject of feminist theory in the present,

however hard she must struggle to retain this position.” (Hemmings, 2011:161). Another today at the fourth floor of my department, the same place I noticed the sticker mentioned earlier, I remembered and paid attention to some pictures that we hang at one of the department's end of term-parties a few years ago. Each classroom at this the fourth floor where only we, the people within the humanities, move got a picture depicting a feminist theorists of importance. The writers pictured are Virginia Woolf, Trinh Minh-ha, and Simone de Beauvoir, but there might have been one or two more that have fallen down which I cannot remember. I was present at the party when these paintings were being hung and though a bit tipsy at the time, I remember the event when they were put up as celebrational, almost ceremonial. I truly felt their presence, I felt I was part of a history and a future. We had even created them together during the night of the party! So though I did not only learn a Western feminist historiography through these pictures, I learnt to see these thinkers as authorities, as someone whose thought processes I should adhere to and continue and develop. And of course I am not saying their ideas are not something worthy of hoisting but to me, they were made into important authorities that should be looked up to rather than thought with. So even though I might not have used them as main sources here, they have definitely did have an impact on this thesis and on my knowledges of the gender research-field in general. I believe this is also how certain names appear in written texts but not in the reference lists: the writers and their books are seen as such authorities that they both have had an impact that is hard to visualize, and that it seems like everyone knows them anyways. Perhaps though, I am thorough this writing placing myself too in the already fixed position of the newbie, of the person that has to prove themself, in relation to the establie where someone else, more knowledgeable, more experienced, more published, more quoted, will be put in the position of the Other-Older feminist.

To conclude this part, I believe that authors, writers, researchers, through our citations not only puts ourselves in a theoretical community or alliance, but also puts others in other positions. This becomes especially visible when seen in a debate like this, where those positions are put in contrast to each other. I believe that those positions are created through narratives, but also reproduces narratives: they are not ontologically ‘true’, but becomes true epistemology too. They construct narratives but are also constructed by narratives. These

positions may have differences and samenesses but the samenesses must, for the sake of the argument, be put to the side; otherwise the conflict would seem pointless.

Controlling the waves from my lifeboat

It is now the last time I am adding something to this document. After an intense period of writing, I finally came to realize what I had sensed, what had been the problem. It was only after the defence held three weeks before deadline that I could pinpoint it, and it was only by asking for help and receiving lots that I could understand what I had written and how to finish it. I want it to be clear that this process has not been easy. Let me repeat myself: “[o]ften, I wanted to leave the thesis behind, and just as often, I wanted to pour my whole bodymind into it.” (Östling, 2019:4). The internalization of your work and the seemingly unbreakable bond between you, the writer, and your text made me completely miserable at worst, and a very passionate writer at best. I am not sure it was worth it, and I am definitely not sure I would recommend it. However, I believe this is what made my project feel important. I needed to depart from myself, from experiences I had had, from ideas that had grown for a long time - but I just as well needed guidance to grasp the issue and distance from it to be able to create. Allowing research to be a creative process, allowing said process to take time and rest, and allowing myself to perhaps not ‘succeed’ in finishing this process is what made me be able to finish this project. All work and no play makes us dull, it makes us uninterested in our work and it makes us exhausted. If we want to do something that is of importance to us and others, we cannot be exhausted. Being careful, full of care, not only in relation to my material and my thesis but in relation to my personal life, my relationships, and my mental health is, what it seems like now, the only way I can recommend the practice of doing research according to my experiences in this project.

In this thesis, I have analyzed a problem of how we as gender researchers position ourselves and others, temporally, affectively, and through citation. I have done this by scrutinizing a public debate held in *Tidskrift för Genusvetenskap* between Sara Edenheim and Nina Lykke, and by allowing myself to put to the front my own embodied experiences of reading these articles and being a relatively experienced student, though still a student, within gender research in academia. I will now return to my research questions, and conclude with some afterthoughts.

In relation to time metaphors and temporal descriptions, I asked how time is constructed in these texts, and what performative effects could this have. In relation to this theme, I most of all noticed how family metaphors and generations, in combination with telling feminist history according to the metaphor of waves, are very visible here. Even though neither author approve the use of them, they still seemed to come forward to me, resonated and got stuck with me as a reader. I believe the performative effects of metaphors related to family to be especially harmful in this sense, since the idea of a family presumes an unconditional love between those involved. Gender researchers and other feminists do not need to be loving towards people that strive for the same cause, however alliances need to be built. These alliances should be built on ideological, scholarly decisions, rather than expected familiar love. In extension, the idea of the feminist family also continuously connects women with the private sphere. Finally, building images of 1970's feminism as the true feminism that included certain questions, certain methods, and certain people, is not only hurtful to those who do not feel they belong to that description, but makes contemporary feminism unnecessary. If feminism is what was done then, then we, as people of today, are expected to have transcended it, already reached our goals. This is why some can claim that we are currently in a post-feminist state: we have already transcended the need for feminism, and feminism is now only a neoliberal nostalgic non-revolutionary branding. If we reconsider how we discuss time and feminist historiography, we may also be able to reconsider how feminism can be radical.

The second question that guided me through this process asked what affects become visible in the scrutinization of these articles and how they are performed through the texts. In this theme, I noticed a lot of anger, frustration, and fear that became in the relation between the two authors. This was expressed through different uses of general/particular in/direct appeals, the use of first and last names, rallying or rational tones, and explicit parts filled of emotion. Those insights became crucial for me to be able to see the two positions that were built here: the one of the newbie and the establie. They do not exclude similarities but have samenesses as well as differences, they are constructed as well as construct the possible narratives the participants can move inside. Affection is performed through these positions, but also define these positions.

My last guiding research question was how the authors construct themselves and each other as agents on certain fields/in certain groups through citation. My main finding in relation to this regarded how they speak of Judith Butler and her theories on performativity. The competition that took place in this debate worked discouraging for me, and made me feel like the two authors were united in an established position on the field, while I was the the newbie that needed to be angry or emotional to get heard: I felt like I did not know enough to participate. This feeling became stronger when I could not use the reference lists to read and learn more, because I also became aware of how much indirect citations take place in fora where you expect people to know what you are talking about. I will use this feeling to learn more and be careful with my references, it seems imperative to me that the reader, you, can look things up and fact-check things you think seems curious. Further, even though Edenheim implicitly renounce the use of progress narratives, and Lykke explicitly writes about Hemmings' theories on them as to make them visible, both authors fall into the trap of telling feminist history through an idea of a progress narrative. This is of course related to how we speak of feminist in temporal states: if we use a progress narrative, we might indeed see this time-space-mattering as a post-feminist such, and it is hard to practice feminism and undo gendering practices in a state that make it seem unnecessary.

Combined, the insights from these three questions is what lead me understand the problem I had felt from the beginning. I felt like words and metaphors construct us into certain positions, which were defined by that which connotes them. We both construct ourselves in relations to them, but each other as well, and when put into the frameworks of those positions, it becomes impossible to move outside them: we get stuck in certain time-space-matterings, with walls that are impenetrable which stops us from being able to listen to each other as well as to ourselves. The problems of positioning are constructing a pit where only two placements are possible, and those two placements demands certain things from those put there. They are defined by differences, but allows samenesses as long as they do not threaten the frameworks. For me, as writer-reader-student-researcher, it suddenly became important to poke holes in this entanglement, I felt a need to unravel the always already intertwined parts of this position making. Is it presumptuous to assume I can do it? I suppose. Do I need to keep doing it? I believe so. Will I strive to not reproduce these positions?

Yes.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Barad, K. (2014). Diffracting Diffraction: Cutting Together-Apart. *Parallax*. (20:3, 168-187).
- Braidotti, R. (1994). *Nomadic subjects: embodiment and sexual difference in contemporary feminist theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Braidotti, R. (1995). Generations of feminists; or is there life after postmodernism. *Found object: a journal of cultural studies from students at the Center for Cultural Studies at the City University of New York Graduate School and University Center*. (1995:6, 55-62).
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Clemens Andreasen, M. (2019). *Master's thesis in Gendering Practices*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Dahl, U. (2006). Ulrika Dahl. *Bang*. (2006:1, 24-29)
- De Castilla, C. (2017). Close Reading. In M. Allen. (Ed.), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods* (pp 136-139). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications
- Deleuze, G., & Parnet, C. (1987). *Dialogues*. London: Athlone.
- Derrida, J. (1994). *Specters of Marx: the state of the debt, the work of mourning, and the New International*. New York: Routledge.
- Ebba Witt-Brattström. (n.d.). In *Nationalencyklopedin*. Retrieved 2019-02-27 from <http://www.ne.se/uppslagsverk/encyklopedi/lång/ebba-witt-brattström>
- Edander, G. (1973). Befrielsen är nära [Recorded by Jösses Flickor!]. On *Jösses Flickor!* [CD]. Stockholm: MNW.
- Edenheim, S. (2010). Några ord till mina kära mödrar, ifall jag hade några. *Tidskrift för genusvetenskap*. (2010:4, 108-118).
- Edenheim, S. (2013). Feministisk dissensus och den icke-identiska feminismen. Ett försök Sara Edenheim svarar Nina Lykke. *Tidskrift för genusvetenskap*. (2013:1, 138-144).
- Ellis, C., Adams, T., & Bochner, A. (2011). Autoethnography: An Overview. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 12(1), n/a.

- Feminismen och vänstern. (2008). *Fronesis*, (2008:25-26). ISSN (print): 1404-2614
- Gemzöe, L. (2002). *Feminism*. Stockholm: Bilda.
- Gemzöe, L. (2010). Faux feminism?: a reply to Mia Liinason's Position paper. *NORA*. (18:2, 122-128).
- Genmäle. (n.d.). In *Nationalencyklopedin*. Retrieved 2019-02-27 from [http://www.ne.se/uppslagsverk/encyklopedi/lång/genmäle-\(politik\)](http://www.ne.se/uppslagsverk/encyklopedi/lång/genmäle-(politik))
- Grosz, E. (2010). The Untimeliness of Feminist Theory. *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*. (18:1, 48-51).
- Haraway, D. J. (1988). Situated knowledges: the science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist studies*. (14:3, 575-599).
- Haraway, D. J. (1992). The Promises of Monsters: A Regenerative Politics for Inappropriate/d Others. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural Studies* (pp 295-337). New York: Routledge.
- Haraway, D. J. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: making kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hemmings, C. (2011). *Why stories matter: the political grammar of feminist theory*. Durham, [N.C.]: Duke University Press.
- Hirdman, Y. (2001). *Genus: om det stabila föränderliga former*. (1. uppl.) Malmö: Liber.
- Jackson, A.Y. & Mazzei, L.A. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: viewing data across multiple perspectives*. (1. ed.) New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jett, J. & Westerberg, P. (1991). Backlash [Recorded by Joan Jett & The Blackhearts]. On *Notorious* [CD]. New York City: Blackheart/Epic-Sony.
- Klein, B. (1990). Transkribering är en analytisk akt. *Rig*. (73, 41-66).
- Liinason, M. (2010). Institutionalized Knowledge: Notes on the Processes of Inclusion and Exclusion in Gender Studies in Sweden. *NORA*. (18:1, 38-47).
- Lindén, C. (2012). Ur led är feminismens tid: Om tidsmetaforer, otidsenlighet och gengångare i feministisk historieskrivning. *Tidskrift För Genusvetenskap*. (2012:3, 5-25).
- Lykke, N. (2012). Generationsfeminisme - nej tak!. *Tidskrift för genusvetenskap*. (2012:3, 27-32).
- Lykke, N. (2013). Konsensus - nej tak! Nina Lykke svarar Sara Edenheim. *Tidskrift för genusvetenskap*. (2013:1, 145-146).

Mah-Jong. (n.d.). In *Nationalencyklopedin*. Retrieved 2019-04-03 from <http://www.ne.se/uppslagsverk/encyklopedi/lång/mah-jong>

Minh-ha, Trinh T., (1988). Not You/Like You: Post-Colonial Women and the Interlocking Question of Identity and Difference. *Inscriptions*. (1988:3-4). Retrieved 2019-05-23 from <https://culturalstudies.ucsc.edu/inscriptions/volume-34/trinh-t-minh-ha/>

Pelias, R. (2011). Writing Into Position: Strategies for Composition and Evaluation. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp 659-668). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

de los Reyes, P. (2006). Paulina de los Reyes. *Bang*. (2006:1, 58-61)

Richardson, L. & Adams St. Pierre, E. (2005). Writing: a method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp 959-978). (3. ed.) Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Rönblom, M. & Åsberg, C. (Eds.). (2010). *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research, Volume 18, 2010 - Issue 1*.

Sedgwick, E. K. (2003). *Touching feeling: affect, pedagogy, performativity*. Durham: Duke University Press.

St. Pierre, E. (2011). Post qualitative research: The Critique and the Coming After. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp 611-626). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Tema: konflikt. (2006). *Bang*, (2006:1). ISSN (print): 1102-4593.

Tidskrift för Genusvetenskap (n.d.). *Om TGV*. Retrieved 2019-02-25 from <http://www.tegeve.se/about.php>.

van der Tuin, I. (2009). On Third-wave Feminism's Generational Logic and Practices of Teaching Gender Studies. In D. Gronold, B. Hopfl, L. Pedersen (Eds.), *Teaching with the third wave: new feminists' explorations of teaching and institutional contexts* (pp 17-36). Stockholm: Centre for Gender Studies, Stockholm University.

van der Tuin, I. (2011). Gender Research with 'Waves': On Re-Positioning a Neo-Disciplinary Apparatus. In R. Buikema, G. Griffin, & N. Lykke (Eds.), *Theories and Methodologies in Postgraduate Feminist Research: Researching Differently* (pp 15-28). N. London and New York: Routledge.

van der Tuin, I. (2015). *Generational feminism: new materialist introduction to a generative approach*. Lanham: Lexington.

Wiegman, R. (2000). Feminism's Apocalyptic Futures. *New Literary History*. (31:4, 805-825.)

Witt-Brattström, E. (2006). Nej tack till feministiskt kvinnohat. *Bang*. (2006:1, 74-75.)

Witt-Brattström, E. (2010). *Å alla kära systrar!: historien om mitt sjuttital*. Stockholm: Norstedt.

Yvonne Hirdman. (n.d.). In *Nationalencyklopedin*. Retrieved 2019-02-27 from <https://www.ne.se/uppslagsverk/encyklopedi/l%C3%A5ng/yvonne-hirdman>

Östling, M. (2017). *Nykomling på genusfältet: en enkätstudie av hur nya studenter upplever litterär kanonisering* (Bachelor's thesis). Göteborg: Department of Cultural Sciences, University of Gothenburg.

Östling, M. (2019). *Problems of Positioning: a qualitative study of narratives in a debate*. Manuscript submitted for publication.