

Iz urednikove beleške

Feministična akcija na področju socialnega dela obstaja v Sloveniji že vrsto let in čas je bil, da ji posvetimo posebno številko tega časopisa. To smo storili z uredniško pomočjo Darje Zaviršek.

Če so pričujoči sestavki reprezentativni za feministično akcijo na področju socialnega dela, imamo priložnost, da si ogledamo njene osrednje poudarke. Prvo, kar nam pade v oči, je, koliko prostora zavzema boj proti spolnemu izrabljanju in spolnemu nasilju. To je – z izjemo ali dvema – pravzaprav edina tema, s katero se avtorice ukvarjajo. Ta eksplozija je zanimiva z več vidikov in odpira nekaj vprašanj. Ali je spolno nasilje tema, s katero lahko feminizem najdalj prodre, saj je, kakor trdijo same avtorice, spolno nasilje strukturno vpisano v našo kulturo (čeprav seveda ne le našo)? Tedaj se feminizem s to temo dejansko loteva nekaterih temeljnih zastavkov naše družbene organizacije, in to s stališča, ki je strateško močno, saj mu v pravni državi ni mogoče resno ugovarjati, mogoče pa se mu je upirati. Izhajajoč iz te hipoteze lahko precej dobro razumemo odpore, ki jih je ta akcija deležna in ki nikakor niso le psihološke narave. Hkrati pa, če je spolno nasilje res tako razširjeno, kakor vse kaže, da je, imajo ti odpori tudi povsem praktično funkcijo; navsezadnje je napad na spolno nasilje napad na nas same (moške in ženske), ki »spontano« funkcijoniramo seksistično in katerih dejanja bi bilo mogoče marsikdaj okvalificirati za spolno nasilje ali spolno izrabljanje, čeprav v javnosti nastopamo kot, recimo, »ugledne osebe« ali celo »stebri družbe« ali pa vsaj kot čisto navadni, »normalni ljudje«. Tak status je s stališča vladajoče moralno-pravne ideologije nezdržljiv s statusom »spolnih pokvarjencev«, za kar imamo tiste, ki se v tej zvezi pojavijo v kakešni črni kroniki ali tabloidu. Ali moramo zdaj končno videti, da smo prav mi sami ti »pokvarjenci«? Ali moramo priznati, da je že status »normalnega človeka«, kaj šele »ugledne osebe«, nujno povezan z dvoiličnostjo, idealizacijo in prikrivanjem nekaterih svojih praks, da o fantazijah – uresničenih ali ne – niti ne govorimo? Feministična akcija – vsaj njen mainstream – sicer navadno ne gre tako daleč, temveč se zaustavi pri tem, da se bojuje proti temu, kar prepoznava kot pojavne oblike spolnega nasilja, in zlasti pri tem, da razvija oblike pomoči njegovim žrtvam. Toda ali je mogoče spregledati te precej daljnosežnejše implikacije?

Še težje je spregledati težo, ki jo ima v obravnavah spolnega nasilja in spolnega izrabljanja besedica »spolno«. Dolgo časa razširjena teza, da pri spolnem nasilju ne gre za spolnost, temveč za nasilje, je protislovna, kajti nasilje »kot tako« je nekaj vsakdanjega in v glavnem prepuščeno v obravnavo državi (ki ga kot »represivni aparat« izvaja tudi sama, včasih celo s splošnim konsenzom), in o izrabljanju »kot takem« že od Marxa naprej vemo, da je ne le navzoče v razredni družbi, temveč je zanj konstitutivno. Šele v spregi s spolnostjo dobiva pojma traumatične, grozljive razsežnosti, o katerih pišejo avtorice. Kako to? Je mogoče, da se še vedno nismo dokopali do tega, kaj pravzaprav spolnost je? Da se je še vedno – ali morda vedno bolj – lotevamo z normativnim namesto analitičnim aparatom, celo v znanosti, kaj šele v ideoloških diskurzih, pravnem, religioznem itn.?

Feministična perspektiva, ki jo bomo srečali v prispevkih, napotuje k tem vprašanjem, čeprav si jih sami še ne zastavljajo, ali vsaj ne na enak način. Vendar je to smer, ki nakazuje korenite družbene spremembe – če se njena akcija ne bo podredila zgolj pragmatičnim ciljem ali ujela v svoja lastna protislovja.

Editor's Notes

The feminist action in the field of social work has existed in Slovenia for quite some time and it was time that we dedicated to it a special issue of this journal. It was done with editorial help of Darja Zaviršek.

If the present contributions are representative for the feminist action in the field of social work, they give us an opportunity to check its central issues. The first thing that becomes obvious is that in the major part, they are concerned with fighting sexual exploitation (abuse) and sexual violence. This is in fact – with an exception or two – the only topic dealt with by the authors. This explosion is interesting from several angles and opens a number of questions. Is sexual violence the topic through which feminism can reach farthest in our social order, as it is, as the authors often claim, structurally inscribed into our culture (though evidently not only ours)? In this case, feminism in fact touches some fundamental stakes of our social organisation, and from the point of view which is strategically powerful, since it cannot be seriously objected to in a »legal state« – but it can be resisted. On the grounds of this hypothesis, resistances raised by the action are quite understandable, and they are by no means only psychological. At the same time, if sexual violence is indeed as spread as it seems to be, those resistances perform a purely practical function as well; after all, attacks on sexual violence are at once also attacks on us (men and women) who »spontaneously« function in sexist ways and whose acts might often enough be qualified as sexual violence or sexual exploitation, even though we appear in public as, say, »respectable persons« or even as »pillars of society«, or at least as ordinary, »normal people«. From the point of view of the ruling moral-legal ideology, this status is wholly incompatible with the status of »sexual perverts« attributed to the few individuals who stand out as perpetrators in the tabloid press etc. Must we finally realise that we ourselves are the »perverts«? Must we admit that even the status of an »ordinary person«, and much more so of a »respectable« one, is necessarily related to hypocrisy, idealisation and hiding some of our practices, not to mention our fantasies, whether they are acted out or not? The feminist action – at least its mainstream – usually does not go so far but merely fights what has been recognised as the different forms of sexual violence and develops various forms of help to its victims. But can those far reaching consequences be overlooked?

It is even more difficult to overlook the force of the term »sexual« in sexual violence and sexual exploitation. The thesis held for a long time, that the issue in sexual violence is not sexuality but violence, is contradictory, for violence »as such« is an everyday occurrence and to deal with it is chiefly delegated to the state (which, as a »repressive apparatus«, performs it itself, often with a general consent), and exploitation »as such« has been known at least since Marx to be not only present in class society but constitutive for it. Not before their connection with sexuality do they gain their traumatic, horrifying dimensions the authors write about. How come? Is it possible that we still haven't realised what sexuality is all about? That we still – or perhaps even more – try to deal with it with a normative instead of an analytical apparatus, even in science, and much more so in ideological discourses such as the legal or the religious one?

The feminist perspective met in the contributions points to such questions, though they themselves do not yet pose them, or not in the same way. Yet it is a direction leading to radical social change – unless the action submits to mere pragmatic goals or becomes entrapped in its own contradictions.