

Thursday, January 24

14.00 – 14.30

Welcome

Ulrike Manz and **Karin Klenke**, DFG-Network „Praxeologies of the Body“

Hiltraud Casper-Hehne, Vice-President, University of Göttingen

Irene Schneider, Chair of the Arbeitsgruppe Geschlechterforschung,
University of Göttingen

Panel I: Materiality

Chair: **Ulrike Manz**, University of Frankfurt

14.30 – 15.15

Susanne Lettow, University of Paderborn

Materiality and praxis. Remarks on Material Feminism

The concept of matter has troubled feminist theorists for decades. Although it seems to be commonplace that “matter” should not be conceived of as passive resource, and according to the lines of the mind/body, or culture/nature split, ideas of how to conceptualize matter and materiality differ widely. This is also the case within “material feminism”. Far from being a homogenous theoretical project, a close look shows that positions that go by this name vary. They vary with respect to the understanding of matter, and – most important from a praxeological perspective – with regard to understandings of subjectivity, agency and praxis. In my contribution I will draw a distinction between vitalist or posthumanist and praxeological perspectives within “material feminism”. I argue that while the first tends to conflate agency and activity, the latter are most promising for feminist theory understood as social criticism.

15.15 - 16.00

Malaika Rödel, University of Frankfurt

What matters? Nature, technology and gender in the discourse of pre-implantation genetic diagnosis

New reproductive technologies have changed our understanding of pregnancy and reproduction. IVF and surrogate motherhood are leading to new forms of family and parenthood, and diagnostic tools like Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis (PGD) enable us to enhance the body of the embryo and to analyze its genetic constitution and potential diseases. As a result reproduction is no longer solely understood as a natural process, and the dualism of nature and technology becomes fragile. But what kind of nature do we have instead, and what does it mean for gender borders?

Theoreticians like Donna Haraway and Bruno Latour describe the relationship of nature and society as co-productive processes in which nature takes an active part. Seen against this theoretical background, the discourse of PGD is not just about ethical questions and the protection of the embryo vs. research interests and parents who want a healthy child. Instead, we can analyze how nature and gender are described and take form in the discourse.

In my talk I would like to outline gender specific aspects in the German debate about Pre-implantation Genetic Diagnosis (PGD). Although Germany is known for its strict embryo protection law (Embryonenschutzgesetz), PGD has been permitted since July 2011. How can the debate be described from a hybrid perspective of nature and society? Can the fracture of nature/culture also loosen the linkage between reproduction and sex, or do we find a reconfiguration of gender borders instead?

16.00 – 16.30

Coffee break

16.30 – 17.15

Silke Schicktanz, University of Göttingen

The giving and taking of organs – ethical and cultural dynamics beyond symbolic actions

Organ donation is a wide-spread medical practice framed by cultural, religious, and legal-ethical constraints. For example, these parameters define the social distance of the relationship between donor and recipient (only family or even anonymous) as well as the moral status of the body (dead, in transition, or alive). Hence, we can observe a broad spectrum of so called morally accepted organ donation: Where postmortem donation is culturally unacceptable, living donation is favored – and vice versa. Moreover, gender disparities, particular in the ratio of living donors and recipients, are well described, but rarely critically questioned.

In my presentation, I will offer an analysis of underlying conceptions of the body in these different organ transplantation practices. A classical understanding assumes that the domination of a medical-mechanical-fractured body concept has historically led to the acceptance of ‘organ harvesting’. Hence, organ donation was publicly framed as a symbolic act of social altruism or even as social responsibility as the body itself has had no particular social meaning.

Instead, I will argue that there exists nowadays a plurality of different body conceptions based on different social power relations which interact, too, with the different practices of organ transplantation. Hence, organ donation is less a symbolic act. The diversity as well as existing resistance to the practice can rather be understood in the dynamics of a social practice shaped by competing body conceptions. They are related to materialistic, phenomenological, and genealogical meanings. Each meaning can theoretically be transferred into a ‘moral-epistemic hybrid’ expressing a coherent position to justify a particular practice. Critical reflection requires, hence, ethical as well as epistemological tools to disentangle these hybrids.

17.15 – 18.00

Eva Sängler, University of Frankfurt

Matter of time: making up babies in obstetrical ultrasound scanning in Germany

In prenatal care gestational time frames are used to monitor pregnancy and birth. Obstetrical ultrasound scanning, a routine part of prenatal care in Germany, has brought about profound reorganization of time during pregnancy and created new norms and imperatives for pregnant women as well as for health professionals: diagnostic options and potential medical interventions vary with regard to the ‘development’ of a fetus and thus gestational ‘age’ of pregnancy. However, fetal ‘development’ is not a pre-given property. In my paper, taking a relationalist-materialist approach to the production of fetal and pregnant subjectivities, I will show how the development of a fetus is produced not as abstract knowledge but rather materially enacted during obstetric ultrasound examinations. Using ethnographic data, I explore how the notion of ‘development’ is the result of temporal practices, enacted through gestures, talks, biometric measurement and computer software. Moreover, the ‘making’ of gestational time is intertwined with the attribution of risk to the fetus as well as with the practice of performing family. I examine the ways in which temporal practices contribute to the enactment of the fetus as a measurable entity and as a baby-to-be that can be woven in a network of kinship relations.

18:00 – 19:30

Dinner

20:00 ct

Public Keynote Lecture

Venue: Holborn'sches Haus, Rote Straße 34

Margrit Shildrick, University of Linköping

Embodied Discourses and Prosthetic Performativity

In the era of postmodernity, issues of the body, gender and power are increasingly raised by the non-normative performativity of the anomalous embodiment. I shall focus in particular on one aspect of such forms of embodiment that mobilises acute questions about the always ambivalent relationship between human subjects and biotechnology. Where in the past, the term prosthesis intended some material object that stood in for a lack that was seen as a negative but compensatable aspect of embodiment, the emphasis now is firmly on enhancement and supplement. For many disabled people, their interface with the world relies to a greater or lesser extent on the deployment of prostheses, no longer in the mode of rehabilitation to normative practices, but as a highly productive alternative that inevitably queers experience itself. Going further, the notion of prostheses can be transformed to encompass a Deleuzian understanding of embodiment as necessarily entailing assemblage - in both organic and non-organic forms – as a mode of existence that speaks to us all.

Friday, January 25

Panel II: Discursivity

Chair: **Karen Nolte**, University of Würzburg

9.30 – 10.15

Mica Wirtz, University of Hamburg

Analysing contemporary fitness practices – methodological reflections

Discourse theories are mainly regarded as incompatible with practice theories, as they are based on different theoretical foundations. Briefly and simplifying, practice theories see embodied practices as the smallest entity of the social and thereby as the driving force of the social, whereas discourse theories focus on discourses as power-knowledge nexuses regulating society. Accordingly, both use different kinds of methodical tool and empirical materials: whereas practice theories mainly work with (participating) observation to analyse practices and their embodied implicit knowledge, discourse analysis focusses on texts. Both approaches necessarily differ in the range of their results.

Using the analysis of contemporary fitness practices as an example, I intend to show possibilities and blind spots of both approaches. Following concepts trying to integrate the analysis of practices as well as discourses, I want to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of an integration or even merging of practice and discourse theories.

10.15 – 11.00

Olaf Stieglitz, University of Essen

Texts and muscles – discourse, practice & the writing of sports history

During the last 12 to 15 years, the cultural turn has also reached the writing of sports history. Part of this development was the ›discovery‹ of the body as an important element of a research agenda that no longer rested only on the histories of well-known athletes, famous clubs or the politics of international sport organizations. Although bodies are pivotal to what constitutes sport and how it is understood and experienced, historians just now begin to realize and underscore the centrality of bodies for sport performances and achievements.

Among the historians who are now writing bodies actively into their narratives, most emphasize the regulation of bodies in and through sports, usually by deploying post-Foucauldian theory. While this approach both changed and enriched the outlook of sports history

enormously, it nevertheless raised critical voices by authors who adopted insights from phenomenology and warned against the limitations of overemphasizing the discursive. Ideas introduced by Pierre Bourdieu seemed valuable for still other authors who tried to bridge the gap between discourse and the sporting practice.

This paper engages with the complex interplay of socially constructed / symbolic bodies on the one hand side and material, affective bodies on the other from the perspective of historical research that has to rely on traces from the past only. After briefly characterizing theoretical positions, it will deploy examples from U.S. sports history in order to discuss how praxeological approaches and discourse theory might be brought into dialogue.

11.00 – 11.30 Coffee break

11.30 – 12.15 **Heike Raab**, University of Innsbruck
Technobodies and dis/ability – on an analyses of a discursive relationship of tension

In recent times especially female, queer and crip body are a favoured target of a new set on discourses about embodied technologies of normalization. For that reason I want to examine these (bio-)technological developments in the field of the body as a kind of the new somatic logics of neo-liberalism. My thesis is that we can see within in that frame a reformulation of dis/ability (and heteronormativity or gender) centered on a cyborgian utopia, evoked through bio-political discourses. An utopia of a boundless and technological intensified bodies which displace the traditional borderlines of dis/ability, queerness or gender. One important role in these reformulations of the relationship of body, nature and culture, are playing discourses on the bio-technological manipulated queer/crip body which arise by neoliberal capitalism. Donna Haraway postulated as one of the first feminist scientists, that it can be possible, with such network-systems of human-technological Hybrids (Cyborgs), to query the traditional binary forms of the bodily order. These new processes of embodiment are possible through incorporations of techniques into the body and through intersections from bodies with machines. Referring to Haraway, Rabinow and Barad I contrast the hype about the queer/crip as cyborg which blurs every socio-cultural binary system with the phenomenon on a new kind of so called liberal eugenics.

In short: I want to outline in my talk current debates about the body in the Disability Studies and connect them with discussions in Gender/Queer Studies in the light of debates about the benefit and adaption of optimization and at the formation of strategies of normalization of the body in the age of bio-power. At centre will be the relationship between the body, discourses, practices and norms concerning to technological developments like neuroprosthesis or enhancement and their impact for Disability Studies.

12.15 – 13:00 **Sigrídur Þorgeirsdóttir**, University of Iceland
Discourses of the Body and Nature in Environmental Ethics

Certain strands of contemporary environmental ethics are a radical field within the humanities because they challenge and undermine traditional, gender denoted, dualistic philosophical notions of "man", "human", "nature" and "culture" with theories of the body as relational, natural-cultural and a site of power struggles. Theories of the posthuman (such as in the works of Braidotti, Barad and Haraway) extend such efforts with their undermining of the distinction between organic and non-organic as well as of the human and the non-human. Notions of life and nature remain problematic in the context of such theories and

call for a praxeological elaboration in order to be radical in the sense of being critical, subversive and constructive.

13.00 – 14.30 Lunch

Panel III: Performativity

Chair: **Karin Klenke**, University of Göttingen

14.30 – 15.15 **Robert Schmidt**, Technical University of Darmstadt
From studies of the performative towards a sociology of social practices.
Notes on changing perspectives

Based on empirical and ethnographic studies of bodily performances in sports and knowledge work my paper suggests to enhance the concept of the performative and to cut across its textual and linguistic limitations. It is pointed out how by focussing on the non-linguistic domains of the social, the cultural analysis of the performative is redirected to a sociology of practices. Corporeality, materiality and the status and roles of the mental in social practices are the core issues of praxeology. My paper spotlights and discusses praxeology's claims to master these issues empirically and conceptually. I conclude with considering methodological implications of this approach and sketch out further research perspectives.

15.15– 16.00 **Uta Schirmer**, University of Göttingen
On the performativity of drag as social practice

The discussion of drag is central to Judith Butler's notion of gender performativity. Thus, though drawing notably on Austinian speech act theory, she develops her concept of performativity also with regard to bodily performance practices. Yet, I want to argue in my paper, she conceives of drag – with its potential to expose the performative character of all gender displays – as a figure of critique of hegemonic norms, rather than as a contextualized social practice.

Based on empirical research among the German drag king scene, I will suggest that a decidedly praxeological understanding of performativity, in contrast, allows for the reconstruction of the specific practical sense of 'doing drag' and of the intrinsic logic of alternative gender realities emerging from this practice. I will conclude by asking for the limits of praxeological approaches when it comes to exploring how the examined subcultural practices are conditioned by (and maybe part of) broader societal change such as neoliberal transformations of modes of subjectivization.

16.00 – 16.30 Coffee break

16.30 – 17.15 **Kristina Schneider**, University of Göttingen
„We are doing it, not appearing like it“ – Performing lesbi genders in Indonesia

My talk focuses on the practices of doing Lesbi genders in Indonesia. Indonesia is a multi ethnic, religious and cultural state. Despite of the cultural and social diversity found in the Indonesian context same-sex desire is colliding with hegemonic religion-based moral orders. Those religious and nationstate discourses define 'natural' desire as heterosexual whereby other sexualities are pathologized, stigmatized and delegitimized. There are also narrow ideals and images of femininity and masculinity prevailing in Indonesia. The ideal woman in this conception is feminine, exclusively heterosexual, wife, mother and restrained - an ideal

which usually is problematic for at least masculine lesbi. But despite of this sometimes hostile context and the complex negotiations of those ideals, most lesbi don't experience their genders as problematic... With this powerful context in mind in which lesbi – as all other Indonesian subjects – develop and perform their genders I will concentrate on the following questions:

How do lesbi do and understand their genders (and sexuality) in this context? How is the body experienced, interpreted and made in/significant in lesbi gender performances and in terms of a supposed physical sex? How is normative and non-normative femininity and masculinity performed by lesbi? Which strategies are used to deal with those narrow gender ideals and the hetero-normative nation-state discourses? How do gender norms get cited in everyday practice and hence reproduced or subverted in the doing of lesbi genders?

By answering those questions I seek to shed light on how Indonesian lesbi perform their genders in dis/connection with hegemonic constellations and point out which transformative potential lesbi gender performances might contain.

18.30 – x

Dinner

Saturday, January 26

Panel IV: Structurality

Chair: **Karen Wagels**, University of Kassel

09.00 – 09:45

Brigitte Bargetz, Humboldt University Berlin

Structuring the everyday. Politics, power, practices

In his theory of the everyday Henry Lefebvre considers everyday life not just as a site of subjection and repression, structured by political and economic forces. Instead he attends to the way subjects are both, binding and bound to specific historical conditions and political structures. In his theory, politics and power are embodied within everyday practices, marking the everyday as force of change as well as maintenance. While I elaborate on this assemblage of practice, power and politics in the first part, I suggest in the second part how it might be rethought from a feminist perspective on gender and the body.

09.45 – 10.30

Katja Jana, University of Göttingen

From Westernization to civilization? Body politics and the formation of modern subjects in the passage from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish nation-state

In 1925, the Turkish Parliament outlawed all headgear other than the "European hat". This law and its repercussions are known as "hat revolution" in official Turkish historiography. Being part and parcel of the Kemalist modernization and nation-building program, the law's implementation was met with fierce resistance. Taking the law and the circumstances of its promulgation as point of departure, I am tracing debates on headgear, dress codes and associated corporeal practices during Late Ottoman and Early Republican times. Various perceptions of masculinity in these discourses are conceptualized as embodiments of the greater Ottoman discourse about Westernization/modernization and the Orient-Occident dichotomy. I am asking in which way the question of dress and especially headgear is linked to gendered, racialized and class based embodiments of power and for the entanglement of embodiments of power structures in the formation of political projects and societies.

10:30 – 11:00

Coffee break

11:00 – 11:45

Anne Marie Rafferty, King's College London
The body politic in colonial nursing

Between 1896 and 1960 8,400 nurses were sent by the Colonial Nursing Association to work in the colonies in the British Empire. Nurses were the second largest category of white single women in the Empire, occupying an in-between position in the colonial hierarchy sandwiched between the indigenous population and male colonial officials. Their primary function was to make the empire habitable and hospitable for trade and commercial purposes by nursing colonial officials and their families but also rehabilitating the bodies of the indigenous population to support the economic interests of imperial labour. Nurses were often motivated to work in empire on account of the freedoms it offered from the customary forms of supervision and stifling conventions of British society. The Colonial Nursing Association played on the sense of adventure, agency and autonomy that nurses could experience in the far flung corners of the British Empire. Yet nurses found themselves both the sources of bio-power as well as subject to it by the super-ordinate authority of their employers and colonial authorities. This paper will consider the way in which the discourses of imperialism and nursing were mutually reinforcing and constitutive of each other. It explores the ways in which colonial/nursing 'embodied' Britain's imperial interests and civilizing mission and the practical ways in which nurses performed their professional and personal authority abroad. Nurses were portrayed as models of hygiene and sanitary practice for colonial subjects to emulate. But in order to inculcate so-called 'natives' with 'civilised' standards of medicine the nurse had to attend first to her own personal hygiene and bodily needs. This paper contends that while the empire held out the prospect of freedom for British nurses it brought with it new and unexpected constraints.

11:45 – 12.30

Bettina Brockmeyer, University of Bielefeld
Colonizing bodies: German structures, African experiences?

As postcolonial studies have emphasised, colonialism was an ongoing, never completed process, a "political project" (Ann Laura Stoler). In order to enrich the approach of 'making' or 'doing' colonialism it seems to be promising to look at the project of colonialism from a praxeological perspective focussing on bodies. In placing emphasis on the colonizer's bodies, on body perceptions, narrated practices, and the emergence of bodies in sources from the period of the German colonies in Africa the "colonial situation" (Georges Balandier) will be analyzed looking at its fragile, shifting, violent and asymmetrical character.

This paper focuses on the perceptions of two German colonizers in the early 20th century, a colonial clerk and a military officer's wife and planter. It analyses several everyday practices these men and women were in. Unlike most research concerning the colonial everyday life and intimacy the paper does not concentrate on sexuality or/and violence but on work and lifestyle. The paper tries a resistant reading of the colonizers' self-descriptions, which construct a narrative about the domestication of African experiences through German structures. It thus wants to present, apart from the overall pervasion of violence, a highly physical setting of power relations – a setting that subsequently has been deleted from the colonial archives.

12:30 – 13:15

Wrap-up:
Andrea Bührmann, University of Göttingen

13.15 - x

Lunch