

Discourses and representations as means of resistance

In this chapter it will be argued that the construction of discourses is the key to understanding how one may resist power-loaded discourses. It is the fact that these discourses are constituted by time, instituted through the repetition of representations that creates the possibility of change. For example, according to Butler, failures to repeat 'correctly' open up the possibility of transformation (1999: 179). Below I will return to Butler's theories, not only to recognize her outline about repetition and social change, but also to argue that social research has given too little attention to why we repeat representations. Taking the 'speaking' of Cambodian politicians as a point of departure, it will be argued, first, that repetition and silence are both important concepts for understanding resistance, and secondly, that an analysis of the impact of different sorts of representations – images, statements, and so forth – must be included into the study of resistance. Finally, the chapter will argue that not only are there manifold ways in which hybridity plays out, but also the making of hybrid truths might confer status, thus negotiating the hierarchies.

REPEATING DIFFERENTLY AND THE CONCEPT OF REVERSE DISCOURSE

One of the foundations of Butler's theories of gendered identities is that to maintain a discourse we have to repeat it. This puts the

concept of performativity at the core of Butler's work. Inspired by Derrida's theory of iterability or citationality, she argues that gender is an identity constituted in time through the repetition of acts. Moi states that the foundation of gender performativity is that gender is something we do, not are – it is action, not a thing (1997: 103). The performance of gendered acts is at once a re-enactment and a re-experiencing of a set of meanings already socially established. This repetitive, and in some sense forced, 'doing' of gender, in Butler's outline produces the fiction that an individual has a stable gender which they are just expressing it in their actions. Gender is thus a kind of repeated, largely forced enactment or performance, steered by disciplinary processes, that produces the imaginary fiction of a 'core gender' (Butler 1999: 178–179).

To Butler, performativity serves as the site for possible contestation of gender: it is precisely the fact that gender is repeated, performed and thereby maintained that opens up the possibility of change. If identity is constituted through repetition of behaviours and modes of self-representation, these repetitions can be the locus of change and every interval of repetition offers a place to locate and investigate change. In Butler's words,

The abiding gendered self will then be shown to be structured by repeated acts that seek to approximate the ideal of a substantial ground of identity, but which, in their occasional discontinuity, reveal the temporal and contingent groundlessness of this "ground." The possibilities of gender transformation are to be found precisely in the arbitrary relation between such as, in the possibility of a failure to repeat, a de-formity, or a parodic repetition that exposes the phantasmatic effect of abiding identity as a politically tenuous construction (Butler 1999: 179).

The remark about 'the failure to repeat' or the concepts of 'de-formity' and of 'parodic repetition' illustrates very well Butler's thoughts about the possibility of transformations. Repetitions are the basis for change, which may occur as we fail to repeat according to the social norms of the discourses.

According to Butler, reloading a concept or image with new meaning may happen accidentally. There is the risk of certain misrecognition when being hailed a name. Naming someone 'Woman,' 'Jew,' 'Queer' or 'Black' may be meant, and interpreted, as an insult. It may be an attempt to force an individual to invest in a certain stereotyped identity-position by treating him/her according to that stereotype. It is possible, however, that the person who is hailed 'Women,' 'Jew,' 'Queer' or 'Black' fails to hear what is meant, misreads the call or in other ways reacts 'wrongly'. The attempt to produce the subject by naming it has failed (Butler 1995: 238–239; Butler 1997: 95–97) and a new meaning is accidentally produced for a word.

A similar reasoning has been mentioned by Foucault; reversed discourses (1981: 101; in Butler 1995: 236). Butler argues that there are textual movements in Foucault's work when freedom from the normalizing oppression is pictured as the return of the body to a non-normalizable wildness. This is rarely seen in Foucault's texts, however, and more often resistance appears in the shape of reversed discourses (Butler 1995: 236). Reversed discourses are used to describe how the subaltern claims the categories and vocabularies of the dominating force or superior norm, precisely in order to contest it (Butler 1995: 236). Butler agrees with Foucault that the subject is constantly in the process of being produced. It is the idea that the subject is never produced instantly in its totality, but repeatedly constituted in subjection, that enables the reverse discourse, namely the possibility of a repetition that repeats against its origin (Butler 1997: 93). Alternatively, in the words of Foucault, 'Deviancy returns from abjection by deploying just those terms which relegated it to that state in the first place – including 'nature' and 'essence'" (Foucault in Parry 1994: 194).

Foucault uses the term 'homosexual' as an example of a reverse discourse:

There is no question that the appearance in nineteenth-century psychiatry, jurisprudence, and literature of a whole series of discourses on the species and subspecies of homosexuality, inversion,

pederasty, and “psychic hermaphroditism” made possible a strong advance of social controls into this area of “perversity”; but it also made possible the formation of a “reverse” discourse: homosexuality began to speak in its own behalf, to demand that its legitimacy or “naturalness” be acknowledged, often in the same vocabulary, using the same categories by which it was medically disqualified (Foucault 1981: 101).

The use of this term does not automatically result in a transcending of heterosexuality, or as Butler expresses it,

[...] it will be the same “homosexuality” which will be deployed first in the service of normalizing heterosexuality and second in the service of its own depathologization: this term will carry the risk of the former meaning in the latter, but it would be a mistake to think that by simply speaking the term one either transcends heterosexual normalization or becomes its instrument. The risk of a renormalization is persistently there (Butler 1995: 237).

Butler states that even though one adds new meaning to subaltern concepts, the actual words are still the same. The reverse discourse is thus always parasitic on the dominant discourse it contests, thus resistance appears as the effect of power, as a part of power itself (Butler 1995: 237).

The above exemplifies resistance geared towards transforming the meaning of a concept. The fact that meaning never can be fixed forms a powerful instrument to challenge, change or contest dominant delimiting discourses. In the process of renaming, deforming or parodying, the old meanings do not always disappear; on the contrary they might remain the same, and the new repetitions often turn out to be just attaching additional meaning. Therefore, in the production of meanings, the reader is as important as the writer. (S. Hall 1997a: 32–33).

Butler’s notion of out-of-the-way repetitions and the concept of reverse discourse invite us to analyse the interviews of the Cambodian women politicians. As stated in Chapter Five, women are ideally expected to stay at home and not expose themselves to the desires of

men, with whom they might do something wrong. As Ledgerwood states, 'The ideal Khmer woman [...] is innocent and therefore vulnerable; she should not go out alone' (Ledgerwood 1996: 414–415), however, for a female politician it is difficult to have such a limited freedom of movement. In the tension between the subject positions of the ideal Khmer woman and what is comprehended as a political subject position, some female politicians have tried to negotiate the meaning connected to women. It seems that repeating gendered norms slightly differently was a means to solve the tension between the different subject positions:

We train for women to provide them with skills that they can use in their work for being better politicians. But we ask them to never forget their identity as Cambodian women. Nothing in the law ... nothing in, how do you say, in we are not suppose to go outside with a man, nothing. We just say that traditionally women stay home. But nothing says that we cannot go out and work.¹

First of all, the above statement argues that female politicians should simultaneously hold an identity as a politician and as a woman ('their work for being better politicians. But we ask them to never forget their identity as Cambodian women'). In the quotation, in line with Butler, the female identity seems strongly connected to what women do, the performing of female gender ('But we ask them to never forget their identity as Cambodian women. What Cambodian women actually do!'). The women are encouraged to do nothing but what women are expected to do. The quotation also implies, however, that this doing can be broadened and slightly redefined within the borders of what women can do. Women are not allowed to leave the home 'to go outside with a man'. The informant, however, states that if women do not go 'outside with a man' but work/perform politics they should be able to go out, because there are no norms or laws that say that women cannot go out if she behaves properly. This is performing the context-specific female identity slightly differently, thus changing the content of the identity position without crossing the borders of what women can do, and making legitimate

and intelligible the new performance of the female identity within the discourses and logic of the expected femininity.

This negotiation of different concepts can be further understood if we make use of the idea of subjectivity, as presented in Chapter Two. The woman quoted tries to organize multiple identities into a possible political identity. Read from the theoretical outline, the contradictions and disturbances in and among the different subject-positions (in this case woman and politician) seem to make possible the negotiations of the very same positions. In this process the woman uses her subjectivity to understand/interpret and act in the social and political context through which she and other female politicians are formed.

Cambodian female politicians try to redefine the concept of woman by repeating it slightly differently, deviating from the optimum of an ideal Khmer woman, however as stated above, the new repetition can never be detached from the old meaning. Butler argues that we must consider the inversion of a word such as woman. Here it is not a question of an opposition between the reactionary and the progressive usages of the word. On the contrary, a reverse discourse implies a progressive repetition of the reactionary in order to create a subversive effect (Butler 1995: 242). Resistance therefore appears as the effect of power, by using power-loaded concepts in a new way. This would be the starting point for the critique against the reverse-discourse theory forwarded by Benita Parry (1994), who points to the discussions of nativism. Claiming ancestral purity as an attempt to reverse discourse may end up in nothing but becoming an Other that reflects the Western assumptions of selfhood, where 'west initiates and the native imitates' (Parry 1994: 175–177).

In sum, one respondent tried to negotiate the practices and the freedom of movement connected to the female image of identity, by repeating it somewhat differently. I want to underscore that these kinds of negotiations are not unique for the Cambodian context. To highlight this I want to link my analysis to the research done by Naila Kabeer (2000), who describes how Bangladeshi women try to 'feminize' and normalize factory work by using some metaphors and

analogies. In order to transform the perception of the factory work as forbidden, the women described the factory as a 'home', making it a 'domestic' space as well as applying a gender-related kinship terminology in order to de-sexualize the working relationship between men and women within the factory (Kabeer 2000: 92–99). This research illustrates the apparent messiness often spotted between different negotiated categories. In the course of conducting the interviews, I too became increasingly aware of the general leakiness, ambivalence and movability of categories, because, not only was the female identity negotiated to fit the outline of a politician, but concepts such as politician and politics were also under negotiation:

You know if you are NGO they say we don't do politics. So I say that: I agree you cannot support any individual party but if you do it for everybody and go to every political party: you do politics. You talk to people to support your goal, what you want to do. That is politics! You go out and you tell people this is your idea and you need support: that is politics!²

This respondent starts off by giving her view of what is traditionally labelled as politics, namely to support a political party ('You know if you are NGO they say we don't do politics. So I say that: I agree you cannot support any individual party'). Thereafter, however, she tries to widen the concept of politics by outlining other practices that she also labels politics ('but if you do it for everybody and go to every political party: you do politics. You talk to people to support your goal, what you want to do. That is politics! You go out and you tell people this is your idea and you need support: that is politics!'). Moreover, also the Women's Media Centre in Phnom Penh appears to argue that politics is not only exercised in governmental institutions, but also something going on in daily life. By broadcasting different stories, they tried to broaden the meaning of the concept to include the strategies used in everyday village life. For example, one film that was televised described an attempt to realize a development project in a village. The negotiations and strategies used to get the project going were labelled as politics, and the concluding speech

argued that every single individual could perform politics. This is in line with the strategies of western feminists, who have entered into a struggle over meanings, trying to break the associations with the word politics and give it a new set of meanings in order to redistribute power more evenly. As stated by Peterson and Runyan, 'Ungendering world politics also requires a reconceptualization of politics' (1993: 165).

THE FREQUENCY OF REPEATING

Given both the theoretical framework discussed in Chapter Two and the above analysis, it seems that there are women in Cambodia who try to negotiate gendered norms, using the practice of altering repetitions and redefining concepts such as women or politics, yet reading the interviews revealed another strategy of repetition. As we will see, it is not only the accuracy of repetitions that matters, but also the frequency. The repetitions of the gestures, images or statements that together comprise the discourses of gender, are not regular, mechanical or analogous. The character of the discourses differs as the representations are reiterated often or more rarely. What does it mean if the respondents constantly repeat representations constituting a gendered discourse, or if the respondents repeat the gendered images more rarely? I shall discuss how the frequency of the repetitions can in some sense be interpreted as responses to the prevailing power relations.

Discourses seem to be more or less visible, that is repeated more or less often, depending on how 'fixed' they are. As Hillevi Lenz Taguchi writes, 'a practice cannot be a normative discursive practice if we [do] not, as subjects, time after time choose to repeat that practice' (2004: 173). As stated in Chapter Five, some women activists and politicians in Phnom Penh stated repeatedly that women make better politicians than men, but still refer to men as the norm. Among other things, the women repeated the perception that women politicians are emotional and understand the needs and feelings of others – a unique ability in their role as politicians, as it is argued:

A good leader is a person with his/her heart in the right place and with an education. If women get an education they are better leaders than men, as they know more than men and have their heart in the right place.³

Women and men have the same ability, but sometimes women have more ability than men. Women are better politicians since they are smart. They are good at relations. They are good politicians since they are gentle and good at psychology and understand relations and other people. But education is necessary. Education makes women believe in themselves. This is important.⁴

In the National Assembly people are treated equally whether they are men or women. People respect politicians. They think women understand people better as they take care of basic needs, domestic duties, etc., at the same time as they are politicians.⁵

Women in Cambodia have a huge responsibility. They have the primary responsibility for maintenance, family, children, everything, but are still pointed out as unqualified to take decisions.⁶

Accounts such as these prevailed among a number of female NGO workers as well as female politicians. Taking discourse theory as a point of departure, one reading might be that the women are trying to negotiate their power relations – the stereotypes and hierarchies – by the repetition of a new ‘truth’. The restatements about female supremacy and the linguistic usage of setting up men as a norm (see Chapter Five), raises the question of whether the women’s repetitions of the image of a superior woman politician is to be read as resistance. It might be the most loudly voiced, explicit norm that is also the weakest. This norm must be anxiously repeated in order to be maintained. It seeks to be established as a ‘truth’, rather than already being steadfastly approved. Implicit in these repetitions is the concept of time: the frequency of the repetitions tells us about how power and resistance are practiced.

Resistance by repetition involves an on-going acknowledgement of the existence of an Otherness precisely in order to make space for this Otherness. This was reflected in the interviews where repetition

was mentioned occasionally as an important means to make space for women within political parties. One party member said, 'Most of the political leaders are men. Sometimes they forget the female candidates. But the women must [remind] them: "Do not forget me"'.⁷ Another woman politician said: 'I keep reminding them: in every activity, if no women, the activity cannot work, because there are 60 per cent women in Cambodia'.⁸ Considering that this woman needs constantly to 'remind them', the quotations imply that women are not spontaneously included into social or political work. The last of these citations highlighted that there are more women than men in Cambodia ('because there are 60 per cent women in Cambodia'). Adding this statement she apparently refers to an established discourse to verify, 'prove' or make concrete her first outline of women as necessary participants of different party activities.

Yet another woman politician relayed a similar account, arguing that 'the strategy is that we keep talking about how women are also human resources'.⁹ This quotation also resonates with the above strategy of repeating ('keep talking about') as a practice to make space for women while simultaneously upgrading women's status as politicians. At this point, however, it might be important to pinpoint that, as we repeat a discourse, an identical repetition is impossible, but each and every statement shifts somewhat (Lenz Taguchi 2004: 173).

While repetition is discussed in terms of resistance in this book, Bhabha argues that power is sustained with a comparable mechanism. He suggests the concept of fixity, whose key discursive strategy is the stereotype. Stereotypes are used in order to establish and sustain power relations, in the contest of power between colonizers and colonized (Bhabha 1994; Childs and Williams 1997: 124–129; see also Said 1995). In order to legitimate and justify the white ruling of the 'irresponsible', 'uncontrolled' natives, stereotypes have been repeatedly used. Stereotypes cannot be proved and so must be constantly reinforced by anxiously restating them. These constant repetitions are a sign of an actor, in this case the colonial power, trying to sustain their unstable power site (Bhabha 1994; Childs and Williams 1997: 124–129). According to Bhabha, the 'space of the

Other is always occupied by an *idea fixed*: despot, heathen, barbarian, chaos, and violence. If these symbols are always the same, their ambivalent repetition makes them the signs of a much deeper crisis of authority' (Bhabha in Childs and Williams, 1997: 129, emphasis added). Although the stereotypes need no proof for existing, at the same time, it is a dilemma that they cannot be proved. This paradox creates an ambivalent situation, which, among other things, ensures the stereotypes' repeatability (Bhabha 1994: 66).

Butler (1997: 16) also talks about powers sustainability in terms of repetition, stating, 'If the conditions of power are to persist, they must be reiterated; the subject is precisely the site of such reiteration, a repetition that is never merely mechanical'. In line with Bhabha, she argues that the need for repetition at all reveals something, it is a sign that the repeated identity is not self-identical and that 'it requires to be instituted again and again, which is to say that it runs the risk of becoming de-instituted at every interval' (Butler 1991: 24).

Both Butler and Bhabha thus touch upon the very core question of the repetition issue: why do we repeat at all? While Bhabha interprets the repetitions as a sign of the crisis of authority and legitimacy, Butler, on the other hand, argues that repetition is an effect of power but also a key to emancipation: 'The possibility of gender transformation [is] to be found [...] in the possibility of a failure to repeat, a de-formity, or a parodic repetition that exposes the phantasmatic effect of abiding identity as a politically tenuous construction' (Butler 1999: 179). While these are both important implications of the notion of repeating, this book argues for yet another angle, interpreting the constant repetition of emancipatory 'truths' in itself as a sign of resistance. In addition, like Bhabha, I believe the repeating tells us something about power. The politics of visibility – the strategy of maintaining and repeating a vision and an image of the competent, peaceful, Cambodian female politician – depends upon the invisibility of the disciplinary system in itself and how hierarchies and stereotypes are shaped in and through time and space (Weston 2002: 16). In other words, the fact that women are stereotyped and put into a hierarchy is not made explicit in relation to the repeti-

tions. Neither is it put on the table that power is being negotiated through the repetitions of statements in and through time. The very reasons for repeating are therefore hidden. In spite of this, the need to reverse the female stereotype and reload it with positive worth implies that women are commonly lowly ranked, because the image of the superior female politician is defined as different from something else. This 'something else' is not made explicit but is still present.

Resistance embodied as repetitions from different sites tells us something, not only about resistance but also about power. The image of the competent, peaceful female politician might reveal the 'normality' from which to view the new repeated image. If we need to be informed about the excellence of the peaceful, non-violent image of a female politician, that is not generally how we view female politicians. There is a hidden discourse about women politicians that is contested. Repetition, in relation to what seems to be hidden, thus makes for an interesting analysis that reveals something about power as well as resistance.

WOVEN DISCOURSES

The image of female identity repeated by the female politicians can be argued to rest upon processes of hybridity. Therefore, in the sections below, the usage of hybridity as 'woven discourses' will be discussed. According to Fairclough (1992), discourses not only represent the world but also comprise a practice that signifies, constitutes and constructs the world in meaning.¹⁰ Accordingly, while discourses reproduce as well as transform how we comprehend the world and how we act within it, they are constitutive in both a conventional and a creative way. For example, they work to maintain the relationship between, and the roles of, the student and the teacher, but simultaneously have a transformative potential to alter the very same relationship.¹¹ From the above, Fairclough develops the concept of intertextuality with reference to the work of Kristeva. The main point made by the latter, who is inspired in her turn by Bakhtin, is that a text absorbs and is based on other texts from the past in terms of responding to, reaccentuating and reworking past

texts. This intersection of different discourses simultaneously enables the continuity of the past and makes possible its transformation (Fairclough 1992: 64–65). The practice of creating hybrid ‘truths’ by relying on different discourses helps us to understand the practices of resistance in Cambodia. As suggested at the beginning, power consists of stereotyped or hierarchical ‘truths’. These ‘truths’, however, can be altered. One way of negotiating hierarchies and stereotypes is to weave together different discourses and thus create a new logical reasoning. As stated previously, Fairclough argues, however, that this possibility to create change by using old discourses in new ways is limited by power relations. Hegemonic relations limit the infinite possibilities of discursive practices that come from the idea of mixed ‘truths’:

The relationship between intertextuality and hegemony is important. The concept of intertextuality points to the productivity of texts, to how texts can transform prior texts and restructure existing conventions (genres, discourse) to generate new ones. But this productivity is not in practice available to people as a limited space for textual innovation and play: it is socially limited and constrained, and conditional upon relations of power (Fairclough, 1992: 102–103).

While it might be limited, there is still a possibility for the subaltern to negotiate power by mixing prevailing discourses in order to create more emancipatory ‘truths’. Within postcolonial theory, this practice is described in terms of hybridity and hybridization, two of the best-known terms associated with the attempts to theorize the ambivalence of the colonial aftermath. According to Werbner, we have to recognize the different interests of social groups in sustaining boundaries, resulting in some experiencing hybridity as disturbing, while for others it is revelatory (1997: 1–23). In line with this it may be appropriate to refer to Bakhtin’s key distinctions between unconscious, ‘organic’ hybridity and conscious, ‘intentional’ hybridity. The first implies the apparently natural evolution of all languages, involving the unreflective borrowing, exchanging and inventions through which culture has always evolved (despite the illusion of

boundedness). Intentional hybrids, on the other hand, are 'built to shock, change, challenge, revitalize or disrupt through deliberate, intended fusions of unlike social language and images' (Werbner 1997: 5). This cultural hybridity is able to shock and disturb by challenging the taken-for-granted.

Further to this, Bhabha, the post-colonial writer particularly associated with the concept of hybridity, reads hybridity in terms of resistance (Eriksson Baaz 2002: 62). He takes as a point of departure the confrontation between the colonialist authority and the 'natives', the colonizers and the colonized. He seeks to describe the construction of cultural authority within, for example, conditions of inequity, arguing that,

At the point at which the precept attempts to objectify itself as a generalized knowledge or a normalizing, hegemonic practice, the hybrid strategy or discourse opens up a space of negotiation where power is unequal but its articulation may be equivocal (Bhabha 1996: 58).

In this sense, hybridity implies that every concept the colonizer brings to the colonized will be interpreted, and thus reborn, in the light of the colonized culture (Childs and Williams 1997: 136). To illustrate the above, Bhabha describes the early dissemination of the Bible in India. A hybridised 'Word of God' was created as the Bible was translated into the many language of India. For example, vegetarian Hindus used notions of cannibalism (eating the flesh of Christ) or vampirism (drinking his blood) to create a new understanding of the Bible while translating it (Bhabha 1994: 102–122; Childs and Williams 1997: 135). By re-interpreting the insistent discourse of the colonizers, the colonized are able to resist, to shift power as well as question discursive authority. The process suggests that colonial discourses are never wholly under the control of the colonizer, as long-established classes and categories are conflated in the process of hybridity (Childs and Williams 1997: 136).¹² Hybridity has been criticised for implying a notion of originary, of single sources that mix, as in the case of Haraway's 'cyborg,' defined as a hybrid of a

machine and a organism, thus relying on an accepted binary, implying two stable, knowable identities from which the cyborg emerges (Wolfreys 1997: 2).¹³

In spite of this criticism, the concept of hybridity might still help us to understand both the processes of change and the practices of resistance within a Cambodian context. In Chapter Three several examples of woven discourses were put forward, when discussing how new discourses of democracy are mixed together with local traditions of decision-making in Cambodia. Both the traditional system and that which is being implemented are changing, as old and new discourses are put together, supporting each other and thus creating new 'truths.' In this sense, patron–client relations have tended to survive as an aspect of the new Western-implemented democracy, while political power within the democratic polity is often distributed in line with these relations. It seems to be a matter of reinterpreting the concept of a (Western, democratic) politician from a Cambodian context, assigning him/her high status and power from a local discourse of decision-making rather than in line with the more Western notions where a politician is primarily expected to represent the people and carry through the party program.

Another example, which I shall discuss further in Chapter Seven, regards Cambodian returnees who sometimes feel excluded from political decision-making because they did not suffer during the Pol Pot era. This reasoning is probably the result of several discourses being woven together, one discourse being concerned with leadership. What does it take to be a leader? What qualities ought one to have? Some state that to be a leader you must be a real Cambodian. But what does it take to be a real Cambodian? For some, to be a real Cambodian you must have suffered along with other Cambodians during the Pol Pot era. Together these different 'truths' are woven together to give a picture of what a leader ought to be. To be a Cambodian leader, one must be a real Cambodian, having had the same experiences as the people, having learnt from suffering and having suffered with the people. Different 'truths', different logics that support each other legitimize a new stratum of the population

as leaders, while the old elite, those who left the country during the Khmer Rouge period, is sometimes marginalized from power.

From the above, I would like to argue that two different outlines of hybridization can be seen in relation to resistance. The first of these is that different discourses being woven together, supporting each other, indicates that hybridization is at work. By mixing different 'truths', politically underrepresented groups are able to base themselves on, for example, globalized Western discourses in order to negotiate the stereotypes or hierarchies that reduce their presence in Cambodian politics. Among other things, as previously suggested, women are trying to change the stereotyped image of themselves and the low status assigned to them by connecting a discourse about private qualifications, that is, women as emotional and caring, with a discourse about public decision-making, that is, the idea that decision-makers ought to have a dialogue with, and understand, the ordinary citizens of the country (see also Chapter Five). The conclusion that emerges from the blending of these different 'truths' is that women's emotions and their ability to understand needs are essential for good governance and that women are indispensable in ensuring that the state's duties are fulfilled. Together the different 'truths' are used to legitimize women in power. Thereafter, as we have seen, the new hybrid 'truth' was repeated in order to be sustained.¹⁴

These processes of transformation are probably growing in significance as we enter a new globalized world order (Thörn 2002: 126). For instance, one female politician focused upon the image of a 'Western state' in order to legitimize women's presence in the political sphere. In her view, an ideal form of governance is typified by a caring state. This type of state however, is rare outside the Western context. The citizens of Cambodia have, for example, probably never experienced the nation-state as an important provider of personal protection. Still, this respondent draws on to this kind of state in order to upgrade the status of women politicians:

[Women are] capable of sensitizing the whole crowd. Better than men, you know, [...] I think if Cambodia, I'm sure ... if Cambo-

dia were a democratic country like the Western countries, women would be brilliant in politics.¹⁵

While arguing in favour of women's exceptional democratic qualities, this quotation draws on the idea of a democracy 'like the Western countries'. This female politician is utilizing a discourse, made accessible by the processes of globalization, to explain the greatness of women in politics, to create a hybrid image of identity. In other words, globalization might provide subaltern groups with discourses from abroad that they can employ to negotiate power sites, in this case the gender inequalities within public administration (see also Chapter Seven). These kind of discourses thus form a sort of capital that one may use to accomplish change and the conclusion is consistent with Ferguson's suggestion (in another context), that when 'social spaces are remapped, so are resident identities; prevailing subjectivities' (Ferguson 1993: 177). The emancipating practice of mixing different 'truths' in order to create new meaning locates resistance mainly in the writer of meaning.

Hybridization is more than the mixing of different 'truths' into new challenging knowledge, however. As noted above, there is a second aspect of hybridity: it may also involve the resistance of local actors by the way of reinterpretation. For example, as claimed in Chapter Three, the implementation of (Western) democracy in many Third World countries has given rise to a number of new discourses, in interpretations of a Western system of rule from the perspective of the local culture. This latter strategy embraces the power of resistance located in the reader who refuses to acknowledge the message from the producer in the way s/he would like it to be understood.

The twofold divide embodied in these two different aspects of hybridity appears to be a simplification, however, with respect to case of Cambodia. Apart from the outline of reinterpretation and the practice of woven discourses, the gap between discourses and practices also seems to run into a hybrid system of rule. Discourses shape our thoughts, with which we act in accordance: in this sense,

discourses form practices (see for example S. Hall 1992: 291). In the Cambodian case, the democratic discourse as implemented by the UN, in some senses is still strong. This is indicated by the fact that while many Cambodians may not be able to differentiate between the political agendas of the main parties, the vast majority (88 per cent), agree that 'to have a democracy, there must be elections with more than one party competing' (Asian Foundation 2003). In contrast to this, just 28 per cent of the respondents highlighted the parties' policies, views and ideology as motives for voting (Asian Foundation 2003). That people stress the importance of multiple parties in spite this might be read as an indication of the fact that the democratic discourse, as it was implemented in 1993 still dominates, although it is not reflected in corresponding democratic practices such as those related to party programs and so on. The gap between discourse and practice creates a new system of rule that in it self can be understood as being hybrid. This creates a number of interesting questions: How can democratic discourses create corresponding practices? What does the gap between discourse and practice reveal about the democratic system and its hybrid nature? (Still all practices are a part of the discourse).

PERFORMING HYBRIDITY AS RESISTANCE

Above I addressed how repetition as well as hybridity makes sense in the light of resistance. Woven discourses are not only an emancipatory strategy in the sense that new 'truths' are produced, but the practice itself might raise women's status and may thereby contribute to the altering of the gender hierarchy. One woman explained how women should act to become successful in politics:

Most of all they have to have a good educational level. [...] Not high graduate you know, I don't mean that. I believe to have an ability to understand what they read and what they hear. You know. That's very important. Not just to...what they have heard or what they have read...not just to repeat, but also to understand, to analyse the whole concept of politics. [...] You might be right, your ideas might be wrong, but you have grounds to say such things.¹⁶

This woman's use of sentences such as you must 'have grounds to say' indicates that whatever ideas female politicians put forward, they must be related to and be argued in connection with discourses that are understandable and well-known to the reader – that is, to the past – thus proving that they mastered the discourses in full. Whatever ideas you put forward, these must be anchored within well-known 'truths'. Moreover, the phrase 'not just to repeat, but to understand, to analyse the whole concept of politics' implies that to promote an idea you must be able to use the discourse by putting discursive facts together into a chain of arguments. By using and mixing discourses as the foundation for new texts or 'truths', Cambodian women may thus be accepted as successful politicians, which could in turn upset the hierarchy and challenge female stereotypes. For this respondent, status thus seems to be ascribed to the speaker when she succeeds in using already existing discourses and genres as cornerstones in the construction of new text – grounding her new 'truths' within the prevailing discursive logic. This can be interpreted in terms of hybridity, with the ability to create hybrid 'truths' giving a higher rank and altering stereotypes and hierarchies by way of resistance.

SILENCE AND DENIAL AS RESISTANCE

Repetitions were interpreted above in terms of resistance: what do they tell us about silence, about non-repeating? According to Lynn Thiesmeyer, what is said is important, however equally important is what is left unsaid (Thiesmeyer 2003: 1). In line with this, in the below section I will argue that silence as a means of resistance should be given more attention within social science. Silence has often been solely seen as a means of power or an effect of power. For example, it is widely recognized among feminist researchers that one aspect of the power-relationship(s) between men and women is that men are often regarded as the most important actors and the most important topic to know about, while the reality of, for example, women and children is treated as secondary to the 'main story' (Peterson and Runyan 1993: 25). Women are thus 'silenced' throughout history and their lives, experiences, and so on are hid-

den. Feminist researcher Hanne Haavind has, amongst other things, put together a list of how women are presented within social science. She argues that men's knowledge, or knowledge about men, is often presented as general knowledge about or of the population, while women in many cases are not visible at all (Haavind in Holmberg and Lindholm 1991: 214).

What feminist researchers earlier concluded regarding silence is today used and studied in other contextual settings by post-structuralist researchers such as Lynn Thiesmeyer. Her edited volume *Discourse and Silencing: Representation and the Language of Displacement* describes how subaltern groups are silenced, 'defin[ing] silencing as a way of using language to limit, remove and undermine the legitimacy of another use of language' (Thiesmeyer 2003: 2). It can be claimed that silence reflects the disciplinary power in any society, as 'the action of silencing is accompanied by social and political judgments of what is acceptable and unacceptable' (Thiesmeyer 2003: 1). Likewise, Kathy Ferguson has argued that the dominant ethnic group in any nation-state may try to strengthen its power by not making visible the other ethnic groups. This has been done, for example, by leaving out the history of the other groups in public museums. The silence surrounding these groups can be interpreted as a strategy of a superior group to strengthen its power, yet the exhibiting of these groups' culture and history could equally strengthen them as subaltern. Henrietta Lidchi argues that 'the politics of exhibiting means museums make certain cultures visible, in other words they allow them to be subjected to the scrutiny of power' (1997: 189). What prevails from this quotation is that not only is it a matter of what is decided to be an important object of knowledge, what becomes visible, but at the next stage an even more problematic aspect is *how* the object or subject is made visible and the processes of stereotyping that may be involved as human subjects are transformed into ethnographic objects (Lidchi 1997: 190). From a feminist perspective, Haavind similarly argues that women when made visible often are presented in rather stereotyped terms (Haavind in Holmberg and Lindholm 1991: 214).

The purpose of the above outline has been to make visible how silence primarily has been addressed either as a means of power or/and an effect of power (see also Jaworski (ed.) 1997; Kronsell 2006; Lorraine 1990). As suggested above, however, resistance is also exercised through silence. A few researchers have explored this theme. Among them, Perry Gilmore, for example describes not only how teachers use silence to exercise power, but also how students adopt dramatically stylized 'silent sulks' to display anger in the power-resistance game between the teacher and student (1885: 139–161). The focus here is on the actual conversation (between teacher-student), where silence actually carries meaning and expresses something, that is, anger. Minh-ha, when referring to silence also seems to imply that it expresses something: 'Silence as a refusal to partake in the story does sometimes provide us with a means to gain a hearing. It is a voice, a mode of uttering and a response in its own right. Without other silences, however, my silence goes unheard' (Trinh 1999: 218; Trinh 1987: 5–22).

In this section it is argued that silence can be used as resistance, not to communicate something but to silence hegemonic discourses, simply by not repeating them; it is resistance by refusing to maintain power-loaded discourses. Addressing silence, denial may be a still more drastic approach. As is evident in the quotation below, silence and denial as forms of resistance aim at diminishing the impact of discourses of hierarchy and stereotyping by a process of disavowal. I asked a woman I met for a second interview to comment on certain stereotyped notions of women that had been expressed in several other interviews. The respondent replied first with refusal – she had never heard that discourse – and then, after a while, admitted in a roundabout way the 'truth' she was being confronted with:

I have never heard people say that women are mentally weak. Women are emotional, yes. We are emotional. We want to avoid any fighting. We think about the long run. We do not want to [act], you know, right away. We see the consequences. They think that we are emotional, unlike men, who take steps, you know, right away, who decide right away ... When they say women are weak, they mean peaceful, not weak, giong sau.¹⁷

Although her first response is one of denial, at the end of the interview the respondent indirectly refers to and acknowledges the fact that she recognizes the dominant discourse that defines women as (mentally) weak:

That happens ... because they are not allowed to go to school up to [more than the] third grade. You only know how to read and write but then ... they stay at home and then they considered us weak because they do not provide the opportunity to go to school. And this perception is carrying it on, generation after generation. And it makes us women believe ourselves to be weak. But as you see, if women are provided with an opportunity to go to school – they are not weak.¹⁸

The denial ('I have never heard people say that women are mentally weak') can be read as a response to her perception of myself as an interviewer and how she understood my aims. She ends the interview by saying that I have low confidence in Cambodian women. Misreading the interview questions, her aim becomes one of altering my view of women and making it more 'correct' ('When they say women are weak, they mean peaceful'), in this case by denying discourses that are inaccurate or uncomfortable to her. She does not want to pass on to me – a researcher with the power to present natural facts scientifically to a broader or at least an important audience – a stereotype which, by putting women last, defines them as less honourable and places them at the bottom of the hierarchy. When she in the end recognizes the existence of a stereotyped image of women as (mentally) weaker, she chooses to explain it in terms of a feminist discourse about women's lack of schooling, thus promoting the need for change ('They stay at home and then they considered us weak because they do not provide the opportunity to go to school. And this perception is carrying it on, generation after generation. And it makes we women believe ourselves that we are weak. But as you see, if women are provided with an opportunity to go to school – they are not weak').

Refusing to pass on or acknowledge discourses may thus be viewed as resistance aimed at preventing those power-discourses from spreading. Lynn Thiesmeyer, quoted above, argues that power

works through a similar strategy. Although her edited volume focuses on the type of silencing that operates through institutions (schools, courtrooms, political institutions, and so on) and how these promote certain kinds of knowledge while other kinds are neglected, it is the same phenomenon that is addressed (Thiesmeyer 2003: 10–11). One important difference may be that the silencing, according to Thiesmeyer, rather than trying to erase the unwanted discourse altogether, seeks to assimilate, filter and replace the unwanted discourse (2003: 13). Analysing the silence of the respondent quoted above, however, it seems that silence is a means of obliterating power-loaded discourses rather than taking on an assimilative function. Drawing on Foucault, it might be argued that silence and denial are strategies for those who refuse to be the subjects to perpetuate power-loaded discourses and act as a part of the net-like organization through which power is maintained.

Silence and denial can be considered in relation to the concept of irony. Rosenberg, Butler and Irigaray all describe irony as a form of resistance by the inferior to the dominant. As I will elaborate in Chapter Eight, the ironic utterance does not correspond to just one fixed meaning, but slides between conflicting connotations. What is most effective, then: not to repeat a repressive discourse at all or to repeat it ironically? Even though irony may deconstruct and denaturalize a statement, the statement simultaneously forwards, acknowledges and maintains a power-loaded discourse. For example, by exaggerating the sexual prowess of black bodies, one makes explicit the stereotypes of it, though the statement simultaneously involves the repetition and spreading of a discourse about the sexual capacities of black men (S. Hall 1997b). Is it therefore more effective not to repeat the discourse at all, not even ironically, but instead to keep silent or express counter-‘truths’?

CONCRETISM AND THE IMPACT OF DIFFERENT REPRESENTATIONS

Analysing discourses, the form of the representation – is it spoken, an image, a gesture, and so on – is seldom a part of the analysis. I pro-

pose, however, that different types of representations carry different meaning and have different impact in terms of resistance. This argument demands an unpacking of the relationship between discourse and practice, two closely related concepts, between which one may see a number of linkages. First of all, as Stuart Hall (1992) points out, discourses shape our thoughts, which we act in accordance with: in this sense, discourses form practices. For example, discourses about the Third World in opposition to the modern, industrialized West are deeply embedded in practices, that is, in Northern behaviour towards Southern countries. Or, as in Cambodia, discourses bring with them negative consequences, such as ethnic discrimination. A low-status stereotype of the Vietnamese minority is often employed, which might provoke hostility towards the Vietnamese community. These nationalist and racial discourses lead to ethnic discriminations of various sorts, as well as an uneven distribution of decision-making power, and of resources. In some cases, Cambodians have even used direct violence against immigrant Vietnamese people.

Secondly, discourses concern the production of knowledge through language. They are then themselves produced by a practice, that is, the practice of producing meaning (S. Hall 1992: 291). Finally, a third connection between discourses and practices is that all social practices entail meanings. Therefore, all practices have a discursive aspect. Every hijab-wearing woman constitutes a representation within a religious, sometimes nationalistic discourse, a discourse that she, by wearing the hijab, is repeating and upholding. She is one representation among several forming an Islamic discourse. She, acting from her identity, becomes a 'living representation' and a powerful means to strengthen a discourse. The above implies that images of identity can also be used to change or alter dominating discourses, for example, by strengthening alternative discourses.

This divide between discourse and practice invites us to return to the resistance by Cambodian female politicians. Cecilia Trenter's outline of the concept of concretism is helpful for exploring how practices, as concrete representations, comprise means of resistance (Trenter 2000: 50–63). Among its impacts, concretism can strengthen a dis-

course by making concrete what is expressed in more abstract terms. For instance, by exemplifying a historical account through giving it a face, a personal memory, the history becomes more concrete, more comprehensible for the reader. Concretism may also involve the art of making complex matters understandable. This can be illustrated by the way in which maps reduce countries, states, infrastructure and nations into a clear and well-arranged paper image, thus visualizing discourses and strengthening them, as well as containing their own stories about time and space (Trenter 2000: 57–60).

Concretism is a useful concept in analysing performances of resistance of Cambodian female politicians, because while some respondents argued in favour of the repetition of new emancipatory ‘truths’ as an effective strategy of resistance – for example, reversing a low-status image of women by restating the notion that ‘Women are good politicians’ – the effectiveness of this strategy vis-à-vis concrete action was at times questioned by critical respondents. When talking about repetitions as a possible strategy of resistance, one female MP concluded that ‘I don’t think it’s good to repeat. Because if you say something too many times, they kind of ignore it. It’s not a good strategy for me. In fact, I will not use that. I just do what I believe.’¹⁹ The argument was that, while the repetition of new emancipatory ‘truths’ may be ignored, visible representations more easily disturb the maintenance of the andocentric social order. Or, as the old fairy tale about the child who cried wolf expresses it, if you repeat something too many times, people may stop listening. While the child keeps screaming, ‘the wolf is coming’, in the end nobody reacts. But as soon as people stop listening, the wolf appears. Repetition may thus have the undesired effect of being ignored as ‘just the same old story’. This type of cynical distancing may, however, be countered and disrupted by practical evidence, that is, by concrete representations. The MP quoted above also talked about the difference between just speaking and actual practice:

[It is] like the case of a woman, afraid to get divorced from a man and that man also says that; Oh this woman cannot get away from me, you know, she’s so submissive and all that. [Then] the only thing

is to just go. And they believe you. But if you don't go, they don't do anything. They just abuse you more.²⁰

This quotation implies that 'abstract' discourses about women's political advantages may have more impact if they are made concrete by visible examples. The message is: do not talk about it. Just show them! Then they believe you! From this perspective, Cambodian women's access to the political arena increases if the present-day female politicians constitute trustworthy images of women's abilities:

They [women politicians] are so, so responsible because they are afraid of what they say; "a, women...they are the weak gender, something like that. They are weaker than men". So, men always look at women.... So they want to prove that they can do that. So, sometimes they try double the men in order to make the party leader go: "Oh, you can, you can do that".

Another woman said,

Like I said, this is a man's world, and we have a long way to go. *Action is the proof*, you know. So, we have to do things that they cannot do. [...] I have the impression that men are used to dominating. So they think that women are not really active like they are. So I think we have to *show them*, you know. We can do something *in action* so they can see.²¹

This woman talks about visible representations as a 'proof'. This is a key term. The concept of proof implies that we believe that certain representations actually have the weight to determine whether or not a discourse is true. It is not enough stating that women are good politicians, but you must show them, you must prove your competence to gain legitimacy. But what must be showed? In what way must women appear as representations to prove their competence? How must they position their bodies? To what correct performance must she measure up?

A spoken discourse stating that women are as good as men probably has less impact than the fact that the majority of politicians are men. Male politicians are in themselves 'proofs' of the discourse of

the male dominance of the democratic arena. In another interview, the following view was expressed:

I believe that, I personally believe that the women become politically involved because they have some yearning, maybe they have been hurt for some reason. They have been what you called discriminated. [...] Becoming political is a kind of revenge, it is a *proof of talent and skill that they are capable*, that they are human resources that need to be given a value. So it is a *demonstration*. It is a fight back.²²

The use of words such as proof and demonstration could be seen as indications of the importance of political practices as concrete representations. In line with this logic, to be trustworthy a discourse must not only consist of statements but also be comprised of other more concrete representations, and as was articulated in the quotation above, concrete representations, such as women who have assumed a political identity and act successfully from it, are to be seen as means of resistance. As the respondent herself expressed it: 'it is a fight back'.

Concretism, in this above analysis, is about using oneself, one's body, as resistance. A number of researchers have addressed the body as means of resistance, including Butler and several others. For example, in the edited volume *Negotiating at the Margins* (Davis and Fisher (eds.) 1993) part one is called 'Negotiating the Body and its Adornments' and it deals with power struggles by exploring the body as a site of resistance. It shows, among other things, how women makes resistance by remaking their bodies surgically or by using certain clothes either to construct a resisting sexual identity or to negotiate the boundaries of the appropriate dress. These are all examples of how the body can be seen as a site for challenging practices, thus letting the body serve as a tool for resistance, and they are all examples of concretism as resistance.

Concretism should thus be considered a strategy of resistance that is used to alter hierarchical, stereotyping discourses about women's political abilities. Concrete representations may contradict the spoken discourse so brutally that the latter must be questioned. One

example of this is when high-ranking capable female politicians visit rural areas where the dominant discourse describes women as non-political. As stated previously women's election speeches attract voters precisely because these people have difficulties conceptualizing a female politician ('Therefore everyone comes to listen to you. They want to see how a female candidate acts.'). Another woman made a similar comment about people's perceptions of female politicians: 'they are surprised and accepting. To get more women to become politicians we need more female role models.'²³ It seems like female politicians in Cambodia, at least according to some, fail to correspond to any of the stereotypes of society, through which we give meaning to different representations. To understand this we can take as a point of departure Mary Douglas's (1966) outline of ambiguous things, the 'in-betweens', which fail to fall neatly into any category, but instead appears threatening as they shake the cultural order. Taking Douglas reasoning a step further, I would like to argue that the women quoted above not only represent something 'in-between', but by their existence, they directly question and contradict the discourse of women as non-political. We can thereby surmise that divergent representations, from a resistance perspective, inevitably require an exploration. I want to highlight that this goes for other contexts as well. For instance, Ane Kirkegaard provides a colourful exploration of the discourses of white people in Zimbabwe in the sixties and their struggle to distance themselves from the wild and sexually licentious blacks, while representing themselves as sexually controlled (following the European principle of 'one man one wife'). The discourse of the white civilization was frequently put forward publicly as political arguments, however it did not exist unchallenged but was constantly questioned, for example, by black politicians who leaned on the very concrete contradictory representations that 'the Coloureds' composed. As a group, the Coloureds were a result of the white peril and formed a discrete population group, which had no given place on the racial ladder (Kirkegaard 2004). Their existence made it possible to resist the white superior discourse, as they, in a very concrete way, represented an alternative 'truth', a conflicting

discourse. Considering this, as well as the above quotations, it must be remembered that whilst doing discourse analysis, it is not enough to state that a discourse consists of different representations, such as sounds, written words, images, musical notes, statements and body language, but one must separate and discuss the different meanings and impacts of these representations.

UNIVERSALISM – ROLE MODELS

As it has been argued repetitions of ‘in-between-representations’ and the concept of concretism are important parts of the study of how discourses are created, maintained and resisted in everyday life. Moreover, the concept of concretism in connection to the concept of universalism can help us to understand and analyse women politicians as role models. It is easier to assume and identify with universal norms, that is feelings, situations and destinies presented in more general, universally recognizable manners (see for example Hamilton 1997: 101). To make use of a more universal but still concrete approach is a strategy sometimes applied by aid organizations in fund-raising for the Third World. *Folkekirken* had a television advertisement in which a black screen was accompanied by the sound of a baby crying and a voice asking, ‘What do you do when your baby is crying?’ The answer was, ‘you comfort it. Feed it. Give it love’ (Westerdahl in Trenter 2000: 50–63). The strategy was to refer to universal values and feelings by playing on the audience’s sympathy for their own children and thereby create feelings of solidarity. This was done by concrete representations that are easy to relate to. The idea is to get the giver to feel that s/he is not different from the aid receiver and thereby reduce the us-them dichotomy that often underpins stereotyping and alienation.

In the light of universalism, the concept of role model in a Cambodian context becomes more understandable. Some Cambodian women politicians referred to themselves as role models for other women, as they constituted a contrasting, competing image of identification. For women the discovery of political possibilities may be a result of watching female political actors: ‘I think this is coming out

a lot, because I've talked to a lot of educated women; they want to be involved but I think we are the examples, you know. (...) that gives them courage to see, well this is not only men, we have to have our voice to.²⁴ An effective role model, however, should probably play on universalism, that is, act in what is understood to be a normal female manner, representing the dominant gender role, and thus act so that women can relate to the role model. Other women must be able to recognize themselves and their female identity in the role model and see how a female self can be combined with political activities. As claimed in earlier chapters, there is a risk when female politicians normalize towards a norm created by a Westernized and masculine perspective, because at the same time the female politician distances herself from the dominant female gender role, women in general will have problems identifying themselves with her. As she no longer represents a generally held 'universal' image of womanhood capable of creating the potential for identification, an us-them divide is created and her potential as role model is diminished. Thus concretism only works emancipatory under certain circumstances.

To sum up, Cambodian women that have assumed, and act from, a political identity that may concretize women's political ability thus constituting examples for other women. Unfortunately, the capacity of female politicians in contemporary Cambodia is seldom recognized by surrounding women.

Women who have positions in politics create no networks or fight for women's rights. These women only adapt to the parties and play by their rules. They play according to men's rules. These women are dolls who only say and do what the parties order.²⁵

This discrediting may be a response to the prevailing relations of power and a way of resisting and distancing oneself from negative stereotypes about one's identity. When analysing the practices of street-people in Texas, Snow and Andersson (in Howard and Hollander 1997) found that individuals tend to distance themselves from other people associated with the negative stereotype they themselves are ascribed in order to resist it. This may be the explanation for why some respondents, first emphasize the good qualities of fe-

male politicians in general, while simultaneously making degrading remarks about the serving female politicians, for example labelling them 'token women.'²⁶ The strategy seems to be to construct a new image of female politicians while at the same time trying to distance themselves from the negative stereotypes and the people and practices that are associated with them in today's Cambodia. Distancing may thus undermine the effectiveness of concretism, and the ability of the latter to transform the dominating discourses concerning women as non-political must be evaluated.

NOTES

1. Interview No. 2A.
2. Interview No. 2A.
3. Interview No. 4B.
4. Interview No. 12B.
5. Interview No. 11B.
6. Interview No. 18B.
7. Interview No. 5A.
8. Interview No 6A.
9. Interview No 2A.
10. Fairclough uses a more limited definition of discourse than that employed in this text, but some of his thoughts are still applicable to the discussion of this chapter.
11. Following Fairclough, three levels can be distinguished in which discourses have constructing effects: first, regarding different images of identity; secondly, in the relationships between humans; and finally, in respect of different belief systems (Fairclough 1992: 64–65). All these aspects are part of the power relations between humans and are dimensions where domination might be altered and resistance established. However, it seems important to point out that the overlapping and intertwining of the different aspects implies that it is in fact rather difficult to separate the above into clearly defined categories.
12. When Said discusses what role culture plays in resistance, he argues, 'In the case of a political identity that's being threatened, culture is a way of fighting against extinction and obliteration. Culture is a form of memory against effacement. In that respect I think it is terribly important. But there is another dimension of cultural discourse – the power to analyse, to get past cliché and straight out-and-out lies from authority, the questioning of authority, the

search for alternatives. These are also part of the arsenal of cultural resistance' (Said 2003: 159).

13. As an answer to this critique, it can be argued that contemporary globalization make all cultures less stable and the processes of change are moving faster. Hybridity makes visible this tendency of change and instability characterized by global mobility and interaction (Thörn 2002; Hammarén forthcoming 2008).
14. This strategy combines two of Stuart Hall's outlines of resistance. According to Hall, in regard to resistance, different strategies stand out. One involves attaching status to a popular stereotype, a transcoding strategy that Hall exemplifies with the new type of movie that suddenly emerged in the 1970s. In *Sweet Sweetback's Baadass Song* the leading character was described as a black hero exhibiting characteristics that formerly would have been regarded as negative but now were valued positively, in that he lived a violent life, made use of his sexual ability at every opportunity, handled quick money, ultimately getting away with everything (S. Hall 1997b: 270–271). In some sense, then, the binary structure of the racial stereotypes remains and the idea of the black hero can be seen as nothing but trapped in its stereotypical Other. Still, this would be a way of negotiating hierarchies.

A second way to resist involves rethinking, for example, 'women' or 'black' by expanding the range of representations and the complexity of the images of identity. This can be done by making visible out-of-the-way representations: black men looking after children or black women as political actors, and so on (S. Hall 1997b: 271–274). In this case it is a matter of changing the reductionism of earlier stereotypes by adding new meanings to a concept or image.

15. Interview No. 1A.
16. Interview No. 1A.
17. Interview No. 2A.
18. Interview No. 2A.
19. Interview No. 8A.
20. Interview No. 8A.
21. Interview No. 8A, emphasis added.
22. Interview No. 2A, emphasis added.
23. Interview No. 17B.
24. Interview No. 8A.
25. Interview No. 18B.
26. Interview No. 17B.