

Discursive Dynamics in Gender Equality Politics

What about ‘Feminist Taboos’?

Emanuela Lombardo

UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID

Petra Meier

UNIVERSITEIT ANTWERPEN

Mieke Verloo

RADBOUD UNIVERSITEIT NIJMEGEN

ABSTRACT Discursive dynamics play an important role in shaping the meanings of gender equality. The article discusses the relation between hegemonic discourses on gender equality policies and feminist taboos. It suggests that feminist scholars could paradoxically be trapped in hegemonic discourses on gender equality policies that may lead to taboos about particular approaches to and interpretations of such policies. Three main feminist hegemonic discourses are considered to act as taboos. They deal with the possibility to overcome patriarchy, the role of elites and other groups of actors in processes of gender transformation and the merits of incremental change. The article further discusses the implications of the postulate about hegemonic discourses and taboos on gender equality for feminist knowledge production and reflects on the potential of Bacchi’s notion of ‘reflexivity’ to overcome them.

KEY WORDS discursive politics ♦ feminist taboos ♦ gender equality ♦ policies
reflexivity

INTRODUCTION

Discursive dynamics play an important role in the social construction of gender equality. Politicians, policy-makers, civil society actors, judges, academics and opinion-makers formulate and/or contribute to the shaping of gender equality policies, and through these discursive processes issues of

gender inequality and equality get their meaning.¹ These meanings are multiple, sometimes more contradictory than coherent and change over time and place. Scholars concerned with discursive constructions of gender equality, such as Bacchi (2005, 2009) and Ferree (Ferree, 2009; Ferree and Merrill, 2000; Ferree et al., 2002) make us reflect on the extent to which feminist researchers in the field of gender and politics, such as ourselves, can actually stand outside the existing hegemonic discourses of our disciplines and political environment. In this article we use the term 'hegemonic discourses' in the sense that Bacchi (2005, 2009) means, that is overarching frames that may steer the actors' conscious shaping of an issue.² These overarching frames set a horizon of meanings that places some specific frames in a more central location, moving actors to fix particular interpretations of gender equality issues, sometimes in automatic and not particularly thought-out ways. While certain biases may be intentional choices, meant to strategically frame a specific policy issue, others are unintentional and owing to the fact that policy-makers and activists do not escape from hegemonic discourses such as these overarching frames.

We postulate that the same goes for feminist approaches to gender equality policies and that feminist scholars could paradoxically be trapped in a hegemonic discourse on gender equality policy that may create taboos about particular approaches to and interpretations of such policies. We define a taboo as *an often tacit but shared and general inclination not to address or question an issue*. While taboo setting is a discursive process that is not the result of intentional struggle, it nonetheless is the outcome of human actions just as discourses are (Foucault, 1971). Taboos may be developed when scholars adopt tunnel visions that lead to a preference for certain outcomes of their analysis. Taboos result in blind spots that need to be addressed to fully understand and tackle issues of gender inequality. We find, for instance, that feminist scholars tend to see patriarchy first, through the identification of framings of the concept of gender equality that shrink it or bend it to the advantage of other policy goals and priorities. This tunnel vision can then create a taboo about the possibility of positive outcomes of gender equality policies. We also find that feminist scholars tend to see, and negatively assess, hegemonizing frames that exclude civil society actors from the political debates. This perspective might lead to the development of a taboo about positively assessing policy processes that are not participatory in general, even when the policy outcomes of such processes are positive for gender equality. Such recurrent feminist approaches, could, if applied without reflection, block gender equality policies.

Our interest is to explore feminist taboos with respect to gender equality policies. Next to putting a spotlight on them, we analyse what the postulate about hegemonic discourses on gender equality implies for feminist knowledge production, and reflect on possible ways to deal with feminist taboos

in research about gender equality and other inequalities in general and in discursive politics approaches in particular. The article is structured into four sections. We start with a discussion of the discursive construction of gender equality policies, more especially the various processes through which gender equality gets meaning. By discursive politics we mean *the intentional or unintentional engaging of policy actors in conceptual disputes that result in meanings attributed to the terms and concepts employed in specific contexts* (see Lombardo et al., 2009: 10). We thereby distinguish between four processes, temporarily fixing a particular interpretation of gender equality, shrinking its meaning, stretching it to include new dimensions or elements, or bending it to goals other than gender equality. We then analyse the negative consequences of such discursive processes for the content of the concept of gender equality, whereby we mainly focus on processes in which the goal of gender equality is bent so as to fit other policy goals. In a third section, we discuss the relation between hegemonic discourses on gender equality policies and feminist taboos. In a fourth section, we, finally, reflect on ways to deal with feminist taboos in research about discursive (gender) equality policies, drawing mainly on Bacchi's (2009) notion of reflexivity.

THE DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF GENDER EQUALITY IN POLITICS

Gender equality is a concept that has travelled a lot – through time and place – across different national borders, amid different policy actors, both at institutional and non-institutional levels, and across a variety of national and international organizations. In its journeys through different times and contexts, the meaning of the concept of gender equality is shaped in different ways in a number of processes. Four such processes can be distinguished that fix a particular meaning of gender equality, stretch it, shrink it or bend it to some other goal (Lombardo et al., 2009). We briefly discuss all of these processes, highlighting how they affect the concept of gender equality and gender equality policies.

Fixing a certain meaning is a frequent process due to attempts to define what is to be understood by gender equality. When particular definitions of gender equality are created in a given context (for instance, equal opportunities or positive actions, or gender equality in politics) they can be fixed for some time. Fixing is not meant here in the sense of repairing the meaning of gender equality, but in the sense of establishing it. This fixing of the meaning of concepts is inevitable to be able to discuss issues that are related to these concepts and to take action. In this respect, the fixing of the concept of gender equality is the result of a discursive struggle. Feminist activists' claims for gender equality in political decision-making – enshrined as parity democracy in France, gender democracy in Germany,

or a balanced participation of men and women in decision-making in the European Union – are specific examples of such fixing of the meaning of gender equality. Fixing, in that case, is also an achievement in the gender struggle, meaning that gender equality has been enshrined in legal or political documents and has become recognized as a no longer contested goal. Fixing a meaning of gender equality, then, can open discursive windows of opportunity for subjects to act, by implementing the fixed meaning. For instance, the goal of gender equality as it is defined in a given legislature is a prerequisite to design strategies and tools meant to reach this goal. However, fixing can also be the starting point for actors to challenge another meaning that is perceived as more limited, or indeed unjust. It can initiate processes of contestation which may result in a wider interpretation of a concept that is more inclusive of actors who were previously excluded, or that better reflects the complexity of gender inequality. However, fixing labels, such as 'gender inequality is a women's problem' or 'domestic violence is an ethnic minority problem', can also result in stereotyping specific ethnic groups in the latter case, and slow down the achievement of gender equality by not questioning privileged groups like men in the first case or the ethnic majority in the second case.

In these cases, it can be noticed that shrunken concepts get fixed. Shrinking the meaning of gender equality occurs when a broader political scope of a concept is restricted to more limited meanings. Gender equality can, for instance, be shrunk into non-discrimination in a strictly legal sense, as the EU tries to do in its treatment of inequalities (Kantola and Nousiainen, 2009). In the US civil rights movement – as Ferree (2009: 90) argues – 'equal rights' claims were progressively shrunk to only imply the most formal legal rights, separated from the concept of 'social justice', and instead tied to the idea of 'diversity', which was shrunk once more to mean that no 'special rights' could be considered. Shrinking the concept of gender equality also occurs when in relation to a particular problem only a limited number of frames are adopted almost automatically, as if there were not a broader pool of meanings to choose from. In this case shrinking seems the result of assumptions that are taken for granted in the context of other dominant discourses. Examples of this process can be found in Rönblom's account of the treatment of gender equality in Swedish regional policies (Rönblom, 2005, 2009), where gender equality is shrunk to mean only women, rather than the relation between women and men, or where gender equality is mainly associated with the issue of women in political representation.

Policy discourses can also stretch the meaning of gender equality by broadening the previous understanding of the concept to incorporate more meanings. For instance, an initial definition of gender equality as non-discrimination can be broadened to include substantive equality, but stretching

can also imply that a definition of substantive equality is to incorporate initiatives of equal opportunities. A good example of the stretching of gender equality can be found in Booth and Bennett's (2002) definition of gender mainstreaming, which comprises a much larger array of actions than the definition put forward by the Council of Europe (Group of Specialists, 1998), also including targeted actions. Stretching is partly also incited by the fact that gender equality ties together two independent – but interrelated – concepts, gender and equality. The multidimensional reality of equality incites stretching initiatives that extend the meaning of the concept, and is a good example of where a tension between gender and equality can arise. Gender equality is a family member of other equality goals, and this can lead either to drawing borders between the different equality struggles or to stretching borders to readapt them in a more inclusive way (Squires, 2007; Verloo, 2006; Walby, 2005).

Finally, gender equality can experience processes of bending when policy discourses shape its meaning at the expense of the goal of gender equality. Bending occurs when the concept of gender equality is adjusted to make it fit some other goal than the achievement of gender equality itself. The issue of reconciling employment and unpaid care work is an example of fixing, shrinking, or stretching gender equality when it is about the enabling of women to combine paid labour and unpaid care work. It becomes one of bending when the focus shifts to economic growth or demographic deficits. For instance, the framing of family policies in the EU over the last decade was at first connected with the idea of sharing tasks within the family. The need to share was a condition to create equal opportunities for women in the labour market, as can be found in the 1992 Council Recommendation on childcare. However, as Stratigaki (2004) argues, when this issue was later incorporated into the European employment strategies of the 1990s, it gradually shifted meaning from the goal of sharing to that of reconciling work and family life. The main accent was placed on the organization of labour, a shift that allowed the growing prioritization of competitiveness and the creation of employment. From an objective of gender equality, the issue of family policies was bent to become a purely market-oriented objective, which involved the reproduction and consolidation of women's traditional roles as primary caregivers instead of the progressive introduction of a sharing of caring tasks.

In sum, we show that the concept of gender equality is shaped through different interpretations elaborated by a variety of institutional and civil society actors, following earlier understandings that have become dominant or embedded into common sense. Meanings of the concept are fixed for some time, shrunk within or stretched beyond particular labels, and bent to fit particular policy frames. These discursive dynamics have their consequences for gender equality.

CONSEQUENCES OF DISCURSIVE PROCESSES: DEPOLITICIZING AND DEGENERATING

Discursive processes that shrink and stretch the meaning of gender equality leave their traces in the contents of the concept of gender equality. For instance, the fixing of shrunk concepts can limit the range of possible framings of an issue, thus leaving out particular interpretations of it, or can block more comprehensive interpretations of the issue. The recurrent focus on women as a homogeneous group, as, for instance, in equal opportunities for women in the labour market, can prevent a thorough analysis of the diversity of women's positions, let alone an analysis of the mechanisms determining the differences between men's and women's positions (Meier et al., 2007). The expansion of the issue of violence against women to violence against women and children or to domestic violence often involved the distribution of the same resources over a larger number of target groups and less attention being paid to women or particular groups of women (such as sexual violence at the workplace) (Krizsán et al., 2007). Some effects can be counter to intentions. The stretching of the concept of gender equality to include other inequalities can result in the privileging of particular inequalities over others and in triggering dynamics of exclusions.

We find that processes in which gender equality is bent towards some other goal have particularly critical consequences. In our view, this is mainly because processes of bending gender equality to some other goal depoliticize the issue of gender equality, thus not representing gender equality as a political issue. One key element that is neutralized in the depoliticization is the 'dimension of conflict' that is relevant because it highlights power dynamics (Rönblom, 2009: 107; Wendt Höjer, 2002). According to Rönblom: 'To politicize a question is to acknowledge existent power relations in society and thus create opportunities for change' (Rönblom, 2009: 108). Depoliticizing an issue tends to obscure its discordant relations, its hierarchy of power, which, if recognized, could have opened up possibilities for challenging that hierarchy. When the normative group of men is not even mentioned as part of the solution or the problem of gender inequality, the unequal power relations between women and men are left unquestioned and this may block opportunities for change (see Lombardo and Meier, 2008). Similarly, when discourses, such as that of 'economic growth', are represented as unquestioned and overarching political goals, this limits the possibilities of actors to contest them and the chances of unveiling power dynamics that are embedded (but silenced) in the process (see Rönblom, 2005). This in turn could prevent political transformation from taking place.

Depoliticization in gender equality is also found in the idea of degenerating. This refers – as Jalušič (2009: 60) states – to how 'issues that were quite promisingly politicized and consciously gendered soon after

became de-gendered (the gender dimension was reduced, neutralized, or abolished). Bending the concept of equality within the family to make it fit the dominant labour market agenda has contributed to degendering the issue, blocking gender equality goals such as the challenging of existing unequal gender roles within the family. In effect, reconciliation policies appear more focused on solving the problem of demographic decline and promoting economic development, than to progressing in gender equality (Meier et al., 2007). The policy issue of domestic violence is another good example of processes of gendering and degendering. The fact that domestic violence is considered as a public policy matter is evidence of the gendering of the issue and represents a success of the long-term feminist efforts for politicizing the sphere of personal and private relations (Krizsán et al., 2007). However, the issue has also suffered from processes of degendering, when new policy frames appear in which victims and perpetrators are described in genderless terms, and power mechanisms get blurred. In sum, politicizing the concept of gender equality seems crucial in order to be able to challenge the power dynamics inherent in it.

Depoliticizing and degendering are different ways of assessing the consequences of discursive processes, which reflect some kind of normative assessment of what gender equality should or should not be. If we scrutinize our own analyses of discursive processes as developed in this article and elsewhere (see Verloo, 2007), we see patterns in our interpretation of processes that shape the meaning of gender equality. These run parallel to the analyses of other authors, who also adopt a discursive politics approach such as Ferree et al. (2002; Ferree and Merrill, 2000), Bacchi (2005), or Rönblom (2005), and as can also be found in a recent collective volume to which these authors contributed (Lombardo et al., 2009). For instance, in many of these contributions gender equality is seen to be edged out to the advantage of other frames, or civil society actors are seen to be excluded from the political debates. In general in these analyses the description of negative effects of discursive processes of gender equality dominates. Why are these interpretations so similar? Is this rooted in a shared position and knowledge as feminist researchers, and therefore an outcome of one epistemic community? Are the effects of discursive processes on gender equality really so negative? Which hegemonic discourses might influence our analyses?

HEGEMONIC DISCOURSES AND FEMINIST TABOOS

Policy actors' shaping of the meaning of gender equality occurs within broader hegemonic discourses that can steer actors' attention towards the privileging of particular interpretations and the marginalization of others. Gender scholars have highlighted the presence of hegemonic discourses

about the economy (Rönblom, 2009), the nation (Rai, 2008), or the state (Kantola, 2006) and their specific demographic (Meier et al., 2007) or crime and justice (Krizsán et al., 2007) concerns that influence the frames on gender equality. In some cases, scholars see these particular hegemonic discourses as setting the goals towards which gender equality objectives are bent. But if some discourses are so hegemonic that they shape policy frames that are articulated by policy-makers, why should they not also have an impact on frames articulated by feminist or gender scholars?

As Bacchi states, 'there is also a need to be wary of placing too much emphasis on the ability to *shape* useful frames (intentionally) and too little attention to the *shaping impact* of dominant systems of meaning on reformers themselves and their interventions' (Bacchi, 2009: 28). Bacchi points precisely to the extent to which (feminist) researchers in gender and politics can actually stand outside the existing hegemonic discourses. In her opinion 'it is important to consider where frames come from and if it is indeed possible to stand outside them and manipulate them to one's purpose' (Bacchi, 2009: 19).

Along with Bacchi, we argue that hegemonic discourses have an influence on the production of feminist knowledge. One aspect to consider in the analysis is the existence of feminist hegemonic discourses and their influence on the thinking of feminist scholars. Feminist scholars are not only surrounded by mainstream hegemonic discourses. Within the feminist niche they also do not escape from the phenomenon of hegemonic discourses. To our understanding there are several reasons of why such hegemonic feminist discourses might exist. One is the position from which actors articulate their frames. Common cultural and theoretical backgrounds might encourage a similarity in the normative frames produced. In our case, the elements that gender scholars in discursive politics share in their backgrounds might influence similar positionings in the assessment of discursive processes. Apart from some knowledge of discursive politics, gender scholars adopting a discursive politics approach also share knowledge of gender equality policies. Moreover, they sometimes explicitly position themselves as feminist, or express more or less implicit normative understandings of what gender equality is or should be. The identification of recurring normative aspects concerning the understanding of gender equality in scholarly works on gender makes us question the normative standard on which gender equality is based. What standard do these definitions of gender equality explicitly or implicitly relate to? Is there a feminist hegemonic discourse on gender equality? If so, what are the feminist taboos or deeper normative assumptions concerning what gender equality is and how it should be reached?

There are at least three discourses we would qualify as feminist hegemonic discourses, and which can be considered to act as taboos. These concern the role of elites and other groups of actors in processes of gender change, the possibility of overcoming patriarchy and the merits of

incremental change. Some of the deeper, unquestioned normative assumptions by feminist researchers come from hegemonic discourses that lead to the fixing of particular interpretations of gender equality issues in an automatic and unreflexive³ way. Certain statements from normative or empirical analysis are then used in an almost dogmatic way.

A first feminist taboo concerns the role of elites and other groups of actors in processes of gender change. This feminist hegemonic discourse is expressed in the tendency to have quick and ready answers to the debate on gender mainstreaming or gender equality policies as technocratic vs participatory that privilege a participatory approach (Walby, 2005). In such answers, participation of non-hegemonic voices in gender equality policies appears as the only or best way of improving the quality of gender equality policies, while improving the knowledge base in other ways is downplayed and presented as a technical move away from politicization (see Lombardo and Meier, 2006; Verloo, 2005; Verloo and van der Vleuten, 2009; Woodward, 2004). Could this be a sort of feminist taboo that comes from this pool of shared meanings on gender equality, which, on the one hand, has its (empirical) reasons for being taboo, but, on the other hand, if automatically and unreflexively applied, could also block further progress in gender equality policies? Bustelo and Verloo (2009), for instance, argue that if technical instruments such as gender impact assessment are based on sound feminist theory and empirical knowledge, and if knowledge is built into a technical tool, then technical approaches should not necessarily involve depoliticization. Rather, such tools could be a valuable contribution to the furthering of gender equality.

Related to the focus on non-hegemonic actors is also the fact that the accent is generally on the need for various sorts of gender experts (in policy-making, the academia and civil society). This automatically downplays the potential role of other actors, such as the so-called mainstream public policy officials who might be valuable contributors to the furthering of gender equality and of alliances with such actors.

Bacchi (2005, 2009: 30) highlights another feminist hegemonic discourse concerning the role of actors in processes of change, which is that elites are assumed to be the only subjects with power to shape discourses for their own interests, while the 'common people' are mere receptors of discourses and have no power to challenge dominant meanings. This perspective – as she argues – could have a disempowering effect on people, as it does not even enable the theorization of resistance to hegemonic discourses. In this way, Bacchi unveils a trap that could block feminists from identifying windows of opportunity for social movement actors to intervene and shape dominant meanings themselves. One example of this could be found in studies highlighting the stigmatization of migrant women through 'biased' policies that target them. These studies show the capabilities of feminist researchers to detect this stigmatization but to some extent are overlooking the potential of migrant women to strategically use these policies for their

own benefit (Holzleithner and Strasser, 2006; Roggeband and Verloo, 2007; Siim and Skeje, 2008).

Two other sets of feminist taboos, which are usually interrelated, concern the possibility of overcoming patriarchy and the merits of incremental change. These hegemonic discourses might stem from the feminist positioning in favour of transformation (Griffin, 2002, cited in van der Sanden, 2007). The will to have or even make things change towards a more (gender) equal society can lead to the consideration that not enough progress is made or draw attention predominantly to stagnation and setbacks. A blind spot that could act as a taboo in feminist literature is the interpretation of processes of bending and stretching in mainly negative terms, or the tendency to look for negative effects that reinforce patriarchy first. For instance, in an analysis of the 2007 Belgian Gender Mainstreaming Act, Meier and Celis (2009) pay a lot of attention to potential shortcomings of this legislation, such as the fact that much of its impact will depend on the orders in pursuance of the new Act. However, the Act in itself stretches the concept of gender mainstreaming beyond the more limited initial interpretation to be found in the Belgian legislation, prescribing a more proactive attitude on behalf of the federal government. The focus on the transformation of existing gender relations and the will to achieve more (gender) equality draws away from a more long-term or comparative perspective. Even though the 2007 Belgian Gender Mainstreaming Act might not be perfect, it fixed the political definition of gender mainstreaming closer to the ideal often put forward than it was the case before. The putting into practice of this new definition might not go without discursive and other political struggles, but the landmark to which feminist and other actors can refer was nonetheless raised to a higher level. This is not a plea for adopting a less critical attitude, but an appeal to be aware of the mental trap that risks overlooking the fact that discursive processes can be enabling and productive as well, and not only constraining.

In one way or another, the analysis of gender equality issues seems to be prone to different feminist traps that frame problems in terms of pre-existing normative feminist discourses. We have given three examples of how these kinds of analyses can suffer from tunnel vision. As the analysis of gender equality policies shows that gender equality frames are regularly caught in existing, sometimes hegemonic, webs of meaning, and feminist discourses also seem to be trapped within particular hegemonic discourses, how then can we conceptualize feminist actors working towards change? It would be highly unproductive and inaccurate to regard hegemonic discourses as shaping everything and everyone, but it is also evident that a simple agency concept would not do justice to the powers of discourse. What solutions to this age-old dilemma of agency vs structure can we offer?

REFLEXIVITY AND DISCURSIVE POLITICS

Bacchi (2009: 27) calls for 'reflexivity' as a way to capitalize on small margins for change. This involves the need for a greater awareness about the feminist academic discourses of which we are all a part. In particular, reflexivity involves scrutinizing our own frames as feminist scholars in order to become more aware of the implicit normative assumptions in the assessment of discourses on gender equality. But how could feminist researchers apply such reflexivity to discursive politics analysis in order to become more aware about what biases shape their discourses, and thus to temper the possibility of adopting taken-for-granted assumptions in their analyses? We see three such possibilities. They have in common that they involve exposing the analysis to a wider set of interpretations.

Bacchi (2005, 2009) suggests drawing upon a wide variety of diverse women's perspectives and experiences, in particular by prioritizing the perspectives and embodied experiences of often underrepresented groups. Although it falls within the first feminist trap that we mentioned (the participation of non-hegemonic subjects as a quality criterion for gender policies), this suggestion has the potential to reveal the predominance of traditional gender relations and power mechanisms in policy practices, particularly if it is reflexively applied so that it does not treat participation as a dogma. The presence of a large array of social groups is not the only quality criterion nor is it only required to feed public policies with respect to gender equality. Drawing upon a wide variety of embodied women's perspectives and experiences should also help feminist scholars and activists to be reflexive on their work and activities.

A second type of applied reflexivity is the approach that looks at the reciprocal historical constitution of the different inequalities which is adopted in Ferree's discussion of how both gender equality and other forms of inequality are mutually and discursively constructed as they encounter each other. This type of reflexivity suggests a reflection on how the pre-existing context in which inequalities interact creates a 'web of meanings' that shapes the way in which inequalities are understood and treated in a particular context (Ferree, 2009: 90). This in turn helps to understand why in different contexts one finds a particular approach to inequalities rather than another. Ferree (2009) shows how Germany and the US institutional and discursive contexts offer actors different kinds of opportunities for intersecting the web of meanings of inequality. The class-centric meaning of inequality that has been historically developed in Germany and the race-centric meaning of inequality of the US have created distinctive ways of understanding gender. Her idea of interactive intersectionality helps to reflect on how intersectionality is a dynamic process in which the meanings that each inequality takes for particular women and men, and the interaction between, for instance, race and gender,

or sexual orientation and gender, contribute to shape the meaning of each inequality. Applied to our discussion on reflexivity, this means not only a general call for awareness of the historical legacies at stake, but also exposing the analysis to reflection on pre-existing discursive contexts that create resonant webs of meaning. For this, comparative or contrasting analysis is most helpful. It also means moving away from reasoning in the direction of expected results only to actual observable results, with an explicit eye on the unexpected. For instance, the policy impact of a particular equality law might turn out to be rather different from what policy-makers and activists had intended, or analysts foreseen. Be the outcome better or worse than the intended one, this encounter with an unexpected policy change that resulted from a variety of interactions can open up the former horizon of the actors who participated in the interaction and change their own presumptions.

Finally, a third type of reflexivity is stimulated by encountering different epistemological perspectives that encourage awareness about feminist taboos. The encounter between more constructivist perspectives (that are biased against a positivist approach) and more positivist perspectives (that are in turn biased against a constructivist approach) can, in spite of the difficulties in understanding each other, be productive for reflecting on the cultural assumptions of participants in the debate. For instance, Walby's work on the possibility to ground feminist knowledge in the power of argument and reasoned debate so as to overcome the postmodern block towards the production of feminist knowledge beyond specific locations (Walby, 2000) allows for the identification of a number of feminist taboos hidden in a given position. It can help discover positive aspects in framing processes that at first glance only seem to embed negative consequences for gender equality. Walby's work on the power of argument beyond the politics of location includes a warning that the focus on discursive processes and their (un)productive consequences might easily be interpreted in a relativist way. The use of this discursive approach might lead to the conclusion that, as there is no feminist knowledge transcending particular locations, it is impossible to act on this knowledge in order to promote gender equality policies. Walby instead argues that it is possible to ground feminist knowledge on the power of argument and reasoned debate. This could be one way of creating common ground for the development of gender equality policies.

However, power mechanisms are also at work in the conditions that enable reasoned debate and argument. Argument and reasoned debate are not neutral, since some structural conditions (resources, authority, time and so on) may enable particular positions to acquire more power than others (Young, 1996). Here, Bacchi's suggestion about the need for feminists' 'introspective reflection' can help feminist researchers to stay 'honest' about their assumptions by reading analyses different from their own particular perspective (Bacchi, 2009: 29). Her suggestion resonates

with the concern of other scholars about the need for a greater awareness of contextual embeddedness and of the existing differences in material and other types of power (Haraway, 1988; Harding, 1991). Introspective reflection might then help understand how partial and unfinished a specific positioning is with respect to the fixing of a certain meaning of gender equality. Similarly, research focusing on how power mechanisms are at work in reasoned debate and argument can increase knowledge and provide ideas for dealing with power differences. And still this research does not delegitimize interventions in the debate and normative assessments of gender equality processes.

The discussion about feminist taboos in the analysis of gender equality policies and the importance of reflexivity can have different implications for the understanding of discursive politics. An important consequence is a reflection on the process of fixing the meaning of gender equality that explores the possibilities of feminist knowledge production in the context of the partiality of each attempt to fix a certain meaning of gender equality. This partiality needs to be understood as a set of ongoing processes of contestation. Our tendency (and that of other feminist scholars, as we have shown) to be so negative about processes that stretch, shrink, bend and fix the meaning of gender equality could be rooted in the assumption that these processes all, in one way or another, pervert the concept of gender equality as we understand it. However, these processes do not necessarily preclude outcomes that are positive for gender equality. We would therefore argue that fixing a specific meaning is in fact inevitable, and even necessary to be able to assess the process and move forward both in theory and practice. As Ferree (2009: 100) writes: 'We make categories to understand the world, and do so from the standpoints that we occupy, but the point of our understanding this world of inequality and injustice is to change it.' We do not mean to argue that any definition of gender equality is valid and that the value of any one over another cannot be assessed. Indeed it can, but being aware of the fluid character of the concept of gender equality and of the fact that sometimes a particular, seemingly negative, fixing of the meaning of gender equality could in fact open up opportunities for gender equality in the future. Ferree (2009) reminds us that the whisper of a butterfly's wings in Hong Kong can set off a tornado in New York. The way in which policy actors will use or reinterpret a fixed meaning is rather unpredictable in the sense that it can have different effects than the ones expected both from the actors involved in the meaning's elaboration and the actors who engage in challenging this meaning.

In this respect, fixing the meaning of gender equality could open discursive windows of opportunity. Fixing the issue of gender equality in laws and other authoritative texts, as Ferree (2009: 89) suggests, can be both constraining and enabling depending on the actors that interpret and employ a certain fixed meaning and on the context in which a meaning is put 'on paper'. In her examples, gender equality in Germany means

something different than in the US because of the distinctive history of inequalities and the webs of alliances created around them, and the emphasis that was placed on one inequality (race or class) rather than another. The identification of constraints in the fixing of certain meanings is a starting point for contesting such meanings. True (2009), for instance, shows how the framing of EU trade policy has not only resulted in trade-offs for gender equality but has also created opportunities for gender advocates to contest its meaning and for the International Labour Organization to make coalitions with the EU.

As Rönnsblom (2009: 118) writes: 'When thinking of politics as discursively produced there is always an opening for change.' In this respect, fixing does not necessarily involve *freezing* the meanings of gender equality and other inequalities, as one might perhaps think. In the struggle for gender equality, constitutional amendments, laws and policy plans are often indeed seen as crowning achievements, whereas they are still only one moment in time or one element in a much broader process. This perception of what a constitutional amendment or law signifies might also make feminist scholars reconsider the value or weight of processes of stretching, bending, fixing and shrinking: do we see them as processes leading to an end product or as unilateral processes? Looking at issues over a long time span might show processes that stretch a bit, bend a bit, fix a bit and shrink a bit, simultaneously or consecutively. What does all this imply for our understanding of discursive politics?

CONCLUSIONS

The emphasis on reflexivity as a device to help feminist scholars develop a greater awareness of their own feminist taboos has provided us with elements for what we could call a more critical understanding of discursive politics. A critical understanding of discursive politics would be based on attention to power and to reflexivity in its different forms and practices. It would draw on a renewed awareness of the enabling and constraining dimensions of discourses (discursive opportunity structures) and on the awareness of power mechanisms operating at different levels for a variety of actors.

One implication of our reflections on discursive politics analysis for feminist production of knowledge and action is that it is necessary to fix a certain meaning of gender equality, or of a specific gender inequality problem at some point, by establishing a particular meaning of gender equality in a law for instance, because this will trigger processes of interpretation, implementation or contestation of this meaning. A second point is that fixing a meaning does not necessarily involve freezing it, or limiting any possibility of further change, as long as this meaning is under

continuous observation and reflection. Reflexivity is needed so that feminist taboos do not automatically affect interpretations, thus blocking out certain attributions of meaning to gender equality, imposing certain discourses, or negatively assessing particular policy practices. Reflexivity also helps us to 'keep honest' – as Bacchi (2009: 29) says – about the imbalance of power between different positionings, since actors' differential access to resources and power positions affects the role they play in frame production. Reflexivity is also necessary in order to maintain our awareness of the ongoing, dynamic process of the construction of the concept of gender equality, which may transform what at some point and in some contexts may appear to be a negative meaning into an opportunity. A greater awareness of the enabling and constraining dimensions of discourses could help feminist theorists to put their taboos in a broader perspective. The issue of gender equality is constantly moving, often with unpredicted consequences, and the main underlying question pushing the process forward is what gender equality is and what it should be. After all, politics itself is a never-ending process and the struggle about meaning remains at the centre of politics, as Schattschneider (1960) already underlined half a century ago.

Discursive politics is a key concept for anyone interested in gender transformation because of its inherent possibility to transform gendered societies, norms, behaviours and identities. The terms of struggle are set in discursive politics, and this is therefore a crucial dimension of power. Policy actors engaging in conceptual disputes, i.e. discursive politics, do so from various positions of material and institutional power. Powerful positions increase the actors' ability to stretch new demands into old pacified ones, bend them towards a mainstream goal, or close down emerging disputes in a way that (intentionally or not) resonates with the interests of powerful actors. Powerful positions can reinforce the use of argument or facilitate the use of discursive opportunities. A lack of such power positions means that the power of argument can still be used, if it can be presented as fitting the present hegemonic webs of meaning. Policy actors working towards change, as feminists, are likely to have lower positions of material and institutional power, and will thus depend more on discursive power in order to make progress towards change. Still, classical power mechanisms in access and use of resources are also at work in the conditions that enable or hinder 'reasoned debate' and 'argument' (Walby, 2000: 2). Hence, to keep the discussion on the concept of gender equality flowing and continuing its travels across time and space, while improving the awareness of the constraining and enabling dimensions of power, actors who engage in the disputes on the concept of gender equality would need to reflect on the experience of their own (feminist) taboos and to especially think of reflexivity-enhancing devices for feminist theorists, activists and policy-makers.

NOTES

This article is a spin-off from a recently edited volume (Lombardo et al., 2009), mainly Chapters 1 and 12. We especially wish to thank Carol Bacchi and Myra Marx Ferree for helping us to clarify some of the concepts we employ in this article. We are grateful to two anonymous referees for their comments on a previous draft, and Emanuela Lombardo also thanks the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science and the European Social Fund for funding her research through the 2006 Ramón y Cajal Programme.

1. In exceptional cases politicians first define the understanding of gender equality before translating it into policies, as did Hedy d'Ancona in the Netherlands in the 1980s.
2. Others – like Ferree (2009: 90) – distinguish between the more static 'master frames', which carry a single, fixed definition that highlights one element as important and gives it a more central position, and the more dynamic and relational concept of 'discourses', which encompass the multiple interconnections and reciprocal references that exist among ideas within particular webs of meaning.
3. See the next section for a discussion of reflexivity.

REFERENCES

- Bacchi, Carol (2005) 'Discourse, Discourse Everywhere: Subject "Agency" in Feminist Discourse Methodology', *Nordic Journal of Women's Studies* 13(3): 198–209.
- Bacchi, Carol (2009) 'The Issue of Intentionality in Frame Theory: The Need for Reflexive Framing', pp. 19–35 in E. Lombardo, P. Meier and M. Verloo (eds) *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking*. London: Routledge.
- Booth, Christina and Cinnamon Bennett (2002) 'Gender Mainstreaming in the European Union: Towards a New Conception and Practice of Equal Opportunities?', *European Journal of Women's Studies* 9(4): 430–46.
- Bustelo, Maria and Mieke Verloo (2009) 'Grounding Policy Evaluation in a Discursive Understanding of Politics', pp. 153–68 in E. Lombardo, P. Meier and M. Verloo (eds) *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking*. London: Routledge.
- Ferree, Myra Marx (2009) 'Inequality, Intersectionality and the Politics of Discourse: Framing Feminist Alliances', pp. 86–104 in E. Lombardo, P. Meier and M. Verloo (eds) *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking*. London: Routledge.
- Ferree, Myra Marx and David A. Merrill (2000) 'Hot Movements, Cold Cognition: Thinking about Social Movements in Gendered Frames', *Contemporary Sociology* 29(3): 454–62.
- Ferree, Myra Marx, William A. Gamson, Jurgen Gerhards and Dieter Rucht (2002) *Shaping Abortion Discourse: Democracy and the Public Sphere in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1971) *L'Ordre du discours*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Group of Specialists (1998) *Conceptual Framework, Methodology and Presentation of Good Practices: Final Report of Activities of the Group of Specialists on Mainstreaming*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

- Haraway, Donna (1988) 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective', *Feminist Studies* 14: 575–99.
- Harding, Sandra (1991) *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Holzleithner, Elisabeth and Sabine Strasser (2006) 'Troublesome Issues: Current Debates on Tensions between Gender Equality and Cultural Diversity in Austria', Working Paper; at: www.univie.ac.at/NODE-CMC/pages/HolzleithnerStrasser_onlinepub_2006-10-30.pdf
- Jalušič, Vlasta (2009) 'Stretching and Bending the Meanings of Gender in Equality Policies', pp. 52–67 in E. Lombardo, P. Meier and M. Verloo (eds) *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking*. London: Routledge.
- Kantola, Johanna (2006) *Feminists Theorize the State*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kantola, Johanna and Kevät Nousiainen (2009) 'Institutionalizing Intersectionality in Europe: Introducing the Theme', *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 11(4; Special Issue on Institutionalizing Intersectionality): 459–77.
- Krizsán, Andrea, María Bustelo, Andromachi Hadjiyanni and Fray Kamoutis (2007) 'Domestic Violence: A Public Matter', pp. 141–86 in M. Verloo (ed.) *Multiple Meanings of Gender Equality: A Critical Frame Analysis of Gender Policies in Europe*. Budapest: CPS Books.
- Lombardo, Emanuela and Petra Meier (2006) 'Gender Mainstreaming in the EU: Incorporating a Feminist Reading?', *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13(2): 151–66.
- Lombardo, Emanuela and Petra Meier (2008) 'Framing Gender Equality in the European Union Discourse', *Social Politics* 15(1): 101–29.
- Lombardo, Emanuela, Petra Meier and Mieke Verloo, eds (2009) *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking*. London: Routledge.
- Meier, Petra and Karen Celis (2009) 'L'Art pour l'art? Gender Mainstreaming in België', *Tijdschrift voor genderstudies* 12(3): 5–18.
- Meier, Petra, Elin Peterson, Karin Tertinegg and Violetta Zentai (2007) 'The Pregnant Worker and Caring Mother: Framing Family Policies across Europe', pp. 109–40 in M. Verloo (ed.) *Multiple Meanings of Gender Equality: A Critical Frame Analysis of Gender Policies in Europe*. Budapest: CPS Books.
- Rai, Shirin (2008) *The Gender Politics of Development: Essays in Hope and Despair*. New Delhi: Zubaan/London: Zed Books.
- Roggeband, Conny and Mieke Verloo (2007) 'Dutch Women are Liberated, Migrant Women are a Problem', *Social Policy and Administration* 41(3): 271–88.
- Rönblom, Malin (2005) 'Letting Women in? Gender Mainstreaming in Regional Policies', *NORA* 13(3): 164–74.
- Rönblom, Malin (2009) 'Bending towards Growth: Discursive Constructions of Gender Equality in an Era of Governance and Neoliberalism', pp. 105–20 in E. Lombardo, P. Meier and M. Verloo (eds) *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking*. London: Routledge.
- Schattschneider, Elmer Eric (1960) *The Semisovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Siim, Birte and Hege Skeje (2008) 'Tracks, Intersections and Dead Ends: Multicultural Challenges to State Feminism in Denmark and Norway', *Ethnicities* 8(3): 322–44.
- Squires, Judith (2007) *The New Politics of Gender Equality*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Stratigaki, Maria (2004) 'The Cooptation of Gender Concepts in EU Policies: The Case of "Reconciliation of Work and Family"', *Social Politics* 11(1): 30–56.

- True, Jacqui (2009) 'Trading-in Gender Equality: Gendered Meanings in EU Trade Policy', pp. 121–37 in E. Lombardo, P. Meier and M. Verloo (eds) *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking*. London: Routledge.
- Van der Sanden, Jeannette (2007) 'Knowledge Transfer about Sex and Gender: The Case of Women's Studies in the Netherlands', pp. 803–10 in M. Kokowski (ed.) *The Global and the Local: History of Science and the Cultural Integration of Europe*, Proceedings of the 2nd ICESHS. Cracow: The Press of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences; at: www.2iceshs.cyfronet.pl/proceedings.html (accessed 18 September 2009).
- Verloo, Mieke (2005) 'Displacement and Empowerment: Reflections on the Council of Europe Approach to Gender Mainstreaming and Gender Equality', *Social Politics* 12(3): 344–66.
- Verloo, Mieke (2006) 'Multiple Inequalities, Intersectionality and the European Union', *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13(3): 211–28.
- Verloo, Mieke, ed. (2007) *Multiple Meanings of Gender Equality: A Critical Frame Analysis of Gender Policies in Europe*. Budapest: CPS Books.
- Verloo, Mieke and Anna van der Vleuten (2009) 'The Discursive Logic of Ranking and Benchmarking: Understanding Gender Equality Measures in the European Union', pp. 169–85 in E. Lombardo, P. Meier and M. Verloo (eds) *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking*. London: Routledge.
- Walby, Sylvia (2000) 'The Politics of Location', *Feminist Theory* 1(2): 189–206
- Walby, Sylvia (2005) 'Gender Mainstreaming: Productive Tensions in Theory and Practice', *Social Politics* 12(3): 321–43.
- Wendt Höjer, Maria (2002) *Rådlans politik. Våd och sexualitet i den svenska demokartin* [The Politics of Fear: Violence and Sexuality in Swedish Democracy]. Stockholm: Liber.
- Woodward, Alison (2004) 'Building Velvet Triangles: Gender and Informal Governance', pp. 76–93. in T. Christiansen and S. Piattoni (eds) *Informal Governance in the European Union*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Young, Iris M. (1996) 'Communication and the Other: Beyond Deliberative Democracy', pp. 120–35 in S. Benhabib (ed.) *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Emanuela Lombardo is Ramón y Cajal researcher at the Complutense University, Madrid (Spain), and researcher in the European QUING and TARGET projects. Her research and publications concern theoretical and empirical aspects of gender equality policies especially in the European Union and Spain. She has published articles in *Social Politics*, *European Journal of Women's Studies*, *The International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *Citizenship Studies*, *Women's Studies International Forum*, *Greek Review of Social Research*, *Journal of Women, Politics and Policy* and *Feminist Review*. She is co-editor with Petra Meier and Mieke Verloo of the book *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking* (Routledge, 2009). Address: Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Fac. CC Políticas y Sociología, Departamento de Ciencia Política y Administración II, Pozuelo de Alarcón, 28223 Madrid, Spain. [email: elombardo@cps.ucm.es]

Petra Meier is assistant professor at the Department of Political Science at the University of Antwerp (Belgium). Her major areas of research are theories on democracy and representation, the normative foundations of electoral systems and electoral system design, feminist approaches to public policies, gender equality policies, policy-making in multi-level settings and Belgian politics. She recently co-edited *Au-delà et en-deçà de l'Etat: le genre entre dynamiques transnationales et multi-niveaux* [Beyond and Within the State: Gender between Transnational Dynamics and Multiple Levels] (with Bérengère Marques Pereira and David Paternotte, Academia Bruylant, 2009). Address: Universiteit Antwerpen, Faculteit PSW, Departement Politieke Wetenschappen, Sint Jacobstraat 2, 2000 Antwerpen, Belgium. [email: petra.meier@ua.ac.be]

Mieke Verloo is professor in Comparative Politics and Inequality Issues at Radboud University, Nijmegen (the Netherlands), and scientific director of the QUING project (www.quiring.eu) at the Institute for Human Sciences, Vienna (Austria). She works primarily on political dynamics of gender and other inequalities. Recent work has appeared in *Social Politics*, *European Journal of Women's Studies*, *The Greek Review of Social Research, Policy and Politics*, *Journal of Gender Studies*, *Social Policy and Administration* and *Feminist Review*. She is co-editor with Petra Meier and Emanuela Lombardo of *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking* (Routledge, 2009). Address: Radboud University Nijmegen, Institute for Management Research, Department of Political Sciences, PO Box 9108, 6500 HK Nijmegen, The Netherlands. [email: m.verloo@fm.ru.nl]

