



Lifelong Learning Programme

## IGIV – Guide

## Tool for Reflection

### Self-learning module for intersectional violence prevention

(By Kerstin Kühn, 2011)

In this module you will be able to improve your knowledge about the concept of intersectionality and – above all – get to know a practical intersectional insight focused on violence prevention.

This is not a scientific paper, I primarily invite you to raise questions and reflect your own perceptions on everyday life and day-to-day actions. You may need something to write. Have fun!!!

A short introduction into the structure of this self-learning-module:

The concept of intersectionality invites us to reflect our own stereotyped thinking and to explore the ascriptions we consider as ‘normal’ in our everyday-life. First of all, I would like to invite you to think about some major social categories, which is necessary to understand the concept of intersectionality that focuses on understanding the mechanisms and interrelations of social stereotypes.

The act of forcing complex social phenomena into simple social stereotypes is an act of violence and this frequently entails counter violence. On one hand the ascription of a certain social stereotype itself is mostly directly connected to violence (e.g., mobbing, physical violence or more subtle forms of violence). Violence – on the other hand – is mostly a reaction from persons that find themselves in a stereotyped position which they perceive as inequitable, which constrains their social recognition and limits their possibilities of living. Consequently the prevention of violence should include the ascriptions of social stereotypes. At the end of this module I will deal with the concept of violence and the relationship between intersectionality and the prevention of violence.

Let’s get started:

**First of all: what do we think about the major social stereotypes and what do others think about them? Take gender as an example. What do you think about gender and what do the people around you think about the variations of gender or gender itself? Collect some statements that come to your mind or that you heard somewhere before.**




## Lifelong Learning Programme

Mostly you will find answers like these: *“Men like to do X, women prefer Y”*. Y is then the opposite of X. Or maybe: *“Men are by their very nature X, women are by nature Y”*.

Gender is a social stereotype, a classification that is perceived as polarized. There is one side and there is the distinct other side, which might be the opposite. And as it comes into fashion to declare nature or even god as responsible for gender differences these statements appear to be non-questionable and non-negotiable. Social explanations are more than ever denied. At the same time, it is obvious that it is no one else but human beings who tell other human beings that they have to be either man or woman and how they have to behave as a man or a woman.

Two examples:

A friend reported to me her observation, that on playgrounds most of the girls wear ballerina pumps and skirts while many boys wear sneakers and trousers. When we decide which clothing is suitable for jumping around, climbing or running the answer is quite clear: it is sneakers and trousers. Because of this, the possibility of developing such skills is very limited for girls and so they gradually develop differing interests. When we look at adults we take these interests for granted, and this is naturally connected to gender.

For an experiment, a baby was dressed in blue clothes and the reaction of the adults around him was observed. They said things like: “Oh, you are a big one!”, “You are already so smart!” and they gave boy’s toys (cars) to the baby. The same baby was dressed pink. The adults around said “You are a very pretty girl!”, “You are such a nice missy” and they gave girl’s toys (dolls) to the baby. It was the same baby!

Idea for further research:

It is interesting to pay attention to the gender role models that can be found in Disney movies or children’s books. Most of these role models are reproduced frequently. There might be tiny niches where you might find some change in the stereotyped view and display of male and female gender roles. But these attempts are not strong enough to crumble the “culture of dualism between men and women” so that as a result children are once again forced to be boy or girl, men or women, as they grow up. This explains the need of children to perform as explicit boy or girl even when small alternatives are offered to them.

Overcoming the idea that we just have one gender there are new approaches in gender studies and parts of sociology, psychology and philosophy that developed the perspective that gender is mostly constructed by the interactions of human beings in their everyday-life. Simone de Beauvoir wrote: “One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman”. This is the idea of the new concept of “Doing Gender” (which means the socially and personal day-to-day construction of gender).

Just think about the first situation you performed as man or women or transgender. If you want you can take an example from your everyday life. When did you perform as a different gender than the one you perform most of the time? How did you shape your performance? How did your environment react?

There is biological and psychological research about issues such as how the production of



## Lifelong Learning Programme

hormones is influenced by psychological factors. In contrast to this, popular science spreads the impression that human behaviour is clearly determined by genes and hormones. In opposition to what is assumed generally it is not definitely clear what is cause and what is effect. Aggressive behaviour, for example, happens more likely under high testosterone levels, but during aggressive behaviour the body produces, increasingly, testosterone.

As we already know, the social stereotype gender is mostly interpreted as polarized. Usually just two possibilities are assumed: woman or man. But there are several additional genders. There are many more human beings than we can imagine who are born intersexual. Why are they more numerous than we can imagine? Because of in our society intersectionality is defined as a disease. And what does that mean? *We* (those of us who fit into the norm: man-woman) do not need to change our belief that there are only two genders, but *we* are “allowed” to perform surgery on these human beings as babies or start mobbing them when they are older. And so *we* can continue thinking *we* are right. This is violence! A surgery performed on children is legally protected violence (mayhem, intervention in the right of sexual self-determination) and mobbing is psychological violence. The handling of the issue of intersexuality is a good example to illustrate that medical and biological research depends on the social beliefs of the researchers. A researcher has to decide whether to define something as a deviation/ disease and keep intact the social belief of what is normal, or to start defining the social norm in a different way. Those issues – which should be crucial for science and popular science best sellers – are mostly not discussed in an openly considered and self-critical way.

Another suggestion:

When we think about gender as man or woman we often search for polarities. What if you try to turn this around in your everyday life and focus on the opposites among men or among women, or search for similarities between women and men? In my experience there are as many differences as similarities between a woman and a man. The better I know a person and the more I look beyond the façade of “typical” socially acquired patterns of behaviour, the more I see the particular individuality of this person, and at the same time I see similar major topics of life and essential causes of action. Hence, it does not matter to which gender the person belongs.

**You might have found some interesting thoughts in the last passages. But what is the problem? Why should we be concerned about this at all? And where is the connection to (prevention of) violence?**

Social norms, including norms of gender, seem to provide security and are for most persons an important part of their identity. But they also **limit individual development opportunities**; the development of these opportunities do not harm anybody, they just don't fit into conventional beliefs. These limitations can be very painful for all human beings. But most human beings adapt because they believe that some parts of their personality cannot be lived out. When we consider the violent character of mechanisms to suppress nonconformity (e.g., mobbing, physical violence) it is no surprise that the means to develop a personal expression are very limited. The conventional beliefs on gender-specific behaviour presuppose sexual violence, above all (but not exclusively) against women.

On a societal level **values are assessed** to gender norms. Work that is typically carried out by women is paid less than works typically carried out by men (or even unpaid such as care



## Lifelong Learning Programme

work). This is caused by specific mechanisms of attribution of value: certain forms of social responsibility gain higher social recognition. The **allocation of material resources** and the resulting **structures of financial dependency and hierarchy** are deeply connected to the assessment of values to gender norms. Gender norms and other acts of classification are responsible for a legitimization of hierarchies and the distribution of power; in the eyes of many people they appear to be just. Because of the fact that an opposite group (e.g., women to men) is imagined as polarized, it is hard to put oneself into their position and to develop collective ideas of a just distribution of power and recognition.

There are many more problems connected to this issue so that it is extremely helpful to question gender norms (and also other norms). For further information about gender you can check the self learning module gender on the peerthink project website. (LINK)

Another major social stereotype or category: ethnicised or culturalised origin, sometimes named as “race”.

Why do I put “race” in double quotes? This is because from a biological point of view human “races” do not exist. Many fatal incidents have happened in Europe during the last century concerning the usage of the term “race” and its associated ideas. As racism still happens and the usage of the term is still present I will keep using this expression, although only in combination with the double quotes to show that I do not stand behind but rather criticise its underlying beliefs. Everything I will mention about culturalised and ethnicised origins is also valid to criticise the beliefs about the existence of “races”.

**What do you think or what do people around you think about ethnic or cultural origins? Try to collect some statements.**


Here are some typical statements:

*“The X / we are simply culturally different.”*

*“This is their / our mentality.”*

*“The X / we are ...”*

*“Islam is ...”*

*“They / we just have it flowing in the veins.”*

Similar to gender, this categorisation seems to rely on immutable facts. It is important to realise the underlying distinctions between “us” and “them”, which varies according to national context, time, century and so on. Who actually is “us” and “them” in your country? Make a short list of such opposite categories.



## Lifelong Learning Programme


However, doesn't "us" as well as "them" include people that can be described as left-wing, right-wing, apolitical, shy, loud, atheistic, religious, ambitious, slow, reformer, traditional, working, academic, rich, poor, musical, unmusical, unfriendly, sincere, pessimistic, optimistic, boring, inspiring, honest, dishonest and so on?

What remains from these differences and categories? In any case people make different experiences depending on which categories they are forced into. Different characteristics are ascribed to them and they react somehow to that, maybe they adapt, maybe they protest, or whatever. Depending on what category they are attributed to they will experience different possibilities of living, material prerequisites or role models.

Therefore I will name the process of increasing importance to ethnical or cultural origins as ethnicisation or culturalisation. This means that too much meaning is attributed to both categorisations and – as an effect – all kinds of phenomena are explained by simple categories. This of course applies only for "the others" – reverting to the "we"-category explains too little, in this case we consider individual explanations as more reasonable. Have you ever heard or thought that a pupil disturbs the class because of his missing migration background? Probably not, but vice versa this is often the case.

If you or people around you think that gender or ethnic origin are above all natural facts this does not mean that you are dull. Even Aristotle thought that way:

*"Nature would like to distinguish between the bodies of freemen and slaves, making the one strong for servile labour, the other upright, and although useless for such services, useful for political life in the arts both of war and peace."*

Although these explanations appear absurd in retrospective we can see that in a different era we had different categorisations but a similar desire to naturalise social structures.

For further information about "race" you can check the self learning module on the peerthink project website.

(<http://www.peerthink.eu/peerthink/content/view/65/87/lang,en/>)

Here is another example of a major social stereotype: class or social stratum.

The perception of socio-economic classes/ strata is actually not very popular. I hereby want to point out the different positions on the spectrum poor and rich, and closely connected to this, the position on the spectrum "more" or "less" educated. It is important to see that it is not as easy as it seems to designate what can or cannot be called "education" and that the quarrel over this term is part of a bigger problem: the assessment of value to the different positions in society.

**Which associations are brought up when you think about socio-economic stratum, meritocracy and education? Collect some statements.**



## Lifelong Learning Programme


Maybe you get statements like:

*“Classes? There are no classes in our society.”*

*“Everyone who wants to and works hard can work his way up.”*

*“Life is what you make of it.”*

*“Welfare recipients are lazy.”*

*“We cannot afford welfare any further.”*

*“The X are vulgar/ antisocial/ shabby.”*

*“The X do not have any culture/ education, they do not know Goethe/ Shakespeare/ ...”*

*“Intelligence is hereditary.”*

When it comes to explanations of inequality or injustice the stereotype stratum/ class will most of the time not be labelled directly. At the same time there are a lot of discussions about social strata when it comes to topics like achievement, motivation or education. A group of people are assumed to lack a willingness to learn, to work or to achieve something. This phenomenon is called classism (stereotyped classification and discrimination because of socio-economic class/ stratum).

Actual research on classism points out that the belief “everybody can achieve everything by merit” has some blind spots. On the one hand structural advantages of members of the higher social-economic stratum remain unconsidered. These can be material advantages like heritages, financial support by the family or connections (being part of the “old-boy network”). But this can also be cultural advantages because the kind of education that is taught in school originates in the culture of the upper classes. Most of the teachers belong to this class and share the same perspective. On the other hand this belief fades out structural barriers for members of the lower socio-economic strata, whose kids must learn a nearly unknown language (“high level” language) and culture at school that has little to do with the culture of their families. Learning this culture is high performance! The way of living (= culture!) of their families on the contrary is not included in the curriculum and often not accepted as culture at all. Material disadvantages such as a lack of connections, financial support, or heritages remain as unconsidered as inconspicuous factors like parents that cannot help their children with homework or children not having enough quiet space in the family’s apartment to do the homework. Furthermore, when children need to orientate themselves on role models to determine realistic perspectives on jobs and the way of living, children of “lower” classes mostly run across role models of their own class and so are unlikely to develop differing life perspectives. This limits the possibility of social mobility.



## Lifelong Learning Programme

Research on classism also points out that the mainstream way of speaking about people from “lower” socio-economic strata (and their culture) is violent. Actually there is no awareness of what the problem is when a student speaks out a phrase like “He is a prole/asbo”. The word asbo (‘anti social behaviour order’) describes unambiguously people as being not part of society. Society seems only to include persons from rich and educated strata. People from higher strata do not realise that this behaviour degrades others and that this degradation is not just on an individual, but rather on a structural level. Example: I know a young medical doctor who just finished university. She told an elder, poor woman who suffers from alcoholism that she is shabby and was surprised that the woman reacted with angry protest.

In a nutshell: classism means the degradation and discrimination of the poorer socio-economic class/ stratum and their cultural peculiarity by the privileged and dominant class/ stratum and their culture.

The discourse on migration and integration often mixes up culturalistic and classistic patterns. Migrants often belong in their society of origin as well as in their host society to the poorer social classes (at least in the beginning). Major parts of the debates on integration concern rather the problem of socio-economic classes than international or cultural problems. When you focus on this you can see the migration discourse in a new light and discover parallels to other discourses.

**Until this point we discussed three major social stereotypes. On page 8 you will find a list of further forms of stereotypes.**

Here are some “frequently asked questions and frequently assumed answers (FAQ)” on social stereotypes and related topics.

**Question: Why do I use the term “categorisation” for the social stereotypes?**

**Answer 1: Because it sounds complicated.**

Yes. I want to catch the reader’s attention by irritating them.

**Answer 2: Because it emphasises that the stereotypes do not have a fixed substance or meaning, but are rather constructed through social interaction.**

Exactly! This is what I just tried to demonstrate in the previous passages. Our perception of social stereotypes is influenced by society and not accidental. They reflect the separation lines which are most present along the distribution of resources and its legitimisation in a particular society.

I do not want to use the terms “characteristic” (often used as “characteristic of discrimination”) or “grounds of discrimination” or “category” or “group” because all these terms appear to be static; as if the underlying concept was merely discovered and then accurately described. But it is just the opposite way: the structure of our perception and the meaning that society attaches to a certain phenomena determine the influence of the particular categorisation.

**Question: Why is it important at all which kind of expressions I use?**

**1. Answer 1: To be “politically correct”.**



## Lifelong Learning Programme

Hmm, what does “politically correct” mean? Often people use this as a reproach. Someone has to say something in a particular manner without really meaning it, only because she/ he otherwise would get a chewing. In this case “politically correct” means a manner of speaking that expresses something the speaker is not committed to, because she/ he does not understand the underlying meaning. This is not what I want. In a wider sense of the term, to be politically correct means to express by the choice of one’s words the meaning of social struggles on social recognition, respect and support. This is a much better reason.

**Answer 2: I want to include more people into my manner of speaking than the usual way of speaking does.**

Yep. Luckily the English language mostly does not “gender” its indications. But when we look at other languages such as German or Spanish we have a lot of gendered indications like for example teachers (Lehrerin/ Lehrer, profesora/ profesor) and mostly only the male form is used in popular language. This is why gender sensitive people in these countries modify their manner of speaking and use the underline character (in German: Lehrer\_in) or the ‘at symbol’ (in Spanish: professor@) to express the inclusion of women and all other genders.

The systematic not-recognising and not-mentioning of heterogeneous realities of life produces exclusions. Systematic exclusions are/ cause discrimination and **violence** (a small foretaste on the later discussed relation to violence prevention). I want to use language in an emancipatory manner and I want to make visible that I do not agree with the manner of speaking about gender in our society.

Language can be used to demonstrate alternatives. When – for example – I am speaking about “businessmen” I have an explicit image of men in mind. This image might result out of an effective under-representation of women and transgender in leading positions in Europe. But when I speak of “entrepreneurs” I might be able to show that it could also be different. But when I stick to the usage of “businessmen” I not only reproduce but even boost the stereotype by making the minority of women and transgender in leading positions invisible.

**It’s showtime ...**

... Intersectionality!!

**Concerning the question:**

**Which categorisations become active regarding my own person or other persons?**

The answer: **ALL** categorisations. And everyone is concerned.

*Take myself as an example ...* I am a white woman with mostly heterosexual and sometimes bisexual orientation. I hold a citizenship of the country I am living in and no one asks me by only looking at me if I am foreigner. This citizenship (a European one) provides certain privileges to me also in other countries or continents. As an example I have the possibility to work and travel in other countries without having major problems. I am young and fit to social expectations concerning attractiveness and physical condition which are shown in television and commercials. I am Christian-influenced and fit hereby to the cultural





## Lifelong Learning Programme

mainstream of my country. My family is financially secure and well educated, so I will most likely be able to work in an academic job that secures me financially. So far, I do not have children.

*I know how it feels* to be discriminated against as woman. And I know that it is easier to live out heterosexuality in public than bisexuality. During my life I have made plenty of effort (make-up, diets, tanning bed, gym, fashion ...) to better approach the social norm. This effort seemed to be necessary to avoid discrimination, to increase my “value” and to fit into social expectations.

*I was involved* in acts of discrimination myself. I degraded and bothered others, called them names because of their appearance, because of their financial resources or because of their education. I eyeballed others because of their culture or religion und I supposedly treated them differently because of this ... The list of discrimination I have carried out myself is long.

**How is your experience?** Just type it into the table or elsewhere.

<b>This is what you would categorise yourself in or what people assign to you.</b>	<b>Categorisation alongside ...</b>	<b>Privileged or underprivileged position?</b>	<b>Space for your comments.</b>



## Lifelong Learning Programme

Theoretical input concerning intersectionality as a question – my answer – game

### **What is the origin of the difficult expression “intersectionality”?**

Intersectionality stems from “intersection”, which means a crossover or a road junction. The term in our understanding was introduced by the U.S. American lawyer Kimberlé Crenshaw who developed this concept to fill a gap in the U.S. American Anti-Discrimination-laws. Here, there was either discrimination because of “race” or discrimination because of gender – but both forms were not considered related and so the specific discrimination of black woman could not be considered. The concept of intersectionality considers all possible forms of discriminations together and reflects on their interconnectivity.

### **Is there something like the “most important” categorisation?**

There are a lot of discussions on that. Most people say: none of the categories should be considered as dominant and more important than others. This is just particular with intersectionality: most important is on one hand to understand the interweavedness and complexity of phenomena and on the other hand that the importance of a specific categorisation depends on the situation/ context. Many people try to analyse/ define those categorisations that have the biggest impact. There are many answers to this question, some say that it might be gender, ethnicity/ “race” and body (physical condition, health, age, attractiveness), others say it is gender, ethnicity/ “race” and class.

We certainly know that all categorisations are of great importance. Probably the one that is for us the most important is the one in which we find ourselves in an underprivileged position. Consider that when the recognition of discriminations and injuries depend on access to power and representation it is crucial to deal with prioritisations of categorisations in a very critical way: there might exist discrimination when the concerned persons do not even have the power to be recognised as discriminated against!

Of great interest is the following question: There are categorisations which are, e.g., broadly discussed by the media (“the level of representation”). Think of the culturalisations that are actually produced by means of ascribing of religious attitudes to people with (assumed) Muslim background. And then there are categorisations which are of equal importance but hardly recognised, such as socio-economic class (which, because of their migration experience affects many people whose difficulties then are explained in a culturalising way by their (supposedly) being Muslims).

An intersectional approach should take both issues into focus: actually occurring discourses of ascription as well as discourses of attention (meaning to recognise what is spotted by public attention and – above all – what is faded out).

### **How many categorisations exist?**

The answer to this question is similar to the one before: the list has as a matter of principle no ending. The “and so forth” should guarantee openness for new perspectives and demonstrate the general problem of such lists that could never be completed.

### **Why is it that complicated?**

Because this is what life looks like! There is no such thing as homogenous groups. Simplification means homogenisation.



## Lifelong Learning Programme

**Isn't it sometimes necessary to homogenise? Otherwise collective solidarity is not possible and you cannot articulate political claims! There must be some base for gatherings!?**

The problem of homogenisation is that groups are mostly formed along the intersecting lines which anyway cross society. This happens because privileged people (mostly) unconsciously reproduce these structures (because they are not sufficiently aware of them). And ... hey presto! The feminist group could find itself being composed exclusively of white heterosexual middleclass women who have a legal citizenship (and so forth, again think of the complete list). We will discuss some possible reasons for this later.

**And: yes, please get together!** An awareness of the different social positions of participants can lead to broader and more productive discussions and the consideration of innovative points of views. And this can attract **more** people, who can collaborate and not need to get in competition with each other.

**But don't we need a clear-cut group to stay on top of things?**

Maybe. But then be aware of your strategic decision (herefore the term "strategic essentialism" exists) and just speak for your own focus group (e.g., "West German middle class woman with children") and not in the name of women in general. And if you wonder about the strange and arbitrary sounding of your selection you can think about how to include further women. And if your selection makes sense for your concrete context you should be able to operate with this.

**Why does it happen so often that we unintentionally exclude people and mostly hang around with persons from our focus group?**

It is mostly because of two basic factors which make it so difficult to include. But one at a time.

**Factor 1: The invisibility of one's own privileges**

Here are some multiple choice questions:

You have never had any doubts about placing a picture of your partner on your desktop?

Applies to me

Doesn't apply to me

If this question applies to you, then you very likely live in a heterosexual partnership or you work in an above-average tolerant office. This is a rare privilege in a society that defines heterosexual partnership as a norm.

Do you know which of the subway stations or busses in your city are wheelchair-accessible?

Applies to me

Doesn't apply to me

If this does not apply for you it is very likely that you are able to walk or you do not have an infant with a baby buggy or you have no further contact to persons concerned with these issues. Not having an infant or being able to walk are privileges in a society that treats people in good physical condition or without children as normal und adjusts the construction of its buildings and its accessibility to these norms. These examples show that discrimination is not necessarily connected to disrespect, but simply happens through mere non-consideration. The point is that the



## Lifelong Learning Programme

privilege is set as norm.

The invisibility of one's own privileges makes it hard to deal with privileges and the corresponding power in a responsible manner and – above all – to include the position of people without these privileges into one's decisions.

Reciprocally we sense it clearly when there are other persons who have higher privileges than ourselves. Other persons similarly sense when we do have higher privileges than them. Being not aware of one's own privileges can be very provocative to other persons.

Do you remember when you were angry at another person who did not realise her or his own privileges and acted irresponsibly?

### **Factor 2: rule and exception**

Complete the following phrase:

The exception \_\_\_\_\_ the rule.

If you wrote "The exception proves the rule" I say: wrong!

From an intersectional point of view it is rather that:

The "exception" IS the rule.

If we think of "rule" and "exception" we are in the middle of the issue. We should open our ears and listen to what we are hearing and re-think our old patterns and rules ... to realise in the end that the things we treated as exceptions were just things we knew very little about.

This makes it possible to treat a person as much as "exception" (as new point of view) as "rule" (to be fully integrated).

### **Next question: Who knows best about the bias of power in our societies?**

People who do not have certain privileges and herefore experience discrimination know best about how inequalities work. They have their own real-life experiences about how it feels to be discriminated against, this experience is mostly hidden for people with invisible incorporated privileges or it is merely conveyed over theoretical discourses like in social sciences.

If we are willing to learn, we need to consider:

to develop an openness and curiosity for "surprising" points of view

to trust people speaking about their own experiences more than the people who are speaking for them

to give also less established (= less powerful) sources a chance to convince or at least to enrich us

... AND WHERE IS THE CONNECTION TO THE PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE ??? ...

First I want to ask you a question:

**What does violence mean to you? Collect some Ideas.**



## Lifelong Learning Programme


Here are some possible answers. Violence can be ...

**criminal offense: physical and sexual violence.**

Yes, but it's much more than that!

**psychological violence – mobbing, social exclusion, name-calling, ...**

Exactly. Here should be a visible connection to the things we spoke about earlier already. Take, for example, any insult which is common in your language and focus on the categorisation it is related to. You will realise that nearly always there is a connection to actual or former categorisations. Social or interpersonal acts of constricting categorisations are often (always?) acts of violence! (The Insult ABC is a method to work on this question; Toolbox No. 10)

**But also quite “normal” patterns of behaviour have a violent character!**

Who has the power of what to define as violence or discrimination? Mostly not those who have been exposed to structural societal violence. **Structural violence** that is implemented in national or international laws or conducted by administrations is also violence.

**Epistemic violence**, which means a manner of speaking about human beings that categorises and homogenises them, that further values and excludes them, is also violence.

In mainstream society especially structural and epistemic violence are treated as “normal” so that people who are executing these forms of violence – and sometimes even people that experience violence – do not realise that this kind of behaviour is violence at all. The central assumption of our way of preventing violence is the following: **The normalisation of epistemic and structural violence is the basis for the visible forms of violence.** This is why we in this project pay so much attention to epistemic and structural violence and disagree with the assumption that violence is simply conducted by certain groups. We recommend an analysis that takes society as a whole into consideration.

The reduction of the term “violence” to physical and illegal violence is itself violent against those whose experiences of violence are hereby negated (by the acts of violence defined as legal).



Education and Culture DG



## Lifelong Learning Programme

Finally, we have reached the end of the self learning module. Hopefully you had some fun, maybe you discovered things that irritated or disturbed you, and definitely I hope you had some proposals about a possible change regarding the normality in society.

For praise or critic on this self learning module I will be looking forward to your mail:  
kuehn.kerstin@gmail.com

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission.

This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.