*3. How does drag performance reveal the ‘nature’ and structure of the concept of gender? Is drag subversive?*

The nature and structure of the concept of gender is shown through the revelation of the imitative structure of gender performativity. Drag performance functions as a subversive practice insofar, as it points out „that the original identity after which gender fashions itself is an imitation without an origin.“ (Butler: 175) Drag is overemphasising stereotypical gender features and is subverting the culturally and socially constructed gender performativity of everyday life.

*4. How and where is fear produced according to Ahmed? How can fear move between objects and signs and becomes conducive to labeling some bodies “fearsome” and not others? How does this relate to Stryker’s concept of monstrosity?*

Fear is based on stereotypes and current or even more important outdated narratives that Ahmed calls a history of associations. The association of ‚negro‘ with animal, bad, mean, ugly is such a narrative from the past, and the little white boy in the story told by Fanon (1967) projects this fearful description of black men on Fanon. Neither the black man is the reason or origin for the fear of the little boy, nor did it came from the little boy himself, it’s the historical narrative which produced the fear. This kind of „histories that ‚stick‘“ (Ahmed 2014, 67) are creating the fear and the fear in turn is creating the borders against the fearsome objects, which are just projections of the fear. So the fear moves from their basis to objects and signs, which are then perceived as fearsome. If the fearsome object then arrives, the fear has to go somewhere else and is searching for a new object of fear, because the fear is even stronger when there is no real object on which the fear can be projected. Drawing the connection to Stryker, the transgender body is, in a partly current narrative of the body being only female or male, the object of fear, because it isn’t following this narrative. The monster as a fearsome Being is projecting his fearsomeness to the non binary bodies,

*5. What are spatial dynamics of an affective politics of fear? Taking the example of women’s fear of violence, how is a sense of vulnerability established and how does fear change patterns of mobility?*

The current performance of narratives what one should be afraid of are shaping the fear of the people and therefore also the objects to whom this fear is ascribed. This fear is restricting the body to the borders of what is constructed as safe space (home, family, us) and prevents the body from crossing this border into another space without anything that makes it safer. Taking women’s fear of violence as example: „Elizabeth Stanko (1990) argues, women’s access to public space is restricted by the circulation of narratives of feminine vulnerability.“ (Ahmed: 69) Ahmed says that vulnerability is an effect that secures the femininity in a sense of domestication. Such feelings shape the social space and narratives. The patterns of mobility change insofar, that women for example are more careful than men when leaving the ‘safe space’ alone or at night because of the fear which is based on the image of women’s vulnerability. The women’s place in public space [and women’s bodies]is shrinking in favour for the bodies of men. Such kind of shrinking and extending of bodies are the effects of an affective politics of fear.

*6. Ahmed speaks about fear as tool of governance in times of crisis. In what ways can Ahmed’s politics of fear illuminate our pandemic situation?*

Ahmed is describing the fear as a tool of governance drawing on? out of the viewpoint von O’Connolly. „In this model […] fear would be the promise of civil society and the elimination of fear.“ (Ahmed: 71) The state is describing a scenario without a functional state as bad and dangerous and something fearsome, following this, the people are giving up a little bit of their freedom (paying taxes; have to act according to the law;…) but in return they get more or less guaranteed safety from the government, that the society is safe, as well from outside as from the inside. Ahmed herself doesn’t want to analyse fear as a ‚governmental tool’ and is offering a different viewpoint. She states that „the language of fear involves the intensification of threats which works to create a distinction between those who are ‚under threat‘ and those who threaten’.“ (Ahmed: 72) The individuals who feel threatened are moving more together, because shared risk is producing a ‚binding force‘ as Ulrich Beck is describing it (Ahmed: 72). At the same time, their bodies are producing one bigger body which excludes all objects and bodies who are presenting the threat. These bodies often have nothing more to do with the ‚threat‘ than some perceived small often phenotypical features historically associated with …(Islam - Arab - Terrorist). Such kind of associations are shrinking the bodies of people who are seen as threat, because they are now seen as fearsome. At the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic, when the virus was starting to spread in European countries, you could see a similar effect with Asian people. In Germany, there were many cases of Asian looking people who were not let into restaurants, because they have the fearsome attributes of the deadly virus, or how Donald Trump likes to call it the ‚China virus‘. Exactly such kind of language and association lets the bodies of the ‚threatening people‘ shrink while the bodies of the ‚threatened people‘ are coming closer together (which sometimes even creates the possibility to extend his body to the range of the group body). Nice example From the viewpoint of the tool of governance one can find many examples for the more or less voluntarily restriction of the own freedom in return for the promise of ‚being safe’ from the virus on part of the government (lockdown, social distancing, curfew,…).

Good answers – try to take up the language Ahmed offers, so economy of affect, rather than images or merely messages…