

## Introduction FRANCES S. HASSO AND ZAKIA SALIME

This book examines the gendered and sexual dimensions of the 2011 Arab revolutions and uprisings, with specific attention to conjunctures between bodies and spaces. It does so by incorporating the language and insights of activists and revolutionaries who themselves worked with theoretical assumptions as they imagined and produced different futures. The revolutions, a sequence of related nonviolent political ruptures of world-historical significance, were initiated by Tunisians who forced their long-time autocratic president to step down on 14 January, inspiring activists with equality, justice, and democracy agendas around the world. The Revolution in Tunisia was followed by large-scale mobilizations and revolts in Egypt, Yemen, Bahrain, Morocco, and Syria, as well as upheavals in every Arab country. Millions rose against militarized, securitized, and unaccountable states, Western imperialism, poverty, and national and transnational forms of economic extraction. The revolutions occurred in places where majorities struggled to be free from repression and degradation and in many cases feed families and access clean water—in short, to live dignified lives. Ruling governments in every Arab country fearfully consolidated as millions chanted in Arabic, “Al-sha‘b yurid isqat al-nizam!”—The people want the fall of the regime! In Arabic *nizam* denotes “order,” “regime,” and “system”; thus the resounding collective demand challenged many orders and systems and was not read simply as a call to rearrange ruling seats. The valences of this chant differed among and within countries, over time, and in many cases between revolutionaries and activists as gendered, sexualized, ideological, and class tensions came to the fore.

Despite calling these revolutions “Arab,” we recognize ethnic terrains and borders to be contested, identifications and solidarities to be multiple, and antecedents to be plural and layered. Nouns such as *spring*, *revolution*,

and *uprising* continue to be debated as descriptions of the cataclysmic events that began in December 2010 in Tunisia. The “Spring of Equality” and the “Amazigh Spring,” coined in the Maghreb, stressed gender struggle, challenged the universalism of *Arab*, and insisted on forms of community and solidarity based on multiple identifications. Any descriptive term is inflected by its genealogies and meaning layers and further complicated by different languages. These are multisited struggles with many historical precursors. Their conclusions have not been written. They are ongoing “process[es] of becoming” that are being “pushed” to their “limits.”<sup>1</sup> They continuously generate rereading and reevaluation, sometimes distorted by presentist cynicism and despair.

Disagreements emerged as state-sponsored repression and violence intensified, ruling classes reasserted themselves, exhaustion set in, precarious economic conditions worsened, and ideological and strategic differences emerged among activists. After the first flush of revolutionary fervor, the meanings of slogans such as *social justice*, *freedom*, and *human dignity* were questioned. Who deserves dignity? How capacious is the freedom and social justice being struggled for? How does respect for ethnic, religious, and ideological differences play within these demands? What is the ideal national community? What is the appropriate role of policing and military power in postcolonial states? Multiple answers, imaginaries, and anxieties emerged.

Tensions and disagreements were often inscribed on and worked through gendered and sexual embodiments and symbolism. Even at the level of language, were girls, women, and nonconformists included in *the people*? Does *regime* refer only to governments, or does it include other controlling systems that require felling? Why did conflict so often take sexualized forms on men’s and women’s bodies? These questions became especially important as competing masculinisms—for example of anarchist football fans, legislators, police and military forces, established oppositions, kings and presidents, clerics, Islamist formations, and Western and regional interventionist forces—asserted themselves in every setting. Though divided by ideology, positionality, and priorities, women and girls burst seams, categories, and rules designed to hold in their bodies, voices, and minds. Just as repressive governments can no longer assume that the universal postcolonial subject will accept the indignities and injustices imposed by governments, security forces, and class elites, everyone was put on notice that neither would girls and women. The revolutions publicly disputed gender

and sexual orders in novel, unauthorized, and often shocking ways, even as a range of forces actively worked to reassert order and respectability boundaries. This is a permanent legacy that will continue to roil sexual and gendered orders in the region.

This book is the outcome of a collaborative research project initiated in a late 2012 call for papers to examine spatialized gender and sexual dynamics and symbolism in the revolutions under the title *Geographies of Gender in the Arab Revolutions*. We held an intensive two-day workshop at the Duke University Nasher Museum of Art in December 2013 with authors of accepted papers, an interlocutor in feminist geography, and a cross-disciplinary group of scholars, including PhD students, from the Durham and Chapel Hill area in North Carolina. We incorporated a tour and discussion of an art exhibit, *Lines of Control: Partition as a Productive Space*, which was evocative in its focus on “psychological and physical” borders, violence, and spatial policing and transgression, themes that emerge throughout the volume.<sup>2</sup> The authors use interpretive methodologies to reflect on spatial, embodied, and gendered dimensions of revolutions and uprisings in Bahrain, Egypt, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, and Yemen. The final chapter offers a comparative study of the Gezi uprising in Istanbul and an analytical coda to the volume.

The authors in this book make four major interventions in analyzing these multiscalar revolutions. First, rather than relying on social science definitions of *revolution* as transformed states and overthrown leaders, we use the term to broadly capture affective, intimate, embodied, institutional, and spatial registers of upheaval and transgression. Thus *revolution* in this volume includes “civilpolitics,” intimate politics, interstitial politics, and heterotopia. Revolution occurred at the levels of identification, imagination, aesthetics, and emotion. Its sites were proximal and virtual, in bedrooms, on blogs, and on streets. We illustrate how revolution generated emancipatory and repressive possibilities, including fleeting wins, memories that cannot be forgotten, spaces that will never be the same, and permanent loss and destruction. We are particularly attentive to words and their spatial and political significance. Such words include *hirak* and *harakiiyya* (movement), *tkoullisse* (backroom discussions), *madaniyya* (civility), *fawda* (chaos), *passe partout* (she goes everywhere), *ghazwat* (invasion), and *saha* and *midan* (square or space). The revolutions notably inaugurated forms of solidarity and identification. But they also produced emancipatory disidentifications that were overt in a manner rarely seen before.

Activists condemned and criticized not only sovereign forms of power such as security forces, ruling governments, and Western imperialism but also totalizing institutions, sensibilities, and ideologies that stress belonging and foreclose nonconformity and plurality.

This relates to the second intervention. The authors disrupt taken-for-granted understandings of place and space and are particularly interested in the nexus of bodies and spatiality as activists engaged in world-challenging and world-making. Indeed the body is not merely a surface or casement of the individual. It is a material space of multiple dimensions that irrupts and interrupts normative orders and activates competing ones through imagination, symbolism, and enactment. Bodies are central to anxiety about difference and depictions of boundaries perceived as impermeable or dangerous, as indicated by infection, invasion, and contamination metaphors. Each chapter indicates how embodiments, gender codes, and spatiality persistently informed each other. The book shows how a range of contentions were prominently worked out through and on bodies, which themselves are scales and locations of individual life, subjectivity, and voice, as well as sites of inscription and expression.<sup>3</sup> In the revolutions and uprisings, bodies and subjectivities were formed and transformed as they congregated in public squares and cafés, on blogs using anonymizing handles, on Facebook chats with chosen interlocutors, and in secret meetings, thus well beyond what Hannah Arendt called “a space of appearance.”<sup>4</sup> People slept, dined, and held open discussions in streets and squares and on front stoops in mixed age, class, and ideological groups. Bodily encounters in physical spaces generated new sensibilities and alliances across sexual differences that challenged taken-for-granted divisions. But they also produced conflicts that reinforced or produced new iterations of partitioning.

In a third analytical intervention, we highlight the dilemmas that continue to be posed by ideological conflict, sexual difference, and class inequality, which are embodied, inscribed in a variety of spaces, and not easily overcome by mass protest. Indeed these sources of inequality and difference were central to strategies of policing and control by governments. But they were also important on the street and among activists and revolutionaries. Thus even as the authors in this volume argue for the dramatic and everyday making and contesting of spaces through symbolic and bodily transgressions, they also demonstrate the “sticky” and embodied aspects of difference and inequality that limited the horizons of the inclu-

sive pluralities that emerged in every revolution and uprising. Solidarities across difference and redefinitions of space in these revolutions and uprisings were often restricted by various forms of policing and moral control, which were persistently structured by gendered and sexual master narratives and anxieties.

Fourth, consistent with a wealth of feminist scholarship, this book undermines the public/private dichotomization of metaphoric and physical spaces, bodies, and social relations. Such boundaries are historical and ideological, constituting rather than simply describing a cleanly divided social world. Moreover they are freighted with gendered assumptions as women so often come to be associated with the body, nature, reproduction, intimacy, emotion, family life, the home, and the sexual, as if these ever exist outside of discourse, politics, economy, and revolution. Or as if boys and men too are not embodied, reproductive, sexual, emotional, intimate, and produced by and implicated in homes and families. The world of the selfie, the iPhone, YouTube, Facebook, and personal blogging makes distinctions between public and private even more difficult, as demonstrated in every chapter. Nevertheless one of the most striking features of the revolutions and uprisings was the centrality of the public square and its massive non-violent occupation by men and women from diverse walks of life. Women and girls widely and insistently claimed cities, streets, neighborhoods, and cyberspace in a historically unprecedented manner. They protested in the light of day and the dark of night, creating new relationships to space and to others, building new sensibilities and communities across difference. The bodies, voices, and ideas of boys and girls, men and women converged in unity, poetry, song, discussion, and ideological conflict in cyberspace, cemeteries, and malls and on sidewalks, streets, roundabouts, and squares. But people also connected and argued in bedrooms, cars, and kitchens. This book shows, however, that the public square “eventfulness” of the uprisings, which made them globally legible and consumable as media “spectacle,”<sup>5</sup> often concealed the quotidian, dispersed, embodied, and less visible dimensions of especially sexual and gendered dynamics in multiple sites, including the “private,” virtual, and discursive.

Some definitional points are in order regarding the words *place* and *space* in this book. Tahrir Square in Cairo, the Pearl Roundabout in Manama, the revolution squares in Aden, the moving automobile on streets in Jeddah, Gezi Park in Istanbul, Rabat’s Aquarium Theater, alleys, front stoops, neighborhood barricades, bedrooms, and kitchens are spaces and

places. Space refers to *arrangements* and *interactions* (e.g., between human bodies, animals, nature, sound, the visual, the digital, built environments) at multiple scales, not all of them material. For example, blogs and Facebook pages may be considered distributed kinds of “squares.” Places are more grounded and specific, “the lived and dynamic location where different people, social agents or powerful actors come together in unpredictable and even shifting ways.” Place enables us to account for the “intersection between worlds and selves” and involves “emotion, imagination, perception, and memory.”<sup>6</sup>

Spaces and places are similar, however, in being patterned by institutionalized inequalities, ideology, and behavioral scripts, shaping how users inhabit them and encounter others. They are also similar in being *made*, redefined, and “reclaimed.”<sup>7</sup> As these authors discuss, these makings and remakings occur through use (everyday and extraordinary encounters; barriers and checkpoints), memory (of massacres, street battles, sexual assaults, major mobilizations), representation (graffiti, aesthetics, poems, songs, sartorial practices), and Facebook and Twitter wars. This dynamism, emergence, and multiplicity is difficult to control. On the other hand, as indicated by our third intervention, boundaries and hierarchies are often *weighty*, reinforced by powerful ideologies, sensibilities, and institutions that may reconstitute to effectively respond to challenges.

### *Valences and Circuits of Revolution*

This volume considers revolution at multiple scales that include digital circuits and platforms, imagination, institutions, language, embodied practices, and physical spaces. The authors richly demonstrate that the revolutions and uprisings fit uneasily within any totalizing ideology, strategy, theory, or method. As Asef Bayat argues, the “Arab uprisings occurred at a time on the global stage when the idea of revolution had dissipated. The decline of the key grand ideologies—revolutionary nationalism, Marxism-Leninism, and Islamism—had left the protagonists with no revolutionary utopia to imagine.”<sup>8</sup> For us this multiplicity of sites and scales, and the apparent open-endedness and dynamism, shatter classic definitions of revolution. Leaders were compelled to step down in Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, and Yemen, for better or worse. Whether or not the revolutions successfully overturned regimes, their languages of “dignity” and “freedom,” and the processes they inaugurated, interpellated multiple subjectivities. Their out-

comes cannot be measured by traditional means. In Bahrain, for example, while the Pearl Revolution did not overthrow the Khalifa regime, Frances Hasso argues that it has transformed space, thinking, relationships, and society in multiple ways. Creative activism by the Southern Movement articulated new “civil” forms of life in southern Yemen, argues Susanne Dahlgren. Lamia Benyoussef demonstrates spatial and imaginative inaugurations and transgressions since 2011 in Tunisia, including that of “freedom that does not require permission.”

These massive mobilizations widely used the slogan “Liberty, dignity and social justice.” To adapt Chantal Mouffe’s analysis of radical democracy, they articulated subject positions and identities of political freedom, respect for embodied forms of life, economic redistribution, and pluralistic frames of belonging.<sup>9</sup> We recognize with Wendy Brown that “freedom is neither a philosophical absolute nor a tangible entity but a relational and contextual practice that takes shape in opposition to whatever is locally and ideologically conceived as unfreedom.” It is not possessed, universal, pure, or ever fully achieved.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, while freedom, in Nikolas Rose’s words, is “infused with relations of power, entails specific modes of subjectification and is necessarily a thing of this world, inescapably sullied by the marks of the mundane,” this does not mean it is “a sham or liberty an illusion; rather it opens up the possibility of freedom as neither a state of being nor a constitutional form but as a politics of life.”<sup>11</sup> Indeed freedom from a variety of subordinations was explicit in these revolutions and uprisings. As unfashionable as it seems in some theoretical circles, we take such desires seriously, even as the multiple meanings of freedom and its limits were widely understood, including by activists.

The revolutions have been marked, Farhad Khosrokhavar argues, by “the pursuit of freedom through cultural creativity . . . mobilizing people through a new symbolism expressed in rage, irony, ‘theatricality,’ and dramatization, but also with sarcasm towards the dictator and his family and elite and derision of power holders.”<sup>12</sup> Zakia Salime points to the emergence of “aesthetic citizenship” marked by embodied, symbolic, and artistic performances of everyday hybrid languages, orality, national identity, and belonging. The Syrian intellectual-activist Samar Yazbek argues that the revolutions radically challenged a binary between intellectual and activist so that “writing is now for everyone.”<sup>13</sup> Rather than “denying these insurgencies the term ‘revolution,’” Hamid Dabashi contends, “we are now forced to reconsider the concept and understand it anew.”<sup>14</sup>

The digital revolution remains key to mobilizing, innovative organizing, and creative expression in the revolutions and uprisings, which, after all, erupted to challenge authoritarian governments. As indicated in many of these chapters, girls and women in the region were major drivers of digital activism, constituting 30 to 33 percent of active tweeters in the 2011 Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions.<sup>15</sup> Digital technologies fundamentally shifted activism and civic engagement from at least 2010 and were especially important in initiating a domino effect when they were used to bring “the details of social mobilization — and success — against the strongmen of Tunisia and Egypt.”<sup>16</sup> Mobile phones facilitated mobilization during the crisis periods of the revolutions, “when physical spaces for public conversation and debate closed down.”<sup>17</sup> Individual and choreographed acts of defiance posted on many virtual platforms proliferated in every country, including Saudi Arabia, the focus of Susana Galán’s chapter.

The digital revolution is double-edged, however, and coexists with “old” media, an adjective we understand as historically relative. Between the mid-1990s and mid-2000s Arabic satellite television technology was heralded as offering new opportunities for free expression and political mobilization, until regime and corporate interests shut down these possibilities. Similarly, even as they offer opportunities for revolutionary and feminist mobilization, expression, and creativity, Facebook, Twitter, Microsoft, YouTube, and Vodafone are corporate circuits designed to make money for CEOs and shareholders. The economic value of these corporations is produced by unpaid users. They are equally available to state and international security forces and imperialistic, sectarian, misogynist, and racist actors,<sup>18</sup> as illustrated in a number of chapters, including by Hasso and Benyoussef. Benyoussef argues that in Tunisia and its diaspora, even as Facebook “paved the way for novel” and emancipatory expression, it also turned into a tool to express conservative, misogynistic, homophobic, or racist sentiments. Moreover “traditional” media, including state-controlled television and radio stations and newspapers, continue to distribute their messages and arguably have far more impact and reach than social media. Nevertheless, as Gillian Rose explains, the “capture of space” by hegemonic systems is always partial, with multiple and diverse openings for individual and collective forms of resistance.<sup>19</sup>

As the chapters by Galán, Sonali Pahwa, and Karina Eileraas indicate, blogs have been crucial to new forms of activism by girls and women in the region. Unlike Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube, blog platforms may be



open-source (e.g., Wordpress) or corporate-controlled. A blog may be set by its owner to be open or limited to a chosen audience. Personal blogs have become part of “the virtual agora” in the region,<sup>20</sup> facilitating continuums of intimacy and publicness conducive to girls’ and women’s authorship and community. Personal blogs have become sites of solidarity, trust, dissensus, and disidentification beyond proximal relations.<sup>21</sup> Even before 2011 Hoda Elsadda argued that Egyptian women literary bloggers produced a “literary counterpublic” that challenged public/private and intimate/formal dichotomies and the gendered restrictions of primarily male literary and political salons.<sup>22</sup> Pahwa contends that personal blogs, initially dismissed as a feminine genre, created “intimate publics” and spaces of alterity. Largely writing in English to avoid censorship, Saudi women bloggers found protection in what Galán calls “camouflage” operations that use “familiar and informal language” to open up “interstitial” spaces for conversation and feminist critique. The Egyptian feminist activist Aliaa Elmahdy, Eileraas argues, used her blog to stage disidentification and expanded forms of belonging and community.

### *Spatial Body Politics*

Linda Zerilli defines politics as a “world-building practice of publicly articulating matters of common concern,” in the process inaugurating freedom practices with others in space. From this perspective, politics is about being “out of order” in relation to dominant understandings of where particular bodies and ideas belong.<sup>23</sup> For Jacques Rancière politics refers to enacted and collectively shared moments of emancipatory rupture in dominant logics of hierarchical separation and control, which he calls “police.” Rancière describes the “essence of politics” as enactment of “dissensus” for emancipation goals. Politics in this reading “makes visible that which had no reason to be seen, it lodges one world into another.” It does not emerge from preconstituted subject positions or identitarian categories (e.g., worker, woman, feminist, Shi’a). Nor is it attached to spheres, spaces, or institutions deemed “proper” for politics.<sup>24</sup> Police, in contrast, does not recognize “particular categories of people as subjects qualified to speak” or “understand the claims of social subordinates as speech.” Politics enacts “equality” without requiring the poor, stateless, or noncitizen to be categorized as fully rights-bearing.<sup>25</sup> Rancière’s definition of politics relies on “opening up new spaces” to disrupt the partitioning of thinking

and life.<sup>26</sup> Feminist geographers similarly understand politics to include “out of place” embodiments, such as when black, pregnant, disabled, poor, homeless, or otherwise nondominant or nonconforming people enter hegemonic spaces.<sup>27</sup>

Coming together in protest across differences in urban spaces was central to the revolts in the region. This required “participants to accept social differences that are often used to divide them” and “building coalitions of young and old, poor and middle class, women with hijabs and without, migrants, refugees, adherents of different religions and sects, people from the slums as well as the posh areas.”<sup>28</sup> This emancipatory coming together of difference to rupture the status quo is close to “politics” as defined by Rancière, albeit Ehsani’s “coalition” indicates less ephemerality. If we take Engin Isin seriously, however, the city is a “force field that operates as a difference machine.” It actively “assembles (groups), generates, distributes, and differentiates differences, incorporates them within strategies and technologies, and elicits, interpellates, adjures, and incites them.”<sup>29</sup> This limits the possibilities of emancipatory assemblage across difference. Pahwa directs our attention away from iconic revolutionary figures and public squares in her discussion of the “digital homes” made by Egyptian women bloggers. For Aliaa Elmahdy, the focus of the chapter by Eileras, actual streets in Cairo were dangerous for nude protest. Indeed they were often dangerous for clothed women and men. Thus Elmahdy’s embodied performance protest was facilitated by the selfie and hosted on her blog.

Benyoussef, Dahlgren, Galán, Salime, and Hasso in this volume also highlight the significance of presence and absence, visibility and invisibility, inclusion and exclusion of different kinds of bodies and voices. Benyoussef examines how competing “mythscape” of belonging and community in revolutionary and postrevolutionary Tunisia depended on fundamental exclusions and elisions. Dahlgren contrasts public with being hidden, silenced, and marginalized rather than private in southern Yemen, recognizing agencies in homosocial spaces and intimacies in street corners and revolution squares. Salime discusses Moroccan 20 February activists’ articulation of spatial metaphors such as *kawlassa* and *tkoullisse* (deriving from the French *coulisse*) to highlight ideological, gendered, and ethnic exclusions at the “backstage” of the movement’s general assemblies despite stated commitments to pluralism, inclusiveness, and transparency. Hasso shows that gendered, classed, and racialized partitions in how bodies inhabit and circulate in space in Bahrain were artifacts of ideological struggle

at particular historical moments, with dominant images of gender segregation and black-robed women hiding as much as they revealed.

Spatial thinking is central to organization, mobilization, and conceptualizations of status quos and their transformation.<sup>30</sup> The term *hirak*, used in southern Yemen to describe the Southern Movement, signaled a politics of *movement* that encouraged mixed-gender activism on street corners, in offices, and in home spaces (Dahlgren). Moroccan activists used a similar term, *harakiyya*, to refer to the 20 February Movement (Salime). Both imply the open-ended putting of dynamics *in the plural* into motion, differing from the goals of traditional social movements and revolutionary projects. Spatial conceptualizations also have gendered registers and implications even if these are not acknowledged or explicit.<sup>31</sup> For example, resistance discourse typically challenges “up” (usually the state) and is less likely to consider gendered and sexualized forms of inequality on lower scales.

Many events described in this book illustrate the significance of embodied spatial strategies in the revolutions and uprisings, including the occupations of the Pearl Roundabout in Manama, Bardo Square in Tunis, and the revolution squares in Aden; the climbing of the clock tower in Tunis; the Freeze events in Rabat and the “standing man” protest in Istanbul’s Gezi Park; and the nude performance protests in Egypt and Tunisia. While nationalist movements, anticolonial movements, Islamist organizations, political parties, and unions usually organize themselves hierarchically, the revolutions and uprisings challenged these dynamics. Malek Sghiri notes that Tunisian revolutionary activists quickly developed an awareness of the benefits of fluidity rather than hierarchal chains of command: “My union background made me argue for at least some degree of organization, but I gradually came to realize that the secret to our success was partly down to our chaotic state, or rather, the number and variety of leaders and the absence of a domineering centralizing command that would stifle initiative and hinder immediate responses to a rapidly developing situation on the ground.”<sup>32</sup> The 2008 strike by Gafsa miners in Tunisia offered a precursor to such activist decentralization.<sup>33</sup>

These dynamics challenge Miriyam Aouragh’s claim that the Arab revolutions were marked by Leninist “democratic centralism,” which she defines as “independent organizations” coexisting with a “vanguard.”<sup>34</sup> Rather Dahlgren, Hasso, Salime, and Eileraas show that tension sometimes emerged with organized oppositions, political parties, and established

feminist organizations and activists. While it's true that social transformation projects find their surest grounds in shared struggles, memories, and proximal relations in a variety of spaces,<sup>35</sup> such grounded confrontation historically privileges the young, physically able, willing, armed, and masculine. Decentralization and dispersals of authority, facilitated by digital technology, produced intimate politics on multiple scales and allowed girls and women to make new spaces, in contrast to their frequent exclusion and minoritization in classically hierarchical organizations and forms of resistance.

### *Bodies Out of Order*

All spaces are structured by ideological assumptions and experienced situationally and interpreted subjectively.<sup>36</sup> This book attends to the micro-physics of gendered bodies and voices in the revolutions, which Sara Mourad contends “brought back attention to the body as a political medium.”<sup>37</sup> After posts and images of his self-immolation in front of a woman municipal police officer in Sidi Bouzid in December 2010 went viral, the Tunisian vegetable seller Mohamed Bouazizi was simplistically read to represent humiliated Muslim or Arab masculinity,<sup>38</sup> a position not easily attached to women's bodies and subjectivities. Khaled Fahmy calls the Egyptian revolution a “revolution of the body” (*thawrat al-jasad*) in his consideration of the case of Samira Ibrahim, who insistently challenged her arrest and subjection to a “virginity” exam by the Egyptian military in March 2011.<sup>39</sup> Women's bodies in the Arab revolutions have been “sites of dissent and revolution,” argues Sherine Hafez, even as they “are disciplined and regulated through discourses of patriarchy, Islamism and secular modern masculinity.”<sup>40</sup>

Feminist scholars of the Middle East challenge understandings of “public” space as masculine and attached to power and “private” space as feminine and without power. They also highlight the sociopolitical processes that produce where and when particular kinds of bodies, practices, and voices belong.<sup>41</sup> In her studies of Cairo, Farha Ghannam argues that a framework of a fixed public “world of men” against a private “world of women” “fails to account for the continuous struggle to define the boundaries” and the centrality of this struggle with kin boys, men, and older women in the production of gender inequality.<sup>42</sup> Scholars of Yemen have

contested definitions of the “domestic” as feminine, “privilege-deprived,” and segregated and highlighted women’s agency and generational differences in women’s mobility “maps” in urban gender-segregated Yemen.<sup>43</sup> Paul Amar has shown that well before 2011 the security state’s “thug” appellation to working-class and poor men in Cairo was facilitated by middle- and upper-class forms of feminism invested in state control and respectability in public space.<sup>44</sup>

Nevertheless there is deep and wide evidence of masculine privilege in access to and experiences of urban space in the modern world, although class status, racialization, dress, and temporality modify this claim. Space is “elastic” and experienced differently by women and men, at night and in daytime. Experiences are further structured by visible sexual or ethnic signifiers of minority status.<sup>45</sup> Doreen Massey, drawing on the work of Elizabeth Wilson, writes that European city culture developed in relation to men, and women were historically seen to threaten metropolis culture and order because they were freer from patriarchal constraints associated with living in familial and less anonymous settings. European cities were historically seen as “a realm of uncontrolled and chaotic sexual license, and the rigid control of women in cities has been felt necessary to avert this danger.”<sup>46</sup> Studying contemporary European urban life, Hille Koskela argues that “an essential part of women’s socializations turns out to be spatial,” in the sense of being cultivated to learn mobility limits in relation to home.<sup>47</sup>

In the 1970s Fatima Mernissi contended that Moroccan city streets were considered male spaces in which “only prostitutes and insane women wandered freely.”<sup>48</sup> Thirty years later Fatima Sadiqi and Moha Ennaji found that while many Moroccan city streets remain an “aggressive domain” for women’s voices and bodies, such exclusions had been effectively challenged by feminists in the 1990s and 2000s.<sup>49</sup> Anouk de Koning found that in early twenty-first-century Cairo the mobility trajectories of upper-middle-class women were “crucially determined by class-based inequalities and distinctions.” Yet their experiences were universal in that streets were considered spaces “for men to inhabit . . . spend time, observe and interact with passers-by, comment and flirt.” Women, in contrast, were required to be on their way to a destination and subject to a male gaze.<sup>50</sup> Despite the fact that cities are often “described as hostile and dangerous for women,” they offer women “fascinating freedoms and possibilities.”<sup>51</sup> These possibilities and

freedoms may be the very reasons cities are sometimes made inhospitable to women. An evaluation of cities as unsafe for women assumes that less urban locations are inclusive and welcoming. Many educated Palestinian women who moved to the mixed metropolitan cities of Haifa and Jaffa, for example, experienced them as offering “a space of choice” in comparison to the kin-based restrictions the women face in villages and smaller towns.<sup>52</sup>

Police and politics as understood by Ranci re correspond in many ways with feminist understandings of embodiment, subjectivity, and space as co-constituted and socially defined and redefined rather than natural or static. Feminist scholars, however, more deeply consider how embodied alterity, interlocking positionalities, and unconscious desires, what Mernissi calls “psychological needs,”<sup>53</sup> have staying power. Liz Bondi and Joyce Davidson stress, for example, that while not fixed, gender identities and places are not “freely chosen or easily transformed. Instead the dynamic interplay between space, place, and sexualized embodiments is subject to inertia and ‘stickiness.’”<sup>54</sup> *Stickiness* refers to obdurate subordinations connected to particular bodies, spaces, and times.<sup>55</sup> It follows that although spaces and places that reproduce dominance can be “breached” by subversive actions, the effects of such breaches are “uncertain and contestable.”<sup>56</sup> These limits have certainly been true in the Arab uprisings, where the purveyors of policing are not only state agents. While Ultras soccer fans in Egypt challenge the control of neighborhoods and streets by agents of the security state, for example, they also exclude girls and women from “fun” and resistance mobilizations.<sup>57</sup> Moralizing and sexualizing gendered policing quickly became essential to a range of repressive players aiming to take back liberated and liberating spaces in the revolutions and uprisings, as discussed in a number of chapters. In response to the Pearl Revolution in Bahrain, existing sectarian partitions intensified and often took sexualized forms (Hasso). In October 2011 and March 2013, respectively, the young Egyptian and Tunisian feminists Aliaa Elmahdy and Amina Tyler provoked solidarity as well as violent and misogynistic, trivializing, and Islamophobic responses when they posted protest images of themselves naked (Eileraas). Both body activists dramatically breached partition lines given the unlimited pings and reverberations of the digital world, but responses largely proved their points.

How much unity is possible after euphoria at the scene of rupture has dissipated, particularly when those invested in particular hierarchies have

much to lose? A number of chapters indicate that inequality is sticky and ideological and positional differences are difficult to negotiate or dissolve. Beyond frissons of solidarity and recognition, it is unclear under what conditions doing politics together across difference can more than temporarily supersede policing sensibilities and practices, including by activists with competing desires, interests, and notions of emancipation. The violent outcomes of many of these revolts have tempered assumptions that even radical and massive ruptures in public squares and streets can easily overturn or erase historical patterns of repression, inequality, and ideological disagreement, including in everyday embodied relations. Such sticky divisions often became bases to reconsolidate lines of control.

Massey argues that every space includes elements of order and chaos. *Order* because all phenomena are caused and thus explicable, and organized systems by definition aim to arrange things and bodies in relation to each other. *Chaos* is intrinsic because any configuration, interaction, or movement always has potential for “unintended consequences.”<sup>58</sup> In 2011 a phrase that rhymed the Arabic word *thawra* with *fawda*, or *revolution* with *chaos*, was used repeatedly by authoritarian leaders desperate to maintain “law and order” in Egypt (Mubarak), Tunisia (Ben Ali), Libya (Qaddafi), Yemen (Saleh), and Syria (Asad), even as the regimes were significant sources of violence and economic and political suffering.<sup>59</sup> The significance of regime-produced order and chaos rhetoric in the region, which preexists 2011, powerfully resonated with the twenty scholars who participated in the Geographies of Gender in the Arab Revolutions workshop, the precursor to this book. As feminist scholars we immediately recognized that chaos is often symbolized by and linked to fears of women’s sexuality and boundary-crossing enactments.

The *thawra-fawda* phrase indicates the importance of competing spatial imaginaries of power distribution. Beyond this the words evoke layers of historical meaning related to gender, sexuality, and alterity. Nonconforming subjectivities and unruly bodies are often cast as “the antithesis of the rational modern progressive and civilised subject, disciplined and obedient.” Citizens are told that “these bodies respond favourably to a strong and dominant government which seeks to impose order on chaos.”<sup>60</sup> Repressive governments in the region have historically constituted themselves as protectors of women and ethnic and religious minorities, and thus better than the spectral alternative, previously represented as post-2003 Iraq.<sup>61</sup> More recently present-day Syria and Libya have been added to the mix.

Leaders who used such language in fact enunciated, even promised, that revolution would translate into negative chaos: destruction and a terrifying loss of predictability and control in daily life. In contrast to Massey's opposition between order and chaos, repressive postcolonial governments often used resources that include state and informal violence to reinforce their preferred order. They promised their people that "the absence of an oppressive state would give free rein to sectarian and communal chaos in society"; they assured that law, prisons, security services, and organized violence were ready to respond to popular resistance; and they encouraged "fear of Imperialist-Zionist-Western attempts" to violate national sovereignty if their rule is undermined.<sup>62</sup> Thus potential and real chaos in its negative valence has been intrinsic to the order they sustain.

Chaos discourse and fear of chaos thread through revolutionary and counterrevolutionary dynamics and remain relevant beyond Arab settings. The opposite of chaos in such discourse is "security" and "stability." The chaos feared by Western powers, economic elites, and authoritarian governments anxious not to lose their geopolitical and economic footing or control differs from the fear of average people that precarious life will be made more unbearable by war, sectarianism, and dislocation. These very governments have a history of building and funding security formations accountable only to them, supporting sectarian and socially conservative formations to undermine leftist and democratic challenges, consolidating wealth and resources to maintain political, personal, and family power, and restricting expression and political association.

A contrasting revolutionary slogan emerged from Jordan and went viral in the Arab feminist Facebook and blogosphere in 2011: "Sawt al-mar'a thawra"—The voice of women is a revolution.<sup>63</sup> Its evocative power comes from the play on and rhyme with an Islamic hadith whose provenance is suspect, "Sawt al-mar'a 'awra" (The voice of women is defective). The word *'awra* expresses equivalence between women's voices and sexualized body parts. In this reading women's voices should be silent in the company of unrelated men, and a woman's body parts should be hidden from all men except her husband to avoid sexual disorder (*fitna*). This power to produce disorder comes from the purported ability of women's bodies and voices to enthrall men and destabilize the hegemonic ordering of bodies in space. The feminist slogan that emerged in 2011 defied this understanding by affirmatively declaring women's voices to be irrepressible



sources of positive disorder. The Arab revolutions have in many cases led to increased sectarianism, ethnic and ideological violence, territorial divisions, rape and sexual assault, foreign interventions, disfranchisement, and dislocation. As already indicated, the foundations of these violent dynamics were in many cases decades in the making, embedded in authoritarian systems and colonial and imperial relations. In many situations nonviolent and widely inclusive revolutionary projects have become militarized. This volume invites us to connect the Arab revolutions with chaos in the positive sense, whereby dominant distributions of subordination are ruptured and rearranged more fairly in a variety of realms.

### *Chapter Summaries*

Given the degree to which the revolutions were embedded in national histories of resistance and explicitly developed in relation to each other, the chapters are organized chronologically according to empirical focus. In chapter 1 Sonali Pahwa investigates the relationship between digital and political repertoires in Egypt, with a focus on women's personal blogs that emerged before the 2011 revolution. She shows that the intimate publics generated by these blogs were not simply sites of debate about revolution but were staging grounds for entirely new political enactments that include identification and disidentification. She frames activist women's personal blogs as "intimate" rather than "private sites of re-forming a social self." The centrality of gender performance in these blogs indicates a productive relationship between gendered affects and political subjectivities in digital publics. Pahwa argues that the politics of the blogs was not merely sentimental; they challenged the dominant scripts of national politics, re-configured proximity and distance to intimates, and challenged a public/private dichotomy. Women's blogs countered a hegemonic dramaturgy of revolution with a beginning and an end and offered alternative theaters of sentiment and politics.

In chapter 2 Lamia Benyoussef explores competing "mythsapes" in Tunisia in the immediate prerevolutionary period, during the revolution, and since by examining music, poetry, visual culture, Facebook projects, and activist campaigns on the streets. She shows that prerevolutionary cultural material anticipated and reflected the sharp class, cultural, and ideological tensions that continue in Tunisia. The mythsapes produced in

these different historical moments relied on very different forms of Tunisian and transnational affiliations, historical reference points, and gendered imaginaries and projects. Benyoussef demonstrates that intense collective anxieties about belonging and authenticity thread through the embodied experiences and metaphors examined. The 14 January Revolution, moreover, inaugurated forms of Tunisian feminist activism that boldly occupy and transform a variety of spaces and differentiate themselves from alliance with the patriarchal state feminism of Bourguiba and Ben Ali and the gender complementarity logic of conservatives.

Susanne Dahlgren analyzes the southern Yemeni revolution, which created new spaces in the city and reconstituted gendered subjectivities and practices, in chapter 3. Revolution squares all over Aden became sites of organizing, street-corner universities, and havens of embodied forms of care and comfort. As the Southern Revolution mobilized women, young people, and the poor, it produced widespread conviction that women should be reintegrated into public space, as was the case during the post-colonial socialist republic in the South (1967–90). The activities of the Southern Movement are part of what Dahlgren terms “civilpolitics,” an imaginary of state power that is subservient and accountable to civil rather than military, tribal, and clerical forces.

In chapter 4 Frances S. Hasso explores spatialized embodied and sectarian dynamics in Bahrain’s 14 February or Pearl Revolution. She argues that gendered, sexualized, and racializing dynamics worked through each other as long-standing conflict between the majority of citizens and the Khalifa rulers intensified. She calls this the sex-sect-police nexus. Hasso’s chapter emphasizes that the Pearl Revolution ruptured the gendered arrangements of bodies and voices in space and triggered sexualization as a racializing state technique. The Pearl Revolution also led to a rise in women-led confrontational street politics not necessarily authorized by Bahraini opposition men. These have produced sublimated tensions not captured by images of orderly gender-segregated marches.

Zakia Salime considers the 20 February Movement in Morocco in chapter 5. She argues that the movement represents an inaugurative moment that set into motion new political, cultural, and gendered dynamics, interrupting the conceptualization of politics, gender, and citizenship around already given identities and modalities of mobilization. By forging new modes of political engagement and discursive spaces, the movement

liberated multiple possibilities for the co-imbrication of sex, gender, culture, and politics in Morocco. She examines these inaugurations by studying discursive, performative, and artistic spaces initiated or expanded by 20 February, which she terms forms of “aesthetic citizenship.” She also shows that feminist enunciations have taken a “sexual turn” on the protest scene and beyond.

In chapter 6 Susana Galán explores the Women2Drive campaign and digital activism that challenges restrictions on women’s mobility and inhabitations of space in Saudi Arabia. She argues that the driving campaign is an example of cautious interstitial gender politics that nevertheless creates radical languages and communities of resistance. Galán examines cars as products, surfaces, interiorities, and vehicles of mobility. Due to gendered regulation of public spaces, blogs and other virtual media represent some of the few available outlets for women to express themselves and enact politics. It is by expressing “individual sentiment” in blogs that sensibilities become shared. By constituting alternative realities, activist bloggers enact a virtual heterotopia where less restrictive futures can be imagined and staged in the present.

Karina Eileraas analyzes the Egyptian Aliaa Elmahdy’s nude blogging in chapter 7, arguing that this activism may be read as a performance of rage against the status quo. Elmahdy brought sex to Tahrir Square on her own terms, injecting herself into the geopolitical scene as a gendered and sexualized subject, activist, and artist. Her “body-that-feels” surrenders full control, magnifies vulnerability, and exposes her to potential sexual harassment and violence in real time and space. Conversely her “cyber body” seduces a voyeuristic audience while performing in the time and space of her choosing. Elmahdy, Eileraas argues, transforms “the photographic field into a space of possibility by writing herself into history as a political and sexual agent.”

In the concluding chapter Banu Gökariksel uses the analytical tools of feminist geography to reflect on the implications of the overall project, as well as to examine gendered-spatial dimensions in iconic representations of the 2013 Taksim Gezi Park protests in Istanbul. Her analysis reveals the gendered and sexual politics at work in the images and accounts that have come to represent the Gezi protests. Some of these images rely on established norms, symbols, and roles, but others challenge dominant understandings of femininity and masculinity. Her analysis traces two themes

that link the Gezi uprising to other cases examined in the volume. The first focuses on the body as an intimately political site at the experiential and representational levels. The second explores the crisscrossing of the public/private divide and the domestication of so-called public space during the revolutions and uprisings.

## NOTES

1. Malek Sghiri, "Greetings to the Dawn: Living through the Bittersweet Revolution (Tunisia)," in *Dairies of an Unfinished Revolution*, edited by Layla Al-Zubaidi, Matthew Cassel, and Nemonie Craven Roderick, translated by Robin Moger and Georgina Collins (New York: Penguin Books, 2013), 44.

2. Nasher Museum of Art at Duke University, "Lines of Control: Partition as a Productive Space," September 19, 2013–February 2, 2014," <http://nasher.duke.edu/exhibitions/lines-of-control/>.

3. Linda McDowell, *Gender, Identity and Place: Understanding Feminist Geographies* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 34, 40.

4. In Mustafa Dikeç, "Space as a Mode of Political Thinking," *Geoforum* 43, no. 4 (2012): 672.

5. Rosalba Icaza and Rolando Vázquez, "Social Struggles as Epistemic Struggles," *Development and Change* 44, no. 3 (2013): 668; Nishant Shah, "Citizen Action in the Time of the Network," *Development and Change* 44, no. 3 (2013): 667.

6. Amy Mills, "Critical Place Studies and Middle East Histories: Power, Politics, and Social Change," *History Compass* 10, no. 10 (2012): 779.

7. Nada Shabout, "Whose Space Is It?," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 46, no. 1 (2014): 165; Kaveh Ehsani, "Radical Democratic Politics and Public Space," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 46, no. 1 (2014): 159.

8. Asef Bayat, "The Arab Spring and Its Surprises," *Development and Change* 44, no. 3 (2013): 599.

9. Chantal Mouffe, *The Return of the Political* (New York: Verso, 2005), 35, 56–57, 70.

10. Wendy Brown, *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995), 9, 24.

11. Nikolas Rose, *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 94–95.

12. Farhad Khosrokhavar, *The New Arab Revolutions That Shook the World* (Boulder: Paradigm, 2012), 1–2.

13. Samar Yazbek, introduction to *Diaries of an Unfinished Revolution: Voices from Tunisia to Damascus*, edited by Layla Al-Zubaidi, Matthew Cassel, and Nemonie Craven Roderick, translated by Robin Moger and Georgina Collins (New York: Penguin Books, 2013), 1–2, 6.

14. Hamid Dabashi, *The Arab Spring: The End of Postcolonialism* (London: Zed Books, 2012), 5.

15. Philip N. Howard and Muzammil M. Hussain, *Democracy's Fourth Wave? Digital Media and the Arab Spring* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 48.
16. Kees Biekart and Alan Fowler, "Transforming Activisms 2010+: Exploring Ways and Waves," *Development and Change* 44, no. 3 (2013): 528, 529; Howard and Hussain, *Democracy's Fourth Wave?*, 22.
17. Howard and Hussain, *Democracy's Fourth Wave?*, 5, 19, 20, 22–23; Khosrokhavar, *The New Arab Revolutions That Shook the World*, 41, 42.
18. For example, Miriyam Aouragh, "Framing the Internet in the Arab Revolutions: Myth Meets Modernity," *Cinema Journal* 52, no. 1 (2012): 152–55.
19. Liz Bondi and Joyce Davidson, "Situating Gender," in *A Companion to Feminist Geography*, edited by Lise Nelson and Joni Seager (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 20–25; Gillian Rose, *Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 137–60.
20. Khosrokhavar, *The New Arab Revolutions That Shook the World*, 79.
21. Fereshteh Nouraie-Simone, "Wings of Freedom: Iranian Women, Identity, and Cyberspace," in *On Shifting Ground: Muslim Women in the Global Era*, edited by Fereshteh Nouraie-Simone (New York: Feminist Press at the City University of New York, 2005), 61–79; George Weyman, "Speaking the Unspeakable: Personal Blogs in Egypt," *Arab Media and Society* 3 (Fall 2007), <http://www.arabmediasociety.com/?article=425>.
22. Hoda Elsadda, "Arab Women Bloggers: The Emergence of Literary Counter-publics," *Middle East Journal of Culture and Communication* 3, no. 3 (2010): 314–15, 317–18.
23. Linda M. G. Zerilli, *Feminism and the Abyss of Freedom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 22–28, 9.
24. Jacques Rancière, "The Thinking of Dissensus: Politics and Aesthetics," in *Reading Rancière: Critical Dissensus*, edited by Paul Bowman and Richard Stamp (London: Continuum, 2011), 1–17; Jacques Rancière, "Politics and Aesthetics: An Interview," *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 8, no. 2 (2003): 192, 201; Jacques Rancière, "Ten Theses on Politics," *Theory and Event* 5, no. 3 (2001): 1, 11–13, [http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory\\_and\\_event/v005/5.3ranciere.html](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v005/5.3ranciere.html); Joseph J. Tanke, *Rancière: An Introduction, Philosophy, Politics, Aesthetics* (London: Continuum, 2011).
25. Andrew Schaap, "Enacting the Right to Have Rights: Jacques Rancière's Critique of Hannah Arendt," *European Journal of Political Theory* 10, no. 1 (2011): 30, 23, 24.
26. Dikeç, "Space as a Mode of Political Thinking," 673, 674.
27. McDowell, *Gender, Identity and Place*, 34–70.
28. Ehsani, "Radical Democratic Politics and Public Space," 159.
29. Engin F. Isin, "Engaging, Being, Political," *Political Geography* 24, no. 3 (2005): 375.
30. For example, Dikeç, "Space as a Mode of Political Thinking," 669.
31. One of the few scholarly examinations of spatiality in the Arab revolutions is Salwa Ismail's comparative analysis of revolutionary dynamics in Cairo and Damascus, "Urban Subalterns in the Arab Revolutions: Cairo and Damascus in Comparative Perspective," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 55, no. 4 (2013): 865–94. Although its subject is men, it is not concerned with issues of gender and sexuality. Ismail found that the

"infrastructures of protest lay in the micro-processes of everyday life that developed at the quarter level, in community forms of organization and in popular youth's modes of action and interaction with state government" (878). Revolutionary consciousness and activity emerged from "spatially grounded hostility," dynamics, and history (873, 874). With regard to Cairo, a focus on Midan Tahrir, the "tech generation," young middle-class icons, and the "cultured," she argues, elided daily violent battles between police and poor and working-class residents, especially boys and men, in the "informal" neighborhoods of Cairo (865, 869, 871, 873). In Damascus subaltern urbanites were spatially and ideologically divided and in conflict because the regime fosters control through sect-based co-optation as well as "clientalization and exclusion" in distributing resources such as neighborhood-based housing (884, 885, 889, 890).

32. Sghiri, "Greetings to the Dawn," 29.

33. Khosrokhavar, *The New Arab Revolutions That Shook the World*, 29.

34. Aouragh, "Framing the Internet in the Arab Revolutions," 151. Democratic centralism is classically used to describe the structure of a proletarian vanguard party, as first developed in the Russian Revolution and widely applied by top-down leftist movements in the Arab world.

35. Sghiri, "Greetings to the Dawn," 21, 27, 34, 41.

36. Anna J. Secor, "The Veil and Urban Space in Istanbul: Women's Dress, Mobility and Islamic Knowledge," *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 9, no. 1 (2002): 5–22; Hille Koskela, "Urban Space in Plural: Elastic, Tamed, Suppressed," in *A Companion to Feminist Geography*, edited by Lise Nelson and Joni Seager (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 257–70.

37. Sara Mourad, "The Naked Body of Alia: Gender, Citizenship, and the Egyptian Body Politic," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 38, no. 1 (2014): 63, 67, 74.

38. Paul Amar, "Middle East Masculinity Studies: Discourses of 'Men in Crisis,' Industries of Gender in Revolution," *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* 7, no. 3 (2011): 38.

39. Khaled Fahmy, "Revolution of the Body" (Arabic), *Jadaliyya*, May 2012, <http://arabic.jadaliyya.com/pages/index/5489/%D8%AB%D9%88%D8%B1%D8%A9-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AC%D8%B3%D8%AF>.

40. Sherine Hafez, "The Revolution Shall Not Pass through Women's Bodies: Egypt, Uprising and Gender Politics," *Journal of North African Studies* 19, no. 2 (2014): 175.

41. Leslie P. Peirce, *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993). Pierre Bourdieu of course has analyzed gender in relation to built environments, especially home spaces, in Algeria. For a review of the debates in Western feminist scholarship on spatiality, see Don Mitchell, "Feminism and Cultural Change: Geographies of Gender," in *Cultural Geography: A Critical Introduction* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000), 199–229. Also see the superb book by McDowell, *Gender, Identity and Place*.

42. Farha Ghannam, *Remaking the Modern: Space, Relocation, and the Politics of Identity in a Global Cairo* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 89–92.

43. Gabriele Vom Bruck, "A House Turned Inside Out: Inhabiting Space in a Yemeni City," *Journal of Material Culture* 2, no. 2 (1997): 141; Toni Kotnik, "The Mirrored Public: Architecture and Gender Relationship in Yemen," *Space and Culture* 8, no. 4 (2005):

472–83; Susanne Dahlgren, “Morphologies of Social Flows: Segregation, Time, and the Public Sphere,” in *Gendering Urban Space in the Middle East, South Asia, and Africa*, edited by Martina Rieker and Kamran Asdar Ali (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 45–70.

44. Paul Amar, *The Security Archipelago: Human-Security States, Sexuality Politics, and the End of Neoliberalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013), esp. 210–33.

45. Koskela, “Urban Space in Plural,” 257–58, 259.

46. Doreen Massey, “Politics and Space/Time,” in *Place and the Politics of Identity*, edited by Michael Keith and Steve Pile (London: Routledge, 1993), 149–50.

47. Koskela, “Urban Space in Plural,” 257.

48. Fatima Mernissi, *Beyond the Veil: Male-Female Dynamics in Modern Muslim Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), 142–43.

49. Fatima Sadiqi and Moha Ennaji, “The Feminization of Public Space: Women’s Activism, the Family Law, and Social Change in Morocco,” *Journal of Middle East Women’s Studies* 2, no. 2 (2006): 91–92.

50. Anouk de Koning, “Gender, Public Space and Social Segregation in Cairo: Of Taxi Drivers, Prostitutes and Professional Women,” *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography* 41, no. 3 (2009): 535, 547.

51. Koskela, “Urban Space in Plural,” 263.

52. Hanna Herzog, “Mixed Cities as a Place of Choice: The Palestinian Women’s Perspective,” in *Mixed Towns, Trapped Communities: Historical Narratives, Spatial Dynamics, Gender Relations and Cultural Encounters in Palestinian-Israeli Towns*, edited by Dan Rabinowitz and Daniel Monterescu (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 243–44, 249.

53. Mernissi, *Beyond the Veil*, viii.

54. Bondi and Davidson, “Situating Gender,” 16.

55. Also see on “congealing,” Geraldine Pratt and Susan Hanson, “Geography and the Construction of Difference,” *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 1, no. 1 (1994): 19–22, 25–26.

56. Bondi and Davidson, “Situating Gender,” 23.

57. Hasso is involved in a research project on the Ultras.

58. Massey, “Politics and Space/Time,” 156, 157.

59. These two videos illustrate the use by rulers of the chaos/revolution discourse as well as its undermining by activists: Mohamedbaolo, “Thawra.mp4,” 15 March 2011, YouTube, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AooofI3CzwY>; Abu Ziad, “Revolution-Chaos” (Arabic), 16 March 2011, YouTube, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nvEn4Mbs6IU>. In RT Arabic, “Ali Abdullah Saleh: What Happened in Yemen Was Chaos, Not Revolution” (Arabic), 25 March 2013, YouTube, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r6-yIug1b3Q>. Saleh, deposed ruler of Yemen, uses the word *chaos* a number of times in an interview with Russian television. Saleh argues that these are *not revolutions* but chaos.

60. Hafez, “The Revolution Shall Not Pass through Women’s Bodies,” 178.

61. For example, Fatima el-Issawi, “The Arab Spring and the Challenge of Minority Rights: Will the Arab Revolutions Overcome the Legacy of the Past?,” *European View* 10, no. 2 (2011): 250, 257.

62. Khosrokhavar, *The New Arab Revolutions That Shook the World*, 8–9.

63. An image of the *sawt al-mar'a thawra* poster is available at <http://www.aljabha.org/?i=66387>. See Yqeen, “A Woman’s Voice Is a Revolution, Not ‘*awra*” (Arabic), YouTube, 10 September 2012, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jgqoAo6GCWs>. The post-July 2013 uses of this slogan by Islamist women in Egypt during street demonstrations against the military government illustrate the instability of language and make evident that women’s bodies and voices may revolt against the repressive order of militarism but not necessarily seek to undermine unequal gendered and sexual forms of spatial order.