In the last decade of the past century several scientific projects conducted research into sexual orientation and the reports aroused great interest not only in the scientific world, but also in the wider public world. Such research projects were interested in the origin of male homosexuality.

The reports claimed that there were indications about the biological origin of male homosexuality. The arguments discussed in these research projects were best received by the American society. The public responded ‘for’ and ‘against’ special rights for homosexuals through public debates thus testing the reports as arguments in the defense of their standpoints.

The interest for the research projects was not limited to gay/lesbian movements, biomedical sciences and public debates on the rights for homosexuals. Many feminist authors criticized the findings. Such criticism was based on the experience with the naturalism as a dominant strategy in the practice of scientific research.
Во рамките на геј/лезбејското движење се изострија теориско-политичките разлики помеѓу доминантните струи: „геј ген“ струјата, како позиција што го поддржува биолошкиот концепт на хомосексуалноста од една, и оние кои го заставуваа „queer“ стојалиштето, односно сите оние кои на некој начин не се „свпаѓаат“ со доминантните хетеросексуални нормативни практики од друга страна. Кон „queer“ стојалиштето се приклучија и оние кои го истакнуваа „изборот“ како исходиште на својата позиција и според тоа беа блиски до антинатуралистите.

Не беше тешко да се претпостави дека ќе се појават нови извештаи од истражувања што ќе имаат за цел да ја проверат валидноста на изнесените наоѓи. И навистина, такви истражувања беа спроведени, но повеќето од нив не ги потврдија наоѓите за биолошките основи на сексуалната ориентација на мажката хомосексуалност. Љубо така, се појавија студии и книги во кои се коментираа сите аспекти од дебатата и нивната мегусебна поврзаност. Но, како и со повторените научни истражувања, авторите доаѓаа до скептички или агностички заклучоци. Методологијата употребена во теориските проценки обично беше феминистичката епистемологија со која се докажуваше инконклюзивност на наоѓите, или се тврдеше дека тие се ирелевантни во борбата за правата на хомосексуалците.

Она што следи претставува обид да се прикажат тензиите помеѓу метафизичките, епистемолошките и политичките дискурси во феминистичките и геј/лезбејски теориски позиции, во контекст на биолошките истражувања на машката хомосексуалност.

Within the gay/lesbian movements, the theoretical and political differences among the dominant factions became clearer: the ‘gay gene’ faction, as a position that supported the biological concept of homosexuality, and those who supported the ‘queer’ standpoint, i.e. all those who in some way did not ‘fit in’ with the dominant heterosexual normative practice. Everyone who underlined the ‘choice’ as an outcome of their position and were close to the antinaturalists joined the ‘queer’ standpoint.

It wasn’t difficult to assume that new reports of research projects would appear in order to verify the validity of the presented findings. Indeed, such research projects were carried out but most of them did not confirm the findings regarding the biological influence on the sexual preference in male homosexuality. In addition, there were new studies and books giving comments on all aspects of the debate and their mutual connection. However, as was the case with the repeated scientific research projects, the authors reached sceptical and agnostic conclusions. The methodology used in the theoretical assessments was usually the feminist epistemology that proved the inconclusiveness of the findings, or claimed that the findings were irrelevant to the struggle for homosexual rights.

What follows is an attempt to present the opposing views among the metaphysical, epistemological and political discourses in feminist and gay/lesbian theoretical standpoints in the context of the biological research into male homosexuality.
These days realism is not popular. The metaphysical doctrine better known as constructivism, in all its versions – from the ontological to the epistemological and linguistic one, develops into a dominant viewpoint. Although we are able to follow the debate between the realists and the constructivists until the medieval discussion on nature and the meaning of concepts, this debate is still vivid and constantly changes the contexts and motives for its re-actualization.

In feminist literature, the discussion on realism was introduced with the famous citation ‘one is not born a woman, one becomes one’, by Simone de Beauvoir. In the early 70s, the ‘discovery’ of the category ‘gender’ as a socio-cultural feature distinctive from the category ‘sex’, contributed for the expansion of the debate on realism in the sphere of anthropology and social ontology. According to the standard interpretation, the category ‘sex’ refers to something given, an unalterable natural attribute, whereas ‘gender’ refers to the socio-cultural aspects. On the grounds that the category ‘gender’ does not depend on given and fixed attributes, its nature was described as a construct. However, it was shown that even constructs may have an essence. The problem arose due to the fact that the category ‘gender’ was interpreted with regard to the category ‘sex’, and this relation was an answer to an ontological issue, not a metaphysical one. The metaphysical issue is an issue about the essence as an attribute typical of every member in a given category, and an issue that can be answered without providing an answer to the ontological issue.
Во поглед на категоријата „род“, есенцијализмот, како неприфатлива онтолошка позиција во современите феминистичките теории, беше дестабилизиран на два начина: со историзација на категоријата и преку нејзината деконструкција. Но, историзмот и материјализмот исто така веќе не беа во мода. Стратешката на деконструкцијата се спроведуваше во две насоки: на метафизичкиот предизвик се одговараше со дезориентација на метафизичкиот концепт на идентитетот, олицетворен во релацијата суштина/појава. Во однос на онтолошкото прашање се кокетираше со лингвистичкиот конструктивизам, според кој, не само што категоријата „род“ е конструкт, туку и категоријата „пол“ е конструкт исто така.

Дискурзивниот конструктивизам на Батлер (Butler, 1990, 1993) беше и сè уште претставува инспирација на теоретското промислување на категориите род, пол, сексуалност. Од мноштвото интерпретации, толкувањето на Фаусто-Стерлинг (Anne Fausto-Sterling, 2000), можеби е едно од најинтересните. Според Фаусто-Стерлинг, теоријата на Батлер може да претставува појдовна точка во анализата и критиката на дискурсот на биомедицинските науки. Анализирајќи ги основите на концептуалните рамки на истражувањата за интерсексуалност, Фаусто-Стерлинг истакнува дека „... пол/род дистинкцијата ја ограничува феминистичката и другите форми на анализи. Терминот „род“ поместен во дихотомијата, нужно ја исключува биологијата. Да се мисли критички за биологијата станува невозможно поради поделбата реално/конструирано, во чии рамки, знаењето за реалното многу минува го пресликуваат во доменот на науката, истовремено изедначувајќи го она што е конструирано со социјалното“ (Fausto-Sterling 2000, 3). Иако гледиштето на Фаусто-Стерлинг се потпира врз дискурзивниот конс-

With regard to the category ‘gender’, the essentialism, as an unacceptable ontological viewpoint in the modern feminist theories, was destabilized in two ways: by historicizing the category and through its deconstruction. Nonetheless, historicism and materialism were no longer in trend. The strategy of deconstruction was carried out in two directions: the metaphysical challenge was responded to by disorientating the metaphysical concept of identity, embodied in the relation essence/appearance. Regarding the ontological issue, the linguistic constructivism was being coquettled with, according to which, not only that the category ‘gender’ is a construct, but the category ‘sex’ is also a construct.

The discursive constructivism of Butler (Butler, 1990, 1993) was and still is an inspiration of theoretical thinking on the categories gender, sex and sexuality. Of the many interpretations, the explanation of Fausto-Sterling (Anne Fausto-Sterling, 2000) is perhaps one of the most interesting. According to Fausto-Sterling, Butler’s theory can be regarded as a starting point in the analysis and criticism of the discourse of biomedical sciences. Analyzing the bases of the conceptual outlines of the research into inter-sexuality, Fausto-Sterling points out that “the sex/gender dualism limits feminist and other forms of analysis. The term ‘gender,’ placed in a dichotomy, necessarily excludes biology. Thinking critically about biology remains impossible because of the real/constructed divide, in which many map the knowledge of the real onto the domain of science while equating the constructed with the cultural.” (Fausto-Sterling 2000, 2003) Although Fausto-Sterling’s viewpoint is based on the discursive constructivism, she alters it with her argument that “As we grow and develop, we literally, not just discursively (that is through language and cultural practice), construct our bodies, incorporating
It seems that this statement allows for new interpretations of constructivism thus expanding its meaning. Provided that we accept that being material means talking about the process of materializing, then Butler’s discursive constructivism becomes discursive materialism. After all, it appears that, according to Fausto-Sterling, one of the most powerful implications of the discursive materialism is the possibility of deconstructing the distinction nature/culture which is reflected in the dichotomies gender/sex, homosexuality/heterosexuality. Being applied in the scientific analysis, deconstruction will prove the groundlessness of the attitude that science works in the domain of the real. However, Fausto-Sterling maintains the distinctions, but only from a heuristic aspect, because, as she points out, in the context of biomedical sciences, people are both natural and social beings, which makes them artificial i.e. constructed beings as well.

According to Elisabeth Grosz (Elisabeth Grosz, 1994), essentialism is a natural enemy of women. Although present in the feminist discourse, according to Grosz, essentialism is connected to patriarchal discourse by justifying female subordination with regard to men. Essentialism entails biologism, naturalism and universalism, which are frames and paradigms for the functioning of science.
According to these metaphysical frames, biologism is represented in the hierarchy of biological capacities. Naturalism can be represented as a version of biologism, but it does not have to be fixed on the biological level of description. Naturalism assumes ontologically determined capacities, not necessarily given in physical terms. Universalism does not depend on the physical and ontological descriptions. It includes general characteristics that can be defined as socio-cultural categories as well.

Contrary to the essentialist epistemologies, feminist epistemology and the philosophy of science are anti-realistic in the sense of a post-Kuhnian epistemological standpoint. Following this tradition, they draw nearer to other approaches to knowledge and scientific analysis that point out their social and cultural aspects. According to the feminist epistemology and the philosophy of science, knowledge and the scientific practices encompass sexist, masculine and homophobic assumptions to some extent. Science as an institution cannot exist out of society; therefore, certain social influences are present in the very conceptualization of the research subjects. Although feminist criticism does not exclude the possibility of objective knowledge, still, it is necessary to eliminate any metaphysical assumptions that support sexism to a certain degree in order to achieve such knowledge. ‘Good science’ is the science that is aware of the social and metaphysical assumptions in its practice and one that aims at eliminating and relativizing the discriminatory political implications of scientific research.
Feminism relates constructivism to criticism of science. As observed in Fausto-Sterling’s interpretation, constructivism appears as an *a priori* argumentation against metaphysical realism that is related to the normal scientific practices. Deconstructivism, placed on the other side of the dichotomy transcendence/immanence, is offered as a transcendental insight in the conditions and possibilities for overcoming the ideological principles of science.

**GAY GENE**

The expression ‘gay gene’ has multiple meanings. It is used to denote genetic evidence for male homosexuality. It is also used as a synonym for the theoretical viewpoint that male homosexuality is grounded biologically. Some theorists use this expression to construct the syntagm ‘gay gene discourse’ to denote separate fields of biologic research on sexuality, such as behavioral genetics, neuroendocrinology, sociobiology, and evolutional psychology. The theoretical applicability of the syntagm does not restrict certain interdisciplinary methodology; it mainly detects the possible associations to the results gained from experiments and research carried out within the frames of the aforementioned disciplines.

An example of such association can be found in LeVay and Harmer’s research (Simon LeVay and Dean H. Harmer), whose findings were widely discussed. They published a joint article in *Scientific American* (Vol. 270, 1994) where they presented the results of the research they carried out on male homosexuality. A year earlier, LeVay had published his book *The Sexual Brain* (1993)

Феминизмот го поврзува конструктивизмот со критиката на науката. Како што можеше да се забележи во интерпретацијата на Фаусто-Стерлинг, конструктивизмот се јавува како *a priori* аргументација против метафизичкиот реализам кој е поврзан со нормалните практики на науката. Деконструктивизмот, поставен од онаа страна на дихотомијата трансценденција/иманенција, се нуди како трансцендентален увид во условите и можностите за надминување на идеолошките премиси на науката.

**ГЕЈ ГЕН**

Изразот „геј ген“ има повеќекратно значење. Се употребува во смисла да ги означи генетските докази за машката хомосексуалност, но и како синоним за теоретската позиција според која машката хомосексуалност има биолошки основи. Некои теоретичари со тој израз ја конструираат синтагмата „геј ген дискурс“ за означување на одделни полиња на биолошките истражувања на сексуалноста, како што се бихејвиоралната генетика, неуроендохринологијата, социобиологијата и еволутивната психолошката. Теоретската оперативност на синтагмата не ограничува некаква интердисциплинарна методолошката, туку повеќе ги детектира можните надоврзувања на резултатите од експериментите и истражувањата спроведени во рамките на наведените дисциплини.

Пример за такво надоврзување може да се најде во истражувањата на Левеј (Simon LeVay) и Хармер (Dean H. Harmer), чијшто наоди беа предмет на дискусии. Во списанието *Scientific American* (Vol, 270, 1994) тие објавуваат заедничка студија во која ги прикажуваат резултатите од истражувањата за машката хомосексуалност што ги спровеле. Една година порано Левеј
The Sexual Brain (1993), and a year later Harmer, together with Copeland, published The Science of Desire (1994). After their works became a great success in public, they, as scientists and active members of the gay movement, were put in the unusual position of having to evaluate their work from both expert and political aspects. It seemed that the public was not interested in the contents of biomedical research but rather in the political and rhetorical dimension in the debate on gay rights.

Biological research on homosexuality has a long tradition. Typical for the work of LeVay and Harmer is that it is a continuation of the so-called ‘modern research’ carried out in the 80s. Namely, a starting point for LeVay was the research projects in the fields of neuro-endocrinology by Gorski and his associates who work at UCLA. Laura Allen, a member of the research team, indicated that the human brain had a dimorphous structure: a group of cells called INAH3 located in the middle pre-optical region of the hypothalamus is larger in the male than in the female brain.

In 1991 LeVay tried to explore and check whether another group of cells located in the mid pre-optical region of the brain varied with regard to the sexual preference. For this purpose, LeVay used samples of the hypothalamus of 19 homosexual men and 16 heterosexual men provided from autopsies. The study included 6 women whose sexual preference was unknown. Based on the test and measurements carried out on the samples, LeVay specified another group of cells: INAH1 and INAH2. Similar to the research carried out by Gorski, LeVay concluded that INAH3 is much larger in men than in women. However,
he also noticed that the INAH3 region is much larger in heterosexual men than in homosexual men.

Nevertheless, the influence of the brain on the sexual preference, i.e. the relationship between them, does not reveal in itself why such interrelation occurs, if there are processes that enable this relation and what their nature is. One of the possibilities for intrinsic differences of the brain is its reaction to androgens during the individual development.

The research projects about the possible genetic role of sexual preference were directed towards examination of the genetic influence rather than the genetic determination. It is a known fact that men possess two sex chromosomes X and Y: the Y chromosome is received from the father whereas the X chromosome is received from the mother. Harmer and his associates postulated the hypothesis about the X chromosome in homosexual men. The project was focused on 40 families having two gay sons. The results of the analysis showed that 33 couples shared the same genetic marker, which was not the case with the other seven couples. The X chromosomal marker detected in the 33 couples is known as XQ28. The interpretation that XQ28 determined sexual preference could not be directly proved; however, LeVay and Harmer’s research showed that it was determined hereditarily, thus biologically predisposed. They postulated the hypothesis about the indirect influence on the specific genetic factor by way of and through the temperament, and, as a most intriguing possibility they indicated the relation between XQ28 gene and its direct influence on the sexually dimorphous regions in the brain such as INAH3.
Although both research projects eventually did not put forward direct evidence about male homosexuality, the inferred generalizations based on the statistical method are still relevant. Current research and theoretical analyses can only argue about the value of the percentage and its interpretation but as such they fit in the inner context of research. The thing such research and analysis cannot question is the very conceptual framework of research and the possibility of such type of research.

The problem with the general approach of the biological theories and projects can be determined only within the frames of meta-methodological debates. Fausto-Sterling criticized the methodological assumptions of the biological research on sexuality that implied independent examination of organisms from the environment. Contrary to the internal model, she highlighted the connectionist model. According to this model, an organism should be observed as a process of constant connections with the environment that result in its dynamic shaping. However, one of the main remarks against this was that, within the frames of biomedical research, issues of sexual preference and gender identity were entwined.

The criticism about ‘gay gene discourse’ from an epistemological aspect as well as from the aspect of the philosophy of science created in the feminist theories progressed in several directions. As previously mentioned, the feminist epistemology criticized the assumptions that science and scientific knowledge were the practice of discovering the reality, and that they were completely independent from society’s values and impacts.
In compliance with these standpoints, the critical analysis is based on two assumptions: that conceptualization of the research subject matter reflects the dominant sexist, homophobic and hetero-normative strategies; and that the relevant research has some kind of influence or reflection on the political status and the aims of the group that is being researched.

An example of such analysis can be found in the critical observations of Brookey (Robert Alan Brookey) in his book *Reinventing the Male Homosexual: The Rhetoric and Power of the Gay Gene* (2002) within the series *Race, Gender, and Science* at Indiana University edited by Fausto-Sterling.

He places research on male homosexuality in the context of homosexual human rights trying to identify the political capacity of the research. He attempts to provide an answer to the question whether the ‘gay gene’ discourse can function as a successful rhetoric strategy for gay rights. For this purpose, Brookey makes use of two concepts in order to answer his question: the concept of ‘bio-rhetorics’ and the concept of ‘background beliefs’.

The concept of bio-rhetorics is developed in the rhetorical research of science and observes the rhetorical and pragmatic effects on society. Lyne (Lyne, 1990, 1993), who postulated the concept, defines bio-rhetorics as a strategy for determining and organizing the biological discourse in such a manner so that it permeates social, political and moral life, supporting certain belief.
In compliance with the critical power of this concept, Brookey concludes that the debate on gay rights is an appropriate illustration of the ‘gay gene’ discourse represented in the implication: homosexuality is biologically determined – therefore homosexual rights should be protected.

The concept of ‘background beliefs’ developed by Longino (Longino, 1990) accounts for certain means for identification of the argumentative discourse elements that transforms the scientific ‘is’ into ‘ought to’ used in public politics. Based on her analysis of scientific research into biology, she concludes that certain scientific findings that do not comply with the current beliefs in a given cultural and civilizational context are misinterpreted. According to Longino, the implicit beliefs define scientific assumptions and determine the trends and interpretations of biological research.

According to Brookey, the ‘gay gene’ discourse cannot function as bio-rhetorics because it is based on the background beliefs about male homosexuality as a feminized phenomenon as a result of the asymmetric, normative dichotomies of sexuality, sex and gender. ‘Gay gene’ discourse, by describing male homosexuality as a sexual deviation and typical sexuality to which one is supposed to belong naturally, according to Brookey, is in favor of the attitudes regarding its allegedly pathological nature. In the context of gay rights, he concludes that the ‘gay gene’ discourse acts more exactly as a bio-rhetorics of the position for anti-gay rights.
**HUMAN RIGHTS**

Texts about the ‘gay gene’ discourse are usually finished raising questions about the political. The attempts for social changes resulting in the elimination of the hierarchical and excluding relationship represented in the relations man/woman, homosexuality/heterosexuality, are also shared by feminism and gay/lesbian movements. However, there is an irony which is the most evident in those books that summarize the theoretical and political position of the movements. A person unfamiliar with such literature might be confused. For instance, in the dispute between essentialism and constructivism, the ontological standpoints are not evaluated according to their theoretical credibility, but due to criteria for political pragmatism, thus falsifying their theoretical justification. The terms ‘strategic essentialism’ or the plural form ‘feminisms’ that should, at least semantically, preserve the unity of the female subject and, at the same time, the diversity among women without it being negated, point to certain tensions. After all, is it possible to set an epistemologically acceptable criterion for human body conceptualization and for the sexual capacity, constructed and assessed on the basis of the pragmatic and political criterion for anti-essentialist feminism and gay-queer movements so that the theoretical conceptualization is neither implied nor it should imply sexism, homophobia etc.?

It seems that the logic of unmasking has no effect. Critical reviews on discursive systems of the science, in order to present their ideological and contingent assumptions of what is ‘normal’ or ‘real’, contribute to no radical step forward because they never functioned on basis of these dichotomies. Science cares little whether what is a variable

**Човекови Права**

Обично, текстовите за „геј ген“ дискурсот завршуват со прашања за политичкиот. Заложбите за социјални промени, со што би бил елиминиран хиерархискиот и исключувачкиот однос претставен во релациите маж/жена, хомосексуалност/хетеросексуалност, се заеднички и на феминизмот и на геј-лезбејските движења. Но, постои една ирија која е највидлива во оние книги и студии кои ја сумираат теоретската и политичката позиционаринаст на тие движења. Некој што не е упатен во таа литература би останал збунет. На пример, во спорот есенцијализам/конструктивизам, онтолошките позиции не се проценуваат според нивната теоретска увереност, туку низ критериумите на политичката прагматика, и на тој начин ја фалсификуваат нивната теориска оправданост. Изразите, „стратешки есенцијализам“ или множината ‑„фeminизми“, преку кои, барем семантички, треба да се сочува единственоста на феминистичкиот субјект и истовремено да не се порекне различието помеѓу жените, укажуваат на одредени тензии. Впрочем, можеше ли епистемички прифатлив критериум за концептуализација на човечкиот организам и за капацитетот за сексуалност, конструиран и проценуван според прагматско-политичкиот критериум на антисенцијалистичкиот феминизам и геј-QUEUE движењата, така што теориската концептуализација да не биде имплицирана ниту да имплицира сексизми, хомофобии итн?

Логиката на демаскирање, по сè изгледа, нема никаков ефект. Критиките на дискурзивните системи на науката, со цел да се покажат нивните идеолошки и континентни претпоставки за тоа што е „нормално“ или „реално“, не придонесуваат за никаков радикален исчекор, затоа што тие никогаш и не функционирале
The very nature of the process of unmasking, remains problematic. It is the point where deconstructionist readings fail, although they do underline the overlapping connection between the ontological, political and cultural aspect. The logic and the sequence of the process of unmasking is an inverted transcendental logic; thus reconstruction of the dichotomies should account for how something we comprehend as given is created.

A strategy of this type from the point of the current normal discourse, shaped as consensual procedures and practices with respect to what is regarded as successful postulating and solving a certain theoretical-empirical problem, causes laughter and mockery. There are two reasons causing this: if criticism is presented with the language of the current normal discourse, it loses its power and emerges as a theory of ontological conspiracy, and, on the other hand, if the criticism is presented with the language constructed as the language of Butler, Derridá and others, then the problem of misunderstanding and falsification of original intentions occurs. Radical untranslatability is always a practice with the discursive transitions. The practices of signifying, such as sciences, are no longer in a speculative order that can be reconstructed and whose untenability can be demonstrated by use of the very principles through which it is legitimized. Namely, the broad overlapping connection among these discourses develops strategies for justification and legitimization that neither can be criticized immanently nor reconstructed.
иманентно да се критикуваат, ниту да се реконструкираат.

Примерите за неодлучноста како да се реагира на маскулинизмот, сексизмот, хомофобијата па дури и на хетеросексуалната нормативност, се покажаа со дилемата за унитарноста на феминистичкиот политички субјект и прашањето на „queer“, идентитетот. Субверзивната насмејка на ефектот на пастишот во пародиските практики се дочекува како гротеска во која уживува верзерноста на циничниот ум. „Не брзайте. Договорете се најпра во кои сте и што сте. Ние секогаш сме подготвени за разговор“. Вака некако би звучела реченицата до оние кои имаат проблеми со идентитетот, а е упатена од теорискиот естаблишмент.

Како и да е, прашањето за идентитетот и понатаму останува централен проблем во дискурсот за геј правата и во движењата за геј ослободување. Длабоката поврзаност на дејствувањето и моќта како значаен политички момент, постојано го повикува теорискиот дискурс повторно и повторно да го преиспитува концептот на идентитетот и неговите политички капацитети во рамките на нормалните дискурси. Дебатите и поделбите во геј движењето произлегуваат токму од радикалната критика на концептот на идентитетот. Политичкиот неуспех на деконструкцијата на идентитетот произлегува од фактот дека при експозицијата за нејзиното правилно разбиране, таа е вовлечена во недоследни стратегии на оправдување и легитимирање на политичките и социјалните движења.

На пример, во дебатата за геј правата, дискусијата која се движи около прашањата за статусот и природата на идентитетот, запаѓа во парадоксални ситуацији. Заставниците на „queer по избор“ позицијата можат

Hesitation regarding masculinity, sexism, homophobia, and heterosexual normative were even more evident with the dilemma about the unity of the feminist political subject and the issue of ‘queer’ identity. The subversive smile of the effect of pastiche in parodic practices is seen as a grotesque in which the perversity of a cynical mind enjoys. ‘Do not rush. First, come to terms with who you are and what you are. We are always prepared to talk.’ Roughly speaking, this is the address of the theoretical establishment to those who have problems with their identity.

Nevertheless, the question of identity continues to remain a focal problem in the discourse on gay rights and gay liberation movements. The profound connection between action and power as an important political point constantly demands from the theoretical discourse to re-examine the concept of identity and its capacities within the frames of normal discourses. The debates and divisions within the gay movement result from the radical criticism of the concept of identity. The political failure of the deconstruction of the identity resulted from the fact that in the course of presenting a detailed explanation so that it could be comprehended correctly, the deconstruction of identity was involved in inconsistent strategies of justification and legitimization of the political and social movements.

For instance, within the debate on gay rights, the discussion about the issues regarding the status and nature of identity becomes paradoxical. The supporters of the ‘queer by choice’ standpoint may say that they agree
that their critics that homosexuality is not a fixed identity. On the other hand, within the ‘gay gene’ discourse, it is claimed that homosexuality is a stable identity, a viewpoint supported by their critics. The ‘Queer’ theory constantly points out, according to their supporters, the catastrophic consequences on gay liberation if the category ‘identity’ is insisted upon, and, at the same time, the ‘gay gene’ discourse reiterates the absurdity of the idea about radical non-identity. Neither gay movement with its forms of liberation nor feminism achieved equally significant results when supporting their viewpoints on essentialist grounds. However, to satanize essentialism as a ground that implies asymmetric relations, nonexistent properties and identities, which produces sexism by definition, and to favour constructivism and its deconstructive variant, means to be closed within the frames of metaphysical dialogisms.

Once formulated in terms of the discourse that is being deconstructed, the findings of the deconstructive readings do not accomplish as damaging an effect as assumed. Statements such as ‘the identity is a construct’, ‘the real is a fiction’ etc., do not cause new ‘normal’ statements the semantics of which reflects deconstructive reading of metaphysical dichotomies. An example of a deconstructive semantic whirl can be found in the discussion between Judith Butler and Katerina Kolozova at the seminar held in Ohrid (2000) entitled The Crisis of the Subject. Using Butler’s deconstruction of the dichotomy sex/gender as a basis for new reading and interpretation of the dichotomy real/fiction, it seems that Kolozova in her text Aporetiké of the Real (Kolozova 2000) abandons deconstruction and acknowledges the concept ‘Vision-in-One’ which was

Со деконструкциjата на метафизичките претпоставки на нормалните дискурси значи дека премногу се претпоставува. Идеjата дека нормалните дискурси мораат и треба да ги следат правилата по кои функционираат и во ситуациjата кога ќе се покаже дека тие правила не се тоа што ги конституира и легитимира како нормални дискурси, значи да се има метафизичка верба во нивната рационална иманентност. Од критиката на реализмот, ниту преку рационалните расправи, ниту со поместувањата во означуваjките практики, никако не можеме да заклучиме дека тоj ќе исчезне од светот на животот затоа што веќе нема никакви рационални разлози да веруваме во неговата нужност или дека оние прaksi developed within Laruelle’s non-philosophy. Although the text is shaped as a deconstructive attempt, it eventually reveals itself as a simulacrum of deconstruction as an interpretative practice. In Vision-in-One ‘the fiction and real are not opposed, they are not even placed into (mutual) relation’ (Kolozova, 2001, 42). Admitting the dead-end of the linguistic constructivism, Butler tries to direct Kolozova’s interpretation for her own benefit thus interpreting the dead-end of her own doctrine as an indicator of the Real. However, she forgets that the Real in Laruelle is neither something that transcends language nor language is something transcending. The radical imanence of the Real is not posited relationally. Despite that, the problem remains. It is not clear how we could formulate hypotheses as strategies of theoretical-empirical research using the approaches of Kolozova and Butler.

The deconstruction of the metaphysical assumptions to normal discourses means that there is too much assuming. The idea that normal discourses have to follow the function rules of functioning even in situations when it is obvious that those rules are not what constitutes and legitimizes them as normal discourses, means to have metaphysical faith in their rational immanence. By virtue of the critical writing on realism, neither from rational debates, nor from the shift in the signifying practices, we can conclude that realism will disappear from the living world because there are no more rational reasons to believe in its necessity, or because the practices which are preconditions for its existence are no longer operative.
кои претставуваат услови за негово постоене, повеќе не се оперативни.

Прашавнето кое треба да се преиспита е дали стратегиите на оправдување присутни во нормалниот дискурс можат да бидат блокиран и со тоа да се осуетат потезите преку кои се легитимираат секзисмот, хомофобијата и хетеросексуалната нормативност. Насоката што сакам да ја предложам — едначност е доста класична. Не станува збор да се отфрлат деконструктивистичките читања, туку тие повеќе да не се земаат како експликативни теории на проблеми кои се дефинирани во термини на нормалните дискуси. Таквиот нивен статус практично и создава забуни и апсурдни теориски позиции како такви, но и кога тие како политичко средство се доведуваат во врска со политичките ангажмани.

Ако деконструктивистичката и радикалните критики веќе го немаат статусот на нормален експликативен дискурс, тогаш веќе нема потреба да се драматизира можното за демаскирање и демистификарање на метафизичките дистинкции и дихотомии. Но тоа не значи дека треба да се помириме со фактот дека тие сè уште функционираат како премиси, или механизми во светот на животот, теориските или аргументативните стратегии. Мислам дека има автори кои веруваат дека деконструкцијата нема веќе да постои кога ќе се деконструираат сите метафизички дихотомии, но дека има и такви што веруваат во дихотомната нужност на светот како оцегледна. Формулирајќи ја таквата ситуација како прашање на избор и одлука само не отгнува во погрешна насока.

Ваквиот распоред на проблемите го поставува предложенот критички период во рамките на нормалните дискуси. Промената на ставот во однос на

The issue that needs to be re-examined is whether the justification strategies typical for the normal discourse can be blocked thus impeding the moves through which sexism, homophobia and heterosexual normative legitimize themselves. The course I would like to suggest is somewhat classical in its approach. It is not about rejecting deconstructive readings; rather, they should not be referred to as explicative theories of problems defined with terms characteristic for normal discourses. Such status causes confusion and absurd theoretical viewpoints, especially when they are used as political means in connection with political activities.

If deconstructive and radical critical writings have no longer a status of normal explicative discourse, then there is no need to dramatize over the possibility of unmasking and demystifying the metaphysical distinctions and dichotomies. This does not mean that we have to bring to terms with the fact that they still function as principles or mechanisms in the living world, the theoretical and argumentative strategies. I think that there are authors who believe that deconstruction no longer exists once all metaphysical dichotomies are deconstructed, but there are also authors who believe that the dichotomous necessity of the world is something apparent. By defining this situation as an issue of choice and decision, we are only misled into a wrong direction.

This organization of the problems is setting the suggested critical approach within the frames of the normal discourses. The change in attitude regarding essentialism
Identities and constructivism and their connection to the possible discriminating and liberating practices is reflected in the fact that these connections should no longer be treated as implicative relations.

We might regard the relations between these positions as justifying practices based on certain argumentative strategies. In other words, essentialism can be treated as justification of sexism carried out in compliance with certain rules. However, the nature of these rules does not allow for creating a universal axiomatic unity. This metaphysical assumption is the cause of the existing problem today: to infer the falsity of sexism and homophobia from the falsity of essentialism. What I wish to point out is that the nature of these relations is semantic-pragmatic, not epistemological-ontological. However, the study of the character of such semantic-pragmatic strategies surpasses the limits of this text.
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