

## **the intersection of cultures with feminism**

in okin's article we can see plenty of examples of how different cultures presents the issue of gender oppression in different ways, and how protecting the plurality of cultures can often lead to protecting the existing oppression which exists within those societies.

she partially gets into some very basic reminders to the need for uniformity in how we regulate minorities: we can't ignore problematic behaviours just because it's their habits and customs. accepting that other groups are discriminatory, indirectly, means we are supportive of the discrimination. of course, this desire for universal freedom becomes a dilemma when a culture is defined by this conservative structure.

## **a different framework for culture**

naranyan, in her article, suggest that cultures are a social strucutre, and it's often hard to define which culture you're really part of, and that it's not necessary for a culture to be static over time: they can evolve and improve.

it's important to note that this doesn't mean we should impose our external values, but rather engage in a dialogue that respects their cultural identities while also advocating for the rights and dignity of everyone, regardless of gender (and other). it's about understanding the power dynamics which are involved from the western conversation, and finding a common ground to address gender oppression in its many forms.

## **polygamy → polyamory**

i personally found the discussion of polygamy of okin a bit interesting, since it seems to me that polyamorous ideals are contrary to the problems of polygamy. people who defend polyamory today put quite strong emphasis on consent, autonomy, equality; and doesn't (completely?) reflect the issue of gender in the relationships.

i'm not entirely convinced the two ideas are even comparable, even if they are both, by definition, about allowing people (men, in the case of polygamy) to be in relationships with more than a single person. that said, i believe it's partially possible within naranyan's framework to skip the "need" for monogamy in their societies by offering a healthier approach to the link between romantic (eh, not necessarily) partners

for any of this to work, though, there needs to be commitment from both sides to desire societal improvement, and common agreement that oppression and discrimination is, actually, bad and undesirable. from my reading of the text, naranyan doesn't really explain how to motivate people into becoming committed.