



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT / DIPLOMA THESIS

Titel der Diplomarbeit / Title of the Diploma Thesis

„Social satire in selected works of Terry Pratchett's
Discworld series“

verfasst von / submitted by

Florian Lautner

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Magister der Philosophie (Mag. Phil.)

Wien, 2018 / Vienna, 2018

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

A 190 344 313

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Lehramtsstudium UF Englisch UF Geschichte, Sozialkunde,
und Politische Bildung

Betreut von / Supervisor:

ao. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Eva Zettelmann

Table of contents

Introduction	1
Satire	4
Origins of satire	4
Modern theory of satire	8
Contemporary criticism	12
Critical Race Theory	16
Historical development of CRT	16
Racism as normal	18
Interest convergence	18
Race as social construction	20
Intersectionality and Anti-Essentialism	21
Storytelling and counter-storytelling.....	23
Myths and misunderstandings about CRT.....	23
The Social Construction of Gender	25
Sex and Gender.....	25
Social Constructionism and gender	27
Gender as something we do.....	30
Identity	33
”If you look quickly and are not paying attention, you might mistake it for jolly” – Discworld and satire	38
”It’s always very tricky, ethnic” – Race and racism in Ankh-Morpork.....	45
”The Watch must reflect the ethnic makeup of the city” – Speciesism in Ankh-Morpork	45
”That damn troll just happened to save my life today” – Inter-species contact in the Watch	58
”Ain’t no dwarfs or trolls or humans in the Watch” – The social construction of race.....	65
”The City Watche Needs Men! Be A Man In The City Watch!” – Gender and identity.....	71
”You never said you were a werewolf!” – Intersectionality	71
” <i>Female?</i> He <i>told</i> you he was female?” – Gender and performativity	81
Conclusion	96
Bibliography	102
Appendix.....	107
English abstract	107
German abstract	107
Plot summaries	109
Ankh-Morpork.....	109

Introduction

Terry Pratchett was one of the most successful, popular, and prolific writers of fantasy literature in the world who released more than 70 novels and sold more 85 million copies worldwide (South x). His immense success is based on the fact that he is rightfully known as one of the most hilariously authors in the entire genre of fantasy literature. In regard to his own literary work, Pratchett himself at one point noted the following: “I think I write fantasy. If it looks like a duck, walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, then you might as well stick an orange in its bottom and eat it with green peas” (Pratchett *Imaginary Worlds* 160), which is in itself emblematic for Pratchett’s sense of humor. Another example of both his humor and his personality is a t-shirt he often wore at conventions reading “Tolkien’s dead. JK Rowling said no. Philip Pullman couldn’t make it. Hi, I’m Terry Pratchett” (Anthony-Rowlands ch. 4). Terry Pratchett’s popularity, however, was not accompanied by academic interest and appreciation. In stark contrast to J.R.R. Tolkien, Pratchett’s genre of choice, fantasy, in combination with his emphasis on humor did not work to his benefit but rather to his detriment in terms of academic interest and research into his work, resulting in an underrepresentation in academic discourse, especially in relation to his success and significance as a writer (South xi). David Langford, in the introduction to “Terry Pratchett: Guilty of Literature”, one of the few volumes focusing on Pratchett’s work, described the issue in the following way: “one literary critic wrote a whole column in which he noted how everyone he respected told him he would enjoy Pratchett, but even so, he could not bring himself to read any of his novels” (viii). Similarly, Jonathan Jones contends that there is a “difference between entertainment and literature – the novel as distraction and the novel as art” and to him, Pratchett’s Discworld clearly is “more entertainment than art” (*The Guardian* 11 September 2015). These views of Pratchett’s literary legacy are not uncommon, especially in regard to the early stages of his writing career. Certainly, Pratchett himself never attached great importance to the verdict of literary critics as he himself asserted that “I am an author. I am, by the crude yardstick of sales, an immensely successful one. I’m quite happy with that yardstick. The author’s prime task is to be *read*” (*Imaginary Worlds* 159). It would be a big mistake, however, to assume that Pratchett’s main literary achievement of 41 *Discworld* novels can be reduced to the mere fact that he created a best-selling series of funny fantasy novels based on him being equipped with an extraordinary sense of humor and his creation of a strange, fictional world filled with ridicu-

lous stories and even more ridiculous characters, even though it might be “one of the most magnificent, brilliant, and funny contributions any one person has made to the world,” as some would argue (Michaud xi). While fantasy literature has often been referred to as escapist literature, especially in the 21st century owing to the success of fantasy series such as *The Lord of the Rings*, *Harry Potter*, and *A Song of Ice and Fire* and especially their screen adaptations, it had a huge impact on (popular) culture (James 62). The genre of fantasy eventually “indicates that [it] is a pervasive phenomenon, demanding critical evaluation” (Baker 437-438). This is also very much true for Pratchett, who unquestionably deserves more critical attention than he has received especially during the early decades of his writing career (South xi), particularly if one takes into account Pratchett’s motivation for writing fantasy and creating the Discworld: “The reason it is fantasy is that it is logical about the wrong things, about those parts of human experience where, by tactic agreement, we don’t use logic because it doesn’t work properly. On Discworld all metaphors are potentially real, all figures of speech have a way of becoming more than words” (*Imaginary Worlds* 160).

Consequently, the aim of this thesis is to examine whether Pratchett’s *Discworld* series and more specifically the so-called City Watch Trilogy is in fact a vehicle for satire and social criticism, as well as to demonstrate that Terry Pratchett is not merely a funny and entertaining author of parodies but a writer who is also concerned with serious topics dealt with in a satirical manner. The City Watch Trilogy consists of *Guards! Guards!* (1990), *Men at Arms* (1994), and *Feet of Clay* (1997), the first three books of the Watch arc, a subset of altogether eight novels. In this context, social satire is understood as a witty criticism on the basis of flaws and issues in society. Specifically, this thesis is interested in the way Pratchett employs satire to try to raise awareness for and of make fun of, and thus criticize, certain social conditions and conventions he disapproves of, particularly in regard to the topics of race, gender, and identity. Furthermore, it seeks to show that the lack of research on Pratchett is actually unjustified and it intends to expand the existent, rather limited body of research on Terry Pratchett especially in regard to social satire, as there seems to be a noticeable gap in academic discourse. In existing books and volumes dedicated to Pratchett and the Discworld (cf. Butler et al. 2004, Held and South 2015, Michaud

2016, Rayment 2014), satire, particularly in regard to race and gender, only plays a minor part.

While it is true that Pratchett originally intended the Discworld as a parody of the large quantities of predominantly pulp fantasy literature being published in the 1970s and 80s, it unfortunately diverts attention from the fact over time, he developed from a parodist to a satirist, while still remaining true to his comic origins. Therefore, Pratchett's main literary achievement, the *Discworld* series, should be held in higher esteem than simply an absurd world that makes fun of fantasy literature conventions and occasional oddities borrowed from real life which struck Pratchett worth of ridiculing. The Discworld is, as Pratchett calls it, a "*largely imaginary*" world inhabited by various fictional beings such as dwarfs, trolls, vampires, golems, and werewolves (*Imaginary Worlds* 160, emphasis added). These inhabitants often exhibit remarkable similarities to ordinary, real-world human beings. As a result, Pratchett's characters "push the limits of our understanding of what it means to be 'human'" (Held 3), because they consistently have to deal with a considerable number of issues common to all of us including death, religion, racism, violence, identity, gender, and social injustice in a fantasy setting, or, as Pratchett described it, "the way they act and interact can be, I hope, curiously familiar to the reader" (*Imaginary Worlds* 160). The way Pratchett approaches these issues is to project them onto the Discworld, this "vibrant, magical, and dangerous place full of insight, truth, and dangerous ideas," which functions in juxtaposition to our own, real world (Michaud xi). Through the absurdity of his plots and characters, which nonetheless exhibit a sense of familiar, he encourages his readers to reflect on the issues presented and consider their relation to reality. Through his cast of hilarious characters such as Cheery Littlebottom, the first openly female dwarf in an otherwise very conservative dwarf society, Angua von Überwald, a vegetarian werewolf woman and victim of intersectional discrimination, Carrot Ironfoundersson, a dwarf by adoption almost two meters tall, and others, Pratchett creates a compelling account of social satire. In the first part of this thesis, a theoretical foundation of these topics is provided. The second part consists of an analysis as whether Pratchett's work can actually be considered satire as well as a detailed analysis of selected passages of the novels in regard to the topics of race, gender, and identity.

Satire

Origins of satire

The origins of the term *satire* are disputed and to this day, it is difficult to determine its precise etymology. A recurring explanation is that *satire* is actually a blend of two terms, one Greek and one Latin. On the one hand, the term *satyr*, describing the “boozy, randy half-goats, half-men of Greek mythology” (Carpenter 91, qtd. in Simpson 4) is assumed to be a root for *satire*, on the other hand, *satura*, as part of the Latin expression for *lanx satura*, “a platter of mixed fruits offered to the deities at festival time” is attributed to be another (Simpson 4). This mixture of Greek and Latin as the origins of the modern term *satire* is in fact also the point of departure for the history of satire as a literary genre and also depicts the uncertainties surrounding the actual ‘ownership’ of both the term and the concept. This is encapsulated in the assertion of the Roman rhetorician Quintilian that “satire is wholly our own” (“*satura tota nostra est*”), that *satura* was entirely a Roman invention (Elliott, *Satire*, Encyclopaedia Britannica Online), although he did in fact recognize Greek influences such as the work of Archilochos and Aristophanes but without acknowledging their work as an early form of satire Roman writers drew upon (Quintero 7).

The very same Aristophanes is the only extant playwright of the so-called Old Comedy, a phase of Greek comic dramaturgy known for “plays of fantasy in verse, often soaring high into beautiful lyric imagination, often crudely vulgar, sometimes downright silly [...] [and] rich with music and dancing, and used many of the technical resources of the theatre” (Hight 26). Aristophanes used ridicule and comedy to achieve a certain effect in a number of plays, for instance in his earliest known work *Daitaleis* (427 B.C.), he made fun of the theories his contemporaries had developed on education and morality, thereby creating a literary form that is today regarded as satirical as early as the 5th century B.C. (Cuddon 632). His comedies introduced “character types [which] will become satiric fodder for the dramatic or narrative undercutting of foolish or knavish behavior”, a narrative mode which forms one of the cornerstones of satire (Quintero 7). However, since the Greek had no specific term for this kind of plays and those who wrote them, Menippus, another representative of the earliest (proto-)satirists, was simply called “the man who jokes about serious things” (Hight 233). As a consequence, Quintilian was able to take ownership of the term in the name of the Romans.

Another reason why Quintilian was able to make such a claim is that during his lifetime, the prototypical satirical poetry of the Greeks was then “metrically disciplined into hexameters and stylistically purified into an identifiable verse genre” (Quintero 6). At the forefront of this development which took place over the course of more than two centuries were, amongst others, the Roman poets Varro (*saturarum menippearum*), Lucilius (*saturae*), Horace (*satirae*), and Juvenal (*saturae*), who created what is today known as “formal verse satire” (Quintero 6-7). Of these poets, Marcus Terentius Varro and Gaius Lucilius could be considered the forefathers of Roman satire for their development of two relatively distinct styles of satire in the late second and early first century B.C. which are today considered the two main categories satire can be attributed to, that is, direct and indirect satire. Varro, drawing upon the work of Menippus, a Greek Cynic philosopher, created a form of satire that sometimes bears the name of either of these two poets in the form Varronian or Menippean satire (Abrams 277). This form is also called indirect satire because, as the name already suggests, it addresses its readers indirectly through a form of fictional narrative where “the author’s intent is realized within the narrative and its story” (Elliott, *Satire*). Instead of discursive monologues, as it would be the case in direct satire, “the objects of the [Menippean] satire are characters who make themselves and their opinions ridiculous or obnoxious by what they think, say, and do, and are sometimes made even more ridiculous by the author’s comments and narrative style” (Abrams 277). Another characteristic feature of this kind of satire was a language “rich in vulgarisms, archaisms, neologisms, and bold imagery” (Highet 37). Famous works of other satirists standing in this tradition are Rabelais’ *Gargantua and Pantagruel* (1564) and Voltaire’s *Candide* (1759).

The second of these two primary forms of satire is direct satire. Direct satire traces back to the work of Lucilius (ca. 180 – 103 BC) and his two most noteworthy successors Horace and Juvenal. It is Horace himself, the earliest author of direct satire whose work did survive, who refers back to Lucilius, whose own works survived only in small fragments, as an important predecessor as a satirist and satirical writer, as someone “who gave direction and purpose to the genus” (Highet 24). In his poems, Lucilius would cover all facets of human life, however, the way he chose to comment on these aspects was “mainly critical, derisory, destructive” (Highet 24), which did not

make him the first Roman poet to do so but according to Horace, he was the first to practice such attacks on a considerable scale and length in his works. As a consequence, “[from] Lucilius onward, verse satire has always had a bite in it” (Highet 25). In general, this form of Lucilian satire is more formally regulated than Menippean satire, thereby justifying its alternative label of ‘formal verse satire’ (Cuddon 430). Direct or ‘formal’ satire features a “satiric *persona*” which then speaks out from a first person perspective addressing either another character in the play (the “adversarius”) or it is the narrator him- or herself that speaks to the readership, therefore receiving the name ‘direct satire’ (Abrams 276).

As mentioned above, it was Horace who acknowledged Lucilius as an important influence on his work as a satirist. In addition to Horace, who developed his own style later termed Horatian satire, another important figure in the Roman satirical tradition drew upon the work of Lucilius: Juvenal. Horatian and Juvenalian satire are both two derivatives of Lucilian satire that “set indelibly the lineaments of the genre known as the formal verse satire and, in so doing, exerted pervasive, if often indirect, influence on all subsequent literary satire” (Elliott, *Satire*). The distinction between these two writers of satire is made “by the character of the persona whom the author presents as the first-person satiric speaker, and also by the attitude and tone that such a persona manifests toward the subject matter and the readers of the work” (Abrams 276). Horace’s conception of mankind is one that assumes that most people are “rather blind and foolish” (Highet 235). He regards himself an optimist because he is of the opinion that although foolish, bad or incurably cruel individuals exist amongst every people and every nation, this is by no means a reason to curse and lose hope in mankind as a whole. Instead, Horace takes up these individuals and tries to use those as an example and warning in his works in order to help all the others to get rid of their ignorance and ‘bad’ behaviors because to him, “[sinners] are not devils, fallen forever. They are men self-blinded, and they can open their eyes” (Highet 235-236). Therefore, Horace “opts for mild mockery and playful wit as the means most effective for his ends”, his laughter is not meant as an act of contempt or disregard (Elliott, *Satire*). Consequently, his satire is one of “gently derisory, essentially comic ridicule of persons or ideas” (Cuddon 338). Within his poems, Horace depicts his speaker as

an urbane, witty, and tolerant man of the world, who is moved more often to wry amusement than to indignation at the spectacle of human folly, pretentiousness, and hypocrisy, and who uses a relaxed and informal language to

evoke from readers a wry smile at human failings and absurdities – sometimes including his own. (Abrams 276)

Horace's counterpart among these two proponents of direct satire is Juvenal. In a more general satirical context, he later became famous for his motto "difficile est saturam non scribere" which translates into "it is difficult not to write satire" (Feinberg 5). This claim is strongly associated with the way Juvenal interpreted and practiced his role as a satirist. While Horace has an optimistic view of mankind and is convinced that (almost) all people can be cured from their sinful ignorance, Juvenal did not share this point of view. As a poet with a misanthropic view of society, he was strongly convinced that evil was deeply entrenched in mankind with no possibility for a curative treatment; that expressing hatred and contempt was the only adequate way to treat mankind. As a consequence, in his laughter there is no trace of benevolence as it was the signature feature of Horace. Instead his laughter aims "not to cure, but to wound, to punish, to destroy". The way he approaches to express his disdain in his satire is through a character who is an "upright man who looks with horror on the corruptions of his time, his heart consumed with anger and frustration" (Elliott, *Satire*) in order to invoke in the reader the very same feelings of antipathy and aversion that fuel both Juvenal himself as well as his speaker characters (Abrams 277). The reason for Juvenal to choose to deviate from the form of satire practiced by Horace and other before him and instead follow Lucilius' example in a such a radical fashion is presumably due to the circumstances of Juvenal living in Rome from the middle of the first to the beginning of the second century A.D., a time during which corruption, decadence, and immorality were rampant in Roman life (Feinberg 5). This is also where Juvenal's dictum "[it] is difficult *not* to write satire" can be traced back to because as an honest Roman citizen, Juvenal could not help but to deeply abhor this way of life and criticize it with all his might (Feinberg 5). The contrast between Horace and Juvenal is described by Highet that "there are two divergent types of satirist [and] two different views of the purpose of satire. The optimist writes in order to heal, the pessimist in order to punish. One is a physician, the other an executioner" (237).

The distinctions of different varieties of satire, that is, Menippean or indirect satire on the one hand, and Lucilian or direct satire on the other as well as comical (Horatian) satire and tragic (Juvenalian) satire as the two ends of the spectrum within direct sat-

ire remain valid to this day as general classifications for a nonetheless very broad genre of literary satire (Elliott, *Satire*).

Modern theory of satire

As outlined above, satire traces its roots as far back as to ancient Greece and Rome. Since then, it has developed into a separate genre in literature as well as it has inspired some of the greatest minds in literature, including John Dryden, Jonathan Swift, and Alexander Pope during what is today known as the great age of English between roughly 1660 to 1800 (Griffin 1). During all this time and even to this day, writers of satire all more or less stayed true to the rules and conventions established by Horace, Juvenal, and their predecessors. In the middle of the 20th century, however, a movement in satire research involving various scholars engaged in (re-)defining satire and its rules and principles. This was deemed necessary due to a lack of a modern, comprehensive definition of satire which both incorporated the different forms and conceptions of satire that existed at that point in time and was also accepted as a general standard (Griffin 2). This group includes, amongst others, Northrop Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism* (1957), Leonard Feinberg's *The Satirist* (1963), Alvin B. Kernan's *The Plot of Satire* (1965), Ronald Paulson's *The Fictions of Satire* (1967), Matthew Hodgart's *Satire - Origins and Principles* (1969), Arthur Pollard's *Satire* (1970), and Gilbert Highet's *Anatomy of Satire* (1972). It was in this period of the 1960s and early 1970s that theoretical frameworks of satire were developed which established the consensus of contemporary satire theory.

One of the first to attempt to (re)draft the concept of satire in the middle of the 20th century in order to fit the needs and expectations of this period was Leonard Feinberg in his *The Satirist: His temperament, motivation, and influence* of 1963. Feinberg claims that there is no comprehensive definition of satire which is universally accepted and therefore proceeds to develop a working definition that tries to incorporate the basic principles constitute (literary) satire. Feinberg agrees on the generally accepted notion that in order for a text to be considered a work of satire, two prerequisites have to be met by the author: first, it has to include the criticism of something that the author does not agree with, be it shortcomings of human individuals, society, or mankind as a whole. Second, humor is the other necessary component of a satirical work (Feinberg 6). However, what Feinberg calls "the criticism-plus-humor formu-

la” is, according to his assessment, “not wholly adequate”(Feinberg 6). He argues that there are several examples of literary satire that are too bitter to completely fulfill the humor requirement of the formula (e.g. satirical works by Jonathan Swift), or, in a similar vein, works that are indeed satirical in the sense of presenting a critical view of society but at the same time not humorous at all, e.g. George Orwell’s *1984*. As a consequence, Feinberg concludes that “‘unmasking’ or exposing is the indispensable characteristic of satire”. However, simultaneously he concedes that unmasking alone does not provide an appropriate measure to gauge whether a work is satirical or not (Feinberg 6). The way in which he finally reconciles these different requirements is his own definition of satire in which the satirists creates a “*playfully critical distortion of the familiar*” (Feinberg 7; original emphasis). This distortion is due to the fact that satire, like philosophy or other humanities, is interested in the depiction of the “nature of reality”. But where satire differs from these other arts is that “satire emphasizes what *seems* to be real but isn’t. It rejects man’s naive acceptance of other men and institutions at face value” (original emphasis). To Feinberg, the very essence of satire is “persistent revelation and exaggeration of the contrast between reality and pretense” (Feinberg 7).

For Gilbert Highet, whose *Anatomy of Satire* (1972) could be considered the culmination of the ‘movement’ to (re-)define satire in the 1960s and -70s, satire is “topical; it claims to be realistic (although it is usually exaggerated or distorted); it is shocking; it is informal; and (although often in a grotesque or painful manner) it is funny” (Highet 5). To him, the core methodical approach of satire is the “combination of jest and earnest [as] a permanent mark of satiric writing” where “the satirist, though he laughs, tells the truth”, or rather, the satirist asserts to the tell the truth even though he or she might really try to unveil and criticize social or political injustices through his or her writing (Highet 233-234). When trying to determine whether or not a certain work can actually be considered satirical and which characteristics and features are necessary to qualify it as a work of satire, Highet presents “a number of reliable tests” (Highet 15) which, if at least one of them applies, would ‘certify’ a literary work as satirical. The first and simplest of these tests is if an author directly claims that he or she is writing satire, it then should be reasonably obvious that the resulting work belongs to the genre of satire. A satirical pedigree, meaning the justification from the author that he or she is writing in a certain tradition of other, preceding works of (classical) sati-

rists and that it therefore is a descendant of eminent writers of satire, is to Hightet the second possibility to pass as satire. The third test is concerned with both the theme as well as the method that is found in the work in question and whether these had been used by other satirists before. While this test may appear to be very similar to the second test of pedigree and Hightet actually admits that this is often “a disguised statement of pedigree” (Hightet 16), he argues that there is a difference in directly referencing an affinity to other (classical) works of satire and the (covert) use of similar themes and methods. These are then further adapted within the new work itself, that is, one can adapt certain aspects of, for example, the ‘school’ of Juvenal without in fact claiming to directly stand in the tradition of him. Another, relatively arbitrary way to claim that one is writing satire that Hightet lists is to directly quote the words of another distinguished writer of satire, even though this does not always automatically result in the ‘membership’ in the league of satirists (Hightet 15-16). Interestingly enough, the “subject-matter in general is no guide” for Hightet because over time, there has been almost no topic that satirist have not dwelled upon and there is essentially no topic that cannot be handled by satirists (Hightet 16). A restriction to this claim is the condition that the subject that is being dealt with has to be “concrete, usually topical, [and] often personal” (Hightet 16). Even though the topics of satire are manifold, the language and especially the vocabulary used to treat these topics are not. Hightet identifies certain signature aspects and “typical weapons” of satire: “Most satiric writing contains cruel and dirty words; all satiric rules writing contains trivial and comic words; nearly all satiric writing contains colloquial anti-literary words” (Hightet 18). Furthermore, there are a number of rhetorical devices which are in his opinion closely linked to satirical writing: “Any author, therefore, who often and powerfully uses a number of the typical weapons of satire - irony, paradox, antithesis, parody, colloquialism, anticlimax, topicality, obscenity, violence, vividness, exaggeration - is likely to be writing satire” (18).

In addition to stylistic devices, Hightet also associates two specific methods of writing satire. On the one hand, writers of satire are to describes scenes, characters, and situations in a way that is as graphic as possible so that readers who are “purblind, insensitive, perhaps anaesthetized by custom and dullness and resignation” are stirred from their supposed inertia. As a result, they become acutely aware of the truth of the situation that is either being described to them or they are in themselves without realizing or accustomed to ignore, given that a satirist first and foremost

writes about conditions that he or she finds unbearable and wants to see changed by the people involved in those, that is, his readership (Highet 19). On the other hand, the language used by a satirist is, as indicated above, as clear as possible so that the disagreeable and troublesome facts and circumstances described actually unsettle the readers and provoke feelings of protest and, ultimately, corrective actions (Highet 18). All of these steps and characteristics result in what Highet calls “the final test for satire”: even if a work passes the above mentioned tests, it is not yet a successful work of satire. There is one final hurdle left to overcome, and that is whether or not it actually provokes the inseparable feelings that are at the core of every satire: amusement and contempt. Only if the situation described by the author is funny to the reader but at the same time also evokes scorn, a satirist has created ‘true’ satire, satire that is in itself a weapon against stupidity and foolishness (Highet 20-21).

As to why write satire in the first place, Highet identifies four motives as to why authors might be drawn to the satirical realm. He claims that the satirist is “always moved by personal hatred, scorn, or condescending amusement” even though he or she might actually deny this and instead argue that the writings are “only for the public good” (Highet 238). However, this does not at all have to be a negative aspect of satire and its writers. It is difficult to muster the energy and courage to openly ridicule and criticize various aspects of certain (influential) individuals, public life, or society at large without being driven by a sense of both purpose and resentment with regard to the respective ‘victim’. Additionally, conveying both amusement and contempt so that the reader eventually shares both and is incentivized to change does indeed require a strong feeling of passion. This aspect immediately ties in with the second motive Highet identifies and which has been at the heart of satire since its very beginnings. He quotes Dryden stating that “the true end of satire is the amendment of vices by correction” and that “the frank satirist is no more an enemy to the offender than the physician is an enemy to his patient” (John Dryden qtd. in Highet 241). The third motive Highet describes has to do with the aesthetics of art in general. He suggests that all artists feel pleasure in creating their respective work of art, their very own pattern and style. Satire attracts artists because of the difficulty to successfully create ‘actual’ satirical art; “[the satirist] needs a huge vocabulary, a lively flow of humor combined with a strong serious point of view, an imagination so brisk that it will always be several jumps ahead of his readers, and taste good enough to allow him to say shocking

things without making the reader turn away in disdain” (Highet 242). The fourth motive which might not be true for all satirists, at least not at the first glance, especially not for writers that follow the tradition of Juvenal which is pessimistic through and through: satirists are “protreptic”, that is they want to instruct and persuade, to „give positive advice, [to] set up an exemplar to copy, [and to] state an ideal“, even if they might not want to admit it or do not think that they actually do (Highet 243).

Contemporary criticism

As stated above, several attempts were made in the middle of the twentieth century at (re-)defining satire. However, all of these are only a kind of approximation because to this day, there is no comprehensive, all-encompassing theory that is universally agreed to. Instead, scholars at the end of the century criticized these theories and argue that there cannot actually exist an all-encompassing theory of satire based on the premises on which scholars like Highet or Abrams grounded their definitions. This is due to the fact that theoretical frameworks of such a broad and elusive genre as satire cannot and do not remain unchallenged over an extended period of time, especially given that satire exists since more than two millennia, even though the core tenets of satire are valid to this day. The issue with this ‘old’ consensus of satire is it was focused solely on works of literature and the way satire was employed in these. What was disregarded was the fact that satire was and is by no means exclusive to the literary realm and its writers. It can be found in such diverse forms of art as theater, films, graphic arts, and music. Especially in the twentieth century a considerable part of mass media and popular culture involves satire (Test 7-8). George Test even goes so far as to invent a term for the way scholars used to attempt to formulate a comprehensive theory of satire in the 1960s and 1970s, “Elliott’s bind”, in reference to Robert C. Elliott, one of the eminent authorities of the ‘movement’. For Test, what Elliott, Frye, Highet and others did was “the attempt to erect a structure (that is, a definition or description of satire) with the wrong tools. Intention, affect, content, form, rhetoric - all literary concepts - have not done the job”. He continues to conclude that “[what] is needed is a broadening of the concept of satire itself and the use of ideas that are not exclusively literary” (Test 8). According to Test, a possible solution to this predicament is to take a step back and focus not so much on the form of the respective satirical work itself, but whether or not there are a number of elements present. To be more precise, he identifies four elements that satirical works usually have in

common, that provide the necessary framework to determine if a work of art is to be considered satire: aggression, play, laughter, judgment (Test 15). Aggression, in varying degrees, has been a fundamental tenet since the very birth of satire. Ever since, satirists have drawn on a (sometimes more and sometimes less) aggressive style to attack adversaries, society, or mankind as a whole to, depending on the individual aims, either condemn or cure (Test 15). Test identifies the element of play essentially “permeating satire, from its presence as imagery and wordplay to its animating the very essence of the satiric act or expression” (19). Counterpart of aggression from satire’s time of origin onwards, “the laughter of ridicule or the truth coated with laughter shames the fool into changing his ways”, thus laughter acts as a powerful tool for both deterrence and punishment for unwanted or disapproving behavior in satire while at the same time also joining together the audience in a sense of community when laughing at a shameful vice or folly (Test 24). Judgment is to Test what makes satire “a weapon, blunt or penetrating” which satirists use to target the persons or behavior that they do not agree with. They present the audience with their (usually disapproving) point of view in regard to a certain topic and therefore establishing satire a way to change or at least criticize behavior (Test 27-28). Without judgment, satire – to stay with Test’s martial metaphor – would not only lose its edge in what it wants to achieve but would be like bringing a knife to a gunfight, that is, it would be utterly useless.

To Dustin H. Griffin, the ‘old’ established consensus is out of date, too. Griffin senses a “disjunction between current critical writing about works of satire and the theoretical consensus about the genre established in the early 1960s” (Griffin 1). Similar to the criticism of Test, he argues that contemporary critics and scholars of satire of the 1990s have abandoned the general, all-encompassing theories because of the ambiguity and complexity to be found in what Griffin calls “the best satire” of authors like, among others, Jonathan Swift and Alexander Pope, so that there has to be a differentiating view of satire instead which replaces the inadequate old theories (Griffin 2). Griffin also recognizes the futile endeavor of trying to find the one formula that encapsulates all of satire with a quote from Alastair Fowler who stated that satire is “the most problematic mode to the taxonomist, since it appears never to have corresponded to anyone kind” (Griffin 3) New critical approaches such as New Historicism or interdisciplinary cultural analysis furthermore introduced new perspectives of anal-

ysis of satire and also society in general. Griffin also addresses the inadequacy of the assumption that satire and its writers operate on the basis of a clear distinction between desirable and undesirable, a classic binary opposition of good (represented by the satirist) and evil in a world of precise and easily identifiable (moral) standards and rules (Griffin 35). It is exactly this distinction that satirists are supposed to represent which Griffin decidedly disagrees with. To him, the “business of the satirist is to insist on the sharp differences between vice and virtue, between good and bad, between what man *is* and what he *ought to be*” (35, original emphasis). This distinction makes the view that satire works this way seem “almost quaint” (35) because “[if] the satirist’s job is to assure us, in no uncertain terms, that the established norms about good and bad, right and wrong, are solidly in place, one wonders how satire ever attracted any mature readers or retained their interest” (36).

To reveal the above mentioned inadequacy of the conventional conception of satire, Griffin breaks it down into four assumptions which he then reviews. According to him, the “bipolar praise-and-blame pattern” of morality which is at the center of almost every satire has been given too much prominence. While it is correct that it is difficult to both identify and condemn any folly or vice without providing a positive equivalent that is promoted as a redeeming virtue, it is by far not the sole (even though it might arguably be the simplest and most effective) possibility to express an author’s moral wisdom in them but it is simply one of several devices that is at one’s disposal (Griffin 36). Griffin’s second assumption is directly related to the first in that the approving expression of moral standards or practices which are given preference over others by the satirist is in itself to be questioned, as these standards often constitute an “irreducible moral minimum for sentient beings” which would not justify the effort of explicitly endorsing them in the first place (Griffin 37). Such essential moral standards could then inhibit the satirist to reach his goal of curing society of a certain vice or folly because “[the] reader’s interest is not in rediscovering that greed is a bad thing or that deceit is to be avoided but in working through [...] the implications of a given moral position [...], the contradictions between one virtue [...] and another [...], or the odd similarities between a vice [...] and a virtue” (Griffin 38).

If it is assumed that shared cultural values and moral standards are the foundation for satire, as it had been for a long time, then Griffin claims that “most of the great satires have failed”. As an example he cites *Gulliver’s Travels* which did not find much favor

in Swift's contemporaries for its moral underpinnings. Rather, the morals of a given piece of satire are far more centered on the morals of the respective author, which of course can and often will indeed coincide with societal standards (Griffin 38). But, once again, if a consensus on moral values is taken as a self-evident point of departure, then Griffin's second assumption comes in again. His final argument deals with the question whether or not satirists are actually successful in their endeavor to persuade their readership to follow a path of virtue and morality and in how far writers of satire are convinced of and believe in the success of their creations. Griffin states that even renowned satirists like Alexander Pope and Jonathan Swift expressed doubt about what their satire has actually accomplished in terms of which vices and follies it really 'cured'. Furthermore, Griffin even argues that modern empirical research has difficulty in finding 'proof' for the power of satire (Griffin 38-39). However, what he does not suggest is that the entire satirical enterprise is doomed to fail from the start but that one should not commit the mistake of over-estimating the power that satire can wield over its readers.

Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory (henceforth CRT) is a “multi-disciplinary approach that combines social activism with a critique of the fundamental role played by White racism in shaping contemporary societies” (Gillborn, Ladson-Billings 341). The relationship between race, racism, and power is at the heart of the pursuit of the scholars trying to study as well as transform the interplay between these forces in society and culture and the resulting inequality due to racial discrimination (Delgado, Stefancic 3). CRT is based on a social constructivist view of race, that is, the concept of race is recognized as a product of social norms which, in turn, are neither “objective, inherent, [nor] fixed, they correspond to no biological or genetic reality; rather, races are categories that society invents, manipulates, or retires when convenient” (Gillborn, Ladson-Billings 341). For this thesis, a working definition of racism as any “practice of discrimination, segregation, persecution, or mistreatment based on membership in a race or ethnic group” is adopted (Delgado, Stefancic 183). Even though developed and primarily focused on the United States, CRT is insofar relevant and applicable for the analysis of works of literature and other forms of cultural products, as it examines and attempts to understand the socio-cultural conditions shaping the experience, the perception, as well as the response to racism which are often also depicted in works of fiction. CRT regards racism as a pervasive phenomenon involving all members of a particular community or society, regardless of racial affiliations. It offers a way to analyze the connections of race with other aspects of identity such as gender and class; hence it provides a way to examine intersectionality (Brizee et al. third paragraph). Furthermore, scholars of CRT are interested in finding answer to questions such as “Where, in what ways, and to what ends does race appear in dominant [...] culture and shape the ways we interact with one another?”, “What types of texts and other cultural artifacts reflect dominant culture’s perceptions of race?”, and “How does racism continue to function as a persistent force in [...] society?”, thus aiming to provide a comprehensive account of racism in a particular community or society (Brizee et al. second paragraph).

Historical development of CRT

CRT originates in the United States of the 1970s and 1980s when it started out as an attempt provide an alternative to the dominant thoughts and perspectives on race in society at the time. It followed on the realization of lawyers, legal scholars as well as

legal activists that the development and advance of civil rights and civil rights activism in itself was beginning to stall and that some achievements of the 1960s were in fact even being rescinded (Delgado, Stefancic 4). As a consequence, due to frustration with this deterioration or at least the lack of improvement of the civil rights situation for the non-white population of the US and also with the negligence and ignorance of the majority regarding racism and change in favor of the minorities, a new framework was developed based on and as a response to critical legal studies (CLS). CLS was “a leftist legal movement that challenged the traditional legal scholarship that focused on doctrinal and policy analysis in favor of a form of law that spoke to the specificity of individuals and groups in social and cultural contexts” (Ladson-Billings *What is CRT* 10). It also challenged liberalism, denied the neutrality of law as well as rejected the assumption that every single case had a definitive and unambiguous correct answer, in order to place special emphasis on race to challenge and combat the prevalent mindset concerning racism (Hartlep 5). But, as Cornel West argues, CLS is “more a concerted attack and assault on the legitimacy and authority of pedagogical strategies in law school than a comprehensive announcement of what a credible and realizable new society and legal system would look like” in regard to non-white people and their legal situation (196), and the demands of future CRT scholars were not met appropriately. So, the development became a logical outgrowth of the discontent of legal scholars of color (Ladson-Billings *What is CRT* 11). At the forefront of the group of foundational critical race theorists were Derrick Bell, Kimberlé Crenshaw, Richard Delgado, Mari Matsuda, and Patricia Williams (Gillborn, Ladson-Billings 342). The term “critical race theory” itself was coined in 1989 as the first workshop dedicated entirely to this then-new movement was held in Madison, Wisconsin. Since then, this approach expanded from a method formerly almost exclusively used by legal scholars to a multi-disciplinary approach in connection to such fields as philosophy, history, or sociology (Brizee et al. first paragraph).

Although there is no universally accepted, unchanging and unchallenged statement of the core themes of CRT, which is unsurprising when taking into account that it is still relatively novel approach, there is, though, a set of characteristics and assumptions that are persistent in the works of the most influential researchers in the field (cf. Delgado, Stefancic 2017; Gillborn, Ladson-Billings 2010). This set includes the fol-

lowing five main tenets of CRT which will be discussed in more detail below (Delgado, Stefancic 8-11):

- racism is normal or ordinary, not aberrant;
- “interest convergence” or material determinism;
- “social construction” thesis of race;
- intersectionality and anti-essentialism;
- voice-of-color thesis or storytelling and counter-storytelling

Racism as normal

That racism is regarded as ‘normal’ in CRT does not mean that racism is in fact considered normal and therefore does not require any resistance or incentive for change, not at all. Rather, CRT considers racism is a common occurrence in (US) society and culture in the way that racism is deeply ingrained in society and the mind of many people so that it does look “ordinary and natural to persons in the culture” (Gillborn, Ladson-Billings 343), that it is the “normal order of things” (Ladson-Billing *What it is not* 37). This is what distinguishes CRT scholars from others researcher of racism. Usually, it would be argued that racism has to do with the supposed inferiority of other people’s race and someone believing in this inferiority and adapting one’s behavior accordingly when having to with people of that race (37). CRT views racism as more than that, it perceives it to consist of “subtle and hidden processes that have the effect of [discrimination]” and which “[operate] much more widely; often through the routine, mundane activities and assumptions” (Gillborn, Ladson-Billings 343). These processes include, for example, the promotion of color-blindness through the majority culture and an unwavering believe in meritocracy. These fulfill two primary functions, as Hartlep notes, “they allow whites to feel consciously irresponsible for the hardships people of color face and encounter daily and [...] they also maintain whites’ power and strongholds” (7). Racism is not viewed as an aspect of society that simply cannot be changed or abandoned. Instead, critical race theorists stress the importance of understanding and incorporating social, economic, and historical contexts into the discussion and perception of racism (Gillborn, Ladson-Billings 343).

Interest convergence

The concept of interest convergence is based on the thought that new legislature mainly protects the status quo and does not tackle existing problems. The term “interest convergence” was coined by Derek Bell and is based on the observation that “civil rights advances for blacks always seemed to coincide with changing economic

conditions and the self-interest of elite whites” (Delgado, Stefancic 22). Bell argues that the 1954 Supreme Court decision in the case of *Brown v. Board of Education* more or less surprisingly ended public school segregation after the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People had fought for exactly that in vain for many years (Delgado, Stefancic 22). Bell hypothesized that there is more to the decision than the Supreme Court coming to terms with the US’ segregational past and finally casting in a legislative mold what had been past due for a long time. For Bell, considerations of domestic and international origins were the reason behind this decision. In 1954, the Korean War ended and the Second World War had been won only seven years prior. While at first glance these facts might not have any relation to school laws in the US, it is important to consider that in both of these wars, many African American soldiers fought alongside White soldiers not only to bring down the Axis powers but also to defend democratic values and freedom, two things that the white elites in power had withheld from them for a long time (Bell 524-525). After this experience of cooperation and fighting side by side with white soldiers for a goal that both of them shared (even though there undeniably were racist sentiments prevalent in the military forces at the time), Black soldiers “were unlikely to return willingly to regimes of menial labor and social vilification. For the first time in years, the possibility of mass domestic unrest loomed” (Delgado, Stefancic 23). What is more, at the time, the conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union later known as the Cold War began to dominate US politics and its associated considerations. If the US wanted to win allies around the world in their fight against communism, they had to show the rest of the world that equality and freedom for everyone was not only part of its propagandistic talk. As a consequence, “[the] interests of whites and blacks, for a brief moment, converged” and laws were passed accordingly (Delgado, Stefancic 23). This procedure has been termed ‘interest convergence’, where “advances in race equality come about only when White elites see the changes as in their own interests” (Gillborn CRT 343). This convergence continued throughout the 1960s, when the most obvious sign of segregations, that is separate schools, restaurants, restrooms, etc., had been removed from sight, but “the reality of ingrained racism continues in economic, residential, and educational terms” even today (343).

Race as social construction

The pursuit of biological differences between people of different races and the accompanying attempts to scientifically prove or justify these differences is a phenomenon which dates back to ancient times but was established especially in the 19th century onwards. However, these efforts of finding a scientific basis for institutionalized racism of course failed as the overwhelming (contemporary) consensus on this matter in fields such as evolutionary biology and anthropology is that there is no evidence of any kind supporting such claims (Applebaum 36). What is more, the minuscule and insignificant differences that indeed have been found between different groups do not account for the social and political weight and meaning which is given to them. Thus, CRT considers race to be a social construction, that is, “races are distinctively constructed to exist only in relation to one another” (Applebaum 36) and “that there is a system of privilege and oppression through which racial social groups are constructed” (37-38). This system is then supported and maintained by institutions of ideological and political nature. As a consequence, even though the purported difference in race might be entire fictional, the oppression and discrimination that results from it is far from being imaginary. For many people, such a system has an actual negative impact in terms of their economic, social, and psychological conditions (37). Historically, there are several examples of what could be considered the ‘fluidity’ of race, that is, the relative meaning of race at a certain point in time in a certain geographical location. For the US specifically, there are two groups of people that underwent a change in the way they were perceived in regard to them belonging to the ‘white’ population, with diametrically opposed results for the two groups. On the one hand, when the Irish in the first half of the 19th century first came to settle in the United States after leaving Europe, they were categorized as non-white population, with all the correspondingly denied rights. However, after they themselves embraced a racist attitude in the turmoil caused by the Civil War in the 1860s, this resulted in a change in their status, now they were considered white (36). On the other hand, as it can be seen in census data of the early United States, Mexican citizens were labeled white. Over time, though, “political, economic, social, and cultural shifts have forced Mexican Americans out of the White category” (Ladson-Billings *What is CRT* 8). This fundamentally arbitrary categorization refers back to interest convergence principle discussed above; it appears to be the case that as long as the dominant white majority profits or at least does not see any advantages stemming from a certain group

being deemed white, no objections were raised. If this condition was changed however, also the 'classification' was changed from white to non-white. Two infamous examples of legislature drawing on a social construction of race are the so-called 'one-drop rule' which ruled that "having [even] the most minuscule black ancestry designates one as black regardless of physical appearance" (Applebaum 36) as well as the abominable Nuremberg laws of 1935 where Jews were defined as "being not of German blood" (Gilbert 32). Such laws are bound by both their historic and geographic origin, that is, if someone is determined to be black because of a certain regulation does not automatically entail the same result in a different location or different point in time. Even in a postmodern and postcolonial society, Gloria Ladson-Billings argues, we are not free from both the concepts and the repercussions of putting more emphasis on race than it is scientifically (and ethically) justifiable. To her, this 'fixatedness' on race is somehow even more embedded in society (*What is CRT* 9). Today, the construction of race is not openly visible anymore but expressed more covertly through a change in language and in the constructions of race itself, even though the attempts to conceal the construct of oppression does not make it less powerful. The terms Ladson-Billings uses to refer to this development are "conceptual whiteness" and "conceptual blackness", both of which connote a specific set of expectations and stereotypes:

Conceptual categories like "school achievement," "middle classness," "maleness," "beauty," "intelligence," and "science" become normative categories of whiteness, while categories like "gangs," "welfare recipients," "basketball players," and "the underclass" become the marginalized and de-legitimated categories of blackness." (Ladson-Billings *What is CRT* 9)

Today, an open binary between black and white was replaced by 'white' serving as the benchmark everyone is being compared with and then categorized and ranked accordingly. Nevertheless, similar to Applebaum, Ladson-Billings asserts that these 'new' categories are fluid and can shift depending on the context in which people are being ranked, for example, she herself reasons that "as an African American female academic, I can be and am sometimes positioned as conceptually White in relation to, perhaps, a Latino, Spanish-speaking gardener" (*What is CRT* 9).

Intersectionality and Anti-Essentialism

Intersectionality is commonly defined as "the examination of race, sex, class, national origin, and sexual orientation and how their combinations play out in various set-

tings". While all these factors individually can already put someone at a disadvantage, the combination (or intersection) of categories potentially pose an even greater risk of discrimination (Delgado, Stefancic 58). The term 'intersectionality' itself is generally attributed to Kimberlé Crenshaw, who was responsible for the term becoming both more widely known and used as an analytical tool (cf. Crenshaw 1991). The following story taken from Ladson-Billings illustrates how the combination of individual factors can blend into an experience of injustice:

A Black woman walks into a luxury car dealer. She has just come from a strenuous workout and is sweating in an old pair of sweat pants and a ratty T-shirt. She is not wearing makeup and her hair is pulled back in a ponytail. She does not look like a "typical" luxury car buyer. During her time in the showroom she notices that the salespeople introduce themselves to everyone but her. She has stood by a high-end model for at least 10 minutes but no salesperson has asked the customary "Can I answer any questions about this car for you?" Instead she is starting to feel invisible. Car salespeople are talking to everyone else in the showroom, including those who have arrived after she did. What seems to be the problem? (*What it is not* 39-40)

Even though race or gender discrimination might have not been an issue in this story as the reason why the woman was being ignored by the salespersons, they nonetheless make up two of the possible reasons for her being at a disadvantage, along with the clothes she wears which at least at a first glance would not indicate that she belongs to a societal group or class which is usually associated with being able to afford luxury cars. Thus, "individuals like [her] operate at an intersection of recognized sites of oppression" (Delgado, Stefancic 58).

Essentialism is the other side of intersectionality. Simply put, essentialism comes down to one question: "Do all oppressed people have the same thing in common?" (Delgado, Stefancic 63). On the one hand, the answer is quite easy and obvious, because yes of course, all people being oppressed share the fact that they are oppressed. This being said, it would be ignorant and wrong to assume that all people belonging to different minorities experience the same level and the same kind of injustice. This is the reason why critical race theorists actually reject essentialism and promote anti-essentialism, because "[the] belief that all people perceived to be in a single group think, act, and believe the same things in the same ways [...] leads to considerable misunderstanding and stereotyping" (Ladson-Billing *What it is not* 40). Certainly, it is necessary and beneficial for members of certain groups to associate with the group and take part in activities specific to the respective group, yet this does

not automatically mean that “people do not relinquish their individual rights, perspectives, and lifestyles because they share group identities” (40).

Storytelling and counter-storytelling

“Have you ever had the experience of hearing one story and being completely convinced, then hearing an exactly opposite story, equally well told, and being left unsure of your convictions?” (Delgado, Stefancic 44; original emphasis). This question encapsulates the power storytelling exercises of us humans and ever since people were able to talk each other, they also told stories. However, they often operate in an “ethnocentric and hegemonic way” and “reflect a perspective or point of view and underscore what the teller, audience, society, and/or those in power believe to be important, significant, and many times valorizing and ethnocentric” (Ladson-Billing *What it is not* 41-42). There is also danger in stories, that is, they often embellish, heroize, downplay, provide only an one-sided account, or simply lie about something. If these stories are held to be true or at least believed to contain some truth in the form of myths or legends, it can always be problematic, especially in the context of stories about minorities told by the majority where the members of a certain minority group are discredited or presented in untruthful manner. Often, there is no way for them to rectify these unjust representations (42). Also, members of minorities often have different thoughts and perceptions of the world they live in and do not feel the same way about society and its underlying systems and hierarchies than the majority group. It is therefore crucial that these minorities have a voice of their own to tell the stories of their experiences so that it can lead to a change of perspective, especially in oppressive societies (Gillborn *CRT* 343). It is important to note, though, that these stories are not undoubtedly true, either. Similar to the stories of the majority, they represent another subjective perception. However, they are valuable in the way that they are ‘counter-stories’ providing “a contrasting story that describes the story from a different vantage point [...] to unmoor people from received truths so that they might consider alternatives” (Ladson-Billing *What it is not* 42).

Myths and misunderstandings about CRT

Since critical race theory offers an approach which is “fundamentally at odds with mainstream assumptions”, it should only be mildly surprising that CRT is occasionally misinterpreted (Gillborn *CRT* 344). Thus, a number of myths and misunderstandings

surround the approach, three of which appear to be the most common and persistent. Even though race plays a fundamental role in what constitutes CRT, it is not constantly viewed as the single most important aspect in each and every circumstance. Instead, race and racism is for critical race theorists always a relevant factor that has to be taken into account, but it is by far the only facet of importance when trying to understand wider social inequalities. As Gillborn points out, “race inequity often cannot be fully understood in isolation from other axes of differentiation such as class and gender” (CRT 344), which leads back to the above mentioned concept of intersectionality. Further, it is not the case that CRT scholars regard all white people as privileged racists. As CRT argues that not all black people are the same simply because they belong to the group of Blacks, the same is true for white people, not all of them are the same, think and act alike, or benefit equally from the dominant role Whiteness plays in certain societies. Especially in regard to the concept of interest convergence, this myth can be exposed, since it is not only members of minorities but often also lower-class white people who are exploited by white elites trying to protect their own position of power. It is merely the case that more often, it is non-white people that are on the receiving end of such politics (Gillborn CRT 345). Lastly, CRT is accused of promoting hopelessness and pessimism in the face of such a deeply rooted phenomenon such as racism. Quite on the contrary, through the account and the criticism of injustice in prevalent in society, CRT wants to encourage active resistance against racism so that maybe some day, as far-fetched as it may seem, a final victory over social injustice based on an elusive concept of racial superiority can be won (345).

The Social Construction of Gender

Ideas and (mis)conceptions about gender and especially gender differences accompany us from the time of our birth onwards and certain perceptions of gender permeate all aspects of our everyday life and society. Consequently, “[talking] about gender for most people is the equivalent of fish talking about water. Gender is so much the routine ground of everyday activities that questioning its taken-for-granted assumptions and presuppositions is like thinking about whether the sun will come up” (Lorber 13). These beliefs that are so deeply embedded in our thinking that often they are almost viewed as axiomatic, common sense or simply ‘natural’. Most of the time, they are not put into question in regard to how and why they emerged, why they are taken for granted, and what functions and effects they (Eckert, McConnell-Ginet 9).

Sex and Gender

Today’s perceptions of gender are based on prior thoughts and beliefs about sex and the way these have changed. The difference between sex and gender is that “[sex] is a biological categorization based primarily on reproductive potential, whereas gender is the social elaboration of biological sex” (Eckert, McConnell-Ginet 10). The relationship between these two is that “[gender] builds on biological sex, it exaggerates biological difference and, indeed, it carries biological difference into domains in which it is completely irrelevant [...] [but] there is no obvious point at which sex leaves off and gender begins” (10). The question of the influence of sex on gender as well as in how far the differences between male and female prevalent in society are really ‘natural’ are part of the wider debate of nature versus nurture, that is, how much we as humans are shaped by biology and the set of genes we inherited versus the influence of the (social) environment we live and grow up in. These two views are also known as biological determinism on the one hand and differential socialization on the other (Kimmel 2). Hoyenga and Hoyenga encapsulated the interplay of nature and nurture in their observation that “[we] are the products of both our biologies and past and present environments, simultaneously and inseparably; we are bodies as well as minds at once and the same time” (6). While it is generally agreed upon that both the biological and the social domain play a part in shaping us individually, the extent to which they influence us respectively is still unresolved (Holmes 18).

In Western societies, the view of the differences between men and women have undergone several changes over time. Currently, as Judith Lorber argues, “Western thinking sees women and men as so different physically as to sometimes seem two species” (Lorber 37). This has not always been the case, as “the bodies, which have been mapped inside and out for hundreds of years, have not changed. What has changed are the justifications for gender inequality” (37). From a historical point of view, until the beginning of the 18th century, the common conception of sex was that that men and women do not belong to distinct sexes but are only two different variations of one and the same sex. However, belonging to the same sex did not automatically put women into a position that made them equal to men, quite on the contrary. In this one-sex model, women were seen as “‘imperfect’ versions of men, their genitalia were described as being the same as men’s, but on the inside rather than outside [...] [reflecting] their incompleteness in comparison to man’s godly perfection” (Holmes 22). In terms of social stratification and constraints, this model, though, did not place special emphasis on femininity or masculinity, which were both seen as “shades of everyone’s being”, not as opposites. Instead, social status was shown through the actual bodies, that is, the further up one was on the social ladder, the more one had to adhere to strict rules regarding the manner in which one dealt with one’s own body, e.g. the way somebody dressed, ate, or even how one blew one’s nose (22). More recent ideas, especially from the 19th century overlapping into the 20th century, started to incorporate biological, or rather phenotypical, differences not just between men and women but between humans in general into a new hierarchy of races, developing into what is today considered racism. In terms of men and women, now a two-sex model was advocated which again acknowledged an inferiority of women in comparison to men, but additionally it was also claimed “that women’s reproductive systems made them irrational [...] [and] not ‘naturally’ suited to the serious business of ruling the world”. This formed the basis for a hierarchical system that put all power into the hands of men and excluded women from such matters (22). More recent understandings of sex in the 20th century were very much influenced from the understanding that while all fetuses initially develop similarly but they go down different developmental paths over time due to different levels and impacts of (sexual) hormones such as estrogen and testosterone and especially of the X and Y chromosomes, thus predominantly developing male or female phenotypical and genotypical features over the course of the pregnancy (23). This more advanced two-sex model

is faced with criticism because although there are hormonal differences between women and men, these are only slight as both do have the same types of hormones only in marginally varying amounts, that is, what is considered 'male' and 'female' is in fact "extremely chemically similar" (23). What is more, not only is the chemical composition very similar, the rest of the body is actually very much identical, procreative organs left aside which make up only a small part of the whole mass that is the human body. Nonetheless, the vast majority of 'modern' societies all around the world devised and cultivate a system that is centered on the clear distinction between two sexes and a subsequent development of two discrete genders which is not justified by the differences in biology, as Judith Lorber pointed out: "Bodies differ in many ways physiologically, but they are completely transformed by social practices to fit into the salient categories of a society, the most pervasive of which are 'female' and 'male' and 'women' and 'men'" (38). Similarly, Penelope Eckert and Sally McConnell-Ginet argue that while claims for differences between men and women based on biological factors are not a novel phenomenon, the ascription of certain personality traits or skills or the lack thereof on grounds of a certain composition of hormones is indeed a recent development and adds a new quality to the supposed binary between the male and the female (12). Eckert and McConnell-Ginet assert that "[sex] difference is being placed at the center of activity, as both question and answer, as often flimsy evidence of biological difference is paired up with unanalyzed behavioral stereotypes" (13).

Social Constructionism and gender

Emblematic of the idea that differences between men and women are *not* inherent or natural but socially constructed is Simone de Beauvoir's famous quote "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman [...]; it is civilization as a whole that produces this creature [...] which is described as feminine" in her seminal work *Le deuxième sexe* [The Second Sex] (267). There is, however, one small caveat to be added to Beauvoir's statement, because not only women are a product of society but the same is true for men, too (Eckert, McConnell-Ginet 15). This is due to the fact that, as outlined above, society wants to put the label of 'male' or 'female' on human beings as soon as possible. Either at the earliest possible moment the sex of a child is discernible through ultrasound while still in the mother's womb or at the latest during or immediately after the delivery of the newborn, "the ritual announcement at birth that it is

in fact one or the other instantly transforms an 'it' into a 'he' or a 'she' (Butler *Bodies* 50).

In this regard, social constructionists hold that gender is neither set from the moment of birth onwards nor is it immutable. Social constructionists, according to Marecek, Crawford, and Popp, refer to knowledge as "an account of reality produced collaboratively by a community of knowers. [...] Social constructionists are interested in the terms and forms in use among the members of a social group. How do people make use of those terms and forms to compose accounts that make sense to others in their social group?" (193). In terms of sexuality and gender, however, this does not mean that social constructionists assume that these two concepts are "social rather than biological, learned rather than innate, or the result of environment rather than heredity" but instead, "the assumptions and linguistic constructs that enable people to talk and think about the phenomena are products of social negotiation and are therefore not universal or fixed" are at the core of this approach (194). Michael Kimmel argues that the social constructionist approach has to answer two major questions: one, why "virtually every single society differentiates people on the basis of gender", and two, why "virtually every known society is also based on male dominance" (2). His own reply on the basis of the social constructionist approach is that "neither gender difference nor gender inequality is inevitable in the nature of things" (4). Kimmel advocates the need to understand that gender is a "fluid assemblage" of several components including various values, ideas, and images of the society and world we live in. The gender identities resulting from these are not fixed or unchangeable but based on the acceptance of and the participation in shaping them. It has to be taken into account, though, that these identities are partly voluntary as well as partly coerced in that, on the one hand, everyone is or at least should be entirely free to become whoever one wants to become. On the other hand, there is always a certain amount of pressure to accept a given framework of rules that dominate society. In short, "[biology] provides the raw materials, while society and history provide the context, the instruction manual, that we follow to construct our identities" (Kimmel 87).

In contemporary society, the construction of gender usually begins at birth, when the child is assigned to its appropriate sex category based on the visual assessment of its genitalia and 'officially' noted in the birth certificate. Immediately after determining

a sex category, the process of constructing the 'correct' gender and its representations and expressions begins through naming the newborn in the way that both creates the gender for the child as well as it also conforms to the appropriate gender expectations of the respective gender. Everything after these crucial steps adheres to a strict protocol attributed to what society has deemed adequate for boys of girls and "everyone 'does gender' without thinking about it", that is, these rules and expectations imposed by society are so deeply entrenched in the minds that they are following unthinkingly (Lorber 13-14). An example for this is the way especially infants and small children are clothed. Often, hospital nurses dress boys in blue caps and girls in pink caps. These have no other meaning than immediately signaling what gender the kids belong to. After leaving hospital, the gender segregation continues when someone tries to buy clothes for infants, as Eckert and McConnell-Ginet observe the following: "Go into a store in the US to buy a present for a newborn baby, and you will immediately be asked "boy or girl?" If the reply is "I don't know" or, worse, "I don't care," sales personnel are often perplexed" (16). Anne Fausto-Sterling points out in her research, however, that this obsession with the legitimate clothing for babies, especially the blue and pink color code, is by no means something like a time-honored tradition going back centuries, quite on the contrary: "From time immemorial haven't adults dressed their little boys and little girls differently? Haven't adults always wanted to be able to tell at a glance whether the infant before them is a boy or a girl? Well, it turns out, not so much" (109). She explains that, at least in the U.S., the "current obsession with baby sex" is a phenomenon which started around 1920. Before that time, it was less important to distinguish between boy and girl than to differentiate between children and adults. Small children often wore basically the same clothes and consisting of short dresses for infants and forms of dresses and suits with short skirts from age 3 to 5 (110). What is more, the contemporary predominant color code is indeed a complete turn-around from previous trends. Before the 1920s, pink had been considered "a more decided and stronger color [...] more suitable for the boy, while blue [...] is more delicate and dainty [...] prettier for the girl" (A. F-S p110). This interesting albeit rather trivial example of something of negligible importance serves as an indicator for the pervasiveness – or, as Eckert and McConnell-Ginet call it, "a prime example of the naturalization of what is in fact an arbitrary sign" (16). The social construction of gender even extended as far as the clothes for human beings not yet able to care for themselves much less to challenge decisions

made for them. Instead, they have to accept everything that is provided for to them, which in turn has a big impact on the perceptions and ideas about the world and the social systems they grow up in. It also shows that “sometimes things that seem obvious, universal, and unchangeable really aren’t” (111). Simultaneously, on a more general level, “*being a girl or being a boy is not a stable state but an ongoing accomplishment*” (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 17, original emphasis) but it depends on the environment and the community the child is born into, with parameters changing over time as well as the people involved and their ideas and expectations which are then passed or imposed on their offspring and heavily influence the children’s experiences and beliefs (17).

Gender as something we do

According to Amy Wharton, the concept of ‘gender’ consists of “system of social practices [...] [involving] the creation of both differences *and* inequalities” (8, original emphasis). She emphasizes that gender is not a fixed state but rather an ongoing process that includes both the production and reproduction of gender, that “*gender is enacted or ‘done’, not merely expressed*” (9, emphasis added). This focus on agency is represented in the way interactionists view gender. In the interactionist approach, it is not the individual but the social context individuals live and act within. Instead of assuming that the actions and behaviors of people are relatively stable over a prolonged period of time, as it is done by individualists, interactionists maintain that these change over time and adapt to the social context. If a certain society expects its women to behave in a certain way, for example as the main caretaker of infants, then the women’s behavior adapts according to that expectations to a certain extent without putting up resistance, in the same way that they would be less “nurturant” in societies that does not or to a lesser extent hold these expectations (Wharton 60-61). Mary Holmes identifies two ways to view gender as something that is done, one of which is the notion that “to ‘do’ gender can mean that we have to work at it”, which was primarily represented through West and Zimmerman’s famous article “Doing Gender”. A second way described by Holmes is that gender can also be interpreted as a performance, that is, “gender is produced through the repetition of gender norms”, a view developed by Judith Butler, which is described below (51).

Doing Gender was published in the first issue of *Gender & Society* in 1987 and is by far the most cited article of the entire journal. This is due to the fact the paper represents an important shift in the theory on gender differences as it “challenged widely accepted views of gender as a role or attribute of individuals or as a reflection of natural differences rooted in biology”. As a consequence, *Doing Gender* transformed the manner in which research on gender and the possible interaction of race, gender, and class was conducted (Jurik, Siemsen 72). It is based on an ethnomethodological tradition which does not assume that gender is “a stable set of personality traits or internalized gender norms” but rather seen as “an ‘accomplishment’, a product of human effort” (Wharton 62). Gender is constructed and maintained “in *practice*” (Carter 246, original emphasis) through the interplay of individuals and society, through the different roles people have to play as actors in society. Depending on these roles and the connotations associated with them, gender develops differently. In this regard, West and Zimmerman contend the following:

“When we view gender as an accomplishment, an achieved property of situated conduct, our attention shifts from matters internal to the individual and focuses on interactional and, ultimately, institutional arenas. In one sense, of course, it is individuals who do gender. But it is a situated doing, carried out in the virtual or real presence of others who are presumed to be oriented to its production. Rather than as a property of individuals, we conceive of gender as an emergent feature of social situations: both as an outcome of and a rationale for various social arrangements and as a means of legitimating one of the most fundamental divisions of society” (126).

For example, staying at home as a man or woman in order to care for children as opposed to focusing on one’s professional career usually carries certain (gendered and usually very different) meanings which in turn have substantial influence on the way gender and gender expectations of what it means to be a man or woman are perpetuated (Carter 246).

The second way is viewing gender as performative, in other words “gender is produced through the repetition of gender norms” (51). The main proponent of this approach is Judith Butler, one of the most influential contemporary writer and thinker on gender issues, who also coined the term ‘performativity’ in regard to gender (cf. Butler 1988, 1990, 2004). Compared to West and Zimmerman’s *Doing Gender*, Holmes argues that gender is not done by us but “gender ‘does *us*’” (59, emphasis added). Similar to West and Zimmerman, though, Butler denies any “causal explanations that assume that sex dictates or necessitates certain social meanings for women’s expe-

rience” (Butler *Performative Acts* 520), meaning that gender and specific views and expectations regarding gender are not based on sex or biology but socially and culturally constructed. In *Gender Trouble*, she further elaborates on the issue of the distinction between sex and gender as well as the supposed influence the first has on the latter:

“[The] distinction between sex and gender serves the argument that whatever biological intractability sex appears to have, gender is culturally constructed: hence, gender is neither the causal result of sex nor as seemingly fixed as sex. [...] When the constructed status of gender is theorized as radically independent of sex, gender itself becomes a free-floating artifice, with the consequence that *man* and *masculine* might just as easily signify a female body as a male one, and *woman* and *feminine* a male body as easily as a female one.” (Butler *Gender Trouble* 8-9, original emphasis).

Her view of gender resembles the idea of a masquerade, that is, gender roles are actual roles we perform as the actors. However, what is not meant is that we can put on and change these rolls at will but that “they are the result of social scripts we actively conform to or reject (always with the possible costs of public censure or worse)” (Pilcher, Whelehan 130). This notion is the basic outline of performativity, which describes the assumption that one repeats or reiterates the norms on the society one lives in and through which one is constituted (130). Gender identity then is the result of the repetition of these institutionalized norms and conventions and not anything related to an innateness or naturalness based on biological attributions, it consists of “acts and gestures which are learned and are repeated over time [and] create the illusion of an innate and stable (gender) core” (Sullivan 82).

Identity

In the contemporary world, identity has become a key concept. The catastrophe of the Second World War, the end of colonialism, as well as globalization with its disruptive forces, both positive and negative, have led to an increased interest in the concept of identity in the social sciences and the humanities, especially since the 1990s (Weedon 1). It is not only academia, though, which is concerned with identity. Identity is a recurring theme in media coverage, first and foremost if there is an aspect of identity that is in a state of crisis, for example in times of high levels of unemployment or, as a very recent example, if there is an influx of foreign people which are considered 'problematic' by a significant portion of the population of certain countries. Then, a supposed crisis of the national identity is diagnosed (Woodward 1). Of course, identity is of importance not only to researchers and media representatives, but even more so on a very personal level for each and every human being. It functions as a way for people to find answers to the fundamental questions of who they are, who or what they belong to, how one presents him- or herself and the way other might perceive them, as well as in what way one does or does not relate to others (Wahl, Scholl 67). As these aspects illustrate, identity is constituted of various levels, ranging from a very personal to a local and a national or even a supranational level. Furthermore, the sources identities are derived from in the contemporary world are manifold. Nationality, ethnicity, social class, community, gender, sexuality – all of these are categories people build their identity on. Frequently, these come into conflict with each other due to contradictory points of view. This means that for example, one can refer to oneself as a Christian while still advocating for gay marriage, LGBT rights, or the legalization of abortion, even though this is highly paradoxical at first glance. Such struggles between different spheres are common to all of us. Still, "gives us a location in the world and presents the link between us and the society in which we live" (Woodward 1).

According to the Oxford English Online Dictionary, the term 'identity' derives from the Latin expression *idem*, meaning 'the same', and today it stands for "the characteristics determining who or what a person or thing is", "the state or feeling of being very similar to and able to understand somebody/something" as well as "the characteristics, feelings or beliefs that distinguish people from others". These definitions in themselves depict the paradoxical nature of identity, that is, identity incorporates both

similarity and difference in it. Both of these aspects are nonetheless crucial for the formation and the maintenance of identity, as it will be demonstrated below. Jeffrey Weeks defines identity similarly:

“Identity is about belonging, about what you have in common with some people and what differentiates you from others. At its most basic it gives you a sense of personal location, the stable core to your individuality. [...] Each of us live with a variety of potentially contradictory identities, which battle within us for allegiance. [...] The list [of identities] is potentially infinite, and so therefore are our possible belongings.” (Weeks 88)

Richard Jenkins agrees with this view in the way that to him, identity is to know ‘who’s who’ (and hence ‘what’s what’). This involves knowing who we are, knowing who others are, them knowing who we are, us knowing who they think we are, and so on: a multi-dimensional classification or mapping of the human world and our places in it, as individuals and as members of collectivities” (5). He then goes on to argue that identity is “a process [...] not a ‘thing’. It is not something that one can *have*, or not; it is something that one *does*“ (5, original emphasis).

The last part of Jenkins’ argument, that identity is something that is done instead of something that is simply had, contains two important tenets of the understanding of identity prevalent in social science, especially in cultural studies. For one, it rebukes the assumption that identity is inherent to human beings and simply has to be ‘discovered’ within one’s self and remains unchanged over the course of one’s life. Second, it emphasizes the agency in the formation of identity, that is, identity is something that is constructed through one’s (inter-)actions and therefore also susceptible to change. The idea that identity is something we possess is frequently referred to as the “universal and timeless core, an ‘essence’ of the self that is *expressed* as representations that are recognizable by ourselves and others” (Barker *SAGE* 94, original emphasis). This view is also known as *essentialism*, where it is assumed that “descriptions of ourselves reflect an essential underlying identity [...] [with] a fixed essence of femininity, masculinity, Asians, teenagers and all other social categories” (Barker *Cultural Studies* 166). Stuart Hall, among others, decidedly argues against this view, holding that exactly the opposite of essentialism in relation to identity and its development. To him, identity does not function as a stable core of the self but does indeed involve change over time. Rather, identities are “fragmented and fractured; never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions” (Hall *Questions* 4). He emphasizes

that “instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished fact [...], we should think, instead, of identity as a ‘production’, which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation” (Hall *Diaspora* 222). Also, identities are attributed a certain plasticity allowing them to develop and transform over time depending on the social, cultural, and historical environment and conditions one is exposed to. The ability to change even extends beyond the realm of the living, or as Jenkins puts it, “not even death freezes the picture”, as the legacy or reputation of a person can be reevaluated after he or she has died, as for example through sainthood or martyrdom (17). The idea of an identity which is not fixed has been summarized as *anti-essentialist*. This anti-essentialism further acknowledges that the process of the construction of identity is built on similarity and difference where resemblance is sought or established with an in-group one belongs to or wants to belong to, while distinction is created towards the out-group consisting of everyone else (Barker *SAGE* 94). As identity is fragmented and shifting, though, these groups can differ or overlap, as can be with the above mentioned example of a Christian supporting gay marriage, where the person actually belongs to two groups that are mutually exclusive but due to the capability to consolidate several identities within one overarching identity, it is not only possible but a common phenomenon to hold conflicting views. Donna Haraway summarizes this paradox as follows: “[Identity] is partial in all its guises, never finished, whole, simply there and original; it is always constructed and stitched together imperfectly, and *therefore* able to join with another, to see together without claiming to be another” (193, original emphasis).

Stuart Hall developed a model which identified three main conceptions of identity which account for the progressive change of the perception of identity and which had a major influence on the contemporary understanding of identity. His model consists of the Enlightenment subject, the sociological subject, the post-modern subject. According to Hall, the Enlightenment subject was a “fully centred, unified individual, endowed with the capacities of reason, consciousness and action, whose ‘centre’ consisted of an inner core [...] [which is] the essential centre of the self was a person’s identity” (Hall *Cultural Identity* 275). This is the base for the above outlined concept of essentialism which assumes that human beings are born with a core identity which only has to ‘unfold’ and stays, once fully unfolded, the same during all of a person’s existence. However, as a result of a more modern society which had gained in com-

plexity, a different notion of identity was required, “one that placed greater emphasis on the interactive nature of identity” (Simon 12). Hence, Hall brought up with notion of the sociological subject which accounted for the changes of a more modern world. It is aware of the fact that its inner core was “not autonomous and self-sufficient, but was formed in relation to ‘significant others’, who mediated to the subject the values, meanings and symbols – the culture” (Hall *Cultural Identity* 275). Interaction between the society and the individual was now viewed as the most important factor in the formation of identity, because although the idea of an inner essence was still held onto, it was now accepted as malleable and the view of an unalterable core was abandoned. It was to function as a sort of mediator between the self and society: “Identity, in this sociological conception, bridges the gap between the ‘inside’ and the ‘outside’ – between the personal and the public worlds” (Hall *Cultural Identity* 276). The recognition of the fragmented nature of identity in an integral part of Hall’s third and final conception of identity, of the post-modern subject. The post-modern subject is a result of further changes of cultural and structural nature in modernity which cause “the very process of identification [...] [to] become more open-ended, variable and problematic (Hall *Cultural Identity* 277). Any idea of an essence or core as the foundation of identity was rejected and instead, “identity becomes a ‘moveable feast” (Hall *Cultural Identity* 277), meaning the post-modern subject is split up in various fragments which are in themselves constantly exposed to change as the subject as a whole is exposed to the culture it lives in. “The subject assumes different identities at different times, identities which are not unified around a coherent ‘self” (Hall *Cultural Identity* 277). This observation is at the heart of the contemporary understanding of identity, particularly in cultural studies. Each and every person is composed of various fragments of identity which can be quite contradictory and are endlessly changing, gaining or losing in prominence or vanishing altogether, dependent on the world and culture one inhabits.

Identity encompasses several different aspects such as gender identity, or cultural identity, both of which are relevant for this thesis. Cultural identity is generally understood as “the experience, enactment, and negotiation of dynamic social identifications by group members within particular settings” and it functions as an umbrella term to “encompass, or subsume, related group identities such as nationality, race, ethnicity, age, sex and gender, sexuality, socioeconomic status, regional identity,

ethnolinguistic identity, political affiliation, and (dis)ability.” (Chen, Lin 2). As with the concept of identity in general, there are two fundamental ways of looking at cultural identity, an essentialist and an anti-essentialist way (Barker *Cultural Studies* 176). Cultural essentialism proclaims that there is “one, shared culture, a sort of collective ‘one true self’” (Hall *Diaspora* 223) that reflects shared historical experiences as well as historical events on which a certain meaning of solidarity is being placed in order to justify the deduction of shared cultural codes and traditions creating “one people” (223). That is, cultural identity is understood as something that one either has or not, something one is born with or not. Cultural identity can be expressed through various symbols such as the ‘Union Jack’ for the ‘British identity’ (Barker *Cultural Studies* 176). This concept of identity is entirely based on (supposed) points of similarity between the members of the respective group identifying themselves as, say, British or Austrian. The anti-essentialist view of cultural identity, by contrast, stresses that while similarity is indeed important for cultural identity, difference is actually the crucial aspect of it, that “there are also critical points of deep and significant *difference* which constitute ‘what we really are’” (Hall *Diaspora* 225, original emphasis). Barker argues that “cultural identity is not an essence but a continually shifting position, and the points of difference around which cultural identities could form are multiple and proliferating [...] [such as] class, gender, sexuality, age, ethnicity, nationality, morality, religion, etc.” (*Cultural Studies* 177). This view distances itself from the assumption of cultural identity as a fixed state by viewing it as “a process of *becoming*” (177, original emphasis). Consequently, the concept of ‘Britishness’ would be “subject to the continuous ‘play’ of history, culture and power” and the meaning of it would never be either fixed nor completed since it undergoes permanent shifts and alterations (Hall *Diaspora* 225).

”If you look quickly and are not paying attention, you might mistake it for jolly” – Discworld and satire

A problem which arises when trying to determine whether or not Pratchett can be labeled as a satirist based on the ‘classic’ definitions outlined above is the fact that satire is traditionally concerned with the real or at least pretends to be set in a real-world environment. With Pratchett, this is obviously not the case because, as the name already suggests, his *Discworld* series is set in a world which is a flat disc which is supported by four elephants standing on the back of a giant turtle that moves through space. Aside from this unmistakably fictional world, his cast of character involves fantastic beings such as dwarfs, trolls, vampires, and wizards. However, to an extent, the same criticism would apply to *Gulliver’s Travels*, as there are, for example, no Houyhnhnms in existence (as far as we know of, that is) and we have yet to discover flying islands. Still, it is held in high regard and considered a seminal work of satire because of the countless hints and references to the real world and to real world figures. The same is to an extent true for Pratchett’s books. Peter Hunt and Millicent Lenz describe Pratchett as “a satirist every bit as incisive and erudite and wide-ranging as Swift. If Pratchett’s contemplation of human foibles is on the whole as much a matter of amusement as of anger, it nevertheless resides in a mocking intelligence and a cordial (and not always genial) contempt for useless activities” (87). Even though set in a fantasy world, Pratchett manages to blur the line between the real and the fictional within the books and to mirror reality. We as readers are often able to identify ourselves and our society with the world Pratchett set up and with the characters and their various traits, shortcomings, and failings who occur in the *Discworld* books. Thus, Pratchett creates a world that functions as a window through which we as readers can view our own world and recognize an undeniable familiarity while still maintaining enough distance due to the fantasy aspect to be able to question and criticize aspects of life that Pratchett deems important, underrepresented, or worth thinking about. Neil Gaiman, a close friend of Pratchett for many years and fellow author, characterized him in an article written by him in the British newspaper *The Guardian* as follows:

Terry’s authorial voice is always Terry’s: genial, informed, sensible, drily amused. I suppose that, if you look quickly and are not paying attention, you might, perhaps, mistake it for jolly. But beneath any jollity there is a foundation of fury. Terry Pratchett is not one to go gentle into any night, good or

otherwise¹. He will rage, as he leaves, against so many things: stupidity, injustice, human foolishness and shortsightedness, not just the dying of the light. And, hand in hand with the anger, like an angel and a demon walking into the sunset, there is love: for human beings, in all our fallibility; for treasured objects; for stories; and ultimately and in all things, love for human dignity. (24 September 2014)

Gaiman, inadvertently or not, points out several features which constitute a satirist: humor, rage against human foolishness and at the same time also a love for human beings which is at the heart of every (Horatian) satirist because he wants people to realize their shortcomings and to aid them in curing them.

In terms of the tests Highet developed, a piece of writing has to pass at least one of his four to receive the 'seal of approval' to be called satire. Pratchett easily passes the third test which is concerned with both the themes as well as the methods of satire found in the work in question. The topics Pratchett writes about in a satirical way are of social and societal significance, as he incorporates themes that are representative of the current political and social issues. Pratchett's method is a form of indirect satire with certain exceptions. The vast majority of his satire is expressed indirectly, that is, through the narrative itself instead of a direct first-person address of the reader by the writer. However, at times Pratchett does address the reader directly as the omniscient narrator or through footnotes but this is done infrequently so these would be an exception rather than the rule, even though Pratchett remains present throughout the books due to this. In addition, Pratchett has also acknowledged himself in interviews that his work is indeed satiric, at least in some respects, which is another test Highet devised, that is, if an author directly claims that he or she is writing satire, it should be reasonably obvious that the resulting work belongs to the genre of satire².

Even though Horatian and Juvenalian satire are sub-categories of indirect satire, they can also be used to identify the manner in which satire is expressed, that is, whether satire is intended to 'cure' or 'punish'. For the most part, Pratchett is dedicated to the Horatian variant, although depending on the topic Pratchett is dealing with at a certain point, the stronger he feels about something, the less genial his tone becomes

1 This was six months before Pratchett died from Alzheimer's disease in 2015.

2 As an example for such interviews see <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2013/apr/22/terry-pratchett-raising-steam>.

as can be seen in the following two examples where his overall satirical attitude oscillates between a light-hearted, mainly amusing satire and a more serious satire which intends to nudge people to think about the topic in question.

Sergeant Colon owed thirty years of happy marriage to the fact that Mrs. Colon worked all day and Sergeant Colon worked all night. They communicated by means of notes. He got her tea ready before he left at night, she left his breakfast nice and hot in the oven in the mornings. They had three grown-up children, all born, Vimes had assumed, as a result of extremely persuasive handwriting. (Pratchett, *Guards! Guards!* 66-67)

Look, there's plenty of women in this town that'd love to do things the dwarf way. I mean, what're the choices they've got? Barmaid, seamstress or someone's wife. While you can do anything the men do..." "Provided we do only what the men do," said Cheery. (Pratchett, *Feet of Clay* 128)

In the first example, Pratchett makes fun of the lack of communication that is generally attributed to couples which have been married for a long time and in the process of getting older more or less ceased to have meaningful conversations with each other and simply living their lives alongside each other instead of together. The second example seizes on a topic Pratchett, as an author with a distinctly feminist streak (see the *Witches*-arc of the *Discworld* books, in particular), does not take as lightly, in this specific case he criticizes the culturally limited choice of occupations of women in a male-dominated society. While there appears to be a number of (non-)choices for women, Pratchett acknowledges that these are a far way off of actually being considered a freedom of choice and criticizes them with caustic wit while still presenting his criticism in a humorous fashion. This scene also illustrates what Highet means when he argues that satire "is a blend of amusement and contempt" (21) Another example that displays the difference Pratchett perceives between the way things are and how things ought to be is "the Captain Samuel Vimes 'Boots' theory of socioeconomic unfairness:

The reason that the rich were so rich, Vimes reasoned, was because they managed to spend less money.

Take boots, for example. He earned thirty-eight dollars a month plus allowances. A really good pair of leather boots cost fifty dollars. But an affordable pair of boots, which were sort of OK for a season or two and then leaked like hell when the cardboard gave out, cost about ten dollars. Those were the kind of boots Vimes always bought, and wore until the soles were so thin that he could tell where he was in Ankh-Morpork on a foggy night by the feel of the cobbles.

But the thing was that good boots lasted for years and years. A man who could afford fifty dollars had a pair of boots that'd still be keeping his feet dry in ten years' time, while a poor man who could only afford cheap boots would

have spent a hundred dollars on boots in the same time and would still have wet feet. (Pratchett *Men at Arms* 35)

Here, Pratchett is dissatisfied with a society where one has to be able to afford to be poor, so to speak, that is, where poor people are worse off not because they lack the necessary money management skills or simply because they are too lazy to work hard to escape poverty. Rather, it is because they are trapped in a situation where everything is more expensive or difficult to get for them, be it basic purchases for everyday use such as the above-mentioned symbolic quality boots, which can be read as a criticism of a neo-liberal, capitalist society without any social safety nets for those who cannot keep up. Pratchett is also concerned with human nature, power, and governance. In *Feet of Clay*, Samuel Vimes reminisces about one of his ancestors, Suffer-Not-Injustice “Stoneface” Vimes, who was at the helm of a brief and violent revolution which relieved Ankh-Morpork of its last despotic and mad king but the people of Ankh-Morpork were apparently not grateful for it:

“He said to people: you’re free. And they said hooray, and then he showed them what freedom costs and they called him a tyrant and, as soon as he’d been betrayed, they milled around a bit like barn-bred chickens who’ve seen the big world outside for the first time, and then they went back into the warm and shut the door—” (104)

Pratchett’s satire easily fulfills what Feinberg has called the two prerequisites for authors of satire. For one thing it has to include the criticism of something that the author does not agree with, such as shortcomings of human individuals, society, or mankind as a whole. For another thing, humor is the other necessary component of a satirical work in order to create a “*playfully critical distortion of the familiar*” (Feinberg 67, original emphasis). As it will be shown in the chapters below, Gaiman’s assessment mentioned above that Pratchett rages against “stupidity, injustice, human foolishness and shortsightedness” is accurate. Pratchett does not take injustices such as racism or discrimination based on gender lightly. Quite on the contrary, he presents the reader with his personal scorn and “condescending amusement” (Hightet 238) towards topics such as these two, which are at the heart of this thesis. What Pratchett as a satirist wants to achieve, though, is not always to present the reader with an obvious moral standard which he fully endorses. Instead, he wants to present his readers with a certain moral position which is then displayed in its specific implications in order to enable the readers themselves to discover the vice or virtue of the specific situation, as it will be seen in the chapters below with a number of examples.

Satire and parody

Since it is of high relevance for the *Discworld* series, the difference between satire and parody has to be outlined in order to avoid confusion. *Discworld*, or to be more specific, especially Pratchett's first two books of the series, *The Colour of Magic* and *The Light Fantastic*, were explicitly intended as a parody. This was due to the circumstance that around the 1960s and 1970s after J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings*, C.S. Lewis' *The Chronicles of Narnia*, Ursula K. Le Guin's *Earthsea* series and other seminal works of fantasy literature had gained in both the number of sales and the popularity among readers, an abundance of fantasy books appeared on the market that wanted to have a share of the success of the pioneers of the genre and, often simply following the pattern of fantasy literature established by Tolkien and others, most were nowhere near to even approach the quality of these. Pratchett felt discontent about this development, he felt that there was too much in general and too much bad fantasy literature specifically written and released, so he decided to create fantasy literature himself that ridicules the many fantasy clichés which had developed over time in the myriad of new (pulp) fantasy books. In a conversation with Steven H. Silver, Pratchett describes his thoughts and intentions about the process in the following way: "The first couple were just gag books and I wasn't really certain too much of what I was doing. I was doing it for the fun to seriously parody a lot of bad fantasy, and, indeed some good fantasy, which nevertheless is worth parodying" (seventh paragraph).

The result of Pratchett's effort were the first two books of what became later known as the *Discworld* series, *The Colour of Magic* (1983), with the subtitle "Jerome K. Jerome meets Lord of the Rings (with a touch of Peter Pan)", and *The Light Fantastic* (1986). An example for the way Pratchett parodies fantasy clichés is the dedication of one of the books analyzed in this thesis, *Guards! Guards!*:

"They may be called the Palace Guard, the City Guard, or the Patrol. Whatever the name, their purpose in any work of heroic fantasy is identical: it is, round about Chapter Three (or ten minutes into the film) to rush into the room, attack the hero one at a time, and be slaughtered. No one ever asks them if they want to. This book is dedicated to those fine men" (7)

As for other examples of Pratchett's parody, there are also the ever-present dragons, which are of course an essential component of every proper fantasy world. This is also true for the *Discworld*. However, the dragons which exist on the Disc in the three

books analyzed in this thesis are swamp dragons. Swamp dragons “would never have survived at all except that their home swamps were isolated and short of predators” (*Guards* 172). While they can rearrange their – quite literal – “internal plumbing” in a way that allows them to breath fire (173), unfortunately, the two most common causes of death among swamp dragons are indigestion and over-excitement, both of which cause spontaneous combustions or explosions of the afflicted dragon. In the city of Ankh-Morpork, one of the latest trends among wealthy citizens is to keep specially bred swamp dragons with impressive names such as “Dewdrop Mabelline Talonthrust the First” (126) or “Lord Mountjoy Quickfang Winterforth IV” (177) as pets. Moreover, there is also the traditional cliché of the hero whose parents, usually some king and queen, have been killed when the hero was an infant and he was then raised by commons in order to be later identified as the actual heir to the throne who then becomes a beloved and benevolent king due to his experiences among the commons. In case of Pratchett, this would be Carrot Ironfoundersson, who is actually the son and lone surviving descendant of the last king of Ankh-Morpork and he incidentally also has a birthmark shaped like a crown (410). However, he was raised by hard-working dwarfs in a mine and as a result, he considers himself a dwarf by adoption and after he had to leave his parental mine due to troubles regarding his true species, he went to Ankh-Morpork to become a proud policeman with no intention at all to take over the throne of the city once he learned about his royal descent (cf. *Guards! Guards!, Men at Arms*).

Only over time, Pratchett began to incorporate a more serious and critical stance on contemporary political issues and social commentary in regard to a variety of topics such as death, religion, stereotypes, racism, xenophobia, cultural clashes, war, monarchy, authoritarianism, social (in)justice, gender struggles, and feminism, usually written in a satirical manner. Due to the blend of satire and parody in Pratchett’s books, it is important to keep in mind the distinction between parody and satire, especially since the difference between the two closely related terms is not always evident or clear. The Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines parody as “a literary [...] work in which the style of an author or work is closely imitated for comic effect or in ridicule“. J.A. Cuddon considers parody a branch of satire, as a form of “satirical mimicry” and “its purpose may be corrective as well as derisive” (514). However, if examined more carefully, the ultimate aim is considerably different: while parody wants to

ridicule the author of a work specifically for a comedic outcome, “[parody] differs from the comic in that comedy evokes laughter mainly as an end in itself, while satire derides; that is, it uses laughter as a weapon, and against a butt that exists outside the work itself” (Abrams 26). Moreover, unlike satire, parody is very much fixated on literary works since the usual way to parody something is to “[imitatively] use [...] the words, style, attitude, tone and ideas of an author” (Cuddon 514), so there is a clear focus on form and style and its subsequent distortion and exaggeration but the intention of punishment or cure that is inherent to satire is usually absent in parody. Instead, the aspect of entertainment through ridicule is foregrounded. Arguably, the same criticism that is mentioned above is applicable to parody as well, that is, it is not exclusively limited to literature as a myriad of other cultural artifacts such as movie and song parodies³. Satire is not exclusively focused on literary works but incorporates a broad spectrum of different cultural products. Formal elements are not given similar weight compared to parody. Instead, satire is aimed at socio-cultural aspects expressed through various media, even if literary works continue to take on a prominent role in the proliferation of satire. On a final note, however, the lines between satire and parody are often blurred. Satirists occasionally use parody as a device to ridicule a certain author while writers of parody also incorporate satirical derision in their attempt to mock a certain author.

3 E.g. Charlie Chaplin's *The Great Dictator* from 1940 as a classic movie parody or "Weird Al" Yankovic's parody versions of various pop songs such as "Amish Paradise" mocking "Gangsta's Paradise" or his "Like a Virgin" parody of "Like a Surgeon".

“It’s always very tricky, ethnic” – Race and racism in Ankh-Morpork

"The Watch must reflect the ethnic makeup of the city" – Speciesism in Ankh-Morpork

“Well here is another fine Turnup for the Books, for I have been made Corporal!! It means another Five Dollars a month plus also I have a new jerkin with, two stripes upon it as well. And a new copper badge! It is a Great responsibility!! This is all because we have got new recruits because the Patrician who, as I have formerly vouchsafed is the ruler of the city, has agreed the Watch must reflect the ethnic makeup of the City which I do not Fulley understand but must have something to do with the dwarf Grabpot Thundergust’s Cosmetic Factory.” (Pratchett *Arms* 7)

With this scene from the first page of the second novel in the Watch series⁴, *Men at Arms*, Pratchett begins to address one of the most important topics in the City Watch Trilogy: race. In the scene, Corporal Carrot is writing a letter to his adoptive parents⁵, as he does on a regular basis, to inform them about the latest developments in his life, the Watch, and Ankh-Morpork in general. Ankh-Morpork is the largest and oldest still existing city on the entire Discworld and home to about one million inhabitants and it features a diverse population of various ethnical backgrounds such as humans, who make up the majority of the citizens of Ankh-Morpork, dwarfs, trolls, werewolves, vampires, zombies, gargoyles, and golems. The largest minority group is the dwarfs with a population of about 50,000 around the time of *Feet of Clay*, followed by the trolls. As it can be seen in Carrot’s letter, the Watch has received new recruits because it is now supposed to “reflect the ethnic makeup of the City” (Pratchett *Arms* 7). While on the surface it might appear as a laudable effort in itself by the Patrician, it is not the actual reason or at least only a part of it. In Ankh-Morpork, the populations of ethnic minority groups steadily increase. Especially dwarfs move from their native regions to Ankh-Morpork to live a better life in the metropolis. Letters by dwarfs writing back home usually include a message along the lines of “come on, everyone, and bring the ketchup” (Pratchett *Feet* 117), based on both the easy access of dwarfs to the labor market as well as on the abundance of the favorite dwarf dish, rats with

4 For a summary of the plots of the three books analyzed in this series, please see the appendix of this thesis.

5 Carrot Ironfounder’sson was born human but raised by dwarfs and considers himself a dwarf by adoption rather than human (cf. *MaA* 28).

ketchup, due to the vast rat population in Ankh-Morpork's sewer system. Unfortunately, there is a tense situation between certain minority groups in the city which frequently erupts in violent conflicts. Particularly, dwarfs and trolls cause considerable trouble in the city; riots in the streets and fights between these ethnic minorities are more the rule rather than the exception. The enmity between dwarfs and trolls is due to two reasons. On the one hand, it is 'natural', because "[t]hey get along like chalk and cheese. Very like chalk and cheese, really. One is organic, the other isn't, and also smells a bit cheesy. Dwarfs make a living by smashing up rocks with valuable minerals in them and the silicon-based lifeform known as trolls are, basically, rocks with valuable minerals in them (Pratchett *Men* 46). On the other hand and more importantly, though, there is the Battle of Koom Valley. The dilemma of this historic battle, which took place about two thousand years prior to the plots of the books, is that both trolls and dwarfs accuse the other side of attacking from ambush, while in reality, "the Battle of Koom Valley is the only one known to history where both sides ambushed each other" (47). Ever since this battle, the relationship between dwarfs and trolls can be summarized in two words: mutual hatred. Corporal Nobby succinctly summarized the situation by saying that "[d]warfs and trolls get along like a house on fire" (45). Hence, the dwarfs and trolls coming to or already living in Ankh-Morpork perpetuate this "permanent inter-species vendetta" (46). As a result, the matter is very delicate and incredibly difficult to resolve.

This seemingly endless conflict and its cause is a reference to cultural identity and Pratchett's criticism of the essentialist notion of it. Cultural essentialism argues that there is "one, shared culture, a sort of collective 'one true self'" that reflects shared historical experiences as well as historical events on which a certain emphasis of a common bond is being placed in order to justify the deduction of common cultural conventions creating "'one people', with stable, unchanging and continuous frames of reference and meaning" (Hall *Diaspora* 223). An important part of both the dwarfs' and the trolls' cultural identity revolves around the fact that they have been ambushed in this battle and therefore are the victim of the other side's treachery. What makes this battle both so unique and so important is the fact that there is no particular side to blame, there is no obvious culprit; both sides were equally insidious. However, this is of course not an adequate course of events to use as the foundation for a people, or in this case species, to base their cultural identity on. So, both trolls and

dwarfs manipulate their side of the story so that there is a clear offender and a clear victim, with each side of course being the respective victim. This is important, because in regard to cultural identity, “there are also critical points of deep and significant *difference* which constitute ‘what we really are’” (Hall *Diaspora* 225, original emphasis). If both dwarfs and trolls admitted that they acted in the same way, there is no difference to deduce identity from. As a result, the difference is fabricated. And this is what Pratchett finds fault with; conflicts which are upheld based on events dating back *very* far and their idealizations, (intentionally) false interpretations, and misappropriations, which *should* have absolutely no relevance at all for the current situation. It is especially the stupidity of this kind of self-perpetuating conflicts without any actual reason with which the enmity is upheld that Pratchett finds fault with. If at least one of the two sides of the feud would realize the irrationality of their fight, then maybe it could all be resolved. However, as it can be seen in the scene, at such a point there usually is no place for rational thought but only for emotion, which more often than not outweighs reason in such conflicts.

Pratchett also acknowledges the complexity of the conflicts between different ethnicities outsiders have to face who intend to solve these problems and persuade the groups to make peace with each other or at least calm down the situation, without a deep understanding of the roots and the course of the conflict. This can be seen in a scene where dwarfs and trolls are approaching each other in a street in Ankh-Morpork and everything points to the outbreak of violence at any moment and the Watchmen are unsure about what to do about it:

“We should do something!” said Angua, from the guards’ hiding place in the alley.

“Weeell,” said Sergeant Colon, slowly, “it’s always very tricky, ethnic.”

“Can put a foot wrong very easily,” said Nobby. “Very thin-skinned, your basic ethnic.”

“Thin-skinned? They’re trying to kill one another!”

“It’s cultural,” said Sergeant Colon, miserably. “No sense us tryin’ to force our culture on ’em, is there? That’s speciesist.” (Pratchett *Men* 50)

Pratchett both demonstrates his awareness of the dilemma the Watch members as he manages to include the topic of cultural assimilation in this situation of cultural essentialism. Cultural assimilation is an integral part of every discussion about immigration. How migrants should be dealt with as well as how they should act themselves is often hotly debated, as there are two almost diametrically opposed sides on this mat-

ter. On the one hand, it is argued that there is no such as thing as a specific, essential 'national' culture, be it American, British, or Austrian. Culture is constantly changing and adapting, depending of the actual people who live in the respective country, so that there really is "[n]o sense us tryin' to force our culture on 'em, is there?" as there is no 'our culture' which could be imposed on them. As a result, "[a]s immigrants integrate in to society, culture evolves" (Gans et al. 399). On the other hand, culturally diverse immigrants are also regarded as counterproductive in regard to the theory of the 'melting pot', a metaphor for a society of heterogeneous members which becomes effectively homogeneous over time as they all adopt a common culture, usually the one most prevalent in the particular country. The function and effect of the melting pot are at risk, it is argued, when there are large quantities of immigrants in a country who then form their own separate communities which counteract assimilation, especially linguistically, and ultimately erodes social cohesion (Gans et al. 399), which, it could be argued, is the case with the communities of dwarfs and trolls in Ankh-Morpork.

If there is a something that the Patrician Lord Vetinari loathes, then it is tumult and disruption in 'his' city, especially if it is disputes based on ethnicity. As Sergeant Colon observes, "the Patrician gets really shirty about ethnic trouble" (Pratchett *Men* 47). Vetinari's answer to the problem is to hire 'representatives' of the three most important ethnic minorities in Ankh-Morpork (in the sense that there simply has to be one of each, regardless of any actual qualification) as members of the Watch: Cuddy, a dwarf, Detritus, a troll, and one werewolf, Angua von Überwald, representing the undead community. This policy is also known, as Colon notes, as "[a]ffirmative action hirin' procedure, or something" (24). Affirmative action is usually defined as "any race- or gender-conscious effort to identify, recruit, hire, admit, train, or promote qualified women or people of color for employment, educational, and contracting opportunities" (Wise 15). Usually, this practice is not self-imposed by employers but instead mandated by policy makers, or in this case by the Patrician of Ankh-Morpork. Affirmative action in the form it is generally known today was introduced in 1961 during the presidency of John F. Kennedy and has been hotly debated ever since (Cohen, Sterba 12). While originally intended as a policy that legally ensured that there was no preference based on ethnicity in public hiring and contracts, over time, affirmative action was transformed into "outright preference by race", which is one of the argu-

ments brought forth by opponents of affirmative action policies. One of the most controversial points is whether or not this kind of preference is actually “unjust to both minority and majority, and damaging to both minority and majority” (Cohen, Sterba 3). Its proponents advocate for justice for and the end of discrimination against minorities and against women. Furthermore, it is supposed to serve as a redress for the discrimination they had to suffer in the past and still have to, as well as an improvement in integration and diversity (Kellough 76). Edward Kellough views affirmative action as “primarily a policy intended to promote the redistribution of opportunity” where there are winners and losers in the sense that there is an equilibrium of opportunities where one side can only gain in opportunity when the other loses some of its, that is, opportunity is redistributed (Kellough 5). The redistribution from those who have been advantaged from a historical perspective, such as white men, to those at a disadvantage based on their race or sex is what sparks the controversy about affirmative action. Even though the actual impact of affirmative action policies is rather small, those who now feel discriminated based on *not* belonging to a minority raise the criticism that preferences based on race or sex contradicts the very concept of equality. Hence, affirmative action is occasionally called “reverse discrimination” by its opponents (Kellough 12-13). Admittedly, if affirmative action is poorly implemented, for instance if blacks are preferred when applying for a certain job based on their race even though they are less qualified than a similar white applicant, then it only serves to fuel racist sentiments (Nieli 98).

Pratchett expresses these concerns through Sergeant Colon, who is less than enthusiastic about the aptitude of the new affirmative action recruits during their first basic training session, where they not exactly performed well: “Oh, gods, thought Sergeant Colon wearily. Add 'em up and divide by two and you've got two normal men, except normal men don't join the Guard. A troll and a dwarf. And that ain't the worst of it—” (Pratchett *Men* 25). Vetinari's rationale behind this step is to diffuse the situation by having members of the most important ethnic minorities in the Watch who would then have a calming effect on the rest of their people as well as on the population in general through their public appearance as government employees. With these scenes, Pratchett exposes both the necessity and, given the first impression of the new recruits, also the potential dangers of affirmative action, while at the same time showing his discontent with the fact that it even has to be necessary for a society to implement

a policy like affirmative action. Pratchett's treatment of affirmative action is satirical because he of all possible employers in Ankh-Morpork, it is the Night Watch which is forced to admit these minority representatives. As Colon mentions above, no one in their right mind would actually *want* to join the Night Watch. However, while the Night Watch is certainly not an employer sought after by anyone in search of work, it nonetheless is above the reach of the minorities in Ankh-Morpork unless it is politically opportune. If Vetinari would have had another idea in mind to combat the ethnic disputes in the city, there would be no minority members in the Night Watch. The Watch represents the public institution with the lowest esteem of all, yet it is not open for everyone, as it is illustrated by the fact that the three original members of the Watch in *Guards! Guards!* are human. Even Carrot, who joined at the beginning of *Guards! Guards!* without knowing what he is getting himself into, is only a dwarf by adoption and actually human. Hence, in Pratchett's satirical distortion, no one would actually join the Watch if there were a choice between the Watch and literally every other occupation imaginable, but nonetheless, the Watch is a segregated work environment until the political intervention of the Patrician. With the introduction of affirmative action in *Men at Arms*, Pratchett lays also bare the real-world discrimination minorities have to endure if their equality is not protected by law, especially in the workplace. For example, usually have a harder time finding jobs in general, especially in professions with high salaries or high social esteem, and occasionally they still earn not the same wage than whites for the same jobs (Cobbs 5-7).

Pratchett also cautions against a misguided use of affirmative action, that is, if it is adopted only because it is politically expedient. In Critical Race Theory, it is argued that measures such as affirmative action are usually a symptom of a phenomenon called 'interest convergence', where "[the] interests of whites and blacks, for a brief moment, converged" (Delgado, Stefancic 23) and "advances in race equality come about only when White elites see the changes as in their own interests" (Gillborn, Ladson-Billings 343). In this case, it is not specifically whites but human elites in general and not race equality but species equality. This system of a dominant human elite is visible when looking at the ruling elite of Ankh-Morpork consisting of the Patrician as well as the heads of the most powerful guilds in the city. These guilds include the Assassins' Guild (headed by Lord Downey), the Thieves' Guild (Mr. Boggis), the Guild of Merchants (Antimony Parker), the Beggars' Guild (Queen Molly), the Seam-

stressess' Guild⁶ (Rosemary Palm), the Fools' Guild (Dr. Whiteface), and the Guild of Lawyers (Mr. Slant). Along with Lord Vetinari, the Patrician of the city, they share one important feature: all of them are human, with the possible exception of Mr. Slant who is actually a zombie, but since he started working as a lawyer when he was still alive and then simply continued working after he died, he *technically* counts as human (Pratchett, Briggs 210). In the form of Vetinari's decision to enforce affirmative action, the human elite only takes a very basic step when trying appease the ethnic minorities, which is exactly what CRT scholars criticize and Pratchett acknowledges on here, too. Only then steps are taken when its already almost too late and the steps taken address only the most immediate of concerns but do not contribute anything in terms of the long-term solution of the difficult conditions of the ethnic minorities concerned. While CRT argues that affirmative action is an insufficient measure in creating or at least approaching a state of equality, Pratchett's verdict seems to differ. As it will be seen later on, affirmative action actually improves the situation for the minorities in Ankh-Morpork, or to be more precise, the situation of those members of ethnic minorities who are admitted to the Watch, whose number steadily increases over the course of *Men at Arms* and *Feet of Clay*. Pratchett's approach to affirmative action is what Highet referred to as "protreptic", that is, Pratchett wants to „give positive advice, set up an exemplar to copy, [and] state an ideal“ (243) in terms of how ethnic minorities should be integrated in order to avoid the dangers of separate minority communities and an erosion of social cohesion.

As a direct consequence of the implementation the affirmative action policy, no leadership position of the most important guilds in Ankh-Morpork was replaced with someone with a minority background. Instead, as outlined above, the individuals chosen to represent the three minority groups of dwarfs, trolls, and undead had to join the Night Watch. For the Patrician, this was actually the most suitable he could find, for a number of reasons. First, the Night Watch is the place where they could do the least harm, in every sense of the word. If one is to recall that the first session of basic training had a disastrous outcome, one is to inclined to approve with the choice. Over time, though, this changed and the three of them proved to be valuable members of the Watch. Second, in case it turns out that they are as incompetent as Vetinari reckons, then he can argue that he at least tried to improve the situation of

6 'Seamstress' is the euphemism used in Ankh-Morpork to refer to (female) sex workers (Pratchett, Briggs 206).

the minorities in Ankh-Morpork but, alas, they themselves are incapable of taking the chance and his efforts were in vain. Third, in case it proves to be a good idea to hire the three of them, then of course the Patrician can argue that he believed in them from the start and that he only has the best in mind for the minorities in the city. Fourth, he cannot lose in any conceivable way by doing so. The possibilities of minority representatives to complain about the lack of support from the ruler are inhibited and his own base of power remains untouched as it is only the Night Watch and therefore the least important of all municipal institutions which could potentially suffer from the new recruits. As a result, the status quo of human dominance is maintained. Thus, the affirmative action policy and the way it was put into action represents a perfect example of interest convergence.

Within the Night Watch itself, the reactions to the new recruits are rather unambiguous as it can be seen both with Colon's reaction stated above as well as with the doubts Captain Vimes, the head of the Night Watch, has regarding the Patrician's order:

The [new recruits] you told me I had to have? he added in the privacy of his head. They weren't to go in the Day Watch, of course. And those bastards in the Palace Guard wouldn't take them, either. Oh, no. Put 'em in the Night Watch, because it's a joke anyway and no one'll really see 'em. No one important, anyway. [...]

It wasn't as if he was speciesist, he told himself. But the Watch was a job for men. (Pratchett *Men* 25)

So, from the point of view of the old, established members of the Night Watch, the new ethnic minority watchmen are not exactly considered a welcome addition to the Watch but rather the exact opposite, a nuisance. This already indicates the lack of appreciation that is displayed for trolls, dwarfs, werewolves, and other minorities by humans, even if the humans actually expressing their disapproval are themselves the lowest step of the human social ladder and should know first-hand what it means to be despised. In the case of the scene above, this view is expressed by Captain Vimes, whose comments regarding the new recruits could be construed as a kind of alleged superiority of *men* as in human beings in terms of the suitability to become a good policeman in the Watch. Specifically, this view is expressed through "It wasn't as if he was speciesist, he told himself. But the Watch was a job for *men*" (*Men* 25, emphasis added). The scene is also an adequate example of what proponents of Critical Race Theory call 'racism as normal'. It refers to the observation that unfortu-

nately, racism is a common part of life and has to be acknowledged as such and dealt with appropriately. It is argued that racism is deeply ingrained in society and the mind of many people so that it does look “ordinary and natural to persons in the culture” (Gillborn, Ladson-Billings 343). It is accepted by CRT scholars, without ever wanting to trivialize, justify, or even glorify racism, quite the contrary, that a not inconsiderable number of people consider racist views and behaviors as the “normal order of things” (Ladson-Billings *What it is Not* 37).

While Pratchett rejects and condemns racist behavior in his novels, as it will be demonstrated below, he does not even begin to assume that racism is an extraordinary phenomenon. Quite on the contrary, practically everyone in Ankh-Morpork is racist, that is, speciesist, in some way or another and to different degrees. Even essentially ‘good’ characters of the novels such as Carrot, Angua, or Cheery, are arguably the heroes of the *Watch* novels and who will be covered in more detail below, have their flaws when it comes to speciesism. Pratchett’s intention with this complexity of his characters is to present the reader with an opportunity to reflect on such attitudes and behaviors and to question an allegedly clear-cut distinction between ‘racism is bad and non-racism is good’ without being apologetic towards racist behavior in general. Especially if the subsequent events of the novels and Vimes’ personal involvement in them are taken into account, it becomes clear that Pratchett uses Vimes as a misdirection to emphasize the moral ambiguity displayed by Vimes. In the scene above, Vimes’ remarks can just as well be interpreted as criticism of hiring members only for political reason, in this case not to jeopardize the Patrician’s achievement of stability and control in Ankh-Morpork, without any regard for qualification or aptitude for the job of police officer. “But the Watch was a job for men” can be read as a reference to people not tough, persistent, and willing enough to be a member of the Watch, especially the Night Watch where life is even harder for policemen than in any other department of the Ankh-Morpork Watch. That is, even though Vimes does not judge the new recruits as capable of being watchmen, it is not because of the fact that they belong to ethnic minorities but because he was forced to admit new recruits whose main qualification is in fact their ethnicity. Admittedly, Vimes has a rather strong view of the minorities (and the human majority, for that matter) in Ankh-Morpork and his relationship with other races or species is often complicated; in short, he dislikes all of them and is not one to keep quiet about his

antipathy, quite on the contrary. When interviewing the dwarf Cheery Littlebottom for the position of forensics expert in the Watch, he communicates this very clearly: “I can’t say I like dwarfs much, Littlebottom. But I don’t like trolls or humans either, so I suppose that’s OK” (Pratchett *Feet* 33). However, in this interview he not only expresses his dislike of dwarfs, trolls, and humans, but also that “[if] troll officers call you a grit-sucker they’re out, and if you call them rocks you’re out. We’re just one big family and, when you’ve been to a few domestic disputes, Littlebottom, I can assure you that you’ll see the resemblance” (33). If one is to draw on a definition of racism as any “practice of discrimination, segregation, persecution, or mistreatment based on membership in a race or ethnic group” (Degaldo, Stefancic 183), then Vimes is not a racist. He does not believe in or support the superiority (or inferiority, likewise) of any people, race, or species over others, nor does he persecute or abuse anyone based on their species. On another occasion, he actually muses about the nature of racism and notes the following to himself:

“There were people who’d steal money from people. Fair enough. That was just theft. But there were people who, with one easy word, would steal the humanity from people. That was something else.

The point was...well, he didn’t like dwarfs and trolls. But he didn’t like anyone very much. The point was that he moved in their company every day, and he had a right to dislike them.” (Pratchett *Men* 129)

The argument Pratchett wants to make through Vimes is epitomized in a remark he at point said to Carrot: “Just because someone’s a member of an ethnic minority doesn’t mean they’re not a nasty small-minded little jerk” (Pratchett *Feet* 319). There is essentially no one Vimes hates solely based on the fact that he or she belongs to a certain species. It is highly probable that he will not *like* anyone, but this is decidedly different from being a racist. This is also the crucial point Pratchett wants to convey. In Pratchett’s opinion, no one is in any way obliged to like everyone, and someone who dislikes others is certainly not automatically racist. Through Vimes, he advocates the freedom for everyone to dislike whomever as long as it stays within reason, i.e. not exclusively based on stereotypes, hearsay, or over-generalizations. Only after *personally* forming an opinion about someone, preferably through direct and extensive communication and contact, and perhaps over time with an adjustment of this opinion based on new information as one comes to know each other better, such antipathy is perfectly justifiable. Pratchett also contends that racism should not be regarded as a just black and white issue; either being wrong or right, good or bad.

Pratchett wants to point out that even when someone hold certain racist views, it does not have to mean he or she is actually a bad person, even though there are of course nuances and exceptions to this position. This view is projected in the majority of characters as they all hold some racial prejudices but to different extents and effects. Moreover, racism is viewed as something ever-present and hard to get rid of entirely. The general idea behind this concept of everyone being racist is, however, that with enough will and effort, racism can actually be overcome, as it will be shown below.

There is, though, a caveat to the claim that everyone in Ankh-Morpork is racist. In fact, there are actually two characters who are known to be entirely free of racist sentiments. The first is the Patrician Lord Vetinari, the authoritarian leader of the city, and the second is Cut-Me-Own-Throat Dibbler, a street vendor who primarily sells something which could only accidentally be called 'food'. Vetinari is free from racist thoughts because he has a very simple view on society as a whole. To him, there are only two categories of people, regardless of racial affiliations or any other discriminating category. On one side, there is the ruler, which in this case would be him, and on the other side, there are those who are ruled. As a result, at the time of the novels, there is a special kind of dictatorship in use in Ankh-Morpork, that is, a highly specialized democracy in which a Patrician, an absolute tyrant, is elected based on the principle of 'One Man, One Vote' where the Patrician himself is the Man and has the Vote (Pratchett, Briggs 17). The only way in which he actually does discriminate against people is if someone poses a threat to his authority. To Cut-Me-Own-Throat Dibbler, whose speciality is a "sausage inna bun" where it is almost impossible to discern where exactly the 'meat' in the sausage actually came from (Pratchett, Briggs 76), the only thing of importance is whether or not someone would actually buy his goods, regardless of the age, gender, race, or shape of his customers; as long as there is profit to be made, Dibbler does not care about anything else. These two examples serve the purpose of further supporting Pratchett's argument that 'racism is bad, non is good' is not always entirely accurate in the sense that even people who are entirely free of any racist ideas are not what one would usually consider 'good' people.

While Pratchett intended Samuel Vimes to function as a kind of thought-provoking impulse for his readers in regard to the nature of racism, Captain "Mayonnaise"

Quirke is the opposite of Vimes. Quirke is often called 'Mayonnaise' by members of the Night Watch because he is "rich, thick and oily" and "smells faintly of eggs" (Pratchett *Men* 222) and he was Captain of the Day Watch before the two Watches were combined to form the City Watch at the end of *Men at Arms* and he had no choice but to leave the Watch. Quirke is something like a 'true' speciesist in the sense that he blindly believes in any prejudices and stereotypes he comes across. He also lets his actions be guided by them and proudly represents the view that humans are superior in any way to ethnic minorities based on these exact biases, for which Pratchett does not show any sympathy at all. He is the one responsible for the unjust arrest of the troll Coalface as a suspect for the murder of the dwarf Bjorn Hammerhock, even though Coalface could not possibly be the murderer since he would not even be able to get through the door of the workshop Hammerhock was killed in and which triggered severe ethnic riots in the city. The following exchange between Quirke and members of the Night Watch explains Quirke's line of thinking quite clearly. In this scene, the members of the Night Watch confront Quirke as they are inquiring the circumstances of the unjust arrest of Coalface by Quirke:

Can you tell me what evidence you have against the prisoner Coalface?"

"That damn troll? It's a troll!"

"Yes?"

Quirke looked around.

"Look, I don't have to tell you with everyone here—"

"As a matter of fact, according to the rules, you do. That's why it's called evidence. It means 'that which is seen'."

"Listen!" hissed Quirke, leaning toward Carrot. "He's a *troll*. He's as guilty as hell of *something*. They all are!"

(Pratchett *Men* 287-288)

On the surface, Quirke can be viewed as criticism of institutionalized racism in the police and the abuse of power through police officers. Quirke, however, can easily be seen to represent more than that. While Vimes simply does not get along with the overwhelming majority of people, Quirke, as a human, despises each and every being who is not human, merely based the prejudices he has for the respective species, be it trolls, dwarfs, or any other species living in Ankh-Morpork. In the scene above, he demonstrates his deeply racist character by expressing a highly problematic and entirely baseless prejudice against trolls. This generalization of Quirke corresponds with what proponents of CRT refer to as 'essentialism'. It is "[the] belief that all people perceived to be in a single group think, act, and believe the same things in the same ways" which "leads to considerable misunderstanding and stereotyping"

(Ladson-Billings *What it is not* 40). In this case, Quirke wholeheartedly believes that his assumption of the criminal nature of trolls is true for the entire species and therefore justifies any action against any other trolls since they are all “guilty as hell of *something*” (Pratchett *Men* 288). Quirke embodies everything Pratchett loathes: pettiness, ignorance, the abuse of the little power he has, a strong sense of racial prejudice, and blatant racism which he proudly and unashamed puts on display; in short, he is a specimen of a bigoted, narcissistic racist. Pratchett rejects such a way of essentialist thinking and joins CRT scholars in their promotion of anti-essentialism. Pratchett rejects over-generalizations and demonstrates that there is actually a large variety of different individuals within specific groups which differ in various respects, even though they belong to one and the same larger group of beings.

Another example of Pratchett’s scorn for ‘true’ racism is a letter the Watch receives one day from a certain ‘J. H. Catterail’. It is testament to the prevalent speciesism among large portion of the population of Ankh-Morpork, that is, the human majority, towards minorities, especially among those belonging to the upper stratum of the human population of Ankh-Morpork. As outlined above, over the course of *Men at Arms* and *Feet of Clay*, the Watch steadily increases its numbers and mainly consists of watchmen from ethnic minorities. It is exactly this aspect which apparently urged Mr. Catterail to write the following letter to the Commander of the Watch:

Commander Vimes,

The Night Watch patrol in this street appears to be made up entirely of dwarfs. I have nothing against dwarfs amongst their own kind, at least they are not trolls, but one hears stories and I have daughters in the house. I demand that this situation is remedied instantly otherwise I shall have no option but to take up the matter with Lord Vetinari, who is a personal friend.

I am, sir, your obt. servant,

J. H. Catterail

(Pratchett *Feet* 155-156)

Pratchett uses this scene and letter to highlight the hypocrisy of certain people to conceal their blatant racism under a pretext. In this case, Catterail claims that he is merely worried about his daughter. Although he most likely really does worry about her, it she is not the actual reason why he writes the letter to Vimes. It is because he himself does not want dwarfs or trolls near his home. He uses his daughter only as a vehicle through which he can conjure up horrifying images of dwarfs or trolls molesting children while really, Catterail only expresses his prejudices and racist senti-

ments regarding dwarfs and trolls. Apparently, dwarfs and other minorities in a governmental institution, even though it is only the Watch, or generally in the public where he can see them, for that matter, do not comply with his perception of the “normal order of things” (Ladson-Billings *What it is not* 37). The normal order he has in mind instead is a segregated society where everyone has their specific place and the place for dwarfs and trolls is as far away from him and his kin as possible. This scene is a prominent example of the attitude and conduct Pratchett does not agree with in any society, especially not from people of wealth and influence who could lead by example instead of, due to their speciesist views, actually interfering with measures that improve the situation of minorities or at least prevent conditions like ethnic riots in the streets. The moment of Vimes’ revenge for this letter comes when he and Sergeant Colon coincidentally inspect the Moporkian equivalent of a sweat shop where golems on treadmills are exploited to power the sewing machines without pause and where poor people are forced to work endless hours in front of sewing machines:

“Who’s that man who owns that place?”

“That’s Mr. Catterail, sir. You know, he’s always writing you letters about there being too many what he calls ‘lesser races’ in the Watch. You know...trolls and dwarfs...” The sergeant had to trot to keep up with Vimes.

“Get some zombies,” he said.

“You’ve always been dead against zombies, excuse my pun,” said Sergeant Colon.

“Any want to join, are there?”

“Oh, yessir. Couple of good lads, sir, and but for the gray skin hangin’ off ‘em you’d swear they hadn’t been buried five minutes.”

“Swear them in tomorrow.”

“Right, sir. Good idea. And of course it’s a great saving not having to include them in the pension plan.”

“They can patrol up on Kings Down. After all, they’re only human.”

“Right, sir.” When Sam is in these moods, Colon thought, you agree with everything. “You’re really getting the hang of this affirmative action stuff, eh sir?”

(Pratchett *Feet* 352-353)

“That damn troll just happened to save my life today” – Inter-species contact in the Watch

The tense situation between dwarfs and trolls also had an impact Within the Watch in the form of the relationship between Cuddy, the dwarf, and Detritus, the troll, who are compelled to work side by side as watchmen since they joined the Watch. As it might be expected, they are not happy with the fact that the two of them were teamed up to

investigate. However, as it can also be seen in the following quote, there is actually an attempt to make the best of the time they have to spend together; there is a willingness displayed by Cuddy to try to bridge the deep cultural that gap that looms between the two: "I just want you to know that I don't like being teamed up with you any more than you like being teamed up with me. [...] "But if we're going to have to make the best of it, there'd better be some changes, OK?" (Pratchett *Men* 169). Cuddy actually wants to make an effort to improve their inherently bad relationship and to help Detritus with something he struggles with, in the case of Detritus it is basic mathematics, or to be precise, counting to more than two: "So two and one more is...?" Detritus looked panicky. This was calculus territory" (169). While initially completely averse to each, after Cuddy helped Detritus to learn how to count, they actually get to know each other better. The actual pivotal moment in their developing friendship occurs when the two of them chase a suspect in the murder case into a refrigerated warehouse where they are being shot at. As the first shot hit Cuddy's helmet, Detritus senses the danger Cuddy is in and pushes him behind himself to protect him, only to be shot himself several times. While a few lead bullets cannot actually kill an adult troll, they still hurt him and knock him out. As Cuddy runs off to search for help, the unconscious Detritus is in danger of freezing to death as he is still in the refrigerated warehouse. Coming back in time, he saves him from the cold and finds him and Detritus surrounded by onlookers outside:

"Can't one of you get him a blanket or something?" he said.

A very fat man said, "Huh? Who'd use a blanket after it had been on a troll?"

"Hah, yes, good point," said Cuddy. He glanced at the five holes in Detritus' breastplate. They were at about head height, for a dwarf. "Could you come over here for moment, please?"

The man grinned at his friends, and sauntered over.

"I expect you can see the holes in his armor, right?" said Cuddy.

"I've got nothing against dwarfs, mind you," said the fat man. "I mean, dwarfs is practically people, in my book. Just shorter humans, almost. But trolls...weeeeelll...they're not the same as us, right?"

"That's a nice coat you've got there," said Cuddy.

"It's a nice coat," said Cuddy. "You know what you should do with a coat like that?"

The man's forehead wrinkled.

"Take it off right now," said Cuddy, "and give it to the troll."

"Why, you little—"

The man grabbed Cuddy by his shirt and wrenched him upward.

The dwarf's hand moved very quickly. There was a scrape of metal.

Man and dwarf made an interesting and absolute stationary tableau for a few seconds. (Pratchett *Men* 202-203)

In the end, Cuddy obtains the coat and wraps it around Detritus and even though there is no actual danger to the life of Detritus anymore once he was outside the warehouse and its freezing temperatures, Cuddy nonetheless attempts to save Detritus from coming to harm. In this moment of crisis, Cuddy steps up and overcomes his own negative sentiments towards trolls by regarding Detritus as a colleague and not as the mortal enemy to his own species as his fellow dwarfs always led him to believe. In stark contrast to Cuddy, however, the onlooker who had to give up his coat displays the sentiments that CRT regards as 'normal' part of society. When asked by Cuddy to help Detritus because the troll is potentially in grave danger, his immediate concern is not directed at Detritus but instead what it would mean if someone is to actually give anything to a troll, as it then would apparently be worthless, at least to other humans. Ultimately, Cuddy had to coerce the man into giving away his coat because otherwise he would not have received any support at all. The result of this event is the first known friendship between a dwarf and a troll in all of Ankh-Morpork.

It is the Watch which provided them with a chance to truly meet each other without the deeply ingrained ideas of their enmity, or rather, the Watch forced them to lay aside these thoughts and feelings. Because of that, they come to realize that they are not so different after all, just two lads looking for a way to make a living for themselves and their families in the big city and not two 'natural enemies' that only have one thought in mind which is the extinction of the other:

"So...how come you joined the Watch, then?"

"Hah! My girl Ruby she say, you want get married, you get proper job, I not marry a troll what people say, him no good troll, him thick as a short plank of wood." Detritus' voice echoed in the darkness. "How about you?"

"I got bored. I worked for my brother-in-law, Durance. He's got a good business making fortune rats for dwarf restaurants. But I thought, this isn't a proper job for a dwarf."

"Sound like easy job to me."

"I had the devil of a time getting them to swallow the fortunes." (Pratchett *Men* 218)

Had it not been for them both joining Watch and Vetinari's policy compelling them into making contact with each other, this possibility to meet each other on equal terms most certainly would have never been possible. With these scenes, Pratchett wants to achieve two things. Firstly, Pratchett expresses his frustration as to why it is even necessary that two people of different races have to be compelled to even properly talk to each other. As it can be seen from these excerpts, in his opinion, a lot

of conflict and misunderstanding could have been and will be avoided by having people talk to each other even though they might look or sound differently than oneself. Secondly, Pratchett wants to present his readers with both the ignorance of letting prejudice guide one's actions and the naiveté of accepting stereotypes at face value. Forming an opinion about someone or an entire people or species based on the distorted memories of a distant event dating back many years, especially if both sides are telling the story from a point of view where they are the respective victims and it is of course the other side that are those to blame for it, as well as on stereotypes and prejudices handed down from one generation to the next may not be the best idea, to say the least. Mutual accusations are no way to settle the differences between the two species. Instead, a suggestion of how to remedy the 'normal racism' is for Pratchett communication between the parties in question. Only then, and even if it starts as small as one dwarf and one troll having to work together as police officers, larger negative sentiments can be overcome and the two sides can discover that despite existing differences in looks and culture, the others are actually rather similar and eventually, the alleged differences and the enmity and hatred can be done away with.

Especially with the fact that dwarfs and trolls do not bear many resemblances in terms of their appearance and way of living and still manage to find similarities, get together, and even make friends, Pratchett exposes all those to ridicule who insist on inherent racial differences and the incompatibility between one's own race or species and others, usually that of ethnic minorities. Moreover, the example of the fat man not wanting to give anything to the troll for fear of it losing re-use or re-sell value is another example of protreptic satire. Pratchett presents to the reader the ludicrousness of someone not unwilling to share a basic item such as a blanket or a coat with someone of a supposedly 'lesser' race than his own, even though it could result in Detritus coming to harm. If someone has a spark of decency in him or her, then it should never even be considered an option to let someone come to harm or risk the life of someone else only because of 'inconvenient' racial affiliations.

What Pratchett appears to be drawing on with the developing friendship between Cuddy and Detritus strongly reminds of what is generally known as the 'contact hypothesis'. This theory asserts that greater diversity fosters, among other things, "bet-

ter intergroup understanding [and] reduced intergroup prejudice” and it believes interracial contact to be “key to dispelling such prejudice and stereotyping [...] between people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds”. It derives its name from the assumption that through direct contact, various stereotypes and prejudices can be dispelled as it will be realized that these resulted from false assumptions due to limited or insufficient contact between diverse groups (Nieli 247). It was especially popular in the United States around the time of World War II due to the fact that in the fight against the Axis Powers, white soldiers with the most ‘exposure’ to black comrades often displayed a reduction of their prejudices against them (248-249). Unfortunately, however, this example seems only to be an exception to the rule that greater diversity does not automatically lead to a better understanding and less stereotypes between different groups or races. During the same time period, the American South proved the contact hypothesis wrong, since many Southerners had extensive contact with blacks but it can hardly be argued that this interaction led to a decrease in prejudice or a considerable improvement in the way blacks were treated by them (249-250). However, there are a number of conditions which, once they are met, actually prove the contact hypothesis to be true and allow for diversity to have the favorable outcomes. There has to be:

- equality of status between those making the contact;
- a noncompetitive environment in which one ethnic group’s gain is not seen to be at the expense of another group’s welfare;
- the opportunity to encounter sufficient numbers of people who counter the negative stereotype one group holds of the other;
- the challenge of a common goal or common task that requires some collective or cooperative effort to achieve;
- the lack of artificiality or Potemkin-like quality to the interaction;
- the support of wider community norms and those in authority (Nieli 250-251).

In the case of the Ankh-Morpork City Watch, all of these conditions, perhaps with the exception of the last one, are fulfilled within in, especially at the end of *Men at Arms* and even more so during *Feet of Clay*. The members of the Watch, the hierarchy of the individual ranks left aside, meet each other as equals, as fellow watchmen, and they are not supposed to compete but to cooperate with each other. Over time, the number and diversity increases considerably so that there is more than sufficient opportunity to meet a range of different people and species within the Watch. At the end of *Feet of Clay*, there are humans, dwarfs, trolls, a werewolf, a golem, a gargoyle, and several Special Constables of various backgrounds including an orangutan. As

for the rest of Ankh-Morpork, though, it is less the contact hypothesis but rather what critics of it have called the 'conflict hypothesis' that applies here. It claims to "describe more accurately the more typical relationships between people in the real world of demographically diverse populations" (251). Instead of improving the relationship between diverse populations, it is argued that contact is far more likely for communities to actually "harbor innate suspicions and distrust of one another, [...] find it more difficult to engage in cooperative ventures with one another than with members of their own group, [...] [and] display less willingness to support government measures to benefit the poor and distressed", among other things (251-252). What has to be taken into account with Pratchett's portrayal of the Watch is, however, that he did not intend to actually depict reality but a combination of the real and the fictional, of what is really happening and what is possible to become reality. Therefore, the way the contact hypothesis is applied here is to be considered an ideal, Pratchett's vision of how it could actually be as well as a reminder for his readers to think about how it could be able to achieve a better understanding between ethnic groups and how to dispel prejudices and stereotypes.

There is yet another aspect which needs to be covered of the life of the new guards in the Watch. As mentioned above, being a dwarf or a troll has had a big impact on their identity since the two species usually define themselves in opposition to each other. This conflict was brought with them into the Watch but diminishes the more time the two of them spent together. As a result, being in the Watch transformed their identity, creating a sort of Watch identity. If there is something like a motto for this Watch identity, then it is what Carrot idealistically proclaimed when there was doubt among the Watch members if they should actually investigate the murder of the dwarf Bjorn Hammerhock: "Who's going to do anything about it, if not us?' [...] 'We're the City Watch,' said Carrot. 'That doesn't mean just that part of the city who happens to be over four feet tall and made of flesh!'" (Pratchett *Men* 98). A moment where the newly developed identity of Cuddy and Detritus is visible happened directly after Cuddy procured a coat for Detritus after he is hauled out of the warehouse where he almost froze to death. Cuddy wants to take him directly to a troll doctor lest he falls ill with the troll equivalent of pneumonia or suffers any lasting damage from the bullet holes in his chest. Unfortunately, this means that he has to take Detritus to Quarry Lane, the hub of the troll population in Ankh-Morpork and therefore usually no-go ar-

ea for dwarfs who are fond of their life and limbs. Cuddy deliberately takes this risk for his colleague and now also friend Detritus in order to ensure that he is taken care of. Unfortunately, it immediately turns out to be a dangerous undertaking, once Cuddy had entered Quarry Lane:

There were, suddenly, trolls everywhere.

I'm a guard, thought Cuddy. That's what Sergeant Colon said. Stop being a dwarf and start being a Watchman. That's what I am. Not a dwarf. A Watchman. They gave me a badge, shaped like a shield. City Watch, that's me. I carry a badge.

I wish it was a lot bigger.

[...]

Finally, one of them said, "What dis, then?"

"He a man of the Watch, same as me," said Detritus.

"Him a dwarf."

"He a Watchman." (Pratchett *Men* 206-207)

Through his employment as Watchman, Cuddy undergoes a change in his identity, based on the experiences he gains during the time in the Watch. He is not 'merely' a dwarf working and living in Ankh-Morpork anymore, now he is a dwarf *watchman* who serves all citizens of Ankh-Morpork regardless of their group, class, religious, or political affiliations, even if it is a troll like Detritus. In turn, Detritus also underwent a change. Like Cuddy, he considers himself a watchman now, even though he would not have ever dared to think about teaming up with a dwarf before joining the Watch. This kind of profound change is very difficult to accomplish, especially given the short time frame in which the two of them managed to achieve this feat. It is only possible based on the assumption that identity is in fact "a process [...] not a 'thing'. It is not something that one can *have*, or not; it is something that one *does*" (Jenkins 5, original emphasis). Within days, the two of them went from not even want to have a drink together to risking one's life to protect the other. The Watch plays an important role as an intermediary of the change the two are going through. It is a vehicle through which both of them are stripped of a substantial part of their identity, that is, the old enmity, only to be equipped with a new sense of identity, that of a Watchmen who does not (or at least should not) discriminate unreasonably against any citizen of Ankh-Morpork. Pratchett understands the significance of identity, the necessity to be able to identify with something, since "identity is about belonging, about what you have in common with some people and what differentiates you from others" (Weedon 88). With this scene, Pratchett satirizes those who place too much emphasis on identity based on an essentialist view of identity which assumes that identity is something

given, something innate that in fact cannot be subject to change (Barker, Jane 166). If that would be the case, Cuddy and Detritus would have been more or less bound to hate each other as a matter of principle, without any possibility to change this fact. That is, through the presentation of mutual enmity they would define themselves, based on a historical event and everything that this entails, the Battle of Koom Valley and the long-lasting hostility it caused. Hence, Pratchett's message is that there is no reason at all to keep clinging to such a kind of cultural essentialism which proclaims that there is "one, shared culture, a sort of collective 'one true self'" reflecting shared historical events, on the basis of which "'one people', with stable, unchanging and continuous frames of reference and meaning" is created (Hall *Diaspora* 223).

"Ain't no dwarfs or trolls or humans in the Watch" – The social construction of race

Over time, the Watch develops a certain appeal to citizens with a minority background because any member can expect to be treated fairly, based on his or her abilities as well as in terms of commitment, trust, teamwork, etc. The Watch thereby removes any boundaries based on species, class, gender, or any other feature discriminatory behavior can be based on, that is, least this is the principle that the Watch now more or less operates on, for most of the time. Like Vimes phrased it, "[w]e're just one big family and, when you've been to a few domestic disputes, Littlebottom, I can assure you that you'll see the resemblance" (Pratchett *Feet* 33). So, in a sense, the Watch could be seen as Pratchett's idea of an egalitarian society where anyone who is part of this motley crew is essentially equal. It could be argued that the Watch represents not an *ideal* society, but that of a *functioning* society, a world where multiculturalism works as smoothly as possible. In other words, Pratchett's idea of a utopia is not a perfect place without any problems at all, especially since life in the Watch is by no means easy but often difficult and frustrating. Instead, it seems to be the case that Pratchett would be entirely satisfied with a world where at least discrimination based on race and ethnicity, gender, or any other superficial categories does not exist. Pratchett even incorporates considerations of ignoring race or species altogether into the Watch Trilogy, as it can be seen in the following scene:

"And your name, mister?"

"SILAS! CUMBERBATCH!"

"Didn't you used to be town crier?"

"THAT'S RIGHT!"

"Right. Give him his shilling. Acting-Constable Cuddy? One for your squad."

“WHO’S ACTING-CONSTABLE CUDDY?” said Cumberbatch.

“Down here, mister.”

The man looked down.

“BUT YOU’RE! A DWARF! I NEVER—”

“Stand to attention when you’re talking to a superierierior officer!” Cuddy bel-
lowed.

“Ain’t no dwarfs or trolls or humans in the Watch, see,” said Colon. “Just
Watchmen, see? That’s what Corporal Carrot says. Of course, if you’d like to
be in Acting-Constable Detritus’ squad—”

“I LIKE DWARFS,” said Cumberbatch, hurriedly. “ALWAYS HAVE. NOT THAT
THERE ARE ANY IN THE WATCH, MIND,” he added, after barely a second’s
thought. (Pratchett *Men* 301)

Here, the Watch’s effort in creating an environment of equality where difference in species are deliberately overlooked is exemplified. This approach is called ‘color-blindness’, which represents the “belief that one should treat all persons equally, without regard to their race” (Delgado, Stefancic 170) and is often viewed as a viable method to battle racism. It is based on the notion that race and alleged differences based on race should have no impact on decision-making processes ranging from first impressions of someone to decision making involved in hiring and college admission. “The logic underlying the belief that color blindness can prevent prejudice and discrimination is straightforward: If people or institutions do not even notice race, then they cannot act in a racially biased manner” (Apfelbaum et al. 205). Norton et al. summarize the rationale of proponents of color-blindness even more succinctly: “If I do not notice race, then I cannot be a racist” (949). Supporters recognize that “noticing race is a necessary precursor to racism”. However, it is also acknowledged that race is usually more or less automatically recognized and any information or beliefs one has about the respective race is activated, independent of whether or not this is actually a conscious process. As a result, if one is to act as if he or she does not notice race, any incentive to actually tackle real issues caused by race and negative associations based on race is inhibited (949). The idea that racism can be stopped by not noticing race was epitomized in 2007 by U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice John Roberts who argued in a case that “[t]he way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race” (Apfelbaum et al. 205). Unsurprisingly, opponents of racial equality and integration embrace this reasoning. Theorists of color-blindness present themselves as “defender[s] of individualism and meritocracy” claiming that “race-conscious politics undervalues individual autonomy” (Emerson 694).

In contrast, critical race theorists emphasize that “the continuing prevalence of racial inequality” necessitates legislation which acknowledges this inequality and takes measures to remedy the disparity between white and non-white (Emerson 694). From the perspective of CRT, color-blindness is able to “remedy only the most blatant forms of discrimination” (Delgado, Stefancic 8). It also corresponds with the other CRT tenet of “racism as normal”, because the promotion of color-blindness through the majority culture as well as an unwavering believe in meritocracy “allow whites to feel consciously irresponsible for the hardships people of color face and encounter daily and [...] they also maintain whites’ power and strongholds” (Hartlep 7). Even though the idea itself might have a liberal and equitable appeal to it, color-blindness – inadvertently or not – only solidifies the status quo instead of actually improving conditions; it claims to be neutral when in fact it only delivers a “false sense of neutrality” (Hartlep 7) that maintains the control of those elites that had held in anyway. Abby Ferber observes that “[c]olor-blind racism assumes racial discrimination has ended, people are being treated in a color-blind fashion, and any differences we see in the success of racial groups is therefore due to inherent differences in the groups themselves. Color-blind ideology leads to the conclusion that we have done all we can” (66). Furthermore, the policy of color-blindness is also criticized for refusing to acknowledge that historic events and developments do have considerable implications in contemporary societies (Gillborn, Ladson-Billings 341).

It is not entirely conclusive whether Pratchett included color-blindness in *Men at Arms* to actually promote it as a viable method to combat racism and prejudice, or if he intended his depiction of it as a satirical criticism and warning of the inadequacy and the way it actually counteracts ambitions to reduce the awareness of racial differences, at least if one is to believe in the conclusions of the opponents of color-blindness. Either way, it definitely corresponds with Griffith’s second assumption of the core principles of satire. According to him, a satirist’s task is not to approvingly write about certain moral standards or practices which often constitute an “irreducible moral minimum for sentient beings” which would not justify the effort of explicitly endorsing them in the first place (Griffin 37). In this case, it would refer to the fact that Pratchett did not explicitly state his personal position regarding color-blindness but instead provide his readers with “the implications of a given moral position” (Griffin

37), that is, racism and color-blindness as a potential counter measure, without anticipating the conclusions the readers should draw from the topic within the text itself.

In this regard, there are at least two possible interpretations why Pratchett included the policies of affirmative action and color-blindness in his novels. On the one hand, it could be the case that Pratchett wanted to actually demonstrate that affirmative action and color-blindness are only small steps in order to achieve a non-racist society and that he wants to convey that these alone are insufficient and further measures are absolutely necessary; that affirmative action and color-blindness should not constitute the greater part of the entire political incentives in terms of the promotion of a more equal society. Especially from a CRT perspective, the actions described in the books do not even help to improve the situation of the minorities in any way but actually solidify them, therefore exposing the shortcomings of these policies. On the other hand, it should be safe to assume that Pratchett did in fact incorporate them for idealistic reasons, to show that improvement is mandatory and can in fact be achieved through these measures, even though he might not have taken into consideration that their extent might be limited, though. In the case of the Night Watch and later of the entire City Watch, the affirmative action hiring and color-blindness do indeed improve the relationship among minority groups, which would have otherwise almost certainly either never happened or taken considerably longer to achieve, so there is a definite upside to it. While, as stated above, there is indeed no change in the composition of the (human) individuals holding the most powerful positions in Ankh-Morpork and therefore no real socio-political progress, the Watch itself over time improves by admitting even more minority members (such as golems, gargoyles, and zombies) and gaining more esteem as well as increasing the social situation of its employees continually, so there is at least an improvement for those employed in the Watch. At the end of *Men at Arms*, there is a temporary roll call of the total number of watchmen in the City Watch. The short dialogue between Vimes and Carrot contains one of the most important conclusions that can be drawn from the three books, namely that *all* the members of the Watch are citizens of Ankh-Morpork in the sense that all of them are equal:

“Blimey,” he said eventually. “Fifty-six?”

“Yes, sir. Detritus is looking forward to breaking them in.”

“Including undead? It says here open to all, regardless of species or mortal status—”

“Yes, sir,” said Carrot, firmly. “They’re all citizens.” (Pratchett *Men* 377)

Generally speaking, Pratchett described the state on the Discworld in regard to the speciesism on it in another one of his Discworld novels called *Witches Abroad* this way: "Racism was not a problem on the Discworld, because – what with trolls and dwarfs and so on – speciesism was more interesting. Black and white lived in perfect harmony and ganged up on green" (*Witches Abroad* 262). In *Men at Arms*, he phrased it similarly: "There was, on the whole, no real racial prejudice in Ankh-Morpork; when you've got dwarfs and trolls, the mere colour of other humans is not a major item" (Pratchett *Men* 225). What these quotes allude to is another one of the main tenets of Critical Race Theory, the social construction of race. That is, the assumption that race is constructed socially, usually by the ruling majority, and not based on scientific findings which would justify the extent of differentiation and discrimination between races found in a particular society. Through social construction, "races are distinctively constructed to exist only in relation to one another" and "there is a system of privilege and oppression [established] through which racial social groups are constructed" (Applebaum 36-38). While it is true that in case of Ankh-Morpork, there are actually clear differences between the species living in the city, they are, as it was shown with the example of Cuddy and Detritus, not so different after all if one is to look past the differences in shape. The differences between the different ethnic groups could be interpreted as a form exaggeration by Pratchett in order to make the system of discrimination even more visible and ridiculous. In Ankh-Morpork, it is a system of non-humans versus humans because the overwhelming majority of both the population and the individual members of the leadership of Ankh-Morpork is human, and non-humans have no possibility to reach out to these leaders and voice their own thoughts, ideas, or concerns, much less to reach such a top position themselves. Decision making is exclusively a matter of the human majority and mainly for human interests and there is no real interest in solving the crisis, as it is potentially detrimental to the Patrician's and the leaders' common goal of both keeping the city going the way it used to and protecting their own base of power, i.e. the control over the guilds as well as to the position of the Patrician and therefore the entire city. As shown above, people like Catterail are very much in support of this system and gladly accept any justification to maintain it. Therefore, the construction of the minorities in the city as inferior, uncivilized, or even dangerous serves the purpose perfectly, since then the policymakers in the city can both continue to consolidate or even expand their power within the city as well as they can rely on the contin-

ued support from the majority of the human population who themselves benefit from a segregated society, as Catterail, for example, can continue to keep up the exploitation of golems in his factory.

With the Ankh-Morpork City Watch, Pratchett blurs the line between the real and the fictional in regard to issues of race and identity and manages to mirror reality to an often great extent. Racism is both in Ankh-Morpork as well as in the real world an issue of high topicality and Pratchett clearly positions himself against any form of discrimination purely based on physical appearance or ethnic background. As a result of the Discworld actually having different species in it, there is actual speciesism, especially in the city of Ankh-Morpork. Particularly by stating that “when you’ve got dwarfs and trolls, the mere colour of other humans is not a major item” in *Men at Arms* (225), Pratchett demonstrates the absurdity and the pettiness of the racism we as humans in the real world often display. The fact that in Ankh-Morpork there are actually different species and they still manage to coexist in a more or less peaceful manner particularly ridicules the fact that we as humans, despite the fact that we are all basically the same with only the slightest difference in appearance, nonetheless manage to *construct* difference that justify discrimination and violence against each other. If the Watch with its multi-species members is viewed as a kind of microcosm of what society in Ankh-Morpork *could* look like, then it serves the purpose of demonstrating the possibility of a peaceful coexistence despite apparent differences, especially because Watchmen are explicitly constructed as equals within the Watch. Based on the analysis of the Ankh-Morpork City Watch novels, it can be presumed that according to Pratchett, discrimination and prejudice based on race should be done away with entirely. He demonstrates that despite the fact that there are members of a variety of different species in the Watch and the potential for conflict which ensues from this, the watchmen still manage to coexist and cooperate in a mostly peaceful manner. To him, this is the example which should be followed by us as humans.

“The City Watche Needs Men! Be A Man In The City Watch!” – Gender and identity

“You never said you were a werewolf!” – Intersectionality

During the affirmative action hiring process, three new members were introduced into service in the Night Watch, two of whom, Cuddy the dwarf and Detritus the troll, were already addressed in the chapters above. In this chapter, the focus is now on the third new member, Angua von Überwald, a young werewolf woman originally from the Überwald region. At the time of her hiring, Angua is the sole female watch(wo)man in Ankh-Morpork, a fact which caused some confusion as to why she was hired in the first place. This is illustrated in one of the first interactions between Angua and Carrot as he accompanies her on her first patrol through the city:

“I don’t think [Vimes] likes the new recruits.”

The other thing about Constable Carrot was that he was incapable of lying.

“Well, he doesn’t like trolls much,” he said. “We couldn’t get a word out of him all day when he heard we had to advertise for a troll recruit. And then we had to have a dwarf, otherwise they’d be trouble. I’m a dwarf, too, but the dwarfs here don’t believe it.”

“You don’t say?” said Angua, looking up at him.

“My mother had me by adoption.”

“Oh. Yes, but I’m not a troll or a dwarf,” said Angua sweetly.

“No, but you’re a w—”

Angua stopped. “That’s it, is it? Good grief! This *is* the Century of the Fruitbat, you know. Ye gods, does he really think like that?”

“He’s a bit set in his ways.”

“Congealed, I should think.”

“The Patrician said we had to have a bit of representation from the minority groups,” said Carrot.

“Minority groups!” (Pratchett *Men* 28-29)

This scene is indicative of another one of Pratchett’s areas of attention of his satirical criticism in the City Watch Trilogy: the way women are treated in Ankh-Morpork. The scene is cleverly crafted by Pratchett by not letting Carrot finish the word he wanted to say (“w—”), because at this point it is not yet known to the reader that Angua is both woman and werewolf and Carrot could have meant so say either one of the two words. However, Carrot most certainly wanted to say “woman”. This assumption is grounded on the fact that he is quite shocked when he eventually finds out about Angua’s secret werewolf descent when talking to Fred Colon, who confides to him that “[Vimes] sort of said, ‘Fred, she’s a damn werewolf. I don’t like it any more than

you do, but Vetinari says we've got to take one of them as well, and a werewolf's better than a vampire or a zombie, and that's all there is to it" (Pratchett *Men* 322). Thus, in the beginning, Carrot is under the incorrect impression that Vimes was ordered to hire Angua because she belongs to a certain 'minority group' in the city, that is, because she is a woman. Angua's incredulity is reflected through her reference to the current Century of the Fruitbat⁷, a time of proclaimed liberalism, where freedom, tolerance, and open-mindedness *should* be the defining qualities of every citizen of Ankh-Morpork and discrimination based on race, gender, or class *should* be a thing of the past: "Angua stopped. 'That's it, is it? Good grief! This *is* the Century of the Fruitbat, you know. Ye gods, does he really think like that?'" (Pratchett *Men* 28).

As for equal opportunities for women, Pratchett uses Angua's enrollment in the Watch to demonstrate that this is not quite the case in Ankh-Morpork. Instead, it illustrates how women are systematically disadvantaged, as can be seen from how the scene continues:

Mr. Flannel looked Angua up and down. Men seldom missed the opportunity.

"Why's she got a helmet on?" he said.

"She's a new recruit, Mr. Flannel."

Angua gave Mr. Flannel a smile. He stepped back.

"But she's a—"

"Got to move with the times, Mr. Flannel," said Carrot, putting his notebook away. (Pratchett *Men* 29)

Similar to above, we do not know with absolute certainty whether or not Flannel actually knows about Angua being a werewolf or if he only wanted to say that she is a woman, it should be safe to assume that he does refer to her being a woman (especially due to him looking her "up and down") and therefore apparently regards her as out of place in the Night Watch considering her social status as a woman in Ankh-Morpork. At this point, it can already be seen that although the times should actually be different in terms of how women are treated, certain people consider women still inferior to men. What can perhaps also be deduced from this scene is that the general population, if this citizen is regarded as symbolic for the majority of the population, does not have a high regard towards a woman in the Watch, that is, a woman in a position which requires (literally) taking up the baton and hold a position of certain

7 Each century on the Discworld is named; the Century of the Fruitbat was preceded by the Century of the Three Lice and followed by the Century of the Anchovy, according to the Ankh-Morpork calendar.

power and respect. This sets the tone for the way Angua is being discriminated against purely based on her being a woman in the Watch, even without taking into account that her position is compounded by the fact that she is a werewolf which could very likely be considered an even bigger issue to many people than being a woman.

Through the way Angua is perceived in her new occupation, Pratchett shows his awareness and criticism of gender-specific stereotypes and role models, especially in regard to the participation of women in the labor market. To this day, there are certain roles and attributes specifically associated with men and women. Men are often considered to be independent, rational, self-confident, egoistic, unrelenting, and competitive. At the same time, women are regarded as emotional, compliant, submissive, empathetic, timid, and weak. If these expectations are not fulfilled or someone clearly deviates from these prescriptive 'norms', then the stereotypes form a basis of legitimacy for societal sanctions such as marginalization or discrimination (Kaup 67-68). A meta-analysis conducted by Hyde of more than 2 000 studies of gender differences, however, did not confirm these assumptions of innate differences between men and women. Instead, supported by the actual findings of the meta-analysis, she put forward a "gender similarities hypothesis [which] states, instead, that males and females are alike on most – but not all – psychological variables" (Hyde 590). Particularly vulnerable to such ascriptions of a lack in 'manly' qualities are women who are on the edge of entering positions of influence and power, for instance in major companies, but are eventually passed over in the considerations for important promotions due to their allegedly missing personal qualities based on their biology. The dilemma of the situation is, however, that even if a woman actually exhibits the necessary character traits and manages to reach a top position, she could be confronted with accusations of not being a 'typical, a 'proper' woman because she refuses to take on the role associated with women in society, namely that of a mother and caretaker as opposed to a 'natural' male leader (Trenkmann 25-26). Implicitly, Pratchett's criticism is also directed at capitalism because this system of androcentrism originates in the separation between the public and the professional as opposed to the private and domestic sphere in (proto-)capitalist societies. This resulted in a relatively strict division of labor tasks along gender lines where women were responsible for housekeeping and re-

productive work which had a formative influence on the subsequent perceptions on masculinity and femininity (Knaut, Heidler 141).

Aside from the hostility towards her she is sometimes met with because she dared to deny to comply with the gender expectations set for her by society as she entered into the male-dominated sphere of the Watch, there is another kind of discrimination she has to endure in the beginning of her career in the Watch due to her being a woman. At first, Carrot is concerned about her vulnerability as a seemingly fragile and lone woman without friends or family in the big city of Ankh-Morpork. He feels the need to protect and take care of her as it is apparently his idea of masculinity since his original motivation of joining the Watch was to “have a man made of him” there (Pratchett *Guards* 40). Unknowingly however, despite meaning well, he rather alienated than supported Angua through his overly protective behavior, as it can be seen in the following scene:

“Where are you staying?” said Carrot.

“Just down there.” She pointed.

“Elm Street? Not *Mrs. Cake’s*?”

[...]

“I mean, doesn’t it strike you the place is a bit odd?”

“But the rates are reasonable and the beds are clean.”

“I shouldn’t think anyone ever sleeps in them.”

“All *right!* I had to take what I could *get!*”

“Sorry. I know how it is. I was like that myself when I first arrived here. But my advice is to move out as soon as it’s polite and find somewhere...well...more suitable for a young lady, if you know what I mean.”

“Not really. Mr. Shoe even tried to help me upstairs with my stuff. Mind you, I had to help him upstairs with his arms afterwards. Bits fall off him all the time, poor soul.”

“But they’re not really...our kind of people,” said Carrot wretchedly. “Don’t get me wrong. I mean...dwarfs? Some of my best friends are dwarfs. My *parents* are dwarfs. Trolls? No problem at *all* with trolls. Salt of the earth. Literally. Wonderful chaps under all that crust. But...undead...I just wish they’d go back to where they came from, that’s all.”

“Most of them came from round here.”

“I just don’t like ’em. Sorry.” (Pratchett *Men* 103-104)

Carrot is worried because Angua stays in a place which is generally known to host what would usually be considered ‘bad company’, including zombies, ghouls, vampires, and other undead who have certain difficulties living in ordinary lodgings and Carrot is afraid she might fall victim to. His usual composure and open-mindedness seems to vanish when his prejudices towards undead people get the upper hand and

he urges Angua to stay away from them. The irony of the situation is of course that he does not know Angua is undead herself and he ultimately tries to protect her from herself. So, he also inadvertently tells her to “go back to where [she] came from”, which he of course only said because he thought he was speaking to another fellow human being. In fact, he is speaking to a member of the Ankh-Morpork undead community, someone who is affected by such kind of sentiments. If he had known, he would have never said this to her, which could be viewed as the core message of the scene. Only because he assumes that she is not affected, he admits to her his speciesism towards undead. She immediately retorts that “most of them came from round here” and exposes the ridiculousness and the stereotypical elements of Carrot’s argument. To make matters worse, Carrot’s justification that he has no antipathy against dwarfs and trolls only serves to deepen the hypocrisy of his resentment to undead people as liking one minority is no justification for hating another. It is scene like this that confirm the necessity of a place like *Mrs. Cake’s* for Angua and her fellow undead to stay at also shows that there is not much support for those who deviate from the ‘norm’. They have to stay among themselves in order to avoid quarrels and hostilities, even from Carrot, who is usually on good terms with everyone in Ankh-Morpork and in turn “even people he was arresting liked Carrot. Even old ladies living in a permanent smell of fresh paint liked Carrot” (Pratchett *Feet* 60). Still, he feels strongly about undead people in a negative way, even though he never explains why. With this scene, Pratchett once more reminds of the complex and pervasive nature of racism/speciesism. While Carrot is otherwise presented as the nicest person imaginable, even he displays speciesist sentiments when it comes to a certain minority. Without depicting Carrot’s behavior in an apologetic way, Pratchett does not portray Carrot in a bad way, that is, he does not present him as a bad person because of his speciesist lapse in regard to the undead. Because interestingly enough, in regard to the conflict between dwarfs and trolls presented above, Carrot argued in a level-headed manner that the Battle of Koom Valley “was a long time ago and we shouldn’t let ancient history blind us to the realities of a multi-ethnic society in the Century of the Fruitbat” (Pratchett *Feet* 62). Carrot could be seen to fulfill a different function. To the reader, his character should both make the pervasiveness of racism obvious as well as show the necessity of self-reflection in regard to racism. Pratchett rather suggests that because racism is so ‘normal’, it both has to be taken seriously and can also be overcome if dealt with appropriately, namely by raising awareness

and facilitating possibilities to face one's own racist sentiments. In the case of Carrot, he eventually finds out about Angua's undead origin and is momentarily rather bewildered. However, given some time to reflect upon the situation, Carrot overcomes his aversion towards the undead, reconciles with Angua and the two of them even develop a lasting romantic relationship.

Carrot's impression of Angua is wrong in two ways. As depicted above, she is not human but a werewolf. Additionally, Carrot's concern for Angua's safety due to her apparent vulnerability and dependency on others to ensure her safety is misplaced, too. As it is to be expected of a werewolf, Angua is quite able to defend herself. In *Feet of Clay*, when Angua has already established herself as a more than capable Watch officer, a bar is robbed, or rather, there is an attempt to rob a bar by three unsuspecting robbers. Unknowingly, they chose a bar almost exclusively frequented by Watch guards off duty. Their demand "Don't nobody move! Anyone moves and they're dead!" is met with unexpected obedience, as nobody really cares about them, so that "[t]o their own surprise their arrival didn't seem to have caused much of a stir" (Pratchett *Men* 181). In their increasing confusion that everyone in the room including the owner of the bar refuse to be intimidated, they grow more and more desperate. As one final attempt to turn the tide in their favor, one of the three robbers regards it as a good idea to take Angua hostage, which, again, did not provide the desired outcome:

The boldest of the three moved suddenly, grabbed Angua and pulled her upright. "We walk out of here unharmed or the girl gets it, all right?" he snarled. Someone sniggered.

"I hope you're not going to kill anyone," said Carrot.

"That's up to us!"

"Sorry, was I talking to you?" said Carrot.

"Don't worry, I'll be fine," said Angua. She looked around to make sure Cheery wasn't there, and then sighed. "Come on, gentlemen, let's get it over with." (Pratchett *Feet* 183)

Due to her ability to turn into a wolf, Angua has no problem fending off the three of them (with several "self-inflicted wounds while resisting arrest" (Pratchett *Feet* 185)). While at first glance this scene could be dismissed as merely a funny incident of an attempted robbery gone terribly wrong, there is more to it than that. It could be interpreted as Pratchett's answer to chauvinism, as his characterization of Angua could be read as Pratchett's firm belief that women in general are more than capable of

taking care of themselves without having to rely on 'chivalrous' men for their own protection, and that stereotypical machismo is out of place and date. Pratchett furthermore rejects a social construction of gender which attributes traits like weakness or dependency to women and which expects them to behave in a submissive or obedient way towards men but instead act confidently and to be aware of one's own strengths.

Unfortunately, though, Angua's special abilities which allow her to take care of herself are also a major reason why she has to live a life on the fringes of society in Ankh-Morpork. It is *especially* because she can take of herself due to her werewolf nature that she is met with suspicion and hostility. Angua is a perfect example of intersectionality, the combination of several in itself discriminatory characteristics which poses a considerably greater risk of discrimination than the particular features occurring in isolation (Delgado, Stefancic 58). In this case, Angua is both woman and werewolf, a species dangerous to humans and therefore naturally feared and generally shunned by human societies. Angua herself, however, is as non-violent and peaceful as she can possibly be with this kind of condition. She follows a strictly vegetarian except at full moon when her self-restraint is severely impaired and she cannot help but to quench the bloodthirst of her werewolf desires. Even then, though, she forces herself only to prey on animals. What is more, to the best of her knowledge, she has never attacked another human, dwarf, or any other sentient and conscious being. Nonetheless, the stigma of being a werewolf is always on her. When asked by Carrot why she joined the Watch in the first place, she is forced to admit that she did not have many alternatives but to join:

"Why did *you* join?" he said.

"Me? Oh, I...I like to eat meals and sleep indoors. Anyway, there isn't that much choice, is there? It was that or become...hah...a seamstress."

"And you're not very good at sewing?"

Angua's sharp glance saw nothing but honest innocence in his face.

"Yes," she said, giving up, "that's right. And then I saw this poster. 'The City Watche Needs Men! Be A Man In The City Watch!' So I thought I'd give it a go. After all, I'd only have something to gain." (Pratchett *Men* 100-101)

Closely related to her issue of finding appropriate housing in Ankh-Morpork, Angua has to face difficulties finding employment because she is only human "three weeks out of four" (Pratchett *Feet* 300). As a result, the Watch's offer of employment provided a way to escape the difficult situation her intersectionality has put her in and the

lengths she has to go to in order to survive in the male- and especially human-dominated society of Ankh-Morpork. There is also considerable cynicism in this scene. Angua is desperate for a possibility to lead a calm and peaceful life in the city simply because of what she is and the way people react to her. Joining the Watch is therefore an actual improvement to the dire situation she is in and to what other alternatives she would have, the same Watch that is the *very* last resort for humans with truly nowhere else to go. Additionally, it would apparently also constitute an improvement for Angua if she were to become “A *Man* In The City Watch” instead of a woman in the Watch, especially as she later tells another female Watch recruit in *Feet of Clay* that “[y]ou can be any sex you like provided you act male. There’s no men and women in the Watch, just a bunch of lads. [...] Just think egotesticle” (Pratchett *Feet* 193-194). Although “just a bunch of lads” implies a certain sense of egalitarianism within the Watch, as the term ‘lads’ already indicates the only way to ‘survive’ in the Watch apparently is to put your femininity aside and act male.

Unsurprisingly, Angua’s intersectionality entails substantial self-doubt and an ongoing struggle with her fate in society. She occasionally reflects about whether or not she should or even want to continue to stand up to the attitudes and behaviors displayed towards her by a vast majority especially of the (human) population of Ankh-Morpork. Or to be more precise, towards what she represents as a werewolf, since usually people do not know about her condition when she does not tell them due to her looking like an ordinary women for most of the month.

She was a werewolf. That’s all there was to it. You either spent your time trying to make sure people didn’t find out or you let them find out and spent your time watching them keep their distance and whisper behind your back, although of course you’d have to turn round to watch that.

[...]

It was just as her father had said. Get involved with humans other than at mealtimes and you might as well jump down a silver mine. (Pratchett *Feet* 60-61)

Unless people find out about her secret, she is usually treated like any other young woman in Ankh-Morpork. If they do find out that she is a member of the undead community, however, her fate is sealed in that she is perpetually confronted with doubts and suspicions whether or not she will attack them or someone else around her. If there was ever any respect for her before, it quickly diminishes in the face of the overwhelming fear of the werewolf in her, regardless of her actual behavior and the almost non-existent danger that she might lose control over her genes.

Her own experiences of being discriminated against do not prevent her from having her own feelings of resentment towards another disadvantaged group of beings in Ankh-Morpork, though. As she herself notes, “[p]eople always needed someone to feel superior to. The living hated the undead, and the undead loathed [...] the unalive” (Pratchett *Feet* 134). Hence, when she and Carrot are pursuing Dorfl the golem (golems belong to the group of the unalive) after freeing it from its previous owner, Carrot senses Angua’s hatred of golems and asks her about it:

Carrot ran a few steps after the figure, and then stopped and came back.

“Why do you hate them so much?” he said.

“You wouldn’t understand. I really think you wouldn’t understand,” said Angua.

“It’s an...undead thing. They...sort of throw in your face the fact you’re not human.”

“But you *are* human!”

“Three weeks out of four. Can’t you understand that, when you have to be careful all the time, it’s dreadful to see things like that being accepted? They’re not even alive. But they can walk around and they never get people passing remarks about silver or garlic...up until now, anyway. They’re just machines for doing work!” (Pratchett *Feet* 300)

With this scene, Pratchett on the one hand raises awareness for the fact that racism is by no means exclusive to the majority but also exists among minority group themselves, a form of racism referred to as ‘inter-minority racism’ (Harbi 144). On the other hand, through Angua’s jealousy of the golem, Pratchett also criticizes a sort of pick and choose-attitude of the group in power when it comes to dealing with minorities and favoring certain groups over others. Even though both undead and golems are minorities, there is a differences in the way they are received by the dominant group, based on how *useful* they actually are for those in power. While humans can benefit and especially profit from having golems a in their workshops and factories as cheap, reliable, uncomplaining, low maintenance workers, the undead literally do have a voice of their own which golems do not possess and they have their own wants and needs which often are in conflict with the interests of human authorities of Ankh-Morpork. Werewolves pose a potentially existential threat to humans, as they are both more aware of the dismal situation they are in and also more than capable to resist and fight back if they see no other way out of their desperate situation. Therefore, humans are much more averse towards werewolves than golems, even though werewolves are far more similar or almost identical to ‘normal’ humans except for their special condition of turning into a wolf once a month. Because golems fit human

interests much better than werewolves, though, they are treated better in the sense that they are 'simply' exploited as a cheap labor force without being physically or emotionally abused. This corresponds with the observation of proponents of CRT and their tenets of the social construction of race and interest convergence. As long as the dominant majority profits or at least does not see any disadvantages stemming from a certain group being tolerated or at least being treated marginally better, no objections are raised. If this assessment changes, though, then also the way the individual minority group is constructed does change relative to their usefulness to the group in power.

While Angua is fully aware that her resentment towards golems is irrational, she simultaneously hates and envies them because they are more accepted even though they are in general much less human than she is, but they are more useful and entirely submissive to human interests. This artificially created preference of one minority over the other by the majority could be viewed as a reference to and a criticism of the myth of 'model minorities'. These are a stereotype that refers to the "representation of Asian Americans as a *racial* minority whose apparently successful *ethnic* assimilation was a result of stoic patience, political obedience, and self-improvement" (Lee 145, original emphasis) during the height of the Cold War in the 1960s, where Asian Americans were seen as "the paragon of ethnic virtue" and "should be emulated by Negroes and other minorities" (Lee 145). At the time, this myth was created in order to signal to the rest of the world and especially the Third World that "the United States was a liberal democratic state where people of color could enjoy equal rights and upward mobility" and as a "narrative of Americanization" and the American Dream while segregation and civil rights movements were a major issues within the U.S. itself. However, it was geo-politically opportune to outwardly present the U.S. as a kind of paragon of virtue in order to win other countries over to their side in the constant conflict with the Soviet Union that shaped the period of the Cold War (Lee 146).

Pratchett's intention with the characterization of Angua seems to be clear. He condemns the discrimination of women based on gender-specific stereotypes and demonstrates the hardship that those affected by intersectionality have to endure. Through Angua, Pratchett creates a compelling case that women should not let themselves be sold short of their actual abilities and that they, as well as everyone

else for that matter, should defy prescribed gender roles which clearly discriminate against women. Instead, he advocates for strong and self-confident women who should not let herself be discouraged by those who cannot or do not want to appreciate and acknowledge women as equals and equally capable.

“Female? He told you he was female?” – Gender and performativity

Angua von Überwald is the first and most established female member of the Watch. However, she is not the only one by the end of *Men at Arms* and even more so after *Feet of Clay*. There are, amongst others, also several women in the Ankh-Morpork City Watch who are not immediately recognizable as female, or to be more precise, who display no immediate features which would usually characterize them as female by any modern standards: dwarf women. Dwarfs, as it is generally known since one of the most famous and most revered works in fantasy literature, J.R.R. Tolkien’s *The Lord of the Rings*, one cannot discern between male and female dwarfs solely by looking at them as all dwarfs have a similar outward appearance:

"It was said by Gimli that there are few Dwarf-women, probably no more than a third of the whole people. They seldom walk abroad except at great need. They are in voice and appearance, and in garb if they must go on a journey, so like to the Dwarf-men that the eyes and ears of other peoples cannot tell them apart. This has given rise to the foolish opinion among Men that there are no Dwarf-women, and that the Dwarves 'grow out of stone'." (Tolkien Appendix A iii)

The same is true for dwarfs living on the Discworld. They all basically look the same and have similar names like Lars Skulldrinker, Abba Stronginthearm, or Hrolf Thighbiter, the first of which being actually female (cf. Pratchett *Feet* 357). This fact is not a topic of public interest and discussion, though. Instead “the pronoun [he] is used by dwarfs to indicate both sexes. All dwarfs have beards and wear up to twelve layers of clothing. Gender is more or less optional” (Pratchett *Guards* 36), even dwarfs themselves are not often unclear on the actual sex of other dwarfs (cf. *Feet* 413).

From a present-day perspective Pratchett’s discussion of an exclusive use of a single (male) pronoun to indicate both male and female is especially topical and appears like an anticipation of a time of increasing sensitivity concerning sexist language. That is, Pratchett includes a discussion of language that “unnecessarily differentiate between women and men or exclude, trivialize, or diminish either gender” (Parks,

Roberton 455) as well as non-binary perceptions of gender and gender identities reflected in the use of epicene and gender-neutral pronouns (Sarrasin, Gabriel, Gyga 113-114). Apart from the obvious parody of Tolkien's concept of dwarfs, Pratchett uses this as an opportunity to discuss the topics of the social construction of gender especially in terms of an essentialist view of gender, performativity and the tensions between biological sex and socially constructed gender, as well as gender identity and its expression. The dwarf population in Ankh-Morpork is an ideal vehicle for Pratchett to spotlight the "the inadequacies and dangers of hegemonic, essentialist views of sex" since "gender is everywhere and nowhere in dwarf culture because all dwarves perform as males" (Rayment 141).

In one of the first scenes in *Feet of Clay*, an applicant (the only one, in fact) for the newly created position of the forensics expert in the Watch, the dwarf Cheery Littlebottom, is interviewed by the recently promoted Commander of the Ankh-Morpork City Watch, Samuel Vimes:

"So," he said. "You're an alchemist. Acid stains on your hands and no eyebrows."

"That's right, sir."

"Not usual to find a dwarf in that line of work. You people always seem to toil in your uncle's foundry or something."

You people, the dwarf noted. "Can't get the hang of metal," he said.

"A dwarf who can't get the hang of metal? That must be unique." (Pratchett *Feet* 30-31)

Cheery's original field of work, alchemy, is not usually heavily sought-after by dwarfs. Now, he decides to switch again, from alchemy to forensic in the police force of Ankh-Morpork where he can use the skills he acquired as an alchemist. His role as a pioneering dwarf manifests itself in the way is that he deviates from the traditional norm of typical dwarf occupations like mining, tinkering, or blacksmithing, because he "can't get the hang of metal", which is one of the fundamental qualities of every reputable dwarf. This is not the only unique aspect about Cheery Littlebottom, though; he differs in more than just his occupation from a 'regular' dwarf. In one of his first encounters with Angua, another more important and more secret peculiarity is revealed by another very peculiar member of the Watch:

Cheery was tidying away the makeshift equipment he'd set up in the privy when a sound made him look around. Angua was leaning against the doorway.

"What do you want?" he demanded.

“Nothing. I just thought I’d say: don’t worry, I won’t tell anyone if you don’t want me to.”

“I don’t know what you’re talking about!”

“I think you’re lying.”

Cheery dropped a test tube, and sagged on to a seat. “How could you tell?” he said. “Even other *dwarfs* can’t tell! I’ve been so careful!”

[...]

Look, there’s plenty of women in this town that’d love to do things the dwarf way. I mean, what’re the choices they’ve got? Barmaid, seamstress or someone’s wife. While *you* can do anything the men do...”

“Provided we do only what the men do,” said Cheery.

Angua paused. “Oh,” she said. “I see. Hah. Yes. I know *that* tune.”

“I can’t hold an axe!” said Cheery. “I’m scared of fights! I think songs about gold are stupid! I hate beer! I can’t even drink dwarfishly! When I try to quaff I drown the dwarf behind me!”

“I can see that could be tricky,” said Angua.

“I saw a girl walk down the street here and some men *whistled* after her! And you can wear *dresses*! With *colors*!”

“Oh, dear.” Angua tried not to smile. “How long have lady dwarfs felt like this? I thought they were happy with the way things are...”

“Oh, it’s easy to be happy when you don’t know any different,” said Cheery bitterly. “Chainmail trousers are fine if you’ve never heard of liggery!” (Pratchett *Feet* 112-114)

This scene provides interesting insights into Cheery’s life and into the dwarf community. Cheery is inept at and not interested in any form of traditional social interaction deemed culturally important by dwarfs such as singing songs about gold, drinking (large quantities of) beer, and fighting (drunkenly). The cultural identity, that is, “the experience, enactment, and negotiation of dynamic social identifications” (Chen, Lin 1), which characterizes the dwarf society are in stark contrast with what Cheery feels comfortable with. Moreover, as indicated above, gender is not a topic that is brought up and discussed openly within the dwarf population because “[o]f course, everyone knew that, somewhere down under all those layers of leather and chain mail, dwarfs came in enough different types to ensure the future production of more dwarfs, but it was not a subject that dwarfs discussed other than at those essential points in a courtship when embarrassment might otherwise arise” (Pratchett *Feet* 268). Cheery is a illustrative example for how reticent the dwarf community really is about sexuality and gender. While Cheery is in fact a female and not a male dwarf other than initially believed by everyone in the Watch, she had been very careful not to let her femininity show in any way that “[e]ven other *dwarfs* can’t tell“. Angua herself has only been able to ‘detect’ her femininity through her improved werewolf-senses and almost accidentally revealed Cheery’s secret to the other Watchmen as she inadvertently

called Cheery a “small delightful mining tool of a feminine nature” when she tried to speak in Dwarfish to Cheery during their very first encounter (110).

Evidently, even though all dwarfs *look* equal, it does not automatically ensure that all *are* genuinely equal, otherwise Cheery’s secrecy would hardly be worth the effort. On the Discworld, dwarf society appears to be a very conservative and male dominated society in the sense that everything is geared towards male dwarfs, or rather, what could be considered ‘male’ by them, creating a “hegemonic binary, a case wherein male and female are placed against each other with male assuming the position of preeminence” (Held 10). In terms of appearance, there is nothing which could be considered feminine: everyone wears chainmail, boots, a helmet, a beard, and always carries an oversized axe with them. If someone were to try to break out of this traditional formula and show or wear anything that clearly indicates femininity, she (or he, for that matter) would most likely be punished immediately by the dwarf community, as it can be deduced from Cheery’s fear of and reaction to Angua’s ‘discovery’. Pratchett’s idea of the dwarf community is in itself an interesting approach to social construction of gender and gender identity. In this case, as there is no actual construction of gender in the sense that there is only a single gender and, therefore, ultimately no gender at all if everyone is of the same gender. For any casual observer, it is simply all male dwarfs. Pratchett’s objective with this scene and the dwarf gender in general is presumably to criticize that it should not have to be the case at all that women have to hide their femininity but that every woman should be free in her expression of her own femininity without having to fear any repercussions.

In the second part of the scene above, Pratchett highlights the fact that in the past, women were often excluded from professions pursued by men. Subsequently, their choices were rather limited, especially from the onset of the Industrial Revolution onwards (Kaup 27). To show his discontent with this circumstance, he ridicules it by completely inverting the situation where dwarf women now could *only* do what men did, yet again resulting in restricted options to choose from but demonstrating the ludicrous nature of the decision to assign women to their separate sphere of work, or in this case. When dwarf women could only do what men do, a kind of a dilemma results from it. On the one hand, there are even some advantages in a society which enables women to provide for themselves in a job market that is formally dominated

by male-oriented jobs but which are also performed by female dwarfs without discrimination. Consequently, this form of society provides dwarf women with access to the job market which many others in societies where women are strictly segregated from men's jobs or the job market in general would consider a step of significant improvement and progress (cf. "there's plenty of women in this town that'd love to do things the dwarf way"). Examples for that can be found all over the world but especially in the Middle East and Northern Africa where the discrepancy between the rights of men and women is glaring (Bresnin, Kelly 2). Pratchett's dwarf society also ensures that there is a place for everyone and no one is left behind in the dwarf society as long as no one rebels against the system. The other side to it is, though, that there is also a structural oppression of women. Dwarf society is "oppression in the guise of egalitarianism" (Malloy 162). It is simply neither intended nor tolerated for women to express their gender in any way that would immediately identify them as female, as can be seen from Cheery's efforts to conceal her femininity. This is obviously far from an actually egalitarian society where every woman has the opportunity to choose herself and not without having to hide her gender. As a result, as a female dwarf who wants to actually act out her gender, Cheery is destined to meet considerable resistance. She expresses her jealousy of other non-dwarf women who dress in a more feminine fashion she encounters in her day-to-day experiences in Ankh-Morpork: "I saw a girl walk down the street here and some men *whistled* after her! And you can wear *dresses!* With *colors!*" (Pratchett *Feet* 114). She wants to be appreciated for what she truly is, that is, a dwarf woman who is not content with wearing the same helmet, chainmail, and boots all the time. Wearing colorful dresses would constitute a step towards liberation and emancipation in the male-dominated culture she lives in, which can also be seen as an allusion to the feminist movement of the 1960s and 70s (Rayment 144). Today, it would often not be considered a step of liberation but instead symbolize the further consolidation of the (visible) division between genders by wanting express femininity through the desire or the expectation to wear dresses, especially in a stereotypical color-coding of a variety of different shades of pink (Fausto-Sterling 109-110). In his satirical approach, Pratchett reversed it in that "these dwarfen females are fighting *for the right to perform their gender*, to adopt the symbols of 'femininity'" (Rayment 144, original emphasis), to be able to wear pink dresses if they should choose to do so. In the case of the Discworld dwarf women, it would absolutely symbolize freedom if they could choose how to express their gender

in the way are most comfortable with, or at least in a way that is not restricted by male dominance and the way men see fit that women dress. To Cheery, it is exactly the possibility to have the *choice* to wear dresses that would symbolize a step of liberation; breaking out of the monotony and the 'rule' of uniformity in appearance would in itself be a victory and major achievement for dwarf women. Angua's reaction to Cheery's comment, "*How long have lady dwarfs felt like this? I thought they were happy with the way things are...*", signifies that an outsider can sometimes be oblivious to the fact that when people of a certain culture dress and in this case also behave uniformly, they quite possibly do it not because they enjoy so much as they do not know better or do not have an alternative, as Cheery responds to Angua: "Oh, it's easy to be happy when you don't know any different". Pratchett points out this issue poignantly: it is not by consent but by coercion and the suppression of individuality or an entire gender that this uniformity maintained. Or, as another possibility which is actually described by Cheery, it is the a lack of better judgment and knowledge that leads to the acceptance of the prescribed way of life, especially if this particular way of life has been part of one's entirely life.

Ultimately, such oppression leads to resistance, especially if it is combined with the knowledge of different experiences, of different ways of living such as those Cheery could gather by living in Ankh-Morpork and joining the Watch, where she met Angua. As a result, Cheery decides to stand up and resist. Encouraged by Angua, Cheery starts to change her appearance more and more to a way she feels comfortable with in order to become the first known openly female dwarf in the history of Ankh-Morpork. Gradually, Cheery starts to wear earrings, lipstick, mascara, a skirt, nail varnish, and high-heeled boots where she welded the high heels on herself (Pratchett *Feet* 213-338). She does not want to take off her helmet, though, which once belonged to her grandmother, and she categorically refuses to shave because without a beard, she would not be a proper dwarf, of course (245). Her goal is not to merely imitate other females, e.g. human women, by wearing skirts and makeup just like them but to find her own way of finding a way to express her gender. Beard and helmet are not part of how she wants to express as part of her gender but are part of her identity as a dwarf. She also decides to change her name as a symbolic step towards the adoption of a new identity and shows to Anuga a list of possible choices:

“Cheri’ is nice,” said Angua. “And it is rather like the one you’ve got already. The way people spell in this town, no one will actually notice unless you point it out to them.”

Cheery’s shoulders sagged with released tension. When you’ve made up your mind to shout out who you are to the world, it’s a relief to know that you can do it in a whisper.

“*Cheri*,” thought Angua. *Now, what does that name conjure up? Does the mental picture include iron boots, iron helmet, a small worried face and a long beard?*

Well, it does now. (Pratchett *Feet* 246)

Despite all of her changes in appearance, Cheri is still a dwarf. As Malloy points out, “Cheery’s personal distaste for certain things and activities generally considered dwarfish, like talking about gold and quaffing, made her uncomfortable around other dwarfs sometimes but never challenged dwarfish identity” (Malloy 161). Cheery’s identity is comprised of more than a specific set of practices or as the application of make-up and wearing different clothing. For Malloy, Cheery’s identity is threefold. There is the identity she claims for herself, the identity “as it is understood by members of [her] group” and the “identity as it is understood by people outside the group” (161). As it can be seen with her unwillingness to remove her helmet and her beard, she would never *not* consider herself a dwarf. Similarly, any non-dwarf would for the same reason recognize the changes in her appearance but not doubt whether she is actually a dwarf or not. The only issue Cheery has to face is what other dwarfs consider to be dwarfish. Looking female is certainly not part of the traditional definition of a dwarf.

As one might expect, the transformation of her appearance does not go unnoticed. Carrot, for example, is concerned about Cheri’s face after she started to wear make-up and he slightly misinterprets her effort: “Um. Cheery?’ ‘Yes, Captain?’ ‘You’ve been, er, you’ve been trying to hide your face from me...oh. Did someone hit you?’ ‘No, sir!’ ‘Only your eyes look a bit bruised and your lips—‘ ‘I’m fine, sir!’ said Cheery desperately. ‘Oh, well, if you say so.’” (Pratchett *Feet* 245). Other reactions to Cheri’s change are not always benign, however. On one occasion when he is alone with Angua, Carrot inquires about Cheri:

When they were out in the fog Carrot said, “Do you think there’s something a bit...odd about Littlebottom?”

“Seems like a perfectly ordinary female to me,” said Angua.

“*Female?* He *told* you he was female?”

“She,” Angua corrected. “This is Ankh-Morpork, you know. We’ve got extra pronouns here.”

[...]

“Well, I would have thought she’d have the decency to keep it to herself,” Carrot said finally. “I mean, I’ve nothing against females. I’m pretty certain my stepmother is one. But I don’t think it’s very clever, you know, to go around drawing attention to the fact.”

“Carrot, I think you’ve got something wrong with your head,” said Angua.

“What?”

“I think you may have got it stuck up your bum. I mean, good *grief!* A bit of make-up and a dress and you’re acting as though she’d become Miss Va Va Voom and started dancing on tables down at the Skunk Club!”

There were a few seconds of shocked silence while they *both* considered the image of a dwarfish strip-tease dancer. Both minds rebelled.

“Anyway,” said Angua, “if people can’t be themselves in Ankh-Morpork, where can they?”

“There’ll be trouble when the other dwarfs notice,” said Carrot. “I could almost see his knees. *Her* knees.”

“Everyone’s got knees.”

“Perhaps, but it’s asking for trouble to flaunt them. I mean, *I’m* used to knees. I can look at knees and think, ‘Oh, yes, knees, they’re just hinges in your legs,’ but some of the lads—”

Angua sniffed. “He turned left here. Some of the lads *what?*”

“Well...I don’t know how they’ll react, that’s all. You shouldn’t have encouraged her. I mean, of course there’s female dwarfs but...I mean, they have the decency not to show it.” (Pratchett *Feet* 268-269)

In this scene, several issues Pratchett does not agree with in terms of the discrimination of women are encapsulated. Angua is visibly appalled by Carrot’s views, who is himself shocked by the fact that Cheri Littlebottom is a “a perfectly ordinary female”. Carrot displays an obvious double standard when it comes to female dwarfs. On the one hand, he claims he has “nothing against females“, on the other hand, he also expects Cheri to “have the decency to keep [her femaleness] to herself” and thinks it is “[not] very clever, you know, to go around drawing attention to the fact”. It could be argued that apparently, Carrot feels himself threatened by Cheery’s challenge and rejection of the male dominance pervading culture through the open and unequivocal expression of her womanhood. In dwarf culture, this dominance is exhibited through the fact that there is only one gender available for all dwarfs to adopt: male. Held contends that “[d]warfs may not recognize gender explicitly, but masculinity is clearly reinforced. Thus, dwarfs may not explicitly discriminate, but in assuming all gender to be male they limit the possibilities of someone like Cheery” (10). Instead of a society which applies the label of ‘male’ or ‘female’ to people, it forgoes the step entirely as there is no other option to select. As a result, dwarf society is uniform to the extreme.

Under these circumstances, it is Carrot who is markedly intolerant in regard to Cheri's actions, someone who, as Angua herself notes, usually "seem[s] to be blind to things like shape and color" and "always seem[s] to care for people" (Pratchett *Feet* 269). Moreover, by suggesting that "it's asking for trouble to flaunt them", Carrot argues in a fashion usually referred to as victim-blaming. As the name already implies, it is a practice where victims of a crime, often of a sexual nature like rape or sexual assault, "are unfairly held responsible for their misfortunes" (Harber, Podolski, Williams 603). Carrot implies that if "some of the lads" could perhaps not contain themselves, it is not due to a lack of self-restraint or simply contempt for women but it is Cheri who is to blame for it because of her 'provocative' demeanor. Angua is justifiably outraged by this. It is hypocritical to be scandalized by Cheri 'outing' herself as female while arguing that 'others' could take this the wrong way while he himself is unable to even tolerate, much less even endorse her actions. Angua clearly senses the contradiction between Carrot's own words and his ability to acknowledge and reflect on them. Of course it is not Cheri's fault if she actually falls a victim to a sexual offense due to the way she dresses and behaves, it is entirely the fault of the perpetrator.

Aside from Carrot's inappropriate comment on Cheri's expression of gender, Carrot himself should actually have more sympathy for her than he does in this scene. He himself is no stranger to the difficulties of being different, of a discrepancy between biology and identity. In his case it is the fact that he is biologically human but identifies as a dwarf because he spent his entire childhood in a mine and was raised by dwarfs. When he arrived in Ankh-Morpork at the beginning of *Guards! Guards!*, Carrot had considerable difficulties both to acknowledge the fact that his appearance does not correspond with usual concepts of a dwarf and to convince others, both humans and dwarfs alike, that he is a dwarf, that is, that he considers himself a dwarf even though the species of his natural parents indicates otherwise. He is not always taken seriously, as he himself admits: "I'm a dwarf, too, but the dwarfs here don't believe it" (Pratchett *Men* 28). So, he knows himself what it feels like to be met with resistance based on his understanding of his own identity. At the same time, he does not take this experience into account when it comes to Cheri and her own desire of being accepted as what she identifies with. It should be expected from Carrot to be able recognize that "biology may play a role in determining whether you can claim it, but simple biology is not enough to assign an identity" (Malloy 158).

With this scene, Pratchett urges his readers to reflect themselves on their own views of gender, gender identity, and gender stereotypes by confronting them with his view on the matter. He is also concerned with the social construction of gender and with performativity. With Cheery Littlebottom's transformation into Cheri, Pratchett questions the innateness of gender, similar to social constructionists. If gender were inextricably linked with sex, and biological male- and femaleness would automatically correspond with the respective social gender, then there would be no dwarf society as it is described by Pratchett, as there is only a single gender although there are of course two sexes. Dwarf gender is both not constructed because there is only one, and at the same time entirely constructed especially because there is only one. In terms of the former, the argument could be brought forth that since there is only one gender for everyone, it is the same as no gender at all since there can be no discrimination, no differentiation based on gender. Dwarf society is egalitarian in the sense that innate biological differences are not enhanced to signify differences in aptitude or capability between male and female dwarfs, thereby creating a single, unified society without double-standards in the way dwarf men and women are treated. Everyone is the same when it comes to gender; everyone is just a dwarf that looks, talks, and acts alike. As for the latter, though, as it is argued in the classic approach towards the social construction of gender, gender is very much constructed in the sense that at birth, one's gender is immediately set to the default, either male or female based on the biological characteristics of the reproductive organs (Lorber 14). In the case of Cheri case, it is set to that of all the others, the only available option: male. There is no agency involved, there is no choice to be made in regard to gender, one cannot choose anything but to be a traditional dwarfish dwarf, meaning male. As there are two different sexes, it entirely suppresses female dwarfs and their potential desire to perform their gender. The supposed equality of the dwarf community does not ensure real equality but actually completely denies it in that only maleness can be expressed.

If it is assumed that gender is a performance, that it is "produced through the repetition of gender norms" (Holmes 51), and if gender is constructed and maintained through the practice of it, then in dwarf society there is no female gender at all. Cheri decides to break up this 'gender monopoly' through the rejection of and deviation

from the social conventions biologically female dwarfs usually have to adhere to, since gender roles “are the result of social scripts we actively conform to or reject, (always with the possible costs of public censure or worse)” (Pilcher, Whelehan 130). Cheri is willing to resist and endure the consequences in order to express and perform her gender identity as she sees fit. In regard to performativity, the dwarf society is also an example of how gender ‘does us’ because there are no “causal explanations that assume that sex dictates or necessitates certain social meanings for women’s experience” (Butler *Performative Acts* 520) within the dwarf community. Instead, sex is entirely left out of the formation of the only gender, that is, until Cheri sets out to shake the very foundations of this system. Cheri herself is a manifestation of performativity in the sense that her gender identity is the result of her rejection of the social scripts which are the heart of the (non-)gender system of the dwarf society, with the “costs of public censure” that goes along with her non-conformity (Pilcher, Whelehan 130). She is also testament to the fact that gender is not fixed but fluid, meaning that it can and does change under certain circumstances. In a sense, what Cheri does is to actually create a *new* gender for dwarfs as there has not been anything like it before her. There is no model Cheri can comply with; femininity had never even been thought of in terms of how to embody it. As a result and as shown above, Cheri tries to find a way of how to create a manifestation of what would fall into the new category of ‘dwarf women’ through wearing a beard, a helmet, lipstick, makeup, a skirt, chainmail, high-heeled boots, etc. She has to find an answer to the question of ‘what is femininity and what does it look like?’ for herself as well as for the entire species of dwarfs in order to become an actual dwarf women. To illustrate what Cheri’s effort would be like for people in the real world, Malloy has come up with a memorable analogy: “In many parts of Roundworld⁸, a biological male choosing to live as a woman or a biological female choosing to live as a man is considered odd, even wrong. Imagine, then, how shocking Cheri’s choice really is for the dwarfs of Discworld. [...] In Roundworld terms, Cheri’s choice would be the equivalent of you or me choosing to be a unicorn” (161-162). In honor of Cheri Littlebottom, the words of Simone de Beauvoir can be slightly modified: A *dwarf* is not born, but rather becomes, a woman.

8 That is, the real world we live in.

Carrot is not the only one who is upset about Cheri's coming out as female. In one of her first encounters with other dwarfs after her decision to become Cheri, some rather traditional dwarfs feel offended by what they see and react accordingly: "That's...*female* clothes, isn't it?", "That's...my mother never even...urgh...that's disgusting! In public, too! What happens if kids come in?", and "I can see your *ankles!*" (Pratchett *Feet* 291-292). Cheri is quite shaken by this encounter with her fellow dwarfs, so she is able to muster only enough courage to answer with a "So what? I can if I want to" (291-292). The really important aspect of Cheri's encounter, however, is not that she has to stand up to other dwarfs who are apparently affronted by her, but how the scene continues:

Two of the dwarfs stormed off towards the locker-room. Another one hurried after them, but hesitated as he drew level with the desk. He gave Cheri a frantic look.

"Er...er...*nice* ankles, though," he said, and then ran.

The fourth dwarf waited until the others had gone and then sidled up.

Cheri was shaking with nervousness. "Don't you say a *thing* about my legs!" she said, waving a finger.

"Er..." The dwarf looked around hurriedly, and leaned forward. "Er...is that...lipstick?"

"Yes! What about it?"

"Er..." The dwarf leaned forward even more, looked around again, this time conspiratorially, and lowered her voice. "Er...could I try it?" (Pratchett *Feet* 292)

First, there is one dwarf who does not dare to 'break the rules' in terms of how Cheri should be treated for her revolt against the system, but at least dares to signal his approval of Cheri's appearance as he appreciates her "nice ankles". This (presumably male) dwarf is one of those who might not entirely agree with the dominant gender ideology but are not brave enough to stand up to it themselves. But, given the opportunity, they are not averse to change or are at least supportive of 'dissidents' in as far as they dare to. The really important dwarf, though, is the fourth. Instead of Cheri's immediate assumption, this dwarf is not interested in further lecturing her about the ways in which her behavior is wrong. Quite on the contrary, it is another female dwarf who actually approves of and wants to participate in what Cheri does by asking whether she could try out Cheri's lipstick. This is a clear signal that dwarf society is indeed no utopia where no thoughts have to be spent on gender issues because there is only a single gender everyone is comfortable with as well as that Cheri is not a unique outlier. Instead, the desire for change is growing stronger, especially now that Cheri, as a single but determined dwarf woman, more or less

inadvertently paves the way for other female dwarfs. In turn, Cheri is also further encouraged since she now realizes that there are as a matter of fact other dwarfs, too, who would want to express their femininity and break from the tradition of perpetually behaving like a male dwarf as well. Another prove for this would be Cheri's inquiry whether she could salvage some dresses Angua is about to through away: "D'you mind if I share them out? Only some of the lads—the *ladies* at the Watch House'—Cheri savored the word 'ladies'—'are beginning to get a bit thoughtful..." (Pratchett *Feet* 411, original emphasis). In terms of real-world relevance, the reactions to Cheri wearing clothes which show her ankles remind of the moral codes and the insistence on 'modesty' in various religions. In a contemporary context, especially Muslim women come to mind when it comes to whether or not a woman is allowed to show her specific parts of her body. In this regard, Pratchett draws an analogy between religion and identity, that is, "Pratchett is well aware that 'Is it *moral?*' to wear certain clothes can segue into 'is it *Muslim?*' to wear such and such an item" (Rayment 147). With Cheri, Pratchett positions himself as a proponent of individual freedom over the social or religious restraints societies might impose on its female members.

Near the end of *Feet of Clay*, Carrot and Angua are having a whispered conversation next to Cheri because Carrot is concerned that something could happen to her as they are about to confront the mad and highly dangerous golem Meshugah:

"I wish Mr. Vimes hadn't wanted us to bring her. Supposing something happens to her?"
"What are you talking about?"
"Well...you know...she's a girl."
"So what? There's at least three female dwarfs in the Watch already and you don't worry about them."
"Oh, come on...name one."
"Lars Skulldrinker, for a start."
"No! Really?"
"Are you calling this nose a liar?"
"But he broke up a fight in the Miner's Arms single-handedly last week!"
"Well? Why do you assume females are weaker? You wouldn't worry about me taking on a vicious bar crowd by myself."
[...]
"Anyway, Cheri is...a bit different. I'm sure he...she's good at alchemy, but we'd better watch her back in a fight. Hold on..." (Pratchett *Feet* 357-358)

Pratchett once more reminds readers how ridiculous stereotypes can be. It is only when Carrot *knows* Cheri is a woman that he begins to be concerned about her safety. In addition, at first he simply cannot believe that Lars Skulldrinker is female, too,

because “he broke up a fight in the Miner’s Arms single-handedly last week”, with is a apparently a feat of physical strength which, in his opinion, dwarf women would not be able to accomplish. Pratchett’s point here is that if one’s opinion of someone else’s abilities is highly dependent on gender stereotypes and one is then clearly proven wrong, it should be interpreted as a sign that one’s ideas about gender are incorrect and should be subjected to change. This is especially true for dwarfs, as the supposed inferiority of women is even harder to justify due to the similarity of male and female dwarfs in physique and strength. Cheri ultimately demonstrates her courage and fearlessness to Carrot by recklessly charging the golem shouting the famous dwarf battlecry “T’dr’duzk b’hazg t’t!” (“Today Is A Good Day For Someone Else To Die!”). Unfortunately, however, her valiant effort is not crowned with success: “The golem watched the dwarf incuriously, like an elephant watching an attack by a rogue chicken. Then it picked the axe out of the air, Cheri trailing behind it like a comet, and hurled it aside” (Pratchett *Feet* 264). She survives this incident more or less unharmed and at the end of *Feet of Clay*, Cheri even has her very personal ‘happy ending’, for the time being: “‘Hrolf Thighbiter’s asked me out,’ said Cheri shyly, looking at the floor. ‘And I’m almost certain he’s male!’” (413).

Eventually, Cheery’s transformation into Cheri initiates a change in the Watch. She has started a revolution in the way that now more and more dwarf women come forward and want to change their appearance to a more feminine manner. They are getting thoughtful because Cheri has broken through the ‘glass ceiling’ which held the representation of her gender back; now, other dwarf women also see that a chance has come to act and be a ‘proper’ dwarf woman in a way they feel comfortable with. “The problem with conformity isn’t that it might be unsatisfying to those that are asked or required to conform, it’s that conformity breeds complicity and obedience, and thus is in direct conflict with agency and freedom” (Held 11). Cheri does not want to conform anymore, she wants agency and freedom for herself that has been withheld from her in terms of the (non-)expression of her gender. She decides to resist this system of ‘this is how it always has been and always will be’ and she is willing to endure the repercussions which come along with this step. As a result, Cheri is able to slowly but surely cause something similar to a tectonic shift in the gender relations of the dwarf community in Ankh-Morpork. Cheri Littlebottom is evidence for Pratchett’s antipathy of the discrimination against women in general, and more specifically the

oppression of the freedom to express one's gender identity in the way one feels most comfortable with. Through Cheri, Pratchett supports the rejection of gender roles imposed on women by society which evidently interfere with equality between genders as well as they undervalue women. What is more, through Cheri's trouble to find out how to actually express her gender appropriately, Pratchett touches on the fundamental questions of what the concepts women and femininity actually entail, that is, he asks essential questions regarding the concepts and notions of the supposedly 'natural' order, roles and embodiments of sexuality and gender (Rayment 148).

Conclusion

In this thesis, it is argued that although Pratchett originally based his *Discworld* series on a comic and parodistic principle, he is also a satirist who has to be taken seriously despite the fact that he maintained his humorist style throughout the entirety of his writing career. The three works analyzed in this thesis, the so-called City Watch Trilogy consisting of *Guards! Guards!*, *Men at Arms*, and *Feet of Clay*, exhibit a number of features which are typical for a writer of satire. For one, they involve criticism of certain aspects of society Pratchett does not agree with such as racism as a 'normal' phenomenon, conflict and violence of any form based on racist sentiments, or discrimination based on sex or gender, specifically against women. Another essential requirement for satire which is met by Pratchett in the City Watch Trilogy is the function of humor as an indispensable component of a satirical work through which he ridicules acts of injustice in order to create a combination of amusement and contempt characteristic for satire. He highlights the issues he finds fault with and exaggerates or distorts them in order to make them clearly recognizable, as well as to encourage the readers to ponder on the presented topic. With the Discworld, Pratchett created a "playfully critical distortion of the familiar" (Feinberg 7) in the sense that while it is actually a fantasy world which does not share a considerable number of characteristics with the real world we live in, it still features enough similarities to recognize certain aspects of the real world in order to convey the particular vice or virtue he wants to highlight. While he certainly points out aspects in society he disagrees with, though, his intention is not to immediately present the reader with his personal solution to the problem but he often presents the implications of a specific issue in order to encourage his readers to reflect on the issues presented and develop their own solutions, of course always guided by his own impressions and perceptions.

Through the vehicle of the City Watch and its unique cast of characters, Pratchett covers a range of topics, a selection of which this thesis focused on, namely racism, gender, and identity. Especially through the recruitment of three new watchmen with ethnic minority backgrounds in *Men at Arms*, Pratchett introduces race and racism as a matter of high priority. Racism is ubiquitous in Ankh-Morpork, and practically everyone is racist. Pratchett's intention with this fact, however, is not to immediately condemn everyone with racist thoughts as a bad person; it is instead testament to the fact that racism is pervading theme in our real world as well. In the novels, even

characters such as Carrot Ironfoundersson, for example, someone who is usually kind and respectful to anyone and in turn liked by everyone, has his own racist feelings in his aversion for undead people. What Pratchett intends to achieve with this is to show that racism is not always a simple black-and-white matter, that is, not everyone with certain racist tendencies is automatically a bad person. Far from trivializing racism, he wants to demonstrate that racism has to be accepted as a 'normal' occurrence and taken seriously. As a result, if dealt with appropriately, especially through self-reflection and especially increased contact with the particular group the hate is aimed at, it can be overcome. This can be seen from the relationship between Carrot and Angua, where Carrot eventually overcomes his hatred for the undead after initially being aghast once he found out about Angua's 'condition'. With the character of Samuel Vimes, Pratchett makes the case for an approach to race that is grounded on actually getting into contact with other races instead of relying on established views which usually highlight negative aspects of the respective species or express an alleged superiority or inferiority, respectively. Through Vimes, Pratchett argues that it is crucial to form a personal opinion through actual contact with other groups of people of different ethnic backgrounds. The conclusions drawn from this experience can still be negative in the sense that one does not have to like everyone one meets, as it is the case with Vimes who does not like dwarfs or trolls or anyone else for that matter, but one's opinion of others must not be based on usually unverified or entirely baseless prejudice and stereotypes.

The relationship between the dwarf Cuddy and the troll Detritus serves as another example for Pratchett's approach to the social construction of race. Even though initially strongly negatively affected by the enmity that has been constructed between dwarfs and trolls in their opinion of and opposition to one another, they eventually learn to put aside the suspicion and the enmity they were always told to harbor against one another. They realize that these sentiments were in fact incorrect or grossly overstated and that they are not very different after all, certain biological features left aside. The approach to racism behind these examples is an idealization of what is known as the contact hypothesis. It contends that increased contact and exchange between demographically diverse populations leads to a better understanding and a reduction of prejudices between different ethnic groups in a specific place and point in time (Nieli 247). The way Pratchett employs this theory is overly idealis-

tic, since it has been shown that there are specific requirements that have to be met for the contact hypothesis to fulfill its promise such as the equality of status, a non-competitive environment, and a common goal (Nieli 250), which are only given within the Watch and not in the rest of Ankh-Morpork. It is in a typically satirical fashion that Pratchett demonstrates how he perceives the discrepancy between what is and what should be. The same is true for the color-blindness policy which is an integral part of the conduct between individual members of City Watch. In reality, color-blindness is able to “remedy only the most blatant forms of discrimination” (Delgado, Stefancic 8). In the Watch, however, it is an important tool to ensure equality among the watchmen and it does function as a counter-measure against racism and prejudice among the diverse members of the Watch. Again, it should be seen rather as the depiction of an ideal rather than Pratchett’s delusion in regard to the effectiveness and the impact of color-blindness. To him, it should actually function in the way it is portrayed in the novels as opposed to how it is often implemented in real life, which was outlined by Critical Race Theory scholars such as Delgado and Stefancic. Another aspect the City Watch Trilogy also touches upon is the social construction of race. The Watch with its multi-species members serves the purpose of demonstrating both the possibility of a peaceful coexistence despite apparent differences. Watchmen are explicitly constructed as equals and not in a way that reflects the rest of society. It serves to demonstrate the ridiculousness of racism among humans where there are only negligible differences between people of different ethnicities, if any. Pratchett alludes to the fact that these supposed difference between human being are less real rather than very much constructed for the purpose of actually creating or justifying differences between ethnicities and establishing systems of privilege and oppression.

There is another, more serious and oftentimes even scathing side to Pratchett’s treatment of racism, especially in regard to racist behavior as it is displayed by ‘Mayonnaise’ Quirke, that is, both the unquestioning and unashamed belief in and the dissemination of racist prejudices and stereotypes combined with a strong tendency to abuse his power to act out his strong sense of racial prejudice. This kind of bigoted, narcissistic racism is different from what Carrot, Vimes, and others represent and is categorically rejected by Pratchett, as it is clearly recognizable from the behavior of members of the then-Night Watch towards Quirke. In a similar fashion, the account of Mr. Catterail and the letters he sends to the Watch is portrayed, where it is a member

of a rather privileged stratum of society which displays racist thoughts and ideas. Another aspect of racism Pratchett deals with is a sort of structural racism, as it is exemplified by affirmative action policy of the Patrician and the hiring of Angua, Cuddy, and Detritus. The policy is intended as a countermeasure to the increasing number of citizens with ethnic minority background and fights among these. In theory, affirmative action is thought of as a means to combat racial and gender inequality by giving preference to women or people of color who are discriminated against in order to create equal opportunities (Wise 15). In *Ankh-Morpork*, however, affirmative action is exposed as what proponents of Critical Race Theory refer to as 'interest convergence'. It describes a state where for a brief moment in time, the interests of the majority or the ruling elite converge with that of minorities or disadvantaged groups. As a result, actual improvements in race equality are only achieved because the interests of the ruling elite changed in a way that align with those of ethnic minorities. Pratchett exposes this hypocrisy and criticizes those in power for their unwillingness to adopt better measures in order to improve or prevent situations of racial inequality.

With the character of Angua von Überwald, Pratchett recognizes the discrimination women still have to endure in a time of proclaimed liberalism. Even though she was hired because she is a member of the undead community of *Ankh-Morpork*, especially in the beginning there are some who are convinced that it was due to her being a woman, by some considered a demographical minority group worthy of special attention, that she was included in the affirmative action hiring process. In satirical exaggeration, women are compared to ethnic minorities in terms of the necessity of special hiring procedures to ensure a proportional participation in the workplace, instead of accepting and treating women as equal to men. Through Angua's struggle in her workplace, Pratchett shows his awareness and criticism of gender-specific stereotypes and role models, especially in regard to the participation of and discrimination against women in the labor market. To this day, there are certain roles and attributes specifically associated with men and women. Pratchett criticizes and rejects a social construction of gender which attributes traits like timidity, weakness, and the expectation of women to behave in a submissive or obedient way towards men and instead promotes self-confidence and an awareness of one's own strengths. Angua von Überwald can be regarded as Pratchett's allegory for the strength and autonomy of women. Her femaleness, however, is not the only reason Angua is discriminated

against. She is also an example of intersectionality, the combination of several, in itself discriminatory categories which pose a considerably greater risk of discrimination than the particular features occurring in isolation (Delgado, Stefancic 58). In Angua's case, the fact that she is a werewolf might literally empower her to defend herself if necessary, but, in combination with her femaleness, it significantly increases the discrimination she has to experience, as werewolves are generally rather unpopular with the human majority. The fact that she tries to live vegetarian as far as it is possible and that she has never ever attacked humans, dwarfs, or any other sentient being does not have much influence on the way people react to her. Pratchett depicts the difficulties people who are affected by intersectionality have to endure and once more reminds his readers that prejudices and stereotypes are a despicable basis to treat people on, especially because Angua turns out to be a more than valuable member of the Watch, not least because of the special werewolf abilities she can contribute to her work in the Watch.

Cheery Littlebottom and the dwarf society of the Discworld serve as a tool for Pratchett to examine a range of topics including the social construction of gender especially in regard to an essentialist view of gender, the tensions between biological sex and gender, performativity, as well as gender and cultural identity. Cheery, the new forensics expert in the Watch, is not only uncomfortable with traditional dwarfish occupations such as mining, drinking, and singing songs about gold, but is also female and craves for a possibility to express it, because in the dwarf society of Ankh-Morpork, each dwarfs looks alike and is by default referred to as 'he'. However, due to the uniformity of dwarfs, there is no category, no female gender available for Cheery to draw upon. In a sense, what Cheery does is to actually create a new gender for dwarfs as there has not been anyone like her before; femininity had never even been thought of in terms of how to express it. Pratchett discusses what it means to be a woman or female in a society with a "hegemonic binary, a case wherein male and female are placed against each other with male assuming the position of preeminence" (Held 10). While on the surface, all dwarfs appear to be equal and dwarf society seems egalitarian, this is only the case because maleness is the dominant norm and the only existing gender. While this actually facilitates equality as all dwarfs can perform all tasks without any division in terms of biological differences, it is in fact an "oppression in the guise of egalitarianism" (Malloy 162) for female dwarfs

who are discontent with the situation. Cheery rebels against this system and becomes Cheri, a dwarf woman who wears a beard, a helmet, lipstick, makeup, a skirt, chainmail, and high-heeled boots where she welded the high heels on herself. She is also testament to the fact that gender is not fixed but fluid in the sense that it can and does change under certain circumstances. With her transformation into Cheri, Pratchett also questions the innateness of gender. If gender were inextricably linked with sex, and biological male- and femaleness would automatically correspond with the respective social gender, then Cheery's transition would have been impossible. Cheri begins to actually perform her own gender, thus creating it. Through Cheri, Pratchett supports the rejection of certain gender-roles imposed on women by society which interfere with equality between genders as well as the possibility and freedom to express one's gender how one sees fit.

Bibliography

Primary sources

- Pratchett, Terry. *Feet of Clay*. London: Transworld Publishers (1997).
---. *Guards! Guards!*. London: Transworld Publishers (1990).
---. *Men at Arms*. London: Transworld Publishers (1994).
---. *Witches Abroad*. New York City: HarperCollins (1991)

Secondary sources

- Abrams, Meyer. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 2003.
Anthony-Rowlands, Rachel. "HisWorld Exhibition - A Virtual tour." *Discworld Monthly* 250 (2018): ch. 4. <http://discworldmonthly.co.uk/dwm0250.php#S_4>
Apfelbaum, Evan, and Norton, Michael, and Sommers, Samuel. "Racial Color Blindness: Emergence, Practice, and Implications" *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 21 (2012): 205-209.
Applebaum, Barbara. "Race, Critical Race Theory and Whiteness." *International Encyclopedia of Education*. 3rd ed. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2010.
Baker, Daniel. "Why we need dragons: the progressive potential of fantasy." *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 23 (2012): 437-459.
Barker, Chris, and Jane, Emma. *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage, 2016.
Barker, Chris. *The SAGE Dictionary of Cultural Studies*. London: Sage, 2004.
Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. London: Vintage Books, 2011.
Bell, Derrick. "Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma." *Harvard Law Review* 93 (1980): 518-533.
Breslin, Julia, and Kelly, Sanja. *Women's Rights in the Middle East and North Africa: Progress Amid Resistance*. New York: Freedom House, 2010.
Brizee, Allen et al. *Critical Race Theory (1970s-present)*. 2015. 6 June 2017. <<https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/722/14/>>
Butler, Andrew, and James, Edward, and Mendlesohn, Farah (Eds.). *Terry Pratchett: Guilty of Literature*. Baltimore: Old Earth Books, 2004.
Butler, Judith. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." *Theatre Journal* 40 (1988): 519-531.
---. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
---. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
---. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
Carpenter, Humphrey. *That was Satire that was: The Satire Boom of the 1960s*. London: Victor Gollancz, 2000.
Carter, Michael. "Gender Socialization and Identity Theory" *Social Science* 3 (2014): 242-263.
Chen, Yea-Wen, and Lin, Hengjun. *Cultural Identities*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication. 2016. 30 November 2017. <<http://communication.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228613-e-20?rskey=t3kr0E&result=1>>.
Cobbs, Zachary. *Labor Force Characteristics: Race, Ethnicity, and Minimum Wage Workers*. New York: Nova Publishers, 2015.
Cohen, Carl, and Sterba, James. *Affirmative Action and Racial Preference: A Debate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (1991): 1241-1299.
- Cuddon, J. A. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2013.
- Delgado, Richard, and Stefancic, Jean. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press, 2017.
- Discworld & Terry Pratchett Wiki. The L-Space Web. 2012. 28 November 2017. <https://wiki.lspace.org/mediawiki/Main_Page>.
- Eckert, Penelope, and McConnell-Ginet, Sally. *Language and gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Elliott, Robert. *Satire*. Encyclopaedia Britannica Online. 7 May 2017. <<https://www.britannica.com/art/satire>>.
- Emerson, Blake. "Dialectic of color-blindness" *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 39 (2013): 693-716.
- Fausto-Sterling, Anne. *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality*. New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- Feinberg, Leonard. *The Satirist: His Temperament, Motivation, and Influence*. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1963.
- Ferber, Abby. "The Culture of Privilege: Color-blindness, Postfeminism, and Christonormativity." *Journal of Social Issues* 68 (2012): 63-77.
- Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Gaiman, Neil. 'Terry Pratchett isn't jolly. He's angry'. 2014. 27 September 2017. <<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2014/sep/24/terry-pratchett-angry-not-jolly-neil-gaiman>>.
- Gans, Judith, and Replegle, Elaine, and Tichenor, Daniel. *Debates on U.S. Immigration*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2012.
- Gilbert, Martin. *The Holocaust: The Human Tragedy*. New York: Rosetta Books, 2014.
- Gillborn, David, and Ladson-Billings, Gloria. "Critical Race Theory." *International Encyclopedia of Education*. 3rd ed. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2010.
- Gillborn, David. "Intersectionality, Critical Race Theory, and the Primacy of Racism: Race, Class, Gender, and Disability in Education." *Qualitative Inquiry* 21 (2015): 277-287.
- Griffin, Dustin. *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1994.
- Hall, Stuart, and du Gay, Paul. *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage, 1996.
- . "Cultural Identity and Diaspora" *Identity, Community, Culture, Difference*. Ed. Jonathan Rutherford. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1990. 222-237.
- . "The Question of Cultural Identity." *Understanding Modern Societies – An Introduction: 4. Modernity and its Futures*. Ed. Stuart Hall. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994. 274-313.
- Haraway, Donna. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. London: Free Assoc. Books, 1998.
- Harber, Kent, and Podolski, Peter, and Williams, Christian. „Emotional disclosure and victim blaming.“ *Emotion* 15 (2015): 603-614.
- Harbi, Naima. "Inter-minority Racial Prejudice and Anti-White Bias: an Underestimated Phenomenon." *Revue Expressions* 2 (2016).

- Hartlep, Nicholas Daniel. *Critical Race Theory: An Examination of its Past, Present, and Future Implications*. 2009. 2 August 2017. <<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED506735>>.
- Held, Jacob. "A Golem Is Not Born, but Rather Becomes, a Woman: Gender on the Disc." *Philosophy and Terry Pratchett*. Ed. Jacob Held and James South. Basingstoke: PalgraveMacmillan, 2015. 3-24.
- Highet, Gilbert. *The Anatomy of Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- Hird, Myra. *Sex, Gender, and Science*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Hodgart, Matthew. *Satire: Origins and Principles*. London: Routledge, 1969.
- Holmes, Mary. *What is Gender? Sociological Approaches*. London: Sage, 2007.
- Hoyenga, K.B. and Hoyenga K.T. *Gender-related Differences: Origins and Outcomes*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1993.
- Hunt, Peter, and Lenz, Millicent. *Alternative Worlds in Fantasy Fiction*. London: Continuum, 2003.
- Hyde, Janet. "The Gender Similarities Hypothesis." *American Psychologist* 60 (2005): 581-592.
- "Identity." *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2 September 2017. <<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/identity>>.
- James, Edward. "Tolkien, Lewis and the explosion of genre fantasy." *The Cambridge Companion To Fantasy Literature*. Ed. Edward James, and Farah Mendlesohn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 62-78.
- Jenkins, Richard. *Social Identity*. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Jones, Jonathan. *I've read Pratchett now: it's more entertainment than art*. 2015. 11 February 2018. <<https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/jonathanjonesblog/2015/sep/11/jonathan-jones-ive-read-terry-pratchett-now-its-more-entertainment-than-art>>.
- Jurik, Nancy, and Siemsen, Cynthia. "'Doing Gender' as Canon or Agenda." *Gender & Society* 23 (2009): 72-75.
- Kaup, Julia. *Die Unterrepräsentanz von Frauen in Führungspositionen*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien, 2015
- Kellough, Edward. *Understanding Affirmative Action: Politics, Discrimination, and the Search for Justice*. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2006.
- Kernan, Alvin. *The Plot of Satire*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.
- Kimmel, Michael. *The Gendered Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Knaut, Annette, and Heidler, Julia (Eds.). *Spitzenfrauen: Zur Relevanz von Geschlecht in Politik, Wirtschaft, Wissenschaft und Sport*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien, 2017.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria. "Critical Race Theory - What it is Not!" *Handbook of Critical Race Theory in Education*. Ed. Marvin Lynn, and Adrienne D. Dixson. Milton Park: Routledge. 34-47.
- . "Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education?" *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 11 (1998): 7-24.
- Lee, Robert. *Orientalism: Asian Americans in Popular Culture*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1999.
- Lorber, Judith. *Paradoxes of Gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Malloy, Daniel. "How to Be a Dwarf." *Discworld and Philosophy: Reality is not what it seems*. Ed. Nicolas Michaud. Chicago: Open Court, 2016. 157-171.
- Marecek, Jeanne, and Crawford, Mary, and Popp, Danielle. "On the construction of Gender, Sex, and Sexualities." *The Psychology of Gender* (2004): 192-216.
- Michaud, Nicolas. *Discworld and Philosophy: Reality Is Not What It Seems*. Chicago: Open Court, 2016.

- Nieli, Russell. *Wounds That Will Not Heal: Affirmative Action and Our Continuing Racial Divide*. New York: Encounter Books, 2012.
- Norton, Michael et al. "Color Blindness and Interracial Interaction Playing the Political Correctness Game." *Psychological Science* 17 (2006): 949-953.
- Parks, J. B., and Robertson, M. A. "Contemporary arguments against nonsexist language: Blaubergs (1980) revisited." *Sex Roles* 39 (1998): 445-461.
- "Parody." *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*. 4 November 2017. <<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/parody>>
- Paulson, Ronald. *The Fictions of Satire*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1967.
- Pilcher, Jane, and Whelehan, Imelda. *Fifty Key Concepts in Gender Studies*. London: Sage, 2004.
- Pollard, Arthur. *Satire*. London: Methuen, 1970.
- Pratchett, Terry; Briggs, Stephen. *The New Discworld Companion*. London: Gollancz, 2003.
- Pratchett, Terry. "Imaginary Worlds, Real Stories." *Folklore* 111 (2000): 159-168.
- Quintero, Ruben. "Understanding Satire" *A Companion to Satire*. Ed. Ruben Quintero. Malden: Blackwell, 2007. 1-11.
- Rabelais, François. *Gargantua and Pantagruel*. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1984.
- Rayment, Andrew. "Dwarfs, Hermaphrodites, Lovers: Fantastic Sex." *Fantasy, Politics, Postmodernity: Pratchett, Pullman, Miéville and Stories of the Eye*. Ed. Andrew Rayment. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2014. 141-170.
- Sarrasin, Oriane, and Gabriel, Ute, and Gygax, Pascal. "Sexism and Attitudes Toward Gender - Neutral Language The Case of English, French, and German." *Swiss Journal of Psychology* 71 (2012): 113-124.
- Silver, Steven. *A Conversation with Terry Pratchett*. 2000. 22 November 2017. <<https://www.sfsite.com/04b/tp79.htm>>
- Simon, Bernd. *Identity in Modern Society: A Social Psychological Perspective*. Malden: Blackwell, 2004.
- Simpson, Paul. *On the Discourse of Satire*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2003.
- Sullivan, Nikki. *A critical introduction to queer theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.
- Test, George. *Satire: Spirit and Art*. Tampa: University of South Florida Press, 1991.
- Tolkien, John Ronald Reuel. *The Lord of the Rings*. London: HarperCollins U.K., 2007.
- Trenkmann, Jeannette. *Frauen in Führungspositionen der deutschen Privatwirtschaft: Eine institutionensoziologische Analyse organisationaler Gleichstellungspolitik*. Wiesbaden Springer Fachmedien, 2017.
- Voltaire. *Candide, or, Optimism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Wahl, Shawn, and Scholl, Juliann. *Communication and Culture in Your Life*. Dubuque: Kendall Hunt Publishing, 2014.
- Weedon, Chris. *Identity and culture*. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2004.
- Weeks, Jeffrey. "The Value of Difference." *Identity, Community, Culture, Difference*. Ed. Jonathan Rutherford. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1990. 88-100.
- West, Candace, and Zimmerman, Don. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1 (1987): 125-151.
- West, Cornel. *Keeping Faith: Philosophy and Race in America*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Wharton, Amy. *The Sociology of Gender: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Wise, Tim. *Affirmative Action: Racial Preference in Black and White*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Woodward, Kathryn. *Identity and difference*. London: Sage, 2007.

Appendix

English abstract

Terry Pratchett was one of the most successful, popular, and prolific writers of fantasy literature and his immense success is based on the fact that he is rightfully known as one of the most hilarious authors in the entire genre of fantasy literature. Terry Pratchett's popularity, however, was not accompanied by academic interest and appreciation. Instead, Pratchett's choice of genre in combination with his emphasis on humor worked rather to his detriment in terms of academic interest and research into his work, resulting in an underrepresentation in academic discourse, especially in relation to his success and significance as a writer. In this thesis, it is argued that this lack of interest is unjustified because Pratchett's *Discworld* series and especially the so-called City Watch Trilogy are a vehicle for social satire and criticism in the same way that Pratchett is not merely a funny and entertaining author but a satirist who is also concerned with serious topics. In this context, social satire is understood as a witty criticism of certain flaws and issues in society. Specifically, in the City Watch Trilogy this satirical criticism is focused on the topics of racism, gender, and identity. Pratchett demonstrates his awareness of and critical attitude towards phenomena of racism both on an individual and on an institutional level. Furthermore, he recognizes and criticizes the discrimination of women based on gender stereotypes as well as the challenges that intersectionality, the combination of several discriminatory categories, constitutes for those affected by it. Pratchett also discusses the concept of gender in terms of the social construction of gender and the performativity thereof. As a result, this thesis intends to demonstrate that Pratchett's literary legacy features far more than a merely funny and parodistic world of absurd characters and events.

German abstract

Terry Pratchett war einer der erfolgreichsten, populärsten, und produktivsten Autoren der Fantasyliteratur und sein großer Erfolg basiert vor allem darauf, dass er völlig zurecht als einer der lustigsten Fantasyautoren gilt. Allerdings geht seine Popularität nicht mit einem wissenschaftlichen Interesse bzw. einer wissenschaftlichen Wertschätzung einher, die seinem Erfolg angemessen wäre. Dadurch, dass er vor allem auf dem Feld der Fantasyliteratur tätig ist und großen Wert auf einen humoristischen Zugang in seinen Werken legt, ist er im akademischen Diskurs unterrepräsentiert. Diese Diplomarbeit versucht daher, dieses Ungleichgewicht zumindest etwas

auszugleichen, indem argumentiert wird, dass das akademische Desinteresse ungerechtfertigt ist. Die Scheibenwelt-Serie bzw. insbesondere in der in dieser Arbeit analysierten sogenannten Stadtwachen-Trilogie beinhaltet nicht nur ausgesprochen komische Situationen und Charaktere, sondern Pratchett thematisiert darin auch sozialkritische Themen wie Rassismus, Geschlecht und Identität, wobei dies auf eine ausgesprochen satirische Art und Weise geschieht, daher auch der Fokus auf Sozialsatire in der Stadtwachen-Trilogie. Pratchett demonstriert sein Bewusstsein für und Kritik von Phänomenen von Rassismus sowohl auf einer persönlichen, als auch auf einer institutionellen Ebene. Weiters erkennt er die Problematik der Diskriminierung von Frauen basierend auf abwertenden Stereotypen an und verurteilt diese. Des Weiteren behandelt Pratchett den Begriff des Geschlechts in Sinne dessen sozialer Kontrüertheit und er geht auf die Thematik der Performativität in Bezug auf Geschlecht ein. Mit diesen Thematiken soll in dieser Diplomarbeit gezeigt werden, dass Pratchetts Werk mehr Tiefgang aufweist als einige Kritiker ihm vorwarfen.

Plot summaries

In case there are some readers who are not familiar with the *Discworld*-series, a brief introduction to Ankh-Morpork, the biggest city on the Discworld and setting of the books, the Ankh-Morpork City Watch, as well as the plots of the three books dealt with in this thesis are provided here.

Ankh-Morpork

The novels are set in Ankh-Morpork, which is the largest and oldest existing city on the entire Discworld and home to about one million inhabitants, or as Havelock Vetinari, the then ruler of Ankh-Morpork, puts it: “Brawling city of a hundred thousand souls! And [...] ten times that number of actual people” (Pratchett *Guards* 110). The Discworld itself is, as the name already implies, a flat, disc-shaped planet of a circumference of 30 000 miles, orbited by a small sun, and moves through space resting on the backs of four giant elephants which stand on the back a giant turtle known as the Great A'Tuin which moves through space towards an unknown destination (Pratchett, Briggs 80). Ankh-Morpork is a city state of a size of only about 1 mile across within the city walls, yet it exerts “political and economic influence which distorts the landscape for hundreds of miles” (Discworld & Terry Pratchett Wiki). Originally, it was two cities, Ankh and Morpork, which were once separated by the river Ankh, which is at the time of the novels are set a body of water “so muddy that it looks as if it is flowing upside down” and, due to its semi-solid state, “probably the only river in the universe on which investigators can chalk the outline of a corpse” (Pratchett *Men* 130) and is accompanied by a smell the city is famous for on the entire Disc. The mottoes of Ankh-Morpork are *quanti canicula ille in fenestra* (How Much is That Doggie in the Window), which is the older of the two mottoes and which was one of three suggestions the mad King Ludwig the Tree, who ruled the city for four years at one point in its long history, was asked for and in the end chosen as official motto by a committee (the other suggestions were “Bduh bduh bduh bduh” and “I think I want my potty now”) (Pratchett, Briggs 16). The other official motto, *merus in pectum et in aquam* (Pure in Heart and Water), was introduced at a later stage in the history of the city, but is less popular with the citizens of Ankh-Morpork and usually considered “a jolly good laugh” as there are not many things to say about Ankh-Morpork which are further from the truth (Pratchett, Briggs 16). In the history of the city, various forms of government including monarchy, oligarchy, and anarchy, had

been implemented but none was able to stand the test of time. At the time of the novels, a special kind of dictatorship is currently in use, that is, a highly specialized democracy in which a Patrician, an absolute tyrant, is elected based on the principle of ‘One Man, One Vote’ where the Patrician himself is the Man and has the Vote (Pratchett, Briggs 17). The incumbent Patrician is the aforementioned Havelock Vetinari, who, while being a despotic ruler who deeply savors the power he holds, only intends the city to function without any regard for personal gain or vanity as previous Patricians. He truly manages to keep Ankh-Morpork going, despite various groups constantly fighting, plotting, and scheming for influence and power in the form of the various Guilds, of which about three hundred for all kinds of occupations exist at the time, such as the Guild of Merchants, the Beggars’ Guild, or the Assassins’ Guild, by “organizing crime that it is self-regulating and therefore not an existential problem to the city”, as it can be seen with one of the masterpieces of Vetinari’s efforts in controlling the city by controlling the Guilds:

One of the remarkable innovations introduced by the Patrician was to make the Thieves’ Guild *responsible* for theft, with annual budgets, forward planning and, above all, rigid job protection. Thus, in return for an agreed average level of crime per annum, the thieves themselves saw to it that unauthorized crime was met with the full force of Injustice, which was generally a stick with nails in it. (Pratchett *Guards!* 57)

Under usual circumstances, as a sprawling city hosting countless workshops and businesses, Ankh-Morpork would constitute a profitable target for raids and attacks by foreign powers, brigands, or barbarian hordes. However, no enemies have ever taken over or at least looted the city. While countless enemy soldiers, barbarian invaders, or similar armed forces have actually *entered* Ankh-Morpork, they never successfully finished their undertaking. This is due to the fact that “under siege, [it] did what Ankh-Morpork had always done—unbar the gates, let the conquerors in, and make them your own” (Pratchett *Guards!* 281) because every time, “the puzzled raiders always find, after a few days, that they don’t own their horses any more, and within a couple of months they’re just another minority group with its own graffiti and food shops” (Pratchett, Briggs 19). Like any other big metropolis, Ankh-Morpork has great appeal for people from regions all over the Discworld. Therefore, it features a diverse population with a human majority and substantial number of ethnic minority groups including dwarfs (Ankh-Morpork actually has the biggest dwarf population outside of their native regions and it is the largest dwarf city overall), trolls, were-

wolves, vampires, zombies, and golems. Unsurprisingly, ethnic riots and feuds are common as a result of the diverse population. Ankh-Morpork is nonetheless a place where many people want to live and therefore end up migrating to it.

The Ankh-Morpork City Watch

The Ankh-Morpork City Watch was founded by King Veltrick I who bestowed on it his personal motto “Fabricati Diem, Pvncti Agvnt Celeriter” (“Make the Day, the Moments Pass Quickly”), which over time eroded to “Fabricati Diem, Pvnc” which, according to current members of the Watch means “To Protect and Serve” (Pratchett *Guards!* 66). It originally consisted of 4 divisions, the Day Watch, the Night Watch, the Palace Guards, and the Cable Street Particulars. The Cable Street Particulars were named after the location of their headquarter in Cable Street and formed a sort of secret police which was feared among the population due to their practice of arresting citizens without warrants and torturing them extensively, even to death. Several years before the setting of the first City Watch book (*Guards! Guards!*), the Particulars were dissolved after the Ankh-Morpork Glorious Revolution. Day Watch and Night Watch both share the same police stations, the only difference between the two is one is in charge during the daylight hours while the other is on duty during the night (Pratchett, Briggs 255-256). As outlined above, Vetinari followed a policy of self-regulation in the sense that each Guild is responsible for the crime committed by their members. As there are Guilds for almost every imaginable occupation including assassination and thievery, this system proved to be very effective and successful in containing unlawful activities which were within the jurisdiction of the Guilds. However, this step proved to be very unfortunate for the Ankh-Morpork Watch, as it put its employees out of work almost entirely and made the entire institution basically unnecessary, since essentially all activities which were formerly considered criminal offenses were now legalized or at least dealt with through the Guild system. Thus, the significance and reputation of the especially of the Night Watch suffered and it slowly became a reservoir of the dregs of Ankh-Morpork’s society who had nowhere else to go. The Night Watch “got up when the rest of the world was going to bed, and went to bed when dawn drifted over the landscape. You spent your whole time in the damp, dark streets, in a world of shadows. The Night Watch attracted the kind of people who for one reason or another were inclined to that kind of life” (Pratchett *Guards* 66). When asked about the Night Watch, Vetinari himself put it this way: “The Watch? The Watch? My dear chap,

the Watch are a bunch of incompetents commanded by a drunkard. It's taken me years to achieve it. The last thing we need to concern ourselves with is the Watch." (110). As a result, "no one ever thinks about the Watch. You'd have to be really out of touch to go to the Watch for help" (110). At the beginning of the first Watch-novel, the Night Watch consists of three member, Captain Samuel Vimes, the head of the Night Watch, Sergeant Fred Colon, and Corporal Nobby "disqualified from the human race for shoving" Nobbs, who form something like a pool of the most deplorable, miserable, and despicable group of people of all of Ankh-Morpork. They are then joined by a new recruit, Carrot Ironfoundersson, a human boy who was raised by dwarfs after he was as an infant the sole survivor of an ambush on the carriage in which he and his parents were travelling in. He had to leave the mine of his childhood after he had reached puberty and it was no longer possible for his parents to pretend that Carrot was in fact a dwarf and decided to go to Ankh-Morpork to join the Watch and "have a man made of him", in the literal and the proverbial sense of the word (Pratchett *Guards! Guards!* 40). Carrot's voluntary entrance into the Watch is the also the starting point of the first of the three City Watch novels this thesis focuses on, *Guards! Guards!* (1989), with the other being *Men at Arms* (1993) and *Feet of Clay* (1996).

Guards! Guards! (1989)

A secret brotherhood plots to take over Ankh-Morpork by overthrowing the Patrician and installing a puppet-king. Their plan to achieve this consists of summoning an ancient dragon that should then instill fear in the people. Following this, they would provide the population with a 'hero' who then slays the dragon and frees the city. In return, the hero is of course made king, as it only befits someone capable of slaying a dragon. Meanwhile, the Night Watch has a new member, Carrot Ironfoundersson, who with his idealism and honesty breathes new life into the band of cynical and utterly incompetent Watchmen, who then set out to investigate the sightings of a dragon, a creature of legends now spreading terror in the city. In the course of their investigation, the Watch members discover the only form of dragon still common on the Discworld, the swamp dragon, a miserable little creature of about two feet who are known for their tendency of spontaneous combustion and meet their most distinguished breeder, Sybil Ramkin. The brotherhood unfortunately manages to execute their plan and presents the city with a hero who 'slays' the dragon and 'liberates' the people of Ankh-Morpork. On the day of the coronation of the new king, though, the

dragon reappears of its own volition (it was never really slain, only banished back into the realm it was repeatedly summoned from), kills the alleged hero and takes over the city itself. As it is the custom for a reigning dragon, it demands gold and a virgin to be sacrificed. After a frantic search, as both is rather rare in Ankh-Morpork, Sybil Ramkin is found to be the only virgin at hand who is not about twelve years old or younger. Shortly before she is devoured by the dragon, one of her own swamp dragons, Errol, comes for her rescue, despite being overwhelmingly inferior to the summoned dragon. It is then discovered that the summoned dragon is female and both it and Errol, a male, feel attracted to each other and eventually fly off together. The brotherhood's plan failed, the Patrician is reinstated and the Watch, which had a major part in solving the mystery of the dragon, is rewarded with an explicitly modest pay rise, a new kettle, and a dartboard.

Men at Arms (1993)

Edwarf d'Eath, the last remaining offspring of a down-and-out noble family, plots the overthrow the current government and the restoration of monarchy in Ankh-Morpork because of his disapproval of the diminishing influence of his and other noble families and of the social changes in the city, as more and more members of ethnic minorities are coming into the city. After a comprehensive research into the genealogies of the kings of Ankh-Morpork, he one day he accidentally discovers an (completely unaware) descendant of the last royal family and heir to the throne in the city: Carrot Ironfoundersson! D'Eath then steals the first and only portable firearm in all of the Discworld, the Gonne, and begins to kill several people in order to discredit the government and force a change to monarchy. In the meantime, the changing social dynamics in the city also affect the Watch. The Patrician decreed a policy of affirmative action hiring in the Watch and as a result, there are new recruits of several ethnic minority groups: a dwarf, a troll, and a werewolf (as representative of the undead population). Captain Vimes meanwhile plans his wedding with Sybil Ramkin, whom he had saved from the dragon, and who incidentally happens to be the richest woman in all of Ankh-Morpork. The Watchmen start to investigate the series of murders even though they are intentionally forbidden to do so by Lord Vetinari, who knows that this is even more reason for them to do so. D'Eath cannot hold his plan to himself anymore and, as a former member of the Assassins' Guild, confides it to Dr. Cruces, the head of the Guild, who promptly kills d'Eath and takes up the plan and

Gonne himself. The final step in the plan involves the murder of Lord Vetinari and Cruces almost succeeds in doing so but a final desperate effort by the Watch both saves the life of the Patrician and solves the murder cases by catching Cruces and discovering the mystery of the Gonne. Unfortunately, one new member is killed in the process and another is shot several times but survives as she is a werewolf who, as everyone knows, cannot be killed with ordinary bullets but only with a weapon made of silver. Vimes and Sybil finally get married, Vimes is promoted to Commander of the entire Watch, and the Watch's prestige grows exponentially as a result of the events. It is rewarded for its efforts in form of the reopening of several former Watch houses closed down in the past, due to the steep increase of now fifty-six members, and a new dartboard.

Feet of Clay (1996)

Yet again, Lord Vetinari should be disposed of, this time by a cabal of several Guild leaders trying to install a puppet-king instead of the Patrician as the leader of the city who is then controlled by a shadow council consisting of the Guild leaders involved in the scheme. Several of the city's golems, creatures made of clay which have to follow what is written on their 'chem', written instructions placed inside their heads, decide to create another golem from parts of their own clay, Meshugah, their 'king' and liberator, as they are nothing but slaves to their owners. They fill the chem with their hopes and dreams such as "Create peace and justice for all", "Teach us freedom", and "Rule us wisely". The cabal's plan to dispose of Vetinari consists of making arsenic candles that poison him unnoticed until it is too late. Unfortunately for them, the golem belonging to the candlemaker is Meshugah, who cannot deal with all the instructions put into his head and repeatedly goes rampant in the city due to an 'overload' of his mind and kills several people in the process. These of course bring the Watch to the scene which promptly starts to investigate both the deaths as well as the circumstances of the poisoning of the Patrician with the help of their new forensics expert, the former alchemist Cheery Littlebottom. They eventually manage to solve the problem of the murders, and after a short but intense fight, the mad golem is taken down. Subsequently, they find out who is responsible for the poisoned candles and the head behind the plotters, a vampire who is also the city's chief heraldry expert, is arrested. In the end, Vetinari recovers from the poison, the last remaining golem in-

volved in the making of Meshugah is sworn in as Watchmen, Vimes receives a modest pay rise, and the Watch gets another dartboard.