

## 젠더 갈등의 ‘선택적 혼종성’ 양상에 대한 신학· 윤리적 제언

백소영 (강남대학교 초빙교수)

### I. 들어가는 말

### II. 대한민국 후기근대의 사회적 상황과 영페미니스트의 정체성 운동

1. 일상의 페미니즘, 영페미니스트의 등장
2. 여혐과 남혐의 기괴한 생존 전략, ‘선택적 혼종성’

### III. 영페미니스트들의 ‘선택적 혼종성’ 전략인가 욕망인가?

### IV. 후기근대적 “위험사회”와 공동체적 생존을 위한 연대

### V. 정체성과 연대 사이, “존재의 기공성”과 사회적 영성

### VI. 닫는 말

---

• ABSTRACT •

---

A Theo-Ethical Proposal on the ‘Elective Hybridity’ Phenomena in the  
Gender Conflicts of the 21<sup>st</sup> century Korea

Prof. Baik, Soyoung (Kangnam University)

With an intensive concern on the ‘young-feminists’ who have rapidly grown as a protesting group against the existing patriarchal culture, this article analyzes their rising as a social phenomenon emerged in the late modern neoliberal Korean contexts. The young-feminists are women, for the first time in the history of modern Korea, who have strong self consciousness at massive scale, while they belong to the generation which has experienced harsh and competitive economic environments of the 21<sup>st</sup> century neoliberal Korea. Witnessing the ‘elective hybridity’ in the ‘mirroring strategy’ of the young-feminists, the combination of the feminist actions and the selective acceptance of profitable resources from the present patriarchal institutions and cultural presuppositions, however, this article worries about the possibility of reinforcing current neoliberal orders as the results of ‘elective hybridity’ strategy. As an alternative feminist strategy for imaging and practicing a new group interaction, which would result in the advent of a gender-equal society, as a concluding remark, this article examines the concept of “the porosity of being,” the ontological ground of communicating with each other while retaining the boundary of an individual/an identity group.

**Key words:** Young-feminists, Mirroring Strategy, Elective Affinity, Neoliberal World, the Porosity of Being

---

※

‘ ’ ( )  
‘ ’ 2016 5  
10

‘ ’ ( )  
IMF  
1990 ‘ ’ 1  
‘ ’ “1990 2000  
‘ ’  
”  
1) ‘  
2.0’ 1990  
1, 2 ‘ ’  
‘ ’

---

1) ‘  
‘ ’ “ ‘ ’ : < >  
‘ ’ “ 『 31 3 (2015): 31.  
2 , 8 ,  
2 “  
: ‘ ’ “ ’ :  
2001), ‘ ’ 『 ( : , 2017)

?

. 2018 11

. 1990

~”3)

2) “ ?” “ X” ... , 『 』, 2018. 11. 17 [http://www.newsis.com/view/?id=NISX20181116\\_0000475596&cID=10201&pID=10200](http://www.newsis.com/view/?id=NISX20181116_0000475596&cID=10201&pID=10200)

3) ‘ ’ . 2015

(2015 5 29 )

2019

78.92%

4)

(hybridity)

(the po-

rosity of being)”

4)

... 2019 1 4  
[http://www.newsis.com/view/?id=NISX20190104\\_0000521568&cID=10201&pID=10200](http://www.newsis.com/view/?id=NISX20190104_0000521568&cID=10201&pID=10200)

»#

#Z

†

1990

( )

?

1

19

20

2

1960 ~70

1970

1

5)

5)

, 2013)





5

“ ” ( )”

“ ” “ (

( )

” ( , 2017),

(elective hybridity)

7) “ ( ) ’ ‘ ( ) ’ ” 8)

---

7) “ ” “ 2014 2 19 32 , 2 26 33 .

8) “ ” 7 , 『 ( : , 2018), 32. ’

< In>  
 < > < In> < > < >

9)

(womad)

10)

---

9) , 『 , 『 ( : , 2018), 77-78.

10) , 『 , 53~55.



, ?  
>>># “ ” 4

‘ ’ ‘ ’  
‘ ’ ?

‘ ’  
‘ ’  
‘ ’

“ ”  
“ ” 12)  
“ ” ?  
?

---

12) , 『 , 『 ( : , 2011), 14.

“ , , .” .13)

/

.

,

‘

.

,

?

.

‘

,

.

1

.

,

‘

,

.14)

.

“

”

“

”

,

,

.

,

,

,

---

13) , , 17.

14) , “ ” 『 (2001. 6 ), 240.

2030

&lt; &gt;

“

”

15)

“

” 16) ,

“

”

17)

?

15) , “ : 2000 , ”

16) “ (performativity)” , 108.

“ , ” ( : , 2006) . “ ” “ ” “ ” . “ ” ( : , 2004), 59. 78.

“ ” , “ ” ( : , 2002), 323.

17) , , 86.

,

( , , )

.

“

” 18)

‘ , ’

“

” ‘ , ’

‘ , ’

.

, -

.

‘ ’(

---

18) “ (elective affinity)”

『

』

.

.



) ,

‘ , ’

5

“ ” ,

‘

, ,

1

‘ ’

‘ ’

( “ ”

) ,

“

”19)

. “ 10  
[ ] ?”20)

✂# . “ ” . . . . .

,  
“ ,  
,  
?  
.  
“  
” . . . . .  
,  
( ) ,  
“  
” ,21) -  
.

---

19) , , 132-133.  
20) , , 133.  
21) , , 『 : ( ) 』 ( : , 1997),  
40.

, , . |  
 , ,  
 .  
 ( , , )  
 . ? 4  
 ‘ ‘ ’  
 .  
 ,  
 .  
 “  
 ,<sup>22)</sup> 1980  
 .  
 ?  
 ‘ ’  
 ?  
 ( )  
 .  
 ‘ ’  
 “ /  
 (reflexive rationality)” .  
 “ ” “

---

22) , , 77.

?” “

?” “

?”

.

‘ ’

-

23)

,

?

20

‘ ’

,

“

”

.

,

‘

’

.

,

,

.

.

.

.

23)

：“

.

.

.

,

,

,

.

. ...

,

”

,

, 357-358.

K#

!“

”

(proleptic)

( )

?

(Carter Heyward)

24)

25)

“ (the porosity of being)”

24) Carter Heyward, *Our Passion for Justice: Image of Power, Sexuality, and Liberation* (New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1984), 43~45, 『기독교사회윤리』 제43집 (서울: 기독교사회윤리연구원, 2018), 155

25) 『기독교사회윤리』 제43집 (서울: 기독교사회윤리연구원, 2015): 85-121

,

‘ ’ ,

‘ ’ ,

‘ ’ ,

‘ ’ ,

‘ ’ ,

‘ ’ ,

“ ”

,

,

‘ ’ , 『 』

26)

“ ”

“ ”

,

,

“ ”

“ ”

“ ”

“ ”

27)

---

26) , 『 』 ( : , 1992), 381.

?

‘ , ’

’

“

1

”

28) “

”

?

’

’

‘ , ’

‘ ( ) ’

‘ ( ) ’

‘ ’

‘ , ’

K>#

“

” “

’

”

27) , , 291-292.

28) “ ’ ”, 7 , , 74.





·  
‘ ’

’ · ’

· ·

·

· ’  
“ ”

·

·

’

’

·

## 참고문헌

- “ ” 7 . 『 』 .  
: , 2018.
- “ ” : 1990 2000  
· 『 :  
』 . : 2017.
- “ ” 7 . 『 』 .  
: , 2018.
- 『 』 . : , 1992.  
· 『 , 』 . : , 2013.  
—— 『 』 . : , 2018.  
—— “ ” :  
· 『 』 32 . ( , 2015): 85-121.  
· 『 : ( ) 』 . : ,  
1997.
- 『 』 . : , 2006.  
· 『 , 』 .  
』 . : , 2004.
- “ ” : 2000  
· 『 :  
』 . : 2001.
- “ ” 『  
』 24 . ( , 2015): 5-79.
- “ ” :  
· 『 , 2017.
- “ ” : < >  
· 『 』 31 3 . ( , 2015): 31-64.  
· 『 : , 2018.

, 『 , 』.  
: , 2011.  
, 『 , , 』. : , 2002.

논문투고일: 2019년 3월 01일

심사계시일: 2019년 3월 13일

게재확정일: 2019년 4월 10일

• 국문 초록 •

vs.

, IMF

bridity)

(elective hy-

“ (the porosity of being)”

주제어: