

## >Wild< and >civilized<1

>Wild< and >civilized< are two sides of the same sign, in certain tongues like this

Both terms are one, tied together

by events in what we perceive and know as history.

>Wild< cannot be thought of separately.

Its colors, tones, meanings, and timbres cannot be perceived in themselves.

They fade away into melancholy, into in the clang of the desire for freedom and liberty.

When it is evoked, it is evoked as other - inferior, unknowing, irrational, different in a degraded way, it cannot represent itself

evokes that with which it is placed in a ratio, dichotomous and binary, that which, from an illusory position of power, masquerades as its superior.

Thus,

reluctantly, it reveals no part of itself,

but that which is attached to it, that which, for some readings is understood as civilized.

An asymmetrical relationship

implicitly

expresses and justifies

a struggle - or rather - an attack.

An attack on »wildness« that has learned to value and own itself within a free interior that is otherwise hidden from the silencing sign of such attributions.

In Western narrative traditions, however, it is neither visible nor audible. It has learned to echo within hegemonic discourses, alongside civilized to subtly, barely perceptible, undermine its confidence.

>Civilized stands for the unmarked supremacy of power structures, and wildness stands for all the attributes and ascriptions it imagines itself apart from in order to be.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This is a revised and expanded version of a text based on the German original entitled »zivilsiert und »wild« from the following anthology, a critical encyclopedia, *Wie Rassismus aus Wörtern spricht(K)Erben des Kolonialismus im Wissensarchiv deutsche Sprache – Ein kritisches Nachschlagewerk* edited by Nadja Ofuatey-Alazard/Susan Arndt. 4th Edition Münster: Unrast Verlag ([2011]2019), p.678

>Civilized thus describes the order of domination that vainly tries to rule and hide the other half of its desires behind its back (mirror).

By romanticizing wildness, or presenting it as outside of history and historically outdated - either as a still life on the backward canvas of time or as a future threat looming on its clear and untainted skyline - civilized, and all its derivatives are invariably cultural representations of (colonial) discourses of power. It others its other, or altered self in order to romanticize itself.

In colonial discourses and imaginaries, wilderness thus signifies muteness, the inability to speak, inferiority, and at the same time danger and threat. As a label of supposed muteness, wild stands for immaturity, so it can be subordinated to the label of civilized. The wild can be killed or tamed; the wild seems to be absent from the civilized order, which can take possession of wilderness (place) or wildness (state) - at the risk of its own life, which is supposed to make it even more heroic. Wildness and wilderness symbolize outlawry or nature; both can be taken, discovered, desired, and abhorred. Civilized is symbolized by the color white - and white stands for the beautiful, for purity, and innocence. In white cultural symbolism, wild is symbolized by black.

And

black

and

dark

stand for courage, grace, resistance, and beauty,

for freedom and solidarity,

for a different,

open view of the wor(l)d,

for the dissolution of binary and dichotomizing thinking,

for the ineffability of writing.

- for you and me.



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (BY) license, which means that the text may be remixed, transformed and built upon and be copied and redistributed in any medium or format even commercially, provided credit is given to the author. <a href="https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0">https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0</a>