Letter from the Director

The Institute for Research on Women began its 27th year with the publication of working papers from the 2002-03 Interdisciplinary Seminar, *Reconfiguring Class and Gender: Identities, Rights, and Social Movements*. The essays in the volume, available from the Institute’s website, consider social justice movements, gendered forces shaping economic development, the possibility of sustained cross-class and transnational feminist alliances, and how our labors affect our self-esteem and identifications. I learned an enormous amount from last year’s seminar fellows, and we’re pleased to make their projects more widely available.

This year’s seminar, *Femininities, Masculinities, and the Politics of Sexual Difference(s)*, has attracted some twenty-five to thirty participants, including the seminar fellows and visiting scholars listed on the right. My hope for frank, buoyant, inspired weekly conversations has been amply rewarded. We invite you to download the papers from the web and join us on Thursday mornings.

In this newsletter we offer excerpts from some talks you may have missed such as Sheila Rowbotham’s meditation on class scholarship in Britain given to the seminar last spring. We present highlights from Suzanne Lebsock’s lecture on women’s culture and Lila Abu-Lughod’s day at the IRW, which included a morning discussion of Egyptian soap operas, a mid-day meeting with graduate students, and a cautionary public lecture on colonial and developmental feminisms.

You’ll also find news about two special roundtables hosted by the Institute over the summer. The first brought thirty-five Danish trade union women to New Jersey to tackle democracy and gender equity in labor institutions. The second, funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, gathered experts on the gender politics of immigrant social movements. We were pleased to welcome Ruth Milkman (Fordham Law School), Nahar Alam (Andolan Organizing South Asian Workers), Maria Ontiveros (University of San Francisco Law School), Seung-kyung Kim (University of Maryland), Candace Howes (Connecticut College) and others to that discussion.

And keep your spring 2004 calendar open for future distinguished lecturers (Joanne Meyerowitz, Deborah Willis, and our own Liz Grosz), international speakers on African women’s health, a May symposium on sexual politics in the workplace, and a welcoming celebration for Bonnie Smith and Beth Hutchison’s edited anthology, *Gendering Disability* (Rutgers University Press, 2004).

I hope to share food, drink, and conversation with many of you as my third year at IRW comes to a close. Thank you for giving me this opportunity and for your support of the Institute!

--Dorothy Sue Cobble

Seminar Fellows

Barbara Balliet, Women’s and Gender Studies
Wesley Brown, English
Cheryl Clarke, Diverse Community Affairs and Lesbian-Gay Concerns
Jewel Daney, Center for Women’s Global Leadership
Cynthia Daniels, Political Science
David Eng, English
Susan Golbeck, Educational Psychology, Graduate School of Education
Elana Mancini, Germanic Languages and Literatures
Jessica Morales-Libove, Anthropology
Jennifer Morgan, History; Women’s and Gender Studies
Pia Mustamaki, English
Sasha Patterson, Center for the American Women and Politics; Political Science
Jennifer Pettit, History
Yoko Suzuki, Music

Visiting Scholars

Marla Bretschneider, Women’s Studies & Political Science; University of New Hampshire, Durham
Deborah Hertz, History & Gender Studies; Sarah Lawrence College & Tel Aviv University (Autumn 2003)
Leslie Heywood, English; SUNY-Binghamton
Caroline Keating, Psychology, Colgate University
Yong-Hyun Kwon, Policy Coordination Division, Ministry of Gender Equality; Seoul, Korea
Eléonore Lépinard, Sociology; Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (Paris)/Fulbright Fellow
Nandita Prasad Sahai, History; University of Delhi, Hindu College/AAUW Fellow

For more information

Check our newly redesigned webpage for upcoming events, visiting scholar project abstracts, and more:

http://irw.rutgers.edu
Suzanne Lebsock on Women’s Culture

By Meredith Hall, IRW Graduate Assistant

The first lecture in the IRW’s Thinking about Gender/Thinking about Sexual Difference(s) distinguished lecture series, “A Reprise in Women’s Culture?,” attracted over 120 faculty, staff and students to join Board of Governors History Professor Suzanne Lebsock in rethinking “the existence, parameters, limits and possibilities of the concept women’s culture.”

Lebsock noted that the idea of women’s culture held a multi-layered appeal for feminists during the late seventies and early eighties. Many feminists and women’s historians hoped to illuminate women’s historical significance and ultimately change the public sphere by describing a separate women’s culture that developed and espoused values denigrated by men.

While acknowledging critiques that a unified sisterhood never existed, Lebsock’s research shows that in the case of white, financially independent individuals, women were more likely than men to free a slave, keep a slave’s family together, and leave legacies to churches and charities in nineteenth century Virginia. She also found that proportionately more women than men wrote wills and specified which of their children would receive legacies, often favoring daughters over sons, whereas men tended to distribute their possessions in equal shares among their progeny.

Lebsock argued that some notion of women’s culture could again be useful to historians. Feminists and women’s historians may be able to talk about a single concept of women’s culture and historians might ask a single set of questions, but when speaking of women’s cultural creations and impact, scholars would have to examine varying women’s cultures, taking into account race, sex, class, etc.

For Lebsock, the most important reason to reassess the usefulness of women’s culture is its transformative potential: “The idea of women’s culture was probably most attractive in the first place because we thought that it might help us change the world . . . Surely our need for transformation hasn’t declined since 1987.”

Commentator: Deborah Gray White

History professor Deborah Gray White responded by questioning whether “women’s culture” could be as inclusive as Lebsock suggested.

“Perhaps we need to wonder whether a women's culture and identity are the same thing,” White said. “Women can share a common identity, but not a common culture.”

Moreover, even within racial and ethnic groups there are many differences in class, region, sexuality, and color. "There is more empirical evidence for separate-ness than togetherness,” White concluded. “I think that the empirical evidence . . . seems to come down on the side of the absence of women’s culture.”

After a brief question-and-answer session, the enthusiastic audience continued this provocative conversation at a reception hosted by the Institute for Women’s Leadership.

For a fuller summary of IRW lectures, consult the IRW website.

Lila Abu-Lughod at Rutgers

On October 16, distinguished feminist anthropologist and scholar of Middle Eastern Studies Lila Abu-Lughod came to Rutgers as part of a day-long series of events that focused on her recent anthropological work on television serials in Egypt.

In the morning, Abu-Lughod met with faculty and advanced graduate students in the IRW/IWL Seminar to discuss a chapter from her forthcoming book—a project begun in 1989 after she observed teenage Bedouin girls listening to radio soap operas, much to the woe of their elders. She soon turned the focus of her project to television serials because they had a larger following in Egypt and had greater influence on the lives of their viewers.
**Lila Abu-Lughod (continued)**

Her chapter, “Modern Subjects? Egyptian Melodrama and Postcolonial Difference,” considers how televised serial melodrama functions as a constitutive force in creating the modernist Egyptian subject, and asks what this might tell us about the creation of an Egyptian national culture.

After the seminar, Abu-Lughod met with a small group of Anthropology, Political Science, and Women’s and Gender Studies graduate students to discuss her books and experiences in Egypt, focusing specifically on the problems surrounding ethnographic research and writing, the political implications of her work, and the ways that context affects the type of political approach one’s writing takes.

Elizabeth Woodruff, a doctoral student from the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies, commented on the meeting, “I was impressed by the way in which she was able to recognize problematics of ethnographic work, yet still maintain an absolute certainty of its importance as a form of activism.” We thank Mary Hawkesworth (Graduate Director, Women’s and Gender Studies) for working closely with us to host this event, the first of many such gatherings that are planned.

The second in the IRW’s distinguished lecture series, Thinking about Gender/Thinking about Sexual Differences, Professor Abu-Lughod’s talk, “Other Differences: Feminism Meets Culture and Class in the Middle East,” was attended by a diverse audience of Rutgers community members and the general public.

Her talk addressed two main issues: the dangers that surround the rhetoric of “saving” Afghan women and the problems and ethical conflicts that face Middle-Eastern feminists when considering the situation of rural, illiterate, and traditionalist women in their countries.

Calling into question the theoretical approaches many Western journalists and scholars have employed when considering issues in the Middle East, Abu-Lughod emphasized that privileging cultural over historical understandings of the Middle East limits our ability to make global interconnections.

**“Other Differences” and the French Feminist Question**

By Eléonore Lépinard, IRW Visiting Scholar

As a French feminist scholar, I was grateful for Professor Abu-Lughod’s presentation of the patronizing and ambivalent assumptions that inform Western feminists’ reactions to the “Afghan woman question.” Her talk illuminated some of the conflicts inherent in French feminists’ responses to the recent heated “headscarf” debates.

Since the wars of decolonization, many people from former colonies in Northern Africa have settled in France. Islam is now the second most practised religion in France and the object of intense public scrutiny.

The French Republic has a long history of assimilation based on principles and values such as individual rights, secularism, abstract citizenship, and blindness towards difference in public spaces and institutions. In this difference-blind model, minorities—especially ethnic and religious ones and particularly recently—have confronted tremendous resistance from the State, as well as political parties and intellectuals, to any public expression of their difference.

The silencing of religious minorities has taken the form, in 1989 and again a few months ago, of banning headscarves for Muslim teenage girls in public schools. The outcome has been an emerging consensus spanning the political spectrum that secularism must be enforced and any religious observances banished from public schools.

Abu-Lughod’s analysis of how feminist arguments have been used to justify U.S. actions in Afghanistan is very helpful in the French context as well. When it comes to conflicts with Islam, the “woman question” emerges, and veils, headscarves and burqas are cited as proof of an unacceptable masculine domination over Muslim women. As Abu-Lughod pointed out, the fact that some feminists endorse a patronizing vision of Muslim women who supposedly need to be saved and emancipated, even against their own will and their own faith, is quite problematic.

In France, the silence of most prominent feminists’ voices, with a few voicing a feminist position against the headscarf at school, expresses a deep crisis in the French feminist movement, as well as a new challenge. During Abu-Lughod’s talk, I heard for the first time a critique that I wished I had heard before in the French context.

As France faces the challenges of globalization and European integration, the Republican stance and the emphasis on the nation’s unity make it difficult for alternative feminist voices to emerge, especially ones that would analyse differences among women, how they interact with culture, religion and class, and how feminist politics should take them into account.
Thinking about Gender/Thinking about Sexual Difference(s)
Distinguished Lecture Series

R.W. Connell & Masculinity Studies

As the newsletter went to press, R.W. Connell (Education, University of Sydney) was in transit to the IRW to present the third in our distinguished lecture series on Tuesday, November 25. One of the founders of masculinity studies and well-known for his many publications on gender and masculinities, he has also authored research reports for the United Nations and UNESCO addressing the role of men and boys in reducing gender-based and other violence and in promulgating peace.

Connell’s talk at the IRW, “Masculinity Politics and World Society” considers how globalization and international capitalism are changing local masculinities and gender relations. More details are available on our website.

He also generously provided two articles as background for discussion with fellows of the IRW/IWL interdisciplinary seminar (“The Role of Men and Boys in Achieving Gender Equality” and “Globalization and Business Masculinities”). Please contact the IRW for information about how to access them on our webpage (irw@rci.rutgers.edu or 732/932-9072).

Spring 2004 Lectures

The IRW’s distinguished lecture series will continue Spring Semester with visits to Rutgers by Joanne Meyerowitz and Deborah Willis. Rutgers professor Elizabeth Grosz (Women’s and Gender Studies) will conclude this year’s series. The lectures, held at the Ruth Dill Johnson Crockett Building, begin at 4:30 with receptions at 4:00.

On Wednesday, February 4, Joanne Meyerowitz (History, Indiana University and editor, Journal of American History), will build from her recent book, How Sex Changed: A History of Transsexuality in the United States (2002), to enter into a broader discussion of nature, nurture, and social constructionist theories as well as changing definitions of sex, gender, and sexuality in her talk, “Gender, Sexuality, and the Politics of Social Construction.” Professor Meyerowitz will also meet with IRW/IWL seminar fellows from 10:30 to noon on Thursday, February 5.

MacArthur Fellow Deborah Willis (Photography and Imaging, Tisch School of the Arts, New York University) comes to Rutgers on Thursday, February 26, to present “The Black Female Body: A Photographic History.” In a survey of images of Black female bodies, photographs and illustrations including the earliest known drawings and photographic portraits made in Africa of Sarah Baartman in the early 1800s, 1930’s studies by Edward Weston, and work by contemporary artists including Lorna Simpson and Carrie Mae Weems, Willis will consider the interplay between the historical and the contemporary, self-presentation and representation.

In “The Future of Female Sexuality: The Becoming of Sexual Difference,” on Thursday, April 1, Elizabeth Grosz will conclude the year's Thinking about Gender/Thinking About Sexual Differences series with a speculative lecture on how female sexuality and desire challenges and problematizes scientific explanations presented of it, and how we may need to transform our understandings of science in order to understand female sexuality more accurately.
Call for Visiting Scholars, 2004-05

We are currently reviewing applications from scholars wishing to be in residence at the IRW during the 2004-2005 academic year. We have already invited two scholars whose research projects are related to the 2004-2005 seminar theme “Diversity: Expanding Theory and Practice,” so we encourage Rutgers faculty to let their colleagues at other institutions know about this opportunity.

IRW Visiting Scholars join our vibrant community of faculty and advanced graduate students whose research and teaching address women and gender across the disciplines. They enjoy private offices at the IRW with networked computers as well as access to University facilities and services.

Visiting Scholars are invited to join our weekly interdisciplinary research seminar, which provides an ongoing basis for scholarly exchange and communication. We particularly solicit applications from prospective scholars whose work is compatible with next year’s seminar theme, “Diversity: Expanding Theory and Practice.” More information about the seminar is available on the back cover and on our website.

Visiting Scholar application information is available on our website; we also welcome inquiries (irw@rci.rutgers.edu or 732/932-9072).

Spring 2004 Symposia

African Women’s Health

The Department of Women’s and Gender Studies and the IRW are co-organizing a two-day consideration of African Women’s Health on March 25 and 26 focusing on HIV/AIDS and gender-based violence with seed money from a Rutgers Research Council Grant.

Bernedette Muthien (Community Law Centre, University of the Western Cape, South Africa), whose work documents intersections between gender-based violence and HIV/AIDS, is among those invited to speak.

Sexual Politics in the Workplace

An award from the Social Science Research Council to Monica Bielski (School of Management and Labor Relations) and Dorothy Sue Cobble will underwrite a second symposium on workplace sexual politics on Thursday May 4 from 4 to 6 p.m.

Marion G. Crain (Paul Eaton Professor of Law at Carolina Law, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill) and Gerald Hunt (School of Business, Ryerson University, Toronto) will be the featured speakers for this event. They will offer an assessment of how labor organizations are responding to sexual difference(s) with a comparative focus on labor policy toward sexual minorities and sexual harassment.
Women’s Organizing: June 2003 Roundtables

Danish Trade Union Women

A group of 25 Danish trade union women visited the IRW on June 18 to compare perspectives on gender parity and democracy within the labor movement with Rutgers faculty and invited guests.

The first panel considered how Danish unions are approaching gender awareness in the workplace and cultivating women’s leadership. Nina Roth, a consultant for the Ligestillingssekretariatet, discussed a new form of union education in Denmark encouraging shop stewards and union members to define what gender equality means and what can be done at their workplace to reduce gender discrimination. Jette Likke from the Danish Federation of Trade Unions (LO), described mentoring projects for women at different levels of age, seniority, and professional responsibility aimed at increasing women’s involvement in union leadership.

As IRW Director Dorothy Sue Cobble pointed out in the day’s second panel, less than 15% of the U.S. labor force is organized, compared to 85% in Denmark. However, because of women’s increasing presence and participation in U.S. unions, women have the potential to change the culture and institutions of labor as never before. The final presenter, Tamara Østergård (KAD), described her experience as a shop steward for the Women Workers’ Union in the cleaning services sector and her interest in ethnic women’s participation and protection, highlighting the problems faced by ethnic women workers in view of the current Danish government’s assimilation policy.

Immigrant Women Organizing: Avenues for Collective Advancement

On Thursday, June 26, Dorothy Sue Cobble and Nancy Hewitt (History and Women’s and Gender Studies) co-convened a symposium on the history, strategies, and prospects characterizing immigrant women’s collective organizing efforts.

Ruth Milkman (Sociology and Director of the Institute for Labor and Employment, UCLA), Jennifer Gordon (Fordham Law School), and Nahar Alam (Director, Andolan Organizing South Asian Workers) each gave brief papers to ground the balance of the discussion in the historical and contemporary experiences of immigrant women.

Maria Ontiveros (University of San Francisco School of Law) and Seung-kyung Kim (Women’s Studies and Director of Asian American Studies, University of Maryland) provided brief responses to the papers. A lively discussion ensued, exploring immigration policy, individual versus collective rights and advancement, and questions of mobility and heterogeneity among immigrant workers. Additional information and portions of the transcribed proceedings are available on the IRW website: http://irw.rutgers.edu/programs/immigrantwomen.html.

The Institute gratefully acknowledges the Rockefeller Foundation’s support of this symposium and the larger project “Gender, Race, Ethnicity: Rearticulating the Local and the Global.”
Sheila Rowbotham on the “Peculiar Silence” of Class

Why is it that when the women’s liberation movement began in Britain, people on the left would only talk about class? In Britain, the topic of class is separated from race and gender because we haven’t had anything equivalent to the Civil Rights Movement. It was a struggle to get discussions on gender. Thirty years later there has been a complete turnaround. Now it’s obvious to talk about gender and race in Britain, but class has a peculiar silence around it. It has almost been “disappeared.”

A possible reason for this could be the decline of the manufacturing industry and of factory workers. Another reason may be that trade union membership also declined through the ’80s and ’90s, although not so much as in the US. A third reason is that all the attempts by trade unions to resist the drastic restructuring that occurred in the ’80s and ’90s were defeated. This also had a repercussion on intellectuals’ interests in workers. Intellectuals ought to have a general interest in workers, but it seems that defeated workers do not capture intellectuals’ imaginations as much as the traditional heroic images of struggling workers.

For all these reasons, there has been a vanishing of any debate or discussion about class. Class as a theme has returned, but it is portrayed by creative people—filmmakers—in terms of personal relationships and personal feelings about identity. To my knowledge, there is still not a lot of academic literature about personal identity and class—although academics are very interested in identity in other areas.

To understand that shift, it is necessary to look back at some of the changes that were occurring in the trade unions. In the mid-’90s, the declining British unions tried to copy the American trade unions by setting up an “Organizing Academy.” They tried to take some of the ideas about identity from the States and recruit women members as well as members of Afro-Caribbean and Asian origin. The problem was that the institutional structure of the unions remained white and male. The question of power within the union, not the issue of membership, was the main problem.

Recently, a whole sway of new left leaders appeared in quite a lot of unions. They were all men, and they all belonged to a generation that was very young in the late ’70s, so they can remember the end of a different era. Due to all the changes that have occurred, they feel uncomfortable about being all men, but don’t really quite know what to do about that. Also, they may be willing to connect with community groups, but they’ve never done it and have no idea how to go about it.

What is remarkable about these groups is the total lack of any connecting ideology. I think it’s important to focus on what all these different groups are complaining about because it is the key to the problems faced by world capitalism. In all these complaints there is usually an idea of how something “ought to be,” and that’s sometimes quite a bit hidden. And it sometimes looks back to an idealized version of what was before. The Chartist movement in Britain—the first working-class movement—had a very romantic idea of how things had been before factories, but that myth was important as a kind of buttress against what was happening and the kinds of changes that were to come.

I think the question of women’s impacts on and relation to unions is really interesting. British unionists have been trying to appeal to young workers and have a different social approach, but only a minority of the young people coming up in the universities are interested in working with unions, and the ones that I have encountered tend to be men, not women. This means that among women’s studies there is no longer a direct interest in working class or trade union issues anymore, like there used to be.

At the same time, there is a change that has taken place among the grassroots consciousness of workers, in part because in the recent big strikes—such as the miners’ strike—the support didn’t come simply from left groups, but from the newer social movements. The miners’ strike, for example, was supported by gays and lesbians of London, and, among the miners, to be opposed to gays and lesbians was equivalent to “scabbing.” Now, a scab is being redefined as a person who is hostile to gays and lesbians. Working-class people have a very long memory, and because there was that support, they are now more open to getting in contact with other groups.

We have the ability to move about and compare, to get information about different kinds of resistance. Many of these alternative movements could be the basis not only for rethinking about what ails us, but also what possibilities there might be for other kinds of societies. When Marx wrote about exploitation in the nineteenth century, he hit on something which is certainly still a problem. Now, in both rich and poor countries, there is a desperate need for broader concepts.

Commodification seems to be part of it, and the notion of the procreation of people’s means of existence and their bodies is another one. These notions appear in environmental movements and in movements concerning the land as well. I don’t think we need a cultural genius like Marx to rethink the terms of what we face. What I learned from women’s organizing is that when you think collectively you think more wisely.

What I learned from women’s organizing is that when you think collectively you think more wisely.

Remarks at the IRW/IWL Seminar, March 27, 2003 transcribed and edited by Claudia Fezzardi, Dorothy Sue Cobble, and Amanda Chaloupka
Call for Applications

2004-2005 IRW/IWL Graduate/Faculty Seminar

Diversity: Expanding Theory and Practice

The IRW is now accepting applications from advanced graduate students and faculty for next year’s seminar, “Diversity: Expanding Theory and Practice.” Faculty accepted as fellows receive either one course release or a research stipend. Graduate students are awarded $4,000 for the year as seminar fellows.

The seminar is designed to allow scholars with diverse academic backgrounds, disciplines and methodologies to share their work in progress as it relates to the seminar theme. We invite applications from faculty and advanced graduate students who would like to explore how cultural and social differences, such as those based on race, gender, ethnicity, nationality, religion, and sexuality, affect economic opportunity, political inclusion, and social integration. Participants are invited to consider, among other topics, the social construction of categories of difference; the origins, impact, and future of affirmative action and antidiscrimination policies; the role of the nation-state in promoting and containing diversity and group equity; leadership, diversity, and institutional change; and postcolonial, feminist, and critical race theories of identity, cultural diffusion, and group interaction.

The seminar will support up to eight Rutgers Faculty Fellows and four Graduate Fellows from diverse Rutgers professional schools and FAS departments/programs on the New Brunswick, Camden, and Newark campuses. Seminar participants will attend Thursday morning seminar meetings during Fall and Spring Semesters 2004-2005, provide a paper for discussion in the seminar, present a formal response to one of the papers, and lead one of the discussion sessions. For a full description of the seminar theme and application materials, visit the IRW webpage (http://irw.rutgers.edu) or contact the IRW at 732/932-9072.

Deadline for applications is January 30, 2004!