Columbia Welcomes Lila Abu-Lughod

The Institute for Research on Women and Gender is excited to announce the arrival at Columbia of Professor Lila Abu-Lughod. She joins the University faculty this semester, with a joint appointment at the Institute and in the Department of Anthropology. Following historian Alice Kessler-Harris, Professor Abu-Lughod is the second scholar to be given a joint position at the Institute and a Columbia department; two more are planned.

During the last two decades, Professor Abu-Lughod has made an invaluable contribution to the development of Middle East women’s studies. Her books include Veiled Sentiments: Honor and Poetry in a Bedouin Society (University of California Press, 1986) and Writing Women’s Worlds: Bedouin Stories (University of California Press, 1993). Both are ethnographies focusing on gender relations in the Awlad ‘Ali Bedouin community on the northwest coast of Egypt. In Writing Women’s Worlds, Professor Abu-Lughod attempts to define and to produce a “feminist ethnography,” an ethnography that attends to “the power dynamics of self and other,” without making generalizations or drawing conclusions. Her methodology involves using women’s own stories about themselves and their worlds as the basis for ethnographic inquiry. In one of her best-known essays, “The Romance of Resistance,” she warns against romanticizing resistance, arguing that forms of resistance can be used as diagnostics of complex forms of power. Recently, she edited Remaking Women: Feminism and Modernity in the Middle East (Princeton University Press, 1998), which was translated into Arabic last fall. She is currently completing a book in which she examines the Egyptian media’s role both in ordinary people’s lives and in public debates about national, religious, and social issues. Professor Abu-Lughod teaches courses on feminist anthropology, women’s life stories and autobiographies, gender politics in the Muslim world, anthropological theory, the politics of ethnography, and critical and social theory. She also plans to teach classes on media and culture in the postcolonial

Director’s Column

The Fall 1999 semester was an especially busy and successful one for the Institute for Research on Women and Gender. We look back with a sense of satisfaction. And we begin the new year with enormous excitement about the arrival of a new colleague, Professor Lila Abu-Lughod, who begins her appointment at IRWAG this January as the Director of Undergraduate Studies. Professor Abu-Lughod’s new course, “Gender and Power in Global Perspective” is one of several new initiatives through which we hope to reinvigorate our undergraduate curriculum. It also manifests IRWAG’s determination to expand its strengths and become more fully responsive to issues of global capital outside of the West.

A good deal of energy this Fall was devoted to a reassessment of the undergraduate curriculum. On that basis, we have instituted changes that we
The Institute for Research on Women and Gender is the locus of interdisciplinary feminist studies on gender. In addition, we organize workshops, seminars, lectures, conferences, and research projects concerning various issues in feminist scholarship and teaching. We administer the undergraduate Women's Studies major and help develop courses for graduate students that supplement their own disciplinary studies on gender. In addition, we organize workshops, seminars, lectures, conferences, and research projects concerning various issues in feminist scholarship and teaching.

The "In the House" series is intended to complement the larger public lecture series entitled "Feminist Interventions." Two of the latter events were hosted this Fall, including a lecture by Alice Kessler-Harris, and a screening and discussion of Kutlug Ataman's Lola and Bildikid, both of which are the subjects of stories in this issue of Feminist News. In the Spring, we look forward to a lecture by professor Ann Douglas and to readings by poets Yvette Christiansen (a former Visiting Scholar at Columbia) and Stephanie Strickland. In its new format, which encompasses both scholarly papers and other kinds of cultural production, "Feminist Interventions" has achieved new momentum and an even broader audience. Nonetheless, the core purpose of the series, to explore the contributions and effects of feminist work, remains central. Indeed, as the University becomes home to more and more interdisciplinary institutions, and as these institutions develop their own venues and traditions of public discourse, the task of IRWAG, to insist on the fact and the problematic of gender (in all areas of inquiry, and not only in women's studies) has become more rather than less urgent. For this reason, we have continued to pursue collaborative relations with other programs. This Fall, we undertook joint sponsorship of several events, including a poetry reading with the National Organization for Women, a lecture by renowned psychoanalytic film theorist, Kaja Silverman, with the Department of Germanic.
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Celebrated feminist labor historian Alice Kessler-Harris inaugurated this year’s “Feminist Interventions” series on October 18 with a lecture entitled “What Discrimination? Words and Meanings in 1960’s America.” In her talk, Professor Kessler-Harris, who holds a joint appointment at IRWAG and in the Department of History, discussed the emergence of the concept of gender discrimination in the mid-1960’s in the context of debates about government policy and civil rights. Her work on the idea of gender discrimination is part of a current book project, which explores the relationship between changing gender ideologies and key twentieth-century American social policies. In the book, she develops ideas she has explored in more than two decades of research and writing on women and work in America. Her books include, A Woman’s Wage: Historical Meanings and Social Consequences (1990); Out to Work: A History of Wage Earning Women in the United States (1982), which won the Philip Taft Prize, and Women Have Always Worked: A Historical Overview (1981).

Professor Kessler-Harris began her talk by asking, “What’s in a word?” She went on to discuss the ways in which the meaning of the word “discrimination” changed over the course of the 1960’s. Through the 1950’s and 1960’s, she explains, as the civil rights movement gained momentum, the term “discrimination” came to have a clear meaning with respect to race, while its meaning remained “contested with regard to gender.” She tells the story of how race discrimination came to serve as a productive model for a conception of gender distinction. During the 1960’s, Professor Kessler-Harris explains, widespread belief in gender difference continued to shape legislative and judicial agendas. Thus women were denied what she calls “economic citizenship,” including the rights, privileges, and responsibilities that emerge from an individual’s relationship to economic resources, and particularly to their access to work. In this respect, it differs from political citizenship, which identifies rights and responsibilities that inhere in participation in the polity, and from social citizenship, which identifies rights that emerge from one’s location in a national or state community. Just as political citizenship ensures certain kinds of equality in the polity, so full economic citizenship would ensure economic equality.

Professor Kessler-Harris points out that although many women fought for work-place rights and political access during the 1960’s, they did not seek “a broader agenda of gender equality.” Also, significantly, they did not challenge the idea of gender difference. As Professor Kessler-Harris says, gender distinctions then “seemed a fact of life”: they were perceived as “natural.” She notes that because of these perceptions, “few women in the early 1960’s would have applied the word ‘discrimination’ to themselves.” At that time, most Americans, both male and female, believed that a woman’s role as a worker was secondary to her role as a homemaker. Professor Kessler-Harris explains, “few disputed the notion that traditional conceptions of family, community, and social order preceded demands for women’s rights as individuals.” Women’s expectations about and opportunities for education and work were often curtailed.

Professor Kessler-Harris asserts that arguments supporting the concept of gender discrimination at this time lacked the “powerful cudgel” of individual rights. To show how gender discrimination came to be seen as analogous to race discrimination, Professor Kessler-Harris examines the debates and findings of government commissions, principally President Kennedy’s Commission on the Status of Women (PCSW), which was formed in 1961, and resulted in the
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equation of race and sex with respect to discrimination. Its members aimed to produce an alternative to an equal rights amendment, which they rejected because they did not want to eliminate special protections offered to women. Professor Kessler-Harris comments that many members of the Commission believed that women’s primary commitment to their families

access to benefits. This loss would particularly affect minority women. The Commission then consulted with a group of “minority women,” who discussed the possible consequences of bringing women under the protection of Title VII, which forbids discrimination on the basis of race or national origin. Many members of this group were concerned that policies that addressed gender discrimination could not help women of color until

Professor Kessler-Harris comments, “Severing women’s rights from the family and releasing women to pursue individual or civil rights had an enormously positive impact on the freedom of many women. But it also had unforeseen consequences for poor women and women of color, especially those who depended on government support.” The legislation, she says, “Encouraged law and policy makers to ignore social and cultural factors peculiar to women”–especially poor women.

The new law began to have a significant effect in the 1970s, when the Department of Justice finally began to prosecute cases of discrimination against women. At this historical moment, Professor Kessler-Harris says, “many women began to identify themselves as individuals rather than as family members.” In 1971, the first sex discrimination case reached the Supreme Court, which ruled that women could not be denied employment because they had small children if similarly situated men were not refused.

Professor Ira Katznelson from the Department of History responded to Professor Kessler-Harris’s talk. He pointed to five causal models that the talk suggests for the “quick change in our polity with respect to gender.” He pointed out that Professor Kessler-Harris placed much weight on the idea that “policy makes possibility,” that once sex was included in the bill, women’s desires and demands changed as a consequence. Professor Kessler-Harris granted that in the early 1960s the language of discrimination had constrained possibilities for expressing discontent. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, she averred, gave women the language with which to identify discriminatory practices.

“….few women in the early 1960’s would have applied the word ‘discrimination’ to themselves.”

justified a differential treatment, and that differential treatment gave women access to benefits. Discrimination could not be claimed if such differential treatment was accepted.

The PCSW’s Executive Director, Esther Peterson, asked Pauli Murray, a black feminist attorney, to join the Committee on Civil and Political Rights, in order to develop a strategy that would bring women into the purview of the 14th amendment. Professor Kessler-Harris reports that Murray’s tactic “echoed the strategy of the Civil Rights movement by explicitly equating sex with race in relation to the Constitution.” Murray thus produced a new conception of discrimination on the basis of sex, one that stressed the rights of women as individuals. According to Professor Kessler-Harris, the debates initiated by Murray’s proposal for a definition of discrimination demonstrated “that issues of class and race complicated the benign view that gender differences could simply be abandoned.” If women were covered under anti-discrimination laws, they would potentially lose race discrimination was fully addressed. Professor Kessler-Harris summarizes the group’s report: “Neither protecting the civil and political rights of black women, nor offering them economic opportunity, would be sufficient to improve black family life. Only enhancing opportunity for black males would do that.” The group’s findings were highly influenced by contemporary research on the black family.

Soon after the PCSW completed its work, sex was added to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, not only because women in congress supported the legislation, but because a group of southern male congressmen believed that adding sex would kill the bill. These men argued that white women would be at a disadvantage in relation to black women if the bill were passed without adding sex. Nine southern men initially supported the bill, and all nine ultimately voted against it. Nevertheless, the legislation passed, and as a result disparate treatment because of sex came to be seen in terms of individual rights and thus could be identified as discrimination.
As part of this year’s “Feminist Interventions” series, IRWAG screened Turkish director Kutlug Ataman's innovative new film, *Lola and Bilidikid*. The film, which is set in a Turkish enclave in Berlin, focuses on a group of gay men who struggle against xenophobia and homophobia. The central narrative is the coming out story of teenaged Murat, who discovers his long-lost brother Lola, a transvestite performer in the gay Turkish underworld, only to lose him to murderous violence. The film has won many awards, including the Grand Prize at the Turin Film Festival, Best Feature at the New York City New Festival, and the Audience Award at the International Istanbul Film Festival.

Rosalind Morris, Director of IRWAG, says she was motivated to bring the film and its director to Columbia because it had become so central to conversations about the relationships between sexuality, nationalism, and violence in Turkey, Germany, and elsewhere in Europe. The press coverage and the furor, but also the enthusiastic popular reception of the film, all suggested that it was working to "out" topics that had previously been kept separate, or, indeed, hidden.

Professor Morris was also provoked by the film’s refusal to decide the question of culpability. Ataman first became enchanted by the fantasy worlds that film creates when he was a small child. He recalls, “My parents’ summer home was used as a location for many Turkish melodramas, so I grew up on film sets, around all the Turkish stars.” He found this atmosphere intoxicating. By the time he was a teenager, he had a super8 camera of his own and was making movies, but not of the sort that had been shot in his family home. He explains, “I was associated with a left-wing youth organization, and I would film their political activities. When the group agitated the peasants to burn feudal lords’ cornfields, I would make a film.” During strikes, he and his companions would show these films in the workers’ tents to keep up morale using portable projectors. Looking back, he says, “Politically, we were very naive, but these activities gave me a chance to play with the film medium at a very young age.” Ataman lost these early films during the military coup in Turkey in 1980. At that time, when he was still in his late teens, he was arrested and then tortured in prison for 38 days; his films were confiscated. When he was released from prison, he fled to the United States alone. Although he spoke no English when he arrived, he eventually attended UCLA, from which he received a BA and an MA in film.

Ataman’s desire to make films is motivated, at least in part, by painful life experience: the experience of growing up gay in an atmosphere of total intolerance, and the experience of torture at the hands of the police. “I grew up with a lot of pain,” he says. “As a result I have a strong sense of justice.” Ataman stresses that violence and discrimination against gays and lesbians in Turkey is an urgent human rights problem that demands attention. Gay activism in Turkey, he points out, “is very hidden, closeted.” Men remain closeted because they fear rejection from their families and violence. He remembers, “I had a hellish childhood and youth, surrounded by family members who didn’t accept me. Making films I am just beginning to come to terms with that and to tell my story.” Ataman stresses the importance of telling the stories of gays and lesbians: “When I was growing up, there were no gay role models; stories about gays were not told.” With his film and through his public actions, he has attempted to

An Interview with Director Kutlug Ataman

As part of this year’s “Feminist Interventions” series, IRWAG screened Turkish director Kutlug Ataman’s innovative new film, *Lola and Bilidikid*. The film, which is set in a Turkish enclave in Berlin, focuses on a group of gay men who struggle against xenophobia and homophobia. The central narrative is the coming out story of teenaged Murat, who discovers his long-lost brother Lola, a transvestite performer in the gay Turkish underworld, only to lose him to murderous violence. The film has won many awards, including the Grand Prize at the Turin Film Festival, Best Feature at the New York City New Festival, and the Audience Award at the International Istanbul Film Festival.

Rosalind Morris, Director of IRWAG, says she was motivated to bring the film and its director to Columbia because it had become so central to conversations about the relationships between sexuality, nationalism, and violence in Turkey, Germany, and elsewhere in Europe. The press coverage and the furor, but also the enthusiastic popular reception of the film, all suggested that it was working to “out” topics that had previously been kept separate, or, indeed, hidden.

Professor Morris was also provoked by the film’s refusal to decide the question of culpability. Ataman first became enchanted by the fantasy worlds that film creates when he was a small child. He recalls, “My parents’ summer home was used as a location for many Turkish melodramas, so I grew up on film sets, around all the Turkish stars.” He found this atmosphere intoxicating. By the time he was a teenager, he had a super8 camera of his own and was making movies, but not of the sort that had been shot in his family home. He explains, “I was associated with a left-wing youth organization, and I would film their political activities. When the group agitated the peasants to burn feudal lords’ cornfields, I would make a film.” During strikes, he and his companions would show these films in the workers’ tents to keep up morale using portable projectors. Looking back, he says, “Politically, we were very naive, but these activities gave me a chance to play with the film medium at a very young age.” Ataman lost these early films during the military coup in Turkey in 1980. At that time, when he was still in his late teens, he was arrested and then tortured in prison for 38 days; his films were confiscated. When he was released from prison, he fled to the United States alone. Although he spoke no English when he arrived, he eventually attended UCLA, from which he received a BA and an MA in film.

Ataman’s desire to make films is motivated, at least in part, by painful life experience: the experience of growing up gay in an atmosphere of total intolerance, and the experience of torture at the hands of the police. “I grew up with a lot of pain,” he says. “As a result I have a strong sense of justice.” Ataman stresses that violence and discrimination against gays and lesbians in Turkey is an urgent human rights problem that demands attention. Gay activism in Turkey, he points out, “is very hidden, closeted.” Men remain closeted because they fear rejection from their families and violence. He remembers, “I had a hellish childhood and youth, surrounded by family members who didn’t accept me. Making films I am just beginning to come to terms with that and to tell my story.” Ataman stresses the importance of telling the stories of gays and lesbians: “When I was growing up, there were no gay role models; stories about gays were not told.” With his film and through his public actions, he has attempted to
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alter this situation. Just before the film's release in Turkey, Ataman came out to the media, giving a long personal interview to the largest Turkish daily newspaper, Hürriyet. Afterwards, he received hundreds of calls and letters of congratulation. He also received several death threats. “The good thing was that although I was attacked the film wasn’t. The press was totally behind it.” Large pictures of the title characters embracing appeared on the front pages of Turkey’s major papers. There were forty or fifty interviews of Ataman in the newspapers and on television.

Ataman’s aim in coming out was, he says, “to establish that there are gays like me, and that it’s okay to be openly gay.” He hoped to provide an “anchor” for other gays, by serving as a role model. After Ataman came out, others followed suit. “There were visible changes in Turkey,” he comments. “Some celebrities, people in the entertainment community who were known to be gay, began to talk openly about it.” The film produced an atmosphere of greater tolerance as well. Ataman says, “A lot of the transvestites would come out in the daytime to see the film. It was extraordinary for them to be so visible. As they were waiting on line in front of the theaters, they would be somewhat timid. But after the film, they would come out holding hands. The film touched their lives; it gave them a bit of courage and approval.”

While Lola and Bilidikid ultimately met with great success in Turkey, when Ataman first showed it to Turkish distributors and exhibitors, they universally rejected it. Ataman reports, “Much of the rejection came from the so-called liberal cinema owners. Although at the time they were showing films that dealt with other explosive issues, like the Kurdish situation, they did not want to show a film that dealt with gays. They would say, ‘Turkey has so many problems, why do we have to talk about the gays?’” Ataman attributes this reluctance not only to homophobia but to the fact that in Turkey discrimination on the basis of sex or sexual orientation is not generally viewed as a political issue. He says, “In Turkey, women’s issues and lesbian and gay issues are commonly seen as personal problems. They are not politicized.” Underlying the distributors’ rebuff was also a fear that the nationalist youth squads recruited by the government (known as “ulkucu”) would vandalize the movie theaters and attack their patrons. Nevertheless, after the film received the Audience Award at the Istanbul Film Festival, Turkish distributors, “immediately became interested,” Ataman recalls. “They suddenly realized they were going to make some money.”

Ataman spent about two years in Berlin conducting research for the film, working with the police and gay support groups, and interviewing hustlers and former neo-Nazis. When he first arrived in Germany he had, he says, “a script in hand as well as many presuppositions.” “I had written the story about Turkish transvestites in Berlin, but when I went to Berlin, at first I couldn’t find any transvestites. I discovered that many had come to Berlin after the military coup in Turkey, but they had

eventually moved west to wealthier cities to make more money.” Ataman did finally manage to find a young boy who was able to help him. “This boy had just become a transsexual. Tragically, she was killed. But she introduced me to a group of transvestites, some of whom eventually started their own cabaret show, imitating the one in the script. They are still performing.” Lola and Bilidikid thus had an unexpected impact on the transvestite community in Berlin.

The film had a wide distribution in Germany. However, to Ataman’s dismay, few Turks saw it. The problem was the advertising. Ataman, remarks, “The poster was designed to eroticize the gay Turks, to make them look attractive to Germans.” Ataman had hoped instead that the film would be presented as “a family melodrama.” Some reviewers in Europe criticized the film as “overly melodramatic” and “too violent.” In response, Ataman insists that the criteria used to make such judgements are skewed. “This is a total misreading of the film. All cultures are not the same. If you look at many Turkish stories from the perspective of New York, they will look melodramatic. If I translated everyday Turkish language into English verbatim, it would sound ridiculous; it’s so flowery, so sweet.” Ataman also says that such reviewers fail to recognize that Turkish culture is violent, particularly toward gays and lesbians. “Every week, transvestites are raped, tortured by the police and hit by cars. Often pairs of girls and boys—probably couples—are thrown into the Euphrates, murdered.” He maintains that although he invented the overall plot of Lola and Bilidikid, all of the stories it encompasses derive from “true stories”—stories narrated to Ataman during his years of research in Berlin.

Kutlug Ataman
Ataman’s experiences in Berlin undermined his assumptions about violence against gay Turks in Germany. “When I went to Germany, I assumed that the neo-Nazi youth who set fire to the homes of Turks were also gay-bashers.” After examining police reports and conducting interviews, he found that “it was not the neo-Nazis but the Turks who were attacking the gays—both German and Turkish.” Ataman set the film in Berlin, he explains, “to draw parallels between German race discrimination and Turkish sex discrimination; people in the Berlin Turkish ghetto say that the Germans are racist and discriminate against us, while they themselves are sexist and discriminate against their own.”

Although his work is firmly located in a particular time and place, Ataman includes a variety of mythological figures and motifs in his work. “I always steal from classical myths because I figure that if they’ve worked for thousands of years, they’re a secure investment for me.” In particular, he steals from the Bible, from the Greek myths and from Middle Eastern folktales. *Lola and Bilidikid*, Ataman maintains, is a version of the Prometheus myth. “In this film, the hero, Murat, receives a message that he must go and confront himself—he must acquire the light. He descends into the underworld, where he meets a series of demigods: Lola, Bili, and the others. It is through his interaction with them that he steals the light, which is self-knowledge. He returns to the surface a hero, able to dethrone his brother and to take his place.” The film focuses on Murat’s journey from youth to adulthood, and from ignorance to self-knowledge. He comes to acknowledge his own homosexuality and his family’s history of violence. Ataman contends that the figure of Murat represents “a new hope” for gay Turks and a new heroism. This heroism he links to the concept of “journeying.” “The idea of the journey is very important for me because I’ve been quite nomadic myself. The hero has to move. He must accept the call to learn about himself and go. This has been the same in every culture in all of human history.”

Although *Lola and Bilidikid* is only his second feature, Ataman has already established a reputation in Turkey as a trendsetter. His first full-length film, *The Serpent’s Tale*, was the first independent film made in Turkey. This film, which he describes as “a political vampire movie,” started what Ataman calls a new movement of young film makers. He says, “Now all of the most interesting films in Turkey are coming from the members of this group.” Ataman’s next film project deals with another charged issue; he explains, “It is about a Kurdish woman who is not allowed to speak her native tongue because of social pressure.” Until recently, it was illegal for Turkish Kurds to speak their language in public. Ataman remarks, “Even if it’s not illegal now, you really still can’t do it if you want to get employed.” Although the new script deals with serious issues, it is a comedy. “If you want to achieve social change, direct confrontation does not always work.” Ataman comments, “I think people can change with laughter.” He believes that the secret of comedy is its “disarming quality.” “Using comedy, you can catch people with their defenses down, and then you can de-program them.” He asserts that although his work is shifting in tone, from drama to comedy, it continues to be motivated by a strong and highly personal “sense of justice.” He says, “I don’t always believe people who say that they are motivated solely by an abstract belief in democracy or human rights. I think there is always something personal that motivates people to seek justice.”

---
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Languages, a discussion of Laurie Essig’s new book, *Queer in Russia* with the Harriman Institute, and a public lecture by activist sociologist Maria Mies, with the Center for Comparative Literature and Society. In the Spring, we look forward to more such collaborations, and to the continued development of strong, mutually sustaining relationships with all those colleagues who share our own deep commitment to radical interdisciplinary work.

In all respects, the Spring semester promises to be a good one. A broad array of courses concerning gender and sexuality is being taught at the Institute and in the departments. Two lecture series will go forward to keep all of us apprised of the latest work in gender and feminist theory. And a new colleague will join us. Sadly, Elizabeth Blackmar will step down as undergraduate director, to take up a much deserved research leave. However, while we shall miss Professor Blackmar’s immediate presence at the Institute, we are all thrilled to have had her working so diligently in our midst this past semester. The undergraduate thesis-writing students all expressed their thanks and their affection to Professor Blackmar at the annual presentation of theses (see the story on the major research projects in this issue). But I would like to join them here, and express the enormous debt of gratitude that the Institute, and I in particular, feel for a job done so very well.

Announcements of lectures and reminders of events will continue to be sent out over the semester, but everyone is invited to drop by the Institute to see what is happening. We can also be found at our new web page (columbia.edu/cu/irwg), where news of activities, courses and related issues will all be available. In the mean-time, I wish all of you good luck in the new year.
Senior Projects

Three seniors majoring in Women’s and Gender Studies are currently writing theses at the Institute for Research on Women and Gender under the direction of Professor Elizabeth Blackmar, the Institute’s Undergraduate Director. The seniors—Prisca Bae, Emily Kramer, and Naomi Schiller—participate in a seminar run by Professor Blackmar. They also work with a writing tutor, Nadia Zonis, a graduate student in the History Department. At their weekly meetings, the group orders take-out food and discusses their recent progress over dinner. Naomi Schiller comments, “At every meeting, we update each other about the work we’ve been doing and the problems we’re having, and we ask each other questions. We’re all looking out for each other’s topics, so often we bring in articles and references. It’s like we each have a team of researchers out there helping us.” The seniors’ projects, which cover a broad range of issues, exemplify the sort of rigorous, interdisciplinary research the Institute encourages. Professor Blackmar comments, “Politics, identity, sex, and power—these topics take us right into the core of feminist studies. What has been so interesting to me is not only watching the individual projects unfold but seeing how issues in one field of inquiry resonate for another field. I have learned so much this semester!” Recently, the seniors spoke with Feminist News about how they are proceeding with their theses.

Prisca Bae

When Prisca Bae first arrived in New York City from the suburbs of Chicago, she intended to study international relations as a Political Science major. Her plans shifted during her first year, when she took Professor David Eng’s somewhat unconventional Literature Humanities class. Bae reports that Eng “introduced the class to gender studies,” while teaching the classics of the Western tradition. She reports, “We read a lot of theory, such as Judith Butler.” For the first time, she was encouraged to read literature from a feminist perspective, and her essays for the class focused on gender and power. “The first paper I wrote at Columbia was on the Odyssey. I looked at the ways in which Odysseus’ masculinity and power were diminished throughout the epic. He seemed to become a little more ‘feminine’ after each adventure, as Penelope became more ‘masculine.’” Soon, she says, “I found myself writing papers in all of my classes from the perspective of gender.” To become a Women’s Studies major seemed an obvious choice. Bae says, “Majoring in Women’s and Gender Studies is the best decision I’ve made since I came to Columbia.” Bae views her education in part as a “personal journey,” and for her becoming a Women’s and Gender Studies major “was the best way to get to know who I was.” She comments, “I believe that gender is the first divide between people. I’m a woman before I’m an Asian American, before I’m Korean.”

Bae’s thesis, “Women and the American Presidency,” explores the effect of gender on the viability of a woman’s candidacy in a presidential election. She notes that although no woman has been elected into the presidency, several have attempted. “In 1872, Victoria Woodhull was the first woman to run for president, and, more than a century later, Geraldine Ferraro was the Democratic candidate for vice president.” Citing a study conducted by the White House Project, she comments that “76% of those surveyed in an opinion poll are willing to elect a female candidate into the presidency.” But “what kind of woman,” she asks, “are the American people willing to vote into this exalted position of political power?”

In the thesis, Bae initially considers the main factors that effect any candidacy. “Regardless of gender, a candidate must be intelligent, politically competent, and a leader.” Next, she examines the role of gender in specific campaigns and elections. Her primary goal, she says, “is to glean successful strategies for female candidates.” If women have more political representation, Bae argues, they will be more likely to gain much-needed benefits, such as child care. Furthermore, she says, increased representation of women in government will “help to change the way people feel and think about gender roles.” She points out that twenty years ago the idea of a woman engineer seemed odd, “But now, I see my female engineering friends, and I think, that’s something my daughter could do.”

A discussion of the campaigns of four successful female politicians gives the thesis what Bae calls its “spin.” She analyzes the political careers of Senator Dianne Feinstein of California, Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas, Lt. Governor Kathleen Kennedy Townsend of Maryland, and Governor Christine Todd Whitman of New Jersey. All of these women have won state-wide elections, and, according to Bae, “they all have the potential to be presidential candidates.” In her thesis, she evaluates their chances to win a presidential campaign and creates a campaign strategy for each of them.

Although Bae has found an abundance of secondary materials in the library, much of her research is conducted on line. “I’m finding a lot of great resources on the internet, such as biographies of elected officials and stories of their campaigns. I also have a stack of books out from the library.” Recently, Bae read a collection of essays called Women in American
Politics, which she found particularly inspiring. In one of the essays, Gloria Steinem writes about Geraldine Ferraro's campaign, describing the candidate's speeches, her reactions to reporters, and the issues she raised while on the campaign trail. In another, Bella Abzug discusses the struggles she experienced in her political career. Bae comments, “It's really inspiring to read about women leaders who broke down some barriers for women in my generation.”

Many factors influenced Bae in her choice of thesis topic. First of all, she has always had a strong interest in politics. “Since junior high school, I've always run for offices and student government.” She observes that the class presidents of both her high school and college have been women. “It's no big deal for a woman to be president of Student Council. But on a national level, we're not quite there yet.” Bae in part faults her own generation for this. Her peers, she says, are conservative and complacent. “A lot of women I know are very strong. I would call them feminists. But if I bring up the idea of feminism with them, they say, 'Being a woman doesn't impede me!' If I give them examples of discrimination against women, they say I'm making a big deal out of nothing. It's very frustrating.” Their position, Bae believes, is based on illusion. She remarks, “You sit next to a guy in class, and you think 'we're equals,' and yet if he ran for president and I ran against him, I'd lose even if I were more qualified, because I'm a woman and because I'm a minority.”

So when will America have a female president? Bae doesn't think it will be any time soon. When a woman does win, Bae claims “She will be a Republican.” She asserts, “The country is not ready for someone who is both a woman and not conservative.” From Bae's perspective, the greatest pitfalls for female candidates are being marked as too liberal, too emotional or too aggressive. She explains, “A female candidate must actually be aggressive, but she can't seem aggressive to the public. A woman who is too aggressive or emotional will be marked as 'hysterical.'”

Hillary Clinton, she contends, is perceived as too aggressive. Another block for women now, she says, is “status.” “I don't think any woman has enough status to be a viable candidate.” Men, she explains, have access to status-building roles: “Al Gore uses Vietnam, and Bill Bradley uses the fact that he's a Hall of Famer. Women don't have those sorts of roles to draw upon.”

According to Bae, “the best part about writing the thesis is the seminar.” “A lot of students in small seminars are intimidated by their professors, so they don't have a chance to address issues that are important to them. Betsy creates a wonderful, intimate environment, in which we're able to talk about our ideas and the progress we're making in our work. I couldn't imagine anything better.” Bae has also been inspired by an additional advisor, Heather Foust, a professor in the Political Science Department. Bae says, “Professor Foust is wonderful to talk to and an expert in the field.”

This semester, Bae plans to extend her thesis project by interviewing campaigning experts. She has a variety of plans for work after she graduates from Columbia College this spring. “Eventually, I'd like to go to law school, but first, I'm going to look at jobs in Washington D.C. I'd love to work on Hillary Clinton's campaign next year, so I may volunteer this semester.” She comments, “Betsy keeps saying that I'll be a campaign manager after I graduate.”

Naomi Schiller

A native of the Bronx, Naomi Schiller moved to New Hampshire as a young teen, when her mother was hired to teach in the Anthropology Department at the University of New Hampshire. In New England, Schiller experienced “culture shock,” and she determined to return to New York City for college. When she began her studies at Columbia, she initially felt lost, but she soon found a “home” at IRWAG, where she is both a major and a work study. “The environment here is supportive, and people know me, so...”
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I feel I can ask questions, be vulnerable, and experiment.”

Although Schiller had an ardent interest in feminism before she got to college, at Columbia she had a difficult time deciding to major in Women’s and Gender Studies. She reports, “Every time you meet somebody new, they ask ‘What are you studying?’ If you say ‘women’s studies,’ that’s either the end of the conversation, or they ask ‘What are you going to do with that?’” With the encouragement of her mother and her professors, Schiller did choose the major, and soon it became clear that this was the right decision. “The moment I walked into the class ‘Intro. To Women’s Studies,’ I felt a huge relief. I thought this is finally what I want to be learning about.”

Now, Schiller feels very confident about her choice of major. “Every time somebody I speak with questions the major, I feel a push to keep doing it.”

The project has forced Schiller to confront herself in several ways. She asks, “Since I am not Latina, what right do I have to analyze Latina culture? What is my place in relation to it?” These questions have led her to explore the category of “whiteness,” and to investigate her own whiteness. With respect to this issue, she has found contradictions in her own thinking. “To feel inherently excluded from Latina culture means that I’m privileging a conception of my identity that I believe is totally constructed. I want to move beyond the privilege of my whiteness, while remaining mindful of my own position and identity. In the end,” she says, “I believe that oppression should be everybody’s concern.”

While Schiller had a strong interest in Latin American cultures before she arrived at Columbia, several recent experiences have led her to pursue research on Latina identity in America. In fall 1998, she took Partha Chatterjee’s “Nationalism” class, which, she says, was “inspiring.” The class encouraged her to think about how the bodies of women function as sites of national identity. She spent the following semester studying in the Dominican Republic. The term abroad, she says, “got me thinking about race, which is a volatile issue in the Dominican Republic.” She explains that although the majority of the country is of African descent, few Dominicans identify themselves as “African” or “Black.” She observes that of the many categories for skin color on the Dominican passport, none make reference to African ancestry. “The women in my host family talked a lot about ‘good’ hair and bad ‘hair.’” In the Dominican Republic, Schiller became interested in the effects of beauty ideals in Latina culture.

Schiller’s project introduces numerous questions, many of which, she says, it does not answer. One such questions deals with the possibility of a pan-Latina identity. Schiller asks, “What are the strategic possibilities for a pan-Latina identity? Would it be useful? Would it only mask differences?” Although she claims that the category “Hispanic” proposes a “fictional unity” and produces a “myth of homogeneity,” she claims that this classification can be “deployed strategically at particular moments in time to struggle against the oppression many Latinos face.” In her thesis, she shows that Hispanic dailies (El Diario/La Prensa) try to create “affinity between different Latino immigrant groups and solidify a single identity, while simultaneously attempting to focus on the different situations of each national group.”
Schiller's interests have been shaped by her mother's academic work, to which she refers as "the background noise of my life." Her mother, Professor Nina Glick Schiller, writes about Haiti, focusing on ethnicity and transnational migration. Schiller notes that her mother has had a tremendous influence on her academic pursuits and has functioned as an important but unofficial advisor on her senior thesis.

The IRWAG seminar, Schiller reports, is both "supportive" and "rigorous." "Betsy encourages us to push ourselves. She pushed me to recognize my own struggle with the material." The individual attention the members of the seminar receive continues to amaze her. "Nadia and Betsy are always available for us. This is ideal. I can't imagine writing a thesis in a group of twenty-five." Schiller feels particularly indebted to Kathleen Savage, Assistant to IRWAG's director. "Kathleen is behind the scenes working magic. She practices what IRWAG should be about, for instance, by introducing work studies to the professors who walk in to the office."

To continue her work this semester, she plans to compare beauty queens and drag queens in the Latino community, focusing on images of femininity and the masquerade of womanliness. "By chance, I was reading about both beauty queens and drag queens and found that they're very similar." After graduation she hopes to spend some time in Venezuela. She has applied for a Fulbright to spend a year there, "working for a foundation that does reproductive health outreach." The foundation recently installed solar paneling in homes in remote areas. She explains, "One of the unanticipated consequences was that many families in rural areas started to get televisions. So I proposed to look at how this development has affected the community."

**Emily Kramer**

Emily Kramer developed a passionate interest in feminism as a high school student at Andover in Massachusetts, where, she says, "I somehow got my hands on *The Feminine Mystique.*" She recalls, "It was the first book I read that was all about women and written by a woman, and it was also the first work of cultural criticism I had encountered. That was the beginning." In the single year she spent at Cornell University before transferring to Columbia, she took five Women's Studies classes. Among these was a course called "Women, Madness and Culture," which she found to be immediately relevant to her own life experience. "I was amazed to find a class that focused on what I considered to be such an important phenomenon."

Kramer's senior thesis at IRWAG explores possibilities for the expression of what she calls an "honest" sexuality in both public and private forums. Her interest in this topic is deeply personal, and a segment of her thesis takes the form of personal narrative. "I started out with a frustration about the large gap between my sexual politics—what I think about sex—and how I express these ideas through behavior in my sexual encounters."

Although she maintains a feminist perspective when she speaks about sex, she says that in her sexual life, "I don't feel that strong, or feminist, or empowered." A second frustration for Kramer is the absence of "honest" information about sex for women, and the dearth of "the female perspective in writings about sexuality." Her thesis proposes ways to address these issues; it comprises three sections, including a personal statement, a theoretical framework, and a set of practical suggestions. With her personal statement, she strives "to contribute to honest and bold sexual discourse, and to develop a stronger voice."

In her research Kramer has discovered a lack of "sexually honest" writings about sex. By "honest," she means "taking a risk or being bold." More specifically, she says, "'honest' means attempting to express something without worrying about how it's going to be perceived." Her explicit goal is to get 'honest' expressions of sexuality into the mainstream.
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culture. Principally, she hopes to focus on what “gets censored” in discussions of sexuality. But what precisely is silenced? Kramer responds, “It’s not that people don’t acknowledge that women have sexual desire.” Instead, she says, they confuse desire and pleasure. “A person can express desire clearly.” Kramer says, “without a partner’s recognition that the expression of desire also voices a desire for pleasure.” In the theoretical section of her thesis, Kramer makes a distinction between “content” and “intent” in discussions of sexuality. The comments that content is not usually “censored.” “Everyone knows about sex. It’s all over the place, in our faces, all the time.” More important for her is to recognize the “intent” motivating this “content.”

In the thesis, Kramer compares mainstream expressions of sexuality with what she calls “more underground expressions of sexuality,” focusing on magazines because, she says, “they’re glossy, sexy, cheap, and popular.” She plans to compare the popular mainstream periodical Cosmopolitan with less conventional magazines, such as Bust, Bitch and New Girl Order. Kramer notes that many of her peers turn to Cosmopolitan “to find out about sex.” While Cosmopolitan does not help these women to discover how to feel sexy or to define the term “sexy” for themselves, Kramer contends that the other publications do. She plans to use this comparison to provide the grounding for a theory of sexual expression.

Of Cosmopolitan, Kramer says, “Cosmo can give you control over how to make someone else think you’re sexy.” This leaves Kramer—and others—feeling “out of control.” What Cosmo does not do, she says, is help you discover how to “feel sexy.” Cosmopolitan creates a confusion in its readers between the desire to feel sexy and the desire to be perceived as sexy. She asks, “Does ‘sexy’ always need to be defined by an interpreter or observer?” As an answer to this question, she plans to come up with her own definition of “what it’s like to feel sexy.”

Kramer stresses the importance of formulating individual definitions of ‘sexy’: “You need to define ‘sexy’ and ‘not-sexy’ for yourself.” To find examples of such individual definitions, she looks at personal narratives. She plans to present such narratives in her thesis as paradigms for sexual honesty. She is particularly interested in lesbian coming-out stories. She sees in writings on lesbian sexuality “the beginnings of a revolution in power dynamics and honest sexuality.” Kramer strives for “a true redefinition of power dynamics, so that ‘control’ with regard to sex means control over yourself.”

Kramer’s role models are those who can express their sexuality freely: “I read an interview with Susie Bright, Nancy Friday and Betty Dodson, in which they were asked if there is a difference between their feminist perspectives and their sexual practices. They all answered, ‘There’s no difference.’” Kramer admires these women because they “say what they want and do what they want, and they do it publicly and loudly.”

As she explores her own ideas about sexuality, Kramer has been rethinking male-perspective heterosocial visions of sexuality. Recently, she read The Century of Sex: Playboy’s History of the Sexual Revolution. She comments, “In the introduction, Hugh Heffner claims that Playboy has been part of a move to liberate sexuality in America, and they have triumphed. Sex is now liberated and America will never be the same.” Although Kramer admires the confidence with which Heffner writes, she marvels at his triumphalism; “Playboy is putting out this book and they don’t think they need to defend it. Their story is simply: we wanted to say things about sex; we wanted to hear about sex, so we wrote about it. They didn’t feel they had to say ‘This had an unfortunate effect in the meantime on women.”

A pivotal experience for Kramer at Columbia was her participation last year in a performance of Eve Ensler’s Vagina Monologues, a play that the author has often performed as a solo. Kramer reads the piece as a commentary on sexual playfulness. “When Ensler performs the whole play herself, she shows that you never have to be one sexual person. Getting stuck in a single confining sexual identity can be a problem.” For Kramer, Ensler’s play points to the possibility of “a more malleable, changing, flowing sexual identity.” Like the play, Kramer’s thesis work is emphatically anti-essentialist. She says, “Your sexuality is never just ’you’; it’s all the roles that you play.” It was exhilarating for her to see “a couple thousand people watching twenty-five different women talk about sex with complete confidence, in a secure commercial arena.” She comments, “That was the beginning of this thesis project.”

This semester, Kramer plans to continue her thesis project with “something more active.” She says, “I’d like to do something on campus, maybe publish a set of women’s sexual fantasies.” After she graduates from Columbia in May, Kramer hopes to have the opportunity to do work that is related to her thesis topic; she is interested in “sex education, public health, or sex writing.”
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world. This semester, she is teaching “Gender and Power in Global Perspective” at Columbia as well as functioning as IRWAG’s Undergraduate Director. Recently, she spoke with Feminist News about her background and her work.

FN: You have emphasized the importance of “situatedness” in your work. How do you identify yourself currently as a scholar?

L A-L: I identify myself first as an anthropologist, then as a feminist, by which I mean someone deeply concerned with women and attentive to the gendered structures of the world we live in. But as someone who studies another part of the world—in my case the Middle East—it is also important to situate myself as a Palestinian-American, a “halfie” as I’ve called us hyphenated ones, because this position between worlds has affected my anthropological and feminist projects. In both, I’ve been especially sensitive to the problems and politics of representing “the other” in Western contexts. This was one of the main issues I tried to deal with in my second book on the Egyptian Bedouins, Writing Women’s Worlds.

FN: Do these identifications ever come into conflict with each other?

L A-L: Recently, in a review essay on Middle East gender studies that will be published in Feminist Studies, I tried to articulate the tricky situation in which Arab feminists find themselves. When they want to criticize gender injustices in their own societies, they realize that such criticisms could play neatly into the hands of those in the West who use ‘the oppression of Middle Eastern women’ to bolster their sense of superiority—a superiority that cannot be separated from geopolitical domination.

FN: How do you contend with this problem?

L A-L: I don’t think there is any solution to this problem except vigilance about making absolutely clear what one is saying and drawing attention to the problem of speaking under such conditions.

FN: How do you view the relationship between feminism and activism?

L A-L: This is a big and important question, but the short answer is that I see feminist scholarship as a form of activism, and the form I feel most comfortable with. I don’t accept the distinction between text and world, and I see the academy as very much part of the world, not separate from it.

FN: What has most inspired you in your research?

L A-L: In my writing I have always followed my own passions, letting my ethnographic research in Egypt suggest important issues to explore—first the role of poetry in social and personal life and gender relations; then women’s everyday storytelling as a way to break with anthropological typifications of “cultures”; and finally television’s attempt to construct and mold national subjects. I have also been inspired by collaborative experiences in the academy. Some of the most memorable have been related to gender studies. I was a fellow at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton in 1987-1988, during the year that Joan Scott organized a seminar on gender. It was eye-opening for me to work closely with a powerful group of feminist scholars from different disciplines, including Judith Butler and Donna Haraway. I have also learned a lot from faculty reading groups at Williams College, where I first taught; from a series of seminars and workshops that Tim Mitchell and I organized at N.Y.U. around area studies; and from a Ford Foundation funded initiative at N.Y.U. to institutionalize gender studies.

FN: How do you conceive the relationship between your teaching and your research?

L A-L: I like to link my teaching and writing when possible. For a number of years, I taught a graduate course called “Gender Politics in the Muslim World” that sharpened for me, through intensive discussions with students, a set of ideas about women and the projects of modernity that were well beyond the anthropological and localized issues I had taken up in my ethnographies, Veiled Sentiments and Writing Women’s Worlds. I ended up pulling together a group of wonderful scholars who were thinking about such issues to meet for a workshop and to contribute to a book called Remaking Women: Feminism and Modernity in the Middle East. Among them was Afsaneh Najmabadi, who will now be my colleague. I was especially thrilled that one of the chapters had started life as a graduate student paper for my course, the chapter on scientific child rearing and motherhood in early twentieth-century Egypt by Omnia Shakry, who is currently writing her dissertation in the History Department at Princeton. I just received a copy of the new translation of Remaking Women, which was published in October to coincide with a conference in Cairo honoring the 100th anniversary of the publication of a controversial book by Qasim Amin called The Liberation of Women. It is very important for me to have my work translated into Arabic because this allows for a different kind of collaboration and exchange. Instead of just writing for our academic world in the U.S. or Europe, I want to be accountable to intellectuals and ordinary people in the region I study.

FN: Have any of your other works been translated into Arabic?
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Faculty Book Picks

Feminist News introduces the "Faculty Book Picks" column. Each semester, members of the IRWAG faculty will report about books they have recently read and wish to recommend to our readers.

Recommended by Rachel Adams, Department of English and Comparative Literature

One of the most memorable books I've read recently is Daniel Boyarin’s *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man*. Emerging out of the author’s attempt to reconcile his commitment to Jewishness and to feminist and anti-homophobic positions, *Unheroic Conduct* sketches a tradition that affirms the effeminacy of the gentle, scholarly Jewish man. This is a tradition that was occluded as Jews came into contact with a modern, Western European culture that valorized aggressive, heroic forms of masculinity. While reclaiming “the eroticized Jewish male sissy,” Boyarin is rigorously attentive to the sexism and homophobia of traditional Jewish culture, the contributions of feminist scholarship, and the alternatives posed by an examination of women’s history. Brilliant and controversial in his argumentation, Boyarin also maintains a consistently witty yet impassioned authorial voice that makes this an engaging read.

Laura Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern England*, an amazing history of women’s mediation of sexual morality in early modern London. Based on the London church court records of women who sued each other for slander, Gowing’s book points to ways in which neighbors, enemies, and friends negotiated social and personal enmities (in 1610, the book begins “Alice Rochester insulted Jane Lilham in front of her neighbors, all at work in their doorways. ‘Thou art a whore and an arrant whore and a common carted whore and thou art my husband’s whore’”). Women made up the majority of personal insult cases in the church courts, and testified against other women and for each other as witnesses. The terms of sexual insult (whore, bawd, jade, strumpet, quean) reveal a great deal not only about gender relations in the period but about how women perceived, and made use of, the condemnatory and prescriptive moral orders in which they lived. The contrast between household advice that women be chaste, silent, and obedient, and the records of the London church courts show us the dangers and limitations of reading women’s history from prescriptive literature, and the errors of simple romanticizations of women’s experiences with one another in the period. The stories show the varied experiences of early modern social life: neighborhood alliances and feuds; the construction, breakdown, and negotiation of marriage; lust and adultery; bastardy; social position; labor practices; and the power of popular opinion and accurately-directed slander. The stories also locate the reader in the “private” geographies (windows and doorways) of London in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and illustrate the inventiveness, belligerence, and socio-political savvy of women.

J.M. Coetzee, *Disgrace* (Viking, 1999)
Recommended by Rosalind Morris, Department of Anthropology

Of the books I’ve read recently, the one that stands out as being the most provocative and the most challenging to my political and aesthetic sensibilities is surely J.M. Coetzee’s *Disgrace*. It’s not a comfortable read—how could a story about inter-racial rape and the ceding of the political to personal violence be comfortable? But it forces the reader to think about what happens when ethics and politics are radically separated. I think Coetzee is forcing us to consider the South African experience of the TRC in allegorical terms. What he suggests is that, when, under the guise of “secular Christianity,” political acts are exempted from the law of the State, a law which would ironically have attributed authorship to individuals who took arms against an unjust regime, the possibility for laying claim to new rights as political subjects is cut off. In those instances, ethical possibility is as severed as is political emancipation. And there is nothing left but personal violence. More often than not, this entails violence against the politically weakest spot in the order of power. In this case (*Disgrace*), the object of resentment is a white male order; the object of violence is a white woman. Novels are not just political treatises, of course. But as an account of the explosion of sexual violence in South Africa and as a commentary on what happens when desire is made the handmaid of a Christian state’s instrumental reason, it is a stunningly powerful book. It is also powerful as an aesthetic achievement, and in *Disgrace*, Coetzee produces one of the most stringent and brutally beautiful narrative voices I’ve encountered in a long time.
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I. A-L: The first piece that I had published was on my position as a "dutiful daughter," to borrow Simone de Beauvoir’s term, doing research. It was translated as part of a book on Arab women in the field. Veiled Sentiments was translated into Arabic and published in 1995 by a new feminist press based in Cairo and devoted to work by and about Arab women. The press, called NOUR, also publishes a women's book review quarterly. I have also had a number of articles translated on my research on Egyptian television.

FN: What projects are you currently working on?

I. A-L: I am currently working on a book called Melodramas of Nationhood: Television and the Postcolonial Condition in Egypt. I began doing multi-sited ethnographic research in 1990, focusing on two groups of marginal women—villagers in rural Upper Egypt and domestic workers in Cairo—but also including television directors and writers in Cairo. I was interested in the cultural politics of Egyptian television drama, curious about how this form of state-controlled popular culture participated in national debates about pressing social issues such as gender, class, consumerism, and the politics of religion. But I was interested in the cultural politics of Egyptian television drama, curious about how this form of state-controlled popular culture participated in national debates about pressing social issues such as gender, class, consumerism, and the politics of religion. But insofar as I’ve been working with, and coming to sympathize enormously with, the socially marginal women that make up part of the audience for television, I have become obsessed with the gap between urban professionals who produce television and people like them. I have been trying to analyze how the genre of melodrama might be shaping modern subjectivities among such women and also how the developmentalist rhetoric of the nation-state has shaped the aesthetics and politics of television, with serious consequences for uneducated women. The big challenge for me is to work out how women live their lives at the intersection of varying institutions and discourses, only one of which is television.

My study of television in Egypt led me into a wider set of questions about mass media and a great collaboration with Brian Larkin, who teaches in the Anthropology Department at Barnard, and Faye Ginsburg, who directs the program in Media and Culture at N.Y.U. We have just finished editing a book to be published by the University of California Press called The Social Practice of Media. The book attempts to define the emerging field of the anthropology of media. We have brought together about twenty anthropologists (including Rosalind Morris, the Director of IRWAG) who study media, mostly film and television, in places as diverse as the Australian outback, Zambia, Kazakhstan, China, India, and the Hmong diasporic community in the U.S. The latest plan is to develop a website, perhaps even a DVD, to go with the book, so we can use this work for teaching in innovative ways.

FN: How would you describe the course you are teaching this semester at IRWAG, and what do you plan to teach in the future?

I. A-L: I am teaching a course for IRWAG this term called “Gender and Power in Global Perspective.” I think this kind of course is important for Women’s and Gender Studies because it explores the different meanings of the global, allowing us to see both how people’s lives in different parts of the world are interconnected (through historical links like colonialism and contemporary links like the global economy) and how one needs sound social theory and sophistication about representation to do cross-cultural analysis—understanding societies that are different from our own. For me this is a challenging course because it stretches me well beyond the traditional confines of anthropology. Yet I feel strongly that we should have the critical tools to understand the forces organizing our worlds and especially the ethical issues involved for feminists to take stands on global gender issues, whether around sexuality, work, or rights.

I would also like to teach courses on feminist ethnography and on women’s life stories and autobiographies cross-culturally.

FN: How do you view your new role at IRWAG, and what are your hopes for your future here?

I. A-L: I’m very excited about joining the Institute for Research on Women and Gender, and I am looking forward to working with the strong faculty and great students who find it a lively intellectual home. What I am hoping is that the Institute can continue to be an inclusive, ecumenical, collegial, and intellectually rigorous site for gender studies. I would like to strengthen links between IRWAG and the area studies programs at Columbia, as well as new initiatives like the program in Comparative Literature and Society. Columbia is particularly exciting for me as an anthropologist because of the spectacular rebuilding of the Anthropology Department and the active role that those from Anthropology are playing in reshaping South Asian studies, African Studies, and Middle East Studies. I’m especially intrigued these days with the relationship between postcolonial studies, anthropology, and feminist theory, and I think Columbia is a place where I’ll have colleagues and students who will help me to think this through.
### Spring 2000 Graduate Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G4000y</td>
<td>Genealogies of Feminism</td>
<td>J. Cohen and D. von Mücke</td>
<td>M: 2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8001y</td>
<td>Gender Studies Pedagogy Workshop</td>
<td>R. Adams and J. Crawford</td>
<td>tba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring 2000 Undergraduate Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V3112y</td>
<td>Feminist Texts II.</td>
<td>S. Lepselter</td>
<td>M: 11–1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3313y</td>
<td>Colloquium on Feminist Inquiry</td>
<td>B. Simon</td>
<td>Th: 9–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3914y</td>
<td>Gender and Difference in Southeast Asia</td>
<td>R. Morris</td>
<td>W: 2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3915y</td>
<td>Gender and Power in Global Perspective</td>
<td>L. Abu-Lughod</td>
<td>Th: 11–1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3920y</td>
<td>Women and Power in American History</td>
<td>E. Baker</td>
<td>W: 11–1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Feminist Interventions

#### February 14:
Ann Douglas, Professor of English and Comparative Literature, Columbia University
Factories of Self-Celebration: The State, Gender, and Race in the Post-War Hollywood Musical
Patrick Horrigan responding
8 PM, 501 Schermerhorn Hall

#### April 10:
Poetry Reading
Yvette Christiansé, Professor of Literature, Fordham University
Stephanie Strickland, Poet and hypertext author
8 PM, 501 Schermerhorn Hall
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