From the Director

If feminist politics is history, then that was news to the over six hundred people who registered for the spectacularly successful conference, “What is Feminist Politics Now? Local and Global.” President Lee Bollinger opened the conference that then went on to explore the changing meanings and goals of feminism in a global context. Over two event-filled days, speakers and audience members debated the genealogies, economies, subjects, and politics of feminism.

This conference was rapidly followed by the commencement of public programming of two Projects currently running at the Center for the Critical Analysis of Social Difference—the Engendering Archives Project sponsored a roundtable on torture and truth and the Liberalism’s Others Project on Sharia, war, and humanitarian interventions. The events provided vigorous intellectual exchange and witnessed audiences that spilled into the hall outside our newly revamped seminar room. Such passionate engagement continued with our fall “Feminist Interventions” lecture, provided by Professor Michael Warner, Professor of English and American Studies at Yale, on the topic of normativity and queer situations and with a speak-out on Proposition 8 organized by the graduate fellows.

The Institute has also been busy working with the Office of the Vice President for the Arts and Sciences to advance the research and pedagogical agenda of the Institute as well as provide the logistical support for students, staff, and faculty. I would like to thank Robert Harrist of the Art History Department for generously providing the Institute with one of its offices and Kevin Fox for agreeing to renovate the space. The Institute will devote a portion of the office to its graduate fellows as well as work with the Center for the Critical Analysis of Social Difference to provide office space for Visiting Fellows.

The Institute will continue to do what it can to provide the range of courses—and the support for these courses—as the University enters a difficult fiscal period. We believe that understanding the gendered nature of our social and cultural worlds is especially vital during periods of national and global economic stress which more severely
Feminist Interventions: 
Michael Warner’s 
“Notes on Normativity”

Pierre Bourdieu, the French Sociologist known mainly for his theory of practice, would hardly be the first person to come to mind when the topic turns to queer theory. But, it was Bourdieu to whom Professor Michael Warner turned to discuss queer norms and normativity in his Feminist Interventions lecture. Speaking ahead of the national elections that saw the passage of Proposition 8 in California, Warner sought to develop a more nuanced understanding of norms and normativity than the one he saw in Bourdieu’s Outline of a Theory of Practice.

In a talk that moved synthetically across contemporary social theory, cognitive psychology, and literary close reading, Warner focused on the account of masculinity Bourdieu presupposed and juxtaposed this to the “girly man.” Is the “girly man” non-normative? “Let us suppose, for instance, that a person had an uncle who was such a girly man” in a household of normative masculinity. Can we simply say that he was outside the doxic structure of masculine normativity? To answer these questions, Warner moved the audience through a dynamic of various situations and meta-situations—states of affairs and how these states are themselves situated—in order to show that there are multiple contexts in which such non-normative gender is perceived as an ideal. These contexts, themselves produced by the perceived rightness of the non-normative gender, may be fleeting, but they provide a potential ground for subsequent elaborations of counter-normative gender.

After the talk, the packed, studied audience could be heard debating the implications of Warner’s argument. But lest this be taken as yet another normal event, an audience member asked Warner to sign her shoe. She explained that she had come out to her parents after they found her reading his book, The Trouble with Normal.

Michael Warner is Seymour H. Knox Professor of English at Yale University where he is Professor of American Studies and English. He is the author of numerous books including Fear of a Queer Planet (Minnesota, 1993), The Trouble with Normal (The Free Press, 1999), and Publics and Counterpublics (Zone, 2002).
On September 19-20, 2008 the Institute for Research on Women and Gender held its annual conference, drawing together scholars, professionals, lay people, and students at Columbia University for two days of dynamic and diverse presentations and discussion. 

Panels and lectures at the event, entitled “What is Feminist Politics Now: Local and Global,” explored the changing meanings of feminist politics in a global framework; the merits of liberalism as a framework for feminism; and the possibilities of macro- and microeconomic policy for gender and social justice. 

“The themes of the conference emerged from long and fraught discussions” of about 15 IRWaG members, said Alice Kessler-Harris, Conference Coordinator and R. Gordon Hoxie Professor of American History at Columbia University. “The idea was to get people to think about what a feminist politics might look like...what issues would it emphasize; to whom would it speak; how would it be enacted? The shape of the final conference emerged out of the compromises to which we came.”

The vast scope and diversity of presentations within and across panels demonstrated that a variety of definitions and interpretations of “feminist politics” abound. The conference revealed sites of struggle and conflict, and moments of political and social potential. 

Alice Kessler-Harris
“What is Feminist Politics Today?”
A Panel Discussion
By Katie Gradowski

Fresh off the 40th anniversary of the 1968 protests at Columbia, a new look at feminism seems almost by definition to be a retrospective project: “What is feminist politics now?” would seem to beg the question, “What was feminist politics in 1968?” For feminists who came of age in the late 60s and 70s, the question, “What is Feminist Politics Now?” can invoke personal, often intimate memories of NOW protests, consciousness-raising and civil protest, a set of shared markers of collective progress in a difficult time. For young feminists today, this model often seems foreign, a frame that cues strong nostalgia for the past, but often seems inapplicable to the problems of a globalized world.

This division was evident in the opening panel entitled “Genealogies of Feminist Politics,” which brought together scholars from a range of academic disciplines: from oral history and memoir (Luisa Passerini) to legal research (Janet Halley), activism, film and media (Ai Xiaoming), Christian theology and to New Womanism (Katie Cannon). The panel offered a varied, often surprising look at how feminism has changed in the wake of second-wave politics and global feminism—noting, above all, that the terms, “feminist” and “politics” themselves have become increasingly difficult to define.

Speaking of younger feminists in Italy, Luisa Passerini, historian and memoirist at the University of Turin, said, “Today they talk about feminism in the plural.” Passerini vividly recalled feminist solidarity in Italy in the 1960’s and 1970’s, which she wrote about in her memoir Autobiography of a Generation. But, she noted, times have changed. Far from a singular movement, “feminism” has become a series of linked initiatives, touching on immigration, geopolitical development, and questions of national access.

“Consciousness-raising seems outdated to today’s young feminists,” Passerini noted. “They don’t feel like it’s their practice.”

Katie Cannon of the Union Theological Seminary in Virginia had a similar experience. She described the rise—and subsequent fall—of “womanism” as a key term in Christian feminist discourse. As feminism has moved into the mainstream, she argued, feminist adherents have largely ceased to embrace the term “womanism” because of what is sometimes seen as its sexual and racial exclusions. Cannon believed that this turn against the concept of womanism marked a critical loss for the post-civil rights generation. For Cannon, womanism was meant to mark an analysis of the exclusions of African American women in the academies of religion from the perspective of race, class and gender—the opposite of what many students, with little memory of what this term originally meant, hear when they hear the term “Womanism.”

Part of the problem, notes Janet Halley, a professor at the Harvard School of Law, is that today’s feminism has become highly professionalized—and increasingly, state-centered. Halley describes this new activism as “governance feminism,” dominated by NGO’s, non-profits, and government agencies. “Feminism has incorporated itself into state institutions...[through] refugees, human rights law, trade policies. It now takes government into account.”

Emerging with this shift, she argued, is a troubling professionalization which alters the discourse from “activism” to “expertise.” “’Viewing’ feminism as expertise [shifts the emphasis] from politics to knowledge,” Halley said, “’collapsing’ decades of debate on rape, on criminalization, gender parity, etc” into consensus opinion, which goes largely unchallenged in feminist politics today.
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Left to right: Janet Halley, Katie Cannon, Ai Xiaoming, Farah Griffin, Luisa Passerini
“Who is the Subject of Feminism?”

By Jessica Adler

Naomi Sobel was drawn to the panel, “Who is the Subject of Feminism” partially because of its unusual composition. “You don’t usually get to see Dorothy Allison, Jack Halberstam, Uma Narayan, and Sara Ruddick on the same panel,” said Sobel, a second year Master of Arts student in Columbia’s American Studies department.

On the first day of IRWaG’s “What is Feminist Politics Now” conference, Sobel joined a packed house for the panel’s four talks, which ranged in focus from Halberstam’s conceptualization of “self-negation” to Narayan’s critique of the provision of micro-credit for women in developing nations. In the end, Sobel came to at least one conclusion: “There is so much diversity in the dialogue about feminism, and so many different ways to talk about it.”

Marianne Hirsch, Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia and co-Director of the Institute for Research on Women and Gender, noted a similar point when introducing the four speakers: “Feminism has been contested terrain for as long as it has existed.” Still, she said, fundamental questions about representation have endured.

Each of the panel’s presenters pursued the question of feminist representation from a different perspective.

Ruddick, a Professor of Philosophy and Women’s Studies at the New School, employed a set of historical reflections to illustrate the varieties of feminist activist movements, comparing and contrasting the American anti-war movement of the 1930s with Kenyan efforts at community-building in the 1990s.

Narayan, Chair of the Philosophy Department of Vassar College, critiqued the notion of a singular model of gender politics by discussing the pitfalls of imposing western feminist norms on Muslim women in European countries and poor women living and working in developing nations.

Halberstam, Professor of English and Director of The Center for Feminist Research at the University of Southern California, took a more theoretical approach. He examined how “aesthetic archives give us other languages for feminism than explicitly activist political archives.” Arguing against the very notion of a subject of feminism, Halberstam urged the consideration of “evacuation, passivity, an un-being,” or “anti-social feminism.”

“Feminism,” said Halberstam, “never existed and doesn’t exist for me.” He urged the idea of getting “rid of the male/female binary where activity is normative.” The novel approach, he said, is contained in a rejection of existence within such normative frameworks, and a “refusal to be.”

Allison, an award-winning editor and writer, described her self-discovery as a lesbian feminist in the leftist politics of the 1960s and beyond while pondering what she saw as the lack of cohesion in current feminist politics.

Focusing on the idea of the collage form, Halberstam described, among other artistic and literary endeavors, Yoko Ono’s 1965 performance of “Cut Piece.” In this work, Ono sat motionless on stage while audience members, one-by-one, cut off pieces of her clothing. As more men came onto the stage, however, the “cutting [became] more aggressive,” according to Halberstam. A distinct feminist politics is...
“Sex, Struggle, and Daily Bread”
By Jessica Adler

When Radhika Balakrishnan, Professor of Economics and International Studies at Marymount College and Chair of the Coordinating Committee of the U.S. Network on Human Rights, was preparing her keynote speech for IRWaG’s 2008 conference on feminist politics, she decided to take an informal survey of friends. Balakrishnan sent emails to a sampling of economists, activists, artists, and stay-at-home moms asking, among other things: What does it mean to you to be a feminist? What do you consider feminist politics?

In return, she received 70 pages of responses from about 100 people. “Feminist politics means a passion for justice and a challenge to hetero-normativity,” said one. “Equal pay for equal work; sharing of household work,” said another. “To be a feminist is to want full equality for women and to recognize that we ain’t there yet.” Some were decidedly skeptical: “Feminism has no teeth for me as Black woman in United States,” one respondent said.

According to another respondent, it “depends on the end of capitalism as… a system,” and consists of a “challenge to bring a new kind of socialism…” This last response struck a chord with Balakrishnan, a Marxist feminist economist who has spent her career examining how capitalism and the market economy shape people’s lives and especially the lives of impoverished women worldwide.

The financial meltdown of late 2008, she said, has only bolstered her belief that the “impact of the neo-liberal economy has not only had a devastating effect on the financial sector, but also on the poor and, in particular, women.”

In her keynote address, Balakrishnan presented preliminary results from one of her more recent projects undertaken while she was an officer at the Ford Foundation. There, Balakrishnan helped bring together economists and human rights activists to “see how we could use international governmental norms, designed from international treaties, to hold governments accountable” for providing entitlements to all citizens.

The resulting study examines intersections between economic policies and human rights advocacy, and assesses monetary policy from a human rights perspective. It discusses the extent of the state’s “role to protect those people who are left out of the market, not just to protect the market,” said Balakrishnan.

According to the Convention on Human Rights, Balakrishnan noted, governments are obliged to ensure basic individual rights, such as access to food, clothing, and housing. But, research reveals that over 4 percent of United States households have “very low food security,” meaning family members lack the finances to eat, or give up meals for children in order to be able to pay rent. Moreover, Balakrishnan said, 12 percent of U.S. households are “food insecure.” In other words, they do not have access to money to eat on regular basis, or to overcome a “nutritional handicap.”

Breaking these statistics down, Balakrishnan pointed out that “this has a specific impact on women and people of color.” Thirty-one percent of food insecure people in the United States, for example, are single mothers, she said.

Using such data, Balakrishnan argued, “we can go back to the government and say it is discriminatory; you are violating human rights standards.”

The assertion corresponds with Balakrishnan’s belief that academic work needs to be placed in the public sphere in order to become “part of the solution.”

Sadhar Sadjadi, and audience member and Columbia PhD student in an interdisciplinary Medical Anthropology program, found such a sentiment inspiring. “We are having economic debates less and less in feminist circles,” Sadjadi said. “The debates have gone so post-structuralist; looking at feminism from a Marxist economic perspective is really refreshing.”
Feminism and the West: 
Re-imagining Feminism’s Liberal Roots

By Katie Gradowski

Inderpal Grewal, Professor of Women’s Studies at the University of California, Irvine, has a striking example of who the U.S. feminists are today. Disillusioned university students? Aging activists, looking back to 1968? Hardly.

It’s the security mom.

The security mom, Grewal argues, is the intimate image of neoliberalism in the age of terror, a figure that turns motherhood into domestic surveillance domesticating in the process intervention abroad. “It was only to be expected that such a mom would emerge as a political authority,” says Grewal, as feminist projects themselves have taken a state-like form.

If feminist politics has increasingly come to mean “governance feminism”—identified in the rise of feminist NGO’s, the mainstreaming of feminist discourse, and more recently, neoliberal concerns over security and nationalism—what remains of its original legacy outside the halls of the state? What does this movement look like in the age of terrorism? What does it look like in a global context?

The closing panel of What is Feminist Politics Now?—“Liberalism and its Others,” took up these issues directly. Speakers discussed the historical and current conditions of feminists movements in China, Sweden, South America, and the Middle East. Across these contexts, Grewal argued, the problem of international feminism has increasingly become framed by the problem of international development.

As many of the panelists pointed out, the transformation of international feminism into international development is a troubling outcome of critical postcolonial feminist theory. For over twenty years, international feminist movements have challenged the notion of feminism as a secular movement aligned with the Western-centered developed view of “equal rights.” The content, goals, and resources of feminist politics were shown to be as diverse as their sources. Lara Deeb, an associate professor at the University of California, Irvine, has spent the past ten years researching women’s groups in Beirut, looking at how Shi’i women have increasingly anchored their politics in a claim to faith, insisting on piety as the anchor of political discourse in Islamic culture. This has emerged, she argues, as women have taken an increasingly visible role in public life, and have been particularly central to shaping the discourse around marriage in Islamic communities.

“Middle class women are claiming the right [to marriage] without permission from family members,” she notes, pointing to the rise in temporary and contractual marriages among middle-class women in Lebanon. But this shift, she notes, is taking place within the framework of religious piety, rather than a model of secular Western-centered feminism and should not be reduced to a developmental framework.

In China, likewise, women’s groups have taken up a model of local community organizing that bears little resemblance to U.S. activism. Wang Zheng, an associate professor at the University of Michigan, studies feminism and urban reorganization in Maoist China, and its long-term impact on women’s activism in China today.

In particular, Zheng looked at the Association for Women’s Research, a small NGO in the Xinjiang province that has tried to increase women’s representation on local community boards. Typically constituting less than 16 percent of village representation, rural women have been dramatically underrepresented in local government—a fact that is particularly striking, given that they constitute a growing part of the workforce in rural areas.

Liberal Roots, Continued on Page 17
An Interview with
Joseph Slaughter
By Jessica Adler

When Joseph Slaughter was in second grade, he told his teacher he wanted to be Speaker of the United States House of Representatives or, if that fell through, Secretary of State. For the grandson of an Indiana U.S. Congressman and the son of a professor of poetry and a community organizer, politics was part of dinner conversation. Young Joseph thought Tip O’Neill, who served as Speaker of the House under Presidents Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, “seemed cool.”

Since his formative years in Jacksonville, Florida, Slaughter’s idea of the “political” has, to say the least, expanded. In his work on postcolonial literature and theory, human rights, and 20th-century ethnic and third world literatures, the Columbia University Associate Professor of English and Comparative Literature has attempted to foreground the connections among social justice, globalization, and literary and cultural forms.

Slaughter has followed a winding path to New York City—educated in the American south, Slaughter traveled through Latin America on his way to various university teaching positions in Texas, Montana, and Michigan before receiving tenure at Columbia University in May 2008.

After spending his high school years in Jacksonville, excelling in A.P. classes, helping to usher the Brain Brawl debate team to the national finals, and styling his hair in the latest punk fashions, Slaughter got a free ride to the University of Florida. In his first semester as an undergraduate, his roster of classes included “The Social Control of Deviance” and a course on French feminism.

It was during a sophomore course on poststructuralism that he began to lean away from the conviction that he would major in computer science. The class was reading the 1984 article, “No Apocryphe, Not Now (Full Speed Ahead, Seven Missiles, Seven Missives),” by Jacques Derrida.

“For some reason, it really appealed to my own ways of thinking; it had to do with the same things that appealed to me about computer programming,” Slaughter says. “There was a beauty to the intricacy of the thought required. Even if I didn’t understand some of it... there was a kind of poetry and playfulness to it that I really liked.”

Before graduating from the University of Florida in 1989, Slaughter studied Anthropology and Spanish while teaching American literature in Merida, Mexico. On the first day of a class on Latin American literature there, he recalls, a professor made an assertion: “There is no such thing as ‘native’ literature,” the teacher said. “It all came from Europe.”

On the first day of a class on Latin American literature there, he recalls, a professor made an assertion: “There is no such thing as ‘native’ literature,” the teacher said. “It all came from Europe.”

“The world of politics and the field of literary studies did not have to be divorced—in fact, probably couldn’t be divorced.”

Before graduating from the University of Florida in 1989, Slaughter studied Anthropology and Spanish while teaching American literature in Merida, Mexico. On the first day of a class on Latin American literature there, he recalls, a professor made an assertion: “There is no such thing as ‘native’ literature,” the teacher said. “It all came from Europe.”

Slaughter, Continued on Page 14

“...the world of politics and the field of literary studies did not have to be divorced—in fact, probably couldn’t be divorced.”
The Shifting Contexts of Self-Narration: 
Lynne Segal on Writing Feminist Memoirs

By Katie Gradowski

Lynne Segal has had enough of feminist trauma narratives. “The
écrit de cour of the talking wounded, the writing wounded,” she
said, in response to a 21st century London exhibition entitled
simply, Trauma. Dwelling on suffering, she said, is “a world
away from the cadence of the 1970’s [feminism].”

It’s narrative, rather than trauma, that Segal is really interested in—as she recounted in
detail in her memoir “Making Trouble,” a history of the women’s liberation movement as
told by Segal, as a burgeoning feminist working on her Ph.D. in Sydney in the late 1960’s.
Marxist, pro-sex and pro-men, “making trouble” is an adequate term for how she defines her
political career.

“I was an underground academic in the 1970’s and an out political revolutionary,” she said with a grin. “I never had a notion of a career in the 1960’s way. I thought you lived your life in politics and earned enough to survive.”

Now a professor of gender and psychology at the University of London, Birkbeck, Segal is the author of Why Feminism? Gender, Psychology, Politics, and Straight Sex: The Politics of Pleasure. As an activist and scholar, she has made a practice of bringing these politics into the classroom through her scholarship and writing.

Writing a memoir, she noted, has taught her a thing or two about what she calls “the strangeness of feminism’s contentious afterlife.” She recalled, especially, how central autobiography itself was to 1970’s feminism. “It was just such a vigorous insertion of personal lives into the political sphere.” “[Autobiography] became a form of feminist consciousness-raising—a utopian coming-of-age genre.” The books of her era—Memoirs of an Ex-Prom Queen, Getting Gloomy, The Women’s Room—were “voyages of discovery,” “diverse texts in which the female protagonists emerged out of the constraints of girlhood…commonly in the company of demanding and difficult men, to arrive at some form of redemptive liberation.”

Often, she noted, its protagonists ended this journey alone—but always hopeful, always a little bit wiser.

Autobiographies written by women remain, she noted, but the genre of feminist biography has largely vanished leaving in its wake much more atomized view of women’s liberation. “Today the confessional models flooding the market are no longer shared journeys…marked by the pursuit of collective goals, but narrated tales of individual trauma, unaided by others except for the wide counsel of some professional expert.” Segal marked the shift around the mid-1980’s—the moment, as she put it, when her students insisted on having therapists. “It was not what this old Marxist feminist had anticipated,” she noted dryly.

Within this context, feminist memoirs play a strange role, being asked to recall an unstable and often highly contested past. Segal confronted her own resistance to “packaging” memoir—the problem of truth-telling, the limits of memory, the difference between memory and history. “[Memory] is itself seen as a fragile thing, vulnerable to all the self-deceptions, conscious and unconscious, of recall.”

For all its faults, though, she now believes that memoir is important for keeping political imagination alive. “The trick of keeping pessimism at bay as we age is surely never to simply turn our backs on our past, but to think critically, to think historically, and to see how fast things change when they start to change.”

The 2nd Annual
Women’s and Gender Studies Prize

All Columbia, General Studies, and Barnard College undergraduates are invited to submit their best papers for consideration. Papers from every discipline, on any topic within “women’s and gender studies”—broadly defined—will be judged anonymously by an interdisciplinary committee of Columbia and Barnard faculty and graduate students.

Deadline for Submissions: Noon, April 20, 2009

$250 PRIZE

The Institute for Research on Women and Gender at Columbia University is proud to present the Women’s and Gender Studies Award. This prize is meant to honor an undergraduate student for his or her excellence in research and writing in the fields of women and gender studies. (There is another prize for Queer Studies; students may submit their essay for consideration for only one prize). Its purpose is twofold: to recognize undergraduate students—who often have few opportunities for such recognition—for their superb intellectual achievement, and to provide students interested in women’s and gender studies with institutional support for their work.
Fear, terror, and horror are hardly new concepts in the political lexicon. The etymology of the word “terror” links the term to a narrative of modernity: cuing images of the Jacobins in Revolutionary France, the Red Terror, late 19th century anarchism, to the 20th century notion of totalitarianism and the terrorist state. Yet as political theorist Adriana Cavarero pointed out in her recent talk at the Hellenic Studies co-sponsored event, “terror” and “horror” are often taken for granted as descriptive concepts. Getting the terminology right, Cavarero said, is essential to understanding what it means to live in a post-9/11 world, where terrorism and its antecedents have reemerged as a commonplace form of political violence.

In her most recent book, Horrorism: Naming Contemporary Violence, Cavarero asked us to set aside the word “terror,” which she viewed as a “useless and misleading term,” one that is at best confusing, and at worst, sanctions the very kind of violence it would seek to identify and prevent. The difference, for Cavarero, hinges on the distinction between “terror” conceived of as a state of action or flight, and “horror” as a state of rooted fear, verging on repugnance. “The physics of terror drives bodies into motion. The victim…trembles and flees in order to survive.” In place of terror, she substituted “horrorism,” which denotes a static fear of the grotesque. “Horror induces a state of paralysis…The movement of flight seems to be excluded.”

To clarify, Cavarero offered two iconic images of horror, Medusa and Medea, as “a screen against which to test the consistency” of these terms. Many scholars, she noted, have pointed to the unwatchability of Medusa, a figure who quite literally resists representation. To look upon Medusa is to do violence to the self, to subject oneself to the basilisk stare. Yet as Cavarero pointed out, what is unwatchable in this case is precisely the spectacle of disfigurement—the severed head, which underlines the “destruction of the human condition, manifested in the singularity of human bodies.”

Cavarero linked this to contemporary forms of violence—specifically, to the suicide bomber, identified by the decapitated head, the visage detached from the body. Taking Medusa as a point of reference, she recounted the father of a Chechen rebel who, when asked to identify the body of his daughter, described “her hair…tousled, as if it had been ruffled by the wind.” Here, disfigurement is an essential part of the act. “The body undone—blown about, torn to pieces—loses its singularity, offends the ontological dignity of the human figure which renders it unwatchable.”

Horror, Continued on Page 18
An Interview with Victoria Rosner

By Jessica Adler

In nursery school and kindergarten, Victoria Rosner could often be found sitting in a corner reading. When she got her first New York Public Library card, she went to the front of the literature shelves and worked her way through the classics numerically, using the Dewey Decimal system as a guide.

Twenty years later, when Rosner realized as a Columbia University graduate student that she could make a career out of reading and writing, it seemed almost too good to be true.

“I continue to think it’s just marvelous that this is my work, and that I can actually do this as a profession,” she says. “Frankly, I think it’s astonishing.”

Rosner, an Associate Professor of English at Texas A&M University, is back at her alma mater as a visiting faculty member for the 2008-2009 academic year. During her time in New York, she is teaching in some of the same classrooms she remembers from her days as a student, as well as pursuing a variety of other professional roles, including scholar, editor, and occasional web columnist.

Rosner entered Columbia as an undergraduate in 1986, just three years after the university began accepting women students. At that point, she recalls, most of her professors were men, and she “really didn’t have what you would call a feminist conscience.”

Still, Rosner distinctly remembers a group of young women climbing to the roof of Butler Library on Columbia’s Morningside campus during the university’s 1989 graduation ceremony and hanging a 140-foot banner featuring the names of world renowned women writers and scholars such as Virginia Woolf, Juana Inez de Cruz, and Sappho. The protestors were attempting to point out that the all-male roster of names engraved in the library façade—Homer, Plato, Shakespeare—was unegalitarian and unrepresentative. The banner was eventually removed, the library building left unaltered.

In the wake of that event, Rosner developed a feminist conscience and began pursuing graduate study at Columbia.

“Suddenly, I did have lots of women professors—Jean Howard, Carolyn Heilbrun, Ann Douglas. It wasn’t only that these women were teaching women’s literature and about the role of gender. They also really were modeling for me what it was to be a woman intellectual in the academy. That was when I first began to see that as a possibility.”

Under the mentorship of faculty in Columbia’s English Department, Rosner’s focus shifted to her current interests in gender studies and the history of private life.

“I think I was really taken with the idea that what had appeared to me to be subjects that were more specific to private sphere, or that were personal and thus somehow excluded from the world of scholarly inquiry—like domesticity, like women’s lives, like sexuality—that these things were legitimate subjects for scholarly inquiry and that they could be approached with rigor and method, and placed into dialogue with other more traditional aspects of literary analysis in a really profitable way.”

While writing her dissertation, Rosner became interested in the relationship between modern literature and modern architecture. Her first book, Modernism and the Architecture of Private Life, published by Columbia University Press in hardcover in 2005 and paperback in 2008, explores the ways in which modernist writers adapted architectural and design notions, such as interiority, to produce new ideas about subjectivity and sociality.

“...Is education really about talking to someone who agrees with you before you’ve said a word? Or is it about adopting relative flexibility?”

Shortly before receiving her PhD from Columbia University in 1999, Rosner accepted a position as an Assistant Professor at Texas A&M University in College Station, Texas.

Raised and educated in New York City, Rosner thought that relocating to the southwest “would be an adventure, in the best sense of the word.” And she has made practical adjustments to her new environs, learning how to drive a car, and adapting to larger sizes of everything—from furniture to hamburgers.

There have been adjustments in the classroom, too. Many of Rosner’s students come from small Texas towns and hold political beliefs more conservative than her own. But these differences only enhance the learning environment, she believes.

“Is education really about talking to someone who agrees with you before you’ve said a word? Or is it about adopting relative flexibility?”

Around the seminar table, Rosner lives by the same advice she gives her students: don’t assume that everyone will automatically agree with your assertions.

“It forces me to think more deeply about what I have to say,” Rosner says. “When you don’t share as many common assumptions, it forces you to go back and think about how you got those assumptions.”

Rosner has taught classes ranging in focus from feminist theory and literary criticism to modern British and 20th century American literature. During her fall semester at Columbia, she taught courses on the Fin-de-Siècle and modernism.
The problem with Iraq, says Nicholas Mirzoeff, professor of visual studies at NYU, is hardly a lack of media attention. “There have been 800 books published on Iraq in English since 2003,” he notes dryly. Photos, too, have captivated public attention, running the gamut from the banal images of coalition and occupation, to handheld snapshots taken by soldiers, to the iconic photo of “the Marlboro Man,” to the sobering images of Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib.

These latter images—the images of Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib—were the subject of heated debate in the panel discussion “Torture and Truth,” sponsored by CCASD’s Engendering Archives project this October. As Mirzoeff points out, the visual archive has changed dramatically since 2003—shifting from highly censored government images to a “vernacular image base,” with soldiers on both sides actively documenting the conflict.

Where we are now, he says, is a “state of invisibility, where there is no war on television of the media.” As a visual media narrative, the war is already over. “We are told that the surge has worked.”

Mirzoeff, as a scholar of visual media, links the images of Iraq to a long tradition of strategic warfare, going back to 19th models of visualization through Carlyle and Clausewitz. As with the earlier models, he says, modern warfare reflects the impulse to map—that is, to place oneself “in the map,” viewing it from above. In today’s terms, he continues, we imagine war as a video game, as a way to visually manage the space of the battlefield.

“War has become culture,” he says. “We have entered a post-perspectival representation—a mass of imagery, night vision, maps, and so forth—which create a full but selective field of imagery of the war.”

Pardiss Kebriaei is a lawyer at the Center for Constitutional Rights who has represented prisoners at Guantanamo Bay since 2007, who takes a much different view of the current problem. She points to the lack of visual evidence as a major problem. “There are no visual images of torture,” she points out. “The video evidence has been destroyed, and many of the cases are so classified that you can only discuss them [with] others who have that level of clearance.”

The imagery that does circulate, she notes, often serves to dehumanize the prisoners at Guantanamo: distant, alienated photographs of prisoners in orange jumpsuits, paired with alarming close-ups of the 9/11 hijackers, the grim visage of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. The secrecy surrounding Guantanamo Bay, she argues, has allowed the U.S. government to continue to control the narrative of Guantanamo Bay, even after doctors and lawyers have been allowed on the base.

More troubling, she pointed out, are those incidents for which no documentary evidence can be provided. She notes that one of her clients, Jamel Amazien, is going blind as a result of being in his cell for so long. “How do you depict that? How do you take a picture of that?”

Unlike Mirzoeff, Kebriaei is not speaking as a researcher, but as an advocate who has spent the last year working directly with clients at Guantanamo Bay.
Guantanamo Bay. Notably, her presentation contains no slideshow or visual imagery. Nor is she describing new information; most of what she says has already been documented in the extensive coverage of the issue.

Rosalind Morris, professor of anthropology at Columbia, speaks to Kebrinae’s problem directly, noting how discussions of torture have increasingly been relegated to exhaustive spoken discourse rather than visual representation. “Somehow, we find it impossible to accord veracity to what we can’t document. Only that which we can render visible is thought to be verifiable.”

These types of representation, Morris continues, take on striking resonance in the photos of Abu Ghraib, where torture operates primarily as a means of information extraction, rather than a form of punishment. Faced with a ticking-bomb scenario, Morris notes, torture is “a way to pass through the barriers to total vision, to total knowledge”—a tantalizing prospect, she notes, even if the knowledge produced is ultimately fictional.

Beyond this, however, Morris argues that images of torture increasingly serve to sanction this kind of abuse—often fetishizing the torture itself, aligning this eroticism with a broader narrative of criminality and assumed guilt. Morris points to a disturbing trend within the Department of Defense to identify prisoners as “criminals” rather than “prisoners of war.” This criminalization of prisoners, she argues, corresponds with the rise of photography in prisons, and the increasing use of torture as a form of erotic pleasure.

“Prior to Abu Ghraib, it was illegal to take photos of detainees for any purpose other than identification—especially photos taken for ‘public curiosity,’ she notes. “There was a deep sense that the dignity of persons entailed their immunization to photos—a defense of privacy for the detainees.” Once detainees were identified as criminals, rather than prisoners, she points out, these rights were effectively suspended, replaced by a narrative of consent in which “criminals,” rather than “prisoners,” are willingly detained on the basis of having committed crimes.

This notion of consent is often perversely ironic, notes Morris. “The Iraqis want to be liberated by being bombed.” Likewise, “criminality implies consent to detention—and consent to be violated.” What the photos of Abu Ghraib capture is not violation itself, but a “simulacrum of consent,” in which prisoners are forced to perform sexual acts on one another, for the pleasure of the camera. “These photos bear the excess of jouissance, of excitement, of pleasure—the excess of a theater in which people are detained by virtue of being criminals, thereby exercising freedom and consent.”

These images, Morris says, do not replace the existing archive of war, but they do point to a disturbing shift—a phase in which violence is eroticized, and then made banal—circulated as screen savers, or posted on the web as a dirty joke (the website “That’s F*cked Up, for instance). “They are changing how war is sexualized, how it is racialized,” she points out. “They are not displacing the older logic of war…but supplementing its sexual and racial economy.”

As Morris points out, we are frequently faced with forms of violence that don’t rise to the level of the visible—where imagery is either suppressed or decontextualized, as in the images from Guantanamo Bay. “We find ourselves saturated with a barrage of imagery…[often] with a shockingly narrow range of images.” Likewise, the archive itself is often already corrupt or contaminated, with the institutions responsible for creating records (in this case, the Department of Defense) often directly culpable for perpetrating the violence in question. “The total archive of this war would contain not just the DOD, not just the records of the prisons…[but] would also include the popular cultural universe, the private archives of members of the military.”

At the same time, Morris insists that this is all the more reason to take these images seriously. “The archive [is] the trace of a violence that we have to read against itself,” she says. “Sometimes it is the only trace of violence that we have.”

Saidiya Hartman and Nicholas Mirzoeff
there, did Slaughter come to realize that he was not the one in danger. At the time, people were being taken off of buses to be killed on the side of the road as part of a government attempt at repression in an ongoing civil war. His fellow passengers, he realized, may have been victims of this rampant oppression and violence.

“I had been worried about my safety, but I didn’t want to get caught not knowing ever again,” Slaughter says. “It was in those archives that I decided that graduate study actually mattered.”


His 2007 book, Human Rights, Inc.: The World Novel, Narrative Form, and International Law, examines the historical, ideological, and formal interdependencies of the 20th century rise of “world literature” and the global expansion of human rights. The book was awarded the René Wellek Prize for Comparative Literature for “an outstanding work in the field of literature and cultural theory” in the triennium 2005-2007.

Currently, Slaughter is working on a second manuscript, “New Wor(l)d Orders: Plagiarism, Postcolonialism, and the Globalization of the Novel,” that considers the role of transnational and translinguistic theft, kidnapping and “copy writing” in the proliferation of the novel form.

In the Spring 2009 semester, he is teaching “Gender and Genre in African Literature” through the Institute for Research on Women and Gender, as well as a class on torture in literature.

Throughout his time at Columbia, he has been “super-impressed” with his juniors and seniors, who, he says, “are incredibly smart, are not given over to the pretensions of these institutions, and do not assume privilege. They’re energetic and work very hard.”

Slaughter continues to question what, as a self-declared “state school boy,” he always perceived to be elitist and insular tendencies of Ivy League schools. Still, he acknowledges that those tendencies are more banal than he once imagined. “I’m going to be critical of where I am no matter where it is,” Slaughter says. But, he notes, it is a good thing to “try to resist the structures that surround you.”

**Archiving Women**

Friday, January 30, 2009 • 9-4pm • Faculty Room, Low Library, Columbia University

Please join us for Archiving Women, a conference co-sponsored by the Center for the Critical Analysis of Social Difference (CCASD), the Columbia University Libraries, the Institute for Research on African-American Studies (IRAAS), and the Institute for Research on Women and Gender (IRWaG). Archiving Women will ask how the scholarship on gender, race and sexuality, nationally and transitionally, has transformed the ways we think about archival structures and feminist practices. What kinds of new archives are being created and how are they structured? Are new materials being collected, new histories being shaped? How has new media radically transformed the ways in which knowledge is classified, stored, and retrieved? What alternative forms of transmission are being imagined?

Join us for two roundtable discussions animated by these questions, featuring Nell Irvin Painter, Elizabeth Weed, Gail Twersky Reimer, Michael Ryan, Jennifer Freedman, Annette Gordon-Reed, Nancy K. Miller, Alice Kessler-Harris, Farah Jasmine Griffin, and Elizabeth Povinelli.

Please see the CCASD website (www.socialdifference.org) for more information.
contained in the piece, he said, one that emphasis passivity rather than activity. Ono’s passive stance drew out “the sexist behavior” within the gendered field. This passivity, Halberstam argued, reveals “gaping holes” in which “the self unravels” and the feminist subject becomes something other than the choice between victim and agent.

At the outset of her talk, Allison expressed unease in following Halberstam and other scholars. “Every time I come to these events,” she said, “I hear clearly the enormous complexity of the issues and the commitment women are making to paying attention to detail, to doing the hard work of not leaving out contradictions, and I become tremendously excited and scared shitless because I don’t think my language is complex enough.”

Allison offered a personal narrative of coming of age in the working-class South while discovering her lesbianism. In contrast with Halberstam’s rejection of the notion of an umbrella feminist movement or ideal, Allison said she felt herself part of “a feminist nation” in the 1960s. Since then, she said, she has come to believe in the virtues of a “large, complicated feminism… always in the sense that we are in this together…” Allison’s notions of the virtues of political and vocal activism contrasted, in many ways, with Halberstam’s proposition for “radical passivity.”

“I thought Halberstam was provocative,” said Samuel Ostroff, a second year Masters student in the Department of Middle East and Asian Languages and Cultures. “I thought it made some people in this room very uneasy, but as a queer theorist, that is one of the intentions of his work. People don’t necessarily understand how to translate his idea of radical passivity into action.”

Uma Narayan’s presentation, in Ostroff’s opinion, was another highlight of the panel. Narayan critiqued western efforts to “rescue” Muslim women from the veil in France and Norway, and a growing enthusiasm among a variety of parties—from the United Nations to CitiBank and feminist intellectuals—for providing micro-credit to women in third world nations.

Narayan argued that craze for microcredit is an example of “suspicious centering.” Advocates of microfinancing see these forms of credit as allowing poor women access to entrepreneurial capital as a first step to improving their own conditions, and the state of their communities. Narayan urged scholars and policy-makers to look beyond the ideologies of gender and capital contained within these programs and ask such questions as: How does microcredit entrench women in developing nations in the global capitalist framework? How does it lead to the “double day” long familiar to western working women? How does microcredit contribute to increased gendered violence as women’s fathers and husbands chafe at their daughters and wives “neglecting their duties,” or seek to control the loans for themselves? And how does it lead to child labor as over-burdened women are forced to pass on work to their younger kin?

Both the anxieties over the veil and the enthusiasms for microcredit, Narayan said, beg questions about “whose interests are really being served by… suspicious centerings.” Instead of attempting to rescue women from a supposed family patriarchy centered on and symbolized by the veil, Narayan said, European nations should focus on deciphering how their own state policies contribute to forms of global structural racism.

Ostroff, for one, was surprised and moved by such findings. “Any time someone can take a hatchet to a fashionable term like ‘micro-credit,’ it’s going to elicit a powerful response.”

“Is Feminism Translatable?” Panel: Dorothy Ko, Lydia Liu, Madhu Kishwar, Afsaneh Najmabadi, and Obioma Nnaemeka
Rosner, Continued from Page 11

“It’s just a pleasure teaching in these classrooms where I was a student,” Rosner said. “The Columbia and Barnard students are so bright and so inquisitive and so deeply engaged in their educations and as a teacher, you really can’t ask for more than that.”

Recently, Rosner has ventured out of the academic world to write for the web site Huffingtonpost.com. In the fall of 2008, she contributed a column to the site that discussed the misrepresentation of Republican Vice Presidential nominee Sarah Palin as a so-called frontier woman.

Non-academic writing poses “a different kind of challenge and flexes a different kind of muscle,” says Rosner. “It’s great to be able to take some insights we get in archives and give them public airing.”

As co-editor of Columbia University Press’s series “Gender and Culture,” Rosner keeps the pulse of emerging scholarship in women’s and gender studies. “Because the field is so diverse, we end up having a big range of work,” Rosner noted. Recent publications in the series range from works on feminist theory, cultural studies, and literature. Recent titles include Margaretta Jolly’s In Love and Struggle: Letters in Contemporary Feminism and Christine Froula’s Virginia Woolf and the Bloomsbury Avant-Garde: War, Civilization, Modernity.

The diversity of the series is “great news,” according to Rosner. “When you consider that the history of women’s studies in the academy is relatively brief compared to many other disciplines, it’s very exciting to see how many different approaches people have found in order to use gender as a category of analysis.”

Rosner is currently working on two books of her own: The Global and the Intimate: Toward a 21st Century Transnational Feminism is co-edited with Geraldine Pratt and under contract with Columbia University Press. Machines for Living, which is in preparation, places the modernization of the private sphere in the 1920s and 1930s in relation to British literature.

Politics, Continued from Page 4

In place of the fervid debates of the 1960’s, Halley continued, “we now have something close to feminist universalism… We say that rape in war is continuous with rape in every day life, that ‘gender violence’ takes precedence over ‘sexual violence.’” The danger, Halley argued with this form of feminist universalism, is that even as it is able to make issues such as the various forms of rape more visible, it stifles debates within feminism, leaving now universalized concepts largely unchallenged as they are taken up by a new generation of practitioners.

Keeping the discourse active is one problem, noted Halley. As feminism has become institutionalized, how do we keep it from collapsing into a critical “common sense”? Another problem, as panelists stressed in the question and answer section, is the need to put the “action” back in activism, taking an intergenerational approach that puts social justice, rather than professional advancement, at the center of feminist politics.

This is exactly what Ai Xiaoming has tried to do in her work. Ai Xiaoming is a documentary filmmaker and scholar at Zhongshan University whose art and research focuses on women’s rights in mainland China. Xiaoming presented segments from two of her latest projects, a performance of the Vagina Monologues held at Zhongshan and a documentary on date rape in China, which focused on the case of Jing Huang, a primary school teacher who was killed in 2003. Splicing together images from these two projects, Xiaoming described how she uses life performance and documentary as a collaborative form of gender education in China. In the latter project, she explained, “[we focused] on the petitioners working on the case, showing government negligence on rights violation issues.”

Xiaoming described her projects as a way of putting theory into practice, using film to advocate directly for human rights. Through her work at the university, she has been able to bring these issues directly into the classroom, while at the same time putting students in direct contact with NGO’s and victims of domestic violence.

This type of activism is especially important given the Chinese government’s backlash against feminist movements. Whatever feminism and politics is, and will become, it is in these real-world negotiations that the answer will be found.

The Fourteenth Annual IRWaG Queer Studies Prize

All Columbia, General Studies, and Barnard College undergraduates are invited to submit their best papers for consideration. Papers from every discipline, on any topic within “queer studies”—broadly defined—will be judged anonymously by an interdisciplinary committee of Columbia and Barnard faculty and graduate students.

Information & application packets are now available at

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON WOMEN AND GENDER
at 763 Schermerhorn Extension and our website:

For more information, call the Institute at 212.854.3277, or email questions to irwag@columbia.edu

Deadline: Noon, Monday, April 20th, 2009
A key part of the AWR’s success, notes Zheng, is that their ability to build grassroots support using existing state structures—in this case, working directly with the Women’s Federation, a relic of the Maoist government that still employs 90,000 officials on government payrolls. As a relic of centralized state socialism, the Federation has reemerged to play a key role in connecting women across villages, opening up more direct routes of access to government support and lending nation-wide visibility to the issue. This collaboration has been key to the AWR’s success, Zheng notes, with women’s leadership now constituting 5 percent of local community boards.

These counterexamples are crucial, the panelists stressed, in an era when the claim to “equal rights” is increasingly used to sanction U.S. intervention abroad. At the very least, says Deeb, they stand as a correction to the “figure of the burka-clad woman in need of liberation by the U.S. military,” a figure often referenced with disdain among women activists in Lebanon.

Inderpal Grewal agreed but also cautioned. “We think of Western Feminism as an embodiment of western liberalism, [but] we need to rethink this,” she says. What we actually have is “a proliferation of feminisms, supported by liberal and illiberal regimes, capitalist and socialist states.” But the rise of humanitarianism in neoliberal discourse, often utilized in developmental feminism, Grewal argues, should give pause to those who enthusiastically support U.S. intervention abroad. “Within this new liberal mindset,” she says, “the ‘human’ itself threatens to become another project by which the West extends its sovereign power.”

At the same time, Zheng, Deeb, and others point to the extent to which “reclaiming” feminism in turn requires to acknowledge the institutions it claims for itself—and with it, an acknowledgment of the growing importance of state power.

“The state is a domain of power that feminism cannot afford to shun,” Zheng insists. “These forms of activism seek to utilize, transform, and subvert the state, looking for opportunities for innovative feminism that includes state structures.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SPRING 2009 IRWaG EVENTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JANUARY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29  Event with Marilyn Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30  CCASD Conference on Archiving Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEBRUARY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5   Gender Colloquium event on Feminist Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9   Gender Colloquium Theory Boot Camp on Judith Butler with Elizabeth Povinelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13  Arendt After ’68: A Symposium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24  Feminist Interventions with Rosalind Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27  Gender Colloquium event on Dissertation Prospectus Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARCH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9   Gender Colloquium Theory Boot Camp on Donna Haraway with Nadia Abu El-Haj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27  Gender Colloquium event on Workshopping Graduate Student Dissertation Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APRIL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17  Gender Colloquium event on Work-Family Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28  Event on Adrienne Rich and Croagh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Impact women, people of color, indigenous people, and the global south more generally.

All of these activities and events would not be possible except for the support of our fabulous workstudy students, Kimberly Alzuphar, Shalisa Cumberbatch, Didi Gosson, Rebecca Johnson, Kate Lovely, Leah Riviere, Antoinette Vo, and Alia Stavrand Woolf, and our graduate fellows Musa Gurnis, Sherally Munshi, Ariel Rubin, and Lisa Uperesa. And this newsletter would hardly be possible without our two dedicated staff writers, Jessica Adler and Katie Gradowski. I am sorry to report that they will be leaving us at the close of this newsletter. But I am delighted to announce our two new staff writers Habiba Nosheen and Kate Polin.

I will close by reminding our readers that IRWaG is always eager to receive private contributions for scholarly programming and student support. Past gifts have helped bring scholars from afar as well as send our students to conferences. These contributions are especially appreciated during times such as these which see the University looking for ways to close budgetary gaps.

Horror, Continued from Page 10

Where horror emerges most forcefully, said Cavarero, is in situations where it is intimately connected with the notion of care—where the perpetrators are women, acting against innocent victims. “We perceive horrible crimes with particular intensity where the terrorists or torturers are women, where [violence evokes] the maternal choice between wound and care.” Here, the iconic example is not Medusa, but Medea—the figure of infanticide, who is horrifying precisely because she enacts violence on the helpless.

Here, too, Cavarero stressed the violence of dismemberment: Medea not only kills her children, but then tears them apart. “Medea’s violence is more forceful, because what we expect from the mother is care.” She linked these classical examples to contemporary forms of violence—not only to Chechen suicide bombers, but also to the photos of Lynndie England at Abu Ghraib, as particularly resonant images of violence perpetrated against defenseless victims.

Cavarero drew on sources as diverse as Hobbes and Hannah Arendt, arguing for a natalist link between notions of care, wounding, and horror. Yet in taking her examples from classical antiquity, she pointed to a form of violence that is undeniably modern. “September 11 [exemplified] the carnage of defenseless victims,” she noted, repeating in Madrid and in Gaza the “normalized horror of contemporary ‘terrorist’ violence.”

Adriana Cavarero is a professor of political philosophy at the University of Verona. Her most recent book is entitled Horrorism: Naming Contemporary Violence, released in November 2008 by Columbia University Press.
Support the Institute:

Become a Friend of IRWaG

Please support the Institute by becoming a “Friend of IRWaG.” We need your help to continue developing innovative public programs, lectures and conferences, and to support the kind of cutting-edge feminist scholarship that has been a hallmark of the Institute throughout our 21-year history. As a friend of IRWaG, you will receive our newsletter in both print and electronic form, you will be invited to special events at the Institute and at Columbia, and you will be involved with New York City’s leading center for the scholarly exploration of women and gender.
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### Spring 2009 Undergraduate Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Call#</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Instructor(s)</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V3111</td>
<td>Feminist Texts I</td>
<td>03365</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N. Kampen</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>9:00–10:50am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3112</td>
<td>Feminist Texts II</td>
<td>02735</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E. Bernstein</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2:10–4:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC3117</td>
<td>Women and Film</td>
<td>09389</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>J. Beller</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7:10–9:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC3125</td>
<td>Pleasures &amp; Power: Intro to Sexuality Studies</td>
<td>07188</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R. Young</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>2:40–3:55pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC3134</td>
<td>Unheard Voices: African Women</td>
<td>03461</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y. Christianse</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>11am–12:50pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3312</td>
<td>Theorizing Women's Activism</td>
<td>07248</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>L. Collins</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2:10–4:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC3515</td>
<td>Women in Israel: An Introduction</td>
<td>08742</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I. Klepfisz</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4:10–6:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC3522</td>
<td>Senior Seminar II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 001</td>
<td>81998</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J. Crawford</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2:10–4:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 002</td>
<td>01088</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>T. Szell</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>11am–12:50pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3813</td>
<td>Colloquium on Feminist Inquiry</td>
<td>27846</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>K. Gravdal</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>11am–12:50pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring 2009 Crosslisted Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Call#</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Instructor(s)</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83224</td>
<td>Women Writers in Renaissance Italy</td>
<td>26549</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M. Martin</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>9:10–10:25am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83462</td>
<td>Music, Gender, and Performance</td>
<td>10792</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E. Gray</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>1:10–2:25pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83710</td>
<td>American Literature &amp; Culture: AIDS and the Politics of Literary Form</td>
<td>85035</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M. Blount</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2:10–4:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84110</td>
<td>Classical Civilization: Gender &amp; Sexuality in Ancient Greece</td>
<td>07500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H. Foley</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>2:40–3:55pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86506</td>
<td>Gender Justice</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>K. Franke</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88760</td>
<td>Seminar in Medical Anthropology: Sex Work, Trafficking, Health, and Human Rights</td>
<td>12206</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C. Vance</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3:00–4:50pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring 2009 Graduate Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Call#</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Instructor(s)</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G4000</td>
<td>Genealogies of Feminism: Politics in the Wake of the Human</td>
<td>86787</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N. Tadiar and S. Hartman</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>11am–12:50pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4300</td>
<td>Advanced Topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4303</td>
<td>Gender, Globalization, Empire</td>
<td>82192</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J. Slaughter</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4:10–6:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4304</td>
<td>Gender, HIV &amp; AIDS</td>
<td>02345</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N. Tadiar</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>11am–12:50pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4305</td>
<td>Feminist Postcolonial Theory</td>
<td>06018</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N. Tadiar</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2:10–4:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4309</td>
<td>Sex, Gender &amp; Transgender Queries</td>
<td>06678</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E. Glasberg</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4:10–6:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4310</td>
<td>Contemporary American Jewish Women's Lit.</td>
<td>02095</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I. Klepfisz</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4:10–6:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4320</td>
<td>Thinking Sexuality: Queer Theories and History</td>
<td>17598</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E. Duggan</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4:10–6:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8001</td>
<td>Feminist Pedagogy (Feb. 6, 13, 27, &amp; Mar. 6)</td>
<td>96400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A. Kessler-Harris</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12:00–2:00pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For more gender-related courses that do not have WMST call numbers, please consult the IRWaG course guide on our website.*