CLAIMING VOICE:
THE INSTITUTE WELCOMES
MAGGIE SALE

Maggie Sale, the new director of Columbia's Undergraduate Women's Studies Program, sits with her feet up on the coffee table in the Institute's seminar room and ponders the events which brought her here. She remembers going with her mother--"a classic seventies feminist"--to the courthouse in Olympia, Washington (Sale grew up in Seattle) in the early seventies when she was eleven or twelve. Sale can't recall whether her mother was lobbying for N.O.W. or the League of Women Voters, nor does she remember the issue--she thinks a pro-choice bill was about to go before the state legislature. Maggie Sale can recall vividly how she felt: "I remember not being sure whether I should be embarrassed...on the one hand, I was very proud; on the other hand, I felt that my mom and her friends were going and making a lot of noise somewhere that seemed very stately."

(continued on page 4)

A CONVERSATION WITH CAROLINE WALKER BYNUM

George Rupp, Columbia's new president, took dramatic action this past June to revitalize undergraduate education by appointing a new administrative team for the Arts and Sciences. The vice presidency, a position formerly held by one person, is now shared by three people. The new vice president of Arts and Sciences and the two associate vice presidents also serve as the deans of Columbia College, the School of General Studies, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

Three distinguished faculty members now occupy these posts: English professor Steven Marcus is now dean of Columbia College and vice president for Arts and Sciences; Caroline Walker Bynum, the Morris and Alma Schapiro Professor of History, serves as dean of General Studies and associate vice president for arts and sciences for undergraduate education; and Biological Sciences professor Eduardo Macagno is now dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

(continued on page 6)

MANNING MARABLE'S MISSION

Manning Marable is adjusting quickly to New York City: on a hot and humid summer afternoon, the former professor of history at the University of Colorado at Boulder wears sandals and shorts as he receives visitors in his Fayerweather Hall office. Marable assumed his position as director of the newly established Institute for Research in African-American Studies on July 1st; one month later, books, mail, and papers already clutter his desk.

As he begins to speak--eloquently and frankly--about his goals for the Institute, it's clear why students are lining up to have him serve on committees and advise their dissertations: Manning Marable is a man with a mission. He intends not just to revitalize Columbia's undergraduate program in African-American studies

(continued on page 10)
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The Institute for Research on Women and Gender, in collaboration with History and American Studies (an organization founded in 1992 by faculty and students), will offer the first Gender and American Studies lecture and discussion series. Speakers Christine Stansell, Gillian Brown, and Kathleen Brown will present three markedly different approaches to the study of gender and culture. Though the talks focus on North America, faculty and students with interests in other geographic areas are encouraged to attend. (For lecture times, see calendar of events.)

Christine Stansell, author of *City of Women: Sex and Class in New York, 1789-1860* and co-editor of *Powers of Desire: The Politics of Sexuality*, is writing a book on radical artists and intellectuals in American cities at the turn of the century. In her talk, "Louise Bryant Grows Older: Bohemian Femininity in the 1920s and 1930s" (Wednesday, September 29), Stansell assesses the adequacy of historical categories for understanding a woman’s life. Bryant, first as John Reed’s lover and then as a successful journalist, seemed the very archetype of bohemian womanhood in the New York of the teens. In her latter years, Bryant descended into alcoholism and mental illness. Stansell questions whether current interpretations of the “New Woman” are useful for an analysis of the years in which such women became increasingly marginal.

Stansell, an Associate Professor of History at Princeton University, is a Visiting Professor at Columbia this fall. She will teach a graduate colloquium in American women’s history. Stansell has won numerous prizes and awards, including a Kent Fellowship, a Whiting Fellowship, and a grant from the American Council of (continued on page 7)

Two New Undergraduate Women’s Studies Courses

Maggie Sale, Program Director of Women’s Studies, is offering two new courses (one in the fall, one in the spring) in Women’s Studies.

**Race, Gender, and U.S. American National Identity, 1770-1860,** offered in the fall semester, will analyze the role played by race and gender in the formation of U.S. American national identity from the emergence of the Republic until the Civil War. Students will map the complex structure of a newly formed discourse, explore the ways in which unequally empowered groups created positions for themselves from which to speak that discourse, and consider the participation of canonical literature in these processes. The course includes a wide range of primary texts, from the Declaration of Independence to Catherine Sedgwick’s *Hope Leslie*, as well as historical and theoretical texts.

The spring course, **Constructing Identities: Gender, Race, and Sexuality,** will examine a portion of a continuing debate in contemporary feminist theory about the validity and use of the category “woman.” Can illuminating generalizations be made about an identifiable group called “women,” or are other categories of identity just as or more important than gender? The course will consider the ways in which gender, race, and sexuality are discursively constructed at several historical moments, and in several cultural contexts. Students should be prepared to question their most cherished beliefs about identity formation. This course will use an array of texts and cultural materials from many disciplines, including sociology, psychology, science, feature films, novels, poetry, etc.
Jean E. Howard Joins The Institute As Scholar-in-Residence

Jean E. Howard, from the Department of English and Comparative Literature, will become the Institute's first Scholar-in-Residence this coming spring. Howard plans to develop the Institute's potential as an interdisciplinary research center that will regularly host visiting postdoctoral fellows and run faculty research colloquia.

In a pilot project this spring, Professor Howard will organize a four-week interdisciplinary faculty seminar on the topic "The Material of Culture in Early Modern Europe." Drawing primarily on Columbia and Barnard faculty in the departments of history, literature, art history, and anthropology, the seminar will also include representatives of other New York institutions and a small number of graduate students whose dissertations bear on the group's work.

The seminar will explore differences in the way various disciplines think about what constitutes the material of culture and how feminist scholarship has affected answers to this question. Participants will explore the range of texts, objects, institutions, and social practices that comprise aspects of early modern culture. The seminar will address such key issues as the adequacy of traditional definitions of culture, the relationship between the present historical moment and reconstructions of historically distant cultures, and the relationship between elite and popular culture and of metropolitan culture to colonial initiatives in the early modern period. The seminar will culminate with a one-day public workshop. Look for further details in the spring issue of Feminist News.

********

Jean E. Howard's latest book, The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England, will be published by Routledge this fall. In addition to courses in Renaissance literature, she has co-taught, with Martha Howell, the Institute's introductory graduate course, Theoretical Paradigms in Feminist Scholarship, and has been a member of the Institute's Advisory Board for the last five years.

Point of View:
Ginsburg on The Court

On August 10, 1993, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Columbia Law School alumna and its first tenured woman professor, took her seat on the U.S. Supreme Court. Justice Ginsburg has a long and distinguished career. For the past twelve years, she served as a U.S. Court of Appeals Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit. From 1972-1980, she taught at Columbia and founded the American Civil Liberties Union's Women's Rights Project: during those years, she argued cases before the Supreme Court and the lower federal courts, cases that established gender discrimination by the government as a denial of the equal protection guaranteed by the Constitution under the 14th amendment.

Yet Ginsburg's nomination to the Court did not receive uniformly enthusiastic support from feminists, some of whom interpreted a lecture she gave at New York University this past April as insufficiently pro-choice. In it, the Judge suggested that the Court should have approached Roe v. Wade as a gender discrimination issue rather than base its decision on a woman's right to privacy. She also suggested that the decision cut off the legislative momentum which had been building in favor of liberalization of abortion law. During her confirmation hearings, however, Judge Ginsburg made it quite clear that she supported a woman's right to choose.

Ginsburg has always championed equal rather than special treatment for women: as general counsel of the ACLU's Women's Rights Project, she represented male plaintiffs who had been denied benefits set aside for women. Her goal was to have the Court come up with standards for scrutinizing gender discrimination cases that could be applied neutrally to either sex. It is this symmetrical vision of equality that a newer generation of feminist legal scholars has attacked. They argue that women as a group have been subjected to socially-constructed and historical inequities, and that the law should take into account how systems which dominate women are deeply imbedded in every arena of American life. These scholars believe the law must therefore consider the

(continued on page 9)

Attention Graduates Of Women's Studies Programs

Feminist News would like to interview you for a feature article in the spring newsletter about career opportunities and challenges facing Women's Studies majors. Ask for Lisa Sack at (212) 854-3277.
Institute Welcomes M. Sale (continued from page 1)

She may not have realized it at the time, but Sale had witnessed women claiming their voices, in both a personal and political sense. Judging by her current scholarly interests and personal convictions, the event resonates in Sale still; her education and life have taken many twists and turns, but with a recently-earned Ph.D. in Literatures in English from the University of California at San Diego and her appointment to Columbia's faculty, Maggie Sale is steadily making her own voice heard in the academic community.

Sale didn't pursue an undergraduate degree in Women's Studies, perhaps because she thought she'd absorbed the essence of the women's movement from her mother as she grew up. Her childhood was unusual in that Sale, who is white, lived in a black neighborhood. Her parents were no strangers to activism: during the sixties, they were supporters of the civil rights movement. When the women's movement began to gather momentum in the early seventies, Sale's mother became a dedicated activist, who, as a champion of the E.R.A., went so far as to live in various communities throughout the Midwest in hopes of winning the bill's passage in several states.

Sale's parents encouraged any curiosity she expressed in progressive politics. She remembers doing a report, at 13, on the Grimké sisters, 19th-century American feminists who advocated slavery's abolition and espoused a woman's right to speak in public. Sale believes that her interest in these early activists presented her with new ways to think about women's roles and the many possibilities for positive interaction between women and men of different races.

But perhaps because every child needs to put some distance between herself and a parent in order to discover herself, Sale never considered majoring in women's studies. Then she laughs, (her laugh is like a saxophone's explosion—a rapid-fire musical trill) and her eyes, which change from slate grey to sky blue depending on the light, laugh too: "I think I was wrong. I think there was a whole lot more I could have learned." When she entered Reed College in the fall of 1977, it was as a math major. But by the end of her sophomore year in 1979, Sale was tired of theoretical equations, so she took a couple of years off before returning to college, this time at the University of Washington in Seattle.

There, she took some courses in women's studies, but her primary focus was English and dance (her training is readily apparent: Sale's compact body radiates a modern dancer's strength and agility; hers is not a ballerina's reed-thin shape). The Dance Department was mostly women; Sale very much appreciated the supportive community she found there—by the time she graduated, she had almost enough credits to make dance her major instead of English. But as a senior in 1985, Maggie Sale knew she would not become a professional dancer. She also knew she had a taste and a talent for teaching: she recalls the excitement of explicating Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde for an English class and thinking to herself when she had finished, "Yep, time to go to graduate school."

Sale chose to do a combined Masters and Ph.D. in the Literature Program at the University of California, San Diego, where each student could design her own course of study. By the end of her first quarter in the fall of 1986, she'd committed herself to feminist scholarship: an introductory course on critical theory, in which Sale volunteered to research feminist criticism and theory, introduced her to a body of scholarship she hadn't known existed. "I went nuts," she says. Elaine Showalter had just published her New Feminist Criticism; Sale jumped right into the middle of a debate begun by Judith Fetterly on what it meant to "read as a woman." She inhaled the introduction to Madwoman in the Attic, and was "blown away" by Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's now classic analysis of Snow White, which characterizes the evil stepmother's mirror as the voice of patriarchy.

Something else happened that first quarter: Sale, new in town, and eager to make friends, wandered over to UCSD's Women's Center, in hopes of finding a sympathetic group much like the dance department she'd left behind in Seattle. She found that and much more--the Center, a collective run entirely by students, not only introduced Sale to some of her best friends (many of them women re-entering undergraduate study in their late twenties or early thirties), it gave her an opportunity to organize programs (e.g., a Women and Leadership Conference) and to find out what it was like to participate in an organization with no official hierarchy where all decisions were made by consensus.

As her professional and scholarly interest in feminist critical studies grew, Sale began to talk more and more at the Women's Center about why there was no undergraduate major in Women's Studies. Her queries eventually turned into discussions with faculty members about the feasibility of creating a formal program, followed by petition drives to secure the major. After two years of negotiations, the University finally agreed, in the spring of 1991, to give its approval for a Women's Studies major; during her fourth and fifth years at UCSD, Sale served as graduate student assistant to the program's first director.
Together, they spent a full year further modifying the program. The first women formally to declare themselves Women's Studies majors did so in the fall of 1992, six months before Maggie Sale's graduation.
Institute Welcomes M. Sale (continued from page 4)

As Sale's participation in the Women's Center blossomed, so did her scholarly career. In December of 1987, she read Toni Morrison's *Beloved*, a novel in which a mother commits infanticide to save her child from slavery. It wasn't a course assignment; coincidentally, her parents and her best friend had given Sale copies of the book for Christmas. She says, "Beloved's voices just knocked my socks off...I had the experience of hearing a language that to me was very familiar...I wanted to find out why that book had [affected me so]...I'd been reading the debates about racism within the feminist movement and in academia, [and I thought] what do I do if I want to write about this book...how am I going to do that...in an appropriate way?"

Thus began Sale's journey into the 19th century and the historiography of slavery: at 31, she found herself returning to the Grimké sisters' world and the voices of her childhood. Her study of *Beloved* led to two important discoveries: first, "in order to read something in the way I want to read it, I [have] to have a very clear idea of the context out of which it comes, in order not to appropriate it to my own agenda." Second, Morrison's novel, written from multiple perspectives, doesn't "authorize" all perspectives equally. As Sale has written in *African American Review*, its core "is multiple, contradictory, and unresolvable"; Morrison "adopts an interactive, dialogic model of interpretation." *Beloved* seems to have given Sale a way to frame her own criticism and historical inquiry: allow for many voices, but don't assume all interpretations offered by those voices are "equally valid."

The work on *Beloved* led to Sale's dissertation, entitled "The Slumbering Volcano: Recasting Race, Masculinity, and the Discourse of US American National Identity." In it, Sale examines the paradoxical relationship of freedom to slavery and its formative role in the discourse of national identity from the Revolution to the Civil War. She looks at the trope of "Liberty-or-Death" and how it was used by differently empowered groups, including rebels on two slave ship revolts.

Although her dissertation analyzes gender operations, Sale has discovered that some of her colleagues have reservations about the feminist nature of her dissertation because it doesn't deal with women explicitly: one of the reasons she decided to accept Columbia's offer was that "people here had no hesitancy or question about whether my work was feminist." The interdisciplinary nature of her scholar-

ship also brought job offers in American and African-American studies from other institutions.

Sale also chose to come to Columbia because she's a lesbian. "It's a goal of mine to be 'out' all the time," she says, "and New York is a good place to practice that. I haven't developed a really articulated relationship between being a lesbian and my feminism...[but] I've come to realize that being able to be healthy and sane as a lesbian and in a relationship as a lesbian is in itself something to work for and be applauded...I need to remember that being able to do so in an extremely heterosexual environment is, in some ways, being an activist...to live an 'out' life is already political because there are all these circumstances in which you're always making noise."

As director of the undergraduate program, Sale plans to study the existing curriculum to see how it can be improved. She hopes to expand the number of core courses, and will teach two new Women's Studies courses this year, one in the fall and one in the spring [see page 2 for course descriptions]. Sale's other prime responsibility is to advise undergraduate majors and see how the program can better address their needs.

As for her own scholarly work, in the immediate future she plans to revise her dissertation (now under consideration for publication) and to write articles on revolutionary rhetoric and Frederick Douglass. Sale also hopes to do further work on the cultural phenomenon of the *Amistad* (one of the slave revolts analyzed in her dissertation) rebellion, which inspired novels and paintings. That's the pleasure of pursuing interdisciplinary subjects: "...the work is all connected," she says. "The categories we create divide things up, not the material." Newspapers of the 18th and 19th centuries fascinate her; Sale wonders what role the sudden pervasiveness of printed texts played in identity formation, particularly for women, who wrote a lot for the popular press and were also its major readers. She intends to learn more about indigenous people of the Americas: she'd like to study gender issues in those societies and to look at how the arrival of Europeans and their institutions disrupted some of the native beliefs.

With the horizon so full of possibilities, it's no wonder Sale looks forward to the fall semester and the start of her appointment. She's unlikely to stand on the stately steps of Low Library and wonder if it's all right for her to be here making noise. Maggie Sale has claimed her voice and Columbia and the Institute can only benefit by her presence.

* * *
A Conversation with C. Bynum (continued from page 1)

and associate vice president for Arts and Sciences for graduate education and research.

Through this major administrative reorganization, President Rupp aims to increase collaboration among Columbia's separate schools, to integrate faculty and administrative efforts, and to reduce duplication. Feminist News spoke with Caroline Bynum about her appointment and her hopes for the future. The following are excerpts from that conversation.

FN: Why was this reorganization necessary?
CB: Columbia has been, as the jargon would say, balkanized. It's grown up as a series of separate schools that's more like a federation than a university engaged in different activities. The federal structure's been loose, and as a result, there's not only wastage of dollars, but an even more important wastage of faculty time, student energy, and human creativity. For General Studies, Columbia College, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, there's an almost complete overlap of faculty. The same faculty goes to three sets of meetings, staffs three different committees on instruction, reads three different bulletins. A vast proliferation of administrators do exactly the same thing in different buildings. It's a nightmare. The staffs of the various schools carry a certain amount of distrust of each other that's conveyed to students. We need to move towards a greater understanding of ourselves as one faculty and stop the divisiveness.

FN: What are the implications of the reorganization?
CB: By having three people share the vice presidency, we insure collaboration. I can't put the needs of General Studies over the needs of Arts and Sciences: I am, in fact, both. There's therefore no way in which I can only speak for my own students, because I also speak for departments which educate everybody. Besides, the job of vice president was too big for any one person and too isolating. To have three of us share it, talk to each other, and make decisions collectively makes the job possible. Each of us has primary responsibility for nine departments: in the interest of fairness, no one of us is responsible for our own department, and we've endeavored to take on departments far away from our own expertise in an attempt to shake things up. Everything we're doing is an effort to establish communication and to break down traditional boundaries. In a funny way, this isn't actually change: it's just a more efficient way to do things. The vice president has always been responsible for the departments. Now we have a troika as a vice president and we're still responsible for the departments. The other consequence of the new structure is that by having three people in the vice presidency who represent three large areas of study (social sciences, humanities, and science), we guarantee representation on the Planning and Budget Committee of every basic kind of endeavor. In the last few years, there's been very inadequate representation on the P&B of the real fundamental values of the university: teaching and learning of arts and sciences.

FN: What are the troika's top priorities?
CB: First, we want to review tenure and promotion procedures. We don't feel that they're unfair; we feel that they're confused and do a lot of damage through lack of transparency. We'd like to start at the bottom with junior faculty and consider how promotions to tenure are made and then work up. The second goal is to improve education. Again, we're going to start from the bottom and focus on undergraduate education, particularly on the junior and senior years which are the weakest part of a Columbia education. Our third goal is to change the nature of the conversation around here from one about money to a conversation about education. We simply want to stop talking about the budget. We don't have enough money to do everything; instead of complaining about it, fighting about it, blaming each other about it, we want to live with limited resources and turn the conversation to how we can offer the best education with what we've got. Let's everybody share the hardship and get on with what's important. No one of us is a career administrator: we're scholars coming straight from the library to provide educational leadership and then we're going back into the library and the laboratory. I really hope that my having accepted this position will suggest that a number of us might be willing to give three years of our lives to providing educational leadership. It doesn't mean that you give up your scholarly life forever, change your career, and become an administrator. If that's the case, no one's going to want to do the job.

FN: It really is a sacrifice in terms of your own career.
CB: It's an incredible sacrifice.

FN: Given that, how did President Rupp persuade you to take the position?
CB: I have to say that one of the major incentives is the people involved. More than any other single factor, it's what George Rupp is himself as a leader and as a human being. The sense of hope he brings to Columbia because of the kind of integrity and vision and educational commitment he represents, makes one willing to say, 'If he can make sacrifices, I can too.' I also have a profound feeling of resonance with Steven Marcus and his values. I've been working with Eduardo Macagno closely for a couple of months, and he's wonderful; I admire the crispness and preciseness of his mind and the basic decency of his reactions. These are wonderful people to work with. I can't imagine doing it with any other team. That said, I suppose there were several other factors: I had just finished a big book and I don't think it's a good idea to race from project to project. (continued on page 7)
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON
WOMEN AND GENDER

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

“A Question of Silence: The Rape of German Women by Occupation
Soldiers in 1945.” Atina Grossmann, Columbia University Professor of
Modern German History. Thursday, September 23, 1993 at 8pm.
Deutsches Haus, 420 West 116th St. For information call (212) 280-3964.

“Identification Papers.” Diana Fuss, Princeton University faculty member and author of
Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature & Difference. Friday, September 24, 1993 at 4PM,

"Louise Bryant Grows Older: Bohemian Femininity in the 1920s-1930s."
Christine Stansell, Visiting Professor, History and American Studies.
Wednesday, September 29, 1993 at 4PM, 754 Schermerhorn Extension.

“Reading Gail Rubin’s ‘Thinking Sex.’” (Colloquium)
Friday, October 8, 1993 at 4pm, 754 Schermerhorn Extension.
Presented by the Lesbian and Gay Studies Group.

“Last Night at Maude’s.” (Film Screening and Discussion)
Friday, October 22, 1993 at 4pm, 754 Schermerhorn Extension.
Presented by the Lesbian and Gay Studies Group.

“German Unification and its Impact on Gender.” Hanna Schissler, Professor of
History, University of Minnesota. Wednesday, November 3, 1993 at 8pm,
Deutsches Haus, 420 West 116th St. For information call (212) 280-3964.

“Enforcing Queer Bodies.” (Colloquium) Friday, November 5th at 4pm,

"Coquetry and its Consequences: Early American Literature and the
Logic of Consent." Gillian Brown, Associate Professor of English, University of Utah.
Monday, November 8, 1993 at 4PM, 754 Schermerhorn Extension.

“Digital Queers.” (Colloquium) Friday, November 19th, 1993 at 4pm,

"Theologizing the Erotic/Eroticizing Theology." Carter Heyward, ordained Episcopal
priest and author of Touching Our Strength: The Erotic as Power and the Love of God.
Friday, December 3, 1993 at 4pm, 754 Schermerhorn Extension.
Presented by the Lesbian and Gay Studies Group.

NOTE: Event dates and times are subject to change.
Please call the Institute at (212) 854-3277 for confirmation and further updates.
Learned Societies. She received her Ph.D. in American Studies from Yale University in 1979.

In 1985, Brown received her Ph.D. in English from the University of California at Berkeley, where she studied with Walter Benn Michaels. She taught at Rutgers from 1985-1990 and has received grants from the University of California and from Rutgers, as well as a fellowship from the American Council of Learned Societies. She is currently an Associate Professor of English at the University of Utah.

The Gender and American Studies series continues in the spring with Kathleen Brown’s talk, entitled “Gender and the Anglo-Indian Struggle for Power.” Brown examines how both English and Indians in British North America used gender to define themselves as distinct groups of people. When John Smith wrote of his meetings with Pocahontas and Powhatan, he noticed differences in sexuality and the sexual division of labor and clothing as distinguishing features of British and Indian cultures. Native Americans focused on the same set of differences. Brown investigates the relationship between a culture’s gender ways and its definition as a distinct group of people.

Kathleen Brown received her Ph.D. in History from the University of Wisconsin in 1990. Her dissertation, “Gender and the Genesis of a Race and Class System in Virginia, 1630-1750,” analyzed the role of gender in the development of the slave system in colonial Virginia. Brown will be teaching at Princeton this fall.

All lectures are at 4:00 pm on dates listed in 754 Schermerhorn Extension.

In addition to co-sponsoring the Gender and American Studies speakers series, History and American Studies will offer a series of talks on consumer culture and a separate series on cultural theory. All graduate students and faculty interested in cultural studies are welcome and should contact Professor Richard Bushman in the History Department for further information. In the spring, Bushman will offer an interdisciplinary colloquium on Early American Culture.

A Conversation with C. Bynum (continued from page 6)

Intellectually, it makes sense for me to lie a little bit fallow. I'll have a better project in three years if I don't race around cannibalizing myself. And I think it was really time that a woman got into higher administration at Columbia. A new administration couldn't go forward without a woman. Someone had to do it, and I'd finished a book and raised a child, and it was a time in my life where I could give three years.

FN: In 1972, you co-authored a Harvard Report on the Status of Women in the faculty of Arts and Sciences. How would you compare the Harvard of 1972 to the Columbia of today?

CB: It's a vast difference; I think it's almost unrecognizable. I don't mean that there aren't problems: there are a lot of structural problems for women faculty and students. That's true for all universities and true of American society. I'm not excusing them in any way, but to someone who's lived through the past 50 years in American society, the changes have been monumental. Monumental. When I taught at Harvard, there were 12 women on a faculty of 600; they were all in the lowest track; there were no tenured women at all, no women associate professors. When I entered graduate school in a cohort of 60, there were 6 women, 3 of whom dropped out in the first year. When I went for my first job interview, I was told "We don't hire women on ladder faculty positions." That was the world of the sixties. It's changed unrecognizably.

FN: Has it gone far enough?

CB: No, of course not. But the measure of change is enormous, so great that it's not going to fall back. Other things may fall apart in the academy--funding, scholarly standards, commitment to the values of education. But we've come far enough for there not to be any simple sense in which things will collapse. And that feels good. Of course it's still harder for women than it is for men and of course we haven't gone far enough, especially in structural changes, but I think we've gone far enough to have some confidence that we're going to be able to go further.

FN: When you say structural changes, what do you mean?

CB: The main problem at Columbia is that we still don't have parental leave, and that lack works disproportionately to the disadvantage of women. There's no question that one of the basic problems for women in American society is that they're still doing one more job than men. They're still doing housework and childcare. We haven't moved to equality there, either in terms of what people do with their time, or in terms of attitudes towards it, and that's a tremendous problem for junior faculty women who don't have any way to plan careers to allow real time for pregnancy.

(continued on page 8)
birthing, and childrearing for the first few years of the child's life. We still have reasons to be concerned about salary equity: the most recent study of salary equity in American universities suggests that women are still seriously underpaid. There's a committee at Columbia that's just been formed to study salary equity. I think we need to look into it.

**FN:** In your dual capacity as associate vice president and dean, will you have any impact on these issues?

**CB:** I hope so. One of the first things I did was to find out what was going on with the Commission on the Status of Women in the University Senate. The parental leave proposal's been brought before the Senate, but it still hasn't passed; I want to find out what the Senate Commission intends to do. There are groups on campus that are set up to consider women's issues; I think it's important that these things come from the ground up. I talked to Marsha Wagner, the ombudsperson, about what kinds of cases have come to her. It's very important that I find out what people care about before I wade in. It's quite wrong to try and impose solutions from the top, but I know enough already to know there are unsolved problems.

**FN:** If parental leave is the biggest problem facing women faculty, what are the problems facing women students?

**CB:** One of the things we need to do is foster more women's careers in science, particularly on the graduate level. That will be Eduardo's principal responsibility and I'll work with him and with women graduate students on those issues. As far as undergraduates are concerned, there are older, transfer, and non-traditional students in General Studies, some of whom go part-time, who have careers that are very different from the 17-year-old that comes to Columbia College. Many of the strongest students are women and there's a big group of single mothers. By definition I'll be working with them, and that's very exciting to me.

**FN:** Because of your status as a single mother, you've described yourself as "non-traditional." What insights do you bring to the deanship?

**CB:** (laughing) Well, as you can tell from the way I've been talking about how difficult it is to combine things when you have small children: I know-- I've been there. I'm probably the only person in the administration who's ever going to be able to talk about how hard it is in a way which really puts that on the table as something it's okay to talk about. Unless you've been there, you don't also have knowledge of the other side-- that many women don't want to give up childrearing. That has to be valued in American society; it's not that that's an extra burden that has to go away. The joy that I felt when I had a small child, the two hours that I spent in the afternoon sitting in the sandbox between going to a lunch meeting and teaching my seminar-- I don't know how you communicate that to someone else. You either feel it or you don't.

**FN:** What can Columbia do to try to meet the needs of women like that?

**CB:** General Studies already exists to do that: we're for non-traditional students; you can go part-time. I think all the things that need to be possible for women students are possible in General Studies. We need to make that option more respected in the larger community. We need more self-respect on the part of the people who choose that option, which comes back to the whole issue of it being okay to talk about how much fun it is to spend time in the sandbox. And the most crucial thing-- we need more financial aid, so we can help people who desperately need it. My top priority for General Studies is fundraising for financial aid-- that's absolutely, totally, and completely my top priority.

**FN:** Will you be able to teach?

**CB:** No. I don't know whether I won't be able to teach at all over the next 3 years, but I'm not going to teach this next year at all.

**FN:** How do you feel about that?

**CB:** Terrible, but you can't do everything.

Ginsburg on the Court (continued from page 3)

substantive context in which legal decisions are made.
Might a shift from a formal model of equality to a substantive equality reinforce the old separate typologies which have restricted women all along? Feminist News spoke to some of Columbia’s law professors to hear their views on these issues and on Ginsburg’s appointment to the Court:

“One of the wonderful things about Ruth is that her name would have appeared on any gender-blind list of the top five prospects for the court because she’s so highly qualified...one has to remember that Ruth Bader Ginsburg is the mother of the women’s rights movement in the higher courts: without someone like her, gender discrimination would not be established as a constitutional principle...there are some deep philosophical divisions within the women’s movement about to what extent-- from a public relations and litigation sense-- we stress and also believe in deep notions of difference [between men and women]...Too much stress on difference doesn’t get us anywhere...it seems to me that some of the theory I’ve read recently makes a cult of victimization...that’s a tricky issue. If you take it too far, it has the implication of enshrining a kind of Victorian difference-- Ruth would be very much against that...Ruth is very oriented to particular facts: I can’t imagine she would disagree that concrete things that really disadvantage women have to be emphasized. I think it will all come out in the wash. I’m just so pleased that someone like Ruth is on the court.” ✷ Vivian Berger, Vice Dean; Professor of Law; Director of the Samuel Ruben Program for Liberty and Equality through Law.

"There’s no question that Justice Ginsburg is extremely qualified to sit on the nation’s highest court. I’m delighted to see a second woman there and I hope there will be many more in the future. But Ginsburg and I are on different sides of the equality paradigm: a paradigm that is useful only in limited circumstances. Women of a later generation concerned with developing a "post-egalitarian" feminist theory find the paradigm of equality problematic. We are concerned with difference-- not in a biological sense, but as a construct. We recognize that gender is socially constructed and can’t be ignored because of the material effects it has on women, particularly in terms of their economic and historical status. The question becomes, how do you correct socially defined and enforced gender constructions? Based on her statements during the hearings and her recent address to the American Bar Association, I think Ruth Bader Ginsburg may be too optimistic about the extent and depth of change for women within the legal system. She views an equality paradigm as an overarching construct, when in fact, the issues are far more complex, especially in terms of their material effects on women.” ✷ Martha Fineman, Maurice T. Moore Professor of Law.

"While my own approach to feminist legal issues probably diverges somewhat from what I understand to be Justice Ginsburg’s, for me, on the whole record, this is a superb appointment, an occasion for rejoicing. Quite aside from her well-known, first-rate qualifications of intellect, experience, and the like, Ruth Ginsburg is a person who combines judiciousness with vision, whose deep sense of role operates in partnership with a profound understanding of the capacity of law to advance human welfare and human dignity, of the capacity of law to work justice, and an understanding of the imperative that law fulfill that capacity. Ruth Bader Ginsburg has been a leader, and, I believe, will continue to lead-- a bright prospect for all who care both about law and about people.” ✷ Barbara Aronstein Black, George Welwood Murray Professor of Legal History.

"It remains to be seen exactly what Ruth Bader Ginsburg’s presence on the Court will mean. Tactically, Clinton felt that he needed someone who was well-respected within the profession; someone in the line of long tradition on the Court of what might be called "liberal" judicial restraint, for lack of a better term. There's no question that Ginsburg, both as a lawyer and as an academic, is a name to be reckoned with. When one looks at the history of how advocates for women's equality have used law as an instrument of progressive social change, I think that in some quarters, the criticism of Ruth Bader Ginsburg and the anxieties about her contributions to the court have ignored the pattern of an entire career, which includes an absolutely splendid and creative legal advocacy for women's rights. But it's also clear that this appointment represents a convergence of a number of factors: the Clinton administration's reading of the political landscape and the situation in which the president found himself after the Lani Guinier affair, where a woman was unfairly painted as a political radical and not given a fair hearing. Ginsburg's a distinguished jurist, and is certainly no enemy of women's rights.” ✷ Kendall Thomas, Professor of Law.

-----


Marable's Mission (continued from page 1)

(which he will chair), but to expand the boundaries of Black Studies scholarship far beyond campus walls. He expects the Institute to function as nothing less than a catalyst for serious discussion and analysis of race-related issues affecting not just the university, but New York City and the entire nation.

If anyone can accomplish such an ambitious undertaking, it's Marable. The 43-year-old professor and author of eight books began his teaching career at 24 as a lecturer at Smith College; by 26, Marable was chairperson of Tuskegee Institute's Department of Political Science; over the next 17 years, he went on to run programs at, among other institutions, Fisk, Colgate, and Ohio State, which boasts the largest Black Studies department in the United States. But Marable has found that he prefers directing an institute to chairing a department. A department, he says, engages mostly in hiring, firing, and course offerings, whereas an institute -- largely dependent on existing faculty in multiple disciplines to create its curriculum-- can focus on both research and service to the community. Marable believes this interdisciplinary approach defines African-American Studies. When lumped into one department, Black Studies all too often become marginalized and lose their impact on public discourse. Marable doesn't hesitate to state his own fervent disagreement with avowed separatists like Leonard Jeffries: "I am adamantly opposed to the idea of balkanizing courses, or that white students shouldn't take Black Studies. I think that's intellectually bankrupt. What does it do to isolate the unit from the broad intellectual currents and demi-currents of the university and I'm very opposed to that." A breadth of scholarship, dialogue, and collaboration will characterize the Institute for African-American Studies; it will welcome everyone to its courses and events, which will include guest lectures, scholarly conferences, film screenings, and research projects. Marable describes the existing undergraduate program as "conceptually weak," and has therefore articulated three general themes (built on the strengths of Columbia's faculty) to shape its and the Institute's research program: history (including collective memory and biography), theory (a critical analysis of current political, literary and social ideology), and politics and public policy (contemporary urban issues pertinent to NYC and the nation, such as health care, education, and housing).

Marable also hopes to establish strong links with other interdisciplinary programs engaged in similar analyses of power and privilege in American society, such as gay and lesbian studies and the Institute for Research on Women and Gender. In fact, collaboration with IRWG has already begun: in a "happy convergence of interests," hammers fly and circular saws buzz on Schermerhorn Extension's seventh floor, where Marable's offices are under construction right next door to IRWG, which will shortly have a new office, expanded room for work-study students, and a common reading room with the IRAAS. Marable sees further collaboration when it comes to faculty recruitment; as part of its agreement with Marable, Columbia will add 3 additional faculty in African-American studies. Marable hopes women will fill at least two of those positions: one a senior hire in social sciences, the other a 3 year term appointment to anchor the graduate program. He thinks it likely both would have a strong background in gender studies.

As for joint programs, Marable imagines "innumerable" ways in which the two programs can collaborate. He will establish "Working Groups" that bring together scholars, citizens from the public and private sectors, and activists to grapple with issues of race and multiculturalism. All of the Working Groups will address issues of compelling importance to African-American women, especially the "Multicultural Democracy" Working Group and the "Black Leadership and Public Policy" Working Group.

Marable points to "The State of Black New York" conference, which this second working group will launch, as a good example for how feminist issues, African-American scholarship, and public outreach can intersect under the aegis of the new Institute: Marable proposes an annual two-day conference which would focus on a significant issue or topic affecting African-Americans citywide-- e.g., the status of African-American women, health care, education, the housing crisis. Scholarly research would be presented on the Columbia campus one day; on the second day, workshops and public conferences with community leaders and activists would be scheduled at a city location like the Schomberg Center (Columbia's proximity to Harlem, which Marable calls "the most important black community in the world" strongly influenced his decision to come here). Papers presented at the conference would be published in an anthology, and public lectures and workshops could be taped for broadcast on television and radio.

Marable agrees that the rigorous, socially oriented program he envisions is ambitious. But he also believes that it's realizable, and his calm optimism persuades and inspires. With his full white beard and white hair swept back off his face, Manning Marable, casual dress notwithstanding, looks and sounds like a prophet. He has no trepidation: "I am very clear about what I want to do. We have an administration that's very supportive of African-American studies, a range of faculty...and the enthusiastic support of students and the backing of the community...the Columbia Institute is my main life's work: this is exactly what I wanted to do, exactly where I want to be, and [it's] a program which exactly fulfills my intellectual interests. What more could I ask?"
New York City Resource File

Did you know that a 1975 Mayoral Executive Order established the New York City Commission on the Status of Women? The Commission serves as an advocate for women: it studies and analyzes the status of women in New York City, supports legislation and changes in public policy to improve women's lives, educates the public about women's issues, and works to strengthen the network of organizations in the public and private sectors which try to expand career and other opportunities for women.

Among the commission's many publications is an indispensable reference volume called "Women's Organizations: A New York City Directory." It includes many categories (Arts, Childcare, Education, Employment, Health, etc.) and lists only those organizations whose goals match the Commission's: namely, dedication to improving the status of women or young girls.

A new edition of the handbook, which costs $10, is due out in mid-September. Copies can be purchased in person or by mail (include a check or money order for $10 plus $2 for postage and handling) from the NYC Commission on the Status of Women, 52 Chambers Street, Room 317, New York, NY 10007. For further information, contact the Commission at (212) 788-2738.

---

The Lesbian and Gay Studies Group at Columbia: From Strength to Strength
By Sarah Chinn

The Lesbian and Gay Studies Group at Columbia presented its most ambitious programming to date during the 1992-93 academic year. We began the fall semester with a controversial and thought-provoking discussion on Nazi persecution of homosexuals and the appropriation of the pink triangle by gay and lesbian and AIDS organizations. As the semester progressed, we continued to focus on the intersection of identity and politics. We hosted colloquia on a number of interrelated topics: Feminist Theory/Queer Theory; “Queer” and/or Lesbian Identity and Visibility; liberation pedagogy for lesbians and gay men.

During the spring semester, we hosted a one-day conference entitled "Crossings Over: Queer Graduate Students in the Academy." More than 200 lesbian, gay, and bisexual undergraduates, graduate students, and independent scholars came from all over the Northeast to take part. The conference, a huge success by everyone’s account, consisted of three roundtable discussions with extensive audience participation. Found Object, a journal based at CUNY Graduate Center, will publish selected proceedings from the conference. Several other colloquia in the spring featured an impressive roster of speakers including our own Patrick Horrigan, who presented a multimedia piece entitled “Loving Al Pacino,” and Judith Butler, author of Gender Trouble and Bodies that Matter.

This year we have a number of outside speakers lined up, most notably literary critic Diana Fuss of Princeton and acclaimed lesbian theologian Carter Heyward (see calendar for date, time and place); we welcome all colloquium ideas for the semester; we particularly encourage interdisciplinary topics on queer issues which concern multiculturalism and political activism, as well as works-in-progress. For further information, call the Institute or contact Sarah Chinn at (718) 789-2073.