ENIKŐ MAGYARI-VINCZE

TALKING FEMINIST INSTITUTIONS

INTERVIEWS WITH LEADING EUROPEAN SCHOLARS

EDITURA FUNDAŢIEI DESIRE
A DESIRE ALAPÍTVÁNY KIADÓJA
DESIRE PRESS
Str. Rapsodiei nr. 10/17, 3400, Cluj, Romania
Director: Ovidiu Pecican

COLECŢIA **„STUDII FEMINISTE"**
„FEMINISTA TANULMÁNYOK" SOROZAT
„FEMINIST STUDIES" SERIES

3

*Colecţia Studii Feministe a Editurii Fundaţiei Desire îşi propune publicarea unor materiale originale şi traduceri din domeniul interdisciplinar al studiilor de gen şi/ sau al studiilor feministe * A Desire Alapítvány Kiadója, a Feminista Tanulmányok Sorozat keretében eredeti írásokat és fordításokat jelentet meg az interdiszciplináris feminista tanulmányok területéről. * The Feminist Studies Series of the Desire Press publishes original works and translations on the interdisciplinary field of gender studies and/or feminist studies.*

Cover: Daniela Chiorean
Cover grafics: Alexandru Pecican
Proofreading: Denisa Piteiu

© 2002 by Enikő Magyari-Vincze
Editura Fundaţiei DESIRE
ISBN: 973-85512-7-7
DTP: Pecolino

Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naţionale:
Magyari-Vincze, Enikő;
Talking Feminist Institutions
Cluj-Napoca. – Desire, 2002
262 p.; 21 cm – (Feminism)

Printed in Romania

ENIKŐ MAGYARI-VINCZE

TALKING FEMINIST INSTITUTIONS

INTERVIEWS WITH LEADING EUROPEAN SCHOLARS

Editura Fundației DESIRE, 2002

For my husband, Nándor, whose enduring support was crucial to go through this work

CONTENTS
TARTALOM
CUPRINS

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS 7

FORWARD/ ELŐSZÓ/ PREFAȚĂ 9

Traveling Across Academic Feminisms/ 11
Utazás akadémiai feminizmusok között/ 23
Călătorind printre feminisme academice 37

INTRODUCING THE INTERVIEWS 51

CHAPTER ONE 55
Feminist Studies – What Difference Does it Make? 57

Women's Studies as a Politics of Difference 59
Rosi BRAIDOTTI
Centering on Gender Equality Worldwide 77
Barbara EINHORN
On the Bridge Between Science and Policy Making 95
Mieke VERLOO
Organising Across Disciplinary Boundaries 117
Carol KEDWARD

CHAPTER TWO 127
Producing Feminist Knowledge 129

Gendering Politics 131
Joyce OUTSHOORN
The Construction of Scientific Knowledge – A Feminist View 139
Ineke KLINGE
The Cross-Cultural Understanding of Reproduction 153
Maya UNNITHAN
Empowering Information 165
Lin McDeVITT-PUGH

CHAPTER THREE 179
Spaces of Inclusion 181

New Deconstructivist Projects: Masculinity and Gay Studies 183
Stefan DUDINK
Widening Education Towards the Margins 205
Gerry HOLLOWAY
Re-Approaching Multiculturalism 221
Marjolein VERBOOM

CONCLUDING REMARKS 229

EPILOGUE/ UTÓSZÓ/ POSTFAȚĂ 235

The Need for Feminist Studies in Romania/ 237
A feminista tanulmányok szükségessége Romániában/ 243
Nevoia de studii feministe în România 249

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book has been the product of a strong co-operation between Rosi Braidotti, Stefan Dudink, Barbara Einhorn, Gerry Holloway, Carol Kedward, Ineke Klinge, Lin McDevitt-Pugh, Joyce Outshoorn, Maya Unnithan, Marjolein Verboom, Mieke Verloo and myself. First of all I would like to express my gratitude to them for being ready to share with me their time and ideas during the whole process of making the interviews and working on the final versions of the texts.

The volume could not be possible without my travels to Great Britain and to The Netherlands, which were financially supported by a collective curriculum development grant of the Higher Education Support Program – International.

Moreover, I wish to thank to colleagues and friends of mine for their assistance at various times during the course of writing and editing, to Ovidiu Pecican, Georgeta Moarcăs, Kozák Gyula, Alina Preda and Denisa Piteiu.

I am similarly grateful to my friends, Eckstein-Kovács Péter and Vita László for providing me with a first financial input that was crucial to begin to edit the book. As a whole, this publication became possible due to the kind support of Takács Csaba, and …….

At last, but not least I need to convey my special thanks to my parents, husband and children for their persisting love and indulgence that I could enjoy while being far away from home.

FORWARD
ELŐSZÓ
PREFAȚĂ

TRAVELLING ACROSS ACADEMIC FEMINISMS*

> *This work was a great opportunity to travel, and to meet marvellous hosts, who provided a friendly environment for discussions. They are the genuine authors of the book. It was a feminist expedition, because it was not only about getting to know others, but about self-reflection as well… it was an empowering journey.*

Starting from an emphasis on the personal significance of travelling across academic feminisms, the Forward ends by stating

---

* *The author is associate professor at Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj, Romania, and is the director of the* Interdisciplinary Group for Gender Studies*, teaching and writing on cultural anthropology and feminism, identity politics and nationalism. On the domain of women's studies she published the book „Diferența care contează. Diversitatea social-culturală prin lentila antropologiei feministe" (Difference Matters. Socio-cultural Diversity through the Lenses of Feminist Anthropology), Cluj: Desire, 2002; co-edited the volumes: „Women and Men in East European Transition", Cluj: EFES, 1997; "Prezențe feminine. Studii despre femei în România" (Female Presences. Women's Studies in Romania), Cluj: Desire, 2002; and coordinated the research and the volume "Femei şi bărbați în Clujul multietnic" (Women and Men in the Multiethnic Cluj), Cluj: Desire, 2001. The interviews published in this book were made in February 2001, when she had the chance to travel to the United Kingdom (University of Sussex) and to The Netherlands (University of Utrecht, Nijmegen, Leiden and Maastricht) due to the* Higher Education Support Program*'s grant for course and faculty development in gender studies at Babeş-Bolyai University.*

the need to participate in transnational alliances. Which other paradigm could offer a broader view on social reality from the personal to the international, or from the local to the global? Or from disciplinary bases to multidisciplinary perspectives? Or from knowledge production to political action, and from criticism to self-criticism and back? For sure, feminism is one of the best partners in taking these journeys. Our book aims to offer an image of this multifaceted dynamic, through the experiences of some main European actors of the stage. And it intends, as well, to facilitate an insight into the ways in which the permanently transfigured and continuously reproduced focus of feminism on how the gendered world works is related to the effort to change that to a more inclusive, but not homogeneous site, where differences are acknowledged and transcended at the same time.

„Talking Feminist Institutions" speaks about power relations within and outside the academia. About the power regimes inherent to the discursive and social practices that shape our thinking and acting, both in everyday life and scientific production. About the gender orders saturated by inequalities of all kinds, and by overlapping oppressive systems, which situate some individuals in subordinated subject positions. And last, but not least, it shows the ways in which feminism intervenes in all these, to make a difference, bridging between differences, and changing the hegemonic social practices and their underlying cultural concepts. „Talking Feminist Institutions" is meant to affirm the power and the related responsibility of institutionalised (academic) feminism.

Building bridges across feminist (academic) experiences

There is a lot of experience to be gained from the interviews made with leading European feminist scholars and published in this

volume. Involved in teaching and research on women's studies in The Netherlands and in Great Britain, these scholars also have important roles in the institutional management of women's studies programmes, both at national and international level, and a rich life experience in crossing borders of all kinds. Since I was a beginner in the field, it was a great chance and challenge for me to encounter them, to have them accept my request of talking about their work, and to become a sort of courier, who brings foreign experiences home. They are the genuine authors of the book. That is why my thanks and respect go again and again to them for letting me be their messenger, and the person who constructs the bridges between their stories. For me, this work was a great opportunity to travel, and to meet marvellous hosts, who provided a friendly environment for discussions. It was a feminist expedition, because it was not only about getting to know others, but about self-reflection as well. Eventually, it was an empowering journey – for me, first of all, but, more importantly, this journey might turn into a support for institutionalising feminist studies at home.

Since I belong to an ethnic minority in Romania, home means for me in-betweenness. But, in this very case, it signifies the effort to make my work useful for scholars in this field, both in Romania, and Hungary. This is not to say that ethnic identification prevails in my self-naming and - positioning. But it means that I am aware of my particular position, and of the fact that acting on the border has its own particularity, among others, in terms of the language that one is writing in, or of the public that one addresses, and/or of the directions from which one might expect feedback and recognition. Most importantly, travelling through feminisms in this way, made me conscious of the meanings of being home without a home, i.e. about partnering in transnational communities and transcending restrictive spaces. Let me call the reader's attention to some of the lessons I have learned, due to my travels, about this sense of togetherness. The following sections are fragments from the

interviews, paraphrased in order to focus on ideas and strategies – shared across borders – about feminist knowledge production and academic institutionalisation.

Women's studies is a field about making a difference, it is about changing the rules of the game, about questioning the vested interests that make the production of knowledge connected to power games and to power relations, and, eventually, it is related to a number of challenges and to the questioning of the status quo. (Rosi Braidotti)

The political agenda of the masculinity and gay studies research would be to show that we live in an ideological prison-house, which supposes that there are such things as masculinity and femininity, homosexuality and heterosexuality. This agenda should be aimed at gender equality, at taking into account what certain constructions of masculinity mean or have meant for women, throughout history. (Stefan Dudink)

Women's studies is a position on the bridge, between research and policy-makers or some practitioners. Because the whole world is constructed around gender inequality, gender mainstreaming is a project that wants to see the whole world change. (Mieke Verloo)

The idea that scientific knowledge is not to be 'discovered', but is 'made', is produced, and dependent on particular local situations, on time and place, gradually took over the early approaches in feminist sciences. It became important to see how particular conditions are dependent on definitions of time and place, and also how science is not only reproducing, but also producing gender. A real epistemological shift. (Ineke Klinge)

For feminists, multiculturalism means stressing the importance of communication between people, and of self-reflection, because they aim to think about social relations, within which everyone is open to listen, and also to explore her or himself. (Marjolein Verboom)

An information centre for women means the production and dissemination of information that improves the position of women. That is why, in a way, doing research is also a form of empowerment. (Lin McDevitt-Pugh)

Within a conservative university, a university establishment, which is also very disciplinary, anything, which is interdisciplinary, like women's studies, is seen with distrust. And this organisation is very hard to change if you want to break the disciplinary structures, and this gives you a lot of trouble in trying to organise. (Joyce Outshoorn)

The institutional support for Women's Studies sometimes is lagged behind the actual level of activity and international recognition of the faculty. This is a common experience in many countries, because there is the view that this domain is not a hard science. But this position overlooks the fact that there is a very well established body of theory in all aspects of this field. (Barbara Einhorn)

In my courses offered for people who left school early and now are coming to the university, among whom there are many women, I am talking about women as agents of change in history. And the focus is much more on how to make them feel comfortable and included. The life history courses, for example, where people can use their own life experience to think about how the world works, make them able to see their own experience as something valorous. (Gerry Holloway)

A lot of women would say that it happens across Western Europe for women to be underrepresented in sciences, especially at higher levels. But one can also think of women in managerial positions at universities who do not think about those things, and are actually quite abrasive. (Carol Kedward)

Some consider that the relation between anthropology and feminism is an awkward relationship, because the two define the Other very differently. The Other for anthropology is the kind of culture that you try to understand, whereas for feminism the Other is men. Feminists always have to fight against women's marginalisation and domination, and this really is not expressed only by using gender as analytical category. (Maya Unnithan)

Obviously, academic feminism is not only about sharing ideas, practices and experiences related to the production and dissemination of knowledge. It is also about debates, tensions, and, why not, power games between those within. In the following paragraphs the Forward highlights some of the latter as further sources of permanent regeneration for a domain that manages to always create a balance between internal diversity and sharing.

Institutionalisation of feminist studies between integration and autonomy

In all cases, and feminism is not an exception in this respect, the institutional strategies for disciplinary developments are dependent upon historical moments, social and political contexts. The women's, gender and feminist studies curriculum varies from institution to institution, depending on administrative arrangements and on the availability of faculty to teach courses. It is also the case that the strategies of introducing these studies have to be defined pertaining to the features of the very academic establishment in which they want to integrate themselves and/or towards which they try to maintain their autonomy.

The autonomy/integration debate is one of the most important features that shape feminist studies (G. Bowles and R.

Duelli Klein, 1989) and refers to the strategies for promoting feminist scholarship in the academia. Integration means mainstreaming women's perspective across different disciplines and across the existing university programs/departments, but it is also about increasing gender-awareness in all the issues addressed. It is a strategy of transforming the patriarchal institution from within. The counter argument goes to stress the risk of the dilution of the radical potential of feminist scholarship due to its integration into a conservative environment and the small amount of power on streamlining the (feminist) curriculum and on hiring staff from this domain. The strategy of autonomy ensures independent programs, a space where feminists of a great variety can engage in active dialogue and have control over material and human resources and knowledge production. It is a way of constructing a new discipline, and a new structure that challenges the traditional compartmentalisation of the academia. The argument against this practice is about ghettozation, about the risk of feminists being perceived as „man haters".

Eventually, the debate is about different views on how (feminist) change could take place more effectively. But, once feminist diversity was acknowledged in terms of the dissimilarities between women of different ethnicity and sexual orientation, the discussion became also about the ways in which „white", „black", „lesbian", „third world", etc. feminisms should be integrated into each other. Ultimately, the aim become important and relevant in the academic sphere, to increase feminism's credibility, respect and acceptance, but without losing the kind of marginality that allows for taking up a critical position.

Whichever strategy would be chosen, in whatever combination would happen, in the institutionalisation process in any kind of academic and broader social context, the main line to follow is empowering feminist knowledge and its producers. This may be accomplished by bringing in more women into the academic sphere,

promoting them to decision-making positions, creating a more open space for women and men who promote feminist awareness, and transforming the traditional ways of disciplining scientific expertise.

Knowledge production from criticism to construction and back

Feminist knowledge places women at the centre of analysis. More precisely, it focuses on power relations from the point of view of the oppressed, while searching for the ways in which gendered constructions of subject positions and experiences are responsible for perpetuating social inequalities.

Studying the work of the feminist perspective in different disciplines (for example in Victoria Robinson, 1993: 5), one might discover that, as a rule, this starts with the „integration stage", which aims to include women to fill in the gaps of the existing knowledge and to expose the silences on issues supposedly irrelevant for „universal" (but actually male) matters. Usually, the feminist reform continues with the „separation stage", i.e. the construction of new theories about women and/or about gender identities and relations, gender orders and power regimes, about the ways in which these operate, both in social life, and in scientific production. This is the shift from the criticism of the male bias (that hides, silences, oppresses, distorts women's experiences as being „the other") towards the affirmation of women's perspective (which restores the dignity and pride of being different). At a certain point, this process is completed by a self-critical enterprise, by the permanent reconsideration of what „women's perspective" is, exactly, of how it is constructed by feminist knowledge, and how it entails internal differences. And, finally, it is culminated in the „revolution stage", in which feminist critique and theory building get mainstreamed, fulfil the aim of making a difference in the academic sphere as a whole.

Obviously, today, these phases might overlap and the „final" endeavours can never be accomplished as long as feminist criticism is characterised by the unwillingness to accept any establishment that resists change.

As many scholars argue, feminism is also a critique of the knowledge, which – in the name of a so-called objectivity – fails to recognise and validate the gendered diversity of experiences. As such is partnering in all those academic ventures that unveil both false universality and hypocritical neutrality. It shows that the gender blindness of the disciplines is actually transforming male experiences into „the" human ones, and that the lack of commitment towards any extra-academic issue is, in fact, a hidden investment into the masculine status quo. Briefly put, feminism is a project of deconstructing power relations inherent in knowledge production and dissemination, but also a way of doing things differently, radically differently. This makes Elizabeth Minnich (1988) affirm that feminists are shattering andro-centricity as Copernicus shattered geo-centricity, and Darwin shattered species-centricity.

The stake of such approaches to feminism's contribution to scienceing is actually represented in the politics of naming, as part of its positioning strategies in the academia. Many scholars argue that feminism means more than adding women to the list of the subjects to be studied in different disciplines, and signifies an additional potential in contrast with „simply" considering gender as a structuring principle of life. Because, as already mentioned, (academic) feminism is about highlighting power relations between women and men inherent in any sphere, including knowledge production, and, most importantly, it is about addressing and changing established orders from the perspective of the oppressed. That is why feminist critique is seen as uncomfortable, and the academia has many tools of marginalizing it in different ways, among others by stating, hypocritically, that politics has no place in sciences and universities. Therefore, some choose to name their

program by the (seemingly) more neutral term of „gender studies", which does not necessarily mean, though it might mean, the inclusion of feminist criticism into analysis. Obviously, even if others use the term „feminism" for self-definition, this could signify many orientations and very many views on how power and subject production function, and how one should explain why, when, where and which women are located in subordinated subject positions. Because, according to some scholars, masculinist power is hold by particular male individuals and groups against female individuals and groups, but others are considering that it is something which circulates through the subject of regulation, in the medium itself where subjects emerge (Wendy Brown, 1997).

The unsettled relationship between (feminist) theory and practice

If one is conscious of the fact that (at least in a Western context) women's studies and feminist studies as knowledge and institution became possible to imagine and create due to the women's movement and the feminist movement, obviously he/ she has to wonder about the development of this relation and the inherent conflicts. This translates as well into the issue of how theory and practice are related in women's studies, as far as the latter affirms that this is one among the particular features which make a difference within an academic sphere sharply disconnected from the external world.

Some consider that theorising is a male way of relating to reality and, as such, it was/ is used against women in validating inequality. But others are convinced that knowledge is a form of social power, which has to be used by women as a tool of empowerment (G. Bowles and R. Duelli Klein, 1989). As far as the other side of the story is concerned, some feminists are aware of the

risk of the political commitment of women's studies, for this makes many scholars suspicious about the non- or anti-intellectual dimension of this field, from where there is only one step towards re-identifying non-intellectuality with women (Wendy Brown, 1997). Altogether, these differences in understanding the utility of feminist theory from the point of view of feminist practice and vice versa, generate some tensions and gaps within feminism, proving once again that this is a domain which develops through permanently producing unbalances and re-establishing equilibrium. Obviously, some variations on this issue are engendered as well by differently interpreting „knowledge" as a tool of empowerment. Because this might mean high theory that, once produced, strengthens (academic) women's positions in their disciplines and scientific contexts. But, on the other hand, it could signify the importance of the full access of girls and women to education, and, most importantly, the power that knowledge ensures in contemporary societies. Nevertheless, the two understandings do not exclude one another, since by gaining the power to construct reality through knowledge production, women's studies legitimates certain ways of talking about women and gender relations and, in this way, increases other women's chance to live in a world that appropriates gender equality discourses and practices as its normality.

Different women's lived experiences, feminist theories and feminist practices have the chance to empower each other, if their links are shaped by a certain way of relating to the „one" and to the „other". This is characterised by abilities such as: respecting the diversity of experiences, struggling with one's own prejudices, listening to each other, establishing non-hierarchical forms of communication, using power as a potential for building and not as a capacity of domination and, finally, entering into different collective working groups. But, in reality, all these principles are problematic to be translated into practice. Because, as it happens with feminism as well, these kinds of strategies are not the natural consequences of

femininity, but consciously chosen options within environments where, many a time, aggressiveness, exclusivism, the domination of the other seem to be the effective tools of fulfilling aims.

Thinking through transnational connections

One of feminism's classical ideas is the assumption according to which there must exist a kind of (universal) Solidarity among women due to their (universal) subordinated position and shared experiences. Obviously, in the background of this thought there lies the notion of sexual difference as „the" difference, which matters, and the concept of masculinist power as the primary dimension of authority. Yet, today, in feminist circles, nobody contests either the multiplicity of identities and power regimes, or the legitimacy of different sorts of feminisms shaped by identities and positions in the name of which they are defined. Most importantly, analysts agree on the fact that it is impossible to extract „race" from gender, or gender from sexuality, or masculinity from colonialism, and one may not treat the various modalities of subject formation in an additive way (Wendy Brown, 1997).

Altogether, the latest developments and the internal diversity of feminism do not prevent the principle of transnational cooperation to continue to be the field's main feature. However, this is not conceived any more as based on natural female essences and/ or on shared universal feminine experiences, but is imagined and practised as a whole range of (pragmatic) coalitions built around concrete cases and issues, permanently remade according to the challenges that have to be answered by women of different places, ethnicities, classes, ages. Today, the master narrative of Solidarity gives space for small stories of sisterhood. And the transnational frame is used for discussing about feminisms from various locations around the globe (Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan, 1994). „Talking Feminist Institutions" wants to take part in this process.

UTAZÁS AKADÉMIAI FEMINIZMUSOK KÖZÖTT*

E könyv a szó szoros és átvitt értelmében vett utazásaim terméke, melyek alkalmat adtak arra, hogy csodálatos vendéglátókat ismerjek meg. Ők e könyv igazi szerzői. Annak a feminista expedíciónak a tükre, mely egy időben szól mások megismeréséről és ön-reflexióról, és amely elsősorban saját munkámat erősíti meg, de remélhetőleg szerepe lesz a feminista tanulmányok itthoni intézményesítésében is.

Az Előszó az akadémiai feminizmusok közti utazás személyes jelentésének hangsúlyozásával indít és a nemzeti határokat átlépő

* *A szerző a kolozsvári Babeş-Bolyai Tudományegyetem docense, a* Gender Studies Interdiszciplináris Csoport *tudományos igazgatója. Oktató és kutató munkájának témája a kulturális antropológia és feminizmus, identitáspolitika és nacionalizmus kérdéskörében helyezkedik el. A feminista tanulmányok terén legfontosabb könyve: „Diferenţa care contează. Diversitatea social-culturală prin lentila antropologiei feministe" (Fontos különbség. A társadalmi-kulturális sokféleség a feminista antropológia nézőpontjából), Kolozsvár: Desire, 2002. Társszerkesztője további köteteknek: „Women and Men in East European Transition" (Nők és férfiak a Kelet-Európai átmenetben), Cluj: EFES, 1997; „Prezenţe feminine. Studii despre femei în România" (Női jelenlétek. Tanulmányok a nőkről Romániában), Kolozsvár: Desire, 2002. Koordonálta a „Femei şi bărbaţi în Clujul multietnic" (Nők és férfiak a multietnikus Kolozsváron) című kutatást és három kötetetes könyvet (Kolozsvár: Desire, 2001). A jelen könyvben publikált interjúkat 2001 februárjában készítette Nagy-Británniai (University of Sussex) és Hollandiai (University of Utrecht, Nijmegen, Leiden és Maastricht) utazásai során, melyeket a* Higher Education Support Program *támogatott.*

koalíciókban való részvétel szükségességének felismerésével zárul. Melyik más paradigma kínál tágabb horizontot a társadalmi valóság értelmezésében, az egyénitől a transznacionálisig, a helyitől a globálisig terjedő jelenségek megragadásában? Vagy a diszciplináris szemponttól a multidiszciplináris megközelítésig, a tudás termelésétől a politikai cselekvésig, a kritikától az önbírálatig és vissza? Annyi bizonyos, hogy ebben az utazásban a feminizmus egyike a legmegfelelőbb társaknak. Könyvünk jelentős európai szereplők tapasztalatainak bemutatásával érzékelteti ezt a sokoldalú dinamikát. Közelebb akar vinni annak megértéséhez, hogy a feminizmusnak a nemek közti kapcsolatokra figyelő és állandóan változó perspektívája miként függ össze azzal a törekvéssel, hogy a világot nyitott/ befogadó, de távolról sem egynemű hellyé alakítsa, olyan térré, amelyben a különbségeket egy időben elismerik és meghaladják.

A „Talking Feminist Institutions" című könyv hatalmi viszonyokról szól, az akadémián belül és azon túl. A diskurzív és a társadalmi gyakorlatban rejlő, gondolkodásmódunkat és cselekvéseinket a mindennapi és a tudományos életben egyaránt alakító hatalmi rendszerekről értekezik, a különféle egyenlőtlenségekkel telített és egymásra tevődő uralmi berendezkedésekről beszél, melyek egyeseket alárendelt helyzetbe sodornak. Végül, de nem utolsó sorban megmutatja, miként avatkozik hatékonyan mindezekbe a feminizmus és hogyan hidalja át a különbségeket, változtatja meg az uralkodó gyakorlatokat és a mögöttük meghúzódó kulturális koncepciókat. A „Talking Feminist Institutions" az (akadémiai) feminizmus erejét és a vele járó felelősséget mutatja be.

Kapcsolat-építés (akadémiai) feminista tapasztalatok között

Sok mindent tanulhatunk azokból a tapasztalatokból, amelyeket – a kötetben közölt interjúk révén –, vezető európai feminista értelmiségiek osztanak meg velünk. Beszélgetőtársaim Hollandiában és Nagy-Britanniában tanítanak és kutatnak, fontos szerepet játszanak a nőkről és nemek közti kapcsolatokról szóló tanulmányok intézményes szervezésében és gazdag élettapasztalattal rendelkeznek különféle határok átjárási gyakorlatában. A velük való találkozás, az, hogy elfogadták felkérésemet és hajlandók voltak munkájukról beszélni és rám bízták tudásuk haza-közvetítését, hatalmas lehetőség és kihívás volt számomra. Ezért köszönetem és tiszteletem ismételten őket illeti, hiszen lehetőséget adtak arra, hogy hírmondójuk legyek, hogy összeköttetéseket teremtsek történeteik között. Ez a munka utazási lehetőséget nyújtott számomra, melynek során csodálatos házigazdákra találtam, akik barátságos, beszélgetésre alkalmas környezetet teremtettek. Ez egy feminista expedíció volt, mert egyaránt szólt a másikról és önmagamról. Mindenekelőtt saját munkámat erősítette meg, de ezen felül otthoni intézményépítési erőfeszítések számára is vonatkoztatási ponttá válhat.

Számomra, romániai kisebbségi csoporthoz tartozó egyén számára az „otthon" köztes állapotot jelent. De ebben az esetben arra való törekvés is, hogy munkámat hasznossá tegyem mind romániai, mind pedig magyarországi kutatók számára. Ez a célom nem arról tanúskodik, hogy az etnikai azonosság számomra elsőrendű fontosságú önidentifikáció. De tükrözi azt, hogy tisztában vagyok társadalmi helyzetemmel, azzal, hogy a határhelyzet bizonyos sajátosságokkal jár olyan dolgok tekintetében (is), mint például az írás nyelve, a megszólított olvasóközönség és a forrás, ahonnan visszajelzésre vagy elismerésre számíthatok. E könyv hátterében álló utazás elsősorban a fizikai értelemben vett haza nélküli otthon jelentéseit értette meg velem, együtt a nemzeti határokat átlépő

partneri kapcsolatok, valamint a korlátozó terek átlépésének fontosságával együtt. Ezen a ponton szeretném felhívni olvasóim figyelmét néhány olyan tanulságra ezzel kapcsolatban, melyet utazásom során fedeztem fel az együvé tartozás különféle módozatairól. Az alábbi – parafrazált – interjúrészletek azt tükrözik, hogy a közvetlen társadalmi-politikai kontextusokból származó különbségek ellenére a feminista tudás termelésének és intézményesítésének vannak közös, határokat áthidaló eszméi és stratégiái.

A nőkről szóló tanulmányok olyan terület, mely különbséget hoz, meg akarja változtatni a játékszabályokat, elemzi a tudás és a hatalmi játszmák és viszonyok összefonódása mögötti érdekeket, és végső soron számos kihíváshoz és a status-quo megkérdőjelezéséhez kapcsolódik. (Rosi Braidotti)

*A maszkulinitás és a „*gay studies*" politikai feladata megmutatni, hogy mindannyian egy ideológiai börtön foglyai vagyunk, mely feltételezi, hogy természettől fogva létezik férfiasság és nőiesség, homoszexualitás és heteroszexualitás. Ezeknek a tanulmányoknak a nemek közti egyenlőség megteremtését kell megcélozniuk, figyelmet kell fordítaniuk arra, hogy a férfiasság bizonyos eszméi mit jelentettek a történelem során és mit jelentenek ma a nők számára.* (Stefan Dudink)

A nőkről szóló tanulmányok a kutatás, a politika és a társadalmi aktivizmus határán helyezkednek el. Mivel a világ mindenütt a nemek közti egyenlőtlenségekre épül, ezért a társadalmi nemek perspektívájának elfogadása és terjesztése, az úgynevezett „gender mainstreaming" politika az egész világ megváltoztatását célozza meg. (Mieke Verloo)

Az a gondolat, hogy a tudományos tudást nem „felfedezik", hanem termelik, létrehozzák, mégpedig mindig a helyi körülményektől függően, fokozatosan teret hódított a feminista természettudományokban is. Fontossá

*vált annak felismerése, hogy miként működik ez a társadalmi-kulturális meghatározottság és hogy a tudomány nem csak újratermeli, hanem ő maga létrehozza a társadalmi nemet. Ez egy valódi ismeretelméleti fordulatot hozott. (*Ineke Klinge*)*

A multikulturalizmus, feminista értelmezésben, az egyének közötti kommunikáció és az önreflexió fontosságára hívja fel a figyelmet, hiszen a feminizmus célja olyan társadalmi viszonyok elgondolása és megteremtése, melyek lehetővé teszik mások meghallgatását és önmagunk felfedezését. (Marjolein Verboom)

Egy női információközpont létrehozása feltételezi és lehetővé teszi azon tudás termelését és terjesztését, mely javítani tud a nők helyzetén. A nők helyzetének kutatása egyben hatalmi eszköz is. (Lin McDevitt-Pugh)

Egy konzervatív egyetem, mely diszciplínák szerint szerveződik, gyanakvóan tekint mindenre, ami interdiszciplináris jellegű, mint például a nőkről szóló tanulmányokra. Ezt a berendezkedést igen nehéz megváltoztatni, a létező struktúrák felszámolása és egy másik típusú szerveződés elfogadtatása nem könnyű feladat. (Joyce Outshoorn)

A nőkről szóló tanulmányok intézményes támogatása néha elmarad az ezen a téren kutatók nemzetközi elismerése és tényleges tevékenysége mögött. Ez több ország közös tapasztalata, mivel létezik egy nézet, mely szerint ez a diszciplína nem nevezhető „valódi" tudománynak. Akik ezt állítják, megfeledkeznek arról, hogy ma már a feminista tanulmányoknak minden területén egy igen jól megalapozott elméleti korpusszal rendelkezünk. (Barbara Einhorn)

Előadásaimban – amelyeket olyan egyéneknek tartok, akik korán kimaradtak az iskolából és most egyetemre járnak és akik között sok nő van –, a nőről mint változást hordozó történelmi ágensről beszélek. És mindinkább arra figyelek, hogy elfogadottnak érezzék magukat. Az életrajzi elbeszélések, például, amelyekben mindenki saját tapasztalatán keresztül értelmezheti a

világ működését, lehetővé teszik számukra azt, hogy saját tapasztalataikat értékesnek, fontosnak tekintsék. (Gerry Holloway)

Sok nő állítja, hogy Nyugat-Európa szerte a nők alulreprezentáltak a tudományban, különösen magasabb szinteken. De például ha néhány, az egyetem vezetésében fontos beosztásban dolgozó nőt tekintünk, láthatjuk, hogy őket nem foglalkoztatja ez a probléma és ellenségesete taszítóak a feminista tanulmányokkal szemben. (Carol Kedward)

Az antropológia és a feminizmus viszonyát sokan ellentmondásosnak találják, mivel mindkettő különbözőképpen határozza meg a másságot. Az antropológiában a „másik" az a kultúra, melynek megértésére törekszik, míg a feminizmus számára a férfi a „másik". A feministáknak állandó jelleggel küzdeniük kell a nők marginalizálása, elnyomása ellen, és ehhez képest a társadalmi nemnek mint analitikus kategóriának a használata nem elégséges befektetés. (Maya Unnithan)

Nyilvánvaló, hogy az akadémiai feminizmus nem merül ki a tudás létrehozatalával és terjesztésével kapcsolatos eszmék, gyakorlatok és tapasztalatok feletti egyetértésben, ezek megosztásában. Hanem vitákról, feszültségekről és, miért ne, belső hatalmi játszmákról is szól. Az alábbi bekezdésekben az Utószó éppen ezeket a vonatkozásait emeli ki, mint olyan csomópontokat, amelyek mentén ennek a tudományterületnek mindig sikerült és sikerülni fog megteremtenie a belső sokféleség és azonosság közti egyensúlyt.

A feminista tanulmányok intézményesítése integráció és autonómia között

Egy tudományterület fejlesztését célzó intézményes stratégiák minden esetben – és e tekintetben a feminizmus sem kivétel –

történelmi momentumoktól, társadalmi és politikai kontextusoktól függnek. A nőkről és a társadalmi nemekről szóló, illetve a feminista tanulmányok tanrendje intézményekként változik, az adminisztratív struktúra és az egyetem által nyújtott lehetőségek szerint. Ezek bevezetésére irányuló stratégiákat azon tágabb rend jellegzetességeihez kell igazítani, melybe beilleszkedni próbálnak és/ vagy mellyel szemben meg szeretnék őrizni autonómiájukat.

Az autonómia/ integráció vita egyike azoknak a legfontosabb sajátosságoknak, melyek a feminista tanulmányokat formálják és tulajdonképpen a feminista kutatás akadémiai körökben való elismertetéséről szól. Az integráció stratégiája azt a célt követi, hogy a nők szempontját, valamint a nemek közti kapcsolatok perspektíváját bevezessék az összes diszciplínába és egyetemi programba, mégpedig úgy, hogy ez minden társadalmi probléma tárgyalásánál előtérbe hozza a nemek közti különbségek és egyenlőtlenségek iránti érzékenységet, a nemi tudatosságot. Ez egy olyan stratégia tehát, mely belülről alakítja át a patriarchális intézményt. Az ellene felhozott érv arra figyelmeztet, hogy a feminista kutatás, a konzervatív intézménybe való integrációja következtében, elveszít(het)i radikális potenciálját. Az autonómia stratégiája független programok létrehozását célozza meg, olyan terek kialakítását, melyekben a feminizmus különböző változatai egymással szabadon kommunikálhatnak, ellenőrizhetik az emberi és anyagi erőforrásokat és a tudás termelésének folyamatát. Röviden, ez egy új típusú diszciplína és akadémiai struktúra létrehozásának stratégiája, mely megkérdőjelezi az egyetem tradicionális berendezkedését. Az ellene hozott érv a gettoizálódás és a „férfigyűlölő" megjelöléssel való megbélyegzés kockázatára és negatív következményeire mutat rá.

Végső soron a vita az akadémiai szféra feminista átalakításával kapcsolatos nézetek közti különbségeket tükrözi. Ugyanakkor (felismerve a különböző etnikumú és szexuális irányultságú nők közötti eltéréseket és a feminizmus sokféleségét) ,

felveti a különféle – „fekete", „fehér", „leszbikus", „harmadik világbeli", stb. – feminizmusok viszonyának kérdését is, ezek integrálásának lehetőségét. A vita tétje végül is az, hogy a feminizmus az akadémiai szféra jelentős és releváns részévé váljon, hogy hitelét növelje, elfogadtassa magát és tiszteletet ébresszen anélkül, hogy lemondana sajátos peremhelyzetéről, ami lehetővé teszi kritikai állásfoglalását.

Bármelyik lenne is a követett intézményesülési stratégia, bármilyen módon is keveredjen a kettő egymással, ebben a folyamatban az a legfontosabb, hogy megerősödjön a feminista tudás létrehozóinak státusa mind az akadémiai, mind pedig a tágabb társadalmi környezetben; növekedjen a nők létszáma az egyetemeken valamint a döntéshozó pozíciókban, az akadémiai szféra nyitott legyen olyan nők és férfiak számára, akik munkájukban érvényesítik a feminista szemléletet és a tudományos tudás hagyományos szerveződésének átalakítását célozzák meg.

A kritikától egy új tudás létrehozásáig és vissza

A feminista kutatás a nőt helyezi az elemzés középpontjába. Pontosabban, az alárendeltek/ elnyomottak szemszögéből ragadja meg a hatalmi viszonyokat, miközben a társadalmi egyenlőtlenségek (újra)termelésében szerepet játszó, az egyének helyzetét és tapasztalatait strukturáló nemi rendet (*gender order*) elemzi.

Aki figyelemmel kíséri a feminista perspektíva térhódítását a különböző diszciplínákban, felfedezheti (például Victoria Robertson nyomán, 1993: 5), hogy ez rendszerint az „integráció szakaszával" kezdődik. Ennek célja a „nő(k)" beiktatása a tudományos kutatás témái közé, a tudáskészletben ilyen szempontból kimutatható hiányosságok felszámolása és olyan elhallgatott kérdések nyilvánosságra hozása, melyekről hagyományosan azt feltételezték, hogy nincs jelentőségük az egyetemes (de valójában a maszkulinitás

életvilágához kötődő) problémák vonatkozásában. A feminista reform többnyire az „elkülönülés szakaszával" folytatódik, amikor is új elméleteket dolgoznak ki a nőkről, a társadalmi nemekről, a nemi identitásról és a nemek közti kapcsolatokról, a társadalmi nemek rendjéről és a hatalmi rendszerekről, ezek működési módjáról a társadalmi életben és a tudományos termelésben. Ebben a szakaszban valósul meg az áttérés a férfi elfogultság (*male bias*) bírálatától női tapasztalatot elrejtő, elhallgattató, elnyomjó, torzító, avagy „a másság" és a „másik" pozíciójába helyező a női szemlélet érvényesítésére, mely visszaállítja a különbözőség méltányosságát és büszkeségét. Adott ponton ez a folyamattal az önreflexiós gyakorlattal egészül ki, mely állandóan újraértelmezi az úgynevezett „női szemléletmód" jelentéseit, kritikailag elemzi a feminista tudás létrehozatalát és a belső sokféleséget. Végül pedig az úgynevezett „forradalmi szakasszal" zárul, melyben a feminista kritika és elméletalkotás széles körben elismerést kap, elfogadott paradigmává válik különféle diszciplínákban és általában az akadémiai szférában. Manapság természetesen ezek a szakaszok átfed(het)ik egymást és nyilvánvalóan, a „végső" cél teljesítése soha nem valósul meg teljesen, hiszen ezt maga a feminista kritika sem teszi lehetővé, mert – sajátosságánál fogva –, soha nem nyugodhat bele a további változásoknak ellenálló állapotokba.

Többek véleménye szerint, a feminizmus annak a tudásnak a kritikája, mely – az úgynevezett objektivitásra hivatkozva – nem ismeri fel és nem tükrözi az emberi tapasztalatok sokféleségét, például a társadalmi nemek tekintetében létező változatosságát. Ily módon a feminizmus partnere minden olyan ismeretelméleti/ tudománytörténeti kísérletnek, mely leleplezi a hamis egyetemességet és a képmutató semlegességet. Megmutatja, hogy a diszciplínák társadalmi nemekkel szembeni vaksága a férfiasság tapasztalatait egyetemes érvényességgel felruházott emberi tapasztalatokká lépteti elő, és hogy az akadémián kívül eső társadalmi problémák iránti semlegesség tulajdonképpen a

maszkulinitás érdekeit kifejező *status-quo* hallgatólagos elfogadását jelenti. Röviden, az akadémiai feminizmus nem más, mint a tudás termelésében és terjesztésében rejlő hatalmi viszonyok dekonstruálásának projektje, de ugyanakkor a tudományos megismerésnek egy radikálisan új modellje is. Ezért hasonlítja Elizabeth Minnich (1988) a tudományos életben uralkodó férfiközpontúság feminista kritikáját a Kopernikusz és Darwin által okozott tudományelméleti földrengésekhez.

A feminizmus tudás-hozadékának ilyen jellegű megközelítése végső soron a megnevezés politikájának, a tudományos életen belüli helyezkedési stratégiának a része. A kutatók amellett érvelnek, hogy a feminizmus többet jelent annál, hogy néhány úgynevezett „női témát" beiktatunk azon problémák közé, amelyekről tudni illik különféle diszciplínákban, és nem korlátozódik arra az álláspontra sem, miszerint a szexualitás és a társadalmi nem az élet fontos szervező elve. Mert, amint már említettem, az (akadémiai) feminista szemléletmód velejárója, hogy a férfiak és nők közötti kapcsolatokat hatalmi viszonyokként kezeli, az uralkodó társadalmi és kulturális rendet pedig az alárendelt pozíciókban levő alanyok szempontjából tárgyalja és akarja megváltoztatni. Ezért kényelmetlen a feminista kritika az élet minden területén, beleértve a tudományos élet világát is, és ezért történik meg az, hogy – egy olyan akadémiai környezetben, mely többek között képmutatóan azt állítja, hogy a tudomány és/ vagy az egyetem politikamentes világ –, marginális helyzetbe kerül és legitimitás-problémákkal küzd. Továbbá ez az oka annak, hogy néhányan programjaikat és intézményeiket a (látszólag) semlegesebb „tanulmányok a társadalmi nemekről" (*gender studies*) kifejezéssel nevezik meg, ami nem jelenti feltétlenül, de jelentheti a feminista kutatás elméleti, módszertani és kritikai potenciáljának a felvállalását. Másfelől, annak ellenére, hogy mások a feminizmus fogalmát nyíltan előtérbe helyezik önazonosításuk során, ez önmagában még nem fejezi ki egyértelműen opcióikat. Hiszen köztudottan a feminizmus számos, egymástól eltérő elképzelést

foglal magában arról, hogy miként működik a hatalom és a társadalmi szubjektum létrehozatala, valamint arról, hogy miképpen magyarázható az, hogy miért, mikor, hol és kik kerülnek alárendelt helyzetbe. Mert, egyesek számára, a maszkulinitás hatalma azt jelenti, hogy bizonyos egyének vagy csoportok elnyomják a nőket, mások számára pedig ez, maga, a médium, melyben az uralkodó normáknak alárendelt női és férfi társadalmi szubjektum létrejön. (Wendy Brown, 1997).

A (feminista) elmélet és gyakorlat közti feszültséggel telített viszony

Ha tudatában vagyunk annak, hogy a nőkről szóló tanulmányoknak és a feminista tanulmányoknak, mint a tudás modelljeinek és intézményeinek a kialakulása a feminista mozgalomnak köszönhető, rá kell kérdeznünk e viszony történetére és a vele járó belső konfliktusokra. A szóban forgó téma tulajdonképpen nem más, mint az a probléma, hogy ezen a területen miként gondolkodnak elmélet és gyakorlat viszonyáról, melyek összefonódása iránti érzékenység éppen a feminizmus jellemzője, szemben a tudomány művelésének azzal a modelljével, mely a kettő összeférhetetlenségét vallja a tudományos objektivitás és semlegesség nevében.

Sokan úgy vélik, hogy az elméletalkotás a valósághoz való férfias viszonyulás jellemzője, és, mint ilyen, a nők alárendelésének eszköze, mivel a nemek közti egyenlőtlenségeket legitimálja. Mások meggyőződése az, hogy – mivel a tudás hatalom –, a nőknek nem szabad eleve lemondaniuk az elmélet-alkotásról és annak használatáról. Amennyiben az érem másik oldalát is tekintjük, meg kell említenünk, hogy a feministák egy része tudatában van annak a kockázatnak, mely a nőkről szóló tanulmányok politikai elkötelezettségében rejlik. Nevezetesen annak, hogy ez gyanakvást

vált(hat) ki azokban, akik amúgy is úgy gondolják, hogy ez a mezőny anti-intellektuális jellegű és tudománytalan, ami csupán egy lépésre van attól, hogy a nőket ismét az értelem hiányával és irracionalitással azonosítsák. Mindent egybevetve, azok a különbségek, melyek abból fakadnak, hogy ki miként értékeli a feminista elmélet hasznát a gyakorlat szempontjából és fordítva, feszültségeket és szakadékokat teremtenek a feminizmuson belül, még egyszer bizonyítva azt, hogy ez a terület az állandó egyensúlyvesztés és - helyreállítás folyamatain keresztül alakul. A probléma különféle értelmezései közti különbségek alapvetően abból is fakadnak, hogy miként értelmezik, mit jelent az, hogy a tudás hatalmi eszköz. Egyesek számára ez olyan új, a társadalmi nemek közti különbségeknek és egyenlőtlenségeknek a tudatában levő tudományos elméletek kidolgozására utal, amelyek rámutatnak arra (is), hogy miként hozza létre a tudományos diskurzus ezeket, és emellett, az intézményesítés bizonyos szintjén, erősítik az akadémiai szférában dolgozó nők pozícióját, tekintélyét. Másfelől, más összefüggésben, vagy mások számára, a tudásban rejlő hatalom alapvetően a nőknek a tanuláshoz való teljes körű jogát és ennek pozitív következményeit jelenti. A két megközelítés nem zárja ki egymást. Mert a tudás révén felépített valóság fölötti hatalom birtokában, a nőkről szóló tanulmányok bizonyos beszédmódokat legitimálnak a nőkről és a nemek közti kapcsolatokról és növelik a nők esélyét, hogy egy olyan társadalomban éljenek, mely természetesnek, normálisnak tekinti a nemek közti egyenlőség diskurzusát és gyakorlatát.

Különböző nők mindennapi tapasztalatai, valamint a feminista elméletek és gyakorlatok egymást kölcsönösen megerősíthetik, ha kapcsolatuk egy bizonyos magatartásra, az „én" és a „másik" közti bizonyos viszonyulásra épül. Ezt az alábbi képességeknek kellene jellemezniük: a tapasztalatok változatossága iránti tisztelet, a saját előítéletek felismerése és leküzdése, egymás meghallgatása, hierarchiamentes kommunikációs helyzetek

létrehozása, a hatalom építő potenciáljának és nem uralmi jellegének kiaknázása, és végül, de nem utolsó sorban, különböző koalíciók létrehozatala és azokban való részvétel. Ezen elvek gyakorlatba ültetése valójában igen problematikus, hiszen – miként általában a feminizmus – ezek sem az úgynevezett nőiesség természetes velejárói/ meghosszabbításai, hanem tudatosan vállalt opciók olyan környezetben, ahol sokszor úgy tűnik, hogy az agresszivitás, a kizárólagosság, a másik feletti uralom az érvényesülés leghatékonyabb eszközei.

Transznacionális kapcsolatokban gondolkodva

A feminizmus egyik klasszikus elvét képezi az a feltevés, miszerint létezik egyfajta (az egész világot behálózó) női Szolidaritás, amely a nők alárendelt helyzetének egyetemességéből és közös tapasztalataiból fakad. Természetesen, e gondolat hátterében egyrészt a szexuális különbség elsődlegességének eszméje áll (mely szerint ez a legfontosabb különbség, amely a nők életében számít), másrészt pedig az az elképzelés húzódik meg, miszerint a maszkulinitás hatalma a társadalmi autoritás elsődleges forrása. Manapság viszont feminista körökben már senki sem vitatja az identitások és a hatalmi rendszerek sokféleségét, avagy a különböző identitások nevében és különféle társadalmi helyzetekben létrejött különféle feminizmusok legitimitását. Az elemzők egyetértenek abban, hogy ezek értelmezésében lehetetlen különválasztani a „faj”-t a nemtől, a társadalmi nemet a szexualitástól, avagy a férfiasság gyakorlatát a gyarmatosítás politikájától, amiképpen a különféle társadalmi szubjektumok (például „nő”, „színes bőrű”, „bevándorló” stb.) létrehozatalát képtelenség egymástól elszigetelten kezelni, úgy, mintha ezek a különbségek egyszerűen összeadódnának (Wendy Brown, 1997).

Mindent egybevetve, a feminizmus legújabb fejleményei és belső sokszínűsége nem szorítja háttérbe a transznacionális együttműködés elvét; ez továbbra is e terület meghatározó sajátossága marad. Viszont ennek többé nem a természetes női lényeg, avagy az egyetemes női tapasztalat képezi az alapját, hanem azok a konkrét esetek és problémák köré szerveződő pragmatikus koalíciók, amelyeket különböző nők hoznak létre különböző helyzetekben. Ezek a szövetségek állandóan változnak (létrejönnek és felbomlanak) azoktól a kihívásoktól függően, melyekkel a különböző helyeken élő, különböző etnikumú, korosztályú, társadalmi státusú és szexuális orientációjú nőknek meg kell küzdeniük. Ma a Szolidaritás uralkodó narratíváját a női testvériségekről szóló kis történetek cserélik fel. A transznacionális keret pedig arra jó, hogy a világ különböző helyein beszélni lehessen feminizmusról és hogy ezek a beszédek partneri viszonyban kommunikáljanak egymással (Inderpal Grewal és Caren Kaplan, 1994). A „Talking Feminist Institutions" című könyv a maga módján ebben a folyamatban akar részt venni.

CĂLĂTORIND PRINTRE FEMINISME ACADEMICE*

Această carte s-a datorat şansei mele de a călători în sens propriu şi figurat şi de a întâlni gazde fermecătoare... ele sunt adevăratele ei autoare. Este oglinda unei expediţii feministe, care a implicat cunoaşterea celuilalt şi reflecţia de sine…a căror beneficiare am fost în primul rând eu, dar care, obiectivându-se în această carte, poate deveni un punct de reper în instituţionalizarea studiilor feministe de acasă.

---

* *Autoarea este conferenţiar la Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai din Cluj, România şi coordonează Grupul Interdisciplinar pentru Studii de Gen. Predă şi publică în domeniul antropologiei culturale şi feminism, politică identitară şi naţionalism. În domeniul studiilor de gen a publicat recent cartea* Diferenţa care contează. Diversitatea social-culturală prin lentila antropologiei feministe, *Cluj: Desire, 2002; a co-editat volumele* Women and Men in East European Transition *(Femei şi bărbaţi în tranziţia Est-Europeană), Cluj: EFES, 1997, şi* Prezenţe feminine. Studii despre femei în România *(Cluj: Desire, 2002); a fost coordonatoarea cercetării şi cărţii de trei volume* intitulate Femei şi bărbaţi în Clujul multietnic *(Cluj: Desire, 2001). Călătoria de-a lungul căreia a realizat interviurile în februarie 2001 a fost posibilă datorită bursei Higher Education Support Program pentru dezvoltare curriculară şi structurală în domeniul studiilor de gen la Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai.*

Pornind de la accentuarea semnificației personale a călătoriei printre feminisme academice, această prefață se încheie prin a susține nevoia de participare în alianțe transnaționale. Care altă paradigmă ar putea oferi o perspectivă mai largă asupra realității sociale, de la personal la internațional, sau de la local la global? Ori de la fundamente disciplinare la abordări multidisciplinare? Ori de la producția cunoaşterii la acțiune politică, de la critică la autocritică şi retur? Feminismul este cu siguranță una dintre cele mai bune companii în astfel de voiaje. Cartea de față doreşte să prezinte această dinamică complexă prin împărtăşirea experienței unor actori principali de pe scena academică europeană. Îşi asumă totodată rolul de a înlesni o privire asupra modurilor în care concentrarea permanent transfigurată a feminismului asupra funcționării realității genizate este corelată cu efortul de a transforma societatea într-un spațiu mai primitor, dar nicidecum omogen, un loc unde diferențele sunt recunoscute şi depăşite în acelaşi timp.

Cartea „Talking Feminist Institutions" vorbeşte despre relațiile de putere din interiorul şi din afara sferei academice. Despre regimuri de putere inerente practicilor discursive şi sociale, care structurează gândirea şi acțiunea noastră atât în viața cotidiană cât şi în producția ştiințifică. Despre ordini de gen saturate de tot felul de inegalități şi sisteme de opresiune suprapuse, în care unele persoane sunt situate în poziții subiect subordonate. Şi, în cele din urmă, ne arată modul în care feminismul intervine eficient în toate aceastea, creând punți între diferențe şi transformând practicile sociale hegemonice, precum şi conceptele culturale ce stau la baza lor. „Talking Feminist Institutions" afirmă puterea şi responsabilitatea conexă a feminismului academic instituționalizat.

Constituind legături între experiențe (academice) feministe

Sunt multe de învățat din experiențele împărtășite în interviurile publicate în acest volum, realisate cu specialişti europeni de prim rang. Fiind implicate în cercetare şi în învățământul superior în domeniul studiilor feministe din Olanda şi Marea Britanie, ele au totodată roluri importante în coordonarea programelor de *Women's Studies* la nivel local şi internațional şi au o vastă experiență de viață în transgresarea frontierelor de toate tipurile. Întâlnirea cu ele, faptul de a fi reuşit să le conving să accepte rugămintea mea de a vorbi despre munca lor, precum şi transformarea mea într-un fel de curier, care aduce experiențele străine acasă, toate acestea au reprezentat pentru mine, începătoare în acest domeniu, o şansă şi o provocare uriaşă. Ele sunt adevăratele autoare ale acestei cărți. Este şi motivul pentru care respectul şi mulțumirile mele sunt în mod repetat adresate lor, pentru faptul că mi-au dat posibilitatea de a deveni un fel de mesager care construieşte poduri între povestirile lor. Această carte s-a datorat şansei mele de a călători şi de a întâlni gazde fermecătoare care au creat un mediu prietenos, propice discuțiilor. Ea este oglinda unei expediții feministe, pentru că a implicat cunoaşterea celuilalt şi reflecția de sine. La baza ei stă o călătorie a cărei beneficiară în primul rând am fost eu, dar care, obiectivându-se în această carte, poate deveni un punct de reper în instituționalizarea studiilor feministe de acasă.

Pentru mine, membră a unei minorități etnice din România, „acasă" reprezintă o poziție intermediară. Dar, în acest caz, semnifică efortul de a da un instrument de lucru atât cercetătorilor din Ungaria, cât şi din România. Această autopoziționare nu înseamnă că identificarea etnică este primordială în propria mea definire. Dar semnalează conştientizarea faptului că sunt o persoană situată într-o zonă de frontieră şi că munca mea are anumite particularități datorită tocmai acestui fapt, cum ar fi, printre altele, limba în care scriu sau publicul căruia mă adresez, şi/ sau direcțiile din care mă pot aştepta la reacții sau recunoaştere. Această călătorie printre feminisme mi-a atras atenția asupra semnificațiilor stării de a fi acasă

fără a avea un cămin fizic propriu-zis, asupra importanței parteneriatelor transnaționale şi a transcederii spațiilor, care limitează. Paragrafele de mai jos exprimă succint ce înseamnă să fii împreună, să împărtăşeşti anumite convingeri dincolo şi dincoace de granițele naționale. Fragmentele parafrazate din interviuri scot în evidență idei şi strategii legate de producția cunoaşterii feministe şi instituționalizării academice.

Studiile feministe constituie un domeniu care face diferența, vrea să schimbe regulile jocului, să pună sub semnul întrebării interesele investite în îmbinarea cunoaşterii cu relațiile de putere, şi, în cele din urmă, stă în legătură cu diverse provocări şi cu subminarea status quo-ului. (Rosi Braidotti)

Agenda politică a studiilor despre masculinitate şi homosexualitate este de a arăta că trăim cu toții într-o temniță ideologică care presupune că există lucruri ca masculinitate, feminitate, homosexualitate şi heterosexualitate. Această agendă trebuie să țintească egalitatea de gen şi să ia în considerare impactul, pe care anumite construcții ale masculinității le au sau le-au avut în cursul istoriei asupra femeilor. (Stefan Dudink)

*Studiile feministe se situează pe granița dintre cercetare şi factorii de decizie politică şi/ sau activişti ai societății civile. Pentru că lumea întreagă este construită pe baza inegalității de gen, răspândirea şi acceptarea perspectivei „*gender mainstreaming*" este un proiect care vrea să transforme lumea în totalitatea ei.* (Mieke Verlo)

Ideea conform căreia cunoaşterea ştiințifică nu este o descoperire, ci mai degrabă o creație, un produs dependent de situații particulare, de timp şi de loc, încetul cu încetul s-a impus în ştiințele feministe ale naturii. A devenit important să se arate cum funcționează această dependență şi că ştiința nu numai reproduce, ci produce genul. Asta a însemnat o adevărată revoluție epistemologică. (Ineke Klinge)

Multiculturalismul, în accepțiune feministă, înseamnă recunoaşterea importanței comunicării dintre oameni şi a reflecției asupra sinelui, pentru că feminismul doreşte să (re)construiască relațiile sociale ca interacțiuni în care fiecare parte este gata s-o asculte pe cealaltă şi totodată să-şi exploreze sinele. (Marjolein Verboom)

Un centru de informare pentru femei înseamnă producerea şi difuzarea acelor informații care îmbunătățesc statutul femeii. Iată motivul pentru care şi cercetarea este un mijloc prin care indivizii devin mai puternici. (Lin McDevitt-Pugh)

Într-o universitate conservatoare, o universitate axată pe discipline, orice inițiativă cu caracter interdisciplinar, ca de exemplu „women's studies", este privit cu suspiciune. Modul de organisare a unei astfel de instituții este greu de schimbat, aici este foarte dificil să înlături structurile disciplinare existente şi să impui un alt mod de organisare. (Joyce Outshoorn)

Suportul instituțional pentru studiile feministe rămâne în urmă față de nivelul real al activității şi de recunoaşterea internațională de care se bucură cercetătorii din acest domeniu. Aceasta este o experiență comună în mai multe țări, pentru că există o opinie larg răspândită conform căreia studiile respective nu ar fi o ştiință „autentică". Dar această poziție ignoră faptul că azi există deja un corp de teorii consacrate în fiecare teritoriu al acestui câmp disciplinar. (Barbara Einhorn)

La cursurile mele oferite celor care au abandonat şcoala în adolescență, iar acum se înscriu la universitate (printre care sunt multe femei) vorbesc despre femei ca agenți ai schimbării în istorie şi încerc să le fac să se simtă în largul lor. Discuțiile despre narațiunile de viață, de exemplu – în cadrul cărora fiecare poate să facă apel la propria-i experiență

pentru înțelegerea realității sociale – le dă capacitatea de a privi experiența proprie drept ceva valoros. (Gerry Holloway)

Multe femei ar spune că peste tot în Europa occidentală femeile sunt subreprezentate în domeniul ştiinței, mai ales la nivelurile mai înalte. Dar trebuie să ne referim şi la femeile care ocupă funcții în administrația universității, dar care nu doresc să se gândească la aceste lucruri şi de fapt se opun studiilor feministe. (Carol Kedward)

Mulți consideră contradictorie relația dintre antropologie şi feminism, pentru că cele două definesc alteritatea în mod diferit. Pentru antropologie, „Celălalt" este cultura pe care vrea s-o înțeleagă, în timp ce pentru feminism bărbatul este „Celălalt". Feminismul trebuie să lupte încontinuu împotriva marginalizării şi dominării femeilor, el înseamnă mai mult decât utilizarea genului drept categorie analitică. (Maya Unnithan)

Dar, desigur, feminismul academic nu constă doar din idei, practici şi experiențe împărtăşite în legătură cu producerea şi diseminarea cunoaşterii. El include dezbateri, tensiuni, şi, de ce nu, jocuri ale puterii între cei dinăuntrul său. În paragrafele următoare, Prefața subliniază câteva din aspectele din urmă, care, de fapt, constituie resursele de regenerare continuă a unui domeniu ce întotdeauna reuşeşte să refacă echilibrul dintre diferențele şi similitudinile interne, dintre diversitate şi împărtăşire.

Instituționalizarea studiilor feministe între integrare şi autonomie

Strategiile instituționale orientate spre dezvoltarea unei discipline sunt înscrise într-un anumit context în fiecare caz (şi feminismul nu este o excepție în această privință), ele depind de un anumit moment istoric şi mediu social-politic. Curricula studiilor

despre femeii, studiilor de gen şi studiilor feministe diferă de la o instituţie la alta în funcţie de organisarea administrativă şi de potenţialul de predare a cursurilor în facultăţi. În altă ordine de idei, strategiile prin care se introduc aceste cursuri trebuie să fie definite în concordanţă cu însuşirile sistemului academic în care doresc să se integreze şi/sau în faţa căreia încearcă să-şi menţină autonomia.

Dezbaterea în jurul problemei de autonomie/integrare este una dintre cele mai importante capitole ale studiilor feministe (G. Bowles şi R. Duelli Klein, 1989) şi se referă la strategiile de promovare ale acestora în academie. Integrarea reprezintă includerea perspectivei femeilor în diferite discipline şi programe/ departamente universitare existente, dar înseamnă totodată creşterea sensibilităţii faţă de dimensiunea de gen în toate problemele abordate. Este o strategie care urmăreşte să transforme instituţia patriarhală din interior. Contra-argumentul adus acesteia subliniază riscul diluării potenţialului radical al feminismului în cazul integrării sale într-un mediu conservator. Opţiunea autonomistă asigură programe independente, un spaţiu în care diversele tipuri de feminisme pot purta un dialog activ între ele şi deţin controlul asupra resurselor materiale şi umane, precum şi asupra producerii cunoaşterii. Este un mod de a construi o nouă disciplină, o nouă structură care provoacă organisarea tradiţională, pe departamente, a universităţii. Ghettoizarea, riscul de a fi categorizat ca „*man haters*" este argumentul adus împotriva acestei strategii.

În cele din urmă, dezbaterea relevă diferenţa dintre diversele concepţii despre modul cel mai eficient de a induce o schimbare feministă în spaţiul academic. Dar ea – recunoscând diversitatea feministă în termenii diferenţelor între femei aparţinând unor grupuri etnice sau de orientare sexuală diferite – are în vedere şi modul în care feminismul „alb", „de culoare", „lesbian", cel al „lumii a treia" etc. pot fi integrate. În final, miza este de a deveni important şi relevant în sfera academică, de a consolida credibilitatea, respectul

şi acceptarea feminismului, dar fără a pierde acea marginalitate, ce-i conferă posibilitatea adoptării unei poziții critice.

Indiferent de strategia pentru care se optează sau de combinația în care aceste studii prind viață, principala direcție de urmat în procesul de instituționalizare în contextul academic şi cel social-politic mai larg este de a conferi putere cunoaşterii feministe şi producătorilor ei; de a creşte numărul femeilor în sfera academică, de a contribui la promovarea lor în poziții de decizie, de a crea un spațiu deschis femeilor şi bărbaților care promovează sensibilitatea feministă şi transformarea modului tradițional de disciplinare a expertizei ştiințifice.

De la critică la crearea unei noi cunoaşteri, şi retur

Cunoaşterea feministă situează femeia în centrul analizelor sale, sau mai precis, ea îşi concentrează atenția asupra relațiilor de putere din perspectiva celor subordonați/ oprimați. În acelaşi timp se află în căutarea modalităților în care construcțiile genizate ale pozițiilor şi experiențelor subiectului social perpetuează inegalitățile.

Observând introducerea feminismului în diferite discipline (de exemplu Victoria Robertson, 1993: 5) se poate descoperi că acest proces începe de regulă cu „etapa integrării". Scopul acesteia este includerea „femeii" printre subiectele cunoaşterii, eliminarea lacunelor şi divulgarea tăcerii în legătură cu anumite fenomene, despre care se presupune că nu au relevanță în raport cu probleme considerate a fi universale ale omului, dar care, de fapt, sunt legate de roluri, activități, valori etc. masculine. Reforma feministă continuă de obicei cu „etapa separării", cu elaborarea de noi teorii despre femei şi/sau identități şi relații de gen, ordini de gen şi regimuri de putere, despre felul în care acestea operează atât în viața socială cât şi în producția ştiințifică. Aceasta reprezintă o turnură de la critica părtinirii masculine (*male bias*) (care ascunde, reduce la tăcere,

domină, distorsionează experiența femeii văzută ca „Celălalt") spre afirmarea perspectivei femeii, care repune în drepturi demnitatea şi mândria de a fi diferit. Acest proces este completat la un moment dat de o intreprindere autocritică, de permanenta reconsiderare a ceea ce înseamnă exact „perspectiva feminină", de o critică a felului în care este construită cunoaşterea feministă, şi a modului în care aceasta conduce la diferențe interne. În finalul acestui lung proces se presupune că s-ar ajunge la „etapa revoluționară" în care critica şi teoria feministă devin larg răspândite şi acceptate, situație în care se realisează scopul de a influența eficient sfera academică în totalitatea ei. Este evident că aceste etape se pot suprapune, şi atingerea scopurilor finale nu se realisează niciodată, deoarece criticismul feminist este caracterizat prin voința de a respinge orice structură care opune rezistență în fața schimbării.

Feminismul este totodată, conform opiniei mai multor cercetători, o critică a cunoaşterii care – în termenii aşa-numitei obiectivități – nu recunoaşte şi nu validează diversitatea experienței genizate. El devine astfel partener în toate încercările epistemologice care deconspiră falsa universalitate sau neutralitatea ipocrită a cunoaşterii ştiințifice. Arată că disciplinele insensibile la dimensiunea de gen transformă de fapt experiența masculină în universala experiență umană, iar neangajarea în problemele extra-academice nu este altceva decât o acceptare tacită a *status-quo*-ului masculinist. Pe scurt, feminismul este un proiect care deconstruieşte relațiile de putere inerente producerii şi diseminării cunoaşterii, dar este şi o modalitate de a face lucrurile în mod diferit, radical diferit şi în acest spațiu al vieții. De aceea Elisabeth Minnich (1988) afirmă că feminismul scutură din temelii androcentrismul aşa cum teoriile lui Copernic şi Darwin au zguduit teoria geocentrică, respectiv teoria centrată pe analiza speciei.

Miza acestor abordări legate de contribuția feminismului la cunoaşterea ştiințifică se regăseşte şi în politica denumirii, ca parte a strategiilor de poziționare în sfera academică. Prin argumentele lor,

mai mulți cercetători afirmă că feminismul este mai mult decât simpla adăugare a femeilor pe lista de subiecte despre care trebuie să se ştie în diferite discipline, şi că el nu se reduce pur şi simplu la recunoaşterea faptului că genul este unul dintre factorii care structurează viața indivizilor şi relațiile sociale. Pentru că, după cum am menționat deja, feminismul academic scoate în evidență relațiile de putere dintre femei şi bărbați inerente oricărei situații date, incluzând aici şi producerea cunoaşterii, şi abordează şi schimbă ordini existente din perspectiva subiecților sociali subordonați. Iată motivul pentru care critica feministă este considerată incomodă, iar academia are instrumente multiple pentru a o marginaliza în diferite moduri, susținând cu ipocrizie că, printre altele, lumea universității şi/ sau a ştiinței este liberă de politic. Acesta este şi motivul pentru care unii aleg denumirea aparent mai neutră de „studii de gen" pentru programele lor, ceea ce nu înseamnă neapărat, dar ar putea însemna, utilizarea potențialului teoretic, metodologic şi politic al feminismului. Dar, pe de altă parte, chiar dacă unii utilizează termenul de „feminism" ca autodefinire, acesta poate desemna în mod evident orientări diferite şi perspective foarte diverse asupra modului de funcționare a puterii şi a creării subiectului social, precum şi asupra felului în care se explică de ce, când, unde şi care femei sunt situate în poziții subordonate. Pentru că, pentru unii, puterea masculină este ceva deținut de anumiți indivizi sau grupuri şi îndreptată împotriva femeilor, iar pentru alții este ceva care circulă prin subiectul supus reglementărilor, este mediul însuşi prin care subiectul social este creat (Wendy Brown, 1997).

Relația tensionată dintre teoria şi practica feministă

Dacă suntem conştienți de faptul că studiul despre femei şi studiile feministe ca instituții şi paradigme ale cunoaşterii au devenit posibile (cel puțin în contextul occidental) datorită mişcării femeilor

şi ale celor feministe, trebuie în mod evident să privim evoluţia şi conflictele inerente ale acestei relaţii. Chestiunea se transpune şi în problema modului în care, în studiul despre femei, se realisează legătura dintre teorie şi practică, aceasta fiind una din caracteristicile domeniului, deosebindu-l de sfera academică tradiţională net deconectată de lumea exterioară.

Unii consideră că teoretizarea este un mod masculin de a privi realitatea, şi teoriile masculiniste au fost folosite împotriva femeilor în validarea inegalităţii de gen. Alţii în schimb sunt convinşi de faptul că, cunoaşterea teoretică este o formă a puterii şi trebuie folosită de femei ca atare (G. Bowles şi R. Duelli Klein, 1989). Având în vedere şi reversul medaliei, amintim că unele feministe sunt conştiente de riscurile pe care le are angajamentul politic al studiilor despre femei, pentru că acesta induce suspiciune în rândul unor cercetători faţă de presupusul caracter non- sau anti-intelectual al acestui domeniu, ceea ce este la un pas de o nouă identificare a femeii cu lipsa intelectului sau cu iraţionalitatea (Wendy Brown, 1997). Diferenţele existente în înţelegerea utilităţii teoriei din punctul de vedere al practicii feministe şi invers, generează tensiuni şi rupturi în interiorul feminismului, demonstrând încă o dată în plus că acest domeniu se dezvoltă prin producerea permanentă a unor dezechilibre şi prin refacerea echilibrului. Este cert că deosebirile în înţelegerea problemei se datorează (şi) diferenţelor în interpretarea „cunoaşterii" ca instrument de putere. Pentru că aceasta poate însemna teoria înaltă, producerea căreia este în măsură să consolideze poziţia femeilor intelectuale în disciplinele şi contextele ştiinţifice de care aparţin. Dar ea poate reprezenta evidenţierea importanţei accesului deplin a fetelor şi femeilor la educaţie şi, ceea ce este mai important, la puterea pe care cunoaşterea o asigură în societatea contemporană. Cu toate acestea cele două interpretări nu se exclud. Prin deţinerea puterii discursive/ simbolice de constituire a realităţii, prin producerea cunoaşterii, studiul despre femei legitimează anumite discursuri şi practici despre femei şi relaţii de

gen, şi, în acest fel, măreşte şansa (şi) altor femei de a trăi într-o lume în care egalitatea de gen se consideră a fi o normalitate.

Experienţele cotidiene trăite de femei diferite, precum şi teoriile şi practicile feministe au posibilitatea de a se întări reciproc, dacă legăturile dintre ele sunt formate de o anumită raportare la „unul" şi la „celălalt". Aceasta este caracterizată de aptitudini precum respectarea diversităţii experienţei feminine, lupta împotriva propriilor prejudecăţi, ascultarea celeilalte/ celuilalt, crearea unor forme de comunicare nonierarhice, utilizarea potenţialului creator al puterii şi nu a capacităţii sale de dominare/ distrugere şi, în cele din urmă, formarea unor coaliţii. În realitate, însă, toate principiile amintite sunt dificil de pus în practică. Pentru că, aşa cum se întâmplă şi cu feminismul, aceste strategii nu sunt consecinţele naturale ale feminităţii, ci opţiuni alese în mod conştient în medii sociale în care, de multe ori, agresivitatea, exclusivismul, dominarea celuilalt par a fi instrumentele cele mai eficiente pentru atingerea scopurilor.

Gândind prin conexiuni transnaţionale

Una din ideile clasice ale feminismului o constituie presupunerea că trebuie să existe o solidaritate (globală) a femeilor bazată pe caracterul universal al poziţiei lor subordonate şi pe experienţele lor împărtăşite. Evident, la baza acestei convingeri găsim noţiunea de diferenţă sexuală gândită ca diferenţa esenţială care contează, precum şi conceptul de putere masculină ca dimensiunea primordială a autorităţii. În prezent însă nimeni din cercurile feministe nu mai contestă ideea identităţilor şi regimurilor de putere multiple, sau legitimitatea feminismelor de diverse feluri axate pe identităţi şi poziţii sociale diferite în numele cărora se definesc. Este important de subliniat acordul analiştilor în legătură cu faptul, că tratarea separată a „rasei"/ etnicităţii de gen, sau a

genului de sexualitate sau a masculinității de colonialism este imposibilă, iar diferitele modalități de formare a subiectului social nu pot fi abordate într-un mod aditiv (Wendy Brown, 1997).

Cu toate acestea, evoluțiile recente şi diversitatea internă a feminismului nu înlătură principiul cooperării transnaționale din statutul de caracteristică principală a domeniului. Însă acesta nu mai este perceput ca având la bază esențe naturale feminine şi/sau experiențe feminine universal împărtăşite, ci este gândit şi practicat ca o paletă largă de coaliții (pragmatice) construite în jurul unor probleme şi cazuri concrete şi remodelate în permanență în funcție de provocările ce trebuie soluționate de femeile din locuri diferite, aparținând unor grupuri etnice diferite, de vârstă, poziție socială şi orientare sexuală diferită. În prezent, narativa dominantă a solidarității cedează locul micilor povestiri despre diverse surorități (*sisterhood*). Iar cadrul transnațional este evocat în diverse locuri de pe mapamond în dezbaterile despre feminism (Inderpal Grewal şi Caren Kaplan, 1994). Cartea *Talking Feminist Institutions* doreşte să se alăture acestui proces.

REFERENCES CITED/
IDÉZETT IRODALOM/
BIBLIOGRAFIA CITATĂ

Bowles, Gloria and Renate Duelli Klein: „Introduction: Theories of Women's Studies and the Autonomy/Integration Debate", in *Theories of Women's Studies*, edited by Gloria Bowles and Renate Duelli Klein, Routledge, 1989: 1-27

Brown, Wendy: „The Impossibility of Women's Studies", in *Differences*, Volume 9, Nr.3, Fall 1997

Grewal, Inderpal – Caren Kaplan (eds.): *Scattered Hegemonies. Post-modernity and Transnational Feminist Practices*, University of Minnesota Press, 1994

Minnich, Elizabeth, O'Barr and Rosenfeld (eds.): *Reconstructing the Academy: Women's Education and Women's Studies,* University of Chicago Press, 1988

Robinson, Victoria: „Introducing Women's Studies", in *Introduction into Women's Studies*, edited by V. Robinson and D. Richardson, second edition, MacMillan, 1997 (1993): 1-26

INTRODUCING THE INTERVIEWS

„Talking Feminist Institutions" is a book about scholars *talking on* the academic institutionalisation of feminism. It is meant to prove that feminist institutions as texts are *talking about* the larger academic and social-political environment. The book is a dialogue initiated by an Eastern European scholar *talking to* representatives of (Western) feminist institutions, and thus establishing a dialogue and entering hopefully long-lasting partnerships. Eventually, it is a personal way of *talking with* the „other", while referring to „us", i.e. of considering the need of feminism in the (Romanian) academia in the light of several (institutional and personal) experiences across borders.

This volume is the result of research on (academic) feminism, based on some of the intrinsic methods of feminist inquiry, and resulting in a situated and accountable knowledge about feminist institutions, discourses and power, viewed from the perspective of the insiders' experiences.

The fieldwork consisted of interviews taken in February 2001, with scholars from The Netherlands and Great Britain during my visits to several universities and organisations in those countries. Besides the recorded interviews, it included quite a few informal discussions with faculty, students and staff, participation on courses, seminars and meetings, library and Internet documentation. As a rule, but even more strongly in this case, fieldwork was not only a procedure of learning, but one of exchanging ideas and feelings as well. Ultimately, it was a process of empowering, which, on the

whole, functioned not in the more common way, from the researcher to the researched, but, on the contrary, from „them" to me, an Eastern European feminist (anthropologist) in the process of making, committed to the introduction of feminism into her own discipline and into the local academic structures.

The analytic course of the research based on the participation and dialogue established „there" was completed both on the field and at home, in the process of writing, by a self-reflection fulfilled with a conceptual and desired positioning. In a way, the whole research and the resulting book was part of a politics of location, aimed at placing myself – my personal and institutional work – in local and global partnerships that transcend linguistic, ethnic, national, and disciplinary boundaries.

The volume is structured in three chapters. Each one includes interviews, which offer a lot of details about several aspects of practising feminism in European universities, about the ways in which feminist knowledge is produced in different disciplines, and, last, but not least, about the importance of creating spaces that are inclusive in terms of gender, sexual orientation, class and ethnicity. Nevertheless, in order to highlight these aspects of institution building and knowledge production, I assembled the texts in the following chapters: „Feminist Studies – What Difference Does it Make?", „Producing Feminist Knowledge", and „Spaces of Inclusion". As a whole, all the sections mirror the differences and similarities between the ways in which the different social and political environments of the institutions, the profile of the various disciplines and the personal experiences of the interviewed scholars are shaping our field and – in their turn – are transformed by feminism.

CHAPTER I

FEMINIST STUDIES – WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES IT MAKE?

WOMEN'S STUDIES AS A POLITICS OF DIFFERENCE

The Dutch state institutionalises the radicals, and, in this way, it makes them less radical ... but the institutionalisation of Women's Studies is not a smooth process of integration of women's perspective into the academic structure.

ROSI BRAIDOTTI

CENTERING ON GENDER EQUALITY WORLDWIDE

Feminism is about recognising difference, acknowledging and respecting difference, even celebrating difference, but also about trying, beyond that, to work together, not eliminating, but transcending differences in order to work towards the creation of societies - and indeed a world - characterised by gender equality.

BARBARA EINHORN

ON THE BRIDGE BETWEEN SCIENCE AND POLICY MAKING

I cannot invent anything or adopt anything at the policy-level without a better understanding of it… the main idea of gender mainstreaming is that we would like to see the world to change, because the whole world is constructed around and is based upon gender inequality.

MIEKE VERLOO

ORGANISING ACROSS DISCIPLINARY BOUNDARIES

Gender, race and class, all of them are absolutely integral in helping students both understand the social world in which they will be going to work, but also enabling them to go out and practice in a way that combats sexism and racism and homophobia

CAROL KEDWARD

WOMEN'S STUDIES AS A POLITICS OF DIFFERENCE

The Dutch state institutionalises the radicals, and, in this way, it makes them less radical ... but the institutionalisation of Women's Studies is not a smooth process of integration of women's perspective into the academic structure.

ROSI BRAIDOTTI*

E.M.V. Let me introduce you as one of the most prominent and productive feminist theoreticians in Europe, having a huge

* *Dr. Rosi Braidotti is professor of women's studies in the Arts Faculty of Utrecht University and scientific director of the Netherlands Research School of Women's Studies. She co-ordinates ATHENA, the European Thematic Network of Women's Studies for the European Commission's SOCRATES programme, as well as the NOISE inter-European University exchange programme. Her publications include:* Metamorphoses. Toward a Materialistic Theory of Becoming, *Cambridge, Polity Press 2002;* Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference, *New York, Columbia University Press 1994;* Women, the Environment and Sustainable Development: towards a Theoretical Synthesis *(together with Sabine Hausler, Ewa Pluta and Saskia Wieringa); and* Patterns of Dissonance: a Study of Women in Contemporary Philosophy, *Polity Press/ Routledge, 1991. Her work has been translated in several languages. She has published extensively in feminist philosophy, epistemology, poststructuralism and psychoanalysis. She serves as an advisor to the journals: Signs, Differences, Feminist Theory and The European Journal of Women's Studies. She is currently concentrating her philosophical research on the concept of difference and the notion of 'Europe'.*

amount of work done in the domain of Women's Studies both as an individual scholar, and as a leader of many Dutch and European networks and institutions.

I would like to start our discussion with mentioning that the Netherlands is a country where feminism has a high level of institutionalisation, and as I could learn from your article on Women's Studies and politics of difference, the institutionalisation of feminism is a political and epistemological issue. Please do comment on this a little bit, especially on how these two dimensions are interconnected?

R.B. Difficult question, of course … As you know, I am not Dutch, I am very much of a guest in this country, which is a very privileged one. I am not complaining, but it does make a difference. I do not come from the Dutch political history and I was never a militant feminist of this movement, I have known other European movements, most of the French, and the Italian directly, more than I have ever heard the Dutch. So that is a very important thing because I would have a different reading even of the situation of Dutch women. On the one hand you have a very high degree of institutionalisation of all the emancipation practices and courses like Women's Studies, but, on the other hand, in the Dutch society women have a relatively traditional role in so far as they are both emancipated and basically not very present on the labour market, in the public sphere, in the decision making processes. This is the famous socio-democratic model of emancipation without much real power in society. And insufficient power is a situation without power ... Is a paradoxical situation. And this paradox enfranchises the process of institutionalisation and the shapes that it has taken here.

This is a country of well-fare from way back, with a very benevolent social-democratic state, that has always worked in a sense from the bottom up, so as to listen very carefully to what the streets said, to what the request of the people were and then try to

comply. It is also an exceptionally small, homogenous and extremely wealthy, very well-organised society and that makes this type of democratic participation really possible, in a way that larger, culturally more heterogeneous and economically less developed countries even within Europe simply could not compare with.

The institutionalisation process carries the mark of the structuralist type of state organisation, where listening to the city squares, to the streets, to the citizens is part of what they do, and where the political representation is also a way of building consensus. This is a culture of consensus, where social peace is purchased through a very equitable distribution of income through taxation, is the country where taxation is really the basis of citizenship. One may observe that the legalization of prostitution, of drugs, and so on, both rest and build on tax equality, because this kind of equality is the basis for solving the problems.

So there is a civil society approach towards building consensus, this is a way of taking the aggressive edge out of politics, which is been at the centre of this institutionalisation processes. The Dutch state institutionalises the radicals, and, in this way, it makes them less radical, because by going into the institutions, you end up working for the institutions, renewing them, changing them. I do think that the Dutch university system is incredibly up to date and very aware of its role in today's world. It is fighting very hard to prevent the collapse of the university system and the coming of commercial education, at the same time it shakes up the inertia and some of the protectionism that university professors, academics, have always benefited from, forcing us to be a little bit more socially relevant and more economically competitive. It is a very good system, which tries to strike a balance; it is the famous Dutch compromise.

With these premises in mind, the institutionalisation of Women's Studies takes the form of bringing into government the knowledge produced at the universities (and for that matter every

aspect of the socio-political life); but it also expresses a demand for radical transformations that go with it, the demand of social justice imposed by feminism.

This is a practice located somewhere between standpoint feminism, if you wish, and a postmodernist awareness according to which the rules of the games have to change if you want the women to really make a contribution. You cannot just let the women in; this is a starting point, but you need a lot more to really make a change. You need to elaborate ways to systematize or canonize our knowledge and also communicate or transmit it to different actors, including governments. This strategy would make possible that social policies would go in our way, so to speak.

In our domain there is a lot of bridge making between the academic world, where knowledge is systematized, produced, evaluated, and the world of policy-making. People like Joyce Outshoorn, my colleague in Leiden, has been adviser to governmental institutions for most of her life, giving suggestions of how to make policies better. That is a part of consultative democracy in the northern European socio-democratic model. My impression is that the high level of institutionalisation, of course, means a transformation or a reduction of the level of extremism and radicalism of our youth, so we might be much more realistic and pragmatic then we were when we started our fights in the 1970s.

That is how I could link the production of knowledge to the presence in the institutions. In a sense this kind of knowledge produced within institutions is never the most radical, it is the knowledge that could be heard and on which some consensus could be built for the community. That is always something in the middle of the road, in some ways.

E.M.V. You were also mentioning that Women's Studies is a politics of difference. Let me ask you to comment on what is this politics about, which are its main aims and features?

R.B. I would use very much my own definition. This will not be consensual out of my colleagues in Women's Studies. I do think that this field is about making a difference; I think it is about changing the rules of the game, about questioning the vested interests that make the production of knowledge connected to power games and to power relations. I think it is related to a number of challenges and questioning of the *status quo*. I do not think it is a smooth process of integration of women's perspectives into the academic structure.

The academic structure has been male dominated in the universities from classical Greek times until yesterday, and I mean the presence of women at the high levels of education is still minimal. Moreover, even if empirical women are present, the worldview that we give, the reading of cultural history and the development of sciences we produce, is completely resting on male assumptions as if women had been peripheral to the whole exercise. At best we think in masculine ways, although sometimes we may be physical women. Thinking through our mothers, as Virginia Woolf said, it is still a long way away…

Thinking through your experience as a woman, thinking through the women writers, the women scholars and through the experience of simple nameless women, gives you altogether a different picture about reality. One should ask what happens if he/she starts to think about any people, about social structure, about the contemporary global economy, or about fascism in Europe, or about 1989, and about the unification of Europe, while putting a woman at the centre. That is exactly what we do deliberately in Women's Studies: we want to look at the world putting a woman at the centre. Why? Because that never happened: she was always on the margins. The production of knowledge creates our understanding of the human subject. It is unjust if through the production of knowledge the „human" is implicitly conceptualised as white, male, heterosexual, and European. It is clear that this is

how the traditional knowledge defines „the human", and everything else is reduced to difference.

So we start from difference, we start from the other… We want to see what reality looks like, if you put a woman as the starting point. Of course, as you know, this is very controversial, because people say „Aha, what do you mean by that…. it is so particular, so specific, so relativistic to put your own little point of view at the centre, when the human being is universal…". Due to the universalistic pretensions, „the human being" is an inflation of the male ego. People far more important than myself, like Freud, and Nietzsche, have declared this, over a century ago. They said, in a much more eloquent way than I ever could, that feminism joins with modernity in criticizing this fake universalism and saying that there are particular realities, which need to be voiced.

The tragedy of the European university system as a whole, and that includes both East and West, is exactly its attachment to this fake universalism, which comes from the nineteenth century: the Van Humboldt university model, the Germanic model, which upholds the view of the Hegelian global universal intellectual, who is supposed to have the answers for all questions. That is the kind of historical angle, which we absolutely need to cast away in order to move on with a very different definition of what the function of a teacher, of a university professor should be today. A radical reform is needed, in order to shake up these vested interests, which have always constructed the university structure. They defend hidden identities, whether it is masculinity or national identity, national treasure, or national specificity. This is not the scholarship we need in the third millennium. Instead of it we need an open, internationally reoriented, accountable and competitive, dialogical confrontation between different perspectives.

I think that for this reason university needs the impact of feminism, but you can put any other social movement into the scheme, the youth culture, the new technologies, the ecological

movements, the peace movements… If one decides that he/ she wants to take them in, should have to redesign the structures of the university up to a point. The interesting thing about working in the European Union today is that everybody is aware that you need to restructure the university. So we are not longer the radicals, we are in fact the social planners and we are the people with a vision to offer at a time when we know that the university is not functioning. It is the case, in fact, that too many of our graduates are unemployed, we are not competitive enough, most of the research is done in the private sector, from cancer research to the new technologies, and the university cannot compete, we have lost fundamental research, so we are left with the human and social sciences, defending some hypothetical idea of national identity. In this context, we critical thinkers really have a wealth of resources to bring in, but bringing them in requires questioning to a certain extent the structures. I think that the smart institutions of the states, and I am thinking of the social democracies of Northern Europe, use our energy to redefine the university. But what is at stake? It is a different model altogether, and not just integrating a few points of view from a few women.

E.M.V. In your work you define yourself as a sexual difference theorist, what does this mean?

R.B. I want very much to develop the European traditions in feminist research, in feminist studies and they are very and many and very diverse. But there is a tradition throughout Europe of thinking through the body, of taking sexuality seriously, of assuming that emotions and affectivity are part of what is a human being, you may call it a humanism, if you want it, even in the Marxist variation of it, because there is a Marxist humanism as well… that tradition, I think, is incredibly important.

What happened in Europe, because of fascism and of the Second World War, is that there has been a real interruption on this continent in the development of our own traditions. We really were, quite-rightly, de-nazified after the war, by having fast dosages of

American social sciences brought in. Social psychologists and sociologists were brought in as a way of re-training a great deal of our population which have been raised in Fascist salute, „white man's burden", and the role of Europe in the world. There was a real process of complete re-training of our population. If you look at the history of European social sciences in the Cold War period (there are some stories that can be told), gender comes in on that wave. I consider that Europe in the Second World War committed a suicide, in the moral and the scientific sense of the term.

The great critical traditions that we developed in the 18th century came to an abrupt end and it costs us, as well as the victims of fascism, an enormous amount. This is not talked about very often in the West, excepting some few people, like Gunter Grass. In academia it was forbidden to talk about this because of the Cold War, and that is why I salute 1989 as the moment when the Cold War was over and we may go back to a more balanced, critical, historically informed reappraisal. We may think now where we come from as European feminists, because we are having very different roots then the Americans have. And we have to face critically phenomenon like anti-Semitism, fascism and colonialism. But not only these. There are also some very rich resources to think about embodiment, about affectivity, about sexuality, which are not there in the Anglo-American culture.

As a sexual difference theorist, I want to simply say: look, we need to ground these theories in our own traditions. I am not a nationalist, I am absolutely nomadic, but I do believe that we are also part and responsible for silencing the European traditions. It is easy to talk about gender, nobody would question that or they will pretend that they understand what you are doing. If you try, however, to talk about, for example, the construction of Romanian masculinity in a post-communist era and about male sexual violence, you will see. Just call things by their names and you will see what happens.

I think we need to follow a number of operations, some strategic, some historical, for making the production of feminist knowledge relevant here and now, and we look for the traditions that were interrupted first by fascism, then by the Cold War. We need to re-connect ourselves to our European traditions as sources of the renewal of our own way of establishing social justice between the sexes. There is not only one-way to do it. The Anglo-American model of sex relations is often inadequate for us. We Europeans cannot be assimilated to an American model: we do not work like that, we do not love like that, we do not have families like that, we do not eat like that, our bodies are not like that. This is not essentialism, but the effect of culture.

So there is a dose of resistance to the American model that is absolutely part of what I would consider my way of being like a leftist Western European. My generation was raised neither with Russians, nor with Americans, but in a third way. And that remains a way to do it.

I want to add to this discussion that the dialogue and confrontation with the women of Eastern Europe is fundamental. A dialogue between „West" and „East", a division that proved to be a historical product not a natural divide, is absolutely crucial and I would think it would be a disaster if the Anglo-American paradigms of feminist thinking would be absorbed in the East uncritically as being „The Feminism." There is no such a thing as feminism, there are powerful alternative traditions from the South of Europe to the North, from the very countries that generated Fascism, i.e. Germany, Italy, Spain, along the countries that fought against Fascism, England and so on, and all the East in it is own way. So I think that is a need for an enormous amount of collective work to reconstruct a space, which will be neither nor… and it would allow us to be socially relevant and to name the issues for what they are. We need to talk about masculine power and masculinity, and about the related issues, like national identity and nationalism. So we are on the right

track, so to speak, in order to construct alliances that would allow us to break out of this hegemonic talk about sex and gender, which I found very problematic.

E.M.V. Is this effort also about linking the struggle for equality to the affirmation of diversity?

R.B. Yes, this is absolutely crucial and I think that we may definitely borrow a great deal from the American thought, but diversity within Europe is a very complicated issue. I do not have to tell you, with the work you are doing on ethnicities and minorities, is a very complicated issue, because Europe is not a land of migration in the sense that America is, but is a continent of enormous internal migrations. There never has been a moment when such a thing like a pure European existed...

I think that looking at the diversity within this continent and our historical inability to deal with it, except by causing civil wars, which then became world wars, looking to the inability to treat difference, the discomfort of living with difference within the European continent, is the very thing that we should do. Why is it so? There has been really interesting work being done on this epidermic reaction of Europeans against differences, on this myth of sameness that we all carry together in our soul far more than the new cultures do, like the Americans and the Australians, who know perfectly well that they are based on diversity.

I think it is the role of sameness and the dialectics with difference that is crucial to the way in which our continent structured itself. If you think that putting together an Eastern European with a Southern European is hard work, try putting together a Northern Italian with a Southern Italian. This is the nightmare of Europe, and this has been our history.

But now we need to take advantage of the historical situation we are in with, when the Cold War is over and the European Union can provide, hopefully, some sort of new frame. Now we will see if we can for a moment live together with difference, or there will be,

as usual, a return to the worst aspects of our history, a repetition of the regional breakdown and nationalism. I hope we can move home hopefully, to a more trans-national definition of what it means to be European today. I consider the European Union as a post-nationalistic framework and I defend the post-nationalistic definition of Europe. I am convinced that is beyond being Italian, British, Romanian, Belgian, is about being of this continent, with the dramatic history that we have. It is not a glorification, it should be the opportunity to take stock over our positions, to take a serious look at ourselves, a cold, sober look at ourselves and say: Ok, where do we go from here? And that means confronting some pretty dramatic history, some of which have been repeated, both in the East and in the West because it is how history goes, it goes through repetitions.

And because of this I would like to link the concept of diversity to nomadism, and to see how it always has been there, and how women have paid the price for it for time to time again in our history. I am trying to verbalize some of that, to make it the object of our study and try to do it in a spirit that looks for connections, and not connections in the sameness, but connections in the awareness of how deep the differences are.

E.M.V. May we talk at this moment about your feminist nomadic project? It seems to me very important how, in that framework, you rebuild the feminist subject in a very theoretical, rigorous but at the same time in a very passionate way. At a certain point in your argument you mention the relation between *the* woman, the real existent woman, and the feminist subject while defining the feminist as the post-women… Would you like to elaborate that idea?

R.B. This argument was a way to make a critique of identity politics… It was a way of saying that what was at stake in feminist production of knowledge was really a paradoxical relationship to the female, to the woman that is the agent of it. And that was again a

reaction to the whole standpoint feminism, according to which a woman knows better, a woman per definition, per socialization, historically, knows better. You know, as a reaction to this, postmodernists said: „what do you mean by a woman, how do you know which woman, where and when?"

In my argument I was trying to devise a scheme that both keeps an attachment to the female experience, but also inserts, as a new step in knowledge and consciousness, another subject position, which would be the feminist subject. That would then allow for this kind of production of knowledge to include a critique of femininity, while not being disconnected from it.

This idea was a reaction to a number of things that were happening during the late 1980s and early '90s in the European feminist theory, the main one being the rejection of sexual difference, the rejection of femininity altogether, considering that femininity is the essentialist trap and if you fall into this essentialist trap, you are going to be lost. Where did this latter idea come from? In the United States, the debate came from a rejection of the heterosexism that is implicit in the assessment of femininity. As I have said time and time again, a lot of the same issues can be dealt with without rejecting femininity, and I was sort of finding myself puzzled by the attacks against the institution of woman that were coming mostly from Anglo-American postmodernism, I am thinking of the early Butler, I am thinking of Denise Riley. They all said that the problem of the standpoint feminism is that it essentializes woman, so we get rid of it and we have a different type of subject, whether she is the lesbian or the cyborg; if you work with that variable, she is the post-colonial, if you work on ethnicity level, she is the native or black. In any case, there seems to be an erasure of sexual difference that puzzles me and worries me for the reasons that I have mentioned before, because I firmly believe in the deep embodied roots of subjectivity.

As far as I am concerned, I wanted to keep the connection to femininity, but not in a genetic deterministic, or psychic

deterministic way, that is why I needed to introduce the feminist subject, and the issue that the difference is about feminist consciousness. In my reading, feminist consciousness includes a certain critique of femininity but it is a critique from within, because I do not think we can cast that away from us, as if it was not our skin. You say after that you can easily change: you can be critical, you can dis-identify as much as you can, but it is still a connection even if you deny it, it is a connection. I mean I would be a de-constructivist to the extent to which I would see a negative connection still a connection.

I think a feminist is somebody who consumes and redefines femininity. You see, for many people lesbianism would be opposed to femininity, lesbians being supposed to be, per definition, males. This is exactly the 19th century imaginary of *à la garçonne*, or of the woman in the wrong body, so to speak. But why would that not be part of being a woman? Why would it be cast out as something that is opposed to femininity, which is exactly what patriarchal culture says? So this is my way to say that, if we see feminists as the women who are intended to repossess femininity and to redefine it, then one may expect that femininity may become a container of all sorts of other things, allowing to redefine female sexuality, heterosexuality, homosexuality, or anything else in-between.

I am particularly concerned to keep the issue of heterosexuality on the board, because it forces men to join us in this struggle, and to make them feel that masculinity is also a feminist issue. I mean there are many feminist men who consider they should help women to change their position, or change child care, or get abortion: it is all very well, but a fundamental issue remains the redefinition of masculinity. A redefinition that would take violence out of it, it takes the sense of arrogance out of it, it takes this idea that the world is there for him out of it. A redefinition that would bring about a massive de-fallicization of masculinity, which we can only do if men join in. It cannot be „us against them", that was the 1970s,

and a lot of men are convinced that it is very tiring to be a macho all day long, and a lot of them would prefer to be new fathers. These are the guys that we need, and sexual difference means also that they work on themselves, and that they join to struggle with women from their own angle which is critiquing this return of belligerent, violent, bigoted masculinity under the cover of either the new liberalism or whatever „quick fix" solution happens to be going on at the moment. That is a crucial issue. I think with sexual difference you can look upon this both ways.

And that would be a way to keep the balance, a sort of going hopefully for a peaceful resolution of the problems. So it is more this kind of thing that I have in mind and that type of politics.

E.M.V. Let me formulate my last question, which is related to the way in which you understand the relation between consciousness and desire within feminism. You are arguing that feminist practice should link the wilful choice and the unconscious desire in order to generate change and you are talking even about a politics of desire and about the desire for feminism …

R.B. This is what I call my European roots. I think that Rousseau's question is still on the agenda. Man is born free, but everywhere she/ he is in chain: so why do people not cast away these chains, what makes people to accept that situation. Of course, it all depends on one's location, you have to be very situated, you have to position this question very carefully in space and time, and look at the historical context in which you ask this question. There are situations in which people have no choice and they are bulldozed in totalitarian extremist regimes, into no margins of choice of whatsoever. And then it is no question of desire.

It is a question that speaks of a context, the one I was raised in, which was relatively free and democratic. Where nonetheless we were been brought up through the 1960s into really actively wanting consumerism as the statement of our citizenship. Citizenship as consumerism, that has been the ethos in which I was brought up,

which means that a great deal of the West was very de-politicised through this saturation of commodities and this next car, next gadget, next Armani suit.

That happened to very large extent within Western Europe as a whole, where the critical culture and the resistance had to struggle. You can look, for instance, at the years of terrorism in Western Europe and see them as a counter-culture that was cornered by the state into producing horrific results. It was really a death's dance between the state and the radical wing that produced the bloodiest results, typical of a culture of political despair. There were no margins for critical theory, no margins for critical resistance. This changed later, in the 1980s, it changed with the punk revolution, it changed in a sense with the technological revolution that opened new horizons, but the social climate of the 1960s and the '70s has been really saturated with the failure of the left and the sense of nowhere to go. There was just no space for resistance in Western Europe. In that context the question became how can we make people who have everything, freedom, democracy etc. with limitations, how can we make them want something else than the next gadget, the next commodity, how can we make them desire different ways of living, better ways of living. Usually the minorities or the marginal groups have the impetus to change, which is why, in that context feminism had a great role in imagining the world differently, not according to the consumerist patterns and norms.

I also think that a lot of psychoanalysts were important to Western Europe because they politicised that question. The new psychoanalysts of the 1970s really politicised desire as a non-profit way of wanting a better society, and that is the attitude of desire. Even if it costs you a salary or maybe a career, you are a pariah… I think that the question of „what makes you to want to run the race", was the very question for Western Europe at that time, as, I am tempted to say, it is for Eastern Europe after 1989. I mean confusing citizenship with consumerism is a risk that you are undergoing now,

much as we did in the 1960s. What do you want, is free markets… a great free market, you can see how free the free market is and what are its results: in terms of pornography, prostitution, the trading of women, the brutality, the disregard of who people are…the free market is an enemy of humanity.

I think that imagination is absolutely crucial in a phase like this, in the culture of a post-industrial era, when all we are selling are dreams… we are calling ourselves information societies, but actually we are dream-merchants, we are selling people, phantasies and mailing-lists and credit-cards lists, so we are selling information that counts but a lot of it is a very much abstract, up here. We live in a culture, which functions so much through media and representation, through the imaginary. From Althusser on, we know that the imaginary is intensely political. Now if we could catch people's imaginary one way or the other, I think we might go a long way into inserting something of an antidote to this saturation of commodities, which is what they call citizenship in post-industrial society. It is in fact a form of apathy, a form of lack of concern, a retreat into molecular individualism that is absolutely distressing.

That is why I think that artists have a very important role to play in our society. At least in Western Europe you have to look at the artist community to see a resistance. And more so, than in the academic community. Artists who write songs, who make movies, who create counter-images, who dress differently, who force the average citizen to realise „hey, but maybe s/he is not like me, what's up"? It is great to see how music, circulated on the Internet, manages to really break some monopolies, to break all the copyright laws and the market laws. The image, on the other hand, is saturated with commercial meaning, while the sound is still able to carry some radical meanings. You can look at the Western European political culture by studying the alternative media… I remember the free radio stations of the 1970s, the crucial importance of radio, and the police busting to free radios in Italy and France, throughout the '70s

and blocking them. Those people from the free radios are the people who invented the Internet, an alternative way of distributing knowledge, of connecting, of reaching people. This is a new, nomadic way of reaching for each other outside of the established channels, which are state television, state newspaper etc.

So this is a way to try to reach out and transform the forms of representation. But you can also do this with feminism. Look at the politics of the self, sexuality, consciousness raising, look how feminism is changing everyday life, is changing the love relations, the family, the way desire is connected to lack, to violence, to domination. It is changing those very difficult things, which we can only do with a big effort in the personal sphere, in the private, even intimate sphere. When we said: „the personal is the political", we really meant all of that and more.

But I think that today feminism can go much further into the politicisation of the imaginary in an era that is starved for representations, for ideas, for everything. It is always the same images, whether it is Madonna, or Lady Diana, or Marilyn Monroe: they repeat even the same bodily positions. There is a kind of a tiredness of the realm, of the register of the image that is absolutely saturated by commercialisation and by repetition. There is a shortage of adequate representations, of strong representations. Maybe some people argue that visual representation is really saturated to death, I mean for example Baudrillard, and there is nothing new that can come from it and then, of course, I would then plead for sounds and music and acoustics as ways of maybe spurring the imagination to dream up a better world.

Unless we can dream up possible futures and better worlds we are not going to be able to realise them. I think that our desires have to go that way or it will not happen. And keeping desires alive in a society that is going towards consumerism, or try to turn you simply into a consumer and try to make you believe that is what you really want, keeping those desires alive is what education should be

doing. In a very Socratic manner, I mean it is really back to the origins of what an education used to be, asking questions, questioning, questioning, questioning.

As a feminist I found myself defending almost classical models of pedagogy and it is a kind of amusing that I am saying: education, for example, makes people think, makes them more aware, makes them eager to produce critical, non-profit knowledge… that would be my definition of an education for the third millennium. And I believe that our culture needs it, for the jobs, for the designing industry, for all of that, but also to keep some sense of desire to make it work, almost desire in the sense of social participation if you want to talk a more reasonable language. I think that is crucial. People do not go to the elections, people do not care, this kind of emptying out of civil society is not only happening in your world, is probably happening a lot more here, this kind of taking so much for granted, this kind of apathy are very dangerous. With the extreme right running at 25% in Belgium, 18% in Norway, and so on, and you are saying that politics does not matter… it is a very dangerous moment, when one may feel that the critical awareness is asleep, stupefied, saturated with, food and drinks, and commodities. Is that kind of thing, awareness, such as consciousness-raising on a global scale, which is very important in our days. And I am convinced that feminists have a huge role to play in this process, in our societies, because we have to stay alert, we cannot afford to go to sleep.

CENTERING ON GENDER EQUALITY WORLDWIDE

Feminism is about recognising difference, acknowledging and respecting difference, even celebrating difference, but also about trying, beyond that, to work together, not eliminating, but transcending differences in order to work towards the creation of societies – and indeed a world – characterised by gender equality.

BARBARA EINHORN[*]

E.M.V. I would like to ask you to talk both about your research on women's condition in Eastern Europe and your

[*] *Dr. Barbara Einhorn is professor at the University of Sussex, Great Britain, and director of the Research Centre in Women's Studies at the same university. Her main research topics are gender and citizenship, women in the global market economy, gender and identity in German-Jewish women's life histories. She is the author of the book* Cinderella Goes to Market: Gender, Citizenship and Women's Movements in East Central Europe *(1993; second edition 2003), co-edited the volume* Women and Market Societies: Crisis and Opportunity *(1995), guest edited the Special Issue of Women's Studies International Forum on „Gender, Ethnicity and Nationalism" (19, 1-2, 1996), and co-edited the Special Issue of The European Journal of Women's Studies entitled „The Idea of Europe" (5, 3-4,1998).*

organisational work on Women's Studies at the University of Sussex. Because in both terms there is much to learn from your experiences and results.

B.E. Let's start with the institutional part. As you know, I am the director of the Gender Studies program at the University of Sussex in England. This program is at the moment a post-graduate program, with an undergraduate program to start in October 2003. We have an MA (one-year full time or a two-year part time) in Women's Studies (now the MA in Gender Studies), which has been established for about eight years now. It began as a part time degree first year and then a full time degree was established. Initially, when I came here, and I am in my sixth year now, there were two completely separate programs of study. The part time degree had been developed with working women in mind, who might have had specific academic interests related to their work place for example. One of our options was called Gender and the Work Place. Another was Gender, Social Policy, and the Law in Britain Today. Both of these were thought to be of interest specifically to people who were already in work. But for the last two or three years now we have integrated the two programs, so there is a single MA program which you can study on a full-time or part- time basis.

The MA has two compulsory core courses, one in the autumn term, one in the spring term, both on Feminist Theory. Feminist Theory One focuses mainly on political theory and international and development issues. Feminist Theory Two focuses more on issues of cultural theory, issues of identity and representation, and constructions of sexuality. Then there are optional courses, so the students take two courses in Feminist Theory plus two optional courses, four courses in total for their MA degree, plus a dissertation based on independent research. The optional courses in addition to the two already mentioned include Life Histories and Feminist Analysis, which combines the theory of life history research with the analysis of feminist autobiographical accounts. Gender, Media,

Nation is a relatively new course, which is offered to the MA in Media Studies and the new MA in Gender and Media, as well as to the MA in Women's Studies, and it has proved to be very popular. It also usually brings together students from a wide range of countries, so that we can pool our experiences of the gendered workings of national discourses across a variety of cultures. Another course that, as you know, I teach, is on the Role and Status of Women in Europe. That is a course, which not only crosses disciplinary boundaries, but is also based on cross-country and cross-cultural studies. That is important for me to stress, because one of the things that really annoys me is the way in which twelve years after the end of the Cold War, when people talk about Europe - even academics, when they teach Europe, when they speak at conferences on Europe – what they understand by that is Western Europe, or even more narrowly: the European Union, often seen simplistically these days as the synonym for everything desirable in both political and economic terms. So this course is specifically designed to counter that view because it refers both to Western and East Central Europe. It is thematically organised, with sections on women and politics, women in the labour-market, the ideology of the family, social policy, issues of migration, issues of nationalism, issues of citizenship. We also offer a course on the Social and Cultural History of Feminism, and that course is historical and British-based. We have an anthropological course called Gender and Identities, which is obviously cross-cultural; and we have a course entitled Body and Society - Representations of Gender, which has been taught up by now by art historians. So you can see that depending on the nature of the course, they are also taught by a variety of faculty from different disciplines, some are taught by historians, some by sociologists, some by faculty teaching Social Policy, some by art historians and so on.

I should also mention our D.Phil. program: as you know, it is called a D.Phil. rather than a Ph.D. here at Sussex. There are new

regulations governing the DPhil at Sussex, which involve one year's coursework towards an MSc in social Research Methods. This is very useful and a wide range of social research approaches are taught, so the student can choose those courses which will ultimately help them when writing their dissertation. It means the DPhil program is a four-year program, with one-year coursework and three years researching and writing the dissertation, with the support and feedback from one's dissertation supervisor. We have about twenty students enrolled in that. And 10-12 in the MA program, although it varies from year to year.

We have quite a mixture of students… At the University of Sussex approximately 25% of the students are international students, from a very wide spectrum of countries, and I would say the same is true for Gender Studies. We have had students from China, from the United States, from Korea, from Hong Kong, from Thailand, from Germany, from various European countries. We have not had any students from Eastern and Central Europe, and this is something that concerns me greatly. The problem is that we have always had outstanding applications from students from Eastern and Central Europe who would be excellent students, but there is always a big problem with finding funding. In England we do not have sufficient opportunities to offer scholarships or studentships to support students at MA level.

Some words about our institutional structure… Up to now I am the core person in Gender Studies, the only one who is appointed to Gender Studies full time. That could change in the future because of the new undergraduate program, which will be introduced in October 2003. At the moment what happens is that faculty members from other subject-groups teach courses or parts of courses for us and I think that is a structure which is very common in both British and American universities, where Women's Studies or Gender Studies tend to be a program rather than a subject-group or a department. However, that might change when we get the

undergraduate program, which would give us the basis to be a subject-group in our own right. As part of a total restructuring of the Arts area curriculum at Sussex, five new interdisciplinary programs will be introduced in October 2003. One of those programs will be Gender Studies, and that is going to be a big change for us. First of all is a very exciting development both institutionally and also intellectually because in the various meetings to develop this program we have had a huge range of faculty from right across the Arts area involved. The new undergraduate degrees will be joint degrees. So, for example, students could take a degree in Gender and Sociology, or Gender and Political Science, or Gender and Anthropology, or Gender and International Relations, or Gender and Drama Studies, or Gender and Geography, or Gender and Linguistics, or Gender and English Language.

These new interdisciplinary programs will be offered to all students taking degrees in the Humanities and Social Sciences, so potentially there could be hundreds of students. And if there really are a lot of students that means that there will be a need for new faculty. Now like all universities, our university is more interested in cutting its budget and not investing extra resources and so this is going to be a struggle, as it always has been and still is with Gender Studies, but I think that eventually there is no other way. So structurally our position is going to change, and I think that Gender Studies will be absolutely central to the new curriculum. And that is a very positive development for us.

E.M.V. Let me go back a little bit to your institutional past and ask you what is the relation between the Research Centre in Women's Studies and the MA in Gender Studies? Which one came first?

B.E. The MA came first. The establishment of the Research Centre is a slightly later development. It was thought that it would bring together faculty from the various parts of the university with research interests in gender issues and we had hoped to apply for

funding for a centre of excellence in this field. We also run a regular research seminar, at which scholars and postgraduate students from this university and all over Britain give papers on their current research. Recently, for example, we have had papers from Mary Evans, Stevi Jackson, Joni Lovenduski, Shirin Rai, and Nira Yuval-Davis.

E.M.V. And the Research Centre obviously supports what is happening in the teaching process…

B.E. Absolutely, yes… And we have always had a strong group of scholars at Sussex, with a very strong international reputation in Western, Eastern and Central Europe, in the United States, and also in the Far East. For many years now we have had links with Women's Studies and Gender Studies programs from these regions. In the past, we had links with three universities in Mainland China, with the Centre for Women's Studies at the University of the Philippines in Manila, and with the Asian Centre for Asian Women's Studies based at Ewha Women's University in Seoul, in South Korea. Currently we have academic exchange programs with the Humboldt University in Berlin, Germany, and with Babeş-Bolyai University in Cluj, Romania. Both programs provide for the exchange of students and staff members.

So, as I have said, we have always had a very strong group of scholars and a very strong research base. I think is fair to say that the institutional support for Women's Studies and now Gender Studies at Sussex has often lagged behind our actual level of activity and definitely behind our international recognition. As Director I have tried very hard to change that, and now, I think, the fact that Gender Studies is one of the new interdisciplinary programs to be introduced in 2003 is in a way a recognition of the work of our team, of our status within university and of the established status of the discipline. That is a very positive moment, which we hope to develop further.

E.M.V. Is there any explanation for that? For the fact that your institutional recognition comes so late? Is this connected with some trends within the British society or with certain academic politics?

B.E. I think that this is a common experience of Women's Studies and Gender Studies programs both in the United States and in Britain, but also in both Western and now Eastern Europe. We still have to struggle against the view that Gender Studies is not a hard science, not a serious academic discipline, despite the fact that there is by now a very well established body of feminist theory and research publications in all areas of Gender Studies. In fact this body of work – whether it be feminist political theory, whether it be studies of gender and international relations, whether it be gender and social anthropology, whether it be gender and sociology, or gender and media, gender and cultural studies and issues of representation – has made a very big contribution to changing ways of thinking in almost all academic disciplines.

An example of the contribution of feminist scholarship to new discourses and theories is that before post-structuralists or post-modernists argued this position, feminist scholars developed the notion that all knowledge is situated knowledge, that there is no such thing as objective, neutral, abstract, universal knowledge removed from people's situated realities and experience. Feminist scholarship was also influential in the establishment of the discipline of oral history, because it treats people's lived experience and people's voices as relevant historical data. Feminist scholars had long argued that women's voices – telling their stories, relating their life experiences - should be regarded as authentic data. Similarly, there has been a big shift in Sociology and other social sciences, again influenced by feminist scholarship, resulting in the acceptance of qualitative data as valuable scientific data, which can enhance quantitative findings. All fields of political theory, whether it be the definition of liberal democracy, citizenship, the state, or civil society, discussions of nationalism, or even definitions of what counts as

politics and where it is located, all of these have been profoundly influenced by feminist contributions. As these examples make plain, I feel that feminist theory and Gender Studies and Women's Studies scholars have made a very substantial contribution to the rethinking of traditional disciplines and to knowledge production.

E.M.V. Yes, but the issue of having institutional structures within the university named Women's Studies or Gender Studies, is still one in its own right. So let me ask you, why is there the need here, at Sussex, to have a subject-group in Women's Studies?

B.E. It will be in Gender Studies … But anyway, I think it is because there has been a lot of talk, not only in academia, but within national and international agencies such as the European Union, the World Bank, or the United Nations about the need to mainstream issues of gender, in particular issues of gender equality or equal opportunities. The idea of gender mainstreaming is that gender concerns should be integrated into every piece of policy-making, into every piece of legislation and into every discipline in the academic world, in the world of scholarship. I think that this is absolutely correct, and necessary, but it may take some time before it becomes a reality. Even at Sussex, which was founded in the 1960s as an interdisciplinary university and has a reputation of being very liberal and progressive in its approach, there are many disciplines, I hear this from students constantly, and sometimes from colleagues, that there are many disciplines in this university, which do not deal with issues of gender or see them as peripheral, at best „adding gender" in one final session of a course. Whereas I would say that gender relations perceived as relations of unequal power are integral to all social relations, and therefore there is not a single discipline that you could discuss without including that central issue. Gender as a category of analysis, or gender as a marker of difference is as decisive as issues of ethnicity, or issues of class. By now, obviously, it is generally recognised that you cannot talk about women as a homogeneous group, because of the differences between women,

both between women from different countries and between women within one country on the bases of age, sexuality, ethnicity, class, able-bodiedess. This is as important as the recognition of the fact that the universal citizen of liberal democratic political theory was in fact gendered male because of the public – private divide and the assignment of men to the public realm and of women to the private sphere. So it is impossible now to talk about the universal citizen without recognising that people have different abilities to access their citizenship status, and those different abilities are mediated by gender, just as they are mediated by other socially constructed differences, like ethnicity, class, sexuality and so forth. I think that these things are recognised and accepted, but this does not yet mean that they are mainstreamed within the academic disciplines and the ways in which they are taught, not to speak of social and political structures at both the national and the international level. So in the meantime, and I do not know how long that meantime is, short or medium term, I think it is very important to have Gender Studies as a discipline which uses gender as a category of analysis or as a lens in order to illuminate the existing disciplines, their theories and their practices.

E.M.V. Now I would like to ask you to share with me some of your individual research experiences. Maybe you could start by discussing why Central and Eastern Europe is your field?

B.E. Well, this began a very long time ago, because my initial field was German literature, and when I was a doctoral student I lived in Berlin for three years and wrote my doctoral dissertation on the novel in East Germany. I used an analysis of the narrative perspective in order to study the way in which the relationship between the individual and society was constructed in East German novels written between 1949 and 1969. And I looked at the way in which this relationship between the individual and society changed over that period, and how those changes in turn reflected a shift in the official cultural policy of Socialist Realism.

Some time later, in the late 1970s, I was looking at some very interesting short stories by East German women writers – which were bitterly comic, or ironic, and pointed to the gap between the rhetoric of state socialist policies regarding women's „emancipation" (as they called it) and the reality of women's everyday lives with, you know, the double burden, full-time working and yet retaining the overwhelming responsibility for childcare and housework. I thought I would be a fool to publish anything about the stories, without knowing more about the actual economic and socio-political situation of women in the former German Democratic Republic. So then, in the 1980s I began to publish on women in the GDR in these terms, and so I slid sideways into Women's Studies and a more sociological approach. In 1989 I received a MacArthur Foundation grant in order to extend my analysis to a comparative study on women in GDR, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary. Due to my sister's serious illness, when I was to take up the research I had to go to New Zealand, so I postponed it until January 1990 by which time, as you know, everything had changed. So this was the history from which my book *Cinderella Goes to Market: Citizenship, Gender and Women's Movements in East Central Europe* was born, which looks both at the contradictions within state socialist policies for women's emancipation, and at the kind of changes in terms of women's rights and gender equality in the transformation process after 1989. And it has been really a very lovely experience for me to know how much that book is appreciated in the region, by women in the region, because, obviously, although I have spent a lot of time researching the region, I mean, going back to the 1960s, I still remain an outsider observer, so it is nice to know that, you get things right sometimes. And the publisher wants to do a second edition with new data and sources, which will be published in 2003.

E.M.V. It is very important that you have a comparative perspective on the impact of state socialism and of post-socialist changes on women's condition and on gender relations. In this way

one may think about socialism's benefits, but as well about its contradictions related to women's situation.

B.E. Yes, I am glad you think so. Most of my work since the beginning of the 1990s has been about issues of citizenship and gender, but also issues of gender and nationalism. And as you know, that book was very cross-disciplinary because, again, it was thematically organised around women in mainstream politics, civil society, women's movements, women and the labour market, family, discourses around the family and the nation, representations of women in literature and the media.

E.M.V. And also on how politics on women is part of a broader political ideology and practice, or how the so-called women's issue is politicised and instrumentalized, how state socialism did that, and how the new liberal and nationalist ideologies and practices deal with it, transforming it through their own lenses.

B.E. Yes, one wonders about the extent to which state socialist policies on women's „emancipation" and „new" nationalist discourses about women's primary responsibility for the family are really concerned about women, and about gender equality, or whether the policy in both cases is actually politically and economically driven and simply instrumentalizes women. You know, in the case of state socialism women's labour was needed during the industrialization process, so the discourse and practice promoted women's integration into the labour market. Now, in contrast, in the case of marketization there is a need to discard labour, and therefore that discourse is reinforced, which emphasizes women's primary responsibility for the family, both caring for the individual family and reproducing the family of the nation. The same thing happened in Britain. And I think that it is important to see that there are parallels. You see, in Britain during the Second World War there were a lot of posters saying: „Send your child to a nursery school, they will have a wonderful social and educational

experience while you are working in an ammunition factory". But when men came back from the war they wanted their jobs back. All of a sudden there were psychologists who discovered that young children need their mothers to be at home with them. A similar pattern is occurring now in the process of East European „transition". Or take, for example, the fact that after the re-institution of private property rights, not in Romania, as you know, but in Poland, or Hungary, one of the first pieces of the state-socialist legislation to be attacked was the law giving legal access to abortion. And similarly, now George Bush is hardly elected when he states that his first priority is to make abortion illegal. And it is very interesting to ask why that happens, and why reproductive rights become such a political issue.

Again, you have to ask what this is about… Anyway, what it does show is that gender, issues of gender, and gender relations are very political, extremely political, and are centrally important in social and political processes of change and transformation. So really, for me there is no question about the importance of gender as a field of study when you think about these examples, and about how – at different points in history and in different countries – gender becomes a central issue, which is at stake in moments of historical transformation. We obviously need to analyse these mechanisms all over the world, we need much more research on the gendered aspects of social transformation.

E.M.V. When we are talking about how women were and are instrumentalized by state policies, by political parties, by mainstream political ideologies, I guess that there is another side, which we have to talk about, that is women's organisations. I do not want to idealize their role, or to say that those organisations are really expressing women's interests as they are out there because obviously what gets called women's interests are constituted also through these organisations. But still, they might play an important

role at least in negotiating with state institutions and political parties about what women's interests are.

B.E. It is true that, if the goal is the achievement of gender equality in all walks of society, then you need to approach that at different levels, you need to address it from the level of mainstream institutional politics and you need to try to get a critical mass of women into parliaments, into political parties, into the European Parliament, so that they can influence legislation and policy-making. But in order for this to happen you also need pressure groups from below, you need civil society associations, you need women's groups, you need feminist groups, and you need NGOs, you need all of those.

Going back to research, one thing has been important to point out about Gender Studies as opposed to Women's Studies. It seems to be the trend now that more people think that Gender Studies is important and notice that is important for us to think not just about women and the way in which women are discriminated, but also about men. Because gender essentially is about relations between men and women, it is about constructions of notions of masculinity and femininity; about how what is seen as appropriate behaviour for men and for women is socially constructed. Let me add the fact that some traditional gender roles are changing partly as a result of social and economic changes. For example, the structure of the labour market is changing, the idea that a forty year unbroken working life was the norm, and in Western capitalist countries was the male norm, that idea is completely undermined now because of globalisation, because we have moved into a post-industrial society where the service sector and the consumer industry and the high-tech knowledge industry are very strong. There are different work requirements, which – on the one hand – might favour women's negotiating skills, women's training, but on the other hand there is also a move towards greater insecurity of work, which might mean simply that men's jobs become more like women's jobs, i.e.

worse in terms of their conditions of employment… So there are lots of new developments there, which need monitoring. But what I mean to say is that at the level of research and analysis we need to think about gender, because we need to think that these new developments, new political and economic developments and their social effects have an effect on men and women and on their roles due to which they are shifting on both sides. And this might – well, we have to see –, but this might have an effect on the traditional division of labour in the domestic sphere, for example … but we do not know that yet because it is all still happening.

E.M.V. Please discuss a little bit the relationship between Western and Eastern feminists, and between them and non-feminists.

B.E. Well, as you know, the dialogue between Western and Eastern women, not to speak about feminists, has been a very difficult one, and continues to be very difficult. Take, for example, the case of the German context, where there was a great lack of understanding on both sides, even though they share the same language and the same culture, you could say, except for the intervening forty years of state socialism. But, you see, that had really made the difference in, among others, the way in which women in the East felt that their sense of identity and of self-confidence had been influenced by their working lives, and, due to the fact that they had always had to go out to work, they had a different sense of self than women in the West. This meant that after German unification, their priorities were different, they were very concerned about how to save jobs, how to save kindergarten facilities, when the process of privatisation and marketization began. Whereas they saw the women in the West as being much more concerned with high theory, less involved in political projects and more involved in small-localized single-issue campaigns.

So there have been great difficulties and women in Eastern and Central Europe have felt understandably that in a way the

women from the West, the feminists from the West, have come with a kind of colonialist attitude towards them, to tell them what feminism is, and have not listen to their experiences, and I think there was some justification for this reaction, at least in the early years after 1989. On the other hand I feel very passionately that dialogue and listening on both sides is essential. And we must not overlook the fact that for all the differences between countries and within countries, between regions and within regions, the fact of the matter is that we are now all stuck with the neo-liberal market paradigm, so we have a lot in common.

You know, we are all struggling with processes of marketization, and privatisation, with the market being elevated to the sole regulator of society, so that the sphere of politics, and even more so, the sphere of social policy gets sidelined. Power issues of social inequality get overlooked and the idea is that everybody can operate as an equal citizen on the market place. Clearly, this is not true, particularly for women, unless they have access to childcare facilities, how can they operate as an equal citizen able to exchange contracts in the market place, for example. And, of course, apart from the neo-liberal market paradigm, the other big influence, which in a way we share though in different ways, of course, is the impact of globalisation.

So although we may be in different positions, we may have different subject positions, we are positioned differently towards these processes because we are located in different countries and cultures, nevertheless it is very important to exchange experiences as well as theories and analyses of our own relative countries, and situations. And I think the more we can do comparative analysis, the more we will all gain from it.

E.M.V. Is there something shared in the ways in which nationalism has an impact on women's life and in which women try to resist nationalism in different contexts?

B.E. There are a lot of paradoxes in today's processes, in the sense that the idea of the European Union is a kind of widening, so you have less country-specific differentiation and you work towards a broader region with common interests. But, at the same time, and in reaction to the state socialist period, in East Central Europe you have a process of fragmentation, so the opposite process is going on, and in that process of fragmentation and in the search for identity in the vacuum which followed the collapse of socialism, obviously nationalist discourses look towards a more distant past, and that is how more traditionalist discourses – in terms of gender roles and expectations – have become very strong. But these processes, again, are not confined only to East and Central Europe, because within the European Union as well there are lots of regional and quite strongly particularist movements, like those of the Basques in Spain, or of the Bretons in France, or of the Welsh and the Scots in Britain, who are separatists and who want devolution, who want regional autonomy. So they are quite strongly nationalist too, and similarly some, although not all, of them have quite traditionalist views about appropriate roles for men and women, based on fixed ideas about masculinity and femininity.

E.M.V. Not to speak about the new forms of racism emerging in the so-called „Fortress Europe"…

B.E. Well, of course, and that is another paradox of the European Union. It is opening up borders within the Union, but it is certainly strengthening borders on the edges of the European Union. In a way obviously, what has been called „Fortress Europe", is also ethnically based, as well as economically based, so the boundaries are going to operate against, for example, those countries of Eastern and Central Europe which are not among the first ten to be included, and against the citizens of so-called „third" countries, who will be prevented from entering the EU, even as refugees and asylum seekers, and stigmatised as „Others" by racist and neo-fascist politicians and their supporters.

E.M.V. Do you think that feminism might have a role in shaping the European Union?

B.E. Definitely…

E.M.V. In combating all those forms of racism and nationalism…

B.E. I think so, yes, because feminism is about recognising difference, acknowledging and respecting difference, even celebrating difference, but also about trying, beyond that, to work together, not eliminating, but transcending differences in order to work towards the creation of societies – and indeed a world – characterised by gender equality.

ON THE BRIDGE BETWEEN SCIENCE AND POLICY MAKING

I cannot invent anything or adopt anything at the policy-level without a better understanding of it… the main idea of gender mainstreaming is that we would like to see the world to change, because the whole world is constructed around and is based upon gender inequality.

MIEKE VERLOO[*]

E.M.V. You are teaching on women's studies and political sciences at the University of Nijmegen, but, at the same time, you are

[*] *Professor Dr. Mieke Verloo is lecturer in Political Sciences and Women's Studies at the University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands. Her main research topic is "Transforming gender. Policies, politics and movements". Recent publications in English are: "On the Conceptual and Theoretical Roots of Gender Mainstreaming", in* The Interface Between Public Policy and Gender Equality, *Sheffield: Sheffield Hallam University, 1999;* Gender mainstreaming: practice and prospects, *Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1999;* Another velvet revolution: Gender Mainstreaming and the Politics of Implementation, *IWM Working Paper 2001 (http://www.univie.ac.at/iwm/p-iwmwp.htm#Verloo). With Conny Roggeband, she co-authored "Global sisterhood and political change. The unhappy marriage of women's movements and national contexts"(in C. van Kersbergen, R. Lieshout & G. Lock (Eds.),* Expansion and fragmentation. Internationalization, political change and the transformation of the Nation State, *Amsterdam University Press, 1999). With Yvonne Benschop she co-authored "Shifting responsibilities. The position of equality agencies in gender mainstreaming", in the International Management 2002.*

working as expert for different policy-making institutions, among others for the Council of Europe's gender mainstreaming project. How are these two roads coming together and how do you manage to do both? Related to this, let me ask you as well if this is a very particular way of dealing with political science as a feminist?

M.V. It is a nice question. I think I am someone who always wants to stand on the bridge between science or research and policymaking. I have started as a researcher after my studies, doing research mainly for Ministries at a Research Institute in Tilburg. After that I worked for a national committee who tried to stimulate Women's Studies, so I moved completely to the other side, let's say. I was not a civil servant because it was an independent committee, but I moved to the policy-making part and I did that for two years. While I was working there, I discovered that one could not really think independently in such a job and started to miss autonomy. Of course, if one is doing research for a certain group or institution, he/she is still a researcher. Sometimes the results do not please the people who commission your research, but that is not your problem. But you are always aiming that your results will be used.

My first research was for the Ministry of Housing. They installed a new policy, according to which the so-called non-families were entitled also to have housing, in fact everyone above 18 years old had a right on housing. They wanted to know what kind of housing was needed for all these non-family households under the conditions when the number of the one-person and two-person households was growing. It was my first research, a qualitative research and it was great. I learned so much and I also really believed that my results and my recommendations were true, that they were reflecting what were the needs and wishes of students, of working young people, of migrant people who were here on their own, and of the older single people. I thought my results were clear and adequate. But the Ministry did not like it. They had already made plans of what kind of houses they wanted to build. Therefore,

the results of my research were never used. But it was very good for me to realise that it is one thing to do research and it is quite another thing to assure that it is used. I discovered that it is good that as a researcher you are independent but also that it is a pity if your results are not used.

My next research at this Institute was on the ways in which both the local residents and local authorities used research in their debates, in their conflicts and struggles. I was very well aware of the political role of the research, but there were still a lot of things I wanted to know as a researcher. Just for the sake of knowing it, for the sake of knowledge. As a feminist I both wanted to know more, to understand how gender works, and I wanted all our newly constructed knowledge to be used for feminist change. My second job was at the committee, which aimed to stimulate women's studies. We were busy mapping out the ways in which new feminist knowledge could be facilitated. At the end of my term I decided that I wanted to be a researcher again. I wanted to go back to university, found money for a dissertation and went back.

So this is my story. I started in research, moved to policy-making, and then went back to science. This is where I came from and I am still the person who is defending the practical use of theory. I am always willing to explain to policy-makers or to NGOs, what is the state of knowledge in a certain field and how they can make use of that. To give an example, I gave lectures for women's NGOs in The Netherlands about the ways in which social movements theory may be used. I advised them not to stick too close to the government, explaining what are the disadvantages of such a position.

It is not only in the mainstreaming project that I have this position on the bridge, and I am going from one side to the other. If I stay too close to policy-makers or some practitioners, then after a while I get very uneasy and impatient and I want to read, to think a bit longer and find out things. On the other hand, if I am burying

myself in the libraries and in the books, then after a few years I get very impatient and I want to go out and tell people about it. That is how it works for me. And yes, this is connected to being a feminist.

E.M.V. You have also a role in the organisation named Women's International Study Europe (WISE), being its national representative in The Netherlands. How does this position relate to the rest of your agenda?

M.V. I really have a position in WISE, but because WISE is based in The Netherlands, my role is very small. I do not need to tell to our director, Margit van der Steen, how things are in The Netherlands. She knows that also very well. Within WISE I am also connected to the division on contemporary feminism and its strategies, which has organised a conference once and published a book. But this kind of work is too hard to do it more often. This year we had a small part in organising a conference on Feminism with an Eastern touch in Dubrovnik, together with Zenska Infoteka from Zagreb. In the past I have been more active at the national level, I have been the chair of the National Women's Studies Association in The Netherlands for some years. These activities originate from my interest in strategic questions. It is about recognising that it is nice if we understand something, but it is just as important to make something happen. And that is clearly connected to being a feminist.

E.M.V. Between 1996 and 1998 you were the chair of a group of specialists working on gender mainstreaming with the Council of Europe. Was this something new for you, or it was the prolongation of an older work? Why did you take that position?

M.V. I did not take it, but this position was given abruptly to me… although in a way, it did not come by accident, because earlier, together with Conny Roggeband, I had developed for the Dutch government an instrument called gender impact assessment. That was made in 1993 and published in 1994. This gender impact assessment is an instrument to screen policies on gender impact before they are going to the Parliament. It is an instrument to screen

all policies before decisions are taken, in order to analyse its impact on women and men. At least that is the intention of it. The nice thing about The Netherlands is that the instrument has been used, in fact now it has already been evaluated, but all this happened only after five-six years. During the discussions before Beijing I also had presented papers on this instrument, for instance in Vienna. The Council of Europe invited me to be a member of this group of specialists on gender mainstreaming, because I was one of the few people involved in making instruments, which were connected to the strategy. And when I arrived there, they appointed me to be the chair of this group.

This was a great opportunity to talk with other people who were involved in thinking about it, and a chance to develop a report. The report was really the result of lots of discussions within the group. We were eight people with very different roles. A few were researchers, like I was, a few were civil servants, working at equality units, like Brigitta Aseskog from Sweden and Agnete Anderson from Denmark. Milica Antic from Slovenia and Malgorzata Fuszara from Poland were from universities, and the Portuguese member was a former Secretary of State, so she was really more a politician, the Spanish people were from the Institute for Women in Madrid. We all reacted to the discussions in ways that were connected to our different roles and perspectives, to our positions. I think that we all got very wise in the course of these discussions. We have met five times, and each time had two or three days of discussions together on parts of the report until we could agree on a certain text.

E.M.V. What was your role? Were you coordinating the sessions?

M.V Yes, I was trying all the time to ensure that we knew what was clear and what was unclear in order to clarify the latter, and we could understand each other, could agree on something. I was proposing things and I had part in the discussion also, because I did not want to be just a traffic-regulating chair.

E.M.V. What happened with that report? How are things working in the Council of Europe in these terms?

M.V. The Council of Europe has a Committee on Gender Equality where every member state of the Council of Europe has a representative. If they want to develop a certain new idea or issue, they can appoint a Group of Specialists who, for most of the times only present a collection of papers at the end, which have been written by the members of the group. We wanted to do more. That is why we made a report that we could all agree on. The Gender Equality Committee, in order to decide what they should do with it, discussed the report presented by our Group of Specialists. They used its papers to construct their own opinion and strategy. And because we had made one single report, it was easier for them to deal with it. They discussed it and agreed on adopting this report and presenting it to the Council of Ministers and advise the Council of Ministers to adopt the report. The Council of Ministers did so, and because it got so far, it became a public report. That was the way it worked.

E.M.V. When such a report is accepted it becomes a principle of the policy on a certain domain?

M.V. Yes, but the Council of Europe still has not done too much on gender mainstreaming itself, not even within its own organisation. The only thing they promised was that they would distribute our report widely and they have done that. They have put it on the web for a while, and then re-printed it and also facilitated some translations. It has been translated into Slovenian, German, French, and in a number of other languages, because they considered it was worth for wide dissemination. But, as you know, the Council have no power on any member state, they can only try to influence and facilitate.

Anyway, I think that the report was very helpful to clarify the concept of gender mainstreaming and to elucidate the discussions. Later, in 1999 they organised a conference in Athens, where new

developments could be presented, but that was a very complicated conference. A lot of papers were presented on gender equality, but there were very few papers on gender mainstreaming. Then, in the preparation for Beijing+5, I was asked to make a report on the current state of the art, on practices and prospects. Later on, in September 2000 we had an expert meeting on gender mainstreaming, where the organisers invited all kinds of representatives of the new initiatives. To put shortly, they continue to facilitate the generation and dissemination of knowledge on gender mainstreaming, are still busy with it. The Committee on Gender Equality also wants the Council of Europe to start a process of gender mainstreaming within the Council of Europe, within all the committees of the Council, but I do not know if that will happen.

In a way, as a researcher, to come back to your first question, if your subject of research were policy-making, then it would be very unwise to just sit behind your desk and wait till reports are published. Because that would be really very late. If you want to know what is going on in the field of gender mainstreaming you need to do something. Doing something in that field is the best opportunity to know. But of course, that has its own problems, because then you get mixed in it and you tend to defend it…

So far I have published only one academic article on gender mainstreaming, and that is in Dutch. In these kinds of articles one may leave the rhetoric behind and discuss how things really are. It is an article, which discusses the roses and the thorns of gender mainstreaming, specifically in the case of a project made for the Ministry of the Flemish community together with Yvonne Benschop. But if I give a speech at the United Nations or at the European Commission, I have to keep their enthusiasm in gender mainstreaming up and I have to clarify the concepts, so that they do not do wrong or misleading things. My role as a consultant is a whole different one. If I would give only speeches on all the dangers involved, nobody would go on developing the strategy. In a speech,

I can only afford to point at misunderstandings and I can at best clarify them. I cannot point to the dangers, if I do not give a solution. So it is very limited what you can do with these kinds of speeches. That is why, at this very moment, I can hardly wait to walk to the other end of the bridge again, to go to the Institute of Human Sciences in Vienna, to write more academically about it, to regain my independent position.

E.M.V. Now I understand your bridging. You are working on the development of the theoretical frameworks on gender mainstreaming, but, at the same time, you are also trying to understand what is happening with that when it is used in practice.

M.V. Yes, and I see this kind of activity as a form of participatory research. It is walking on a bridge between science and policy-making. What I am trying to do on gender mainstreaming is engaging in discourse transformation, which makes necessary to use a framework that can be understood by policy-makers. Because they will never say, let's engage in the strategy of discourse transformation. That does not sound like something practical. It sounds complicated, political and unpractical, and therefore you have to translate things. As far as I am concerned I cannot invent anything or adopt anything at the policy-level without a better understanding of it. I cannot understand anything without theory, but at the same time I need to be where things are happening, to know what it is that I would like to understand. So that is why I am walking through this bridge all the time.

E.M.V. I would like to ask you to define briefly what gender mainstreaming means and why is this policy different than the previous equality policy, or the so-called women in development view on equality policy?

M.V. Well, there are a number of differences. The former women-specific policies aimed to make changes in some specific problems of women's lives, like: they do not get into political parties and higher positions, they do not get to the top levels of the

university, or they suffer from violence in their homes, or they do not dare to go out on the streets at night, or they do not have access to loans of the banks… Specific policies always start with a problem that women have and they try to solve that problem in a direct way, in a way which makes sure that the problems are solved quite quickly. At the same time this is an incidental way of solving problems, and it is not changing the whole context of the specific problems. This strategy has advantages and disadvantages, because it is really making some change, but in a very limited way.

If this is how things are with this strategy, one should ask, well, what would we like to see instead of it? We would like to see the world to change. Because the whole world is constructed around and is based upon gender inequality, there are not only separate problems to solve. The whole government is part of these problems, because it is (re)producing gender inequality by its policies. For me this is the main background of gender mainstreaming. To make sure that governments not only are not reproducing gender inequality by their policies, but that they actively work towards gender equality, in all of their policies and especially all their normal or regular policies, their tax policies, their pensions policies, their education policies, their employment policies. The whole of it. There is so much public money involved there, that it is against all principles of justice to have policies which privilege men. This is the political legitimisation of gender mainstreaming.

But that is only the background of the issue. What you need to do for gender mainstreaming is to re-organise the whole way, in which policies are made. The whole idea is connected to how power works, and this goes back to Foucault. First of all it has to be mentioned that these people in the government are not out there, only to discriminate against women or to exclude them. The case is that they are part of the gender inequality system and of the gender inequality discourse, so they are not even able to see where this bias is, because it is part and parcel of their reality. This means that in

gender mainstreaming you always have to see first of all the ways in which the gender bias is made through policies. One should answer these questions: Where do they get their data from, where is it decided what the problem is, what is the way they make policies? And then he/ she may try to reconstruct this policy process and introduce new routines, new actors or other procedures and new instruments, and make sure at the same time that they will not be able to include this gender bias again, make sure that knowledge on gender relations would be part of policy-making.

Gender mainstreaming, of course, is a very long-term strategy, because it changes things very slowly… so while you are using it, you still need the specific policies, because some problems of some groups of women are too urgent. Some migrant women are women with very low incomes, if they would have to wait for the strategy on gender mainstreaming to work, they might be dead by then. So it is better if you identify groups who have very specific problems and you try to work on these problems immediately, but at the same time you should try to see why is it that they have these problems, you should ask if there are any normal or regular policies, which are also related to their problems, and if these should not be reconstructed? To work on the latter aspects, it takes a lot longer, and sometimes you do not have time to wait for that.

E.M.V. At what stage is the work on gender mainstreaming right now? On the level of developing theoretical framework, developing theoretical arguments, or is it already translated to a certain degree into operational terms?

M.V. What I do and what a number of other people do is to develop instruments, to develop procedures, to develop good examples of how you can do that. For example, the gender impact assessment which we developed for The Netherlands is one instrument of gender mainstreaming.

E.M.V. Do you want to tell something more about that?

M.V. It is just a screening instrument, very similar to the environmental impact assessment. In the case of the environmental impact assessment, if you want to build a new airport and you want to know how it will affect the environment, you do an environmental impact assessment and then, if that is negative, you try and make another plan that will be less negative. Most Western European countries have such an instrument, and most importantly, most Western European countries have it in a compulsory way. The gender impact assessment is doing a similar thing, but related to gender. It asks: if we plan to have this new tax policy or this new education policy, how will that affect gender relations, how will it affect women and men? The instrument gives answers to these questions.

Now, the difference or maybe the problem with the gender impact assessment instrument in The Netherlands is that it is not compulsory. In that sense, it is not really gender mainstreaming, because it is done in a very accidental way. It has been done at several Ministries (ten times now), but it is not compulsory, it is a bit of an accident if it happens somewhere. More precisely it is not really an accident, it has been advocated by NGOs a number of times, but it is still not the system, and in order to be gender mainstreaming it would have to be a system. Because only in this way it could ensure that policies will be not made without a gender impact assessment. If this becomes compulsory, then you have a chance that this policy will be all right. This is exactly the reason why I am involved also in a new group who tries to improve this instrument. It has been used ten times, another researcher has done an evaluation on it, and there is some group of experts who is trying to develop it further, to make it better. At the same time the Ministry is busy to stimulate its use.

There was also a project that Yvonne Benschop and myself did for the Ministry of the Flemish community who asked me to make such an instrument for them in order to integrate gender into their

personnel policy. We agreed that it would be better to screen their whole process of making personnel policies, to see the whole picture: what exactly were they doing there and where could the gender bias be part of their work and how one might counter-balance that? Yvonne Benschop is from the business school, so she knows everything about personnel policy, and I know a lot about these instruments on gender mainstreaming. In the report we made a larger description of the project. First, we decided that this strategy would have to be adopted by the top of the Ministry, because nothing will ever happen in such an institution if only the equality unit wants something. We had interviews with the top of the Ministry and we asked them what was the gender problem here, what would they want to adopt as a goal, what did they know about the gender segregation in their organisation and so on. Then we discussed that with them. After the interviews we made for them a sort of a mission statement on gender in personnel policy and they were ready to adopt it. It was like an one page text and they sent it to the whole top of the Ministry, to two hundred people, who were around there, including the eight director generals. It was very important to define gender equality as a basic goal adopted by the top and communicated to the rest of the organisation.

We were working with people involved in training or in human research management, or with the statute of civil servants and different aspects of the personnel policy. They had to tell us what it was exactly they were doing there, how were they evaluating people, or were they making new laws on civil servants, or whatever. We used this information to explain to them how a gender connection could be hidden in what they were doing. We explained that this is never a direct connection, because they do not have special training for women, or laws only for women, or evaluation only for men, and we told them that these connections function indirectly. Because, for instance, if they will have certain procedures only for the top and there will be more men on the top, or they will

make certain training only for the top or for certain parts of the organisation where mostly men are, or only for the people with a certain type of contract, or for people who work full time, they will privilege some categories, while others will be disadvantaged. That is how it works, that is how gender segregation is connected to gender inequality, and how it is related to social norms of masculinity and femininity. We had to discuss this actively with them, because they did not always see a connection to gender. In the next step we made a short analysis of what were the strengths and weaknesses, and the threats and opportunities of the organisation linked to gender segregation.

After we had some kind of agreement on what was the problem, we started to develop ideas with them on what we could do. We proposed a whole action-plan. I will give here only some examples. We proposed that they always should have a segregation measurement in the annual personnel report, year by year, in order to see if things improved over time or not. We told them how to make such a measurement, because we knew what kind of data they had. They were very busy with making new job descriptions, so we made a checklist about how to avoid gender bias in job descriptions, and they promised us that they would use the checklist in making new job descriptions. We made a final agreement with them, about what they should do and who could do that. And as they were modern bureaucrats, this agreement got a place in the departmental annual plans. Of course, they still might not do it, but anyway, they built these principles into the normal evaluation procedure. And all this happened at the level of the individuals, as well. Everybody knew what he/she should do in each year, this became part of his/her annual plan and she or he would have a problem in the evaluation of that year if he or she had not done that.

E.M.V. This work must have take very much time…

M.V. Yes, it took a whole year. This is a good practice for gender mainstreaming, but obviously there are more good practices.

This was one, in which I have been involved. At that organisation there was a very small equality unit that had been trying to do something on the personnel policy, who found that our project improved their position, in particular it became a normal member of the personnel committee. As a result, they had a better access to and knowledge about the whole policy process, they could be present at all these meetings, they knew about all these promises, so they could also be a watch-dog in this committee. It was good for them. The Ministry decided to offer the possibility to four of their public institutions to do a similar project. We did this in the past years, just finished it before summer. And did a similar project for the Flemish Water Company, the Flemish Land Company, the Flemish Institute for the Entrepreneurs and a psychiatric hospital. These reports are now finished and most projects have been successful, with one exception. The Psychiatric Hospital, we discovered, hardly had any personnel policy. It is very hard to do gender mainstreaming on a policy that they do not have. They were a very old fashioned kind of institution, people got hired and fired, but they had no programs for selecting or training their people, no policy on how to improve them or how to evaluate them really, nothing much happened there. And if there are no procedures, you cannot change them. There has to be a procedure first, which one may start to improve.

This goes for Central European countries as well, I guess… There is a lack of procedures and routines in policy-making. At the same time, a certain kind of transparency is needed, as well, in order to find out how policies are made. Because it is very well possible that there is a routine for policy-making, but if there is no transparency at all, one can almost not find out who is really deciding something or where, or why? Of course, if you start a gender mainstreaming initiative, it can increase the transparency of the policy-making process. In any case, your work is easier if you work in a country like The Netherlands, where we have a law on

public information, due to which basically all information is public here.

E.M.V. And first of all you have to have an institution, or an organisation which recognises that there is a problem there with gender segregation and discrimination. Because the big problem, at least in our country, starts somewhere there… people usually say that there are no problems in the terms of gender equality and this is not an issue that we have to be concerned with. In this case the question is, how do you make people aware of the problems and how do you make them to accept that there is a problem and they have to solve that?

M.V. You need data, of course, to show them … To explain how this happened in The Netherlands, I have to start before we made the gender impact assessment instrument. What has been very influential in The Netherlands was a study called „Unseen difference according to sex". The researchers of this study analysed, I think, five policies, policy reports. You know, in The Netherlands we do not make many laws, we have a lot of policy reports that set out the direction. It is quite a vague type of policy-making here, sometimes. They had analysed five of these existing policies, their connections with gender, hidden norms on gender, hidden norms on femininity and masculinity. That work has been very influential, I think also because one of the policies was on sport. The current Minister for Sports at that time was a very famous feminist. This Minister was furious when she was „accused" of having gender bias in her policies on sports. At first she tried to block publication of the report altogether, and that caused a lot of attention. Since then no civil servant, being in his/ her right mind cannot afford to say that they have neutral policies. As I said, five policies were analysed, selected quite randomly. All of them appeared to have a large gender bias in them. As a result, there was a very firm ground to ask for the gender impact assessments.

When we made the instrument, we did four pilot projects on existing policies: two in a field where we thought everyone would think that there is a gender relevance, and two in a field of which people would think that it has nothing to do with it. We did an investigation on a policy about family forms, one on social security and employment policy, one on chronic illness policy, and another on the open-air recreation policy. Especially these last two ones were shocking. Because the whole program on open-air recreation did not even mention the words men and women, while it was only about activities that are predominantly „male": fishing, sailing, jet-skying. It was not about hiking or swimming or aerobics, or something like that. The policy on chronically ill people was also outrageously male biased. This policy said that the problem of chronically ill people was that they were not a full part of society. They get isolated and what we need to do in order to solve that problem is to find them places on the labour market. Now, that is really ridiculous in The Netherlands, because if you look at who are the chronically ill people in this country, you will find that the majority of these people are old or middle-aged women. And most of the middle-aged women in The Netherlands have never been on the labour market. We always had a very low female participation on the labour market. It is improved now, but this has no impact on the middle-aged women, only on the younger ones. So if most of these chronically ill people are women who have never been on the labour market, not even when they were healthy, you can see that to propose such a solution is practically nonsense. Who would hire someone without any experience on the labour market at the very moment when she is middle-aged and chronically ill? That is ridiculous. This policy could be a good strategy in the case of young people (mainly men), who have had an accident and became chronically ill as a result of that, but they are a total minority. Analysing this policy, we could show how a terrain that seemingly is gender-neutral, is deeply gender biased.

And I think this is what you could do in all countries where it is a problem: to take a few existing policies, analyse their texts and show very clearly that they are gender biased and try to get that into the public debate, so that it gets widely known.

E.M.V. Do you know any of such analysis done in Central and Eastern Europe?

M.V. No, not really… maybe in Slovenia. I think they made a good plan. In a way, they said, well, let's not start everywhere because we have limited resources, but let's start with an inter-ministerial group of three Ministries, which are open to the subject. Let's start with a process of training people, so that one may induce some gender expertise into the process of policy-making. But they did not get anywhere because the political context changed in a negative way. Since then, as far as I know, it has not been better.

E.M.V. Your research is also about how gender mainstreaming is used by different actors in different countries?

M.V. Yes…

E.M.V. And you have data on this from Western European countries…

M.V. Yes, the countries that are most advanced are Sweden and The Netherlands, but other countries have been quite active as well, like Norway, Belgium or Flanders also. And recently, there have been very interesting initiatives in Switzerland and France, at the regional level. So, yes, I keep track of that.

The reason for which I am interested in comparing is that countries seem to make very different choices in how to start and where to start. If you look at The Netherlands, we started with a gender impact assessment instrument, and in a way that was a very technocratic way of doing it. It was about de-politicising the issue. In Sweden, at the national level, they started with training their Ministers and State Secretaries on gender. What are the differences between the two approaches? The latter is much more dynamic, because these people can use their new expertise in all the things

they do. But one may ask what will happen if a new government comes, is it arranged or not that the new people would get training? If this is not organised, such an instrument is weak.

It is clear that you can develop all sorts of instruments. Part of the Swedish instrument at the local level – called 3R – is that you have to go and talk with all the people. At the local level you can do that, but at the national level it is almost impossible, participatory democracy does not work with millions of people. But if it is about villages, and it is about a youth policy or sport policy in that village, you can clearly go out and talk to the people and make sure you talk to as many women as men. You may try to take the different needs into account, and use consultation as a very important instrument for mainstreaming. Shortly put, it is easier to use this instrument at the local level, or maybe in specific fields, or in cases when one could consult with representative NGOs or with experts.

It is very clear to me that there are so many ways of doing it, and that is why I am wondering if there is a rule in the way in which these different contexts and these different ways of doing are connected. We tend to think that Sweden has a bit of a patronising policy style - think about the fact that Sweden is a country where alcohol is totally regulated in a prohibiting way -, they are acting as if their society would be better if they make something compulsory or forbidden. That is very different from The Netherlands. We think that something can only happen if we all agree on it. We think that if you would prohibit it will not work. So this is a difference in national culture and in the bureaucratic culture… The Netherlands also has a long tradition of dealing with problems in a technocratic way, which makes them solvable. This is a strategy of taking the political edge out of a problem, so that it can be discussed and solved. In a way, the gender impact assessment fits well into this pattern.

If one looks at Central and Eastern Europe, he/ she may see that those countries who are most eager to enter into the European Union are motivated for gender mainstreaming also along the line of

the Accession. Gender equality policy is one of the things which they can do to show that they are part of the West, or part of Europe, or whatever you call it. Two or three years ago, when I started to think about these differences I also aimed to contribute to gender mainstreaming developments in Central and Eastern Europe. But there are very different chances. I think that those Central and Eastern European countries where some feminist NGOs have developed, have some advantage because at least they have an agency in society that can work on gender equality. If the European Union is pushing these countries towards gender equality, NGOs can push from the other side to increase the chance for action. Countries where pushing comes only from the European Union can never get so far. It is clear that these NGOs are important, must be important in Central and Eastern Europe. I hope to find out more about this because I do not know enough. There is one main point where all these countries are really having an opportunity for gender mainstreaming and that is the fact that they are all undergoing large changes in the policy-making processes. There are no totally fixed routines in those countries, they are all undergoing changes, and wherever there is change in such a radical way there are opportunities for many things, because a system that is changing is not closed, cannot be closed. But I do not have any idea yet about how things will really happen on this domain.

Or, and that is the other part of the story, within Western Europe „equality" is the main framework to talk about gender mainstreaming. In fact equality is not naturally resulting from gender mainstreaming, no, gender mainstreaming is only a strategy to integrate a gender perspective. It does not prescribe what that gender perspective is exactly. This is one of the things I have discovered after having made the gender impact assessment in The Netherlands, when other countries called and wanted to adopt it. I had to ask myself: is it specifically Dutch or not? In the gender impact assessment, as we developed it, there were two criteria used

to decide if a policy was positive or negative, the criterion of equality and the criterion of autonomy. We could use these two criteria in The Netherlands because they were already there, they were in use in the policy-making process. Equality was adopted within what we call emancipation policy in equality before the law, and equal treatment, and so on. Autonomy was used in the field of development, in the sense of political autonomy, economic autonomy, sexual autonomy, physical autonomy, in a sense that women should have the opportunity to make their own decisions about what is a good life for them. We know that equality as a criterion has always a risk of having a male norm inside. Equal to whom? It is always women equal to men. There was a big risk of installing a male norm and in order to counterbalance this we thought that the idea of autonomy would be better than the concept of difference. Because difference easily implies that you have to assume some kind of essential difference between men and women, which we did not like, and which is totally not part of the Dutch culture. I think there is a large consensus in The Netherlands about the fact that basically men and women are both human beings, they are not really different. We tend to downplay the differences, whereas Southern European countries tend to emphasise them, stressing that men and women are really two different kind of people. So it is clear that through the criteria of the gender impact assessment, the goals and the fundamental criteria of gender mainstreaming are linked to the Dutch politics on emancipation. The same criteria would not be adopted probably in an Italian context, or in a Spanish context, or in a French context where difference is such a highly valued criterion.

To me, it is clear that there is not enough discussion within Europe on our different political views on what equality is and on the meanings of gender equality. People understand it very differently. For many people is not clear that equality is about gender, and not only about men and women, is about how the world

is defined, about how the world is interpreted, which are the definitions of femininity and masculinity, the definitions of, for example, who is a good father, and why is that different from being a good mother and so on. And what our schools are doing with that. I think there should be more political discussion on these issues.

But on a political level people may think that it is quite dangerous to have these discussions because now you can at least act as if you agree. You can pretend to agree. On specific levels, there are a lot of issues where the whole women's movement agrees. In the field on the violence on women, on domestic violence, for example, there is a large agreement on the fact that this is wrong. But if you look at prostitution you already see that there is no agreement in the women's movement. The Netherlands are defending good working conditions for prostitutes, and consider that legalisation of prostitution is a kind of solution, but the rest of Europe thinks that is really horrible.

I think we need a discussion on the goals and on what a gender perspective is. Yes, this discussion might be dangerous. Because at this point, there is consensus, even if it is a „pretended" consensus needed in order to be able to do something. Anyway, as far as I am concerned, I am interested in analysing how different views on this problem and on solutions are hidden in the policies on equality, and also how they get into a gender mainstreaming policy. That is one of the many things which I would like to find out in the next months.

ORGANISING ACROSS DISCIPLINARY BOUNDARIES

Gender, race and class, all of them are absolutely integral in helping students both understand the social world in which they will be going to work, but also enabling them to go out and practice in a way that combats sexism and racism and homophobia.

CAROL KEDWARD *

E.M.V. I would like to ask you about the School of Cultural and Community Studies of which you are dean, about your position

* *Professor Dr. Carol Kedward is dean at the School of Cultural and Community Studies, University of Sussex, Great Britain. She is teaching in theory and practice of social work, therapeutic interventions and family therapy, gender issues and anti-oppressive practice. Her recent publications include: „Violence and Practice Teaching", in* Practice Teaching: Changing Social Work*, edited by Hilary Lawson Jessica Kingsley, 1998; „Mediation and Post Adoption Contact", in* British Association of Adoption and Fostering Journal *1999; together with Hilary Lawson and Barry Luckock she is the author of* Local Authorities and Social Work Staff: Towards a Common Framework*, Department of Health Government Report of the Taskforce on Violence against Social Care Staff (website, www.doh.gov.uk/ violence taskforce 2001).*

in the school, and, most importantly: is it usual for a woman to become a dean in this university?

C.K. Sussex is divided into Schools of Study at the moment. All this is probably about to change and there are about eleven schools altogether, science and arts, and I am the only woman dean at the moment. There have been woman deans in the past, but I think only about two in the history of the university. Even though the School of Cultural and Community Studies has more women faculty than all the other schools, this is the first time even though we have many more female staff in the school than the others. What is nice about a woman dean is that a lot of other people seem to be pleased about that. I mean people have felt that there should be more women deans, there just have not been…

E.M.V. Is there any particular policy at your university for promoting women to high position?

C.K. There is not a policy, and, as I have said, there are not very many women professors in the universities either, considering how many staff there is. The present Vice-Chancellor, when he recently appointed some women professors, made a point of saying how very pleased he was to be able to do that, but he also made the point that there was not a policy of appointing people unless they were able and fit to do the job. So there is a positive attitude, but there is not a positive discrimination policy and in any case, Sussex has a rather unique way of getting deans… soundings are taken through the school, you are chosen by your school of studies, so to some extent, even if the Vice-Chancellor wanted to have a woman dean, unless the school chose women, it will not happen. In this sense I have to confess that, because my colleagues have chosen me, I am pleased to be here and very pleased that they chose a woman.

E.M.V. During the university's history were there periods when any kind of affirmative action or positive discrimination policy was practised here?

C.K. No, and I also think that a lot of women would say that Sussex has not done enough to facilitate women's promotion … In a way this happens across Western Europe, women are underrepresented in sciences, especially at higher levels. At undergraduate level there are a plenty of women in science. As soon as you get to the postdoctoral level they are fewer and as soon as you get above basic lecturer grade there are hardly any women in positions of power at all, a tiny number. But generally speaking, right across Sussex, women will say there are lots of women lower down. The usual thing happens, the higher up you go, the fewer women there are, and Sussex has not really done anything explicit or organised … although, as I said, the present administration is very pleased to be able to change that, but it is slow.

E.M.V. Do you think that you have a different style of deanship because you are a woman? Is there something gender specific in leadership?

C.K. I am quite cautious about that, not least because I have had experiences myself of being very badly managed by a woman, by somebody who is not here anymore. One has to be terribly careful about that and I do not think that I am doing anything, which a good male dean could not do.

It is also a little bit my orientation which makes me to think like this. As you know, therapy is one of my skills, so maybe that is why I have tried to be a good listener, I have tried to take staff development seriously, and I do try to foster a cohesive environment for the students and for the faculty. But, possibly, a male colleague, especially one coming from my discipline, which is a human relations based one, might do similar things. I can also think of women in other managerial positions in the university who do not do any of those things, and are actually really quite abrasive… In my own case some of my style is about my orientation and some of it is about my personal way of doing things, some of it is because I am a woman. So it is hard to disentangle.

E.M.V. How is your school structured?

C.K. We are quite unusual in the sense that we are half what you would have called once humanities and half social sciences, so we are really very interdisciplinary, but our focus is very much on cultural studies, as you might suppose, and cultural contacts. That is one of the important things about the original Sussex ideal. The disciplines that are based in this school are English, Media Studies, History of Art, Geography, History, and so we have a range of traditional disciplines and newer one, Media being an obvious example of a newer discipline. But the way in which those disciplines interact is what the school offers. We propose school courses to students, where people offer interdisciplinary perspectives, they present combined facets of major disciplines, so people often teach courses on culture, which may have elements of English and History of Art and Media, and Music, all mixed in the course. That is what makes the school different from a traditional department. And Women's Studies is very much a part of that, because although at the moment it is only offered at the graduate level, there are a lot of people in the school who are interested in the new undergraduate program, which will be called Gender Studies, which is a genuinely interdisciplinary discipline. So it fits very well with the school ethos.

E.M.V. This looks to be quite a difficult structure … faculty are organised in subject groups, but as well in the interdisciplinary programs. How does this work?

C.K. OK, well, subject groups are what other people would call departments. Everybody here belongs to a discipline, historians belong to a subject group called History, but they are attached to different schools depending to their orientations. So the historians who are particularly interested in cultural studies are in this school, historians who are much more interested in social and economic issues are in the school of social sciences, so you have two allegiances, usually: one to your subject group or department, and

the other to your school of studies. That is difficult to begin with, but once you get familiar with it, it is not as difficult as it looks.

Students spent half their time reading their major subject, History, for example, and the other half of their time reading school courses in the school in which they are based, so our students do half History or half Media, or half Music, or whatever, and half school studies. And those are specific courses designed to fit with the major subjects in our school.

E.M.V. At the same time, the professors are members of research institutes, or graduate research schools, while teaching at the undergraduate level as well…

C.K. Yes, a lot of faculties teach undergraduates, but as part of the School of Cultural and Community Studies they will also teach graduates in any of the graduate schools. And they will make up a work load with both, I mean some people do mostly undergraduate and a little graduate, some people do a lot of graduate teaching and just do a couple of undergraduate courses. There is a tier of organisation but I think that is not uncommon, that universities have undergraduate programs and graduate ones and there is an interrelationship between the two.

E.M.V. Do you have some personal interests invested in Women's Studies?

C.K. Well, certainly, in my graduate teaching I always integrate the gender perspective in my courses. Gender, race and class, all of them are absolutely integral in helping students both understand the social world in which they will be going to work, but also enabling them to go out and practice in a way that combats sexism and racism and homophobia. This is absolutely central to the teaching that I am doing, and I think that much of the undergraduate tutors are very aware of those issues. They might well teach literature, for example, but using that approach, in order to make people aware of gender issues, this would be absolutely core to the way in which they approach their critical understanding of any text.

E.M.V. That is great, but it is still a difference between using gender perspective in different courses and having a program as such…

C.K. Yes, sure… And in the new, reorganised framework of our school, hopefully there will be a program as such, because as you know Sussex is reorganising its curriculum, a lot of work is going on around that. In the future Gender Studies will be available at undergraduate level as well, and that would be a huge advance, beside, as I have said, having the awareness of gender in other teaching. This will be excellent.

E.M.V. Is Gender Studies going to be structured under the School of Cultural and Community Studies?

C.K. Well, that is under discussion at the moment… Changing the academic structure, at the same time the administrative structure does need some streamlining. This is rather cumbersome, complicated and consequently time wasting at the moment and expensive to run… But how it gets reorganised is a subject for very, very heated debate, because there are very different views about how that should be done. And we are embarking on that process right this minute, so there are lots of strong feelings around it. So I cannot tell you at this moment that in 2003, when this starts, what the administrative structure would look like, because there is a lot of arguing and discussion going on. The School of Cultural and Community Studies will certainly not exist in its present form, nor any of the other schools will be the same, there are going to be huge changes.

E.M.V. Why is there a need for restructuring these schools?

C.K. I think because there are quite a lot of schools, and it is expensive to run them all… On the other hand I do not believe that a huge restructuring along the lines of just two enormous Art Schools is helpful, because they will be to big, there will be lots of tiers in the administration to do all the things that we at present do separately. There is a huge amount of time which needs to be spent on

organisation, staff support, and student support and I do not think students will feel attached to an enormous faculty of humanities or whatever. We do need to reorganise but we do need to consult very widely about what people will feel would fit best with the interdisciplinary structure. Because that is at the heart of Sussex and if we lose that, then really we lose something very important, and a lot of people will probably leave or feel utterly demoralised. We do need some streamlining, we do need to save some money, but we need to be very careful about how we do it, because if we do it wrong, we will end up in a worse position than we are now, actually. A lot of my male colleagues who are deans feel the same: we must be careful how we do this. We are not against change, at all, but we do have to be careful what kind of change we make, how fast it is brought about and how well we support the people who will do it. Because everybody is working very hard at Sussex and you cannot just tell them that they have to move under other structures, whether they agree with it or not, because clearly that would be a disaster.

And there is the interdisciplinary structure, the very base of Sussex, a lot of time already invested in organising it. It would be a great shame to just forget about it… There seems to be a general agreement on the fact that interdisciplinarity is very important and that we would be very foolish to give that up, because a lot of other universities are moving towards that.

E.M.V. How do the changes affect the new Gender Studies program planned to be started at undergraduate level in 2003?

C.K. The new program will exist as an undergraduate program, that is a decision which has been taken now, and the paper work is all going through, which is great.

It is the other issue, which is not clear, where it will be located. The fear is that if the new structure of the university is wrong, then a new program like Gender Studies, instead of being well supported and encouraged, over time would be undermined, and not just

Gender Studies, but other interdisciplinary programs as well. They might wither away, and we need to be extremely careful about that.

It is a stressful time to be at the university, sometimes there are exciting times, obviously, but now is very stressful. Because the discussions on structural issues are quite fraught, really, there are very different views about where we should go, and it is very wearing to constantly debate these things, and, of course, maintain the present program in a good state. Because you know, we have students here now, they need to be well taught, well supported and to have a good experience for this is their unique time at the university. It is very important to bear that in mind, too.

Shortly put, it is a busy time to be a new dean.

E.M.V. I can imagine that the debates around restructuring are also about losing some leadership positions, and gaining some new ones, because the existing power structure will be changed as well. Are there any conflicting interests among disciplines, or among schools, or, among the more culturally orientated subject groups and social sciences, for example?

C.K. Well, there are all kinds of power struggles. But in this school we have a very good tradition on working together, of being able to disagree very strongly, but without becoming vindictive about it. I hope the same happens in other schools as well: they should be able to talk these things out and arrive at sensible compromises really because obviously the potential for things to get very unpleasant is there… we shall see…

E.M.V. As far as I understood, your school has now the highest number of the enrolled students. Is it so?

C.K. I think that is right, we are a very big school, yes, we have got well over eight hundred students and probably we will have near to nine hundred if all goes well next autumn. So that is one of the concerns, if you put all these schools together, you will have thousands of students, and we know that one of the things which keeps students attached to their university is a sense of identity with

a cohesive welcoming unit. So, if you do away with schools, you have to put something else there, that students can bond with, because otherwise, they quite feel very alienated, the weaker students, or the most stressed students may leave. This already happens, and the university is very concerned about the number of students who, because of the pressures of university life these days find it difficult to stay here. So, those are the sorts of things that will have to be thought through.

E.M.V. Basically it is the financial concern that generated all this restructuring process?

C.K. It is partly financial, yes, and it is partly about workload. The theory is that because it is a very complicated structure, and there are too many choices offered for students, we end up doing too much teaching. At Sussex, really, faculty in the Arts do a lot of teaching, they are very heavily burdened. The restructuring is driven by a number of considerations. The theory runs that if you could simplify the structure it would ease people's workloads and it would be cheaper. But it is not entirely clear to me that would be true up to a point. It is also important to mention that one may see these kinds of changes in other domains of activity as well in Britain, today. It happens in social services, and the health services, for example, where tiers of bureaucracy have been cut out, but then a lot of them had to be put back in, because things do not happen without a certain level of management. People discovered that it was nobody's job to do a whole range of things, and gradually, a lot of these tasks got put back in, and posts had to be re-created, and that is how one goes around a great circle. I think we should try to do things more simply but we should be careful, as we say in English, not to throw the baby out with the bathwater. I mean we just need to be careful, and check at each stage that what we are doing makes sense and that it does not have unforeseen consequences which that we have not thought through. You will have to come back in 2005 and see how it is all going.

E.M.V. Let me mention at the end of our discussion another aspect of Sussex, which is amazing for me: the fact that you have so many students, visiting faculty and researchers from all over the world. It must be great to have this diversity, which makes academic life very exciting, full with all kinds of exchange and debates.

C.K. Yes, you are right. And we always try to include in our courses a cross-cultural approach, for example the newly proposed Gender Studies program does that, but I was aiming for that as well within the new Cultural Studies program. We have gone to enormous lengths to include both the historical past and the present across borders. We have, for example, programs on Chinese art, and we have a lot of African based input. We have tried very hard to make our school as wide-ranging and varied and rich as possible, both in terms of time scale and geographical input, and intellectual discipline. That is how we became truly interdisciplinary, and all that is very exciting, that is the bit I think everybody is feeling very positive about. And in particular, as you know, one of the great strength of Gender Studies and Women's Studies is that it has managed to involve people from worldwide and this is a very enriching thing which we should continue to do at Sussex.

CHAPTER 2

PRODUCING FEMINIST KNOWLEDGE

GENDERING POLITICS

The famous core concepts of political traditions, citizenship, authority, justice, leadership and democracy all are gendered, but political scientists refuse to recognise that…You have to use face to face contacts to convince them of the fact that gender is more than just adding on women in politics.

JOYCE OUTSHOORN

THE CONSTRUCTION OF SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE – A FEMINIST VIEW

Take, for example, experiments on mating behaviour in rats. Female rats were tied to the cage and the male rats were entered freely into the cage and then one could observe how male mating behaviour took place. What you could not observe in such a situation was female mating behaviour.

INEKE KLINGE

THE CROSS-CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING OF REPRODUCTION

By providing contraception, you do not necessarily empower women ... condoms do not make any sense in a context where you do not actually talk about sexual matters with your husband. Or where, as a woman, you do not have the idea that you may have some kind of authority to insist your husband wear a condom.

MAYA UNNITHAN

EMPOWERING INFORMATION

The traditional way of looking at women's information is to define it as information, which contributes to the improvement of the position of women ... But that information does not just exist: it has to be created. That is why, in a way, doing research is a form of empowerment. Moreover, we have definitely to notice the connection between providing information and making change happen.

LIN McDEVITT-PUGH

GENDERING POLITICS

The famous core concepts of political traditions, citizenship, authority, justice, leadership and democracy all are gendered, but political scientists refuse to recognise that…You have to use face to face contacts to convince them of the fact that gender is more than just adding on women in politics.

JOYCE OUTSHOORN [*]

E.M.V. You are professor at the University of Leiden, at the Faculty of Social Sciences, and the chair of the Women's Studies

[*] *Professor dr. Joyce Outshoorn is director of the Joke Smit Institute for Women's Studies at Leiden University The Netherlands. She studied political science and contemporary history, her first thesis was on the women's organisation of the Dutch Social Democrat Party around 1890-1920, and her doctorate was on the contemporary abortion issue in The Netherlands. Her fields today are comparative politics, public policy, and social movements, i.e. women's movements. At the present she is working on an international co-operative project which compares a number of advanced industrial democracies to trace the impact of women's movement and women's policy agencies on public policy, looking in how far they have managed to gender a number of critical debates on issues concerning women (such as abortion, prostitution and trafficking of women, and the representation of women in political decision making).*

Centre called Joke Smit Institute. At the beginning I would like to ask you to talk about this institute.

J.O. The Joke Smit Institute is actually a recent invention… Before 1996 we had a Department, but when all the Dutch universities changed the system in 1996-1997, things changed here, in Leiden, as well, however, each town had done this in a different way.

In 1996 we have found it necessary to set up a centre for Women's Studies, for research purposes. Before we were able to combine teaching and research within our department where we were allowed a lot to stay together for our research. But in 1996 the teaching was allocated to the other departments, of which we are members, too. Before 1996 we had a Faculty organising subjects in Women's Studies, which the students in Leiden could take as an optional or could do the whole Women's Studies program, as part of the regular, compulsory curriculum in various departments in the social sciences, such as political science, anthropology, public administration, psychology and education. In 1996 it was a loss for us not to have the department any more, both in institutional and individual terms. But anyway, we could at least set up a new research centre.

So the faculty allowed us to do that… and we call it Joke Smit Institute after the person, who was a pioneer in women's movement, but as well a member of the council of Amsterdam. When she led the council, she held a very famous speech in which she compared the male political arena with monkeys on a rock in the zoo. Later she became active in the Labour Party and she was also very important in the first emancipation commission that the Dutch government set up to organise women's policy in The Netherlands.

The institution is very small. Before 1996 we had a large group, there were five permanent positions and a secretary, we had quite a big job, four days a week, we had at least one research student, a PhD student, and we did quite a lot of research for

government, for local government, but also for central government and also sometimes for private organisations. That is what we called contact research, so we managed to have extra-people coming in to do research for us, usually about three to four, whose salary was paid by the local government, money provided by these organisations. In 1993-1994 we had fifteen people working here… that was a large number. To do contract research requires a lot of time, it requires a lot of negotiations, you have got to be very careful about the contracts. The financial part is difficult and you have to watch your books very carefully, and you also have to have somebody to look after all of this. After the institutional re-organisation we could no longer afford to have somebody to do that. And I could not do it because I had so many other duties. We said, OK, let us cut down.

We have been living on a very modest scale since 1997. But recently we have started again to do contract research. And some of the difficulties we have had, we are meeting them again, so it is not easy to deal with. I think it is a bad thing we do not call it contract research anymore, because it did provide opportunity for young women to get research experience under the conditions in which PhD places at universities were scarce. About five years ago it was very hard for graduate people who wanted to continue an academic career, and the contract research provided an opportunity for them. They could stay and be trained, we had some really good people who got their PhDs much later and who, of course, acquired a research experience here. But that was exciting for us as well, because we have been able to do new things, and also to be able to get a close look on the politics of the government, both at the local and national level.

We did a little bit of research for client's organisations, such as the Platform for senior citizens, the organisations of old people and we have get a really good insight in how society was working. And it also gave us a role in the local society… we all wanted to be not

just purely academics, we felt the need of a social and political change. Doing contract research is really a good way for that, because you have this expertise, you have the researchers, and you try to work with people in society or civil servants who are working in the human services, often feminists as well, and you could really combine that two into something new and something good.

We did not make much money out of it, that was never the idea, it was meant to be a training ground, so it was a pity to drop it, but it was no way to continue it due to financial reasons, to the hard times through which the whole university was running through. But what we have been able to maintain is that all of us continue to teach compulsory subjects, which include gender, throughout different courses at the university. And that was also important to us because we believed that it is really important that not just students who do Women's Studies are informed about gender, but others, too, who are doing „regular" disciplines. So we are all glad that we are doing part of the core curriculum. We still give courses on feminist classics, we teach people about the traditions of the feminist thinking, so we start right in the Middle Ages, with Christine de Pisan and the French writings of the 17th century and we let them read Mary Wollstonecraft and John Locke and Olympe de Gouges, and, of course, the classics of the second wave of feminism. Sometimes we are a little bit contested because of the core courses we still held, my colleagues are under pressure to teach mainstream political science, mainstream psychology and so forth and not to teach feminism any longer.

In comparison with Utrecht, for example, in Leiden one cannot take gender in humanities, and there is no major in Women's Studies. What it is possible here, it is a cross teaching in the social sciences. Leiden is a very conservative university, is an establishment university, it is also very disciplinary, they want to retain the idea that they are disciplined, of which of course I am extremely critical, and anything which is interdisciplinary they are

very distrustful. And this organisation is very hard to change if you want to break across or break the disciplinary structures. Everything is organised, institutionalised along disciplinary main lines and that gives us a lot of trouble in trying to organise ourselves.

Well, I was looking to the case of Amsterdam, and, of course, in Amsterdam a lot of people started to do Women's Studies in the 1960s, '70s, but there things have not worked very well, there was an endless political fighting. So when I had the opportunity to come to Leiden, I was happy to be invited to apply for a job here, however I knew this was a more conservative university, a very well organised university. But I am still glad I did it, in spite of what happened in 1996-1997, and even now, when our group became smaller, I think the program is going well, our teaching is going well, and I never felt sorry I left Amsterdam.

Of course there was a challenge for me, because when I came here, everything was still very experimental, and I had to set up a permanent institution. It had been a hard work. Now, when I am getting a bit older, I am glad that young people takes it up. I have done a lot of administration, I have done a lot of politics, and actually I am glad to have more time for research now. I am writing more than I wrote five years ago and I think it is really good because if you do research that is what you have to do. So, we came a long way… and it was not easy, it was not a natural thing to have Women's Studies, it was a permanent fight.

E.M.V. And I assume that you have done the same fight in your discipline for making the feminist perspective to be recognised.

J.O. Oh, yes, I cannot say… In political sciences we have been less successful in that than others were in other disciplines. There is quite an international discussion on this, and many articles are published about why is this the case. There is a consensus on the fact that political sciences have been willing to put on their research agenda some gender-related issues, like women in politics, women in Parliament, women's movement. But, political scientists are very

much focused on political behaviour and on institutions, and they are less willing to take on a criticism of the core concepts, a criticism of the institutions. I mean the famous core concepts of political traditions, citizenship, authority, justice, leadership and democracy, well, they all are gendered, but political scientists refuse to recognise that. One part of the explication is that political science has taking up very slowly the course of the day, they started very late to transgress the disciplinary borders.

The other side of the explanation is related to the fact that among Women's Studies scholars, politics have often been neglected. Women have been taken into a lot of other fields, but there seems to have been desertion in the field of politics. I think it has to do with the feminist distrust of the state… it also has to do with the turn to linguistics, and it takes some time before Women's Studies could actually apply new ideas from the linguistic turn into political science. I think that only recently, during the last two or three years the debate about the cross-fertilisation of the disciplines has been taken up again in my discipline. In the last two-three years there has been a sort of reopening of the debate, which I think it is extremely important, it is very welcomed.

If you look to Amsterdam in these terms, things are quite well. You know, in Leiden the situation is much more conservative once again, but there used to be a really good woman professor teaching at the department here, she was teaching women and politics. But she got a very good job in Nijmegen, so she left. She was not replaced. There were other two good women, they have got jobs elsewhere, and when I joined the department there were only two other women on the start… they were in junior position, so I was the only senior person here, on this domain. The mainstream political science ignores the feminist political thinking and my male colleagues tend not to think about gender. I think that the problem in Leiden with political science is that it always does so well in the university ratings, it does not entertain the idea that things might

have to change. Leiden is a good university, the Leiden political sciences are on the top, you know. So, it is possible to introduce topics which are congruent to its research, but nothing more fundamental, and you have to take the initiative yourself to introduce feminist issues. And zou have touse face-to-face contacts to convince others of the fact that gender is more than just adding on women in politics.

At the national level, what we do, where we are successful is that political science is organised in The Netherlands in the Association of Political Science and we have annual meetings and workshops every other year. Within the Dutch Political Science Association it is possible to organise and to get women together, there is never any problem, and we usually manage to put together quite distinct workshops. Fourteen scholars are coming together, mainly women, that is OK … there you can get feedback on your work, a feedback that is really missing if you present your work for your male colleagues. That is why I like Women's Studies.

E.M.V. Let me ask you now to talk a little bit about your research subject. As far as I have read, it is quite diverse, including women's organisation, abortion, social democrat parties, and so on and so forth. And, as related to that, please comment on why it is that abortion, the politics of reproduction, but as well prostitution is so central to politics?

J.O. Because all these issues has to do with the body. The body has become a political issue, with the rise of state power and the importance of demographics. What you see today, everything, of course, goes really back in history, in the increasing of the state power in the 19th century, and the interstate rivalry in the European context. And I am not thinking only about the colonial context, but also about the interstate rivalry between Germany, French, Russia, and others, which of course wanted to build empires.

I think that from that moment state parties took interest not only in the number of the bodies but also in the quality of the bodies.

You see an increased interest of the state to anything what contributes to the quality of the „good bodies", an interest in education policy, back in 19th century, the beginning of health policies. And you also see this interest in putting laws on abortion and contraception. Prostitution was seen as a health hazard to the military, so it had to be regulated for health reasons in many European countries.

As far as my research is concerned, now I am working on a comparative international project (called RNGS, Research Network on Gender Politics and the State) in which we assess the impact of the women's movement and women's policy on the state. For this we work on advanced democratic states, and we have chosen five issue areas for in depth analysis, like abortion, prostitution, job training, political representation and a hot issue, varying per country, depending on what is hot in that particular polity. Two books have been published already; I am editing now the third, on *The Politics of Prostitution*.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE
A FEMINIST VIEW

Take, for example, experiments on mating behaviour in rats. Female rats were tied to the cage and the male rats were entered freely into the cage and then one could observe how male mating behaviour took place. What you could not observe in such a situation was female mating behaviour.

INEKE KLINGE[*]

E.M.V. You are the coordinator of the Dutch Research Network for Women's Studies in Biology and Medicine. I do not

[*] *Dr. Ineke Klinge is assistant professor in Gender Studies in Health Sciences at Maastricht University, The Netherlands. Biologist by training, she is specialized in immunology and in Gender Studies in Science. As lecturer at Utrecht University (1988-1997) she developed and coordinated an interdisciplinary research program, Health and Gender: the medicalisation of the female body with a focus on ageing. Her PhD thesis Gender and Bones : the Production of Osteoporosis 1941-1996 was published in 1998. In 2001 she conducted a European Community commissioned study, and together with M. Bosch she published the resulted paper* Gender in Research. Gender Impact Assessment of the specific programmes of the Fifth Framework Programme. Quality of Life and Management of Living Resources *(EUR 20017), Brussels: European Commission, 2001. Her current research programme focuses on genomics from a gender and diversity perspective with special attention for practices of prevention of cardiovascular disease and osteoporosis. Female embodiment in a risk culture is another line of research. Her main publications in English are: „Female bodies and brittle bones. Medical interventions in osteoporosis", in* Embodied practices. Feminist perspectives on the body, *edited by K. Davis, London: SAGE Publishers, 1997: 59-72; „Menopause and osteoporosis: theoretical aspects. Effects of pluriform practices for present day health care and for women", in* Journal of Psychosomatic Obstetrics and Gynaecology, *18(2), 1997: 105-112; „Postmodern visions of the menopausal body: the apparatus of bodily production and the case of brittle bones", in* Between Monsters, Goddesses and Cyborgs. Feminist Confrontations with Science, Medicine and Cyberspace, *edited by N. Lykke and R. Braidotti, London & New Yersey: Zed Books, 1996: 192-206.*

know if you still are, but I have read about this on your web site… as related to that I would like to ask you about the position of Women's Studies in Biology and Medicine and about what are feminist science studies about?

I.K. Well, I was the coordinator of the Network of Feminist Studies in Biology and Medicine. I have been that for ten years but it is finished now and that Network does not exist any longer in its original form. The reason for which was founded, I think in 1988, (at least at that time I entered the network and I soon became the coordinator), was a need of a community of researchers who were doing Feminist Studies or Women's Studies in biology and in medicine and in psychology. All these researchers were carrying out PhD projects and they needed a platform for feedback or theoretical discussions or even a personal support, but it was always the contents that were on the foreground. We had a meeting schedule, we met about seven times a year and we discussed each other's work in progress. Two persons were always presenting an article in preparation or part of their theses and the others had to react. There was a rather strong discipline to attend… It was a good forum for each other, especially for those, who were not having very specialized supervisors at their university… so our effort was really to create, well, this Women's Studies enterprise, so to say. Not everybody completed her thesis, some left and gave up the project of writing their thesis, but well, some ten have successfully completed their PhD. However, not all ten succeeded in getting a tenured job afterwards.

E.M.V. So this was the first generation of scientists doing Women's Studies.

I.K. Yes, this more specialized network on biology and medicine was split off from a larger group of Women's Studies in the natural sciences, which also included women mathematicians, chemists, physicists. The latter organised themselves into another network called Nymph (Network of mathematicians, chemists, and

people in informatics). The reason for this split was because the questions and the perspectives you could employ as Women's Studies scientists in the exact sciences were rather different from areas as biology and medicine, also called the life sciences.

E.M.V. I would like to ask you to characterise a little bit some main problems and research topics that are considered being part of the feminist science studies.

I.K. A large number of topics have been subject of Dutch PhD research. If I recall these theses in chronological order then we have Nelly Oudshoorn – she was the first one to complete her thesis; she studied the development of sex hormones, the early history of endocrinology and the labelling of sex hormones as male and female hormones: during that period, the chemical substances, became labelled as female sex hormones and male sex hormones, although female sex hormones turned out to be present in a male's body and vice versa. She also described how those chemicals were materialized into a technology for contraception, the development of the contraceptive pill for women. The definition of the female body in terms of hormones, in contrast to the male body, has been one of the reasons, according to Oudshoorn, of the delay in the development of a male contraceptive pill.

A second thesis addressed theories on the organisation of the brain, under the influence of prenatal hormones, written by Marianne van den Wijngaard. She analysed theories about the „male" brain and the „female" brain, the ways in which those theories became accepted and what it meant, and if it could have been otherwise.

A third thesis by Els Bransen, addressed premenstrual syndrome; this thesis was not completed, but a number of articles appeared.

Martha Kirejczyk wrote a thesis on reproductive technology focusing on issues of embedding in-vitro fertilization in The Netherlands.

Irma van der Ploeg also addressed reproductive technologies in her thesis on female embodiment in reproductive technologies.

A former colleague of mine, Christien Brouwer is still working on a thesis on botany, a topic from another branch of biology, on how elements of a flower, pistil and stamina became labelled as male and female sex organs. It is a historical study located in the 17th and 18th century.

Another member of the network, Lidy Schoon has written a thesis on the development of gynaecology as an area of „embodiment" of women, on how gynaecology became *the* science of women.

My thesis addressed the issue of women and osteoporosis, called *Gender and Bones: the production of osteoporosis 1941-1996*. Maybe I have not mentioned all members now but I think you have a fairly good idea. Network member Yvonne Winants who is a medical doctor, wrote a thesis on the socialization of doctors during their training to become a good doctor and what happens then, how that is different for men and women.

E.M.V. I guess there must have been a reason and a need for the appearance of such perspectives in the life sciences…

I.K. Yes, from our part the need was there, explicitly, and of course, we were inspired by developments in the arts and in social sciences. Women's studies in those areas were ahead of us, and these enterprises were supported by the government and by local universities. From the mid-eighties, opportunities were created to explore what Women's Studies in biology might be, how this domain might be developed and what kind of things should then be the topic of the research.

E.M.V. Let me come back to what feminist science studies might be … I am wondering if it is about reflecting on what life sciences were doing and how they were constructing the image of the two sexes and the body as a natural fact. Is it this what is about?… Or is about more?

I.K. Well, since Women's Studies is now well established in the life sciences, not only in The Netherlands, but also in the Anglo-Saxon world, we can reflect on the history of its development. Londa Schiebinger has also reviewed this history in her book: Has feminism changed science?

First of all, there were some big gaps in sciences; some sciences were not about women. Women were simply left out or not seen as interesting for research; some conditions in women have never been of interest to male researchers. Feminist scientists try to fill these gaps. On the other hand, scientific research aims to be objective and neutral. And the feminist scientists who engaged in biology, medicine, well, their first task was to expose how the sciences were not neutral and how scientific knowledge was not as neutral as one has always wanted it to be or still wants it to be seen like that. So they pointed to several elements of scientific research in which these two starting points were no longer tenable. Others started to talk about the design of the scientific experiment, which might be very male biased. Take, for example, experiments on mating behaviour in rats. Female rats were tied to the cage and the male rats were entered freely into the cage and then one could observe how male mating behaviour took place. What you could not observe in such a situation was female mating behaviour. Actually the researchers were not interested in that, because it was not their idea that females could take initiatives in mating behaviour, except for being receptive to the male. When this experiment was done in a different way, and the females were not tied to the cage, then they saw a lot of other mating behaviour of the females, as well as of the males. This demonstrated the fact that the method is not neutral, but also influenced by gender presuppositions. Moreover, next gender influences also the interpretation of results, it is rather obvious that there is a difference between speaking about a male lion and his harem, or about a group of female lions, which just tolerate one male.

The idea that scientific knowledge is not to be „discovered", but that scientific knowledge is „made", is produced, and dependent on particular local situations, on time and place, gradually took over the early approaches above. It can be viewed as the constructivist turn in feminist science studies, which focuses on how particular conditions are dependent on definitions of time and place, and also how science is not only reproducing gender, but also producing gender. This was a real epistemological shift.

E.M.V. I would be very interested to find out about your relations with your basic specialisations and also with Women's Studies in arts and social sciences. How do they receive your work? Do you have impacts on both sides?

I.K. Yes, we hoped to… When I was carrying out this coordination work and was doing my PhD research, I was located in a department called Science and Society, a department in which biologists, chemists and physicists worked together, with a more reflexive attitude compared to the „real" experimental departments. We were not standing behind the laboratory bench, rather we reflected on „what is science", and „what is science" meant to be.

In that department we developed a research program for Women's Studies in the natural sciences, in which we created a co-operation with the Arts Faculty, with social scientists, and with women's studies in Pharmacy. The program was called the medicalisation of the female body, in which all the above disciplines worked together. The philosopher Rosi Braidotti was especially interested in the body, and so were others as well. It was a rather big interdisciplinary program.

The reception of this program by other groups of Women's Studies was always very good. They rather admired us to tackle such „hard" area like the life sciences and medicine. However, within my department of Science and Society we had to defend that gender is relevant in research.

For my PhD thesis, which was so explicitly about a biomedical topic, I had to work with medical doctors, too. My second supervisor was a professor of medicine. Of course, I was not going to treat patients or to tell how it could be done better, but I analysed the kind of basic scientific knowledge lying at the basis for practitioners and specialists in prescribing treatment.

The medical professor recognised his area of specialty in my writings on the subject, and I could take the liberty to take another stand, to give another view of the development of the area. So that's the difference between a researcher and a doctor, because a researcher never sits behind a desk to prescribe some treatment to a patient. It offers more room for reflection on scientific knowledge.

E.M.V. It looks to me that in life sciences it is even more difficult to make people recognise the relevance of the gender perspective than in social sciences.

I.K. Yes, it is a lot more difficult. But it is coming now and I must say that at this very moment, we conduct a commissioned study for the European Commission. It is a Gender Impact Assessment of the European Union research program for the life sciences. Somehow an ultimate point, it is about the redressing of science policies, about really incorporating a gender dimension into research!

E.M.V. At a certain moment you were taking part in the Women's International Study Europe (WISE) lobby for improving the Fifth Framework Program of the European Community for Research, being the chair of the Women, Science and Technology Division of WISE.

I.K. Yes, but that is also changed… since I have become appointed in Maastricht and my research area now is explicitly health and health care, I thought I should no longer chair Science & Technology, but I should chair Gender and Health. Now I have launched an initiative to start this division.

The WISE report produced by Margit van der Steen and Renée C. Hoogland gave recommendations on how to incorporate a gender dimension in the Fifth Framework Program. The Women and Science issue became a real topic for the European Commission, but that was not only the outcome of the WISE lobby, but it was due as well to the efforts of Mrs. Cresson. We are now a step further. The Fifth Framework Program is in execution. We are asked to assess the integration of the gender dimension in that program and have to frame recommendations for the next Sixth Framework Program.

Our Gender Impact Assessment of the EU research program for the Life Sciences „Quality of Life and Management of Living Resources (QoL)" will, on a very detailed level, give recommendations on how the gender dimension should be taken into account in all areas of the life sciences. What it would mean in agricultural research, in cellular, molecular research, how should it look like in research on food and nutrition, how should it be done in the case of the research on ageing, on chronic diseases, on neurosciences? All these different areas belong to the QoL program. We love to do it, it is a very challenging task and never done before, it is a very novel thing to do.

E.M.V. It must be very important to have an impact on making research-policy, because it is money and it is power there, it is the power, among others, of defining the main directions of the research…

I.K. Yes, it is a large project, a large amount of money goes around, it is public money because member states pay to the European Commission, so from a point of justice, you could also say that research issued by the European Commission should at least benefit men and women alike. Inequalities like women who do not receive research projects or research that is not covering the needs of women, should be corrected if you are dealing with public money.

The gender impact studies are really meant to further develop science by women, to strengthen the participation of women in

science and to improve research on and for women. In short to stimulate research by, for and about women. From my point of view the most challenging thing is to try to convey your gender literacy to the administrators in Brussels. Look, science by women and for women is easy to see, but if you are going to talk about gender as a power relationship, then it already becomes difficult but nonetheless, that is our objective. We have to employ a careful and educational approach, I think, to convince the EU officers. We do not want them to take their hands off the project, because it is too difficult or too political. Of course, it is political, but you should phrase your issues in such a way as not to loose your horizon, but to take them step-by-step towards your goals. That would be my objective. You learn a lot when dealing with administrators.

E.M.V. One should use another kind of language with them?

I.K. Yes, sure, you have to be very careful.

E.M.V. And what about women's positions in life sciences and technology sciences?

I.K. That has been, for a long time already, also an issue of attention for the European Commission. A report called The ETAN Report – European Technology Assessment Network, gives an overview of data on the participation of women in science for the different European countries. It is a very comprehensive report, very well written, elegantly, very convincing. It is a systematic inventory of the position of women, how it happened, what kind of measures should be taken, which kind of measures have already been taken. The aim of this report is to secure a gender mainstreaming in science policy.

By the way the report notes that the participation of women in science in The Netherlands is the lowest of all European countries. There are only 5% female professors.

E.M.V. In life sciences?

I.K. In life sciences… in all sciences…

E.M.V. In all sciences?

I.K. In life sciences even worse, I think…

E.M.V. Do you have an explanation for that?

I.K. Well, explanations are difficult to give, numbers always have to be seen in relation to the particular history of a country or to a particular societal system. Many have put forward that the dominant post-world war societal system in The Netherlands, in which the man is the breadwinner and the woman is the caretaker at home, has been a factor in this development. However it can not be the only factor and we have also to look for other explanations such as the provision of child-care, and so on and so forth.

E.M.V. I would like to ask you to return a little bit to your own research on gender and bones, on the medicalisation of the female body, and on the cultural images of this medicalisation. It would be nice to find out how are these issues linked, for example, what is gender doing with bones …

I.K. I have written some articles in English on the subject, so I could provide you with the articles… In short: there have been two theories put forward on osteoporosis, one, which considered that the primary cause of osteoporosis is a deficiency of oestrogen, and the other affirming that the primary cause is a deficiency of calcium. The theory that took the deficiency of oestrogen as a causal mechanism immediately connected this to menopause, due to which male patients soon disappeared form the osteoporosis scene. The therapy, namely giving estrogens to women was linked to the cultural conviction that oestrogen is standing for femininity. So if you were taking care of your bones, you were also preserving your femininity. It is very obvious to see the influence of gender here. Both ways of treating or preventing osteoporosis were connected to concepts about femininity, and the images used in advertising are showing this nicely, although very differently. In the case of oestrogen therapy, the fight against osteoporosis was about a fight for preserving femininity and preserving a woman, even preserving an emancipated woman, while in the case of calcium therapy the

information was linked directly to the osteoporosis itself, but at their turn emphasized a fear for future fractures and a fear for getting crippled etc. I tried to catch this difference in pictures, they are in my thesis, you can see how in promoting a therapy for osteoporosis you are also promoting female sexuality etc. That emphasis was absent in the other therapy, which instead played on the fear factor.

I chose the topic of osteoporosis within the Utrecht Women's Studies program „The Medicalisation of Female Body" because it was about a part of a woman's life, which had not received much research attention. We had become acquainted to research on the medicalisation of childbirth, of pregnancy, of menopause. Osteoporosis is a condition, which becomes important after menopause, in the third phase of life and should be studied as such. My current research is shifting to the area of predictive medicine also called surveillance medicine. Osteoporosis in a way also belongs to the area of predictive medicine because it is about something, which you can get in the future. This recent development within medicine, from a complaint related medicine to a risk oriented medicine is central to my current research.

E.M.V. Are these researches on the cultural production of sciences having some impact on the way in which the medical research is done?

I.K. That is the hardest thing to accomplish … I have never spoken to a researcher in osteoporosis research if he/she is doing his or her research differently after having read my thesis. But I know that it was well received in circles of medical doctors and physicians. They really saw their own uncertainties expressed about how to deal with risks for the future and how they have to select, from a number of options, the one that is best fitting their patient.

They also recognised the divergent knowledge, which is being developed in research. And realised, that they always should be aware of the fact that when they are treating a patient according to a particular protocol they include in such a protocol particular parts of

knowledge and neglect their parts. The diversity of scientific knowledge on a particular condition as osteoporosis and the non-homogeneity of that scientific knowledge can be read from my book.

E.M.V. But I guess it might be very difficult to treat your patient if you are overwhelmed by these kinds of uncertainties.

I.K. Yes, but usually researchers and people who treat are not the same persons. As a researcher, you are developing your part of knowledge. For the medical doctors there are meetings and congresses to reach consensus about what is the best practice. But from studying the literature as I did, I produced an insight into this divergent knowledge.

E.M.V. I think that another social actor who is participating in the construction of female images through the medicalisation of the body, or, to say, who is interested in the promotion of certain images and therapies of, for example, osteoporosis is the pharmaceutical industry?

I.K. Yes, and those who produce the technologies and the measurement instruments, they also are an important actor in this whole field. They produce some kind of machine which can measure your bone mass and which gives a particular picture of your bone mass, so they are also involved…

E.M.V. It looks to me that your approach towards this issue is especially interesting, because you consider all the different social actors of the scene who are interested in the production and promotion of certain images about femininity, even if each of them in his or her own self would not think about that…

I.K. And is sure that everybody does what is best fitting to one's job, for instance the pharmaceutical entrepreneur… Of course, they should try to sell as much of their products and of course they will use particular marketing strategies etc. It is their good right. But analysing which kind of marketing strategies they employ, which kind of women are targeted by them, and what is behind this, that is

a different job! Many pharmaceutical strategies are attracting women in a false way. Maybe you know, in developing their marketing strategies, they even employed feminist ideas! That is very clever, isn't it? Just to overcome resistance, they used feminist ideas in order to promote what they wanted to sell…

E.M.V. So it is a business here…

I.K. This is all business…

THE CROSS-CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING OF REPRODUCTION

By providing contraception, you do not necessarily empower women... condoms do not make any sense in a context where you do not actually talk about sexual matters with your husband. Or where, as a woman, you do not have the idea that you may have some kind of authority to insist your husband wear a condom.

MAYA UNNITHAN[*]

E.M.V. You are here, at the University of Sussex since 1991…

[*] *Dr. Maya Unnithan is Senior Lecturer in social anthropology at the School of African and Asian Studies of the University of Sussex, Great Britain. She received her Ph.D from Cambridge University in 1991. Her research interests are in issues relating to culture and identity, and poverty and women's reproductive health in India. She is author of the book* Identity, Gender and Poverty: New Perspectives on Caste and Tribe in Rajasthan *(1997), and has co-edited the volume* Postcolonial India *(2000) with Vinita Damodaran. Her forthcoming book is on the anthropology of reproductive technologies and public health.*

M.U. Yes, so it is about ten years of teaching anthropology here, after doing my doctorate at Cambridge. My PhD thesis was based in north-west India, in Rajasthan, that is where I did my fieldwork, in the community of the so-called tribal people, and what I was looking at in the thesis, which in 1997 came out as a book, called *Identity, Gender, and Poverty*, was the ways in which a gender analysis can provide insights into the ways communities and individuals construct their identities. In other words, gender is an important dimension in understanding this construction of identities across tribe and caste in India. And it is not just gender, but gender as it intersects with two other dimensions: one has to do with kinship that is how people think about how they are related, and also poverty, which is related to the economic circumstances. In my analysis I am showing how these three intersect and need to be understood. If we want to understand from the local level, from the level of people's own perceptions the ways in which they define themselves against other people, we have to see how the wider tribal identity is constructed in India in relation to caste. You cannot understand it without that.

And what my fieldwork has shown is that in fact wider tribe-caste distinctions are more rooted in questions of economic inequality and political marginalisation. That in fact, these kinds of identities become important because they are useful for people in power. And that is why it is difficult to question them. In my research I focused on a particular group called *girasia*, who were a so-called tribal community. I was looking at their relationships with other people in the region, and the way they are defining themselves as being a lower caste, a lower caste of Rajput, which is a particular sort of middle-level caste in India. And what I am saying is that if you consider their style of living, as well as their history (oral and archival), especially at the way the Rajput state was organised before the British came, before colonialism, which was followed by Indian

independence, then you will find that in fact the *Girasia* claims to be part of the (lower) Rajput caste community.

This aspect of my work has connection with the work of recent South Asia historians (especially the subaltern historians) who, in the last twenty years have focussed on recovering the histories of „ordinary" people. Another aspect of my doctoral work, as mentioned previously, was regarding gender, in particular I analysed the discourse connected with the representation of tribal women in India. Are they really as sexually free and autonomous as they are made out to be?

E.M.V. How was this image constructed?

M.U. Well, for example, in popular journals, in local journals, but also in academic writings on tribal people in India… surprisingly feminist groups have also played a role in reinforcing the „free" image of tribal women, although in a celebratory rather than a derogatory manner. Contrary to the image of the sexual freedom associated with the lower caste women, what I observed when I stayed with the Girasia was that in fact, women have very little choice across caste and tribe you discover this when you look at the relationship between women as wives and their husbands, when you look at the kind of decisions related to ownership of property and with regard to the ownership of the body, sexuality, children.

The institution of marriage payments provides an interesting insight into the paradox of freedom and constraints of lower class women. The Girasia practice bride-price payments (where the bride's father receives a remuneration at the marriage of his daughter; which reinforces their „tribal" identity in outsider perceptions). This seems to be opposite to the practice of dowry payments (where husbands receive both women and gifts) in the area. And in turn because of bride price payments, it is believed that Girasia women are more powerful than women in other contexts, where dowry takes place. The ideology, which accompanies dowry payments, constructs wives as an economic burden, devaluing the

labour and reproductive contributions they make to their husband's households.

But what I show in the case of the tribal women is that even though there are the marriage payments that are moving the opposite way, as in the caste context, women's productive and reproductive contributions are still devalued. I thus show that „tribal" and caste identities have similar implications for women in the region. I show how by focusing on marriage payments and processes of marriage negotiation, tribal, caste, and class identities become blurred. Thus kinship practices, poverty and gender identities are inextricably intertwined.

E.M.V. So through this fieldwork you could understand the differences in the ways in which women are perceived in different tribes…

M.U. Yes… But what I am saying is that there are more similarities rather than differences across caste and tribe in the way women experience their lives. At the same time I also show that there are contexts in which the so called tribal or lower class women have agency… I do not say that all lower class women are oppressed in India, I am not saying that, but what my work shows is that when it comes down to the structural issues, such as the access to resources, ownership of property, command over labour, there is a great similarity in women's experiences across tribe, lower caste and class boundaries.

E.M.V. And is there any connection between how tribal identity is constructed and defined and how women's role is?

M.U. Yes, that is the starting point, because tribal identity in India is constructed with the focus on women, in other words, whenever people want to convey what a tribal group is like, they always use the example of women. The first thing they say to the question „how do you know this is a tribal group?" is: „look at their women", implying how sexually free they are.

You see, gender or the relationship between men and women is a kind of metaphor, a representation of the way in which the community itself may be perceived. That is why it is so important to focus upon. Going back to the popular conviction according to which tribal women in India are more autonomous and sexually free than in the caste context, which is more rigid. If you take the issue of divorce as another example, you find that Girasia and other lower class women who may be valued for their labour contributions, are still constrained by men in terms of whether they can exercise that choice over their life and body. That is they cannot decide to leave their husband because that would limit their own access to the resources of the community, of their own survival. Lower class women thus fall between the privileged position related to the freedom conferred on them as a result of their work and labour value, on the one hand, and the constraints of a patriarchal ideology which limits their access to resources, making them dependent on men. This is not a new finding… what I show in my work is that „tribal" women are similarly affected.

Since my book was published in 1997, I have moved into the area of medical anthropology, especially focusing on reproduction and health issues, on reproduction and sexuality. I have been looking at the question of women's access to health care, that is how women, especially poor women, have access to specific health services, how their resort to health services is connected with their perceptions of the body, illness and healing. I also consider how health policies are constructed, and how in turn they construct women. I address both anthropological and policy oriented issues. I have written on issues ranging from the importance of emotions in choices to do with healing, the engagement of midwives and spiritual healers with reproductive technologies, the local framing of claims and entitlements to reproduction (or reproductive rights). My work is also a critique towards policy-making in relation to reproductive health, towards the ways in which they function,

empowering certain people to do certain things, for instance, the medical doctors, at the cost of others. These issues are not connected to India alone but have global, cross-cultural relevance.

E.M.V. I can imagine how crucial the anthropologist's contribution might be to such a comparative, cross-cultural investigation that deconstructs both images of differences and similarities across borders.

M.U. Yes, cross-cultural analysis is actually important within India too, given the great diversity which exists within India, but equally so between India and the Euro-American context, where for example, we see an equal public concern and varied response to the different reproductive technologies. There are many differencesin the ways in which people from different countries deal today with all sorts of globalized reproductive health technologies. Within anthropology there is at now a rising trend of scholarship engaged in investigating the impact of the upcoming medical technologies, in particular on how these technologies change existing social relationships (for example around surrogacy, or around invitro fertilisation).

E.M.V. But obviously there are also huge differences between people having different kinds of access to these technologies, understanding and using them in their local context in many different ways…

M.U. Yes, absolutely…

E.M.V. May I ask you to give some details about the issue of reproductive rights in India?

M.U. Let me mention at the very beginning the importance of the Cairo conference on population from 1994, which really set the development agenda in everything to do with health and women's health. A holistic approach was developed towards this issue, and the argument, according to which the reproductive rights should not be treated only in terms of population reduction, but also in terms of women's health and gender, was widely accepted. It was

emphasised that one should pay more attention to the context in which women live, and the aim should be to give women the choice of having a more active role in family planning, a choice in questions of sexuality and pregnancy.

In India you have an interesting disjunction in the way the state treats reproduction and the cultural notions of reproduction. Thus on the one hand, there is the belief that the access to contraception is empowering women, because a reduction in childbearing can have a positive impact on the overall health of women and arguably enhance the mother-child relationship. But what the official line on contraception does not recognise is that there is a tremendous sort of pressure on women to have children, as womanhood is linked to fertility and producing boys is the sign of an ideal mother. Because of the kind of conditions in which women give birth, as well as of the prevalence of frequently unhygienic sexual practices, there are a high percentage of women who suffer from reproductive tract infections and the inability to have children. And you have to realise that the state with its eye on the macro population figures does not meet the needs these women have, for reducing their vulnerability or indeed in assisting their capability to conceive. This is the kind of ironic situation in which individual women live, forced by their families to have more children, and being under the pressure of a state, which wants to reduce the total number of children. In this context, the provision of contraception, does not necessarily empower women, on the contrary it forces them into new paradoxes and constraints. Women's own needs for access to treatment for reproductive tract infections become invisible in the process.

E.M.V. What about women's groups, feminist groups in India? Are they active on these issues?

M.U. Feminist groups are very, very active in India. They are mainly active in the area of health, in preventing, for instance, certain unethical clinical trials, in making public the side effects and

dangers of different sorts of techniques used in the state's effort to control reproduction …

This is where feminists are very active and have an important role to play in monitoring the family planning programs. On the other hand they are also instrumental in trying to enhance and broaden the knowledge base that women have. Because we are talking about large groups of women who do not have the information available to make choice. So I think that in that sense feminists are important…although there is a division between those who see contraception and access to other technologies as empowering, in contrast to other feminists who see any medical technological intervention as a reflection of the continued medicalisation of women's bodies.

E.M.V. And how do they deal with the paradox you have just described?

M.U. Exactly by providing people with information and monitoring state practices.

E.M.V. This is obviously a totally different situation than it was in my country, where before 1989 abortion was criminalised. In that context, the right to decide on family planning, on the number of children etc. had to be won after 1990, and it is to be mentioned as well that there is still a long way from legalising abortion to the development of new ways of thinking about and acting around reproductive rights. But quit many women's organisations are working on that.

M.U. You know, this is not only a question of information, because, for example, in the Indian context, all kinds of techniques of preventing pregnancy are available… but the issue is that, for instance, condoms do not make any sense in a context where you do not actually talk about sexual matters with your husband. Or where, as a woman, you do not have the idea that you may have some kind of authority to insist your husband wear a condom. And this is an

issue in India, unless the men themselves have the awareness and accountability in the use of condoms.

E.M.V. So the issue is the power of women to negotiate on the control of their sexuality…

M.U. That is right… And it is linked to a more general way in which women relate to men, which becomes important. It is not only about religious beliefs, but also, obviously, about the issue of poverty and social security, about the wider agendas of governmental development projects financed by the World Bank, about the national program on family planning. And about the ways, in which they are implemented, often with quite dangerous implications for women. Where the state is unable to provide social security, as in India, there your social security is assured by having children. In such an environment it makes sense, cultural and economic sense to have four or five children. You know, that kind of logic has not been heard very much as it does not connect with the ways in which state policies are formulated. The state is driven by a demographic and development related thinking, which does not value the ways in which people think or appreciate the difficulties they face in the economic and social contexts of their everyday life. That is why, among other reasons, anthropological research is important, because it seeks to understand issues from the people's own point of view, and may help in informing government planning on reproduction and health matters. It helps you to understand, for example, that there can be a local demand for family planning and techniques to control conception (from women who have had already four or five children) but there is as well a need for assistance with conception…

E.M.V. Were there cases when anthropologists and/ or feminist groups were involved in policy-making?

M.U. They are trying to do that, but you know, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, where the money is, have the power to decide on these issues as well, and, broadly speaking, on how the reduction of poverty would be possible.

E.M.V. That is why the issue of reproduction is central for the state politics in India.

M.U. Absolutely, absolutely…

E.M.V. At the end of our discussion I would like to ask you to comment on your understanding of the relationship between anthropology and feminism. Are you defining yourself as a feminist anthropologist, if yes, what does this position mean to you?

M.U. I think that feminism both outside and within our discipline made very important contributions during the 1970s and 1980s. Anthropologist scholars at the time were evolving an „anthropology of women", which sought to redress the male bias in the discipline. Early contributions of people like Sherry Ortner, Michele Rosaldo, Louise Lamphere, Carol Stack, McCormack, were very crucial. And it is to mention, obviously, that this trend was emerging across disciplines, within history, within English literature, and so on and so forth…

Later, during the 1980s, gender was introduced in the anthropological literature as an analytic concept, and as Henrietta Moore has so clearly shown, here we are dealing with the emergence of the anthropology of gender.

As far as the relation between feminism and anthropology is considered, we have to know about the debate on this within anthropology, and, among others, about Marilyn Strathern's position, according to which this is an awkward relationship, because the two define the Other very differently. For instance, the Other for anthropology is the kind of culture that you try to understand, where for feminism the Other is men, that is why, the relation between the self and the Other is more conflictual on the feminist side than on the anthropological side.

As far as I am concerned, my work is very much informed by feminism and by questions of rights, and by gender as an analytic concept, and I consider this impact very useful, important and influential. But I do not see myself as somebody who is only

feminist, so when I assume the term feminist anthropologist I want to bring the two together, in fact to do contact but also not to do contact. I also feel, however, that using the word gender, as Henrietta Moore has said, in a sense de-politicises the issues of power and inequalities. This is the other side of the story, and I think that feminists always have to fight against women's marginalisation and domination, and this really is not completely expressed in using gender as analytical category. I do not categorise myself as a feminist of any particular kind, however I think that I am entitled to see my work as a feminist one.

E.M.V. I guess that you are teaching within the MA program on Women's Studies from this position…

M.U. Yes, I actually do teach on gender related issues in three MA programs. Apart from the Women's Studies M.A., I am teaching teach on the Development M.A., and the Anthropology M.A. I have developed a new MA programme in Medical Anthropology, which will be offered in 2003. I also do a lot of teaching at the undergraduate level. Within anthropology I teach a core course on Kinship and Gender in the second year, and another one on religion in their social contexts. In the past I have taught economic anthropology, and, the anthropology of gender and feminism in the third year. I have just developed a new course on Fertility, Reproductive Health and Social Policy, which is an optional course for third year anthropology students.

E.M.V. A lot of individual work. But as far as I know you are involved also in organising, publishing, getting people together from different disciplines.

M.U. Yes, definitely, beside my teaching, administration and research work, I have organised several seminar series, workshops and a conference in 1997. The 1997 conference was an international conference celebrating 50 years of Indian independence, and brought together academics from science, economics, literature, visual arts, etc., to talk about the main themes that they are engaged in. We all

had an understanding of the region, but we were working on different issues, with different methodologies and theories… It was great. More recently I have organised workshops and seminars around medical anthropology research and teaching issues. I think that Sussex is a very enabling institution, and especially great for putting people and issues together, and for moving beyond disciplinary boundaries.

EMPOWERING INFORMATION

The traditional way of looking at women's information is to define it as information, which contributes to the improvement of the position of women... But that information does not just exist: it has to be created. That is why, in a way, doing research is a form of empowerment. Moreover, we have definitely to notice the connection between providing information and making change happen.

LIN McDEVITT-PUGH[*]

E.M.V. I would like to ask you to have a talk with me about two issues. About your own activities here, at the IIAV, as an international program manager, but also about the centre as such. If you agree to start from the latter, please share with me something

[*] *Lin McDevitt-Pugh is program manager of the Department of International Cooperation at the International Information Centre and Archives for the Women's Movement in Amsterdam, The Netherlands.*

about the history of the IIAV, especially about how it was and is connected to the broader social and political environment of The Netherlands.

L.McD.P. The International Information Centre and Archives for the Women's Movement was started 65 years ago by a small group of women. They were involved in the women's suffrage movement and at the turn of the century that was a pretty hard struggle. Women throughout the world used to meet together, and talk together about their strategies. Three women who started up this organisation used to travel around the world and collected a lot of information about women's movement, but they were also creating the information. That is how they started to have many books, they had all sorts of background information and they thought it was a bit of a shame to just have it in their homes, so they made it open to the public. They created a public facility, which was called the International Archives of Women's Movement. And that is been around ever since.

Then in the 1970s, another group decided that it was important to collect documents related to women, and not just from the archives, not just books, but also newspaper clippings, in order to get right into the substance of the history of the women's movement in the Dutch society.

Another organisation was set up 25 years ago, a magazine called "Lover", which means "Leaves on a Tree", it was an academic magazine giving a feminist analysis of the academic and cultural issues.

These three initiatives joined together about two decades ago and became the International Information Centre and Archives for the Women's Movement. This is a very dynamic organisation, and actually it was already dynamic 65 years ago. Throughout the period of its existence it has always been changing and looking at what the needs of the women's movement in The Netherlands are, and how can it serve them.

During the war most of our collection was stolen, as was most of the library, our collections and anything of cultural significance was stolen by the occupiers and quite a deal of that original collection is still not available to us, is vaulted up in Moscow. We cannot get access to it, however we were working on getting it back, as it is would be very important to us to have the integral collection.

In the mean time we have moved with the needs of the women's movement, collecting and disseminating and making available information around the issues of the women's movement in The Netherlands. There are now about forty women's information centres or archives in this country. We are working closely with all of them. We are also very much aware of the fact that, while we started off being a book and documentation centre, a lot of information these days goes through the Internet, and this is why we have began at a very early point to use it. Our entire catalogue is available today through the Internet, you can just sit in some distant part of The Netherlands, not that The Netherlands is very huge, and look up something on the Internet, and send us an e-mail and we will send the information through the country. So it is very accessible.

What we also do is we say, well, it is not just information, but it is physically this library that has important to an audience, to a target audience formed by policy-makers, women's organisations, researchers and the media. Moreover, we understand that groups also need information beyond the Dutch borders, so one of the projects that we have is to connect our users to women's information centres throughout the world through a database. That database is made of the world's women's information services and centres. At the moment we have about three hundred women information centres and at least 120 countries in our database. Our users anywhere in the world may go to that database and look for information on issues, which affect, for instance, women in Romania and they may go probably to the ANA centre and to the resources that it can provide.

Furthermore we are recognising the fact that the Internet is a vast resource, and quite time consuming. So we are creating a database of Websites on Women, and we are going through using our own instruments, which we have developed for making women's information accessible around catalogue terms. We will create a database saying, if you want information on trafficking in women, these are the websites that you have to look through, but if you want information on economic position of women, you have to browse some other websites.

An underlying instrument, which we have developed to be able to deal with this issue is the so-called European Women's Thesaurus, which has been produced collectively by women's information centres in Europe, based on what we have created ourselves in the Dutch language in the early 1990s.

And there are some other things that we are involved in…

E.M.V. How would you define what is women's information? I guess that what was understood by women's information changed a little bit during this couple of decades. What is "women's information" today? Who defines it and how is that going on?

L.McD.P. It is a very good question… I was embarrassed using the term women's information because it is a very shortcut way of saying what really is, although there were also discussions of the moment, in various groups that we were working with.

The traditional way of looking at women's information is to say that it is information, which contributes to the improvement of the position of women. What I would like to emphasise firstly is the fact that information empowers women to take control of their own destinies. Obviously, this kind of information is very various, for example today, in our societies, is connected to the issue of the enlargement of Europe.

What is the feminist perspective on the enlargement, what is going to be – for example – for women in Romania to be part of Europe, what is the economic advantage, what is the social

advantage? This is the sort of information, which has relevance to the lives of women. And we are very eager to recognise as well that this information does not just exist, but it has to be created, there have to be researches producing information. In a way, doing research is a form of empowerment. At the same time, we combine our findings with, for instance, the information coming from Romania, and we support the empowerment of women's organisations from that country to take control of their information and to make sure that developments happen in a way, which is beneficial for women.

E.M.V. I guess this explains why, in the name of your centre, the term "for" is very important. If you are working "for" the women's movement, and you are financed by the state, this also means that the state supports women's movement as well. Would you like to comment about this support?

L.McD.P. One of the agreements made by the United Nations, by all the countries in the United Nations, by all the 186 of them, during the 4th World Conference of Women held in Beijing in 1995, was that governments must support institutions, which promote the emancipation if women.

Now, our organisation is being supported for twenty years by government grants, so The Netherlands has recognised this duty for a long time, but actually all the countries in the world really have to make that bound by agreements they have made five years ago.

E.M.V. Tell me a little bit about your collection policy.

L.McD.P. Well, for example, take the example of Albania… after the fall of communism in Albania, women's movement, women's organisations, very small groups of women started up to work for women's emancipation. And one group thought that the best thing they could do is to collect information, and to go out with this information and do something about it. And as the movement grew, and as more and more women became involved, small

organisations started up, and were taking on very specific issues related to women's lives.

Turning to the collection policy, one may observe that there is a general discussion within women's movement on it. Let me make a couple of important comments on this.

Firstly, if there already were organisations collecting specific kinds of information, then we would not collect it. For example, there is an organisation, and has a library in this country, which collects information on everything regarding the law on women. So we do not bother collecting anything on law and if we find something, we pass on to them. They have a wonderful system for cataloguing and making it available for the public. Further on, there are a number of lesbian archives in the country. So we do not have to concentrate on that area… There are a lot of areas in which we do not have to collect because somebody else is already doing it. It is not our aim to have everything and to cover all the fields by our own.

Contrary, we are following our own collection policy, which has two main focal points. One of them is related to the migrant, black and refugee women in our country. We have got a lot of Roma women for example in The Netherlands, and we collect any information relevant to that community. Another crucial point of ours is Women's Studies. As related to that, let me mention here the creation of a chair on black women's studies. The government has just announced that it will provide funding for three years for a chair on black women studies, which will be connected to the University of Utrecht.

E.M.V. This means that as a result of the information-collection, an interest was generated towards the issue on which you collect information. It is a great impact.

L.McD.P. Yes, we initiated the black women's studies chair together with the University of Utrecht, and we lobbied for it a lot…

Now we are working hard to have a researcher be appointed to do research on the material available in our library, to make an

academic assessment of it. We hope that in this way it will become more accessible to more academics, and, generally speaking, we want to do gender mainstreaming on this domain. We want to prove that Women's Studies is part of any proper study, psychology has to have it, anthropology has to have it, probably even physics has to have this component, and so on and so forth.

All this effort is related to our aim to use the material from this library in order to support people promoting those sorts of ideas.

E.M.V. You have mentioned that besides researchers, faculty, and students other users of yours are the policy-makers. How does this relation going on?

L.McD.P. That has very much to do with understanding the needs of the consumer. It sounds a little bit like marketing, and it is a pragmatic work. Our aim is to help any particular consumer to understand certain things very well. Let me tell you an example. In 1995 all the governments of the world made agreements on how to improve the quality of life for women in their countries. And they had a whole book full of plans and agreements about the ways in which they were going to do that called Beijing Platform for Action. This was a ten years plan, but they decided that after five years the implementation process has also to be evaluated. Now, in the process of evaluation, in order to make adequate decisions, they need to know what different women are thinking, or what women's organisations feel or not feel, what they know about the actual position of women. So we decided to provide this kind of information and we did that by setting up a platform; it was an electronic platform called European North American Women Action. We set up a web-site, and called for all the women's lobbies, organisations, information centres, whatever, to send the information relevant to this subject to our web-site. There is a group of Africa doing the same for all of Africa, and a group in Latin America doing the same for Latin America. And in Asia Pacific there is something similar going on. Together we were called Global

Women Action, but within this network each region was quite autonomous in the way in which they defined what they would set up and how they would go about providing information.

Well, this was not just policy-making. We were also providing women's organisations with information facilitating their access to each other throughout the year, from March 1999 to June 2000. They found out about the ways in which each of them was preparing their work with their governments, and about the strategies of informing the governments about what was going on. Sometimes governments do not want to pay attention to this work, but if you have a network of group able to say, look at this situation over here, that network may make a pressure on the government to actually do it promised.

Another matter, on which we were working, was the creation of a link between governments and information sources coming from researchers and women's organisations. That was started in a co-operation with UNESCO in 1998, when UNESCO had just been asked by the United Nations, as part of the implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action, to collect gender disaggregated information. UNESCO chose to partner with the IIAV to fulfil this task and supported us financially and theoretically to develop the Mapping the World of Women's Information Services database. They have recommended to all United Nations' agencies and to all the governmental departments for women's affairs throughout the world to use that database.

E.M.V. This year, not long time ago, you won an important prize from your government…

L.McD.P. Well, yes, they were recognising the work we have done for 65 years, the contribution we have made for the lives of women in The Netherlands and also recognising the work that we are doing internationally.

E.M.V. And what is the prize about, is it named after a person?

L.McD.P. Yes, Joke Smit was a politician, who in the 1970s put women's emancipation on the political agenda. She was responsible

for the introduction of a Ministry for Emancipation and a directorate for emancipation in the Dutch political system. She died in 1981. The Ministry for Emancipation administers the prize. It is a great honour for us to receive it. In the jury report, the state recognised the contribution we had to the improvement of women's life in The Netherlands, but also on the international level; this is the most exciting thing for me about winning the prize.

E.M.V. Let us return to your international activity. As far as I could learn, the International Cooperation Department of the IIAV was established in June 2000 and you are the director manager of this department. Please tell me a little bit about your department and your work.

L.McD.P. I have a couple of projects, which are very exciting. Now, the first "I" of our name "International Information Centre and Archives…" refers to our international involvement for a long time and really there has been a lot of work being done in this respect. One of my predecessors was very involved in, for example, helping set up the women's library in Turkey.

I came on board in 1997. The reason I arrived here was because the organisation, the library had to organise the third in a series of international conferences for workers in women's information centres. The first was in 1990, organised by the Istanbul women's library as a celebration of the first year of their existence. They held a workshop and invited the partners, which had helped them establishing their centre to talk about the issues of librarianship together. That was the first time for the women's information specialists to come together in an international context.

The meeting was such a success that the colleagues from the Schlesinger Library in Boston, United States offered to organise the next conference in 1994. There were representatives of forty countries there, many of them students. It was quite an inspiring gathering, and people were very motivated to continue having conferences. They also produced a political Statement on the

importance of information on the position of women, a lot of which was actually incorporated in the Beijing Platform for Action a year later. The IIAV offered to organise the next, the third conference, which took place in August 1998.

We called it the Know How Conference. It provided a fabulous opportunity for people to get together. We had three hundred information specialists from 86 countries attending. We dedicated a lot of time to find funds for women from these different countries to attend. We had women from Eastern Europe, from the developing countries, from everywhere. The Declaration of the Know How Conference was a political statement coming out of it, which was presented to the United Nations Committee on the Status of Women in March 1999. The participants asked the IIAV to continue its networking and international co-operation activities between the international conferences. The response of the IIAV was to create the Department of International Cooperation. It basically works on co-operative projects and programs, together with other women's information centres. Our purpose is to share knowledge: both the knowledge available within our centres, and the knowledge available to those centres.

There is another project that we are about to start up together with a large funding organisation. This funding agency finances probably about one hundred and fifty different organisations throughout developing countries and Eastern Europe to eliminate violence against women. What they want to do is to make sure their money is well spent. So we are going to work with them, to have a discussion, to actually have an Electronic Mail based discussion between all these organisations. We have twenty months to determine benchmarks for effective organisation against violence against women. We will work in four languages. And after information will be created through this discussion, documents are going to be written and to be offered to other major funding agencies

to support them in their work. This is a very good way of using our ability to communicate and inform.

We will continue to manage the European and North-American Women Action (ENAWA), that was our main theme last year… As an information and communication organisation we will focus on the social processes, which affect the lives of women, such as globalisation and racism. We will build an electronic platform for information exchange in these areas. We are going to highlight the gender aspect of development in order to create gender analyses, and present that analyses to the mainstream media.

One thing, which we have noticed in The Netherlands concerning the Beijing Platform for Action review process was that very little information goes out to the press. For example, there was a very stormy meeting in New York, where a great concern was expressed about the process blocked down in a bureaucratic argumentation… Well, none of these debates were reported… and we thought that we have to continue to show that the gender analysis is not something just for women, but it is for everybody in the society, it is an important thing to know about.

Further on, because this is not ending, we want to create and support a Europe-wide network, a strong co-operation with women's information centres throughout the entire Europe. We have to figure out how to do that.

Another aim of ours, which will be certainly accomplished, is to develop an on-line resource for information relevant to women's organisations in Central and Eastern Europe.

E.M.V. All these ideas are very near to be started, and to be worked out?

L.McD.P. Well, the European and North-American Women Action website is already there, we put out weekly news brief, we are very much starting to develop its new site. The project with the funding agency is about to begin, and a lot of other things are about

to start. What have we already done? For example a program last year, consulting with about 2500 women's organisations throughout the world, on the issue of gender and water. We created a document including 21 recommendations to the World Water Forum, a conference of the world's environmental ministries. The recommendations were taken up by the ministries and at the next World Water Forum to be organised in Osaka, Japan in 2003, gender will be on the agenda. The core of the group, which developed these recommendations, formed itself into the Gender and Water Alliance, which is now in the process of starting up a new international information program. Yes, we are definitely noticing the connection between providing information and making change happen.

E.M.V. Do you have any connection with the European Union and the enlargement process?

L.McD.P. Well, not really… The European Women's Lobby has the greatest access to information on enlargement. And they are also talking with women's organisations in Eastern Europe about co-operation and about sharing resources, information, and strategies in that area.

E.M.V. Are you taking part in that process? What is your relation with the European Women's Lobby?

L.McD.P. They are one of the partners in the European and North-American Women Action, but they have a direct web-line, so people may contact them directly. They are working with us to create communication channels. Their input into our work is really important, because they have the expertise at the local level of the European Union, which is vital.

E.M.V. And your role is to connect all these groups…

L.McD.P. Yes, that is our task, that is a mandate from the Know How Conference. Of course, you cannot set up co-operation unless others want it… I think that what makes co-operation so very powerful is that each participating centre meets its strategic needs through co-operation. For example, the European Women's Lobby

wants to make sure that they are successful in providing information to organisations in Europe. They work with the ENAWA, which enables them to reach many organisations in Europe. Women Action trained them in conducting electronic discussion-groups, so they are developing expertise while pursuing their goals. Or, for the French-speaking group, who only publishes in French, a co-operation with ENAWA means that they have access to a wider audience, and they may get information from more sources, because people are finding out about them putting them on the mailing list.

E.M.V. Let me ask now my last question. What do you like most in your work, or what are you proud of mostly?

L.McD.P. Oh, I just love it. I love the idea that this work contributes to the empowerment of women anywhere in the world. This is something that really inspires and moves me. But what moves me and inspires me a lot in the present is working with women's organisations and research organisations in Eastern and Central Europe because we have a lot to learn from them. For me the co-operation with them means that I have the possibility to be part of the broader democracy and of gender equality in Central and Eastern Europe, and this is exciting, it is a great thrill.

CHAPTER 3

SPACES OF INCLUSION

NEW DECONSTRUCTIVIST PROJECTS: MASCULINITY AND GAY STUDIES

I would like for gay to be much more open, a sort of category that more people can identify with, which is not just the privilege of the advanced hyper-political and radical people, but a more open category, that allows for more people to identify with and perhaps even to struggle for.

STEFAN DUDINK

WIDENING EDUCATION TOWARDS THE MARGINS

I always give the example of one student, who… when came on our course was working in a nursing home as a cleaner. When she started doing our women's studies course she got self-confidence and by the end of the year she was promoted to the manager of that nursing home. That is important for me, because in this way I see my political activity in my work, which consists of being able to help people to change their lives.

GERRY HOLLOWAY

RE-APPROACHING MULTICULTURALISM

There is nothing wrong with thinking that something is not good or right for women from other cultures, but, most importantly, when one comes out with this opinion, has to listen for the women who are inside those cultures and to see what all this means for them. As a feminist with a certain social and cultural background you should always get in contact with women from other environments.

MARJOLEIN VERBOOM

NEW DECONSTRUCTIVIST PROJECTS: MASCULINITY AND GAY STUDIES

I would like for gay to be much more open, a sort of category that more people can identify with, which is not just the privilege of the advanced hyper-political and radical people, but a more open category that allows for more people to identify with and perhaps even to struggle for.

STEFAN DUDINK[*]

E.M.V. Your field of specialty is Gay Studies, and you are focusing your research on masculinities in the Dutch political

[*] *Dr. Stefan Dudink is assistant professor of Gay Studies and member of the Centre for Women's Studies at the University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands. His main research interest is the history of masculinity in Holland between 1800-1900. He teaches on gay and lesbian studies and history and on nationalism and sexuality. He has published in various Dutch and international journals and books. His article „The Unheroic Men of a Moral Nation: Masculinity and Nation in Modern Dutch History" has been published in 2002 in the volume* Militaries, Masculinities and the Postwar Moment: Bosnia, the International Community and the Netherlands*, edited by Cynthia Cockburn and Dubravka Zarkov (London: Lawrence and Wishart). He is co-editor, with Karen Hagemann and John Tosh of* Masculinity in Politics and War: Rewriting Modern History *(Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 2003).*

history. At the beginning of our discussion I would like to put some questions related to these domains of interest of yours, knowing that the public from Romania might be not very aware of them. At the very beginning let me ask you to specify a little bit what Masculinity Studies are and how are they related to Gender Studies, and what Gay Studies are and how do they relate to both.

S.D. Of course you probably know best if people are familiar with this or not in Romania, but I should warn you that in The Netherlands as well, people outside of the community of scholars, of Gender Studies, and Sexuality Studies, or outside of the more enlightened progressive historians or social scientists are not aware of the fact that there is such a thing as Masculinity Studies or Gay Studies. And if they do, many of them would probably think that it is ridiculous and just fashionable or not scientific or will say that it is just politically correct, which is the term to use over here to kill any sort of intellectual or political project that you are not in agreement with. You say it is just politically correct and that it is just an import from the United States and therefore not appropriate for us.

So these kinds of programs, although they exist here, and although they have certain legitimacy, are also contested. It is not totally self-evident that they are there, and that they have to be appreciated. This has to be mentioned, first of all…

Now, as to Masculinity Studies, what you could say is that it is an outgrowth of and a development from Gender Studies, which in itself developed out of Women's Studies. Of course a short historical genealogy would be that Women's Studies started to focus on making women's lives, women's experiences, women's history visible in the field of science, a field of scholarship which totally ignored these issues. Then the next step was made towards gender, the aim became not just to do research and write about women's lives and experiences, and histories but to focus on the way in which in a society sexual difference is being made, the way in which gender is being produced. So the step from Women's Studies to Gender

Studies implied that there is also a need to focus on masculinity, because you cannot understand how a society produces and reproduces sexual difference, how it reproduces the idea that there is a fundamental difference between the sexes without speaking about masculinity. This was done gradually, so a new field has emerged during the last ten years, strictly related to gender, as an analytical category. That is one important aspect of the histories of Masculinity Studies.

Another issue of Masculinity Studies is that of the so-called pro-feminist man. These were the men who took feminism seriously from the late 1970s onward and started to think about what it meant to be a man in this society. That was how, as a political responsibility for men, some researchers started to think about what men and masculinity are, how men contribute to the perseverance of patriarchy, how they benefit from patriarchy and what they could do about that. This is another line in the history, another genealogy, if you wish, of Masculinity Studies.

At the moment, what you see is that Masculinity Studies are developing quite rapidly in certain fields, in social sciences, in psychology and in history. There is a strong and fast development of Masculinity Studies because it can benefit from all of the theoretical and conceptual apparatus, which has been provided by Gender Studies and by feminist theory. The latter provided Masculinity Studies with such a good start that we can start in flight, so to say, we can benefit from everything which has been done. So at the moment you see quite a number of established scholars in Western Europe and in the United States starting to work on this. There is a *Journal for Men's Studies*, and another one titled *Man and Masculinities*. There are certain, more or less, informal working groups, networks, so there is a certain degree of institutionalisation as well.

Now, as to what Masculinity Studies are about, that is a difficult question, and the answers are probably as diverse as the

answers to the question what is Women's Studies about, or what is Gender Studies about. There are a lot of definitions of that already. What I can say here is what Masculinity Studies for me are about… For me this is what we call a deconstructivist project in the sense that I want to show how masculinity or masculinities have been constructed historically, how they have been made, that there is nothing „natural" or self evident about them, that masculinities are social and cultural products, and I want to make that history visible. Furthermore, I want to show how in the course of the last two or three hundred years modern masculinity has been produced, has been the result, the effect of all sorts of other political, economical, social and cultural developments. I want to demonstrate that it is not „natural", but it is a historical product, that masculinity has been produced, it is embedded in all sorts of other developments and the aim, of course, is to argue, that if it is not „natural", if it is a historical product, if it has not always been here, then it might also disappear again.

That is the political agenda for Masculinity Studies, as I understand it. To show that masculinity is not necessarily there, and that it is a very unfortunate construction to live in. Yes, I think it is very constraining and very unpleasant to live in the dominant constructions of masculinity. This is part of the political agenda. But obviously the intellectual agenda is very important for me as well. Especially to demonstrate that masculinity is a historical product and to analyse how it came about, why it came about, when precisely modern ideas of masculinity were created, what sort of ideas they were, what sort of effects they had, that is my project, in general terms.

More specifically, my own research is doing parts of this huge general project in a very specific and contextualised manner, in order to analyse the ways in which the political culture in The Netherlands in the 19th century and especially around 1800, produced new ideas of masculinity, and was – at its turn – shaped by notions of

masculinity. An important element of this context is the rise of modern nationalism, after all this was the period in which modern nationalism was invented. I want to know what kind of impact the ideas of masculinity had on modern nationalism – and the other way around. Another important aspect of that historical context is, of course, democratisation. This is the period of French revolution and of the new ideas about citizenship, new ideas about political life, about popular sovereignty. I want to know how these new ideas about democracy and citizenship were connected to masculinity.

E.M.V. And what about Gay Studies?

S.D. Now, as to Gay Studies, they are very much connected to feminist studies, Masculinity Studies and Women's Studies, but they also claim certain autonomy in the sense that they underly the fact that there is something specific about the way in which our society organises (homo) sexuality, and that should be reflected in the way we study it. We cannot study Gay Studies, we cannot study homosexuality, only or primarily from the perspective of gender, we have to be clear that sexuality and gender are separate aspects of the organisation of society and we should do justice to that. So there should be a semi-autonomous field of Gay Studies, of Gay and Lesbian Studies while acknowledging that this is connected to gender and that we cannot understand homosexuality without speaking about gender – but nevertheless we should give it certain autonomy.

And for me, Gay Studies are, or should be deconstructivist pretty much in the same way as Masculinity Studies should be deconstructivist, showing the ways in which Western modern society has created the phantasm according to which there are such things as homosexuality and heterosexuality, and there are such things as homosexual and heterosexual identities. What I would like to try to understand is that how these two have been produced historically, how these ideas have been made into reality, how ideological constructs of heterosexuality and homosexuality have

been made into social and cultural realities. The political agenda of such a research would be to try to get beyond them, to show that this is a sort of prison-house in which we live in, an ideological prison-house which supposes that there are such a thing as homosexuality and heterosexuality. There is an appeal in this for trying to think about a world which is differently organised.

At the same time I acknowledge that there are still profound inequalities in the field of sexuality. That heterosexuality is the norm, it is dominant, it is hegemonic, that homosexuality is discriminated against in all sort of ways, it is culturally considered to be deviant or perverse etc., etc. And there is still a need to fight for full equality, and that, of course, requires also doing politics in the name of homosexuality, which is a bit contradictory, or very contradictory to a sort of deconstructivist, political and intellectual agenda, which is about getting rid of these strict ideas of identity.

So there you find a paradox, which is a paradox that you also will find in feminist studies and Women's Studies. They are also about deconstructing gender differences as we know them, deconstructing femininity as we know it, while at the same time acknowledging that there are profound differences, profound gender inequalities which we should fight against and which we need some sense of identity for that, that we have to fight by using the terms men and women to undo these inequalities. There is a sort of tension there, which you will find in all of these fields, all of the scholarly and political fields that are about identity. There is a tension between, on the one hand, deconstructing identity itself, saying that identity itself is a problem, and on the other hand saying that there are profound inequalities and we need a sense of identity as the starting point, the beginning point of our politics.

What my position as intellectual is towards the identity politics other people do? I think that the idea according to which there is something like homosexual identity is so deeply founded within our society that I do not have to encourage it… This idea is so

dominant that for me, as an intellectual, it does not have a priority to reproduce it constantly. Although I will support, of course, gay and lesbian politics and gay and lesbian struggles, I think my duty as an intellectual is not to constantly reproduce these identities, but it is to be critical about these identities and it is to make people aware of the fact that there is a paradox within gay and lesbian politics and within feminist politics, between - on the one hand - constantly acknowledging the fact that their identities are important, that we should use them as rallying points for politics, as the starting points for politics, and – on the other hand – being aware of the fact that they are also problematic.

E.M.V. And what about your own research?

S.D. I mainly focus on masculinity at the moment. The history of homosexuality has been more or less written for The Netherlands, at least within the existing theoretical paradigm, whereas on masculinity hardly anything had been done.

So it is important to focus on masculinity and that is what I am doing at the moment, writing about masculinity within the context of politics, within the context of political culture and political history. And what is interesting about that for The Netherlands is that, because The Netherlands are such a small country, because they are not very powerful in military terms, and have never been, at least in the 19th century, what you will *not* find in The Netherlands are these very, very ostentatious militarised forms of masculinity. The dominant masculinity in The Netherlands is always based on other models of masculinities, models of morality, the model of the merchant, of commerce, not of war… So there is a sort of combination of morality and commerce which is dominant in the Dutch constructions of masculinity in the 19th century.

And this is interesting from a comparative perspective, compared for instance to France and Germany, where during the same period, in the 19th century and late 18th century, you will find a creation of highly militarised, highly nationalist forms of

masculinity, which are much more ostentatiously and self-consciously masculinist, then the forms you may find over here. And this is exactly what I want to show, that there are more masculinities, and in the same period different masculinities are being produced. Moreover what I also want to do is to show that these different masculinities, for instance that you will find in The Netherlands in this period are not necessarily better masculinities, in the sense that they are not necessarily better for women. The Netherlands, despite the fact that it has this „soft" tradition of masculinity, is not necessarily a better country for women, historically speaking. I mean women do not necessarily have more political and social opportunities because of the fact that there is a soft masculinity. Soft masculinity can be just as oppressive for women as these more ostentatiously masculinist forms of masculinity can be.

E.M.V. When one is talking about Masculinity Studies being linked to Women's Studies he/she might think that there are some kind of complementarities between the two. But we may wonder as well if there are points of debates or even conflicts in their relation …

S.D. Yes, they are definitely related fields, but there are, of course, huge debates. I mean there are quite a few feminist scholars who are suspicious of Masculinity Studies. They will say, well, how do Masculinity Studies differ from the sort of scholarship that we have been having for the last three hundred years, which was always about men... How are Masculinity Studies going to be different, and that is a serious and legitimate question. I think that we should take this absolutely serious, because Masculinity Studies could very easily become conventional scholarship about masculinity.

What should make Masculinity Studies different is their political agenda. There should be a political agenda aimed at gender equality, aimed at thinking about the power of masculinity, and always trying to take into account what certain constructions of masculinity mean or have meant during history for women. How

certain constructions of masculinity do relate to the position of women, how they relate to the social and cultural positions and opportunities of women. I think that these questions about the legitimacy of Masculinity Studies are very relevant and we should take them seriously.

So they are very related fields, but there are tensions, as well. I think that these are good tensions, because they make it clear that we cannot just have Masculinity Studies just like that. But we really should be serious about thinking what Masculinity Studies should be, both in intellectual and in political terms. And, of course, Masculinity Studies should acknowledge that they are an offspring of Women's Studies and feminist studies and Gender Studies. We should acknowledge that due to the work, which has been done we do not have to start from scratch, or to pretend that we are brilliant and have simple invented our Masculinity Studies. We should be very much aware of the fact that we are part of a huge amount of work, which has been done over the last 25 years, and we are building on what is already a tradition that we can relate to, we should not forget about that.

E.M.V. How are all these relations functioning in your case? You are teaching on Masculinity and Gay Studies within the Centre for Women's Studies. Is this institutional connection a rule or it is an exception?

S.D. No, I do not think that it is institutionalised to that degree and I have not been appointed to do Masculinity Studies, but to do Gay Studies.

What you will find is that there are people working within various fields who have an interest in Masculinity Studies and in one way or another have found an opportunity to do that. For instance, the big names in Masculinity Studies like Michael Kenal from the United States, or Robert Connell from Australia are sociologists, both of them are working in sociology departments, but have found and

created the opportunity to work on gender issues and to focus on masculinity.

I do not think that they are people who are explicitly appointed to do Masculinity Studies. Of course there are some men, who have been appointed to do Gender Studies, or sometimes even Women's Studies and then they do Masculinity Studies, or they have been appointed to do Gay Studies, as I have.

My position is quite unique in the sense that there is not a lot of Gay Studies left in The Netherlands. In the 1980s that was a really flourishing field, but now there are only four people left in the whole country who do Gay and Lesbian Studies. There are two people in Amsterdam and two people in Nijmegen; in Amsterdam they are part of the sociology department. In Nijmegen the construction is somewhat different. Here we are relatively autonomous, we are a sub-department of the Centre for Women's Studies called Lesbian and Gay Studies, however, department is a big word for two people … It is a construction, which is a good one for me, because I am very interested in gender. I do not just want to do sexuality studies, but I want to do sexuality studies, Gay and Lesbian Studies with a very strong focus on gender, because I find gender so important and interesting.

But there are also people who will say, well, Gay and Lesbian Studies should focus more on gay and lesbian issues as having to do with sexuality, to focus on sexuality rather than on gender and they will be more happy to be more independent, to be not so much connected to a gender department, or a Women's Studies department.

E.M.V. Please explain a little bit the relation between Gay Studies and Lesbian Studies …

S.D. Lesbian and Gay Studies is a field full of tensions, of course, which have to do with the fact that there has been and there is a lot of political debate over the question what exactly it is that gays and lesbians share? If they share anything at all…

There are a lot of differences between gays and lesbians, between their social, cultural and political positions. There has been an enormous debate within Women's Studies, among lesbian feminists for instance, over the issue whether the position of lesbians should be understood primarily in gender terms, as resulting from gender oppression, or whether the position of lesbians was in essence comparable to that of gay men, more related to their oppression on the base of sexuality, sexual identity.

These have been very important, very profound debates. In Nijmegen we use the title which we use in order to make it clear that these are not the same things, that we might share some things, but there should be a debate as to what exactly it is that we share or not. This is also an attempt to make lesbian sexuality visible, because, of course, that is something, which very, very quickly disappears under the sign of male homosexuality. The field of homosexuality is just like the rest of society, where women's issues very quickly disappear; they are very quickly made to appear as less important than men's issues.

E.M.V. It would be great to hear from you about the gay politics in The Netherlands, where one may already talk about a history of gay politics as part of the broader social developments.

S.D. I am a historian, so be careful, we will go all the way… The gay and lesbian politics in The Netherlands started at the beginning of the 20th century, when Christian parties began to dominate political life. Before that, liberal parties had dominated political life but at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century Christian parties became the dominant parties in Dutch politics and one of the things, which they did was to introduce, in 1911, a new set of morality legislation. This legislation aimed at pornography, at abortion, at contraceptives, and also at homosexuality.

Homosexuality was not illegal in The Netherlands for most of the 19th century, there existed a liberal sort of legislation, which said

that the state should not interfere in the private life of citizens. This did not mean that they thought homosexuality was a good thing, but they let other institutions, like the Church, private morality organisations, and the family to deal with that. They stated that „we" do not want homosexuality, but the state is not the right agent to deal with it.

In the 19th century The Netherlands had a liberal legislation, but then, beginning with the 20th century, due to the changing of the political landscape we got this morality legislation, which partially criminalised homosexuality. It was not totally illegal, but was illegal to have sex with people of the same sex between the ages of 16 and 21. Heterosexuals could do that, heterosexuals were free to have sex with each other from the age of 16 onwards, homosexuals could not do that, they could only do that when they became 21. These laws were supposedly aimed against older people making younger people homosexuals. The idea was that young people could be tempted to become homosexuals, and they should be protected of doing that. This sort of legislation was bad, because it criminalised homosexuality of course, and especially because it led to blackmail.

The introduction of this law was the beginning of the gay and lesbian movement in The Netherlands, and it was gay and lesbian because the law was aimed not just against men, but also against women. From the beginning, the gay movement in The Netherlands was mixed: it was a movement of gays and lesbians, although gays dominated it from the very, very beginning.

Up until 1940, so till the beginning of the Second World War, this movement was not very influential, it had a very hard time because The Netherlands was a very Christian, conservative country. After the war the gay and lesbian movement was founded again. In 1946 the Dutch gay and lesbian organisation movement, what is now the COC, was founded, it is the oldest still existing gay and lesbian organisation in the world, and it pretty much had the same goals, to fight against the law, the law that was still there, but also to offer

gays and lesbians a shelter in a hostile society. From the very beginning the organisation was partly political, but especially in the 1940s, the 1950s and the large part of the '60s it was an organisation, that was aimed to fight against prejudices, to give homosexuals something of a life, making possible for them to meet in a surrounding that was not the semi-criminal surrounding of the bars and the street etc. But at the same time it was a very careful sort of organisation, it aimed very much to turn the gays and lesbians into normal, respectable, decent citizens and to convince the rest of the world that gays and lesbians were decent, respectable, just like everybody and not sex-perverts.

During the 1960s this orientation gradually changed, when first the COC itself chose a strategy, which was aimed more outwards, was seeking contact, and to a certain extent, confrontation with the rest of society. It was not any more so much an inwardly oriented shelter, but aimed to go out into society, to be more open, to be more in dialogue with the rest of society. And what happened as well in the late '60s and at the beginning of the 1970s was that a more radical gay and lesbian movement emerged, which said: well, we do not just want to be respectable citizens like everybody else, we want a radical gay and lesbian politics, we are for radical ideas of equality, we want to radically change what society thinks about sexuality, what society thinks about differences between men and women, between gays, lesbians and heterosexuals. That is how this movement became more radical, very much in line with other radical movements of that period.

What is crucial for understanding the gay and lesbian politics in The Netherlands until the late 1960s actually is that, from a very early point on, religious organisations gradually started to support the gay and lesbian movements. The intellectuals who were in top positions within religious organisations, and especially the intellectuals who were working in the modern human sciences like psychology and sociology, gradually started to support the gay and

lesbian movement. And that was one of the reasons of the success of gay and lesbian movement in that period.

In 1972, when the law against homosexuality was finally abolished, which was of course a huge success, and from that point onwards, you may see a string of successes in the politics of gay and lesbian movements in The Netherlands. The gay and lesbian movement received state subsidies. For example, the creation of gay and lesbian mental health care institutions, which were not aimed at curing homosexuals and making them heterosexuals, but at helping them coping with the hostile world, received financial support. Beside this, all sorts of discriminatory legislation were gradually abolished. The principle of equal treatment has been introduced at the end of the 1980s, which made illegal to treat gays and lesbians unequally in all fields covered by civil law, so they became to be protected by law against discrimination and now, of course, we see the introduction of gay and lesbian marriage. So there have been quite a few successes...

What you may observe in the 1980s and '90s within the movement, is a sort of pluralisation. The organisation, which was for so long the main organisation, gradually lost its hegemony, its dominance over the gay and lesbian movement, and a lot of smaller movements emerged, all kinds of specialized movements. And what happens from the mid 1980s onwards is that the gay and lesbian movement gradually becomes less radical. It aims for full legal equality, for normalization to a certain extent, and it is about fighting against discrimination, it no longer follows the sort of radical gay and lesbian politics, which radically wanted to change society, and the ideas about sexuality.

At the moment, what is difficult and frustrating in The Netherlands is that the legitimacy of gay and lesbian movement is rapidly diminishing. This is because people say, well, you are in paradise, you have achieved so much, the position of gays and lesbians is so good over here that it is no longer valid to complain,

and there no longer should be a gay and lesbian movement. I think this is the phantasm of full emancipation, which suggests that everything has been reached, whereas, of course, that is not the case at all. I mean, yes, this is a fairly good society for gays and lesbians, but nevertheless there still is discrimination, there still are inequalities, there still is violence, albeit limited, but nevertheless, there is still something to fight for. If full equality has been achieved, other people will say, it is ridiculous what you are doing, you just want to be different, you just want to perpetuate your own inequality, you want to remain in the ghetto, you do not want to accept that you have become equal. And the most frustrating argument is that, which states that due to all this there is no more need for gay and lesbian institutions. Then I always say: what does equality mean? If there is no social and cultural space in which you can be gay and lesbian how can you speak about equality? I mean, in order to have a flourishing social space, in order to have a real equality you have to have a civil society that is profoundly pluralist, where there are spaces where people can be gays and lesbians, where there is an organised, collective, and visible gay and lesbian life.

So I think it is very important that we still have it, that we organise it, that we fight for it, because I think that the sort of equality, which says well, there is full equality, there should be no difference whatsoever, is a very sterile phantasm of a society in which there is no longer meaningful difference. I mean you cannot have equality without being in favour of difference. That is the sort of challenge for gay and lesbian politics now. To say yes, we are equal, there is full equality, we have come to enjoy that, but at the same time we want to live in a society in which difference can exist. And then the question, of course is what sort of difference should that be, because as I pointed out earlier, very strong identity politics, which organises everything around the identities of gays and

lesbians has its own problems. It is also exclusionary, it is also a norm, it is also restraining in a sense.

But nevertheless I do think that we should try to have a civil society, which allows for meaningful, visible, „collective" if you wish, differences. And, I think, this is exactly the challenge for gay and lesbian politics nowadays: after having achieved equality to the extent that we have, we should now re-open the fight for meaningful visible difference, at the same time trying to make it clear that these differences are not fixed, that we should have debate about what sort of difference is meaningful, what sort of difference would we like to have in civil society, and in culture. Should that be the fixed difference gay – lesbian, or should we have more fluid and open sorts of differences, which allow for further development.

E.M.V. So the gay and lesbian movement actually was about a process of constant changes as far its aims and forms of organising are considered. And there was a shift from fighting for the right of being different in the private life to fighting for a public visibility, for being pride of ones gayness, if I may say so. Help me to understand how this public visibility is organised, and if there is any agreement on how a public space, which recognises differences, should look like. Is there a need for own public spaces or there is a need for a hybrid or a mixed public space, where the rights that were acquired might be fully lived out?

S.D. Both at the same time. I think that is the challenge, to have all these things at the same time, to have hybrid spaces, but also to have spaces where the difference is visible and where it is allowed to exist. But the problem is that people can think about these things only in very restrictive and very static terms, in terms like „there should be difference, or there should not be". And if there is a difference, we want to know what difference exactly this is and how long is going to last … Well, the real emancipation for me is to be found in acknowledging that differences are sometimes, at some points important, but at other times and in other places are not. And

acknowledging that differences are not static, but they are dynamic, that they might change over time, and their importance might change over time.

E.M.V. When I was in the United States, at the University of California Los Angeles, that was between 1998 and 1999, I could learn something about the gay and lesbian movement on the campus, and encountered, among others, the position according to which one may assume the gay or lesbian identity politically, without having a gay or lesbian sexual orientation behind that option. Political lesbianism in that context meant to fight both against the Mexican-American nationalism and against the white American dominant culture. Is this phenomenon observable here?

S.D. No, it does not happen here at all, and part of the reason for that, of course, is that in the United States the entire category of gay is so controversial, the entire issue of homosexuality is so controversial, so deeply, deeply political, that it is possible for some people to say, well, I identify as gay because that is a sort of ultra-subversive position. It is so thoroughly politicised, it is so contested, it is so controversial that to identify as gay is to take up, let's say, the most radical position imaginable; that is what they will say.

Over here, gay has been normalised, to a certain extent de-politicised, become not subversive, become uncontroversial, so you cannot do this sort of politics. I mean taking up the category of gay here as a political category, does not make you heretical, absolutely not, because this is a very, very mainstream, middle of the road, totally acceptable sort of figure. So that is the difference in context.

And apart from this difference in context, I should also say that I am weary of that sort of politics where gay is a sort of the most radical category, because, first of all, I do not think that it is necessary so, and I am not sure whether it is desirable to make gay into the most radical position imaginable. I do not know whether it is

desirable, I would like for gay to be much more open, a sort of category that more people can identify with, which is not just the privilege of the advanced hyper-political and radical people, but a more open category that allows for more people to identify with and perhaps even to struggle for, to have political struggles for, but not necessarily these highly radical struggles. So I am weary of all sorts of interpretations to gay that are limiting, and which claim that well, gay is this and this, it is this and that political position. I am weary of that and not very much in its favour. And apart from that, as I said, it is impossible in The Netherlands; you cannot do that because of the context.

E.M.V. And what about the Queer identity and movement? Is that a subversive position?

S.D. It is very mixed… In the United States there is an attempt to open it up not only for gays and lesbians, but also for bisexuals, for transsexuals, for transgender people etc. So for all the outcasts, we should fight for all the outcasts. In that sense Queer is defined as an inclusive category. But, at the same time, Queer is exclusive, precisely because of its radical nature, because of its attempt to be the most radical sexual program imaginable. And that makes it exclusive, of course, makes it the privilege of the avant-garde who was willing to risk everything, who was thinking of itself as the absolute avant-garde in sexuality and gender issues. So „queer" is mixed: on the one hand it is an opening relative to the earlier notion of gay and lesbian that was restrictive to certain ways, but on the other hand it is a closure because of its hyper-radicalism.

E.M.V. And it is mainly an American project…

S.D. The combination of „Queer" as both an intellectual and political project is an exclusively, almost as far as I can see, almost exclusively American project. We also have some smaller groups like that in Europe, but in The Netherlands the political part of it is unimaginable to happen, precisely because here, as I already pointed

out, gay is not a highly contested political category, so turning it into Queer it would not help. That cannot be done.

On a more intellectual level, some Queer theorising has influence in The Netherlands, but as part of the larger post-structuralist or post-modernist sort of theorising about gender and sexuality. Take the example of Judith Butler, for instance, who is important in Queer theory, she is influential here in feminist studies, in Women's Studies, in Gender Studies, but not as a Queer theorist, but as a post-modern, post-structuralist theorist of sex and gender. This is due to this specific political situation of homosexuality in The Netherlands: Queer is not a huge success over here.

E.M.V. At a certain moment you mentioned that in the history of the gay movement there was some sort of alliance between intellectuals working on social sciences and between the gay activists, so that they could empower each other in their fight against the conservatives. Was that radical?

S.D. No, it was not radical at all. This was in the 1960s, and the social scientists and psychologists whom we are talking about, were people situated at the top of all sorts of religious organisations, so it was a very, very careful way of making religious organisations more progressive. Because of the influence of the modernist psychological theory and modernist sociological theory on the ideology of these religious organisations, the latter were gradually and very carefully going through a process of modernisation. The changing attitude towards homosexuality was one of the aspects of this process. But that is history, and has absolutely nothing to do with modern gay and lesbians politics. From the '70s onwards that landscape has changed profoundly. An altogether different period has started and a different political and intellectual context emerged.

E.M.V. Now I am trying to link all that you told me to Romania. I am wondering what sorts of social alliances might be imaginable among people who are trying to deconstruct the taken for granted conceptions of their own society at different levels and in

different domains. One may observe, for example, that many people are afraid of making alliances with gays or putting together feminists with gays and lesbians, being afraid of threatening their altogether not so strong positions.

S.D. Well, of course, the very, very moderate democrats perhaps think that it is dangerous, but I think what they should remember is that the struggle for democracy has always been a struggle for re-interpreting what democracy means, for giving new interpretations of democracy, new interpretation of human rights in order to include as many people as possible. Take for example the French revolution. At the very beginning, democracy was something only for men. Equality, legal equality referred only to men, and from that point onwards, there has been a continuous struggle to open it up, to include women, to include other men than white men, to include black men, to include the Jews, and so on and so forth.

Democracy is about this continuous reinterpretation of what democracy is, to whom and what it applies, so you cannot exclude gays and lesbians from that. But on the other hand, this is a struggle, and it is not going to be automatically there. So moderate democrats, cautious democrats should be reminded of the fact that democracy is nothing but a continuous process of struggle over what democracy is, over who is, and who is not included. And gays and lesbians should be reminded of the fact that being included does not come automatically, but it requires struggle within democracy and it needs the reinterpretation of what democracy means.

E.M.V. In my country, the anti-gay and anti-lesbian attitude is very strictly connected to nationalist feelings backed up by religious fundamentalism, which considers that homosexuality is something not natural, and definitely is stranger from the „natural national identity", from the authentic Romanianness.

S.D. Yes, the fantasies of nationalism are to a large extent dependent on fantasies of gender and sexuality. Women are considered to be the symbols of the nation, of the boundaries of the

nation, which separate one nation from others, while the national self is very often identified as male, as strong, whereas the other nations are considered to be effeminate and weak. In this context, homosexuality is very often considered to be a threat to the nation, to its purity, and it is excluded as not being part of the history of the nation, of the tradition of the nation. To think critically about gender and sexuality in such a context also implies thinking critically about nation and nationalism and the other way around. The people who are critical of nationalism should be reminded that nationalism depends on all these gendered and sexualised images, that fantasies about gender and sexuality are very important in creating and sustaining nationalism, so that their critiques of nationalism should also be critiques of the dominant fantasies of gender and sexuality.

We should constantly try and connect these, but for me, of course, it is easy to say this from the safe surroundings from which I speaking. It is an entirely different matter when you live in a context where doing these sorts of works is dangerous. But I am really convinced that if you are dedicated to fight against nationalism, you should fight against sexism and homophobia as well. Because you cannot dislocate the one and leave the other intact. This is an interconnected struggle, which is horrible, because it is never to become very easy.

E.M.V. Let me ask you at the end of our discussion about the existence of any trans-national solidarity within the gay movement, any sort of co-operation, say, with people from Central and Eastern Europe.

S.D. Yes, there is the International Lesbian and Gay Association, within which various groups work together and which also has an East European representation. In The Netherlands there is the national gay and lesbian organisation COC, and I think that this, together with the former one, and with the Ministry of Development is supporting projects abroad, among others in Romania.

But, of course, it is a notoriously difficult thing to do this sort of international organising because it requires a lot of energy, it requires building and sustaining long-lasting organisations, which is difficult in an international context, where people come and go, have other things to do, especially in the countries where this kind of work is much more difficult to accomplish … so this is a hard thing to do. But we should not forget that, in Europe, this kind of international support for local projects becomes more and more important in the context of the European integration. It is important that there is a European legislation regarding gay and lesbian rights, due to which member states can be forced to be Euro-conform among others in this matter as well. Discriminatory criminal law against gays and lesbians has been abolished through the European courts, so we should not forget about that and should use this as many feminist groups are doing. It is an opportunity to get some changes for the better.

E.M.V. Yes, there exists, at least at the rhetorical level, a commitment towards European integration in Romania, too...

S.D. Yes, of course, this is partly rhetoric, but rhetoric is never just rhetoric, I mean rhetoric can also be used, you can try to force people to do what they say they want to do. You should emphasize again and again that is what they have said, and show that you do not just want this to be only rhetoric, but you want to really do something about it. So we should not forget that rhetoric is always part of the critical struggle and we should try to deploy it for out own purposes as much as we can.

WIDENING EDUCATION TOWARDS THE MARGINS

I always give the example of one student, who… when came on our course was working in a nursing home as a cleaner. When she started doing our women's studies course she got self-confidence and by the end of the year she was promoted to the manager of that nursing home. That is important for me, because in this way I see my political activity in my work, which consists of being able to help people to change their lives.

GERRY HOLLOWAY[*]

[*] *Dr. Gerry Holloway is professor on history at the University of Sussex, Great Britain, working at the Centre for Continuing Education of the same university. She has done research on the late 19th- and early 20th-century women's organisations, on life histories and local women's history. She is the author of the book* Ada Nield Chew: An Uncomfortable Feminist *(1997), and, among others, of the article "Finding a Voice: On Becoming a Working Class Feminist Academic" published in the volume* Class Matters: Feminist Academics Talk about their Lives*, edited by P. Mahony and C. Zmorczek (1997).*

E.M.V. You are historian, teaching on women's studies, and as well working in the continuing education centre at the University of Sussex. At the beginning of our discussion I would like to ask you to share with me some information about this centre.

G.H. The continuing education is part of the university, it deals with adult students, who are returning in education and on the whole can only study part time. Some adults go into full time courses at Sussex, but there are a lot of people working who want to study part time, and/or who cannot come to study on our campus, but in small localities across the region. They are coming to us. We organise a whole range of courses, which are called open courses where anyone can come to, and we also offer certificates, diplomas and degree. Some courses are more academic, others more vocational, like management, arts management, or education management. The courses are taught either in the evening, or at weekends, that is why we employ a whole range of part time tutors who teach in the evenings and weekends, and/ or who are willing to teach in small towns and villages in the countryside. We are different to the rest of the university. But all of our courses are university level courses, they are not basic education, but are higher education courses. Let me give you a look at the range of them.

The open courses are offered all around the Sussex region, like the art courses, creative writing drama, literature, music, landscape and scientific type courses, geology, and there is social critical studies that tends to be like management, Women's Studies, life history work, which I am involved with, environmental politics. These are all courses that run in the evening for people, for anyone who want to join. Students on open courses do not get access to the university library, so they have to get books from their local libraries.

Then we have got a range of courses that we call award bearing courses and these are certificate, diploma and degree giving courses, again, on the same sort of subject areas, but these are for

people who are prepared to work towards a qualification. And these courses are usually, but not always, run on the university campus, the students are treated like full-time students, they have rights to the university facilities. But they also come in the evening, for few hours in a week, and work independently at home as well.

So this is the department that I work in. Within it we offer women's studies course as well. I am teaching the one called Revolting Women, where we are dealing with women as agents of change in history, and with how women have been involved in changing British society. We look at the suffrage movement, which begin in the 20th century, and on women's liberation movement in the 1970s. We do not just look at the history of them, but both at the ways in which women represented themselves and they have been represented in history and in the media at the time. The second course, which is going on at the moment, is called Feminism Today. That is theorising and representing women's lives in two different ways. It looks at women's life through the laws, which affect women, like laws around rape and violence against women, and, on the other hand, it deals with women's life through the ways women are represented in film, like pornographic films, but also Hollywood films. These courses are also offered as options to our students on the BA in cultural studies. Quite a few students who do this course, go ahead to do the MA in Women's Studies, so sometimes we can see this progression as well, into postgraduate study.

So these are the sorts of courses we run and there are three tiers: the open course, which is of low level assessments, the certificates that are more heavily assessed, but only last for one or two years, and then the degree. And because the degree is part time, it lasts for six years, students study for six years, in the evenings and in the weekends. Although they can complete their degree in a shorter or longer time, if they wish.

One of the big problems our students have, being mature students, who left school fairly early on for all sorts of reasons, is that

they have not got the confidence the younger students have of being able to just sit down and write an essay, to read the textbook, and to construct their notes. They also think that everybody else is cleverer than they are. We do a lot of work to encourage them, we do lots of workshops around, and we have, for example, the Resources Room, where there are lots of handouts that they can take, which explain how to write an essay and how to take notes. On the other hand, obviously, they have to solve the problem of managing their time, because they are working full time, got families to look after, have all the responsibilities of the adults, and that is very difficult.

That is what we are doing in this department…

E.M.V. Is this centre quite new?

G.H. No, is going on for a long time, for about twenty years. But in its present form it exists for the last seven or eight years. It used to be very different in the old days. Now is much more focused on helping people, either to get jobs or to improve their chances of promotion, or enabling people to pursue something at the high level, that they might be interested in as a hobby. So if they are interested in art, they can actually study art at a high level, they have to critically analyse paintings.

E.M.V. Is this kind of program much more focused on people's life and experiences than the others?

G.H. Yes, because these are people who have experiences, and who bring those experiences to the courses. What we tried to do is to help them to use those experiences, and to be able to move on to do other things, if that is the case, like in the case of the unemployed, whom we help to work towards starting something new. Other people, who enrol, are retired, have finished in a way their careers, and now have time for their hobby, like writing, so they do a creative writing course. It is important that people, who have lots of problems in finding a job, receive help from us. And not only in the terms of finding a job, but also in that of finding the confidence that

they are able to do that, because we encourage them to move on that way as well.

We do quite a lot of work, out in the estates, trying to get people confident enough to do the higher-level courses and to come to the university. One of the big experiences is the first time when they visit the university. We bring them here and show them the library, and bring them to a class, and show them what is like to be a student. And they really enjoy it, but they have to stop the fear, that this is not for them, but for other people, who are young and clever. We have to encourage them to say, „I can do it".

E.M.V. And when they are here, are they isolated within the university or they really have the feeling that they belong to this place?

G.H. The program used to be very much on the margins of the university. But now it is a lot better, because people like me, who were both in this department and in other parts of the university, help to integrate their work in the broader academic environment. Now people see the courses offered in this program as university courses, and some of our students, if they can study during the day, can choose to do some of the courses that run during the day, alongside the younger students. There is a problem with that sometimes, so they do feel a bit on the outside, but if there is something they want to do, we encourage them to do it. We are trying hard within the university to get away this division between people who study part time and full time. It is difficult, because the problems of the part-time students are very different from the life of the full-time, 19-20 years old students. If you want to keep them at the university, you do not want them giving up, you have to find ways to help them to study, even though their lives can be very difficult.

E.M.V. There must be all kinds of motivations to join your program, and there might be all kind of social categories who have

access to the university due to it, many of whom, would not have access otherwise…

G.H. That is right… one of those categories, are for example, the refugees, people coming in this country, who might have qualifications from their home countries, but these qualifications are not recognised here… In their case we have to find ways to help them becoming able to use these skills within this country. We have a lot of refugees from Sudan, from Ethiopia, and from North Africa… we do not get so many from Central Europe. In their case language, of course, is one problem. But there are also cultural differences in understanding how the system works here, how we do things and all those sorts of things. We have courses to help those people, too. Because our department really looks to widen the participation in education and to listen to people, find out what they need and offering courses that help them to be able to take part in education.

E.M.V. This reminds me a little bit of what I was learning about Ethnic Studies in the United States, where those programs, beside being an academic opportunity, aimed as well to help minority students to integrate into the wider university by offering them a home-like, friendly environment.

G.H. Yes, that is right. This is very different from the so-called normal academic institution. You have to be much more focused on the student, rather than on research. We also do research, obviously, but the focus is much more on how to help people to learn, how to make people feel comfortable and included. That is the sort of the work, which we do.

Some of our courses are very popular in this respect. Like the life history courses, where people can use their own life experience to think about how the world works, about where their places are within it, courses, which make them able to see their own experience as something valuable, as something interesting to other people. Because these people usually think that they have done nothing, they

have just lived in the same town, and worked, and have their children, so they do not see their lives as interesting. Having the opportunity to look at how their family works, how their society works, actually helps them to think all about this in theoretical terms as well, and eventually helps them to get into the education. And one of the ways we do that, is asking them to tell us about their education, about the schools they had, about why they left school at fifteen or sixteen years. Because that is the age people have left school in the past, and that has to do a lot with family expectations … After the Second World War people were preparing their children to have a home and a job, and it was not so much pressure on going to university. It was especially so in the case of women growing up in the 1950s… if they came with a working class background it was very difficult to get into higher education. Even if at that time it was free education in this country, right up to university level, young women in particular were not encouraged to go to university, because they were seen as getting married, having children… So what we are trying to do is to get to people by looking at their own experiences and then make them to move from this level into theorising about wider ranges of issues. And once people start doing that, it really helps them into realising that they left school not because they were not clever, not because they could not do it, they left school because society has said to them that this is not for them. Today, the notion that the government wants us all to go into education and talks about lifelong learning, about never stopping to learn, gives an opportunity to those people to find a space in their lives. And to say, well, I am going to be a student now, I am going to study, and I will have my desk in the corner. I think this really enriches people's lives and is very important to make them to believe that they are able to do that.

E.M.V. Is this class-based inequality belonging to the past, or is it still structuring today's British society?

G.H. It was very strong in the 1950s and 1960s, when certain people could do certain things and others could not due to their family background. However, the girls growing up in the 1950s are the first generation of girls, who began to go to grammar schools and to see university as a possibility for them. But there were all sorts of barriers, which they had to overcome, like family barriers, and not only material matters, but as well ways of thinking about what a girl should do, where she should go and so on. And if they did go to university, in a way they left behind their families. Because the whole culture of the university and the sorts of jobs they have got when they came out of the university was so different to their mothers' lives, and, at the same time, they could not necessarily feel part of the educated elite. But they did began a transition from a period of time when very few people had higher education to a situation where it was expected that young people should stay at college till they are eighteen years old, and then most likely should go to university. You may see my own example. When I was young, I left school at sixteen and I went to university when I got older, I was one of those people, to whom their parents said: „you should go to work and then you should get married". My daughter, who is seventeen, is doing her exams to go to university. And amongst all her friends the expectation is to finish school, to go to college, and then to go to university. This is not to say that every eighteen years old girl goes to university in Britain, but the expectation is more that they should do that rather than they should not. Well, in my generation the expectation was about not doing that. This has changed a lot, it really has.

E.M.V. Probably there are huge differences between different universities in terms of their social openness … I was visiting Oxford in the last weekend, and the whole atmosphere, including the use of space suggested me that this was still a closed system …

G.H. That is true, although today they have more ordinary young people going to Oxford and Cambridge. They, of course, still

have to get very, very high exams results, „A" grades and everything, and they have to go through an interview and be seen as the right sort of person who will do well at Oxford. You may encounter all sorts of problems if you do not come from a family where education, including higher education is taken-for-granted, where the parents do not know how to encourage their children to learn how they should deal with this situation. Of course, Oxford and Cambridge are the elite universities, but there are a lot of good universities, which in some subjects excel Oxford and Cambridge. At certain subjects you would not want to go there... But I suppose, if you are interested in sciences, the sciences is very good to go, especially to Cambridge, so a lot of the top young people go to Cambridge. But there are other good universities for science as well, like the Imperial College in London, or Bristol University. Obviously, in any case it helps to have people in your family to know about these things … I have always been able to ensure that my daughter got a good advantage, because I know the university sector, and I could advise her on that. Whereas other young people – whose parents have not been to university – are somehow disadvantaged, especially if their teachers do not help them either. Anyway, I would not be someone who would say that you must go to Oxford or Cambridge because they are traditionally „the" elite universities. I think that for some people they might be a horrible experience, because a lot of people have a lot of money there, and if you got there and you have no money, you may never really feel that you are part of that world.

E.M.V. How have you started your university career?

G.H. First I studied history. And I studied it here. When I started as an undergraduate, being innocent of the higher education, I was shocked that there were no courses which included women, all the courses were about men, there were no mentioning of what women did and where women were in history. Sometimes, depending on the tutor's interest, we used to land up doing

something on women at the last week of term. Slowly I began to realise that this is the way things were in the university at the undergraduate level, and that is why I got involved with other women who were trying to change things in the 1980s. I became a feminist historian studying women's history, writing about women in history, because of the gaps, which I have discovered in the traditional way of writing history.

And that is what I have been doing ever since, writing, and at one moment I am writing a book on the history of women's work in Britain since 1840. This is going to be an undergraduate textbook. That is how I have got interested as well in life histories, in people's lives, where they came from, how they talk about their lives, what they say about their lives, and what can we learn from that, how can we use those ideas and theorise about them.

E.M.V. May I ask you to tell me about your reasons of becoming a feminist and about the ways in which you practice feminism?

G.H. Well, I think that my feminism came from being a young girl who got really crossed every time someone, who said to me, „you cannot do that, boys do that". I was not the sort of girl who wanted to do those sorts of things, and I used to be very cross as a child. As I got older and went to work, I found that I was training young men to do jobs but still, get paid low less than them. It was very much like that in the 1970s in this country. Women got paid lower less than men and there was no legislation, which said that you have to treat women the same as men. So my feminism grew out from this sort of anger of being treated unfairly in life.

Once I got involved in the women's liberation movement, I became aware of what was going on, and when I got to university I felt that I was an older student, who already knew about these things. That is why I could discover that something is missing at the university, that it is not alright to not to talk about women, to keep them invisible, as they would never do anything. And that is why I

became a feminist academic rather than a conventional academic. But also because I came up through a non-traditional route, I have returned to education when I was thirty years old and already had a child, and I was telling myself that I could do it. That is the reason why I was choosing to work in the sector where I am now, in order to be able to help other people to get in education and that is why, as well, women's studies courses are so important for me… There are so many women of my age, and even younger, some about thirty and upwards, who did not have the opportunities to study. They were told, you are going to get married and have children and you just need a job that make you able to sustain your family, you do not have to study at a higher level. If they are single mums with two, three or four children, and they want to study, we try to help them. And it is a lot easier now, because there are some hardship funds, which will pay their fees and buy their books and help with the childcare. There is a move with the government we have at the moment which actually encourage people to get higher education by providing things that help them in this respect. We get the money from the European Social Fund to run some of our courses and to offer them for people who can not pay the fees, and/or who live in areas where there is not much transportation. In this case we either organise a course in their community centre, or we hire transport to bring them out of the community centre … that is how we do it.

E.M.V. You are not only teaching courses on Women's Studies, but you are also the convener of these courses.

G.H. Yes… each program, Women's Studies, media studies, oral history, has a convener like me, who organises all the courses in that program, teaches some of them, but employs other part-time tutors to teach other courses. That is how it works. You have to take the responsibility for the management of those courses in that program. This means that I am also a personal tutor, a person to whom the students come to with their all kinds of problems; I am the person who guides them through the degree.

E.M.V. I guess that if you are so closed to your students and their experiences, there must be a very strong link between your teaching and research activity. I have read in one of your studies that sometimes you have the feeling that you have to choose between being a feminist and making a university career, because the two sometimes do not fit together.

G.H. Yes, that is how it is. If I would have decided to become a straightforward historian, and to study and taught history, I probably would have ended to be promoted in a very conventional manner. But because I have chosen to work on this department, which is on the margins of the university, it is very difficult to be recognised as a „real" historian. And added to all this, I am also a feminist historian… and history is still very male dominated and there are a lot of historians, who still consider that women's history is not important. They would not say it now, because it is not politically correct to say so, but this opinion shapes the way they think about the promotion of feminist historians like I am.

As far as I am concerned, I am much more interested in my students than in working on what I need to do to get up the ladder. And I think lots of women are like that. In this country, not just in higher education, in lots of ways, they are not prepared to do what men do, to become top, to enjoy, for example, the privileges of being in high positions at the university. There are some women who do that, and who usually forget that they are women and they just become centred on their own careers, and do not think about other women, who do not have that chance. They have decided that they want to be successful and, of course, there is no problem with that, the problem arises when they forget about everybody else. As far as I am concerned I do not do what I do because I am a good person, but I do it because for me politically is important that other women get the opportunity to study. Maybe to become academics, but anyway, to get the confidence to feel that they can do something with their

lives, whatever that is. You know, studying opens up doors and gives them ideas about themselves.

In this sense I always give the example of one student, who never finished the course, but when she came on our course she was working in a nursing home for people, just as a cleaner, just looking after the old people. And when she started doing our women's studies course she got self-confidence and by the end of the year she was promoted to the manager of that nursing home. I am convinced that that could never ever happen if she had not done a course which gave her the confidence to say I can do that job, I can be the manager, I do not have to be just a cleaner, I can be the manager. And she proved herself that this is true, and I am always very proud of that, because that is the sort of things that I like to see happening. I like to see women thinking about their ability to do other things, to move on, and not to be somebody who is exploited by everybody. That is the sort of work, which I like to do and that is important for me, because in this way I see my political activity in my work, which consists of being able to help people to change their lives.

E.M.V. This sounds very, very great, and challenging, but it must be very difficult to follow this strategy within a university.

G.H. It is difficult because you have always got bureaucracy. You have always got to fight your corner, and you have always got to argue, and to make people say „oh, is that woman again, saying those things again". But eventually if they start to listen they might take seriously the need for a political cultural change in this country and the notion that everybody has the right to learn, and we must not just have elitist education. For those, who recognise this, my work looks very useful, and they recognise what I am doing as being valuable. And a lot of developments happened in this sense on our campus as well. I mean is not open to everyone, not everyone comes to the university, there are still doors to be passed through these gate-keepers, but a lot more people are here today then they used to be. Of course, not everybody is interested, why should they be? But

if people want to, then we have to find ways to help them in doing that…

E.M.V. Your whole career seems to be about not being in the mainstream, neither in history, nor in feminism…

G.H. That is right, yes, I am not in the mainstream of either, and this gets difficult when you are doing research, because some of my work is on feminism and some of it is on history, and sometimes is difficult to bring them together. But that is the problem of institutions that catch everybody in boxes, we are not all in boxes, some of us work laterally rather than vertically, you know…

On the other hand, obviously, today is widely recognised that feminism is not only about the feminism of middle class women, but there are different voices within, there are a lot of small pressure groups organised around different (women's) issues. Sometimes an activist from one of those groups would come and do one of my courses, could get the theory and then might go back and use it. It is a sort of help, again, that I am able to give for these groups, from where some representatives are coming to the university to think through the ideas they find it difficult to struggle with. I am much more than an activist or a theorist, I am the person who gets things together; I am an organiser rather than somebody who writes the theory. And you know, in feminism we need all sorts of people.

In Britain, like elsewhere, historically it was the case that feminism was dominated by middle class women and it is important to find out what happened to those women, who were very active but working class, why could not they ever succeed? Why were they always just the assistants? One needs to look at how class, power and gender intersect and how organisations are put together, who gets the decisions. Today things have changed, this case is not so straightforward… but it is still about networks, it is still about how you get to do things, and who gets to do things and who does not. You have to recognise that women have power in their own organisations, and here we do not deal only with the issue of male

power, but with that of women's power, and of what they are doing with that. How do they help, if help, other women, who are having less power.

E.M.V. Let me ask you at the end of our discussion to briefly outline some of the main issues around which women's organising is going on in Britain today.

G.H. There is a whole range… The organisation called the Fawcett Society is quite powerful, this is an equal rights organisation which is involved in lots of campaigns around work and women not being paid as much as men, and around women on the top positions, and these kinds of issues. That is a big organisation, and its voice is really heard by the Labour Party at the moment, so it is quite a powerful one.

And there is an organisation called Single Parents Action Network, spanned in school, which is lobbying for the rights of the single parents, usually mothers, in particular they try to stop the government to reduce single mothers' benefits, forcing them to take jobs they do not want to take. There is also a campaign going on around issues of law, in order to eliminate women's discrimination… and this is again very interesting today, because Tony Blair's wife, Shirley, is a lawyer and she is very active around those sorts of issues.

There is another organisation called Transgap, which is interested to work on women in science and engineering. I know about that because my daughter is going to do science, and they put on all sorts of events to encourage girls to do science rather than arts subjects. This is another way to open up new careers for women. And one has to mention as well black women's organising against racism in this country… So there are lots and lots of women's organisations, involved in very different women-related social and political issues.

RE-APPROACHING MULTICULTURALISM

There is nothing wrong with thinking that something is not good or right for women from other cultures, but, most importantly, when one comes out with this opinion, has to listen for the women who are inside those cultures and to see what all this means for them. As a feminist with a certain social and cultural background you should always get in contact with women from other environments.

MARJOLEIN VERBOOM[*]

[*] *The interview with Marjolein Verboom was made, like all the interviews in this volume, in February 2001. Since the fall of 2001 she is not working any more at GEM, at this very moment she is a diversity officer at the development organisation called NOVIB. This text might look out dated from the point of view of the developments of the Centre for Expertise on Gender, Ethnicity and Multiculturality, but is very important in this book because it focuses our attention on the relationship between ethnicity and gender, feminism and multiculturalism. For this reason I am happy to have Marjolein's agreement on publishing it. For the newest information about GEM the reader is kindly asked to consult its Web Page at the address <www.let.uu.nl/gem>.*

E.M.V. We are at the Centre for Expertise on Gender, Ethnicity and Multiculturality (GEM), an offshoot of the Department of Women's Studies at the University of Utrecht, The Netherlands. Please share with me what this centre is about and what are you working on.

M.V. Let me start by telling you that we are sponsored by the state, by the Ministry of Education, and we get some support also from the university. I think this is important for understanding what our position is. As an expertise centre, our effort is to translate the knowledge we have here at the university, especially which was built within Women's Studies into the broader field of education. And it is our main task to work on gender and multiculturalism as we have expertise on this.

E.M.V. You are a group of how many people?

M.V. The regular staff includes two people, professor Gloria Wekker as director, and myself; and then we work with different people on a project basis. We are working on several projects. Most importantly we have a role to play in making school curricula gender-conscious and sensitive to ethnicity. In this sense we organised workshops, and published a book, a very practical book about how to introduce inter-culturality into higher education. It is a book in Dutch, with essays and much practical information, like tips for teachers and related website addresses and literature.

Recently we organised a workshop for teacher-training institutions, focusing on those training future high school teachers. There are about eight of these kinds of institutions in Holland, and people from these schools came together to discuss how they could combine gender and ethnicity issues in their teaching. Because by now, what you may see in the ministries and in schools and at all levels of education, is that either people speak of gender and they are thinking about how can they motivate girls to choose the technical disciplines (which has been a great movement in Holland), or they

talk about ethnicity and multicultural society. Under these conditions there is a need to link the two issues and directions of action together.

As I said, on the one side it is a whole world of people working on intercultural education, and on the other side you find people interested in gender education, but they never meet, never exchange their expertise and never think about what they might learn from each other. That is why our workshop was very interesting. It invited the „intercultural people", so to speak, and the „gender people" to have a dialogue, it was a very fruitful day, which will be continued in the future.

Another project of ours is building a database of the university courses, which work from a gender and ethnicity-perspective. We work on that in co-operation with the International Information Centre and Archive for the Women's Movement from Amsterdam. We are going to put the database on the Internet, including a list of experts, research and courses for gender and ethnicity, in order to stimulate some work in collaboration. *

In March 2001 we are going to present a book about the history of black feminist thinking in The Netherlands during the last thirty years or so. This is the third project of GEM, a unique initiative, because there is no such publication on the book market yet in our country. It is a very important product, for education, policy, and arts as well.

In addition, we participate in a general training for teachers on intercultural education. In The Netherlands there are quite a few organisations, which develop education material from an intercultural perspective. Together with six other organisations we offer a workshop on this topic, but it is to be mentioned that GEM is

* Since our discussion with Marjolein the database called *Expanding Horizons. Database for expertise on gender and ethnicity* was developed and is already working. The interested reader may find more about it on the website of the International Information Centre and Archives for the Women's Movement (www.iiav.nl).

the only one that addresses both gender and ethnicity. Again, in The Netherlands there are hundreds of initiatives, either on gender or on ethnicity, but there is no policy yet on their combination on the side of the Ministry of Education, and there is no co-operation between them. So we have this important impact of bringing people together. It is GEM's possibility and expertise to combine gender and ethnicity. Sometimes it is difficult to translate the existing theoretical ideas on the relationship between gender and ethnicity into school materials, but we have to be prepared for that, because people in the field really ask very concrete questions, like how do you communicate with parents of black children or of Moroccan and Turkish origins. This is a big problem, which that we face, the fact that schools cannot get into contact with the parents. Especially in primary education teachers feel that as a very big problem… and it is not easy to develop practical answers to their question. Let me mention that one of the organisations, which participate in the training, is developing a whole training program, with video material, on communicating with migrant parents.

E.M.V. What are the main issues that you have to deal with in your multicultural society when you are talking about the need to change education?

M.V. Inter-cultural education has many aspects and has to be addressed at many levels. For example, here it is the curriculum, with which many children cannot identify, because it is white and Dutch, in all senses. The pictures, the stories, the histories, everything is about a certain way of life. Nevertheless, there are some attempts to change this situation. For example it is popular nowadays in primary schools to have some preliminary days when children may teach other children about their culture. This is good, of course, but is not enough, and the meaning of multiculturalism should not be restricted only to that, or only to listen the music of the other, or to eat each other's food. Most importantly, teachers have to be self-conscious about who they are and what their sense of

normality and normativity is, and what their expectations of children are, because that influences very much how they treat them. And especially when you are a white person, most of the time you do not have any idea that you are prejudiced, because you think it is so normal and obvious to think as you think, and you have no idea that your behaviour is very shocking or disturbing to people with different backgrounds. Here, at GEM, we think that the reflection on whiteness is something which is very much missing in many multicultural approaches. In Holland, to the extent to which there is attention for the development of a multicultural society and towards intercultural training, the majority of the programs are focusing on the „Other", at best they are trying to give a sense of different cultures. This is a very rigid scheme, but that is how many people are still working in this sphere. I do not think that this is right, because people, who live here, and have other cultural backgrounds or other historical and ethnic backgrounds, should not be simply classified as people from Africa, or from Eastern Europe or whatever. Unfortunately, this simplification is very much there, and it also goes back to the problem I raised earlier about how to deal with parents of black, Turkish or Moroccan pupils; the focus is almost exclusively on the „Other", while white people continue to think that they manage to be neutral or objective persons.

E.M.V. Where did your initiative come from?

M.V. Initially it came from the Women's Studies Department. In The Netherlands there are not so many scholars working and writing on this domain, on issues at the crossroads of gender and ethnicity. And, if there are, they are mostly focusing on theory development. In this sense the role of GEM is huge. It was especially founded in order to translate this knowledge to more practical applications in education.

E.M.V. Are there initiatives in this domain coming from different ethnic groups?

M.V. There are some, but not many. Recently, some Turkish mothers protested against sending their children to the so-called „black" primary schools, where the majority of pupils are of ethnic minority origin. Their reasoning is that their children do not learn Dutch at a satisfactory level. There also is a national organisation, called Forum – Institute for the Development of a Multicultural Society –, which formulates policy proposals on multicultural education, but exclusively for the primary and secondary level, and again not paying attention to the combination of gender and ethnicity. I think that there are two major reasons why we do not see more initiatives: first of all in The Netherlands the dominant discourse of assimilation/ integration is very strong. It is very hard to place oneself outside of that discourse. There is an awful double bind that migrants are placed in. The overriding message is: be like us, so if you present yourself as different, having different educational needs, you are looked upon as inferior. Secondly, our ethnic minority groups, having been recruited, since the 1960s, from working-class backgrounds, are almost not present at universities; however their number is growing now. To be more accurate, one should mention that these groups have developed initiatives in the public sphere, but not in this particular field at the crossroads of gender and ethnicity. There are, for example, Maroccan, Turkish and Surinamese student organisations, and there is some organising in the primary schools as well. But not on developing a school curriculum sensitive on gender and ethnicity issues.

E.M.V. Please tell me something about your centre's name.

M.V. I was not here when they thought about the name, but its acronym – gender, ethnicity, multiculturality – of course plays with the image of a jewel, of something precious, of shedding light on different sides of this very complex problematic. I can imagine that people had many discussions about the meanings of multiculturalism. In the book that I was mentioning to you a little bit earlier, we use the term inter-culturalism. It is interesting to see that

there are many arguments about why one should use one of the terms or the other. „Multiculturalism" could suggest that you see the different cultures living next to each other, according, maybe, to the American „salad bowl" model, where having multicultural curricula means that you have separate African-American, Native-American, Asian-American, Mexican-American courses offered, you have different courses on these subjects, and there is hardly any exchange between them. I think that on this domain there is a need for much more critical thinking, and that is why we chose to talk about inter-culturalism, because we focus on the exchange between different cultures. And, at the same time, we use the term „culture" in a very broad sense, not only in an ethnic sense or in a more traditional connotation, but also in a sense which includes differences in life styles and ways of thinking. We talk about, for instance, lesbian culture, or class culture and so on and so forth.

I always stress the importance of communication between people, as well as of self-reflection. This is because my aim is to think about social relations, within which everyone is open to listen and also to explore her or himself. It is important to think where the differences are coming from, to be able to see our-selves as being different, and not only to define the „Other" as different.

E.M.V. In the recent feminist debates a critique of multiculturalism is growing and some are stressing that in cases when the politics of multiculturalism means the preservation of cultural traditions, which are oppressive for women, feminism cannot go hand in hand with multiculturalism.

M.V. I cannot simply answer that, because I think every situation is different. But, again, what I think as being very important, it is to listen, to speak and to communicate with the women who are part of those „other cultures". I think there is nothing wrong with having an opinion, and thinking that something is not good or right for women from other cultures, but, most importantly, when one comes out with this opinion, has to listen for

the women who are inside those cultures and to see what all this means for them. As a feminist with a certain social and cultural background you should always get in contact with women from other environments.

There is a discussion on the relationship between feminism and multiculturalism, I know. For example, one of the board members of GEM has recently published an essay on the subject. And, of course, there are frictions around this issue, because we operate from strong western feminist traditions about how women are (not) supposed to be, about how their life should be. Every time you have to negotiate the pros and the contras. I cannot give you a simple answer to this question, just to stress again the need to always talk with the people, with the women who belong to the group. And again, it is important not to fall into the trap I have mentioned before: only to focus on the „Other" and not to see how our own practices regarding masculinity and femininity are still steeped in and reproducing inequalities.

You see, for example, that the relations between the so-called white women's movement and the black women's movement had not been very harmonious. In the 1980s there had been real tough discussions between them. I think that this was necessary. I feel that now we are better at bonding on important issues, but unfortunately in Women's Studies there are not many black women, so there is still a lot to be done. The director of GEM is a black woman, who is going to get the first chair on gender and ethnicity in The Netherlands. She always stresses that Utrecht University is a white university, and efforts should be done to attract black women students and to attract black women faculty. I am hopeful and believe that this situation will change in the future, even if change goes too slowly.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Making a thematic and/ or a content analysis of the interviews published in this volume is not among my aims. Also, I do not see any reason to transplant the texts into my own wording, because the book is meant to be a place for a dialogue between dialogues. As such, it has definitely more potential than a master narrative that I would be able to produce by processing the collected stories from a single point of view. However, this mobile point that I have represented was/ is the one that initiated, assisted, and, in a way chaired the dialogue with each individual scholar, while being also a kind of bridge through which they might talk with each other. Each interview speaks in its own right about feminist knowledge and institutions, about their broader social and political environments, and about cultural conceptions and discursive practices that underlie them. And all the interviews together talk about an imagined community, which transcends national, disciplinary, sexual, generational, social boundaries and is shaped by debates and internal diversity, and also by shared experiences and a sense of consensus.

The issue of authoring, in particular that of multiple authors – as addressed, for example, by the experimental and/ or post-modern ethnography –, is one that I have to face here, when locating my voice in a research defined as a space of polyphony. The idea of producing the book, the work done during the whole process of choosing, knowing, meeting the interviewees and talking with them,

and everything that followed this – transcribing the tapes, keeping contact, structuring the texts and the chapters of the volume, writing the Forward and the Epilogue – was, obviously, my contribution. But, as it usually happens in any empirical investigation, the content that fills up the channels through which the researcher is able to enter the addressed issue is produced by the actors who let him/ her enter their life, or, more precisely, is the result of his/ her encounter with them.

The purport of our talk is allowed to unravel from the lived experiences of doing feminism in the academia, expressed in the interviews both self-reflexively and analytically, and by personally articulated meanings. Nevertheless, the motivations that back up my whole work, the questions I have asked and the explicit discussion about the need for feminist studies in Romania, define the main directions towards which I would like to direct the readers' attempts to interpret the otherwise multiple and very complex messages of „Talking Feminist Institutions".

Firstly, my aim is to emphasise that, as any other social institutions, the academic ones are also characterised by a gender order even if they are supposed to be neutral spaces of incorporeal pure knowledge. A certain state of gender relations, a gendered division of labour and power, patterns of thinking about sexuality, femininity and masculinity, and about their relationship mark the life within these institutions. Similarly, disciplinary boundaries, material interests, inter-ethnic relations, generational gaps, social-economic distances are also imprinted in their structure and functioning. Knowledge is embodied and knowledge production, dissemination and consumption happen within social relationships saturated (also) with gendered meanings. In this respect, the interviews reveal that women's studies, gender studies, feminist studies also refer to increasing women's presence in the academic sphere, to promoting women in leadership positions, and creating an environment where they are motivated to make good use of their

scientific and leadership abilities, and where they might have equal opportunities in building a career while preserving their otherness.

Anyway, one may obviously realise that public talk on these issues cannot even be started in a context where gender-neutrality pretends to be one of the main features of the *status quo*. The role of feminism in such a context is to deconstruct this myth, to show its consequences, but also to define and impose strategies for doing things differently. Each speaker in the book is convinced of the need of gender mainstreaming in the academia, of integrating the gender perspective into every domain of study, of establishing a balance between gender and other markers of difference. However, they also recognise the necessity of gender, feminist, and women's studies as autonomous fields and institutional structures where knowledge producers have the power to provide and to control the material and professional requirements of their work and development. Accordingly, they are talking about their experiences, results and difficulties in institutionalising these domains.

Secondly, the message of this book is that academic institutions (their gender order and the condition of feminist studies within) should be addressed as part of the broader social and political order where they exist. Moreover, they are to be seen as „mirrors", representing and (re)producing some of the latter's dominant features. One of the most challenging issues to consider is to whom universities and other academic institutions belong. Who has access to them, who has a sense of comfort and belonging in them, due to the fact that his/ her life experiences and expectations are catered for there? What kinds of factors shape these opportunities? How are the social and economic inequalities – underlied, among others, by certain cultural concepts and stereotypes about women's and men's roles – translated into unequal chances in attending higher education and being promoted there, and how do they reproduce, in their turn, those inequalities?

Feminist institutions – within and/ or outside the academia – are among the critical discourses committed to increasing public and scientific awareness and sensitivity towards these issues. By definition, they are not only places where knowledge is produced, but also ways of making a difference and causing change in every aspect of the unjust (academic, but not only) order. Or, more precisely, they are the medium where the actors create another knowledge about knowledge, or another thinking about scientific thinking, or other subject position for knowledge producers. That knowledge, that way of thinking, and that subject position are centred on the recognition of the social embeddedness of science, both in terms of its starting and ending points, including the awareness of the gendered assumptions and consequences of sciencing as an instrument of empowerment and subordination.

And here we are, already, in the middle of the all-encompassing aim followed throughout the book: to show why and how (academic) feminist talk is different from other kinds of (scientific) discourses. The interviews offer some key words by means of which one may begin to decipher its features. These words are: nomadism, bridging, transcending, inclusiveness, questioning, transformation, thinking through particular experiences, situatedness, recognising and transcending differences, participatory research, cross- and multi-culturality, and, of course, interdisciplinarity, criticism, and the political agenda of deconstructing the hidden interests vested in naturalising gendered stereotypes and hegemonies. All these and even more crucial themes are defined, interpreted and contextualised in the texts carefully read and revised by the interviewees.

The reader is welcome to make his/ her own journey through them. All that is now left for me to do, at this very moment, is to briefly outline a link between the world of (academic) feminism objectified in these talks and my local milieu, where – together with other scholars –, I am trying to do my best for the creation of feminist institutions.

EPILOGUE
UTÓSZÓ
POSTFAȚĂ

THE NEED FOR FEMINIST STUDIES IN ROMANIA

As always and everywhere, both in terms of institutionalisation and research, feminist studies should respond to local needs in Romania, too, as the immediate academic environment and the broader social-political context shape their orientation and strategies. Defined in a post-socialist context, they are mostly the result of the disciplinary developments of individual scholars, who, in some cases, have managed, by now, to build up collective structures for research and teaching.[*] Most importantly, they are preceded and empowered neither by existing local women's and/ or feminist movements, nor by governmental or other kind of public requests for such a work, but depend on the commitment, prestige and position of the interested academics, to negotiate the recognition of their work and results in this domain. Nevertheless, the European

[*] Examples of this organising might be seen at the National School of Political and Administrative Studies of Bucharest (where an MA program now called "Gender Studies and Public Policies" was set up in 1999); at Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj, where the Interdisciplinary Group for Gender Studies has offered, since the year 2000, a four-semester long undergraduate program on gender studies and is preparing to develop an MA in this field; at Bucharest University, where The Centre for the Research of Feminine Identity – "Gender" offers courses in feminist literary criticism; and at the Western University of Timişoara, where the Centre for Feminist Studies focuses as well on feminist literature, but also on social-political issues.

integration process – to which Romania is, at least formally, dedicated – might be used as an authorised source in order to include into the reform of education the gender perspective as well.

Under these circumstances, feminist studies should consider focusing on several aims, such as: the production of empirically based knowledge about women's condition and gender relations, using different methods of the social and cultural analysis; having a contribution to the development of theoretical tools for the understanding of the pre-socialist, socialist and post-socialist realities from the perspective of the construction of gender differences and inequalities; the participation in the inter-disciplinary debate and co-operation between social sciences under re-making, in order to understand the complexity of its topic, while proving, as well, the concrete usefulness of a trans-disciplinary teamwork; the struggle for scientific and political legitimacy within an environment which is basically hostile to feminism and, at best, considers that, after socialism, there is no social issue to be addressed by this approach; building bridges between and within women in the academia, and the active women in non-governmental organisations, political parties, governmental structures.

And also under these circumstances, people in decision-making positions should consider supporting the endeavours of building up such programmes, for reasons such as the following: where it gained and gains terrain and recognition, feminism had and has an essential contribution to the empowerment of an interdisciplinary, multicultural, critical and responsible way of doing science; because in our society one may identify serious signs of gender inequality and discrimination that have to be considered while addressing any social issue, it is time to focus on the former social order and the post-socialist changes from women's point of view, and from the perspective of the changing gender relations as power relations between women and men; for our country is still confronted, on the one hand, with the dormant hostilities embedded

in the politics of the Romanian-Hungarian relationships, and, on the other hand, with the racism and (self) segregation intrinsic of the „Roma issue", anyone should credit feminist research in addressing the re-strengthening of nationalism and essentialist ethnic identity politics, as well as the social inequalities produced at the crossroads of gender and ethnic hierarchies; and last, but not least, as already said, if one takes seriously Romania's integration into the European Union one should refer, as well, to its politics on mainstreaming gender in politics and education.

My conviction is that feminism has a great role to play in the contemporary Romania in the development of a critical approach towards the paternalism of the socialist state, and the re-strengthened patriarchy professed by the nationalist and/or liberal post-socialist politics. In this context I consider it as a critical perspective that deconstructs both the socialist type of gender-consciousness, and the post-socialist kind of gender-blindness, as well as the ways in which they re-enforce each other today. But I would also define it as an effort, which considers how a new balance between gender neutrality and gender awareness could be reconstructed after experiencing these practices under different regimes. Due to these capacities, everyone may discover that feminism does not serve „only" the interests of women located in subordinated positions, but has the potential to highlight the mechanisms of oppressive powers and to empower citizens as autonomous and accountable subjects.

Contested by some, both politically and scientifically, blamed by others as being a Western import in vogue, in Romania feminist studies became a field where scientific production increased spectacularly in the last few years, proving, once and for all, that it is a territory embedded in local realities. In this respect it is worth mentioning, on the one hand, the translation of some foreign

literature into Romanian*, and, on the other hand, the publication of books resulted from indigenous research done in our country**.

---

* In the Gender Studies Series of the Polirom Press the following titles were published: Moira Gatens: *Feminism şi filosofie. Perspective asupra diferenţei şi egalităţii* (Feminism and Philosophy. Perspectives on Difference and Equality); Mary Lyndon Shanley: *Uma Narayan: Reconstrucţia teoriei politice. Eseuri feministe* (The Reconstruction of Political Theory. Feminist Essays); Gloria Steinem: *Revoluţia interioară. Cartea respectului de sine* (The Internal Revolution. The book of self-respect); Andrea Dworkin: *Războiul împotriva tăcerii* (The War Against Silence). In the Cultural Analysis Series of EFES it is under publication: Susan Gal - Gail Kligman (eds.): *Reproducing Gender. Politics, Publics, and Everyday Life after Socialism.* And in the Feminist Studies Series of the Desire Press it is under translation and publication the book of Sylvia Walby: *Gender Transformations*.

** The Gender Studies Series of the Polirom Press published: Mihaela Miroiu: *Convenio. Despre natură, femei şi morală* (Convenio. On Nature, Women and Morality); Otilia Dragomir – Mihaela Miroiu (ed.): *Lexicon feminist* (Feminist Lexicon), and are under publication the following titles: Laura Grünberg: *(R)evoluţii în sociologia feministă. Repere teoretice, contexte româneşti* ((Re)volutions in the Feminist Sociology. Theoretical References, Romanian Contexts); Ştefania Mihăilescu (ed.): *Din istoria feminismului românesc. Antologie de texte. 1839-1929* (From the History of Romanian Feminism. A Reader. 1839-1929); Renate Weber – Roxana Teşiu: *Dreptul de a fi femeie* (The Right to be Woman); Otilia Dragomir*: Femei, cuvinte şi imagini* (Women, Words and Images). The Feminist Studies Series of Desire Press published: Enikő Magyari-Vincze (ed.): *Femei şi bărbaţi în Clujul multiethnic* (Women and Men in the Multiethnic Cluj); Ghizela Cosma – Enikő Magyari-Vincze – Ovidiu Pecican (ed.): *Prezenţe feminine. Studii despre femei în România* (Female Presences. Women's Studies in Romania); Enikő Magyari-Vincze: *Diferenţa care contează. Diversitatea social-culturală prin lentila antropologiei feministe* (Difference Matters. Social-cultural Diversity through the Lenses of Feminist Anthropology). In this respect it is worth mentioning the publication, in 2000, of the results of the opinion poll called „Barometrul de Gen", carried out with the support of the Foundation for Open Society from Bucharest, the publication entitled *Femei şi bărbaţi în România* (Women and Men in Romania), made by the National Committee on Statistics in co-operation with the United Nations Development Program. But one should not forget either about some „older" publications, pioneering in this domain, like: Mihaela Miroiu: *Gândul umbrei. Abordări feministe în filosofia contemporană* (The Thoughts of the Shadow. Feminist Approaches in Contemporary Philosophy), Editura Alternative, 1995; Mădălina Nicolaescu (ed.): *Cine suntem noi? Despre identitatea femeilor din România modernă* (Who are We? On Women's Identity in Modern Romania) , Editura Anima, 1996; Margit Feischmidt –

One may notice that all these intellectual efforts are completed by activist-like initiatives of the same scholars/ authors, who want to have an impact on civil society and politics. These initiatives consist of direct civic actions organised in co-operation with several women's non-governmental organisations, and of the dissemination of the results of their empirical and theoretical investigations in different public circles. Both types of activism aim at increasing gender awareness in our society and at proving that women's issues are important social and political matters of today's Romania [*].

Even if at this very moment there are some voices in the academic environment which state that gender studies should be practiced and institutionalised like scientific innovations, which define new research subjects within different disciplinary fields, the dominant paradigm in this space is one that militates both for the constitution of institutions committed to feminist production, and for the recognition of its social and political usefulness.

Enikő Magyari-Vincze – Violetta Zentai (eds.): *Women and Men in East European Transition*, EFES, 1997; and the volumes *Gen şi Educaţie* (Gender and Education), *Gen şi Societate* (Gender and Society), *Gen şi Politică* (Gender and Politics) edited by ANA – Societatea de Analize Feministe (The Society for Feminist Analysis).

[*] Noteworthy are the activities of "ANA - Societatea de Analize Feministe" (The Society for Feminist Analysis) from Bucharest, the DESIRE Foundation from Cluj, the Centre for Curriculum Development and Gender Studies FILIA from Bucharest, which are non-governmental organisations with an expertise on gender research, but committed as well towards building bridges between the academic sphere and the incipient feminist movement in Romania.

A FEMINISTA TANULMÁNYOK SZÜKSÉGESSÉGE ROMÁNIÁBAN

Mint mindig és mindenhol, a feminista tanulmányoknak – úgy az intézményesülés, mind pedig a kutatás vonatkozásában – Romániában is a helyi szükségletekre kell válaszolniuk. Ezért ezek fejlesztési irányait és stratégiáit itt is a közvetlen akadémiai környezet és a tágabb szociálpolitikai kontextus alakítja. Jellemzőjük, hogy poszt-szocialista kontextusban jelennek meg, és többnyire olyan kutatók diszciplináris fejlődése és kezdeményezése eredményeként kristályosodnak ki, akiknek néhány esetben sikerült kollektív intézményes struktúrákat is létrehozniuk*. Jelentős tény,

* Itt kell megemlítenünk az alábbi kezdeményezéseket: a bukaresti „Şcoala Naţională de Studii Politice şi Administrative" nevű egyetemen 1999-ben indított poszt-graduális program, melynek neve ma „Studii de Gen şi Politici Publice" (Társadalmi nemek tanulmánya és Közpolitikák); a kolozsvári Babes-Bolyai Tudományegyetemen létrejött „Grupul Interdisciplinar pentru Studii de Gen" (Gender Studies Interdiszciplináris Csoport), amely 2000-ben egy négy félévből álló programot kezdeményezett és kidolgozta egy későbbiekben induló poszt-graduális oktatási forma tervét; a Bukaresti Egyetemen létrejött „Gender – Centrul de Cercetare al Identităţii Feminine" (A Női Identitás Kutatóközpontja), mely feminista irodalomkritikában tart előadásokat; valamint a Temesvári "Universitatea de Vest"-en létrehozott Feminista Tanulmányok Központot („Centru de Studii Feministe"), mely mindenekelőtt úgyszintén feminista irodalommal, de emellett társdalmi-politikai kérdésekkel is foglalkozik.

hogy e szak-tanulmányok kialakulását esetünkben nem előzi meg és különösebben nem támogatja sem helyi feminista vagy női mozgalom, sem pedig kormányszintű vagy egyéb állami- és/ vagy pártpolitika. Ezek térhódítása kizárólag az egyetemi és tudományos életben eredményeket, pozíciót és tekintélyt elnyert kutatók személyes elkötelezettségének, érdeklődésének és intézményépítési erőfeszítéseinek köszönhető. Minden esetre, az európai integráció folyamata (melynek, legalábbis formálisan, Románia is elkötelezte magát) legitim forrásként használható arra, hogy a társadalmi nemek szemléletét beiktassák a tanügyi reform elképzeléseibe és gyakorlatába (is).

Ilyen körülmények között a feminista tanulmányoknak számos célt kell követniük, mint például: a nők helyzetének és a nemek közti kapcsolatoknak az empirikus vizsgálata a társadalmi és kulturális elemzés különféle módszereivel; hozzájárulás olyan elméletek kidolgozásához, melyek értelmezhetővé teszik a szocializmus előtti, a szocialista és a poszt-szocialista valóságot a nemek közti különbségek és egyenlőtlenségek szemszögéből is; interdiszciplináris viták kezdeményezése és az együttműködés gyakorlatának kialakítása az újraszerveződő társadalomtudományok minden területén annak érdekében, hogy valóra váljon a transzdiszciplináris kutatás potenciálja; küzdelem tudományos és politikai legitimációért egy olyan közegben, amely alapvetően ellenségesen viszonyul a feminizmushoz, és a legjobb esetben azt tételezi fel, hogy a szocializmust követő időszakban nincs olyan társadalmi téma, mely indokolttá tenné a feminista szemlélet meghonosodását; hídépítés a tudományos élet intézményeiben dolgozó nők, valamint a civil szervezetekben, politikai pártokban és kormányzati struktúrákban aktív nők között.

A döntéshozó szervek szempontjából tekintve a feminizmus intézményesítésének fontosságát, sajátos feltételeink mellett ezeknek az alábbi szempontokat kellene figyelembe venniük: ahol teret hódított és elismerést szerzett, a feminizmus mindenütt hozzájárult

és hozzájárul a tudományos megismerés interdiszciplináris, multikulturális, kritikai és felelősséget vállaló fejlesztéséhez; mivel az elmúlt évtizedben társadalmunkban a nemek közti egyenlőtlenségnek és a nők hátrányos megkülönböztetésének számos jelei mutatkoztak meg, szükségessé vált minden társadalmi problémának, és általában a poszt-szocialista változásoknak a férfiak és nők közti különbségek szempontjából való tárgyalása, melynek elméleti és módszertani eszköztárát éppen a feminista szemlélet biztosítja; mivel országunk a román-magyar kapcsolatok politikájában még mindig lappangó ellenségeskedéssel, a roma kérdésben pedig rasszizmussal és (ön)elzárkózással szembesül, támogatni kellene a feminizmus által végzett kritikai nacionalizmus- és identitáspolitika-kutatást, és azokat a vizsgálatokat, melyek a nemi és az etnikai hierarchiák találkozási pontjain létrejövő egyenlőtlenségekre világítanak rá; és végül, de nem utolsó sorban, aki következetesen akarja kezelni Románia uniós csatlakozását, az nem engedheti meg magának azt, hogy ne vegye komolyan a nemek közti egyenlőség politikájának következményeit a nevelés és az oktatás terén (is).

Meggyőződésem, hogy a (romániai) feminizmusra fontos szerep hárul egy kritikai álláspont kialakításában mind a szocialista paternalizmussal, mind pedig a poszt-szocialista nacionalista és/vagy liberális politika patriarchális rendjével szemben. Ebben az összefüggésben a feminizmust olyan szemléletmódként határozom meg, mely egyaránt kritikusan tudja kezelni a szocialista nemi tudatosságot és az úgynevezett szocialista női emancipációt, valamint a szexualitás poszt-szocialista (újra)felfedezését és a szocializmus utáni változások időszakára jellemző érzéketlenséget a nemek közti egyenlőtlenségekkel szemben, illetve azokat a mechanizmusokat, melyek révén ezek a politikák napjainkban egymást erősítik. Ugyanakkor olyan kezdeményezésként kezelem, mely képes arra, hogy újfajta egyensúlyt teremtsen meg a nemek közti különbség tudatosítása (*gender awareness*) és ezen különbségek

meghaladása (*gender neutrality*) között, tekintetbe véve ezek különböző politikai-társadalmi rendszerekben megélt tapasztalatait. Ezen potencialitások tükrében bárki felismerheti, hogy a feminizmus nem „csak" az alárendelt pozícióban levő nők érdekeit szolgálja, hanem képes megvilágítani a hatalom különböző formáinak működését és, mint ilyen, az egyént autonóm és felelősséget vállaló társadalmi alanyként erősíti meg.

Az egyesek által mind politikailag, mind tudományosan megkérdőjelezett, a mások által nyugatról importált divatnak tekintett feminista tanulmányok terén, az elmúlt néhány évben, Romániában is rohamosan felgyorsult a tudományos termelés, egyszer és mindenkorra bebizonyítva azt, hogy ez a mezőny igenis hazai valóságunkba ágyazottan alakul és fejlődik. Ebben az értelemben kell itt megemlítenünk egyrészt néhány feminista munka román nyelvre való fordítását és publikálását*, másrészt pedig a helyi kutatások eredményeit tükröző könyvkiadást**.

---

* A Polirom Kiadó „Studii de Gen" Sorozatában a következő címek jelentek meg: Moira Gatens: *Feminism şi filosofie. Perspective asupra diferenței şi egalității* (Feminizmus és filozófia. Perspektívák a különbségről és az egyenlőségről); Mary Lyndon Shanley: Uma Narayan, *Reconstrucția teoriei politice. Eseuri feministe* (A politikaelmélet rekonstrukciója. Feminista esszék); Gloria Steinem: *Revoluția interioară. Cartea respectului de sine* (A belső forradalom. Az öntisztelet könyve); Andrea Dworkin: *Războiul împotriva tăcerii* (A hallgatás elleni háború). Az EFES kiadó „Kulturális Elemzések" Sorozatában megjelenés alatt: Susan Gal – Gail Kligman (szerk): *Reproducing Gender. Politics, Publics, and Everyday Life after Socialism*. A Desire Alapítvány „Feminista Tanulmányok" Sorozatában fordítás alatt áll: Sylvia Walby: *Gender Transformations*.

** A Polirom Kiadó „Studii de Gen" Sorozatában megjelent: Mihaela Miroiu: *Convenio. Despre natură, femei şi morală* (Convenio. A természetről, a nőkről és az erkölcsiségről); Otilia Dragomir – Mihaela Miroiu (ed.): *Lexicon feminist* (Feminista Lexikon), és megjelenés alatt áll: Laura Grünberg: *(R)evoluții în sociologia feministă. Repere teoretice, contexte româneşti* (A feminista szociológia (r)evolúciói); Ştefania Mihăilescu (szerk): *Din istoria feminismului românesc. Antologie de texte. 1839-1929* (A román feminizmus történetéből. Szöveggyűjtemény. 1839-1929); Renate Weber – Roxana Teşiu: *Dreptul de a fi femeie* (A nőnek lenni joga); Otilia Dragomir: *Femei, cuvinte şi imagini* (Nők, szavak

Megfigyelhető, hogy ezeket az értelmiségi erőfeszítéseket sok esetben kiegészítik az éppen a bennük fő szerepet játszó kutatók azon kezdeményezései, amelyeknek célja, hogy kilépjenek a szűk értelemben vett akadémiai szférából és hatást gyakoroljanak a civil társadalomra és a politikumra. Ezek vagy közvetlen, más női szervezetekkel közösen szervezett civil akciók, vagy pedig az empirikus kutatások mediatizálását szolgáló megnyilvánulások, de minden esetben arra törekednek, hogy felhívják a közvélemény figyelmét arra, hogy a nők helyzetének kérdése a mai Románia egyik igen fontos társadalmi és politikai problémája*.

és képek). A Desire Alapítvámy „Feminista Tanulmányok" Sorozatában pedig az alábbi címek láttak napvilágot: Enikő Magyari-Vincze (szerk.): *Femei şi bărbaţi în Clujul multietnic* (Nők és férfiak a multietnikus Kolozsváron); Ghizela Cosma – Enikő Magyari-Vincze – Ovidiu Pecican (szerk.): *Prezenţe feminine. Studii despre femei în România* (Női jelenlétek. Tanulmányok a nőkről Romániában); Enikő Magyari-Vincze: *Diferenţa care contează. Diversitatea social-culturală prin lentila antropologiei feministe* (A fontos különbség. A társadalmi-kulturális sokféleség a feminista nézőpontjából). Szintén itt kell megemlítenünk a „Gender Barométer" címmel 2000-ben kiadott közvélemény kutatást, melyet a bukaresti Nyílt Társadalomért Alapítvány támogatott, valamint a Romániai Országos Statisztikai Hivatal és a United Nations Development Program közös gondozásában publikált *Femei şi bărbaţi în România* (Nők és férfiak Romániában) című kiadványt, de néhány, viszonylag régebbi, a romániai feminizmus szempontjából úttörőnek számító könyvet is, mint például: Mihaela Miroiu: *Gândul umbrei. Abordări feministe în filosofia contemporană* (Gondolkodó árnyék. Feminista megközelítések a jelenkori filozófiában) , Editura Alternative, 1995; Mădălina Nicolaescu (szerk.): *Cine suntem noi? Despre identitatea femeilor din România modernă* (Ki vagyunk mi? A nők identitása a modern Romániában), Editura Anima, 1996; Margit Feischmidt – Enikő Magyari-Vincze – Violetta Zentai (szerk): *Women and Men in East European Transition* (Nők és férfiak a Kelet-Európai átmenetben), EFES, 1997; valamint a *Gen şi Educaţie* (Gender és Nevelés), *Gen şi Societate* (Gender és Társadalom), *Gen şi Politică* (Gender és Politika) című kiadványokat, amelyek az „ANA – Societatea de Analize Feministe" (Feminista Elemzések Társulata) gondozásában jelentek meg.

* Ebben az összefüggésben kell megemlítenünk néhány, társadalomkutatásra és tudományszervezésre szakosodott nem-kormányzati szervezetet, mint például a bukaresti „Societatea de Analize Feministe ANA" (Feminista Elemzések Társulata), a kolozsvári DESIRE Alapítvány, a bukaresti „Centrul de Dezvoltare Curriculară şi Studii de Gen FILIA" (Curriculum-fejlesztő és Gender Studies Központ). Ezek

Holott egyetemi környezetünkben hallani lehet olyan hangokat, melyek szerint a társadalmi nemek tanulmányát kizárólag mint a diszciplináris mezőnybe új témákat bevezető tudományos munkát kell gyakorolnunk és intézményesítenünk, ezen a területen uralkodónak látszik az a törekvés, mely egyaránt aktivál mind a feminista tudással szemben elkötelezett intézmények létrehozásáért, mind pedig e tudás társadalmi és politikai fontosságának felismeréséért.

szerepet vállalnak egyrészt az akadémiai feminizmus támogatásában, másrészt pedig a közte és a kibontakozásban levő feminista társadalmi mozgalom közti hídépítésben.

NEVOIA DE STUDII FEMINISTE ÎN ROMÂNIA

Ca întotdeauna şi pretutindeni, atât în termenii instituţionalizării cât şi în cei ai cercetării, şi studiile feministe din România trebuie să răspundă unor nevoi locale, orientarea şi strategiile lor fiind influenţate de mediul academic şi contextul social-politic imediat. Definite într-un context postsocialist, azi ele sunt în mare măsură rezultatul evoluţiei disciplinare a unor cercetătoare/ cercetători care, în unele cazuri, au reuşit să construiască structuri colective de cercetare şi predare [*]. Este important de menţionat că aceste eforturi de instituţionalizare nu sunt precedate sau susţinute nici de mişcări ale femeilor şi/sau feministe existente pe plan local, nici de aranjamente politice statale şi/ sau de partid, ci depind de angajamentul, prestigiul şi poziţia unor universitari interesaţi să negocieze recunoaşterea muncii

[*] Exemple ale acestor forme de organisare se pot întâlni la Şcoala Naţională de Studii Politice şi Administrative din Bucureşti, unde în 1999 a fost iniţiat un program de masterat azi intitulat „Studii de Gen şi Politici Publice"; la Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai din Cluj, unde Grupul Interdisciplinar pentru Studii de Gen oferă din anul 2000 un program la nivel de licenţă de patru semestre şi pregăteşte un masterat în acelaşi domeniu; la Universitatea Bucureşti, unde prin Centrul de Cercetare al Identităţii Feminine „Gender" se oferă cursuri în critica literară feministă; precum şi la Universitatea de Vest din Timişoara, unde Centrul de Studii Feministe se axează de asemenea, mai ales pe literatură feministă, dar şi pe problematici social-politice.

prestate şi a rezultatelor obținute în acest domeniu. Cu toate acestea, procesul de integrare europeană – căruia, cel puțin formal şi România i se dedică – poate fi utilizat ca o sursă legitimă pentru integrarea perspectivei de gen în reforma învățământului.

În aceste condiții, studiile feministe în România trebuie să se concentreze asupra mai multor obiective, ca producerea de cunoştințe empirice despre relațiile de gen şi condiția femeii, utilizând diferite metode de analiză socială şi culturală; contribuția adusă la elaborarea unor instrumente teoretice capabile să interpreteze realitățile presocialiste, socialiste şi postsocialiste din perspectiva construcției diferențelor şi inegalităților de gen; participarea la dezbaterile interdisciplinare şi la generarea unor colaborări între ştiințele sociale aflate în curs de reconstituire, cu scopul de a înțelege complexitatea propriului obiect de studiu, dar şi pentru a dovedi utilitatea investigațiilor făcute de echipe transdisciplinare; lupta pentru legitimitate ştiințifică şi politică într-un mediu, care este fundamental ostil feminismului şi care, în cel mai bun caz, consideră că, după socialism, nu există tematică socială ce poate/ trebuie să fie abordată din această perspectivă; constituirea unor parteneriate între femeile din sfera academică şi femeile active în organisații neguvernamentale, partide politice şi structuri guvernamentale.

Privind instituționalizarea feminismului din perspectiva factorilor de decizie, aceştia trebuie să aibă în vedere sprijinirea inițiativelor cel puțin din următoarele considerente: acolo unde a câştigat teren şi recunoaştere, feminismul a avut şi are în continuare o contribuție esențială la consolidarea unei practici ştiințifice interdisciplinare, multiculturale, critice şi responsabile social; deoarece în prezent, în societatea noastră, observăm semnele unei inegalități de gen şi forme ale discriminării femeilor, care trebuie considerate în abordarea oricărui subiect social, este timpul să ne îndreptăm atenția aupra ordinii sociale socialiste şi asupra schimbărilor postsocialiste din punctul de vedere al femeii şi din

punctul de vedere al transformării relațiilor de gen ca relații de putere între femei şi bărbați; fiindcă țara noastră se confruntă în continuare cu ostilitățile latente ale politicii relației româno-maghiare pe de o parte, şi cu rasismul şi (auto)segregarea intrinsecă problematicii romilor pe de altă parte, cercetarea feministă ar trebui şi ea creditată în abordarea revirimentului naționalismului şi a politicii identitare esențialiste, dar şi a inegalităților sociale produse la intersecția dintre ierarhiile etnice şi de gen; în cele din urmă, după cum am amintit deja, dacă integrarea României în Uniunea Europeană este tratată cu seriozitate, politica de aderare trebuie să se refere şi la promovarea perspectivei de gen în toate domeniile vieții, inclusiv în educație şi în învățământul superior.

Convingerea mea este că feminismul are un rol important în abordarea critică a paternalismului de tip socialist, dar şi a patriarhatului inerent politicii naționaliste şi/ sau liberale din perioada postsocialistă. În acest context, definesc feminismul ca o critică care deconstruieşte conştiința de gen de tip socialist şi ignoranța (insensibilitatea) față de gen din perioada actuală, şi care este capabilă să analizeze mecanismele de întărire reciprocă ale celor două atitudini față de problematica de gen. Totodată, sunt convinsă că – pe baza cunoştințelor despre experiențele trăite ale acestor practici în diferite regimuri – feminismul este şi un efort de constituire a unui nou echilibru între neutralitatea de gen (*gender neutrality*) şi conştiința de gen (*gender awareness*). În conformitate cu aceste potențialități oricine poate realiza că feminismul nu serveşte „doar" interesele femeilor subordonate, ci are capacitatea de a evidenția mecanismele puterii de toate felurile şi de a întări indivizii în calitatea lor de subiecți sociali autonomi şi responsabili.

Contestate de unii atât politic cât şi ştiințific, blamate de alții a fi un import occidental la modă, studiile feministe au devenit şi în România un teritoriu în care, în ultimii doi ani s-a accelerat în mod simțitor producția ştiințifică, dovedindu-se o dată pentru totdeauna ancorarea lor în realitățile autohtone. În acest sens trebuie

menţionate aici, pe de o parte, traducerile făcute*, iar pe de altă parte cărţile rezultate din cercetările din ţară**.

De observat că toate aceste eforturi intelectuale sunt dublate de înseşi cercetătoarele/ autoarele în cauză prin iniţiative care doresc să aibă un impact asupra societăţii civile şi sferei politice. Acestea constau ori în acţiuni civice directe organisate în colaborare cu organisaţii de femei neguvernamentale, ori în mediatizarea rezultatelor obţinute prin investigaţii empirice, menite să atragă

---

* În Colecţia Studii de Gen a Editurii Polirom au apărut: Moira Gatens: *Feminism şi filosofie. Perspective asupra diferenţei şi egalităţii*; Mary Lyndon Shanley: Uma Narayan: *Reconstrucţia teoriei politice. Eseuri feministe*; Gloria Steinem: *Revoluţia interioară. Cartea respectului de sine*; Andrea Dworkin: *Războiul împotriva tăcerii*. În Colecţia Studii Culturale a Editurii EFES se află în lucru Susan Gal - Gail Kligman (eds.): *Reproducing Gender. Politics, Publics, and Everyday Life after Socialism*. În colecţia Studii Feministe a Editurii Fundaţiei Desire se află în curs de traducere cartea Sylviei Walby: *Gender Transformations*.

** Colecţia Studii de Gen a Editurii Polirom a publicat următoarele titluri: Mihaela Miroiu: *Convenio. Despre natură, femei şi morală*; Otilia Dragomir – Mihaela Miroiu (ed.): *Lexicon feminist*, şi pregăteşte următoarele: Laura Grünberg: *(R)evoluţii în sociologia feministă. Repere teoretice, contexte româneşti*; Ştefania Mihăilescu (ed.): *Din istoria feminismului românesc. Antologie de texte. 1839-1929*; Renate Weber – Roxana Teşiu: *Dreptul de a fi femeie*; Otilia Dragomir: *Femei, cuvinte şi imagini*. La Editura Fundaţiei Desire, în Colecţia Studii Feministe au fost publicate: Enikő Magyari-Vincze (ed.): *Femei şi bărbaţi în Clujul multietnic*; Ghizela Cosma – Enikő Magyari-Vincze – Ovidiu Pecican (ed.): *Prezenţe feminine. Studii despre femei în România*; Enikő Magyari-Vincze: *Diferenţa care contează. Diversitatea social-culturală prin lentila antropologiei feministe*. Tot la acest capitol trebuie să menţionăm publicarea în anul 2000 a „Barometrului de Gen", realizat cu sprijinul Fundaţiei pentru o Societate Deschisă din Bucureşti, precum şi a broşurii *Femei şi bărbaţi în România*, realizată de Comisia Naţională pentru Statistică – România, în colaborare cu United Nations Development Program. Dar să nu uităm nici de cărţile mai „vechi", deschizătoare de drumuri, cum ar fi: Mihaela Miroiu: *Gândul umbrei. Abordări feministe în filosofia contemporană*, Editura Alternative, 1995; Mădălina Nicolaescu (ed.): *Cine suntem noi? Despre identitatea femeilor din România modernă*, Editura Anima, 1996; Margit Feischmidt – Enikő Magyari-Vincze – Violetta Zentai (ed.): *Women and Men in East European Transition*, EFES, 1997; precum şi de volumele *Gen şi Educaţie*, *Gen şi Societate*, *Gen şi Politică* editate de ANA – Societatea de Analize Feministe.

atenția asupra problemei femeilor ca problemă socială şi politică importantă în România zilelor noastre*.

Chiar dacă, în mediul universitar, există voci care afirmă că studiile de gen trebuie practicate şi instituționalizate exclusiv ca inovații ştiințifice care includ o nouă temă în câmpul disciplinar, modelul dominant în acest domeniu se arată a fi acela, care militează atât pentru constituirea unor instituții academice dedicate producției feministe, cât şi pentru recunoaşterea nevoii sociale şi politice a acesteia.

* În acest sens trebuie amintite aici Societatea de Analize Feministe ANA din București, Fundația DESIRE din Cluj, Centrul de Dezvoltare Curriculară şi Studii de Gen FILIA din București, care sunt organisații ne-guvernamentale de cercetare, asumându-şi un rol în sprijinirea feminismului academic, dar şi în constituirea unor punți de legătură între acesta din urmă şi incipienta mişcare feministă din România.

LA **EDITURA FUNDAȚIEI DESIRE** AU MAI APĂRUT

COLECȚIA *CERCETĂRI*
***KUTATÁSOK* SOROZAT.**
***RESEARCHES* SERIES**

Enikő Magyari-Vincze (ed.):
Femei şi bărbaţi în Clujul multietnic, 2001
Nők és férfiak a multietnikus Kolozsváron
Women and Men in the Multiethnic City of Cluj

Cartea prezintă în trei volume rezultatele unei cercetări complexe, începute în august 2000 în cadrul proiectului „Parteneriat împortiva discriminării etnice şi sexuale" finanţat de către Centrul de Resurse pentru Diversitate Etnoculturală din Cluj. Investigaţiile empirice au fost realisate cu metode cantitative şi calitative. Ancheta sociologică, interviurile aprofundate, focus-grupul, talk showul şi monitorizarea presei au căutat să înţeleagă modul în care etnicitatea şi genul se întrepătrund şi structurează concepţiile culturale şi practicile sociale legate de relaţiile dintre femei şi bărbaţi, precum şi

de relaţiile interetnice. Pe lângă editoarea cărţii, echipa, care a realisat cercetarea şi cartea a fost compusă din Nándor L. Magyari, Sidonia Grama Nedeianu şi Barbara Butta.

A könyv három kötetben mutatja be annak a komplex kutatásnak az eredményeit, amelyet 2000 augusztusában kezdtek el az „Együttműködés az etnikai és szexuális hátrányos megkülönböztetés ellen" projekt keretében, a kolozsvári Etnokulturális Sokféleségért Központ támogatásával. Az empirikus vizsgálatot mennyiségi és minőségi módszerekkel végezték. A szociológiai felmérés, a mélyinterjúk, a fókusz-csoport, a talk show és a sajtófigyelés az etnicitás és a nemiség összefonódására kerestek választ, arra, hogy ezek együttese miként határozza meg a férfiak és nők közti kapcsolatokra, valamint az interetnikus viszonyokra vonatkozó kulturális koncepciókat és társadalmi gyakorlatokat. A szerkesztő mellett a kutatásban és a könyv megírásában Magyari Nándor László, Sidonia Grama Nedeianu és Butta Barbara vettek részt.

The book is presenting in three volumes the results of a research started in August 2000 within the project „Partnership against ethnic and sexual discrimination", financed by the Centre for Ethno-cultural Diversity from Cluj. The empirical investigations made use of both quantitative and qualitative methods. The survey, the in-depth interviews, the focus group, the talk show and the press monitorization aimed to understand the ways in which ethnicity and gender are intertwined and are structuring the cultural concepts and social practices regarding gender and ethnic relations. The research and the book was made by a group of scholars composed by, beside the editor of the book, Nándor L. Magyari, Sidonia Grama Nedeianu and Barbara Butta.

COLECȚIA *STUDII FEMINISTE*
***FEMINISTA TANULMÁNYOK* SOROZAT**
***FEMINIST STUDIES* SERIES**

Ghizela Cosma –Enikő Magyari-Vincze – Ovidiu Pecican (eds.):
Prezențe feminine. Studii despre femei în România
Női jelenlétek. Tanulmányok a nőkről Romániában
Female Presences. Women's Studies in Romania

Cu o Introducere de Enikő Magyari-Vincze şi o Postfață de Maria Bucur, volumul este rezultatul unei munci de pionerat realisat de un grup de cercetători din România dedicați introducerii perspectivei feministe în analiza social-culturală. Istoricul Ovidiu Pecican, psiholoaga Adriana Băban, antropoloaga Enikő Magyari-Vincze şi filosoful Aurel Codoban publică sub capitolul „Femei, Feminitate, Feminism". Istoricii Florin Valeriu Mureşan, Adriana Florica Muntean şi Lucian Nastasă analizează condiția femeilor în „Mediul Familial". Istorica Simona Stiger, socioloaga Enikő Demény şi filosoafa Mihaela Frunză discută aspecte ale „Prezenței Publice" a femeilor. Problematica „Identităților Multiple" este analizată de antropoloagele Csilla Könczei şi Anamaria Iuga, precum şi de istoricii Sorina Paula Bolovan şi Bogdan Crăciun. În ultimul capitol al cărții, o analiză a prostituției (de istorica Ghizela Cosma), una a Gulagului Românesc (de eseista Ruxandra Cesereanu), şi o alta despre indicatorii dezvoltării umane (de socioloaga Livia Popescu şi psiholoaga Mária Roth) este realisată din perspectiva femeilor şi a diferențelor de gen.

A Magyari-Vincze Enikő Előszavával és Maria Bucur Utószavával megjelent kötet egy olyan romániai kutatócsoport munkájának eredménye, amelynek célja, hogy bevezesse a társadalomtudományos kutatásba a társadalmi nemek perspektíváját. A „Nők, nőiesség, feminizmus" fejezet írásai a történész Ovidiu Pecican, a pszichológus Adriana Băban, az antropológus Magyari-Vincze Enikő és a filozófus Aurel Codoban tollából származnak. Florin Valeriu Mureşan, Adriana Florica Muntean és Lucian Nastasă történészek tanulmányai a nők helyzetét családi környezetben vizsgálják. Simona Stiger történész, Demény Enikő szociológus és Mihaela Frunză filozófus a nyilvánosság szférájában elemzik a nők jelenlétét. A „Többszörös Identitások" fejezetben Könczei Csilla és Anamaria Iuga antropológusok, valamint Sorina Paula Bolovan és Bogdan Crăciun történészek közölnek. A könyv utolsó fejezetében további társadalmi jelenségek kerülnek vizsgálat alá a nők és a nemek közti kapcsolatok szemszögéből: Ghizela Cosma történész a prostitúciót, Ruxandra Cesereanu esszéista a román Gulágot, Livia Popescu szociológus és Roth Mária pszichológus pedig a társadalmi fejlődés indikátorait elemzik.

With an Introduction by Enikő Magyari-Vincze and an Epilogue by Maria Bucur, the volume is the result of a pioneering work done by a group of scholars from Romania committed to the introduction of the gender perspective into social-cultural analysis. The historian Ovidiu Pecican, the psychologist Adriana Băban, the anthropologist Enikő Magyari-Vincze and the philosopher Aurel Codoban are writing under the chapter „Women, Femininity, Feminism". The historians Florin Valeriu Mureşan, Adriana Florica Muntean and Lucian Nastasă are addressing women's condition within families. The historian Simona Stiger, the sociologist Enikő Demény and the philosopher Mihaela Frunză are publishing under the heading of women's presences in the public sphere. The issue of Multiple Identities is addressed by the anthropologists Csilla Könczei and Anamaria Iuga, but as well by the historians Sorina Paula Bolovan and Bogdan Crăciun. In the last chapter of the book, an analysis on prostitution (by the historian Ghizela Cosma), one on the Romanian Gulag (by the esseist Ruxandra Cesereanu), and another on the indicators of human development (by the sociologist

Livia Popescu and the psychologist Mária Roth) are made from the perspective of women and gender differences.

Enikő Magyari-Vincze:
Diferența care contează. Diversitatea social-culturală prin lentila antropologiei feministe
Fontos különbség. A társadalmi-kulturális sokféleség a feminista antropológia nézőpontjából;
Difference matters. Socio-cultural diversity through the lenses of feminist anthropology

Pe lângă recunoaşterea faptului, că azi – în condiţiile globalizării şi a proceselor transnaţionale – diversitatea socio-culturală continuă să fie o constantă preocupare pentru elitele politicilor identitare, dar şi o provocare a convieţuirilor cotidiene, acest volum este un testimoniu în favoarea potenţialului teoretic, empiric şi critic al antropologiei feministe. Relevă cum, în anumite condiţii, etnicitatea devine diferenţa care contează şi politica identităţii etno-naţionale domină sfera publică, iar în alte circumstanţe genul funcţionează ca cea mai importantă marcă a diferenţei şi feminismul devine o politică legitimă. Exprimă convingerea, că practicile sociale producătoare de diferenţe/ inegalităţi, precum şi conceptele culturale despre diversitate/ excluderea alterităţii se produc şi susţin reciproc, şi ordinea de gen se produce la răscrucea dintre construcţiile discursive şi instituţionale ale genului, precum şi a experienţelor subiective ale feminităţii şi masculinităţii. Şi nu în ultimul rând analizează aspectele simbolice şi implicaţiile materiale ale proceselor care transformă diferenţa în inegalitate în cazul României.

Felismerve, hogy – a globalizáció és a transznacionális folyamatok körülményei között – a társadalmi-kulturális sokféleség mind az identitáspolitikai elitek, mind pedig a mindennapi együttélés szempontjából kihívásokkal teli valóság marad, a kötet tanúságot tesz a feminista antropológia elméleti, módszertani és kritikai potenciálja mellett.

Kihangsúlyozza, hogy a különbségeket/ egyenlőtlenségeket termelő társadalmi gyakorlatok és a sokféleségről/ a másság kizárásáról alkotott kulturális fogalmak egymást kölcsönösen fenntartják, és hogy a társadalmi nemek rendje a gender diszkurzív és intézményes felépítésének, valamint a nőiesség és a férfiasság szubjektív tapasztalatainak kereszteződésénél jön létre. Amellett érvel hogy bizonyos körülmények között az etnicitás válik a legfontosabb identitássá és az etno-nacionális politikák uralják a nyilvánosság terét, de – más feltételek mellett – inkább a nemiség strukturálja az egyének életét és a társadalmi kapcsolatokat és a feminizmus legitim politikaként működik. Végül, de nem utolsó sorban – Románia esetében – a különbséget egyenlőtlenséggé alakító folyamatoknak mind a szimbolikus vonatkozásait, mind pedig anyagi következményeit tárgyalja.

Recognising that – under the conditions of globalization and transnational processes – socio-cultural diversity continues to be a constant preoccupation for the elites of identity politics, but also a challenge for everyday co-existence, the volume is a testimony of the theoretical, empirical and critical potential of feminist anthropology in studying it across borders. It emphasizes that the social practices – which create differences/ inequalities –, and the cultural concepts on diversity/ exclusion of otherness are sustaining each other, and a gender order is generated at the crossroads of the discursive and institutional constructions of gender, and of the subjective experiences of femininity and masculinity. Argues that under some conditions, ethnicity might be the identity that matters most and ethno-national politics dominate the public sphere, but – in other moments – it is gender that dominantly structures people's life and social relations, and feminism becomes a legitimate politics. Last, but not least – in the case of Romania – the volume investigates the symbolic aspects and the material consequences of the processes, which transform difference in inequality.

COLECȚIA *PERGAMENT*
***PERGAMENT* SOROZAT**
***PARCHMENT* SERIES**

Ovidiu Pecican:
***Arpadieni, Angevini, Români. Studii de medievistică Central-Europeană*, 2001**
***Árpádháziak, Anjouk, Románok. Tanulmányok a Közép-Európai középkorról*;**
Arpadiens, Anjous, Rumanians. Studies on the Medieval Central Europe

Studiile care alcătuiesc volumul încearcă să descifreze diverse aspecte ale istoriei sociale şi politice din lumea medievală românească a secolelor XII-XVI prin raportare la realităţile istorice ale Regatului Maghiar. Autorul propune o nouă viziune asupra românilor transilvăneni, bănăţeni şi maramureşeni, observând că a existat o nobilime de origine română încă din vremea regilor arpadieni. Diversele categorii ale acesteia – de la *iobagiones castri* la *servientes regis* – sunt analizate în contextul evenimentelor politice şi militare ale Ungariei meidevale, încercându-se refacerea unei istorii a elitelor sociale şi politice feudale uitate. De la participarea la confruntările între diferitele partide din Ungaria medievală (în timpul lui Andrei al II-lea, al lui Ludovic de Anjou şi al lui Sigismund de Luxemburg) şi până la polemicile cu conţinut ideologic menite să argumenteze păstrarea autonomiilor acordate de regii arpadieni, volumul se interesează de dinamica social-politică şi culturală a feudalilor români supuşi ai regilor arpadieni şi angevini, încercând o nouă explicare a tentativelor lor de desprindere în Ţara Românească, Maramureş şi Moldova.

A kötet tanulmányai a XII-XVI. századi román társadalom- és politikatörténet számos vonatkozását a Magyar Királysághoz kapcsolódva tárgyalják. A szerző új megvilágításba helyezi az erdélyi, bánsági és máramarosi románság helyzetét, rávilágít arra, hogy még az Árpádházi királyok idején létezett egy román származású nemesség. Ezek különböző kategóriáit a iobagiones castri-tól a servientes regis-ig a középkori Magyarország politikai és katonai eseményeinek kontextusában vizsgálja, hozzájárulva az elfelejtett társadalmi és politikai feudális elitek történetének megírásához. A kötet egyaránt tanulmányozza a II. Endre, Anjou Lajos és Luxemburgi Zsigmond korabeli középkori Magyarország különféle pártjai közti összetűzéseket, valamint azokat az ideológiai töltetű vitákat, amelyek az Árpádházi királyok által jóváhagyott autonómiák megtartása mellett érveltek. Végső soron az Árpád- és Anjou-házi királyoknak alárendelt román feudális urak társadalmi-politikai és kulturális fejlődését elemzi, új magyarázatot keresve ezek Havasalföld, Moldova és Máramaros irányába mutató kitörési kísérleteire.

The articles of the volume are dealing with several aspects of the Rumanian Medieval World between the XIIth and the XVIth century as related to the historical realities of the Hungarian Kingdom. The author proposes a new view on the Rumanians from Transylvania, Banat and Maramureş, observing that there already existed an aristocracy of Rumanian origin during the Arpadian kingship. Its different categories – from the iobagiones castri to the servientes regis – are investigated in the context of the political and military events of the Medieval Hungary, while the author aims to reconstruct the history of the forgotten social and political feudal elites. Considering the period under the leadership of Andrew the Second, Louis d'Anjou and Sigismund of Luxemburg, the book analyses both the confrontations between different political parties and the ideologically charged debates around the maintaining of the autonomies given by the Arpadian kings. Eventually it aims to describe the social, political and cultural dynamics of the Rumanian aristocracy subordinated to the kings of the Arpadian and Anjou dynasty, trying to offer a new explanation to their efforts of approaching Wallachia, Maramureş and Moldova.