Director's Column

So much has happened since I last wrote a Director’s column, I am not quite sure where to begin. Certainly I have the urge to linger over details of my sabbatical, when I had time to explore being something other than an academic, while also inhabiting the contemplative stance that is necessary to good research. I would like to tell you about books you might enjoy reading or describe my recent travels in the former East Germany, where I learned again just how complex the world is when viewed through perspectives distinct from my own. I'd even like to put words to what it means to return from leave to serve my final year as Margaret Taylor Smith Director of Women’s Studies and to ruminate on what shape life might take after the obsessions of the directorship wane. (I imagine it, vaguely, as a world without email!)

But there is something I find far more pressing. As everyone knows, last school year was a challenging one for Duke, and I traveled nowhere without encountering a host of questions about the events that rocked our campus in the spring. By “events” I do not refer merely to the distillation of a complex social situation into the question of guilt or innocence in a legal case concerning three Duke Lacrosse players. I’m talking instead about what it means for each of us—members of the Duke and Durham communities—to find ourselves called forth by a national media apparatus to account for the local worlds we inhabit, for the character of our communities, and for the future of our institution. While the media seems fixated on discerning exactly who did what to whom, I have been compelled toward examining the ways in which none of us at Duke can allow ourselves the luxury of feeling innocent.


As an interdisciplinary field, Women’s Studies has long been in conversation with a variety of disciplines, such that its languages of analysis and methodological priorities routinely reflect the disciplinary training of its practitioners. In recent years, however, with the international growth of doctoral programs, there has been much speculation about the extent to which Women’s Studies has its own postdisciplinary mode of inquiry. The answer to this is certainly debatable, but one primary candidate is that seemingly amorphous entity called feminist theory. It is typically the name of the one course that is required for students in every core curriculum in undergraduate and graduate education, and it serves as the acknowledged critical domain for debates that cross multiple disciplinary and national lines.

The March event at Duke is called a workshop to foreground the sense in which feminist theory names a vibrant and ongoing domain of inquiry in Women’s Studies. It is organized to prioritize intense study, featuring both small working seminars and keynote lectures by internationally known scholars (Care Hemmings, London School of Economics; Elizabeth Grosz, Rutgers; Inderpal Grewal, UC-Irvine; Lisa Lowe, UC-San Diego; and Hortense Spillers, Vanderbilt). Registration begins in late January. The workshop is free and open to the public.

Refer to page 15 for more Upcoming Spring Events
Directors Column continued from page 1

I am not saying that we are all guilty. I am saying something far more difficult to render: None of us is innocent. Sure, the media has tried to isolate Duke from the world of higher education more generally, where alcohol and athletics, privilege and pride, sex and desire commingle with competition and collectivity, hope and harm. Many people at Duke rush to the institution’s defense, as though we must clear its name. Some people think justice will be served by the courts and I have heard many people advise that we simply await the legal decision, as if it will provide us with all the necessary truth. It would certainly be easier to believe that the legal outcome will settle what these events have raised for everyone living, learning, and working at Duke, but what educational mission is served by such a strategy? Our noninnocence is merely heightened by our willingness to disengage.

How to stage an educational response to the world we inhabit is one of the most important responsibilities of every university. But it is never easy, not simply because it is so difficult to see the complexity of what we are immersed in, but because there is enormous fear in confronting the profound ways in which people are different from one another. We often prefer to acknowledge our differences at a distance. We celebrate diversity. We become tolerant. But learning to think about and through difference requires us to be far more brave. We have to get close to our fear; we have to learn to endure the anxiety that comes from pursuing the most intractable social questions. For instance, what makes some of us put our faith in the legal system to deliver truth and justice, whereas others believe that through it, fairness and redemption are never within their reach? What makes some of us view this campus controversy through the lens of race, gender, sex, and class while others find it to be about none of these things? Why do some of us point our finger at the athletes for hiring an exotic dancer, while others focus rage on the women who engage in such work in the first place? Who finds whom the victim here, and why?

The university as a whole might be said to be organized around the foundational task that underlies all of these questions, which concerns the critical work of analysis and interpretation. Various fields pursue the interpretation of the social world as a methodological question. They work—through statistics or ethnography or interviews—on detailing the problem. Other fields are more outcome oriented; their task is to solve the problem, to move from evidence and interpretation to implementation. They seek ways to measure concretely the success of our thinking in the world. Still others want to linger over the problem of asking the right questions. Ethics or philosophy or a field like Women’s Studies spend a great deal of time asking questions about our questions. All of these tasks are crucial, and they all are needed for the hard work of engaging faculty and students, at the core of our curriculum, in considerations about difference and democracy, or what I think of more generally as the task of situating oneself in a world of others.

The reason that none of us is innocent has to do with just this. We are all implicated in a world of others; we all make choices about how much we want to know about our relationship to others; we all make decisions about how we live, with whom we socialize, what we read, where we travel, what courses we teach and take, what values we value, and what ideals we seek to cultivate. In doing so, we all, consciously or not, produce a stance—some would call it an ethics—toward the relationships that enmesh us. To study the making of that stance (our own as well as that of others) is to admit that we share responsibility both for how we make the world and for our relationship to what it has made of us. No education matters unless it takes this to its curricular heart.

At the very least, then, we need to act affirmatively in the context of acknowledging differences. Although every undergraduate student at Duke today is required to fulfill a course requirement in cross-cultural studies and ethical inquiry, we need to add a requirement that foregrounds the challenge of social ethics in the places in which we all currently live. No student should graduate from a university dedicated to a liberal arts education as foundational to every path of professional education without rigorous instruction into the complexity of race, gender, sexuality, religion, and class in the world in which they most immediately live. These issues are not simply local or domestic. They are imbricated in global considerations, and they are central to any understanding of what it means to live in a world of others.

This issue of the newsletter features pieces on the current moment, written by scholars and teachers who work in or have been influenced by conversations in Women’s Studies about gender, race, sexuality, democracy, and social justice. Karla Holloway writes about the bodies put on the line by controversies that involve sex and race, and the ways in which justice itself is never innocent. We reprint her essay knowing that it raises issues that many might find difficult to hear. Tara Kachgal offers an account of her recent course on media and sports, where students studied the media’s now standard approach to covering sport and violence. Her explication of the contradictory meanings that attend the phrase “alleged victim” is both fascinating and informative.

We hope these two articles will stimulate reflection and conversation, and that they will be at home with the other pieces collected in this newsletter, on the work of our students, the engagements of our faculty, and the future plans for our program and field. There’s much to fear in speaking directly about the controversies that envelop us. But what value is education if we take refuge in disengagement, with the seeming objectivity of wait and see? It’s much better to use a university to do what only it can do: mobilize all its talent and rigor for inquiry into the complexities of the world we inextricably share with others.

Robyn Wiegman
Director of Women’s Studies at Duke
The Pursuit of Humane Meat: Kathy Rudy’s Challenge to First-Year Students

Efforts by campus leaders to improve the first-year student orientation process have resulted in a new project that encourages the class of 2010 to actively engage in the community in which they live. "Into the City" provides an opportunity for first-year students to learn about Durham through service projects and themed tours (tobacco warehouse district, Black Wall Street, etc.). As part of these new orientation efforts, Women’s Studies faculty member Kathy Rudy organized an event about alternative farming practices in the region. Through a tour of local farms, students were asked to think about themselves as agents of change by using, in Dr. Rudy’s words, “two of their most powerful tools: their fork and their dollar.”

In the first month of classes, Dr. Rudy accompanied 60 first-year students to Cane Creek Farm, which is owned and operated by Duke alumna Elizabeth MacClean. Featured on Martha Stewart and other food shows, MacLean’s healthy alternative to factory farming is changing the way people think about meat, consumption, and political action in their daily lives. MacLean’s farm produces organic pork products from free-range, pasture-raised pigs.

Dr. Rudy’s commitment to the ethical treatment of animals has been a core value throughout her personal and professional life. With a Ph.D. and Master of Divinity degree, Dr. Rudy’s research focuses on ethics, feminism, religion, reproductive technologies, and animals. She is currently working on a new project critiquing animal rights from a speciesist perspective. She organized the farm tour to tap into increasing student interest at Duke in various aspects of food justice, including the push for vendors to offer humane meat. This meat, regularly referred to as free-range, grass-fed, or organic, comes from animals allowed to live free from confinement and hormone and antibiotic treatments. The visit to Cane Creek Farm gave students the chance not only to see alternative farming in action but to talk to members of a family whose farm currently leads the state in producing free-range, pasture-raised organic pork products.

Dr. Rudy is well aware of some of the skeptical attitudes toward humane meat, alternative farming techniques, and animal rights. She has heard those perspectives for over twenty-five years, nearly the length of time of her involvement in Women’s Studies Program at Duke. "I find it exciting. I want to be a part of this student interest. In fact, they are ahead of the faculty on this issue.” New research supports the importance of paying attention to the link between meat products and health. According to Dr. Rudy, "The rate of multiple births from women who eat factory farm meat once a day is three times the multiple birth rate of women who do not. Girls who reside within a five-mile radius of livestock waste lagoons are entering puberty at age five, six, and seven—far ahead of their peers. And it’s not just our medical health to consider. Hog farming has replaced tobacco as the state’s dominant industry. Hogs are the number one North Carolina export, and North Carolina is the second highest state in the nation in the amount of hogs exported. We’re talking about an industry norm that confines animals in a small space, where they are fed only corn, not grass. Small hogs are often separated from their birth mothers by wire, and often times the mothers are not even allowed to stand up in their cages for fear they will crush the babies.” Rudy continues, "Everything that is good about being an animal is taken away from them.”

Rudy hopes that student initiatives will continue to transform meat consumption at Duke. Presently, the Nasher Museum, Faculty Commons, and the Refectory Café serve humane meat. Recently, the Women’s Studies Program negotiated with Durham Catering Company to provide free-range chicken for meals at the Graduate Scholars Colloquium meetings each month. Rudy would like that trend to expand. "I really don’t believe it’s immoral to eat meat. But we owe it to the animals a good life before we eat them. It’s not ‘that’ we eat them, it’s ‘how’ we treat them that needs to change. I am hoping students can learn that they can be agents of change by asking other Duke vendors to adopt a policy of using meat products that come from alternative farm practices. Last year, Duke students got all vendors to agree to use only cage-free eggs. Let’s expand that agenda and get all vendors to use only free-range meat.”

Before visiting the farm, students gathered to view the film Earthlings. The film is an animal rights movie that vividly documents the conditions from which 99% of consumed meat in the United States is derived. Rudy states, “Unless they are careful and pay attention, students can contribute to animal suffering, as well as the ongoing environmental crisis in North Carolina. They could be damaging their own health by ingesting meat that is unnecessarily filled with antibiotics and hormones. I want to provide students the chance to see and think about that. They can very easily be a part of positive change.”
Ara Wilson Joins Duke Faculty to Lead Sexuality Studies
An Interview with Ara Wilson by Rachel Weeks

Ara Wilson’s scholarship investigates sexuality and gender in relation to globalization. Trained in cultural anthropology at the City University of New York (CUNY), she began this line of research with long-term fieldwork in Thailand that generated her 2004 ethnography, *The Intimate Economies of Bangkok: Tomboys, Tycoons and Avon Ladies in the World City* (University of California Press). This book applied questions from feminist and queer theory to analyze the changing formulations of sexuality, gender, and ethnicity found in the emerging capitalist modernity of Asia. Wilson is currently working on another book, *Sexual Latitudes: The Erotic Politics of Globalization*, which further considers the implication of globalization as the stage for sexual politics, through such examples as human and sexual rights organizing and sex tourism. Before coming to Duke, she taught at Ohio State University, and has been a fellow at the Institute for Research on Women at Rutgers University, the Five College Women’s Studies Research Center in Massachusetts, and the Centre for Law, Gender and Sexuality at Kent University (UK). She was also a board member of the Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies (CLAGS) in New York.

RW: Let me begin by asking how you got involved in Women’s Studies.

AW: That’s not quite as easy as it sounds. When I was an undergraduate at Vassar College, there were courses offered on gender and sexuality but no fully developed programs. But the field that I was studying- anthropology-paid a good deal of attention to gender, so I sought out courses there. Still, much of what I learned came from reading on my own, or with networks of students rather than through formal education.

While [I was] a graduate student at CUNY, I took courses that bore upon gender and sexuality while also engaging it in my own research. Women’s Studies took place both inside and outside the academy, in academic conversations and activist ones.

But my institutional engagement with Women’s Studies really began when I took a position at Ohio State University in 1997, where I was hired to teach transnational feminist studies.

RW: Were there other formative intellectual experiences you can speak to?

AW: I spent a few years in the Bay Area working as the managing editor of *Socialist Review*, while simultaneously working for *On Our Backs*. At *Socialist Review*, I had the opportunity to review and develop manuscripts, so I learned a great deal about editing and also about certain intellectual currents that were new at the time. At that point, new work was focusing on post-Fordism, and *Socialist Review* put out a special issue on the topic that was one of its first intellectual treatments in the United States, with pieces by Stuart Hall and David Harvey. The theories that combined Marxism with cultural studies continue to influence my research today.

It was also quite exciting to be at *Socialist Review* in 1989 during the fall of the [Berlin] Wall, when the intellectual community was sending up big questions about “whither socialism?”-- the most clichéd form of a very interesting question. So I was there at a moment of real reflection among lefties and socialists around this idea that, even if we were not “pro-Eastern,” even if we did not support the Soviet Union or believe in it as a manifestation of certain socialist principles, all of our reference points for thinking about alternatives to capitalism had changed. What were our basic tenets in such a context?

At the same time that I was engaged in these conversations about post-Fordism, the global economy, and disorganized capitalism, queer theory was just emerging. (My brief stint as Susie Bright’s assistant at *On Our Backs* illustrated some of the concepts that queer theory was investigating in different terms.) What really struck me was the gap between conversations about political economy and sexuality. This motivated me to try to pull them together, and to think through questions about identity and subjectivity with more sustained attention to political economy. This is what I am still doing in my work.

Another important influence was my activity as a student member on the board of the Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies (CLAGS), where I learned a great deal about sexuality studies. At one point, I was also a teacher’s assistant and editorial assistant for Johnnetta Cole, former President of Spelman College and current President of Bennett College here in North Carolina. That was really quite a training, to have the opportunity to work with such a charismatic feminist leader.

RW: What do you think motivated you to work in radical or feminist publications?

AW: When I went to Thailand (and everywhere I’ve been in the global South), I found that people who work in non governmental organizations (NGOs) and people who work in the academy have much more dialogue, even with very theoretical questions. In the United States, we have very strong anti-intellectual tendencies, within progressive circles and even in the academy, and so I’m interested in which networks allow critical thought, reflection, and engagement. The arts are one place where this happens. Another is the progressive press, which is less an escape from the institution than a kind of counterpart to it.

RW: Tell me about your research interests.

AW: I see myself as a feminist ethnographer of globalization. I describe my work as having two different domains. One of them is ethnography, which has focused on Thailand. I did fieldwork for two years in Bangkok, which is a frontier of capitalist modernity in the global South. I looked at how gender, sexuality, and ethnicity were being reconstituted in consumer spaces, including the large sex trade as well as department stores, Avon, and Amway. For example, I wanted to know why shopping malls were such popular sites for what are called tomboys, or tom in Thai (which we might refer to as female to male transgenders, or lesbians, or figures of female masculinity). My book, *The Intimate Economies of Bangkok*, uses this kind of question to explore how capitalist development draws on and changes gender and sexuality (including heterosexuality) as well as ethnicity (in this case, mainly Chinese and Thai identities, but white identities as well).

My more recent research project looks at transnational organizing around feminism and sexual rights, and uses a wider range of methods and research sites. I study what I identify as strategic entities for transnational political organizing, including meetings connected with the UN, everyday life in NGOs, and the World Social Forum as a global organization and event. I’m interested in how sexual politics and feminist projects are defined and realized at the transnational level, how people are mobilized into action,

"The best Women’s Studies work is done when the field is understood as a hub for critical interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship, and Duke WS definitely has a firm grasp on this.”
Senior Women Scientists Organize for Change

By Naomi Quinn and Roxanne Springer

Senior Women in Science (SWS) is a political action group numbering as its members all 20 full and associate professors who are regular faculty in the Natural Sciences (NS) departments and organized around the realization that the natural science departments in Duke’s School of Arts & Sciences lag significantly behind the humanities and social sciences in achieving parity for women. Further, because the absolute number and relative proportion of women faculty in the natural sciences remains so small, it is more difficult to eliminate entrenched discrimination in those departments. One year old, the group already has several accomplishments to its name and is working toward a range of other improvements for women scientists at Duke. One of its early projects, funded by President Brodhead, to be named the Hertha Sponer Presidential Lecture Series and inaugurated this year, will feature two prominent women scientists from different fields as speakers annually.

Another gain, in a division in which formerly about one-third of all men full professors but no women full professors had been appointed to named chairs, was the successful nomination last year of Barbara Shaw, who is now the William T. Miller Professor of Chemistry. SWS intends to continue its efforts to increase the number of women scientists in named chairs until parity with men in the NS departments is achieved. The group is also pushing for reforms in the process for review of nominations for these distinguished professorships.

An SWS subcommittee on Recruitment, Hiring, Promotion and Retention is collaborating with the Dean of Natural Sciences, Stephen Nowicki, toward the adoption of best recruitment and hiring practices that eliminate gender bias, and the identification and correction of problems in these practices department by NS department. That subcommittee and the Dean have also turned their attention to promotion policy in the NS, after a 2005 Compensation Committee report revealed that, in any given year, across the University, women are only half as likely as men to be promoted from the associate to the full professor rank. That subcommittee’s next concern is the campus climate for women scientists and its effect on their retention, career satisfaction, and advancement. SWS advocates the collection of quantitative data, such as salary, overhead return, lab space, teaching relief, retention data, and other mechanisms of University support, as measures of this climate.

The ultimate goal of SWS is to improve the climate for all women scientists at Duke, including undergraduates, graduate students, postdocs, staff, and faculty. Anyone interested in learning more about the activities of SWS or desiring its services should contact one of its advisory committee members, Merlise Clyde (clyde@stat.duke.edu), Carla Ellis (carla@duke.edu), Barbara Shaw (brs@chemistry.duke.edu), or Roxanne Springer (rps@phy.duke.edu). More specifically, any woman in the sciences who is experiencing harassment can seek advice and support from the SWS harassment contact person, Amy Needham (needham@psych.duke.edu, 660-5714).

Naomi Quinn is Professor Emeritus, Cultural Anthropology and Affiliated Faculty Women’s Studies Program. Roxanne Springer is Associate Professor, Physics Department.

what language is used to talk
about identity and sexuality, and the kinds
of differences that are at work in these places
and projects.

Much of this research is part of a book I’m
working on called Sexual Latitudes. In the
broadest terms, this book revisits questions
of how capitalism is involved in sexual politics
while also paying greater attention to the
Western nature of our theories and frame-
works for discussing both sexuality and global-
ization. I am grateful to find myself at Duke,
where there is real appreciation for political
economic scholarship that is connected with
cultural studies and textual analysis.

RW: Why did you decide to come to Duke?

AW: The prospect of directing Sexuality Studies
at Duke was very appealing. Duke is known
across the country for engaging feminism,
sexuality, transnationalism, globalization,
and diaspora in innovative ways. Also, I think
people find that when Robyn Wiegman chairs
a program, she makes it a very intellectually
alive, dynamic place. So the combination
of Duke, and Robyn Wiegman’s leadership
– along with the rest of the faculty’s
contributions– made it a compelling
intellectual location for me. The best
Women’s Studies work is done when the
field is understood as a hub for critical
interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship,
and Duke WS definitely has a firm grasp on
this.

RW: Do you have any immediate plans in terms
of research or courses you’ll be offering?

AW: I came to Duke to be the new Director of
Sexuality Studies and to further develop that
program. I anticipate that I will play a role
in continuing the transnational focus of the
Women’s Studies Program, and much of my
teaching will be oriented to that end.

In the spring I’ll be teaching a graduate
course on human rights and nongovernmental
organizations, with a focus on feminism
and sexual rights. There’s been too much
celebratory scholarship which declares that
since the Cold War has ended, civil society is
emerging through human rights and NGOs.
Critical scholarship asks us to unpack the
liberal traditions that are encoded within
human rights and reflect on the institutional-
ization of NGOs with a bit more skepticism.
I’m also interested in the body of work that
looks at organizational practices and asks,
what precisely are human rights and NGO
workers doing? What is the meaning of their
activity? We’ll be looking at these questions,
and considering broader theoretical issues
about universalism and the relation of rights
to capitalism, particularly in the context of
women’s issues, gender, and sexuality.

RW: What can students expect from you?

AW: At both the undergraduate and graduate level,
I tend to emphasize a rigorous engagement
with the texts we read. I like the discussion
to refer to specific pages and authors so that we
stage our debates through them. Students can
also expect courses with a strong international
perspective and with alternative content; we’ll
study laws, government documents, and NGO
reports. I do think that closely engaging texts
can be both earnest and fun, and I try to allow
for a bit of wit and humor in the course of
our studying together.

RW: I know our Women’s Studies community
is quite excited to have you. As a senior,
I certainly plan to keep up with the
development of the Sexuality Studies Program
under your leadership in the years to come.
and I know you’ll find the community to be
dynamic, nurturing place for it. Welcome
to Duke!

Rachel Weeks is a senior majoring in Women’s Studies.
“Are those who have been charged with the crime Duke students, accused rapists, young men, privileged athletes? And is the woman making the accusation a rape victim, an exotic dancer, a student, a mother, a false accuser, a Black woman?”

(“The Power of Words,” on The State of Things, the WUNC radio program hosted by Frank Stasio, July 20, 2006)

By Tara Kachgal

These are intriguing questions. According to many critical news practitioners and scholars, the political implications of news language are often overlooked and taken for granted, by readers/listeners/viewers and journalists alike. For instance, a popular reporting textbook advises journalism students to use the word accuser to refer to a person who files rapes charges because “the word, ‘victim,’ implies that the suspected attacker is guilty.” But to what extent is accuser really neutral?

Jackson Katz, a noted antiviolence expert who has examined coverage of the Kobe Bryant rape case, explains that the persistent use of accuser shifts the focus away from examining the strengths or weaknesses of the prosecution’s case against the defendants to focusing on the alleged victim’s conduct. This effectively puts her on trial in the press. Katz argues that the use of accuser also works at another level, in eliciting sympathy toward the defendant and public contempt toward the person who says she has been raped. “The alleged victim is now the one doing something to [the defendant]—she’s accusing him. It almost appears to the casual observer—that he is not really the one who is on trial for committing an act of violent sexual aggression. Instead, he has become the victim of her accusation.” With “balance” a normative ideal in journalism, it seems puzzling, then, that a phrase like “alleged victim”–which does not imply the defendant’s guilt or negate the experience of rape—is not the default term in such stories.

Do journalistic norms and conventions privilege a patriarchal point of view? This question is something I explored this past summer when I taught a course, “Gender Issues in Sports Media,” for Women’s Studies. Viewing sport and sports media as microcosms of the gender values structuring contemporary U.S. society, the class examined a range of issues, from how sports participation and media consumption contribute to gender role socialization to why the marketing, production, and distribution practices of transnational sports and fitness companies have been increasingly scrutinized in recent years. The controversy involving the Duke men’s lacrosse team, of course, provided a starting point to address a range of questions concerning ethics, the institutions of sport and mass media, and gender relations.

In their first assignment, students conducted their own analysis of two months of news stories on the case. This highlighted how quickly the case got on the national news agenda. Within two weeks of being reported to police on March 14, 2006, the alleged assault was a leading news story, both in the traditional media and the blogosphere. (It remained so for most of April.) The course considered why this particular situation was deemed not only newsworthy but also a media “event.” Our exploration focused both on how the emerging “story” fit with prevailing values for what counts as news, and on the attractive qualities it had for news storytelling. With a prominent news value being conflict, the seeming obviousness of the contrasts and oppositions in the story (race, gender, class, education, geography, etc.) resonated, and it was flush with rich symbolic value, both visual and verbal. (See Newsweek’s cover story, 5/1/06.) Also, the controversy seemed amenable for a preexisting audience not yet sated by coverage of the Bryant scandal. With its foreseeable investigation and legal proceeding, the story would, like Bryant’s, pique interest over a period of time.

At the same time, there would be clear resolution—indeed, a narrative for how the story would unfold, in part because of statements made by District Attorney Mike Nifong, the news media and the public were primed to focus on the findings of DNA testing that might link team members to the alleged victim. When defense attorneys quite publicly commented, in the second week of April, on these findings, a noticeable shift in coverage and public opinion followed. With Nifong, who had been much criticized for his early statements, not talking to the press, defense attorneys became even more prominent as sources, and their views (e.g., on how to evaluate the DNA findings) served to frame coverage. Often it was difficult, especially when journalists failed to carefully attribute the information they used in their reporting, to not see defense viewpoints presented as an objective rendering of social reality. An example is The Herald-Sun’s front-page headline, “Jury May Never Hear About ‘96 Accusation” (4/29/06) concerning revelations that the alleged victim had told police, years earlier, about another incidence of alleged sexual violence.

Left unexamined in this reporting was the fact that women, especially racial minority and poor women, may be more vulnerable to sexual violence. What was conveyed instead was part of the “rape myth”: that women, more often than not, lie about being raped. Thus, news coverage worked to assign responsibility and guilt for the alleged crime, to the alleged victim. The cumulative effect of such reporting was not only to foment increased anger at her (and Nifong, to a lesser extent) but to convince many that the investigation had no reason to continue and furthermore, that doing so would only prolong the trauma experienced by the defendants, the team, the university, and the city of Durham. (See letter to the editor, The News & Observer, 8/17/06.) With the clear villain in the story identified as the accuser, the task of news storytelling was to move the narrative toward closure. In cases of public trauma like this one, the desire to see order in the world is certainly understandable, but it comes at the expense of any consideration of the reality of racialized,
“Left unexamined in this reporting was the fact that women, especially racial minority and poor women, may be more vulnerable to sexual violence. What was conveyed instead was part of the “rape myth”: that women, more often than not, lie about being raped.”

Coda: Bodies of Evidence

By Karla F. C. Holloway

When things go wrong, when sports teams beget bawdy behavior and debasement of other human beings, the bodies left on the line often have little in common with those enclosed in the protective veneer of the world of college athletics. At Duke University this past spring, the bodies left to the trauma of a campus brought to its knees by members of Duke University’s lacrosse team were African American and women. I use the kneeling metaphor with deliberate intent. It was precisely this demeanor toward women and girls that mattered here. The lacrosse team’s notion of who was in service of whom and the presumption of privilege that their elite sports’ performance had earned seemed their entitlement as well to behaving badly and without concern for consequence.

Justice inevitably has an attendant social construction. And this parallelism means that despite what our desire may be, the seriousness of the matter cannot be finally or fully adjudicated in the courts. The appropriate presumption of innocence that follows the players, however the legal case is determined, is neither the critical social indicator of the event, nor the final measure of its cultural facts. Judgments about the issues of race and gender that the lacrosse team’s sleazy conduct exposed cannot be left to the courtroom. Just as aspects of their conduct that extend into the social realms of character and integrity should not be the parameters of adjudicatory processes, the consequence of that conduct will not be fully resolved within a legal process. Those injured by this affair, including the student and the other young woman who were invited to dance under false pretenses and then racially (at least) abused, as well as Duke’s campus and Durham’s communities, are bodies left on the line—vulnerable to a social review that has been mixed with insensitive ridicule as well as reasoned empathy. Despite the damaging logic that associates the credibility of a sociocultural context to the outcome of the legal process, we will find that even as the accusations that might be legally processed are confined to a courtroom, the cultural and social issues excavated in this upheaval linger.

Perhaps the most critical, if not the most sustained response of the campus to the rape allegation and the series of incidents of misconduct and the lack of administrative oversight that it has exposed, has focused on the matter of culture. Duke University’s president, Richard Brodhead, commissioned a series of committees, one of them to review and examine the campus culture. The Campus Culture Initiative has focused on the fault lines—alcohol, gender, race, and athletics—the spaces of university life where problems of community and conduct visibly reside. If athletes with otherwise good grades use alcohol as their reason for laxity, racial bias, and gendered tirade, why is it that public media cultures, and other lay respondents of community and conduct visibly reside. If athletes with otherwise good grades use alcohol as their reason for laxity, racial bias, and gendered tirade, why is it that public media cultures, and other lay respondents of community and conduct visibly reside. If athletes with otherwise good grades use alcohol as their reason for laxity, racial bias, and gendered tirade, why is it that public media cultures, and other lay respondents within and outside of campus would elevate good academic performance and subordinate these issues of character? With no blueprint on how to interrogate these broad and deeply entrenched matters of culture, Duke’s commission of this investigatory committee arguably indicates its notice of the inequities and imbalances on the campus—where the “culture” of sports seems for some a reasonable displacement for the cultures of moral conduct, ethical citizenship and personal integrity. But “culture” is also the catch-all for the event, one that contains as much potential to replicate our failures as well as for engaging and sustaining a more progressive and democratic campus community. And it is not the first time Duke has positioned an institutional investigation of a problem of culture.

When, in the last year of President Nannerl Keohane’s presidency, a report on the status of women at Duke discovered evidence of cultural and social practices that disadvantaged women, a commission of women faculty and administrators, a group of women student scholars, and an alumnae group of women (legates of the Duke Women’s College) were charged with discovering the “fix” to the problem. This flurry of restructurin g and response came after a committee of women faculty, students, and administrators labored to uncover the gendered issues of disparate treatment and its consequences. As if a prelude to the events of spring 2006, the bodies that mattered, those who were the objects of inquiry, we were also the bodies whose labor was required to fix the inequity.

At What Cost?

How do we measure, value, assess, and document the energy of spirit, body, and intellect expended by those who endure the problems caused by cultures of both masculine and white racial disrespect? In its forms of verbal violence as well as physical, in its presumption that there are some bodies available for taunt and tirade, whim and whisper, the “event” is phased back into the subaltern spaces of university life and culture. Their sporting behaviors, on and off the courts, endure.

At the conclusion of spring semester the lacrosse team, minus three indicted (and one suspended) member, gathered to celebrate their reinstatement on Duke’s campus. Their reinstatement was accompanied by continued on page 8
a code of conduct they inexplicably wrote for themselves. At this gathering, their interim coach (who had been, just three years prior, their former team member) vigorously professed his blanket judgment that those who stood indicted for the rape of a student from North Carolina Central University were innocent. As the day drew to a close, every indication was that the remaining team members’ athletic careers would continue nearly uninterrupted except for the scrutiny of the administration and their self-authored code.

The interim coach’s pronouncement was critical in weighing the significance of this event. In nearly every social context that emerged following the team’s crude conduct, innocence and guilt have been assessed through a metric of race and gender. White innocence means black guilt. Men’s innocence means women’s guilt. These capacious categories, which were in absolute play the night of the team’s drunken debacle, continue their hold on the campus and the Durham community.

After their reinstatement, things for the Duke Lacrosse players edged as near to normal as the aftermath of the horrific affair could allow. And ironically, for the rest of the campus, everything else was curiously normal as well. Not so strangely—indeed, predictably—those members of a class who have been exposed to abuse or intolerance or inequity (on this campus, as in the nation, women and black folks) are called once again into service to help remedy the campus culture that these boys’ sports culture created and exploited. Our labor on newly invented committee structures and our availability for public and private consultations, conversations, and often intense confrontations persists despite and amidst the growing acclamation of support for the team.

The irony of this displacement is fully inscribed on the weary bodies of black and women faculty and students at Duke whose visibility placed us eventually to normal as the aftermath of the horrific affair could allow. And ironically, for the rest of the campus, everything else was curiously normal as well. Not so strangely—indeed, predictably—those members of a class who have been exposed to abuse or intolerance or inequity (on this campus, as in the nation, women and black folks) are called once again into service to help remedy the campus culture that these boys’ sports culture created and exploited. Our labor on newly invented committee structures and our availability for public and private consultations, conversations, and often intense confrontations persists despite and amidst the growing acclamation of support for the team.

The interim coach’s pronouncement was critical in weighing the significance of this event. In nearly every social context that emerged following the team’s crude conduct, innocence and guilt have been assessed through a metric of race and gender. White innocence means black guilt. Men’s innocence means women’s guilt. These capacious categories, which were in absolute play the night of the team’s drunken debacle, continue their hold on the campus and the Durham community.

After their reinstatement, things for the Duke Lacrosse players edged as near to normal as the aftermath of the horrific affair could allow. And ironically, for the rest of the campus, everything else was curiously normal as well. Not so strangely—indeed, predictably—those members of a class who have been exposed to abuse or intolerance or inequity (on this campus, as in the nation, women and black folks) are called once again into service to help remedy the campus culture that these boys’ sports culture created and exploited. Our labor on newly invented committee structures and our availability for public and private consultations, conversations, and often intense confrontations persists despite and amidst the growing acclamation of support for the team.

The irony of this displacement is fully inscribed on the weary bodies of black and women faculty and students at Duke whose visibility placed us eventually (after a team of white male administrators decided on the parameters of the university’s response) into membership and leadership roles of committees charged to remedy the damaging culture that was now in evidence. This responsibility emerged despite the fact that neither women nor African Americans were the ones who enabled, permitted, arguably encouraged, or facilitated the cultures of disrespect that had been tolerated. Because otherwise and after all, the lacrosse team members were stellar academic performers as well as athletic players. Their moral misconduct seemed secondary to the fact—even a righteous “release”—for those who otherwise performed so admirably. And even at this moment of transition of the event—to the courts to handle the charges of rape, sodomy, and assault, and to the university to handle the matter of culture—the team’s athletic agenda proceeds apace, and those most wounded by the event, by direct and indirect association, are left to manage the exploitation they have suffered as the consequences of this particular culture of elite sports and the protections of privilege.

The culture of men’s sports in particular, with its elevations and hierarchies, with its often brutal physical contact, and with its body-intense loyalties remains unindicted in this curious yet predictable aftermath of the men’s lacrosse team’s documented record of demeaning, brutish, rude, and alcohol-ridden conduct. It is behavior that seems so attached to its winning season and its members’ successful academic performance that the very notion of the choices endemic to the culture of team mentalities and conduct—who plays, who does not, who makes the team, who is varsity, who is second string—has meant we have responded to this as just another form of choice. The ethic of sportsmanship means we have been overly tolerant as well of aberrant conduct as just another choice, solely a dimension of the ways and means of sports.

When Catherine Stimpson reminds us that “boosterism can be boisterous . . . victory will bring ecstasy and too frequently a bullying attitude of superiority [and] defeat will bring pain and too frequently a churlish and belligerent anger,” she indicates precisely the demonstrable after-the-game conduct that has been so destructive in this particular occasion. Stimpson notes how “defeat also tests the character of the fan, for the true fan must remain loyal even during the bad times.” She might well be speaking of the women’s LAX team, who went on to their postseason play proclaiming to the media that they would write the word innocent on their sweatbands, and who finally decided that their fidelity could be expressed by recording on their sweat bands the jersey numbers of the indicted men. They were athletes themselves, as well as “true fans.” In a moment that called on more action than I had will for, I wanted to write to them to ask if they might, instead, consider writing the word justice onto their gear, a word whose connotations run deeper than the team-influenced and morally slender protestations of loyalty that brought the ethic from the field of play onto the field of legal and cultural and gendered battle as well.

I write these thoughts, considering what it would mean to resign from the committee charged with managing the post culture of the lacrosse team’s assault to the character of the university. My decision is fraught with a personal history that has made me understand the deep ambiguity in loving and caring for someone who has committed an egregious wrong. It is complicated with an administrative history that has made me appreciate the frailties of faculty and students and how a university’s conduct toward those who have abused its privileges as well as protected them is burdened with legal residue, as well as personal empathy. My decision has vacillated between the guilt over my worry that if not me, which other body like mine will be pulled into this service? Who do I render vulnerable if I lose my courage to stay this course? On the other side is my increasingly desperate need to run for cover, vacate the battlefield, and seek personal shelter. It does feel like a battle. So when asked to provide the labor, once again, for the aftermath of a conduct that visibly associates me, in terms of race and gender, with the imbalance of power, especially without an appreciable notice of this as the contestatory space that women and black folk are asked to inhabit, I find myself preoccupied with a decision on whether to demur from this association in an effort, however feeble, to protect the vulnerability that is inherent to this assigned and necessary meditative role.

Until we recognize that sports reinforces exactly those behaviors of entitlement which have been and can be so abusive to women and girls and those “othered” by their sports’ history of membership, the bodies who will bear evidence and consequence of the field’s conduct will remain, after the fact of the matter, laboring to retrieve the lofty goals of education, to elevate the character of the place, to restore a space where they can do the work they came to the university to accomplish. However, as long as the bodies of women and minorities are evidence as well as restitution, the troubled terrain we labor over is as much a battlefield as it is a sports arena. At this moment, I have little appreciable sense of difference between the requisite conduct and consequence of either space.

Karen F. C. Holloway is the William R. Kenan Professor of English and former Dean of the Humanities and Social Sciences of Trinity College.

Reprinted with permission from the Scholar and Feminist Online 4:3 (2006), special issue on gender and sport. See http://www.barnard.columbia.edu/sfonline/
Duke Women’s Studies Staff Seeks Professional Development

By Paul Grantham, Office of Communication Services

Beginning in January 2007, the new Employee Tuition Assistance Program will reimburse staff up to $5,000 per year for tuition related to an employee’s job or continued career growth at Duke. The benefit can be used for up to two classes per semester or quarter at any higher education institution in North Carolina that is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools—not just Duke. Duke launched a pilot program in November 2004 to assess interest in a new benefit that provided tuition reimbursement for courses outside Duke. The pilot results suggested broad interest in such a benefit. Under the current benefit, which only covers courses at Duke, fewer than 300 employees received more than $1.6 million for tuition expenses in 2004.

Gwen Rogers has accumulated thousands of dollars in student loans while working on a business technology degree at North Carolina Central University (NCCU). A staff assistant in Women’s Studies at Duke, she’ll be the first in her immediate family to earn a four-year college degree. With a year and a half of classes left, Rogers hopes to limit her future debt by tapping into the new tuition assistance program for Duke employees.

Rogers, who has worked at Duke for nearly 20 years, believes her education will only help her continued success at Duke. She was at the front of the line for the pilot program after her supervisor in the Women’s Studies Department, Lillian Spiller, brought it to her attention. Spiller has supported Rogers’s education by using flexible work arrangements to enable her to leave early or come in late for classes.

“I got an email about a pilot program with limited funding,” Spiller said. “So, I told Gwen to call right away because I didn’t know how much was available.”

Duke provided $100,000 for the pilot, but because of high demand, the available funds were committed in about three weeks. At the end of the pilot, more than 120 Duke employees received financial support for classes.

Rogers received $4,686 through the pilot, and she was thrilled to learn that the program will return in January 2007. If approved, tuition for two of her classes each semester—up to $5,000 per year—could be covered completely by Duke.

“Thank you, God,” Rogers said. “I will only have a year left, but it will be a big help.”

Rogers said her financial and personal investments for a degree are worth it, but she believes the new benefit will help many more employees pursue their aspirations for education and career development at Duke.

“I think this benefit offers a lot of advantages, so people are not stuck in my situation,” Rogers said. “It gives people a greater chance to succeed. If someone is going to pay for your tuition, you’d be a fool not to take it. This will open doors for a lot of employees. I know a lot of people who want to go back to school—single moms and single dads—but they just don’t have the means. This benefit will help.”

This article originally appeared in Working@Duke (August 2006). Portions of it are reprinted with permission from editor Leanora Minal.

Women’s Studies Staff Changes

Pat Hoffman, Women’s Studies Program Coordinator since May 2002, has accepted a position with SeaSaw Studio in Durham, North Carolina. She leaves Duke to pursue her interests in working with younger students and the arts. SeaSaw Studio offers an apprenticeship program and career training in art and design for youth. While at Duke, Pat transformed the newsletter, coordinated conferences and event planning, and provided staff support for both the graduate certificate program and the Council on Women’s Studies. Many thanks to her commitment, contributions, and service to the Program!

Susan Perry is our new Program Coordinator. She joins us after three years working in Duke University’s Division of Student Affairs. Susan has a PhD in Educational Administration, a Master of Social Work (MSW) from the Smith College School for Social Work, and has worked extensively with adolescents and their families. When not working at Duke, she can be found watching her five year old rescued greyhound “Oscar” enjoy his freedom from the racetrack.

CONFERENCE REPORT:

“New Directions in Feminist Scholarship”

By Lesley Shannon Curtis

During the spring semester of 2006, Clare Hemmings, Visiting Professor from the London School of Economics, taught the introductory graduate course Foundations in Feminist Theory for the Duke Women’s Studies graduate certificate program. The course introduces students to key debates in feminist theory, focusing on the works of authors such as Gayle Rubin, Judith Butler, Hortense Spillers, and Elizabeth Grosz. In addition to participating in lively and engaging discussions in class, students traveled to New Brunswick to attend a conference in April sponsored by the Women’s Studies Department of Rutgers University. The conference, “New Directions in Feminist Scholarship,” was organized by doctoral graduate students in Women’s Studies from several universities, including Ohio State, Emory, Claremont, Iowa, Minnesota, Maryland, Washington, UCLA, Clark, and Rutgers.

At the two-day conference, student presentations were grouped into six panels, each aimed at reporting on new and diverse topics of research in the field of Gender and Women’s Studies. The first day’s panels, “Reframing Feminism: Reflections, Pedagogy and Activism; Centering Corporeality: Subject Formations and Sexualized Bodies; and Feminist Infiltrations in Science and Medicine,” initiated a dialogue among attendees about current debates in their field. On the second day of the conference, attendees listened to panel discussions on more specific topics, including gender and war, cinema, and global feminism.

In addition to the panel presentations, lunchtime discussions allowed attendees to explore topics such as feminist pedagogy, intellectual activism, and future publication. Dr. Mary Hawkesworth, the Editor-in-Chief of the leading journal in the field, SIGNS: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, provided tips to graduate students hoping to publish their research in the near future. In the evening, Dr. Cheryl Clarke, from Rutgers, read selected poems from her four published books. The conference ended with a keynote address by Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies Elizabeth Grosz, who related her philosophical musings to feminism by explaining that her goal is to fight not for more recognition or more rights but for more action.

As members of a new generation of scholars studying feminist and gender theory at the doctorate level, the future feminist academics who attended this conference were asked to imagine that their research would help in building this world. Since April, conference organizers have started a graduate feminist blog and email list to share concerns and information about research and funding opportunities. Additionally, the planning for a second conference, to be hosted at Emory University March 31–April 1, 2007, is already underway. Graduate students are invited to submit one page abstracts (250–300 words) of presentations by January 8, 2007 to conf2007@notes.emory.edu. For more information, see http://www.students.emory.edu/wgrads/page4.htm.

Lesley Shannon Curtis is a Graduate Student Instructor of French in the Department of Romance Studies and is enrolled in the graduate certificate program in Women’s Studies.
The Hybrid Immigrant Woman
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push the category of the real to new ideations of success and failure, and how might that What happens when we move beyond the binary attempt-and fail-at representing the real or the we were trying to understand what it means to as a manifestation of something like the real, Rather than accepting the success of the visual Adopting a Strategic Tactic Beyond Success.

Salerno, I had the opportunity to participate on a panel titled “The Failure of Visible Evidence: Success of Visible Evidence: Adopting a Strategic Tactic Beyond Success.” Rather than accepting the success of the visual as a manifestation of something like the real, we were trying to understand what it means to attempt–and fail–at representing the real or the truth. What might be valuable about failure? What happens when we move beyond the binary of success and failure, and how might that push the category of the real to new ideations or representations?

The conference covers topics of documentary production and theory within the cinematic, photographic, journalistic, and even the extra-visual realms. It also concerns how we evaluate the category of “the real” and how it is represented: in theory, in our culture, in our literature and texts, in our conversations, and of course, in the visual realm. This was the thirteenth year the conference has been running, and though it continues to set the pace with academic theoretical inquiries, it also aims to bring together both theory and practice, and ends up complicating the relationship and division between the two. With two other graduate students, Shilyh Warren and Abigail Salerno, I had the opportunity to participate on a panel titled “The Failure of Visible Evidence: Accepting a Strategic Tactic Beyond Success.” Rather than accepting the success of the visual as a manifestation of something like the real, we were trying to understand what it means to attempt–and fail–at representing the real or the truth. What might be valuable about failure? What happens when we move beyond the binary of success and failure, and how might that push the category of the real to new ideations or representations?

My paper was “Dirty Bodies, Clean DNA: Robert ‘Willy’ Pickton and the Missing Women.” It looked at the trial and visual evidence surrounding the Vancouver–area alleged serial killer, Robert Pickton. He allegedly murdered dozens of prostitutes in Vancouver and, after dismembering their bodies, either fed them to his pigs or combined the remains with his pork products. It’s a complicated case that spans decades, acres, dozens of women and witnesses, and my paper focused on the visual manifestations of evidence in the extralegal discourses. My reading traced each of the stages of the visual media in the case: from the familial missing persons posters, to the official Missing Women poster published by a specialized task force, to a hypervisible search for missing meat products from the farm, to pictures of dozens of forensic anthropologists sifting through tons of dirt while wearing their white jumpsuits, and finally, leading up to the investment in the discourse of the women’s DNA as admissible evidence. My thesis was that the visual realm had to produce its own failure to make way for the new kind of extra-visual discourse of the body, the subject/victim, and ultimately the public itself. Both the images and the modes of consumption operate as a sanitization project and were symptoms of a larger failure to sustain a critical contextualization of the female victims as subjects. This failure culminated in the star role that situates DNA as the visual evidence for a new kind of subject in a new kind of public.

Delivering this paper was the culmination of a two-year research project. The conference was held over five days in the brand-new Cinemateca Brasileira in São Paulo; it houses the national film archives, a series of screening rooms, social spaces, and a cafe. I was able to develop in–depth conversations about my own project, other scholars’ presentations, and documentary films in general, and questions of pedagogy, writing, archiving, and screening. It was a stimulating opportunity to meet documentary scholars who have impacted on my own work and receive valuable feedback on my current project. We also met many other graduate students from Brazil, greater Latin America, Australia, Europe, and North America.

The travel grant was a great support for this particular project, and I am pleased to say the conference itself generated another avenue for a future paper. I will be revising it and presenting a version of the paper this spring in the Women’s Studies Graduate Scholars Colloquium. Travel grants allow graduate students to bring new ideas, concepts, methods, questions, and interactions back into the fold of the Women’s Studies community at Duke. Women’s Studies have been instrumental in both the development of my own work and furthering my understanding of how a successful intellectual community can be maintained. As the recipient of a travel grant and the co–leader of this year’s Graduate Scholars Colloquium, I thank you for your continued support of Women’s Studies. It is a crucial community at Duke and, beach or not, I know many other Women’s Studies scholars who look forward to presenting their work at important conferences.

Fiona Barnett is a doctoral student in the Program in Literature and is enrolled in the graduate certificate program in Women’s Studies. In 2006–07, she is a co–organizer of the Graduate Scholars Colloquium in Women’s Studies.

Graduate Student Adventures

By Fiona Barnett

Friends are convinced that I received funding to go to the beach; they deny the possibility that a trip to Brazil involved trading a beach chair for a chair in a darkened theater. But it is indeed possible, and Women’s Studies provided partial funding so that I could do just that at a conference in São Paolo and Rio de Janeiro this summer. The funding allowed me to present my work at the annual Visible Evidence conference, a major conference for all things documentary.

The conference covers topics of documentary production and theory within the cinematic, photographic, journalistic, and even the extra-visual realms. It also concerns how we evaluate the category of “the real” and how it is represented: in theory, in our culture, in our literature and texts, in our conversations, and of course, in the visual realm. This was the thirteenth year the conference has been running, and though it continues to set the pace with academic theoretical inquiries, it also aims to bring together both theory and practice, and ends up complicating the relationship and division between the two. With two other graduate students, Shilyh Warren and Abigail Salerno, I had the opportunity to participate on a panel titled “The Failure of Visible Evidence: Accepting a Strategic Tactic Beyond Success.” Rather than accepting the success of the visual as a manifestation of something like the real, we were trying to understand what it means to attempt–and fail–at representing the real or the truth. What might be valuable about failure? What happens when we move beyond the binary of success and failure, and how might that push the category of the real to new ideations or representations?
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The conference covers topics of documentary production and theory within the cinematic, photographic, journalistic, and even the extra-visual realms. It also concerns how we evaluate the category of “the real” and how it is represented: in theory, in our culture, in our literature and texts, in our conversations, and of course, in the visual realm. This was the thirteenth year the conference has been running, and though it continues to set the pace with academic theoretical inquiries, it also aims to bring together both theory and practice, and ends up complicating the relationship and division between the two. With two other graduate students, Shilyh Warren and Abigail Salerno, I had the opportunity to participate on a panel titled “The Failure of Visible Evidence: Accepting a Strategic Tactic Beyond Success.” Rather than accepting the success of the visual as a manifestation of something like the real, we were trying to understand what it means to attempt–and fail–at representing the real or the truth. What might be valuable about failure? What happens when we move beyond the binary of success and failure, and how might that push the category of the real to new ideations or representations?

The travel grant was a great support for this particular project, and I am pleased to say the conference itself generated another avenue for a future paper. I will be revising it and presenting a version of the paper this spring in the Women’s Studies Graduate Scholars Colloquium. Travel grants allow graduate students to bring new ideas, concepts, methods, questions, and interactions back into the fold of the Women’s Studies community at Duke. Women’s Studies have been instrumental in both the development of my own work and furthering my understanding of how a successful intellectual community can be maintained. As the recipient of a travel grant and the co–leader of this year’s Graduate Scholars Colloquium, I thank you for your continued support of Women’s Studies. It is a crucial community at Duke and, beach or not, I know many other Women’s Studies scholars who look forward to presenting their work at important conferences.

Fiona Barnett is a doctoral student in the Program in Literature and is enrolled in the graduate certificate program in Women’s Studies. In 2006–07, she is a co–organizer of the Graduate Scholars Colloquium in Women’s Studies.

Seniors Pursue Graduation with Distinction

This year the Women’s Studies Program is fortunate to have three undergraduate students pursuing Graduation with Distinction. A university-wide program, Graduation with Distinction recognizes students who achieve excellence in their major area of study. Students typically pursue Distinction for a variety of reasons, including their deep personal investment in independent writing and research. Below are the titles students assigned to their thesis project, the faculty directors of the research, and the faculty readers for each student project.

Rachel Weeks: Fashion, Free Trade, and Feminism
Directed by Robyn Wiegman
Second Readers: Gary Gereffi, Kathy Rudy

Christina James: Perspectives on Birth Control in Roman Catholicism and Islam
Directed by Mary Fulkerson
Second Readers: Kathy Rudy, miriam cooke

Patricia Agustin Galindo: The Hybrid Immigrant Woman
Directed by Kathy Rudy
Second Reader: Antonio Viegó

At the end of spring term, all three students will present their research publicly at a special celebration on April 18, 2007 in the East Duke Parlors.
Duke Students Use Women's Studies Program Awards

Each year, students apply to the Women's Studies program for research and travel funds to attend international and domestic conferences, pursue individual research, and engage in other academic pursuits. In recent years, students have used their grant funds for a variety of projects. On returning from their studies and travel, students write to tell us about their experiences. Below is a description of some of the most recent awards and the manner in which students used the assistance.

Joyatee Basu, Public Policy, 2008, Travel Award

Last summer, Joyatee was an intern with the U.S. State Department in Paris and worked under Connie Morella, who is our ambassador to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. [The OECD uses British spelling for their full name] Ambassador Morella was a member of the Maryland congress (1987–2002) before becoming a House representative, where she developed a national reputation as a leading advocate for women, children, and families. Joyatee found Morella "a fantastic female mentor in the field of American politics and International Diplomacy. It was an incredible way to learn about global policy, women’s leadership, and my own priorities. I am genuinely grateful for the Program’s assistance in making it happen."

Nathan Hensley, English, 2009, Conference Travel Grant

Nathan attended and presented a research paper at the "Trollope and Gender" conference this summer in Exeter, England. The conference was focused on re-readings of Anthony Trollope in light of the most recent readings in gender studies.

Ariel Bybee Laughton, Religion, 2007, Research Travel Grant

In March 2005, Ariel presented her scholarly work at the second Christina Conference in Women’s Studies at the University of Helsinki in Finland. The conference drew a number of scholars from across the world to explore both culture-specific and global issues in women’s studies. Ariel wrote: "Interacting with women’s studies on an international level for the first time, I encountered a number of new ideas and perspectives that I had never been exposed to that have greatly enriched me and my academic pursuits. Attending this conference was truly the opportunity of a lifetime, and I’m appreciative of those who make travel grants like this possible for young scholars."

Susan Perlman, Psychology, 2009, Conference Travel Grant

Susan Perlman traveled to Japan to follow her interest in psychology and specifically the mother/infant relationship. She attended the International Conference on Infant Studies in Kyoto. "It was a great trip! I presented a poster on a research study I did on infant–mother interaction. The study found that infants and mothers who have coordinated physiological patterns also have more coordinated behavioral interactions. Thanks so much for the money. It was a great opportunity!"

Alumnae News

We would like to hear from you! Contact Program Coordinator, Susan Perry at 919-684-3655 to share your alumni news.

Angela Jarman, (B.A. Women’s Studies, 2006) was a panel member in a discussion at the Wednesdays at the Center Program hosted by the John Hope Franklin Humanities Institute at Duke University in September. Jarman joined Grant Farred, Associate Professor of Literature, and Jon Pessah, deputy editor, ESPN The Magazine, to discuss sports, media, and questions of social justice. The event was organized by the Institute for Critical U.S. Studies (ICUSS) and took as its point of departure the media’s scripting of the men’s lacrosse scandal and the specific ways in which nuance and complexity were sacrificed in the name of expediency and sensationalism.

Lisa Yun Lee (Ph.D. German, 1999) has been named the Director of the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Lee is the former director of The Public Square, a non-profit organization she founded, which provides programming that links social critique to the arts and academia. Her new position will build on her commitments to community engagement and the development of social justice in civic life. She also serves on the boards of Bryn Mawr College and Ms. Magazine. Last year, Lee published a scholarly monograph on Adorno, called Dialectics of the Body: Corporeality in the Philosophy of Theodor Adorno (Routledge). In 2001, she endowed the Jean O’Barr Chair in Interdisciplinary Feminist Studies.

Richie Richardson (Ph.D. English, 2007), who participated in the Women’s Studies program from 1993 to 1998 and received a program certificate in 2002, is now an Associate Professor in English at the University of California, Davis. His book, Black Masculinity and the U.S. South: From Uncle Tom to Gangsta, will be published in February 2007 by the University of Georgia Press.

Rebecca Wanzo (Ph.D. English, 2006) is using her leave from Ohio State University, where she teaches Women’s Studies and African American and African Studies, to complete research on her book project, The Suffering Will Not Be Televised: African American Women, Sentimentality and Political Storytelling. An extension of her dissertation work at Duke, the book examines the ways in which African American women have struggled to make their victimization legible to both the state and communities that have inadequately addressed their pain. The book covers such topics as child abduction, research about black women and pain thresholds, sexual violence, and Oprah Winfrey’s book club.

Jini Kim Watson (Ph.D. Literature, 2006) is an Assistant Professor in the English Department at New York University where she teaches courses in Asia-Pacific literature and cultural studies; postcolonial studies; spatial and architectural theory; and feminist and critical theory. She was an active member of the Graduate Scholars Colloquium during her years at Duke.

Judy Woodruff (B.A. Political Science, 1968; Honorary Doctorate Humane Letters, 1998; Trustee Emeriti) is teaching a course in Public Policy at Duke this fall on Media and Politics: The Clash of Ideology, Technology and Ownership. The course explores the relationship between media and democratic practices, and draws on Woodruff’s extensive experience as a journalist. She has worked as chief White House correspondent for NBC (1977–1982) and as the Washington reporter for “Today,” and has been news anchor of both PBS’s “Frontline” and CNN’s “Inside Politics.” Duke’s News and Communication service interviewed Woodruff about her course last March (http://www.dukewnews.duke.edu/2006/03/brooks_woodruff.html). She continues to be an active supporter of Women’s Studies, the Baldwin Scholars Program, and Duke’s financial aid initiative. This year, Woodruff’s endowment fund in Women’s Studies is directed toward research conducted by undergraduate scholars.

ANNOUNCEMENT: In conjunction with the publication of Anne Firor Scott’s new book by UNC Press next month, Bridge Booher plans to write a comprehensive profile of Professor Scott for one of Duke Magazine’s spring issues. Duke Magazine is soliciting contributions from alumnae who studied with Professor Scott. Please contact Senior Writer Bridge Booher at (919) 684-2863 or bhb@duke.edu.
Anne Allison, Professor of Cultural Anthropology and Associate faculty in Women’s Studies, recently published a new book, *Millenial Monsters: Japanese Toys and the Global Imagination* with the University of California Press. From sushi and karaoke to martial arts and technology, the currency of made-in-Japan cultural goods has skyrocketed in the global marketplace over the past decade. Examining the crossover traffic between Japan and the United States, *Millenial Monsters* explores the global popularity of Japanese youth goods today while it questions the make-up of the fantasies and the capitalistic conditions of the play involved.

Tina Campt, Associate Professor Women’s Studies, is on leave this fall conducting research on her next book project on black visual culture. She also co-organized a conference in October in Toronto on *Diasporic Hegemonies*. The conference grew out of a symposium organized by Women’s Studies at Duke University in November 2005. Focusing on difference, genealogies, indigeneity, unequal circulations, and configurations of culture, power and politics, the 2006 conference continues the effort to formulate a gendered transnational analysis of the relations of diaspora that rethinks the implications of globalization in generative and dynamic ways.

Jonna Eagle, Visiting Assistant Professor, earned her Ph.D. from Brown in American Civilization. Her dissertation—now being revised into a book—is a historical study of masculinity and cinema called *Making a Spectacle of Himself: White Masculinity, Melodrama, and Sensation in the American Cinema, 1898–1999*. She is teaching WST 90 in the spring.

Kevin Haynes, Visiting Assistant Professor, joined the Duke Women’s Studies faculty this fall. Professor Haynes has a diverse background in law and literature, with a B.A. in English from Rice University in 1986 and a Juris Doctorate from Stanford Law School in 1991. He taught law at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (contracts, corporate law, mergers, and acquisitions) and is currently finishing his doctorate from Duke’s English Department. He is team teaching with Karla Holloway a graduate seminar, “Legal Fictions,” under the WST 360 Interdisciplinary Debates rubric.

Negar Mottahedeh, Assistant Professor and Associate faculty in Women’s Studies, curated, with miriam cooke (African and Asian Languages and Literatures), a film series this fall called “The Aftershocks: September 11.” The series featured *Road to Guantanamo*—a fictional portrayal of the three recently released British Guantanamo detainees; *Iraq in Fragments*—a documentary from contemporary war-torn Iraq; and *Underexposed*—the first feature film shot in Baghdad after the fall of Saddam Hussein. The series ran September 11 through September 13, 2006, and included a Q&A with Abdul Sattar Jawad, visiting scholar at Duke’s John Hope Franklin Center as well as a faculty panel with Jane Gaines (English and Literature), Bruce Lawrence (Religious Studies), Madeline Morris (Law), David Schanzer (Public Policy), and the series organizers.

Charlotte Pierce Baker has accepted a position at Vanderbilt University in the departments of English and Women’s and Gender Studies. Prior to her move, she completed her book manuscript, *No Sunshine When He’s Gone: One Family’s Struggle with Their Bipolar Son*. The book will be published by McGraw-Hill and may be available sometime next spring.

Rebecca Stein, Assistant Professor in Cultural Anthropology and Associate faculty in Women’s Studies, has a new book forthcoming from Duke University Press called *National Itineraries: Tourism, Coloniality, and Cultural Politics in Contemporary Israel*. She is turning now to a new project on “repossession” that investigates how expropriated, stolen, or otherwise repossessed Palestinian property was absorbed into Israeli society and the social meanings that attended this process. She writes, “While most of the scholarship on Palestinian property losses has focused on Palestinian land, my investigation focuses on everyday Palestinian objects of variable form and function—including furniture, folklore, household goods and appliances. In the broadest terms, this study aims to expand the scholarly conversation about the history of Israeli nation-making, the legacy of Palestinian dispossession, and the relationship between them.”

Kathi Weeks, Associate Professor in Women’s Studies, is spending the fall semester teaching for the Duke study abroad program in Italy at Venice International University. Professor Weeks’s course on Gender and Everyday Life is the first gender studies course taught in Duke in Venice. It explores the subjectivities, institutions, and politics of gender, with special attention to the Italian context. She has students in the class from Duke, Boston College, Waseda University (Japan), Tilburg University (Netherlands), Tel Aviv University (Israel), and Ludwig Maximilians University (Germany).
Women’s Studies Applauded in External Review

Last fall, the Women’s Studies Program underwent an external review that affirmed its status as a rigorous, innovative program that provides leadership for the field nationally. The review was part of the normal cycle of assessment conducted systematically at Duke and elsewhere, and featured a team of scholars from three different Women’s Studies programs who spent two days on campus last November to gather information. Their report, which included both evaluation and recommendation, was submitted to the dean of the Graduate School.

The report was overwhelmingly complementary to the program. The external committee lauded the program’s curricular efforts to create “an intellectual project in which intersectional analysis and critical approaches to race, gender, sexuality, and class are understood from transnational and postcolonial approaches. These approaches bring together what was formerly the more U.S.-based curriculum (as were most women’s studies curricula across the country) into connection with what are understood as ‘international’ issues, rather than seeing these as separated.” In doing so, it found the curriculum “distinctive and innovative,” and widely conversant in “key theoretical debates in both humanities and social sciences.”

In addition to its strong curriculum, Women’s Studies was praised for its contributions to the intellectual atmosphere at Duke more generally. “Few similar programs have the intellectual strength and excitement of this one. . . . A great number of the Duke faculty members we spoke to in the two days of meetings in November testified to what they saw as the outstanding contribution of Women’s Studies to the intellectual life of the university as well as to the development of their own research goals.” Students who were interviewed for the report also noted that the program faculty extended themselves to students in a manner that reflected “genuine care” and treated them as “intellectual peers.” The External Review team concluded in their report, “we believe strongly that the current profile of the Women’s Studies Program will be the light that attracts the best scholars in gender and feminism to Duke.”

The External Review team was comprised of Inderpal Grewal, Professor of Women’s Studies, University of California; Judith Howard, Divisional Dean of Social Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle; and Amy Villarejo, Associate Professor and Director of the Feminist, Gender and Sexuality Studies Program, Cornell University.

A copy of the final External Review Committee report can be obtained by contacting Program Coordinator Susan Perry at 919-684-3655.

Graduate Scholars Colloquium

Off to a Great Start

Calvin Hui

The Graduate Scholars Colloquium provides vibrant intellectual exchange and engagement for graduate students across the disciplines involved in the study of gender and its multiple social, cultural, political, and material implications. The colloquium is designed to address issues emerging out of the work of its participants, as well as urgent questions in feminist studies. This academic year, Fiona Barnett (Literature, Duke) and Calvin Hui (Literature, Duke), who are also pursuing the Graduate Certificate in Women’s Studies, are the colloquium’s co-directors. They can be contacted at fiona.barnett@duke.edu and kh42@duke.edu respectively.

Robyn Wiegman, Women’s Studies Program Director, was the first speaker in the Colloquium, which meets monthly in the East Duke Parlors. In the meeting, she presented her article, “The Desire for Gender,” and introduced the audience to the larger book project on identity objects of study in the U.S. university. Many graduate students attended this event (we didn’t have enough chairs!) and they were all intrigued by Professor Wiegman’s theoretical insights into feminist studies, queer studies, American studies, and critical race theories. The discussion was so dynamic that the event ran 30 minutes overtime. Many students said they would definitely come back for the fall and spring events.

In October, our second speaker was Kinohi Nishikawa (Literature, Duke). He presented his project, “The Pimp, the Queen, His Life and Her Mother,” and Professor Mark Anthony Neal (African and African-American Studies, Duke) served as respondent. Graduate students learned a great deal about print culture as well as the racial and gender politics in the United States.

The special event of the colloquium in the fall was Professor Elizabeth Povinelli’s (Anthropology, Columbia) visit to Duke. In this two-day lecture and seminar, Professor Povinelli presented work from her most recent book, The Empire of Love: Toward a Theory of Intimacy, Genealogy, and Carnality (Duke University Press, 2006). By mediating on the indigenous populations in Australia and the North American radical faeries, she studies the ways that intimate relations serve as the pivotal domain for liberal governance.

The December meeting is a professional workshop that helps graduate students prepare for the job market. In the spring, Cindy Current (English, UNC) will give her presentation on late nineteenth-century U.S. literature and science studies. And in April 2007, Britt Ruserts (English, Duke) will present on American literature, science and technology studies, and race and feminist studies.

To become a member of the Graduate Scholars Colloquium, contact Susan Perry at susan.perry@duke.edu.

Calvin Hui is a doctoral candidate in the Program in Literature and is enrolled in the graduate certificate program in Women’s Studies. He is in his second year as co-organizer of the Graduate Scholars Colloquium.
Feminist Studies Across the Disciplines

Lecture Series

In September, Professor Jennifer Terry, Director and Associate Professor of the Program in Women’s Studies at the University of California at Irvine, presented a lecture on “Governmentality, Sentimentality, and Imperial Erotics in Amateur Media Works by U.S. Soldiers.” The talk looked at documentary footage from soldiers currently stationed in Iraq. Professor Terry is the co-founder of Professors for Peace, an international network of educators established in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 that is committed to promoting nonviolent solutions to global conflicts and countering racism and anti-immigration aggression. Her presentation was part of her ongoing book project on militarism and masculinity in the present context of total war.

The second speaker in the Lecture Series was Elizabeth Povinelli, Professor of Anthropology at Columbia University and author of The Empire of Love: Toward a Theory of Intimacy, Genealogy, and Carnality, published by Duke University Press (2006). In her public talk and luncheon seminar, Dr. Povinelli presented sections of her recently released book. She describes her research as an attempt to develop “a critical theory of late liberalism grounded in theories of the translation, transfiguration and the circulation of values, materialities, and socialities within settler liberalism.” As an anthropologist who studies intimacy and sexuality, she became well known with her publications on Australia, multiculturalism, and indigeneity.

The final visitor in the series in the fall was Northwestern University Professor Laura Kipnis, who read from her newly published book, The Female Thing: Dirt, Sex, Envy, Vulnerability, at the Regulator on November 7, 2006, at 7 pm. Professor Kipnis is in the Department of Radio and Television-Film and known for her provocative rethinking of questions of sex, embodiment, and intimacy. Her earlier book, Against Love: A Polemic, was no less controversial than her writings on pornography and Marx. She offered a luncheon seminar for faculty and graduate students on November 8 from 11 am to 1 pm.

UPCOMING COURSES

Looking Ahead to Spring 2007: Classes Offered by Women’s Studies

Though it is fall on the calendar, the program has been busy preparing its course schedule for spring 2007. The familiar core courses will be offered: WST 90 Gender and Everyday Life, WST 160 Feminism in Historical Context, WST 161 Money, Sex and Power, and WST 163 Interpreting Bodies: Identity and Beyond, along with two new courses for the 160s series: WST 165 Gender and Political Theory (cross-listed with Political Science) and WST 166 Ethics, Rights, and the Subject. Gender and Political Theory, taught by Kathi Rudy, will focus on a feminist analysis of and engagement with some of the canonical texts and traditional concepts of Western political theory, including the ways that feminists have contributed to, challenged, and revised the terms of the key conceptual and political debates in political theory. Ethics, Rights, and the Subject will review significant ethical developments and issues in contemporary society, including ethical principles and concepts behind international debates on such matters as democracy, human rights, animal rights, sexual ethics, abortion, labor, asylum, ecology, medical rights, violence, and corporate responsibilities as well as feminist perspectives and analysis of systems of domination. This spring, Kathy Rudy will base the course on her investigation into the ethics of human use of animals by studying the overlapping conversations of “animal rights” and “species-ism.”

Robyn Wiegman will reprise her version of WST 220 Foundations of Feminist Theory, which serves as an in-depth introduction to the various theoretical frameworks that have informed and continue to inform scholarship in the field of Women’s Studies. As in the past, readings will be drawn from a wide array of disciplinary arenas, including law, political science, cultural studies, philosophy, anthropology, comparative ethnic studies, African American Studies, queer studies, postcolonial studies, and literary studies.

Ara Wilson, Director of the Sexuality Studies program (see interview in this issue), will teach the Introduction to the Study of Sexualities, which has received great reviews from students this fall. In addition, Margot Weiss, Visiting Assistant Professor of Cultural Anthropology, and Anne Allison, Professor and Chair of the Cultural Anthropology Department and Associate Faculty of Women’s Studies, will co-teach a course cross-listed with Anthropology and Women’s Studies called Hook-Up Culture at Duke. The goal of the course is twofold: (1) to understand “hooking up” at Duke in terms of larger frameworks of sex, gender, power, and capital; and (2) to enable students to assess both the nature of Duke hook-ups and the institutional setting of Duke itself as part of the ongoing Campus Culture Initiative. The spring schedule features:

- WST 90 Gender and Everyday Life - Jonna Eagle
- WST 160 Feminism in Historical Context – Caroline Light
- WST 161 Money, Sex and Power – Genna Miller
- WST 163 Interpreting Bodies: Identity and Beyond – Kathy Rudy
- WST 165 Gender and Political Theory (cross-listed with Political Science) – Kathi Weeks
- WST 166 Ethics, Rights, and the Subject. Gender and Political Theory – Kathy Rudy
- WST 150S.01 Women at Work (cross-listed with Sociology) – Martha Reeves
- WST 150S.02 Subjects of Alienation: Representations of 20th-Century South Asian Women (cross-listed with Literature) – Sri Mukherjee
- WST 150S.03 Gender and the Global Assembly Line (cross-listed with Economics) – Genna Miller
- WST 150S.04 Time & Difference: Evolution, Genomics the Organizations of Race, Sex, Gender – Cynthia Current
- WST 180S Feminism and Cross-Cultural Experience (cross-listed with Romance Studies) – Stephanie Sieburth
- WST 195 Senior Seminar: The Theory and Politics of Women’s Studies – Robyn Wiegman
- WST 205 Debates in Women’s Studies – Kathi Weeks
- WST 220 Foundations of Feminist Theory – Robyn Wiegman
- WST 300.01 Race/Photography/Archive – Tina Campt
- WST 300.02 NGOs, Human Rights, and Transnational Feminist Theory – Ara Wilson
Upcoming Spring Events


A diverse group of scholars are convening for a conference in January at Duke organized by the Program in Literature. According to materials provided by the program, the conference will examine the seismic shift in the organization of the world’s economies, cultures, political and societal formations, and processes of knowledge production. Speakers include: Christopher Newfield (English, UC-Santa Barbara); Judith Butler (Rhetoric, Berkeley); Sheila Jasanoff (Kennedy School of Government, Harvard); Saskia Sassen (Sociology, Chicago); Lewis Gordon (Philosophy, Temple); Linda Alcoff (Philosophy, Syracuse); and Avery Gordon (Sociology, UC-Santa Barbara). Various campus units, including Women’s Studies, will co-sponsor.

Ethnopornography Conference, March 29-31, 2007

An international conference on ethnopornography, coordinated by Pete Sigal, Department of History, and Neil Whitehead, the editor of Ethnohistory and Professor of Anthropology at the University of Wisconsin, will take place next March at Duke during Women’s History Month. The conference plan includes a series of workshops over two days and a final day of roundtables and a keynote address. The conference aims to examine the ways in which the “native informant” in ethnography and the “racialized body” in pornography promote a search for the truth about desire for the Other. Through an interdisciplinary exploration of the connections between the colonizer’s gaze and the creation of modern concepts of race, sexuality, and ultimately pornography, the conference hopes to generate broad conversations about knowledge production. Women’s Studies and Sexuality Studies are co-sponsors, along with other departments and institutes at Duke.


Details about this workshop listed on this newsletter cover page.

Gender, War and Politics: The Wars of Revolution and Liberation-Transatlantic Comparisons, 1775-1820; University of North Carolina, May 17-19, 2007

The Program in Women’s Studies will join the History Department as a sponsor of this spring conference at UNC. The conference will focus on the relationship between war, the shaping of political and national identities, and changing gender regimes in the period between 1775 and 1820. It will consider how far the mobilization of men for war contributed to more rigid notions of masculinity and femininity, constructed in relation to other categories of difference, in particular, class, ethnicity, race and religion. At the same time, the conference will recognize and explore ways in which women, while barred from military service, nonetheless continued to participate in military institutions—as cross-dressers, camp followers, nurses, and food suppliers. The conference is organized primarily by Karen Hagemann (History, UNC). Dominique Godinou of the Université de Rennes will be the conference keynote. Other contributors include: Gisela Mettele (German Historical Institute), Katharine Axtalad (West Virginia University), Dirk Bonker (History, Duke), Chad Bryant (History, UNC), Kathleen DuVal (History, UNC), Barbara Harris (History, UNC), Judith Miller (History, Emory), and Jane Rendall (Centre for Eighteenth Century Studies, University of York).

Gender, Empire, and the Politics of Central and European Europe, Central European University, Budapest, Hungary, May 17-18, 2007

A three-year collaborative project with the Central European University and the University of Washington begins next May with an international symposium in Budapest on “Gender, Empire, and the Politics of Central and Eastern Europe.” Organized by Allaine Cerwonka, head of the Department of Gender Studies at Central European University; Eva Cherniavsky, Hilen Professor of American Literature and Culture at the University of Washington; and Robyn Wiegman of Duke, the symposium is designed to foreground the different emphases, histories, and modes of inquiry that characterize gender studies in various world contexts, with the case of Central and Eastern Europe as our starting point. This region is particularly interesting today, as national university systems across Europe are being integrated under the auspices of the European Union, and new migration patterns affect the ethnic and gender organizations of everyday life. The symposium seeks to explore and contextualize the collision between capitalist democracy and various kinds of socialism in this world region to think more comprehensively about globalization. The organizers frame this inquiry under the category of “empire” to think through a series of important global reconfigurations of power: from the former East’s critique of the West, to Western Europe’s resistance to U.S. empire, to the very different histories and trajectories of Soviet power in the region. The symposium thus imagines empire as both geopolitically mobile and historically transforming, and seeks to contextualize the “West” as part of the elaboration of gender studies in a transnational framework.

Jean Fox O’Barr Professorship in Interdisciplinary Feminist Studies

The Program in Women’s Studies invites applications for the Jean Fox O’Barr Professorship in Interdisciplinary Feminist Studies to begin September 1, 2007. We seek a distinguished scholar at the rank of tenured full professor who has an internationally recognized research record in feminist studies; demonstrable commitment to Women’s Studies as a field; and experience in interdisciplinary teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Applications received by December 15, 2006, will be guaranteed consideration.

Send applications, CV, and names of three recommenders to Robyn Wiegman, Director, Women’s Studies, Box 90760, 210 East Duke Building, Durham, NC 27708. Our program information is available at www.duke.edu/womstud.

Duke University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.
Become a Friend of Women’s Studies!

Become a Friend of Women’s Studies! Your gift of $50 or more makes it possible to publish this newsletter and report on Women’s Studies scholarship. Contributions to Friends and other endowments also support on-campus and regional Women’s Studies events and help to continue our outreach to alumnae/i.

* Gifts by check can be mailed with this form in the enclosed envelope.

* Or you may make your gift by credit card at Duke’s secure credit card site
  http://www.duke.edu/womstud/aftergrad/contributing.html

  Please mention code NFO6, Fund Code 399-2735. Or fill out the form below.

☐ YES! I am a Friend of Women’s Studies and would like to continue receiving the newsletter twice a year, as well as invitations and notices about upcoming events.

Please find enclosed my check for $_______ ($50 or more)

Please charge my credit card account:

  Card Type (Master Card, Visa, etc) ________________________________

  Amount $_______

  Account number _________________________________________________

  Exp. Date _______ Signature ________________________

For Office Use Only: Technique code NFO6, Fund Code 399-2735