Journal of Feminist Scholarship

Issue 2 (Spring 2012)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITORS

We are delighted to announce the second issue of the *Journal of Feminist Scholarship* (*JFS*). The fundamental aims of *JFS* are to offer an open-access academic forum for the publication of innovative, peer-reviewed feminist scholarship across the disciplines and to encourage productive debates among scholars and activists interested in examining methodological directions and political contexts and ramifications of feminist inquiry.

The *Journal of Feminist Scholarship* is pleased to announce the formation of our Advisory Board. We are joined by distinguished feminist scholars working across the disciplines and in the community: Debra Ann Castillo, Elora Chowdhury, Agnieszka Graff, Elizabeth Grosz, Joy A. James, Carla Kaplan, Michael Kimmel, Gary Lemons, Robyn Ochs, Karen Offen, and Nikki Sullivan. We extend a warm welcome to our new Advisory Board members and appreciate their willingness to contribute to the mission of the journal.

The articles we have chosen for the main section of our second issue build upon the breadth of contemporary feminist inquiry demonstrated by the first issue of *JFS*. The second issue has at its core three insightful and in-depth analyses ranging from an examination of the 1972 feminist text *Novas Cartas Portuguesas* and its intersections with French and Anglo-American theorizing to a challenge to US Women's Studies curricular models for study abroad and global perspectives on women and gender to an article that asks readers to not only better understand intersexed identities but also reconceptualize how we approach difference. Each article is firmly grounded in feminist theory and invites readers to rethink ongoing issues in our culture.

For example, in "Staying Home While Studying Abroad: Anti-Imperial Praxis for Globalizing Feminist Visions," Shireen Roshanravan challenges the field of US Women's Studies to question what Chandra Mohanty has identified as the "feminist-as-tourist" curricular model. Specifically, Roshanravan argues against current study-abroad opportunities that claim to introduce students to global perspectives on women and gender while continuing to skirt the problem of US-centrism in Women's Studies. Instead, Roshanravan suggests a need for the field to approach the practice of study abroad through a reinvestment in understanding and applying the radical genealogies and epistemologies of US Women of Color, a strategy she identifies as "the anti-imperial feminist praxis of 'staying home.'"

Ana Margarida Dias Martins turns our attention to the feminist literary and theoretical canon as she focuses on the text *Novas Cartas Portuguesas* (*New Portuguese Letters*), published in 1972 and co-authored by Portuguese writers Maria Isabel Barreno, Maria Teresa Horta, and Maria Velho da Costa. Martins reassesses the internationalization of *Novas Cartas Portuguesas* in order to understand what forces, both theoretical and political, kept the text from becoming an established part of feminist literary canons in Europe or the United States, while also exposing how it contributed to 1970s feminist intellectual conversations and movement. In doing so, Martins also argues for further reanalysis of *Novas Cartas Portuguesas* in order to understand the often overlooked relationship between French and Anglo-American feminisms and texts from outside the Franco-Anglophone spectrum.

The issue's third article comes from Amy Falvey who offers an incisive analysis of the rhetoric of protection that emerges around intersexed infants who face the prospect of normalizing surgeries. Falvey argues that the typical justification for normalizing surgeries from both physicians and parents is the "protection" of the child whose body does not conform to social, morphological, and biological norms. Pressing on this central notion, Falvey asks whether there are other narratives or concepts of protection that can also be employed in such contexts. Ultimately, her discussion leads us to consider how we understand—and respond to—physical difference.

The final article in the issue is a "Viewpoint." As we established with our first issue, "Viewpoint" is a space to showcase new directions in feminist inquiry and practice and to feature commentaries on ongoing debates in contemporary feminist scholarship and pedagogy. We also see "Viewpoint" as a forum for reconsiderations of issues central to feminism at large, as well as a space to share information on innovative and useful resources for feminist studies. Kimala Price's essay discusses the challenges of crossing disciplinary boundaries in the academy, drawing both on her own experiences and on the academic literature on interdisciplinarity. She points out that there is surprisingly little work done on the experiences and challenges of those working across disciplines in the field of Women's Studies. The "Viewpoint" format allows Price to make sense of her own particular experiences, experiences she believes are shared by others in interdisciplinary programs.

In closing, we would also like to announce the appointment of Anna M. Klobucka to the position of Executive Editor of the *Journal of Feminist Scholarship* for a two-year term. Co-editors Catherine Villanueva Gardner and Jeannette E. Riley are pleased to see Anna taking the helm as we build the scope and audience for *JFS*.

The double-anonymous review process followed by *JFS* necessitates that our manuscript reviewers remain unnamed, but we would like to take this opportunity to extend a thank-you to them as a group.

Staying Home While Studying Abroad: Anti-Imperial Praxis for Globalizing Feminist Visions

Shireen Roshanravan, Kansas State University

Abstract: This paper hinges on the recognition that when study-abroad opportunities are presented and perceived as a means of access to global perspectives on women and gender, they reduce the problem of US-centrism in Women's Studies to a geographic rather than an epistemic limitation. According to this logic, physical travel away from the United States can serve as an effective method for overcoming US-centrism and attending to the "global," a curricular strategy that Chandra Mohanty and M. Jacqui Alexander call "the cartographic rule of the transnational as always 'elsewhere'" (Mohanty and Alexander 2010, 33). This cartographic rule reinforces hegemonic representations of the United States as a unified "modern" white/Anglo nation against which the culturally Other terrain of the "global" becomes understandable. As such, the study-abroad approach to internationalizing US Women's Studies relies on the re-erasure of US Women of Color genealogies and epistemologies that disrupt the white/Anglo cultural assumptions grounding the field's central category of "woman/women." If challenging US-centrism in US Women's Studies is meant to dismantle the white/Anglo monocultural perspective of US imperialism, I argue that the geographic travel imperative of "study abroad" must be tempered by a re-inhabitation of the field through the radical genealogies and epistemologies of US Women of Color, a strategy I call the anti-imperial feminist praxis of "staying home."

Keywords: women of color, global feminism, study abroad, women's studies

Efforts to internationalize US Women's Studies programs and departments increasingly entail institutionalizing study abroad as part of the curriculum. Although not explicitly tourist in their orientation, such university study-abroad programs attract predominantly white/Anglo students whose participation is often motivated by a desire to gain a careerist advantage in the global marketplace and/or to "satisfy a desire to travel and to have fun" (Salisbury 2010, 43; Jessup-Anger 2008, 360). While this academic travel seems, on the surface, not only professionally productive for students but also intellectually and academically "progressive" on the programmatic level, it carries with it an often unseen and unremarked Occidentalist logic.[1] That is, university study-abroad initiatives often rely on the modernist paradigm that centers a normative Euro-American "local" as the seat of modernity against which the culturally different and geographically distant realm of the "global" becomes legible. Accordingly, institutionalizing study abroad as a means of internationalizing Women's Studies curriculum risks feeding what Chandra Mohanty has analyzed as the "feminist-as-tourist" curricular model. Such a model, Mohanty argues, grounds the "local" in nationalist assumptions, reproduces ideas of center and margin along Eurocentric lines, and "confirms the sense of the 'evolved U.S./Euro feminist'" (Mohanty 2003, 239). In accordance with Mohanty's call to push against such imperialist feminist curricular models, this paper develops a politics of "staying home" that negotiates the study-abroad logics that can manifest in efforts to internationalize the contemporary field of US Women's Studies.

My paper hinges on the recognition that when study-abroad opportunities are presented and perceived as a means of access to global perspectives on women and gender, they reduce the problem of US-centrism in Women's Studies to a geographic rather than an epistemic limitation.[2] According to this logic, physical travel away from the United States can serve as an effective method for overcoming US-centrism and attending to the "global," a curricular strategy that Chandra Mohanty and M. Jacqui Alexander call "the cartographic rule of the transnational as always 'elsewhere'" (Mohanty and Alexander 2010, 33). This cartographic rule reinforces hegemonic representations of the United States as a unified "modern" white/Anglo nation against which the culturally Other terrain of the "global" becomes understandable. As such, the study-abroad approach to internationalizing US Women's Studies relies on the re-erasure of US Women of Color genealogies and epistemologies that disrupt the white/Anglo cultural assumptions grounding the field's central category of "woman/women." If challenging US-centrism in US Women's Studies is meant to dismantle the white/Anglo monocultural perspective of US imperialism, I argue that the geographic travel imperative of "study abroad" must be tempered by a re-inhabitation of the field through the radical genealogies and epistemologies of US Women of Color, a strategy I call the anti-imperial feminist praxis of "staying home."

Haunani-Kay Trask's articulate anger at and hatred for the United States as a settler-colonial state motivates my formulation of an anti-imperial praxis of "staying home."[3] In *From a Native Daughter*, Trask powerfully details the neocolonial destruction of her native Hawaii by the tourist industry, making clear that global travel to her homeland has created two coexisting Hawaiis—a tourist paradise and a native Hawaiian nightmare. Trask's juxtaposition of a colonized Hawaii alongside its tourist construction exposes her homeland as fractured and, in the process, fractures the hegemonic US national imaginary. Because the colonial construction of Hawaii and the United States renders indigenous peoples nonexistent or zombified relics of a primitive past, the epistemic fracturing of this colonial construction is inextricably tied to seeing indigenous peoples as active resistant subjects whose perceptions of reality conflict with those institutionalized by the US nation-state. The epistemic fracturing enables a double vision of the United States that is anchored in the perspective of the colonized; specifically, the indigenous view of the United States as "foreign occupier" clashes against its institutionalized representation as a homogeneous unified nation of immigrants. As "foreign occupier," the United States is visible as a primary site of global violence sustained by circuits of colonial and global capitalist travel that render it dependent on the conquest, occupation, and exploitation of other peoples' homelands. From this perspective, Trask issues the following directive as a call to accountability for the non-native Hawaiian reader: "If you are thinking of visiting my homeland, please do not.... If you want to help our cause, pass this message on to your friends" (Trask 1999, 146).

One can hear Trask's directive as an anti-imperial praxis for cross-cultural solidarity that is tied to a politics of "staying home," whereby "*staying* home" is understood as *fracturing* the familiar ideological and epistemic boundaries that constitute one's sense of home by *re-inhabiting* one's geographic home through the lens of the colonized and racially dispossessed. The fracturing of familiar ideological and epistemic boundaries of home involved in this "re-inhabitation" requires "staying" or suspending culturally specific assumptions of self and home to enable one to employ the lens of non-dominant others on whose exclusion or distortion one's sense of "home" is built. Because the colonized and racially dispossessed are historically constructed as outsiders in their own "home," re-inhabiting "home" through their lens would necessitate engaging, for example, disjunctions and confrontations between indigenous and settler colonial histories. In this formulation, an anti-imperialist politics of "staying home" refuses tourist travel or nomadic flight from

the consciousness of one's complicity in located histories of struggle and demands a historical awareness of the locus informing one's basic assumptions of self and other, home and away. Employing such a politics in efforts to internationalize US Women's Studies curriculum would dismantle homogeneous or innocent narratives of "home" as the seat of modern progress from which the knowing US feminist must travel to discover, to consume, or to save the cultural Other.

The politics of "staying home" that I elaborate here builds on Mohanty's "feminist solidarity" curricular model, which conceives of the local and the global as relationally forged through colonial histories and thus emphasizes the interconnectedness and co-implication of histories, experiences, and struggles of different women within and across national borders (Mohanty 2003, 242). An anti-imperialist feminist politics of "staying home" incorporates these principles as well as Mohanty's later emphasis on making US imperialist feminist complicities visible by challenging the role of hegemonic second-wave white feminist epistemologies and genealogies in US Women's Studies (Mohanty 2006, 17). Because I seek to address the Occidentalism that manifests in study-abroad logics, I especially heed her analysis of the need for US Women's Studies to counter citizenship narratives that uphold the US self-image as "that of a benevolent, 'civilized' white paternal nation bringing democracy to the rest of the world" (Mohanty 2006, 10). I thus offer the politics of "staying home" as one of many methodological tools that can enact Mohanty's anti-imperialist feminist praxis in efforts to internationalize US Women's Studies curricula, particularly those keen on incorporating study-abroad programs.

Methodologically, an anti-imperial praxis of "staying home" in US Women's Studies involves two simultaneous and interdependent epistemic shifts: *fracturing* the central universalized concept of "women" and the hegemonic/white "waves" genealogy that ground mainstream US feminism by *re-inhabiting* the geography of US feminisms through the genealogies and political perspectives of US Women of Color.[4] Specifically, I highlight the following US Women of Color feminist genealogies and methodologies that jam the study-abroad logics of US academic feminist global initiatives: (1) the Third World Women's Alliance of the late 1960s and early 1970s; (2) the coalitional politics of connecting through non-dominant differences; and (3) the geo- and body-politics of reading and inhabiting contradictions.[5]

An early Women of Color political formation of the 1960s and early 1970s, the Third World Women's Alliance emphasized critiques of US imperialism and transnational connections between struggles against oppression in the United States and those waged by women in Asia, Africa, and Latin America (Women of Color Resource Center 2008). Remembering this radical US Women of Color genealogy disrupts the "chronopolitics"—or Eurocentric evolutionary logic—of the hegemonic "waves" periodization of US feminist history.[6] As Andrea Smith argues, this hegemonic feminist genealogy centers white/Anglo women's actions as the evolutionary motor of feminism, with Women of Color feminism emerging as a transitory "phase" in the 1980s (Smith 2006). The contemporary push to internationalize US Women's Studies curriculum follows the logic of this evolutionary motor when it eclipses US Women of Color politics on the justification that it is time to move on to the more expansive concerns of a "global" feminism. Key to dismantling this colonial modern narrative of US feminism and US Women's Studies is fracturing the unified and universalized category of "woman/women" that anchors mainstream feminist genealogies and epistemologies. Because white/Anglo cultural standards of intelligibility define the universalized category of "woman/women" anchoring US Women's Studies, white/Anglo women and their stories constitute the central subject of concern in studies of "women's history" or "women's issues" (Barkley Brown 1991). An investment in concepts like "women in general" as the primary subject of US Women's Studies thus contributes to the forgetting of US Women of Color genealogies as well as to the imperialist assumption

of a white/Anglo feminist protagonist who must now go "global." To counter this epistemic imperialism, US Women of Color theorize and enact a politics of cross-cultural solidarity grounded in non-dominant differences (rather than sameness) amongst women and a commitment to inhabit and read (rather than resolve) epistemic contradictions born of uneven historical relations of power.

To the non-indigenous inhabitant of the US mainland, Trask's political directive invokes many contradictions, including learning to hate one's own geopolitical "home" (for its colonial foundations) without recourse to a geographic or epistemic escape from that "home." Politically identified US Women of Color actively inhabit and theorize these historical, political, and epistemic contradictions and thus provide a particularly strategic locus from which to imagine a global feminist politics that does not re-inscribe hierarchical imperial dichotomies of "us" and "them" in the way that study-abroad rationales and rhetorics often do. Affirming non-dominant differences, contradiction, and historical relationality, US Women of Color politics fractures mainstream US feminism's emphasis on singular, coherent, and categorial constructions of "women's" struggles across time and space and thus methodologically challenges an imperialist measure of others against a white/Anglo US standard.[7]

Occidentalist Trajectories of Global Feminism and "US-Centric" Elisions of Women of Color

Before I examine the logics of study-abroad initiatives themselves, I must first map out the eclipsing of Women of Color feminisms by the supposedly "global" turn in US Women's Studies to show how its erasure impacts the (anti)imperialist orientations that travel-abroad programs can take in US Women's Studies. The centrality of US Women of Color politics to an anti-imperial, anti-US-centric global feminist perspective rests in its persistent fracturing of mainstream US feminism's fundamental category of analysis, namely "woman" or "women."[8] Sojourner Truth's famed rhetorical refrain, "Ain't I a woman?," punctuating her speech at the 1851 Women's Convention in Akron, Ohio, is a clear early recognition of racist exclusions from the white/Anglo bourgeois construction of "woman" and the limited feminist campaigns that this category mobilized and continues to anchor (Davis 1983). The 1960s emergence of US Women of Color as a coalitional political formation saw further theoretical elaboration of Truth's insight. African, Asian, Arab American, and Latina women forged political organizations like the Third World Women's Alliance and developed concepts like "double jeopardy" and "triple jeopardy" to explain their simultaneous experience of racism, sexism, and capitalist exploitation (Women of Color Resource Center 2008). Excluded from a white/Anglo women's liberation movement and marginalized within masculinist community-based mobilizations for racial and economic justice, Women of Color refused the assumption that gender or race, as singular and separable categories of identification, could serve as the basis for any political unity without mandating racist or sexist exclusions (Lowe 1997; Burnham 2001; Women of Color Resource Center 2008).

By fracturing "woman" as a universally applicable category of analysis in feminism, US Women of Color politics unsettles the search for universal truths and encourages, instead, a consciousness of one's own epistemic limits across unfamiliar sociohistorical and cultural terrain. Taking seriously this epistemic uncertainty, the desire to know about "women" across racial, cultural, class, sexual, and geopolitical boundaries would require asking basic questions such as those formulated by Oyeronke Oyewumi in her book *The Invention of Women: Making African Sense of Gender*: "Who qualifies to be women in this cultural setting, and on what bases are they to be identified?" (Oyewumi 1998, 16). US Women of Color theoretical interventions motivate these very questions in their challenge to the fundamental unit of analysis—"woman"—in mainstream/white US feminism. Consequently, the dismissal of Women of Color theories and of women of color as "US-centric" subjects from the "global turn" of study-abroad programs in

US Women's Studies forwards a dangerously invisible imperialist indifference. The recognition of such an elision makes legible the culturally limited epistemic tools that continue to structure the (mis)diagnosis of problems and prescribed solutions for the plight of "women" across time and place.

In her essay, "Feminist Scholarship and the Internationalization of Women's Studies," Minoo Moallem argues that an unwillingness to let go of universal truths about "women" produces internationalizing efforts that render feminism complicit with the logic of colonial modernity. Through a review of feminist volumes with an international focus published in the last decade, Moallem identifies a strong tendency to advance an avant-garde feminist subject/discourse motored by a rational will to universal truths (e.g., women's liberation globally depends on x). She notes that even feminist scholarship critical of imperialist formulations of "global sisterhood" relies on a feminist framework that proposes a universal map that can lead all women—including and especially the "most marginalized"—to liberation from all structures of oppression.[9] Such scholarship upholds the colonial modern "myth of progress" in which the non-Western "other" must always exist as a victimized subject in need of (Western) saving, mobilization, or illumination.[10] Consequently, those outside the non-West become the primary subjects (in need) of internationalizing initiatives, while feminists in the West become the ones who must "go global" and orchestrate the criteria and terms of the internationalization progress. According to this logic, study abroad literally enables the US feminist scholar to "go global" and thus becomes a fulfillment of the (colonial modern) "transnational imperative" in US Women's Studies.[11]

Although Moallem concludes that feminist departures from the logic of colonial modernity require attention to the complicities and discontinuities between "women" and their feminist enactments, she distorts—however unwittingly—the potential role of US Women of Color politics in accomplishing this methodological intervention. Her brief mention of US Women of Color comes in her critique of Adrien Katherine Wing's generalized use of the identity in the anthology *Global Critical Race Feminism*. Wing uses the identity as a lens to read the different ways "women" are simultaneously oppressed and privileged through multiple social categories like race, gender, class, nationality, and so on. This generalization of a historically and geopolitically specific identity not only distorts understandings of "women" in locations where gender and racial violence manifest distinctly but also falsely reduces Women of Color to an oppositional identity politics overdetermined by dominant logics of categorial exclusion.[12] While Moallem identifies Wing's "US-centrism" in her failure to interrogate the shifting meaning and salience of these social categories across geopolitical contexts, she overlooks how Wing's distortion of Women of Color identity, via its generalization, is also an enactment of US-centric thinking. That is, the politics that historically grounds Women of Color identity challenges the mono-logic of U.S imperialism and thus rejects the universalization of culturally and sociohistorically specific identities. By not clarifying this, Moallem risks furthering the assumption that Women of Color—as a subject or analytic of feminism—always inevitably produces US-centric formulations of internationalism. If Women of Color is a political identification committed to challenging US imperialism, then Wing's abstracting of the identity from its geopolitical context is a US-centric act that contradicts the politics from which it emerges.

Moallem's critique of Wing's deployment of María Lugones's notion of "world-traveling" further obscures the politics of Women of Color theory. Wing argues that "world-traveling," which she glosses as a way of re-seeing one's self in historical context through the eyes of cultural others, can be employed as a methodology for understanding gender and law in a global context. Moallem cites Wing's definition of "world-travel" as "demanding that we see ourselves in historical context, as the 'other' might see us, and see the 'other' within her own complex cultural context" (Moallem 2006, 346).[13] Her critique of such

"world-traveling" is that it is then imagined as an act only the privileged can accomplish and thus becomes a "romantic way of dealing with … global power relations, where movement and mobility do not happen outside 'the histories of the production of colonial discourses'" (Moallem 2006, 246). However, Moallem herself reduces Lugones's methodology to geographic/physical rather than epistemic travel. By contrast, as I explain in more depth later in this essay, Lugones's concept of "world-traveling" references an epistemic skill in which the oppressed are fluent: they must involuntarily "travel" to the oppressor's "worlds" in order to navigate the hegemonic order of mainstream society. But more to the point, at least in terms of my discussion of the logics that often undergird study-abroad programs in Women's Studies, is that Lugones develops "world-traveling" as central to the politics of Women of Color. According to Lugones, the methodology of "world-traveling" demands cross-cultural and cross-racial coalitional identifications that recognize interdependence with others without reducing the other to a version of one's self. Moallem's inadvertent reduction of "Women of Color" to a US-centric racial and gender identity descriptor blocks recognition of the ways in which Lugones's "world-traveling" speaks to her own demands for cross-cultural feminist theorizing of multiple and contradictory perspectives of interrelated realities forged through interdependent histories of domination and resistance. In doing so, she blocks the multiple tools offered by Women of Color politics to counter the colonial modern study-abroad logics employed in efforts to internationalize US Women's Studies curricula.

According to Sandra K. Soto, this erroneous reduction of Women of Color to a US-centric identity derives from a failure to distinguish "the critical work produced under the sign of 'women of color' from the ways that women's studies has responded to and utilized that work" (Soto 2005, 117). Because Women's Studies scholars have primarily responded to substantive Women of Color critiques by token inclusions of "women of color," the identity has circulated primarily through this institutionalized misrepresentation. As Soto clarifies, the actual critical work by feminists who politically identify as Women of Color rejects essentialized racial-gender identity politics and challenges the field's foundational investment in the universalized Western bourgeois white/Anglo category of "woman" (117). The refusal of mainstream feminism to engage with and see Women of Color as producers of knowledge rather than guilt-inducing symbols of racial difference accounts for the dismissal of Women of Color as passé subjects of a less sophisticated US-centric identity politics. Soto thus makes clear that it is racist US feminist (mis)representation of Women of Color that justifies their re-erasure in the name of transnational feminism.

US Women of Color have historically born the burden of questioning white/Anglo racial-cultural competence in the field of US feminist studies. Consequently, dismissing the politics and subjects of Women of Color as US-centric in the move to a "global feminism" can easily be seen as strategic evasion of local critiques that would decenter white/Anglo perspectives and knowledges still anchoring the field (Holloway 2006; Kaplan 1995; Chowdhury 2006). Yet this dismissal is inextricably tied to upholding Occidentalist formulations of global feminism that conceive of difference and diversification primarily as a quantitative issue measured geographically (in terms of representational samples or discrete case studies funneled through a singular epistemic framework) rather than a political issue measured through epistemic capacities (in terms of one's ability to perceive others through their own cultural logic). Accordingly, geographic—not epistemic—travel becomes a primary method for internationalizing perspectives in the field of US Women's Studies, a process most obviously institutionalized through study-abroad programs.

Global Feminism and the Logic of Study Abroad: Institutional Amnesia and the Re-Centering of White/Anglo Faculty and Students

Just as internationalization efforts in Women's Studies re-center white/Anglo theorizing by jettisoning Women of Color feminism as a narrow US-centric identity, the institutionalization of study-abroad approaches to globalizing perspectives on gender also re-centers white/Anglo students as consumers and knowers of cultural diversity. An assumed connection between "study abroad" and "internationalization" implies that geographic travel away from "home" is either necessary or necessarily beneficial to achieving a "global" feminist perspective. This assumption erases the presence of culturally and racially different inhabitations of gender amongst US people of color. Consider, for example, UC Santa Barbara's advertisement for study abroad in the field of Feminist Studies:

> Feminist Studies has increasingly moved from a primary focus on the United States to a more global vision of the ways that gender, in interaction with race, class, ethnicity, sexuality, age, nationality, religion, ability and other differences, shapes the lives of people everywhere. What better way to understand one's own society than to explore the ways that other cultures organize gender relations differently? (University of California Santa Barbara)

According to the above advertisement, a "more global vision" of gender is hindered by a primary focus on the United States and thus requires geographic travel outside US borders (study abroad). If to be "more global" in one's feminist scholarship involves a quantitative increase in the amount of nations or territories one studies, then "global" becomes a marker of scale, not methodology (Lal et al. 2010, 16). One therefore needs to increase knowledge about women from different geographic locations but does not necessarily need to adjust the frame through which this knowledge is produced. The advertisement assumes this frame to be monocultural, since one must travel outside the United States to "explore" *other* cultures, and it is reasonable to assume that this US monoculture is white/Anglo, given the hegemonic racial-cultural identity of a presumed monocultural "America" (Haney López 1994). In this frame, women of color—including and especially Native American women—disappear as US peoples with heterogeneous cultures and racial identifications, as do the US histories of genocide, enslavement, indentured servitude, colonization, and military occupation from which this cultural-racial plurality emerges.

The marriage of global feminism to study abroad thus shifts the objectifying gaze of white/Eurocentric disciplines from the "domestic minority" to the geographically distant "foreign" cultural other. Many Women's Studies advertisements that link study-abroad opportunities to the development of a global feminist perspective reveal a reduction of the "global" to something one "experiences," a move reminiscent of the reduction of US Women of Color to portals of experience or case studies to which white/Anglo feminist theory can be applied (Alexander and Mohanty 1997, xvii; Soto 2005, 120).[14] When qualifiers like "global" and "of color" turn the subjects to which they are attached into "evidence" that support or illustrate Eurocentric epistemologies, they effectively reproduce the colonial modern logic that would affirm Western Europe and white/Anglo America as the only legitimate base for universalized knowledge production. They thus deny Women of Color and "global" women (read non-US and non-white women) as capable of making methodological and epistemic interventions in US feminist studies.

The UC Santa Barbara's Feminist Studies study-abroad advertisement referenced above provides a glimpse of this colonial modern trajectory in Women's Studies via its connection between "study abroad" and "globalizing" perspectives on gender. Similar Women's Studies advertisements abound across US universities. At St. Cloud State University in Minnesota, Women's and Gender Studies faculty are

encouraged "to incorporate *global* perspectives in teaching and scholarship by way of developing *study abroad* programs to provide diverse global and cultural *experiences* for students" (St. Cloud State University website; emphasis added). Virginia Commonwealth University also describes "study abroad" as a means of providing "students with an *international experience* that focuses on global feminism and *the lives of women around the world*" (Virginia Commonwealth University website; emphasis added). Both university programs equate gaining "global perspectives" with geographic travel away from the United States, link global feminism to learning about the "lives" (rather than the worldviews) of women around the world, and reduce the "global" or "international" to a portal of personal "experience."

Besides reducing the term "global" to a scalar increase in the amount of knowledge one has about women's experiences, the institutional marriage between "study abroad" programs and "global feminist studies" recalls the imperialist institutional genealogy of area studies. For example, the journal *Women in Higher Education* features an article in which the director of the Women's Studies program at St. Ambrose University in Iowa explains how efforts to internationalize Women's Studies have been linked to "the development of courses connected to study abroad programs" as well as to "opportunities for international activism and service such as sponsoring a local refugee family" (Santovec 2008, 23). Internationalization in this case is not only scripted in terms of geographic travel outside the United States via study-abroad programs, but also in terms of "helping" the foreign others who have found refuge in "our home"—the United States. This initiative contains echoes of the "missionary imperialism" grounding state-funded area studies in the United States (Schueller 2007, 43). These echoes become louder when the director also goes on to frame the St. Ambrose program's efforts to internationalize as a strategic means of making Women's Studies more viable within an institution always facing budget cuts. That is, as the US state cuts funding to higher education, proving viability as a disciplinary program tempts accommodation to state-funded initiatives for educational programs that support US state interests in "globally competent" citizens (Santovec 2008, 23; Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship 2005). While concern for program or departmental survival is pressing, the survival technique proposed not only situates study-abroad programs as an extension of US nation-state ideologies, but also relies on an institutional amnesia of the connection between "area studies" and US imperialist investment in knowledge production that furthers neocolonial globalization.

Malini Johar Schueller reminds us of this institutional genealogy of studying cultural others, noting the "missionary imperialism" of the 1843 American Oriental Society, a precursor to the formal establishment of area studies in US universities (Schueller 2007, 43). Title VI of the 1957 National Defense Education Act provided the primary funding for university area studies, explicitly recognizing "that the defense and security of the nation were inseparably bound with education" (Schueller 2007, 43-44; Scarfo 1998, 23). The institutionalization of university-based studies that focus on gaining knowledge about "foreign" territories thus emerged explicitly with US imperialist state interests to know, in order to control or combat, their "foreign" enemies. Remembering imperialist state investments in funding global-education initiatives should caution minoritized academic fields, like Women's Studies, from an unquestioning embrace of institutional celebrations and support for study-abroad programs.

Indeed, given the lack of US students of color who participate in study-abroad programs, institutionalizing study abroad as a method of internationalizing US Women's Studies further privileges white/Anglo students as the consumers and producers of knowledge in the field. The hierarchical racial classification of the world's population in correspondence with access to institutionalized wealth and power (what Aníbal Quijano calls "coloniality of power") explains why those who are most likely to (believe they can and are

entitled to) access the upper echelons of the global marketplace and afford vacations abroad are primarily white/Anglo (Quijano 2000). The overwhelmingly and disproportionately white/Anglo demographic of university study-abroad participants further justifies this claim (Salisbury, Paulsen, and Pascarella 2011, 123). For these students, "global competence" is more readily understood as a careerist asset, as well as an excuse to consume the "foreign" or "exotic," than it would be for US students of color whose daily encounters with racism and ethnocentrism make them painfully competent in issues of diversity and cross-cultural difference. In their investigation of the discrepancy between white/Anglo and racial minority student inclinations to participate in university study-abroad programs, Mark Salisbury, Michael Paulsen, and Ernest Pascarella reveal that an interest in diversity greatly increased white/Anglo students' decisions to study abroad, while it had no effect on racial minority students' desire to do the same. As the authors suggest, students of color "don't need to seek out cross-cultural experiences by traveling to another country because in most cases—especially as students at majority white postsecondary institutions—they already interact across cultural differences every day" (Salisbury, Paulsen, and Pascarella 2010, 143). Therefore, in addition to eliding the place of Women of Color theory, study-abroad logics that equate knowledge of other cultures with geographic travel outside the United States also erase the subordinated cultural differences inhabited by US people of color by ignoring their cross-cultural competence and, by the same token, their everyday experiences of racism. Framing the "global" in terms of study abroad redefines "global competence" as the domain of white/Anglo knowers. As a result, efforts to internationalize the curriculum in terms of geographic travel away from "home" reveal an institutional disregard for US communities of color as crucial sites of cultural diversity from which the field of Women's Studies has much to learn.

I am not discouraging study abroad. I do, however, seek to raise critical questions about the link between "global feminism" and "study abroad," insofar as "globalizing" feminist perspectives on gender becomes synonymous with a focus on geographic (rather than epistemic) travel outside US boundaries. When study-abroad programs are equated with "diversifying" knowledge about women and gender across cultures, they illuminate the existence of a significant programmatic and ideological faultline. Ultimately, this linkage demonstrates that perspectives on gender have failed to be diversified within bounds of US educational institutions. Rather than expanding students' understanding of transnational feminisms, this disciplinary failure will simply reproduce itself in studies outside the United States. The National Women's Studies Association's (NWSA) 2009 and 2010 annual conferences—"Difficult Dialogues" and "Difficult Dialogues II"—highlight this point. Under the direction of prominent US Black feminist scholar Beverly Guy-Sheftall, these NWSA conferences re-centered the unfinished US feminist work of shifting away from thinking of gender as a stand-alone category of identification and recognition. Refusing to let fade away the memory of NWSA as a site of contentious feminist dialogue on issues of race and racism (Sandoval 1990), Guy-Sheftall and Vivian May explain the need to foreground "Difficult Dialogues" in US Women's Studies: "Despite claims that 'everyone' now 'does' (or has always 'done') Women's Studies from intersectional and transnational perspectives, many of the ways in which the politics of both race and nation have been taken up in the field have been more nominal than transformative" (National Women's Studies Association). Guy-Sheftall and May reference Johnella Butler's essays as the source of inspiration for the conference title. In their words, Butler's work explored the "reluctance to engage questions of gender and sexuality in Black Studies and Ethnic Studies, and a reluctance to engage with questions of race and class in Women's Studies" (National Women's Studies Association). The "difficult dialogues" that Guy-Sheftall and May reference involve confronting the stubborn reluctance of the majority population in US feminist studies to engage *racialized gender politics within the United States*. This call to account for US racialized gender politics does not,

however, exclude transnational perspectives in feminism. Indeed, one of the thematic areas highlighted in the conference is "reconceptualizing Women's Studies within the Transnational." The "Difficult Dialogues" called forth by the conference title invoke a subalternized genealogy of global feminism, one that has always conceived the "global" as inseparable from addressing the feminist politics of the "local." It is to this US Women of Color genealogy and its methodological interventions that I now turn.

Subalternized Genealogies of the Transnational Imperative: The Third World Women's Alliance

As outlined at the beginning of this essay, US mainstream feminism's historical narration in terms of a first, second, and third "wave" centers white/Anglo women as the feminist protagonists who encounter Women of Color in the "third wave" and then move on to the more pressing concerns of "global" women. This narration of feminism's history assumes a colonial modern frame of evolutionary history, in which Western Europe and Euro-America initiate civilizing and modernizing progress while the racialized peopled geographies of the Americas, Asia, and Africa remain frozen in a "primitive" past, in need of modernization yet always incapable of it. US Women's Studies, however, is not the only discipline to organize its historical narrative through a colonial modern lens. Colonial modern epistemic frameworks are core to the emergence of most US academic disciplines in the humanities and social sciences, the evidence for which lies in their predominantly masculinist Eurocentric canons defining the parameters of core disciplinary knowledge.

In the 1970s, race-based ethnic studies programs emerged in the United States to counter this institutionalized disciplinary erasure of knowledge by, about, and for those historically denied status as knowers and knowledge producers. Again, as Schueller aptly reminds us, "Restitution of subaltern knowledge … was initiated in the United States most dramatically through racially disenfranchised students who sought both to extend the imperatives of civil rights into education and to link their struggles to those of third-world decolonization" (Schueller 2007, 46). This subaltern historical genealogy unveils an early international consciousness in local struggles against US institutionalized racism, one that is especially evident through the politicized adoption of the term "Third World" amongst US activists and intellectuals of color. Adopting what was originally a racial-economic classification of impoverished (post-)colonized nations, US intellectuals and activists of color like W. E. B. Du Bois and Angela Davis identified as "Third World" to communicate a politics of liberation that linked anti-racist, anti-colonial, and anti-capitalist/imperialist struggles at home and abroad (Young 2006). The 1970s student movements for inclusion of ethnic studies in universities thus operated through an understanding of anti-racism that was inseparable from decolonization and anti-Eurocentrism (Schueller 2007, 46). The goal was not simply to include a course or two on different subordinated US racial-ethnic groups, but rather to challenge the Eurocentric colonial foundations of disciplinary knowledge production. This educational emphasis on race as tied to a decolonial global politics therefore countered the simultaneous institutional genealogy of area studies, which, as mentioned earlier, established itself in universities through the 1957 National Defense Education Act with explicitly imperialist interests to preserve the United States as a global power.

Taking its lead from the 1970s radical race-based movements for decolonizing the university, the growing US women's movement also fought to establish Women's Studies in universities to counter masculinist exclusions central to Eurocentrism (Lutz 2000, 642). Yet the link between the establishment of Women's Studies in the 1970s and the anti-Eurocentric race-based politics that laid the ground for its emergence fades in the mainstream "waves" periodization of US feminism. This historical narrative mirrors that of colonial

modernity's chronopolitics foregrounding the white/Anglo subject in her march towards emancipation, each wave building on the advances of the previous one. Andrea Smith explains:

> In the United States, the first wave is characterized by the suffragette movement; the second wave is characterized by the formation of the National Organization for Women, abortion rights politics, and the fight for the Equal Rights Amendments. Suddenly, during the third wave of feminism, women of color make an appearance to transform feminism into a multicultural movement. This periodization situates white middle-class women as the central historical agents to which women of color attach themselves. (Smith 2006, 16)

If the periodization of US feminism centered the genealogies of US Women of Color, this coherent narrative of white/Anglo feminist chronopolitics would not hold. As Smith notes, "if we were to recognize the agency of indigenous women in an account of feminist history, we might begin with 1492 when Native women collectively resisted colonization" (Smith 2006, 16). Likewise, if we were to read US feminism through the eyes of enslaved Black females, Sojourner Truth's 1851 "Ain't I a Woman" speech would be recognized as a burgeoning methodological articulation of intersectionality and the coloniality of gender, instead of a token add-on to the bourgeois middle-class white suffrage movement.[15] But most importantly to the argument of this essay, Women of Color would not emerge as a brief stage in US feminist history, a moment in time now superseded by the new and improved focus on a "global feminism" that (Anglo) Women's Studies students must travel abroad to encounter.

Ultimately, then, the amnesia that prepares the ground for unwitting collaborations between global feminism and Western imperialism in US Women's Studies includes a forgetting of both institutional and subalternized genealogies of internationalization. The institutionalized dismissal of feminists-of-color politics is evidenced by the fact that the contemporary institutional preoccupation with "globalizing" feminism in the field of Women's Studies emerged in the 1990s, several decades after US Women of Color politics had developed global analyses of power and mobilized organizations to connect local struggles at home to those happening abroad (DuBois and Oliviero 2006; Women of Color Resource Center 2008). A clear example of this ignored genealogy is the Third World Women's Alliance, an early US Women of Color political formation that emerged in the 1960s yet is often erased by the hegemonic US periodization of "second wave" feminism. Born of the 1960s radical race-based movements, the Third World Women's Alliance centered the concerns, experiences, and perspectives of Black, Asian American, Chicana and Puerto Rican women who were critical of the masculinist ideologies infiltrating the community movements for racial justice to which they were committed. The adoption of the political identification "Third World" to name an organization composed of US Women of Color signaled their solidarity and sense of connection with struggles against European colonization and US military occupation taking place in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

From 1971 to 1975, the Third World Women's Alliance produced a newspaper, *Triple Jeopardy: Racism, Sexism, Imperialism*, which consistently featured articles by and about women revolutionaries participating in grassroots liberation movements in places like Puerto Rico, the Philippines, China, and Chile (Women of Color Resource Center 2008). These stories were juxtaposed with political analyses of the struggles against poverty, racism, misogyny, and political imprisonment facing US Women of Color and their communities. Always making transnational feminist connections between struggles at "home" and abroad, the Third World Women's Alliance emphasized a need to learn from women struggling for self-determination in different geopolitical locations. In this regard, the Third World Women's Alliance implied that the "travel" necessary to globalize feminist agendas was less geographic than epistemic or, at least, it implied that geographic travel was to be undertaken to expand one's epistemic capacities for cross-

cultural understanding. Peoples of colonized geographies outside the United States and Western Europe were engaged as historical protagonists and knowing subjects rather than backward victims in need of Western saviors. This reversal exposes a direct challenge of colonial modernity's chronopolitics. Consider the following excerpt from a speech published in *Triple Jeopardy*:

> The main objective of women in other Third World countries is the liberation and self-determination of their peoples. They understand clearly that there is no liberation for them as women unless everyone is free. Our goals here should be the same—self-determination and the liberation of our people; freedom for all. In this way *we will bring ourselves up to the level of our African, Latin American, and especially our Asian sisters*, while at the same time giving new impetus to our struggle. (Third World Women's Alliance; emphasis added)

This statement positions women struggling in "other Third World countries" as leaders in the mobilization against global oppression and as people from whom those in the United States have much to learn. Instead of backward passive victims with little to no feminist know-how, "African, Latin American, and … Asian sisters" become models of humanizing progress to which US feminists must "bring ourselves up." Yet there remains a respect for the specificity of different geopolitical struggles, as the author adds that aspiring to the goals of the struggles led by Third World women outside the United States would "give new impetus to our struggle." Bringing one's self up to the level of other Third World sisters does not demand an unthinking assimilation or imitation as much as it suggests a political shift in how one conceives the parameters, politics, and desired outcomes of these struggles. In other words, "our struggles" (US-based feminist struggles) remain distinct, though we have much to gain from sharing knowledge and insight with those waged in different geopolitical and cultural contexts.

Centering subalternized US feminist genealogies like the Third World Women's Alliance accomplishes Minoo Moallem's suggestion that US Women's Studies engage, rather than evade, discontinuities and complicity between different manifestations of feminist/women's resistance across time and space. Instead of a coherent unified movement always improving upon itself (always moving forward), US feminism narrated through Women of Color genealogies multiplies its historical origins and reveals discontinuous and incongruous trajectories. These discontinuities disappear when US Women of Color emerge solely as a 1980s "third-wave" manifestation of multicultural feminism, which has now yielded to US feminism's (inevitable) forward-moving expansion beyond the United States: global/transnational feminism.[16]

The Third World Women's Alliance therefore effectively jams the logic of colonial modernity by situating "global" non-US/non-white women as historical protagonists in the civilizing mission to end all forms of violence against women and their communities; exposing the investments of US feminists of color in global dimensions of gender violence long before the predominantly white/Anglo institutionalized academic field of US Women's Studies issued its "transnational imperative"; and articulating a global feminist politics that decenters Eurocentric conceptions of gender and centers subalternized cultural logics of resistance as the ground for transnational feminist connection. According to this formulation of global feminist politics, transnational connections and cross-cultural solidarity foreground the voices, politics, and ways of knowing of those with whom one seeks to struggle as comrades. The attraction and motivation for building solidarity across cultural and geopolitical terrain emerges from an inspiring vision of fierce women revolutionaries with an arsenal of resistance strategies that can be shared, adapted, and multiplied.

The version of a globalized feminism that emerges through the Third World Women's Alliance relies on two crucial methodological interventions that ground US Women of Color politics: forging solidarity across non-dominant differences (rather than commonalities or sameness of oppression) and a commitment to reading and inhabiting contradictions produced by multiple interconnected oppressions. Now that we have

explored how a centering of US Women of Color genealogies can help jam the colonial modern logic of the "study-abroad" approach to global feminism, let's consider the uses of these particular methodological tools for enacting an anti-imperial praxis of "staying home."

The US Women of Color Politics of "World"-Travel: Connecting across Non-Dominant Differences

Because challenging Occidentalist formulations and modernist frameworks of global feminism requires attending to differences, discontinuities, and incommensurability between "women" and feminist models of resistance and liberation, methodologies that offer tools for navigating plural ways of knowing and seeing the world are crucial to anti-imperialist global feminist praxis. US Women of Color—in their rejection of "simple unity" as the grounds for cross-racial and cross-cultural coalition—become a crucial site for accessing such methodologies.[17] Indeed, a fundamental methodological intervention of US feminisms of color has been the elaboration of a conceptual shift to enact solidarity motivated by difference rather than commonality. This methodological intervention is best articulated by Audre Lorde's now-famous edict: "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House" (Lorde 1984). Although frequently assigned in many an introductory Women's Studies course, readings of Lorde's "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House" rarely engage the text as offering a fundamental epistemological strategy for enacting cross-cultural solidarity in accordance with an anti-imperial global feminist praxis. Here I offer such a reading by underscoring María Lugones's elaboration of Lorde's concept of connecting across non-dominant differences as central to non-colonizing ways of coming to know and identifying with cultural others.

The "master's tools" referred to in Lorde's political directive comprise the divide-and-conquer logic of white supremacist capitalist heteropatriarchy (or the "master's house"). In the "master's house," only one way of being, seeing, and living in the world can be valued over and against others. The "master's tools" thus always turn difference into hierarchy whereby being "different from" the master's criteria marks one as suspicious, threatening, subordinate, and marginal. Lorde thus argues that any feminist politics truly committed to cross-cultural and cross-racial solidarity would need to re-see "difference" amongst women in "non-dominant terms." Without this epistemic shift, unity amongst women would always require those who were not of the wealthy, white, heterosexual bourgeoisie to shed their differences or accept marginal and token positions within the feminist movement. In other words, Lorde explicitly articulates the need for epistemic decolonization in US feminism—a way of knowing that departs from dominant Western cultural logic that always scripts difference in negative and hierarchical terms. Such a move, Lorde insists, is crucial if feminist solidarity is not to reproduce the imperialist and colonialist mandates of assimilation or exclusion.

María Lugones develops this methodology of shifting to non-dominant perceptions of difference in cross-cultural and cross-racial feminist coalition building through the concept of "playful 'world'-travel" (Lugones 2003). "'World'-traveling" is an epistemic shift to see one's self and the world through the eyes of cultural and racial others, a task Lugones explains is necessary for most US people of color who must see through the oppressor's eyes in order to navigate the dominant racial order of things. Because "'world'-travel" is often an involuntary activity for US people of color who must travel to hostile dominant white/Anglo worlds, Lugones notes that it is not easily recognized as a valuable skill.

Yet Lugones argues that the same skill developed to survive in dominant white/Anglo culture can be used to enter the non-dominant worlds inhabited by subordinated others. Because these worlds lack the institutionalized power to coerce others to abide by their rules and logics, one can enter them "playfully,"

with an "openness to surprise, openness to being a fool, openness to self-construction or reconstruction and to construction or reconstruction of the 'worlds' we inhabit playfully" (Lugones 2003, 98).[18] "Playful 'world'-travel" thus involves a suspension of our own familiar ways of perceiving and making sense of the world, allowing us to see subordinated others in their resistant self-constructions, as they see themselves through their own eyes, according to their own cultural logics.[19] We also see ourselves through the other's eyes and thus multiply our sense of ourselves in relation to others. Often this perception can challenge our sense of innocence or isolation from differently subordinated peoples. This multiplication of how one perceives and knows across difference thus disallows evasion of complicity in the oppression of others and counters the tendency to approach those unfamiliar to us with certainty or a desire for mastery, all of which is crucial to anti-imperialist processes of internationalizing Women's Studies. In other words, an anti-imperialist incorporation of study abroad to internationalize US Women's Studies would emphasize study abroad as necessitating not only physical travel to other geographic sites but also Lugones's epistemic travel to the worlds of non-dominant cultural others.

Acknowledging the above, Caren Kaplan identifies Lugones's "playful 'world'-travel" as a "critical transnational feminist practice" that challenges "global feminism's vision of a unitary world of women" as it "reinscrib[es] the centrality of white women's position within Western feminism" (Kaplan 1995, 141). Kaplan highlights the elision of US Women of Color in this formulation of global feminism and acknowledges its "suppression of discussions of differences between white women and women of color within the geographical boundaries of the United States in favor of a new binary—North American white women and the victims of North American foreign policies" (Kaplan 1995, 141). Because "world"-traveling involves relational knowing of multiple selves and multiple others, through histories of power, Kaplan advocates it as a way of feminist knowing within and across different locations that does not appropriate or assimilate the differences encountered.

Although María Lugones is an Argentinean immigrant to the United States, she emphasizes her development of "playful 'world'-travel" as connected to her participation in the US politics of Women of Color. Lugones makes this clear in the opening of her essay, explaining that "Playfulness, 'World'-Traveling and Loving Perception" emerges from her "coming to consciousness as a daughter and [her] coming to consciousness as a woman of color" (Lugones 2003, 77). Lugones clarifies for the reader her use of "woman of color" in its specifically US political coalitional identification and includes an entire section on "Identification and Women of Color." In this section, she unpacks the coalitional logic of Women of Color identification as one that necessitates Lorde's "epistemological shift to non-dominant differences" and conceives of "playful 'world'-travel" as a means of enacting this shift (Lugones 2003, 84). She writes, "To the extent that identification requires sameness, this coalition is impossible. So, the coalition requires that we conceive identification anew" (Lugones 2003, 85). From this impetus to conceive Women of Color coalitional identification against the demands for sameness, Lugones theorizes "playful 'world'-travel."

While Kaplan does include Lugones's attention to Women of Color in the elaboration of "world"-traveling, noting Lugones's argument that "women of color must value this familiar form of 'travel,'" she does not explain that it is within a genealogy of US Women of Color politics (methodology and knowledge production) that Lugones develops the concept of "world"-travel. By identifying US Women of Color theoretical intervention as central to this critical transnational feminist practice, Kaplan would more powerfully intervene in the dismissal of US Women of Color as incommensurable with an anti-imperialist global feminist praxis. But more importantly, identifying the epistemic connection between Women of Color politics and Lugones's "world"-travel would underline the necessity for white/Anglo feminists to

"world"-travel to Women of Color "worlds" as crucial preparatory ground for anti-imperial "global" travel undertaken in the name of diversifying perspectives on "gender" and "women."

For the purposes of enacting an anti-imperialist feminist praxis, "world"-travel to US Women of Color "worlds" would address Haunani-Kay Trask's call to re-see the United States in terms of its racial-colonial fractures and thus disable Occidentalist perceptions of the "West and the Rest." US white/Anglo women who practice "world"-travel to US Women of Color "worlds" would re-see themselves and the United States as complicit in histories of racial dehumanization, cultural imperialism, and colonial takeover. Such dark construction of the self may exist simultaneously and in contradiction with affirming positive constructions of a feminist self forged in their own "worlds" of sense making. As Lugones mentions, US people of color are skilled in sustaining and inhabiting these multiple and contradictory conceptions of self, particularly as they must navigate racist constructions of themselves in the mainstream organization of US life. Inhabiting these contradictions is uncomfortable yet hopeful when recognized as evidence of the historical and social construction of oppressive realities and the simultaneous presence of counter/resistant realities. That is, consciousness of our inhabitation of multiple selves—through dominant racist-(hetero)sexist-colonialist-capitalist-imperialist culture *and* through different cultures of affirmation-resistance-empowerment—exposes the workings of power and the ability to jam their operation rather than be trapped in their logics of domination. Such consciousness is possible only through a willingness to dwell in, rather than resolve, contradictions and to see geopolitical and embodied contradictions as significant sites for knowledge production against the imperialist logic of cultural domination. This leads us to the second US Women of Color methodological intervention useful to an anti-imperialist global feminist praxis: the geo- and body-politics of reading and inhabiting contradictions.

"Homesick at Home with Nowhere to Go": The Geo- and Body-Politics of Reading and Inhabiting Contradiction

Thus far, I have elaborated the Occidentalist and modernist underpinnings of global feminism framed through study-abroad logic in the field of US Women's Studies and illustrated its imperialist institutional re-centering of white/Anglos as primary knowing subjects. Because Occidentalism relies on homogenized conceptions of "home" in relation to equally homogenized and subordinated conceptions of "away," disrupting US geopolitical conceptions of a monocultural and mono-racial "home" is a necessary step to developing an anti-imperialist feminist praxis. Centering US Women of Color genealogies like the Third World Women's Alliance and epistemic interventions like "playful 'world'-travel" disrupts singular coherent models of feminist politics, revealing multiple cultural and racial logics of oppression and resistance within and across geopolitical sites. As such, it reveals fractures in the conception of one's "home" that can be unsettling. Accordingly, I suggest that an anti-imperialist praxis of "staying home" in US Women's Studies must involve centering another fundamental methodology of US Women of Color: the geo- and body-politics of reading and inhabiting contradiction.

US Women of Color politics center the insights born of peoples who are never unconditionally at ease at "home" or for whom "familiar" grounds are always vulnerable to state and interpersonal violence (Incite! Women of Color Against Violence 2006). While the pandemic of domestic violence belies common understandings of "home" as a site of comfort and safety for women of all racial, cultural, and class locations, women of color experience the interpersonal violence in the domestic space as inseparable from the state-sanctioned violence of racial profiling, police brutality, welfare-workfare, and the tracking of their loved ones into the prison-industrial complex. Feminists of color have thus taken up "home" places as sites of struggle,

where the rules and foundations must be assessed and reassess (hooks 1990, Lugones 2003). Again, Audre Lorde's claim that "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house" reemerges here to invoke the need for constant assessment of one's familiar ground and its foundational assumptions. The statement also implies that the master's house needs dismantling, an act that would require a creative rethinking and remaking of conceptions of home altogether. Such an implication reverberates with Women of Color feminism in its persistent critiques of the nation-state as violent against women and our communities, a stance that demands a recounting of the histories of colonialism, capitalism, and racism through which nation-states and their institutions emerged across the globe.

Writing in the immediate aftermath of September 11, Cherríe Moraga reads the "global" through the irreconcilable contradictions inhabited by US people of color for whom the always incomplete process of becoming "American" has meant both survival and death, the vibrant creation of new resistant identities, and the violent loss of land, memory, and self-determination (Moraga 2002). To simultaneously be of and not of the nation, as citizen and enemy alien, US people of color live at the ideological intersection of a falsely inclusive multicultural America and the foreign, backward, and always suspect realm of the global (Bell 1998; Chang 2000). This ideological intersection relies on the categorial separation of the "local" and the "global," whereby the United States is conflated with the former while the (post-)colonized territories of Africa, Asia, and the Americas are conflated with the latter. US people of color disrupt this binary by virtue of their racialized inhabitation of a geopolitical space where they are always potential outsiders and never complete insiders to the US national imaginary. Investigating, rather than dismissing, the disruption reveals historical subjects situated in a messy web of complicit and resistant relations to US imperialism, ethnocentric racism, and colonial legacies of global capitalism. We see forced migrants turned settlers on indigenous land and leaders of national liberation movements turned masculinist collaborators with state ideologies of heterosexual subordination. In other words, US approaches to a globalized feminism, when framed through the locus of US people of color, deny any claims to absolute innocence or victimhood in one's historical negotiations with the forces of global capitalism, colonialism, and racism.

Accordingly, Grace Kyungwon Hong argues for Women of Color feminism as a strategic "reading practice, a 'way of making sense of' that reveals the contradictions of the racialized and gendered state" (Hong 2006, x). Sojourner Truth's refrain, "Ain't I a woman?," is a popular illustration of this reading practice, exposing the seeming contradiction of the speaker being female yet not "woman" in her Blackness. Women of Color feminism does not seek to resolve this question—"yes, Sojourner, of course you are a woman!"—but rather seeks to understand its production by a racialized gender state. Angela Davis (1981), Oyewumi Oyeronke (1997), and María Lugones (2010), for example, read the contradiction articulated by Sojourner Truth's speech as an insight into the state's restriction of the gender identity "woman" to those who are understood to be human, making it inaccessible to those racially dehumanized in their classification as Black. Such a reading may hinder the inspiring connection often expressed by my (mostly white/Anglo) introductory Women's Studies students who are inclined to read Truth as singularly defending "women" in its falsely de-racialized use. Applying "Women of Color feminism" as a reading practice to Sojourner Truth's speech moves them to consider the long history of white women's complicity with the racial state's oppression and exclusion of women of color. It places a question mark on that foundational identity "woman" to which so many introductory Women's Studies female students cling in their budding consciousness of gender oppression. Yet it is such uncertainty of foundational identities that facilitate an anti-imperialist cross-cultural understanding that truly diversifies perspectives on gender. If we consider Women of Color feminism as a reading practice, then it becomes a strategy available to all US students of Women's Studies, one that can induce critical perspectives of "home" that prevent imperialist travel "abroad."

Minnie Bruce Pratt's "Identity: Skin Blood Heart" further exemplifies this reading practice as she critically investigates her "home" place to account for her own geo- and body-politics of knowledge production as a white Christian middle-class lesbian feminist. The essay is rich with details of Pratt's peopled and located process of coming to political consciousness as a woman, lesbian, anti-racist, and struggler for justice against all oppressions. Her emotional longings for the comforts of "home" are consistently disrupted by making present the lives, histories, voices, and narratives of people of color, battered women, and invisible lesbians on whose violent exclusions and erasures from humanity Pratt's sense of the familiar is built. Pratt acknowledges that the work—political and theoretical—of Women of Color and Jewish women has been central to her ability to critically reread her "home" place. She writes:

> Part of this process, for me, has been to acknowledge to myself that there are things that I do not know: an admission hard on my pride, and harder to do than it sounds; and to try to fill up the emptiness of my ignorance about the lives of Jewish women and women of color. It has also been important for me to acknowledge to myself that most of my learning has been based on *the work* of these women. (Pratt 1988, 42; emphasis added)

The distinction Pratt makes between the "lives of women of color" and "the work of these women" is crucial in grasping epistemic contributions of Women of Color to Pratt's ability to now read the racist, classist, colonialist, and (hetero)sexist fractures of her "home" in the United States, seeing always dual realities of oppression and resistance to that oppression. In other words, Pratt allows Women of Color political perspectives to infiltrate her own sense of self and home instead of reading about their lives as interesting or sad instances of oppression that have little to do with her own history, experience, and possibilities.

Pratt is honest about the difficulties of this reading practice, explaining the loss of security, certainty, safety, pride, and innocence that the white/Anglo Christian middle-class heterosexual limits of her understanding afforded her. In her description of coming to feminist and lesbian consciousness, she articulates this loss in a particularly poignant and useful way: "For being a woman was the constriction that I felt. There I was in a place so much like home: grown-up and I didn't want to be there.... I wanted to go some place where I could just be; I was homesick with nowhere to go" (Pratt 1988, 24). The emotional state of being "homesick [at home] with nowhere to go" is also simultaneously an important epistemic location. It is a recognition of multiple simultaneous realities and logics, some institutionalized and dominant, others subalternized and non-dominant. Being "homesick at home" is being aware that one has a "home," is grounded and shaped by that "home," but is also aware of its violent foundations. Such an awareness is disorienting yet useful in motivating "'world'-travel" to non-dominant worlds of sense as a means of arming one's self in struggles for violence-free homeplaces. Equally important is Pratt's sense that she cannot escape to another "home"—she is "homesick with *nowhere to go*." Conscious of the structural dimensions of violence, their long histories and infusion into her "skin blood heart," Pratt comes to realize that struggle against these structures and their manifestations in her own and other homeplaces is where she must reside politically, emotionally, and epistemically. In practice, this means becoming hyper-vigilant against the desire to find "home" in the identity "woman," something she describes as difficult after losing her children to a violent husband after coming out as lesbian. Reflecting on her activist work with the National Organization for Women, Pratt writes: "I understood then how important it was for me to have this new place; it was going to be my new home, to replace the old one I had lost.... I needed desperately to find a place that was mine with other women, where I felt hopeful. But because of my need I did not push myself to consider what separated me from other women" (Pratt 1988, 30). Trying to resolve the homesickness at home, make it go away, leads Pratt to evade divisions, discontinuities, and complicity produced through the "home" she sought in the identity "woman."

Given that the imperialist logic of the transnational imperative in US Women's Studies relies on homogenized conceptions of "home" that remain outside the limits of global terrain, re-seeing "home" places as sites of global struggles is a good way to begin exploring strategies for an anti-imperial praxis for feminist travel. As Pratt illustrates, centering Women of Color politics can facilitate a questioning of the foundations of "homeplaces," whether they be synonymous with the nation-state, the nation, or the neighborhood. To repeat Pratt's poignant phrase, Women of Color are well versed in being "homesick [at home] with nowhere to go" (Pratt 1988, 24). Accordingly, "going global" from the perspective of a US Women of Color politics cannot register as an escape to another "home," nor a civilizing mission to make women abroad like the women at "home."

Conclusion

Preparation for students who choose to "study abroad" often includes a segment on "homesickness." They receive literature explaining the likelihood that they'll experience sadness, loneliness, anxiety, depression, frustration, and shock at some point during their time abroad. Students are instructed that these feelings are classic symptoms of "homesickness," a temporary malady that waxes and wanes as they adjust to their new surroundings. Homesickness, in short, is sickness caused by being away from one's home. The definition assumes that one has a "home" and that this "home" is a place where feelings of sadness, alienation, anxiety, loneliness, frustration, and shock are not common to one's everyday experience. US Women's Studies should be at the forefront in preparing students to challenge this assumption if it seeks to utilize "study abroad" as a means of globalizing perspectives on gender without contributing to imperialist knowledge production.

While Trask's directive that non-Native Hawaiians stay home (instead of visiting her homeland) is certainly direct and literal, I want to suggest that it can and should also be heard as an epistemic challenge for US feminists seeking to globalize their analyses of gender and sexual violence. That is, to "stay home" in one's anti-imperial commitment to global and transnational feminist solidarity can be understood as an epistemic commitment to see the colonial/racial fractures that shape both one's cultural, social, and political sensibilities and one's (lack of) knowledge about differently located peoples and places. For US students and faculty invested in a globalized feminist consciousness, "staying home" while "traveling abroad" would entail a refusal to position the United States as an invisible site from which one explores the "global." Instead, efforts would be made to make the United States known through the histories of genocide, enslavement, and hidden global circuits of exploitation that make possible its institutionalized power and wealth. For the field of US Women's Studies, "staying home while studying abroad" would thus require centering the genealogies and epistemologies of Women of Color as it seeks to expand its cultural knowledge of "women" and gender across geopolitical boundaries. This is not a "staying home" that reinforces ethnocentrism. To the contrary, I am suggesting an epistemic commitment whereby "staying home"—heard as a call from the colonized and racially dispossessed—entails a refusal to escape into the imagined "exotic" or to evade accountability for one's own limits in knowing and engaging cultural and racial others on their own terms.

Notes

Thank you to Lynn Fujiwara, Lisa Tatonetti, Cricket Keating, Tushabe, Allison Wolf, Marilyn Ortega, and the anonymous reviewers at the *Journal of Feminist Scholarship* for invaluable feedback on drafts of this essay. I am also grateful to Michael Hames-Garcia, Ernesto Martinez, Irmary Reyes-Santos, Judith Raiskin, Elizabeth Reis, Yvonne Braun,

Linda Fuller, Ellen Scott, and other participants in the 2011 Women's and Gender Studies postdoctoral colloquium at the University of Oregon where I first presented and workshopped the central ideas of this paper.

1. According to Fernando Coronil, Occidentalism refers to "the ensemble of representational practices that participate in the production of conceptions of the world, which (1) separate the world's components into bounded units; (2) disaggregate their relational histories; (3) turn difference into hierarchy; (4) naturalize these representations; and (5) intervene, however unwittingly, in the reproduction of existing asymmetrical power relations" (Coronil 1996, 57). Occidentalism as a representational logic supports colonial modernity's "myth of progress" discussed later in this essay.

2. Although not an exhaustive list, the following university Women's Studies program and department websites link a focus on globalized feminist visions to participation in study-abroad opportunities: University of Michigan–Ann Arbor; University of California Santa Barbara; University of California, Los Angeles; Central Washington University; University of Connecticut; University of Minnesota; University of Delaware; Guilford College; Boston College; Skidmore College; McMicken College; University of Kansas; Wells College; University of Wisconsin–Eau Claire; Old Diamond University; University of Colorado Boulder; Medgar Evers College; University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee; Virginia Commonwealth University; Western Washington University; Goucher College; University of St. Thomas.

3. I purposefully use the harsh terms "anger" and "hatred" to describe Trask's feelings towards the United States, because they aptly convey her unequivocal political perspective on the US as a colonial-settler state and because she explicitly uses these terms herself in an episode of the Aljazeera English series *Inside USA* in which she responds to her interviewer with the following: "Do I hate the United States? Absolutely. I absolutely hate them. And lots of Hawaiians do. And the mystique of Hawaii as soft, sweet and kind… that's all propaganda. Lots of us are really, really angry" (Aljazeera English 2008).

4. I capitalize the term "Women of Color" to mark the US political formation of the identity. I lowercase the term when using it in its reduction to a racial and gender identity description.

5. Madina Tlostanova uses the terms "geo-politics" and "body-politics" to describe a decolonial politics of knowledge production that counters colonial modernity's ego- and bio-politics of knowledge production. As she explains, the geo-politics and body-politics of knowledge "signify the geographic and body-graphic grounds of knowledge and cognition in which history, memory, and languages of people who found themselves, often against their will, at the cross-roads of imperial and colonial differences and experiences and who were refused in their belonging to modernity, and hence, to humanity" (Tlostanova 2010, 35).

6. Chronopolitics is a term coined by anthropologist Johannes Fabian to name the evolutionary temporal classification of anthropological objects of study as stuck in a different (prehistoric or ancient) time than that of the anthropologist, who is assumed to belong to a more modern, evolved, and progressive time. Chronopolitics is fundamental to the epistemic frame of colonial modernity that positions Europe and Euro-America as protagonists of a civilizing history in which Latin America, Africa, and Asia remain stuck in a primitive, underdeveloped past.

7. I borrow the use of the term "categorial" from María Lugones as she uses it to describe the conceptual separation of categories of gender, race, and class in understanding the impact of these vectors of oppression. A categorial construction of women's struggles would pull apart the gender category of oppression from the race category of oppression, privileging the dominant members within each category (e.g., white women in the gender category; men of color in the race category), and would thus falsely universalize a singular account of gender or race.

8. US-centrism, like Afrocentrism or Eurocentrism, falsely universalizes an epistemic frame anchored in hegemonic and homogenized understandings of the "US" or "Africa" or "Europe." In this regard, US-centrism disallows the possibility of multiple logics across cultural settings. US people of color are certainly not immune to "US-centric" thinking as they cross geopolitical and cultural boundaries. Patrícia de Santana Pinho illustrates this well in her essay on

"African-American Roots Tourism in Brazil" (2008), explaining erroneous African-American assumptions of US-based conceptions of "Blackness" as grounds for commonality and connection in Brazil.

9. Moallem's critique is based, in part, on a review of Chandra Talpade Mohanty's careful and transformative work, *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Mohanty claims to anchor her analysis in "the most marginalized communities of women" to provide "the most inclusive paradigm for thinking about social justice" (Mohanty 2003, 231).

10. "Illumination" as used here is meant to suggest simultaneously "discovery," Western "enlightenment," and "enlightenment" for the sake of more complete universal theories of global liberation.

11. Karla F. C. Holloway uses the term "transnational imperative" to reference the eclipsing of racialized gender politics in the United States by the popular trend to internationalize the field of US Feminist Studies (Holloway 2006).

12. Women of Color emerged as a political coalitional identity that emphasized a shift to perceiving gender, racial, class, sexual, and cultural differences against their negative categorial institutionalized representations. This politics of re-seeing difference is missed when Women of Color is reduced to an oppositional identity based on a common understanding of racial and gender categorial oppression.

13. Moallem erroneously attributes the concept of "world-travel" to Wing (Moallem 2008, 346).

14. Anti-violence feminist activist-scholar Andrea Smith spoke directly to this point in a 2003 interview with Maria Cotera at the University of Michigan–Ann Arbor, when she explained her reason for refusing to provide personal accounts of her feminist politics: "I've noticed in classes … people always want to hear stories and novels from women of color, but they don't want to hear our analysis" (Smith 2003, 34).

15. In "Toward a Decolonial Feminism," María Lugones suggests that we not hear Sojourner Truth's "Ain't I a woman?" question in her famous speech as rhetorical, but rather as pointing to the restriction of "woman" historically to white/Anglo bourgeois females of the colonizing class. Lugones refers to this restriction of the gender binary and gender itself to the white/Anglo colonizing bourgeois as a consequence of the "coloniality of gender," a frame that denied gender to the racially dehumanized and used exclusion from gender to racially code the colonized as beasts fit for brutal exploitation and sexual violence (Lugones 2010).

16. Chandra Mohanty (2003), among other feminists of color, carefully distinguishes between the politics of a global feminism and the politics of a transnational feminism, the latter often understood as a departure from the early Western assumptions of an imperialist "global sisterhood." However, the study-abroad logic motivating an internationalization of US feminism often disregards this careful distinction, generalizing each term as a reference to a feminism geographically focused outside the United States.

17. Chela Sandoval documents the 1981 NWSA Annual Conference discussions amongst women of color as they negotiated their politics of identification. Clear that they did not want a politics of unity that required "the erasure of our many differences," the participants concluded that "there can be no simple way of identifying our enemies or our friends … and no simple unity for feminists of color" (Sandoval 1990, 65).

18. Lugones purposefully leaves the concept of "worlds" vague in order not to reduce the complexity it references. She does indicate that a "world" is inhabited by flesh-and-blood peoples, shaped by specific material histories of oppression and resistance, and always exists in relation to other "worlds" (Lugones 2003, 87).

19. These resistant constructions are often imperceptible to those not "inside" the resistant collectivities. How one gets "inside" such collectivities thus becomes a crucial methodological question for those invested in pursuing feminist research beyond their own racial, cultural, and national locus.

References

Aljazeera English. 2008. "Inside USA—The Other Hawai'i." Aljazeera English video, 11:43 and 11:01, posted on Hawaiian Independence Blog, September 29, 2008, http://www.hawaiiankingdom.info/C1126750129/E20080929070444/index.html.

Alexander, M. Jacqui, and Chandra Mohanty. 1997. "Introduction: Genealogies, Legacies, Movements." In *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*, edited by M. Jacqui Alexander and Chandra Talpade Mohanty, xiii-xlii. New York: Routledge.

——— . 2010. "Cartographies of Knowledge and Power: Transnational Feminism as Radical Praxis." In *Critical Transnational Feminist Praxis*, edited by Richa Nagar and Amanda Lock Swarr, 23-45. Albany: SUNY Press.

Barkley Brown, Elsa. 1991. "Polyrhythms and Improvisation: Lessons for Women's History." *History Workshop: A Journal of Socialist and Feminist Historians* 31 (Spring): 85-90.

Bell, Derrick. 1998. *Afrolantica Legacies*. Chicago: Third World Press.

Burnham, Linda. 2001. "Introduction." In *Time To Rise: U.S. Women of Color—Issues and Strategies*, edited by Maylei Blackwell, Linda Burnham, and Jung Hee Choi, 7-16. San Francisco: Women of Color Resource Center.

Chang, Robert S. 1999. *Disoriented: Asian Americans, Law and the Nation-State*. New York: New York University Press.

Chowdhury, Elora Halim. 2006. "Global Feminism: Feminist Theory's Cul-de-sac." *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge* 4 (3): 291-302.

Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. 2005. "Global Competence & National Needs: One Million Americans Studying Abroad" (Final Report). Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, http://www.aplu.org/document.doc?id=190.

Coronil, Fernando. 1996. "Beyond Occidentalism: Toward Nonimperial Geohistorical Categories." *Cultural Anthropology* 11 (1): 51-87.

Davis, Angela. 1981. *Women, Race & Class*. New York: Random House.

DuBois, Ellen Carol, and Katie Oliviero. 2009. "Circling the Globe: International Feminism Reconsidered, 1920 to 1975." *Women's Studies International Forum* 32: 1-3.

Fabian, Johannes. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Haney Lopez, Ian F. 1996. *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race*. New York: New York University Press.

Holloway, Karla F. C. 2006. "'Cruel Enough to Stop the Blood': Global Feminisms and the U.S. Body Politic, Or: 'They Done Taken My Blues and Gone.'" *Meridians: feminism, race, transnationalism* 7 (1): 1-18.

hooks, bell. 1990. *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End Press.

Hong, Grace Kyungwon. 2006. *The Ruptures of American Capital: Women of Color Feminism and the Culture of Immigrant Labor*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Incite! Women of Color Against Violence. 2006. *Color of Violence: The Incite! Anthology*. Boston: South End Press.

Jessup-Anger, Jody. 2008. "Gender Observations and Study Abroad: How Students Reconcile Cross-Cultural Observations Related to Gender." *Journal of College Student Development* 49: 360-73.

Kaplan, Caren. 1994. "The Politics of Location as Transnational Feminist Practice." In *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices*, edited by Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan, 137-52. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lal, Jayati, Kristin McGuire, Abigail J. Stewart, Magdalena Zaborowska, and Justine M. Pas. 2010. "Recasting Global Feminisms: Toward a Comparative Historical Approach to Women's Activism and Feminist Scholarship." *Feminist Studies* 36 (1): 13-39.

Lorde, Audre. 1984. *Sister/Outsider*. Freedom, CA: Crossing Press.

Lowe, Lisa. 1997. "Angela Davis: Reflections on Race, Class, and Gender in the USA." In *The Politics of Culture in the Shadow of Capital*, edited by Lisa Lowe and David Lloyd, 303-23. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lugones, María. 2003. *Pilgrimages/Peregrinajes: Theorizing Coalition against Multiple Oppressions*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

———. 2010. "Toward a Decolonial Feminism." *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy* 25 (4): 742-59.

Lutz, Helma. 2000. "Eurocentrism." *Routledge International Encyclopedia of Women*, edited by Cheris Kramarae and Dale Spender, 2: 641-42. New York: Routledge.

Moallem, Minoo. 2006. "Feminist Scholarship and the Internationalization of Women's Studies." *Feminist Studies* 32 (2): 332-51.

Mohanty, Chandra. 2003. *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

———. 2006. "US Empire and the Project of Women's Studies: Stories of Citizenship, Complicity and Dissent." *Gender, Place and Culture* 13 (1): 7-20.

Moraga, Cherríe. 2002. "From Inside the First World: Forward 2001." In *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, edited by Cherríe Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa, xv-xxxiii. Berkeley: Third Woman Press.

National Women's Studies Association. "Call For Proposals: Difficult Dialogues, November 12-15, 2009," accessed March 3, 2011, http://www.nwsa.org/downloads/2009cfpNWSA.pdf.

Oyewumi, Oyeronke. 1997. *The Invention of Women: Making an African Sense of Western Gender Discourse*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Pratt, Minnie Bruce. 1988. "Identity: Skin Blood Heart." In *Yours in Struggle: Three Feminist Perspectives on Anti-Semitism and Racism*, by Elly Bulkin, Minnie Bruce Pratt, and Barbara Smith, 9-63. Ithaca: Firebrand Books.

Quijano, Aníbal. 2000. "Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America." *Nepantla: Views from South* 1 (3): 533-80.

Salisbury, Mark H., Michael B. Paulsen, and Ernest T. Pascarella. 2011. "Why Do All the Study Abroad Students Look Alike? Applying an Integrated Student Choice Model to Explore Differences in the Factors that Influence White and Minority Students' Intent to Study Abroad." *Research in Higher Education* 52 (2): 123-50.

Sandoval, Chela. 1990. "Feminism and Racism: A Report on the 1981 National Women's Studies Association Conference." In *Making Face, Making Soul/Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Feminists of Color*, edited by Gloria Anzaldúa, 55-71. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Santana Pinho, Patrícia de. 2008. "African-American Roots Tourism in Brazil." *Latin American Perspectives* 35 (3): 70-86.

Santovec, Mary Lou. 2008. "Setting the 'Long Table' for Women's Studies Issues." *Women in Higher Education* 17 (8): 22-23.

Scarfo, Richard D. 1998. "History of Title VI/Fulbright-Hays." In *International Education in the New Global Era: Proceedings of a National Policy Conference on the Higher Education Act, Title VI, and Fulbright-Hays Program*, edited by John N. Hawkins, Carlos Manuel Haro, Miriam A. Kazanjian, Gilbert W. Merkx, and David Wiley, 23-25. Los Angeles: International Studies and Overseas Programs, University of California, Los Angeles.

Schueller, Malini Johar. 2007. "Area Studies and Multicultural Imperialism: The Project of Decolonizing Knowledge." *Social Text* 25 (1): 41-61.

Smith, Andrea. 2003. "Global Feminisms: Comparative Case Studies of Women's Activism and Scholarship. Site U.S.A." Interview by Maria Cotera, June 24. University of Michigan Institute for Research on Women and Gender. http://www.umich.edu/~glblfem/transcripts/us/Smith_U_E_102806.pdf.

———. 2006. "Indigenous Feminism Without Apology: De-Centering White Feminism." *New Socialist* 58: 16-18.

Soto, Sandra K. 2005. "Where in the Transnational World Are U.S. Women of Color?" In *Women's Studies for the Future: Foundations, Interrogations, Politics*, edited by Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy and Agatha Beins, 111-24. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

St. Cloud State University. "Women's Studies Program: Study Abroad in Kenya," accessed February 2, 2011. http://www.stcloudstate.edu/ws/Kenya.asp?pab=1_1.

Third World Women's Alliance. "Live Like Her." *Triple Jeopardy: Racism, Sexism, Imperialism* (online archive), image "Vietnam Woman," uploaded on June 10, 2008, accessed February 4, 2011, http://www.flickr.com/photos/27628370@N08/2569180687/in/set-72157605547626040.

Tlostanova, Madina. 2010. *Gender Epistemologies and Eurasian Borderlands*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. 1999. *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

University of California Santa Barbara. "Study Abroad for Feminist Studies Majors," accessed February 2, 2011. http://www.eap.ucsb.edu/academics/womstudies.pdf.

Virginia Commonwealth University. "VCU Education Abroad Faculty-Led Programs: Women's Worlds 2011," accessed February 2, 2011, http://www.global.vcu.edu/abroad/programs/vcu/programdetail/p93.aspx.

Wing, Adrien Katherine. 2000. *Global Critical Race Feminisms: An International Reader*. New York: New York University Press.

Women of Color Resource Center. 2008. *Paving the Way: A Teaching Guide to the Third World Women's Alliance*. Oakland, CA: Women of Color Resource Center.

Young, Cynthia. 2006. *Soul Power: Culture, Radicalism, and the Making of the Third World Left*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Novas Cartas Portuguesas: The Making of a Reputation

Ana Margarida Dias Martins, University of Cambridge

Abstract: *Novas Cartas Portuguesas (New Portuguese Letters)*, co-authored by Maria Isabel Barreno, Maria Teresa Horta, and Maria Velho da Costa, was banned in 1972 in Portugal for exploring sensitive issues such as women's oppression under the Catholic patriarchy. Given that police action against the authors soon became the focus of an international feminist protest in 1972-73, existing discussions of the book's reception often focus almost exclusively on what may be called its political life. I propose to approach the book from a new angle, with the purpose of uncovering its theoretical dimension as a literary-critical text that may have played an important role in helping to shape feminist intellectual directions of the 1970s. Specifically, I analyze how a general insistence on the political life of *Novas Cartas* contributed to marginalizing the work on a theoretical level, transforming it into a "strange" (Ahmed) textual body out of place. In a manner similar to what would later happen to the Brazilian writer Clarice Lispector as a result of Hélène Cixous's feminist sponsorship of her work, this marginalization helped define the boundaries of "international feminism" as opposed to "Portuguese anti-fascism," according to a conception of the Lusophone cultural sphere as an anachronistic feminine space for political action, entirely disconnected from the centers where feminist theory is made.

Keywords: *Novas Cartas Portuguesas*, Barreno (Maria Isabel), Horta (Maria Teresa), Velho da Costa (Maria), Three Marias, second-wave feminism, international feminism, Lispector (Clarice), Cixous (Hélène)

> No need to hear your voice when I can talk about you better than you can speak about yourself.
> —bell hooks, "Marginality as a Site of Resistance"

> De nós se utiliza quem a nós nos quer e a quem parecendo consentir utilizamos.
> (We use those who want us by seemingly allowing them to use us.)
> —Barreno, Horta, and Velho da Costa, *Novas Cartas Portuguesas*

Introduction: On Silence and Falling Rain

The aim of this paper is to lay the groundwork for an investigation of the historical, cultural, and theoretical legacies of *Novas Cartas Portuguesas* (*New Portuguese Letters*), co-authored by Portuguese writers Maria Isabel Barreno, Maria Teresa Horta, and Maria Velho da Costa.[1] When the "Three Marias," as they came to be known, published this book in 1972, they were prosecuted by the Portuguese police for daring to write outside of the prescribed morality. When the international solidarity campaigners took up the authors' cause, they assigned the three women to the political realm of feminist solidarity politics for daring to write outside of (mainstream) theory. The story of *Novas Cartas* is one of impending arrests and great bailouts, followed by silence and falling rain—the kind of silence and rain that fall on segregated edges of the world often "liberated" by someone else's theory. Indeed, one of the grim consequences of this book's astounding

international success was that, although it remained important in the political context of international feminist solidarity, it failed to enter the feminist canon of theory texts in Europe and the US. The theoretical richness of *Novas Cartas*, convincingly defended by critical voices (Amaral; Kauffman; Klobucka 2000; Owen 1992, 1995, 1999, and 2000; Owen and Pazos Alonso), reflected the familiarity of the authors with various feminist discourses of the time. However, it was sidestepped by the privileged discourse of others—from Portugal and beyond—who spoke *for* the Three Marias. This tendency confirms the extent to which the exceptional political support enjoyed by the authors came at the expense of another kind of recognition (theoretical). It is fair to say today, with forty years' hindsight, that the renowned international scholars who publicly defended *Novas Cartas*, the Three Marias, and their publisher during the international solidarity campaign (between 1972 and 1974) never explicitly incorporated this text into their own theoretical and critical work.[2] This article sets out to address the reasons why this was so. What was it that prevented international legitimization of *Novas Cartas* as a feminist theoretical work of reference?

In attempting to answer this question, I shall take as a point of comparison another famous Portuguese literary voice, that of the Brazilian writer Clarice Lispector, whose international rise to stardom was also due to international feminist sponsorship, namely through the involvement of the champion of *écriture féminine*, Hélène Cixous, in the diffusion of Lispector's texts. The manner in which Lispector's writing was perceived, after 1978, as *illustrating* the theoretical insights of Cixous bears resemblance to the way in which, some years earlier, the Three Marias' case had been seen as creating "the spontaneous combustion that *energised* the Women's Movement" (Gillespie 23; my emphasis). The appropriation of *Novas Cartas* as a symbol for sisterhood in the 1970s set a precedent of Lusophone theoretical assimilation via international feminist sponsorship, which was later reproduced when the work of Lispector started to be seen as providing the vessel for Cixous's theoretical voice. As pointed out by Morag Schiach, Cixous "is not talking about the real Clarice Lispector, a Brazilian left-wing modernist writer who died in 1977, but rather exploring the power of Lispector as a symbol" (161).

Cixous's imperative of faithfulness toward the "other" text of Lispector, incisively deconstructed by Anna Klobucka in "Hélène Cixous and the Hour of Clarice Lispector," was dependent on "the Brazilian writer's becoming assimilated by the models created by the very 'metropolitan' voice which finds in her a source of its own renewal" (51). To Klobucka, Lispector's otherness was not respected by Cixous and other commentators who misread her complexity in the name of a feminine writing that turned out to be more of an "écriture-miroir" (writing as a mirror) than an "écriture-fenêtre" (writing as a window). Lispector had to be reinvented as French in order to truly become mother for Cixous (Klobucka 1994, 47). A similar process was at work in the appropriation of the Three Marias by international feminism, since they also had to be reinvented as one universal woman in order to truly become sisters for second-wave feminists.

In bringing together these two cases of transnational monologue disguised as intertextual dialogue, I am aware that there were important differences in the processes of legitimization and assimilation of the textual otherness of Lispector and the Three Marias by international feminists. For example, *Novas Cartas* became very popular internationally well before it was translated from the Portuguese, whereas in the case of Lispector it was the translation and interpretation of her texts by one individual that triggered the mass popularity of the author and her fiction beyond the Brazilian and Latin American borders. Also, Lispector's case seems to be exceptional in terms of the intensity of the institutional support her work received from Cixous. In the case of *Novas Cartas*, their astounding international following, which cannot be limited to any one feminist theoretical trend, was mostly articulated in political, rather than theoretical, terms. If there ever was, outside Portugal, careful understanding and theoretical engagement with *Novas Cartas*

by second-wave feminists, such engagement has been significantly obscured, largely at the expense of the Three Marias' autonomous theoretical standing.

The above-mentioned differences were no doubt influential in setting out two distinct ways of attending to Lispector's and the Three Marias' literary and theoretical transgressions. The collective writing activity in which the Three Marias engaged challenged the assumptions of authorship that were, and still are, central to literary criticism. By not signing their letters, for instance, the Three Marias radically challenged the conventions of a text's maternity well before "Gilbert-and-Gubar" became shorthand for one kind of feminist scholarship.[3] This may explain why, in their case, the premise of absolute reciprocity was quickly (from 1974 onwards) substituted by anachronism as the official metaphor signifying the otherness of their collectively authored book, whereas the textual relationship between Cixous and Lispector continues to offer insights to feminist criticism.[4]

The metaphor of anachronism used by Anglo-American critics to describe *Novas Cartas* was responsible for resignifying the text as a kind of border between a supposedly static European margin and a forward-looking center. For example, in February 1975, the *Washington Post* published a review of *New Portuguese Letters* titled "Alien Porn" by William McPherson, who observed: "That women have been oppressed, and may be especially oppressed in macho Latin cultures, is no longer news sufficient to justify a book" (139).[5] Hence the appearance of published translations of this book could be seen as modifying what was being appropriated: if, until 1974, second-wave feminists fetishized the book as a symbol of unity, cutting it off from its historical, political, and literary Portuguese context, afterwards it was the text as a "strange" body out of place that was objectified and distanced from theoretical developments of mainstream feminisms in Europe and the US. Also implicated in this story was the emergence of a Portuguese non-feminist discourse on the text, exemplified by the Three Marias' public split in May 1974, and, among other examples, by Helder Macedo's review in the *Times Literary Supplement*, which represented a reaction to the book's appropriation by international feminist solidarity politics. As I shall argue, this discourse, which highlighted *Novas Cartas* as strictly Portuguese, played an important role in molding international perceptions of the book's supposed (temporal and geopolitical) out-of-placeness.

Using the example of intertextual "dialogue" with Lispector as a comparative case, this article aims to map the role of international and Portuguese readerships in the process of resignification of *Novas Cartas*, which may be best described as a movement between an inside, when it was taken as a symbol of reciprocal exchange, and an outside, when it became synonymous with temporal and geopolitical out-of-placeness. The reason why my task here is a complicated one is that, until now, most readers of *Novas Cartas* have comfortably kept both eyes either on the book's appropriation by international feminism or on its specifically Portuguese roots and anti-fascist tone. By attempting to approach the book's international reception from a new angle, I wish to deal with the difficulties inherent in challenging the authority of established ways of reading the value of this work of literature and theory, whilst simultaneously discussing its importance without making use of the very much established canonical standards whose theoretical contours have been defined by the mapping of *Novas Cartas* as an "uninhabitable" book. With this essay, therefore, I am not asking, on behalf of the Three Marias, for "a piece of the pie" (Spivak 46) of canonical feminist discourse. Instead, I aim to describe some of the mechanisms of discrimination at work in the readings of *Novas Cartas* that have been responsible for the articulation of the asymmetrical relation between the political and the theoretical.

My use of the word "strange" in reference to *Novas Cartas* is informed by the work of Sarah Ahmed on "strangers" and "strangeness." Thinking through feminism, the critic conceptualizes these notions

by analyzing the fetishization of the stranger in the contemporary Western world. In her "Embodying Strangers," Ahmed defines strange bodies as "bodies that are unliveable in so far as they are already recognisable as bodies out of place" (94). It is informative to quote her definition at length here:

> Strange bodies are precisely those bodies that are temporarily assimilated as the unassimilable within the encounter: they function as the border that defines both the space into which the familiar body … cannot cross, and the space in which such a body constitutes itself at home. Hence the strange body is constructed through a process of expulsion—a movement between inside and outside which renders that the stranger's body has already touched the surface of the skin which appears to contain the body-at-home. (95)

Drawing on Ahmed's work, I will attempt, in the following sections, to describe and unsettle two established ways of reading *Novas Cartas* as a strange textual body out of place. The first section will address acts of non-reading or fragmentary reading as the common way in which the international audience first got in touch with the book. So far, and apart from a few notable exceptions, the international impact of *Novas Cartas* has been measured in Portugal by focusing on the supposedly negative implications of this type of reading, which arguably led to the fetishization of the book by second-wave feminists as a symbol of "sisterhood" in the 1970s. But what if the form of *Novas Cartas*—its insistence on fragmentation and on female multiple voice, its self-conscious use of non-linear narrative—lent itself to forms of reading that go beyond its narrower sense (reading a book cover to cover)? If this is the case, then surely the way in which mainstream feminists listened to the book's multiple and fragmentary female voice in 1972-73 was also, in a sense, a consequence of the Three Marias' theoretical endeavors, as much as it was the result of the authors' desire to write not so much *for* but *with* non-Portuguese-speaking international feminist audiences. Instead of altogether dismissing essentialized international readings of the book, I shall argue here that there may be something to be learned about the theoretical power of *Novas Cartas* from thinking through the manner in which second-wave feminists attended to the book's transgressions.

The second part will address the moment, from 1974 onwards, when anachronism substituted absolute reciprocity as the official metaphor signifying the supposed strangeness of the book. Here, I will turn to the not-so-minor role that a specifically Portuguese way of reading it as authentically Portuguese and anti-fascist may have played in the resignification of *Novas Cartas* abroad as a strange textual body out of place by international feminists. I will refer to this type of reading as reading "à la portugaise," after the celebrated writing code by the same name.[6] To read "à la portugaise" is the result of what I consider to be the sterile opposition between "Portuguese anti-fascism" and "international feminism," which corresponds to one established Portuguese formula for writing about *Novas Cartas*. I argue that this paradigm is overly simplistic for at least three reasons. First, it disregards the Three Marias' exposure to international feminist thought, namely Simone de Beauvoir's, before the publication of their book. Second, it ignores the role that may have been played by the Portuguese exile community in the appropriation of *Novas Cartas* by international feminist politics. Third, it overlooks the role of the book itself in its own consumption at home and abroad.

I conclude by arguing that neither the universalist (international feminist) nor the nationalist (Portuguese non-feminist, anti-fascist) types of reading provide wholly adequate tools for dealing with *Novas Cartas*, for they have equally contributed to marginalizing it on a theoretical level. This situation has reinforced a perception of Portugal, and in the case of Lispector also of Brazil, as Lusophone spaces where the possibility of responding to theoretically informed international political action simply does not exist.

What Can They Do for Us? Judging a Book by Its Cover

The international solidarity campaign that developed in 1972-73 around the banning of *Novas Cartas* provides a spectacular example of massive international consumption of a text that was mostly not read at all, at least during the heated years of the protest. Soon after its publication in 1972, the censors of the Portuguese right-wing regime banned the book. Its authors faced jail terms of up to two years for "outrage to public decency" and "abuse of the freedom of the press." The forty-six-year-old environment of intimidation and repression in Portugal stifled the domestic campaign of solidarity in support of the authors.[7] Had they relied entirely on national support, instead of taking an active role in disseminating their book among prominent members of the French feminist movement, the Three Marias would most likely end up in jail. Wishing to denounce the injustices they were experiencing, the authors smuggled their book to France, addressing it to the editors of three feminists whose work they were acquainted with and admired: Simone de Beauvoir, Marguerite Duras, and Christiane Rochefort. Maria Isabel Barreno describes in an interview the encounter of the latter with *Novas Cartas*:

> No momento em que a nossa carta chegou, a Christiane Rochefort estava em viagem, pelo que foi uma vizinha peruana chamada Carmen, encarregue de regar as plantas e dar comida aos gatos, que viu a carta com o livro e o abriu. Como ela era de língua espanhola, entendeu o suficiente para achar aquilo muito interessante. Escreveu a Christiane e, já com a autorização dela, abriu a carta anexa ao livro. Esta Carmen estava ligada ao MLF (Mouvement de Libération des Femmes) francês que, por sua vez, tinha anexo um grupo de mulheres latino-americanas, a quem leu o texto. (Barreno 67)

> When our letter arrived, Christiane Rochefort was away on a trip, which is why the first person to see the letter and the accompanying book was her Peruvian neighbor named Carmen, who was responsible for watering the plants and feeding the cats. Because she spoke Spanish, she understood enough to find the book very interesting. She wrote to Christiane and, with her authorization, opened the letter and read it. This Carmen was linked to the French Mouvement de Libération des Femmes (Women's Liberation Movement), which was connected with a group of Latin American women, to whom Carmen read the text. (my translation)

Barreno's recollection, in which the book *almost* reaches Rochefort, is noteworthy. It is through the hands, eyes, and mouth of an "other" woman, the Peruvian neighbor Carmen, that the book reaches the MLF, or rather, its Latin American members. Carmen is touched by the content of *Novas Cartas* due to her knowledge of Spanish. Her capacity to understand Portuguese distances her from Rochefort, who, we suspect, could not have been immediately impressed by a book almost entirely written in Portuguese, but only by the explanatory letter in French that accompanied it. Whilst the circumstances of this event are the product of coincidence, the act of recalling it in this particular way is not. Barreno's emphasis on Rochefort's non-reading is symptomatic of the terms in which the discursive space around the international success of *Novas Cartas* would be construed.

In fact, the international crowds supporting the book and the Three Marias were at best fragmentary readers and, at worst, non-readers of the book's transgressions. This was because in the first two years of its notoriety no published translations from the original Portuguese were available. In France, the book was translated in 1974 and published by Éditions du Seuil. The English translation appeared in 1975, with Gollancz in London and Doubleday in New York. In Germany, the translation came out in 1976 (Tranvia–Verlag Walter Frey), and the Italian translation appeared only in 1977 (Rizzole Editore). This may explain why *Novas Cartas* was somehow voided of its own contextual meaning by international feminist politics, instead of being historically and politically contextualized and absorbed by academic feminist theory.

During the wave of international solidarity, only fragments of the book circulated in translation. Parts of it were adapted for the theatre by Brazilian playwright Gilda Grillo and staged in Paris and New York. One of Grillo's dramatizations was presented on Broadway in January 1974, just months before the Portuguese revolution. Radical feminist Robin Morgan introduced the event, explaining the content of the book to the audience in the following terms:

> *Their* collective book explores themes such as the loneliness and isolation of women, the exploitation of *our* sexuality and the denial of *our* own fulfillment as whole human beings. It speaks of the suffering caused by rape, prison, sadistic abortions, it explores *our* political and economic condition, it talks of religion and the cloister, of adultery and madness and suicide. It is not a timid work—it is a strong and womanly book. (Morgan 203; my emphases)

This synopsis, which tellingly switches from "their" to "our," illustrates the pattern underlying the consumption of the Three Marias' book outside Portugal. Morgan's summary of *Novas Cartas* is followed by a footnote: "When the book was published in the Unites States, the English translation seemed to me somewhat less inspiring than the selections [for that evening's performance] done by Gilda Grillo and Louise Bernikow" (203). The insistence on the fragmented version—in the presence of a full translation of the text—reveals the extent to which the myth of absolute reciprocity between the Three Marias and their international "sisters" was, in fact, aided by a particular reading practice, which privileged extracts published in the media and adapted to the stage, newspaper commentaries, reviews, and word of mouth over the full text. Morgan's choice of the term "inspiring" emphasises the supposed authenticity of the fragment over the entire book. It is as if fragmentary translations diminished the risk of betrayal—betrayal of second-wave concerns, not those of the Three Marias.

The perils and delights of translation are also a prominent theme in Cixous's reading of Lispector. But that does not prevent the French feminist from erasing the cultural and individual otherness of Lispector's texts, which, according to Klobucka, "disappears without a trace, leaving behind only such a pale reflection of itself as can, in effect, be labeled 'Cixousian'" (1994, 46). When discussing the subtle reversal of intertextual relationship at work in Cixous's discourse towards her "loved object," Klobucka exposes the fit between the myth of amorous "dialogue" and the actual lack of respect for Lispector's irreducible otherness. The terms in which Cixous's reinvention of the foreign subject's text includes through exclusion (Ahmed) may also be found in the preface to the 1975 edition of the English translation of *Novas Cartas* (*The Three Marias: New Portuguese Letters*). Here, translator Helen R. Lane assures the American audience that, although the authors were not all in agreement as to how to define feminism, theirs is the story of "a precarious but real sisterhood," because "what they say applies equally to contemporary Portuguese women in a society far more tradition-bound than ours in America, and to women *everywhere*" (11). To Lane, the relations between Mariana and her French chevalier "become the symbol of the deep ambivalence underlying the relations between man and woman *in all times and places*," and all the "Marias and Marianas and Maria Anas of the book thus become a sort of a *universal name for woman*" (10; all emphases mine).

So far, and apart from a few notable exceptions (as noted in my introduction and conclusion), the international impact of *Novas Cartas* has been assessed by focusing on the negative implications of this type of reading. In this scenario, the book becomes the unwitting victim of a process of fetishization wholly orchestrated by strident second-wave feminists abroad. But what is the role of *Novas Cartas* in setting the tone of how to listen to its own transgressions?

Reading practices and readerships are at the heart of *Novas Cartas*. Hilary Owen argues that the Three Marias' indivisible voice as authors shifts "one's authoritarian certainties and one's critical assumptions

predicated on a single, unified author/narrator figure [and is] part of learning a new reading practice and [of] conditioning one's own reading public" (1995, 183). To the critic, the central theme of *Novas Cartas*, which corresponds to the construction of the female writing subject, is inseparable from "the construction of woman as reader" (185). By speaking of a book that aims at educating a reading public with whom the authors share images, Owen echoes Maria de Lurdes Pintasilgo's perception of the book as "apelo a uma escuta para além da imediata leitura" (a call for a mode of listening beyond immediate reading) (Pintasilgo xxxvi; my translation).

In *The Question of How: Women Writers and New Portuguese Literature*, Darlene Sadlier points out that *Novas Cartas* is difficult to describe with standard critical terminology: "Even the authors themselves refer to their book as a 'thing,' which suggests their inability, or perhaps better, their reluctance to categorize it" (7). Relying considerably on the fragmentation of the female voice and on the interplay between subject and object positions, the Three Marias wove their "thing" around many different kinds of material. The book includes letters written by a host of fictitious Anas, Marias, Marianas, and Marias Anas of today, historical documents, poems exchanged between the three authors, prose essays on the condition of women throughout history, reflections on the role of men in shaping the condition of women, and invented letters, spanning a period of three centuries, to and from a long line of Mariana's female descendants and their lovers. Fragmentation in *Novas Cartas* expresses the authors' mistrust in the language they were using to make their case. They lacked faith in the power of language and theory to represent the political realities they were concerned with. As argued by Owen, this lack of faith in language may explain the way in which "the love letters and self-referential word play of *Novas Cartas* are periodically interrupted as the Marias express a fear of mysticising language for its own sake to the exclusion of the problems of reality" (1995, 76).

As suggested by Owen and Pintasilgo, a better understanding of the reception of *Novas Cartas* implies a reconceptualization of what is meant by "reading," since the form of the book invites its readers to listen beyond/across/in between what is written. Building on this argument, I would add that a reconceptualization of what is meant by reading must account here also for forms of reception and mass consumption other than "cover-to-cover" readings. There are at least two reasons as to why fragmentary readings would have been preferred by the Three Marias. First, this type of reading would expand the authors' possibilities of survival in a Portuguese context of routine censorship and repression, where the kind of themes they addressed were considered offensive to public morals and family values sustaining the regime. The Portuguese censors were in fact the first to perform and, as a result, encourage fragmentary readings of *Novas Cartas*, since to the Portuguese authorities only certain passages constituted an outrage to public morals and good customs. Second, fragmentary readings of the book would create the conditions necessary for the text to reach beyond the political borders of Portugal. Because each Maria had her own views on feminism, the authors used the many legacies at their disposal in order to educate feminist readerships in Portugal and to hold the attention of feminist audiences abroad, whilst simultaneously uncovering the limitations of these legacies.

Thus, while the fragmentary form of *Novas Cartas* allowed for its message to effect theoretical critique, the partial, distorted readings that ensued also created the conditions necessary for its authors to survive prosecution and for the text to reach beyond the Portuguese borders. This implies that the manner in which the reception of *Novas Cartas* unfolded was no accident. Fragmentary readings were, in part, strategically orchestrated by the Three Marias as a tool of mediation between the political and the theoretical. Such form of mass consumption was a consequence not only of the Three Marias' political imperative to secure an audience abroad, but also of their theoretical imperative to construct the Portuguese woman as a

feminist reader in dialogue with other feminists beyond Portugal. To simply dismiss, or to blame others for, the way in which *Novas Cartas* was (not) read, or misread, or read fragmentarily, or distorted by its international supporters, is to neglect the Three Marias' role, however minor, in dictating the terms of their book's reception abroad. In order to both address and go beyond the physical and political frontiers of the Portuguese reality, the Three Marias had to devise a book that was able to elude the Portuguese censors and educate its Portuguese readers to read and write *with* (as well as *against*) distinct transnational readerships. However, as we shall see in the following section, this is not the way in which the story of the international reception of *Novas Cartas* has been told.

What about Us? Reading *Novas Cartas* "à la portugaise"

As a way of countering reductive liberal feminist readings of *Novas Cartas*, such as the one outlined above, a Portuguese non-feminist discourse emerged, highlighting what was specifically Portuguese and anti-fascist (i.e., non-feminist) about the book. Shortly after the Three Marias' acquittal, which took place two weeks after the Carnation Revolution, on May 7, 1974, a bitter polemic erupted following Maria Velho da Costa's publication of an open letter titled "Portuguese Letter and Mine Alone to the People Still United" in the literary supplement *Artes e Letras* of the Portuguese newspaper *A Capital* (May 16, 1974). As noted by Loretta Porto Slover, in this letter Velho da Costa publicly dissociated herself from any involvement in Women's Liberation groups. Denouncing feminist ideology, she wrote: "I don't like what was done with that book. I don't like what was done with me about it. When it was written, it was a book. Now, they say, it's a feminist book" (qtd. in Slover 107). Velho da Costa's anti-feminist stance was immediately countered by Maria Isabel Barreno, who on May 27, 1974 published an open letter titled "Letter Neither Particularly New Nor Particularly Portuguese to the People Who Are No Longer Unprepared" (qtd. in Slover 107). Here, Barreno articulated her feminist position against the Marxist stance espoused by Velho da Costa, to whom class struggle now preempted feminist engagement.

This epistolary polemic continued when on June 18 a reply from Monique Wittig (the French translator of *Novas Cartas*) appeared in *A Capital*. Wittig's letter was entitled "First Letter of a French Feminist—Which Could as Well Have Been Written by an International Brazilian Feminist—to Maria Velho da Costa." As pointed out by Slover, Wittig refused the suggestion, made in Velho da Costa's letter, that French feminists involved themselves in supporting the authors of *Novas Cartas* because they were primarily interested in the benefits the book might bring them: "We made a great effort to help you because you were up against male and fascist repression, not because of your book. Because we couldn't even read it" (qtd. in Slover 111).

In her description of this polemic, Slover arguably takes sides with Wittig and Barreno, as she makes clear by referring to Velho da Costa's final letter to Wittig as "a mocking personal attack" that was "sarcastic and insulting" (111-12). Her stance is also visible in her comments on the quality of the arguments put forward during the epistolary battle between two of the Marias (Maria Teresa Horta stayed out of the polemic): "To Velho da Costa's facile characterizations of the Women's Movement, Barreno opposes serious issues" (109). To Slover, then, "the issue revealing the depth of disagreement between them is the legitimacy of feminism as a political cause" (109). To my mind, however, the question at the heart of the dispute between the two Marias and Wittig is not the legitimacy of feminism as a political cause, but the burning issue of the international feminist appropriation of *Novas Cartas* (as represented by Wittig's letter) versus the Portuguese anti-fascist claim to it (as staked in Velho da Costa's letter). Slover's 1970s internationalist feminist bias arguably prevented her from reading *Novas Cartas* as a text that, to paraphrase the title of Barreno's letter, is neither particularly Portuguese nor particularly feminist, but both. To some extent, what

her 1977 study reveals about Portuguese feminist history from the outside is the view of a country proudly rejecting foreign (feminist) meddling in the Portuguese (Marxist) revolution. As I wish to suggest, this is problematic, particularly if we consider that Slover's unpublished dissertation is, at present, the only existing study that directly deals with the issue of *Novas Cartas*' internationalization.

This view of Portugal was reinforced when on June 1, 1974 *Index on Censorship* published an article by António de Figueiredo, in which the author inscribed *Novas Cartas* in "the history of repression in Portugal since the advent of the corporate state in 1926" (19). A year later, Velho da Costa's reaction to the promotion of the book abroad as feminist was reproduced in a text penned by London-based Portuguese writer and literary critic Helder Macedo, who strategically reappropriated the Three Marias through their less known first names by titling his review "Teresa and Fátima and Isabel." Macedo's important article must be read in the context of the wave of negative reviews of the English translation of *Novas Cartas*, which hit the US and UK press in 1975.[8] In his text, which takes issue mainly with the commodifiable expression "Three Marias," Macedo argues for politically and historically situated readings of the book by describing the events preceding its publication, such as the dismantling of the Society of Portuguese Writers and the banning of an anthology of erotic poetry, as two examples of Portuguese political and sexual repression against which *Novas Cartas* "took a brave stand" (1484). To the critic, the book eventually came to be marketed as a feminist manifesto because it was disconnected from its political background, when it should have been read in the context of the Portuguese fascist struggle and of the Portuguese literary feminine (feminist?) tradition alone. As a way of countering reductive liberal feminist readings interested in "mothering" *Novas Cartas*, Macedo goes on to name the real father of Teresa, Fátima, and Isabel. The reference in the article to a story in *Novas Cartas* in which a father rapes his daughter and sends her away from home ("The Father") affords the key to Macedo's claim that "the book's feminism is deeply rooted in the old tradition of Portuguese feminist literature." His attempt to establish a genealogy by comparing *Novas Cartas* to Bernardim Ribeiro's sixteenth-century masterpiece *Menina e Moça* is complicated by his reference to a broader *sui generis* Portuguese literary tradition in which male authors stage their abdication of the voice of authority by writing female-voiced texts. This tradition of literary transvestism in itself signals the historical ambivalence surrounding issues of gendered authorship in Portugal. The attempt to accentuate what was specifically and authentically Portuguese about *Novas Cartas* is meant to root the Three Marias in a Portuguese "feminism" without women.

Furthermore, Macedo condemns the commodified use of the collective name "Maria," as perfomed abroad by international feminism, implicitly describing it as a false name, as opposed to the "real names of Teresa (Maria Teresa Horta), Fátima (Maria Velho da Costa) and Isabel (Maria Isabel Barreno)" (1484). The critic's choice of the word "real" is significant, for it reveals his anxiety about the Three Marias' Portuguese authenticity in a manner that echoes Helen R. Lane's anxiety about their sisterhood as "precarious but real" (11). Structuring the review around the opposition between an authentic feminine Portuguese "I" (rooted in a literary past without women) and a false feminist "them," Macedo distances the authors from the present of international feminisms made up of real women.

Despite its undeniable political importance, the reading put forward in Macedo's review leads to a dead end, since it does not provide wholly adequate tools to address the dialogues enacted between the Three Marias and their various feminist audiences, national and international alike, as well as among their several writing selves. I will name this type of reading as reading "à la portugaise," after the writing manner "à la portugaise," which became famous as a result of the multiple translations and editions of *Lettres portugaises*, the seventeenth-century text that supplied the starting point of *Novas Cartas*.

First published in 1669 by Claude Barbin in Paris, *Lettres portugaises* is a collection of five letters written in French from the perspective of a Portuguese nun called Mariana Alcoforado and addressed to Chevalier de Chamilly, her French lover. Set at the time of Portugal's struggle for independence against Spain, the letters were supposedly translated from the Portuguese original, which was never found. It is now accepted that these letters, which speak of the nun's suffering after being abandoned by her lover, were originally penned by a French male writer, Gabriel Joseph de Lavergne de Guilleragues, and not by a real Portuguese nun. Nevertheless, this collection linked Portugal and the name of Mariana Alcoforado to an extremely interesting case of literary success in Europe. As pointed out by Claire Goldstein, the book provoked commentary not only because of its "mysterious" origin or authorship but also because of its content and style:

> As a text which engaged readers in a representation of female desire as well as in the question of authentic or fictional female style, the *Lettres portugaises* presented a locus for a discussion of women's writing, a space for critics to articulate their conceptions of feminine sensibility and writing style. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the feminine coding of the epistolary and the formulation of a certain image of a female suffering voice crystallize in the critical discussion of the *Lettres portugaises*. (575)

If to write "à la portugaise" became in the seventeenth century "a veritable code for a certain style—written at the height of passion in a moment of disorder and distress" (Kauffman 95), to read "à la portugaise" could be defined as a code for reading that similarly plays on various readerships' expectations of authenticity regarding Portugal's order (or disorder) in relation to the central orders of the world; a reading practice that is less interested in denouncing gendered national myths of authenticity than in reaffirming the deep-rooted "Portugueseness" of the Three Marias, and that draws a temporal line between the feminine roots of their work and the feminist fervor of their audience.

This type of reading shares similarities with that performed in Slover's dissertation, since it arguably does very little to destabilize external views of Portugal as a supposedly primordial, authentic space, incapable of producing international theoretical alliances of its own. Such readings "à la portugaise" neglect an entire history of mediations, alliances, and conflicts between Portuguese and international feminist, Marxist, and other anti-fascist resistance movements in the 1970s. A more historically located view is needed here, one that goes beyond existing Portuguese attempts to rescue *Novas Cartas* from the international campaign and restore it to a Portuguese lineage of feminist thought.

The first step towards achieving this view is to acknowledge the familiarity of the Three Marias with international feminist discourses of their time. Acquainted with some major second-wave concerns of universalist liberal feminism, they appropriated, for instance, Afghan Muslim examples of women's oppression in order to express their own experiences:

> A mulher adúltera é ainda apedrejada de morte no Afeganistão e na Arábia Saudita.... Em Portugal ... não é necessário ser-se adúltera para se ser "apedrejada," aniquilada... Basta que ela surja e fale como "um homem." (247-48)

> A woman taken in adultery is still stoned to death today in Afghanistan and in Saudi Arabia.... In Portugal ... it is not necessary for a woman to commit adultery for her to be "stoned to death," to be destroyed... She need only appear in the public eye and talk "like a man." (259)

The authors cite the work of prominent feminists, namely the American author Ti-Grace Atkinson: "Ti-Grace Atkinson, teórica feminista de 29 anos, afirma: 'O amor é a armadilha, a vedação de arame farpado, o eixo de opressão das mulheres num mundo gozador. Que é o amor senão a necessidade e o medo?'" (249)

(Ti-Grace Atkinson, a theoretician of the feminist movement, who is twenty-nine years old, writes: "Love is the trap, the barbed wire fence, the focal point of repression of women in a sexist world. What is love but need or fear?" [261]). On the one hand, they problematize the legacies of Marxist feminism, criticizing it for placing too much emphasis upon class relations in the economic sphere and for not paying enough attention to female experiences outside the labor market: "Entendo, pois, que não basta pensar em relações de produção, sendo socialmente a mulher produtora de filhos e vendendo sua força de trabalho ao homem-patrão" (80) (I realize, therefore, that it is not enough merely to consider the relations of production from the point of view of the fact that socially woman is a producer of children and a seller of her labor to man-the-boss [88]). On the other hand, they tackle the sexual liberation of the 1960s, condemning it as an illusion: "Eis-nos pois, irmãs, em plena era da libertação da mulher portuguesa … e o homem exulta, irmãs, e ajuda a mulher nesta falsa e vergonhosa 'libertação'" (221). (So here we are, sisters, in the midst of the era of the liberation of the Portuguese women … and the man rejoices, sisters, and aids and abets the woman in this farce, in this delusion, in this false and shameful "liberation" [235]). The book calls for the deconstruction not only of male and female sexual identities, but also of the traditional roles associated with them: "é preciso curar o homem, dizer-lhe que nem o seu corpo é estéril e nem só o falo é criador" (301) (it is necessary to cure the man, to tell him both that his body is not sterile and that it is not only his phallus that is creative [300]). As pointed out by one Maria, "Ao que deveras buscamos, qualquer lei, mesmo natural, é escandalosa" (273). (From the point of view of what we are really seeking, any law, even a natural law, is scandalous [286]).

The de-homogenizing reading method emblematized by Macedo's title, "Teresa and Fátima and Isabel" (as opposed to "the Three Marias"), does not entirely take into account the familiarity of the authors with French and other feminist discourses of their time. Maria Teresa Horta explains in an interview how her life and her writing have been influenced by a number of women:

> A Simone de Beauvoir mudou a minha existência, a Marguerite Duras a minha escrita. E as duas acabariam por ficar ligadas ao processo das *Novas Cartas Portuguesas*, a partir da altura em que eu, a Maria Isabel Barreno e a Maria Velho da Costa lhes enviámos o livro. (Horta 61)
>
> Simone de Beauvoir changed my existence, Marguerite Duras my writing. And the two of them would end up being linked to *New Portuguese Letters* when I, Maria Isabel Barreno, and Maria Velho da Costa sent them the book. (my translation)

In Macedo's review, however, the contours of a Portuguese "margin" are naturalized by means of the homogenization of a mainstream "core," as attested to by the reference to the "Anglo-Saxon media" (1484), against which Portugal has to struggle as a marginal periphery. Macedo's main concern is to emphasize "the Three Marias' proper and central place in society." But their place as authors of *Novas Cartas* can neither be named in the singular nor in relation to one center. As a result, the review fails to account for the kind of margin and center Portugal becomes in relation to multiple shifting feminist and linguistic (Portuguese and French) cores and peripheries, the latter including, for example, Portugal's African colonies.

As a three-headed, fragmented "thing," *Novas Cartas* holds the power to destabilize fixed reference points that anchor feminist legacies and collective political identities, even as it unmasks its own complicity with the mainstream. It is therefore no surprise that, once it was translated and made available to a global audience, *Novas Cartas* failed to materialize in the constructed familiar form feminists had ascribed to it. As pointed out by Linda Kauffman in *Discourses of Desire*, many of the post-1974 international responses to the book were mixed. It did not enter the American or European canons of feminist theory and remained

an important text outside Portugal mainly for feminist solidarity politics. What the negative international responses to the book demonstrate, according to Kauffman (writing in 1986), was the lack, in 1972, of a vocabulary that could encompass the anti-canonical, theoretically transgressive, avant-garde strategies of this particular text (307). In this context, what was the role of readings "à la portugaise" in the resignification of the book abroad as a strange textual object out of place?

The consequences of Macedo's insistence on a male tradition of Portuguese "feminine" literature share common ground with the consequences of the fragmentary and essentializing readings of *Novas Cartas* by international feminists: in both cases, there is an emphasis on someone else's identity, which corresponds to the identity of the privileged subject, be it a male Portuguese writer or a first-world mainstream feminist. As a result, it is possible that the process of relegation of the Three Marias to the margins of theory making by more central, canonical feminist voices may have been aided by readings "à la portugaise."

Take, for example, Kauffman's *Discourses of Desire*, which provides, for the first time since the publication of *Novas Cartas*, a theoretically informed context for a critical consideration of the book. Kauffman notes that the Three Marias were familiar with Lacanian psychoanalysis and the theories of French women. She points out that they attempt to overcome the repression of the feminine in language by acting it out, by making the hidden or oppressed visible. The Three Marias "allude specifically to Freud, Lévi-Strauss, the Imaginary, deciphering signs and texts, to linguistics, psychoanalysis, anthropology, Marxism, semiology, and to a range of feminist theorists, from Shulamith Firestone to Simone de Beauvoir" (309).

Kauffman's most intriguing insight is that the Three Marias' text arrived too early. She goes as far as to emphasize that the authors' feeling of admiration for French feminists and familiarity with their theories were reciprocal. As clarified in one footnote, these comparisons serve to demonstrate "the relevance of recent French, feminist, and psychoanalytical theories to the Three Marias within the context of amorous epistolary discourse" (287). Nevertheless, the footnote significantly omits the fact that most of the theories Kauffman refers to could not have been applied by the Three Marias to their text, precisely because many of them postdate *Novas Cartas*, as noted by Hilary Owen in "New Cartographies of the Body" (47). Instead of addressing the urgent question, raised by Owen's observation, of the extent to which *Novas Cartas* actually influenced mainstream feminisms of the 1970s, Kauffman goes on to reproduce "the more essentialist, universalizing movements of the Three Marias' text" (Owen 50). As pointed out by Owen, the centrality of the "woman-as-land" metaphor in Kauffman's reading creates a tendency for her to see in the Portuguese case of the Three Marias an elucidation of "women's perpetual colonization historically, from Louis XIV to Angola" (qtd. in Owen 50). Here, Kauffman's reading reinforces, to a large extent, some of the universalizing claims criticized by Macedo. Interestingly, this does not prevent her from strategically praising in her text Macedo's own nationalist and anti-feminist mapping of *Novas Cartas*. As Kauffman writes,

> There was no tradition like the one I am tracing that could provide a context for critical consideration [of *Novas Cartas*]: the sole example of an attempt—and the most intelligent review—places the Three Marias in a long tradition of Portuguese feminism, showing its similarities to the cycles of stories in which an older woman has a dialogue with a younger woman about love. (307)

The critic's reference to Macedo's review is telling, for it shows how the reviewer's attempt to reinforce the Portuguese authenticity of the book—through his reading "à la portugaise"—is easily co-opted by Kauffman's useful but at times essentialist and universalizing analysis. This situation illustrates the way in which the Three Marias' book has been relegated to the margins of theory making.

Conclusion: The Women inside the Paper Horse

Only rarely has criticism prevented such "proper" binocular vision of the book as that I've attempted to diagnose here. Despite the existence of a Portuguese non-feminist discourse on *Novas Cartas*, the book has been occasionally read in Portugal as both "Portuguese" and "feminist," as attested by the work of Graça Abranches, Maria Alzira Seixo, and Ana Luísa Amaral. In "Desconstruindo Identidades: Ler *Novas Cartas Portuguesas* à Luz da Teoria Queer," Amaral discusses the role of excess in *Novas Cartas* by emphasizing the book's textual and theoretical hybridism as well as its emphasis on sexual/identitarian otherness, both of which are issues privileged by queer theory. To the critic, queer theory helps recognize that the language of *Novas Cartas* is "o espaço do excesso do nosso discurso, sempre ameaçado pelo hegemónico, seja ele cultural, universal ou nacional. 'Je t'aime, je t'aime, como é que se pode em português dizer tal coisa?'" (89) (the space of excess in our discourse, which is always threatened by hegemony, whether cultural, universal, or national. "Je t'aime, je t'aime, how can you say such a thing in Portuguese?") (my translation).

Outside Portugal, Hilary Owen in particular has viewed *Novas Cartas* as a work of theory in the context of international and Portuguese feminist and women's writing traditions. She has also argued productively in favor of the book's originality by outlining what could be seen as the Three Marias' theoretical "trademark" or signature (Bourdieu 262), which consists of the crafting of a multiple female voice. More recently, Margaretta Jolly has published an important monograph, *In Love and Struggle: Letters in Contemporary Feminism* (2008), which includes a discussion of *Novas Cartas* in the context of women's private and public correspondence from the 1970s to the 1990s. Jolly acknowledges the role of the Three Marias' book in the construction of a transnational feminist imagined community that shaped second-wave feminism in the seventies:

> The Three Marias' "passionately nourishing" letters, Wittig's "écrivante féminine," Walker's "dear sister," Hanscombe and Namjoshi's "fleshly paper," and, just as much, the silly, loving, angry, jokey, pretentious, and nervous letters actually sent and received by the kinds of women who read this literature in different ways personify the discovery of an erotic and spiritual identity among women.... (48)

By emphasising, however, the extent to which *Novas Cartas* "as the record of a romance with the idea of *political* identity itself ... form[s] an important element in the 'corporeal soul' of feminism" (48; my emphasis), Jolly does not further develop the theoretical life of the book. In fact, the critic effectively links *Novas Cartas* to the building of an international feminist community by giving priority to the public split of the authors (letters published in *A Capital*) over the various internal cracks and splits inscribed in *Novas Cartas* itself, which repeatedly undermine not only the book's own literary project but also the several international feminist projects it alludes to. As Jolly notes, "If the Three Marias' 1973 collective-love-letter novel to one another symbolised women's reclaiming their sexuality from men, their bitter falling out in May 1974 ... foreshadowed what was to happen under the sign of women's identity" (61). This bitter breakup was a rather sterile event, which did not cancel the fruitful polyphony of voices articulated in the book. Nevertheless, it is the former and not the latter that is perceived by Jolly as belonging to the public (international feminist) sphere: "This classic socialist-radical split of 1970s feminism, followed by many more political divisions of strategy and identity throughout the 80s, gradually revised feminist uses of the epistolary motif" (61). The emphasis on the public split, here defined as "classic," or in place, becomes a way of containing the untamed and excessive out-of-place body of *Novas Cartas*, which cannot be explained by means of the question "What happens when feminists disagree?" (Jolly 92). Similarly to what occurs in

Cixous's reading of Lispector, the window is once again transformed into a mirror, as the three-tongued literary voice of the Three Marias is tucked away behind the ordered, clean split between two of the Marias.

In sum, all the studies mentioned here confirm the exceptionality of readings of *Novas Cartas* that are able to move beyond the nationalist-versus-feminist debate. More research is needed in order to throw light on the largely overlooked relationship between Portugal and the dominant French and Anglo-American theory centers of feminist thought, so that the possibilities opened up by the alleged "strangeness" of *Novas Cartas* may be fully addressed.

As argued by Ahmed, strange bodies have the capacity to confound the identities of privileged subjects: "We still need to question how some bodies come to be the impossible object that both establishes and confounds the border [which defines the privileged subject]" (93). When the Three Marias decided to send their "impossible object" to the three French feminists, they were in fact sending a Trojan horse whose form and content, wrapped in paper, had the potential to question existing feminist theoretical forms and conventions. As we have seen, feminists in France accepted the gift but kept the horse at arm's length—not without some help from Portugal—thus disallowing the movement of this text across boundaries on a theoretical level. Contrary to the reading practices discussed here, this paper horse requires us to read otherwise, against the fantasies of wholeness that have pinned it down to the Portuguese or international political realm. What this new reading practice will reveal about feminism and theory making in Europe and the US is yet to be addressed. Meanwhile, the paper horse awaits its hour, as "quelque chose qui reste et qui attend" (as something that remains, waiting) (Barreno, Horta, and Velho da Costa 2004; my translation).

Notes

1. Throughout this article, I will quote from Ana Luísa Amaral's new annotated Portuguese edition of *Novas Cartas* (Barreno, Horta, and Velho da Costa 2010). Except when stated otherwise, all translations into English are Helen R. Lane's (Barreno, Horta, and Velho da Costa 1975). I would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers of my manuscript for their helpful criticism and advice.

2. Since the 1980s, however, this situation has changed. Three important books have been published that make extensive references to *Novas Cartas* in the Anglo-American context: Linda Kauffman's *Discourses of Desire: Gender, Genre and Epistolary Fictions* (1986), Darlene Sadlier's *The Question of How: Women Writers and New Portuguese Literature* (1989), and, more recently, Margaretta Jolly's *In Love and Struggle: Letters in Contemporary Feminism* (2008).

3. In comparing the Three Marias to the hyphenated authorial entity of "Gilbert-and-Gubar," co-authors of *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*, I am not suggesting that the Portuguese text is as seamlessly unitary as that produced by the North American feminist critics. Contrary to the text of Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, *Novas Cartas* enacts very complex internal dialogues that deliberately dramatize differences among the Three Marias. My intention here is merely to acknowledge the historical precedence of the Three Marias' decision to create a unified-in-difference authorial entity, which they also strategically used during the court proceedings against them, in relation to Gilbert and Gubar's collaborative feminist scholarship, which, as pointed out by Marlene Tromp, many feminist critics have since chosen to imitate (50).

4. See, for example, Jean-Claude Lucien Miroir's master's thesis, "Clarice Lispector via Hélène Cixous: uma leitura-escritura em vis-à-vis" (2009).

5. I would like to thank Anna Klobucka for bringing this review to my attention.

6. The expression "to write *à la portugaise*" was coined in reference to the style of *Lettres portugaises* (1669), the collection of letters allegedly penned by a Portuguese nun to her French lover, which supplied the inspiration for *Novas Cartas*. It designates a kind of writing to the moment, apparently unmediated by artifice, in which a woman speaks her heart in a supposedly authentic, because passionate, manner. I will offer a fuller account of this writing code further on in this article.

7. The few Portuguese intellectuals who publicly defended the three women were Natália Correia, Urbano Tavares Rodrigues, Maria Lamas, Augusto Abelaira, Natália Nunes, Vasco Vieira de Almeida, Carlos Jorge Correia Gago, and José Tengarrinha (Tavares 180-81).

8. The review by Jane Kramer in *The New York Times Book Review* exemplifies this wave of negative criticism.

References

Abranches, Graça. "On What Terms Shall We Join the Procession of Educated Men? Teaching Feminist Studies at the University of Coimbra." *Oficina do CES* 125 (1998).

Ahmed, Sarah. "Embodying Strangers." In *Body Matters: Feminism, Textuality and Corporality*, edited by Angela Keane and Avril Horner, 85-96. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

Amaral, Ana Luísa. "Desconstruindo Identidades: Ler *Novas Cartas Portuguesas* à Luz da Teoria Queer." *Cadernos de Literatura Comparada* 3/4 (2001): 77-91.

Barreno, Maria Isabel. "Conversa com Maria Isabel Barreno." Interview by Ana Raquel Fernandes, Claudia Coutinho, and Sara Ramos Pinto. *Textos e Pretextos* 3 (2003): 64-68.

Barreno, Maria Isabel, Maria Teresa Horta, and Maria Velho da Costa. *The Three Marias: New Portuguese Letters*. Translated by Helen R. Lane. London: Gollancz, 1975.

———. "On les appelait les trois Maria." Interview by Marie-Laure Colson. *Libération*, April 22, 2004. http://www.liberation.fr/grand-angle/0101486239-on-les-appelait-les-trois-maria.

———. *Novas Cartas Portuguesas*. Edited by Ana Luísa Amaral. Lisboa: Dom Quixote, 2010.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Production of Belief: Contribution to an Economy of Symbolic Goods." *Media, Culture and Society* 2 (1980): 261-93.

Figueiredo, António de. "The Portuguese Context." *Index on Censorship* 3, no. 2 (1974): 19-22.

Gilbert, Sandra, and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Guilleragues, Gabriel Joseph de Lavergne. *Cartas Portuguesas*. Translated by Eugénio de Andrade. Lisboa: Assírio & Alvim, 1998.

Gillespie, Faith. "The Women's Liberation Context." *Index on Censorship* 3, no. 2 (1974): 22-26.

Goldstein, Claire. "Love Letters: Discourses of Gender and Writing in the Criticism of the *Lettres portugaises*." *Romanic Review* 88, no. 4 (1997): 571-90.

hooks, bell. "Marginality as a Site of Resistance." In *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures*, edited by R. Ferguson et al., 241-43. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990.

Horta, Maria Teresa. "Conversa com Maria Teresa Horta." Interview by Ana Raquel Fernandes, Claudia Coutinho, and Sara Ramos Pinto. *Textos e Pretextos* 3 (2003): 59-63.

Jolly, Margaretta. *In Love and Struggle: Letters in Contemporary Feminism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Kauffman, Linda. *Discourses of Desire: Gender, Genre and Epistolary Fictions*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986.

Klobucka, Anna. "Hélène Cixous and the Hour of Clarice Lispector." *SubStance* 73 (1994): 41-62.

———. *The Portuguese Nun: Formation of a National Myth*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2000.

Kramer, Jane. "The Three Marias." *New York Times Book Review*. February 2, 1975, 1-2.

Macedo, Helder. "Teresa and Fátima and Isabel." *Times Literary Supplement*. December 12, 1975, 1484.

McPherson, William. "Alien Porn." *The Washington Post*. February 2, 1975, 139.

Miroir, Jean-Claude Lucien. "Clarice Lispector via Hélène Cixous: uma leitura-escritura em vis-à-vis." Master's thesis, Universidade de Brasília, 2009. http://hdl.handle.net/10482/4064.

Morgan, Robin. *Going Too Far: The Personal Chronicles of a Feminist*. New York: Random House, 1977.

Owen, Hilary. "(W)rites of Passage: Portuguese Women's Narrative After the Three Marias." PhD diss., University of Nottingham, 1992.

———. "Um Quarto que Seja Seu: The Quest for Camoes' Sister." *Portuguese Studies* 11 (1995): 179-91.

———."Exiled in Its Own Land." *Index on Censorship* 28, no. 1 (1999): 57-69.

———. "New Cartographies of the Body in *Novas Cartas Portuguesas*: The (Counter-)Narrative of the Nation and the Sign of the Voyage Back." *ellipsis* 1 (1999): 73-83.

Owen, Hilary, and Cláudia Pazos Alonso. *Antigone's Daughters? Gender, Genealogy and the Politics of Authorship in 20th-Century Portuguese Women's Writing*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2011.

Pintasilgo, Maria de Lurdes. "Prefácio (leitura longa e descuidada)." Preface to *Novas Cartas Portuguesas*, by Maria Isabel Barreno, Maria Teresa Horta, and Maria Velho da Costa, xxxi-xlviii. Edited by Ana Luísa Amaral. Lisboa: Dom Quixote, 2010.

Sadlier, Darlene. *The Question of How: Women Writers and New Portuguese Literature*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1989.

Schiach, Morag. "Their 'Symbolic' Exists, It Holds Power—We the Sowers of Disorder Know It Only Too Well." In *Between Feminisms and Psychoanalysis*, edited by Teresa Brennan, 153-67. New York: Routledge, 1989.

Seixo, Maria Alzira. *Outros Erros, Ensaios de Literatura*. Porto: Asa, 2001.

Slover, Loretta Porto. "The Three Marias: Literary Portrayals of the Situation of Women in Portugal." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1977.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Interview with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: New Nation Writers Conference in South Africa." Interview by Leon de Kock. *Ariel: A Review of International English Literature* 23, no. 3 (1992): 29-47.

Tavares, Manuela. *Feminismos: Percursos e Desafios (1947-2007)*. Lisboa: Texto, 2011.

Tromp, Marlene. "Modelling the Madwoman: Feminist Movements in the Academy." In *Gilbert & Gubar's The Madwoman in the Attic: After Thirty Years*, edited by Anette R. Federico, 34-59. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2009.

The Problem of Protection: Rethinking Rhetoric of Normalizing Surgeries

Amy Falvey, Augustana College

Abstract: This essay focuses on the rhetoric of protection that emerges around infants who face the prospect of normalizing surgeries. Frequently, decisions to proceed with normalizing surgeries are made by doctors and parents with "protection" of the infant as a motivating force. "Protection," in such contexts, typically refers to protection of the infant from the inhospitable world that lies in wait for an individual whose body does not conform to social, morphological, and biological norms. While this concern may be valid and important, this essay argues that there are alternative narratives or notions of protection that must also be acknowledged and validated.

Keywords: protection, safety, intersex, disability, normativity, gender, legibility

> It is strange that her desire to protect me from harm had the unintentional consequence … of actually causing me harm.
> —Cassandra Aspinall, "Do I Make You Uncomfortable?"

> [B]odily-being is shaped not only by the surgeon's knife but also by the discourses that justify and contest the use of such instruments.
> —Nikki Sullivan, "The Somatechnics of Intersexuality"

> I question some of the assumptions leading well-intentioned people to believe that surgery for children with atypical bodies is a good solution to the difficulties children may face because of their atypicality.
> —Adrienne Asch, "Disability, Bioethics, and Human Rights"

> It is significant that today the lives of conjoined twins are considered tragic if the operation to separate them is not feasible. This does not always accord with the feelings of the conjoined twins themselves.
> —Elizabeth Grosz, "Intolerable Ambiguity"

When Cassandra Aspinall, herself born with a cleft palate, gave birth to her third son—who, like Cassandra, was born with a cleft palate—the issues she struggled with as both a child and an adult reemerged in new, extremely complicated ways. In her own life, Cassandra's parents had decided that she undergo surgery at a young age. Cassandra continued surgeries into her seventeenth year, and then chose against later procedures that would have made scarring much less evident. Aspinall recounts her own experience as a constant challenge to negotiate between what others thought about her and her appearance, and her own perceptions of herself. She does not share her story in order to warn against early appearance-normalizing surgery; instead, she urges parents to consider the motivations behind early surgical change: "Acknowledging the incredible complexity of relationships, the intensity of social pressures, and how difficult it is for children to express their opinions means that time must be taken to do the right thing. The possibility of coercion

cannot be ignored" (Aspinall 2006, 27).[1] Like almost all other narratives about early surgery, Aspinall's story evokes the term around which so many questions revolve: protection. Similarly, Aspinall directly addresses the prospect of coercion that—whether implicitly or explicitly—underlies the complexities of decision making in regard to early appearance-normalizing surgeries.

As feminist and gender studies, medical studies, and disability studies have all grown more aware of the complicated questions of surgeries aimed at normalizing the appearance of infants born with physical anomalies and/or genitalia considered ambiguous, so too has the problem of what exactly constitutes protection been more frequently called into question. Much of the research clearly reveals that protection and coercion are terms that require significant dissection and are of the greatest significance when one is born "abnormal." As Aspinall points out, "I acknowledge that there will be (and have been) instances where my interpretation is the one that matters and leads me to step in to protect my children, even though they would prefer that I didn't. But it is important to remember that there are many ways to interpret the same set of circumstances. Your version may not be the most important one worth acting on" (Aspinall 2006, 27). Although many stories that express such complexities and ambivalence—told by parents and children in response to personal experience with appearance-normalizing surgeries—have surfaced, the dominant understanding of "protection" in such circumstances has remained the same.

Aspinall points out that the *possibility* of coercion cannot be ignored. In this essay I contend that it is this very possibility that often goes unacknowledged, or is erased, through the rhetorical creation of doctors and parents that are saving one from an impending and inevitable life of tragedy. Although normalizing surgeries tend to be chosen for the sake of the child's protection, the meaning of protection in this context is predominantly understood as protection from a social world that is hostile towards physical difference. While this understanding of protection certainly warrants consideration in making a decision about surgical intervention, its dominance also elides other narratives of what protection might constitute in such circumstances. Thus, this essay works not to disavow the protection that is understood as an effort to keep a child safe from the inhospitable social environments the child would surely encounter; rather, it proposes that we heed the multifarious voices that pose a challenge to thinking of protection as *only* protection of the child from the social world. Utilizing both a fictional narrative—the 2007 film *XXY*—and the nonfictional stories of parents and children who have been directly involved in early normalizing surgeries, this essay seeks to present alternative narratives of protection.

Often the dominant narrative of protection is affirmed through the rhetorical creation of a savior. Again, I do not wish to suggest that a child whose bodily contours do not fit social norms of morphology or biological sex faces no threat in society. However, this threat often becomes emphasized to the point at which the life of an individual (the infant or child) is prematurely and authoritatively pronounced to be inescapably tragic. The centralization of this "tragic" figure, then, rhetorically generates a savior out of those who work to alleviate the tragedy. When this centralization occurs, it is often precisely *the possibility of coercion* that can be left ignored. I propose that the multiplication of other, non-dominant, narratives of protection might be heard, in order to transform the discourses in which anomalous bodies are understood and approached not only by the medical industry and parents, but in the public imagination. I also suggest here that in affirming other definitions of "protection," we might consider as well that norms themselves are being protected from the threat to social order and coherency posed by the persistence of ambiguity and/or anomaly.

"Show Them … Mercy": The Making of Saviors and Tragic Bodies

Olympia, the albino, hunchbacked, and bald narrator of Katherine Dunn's *Geek Love*, the 1983 novel about a carnival couple who breed their own freak show, does not view her life of "deformity" as the tragedy that most of the world sees in or on her body. As an adult, accompanied by her friend Miss Lick, she narrates the feeling of eyes upon her at the swimming pool. The passage is worth quoting at length, as it exemplifies both the discourses of "tragedy" and the role of the "savior" in dominant narratives of protection:

> With my eyes closed I can feel the children looking at me. They have stopped their games for a moment in the shallow end where they can watch me. I too am at the shallow end, sitting on the steps in water up to my nipples. Miss Lick is plowing up and down the pool in her ponderous and dutiful laps. The children's eyes are crawling on me. If I opened my eyes they would smile at me and wave. They are just old enough to be embarrassed at their normality in front of me.
>
> Because I am Olympia Binewski and am accustomed to the feel of eyes moving on me, I turn slightly on my submerged seat and reach down as though examining my toes under water. This angle will allow the children a clear profile view of my hump….
>
> But Miss Lick is standing in the shallow end, glowering down at the children. I can hear her harshness. "Are you swimming laps or fooling around?" And four little creatures do not speak but kick off from the wall and chase each other down the far lane of the pool to escape.
>
> The light is pale green and moves on Miss Lick's enormous shoulders and chest. She turns and nods at me—a quick twitch of tension at her mouth that stands for a smile. She is telling me that she has saved me from the stares of idiots and that I am safe with her to guard me. (Dunn 1989, 325-26)

Although Olympia realizes that these childrens' eyes are upon her body, she does not express shame. Rather, she angles her body so that the children may see it more fully; aware of their gaze, she chooses how to be seen. Olympia does not feel that her body is a tragedy, but Miss Lick demands that Olympia's body signify this tragedy in her adopting the role of savior. She silences the desire of Olympia—who shifts her body to be seen more fully—in that her response deems this desire impossible. When Olympia acknowledges that Miss Lick is playing the role of savior, it becomes clear that Miss Lick both misunderstands and misinterprets how Olympia feels about her body (that it is not a tragedy) or what Olympia desires, which is "abnormal." It is both the tragedy and the savior in this excerpt that become very useful to interrogate. Miss Lick exercises a choice in the name of saving Olympia from her own tragic body, but Olympia neither considers her body tragic nor believes she needs saving. There is a violence exerted in this silencing and "saving." Although fictional, this instance serves as a reminder that we must be cautious in assuming that one *desires* protection from abnormality itself. It warns against the possibly erroneous and paternalistic assumption that life in an anomalous body is inevitably undesirable and tragic.

Because of the discourses of tragedy that so vehemently persist around the subjects of both disability and infants born intersexed, and because these two subjects deal directly with dominant conceptions of wholeness and normality in relationship to morphology, this essay approaches these "abnormal" bodies in conjunction with one another.[2] This is not to conflate "deformities" and intersexed bodies, but rather to address the similar ways in which these bodies are constructed and represented through dominant ideological rhetoric. As Nikki Sullivan states, "We are surrounded by, and have embodied, the idea that while the vast majority of bodies may not be ill, they are nevertheless 'wrong' in one way or another: they have too few (or too many) limbs or digits; they (or parts of them) are the wrong size, the wrong age, the wrong color; they are 'sexually ambiguous'" (Sullivan 2009, 313). Surgical interventions in infants, Sullivan contends, are implemented to "restore order" to bodies. Both intersexed infants and those born with other

physical anomalies are predominantly viewed as wrong and in instant, urgent need of correction by medical doctors and surgeons.

Anne Fausto-Sterling suggests that few "ambiguous" infants would make it into adulthood in "sexually diverse form." She argues that, while the medical industry seeks to make legible sexes, the decision for surgery from parents or guardians is often made out of a "genuinely humanitarian concern":

> Almost at once such infants are entered into a program of hormonal and surgical management so that they can slip quietly into society as "normal" heterosexual males or females. I emphasize that the motive is in no way conspiratorial. The aims of the policy are *genuinely humanitarian*, reflecting the wish that people be able to "fit in" both physically and psychologically. (Fausto-Sterling 1993, 22; emphasis mine)

Through the rhetoric of tragedy—concerns about locker rooms and men's or women's restrooms, distrust of the terrible and terrifying world of judges that await in classrooms—the choice for early surgery is often made through the rhetoric of saving, or protecting. Saviors are created rhetorically, in the name of giving a good life or saving a body from the possibility of a life of shunning and teasing, or, further, saving one from the impossibility of a "productive" and "normal" life. And while these aims may be "genuinely humanitarian," demonstrating a desire for a "good" and "normal" life, they also potentially elide what some (including many who underwent surgery as an infant in the past) might call acts of coercion or violence upon an uninformed and unconsenting person. Such rhetoric also might foster "protection" of an inhospitable world for atypical bodies. Continuing to assert that humanitarianism lies in the child's transformation, rather than the transformation of social norms and the social world, elides the humanity of the child whose life and body are at stake—and may also erase the *possibility of coercion or violation* that troubles that humanitarian motive.

Disability studies theorist Adrienne Asch calls attention to the means by which bodies born with physical impairments are often construed as being unfortunate, in need of pity. Asch critiques this assumption and argues for a cessation of marking disabled infants as defective—to cease seeing these bodies as less than human and assuming that a life in such a body is a tragedy. Asch notes that there is a "gap in understanding that persists between people with and without disabilities regarding the potential for life with disability to be acceptable, rewarding, or as rewarding as the lives of people who do not report impairments" (Asch 2001, 301). This gap persists, Asch suggests, in that people who report impairments do not consider their lives defective, less whole, less fulfilling, while the dominant notion about impairments is precisely that they always already inscribe an "unremitting tragedy" (300):

> When people with disabilities report unhappiness or dissatisfaction (a minority in every study), the sources resemble sources of unhappiness in the lives of nondisabled people—inadequacies in financial security, work, or social and personal relationships … sometimes impairment-related factors, such as pain and fatigue, contribute to unsatisfying relationships or to the difficulty of holding a job, but the frustrations come from difficulty in incorporating the impairment into existing interpersonal and institutional life. (Asch 2001, 301)

Asch reiterates that life with disability is not the tragedy that dominant ideologies and medical institutions claim it to be. And when one does "report" feelings of unhappiness with one's life, they are either similar to those unhappinesses which are reported by those who do not possess physical impairments, or otherwise suggest a discontent that pertains not to their own biology or morphology but to the shapes of society and institutions that do not accommodate the contours of that body. This is similar to the "tragedy" continually assumed on the body of an intersexed infant.[3]

Martin S. Pernick describes the debates that waged in the US following the public disclosure of Dr. Harry

J. Haiselden's decision, in 1915, to let "Baby Bollinger" die because of the infant's multiple impairments. Pernick suggests that "Haiselden's crusade did not combine logically incompatible goals, but it did appeal to fundamentally irreconcilable emotions: His supporters were motivated by a jarring combination of compassion and hatred" (Pernick 1996, 94). The language of love and compassion came to permeate the discourses that surrounded the deaths of what Pernick refers to as "defectives," a term that worked in conjunction with the discourses of eugenics he both exposes and critiques.[4] Argumentative constructions—which still permeate how bodies are imagined (as whole and integrated) and how discourses frame those bodies—relied on the rhetorical eclipse and erasure of *even the possibility* of coercion or violation through the language of compassion and mercy, through the alleviation of a tragedy:

> Without a word of transition, Helen Keller [who lived a life with impairments until the age of 88] described the Bollinger baby as "the hopeless being spared from a life of misery. No one cares about that pitiful, useless lump of flesh." Clarence Darrow's comments revealingly captured the full ambiguity of this appeal. "Chloroform unfit children. Show them the same mercy that is shown beasts that are no longer fit to live." (Pernick 1996, 96)

In Helen Keller's first sentence, the letting die of an impaired infant is an act of mercy, the act of a savior, protecting the infant from a tragic life in a tragic body and from the path of persecution that lies in wait. Her second sentence contradicts the first and explicitly articulates the eclipse that occurs in the creation of a savior in this rhetorical construction. The first sentence presumes a position of caretaker, relieving the infant of the "life of misery" out of love or compassion. The second sentence contradicts that claim to protection, in that it states outright that "no one cares." In calling the infant's body a "useless lump of flesh," Keller suggests that this body is a failure, a failure to fall into the norms of permissible bodily shapes. The body fails to meet normative (which here means explicitly able-bodied) molds in its designation as a "lump": it does not map, conform, and take shape within normative constructions of what bodies are, should be, or can possibly be. Thus it also fails to fulfill its capacity as a productive body in the capitalist system that devalues the body it cannot utilize for its own ends—it becomes "useless."[5] What constitutes a "useful" life is shaped by the economic, social, and normative mappings of how bodies, and lives, should be shaped, and how bodies can be made useful or lead "fulfilling" lives. Clarence Darrow's command to chloroform unfit children, in order to show them mercy, proclaims that a life in "unfit" embodiment is less preferable (or merciful) than death itself. While the social pressures that surround atypical bodies cannot be dismissed or minimized, this presumes not only that life cannot be—in the words of Judith Butler—an "occasion for flourishing" but that it can be none other than wholly tragic. As Butler writes,

> Resistance to coercive surgery moreover calls for an understanding that infants with intersexed conditions are part of the continuum of human morphology and ought to be treated with the presumption that their lives are and will be not only livable, but also occasions for flourishing. The norms that govern idealized human anatomy thus work to produce a differential sense of who is human and who is not, which lives are livable, and which are not. This differential works for a wide range of disabilities as well. (Butler 2004, 4)

As I have argued, "saving" the infant from a socially unlivable life rhetorically becomes an act of compassion, and the space for considering the *possibility*, the *potential* for coercion or violation seems to vanish. Butler argues that infants with anomalous or atypical bodies should not be treated as tragic—as persons whose lives will be inevitably so. Rather, such lives should be approached not just as survivable, but as "occasions for flourishing." What would it mean to treat these lives in such a manner? How might the term "protection" be differently approached or understood if one were to affirm the livability and possibility of one's life, rather than to foreclose that opportunity by preemptively deciding it must be tragic?

"Occasions for Flourishing": Narratives of Protection and *XXY*

Fausto-Sterling asks her readers to consider "the psychological consequences of … raising children as unabashed intersexuals," while noting that "on the surface that track seems fraught with peril" (Fausto-Sterling 1993, 24). She suggests that such a track encompasses encounters with many normatively charted spaces of bathrooms and schoolyards and entails entering a society that awaits without a provision of welcoming or habitable spaces. Yet what would be the consequences of embracing this perilous track? According to Sara Ahmed, "we walk on the path as it is before us, but it is only before us as an effect of being walked upon. A paradox of the footprint emerges. Lines are both created by being followed and are followed by being created. The lines that direct us, as lines of thought as well as lines of motion, are in this way performative" (Ahmed 2006, 16). As she suggests, norms are reiterated and perform certain lines of life, of ideology, and of embodiment. To embrace the dangerous path of "raising children as unabashed intersexuals," then, would mean to make new lines, new tracks that could be followed; it would mean to make more habitable spaces. As Ahmed states, "Deviation leaves its own marks on the ground, which can even help generate alternative lines, which cross the ground in unexpected ways. Such lines are indeed traces of desire; where people have taken different routes to get to this point or that point" (20). Released in 2007, *XXY* is an Argentine film that, I would argue, presents such alternative routes or lines, along with alternative notions of protection.[6] In so doing, the narrative also refuses to make its main character, Alex, into a figure of tragedy in need of saving.

XXY is set in the aftermath of a family's departure from Buenos Aires to a secluded house on the shores of Uruguay. The family—comprised of father Kraken (Ricardo Darín), mother Suli (Valeria Bertuccelli), and their child Alex (Inés Efron)—has been mostly isolated from urban contact or community; Kraken works as a biologist on the Uruguayan shore. Despite the seclusion of the family, the film opens with the arrival of visitors, and we soon know the reason for their arrival. The family that stays with Kraken, Suli, and Alex is also comprised of three: father Ramiro (Germán Palacios), mother Erika (Carolina Peleritti), and their son Álvaro (Martín Piroyansky). It is quickly revealed that Ramiro's profession has to do with his visit; Ramiro, a plastic surgeon, has come to stay with the family by request of Alex's mother. Suli is interested in his services because Alex, who is fifteen years old, was born intersexed, and Suli believes it in the best interest of her child to have surgery performed to mold Alex into a woman. Suli has grown increasingly concerned because Alex has stopped taking hir hormone pills.[7] Alex's case and the story we follow in *XXY* are not unique because cases of intersexed infants are all that rare, but for the reason suggested by the film's director Lucía Puenzo: "In Argentina and Italy, and other countries where the film has already been released, it created a debate on what seems almost impossible in our societies: an intersex body that has not been mutilated, and not only survives but demands the opportunity to be desired" (Tehrani 2008). What we are presented with in *XXY* is, instead of a narrative of tragedy or a narrative of normative desires, a story of a livable life, and an "occasion for flourishing."

But Alex is not without hir enemies. Not even in the quite rural community where Alex lives is ze exempt from a very real threat of violence and persecution. After ze reveals the secret of hir "ambiguous" genitalia to hir best male friend Vando (Luciano Nobile), he shares this information with three other male classmates at school. In the latter half of the film, the results of this "betrayal" (as Alex calls it) come to fruition when the three schoolmates Vando has informed assault Alex, pulling down hir pants and demanding to see hir genitalia. Though Alex is not raped, the violent attack on hir body bespeaks of the endangerment of those who do not conform to the constructed binary of male or female.

The varying responses to Alex's body conveyed by the characters in *XXY* reveal differing and shifting

understandings of "protection" and "safety." Alex's mother Suli, for example, initially is the force seeking out Ramiro—and plastic surgery—for her child's well-being. Yet Suli's role gradually shifts over the course of the film. At the beginning, she articulates the "generally humanitarian" concerns that a parent might have for a child facing an antagonistic social world. She desires the good and normal life for Alex. At this juncture, Suli sees the problem as, and in, Alex's body, rather than the social spaces in which hir body exists. She expresses growing concern over Alex's recent refusal to continue taking hormones and worries that "her body will change … she will stop developing as a woman."[8] Suli expresses a fear of Alex's being infringed upon by "the other" that threatens to overtake hir body. The transitional moment for Suli's character takes place after the attack on Alex by the aforementioned three schoolboys. In response to this attack, it is implicit that Suli begins to understand that the problem is not in Alex's body but in the social body. Rather than suggesting that an attack of this nature warrants or justifies the surgery she initially desires for Alex, she lies curled in bed next to Alex and Alex's female friend. The visitors' stay following the attack is not lengthy, and Suli does not again articulate a desire for her teenage child either to have surgery or to continue taking hormones.

While Suli's conflicted and shifting responses to Alex suggest a notion of safety and protection that is undergoing revision, the somewhat juxtaposed figures of Kraken and Ramiro also reflect conflicting (and for Kraken, developing) notions of protection. Ramiro, the plastic surgeon, is constructed somewhat antithetically to Kraken, Alex's father. This is emphasized in the moment when the two families (all except Alex) convene around the dinner table and, after Ramiro attempts to force his son to drink wine, Kraken states, "I can't stand bullying." Ramiro's dominant and coercive stance is aligned in relative opposition to Kraken's defense of the "bullied." While Ramiro believes Alex has a condition that needs fixing, Kraken believes that Alex was "perfect" from the moment of hir birth. In articulating this, a very different narrative of wholeness or integrity emerges. Rather than desiring Alex's body to conform to dominant fictions of wholeness, or reading hir body as a tragedy, Kraken immediately (and continually) believes hir to be "perfect" —an "occasion for flourishing." Since Alex has been treated for the past fifteen years as a female, the contrast between Ramiro and Kraken may initially seem to be the result of Kraken's view of Alex as a daughter in need of fatherly protection. Yet, Kraken refers to Alex as *both* his daughter *and* his son throughout the course of the film, suggesting that he does not see Alex as "female."

In conversation with Álvaro, Alex refers to Ramiro's occupation of cosmetic surgeon as that of a "butcher." Defending his father's line of work, Álvaro contends that he "doesn't butcher people. He fixes them." According to Álvaro, Ramiro works mostly on the correction of what Álvaro refers to as "deformities," and this concentration suggests the pertinence of his expertise to Alex's presumed "deformity" that needs proper "fixing." While Alex alludes to the possible violence involved in the cutting of the body to alleviate "deformity," Álvaro elides the prospect of "butchery" by creating a savior who both heals and fixes the supposedly sick. Ramiro's occupation, which involves the "fixing" of the "wrong" body, also overlaps with his desire to form his son Álvaro into a "proper" heterosexual man.

The consistently evident concern over the masculinity and heterosexuality of the surgeon's son emerges specifically in a moment towards the close of the film, as Ramiro and Álvaro sit beside one another after dark at the beach. After admitting to his son that he doesn't particularly like him or believe that Álvaro will have his father's "talent" (Álvaro's artistic drawings are diminished and feminized by Ramiro earlier in the film), Ramiro discovers that Álvaro has feelings for Alex: "Finally, good news," he says in response to this revelation, "I was afraid you were a fag."

While Ramiro's character does not explicitly convey the "humanitarian" concerns that have been

addressed in this essay, the language that converges around both his occupation and his relationship with his son suggests that Ramiro *does* believe that his surgical work *and* his anxiety over his son's masculinity and heterosexuality are both driven by "humanitarian" instincts. Ramiro presumes that someone who does not fit morphological or sexual norms is less capable of operating in the social world—and accordingly, it is individual bodily or sexual shapes that must be altered. Ramiro never expresses concerns over the social environment that deems these shapes the only possible or permissible ones, but rather seems to simply accept the very strictly demarcating lines that separate biological sex and sexuality itself.

When Ramiro finds out, for example, that his son has feelings for Alex, he is contented to know that his son is not the "fag" he worried he might be. In Ramiro's mind, then, Alex (quite simply) *is* a female whose present illegibility simply needs the restorative powers offered by the medical industry (which heals by purportedly making that unreadability readable). There is nothing queer (to Ramiro) about Álvaro's desire for Alex, and nothing possibly queer that might occur in that multidirectional and complex desire—a complexity that becomes evident to the viewer in the sexual encounter that reveals Alex anally penetrating Álvaro. Thus, Ramiro's desire for healing or restoring a body to its supposed coherency of biological sex (or his "fixing" of "deformities") reveals that he believes himself to be acting in the best interest—eliding the space between normative and surgical coercion—of his patients (or, in Alex's case, potential patient).

As I have mentioned, Ramiro sees his work as the healing of the sick, as an act of mercy that allows a body to persist more operably within the norms that make life livable. Where Ramiro does not evidence any consideration of the possibility of a life of flourishing and operability in the social world outside of the prospect of "fixing," Kraken—while still caught in a tormented anxiety in regard to the social world that poses a real threat to Alex—makes room for both imagining the possibility of a life of flourishing and for understanding *protection* and *safety* in alternative ways. Ramiro does not question the language of protection as singularly indicative of shielding the child from social hostility and violence; Kraken, however, comes to interrogate protection, even while he experiences anguish over Alex's "condition." Early in the film, Kraken and Alex discuss the recent revelation to Vando, and Alex asks hir father, "If I'm so special, why can't I talk about it?" While Kraken and Suli opted against normativizing surgeries when Alex was an infant, numerous references in the film suggest that other measures have been taken to protect hir from the social world. Not only has Alex not been permitted to "talk about it," but the family repeatedly asserts that they moved from Buenos Aires to a remote part of Uruguay in order to avoid the possibility of increased confrontations within a more populated and urban region. While the circumstances suggest that Kraken and Suli have repressed or hidden Alex's body, this assumption makes a turn when Kraken articulates that these measures have been taken merely to protect Alex until an age (which, for Alex, seems to be fifteen) that permits hir to make a decision for hirself about hir body.

In one of the last scenes of *XXY*, Kraken and Alex discuss choice as it pertains to two separate, but related, circumstances. Kraken asks Alex whether or not ze would like him to go to the police in order to report hir attackers. Preceding the conversation, viewers watch Kraken pull up to the police station, sit in his car, and decide to leave. Because of his reaction, and the conversation with Alex that follows, it is implicit that Kraken feels this is a decision Alex, and not he, should make, since, as he tells Alex in this scene, "everybody'll find out." Alex replies to this concern by saying, "Let them." In the course of this conversation, Kraken—before asking about the police—also tells Alex that he is "looking after [her] until [she] can choose." "What?" Alex asks. "Whatever you want," he responds. "What if there isn't a decision to make?" Alex replies, and hir father simply nods. Kraken can be seen in opposition to the parental figure of Ramiro, who consistently appears as domineering, attempting to pressure his son into a credible and

sanctioned version of masculinity. Kraken, on the other hand, allows his child to take shape; rather than forcing hir into the binarized and clean-cut delineations between male and female, he allows hir to choose, even if this means ambiguity. And in Alex's determination not to make a decision—which, of course, is very much a decision—and in hir decision to let "them" (the community) "find out" (about hir "condition"), Alex provides a representation of a different way of living, a possibility of flourishing. As Ahmed suggests, "Inhabiting a body that is not extended by the skin of the social means the world acquires a new shape and makes new impressions" (Ahmed 2006, 20). Alex's attackers evidence the lack of extended social skin to provide a habitable space, yet Alex's world acquires a new shape in both hir decision to "let them" know and hir decision to "not decide."

Importantly, in one scene during which Kraken tries to sort through his own complicated emotions, he seeks out Juan (Guillermo Angelelli)—a local man who underwent normalizing surgery as an infant himself—in order to ask his advice and opinion about Alex's situation. Kraken questions his and Suli's decision against surgical intervention when Alex was young: "What if I got it all wrong?" Juan responds, "By letting her choose?" Juan proceeds to present Kraken with an alternative narrative about what protection means to him, as an adult who was operated on as a child. He reveals to Kraken: "Do you know what my earliest memories are? Medical examinations. I thought I was so horrible when I was born that I had to have five operations before my first birthday. That's what they call 'normalization.' It's not surgery. It's castration. Making her afraid of her own body is the worst thing you can do to your child." Fortunately, Kraken finds validation for his narrative of protection in an adult who refuses the idea that his early surgeries "normalized" or protected him. His assertion that it is not surgery but castration indicates that Juan's perspective on the surgery is that it was harmful, not protective. Likewise, the nonfictional stories of parents and children involved in early surgeries have later voiced their own reinterpretations of the term "protection." Although it is productive that fictional narratives such as *XXY* promote complicated, contradictory, and alternative understandings of protection, it is of utmost importance that we seriously consider the accounts of those who have actually lived with and in the challenges presented by anomalous bodies.

"Raped": Parents, Children, and Their Challenges to "Protection"

Again, although *XXY* presents an alternative fictional narrative about the parental place in making surgical decisions on infants born intersexed—and that fiction is promising for imagining other ways of understanding "protection"—the narratives of those parents and children who have been involved in early surgical decisions on atypical genitalia are essential to complicating and critiquing notions of protection. The emergence of the ISNA (Intersex Society of North America) and other intersex activist and support groups, over the course of the 1990s and into the present, has produced one of the centers of dispute and recognition in challenging the typical response of immediate surgical intervention in infants. These groups have functioned as among the most vocal and influential forces in contesting the concept that surgical intervention works as a mechanism of "protection" rather than harm, as many adults have come forward in anger, frustration, and resistance regarding the surgeries imposed upon them as infants. In addition, some parents have also come to regret the decision they made in the past about their children's bodies and lives. This is not only, though, about a lack of consent or an inability to participate in the decision-making process. Children often not only undergo multiple surgeries as an infant but also continue to have surgeries throughout their entire childhood, making them feel ashamed, ostracized, or humiliated rather than protected.[9] Additionally, children often feel dehumanized and violated, as the genital region becomes

the constant "object" of medical scrutiny and doctors' gazes.[10] Further, early normalizing surgeries often leave lasting and devastating effects on the person who undergoes surgery. Most times, infants who were born with the ability to reproduce, and who undergo surgery, are left without that capacity intact. Likewise, infants often lose any physical sensation in the genital area that might produce sexual pleasure.[11]

Ellen K. Feder introduces a number of parents' stories in her essay, "In Their Best Interests: Parents' Experience of Atypical Genitalia." She relays the story of Ruby, who had two daughters born with CAH (Congenital Adrenal Hyperplasia). Although Ruby's first child had medical complications that put her health at risk, which resulted in surgical intervention for her child, the second daughter faced no explicit physiological risk; yet, Ruby chose to go forward with normalizing surgery for her second child as well. Ruby, like many other parents, has come to regret her decision in retrospect: "My younger daughter is angry with me as an adult. She felt that she was raped, medically raped. And she's right" (Feder 2006, 194). The accusation made by Ruby's daughter—and affirmed by Ruby herself—is a claim that the surgery was not protection, but rather an extreme form of violation and coercion. As Feder suggests, "The tragic paradox of Ruby's situation is precisely this: her caring and concerned attempts to fulfill her responsibility to her daughters' well-being led her to consent to actions that resulted in harm to her daughters" (197). Feder points, then, to the contradiction—the paradox—that efforts to protect may cause harm. Through Ruby's story, we might gain an insight into the very complex nature of the term "protection." While this, again, does not disavow the potency of hostile social environments from which a parent might seek to protect their child, it does present us with an alternative story about protection—one that challenges us to reconsider the prospect of coercion or violation that may be masked by narratives suggesting that life with atypical genitalia or physical anomalies (or even physical impairments) must be unavoidably tragic and that, to avoid the unavoidable, one must "rescue" the child through surgical intervention.

Likewise, Katrina Karkazis, writing about interviews she has conducted with patients, families, and doctors involved in intersex births, describes two parents she interviewed about the choice they made for surgical intervention:

> Ramona Diaz whose daughter has PAIS [Partial Androgen Insensitivity Syndrome] and who wishes she had not chosen genital surgery for her daughter has found another way to deal with her disappointment and sadness: she has become an advocate for delaying surgery until the child is old enough to decide: "I feel very bad. I hurt because she hurts. I just want to spare people everything that she's been through. I feel the same way that a lot of intersexed people do now: Let that person make the decision when they are ready. If they are ever ready to say, 'Yes, I want to do this,' or, 'No, I don't want to do this.' Let them have the say in the matter. Not the medical profession. Not the parents." And for Rebecca Davis, whose two daughters have CAH, the stresses associated with their reaching puberty resulted in a broken marriage. A psychiatrist explained to her that having a chronic illness in a family creates an enormous amount of pressure, but she says, "I didn't have a great marriage to start with, but even those with really good marriages, most of them didn't make it." She is still struggling to cope with the anger of one of her daughters: "I can't make it right. Part of what she's so upset about is that she feels raped, and in a way she really was, and I couldn't help it. She can't see that I couldn't help it, all she can see is that I let it happen and ask, why didn't I protect her? Oh, God, that hurts." (Karkazis 2008, 209-10)

Both of these parents advocate delaying surgery until a decision can be made by or with the child, allowing the prospective surgical patient to have a say in a choice that has ultimately irreversible effects on their own body and life. Although parents may be less familiar with the "condition" of intersex, and may also be alienated by the overt jargon utilized in describing both the "condition" and the possible routes of "solution," they nonetheless often believe that (as previously mentioned) they are making a choice to

surgically intervene in order to "protect" the child. Parent Rebecca Davis, whose response Karkazis notes above, thus issues a poignant challenge to those beliefs. Davis, who regrets her decision to let surgeons intervene in her infant child's body, seems most pained by the use of that very term: *protect*. Her daughter's question—why didn't you *protect* me?—forces Davis to confront the oppositional understanding that the once-infant expresses in regard to the decision made for, and on, her body. Protection, according to her daughter, would have been to protect her body from surgical intervention, and from the "rape" of her body and her will that took place when she was an infant. Davis, who implies that she believed her decision *was* made in order to do *precisely* that (protect her), must confront the voice of her daughter that speaks back and argues for a new understanding of what "protection" really means through issuing a question: Why didn't you protect me? In addition, then, to the proliferation of other fictional narratives of protection, the voices of those most intimately affected by intersex surgeries must also be heard, so that practitioners, families, and parents might consider the contradictory and complicated claims to protection evoked in the name of the child.

Protecting the Norm: The "Menace" of Difference

In addition to the challenges presented in these alternative notions of protection, we might consider the possibility that the norm itself is also (although never explicitly) being protected in decisions made to perform appearance-normalizing surgeries on infants. Earlier in this essay, I discussed the controversies over the case of "Baby Bollinger" in the early twentieth century, when Dr. Haiselden, the baby's doctor, advised parents that the infant (among other infants) should be allowed to "let die." Martin Pernick goes on to discuss Haiselden's autobiography, which reveals an underlying fear of the threat that anomaly or ambiguity pose to norms themselves.[12] Of Haiselden, Pernick writes: "In a particularly striking passage in his autobiography, he recalled that he first became aware of the retarded when, at the age of eight, he joined the gang of boys who regularly assaulted 'Crazy Mary,' the village idiot.... Even a child [Haiselden wrote] 'instinctively sees the menace in these wretched beings and adopts this means of fighting against it'" (Pernick 1996, 97). Thus the beatings that Pernick suggests were part of Haiselden's regimen of "defense" against "Crazy Mary," are justified, in his rhetorical construction, in the name of "fighting against" a "menace" that poses a threat.

Judith Butler asks us to consider what provokes violence toward intersexed or transgendered individuals, and her question resonates with the argument constructed by Haiselden—in mentioning both the "menace" that might be posed and the violent response that proceeds in the name of "protection": "The violent response is the one that does not ask, and does not seek to know. It wants to shore up what it knows, to expunge what threatens it with not-knowing, what forces it to reconsider the presuppositions of its world, their contingency, their malleability" (Butler 2004, 34-35).

Thus, what is being protected when infants are surgically altered to look "normal" might also be the norm itself, and the appearance of that norm as both natural and immobile. Perhaps this may help us to understand what "menace" Dr. Haiselden records feeling in response to difference. In "the violent response," division between self and other is enforced in the name of protecting the body of the self from the menacing infringement of "the other." But what threat, precisely, does "Crazy Mary" pose? The "menace" of this body resides in its potential to remind one that all bodies—individual, as well as the "body" of norms themselves—are ever-fluctuating and incoherent. Surgical interventions that are meant to make one's body look more "normal" also continue repeating, reiterating a binary of biological sex that keeps the binary of biology "safe" from infringement—safe from variation and ambiguity. What is in jeopardy with the presence

of bodies considered "ambiguous" or "shapeless"—"lumps of flesh," as Helen Keller called them—is that they threaten to suggest the ambiguity of all embodiments, their tenuousness, their intershapings, their collapsible edges. The work of Margrit Shildrick, in the context of critical disability theory, suggests that, "In failing to reproduce the ideal image of corporeal invulnerability, disabled bodies are not positioned as *dis*empowered; on the contrary, they signal threat and danger insofar as they undermine any belief in the stability and consistency of bodies in general" (Shildrik 2009, 20). Using the work of Julia Kristeva, Shildrick argues that anything which disturbs our notion of whole, integrated, invulnerable bodies forces us to question our own sense of self as invulnerable. Likewise, it calls into question the equally holistic dominant notion of biological sex as definable and dividable, neatly and clearly bordered.

When surgeries are performed to alleviate ambiguity, there is an effort made to *visually distinguish* (to create a distinction between "one" and "the other") and to *visually extinguish* the evidence of that ambiguity. I would argue that often, in the rhetorical creation of a tragic body in need of saving, notions of protection can *erase the work* involved in *extinguishing in order to distinguish*. This labor is continually exercised in the name of maintaining "coherent" sexes and norms. In order to give form to a mass of pluralities, infants born intersexed are, much more often than not, surgically altered to fit the format of the norm.[13] The incoherence of both embodiment and norms themselves is effaced, through labor, to produce "smooth," distinguishable surfaces.

Because of the "power and danger" held in margins, there is a threat to the readability and dominance of norms themselves posed by ambiguity and anomaly (Douglas [1966] 2002, 117, 150). Ellen K. Feder suggests that there is a "grave threat that the revelation of intersex poses to the existing social order" (Feder 2006, 206). If parents, Feder argues, "were to work to identify with their children as intersexed individuals, if doctors were to use their considerable authority to promote acceptance of genital variation instead of erasure, the prevailing *habitus* would undergo genuine transformation. Not only would such a positive identification lead to improved relationships between parents and children, it would also work against the conservative principles of *habitus* to effect social change" (206). The "habitus" in which we currently exist promotes the medical and parental response of immediate surgical intervention when a body does not appear "normal." The socio-medical response, Feder suggests, is to erase signs of human variation in favor of clearly legible lines between male and female. According to Feder, "habitus" is a term that describes the unquestioned "normative order" that implicitly and redundantly regulates, "conformity with a prevailing social order" (191). Feder argues that a parental willingness to identify with a child—and his or her potential (future) concerns, desires, physical and sexual sensations—along with the willingness of medical practitioners to reconsider their own response might open an entirely transformative understanding of difference and the human body, which would fundamentally alter the social landscape of our existence. If we acknowledge *variation as a norm of human existence*, we might also be forced to reconsider the constructed nature of so many binary oppositions that shape who we are, who we can be, and how we understand—and respond to—physical difference.

Notes

1. By "appearance-normalizing," I mean that the surgeries that will be the focus of this essay are those that are meant to make one appear more "normal." In the introduction to *Surgically Shaping Children*, Erik Parens differentiates between surgeries meant to improve physiological functioning and those meant to improve psychosocial functioning.

Parens describes the story of LilyClaire, the daughter of Lisa Abelow Hedley who relays a narrative in the chapter titled "The Seduction of the Surgical Fix" in Parens's collection. LilyClaire is a seven-year-old with achondroplasia (a form of dwarfism) whose mother contemplates whether or not to have her daughter's legs lengthened during a medical procedure to fix the bowing of her legs. Here Parens describes the difference between fixing the bowing and lengthening LilyClaire's legs: "The goal of preventing cartilage degeneration is straightforwardly medical; it aims to promote what we might call *physiological* functioning. The goal of adding height, on the other hand, is primarily *psychosocial*. Of course, for anyone who rejects dualist conceptions of the relationship between the physical and the psychical (the body and the mind), the distinction between the physiological and the psychosocial aims is fuzzy. Improved physiological functioning usually has positive psychosocial effects, and improved psychosocial functioning can have positive physiological effects" (2006, xix). Thus, my essay focuses on those surgeries performed for explicitly psychosocial purposes.

2. See Stryker and Sullivan 2009 and Loeb 2008. Loeb states that her "readings of 'bodily integrity' find fantasizing a fully agentive, masculated, triumphant subject that acts out onto the world, inviolable and unviolated by feminized or queered forms of penetration" (2008, 50) and that it is not possible to "separate our lived ideas of what constitutes a 'whole' body of a 'normal' man from our lived experience of patriarchy, white supremacy, violent colonialism, and capitalist exploitation" (55).

3. I do not want to conflate atypical genitalia, physical impairment, and physical anomaly. However, the three do come together in the way in which they are predominantly understood to be tragic.

4. One might argue that to "let die" would be the equivalent of "letting be"—that is, to let the baby die without medical intervention is no different than the "letting be" of an infant whose genitalia are "ambiguous." However, we might consider the difference between Haiselden's "letting be" and the "letting be" of an infant born intersexed. Haiselden's "letting be" is the denial of medical intervention on a body that might otherwise survive. The "letting be" of an infant born intersexed would not equate, because in most instances (and these are the instances under discussion in this essay), infants receive surgical intervention not because of a physiological need to survive, but for the purposes of normalizing appearance. Thus, the situations are not parallel.

5. Elizabeth Loeb's observation, quoted in note 2, is again pertinent here.

6. The film, directed by Lucía Puenzo, is based on the short story titled "Cinismo" by Argentine writer Sergio Bizzo.

7. I have chosen to use gender-neutral pronouns for Alex because, although some others in the film may view hir as a young woman, Alex hirself does not necessarily identify as either or solely male or female.

8. All quotations from *XXY* are derived from the English subtitles of the film, which is spoken in Spanish.

9. Katrina Karkazis's *Fixing Sex* (2008) is a great resource for information regarding this issue.

10. Again, see Karkazis. Also, the 2002 novel *Middlesex* by Jeffrey Eugenides gives readers a very rich (though fictional) account of a child with atypical genitalia who is repeatedly dehumanized and treated as a medical specimen by doctors: "I lay back. Without having to be told, I lifted my legs and fit my heels in the gynecological stirrups. The room had gone ominously silent. The three doctors came forward, staring down. Their heads formed a trinity above me. Luce pulled the curtain across the table. They bent over me, studying my parts, while Luce led a guided tour. I didn't know what most of the words meant but after the third or fourth time I could recite the list by heart. 'Muscular habitus… no gynecomastia… hypospadias… urogenital sinus… blind vaginal pouch…' These were my claim to fame. I didn't feel famous, however. In fact, behind the curtain, I no longer felt as if I were in the room" (2002, 420).

11. Again, see Karkazis 2008.

12. See Grosz 1996 for a further discussion about the "intolerability" of identities that are in between or challenge our notions of selfhood, individuation, and categorization.

13. As Elizabeth Loeb notes, "the medical and legal assignation of sex according only to the binary options of 'male' and 'female' constitutes something of an accident for each of us, an assignation of status that belies and homogenizes our unique physicalities into enforced norms" (2008, 46).

References

Ahmed, Sara. 2006. *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Asch, Adrienne. 2001. "Disability, Bioethics, and Human Rights." In *Handbook of Disability Studies*, edited by Gary L. Albrecht, Katherine D. Seelman, and Michael Bury, 297-326. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Asch, Adrienne. 2006. "Appearance-Altering Surgery, Children's Sense of Self, and Parental Love." In Parens, *Surgically Shaping Children*, 227-52.

Aspinall, Cassandra. 2006. "Do I Make You Uncomfortable? Reflections on Using Surgery to Reduce the Distress of Others." In Parens, *Surgically Shaping Children*, 13-28.

Butler, Judith. 2004. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.

Douglas, Mary. (1966) 2002. *Purity and Danger*. New York: Routledge.

Dunn, Katherine. 1989. *Geek Love*. New York: Vintage Books.

Eugenides, Jeffrey. 2002. *Middlesex*. New York: Picador.

Fausto-Sterling, Ann. 1993. "The Five Sexes: Why Male and Female Are Not Enough." *The Sciences* 33 (March/April): 20-24.

Feder, Ellen K. 2006. "'In Their Best Interests': Parents' Experience of Atypical Genitalia." In Parens, *Surgically Shaping Children*, 189-210.

Grosz, Elizabeth. 1996. "Intolerable Ambiguity." In *Freakery: Cultural Spectacles of the Extraordinary Body*, edited by Rosemarie Thomson, 55-66. New York: New York University Press.

Karkazis, Katrina. 2008. *Fixing Sex: Intersex, Medical Authority, and Lived Experience*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Loeb, Elizabeth. 2008. "Cutting It Off: Bodily Integrity, Identity Disorders, and the Sovereign Stakes of Corporeal Desire in U.S. Law." *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly* 36 (3 & 4): 44-63.

Parens, Eric, ed. 2006. *Surgically Shaping Children: Technology, Ethics, and the Pursuit of Normality*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

———. "Introduction: Thinking about Surgically Shaping Children." In Parens, *Surgically Shaping Children*, xiii-xxx.

Pernick, Martin S. 1996. *The Black Stork: Eugenics and the Death of "Defective" Babies in American Medicine and Motion Pictures Since 1915*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Shildrick, Margrit. 2009. *Dangerous Discourses of Disability, Subjectivity and Sexuality*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Stryker, Susan, and Nikki Sullivan. 2009. "King's Member, Queen's Body: Transsexual Surgery, Self-Demand Amputation, and the Somatechnics of Sovereign Power." In *Somatechnics: Queering the Technologisation of the Body*, edited by Nikki Sullivan and Samantha Murray, 49-64. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing.

Sullivan, Nikki. 2009. "The Somatechnics of Intersexuality" (review essay). *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 15 (2): 313-27.

Tehrani, Bijan. 2008. "An Interview with Lucía Puenzo, director of *XXY*." *Cinema Without Borders*, February 19. http://cinemawithoutborders.com/conversations/1477-an-interview-with-lucia-puenzo-director-of-xxy.html.

XXY. 2007. Directed by Lucía Puenzo. DVD. Film Movement, 2008.

VIEWPOINT

Reflections on Intellectual Hybridity

Kimala Price, San Diego State University

Abstract: Drawing from the growing literature on interdisciplinarity and my own experiences as an intellectual hybrid, I discuss the personal and institutional challenges inherent in crossing disciplinary boundaries in the academy. I argue that boundary crossing is a natural occurrence and that the issue of (inter)disciplinarity is a matter of degree and of determining who gets to define the boundaries. Defining boundaries is not merely an intellectual enterprise, but also a political act that delineates what is, or is not, legitimate scholarship. This issue is especially salient to women's and gender studies during times of economic distress and educational budget cuts.

Keywords: interdisciplinarity, multidisciplinarity, research, activism, pedagogy, the academy, women's studies

For the past two decades, scholars across the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences have been debating the merits of interdisciplinarity. Nearly 8,000 articles have been published on the topic, and there has been a concerted effort among universities, private foundations, and federal agencies, such as the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, to cultivate collaborative research and teaching across disciplinary boundaries (Jacobs and Frickel 2009; Metzger and Zare 1999; Paletz, Smith-Doerr, and Vardi 2010). Moreover, we have seen an increase in the number of interdisciplinary programs at universities. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2010), more than 800 universities and colleges (out of 2,348) granted bachelor's degrees in area, ethnic, cultural, gender, and multi- or interdisciplinary studies. More than 300 institutions out of 1,777 and more than 150 out of 737 granted masters' and doctoral degrees, respectively, through these programs. Although some research studies have shown that many faculty say they value interdisciplinary knowledge, this support varies across disciplines. For example, scholars in area studies are the most likely to cite research outside of their discipline, whereas mechanical engineers and economists are the least likely to do so (Jacobs and Frickel 2009). Interdisciplinarity, however, has always been central to feminist intellectual inquiry.

Proponents argue that interdisciplinarity spurs intellectual creativity and leads to the emergence of new kinds of knowledge. Interdisciplinary collaboration requires the cooperation of experts who bring different concepts, methodologies, and epistemologies to these endeavors; accordingly, such intellectual cross-fertilization can lead to fresh insights and overcome disciplinary shortsightedness (Mills et al. 2011; Nissani 1997). Advances in nanotechnology, for instance, would not have been possible without the contributions from physics, chemistry, electrical engineering, and materials science (Jacobs and Frickel 2009). Postmodernism has successfully diffused from philosophy across the humanities, social sciences, and applied fields such as education. As Jacobs concedes, "The [postmodernist] writings of the humanists Jacques Derrida, Jacques Lacan, and Michel Foucault, along with prominent social scientists like Charles Tilly and Robert Putnam, come to mind. While each of those authors has been influential in a somewhat different set of disciplines, each has been the subject of articles in many fields in the social sciences and humanities" (2009).

Interdisciplinarity can potentially transform the academy, creating an environment where disciplinary boundaries matter less and individuals are not penalized for crossing them. Critics, on the other hand, argue that interdisciplinarity does not transcend disciplinary dominance and may, in fact, reinforce disciplinary boundaries (Jacobs and Frickel 2009; Wallerstein 1996). Peterson (2008), for instance, argues that relatively newer interdisciplinary studies, such as women's studies, ethnic studies, and communication, are often "ghettoized"; they are viewed with suspicion because they threaten existing practices and structures of more traditional disciplines and the university. There may also be the lingering perception that interdisciplinary studies faculty are "second-class scholars" who failed to measure up to the rigor and focus of disciplinary scholarship and thus have taken refuge in the hinterlands of academe (Benson 1982). During times of financial difficulties, interdisciplinary departments and programs are often among the first to be targeted for elimination as part of overall budget-cutting strategies—which signals that these programs are dispensable in the eyes of university administrations and public officials.

Critics also argue that interdisciplinarity as a concept is ill-defined; it is not clear what exactly constitutes interdisciplinarity. Sociologists Jacobs and Frickel define interdisciplinarity simply as "communication and collaboration across academic disciplines" (2009, 44). This definition begs various questions. What does interdisciplinary collaboration look like? Is interdisciplinarity constituted exclusively by collaborative research? Julie Thompson Klein, a specialist in interdisciplinary studies, argues that there are three different models for crossing disciplinary boundaries: 1) the casual borrowing of ideas and methodological tools from another discipline; 2) the creation of multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary departments, programs, centers, and fields of study in which a disciplinary center holds; and 3) the complete deconstruction of disciplinary boundaries (qtd. in Boxer 2000, 123-24). The first two models are already prevalent within academia. For many practitioners of interdisciplinarity, the third is the ideal model; however, many might question the feasibility of the total destruction of disciplinary boundaries, given current institutional structures. The third model might work for the development of individual interdisciplinary courses, but it is not clear how it translates to the overall transformation of the structure of colleges and universities. Perhaps it is most useful to envision interdisciplinarity as an enterprise that assumes multiple guises and occurs at multiple levels: collaborative projects that bring together researchers from different disciplines; the individual scholar who incorporates several disciplinary traditions in her or his research and/or pedagogy; university courses that are team-taught by professors from different departments; university departments and programs that are interdisciplinary in structure; and fields of study that are interdisciplinary in nature. Each guise and level has its own particular, albeit interrelated, set of challenges and rewards.

As a faculty member of an interdisciplinary department who was trained in a traditional social science discipline *and* women's studies, I often find myself reflecting on my own experiences with boundary crossing and really contemplating what it means to be "interdisciplinary" in terms of scholarship and pedagogy. What makes a field or program of study or courses interdisciplinary? How do we advise graduate students who are pursuing or want to pursue interdisciplinary work, especially in women's studies? What are the benefits and challenges of interdisciplinarity? Given my own experiences in graduate school, on the job market, in publishing, in advising graduate students, and in developing and teaching university courses, I have developed conflicting opinions about crossing disciplines. Boundary crossing can be exhilarating and illuminating, as it allows a scholar to expand her or his intellectual curiosity. At the same time, boundary crossing can also be frustrating and tiring, as one is constantly defending her or his intellectual standpoint.

Not only must faculty deal with overbearing inquiries about the relevance of their interdisciplinary scholarship and courses, but students who choose to major or minor in interdisciplinary fields are also

often obliged to defend their choices. They are constantly bombarded with questions from their parents, friends, and other involved parties who are concerned that said students will not be able to land decent-paying jobs after graduation. After all, what can one *do* with a degree in women's studies, ethnic studies, or a general liberal arts degree? *Who* will hire you for what *kind* of job? What kind of career could you possibly have? Employing a line of questioning that reifies a vocational-training model of higher education and the supremacy of traditional disciplinary boundaries, concerned parties ignore the possibility that these students are not only learning concepts and critical-thinking skills that are transferable to the workplace and life in general, but that they are also learning the skill of solving problems and dealing with situations from multiple angles. I must confess that there are times in which *I* question the viability of interdisciplinary degrees, especially doctoral degrees in women's studies. While individuals with doctorates in women's studies are prime candidates for faculty positions in women's studies departments, would they be considered good candidates for positions in other kinds of departments, including more traditional disciplinary departments, even if their research and teaching interests match a specific job position's requirements?

I have had to learn how to navigate several different sites of knowledge in my research and pedagogy. I have had to be highly motivated and persistent in pursuing interdisciplinarity in my coursework and research on my own; however, I was also fortunate to have mentors who provided the support, guidance, and advice I needed, especially during the times I was tempted to give up. I often contemplate how I can pass this knowledge, support, and advice on to students who are interested in pursuing interdisciplinary work, as they are potentially the next generation of scholars and teachers. I contemplate whether there are ways to institutionalize such knowledge.

Using my own experiences as a springboard for discussion, this essay offers my reflections on what it means to be interdisciplinary and/or multidisciplinary, not only in theory but also in practice. It is part personal narrative, part critical analysis. It is also partially informed by casual conversations that I have had with colleagues over the years. It is an attempt to make sense of my *particular* experiences within academia, while attempting to understand how these experiences are indicative of larger systemic, institutional processes at play.

This essay is not meant to be a treatise arguing for or against interdisciplinarity; that is already well covered in the literature on the subject. Instead, it begins with the premise that boundary crossing is a regular occurrence, as disciplines have always borrowed from each other at one time or another. After the rise of interdisciplinary studies, such as women's studies and ethnic studies in the 1960s and 1970s, some scholars have felt the need to defend or decry the legitimacy of disciplinary boundary crossing. Given that there are real professional consequences, especially in terms of employment and publishing, what does it mean for the individual scholar who dares to transgress against the boundaries? What are the sanctions for not fitting within a neat disciplinary category? Equally, what does it mean to be a self-contained discipline, as it can be argued that many interdisciplinary fields of study (e.g., women's studies, African American studies, and American studies) have become disciplines themselves? How does the field of women's or feminist studies fit into the mix? Ultimately, defining and defying disciplinary and interdisciplinary boundaries are inherently political acts, not just mere intellectual enterprises.

Intellectual hybridity is simultaneously liberating and challenging. Interdisciplinarity expands the limits of intellectual and scholarly creativity, as it has allowed the exploration of topics that defy disciplinary boundaries. There is no "right" way to do intellectual hybridity; it can take on various forms depending upon the needs and preferences of the practitioner, as well as the constraints with which he or she must

contend. Interdisciplinarity also poses many institutional and disciplinary challenges. There are the institutional challenges posed by bureaucratic structures of the university that make it difficult to create and maintain interdisciplinary programs or even to cross-list courses. There are the scholarly gatekeepers who actively and rigorously maintain disciplinary boundaries and who can make it difficult for the intellectual hybrid, often accused of being both too broad and too narrow in his or her intellectual scope, to find a home within academia.

Intellectual Hybridity?

I have chosen to use the term "intellectual hybridity," instead of interdisciplinarity, multidisciplinarity, or transdisciplinarity, in the title of this essay. What's the difference? Terminology has been a point of contention in the discourse on cross-disciplinarity; distinctions are made among all these terms. Interdisciplinarity literally means moving "between disciplines," while multidisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity translate into engaging with "multiple disciplines" and working "across disciplines," respectively. Multidisciplinarity implies an "add and stir" approach, whereas interdisciplinarity implies mixing, or blending, of disciplines. Within a multidisciplinary approach, the disciplines are still very distinct and discrete. Multidisciplinary researchers work less interdependently; one is merely interested in seeing how different disciplines approach a particular issue. In a multidisciplinary project on a given subject, one might ask: "How would a biologist deal with this issue as opposed to a sociologist or an historian?" In an interdisciplinary approach, one is interested in culling information, knowledge, research, and scholarship that best provide insight to a particular issue; such approach is more integrative in nature. There still might be some distinction among the different disciplines represented, but there is also some blurring of the lines.

In conversations regarding cross-disciplinarity there are often implications that one approach is better than the other. I like the term "hybridity," for it connotes a blending without the value judgments inherent in conversations about correct terminology. After all, there are degrees of boundary crossing beyond the divide between interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinary approaches. Any mode of boundary crossing is acceptable, in my opinion, as long as it is not superficial and remains true to the unfettered spirit of creative pursuit and scholarly discovery. Hybridity also connotes the inseparability of the disciplinary perspectives that inform one's scholarship. The parts work so seamlessly together that it can take a great deal of work to pull the disciplines apart, to separate them into discrete entities, if at all possible.

My concept of hybridity is partially informed by Wallerstein's call to eradicate the boundaries among the social sciences, in keeping with his belief that the concept of interdisciplinarity only reifies the traditional disciplines (2008, 1996). Although I do not think that total eradication of disciplinary boundaries is necessary, Wallerstein's claim has reinforced my stance that scholarship, especially among the social sciences, should truly be problem or theory-driven, as opposed to driven by specific methodologies, epistemologies, and frameworks that are discipline-bound. One should start with a substantive or theoretical question and then determine from there what the appropriate scholarly tools are to explore that question.

One Scholar's Journey

I have spent much of my academic career defining my intellectual home. I am a political scientist who specializes in reproductive and sexual health policy; I am also a professor in a women's studies department. Additionally, I identify (as many women's studies academics do) as an activist-scholar who is interested in translating theory into practice, as well as in having action inform theory. While my research focuses on

feminist activism, I also have been a direct participant in activist movements. Despite the increased interest in interdisciplinary (or is it multidisciplinary?) research and pedagogy in the academy, I have often been asked to explain, and even defend, my academic and intellectual identity, whether in casual conversation or at job interviews. Am I a political scientist who happens to be a women's studies professor? Am I a reproductive health policy researcher who happens to be a policy analyst? Is my primary identity construed through women's or feminist studies or through political science or policy studies? How does one reconcile activism with the academic enterprise, given that their goals seem to be at odds with each other?

The simple answer is that I am all of these things simultaneously, as it is not a simple task to separate different sites of intellectual curiosity into discrete components. My research and activist engagement has not necessarily been discipline-bound, even though I have always had an interest in politics. Instead, it has been driven by my interests in specific topics, particularly reproduction, sexuality, and social justice. My initial motivation for returning to academia for graduate training was to pursue my interest in women's health policy and politics, specifically reproductive health and rights, after spending a few years working for a number of women's advocacy organizations. The question then was: What would be the right discipline and degree to pursue this interest? I ultimately settled on pursuing a doctorate in political science and a minor graduate certificate in women's studies, but I also crossed disciplinary lines by taking courses in public health, public policy, and social work.

Each discipline had much to offer to further my intellectual goals. For instance, women's studies could provide the feminist theoretical and epistemological foundation that I wanted, whereas political science could provide social science methodological training as well as insight into the inner workings and structures of government and political institutions. Public health could provide substantive knowledge on health care provision and policy. Public policy could provide insight into policy analysis and implementation. I ended up fashioning a course of study that included all of these elements.

Crossing these disciplinary lines was not as easy as it sounds. Although I ended up at a university that embraced and encouraged interdisciplinarity among its faculty and students, only a few of the courses I took were truly interdisciplinary in nature; my training in interdisciplinarity essentially consisted of taking a variety of courses outside of my home department. Due to this cross-fertilization, or experimentation, I even faced a degree of resistance from some faculty and students in my home department, who suggested that I was probably not really *doing* political science but some bastardized imitation of it.

On the job market, I initially thought of my self-constructed interdisciplinarity as an advantage. After all, I could apply to positions in a range of disciplines, including political science, public policy, women's studies, and African American studies. Instead, it offered a different set of challenges. The usual questions that one gets asked in job interviews became a minefield I had to tread carefully: What kinds of courses will you develop and teach? What will your research agenda look like? What kinds of grants will you apply for? What journals do you plan to publish in?

Each discipline has different disciplinary expectations even when there is some overlap among the disciplines. The boundary crosser must not only be mindful of these different expectations, but has to be conversant enough in all sets of norms and literatures in order to be perceived as legitimate in each discipline.[1] This can be a daunting task in just *one* discipline, much more so in multiple disciplines. Sharing his observations on interdisciplinarity and scholarly publishing, Robin Derricourt argues that

> the average scholarly book stretching beyond boundaries will, in my view and experience, suffer from going against the limitations of the bounded world of academia.... So the [author] with a book in two disciplines may find it secures a home in neither. Perhaps this is the curse of the Anglo-Saxon tradition, suspicious of the broad sweep and the over-ambitious ground-breaker. (1996, 80)

In other words, one must neatly fit into a disciplinary niche in order to be considered a "legitimate" scholar.

It can be challenging for the individual scholar to secure an academic appointment or to place articles in journals, especially those that are discipline-bound, as questions of intellectual "fit" are levied against her or his work. By deeming a particular interdisciplinary paper, project, or body of work insufficiently grounded in a particular traditional discipline, academic gatekeepers—including hiring committees, tenure and promotion committees, journal editors, and grant-making institutions—undermine the legitimacy of interdisciplinary research, whether they do so knowingly or not. It is not necessarily always clear what makes a particular project sufficiently grounded in a discipline. Does it mean that a certain percentage (at least 50 percent?) of the references should be from a specific discipline, for instance? Or regardless of the percentage of references, does the mere inclusion of references and theories from other disciplines signal the "unfitness" of a project? In any case, questions of "fitness" insinuate that such research does not significantly contribute to or advance a traditional discipline's collective knowledge.[2] Unfortunately, some scholars have argued that interdisciplinary studies are not as theory-driven as the traditional disciplines and therefore not abstract enough to contribute to our broader understandings of the human condition (Jacobs and Frickel 2009). In the end, academic gatekeepers play a significant role in defining disciplinary boundaries and thus in determining which types of research are legitimate and which are not; "fitness" is one of the measures used to define such boundaries.

This has implications for career advancement for interdisciplinary scholars. Reporting the results of a research study on environmental studies programs, Pfirman et al. argue:

> [M]any colleges and universities have committed themselves to fostering interdisciplinary scholarship. But the scholars who work at that junction are confronted with conventional departmental hiring, review, and tenure procedures that are not suited to interdisciplinary work and that can slow or block the progress of their careers.... [W]hile growing numbers of universities and colleges have adopted formal procedures for hiring, and sometimes for reviewing, interdisciplinary faculty members, few have a comprehensive approach to the entire pre-tenure experience. Often, as such scholars move toward tenure, their intellectual contributions to works with many authors are challenged. That creates a disjuncture: Lured into the collaborative research needed for progress in an interdisciplinary field, scholars are later held to the standards of specific disciplines. (2005, B15)

Some universities have developed strategies to deal with interdisciplinary scholars at various stages of their academic career: graduate training, hiring, evaluation, tenure and promotion. A number of institutions, such as the University of Wisconsin at Madison, have raised money to hire faculty in interdisciplinary clusters of up to five researchers, while others have developed faculty co-funding schemes in which institutes support half of the costs of new faculty proposed by a department (Sá 2008). The expectation is that interdisciplinary scholars will have a dedicated space to foster their collaboration, while still being connected to colleagues in the traditional disciplines. Despite these efforts, some interdisciplinary scholars still report that their research is undervalued (Sá 2008).

Defining and Blurring the Boundaries

It is generally understood that certain fields of study, such as women's studies, ethnic studies, public policy, and public health, are interdisciplinary by nature. It is also generally understood that other fields of study, such as history, literature, sociology, anthropology, chemistry, and biology, are the "traditional," "pure" disciplines. We often have discussions about disciplines as though they have always existed in the forms that we are familiar with in our contemporary context; we often ignore the historical development of our

current understandings of disciplinary fields. According to Wallerstein, there were literally hundreds of disciplines in the period between the mid-eighteenth and late nineteenth centuries and little distinction existed between philosophy and science (2008, 1996). However, "natural scientists" felt the need to make distinctions, specifically drawing the line between science, which they equated with certainty, and non-science, which they believed dealt with the imaginary. In the period between the 1880s and 1945, we start to see the emergence of the "social sciences," as some scholars advocated using "hard science," as opposed to literature, law, and philosophy, to study social phenomena. From this emerged six "pure" social science disciplines: history, economics, sociology, political science, and anthropology. These new disciplines were reflected in the names of university departments, professional or scholarly associations, and journal names, as they developed during the first half of the twentieth century. The concept of interdisciplinarity as we know it today emerged in the 1920s, spurred by the activities and publications of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) (Wallerstein 2008).

The concept of academic disciplines implies that there are discrete boundaries and rules for inclusion and exclusion that keep those boundaries in place, as disciplines have mechanisms at their disposal that reward and police their practitioners. Disciplines also have shared knowledge, vocabulary, and concepts as well as a core of influential literature (or a canon) that shapes the direction of the discipline. A field of study becomes a discipline when it becomes part of academic institutional structures. Schools, institutes, and departments—possibly with tenure lines—are established across universities, and professional associations are founded to provide a professional home. Because of the perks associated with institutionalization—operating budgets, tenure lines, approved courses—it has been in the best interest of women's studies to establish it as a distinct discipline. Feminist historian Marilyn Boxer argues:

> Disciplines provide important tools for learning. Disciplines also inspire collegiality, loyalty, and pride; and many if not most of us share, at least as associates and affiliated members, some of the benefits of belonging to the corporate bodies that provided our institutional homes as students and aspiring academicians. We sought admittance to the goods held and dispensed by the select, those entitled to identify as professors of the discipline. (2000, 123).

Women's studies can be best described as an interdisciplinary discipline, given that it combines elements of both concepts (Boxer 2000; Buker 2003; Friedman 1998; Katz 2001). First, women's studies scholarship and pedagogy draw from a range of traditional disciplines across the humanities, social sciences, and, increasingly, the physical and biological sciences. Although women's studies is interdisciplinary by design, over the last four decades it has developed into and functions as a discipline. For instance, women's studies students are expected to master certain concepts, such as the social construction of gender and sexuality, intersectionality, transnational feminism, and privilege and oppression, even though the precise meanings of these terms are contested within the discipline. Women's studies has a growing canon of literature with which most scholars and practitioners are familiar: Simone de Beauvoir and Judith Butler (feminist theory); Patricia Hill Collins, bell hooks, Kimberle Crenshaw, and Gloria Anzaldúa (intersectionality); Chandra Talpade Mohanty (transnational feminism); Catharine MacKinnon (feminist jurisprudence); and Jennifer Baumgartner, Amy Richards, and Rebecca Walker ("third-wave" feminism). While we can argue that there is not necessarily a common feminist methodology, women's studies scholars do share the propensity to critique methodological approaches within the (non-feminist) mainstream of traditional disciplines.

The composition of individual women's studies programs and departments most often reflects the multidisciplinary model of hybridity, as many of the core faculty in these programs have been trained in a traditional discipline. Additionally, many programs rely on affiliated faculty members who have tenure

lines in other departments. My current department is best described as an interdisciplinary unit comprised of scholars who hold degrees in traditional disciplines such as history, English, comparative literature, psychology, and anthropology. Although my department offers many courses that are interdisciplinary in nature, such as "Women's Sexuality and the Body" or "Gender, Race, and Class," we all teach courses in our areas of expertise, which often reflect our disciplinary leanings.

Some of us within my department have had formal graduate training in women's studies; others have not. Among those of us with women's studies graduate training, none actually hold a PhD in Women's Studies or even a joint PhD in Women's Studies and another discipline. This is the case for most of the more than 900 women's studies departments and programs nationwide. There are only fifteen stand-alone PhD programs in Women's Studies, notably at Rutgers, Emory, UCLA, University of Maryland at College Park, and Arizona State University (NWSA 2009). There are a few other institutions, such as the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, Brandeis, and Penn State, that offer joint PhDs in Women's Studies with other disciplines. Even though many women's studies programs now seek job candidates who hold a PhD in Women's Studies, there currently are not enough stand-alone doctoral programs to fill these positions.

Even within interdisciplinary departments and programs, disciplinary boundaries may be unconsciously maintained. Women's studies professors often still also identify as scholars of "traditional" disciplines—historians, anthropologists, psychologists, or literary studies scholars—as a quick review of a sample of departmental and program websites can illustrate. While there are the well-known and respected interdisciplinary journals that many of us read and contribute to, such as *Signs* and *Feminist Studies*, there are also many specialized journals within the discipline—e.g., *Gender & Society* (sociology), *Sex Roles* (psychology), *Gender & Politics* (political science), *Hypatia* (philosophy), and *The Journal of Women's History*. These specialized publications provide space for dialogue among similarly oriented and trained feminist scholars, who work within both women's studies *and* their respective traditional disciplines. This signals the desire and need to have overarching conversations not only within the general space of women's studies but also in the more specialized spaces within the discipline.

Although political science has established itself as a distinct, self-standing discipline over the last century, the field still has internal struggles about its academic and intellectual identity; it can be challenging to determine what distinguishes political science from the other social sciences. Political science has borrowed from and has been influenced by a range of disciplines, notably history, philosophy, sociology, economics, psychology, and anthropology. Most practicing political scientists agree that the study of political institutions, behavior, and phenomena is the unifying element of the discipline; the disagreements and debates are about the best epistemological and methodological approaches to studying these objects (Monroe 2005). When does political science cease to be political science? What distinguishes political science from sub-specializations in other fields, such as political sociology, political psychology, political economy, or political ethnography or anthropology? Do those distinctions really matter?

A growing contingent of political scientists is consciously building conceptual and methodological bridges between anthropology and political science. They believe that political ethnography can provide a fresh perspective on politics, for example on topics such as power and public opinion. Despite the fact that several canonical political science texts, such as *Home Style* by Richard Fenno (1978), which studies members of Congress in their home districts, are based on participant observation, ethnography is generally underappreciated in academic political science (Schatz 2009). Nevertheless, political ethnographers (or political anthropologists?) have provided interesting insights on a range of political phenomena. For example, Michael Schatzberg has studied the influence of popular culture, literature, and religion on

politics in the Congo. Katherine Cramer Walsh has taken a non-traditional (by political science standards) approach to studying public opinion by observing (and participating in a limited fashion in) conversations of the patrons of a neighborhood corner store, which deviates from the use of standardized large-scale surveys that is standard procedure among public-opinion researchers (Schatz 2009). The insights on the mechanisms at play in both of these projects would not be possible without the total immersion of the researchers in the respective communities of study.

Some other fields of study, such as public health and policy studies, are more elusive. Public health is an interdisciplinary, substantive field that draws from medical, anthropological, sociological, economic, historical, legal, political, communicational, and demographic perspectives. For example, women's health, particularly reproductive health, menopause, and differences in health status among women, require interdisciplinary inquiry. In the area of health status among women, research studies need "to address the complex interaction between women's genetic and biological dispositions, their environment, personal health behaviors, racial/ethnic/cultural attributes, access to health care, and many other aspects that may contribute to differences in health status or outcomes between different populations of women" (Pinn 2005, 1407). We have begun to see more collaborative interdisciplinary research on women's health, much of it supported by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) (Pinn 2005). A notable example is the work of Gipson et al. (2011), an interdisciplinary team comprised of researchers representing the fields of public/community health, anthropology, and women's and gender studies. The team conducts research on abortion in international settings, in places as diverse as Poland, Zanzibar, Mexico City, the Philippines, and Bangladesh. Abortion, controversial and stigmatized in many parts of the world, is a topic that requires researchers who are knowledgeable and skilled in navigating the social, political, and cultural taboos, as well as the associated clinical aspects.

The field of public health has moved toward disciplinary status, as many universities have departments or entire schools of public health; it even has a professional association, the American Public Health Association, which publishes the peer-reviewed *American Journal of Public Health*. One can get a master's or doctoral degree in public health. With its focus on analysis and program evaluation, policy studies is an interdisciplinary field that can stand alone as a separate department or school, or be declared as a specialty or subfield in more traditional disciplines, such as political science, economics, and sociology. However, given their interdisciplinary natures, can we say that there are theoretical or methodological cores that hold these respective fields together? Is there a core canon in either field?

Boundary crossing also happens between the academic and non-academic worlds. Women's studies and ethnic studies have a long tradition of praxis, i.e., the combination of theory and practice, as the practitioners of these fields are concerned with eradicating social, economic, and political injustices, not just theorizing about social justice (Naples 2006). Many of us working in such fields constantly cross the boundaries between scholarship, activism, and policy advocacy, and consider our advocacy and non-academic work as a unique intellectual enterprise that informs the kinds of research questions we explore in our projects. Our activism also informs our pedagogy.[3] We design courses that not only develop analytical and critical-thinking skills, but also challenge students to explore how scholarship and theorizing can have an impact on everyday practice and vice versa. Activism is at times looked upon with suspicion by some academics who believe that it can cloud one's objectivity; however, the concept of objectivity has been challenged by many, especially feminist scholars who argue that there is no such thing as pure objectivity. There are merely differing degrees of subjectivity, as we all come with our own set of values and biases. The goal of research and scholarship should not necessarily be the achievement of objectivity, but the ability to approach our subjects of inquiry with a sense of fairness and respect (Harding 1987).

Knowledge and disciplines evolve; disciplines borrow from other disciplines. Given the amount of "cross-fertilization" among them, can we truly say that there are any "pure" disciplines anymore? Boundary crossing is a given. It is simply a matter of degree, mode of implementation, and the willingness of a discipline's practitioners (and university administrations) to acknowledge and accept that this happens. This acceptance includes removing, or at least lessening, the obstacles that impede boundary crossing.

Interdisciplinary Hybridity in the Classroom

Establishing permanent interdisciplinary or hybrid courses and programs at universities is another challenge. There are disputes over intellectual turf among departments and programs, especially over who has legitimate claims to specific course topics. There are also institutional structures that can impede the development of hybrid courses. For example, when I assumed my position at my current university, I was eager to develop a new course around my specialization in reproductive rights. Many students and my colleagues were eager to have such a class taught, as no comparable course had been offered at the university, at least not in recent memory.

The course was going to examine the history, cultural attitudes, economics, demography, and politics of reproduction and sexual health. We would not only survey the anatomical, demographic, and behavioral facts about reproductive and sexual health, but also explore societal and cultural attitudes through film and personal narrative, and legal and policy issues through the study of key court cases and Congressional legislation. After all, reproduction is not *merely* a biological process. We, as a society, have imposed so many social, cultural, and political meanings on this basic function of the human body that it has become a politically contested issue that is increasingly regulated by the state. It makes sense to study it from multiple perspectives.

I originally wanted to call my new course "The Politics of Reproduction"; however, I was warned by a senior colleague that the title might trigger a turf war with the political science department, whose faculty might see the course as an encroachment on their intellectual territory. Such concerns make one wonder whether women's studies departments, or any other department or program, can have a claim on developing courses on politics and government and whether it is legitimate to conceptualize "politics" beyond the sphere of official governmental action. Would it have made a difference that I was trained in political science? I ultimately settled on the title "Reproductive Rights and Justice" in order to circumvent the discussion altogether. This episode, however, left me wondering whether the "pure" disciplines will ever take interdisciplinary fields seriously—and whether they will consider interdisciplinary scholars as viable job candidates and acceptable instructors of courses that might encroach upon their discipline's intellectual territory.

It can be difficult getting courses cross-listed at universities, even with the agreement of the departments involved. It usually becomes a question of which department can lay claim to the student enrollment in a specific course, as signified by the number of Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES). Student enrollments in courses determine a department's future budget allotment. Departments are usually reluctant to share or even give up FTES to another department, especially in times when budget funds are tight.

FTES can be detrimental to boundary crossing in other ways. The introduction to women's studies in our department is not a single course. In fact, we have two introductory courses: WMNST 101, Self, Identity & Society, which is social science-based, and WMNST 102, Women: Images and Ideas, which is humanities-based. Although we would prefer to have a single, interdisciplinary introductory women's studies class, we have our present structure in place because of institutional constraints due to FTES. This arrangement

is a way to ensure that the department enrolls enough students in our courses, while keeping enrollment numbers in individual sections at manageable levels. The challenge has been to develop these courses so that they are distinct from one another, without much overlap. We created a special curriculum committee to develop guidelines for our introductory course instructors.

Interdisciplinary or hybrid courses can be taught in a variety of ways. There is the model of the lone instructor who draws materials from multiple disciplines, or even uses materials that are in themselves interdisciplinary. When designing any type of course, instructors must determine the learning goals for the students, including the key concepts students should have mastered by the end of the semester or quarter. Instructors must also decide which texts would be the most illuminating for students. When determining the assigned texts, however, the instructor of an interdisciplinary course is not bound by a specific discipline's literature. It is likely that the instructor is developing an interdisciplinary course in order to examine a specific topic or theme, usually one that is of intellectual and research interest to her. That said, the instructor is probably already well versed in multiple literatures; however, she may not feel as confident and competent in some areas as she does in others in terms of teaching. As a result, she may resort to bringing in guest speakers in certain weeks. For example, in my reproductive justice course, I brought in a licensed health educator to conduct the reproductive anatomy portion of the course.

Another model is the interdisciplinary course taught by a team that is comprised of faculty drawn from two or more disciplines or areas of specialization. While in graduate school, my first foray into teaching was a large (250 students) introductory course offered by the women's studies department. The team consisted of six graduate students and a faculty advisor. Although all members of the team were connected and trained in women's studies, we also came from a number of disciplinary approaches including literature, history, philosophy, American studies, political science, and public health. We developed the course together, choosing the topics to be covered and creating the syllabus and assignments. Each member of the team took the lead on at least two topics, usually within our individual disciplinary expertise; each topic had at least two to three leads who worked together. As the leads, we were not only responsible for suggesting the readings for our topic(s) but also for developing the lecture(s) on said topic(s). We all learned from each other, as this teaching structure allowed each of us to step away from our disciplinary comfort zones and learn how to teach different kinds of texts from different analytical standpoints. Given that we were also responsible for leading two weekly two-hour discussion sections, comprised of 25 students each, it helped having team members from other fields to turn to for advice on how to teach specific types of texts.

Although there was a shared sense among the members of the team of what were the "essential" women's studies or feminist readings, there were also tensions in terms of finding the right balance between the humanities and social sciences. We did not want one or two disciplines to dominate the course. Additionally, it was difficult to find an existing textbook that we could all agree upon, one that in our collective opinion successfully combined readings based in the humanities and in the social sciences. Many women's studies textbooks lean heavily in one direction; they are either mostly humanities-based or social science-based. Ultimately, we chose to design a course packet of readings that would serve as the main text of the course. Although the course packet cost a bit more than a standard textbook, due mainly to costly copyright permission fees, it served our goals of disciplinary balance and breadth of coverage of topics. We paired a novel (*A Handmaid's Tale* by Margaret Atwood), short stories, poetry, and personal narratives with readings that provided statistical and other empirical evidence within our weekly topics, so that students could gain multiple perspectives. We also included readings that defied disciplinary boundaries.

This tension related to the right balance between the humanities and the social sciences within women's

studies is a theme I would come to encounter many times since my graduate teaching experience; it is also felt in many interdisciplinary departments and programs beyond women's studies. Such tensions can manifest themselves not only in debates over how to teach specific courses but also in a department's overall curriculum, both undergraduate and graduate (Levin 2007). Many of the disagreements regarding the curriculum, especially graduate curriculum, can fall along disciplinary lines: What courses should be required for undergraduate majors and minors and graduate students? How should these required courses be taught? What readings and other materials should be included in the required courses?

Within my current department, we recently discussed whether to make the feminist methodology course a requirement for our master's graduate students and how the course should be structured. The discussion arose out of concerns that our graduate students did not have adequate training in designing research projects, which they needed for developing their theses. Many of our graduate students, especially those attempting social science-leaning research, were having a difficult time conceptualizing their thesis projects. We also noticed that students who took the methodology course were more likely to have a thesis proposal in place by the beginning of their second year in the program and more likely to finish their projects in a timely fashion.

The discussion fell along disciplinary lines, with faculty trained in the social sciences strongly advocating for the requirement. It generated many questions: Is there a core feminist methodology? If so, what does it look like? Methodology means different things within different disciplines. For many social scientists, methodology means the systemic collection and analysis of data, whether quantitative (numbers) or qualitative (textual), and is considered an integral part of research design. On the other hand, some of my humanities-trained colleagues have argued that they do not have an explicit methodology; they just do a close reading of a text. How do we reconcile these different approaches to methodology within an interdisciplinary discipline?

Some women's studies graduate programs that require feminist methodology, in fact, have two "methodology" courses: one that is focused on the humanities and another that is based in the social sciences. For example, the women's studies department at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor has separate methodology courses. This suggests that there are "tracks" within the interdisciplinary discipline of women's studies. My department ultimately decided to have a required methodology course that covers the range of disciplinary approaches to methodology. Although the course is run by one faculty member, other faculty contribute guest lectures in the areas of their methodological expertise, including, but not limited to, historical archival research, discourse analysis, ethnography/field observation, interviewing, and literary close reading. Although the course gives students a glimpse of the variety of methods available to them, it does not have the capacity to cover any of these methods in depth, a reflection of the compromises that are often made in interdisciplinary courses. Faculty still have to work closely with individual students on developing the methodology for their thesis projects, but at least now students will have a foundation from which to begin.

In the end, the structure of the methodology course is a lesson unto itself to graduate students. While they learn that they should not necessarily confine themselves to just one theoretical, methodological, epistemological, or analytical approach, they also witness the challenges of doing interdisciplinary work. It is not as easy to reconcile different disciplinary frameworks as it seems, as each discipline comes with its own set of norms, assumptions, and limitations. It takes time, practice, and patience to become a skilled interdisciplinary scholar and instructor who can manage and merge multiple disciplinary perspectives.

Some graduate students might elect to obtain degrees in interdisciplinary fields, or they may decide—or

be forced—to create an ad hoc program of study that reflects their interdisciplinary leanings as they pursue degrees in more traditional disciplines. Graduate programs should be flexible in allowing students to take courses in other programs and allowing at least some of these courses to count toward degree requirements in their home departments. As a graduate student, I did not just take courses outside of the political science department: I actually earned a graduate certificate in women's studies, which required taking another 18 credit hours in addition to the hours I needed for the doctorate. I was fortunate to have a home department that allowed some of the credit hours from my women's studies and public health courses to count toward my course requirements in political science. This, however, was after I made the case to my department's advisor for graduate studies for how these courses were important to my intellectual development and deepened my understanding of health policy and politics; it also helped that the department did not offer courses in health policy. There should be more cooperation among individual programs and departments, so that students can venture into interdisciplinary waters. Recent research supports this sentiment. Newswander and Borrego assert that "an engaged faculty and student body are important factors in quality interdisciplinary graduate education. Furthermore, engagement can also be a reflective indicator of how well a program is meeting the unique needs of the interdisciplinary student" (2008, 560).

Concluding Thoughts

We need to recognize that disciplines are not static; they are always changing. Cross-fertilization is the norm, as disciplines have always borrowed from other disciplines, in a process that has enriched and broaden the creative scope of individual fields of study. It is a matter of us all accepting this reality and making the necessary accommodations that allow interdisciplinarity to flourish. Additionally, it is important to continue the dialogue about intellectual hybridity within women's and feminist studies, especially during times of economic distress. (Inter)disciplinarity has a direct impact on the survival of our departments and programs within the academy and it influences the ways in which we function internally as an interdisciplinary discipline.

As I mentioned at the beginning of this essay, it represents my attempt to make sense of my particular experience; it is my meaning-making process. Even within a women's studies department, I still feel the tensions among disciplinary boundaries, which tells me that interdisciplinary programs are not immune to these tensions. Based on my casual conversations with colleagues, I am not alone in my experience. Despite the number of articles written about interdisciplinarity, there is a surprising dearth of studies that systematically document and examine the experiences of scholars who deliberately cross disciplinary boundaries, particularly studies based on personal interviews. How do interdisciplinary scholars make sense of their experiences and institutional processes? What are their stories? How do they find meaning in all of this? Perhaps I have just unwittingly created a new thread of inquiry for my research agenda.

Notes

1. Some readers may object to my use of the term "illegitimate" here and in other parts of this paper, as opposed to other, less inflammatory terms such as "non-normative" or even "marginalized." My use of the term is deliberate. It is not a value judgment on the "objective" scholarly soundness or rigor of a body of knowledge; instead, it reflects the subjective perceptions of others judging such bodies of knowledge from the outside. The use of the term is meant to evoke a degree of alienation and value judgment that the other terms simply cannot capture.

2. Dvora Yanow's enlightening chapter in Schatz (2009) advises editors of political science journals on how to fairly and responsibly evaluate submissions that employ political ethnography and instructs writers in how to represent their ethnographic research effectively to editors and readers. This article has implications for editors in general on how to review interdisciplinary research.

3. Much has been written on this subject, and it is beyond the scope of this paper to delve into it more deeply. The following volumes provide in-depth discussions of the topic: *Meeting the Challenge: Innovative Feminist Pedagogies in Action*, edited by Maralee Mayberry and Ellen Cronan Rose (Routledge, 1999); *Teaching Feminist Activism: Strategies from the Field*, edited by Nancy A. Naples and Karen Bojar (Routledge, 2002); and *Activist Scholarship: Antiracism, Feminism, and Social Change*, edited by Julia Sudbury and Margo Okazawa-Rey (Paradigm Publishers, 2009).

References

Benson, Thomas C. 1982. "Five Arguments Against Interdisciplinary Studies." *Issues in Integrative Studies* 1: 38-48.

Boxer, Marilyn J. 2000. "Unruly Knowledge: Women's Studies and the Problem of Disciplinarity." *NWSA Journal* 12 (2): 119-29.

Buker, Eloise. 2003. "Is Women's Studies a Disciplinary or an Interdisciplinary Field of Inquiry?" *NWSA Journal* 15 (1): 73-93.

Derricourt, Robin. 1996. *An Author's Guide to Scholarly Publishing*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fenno, Richard. 1978. *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. 1998. "(Inter)Disciplinarity and the Question of the Women's Studies Ph.D." *Feminist Studies* 24 (2): 301-25.

Gipson, Jessica D., Davida Becker, Joanna Z. Mishtal, and Alison H. Norris. 2011. "Conducting Collaborative Abortion Research in International Settings." *Women's Health Issues* 21 (3): S58-62.

Harding, Sandra. 1987. "Is There a Feminist Method?" Introduction to *Feminism and Methodology*, edited by Sandra Harding, 1-14. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Jacobs, Jerry A. 2009. "Interdisciplinary Hype." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 22, http://chronicle.com/article/Interdisciplinary-Hype/49191/.

Jacobs, Jerry A., and Scott Frickel. 2009. "Interdisciplinarity: A Critical Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35: 43–65.

Katz, Cindi. 2001. "Response: Disciplining Interdisciplinarity." *Feminist Studies* 27 (2): 519-25.

Levin, Amy K. 2007. "Questions for a New Century: Women's Studies and Integrative Learning. A Report to the National Women's Studies Association." College Park, MD: NWSA.

Metzger, Norman, and Richard N. Zare. 1999. "Interdisciplinary Research: From Belief to Reality." *Science*, January 29, 642-43.

Mills, Julie E., Judith Gill, Rhonda Sharp, and Suzanne Franzway. 2011. "Getting It Together: Feminist Interdisciplinary Research on Women and Engineering." *Women's Studies International Forum* 34 (1): 13-19.

Monroe, Kristen Renwick, ed. 2005. *Perestroika! The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Naples, Nancy A. 2006. "Feminist Activism and Activist Scholarship in the 21st Century." *FemTAP: A Journal of Feminist Theory and Practice* (Summer). Accessed March 6, 2008. http://www.femtap.com/index.html.

National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. 2010. "Table 289. Number of Degree-Granting Institutions Conferring Degrees, by Control, Level of Degree, and Field of Study: 2008-09." *Digest of Education Statistics*. http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/tables/dt10_289.asp.

National Women's Studies Association (NWSA). 2009. "Guide to Women's & Gender Studies: Ph.D. Programs." Accessed May 5, 2012. http://72.32.34.202/research/theguide/grad.php.

Newswander, Lynita K., and Maura Borrego. 2009. "Engagement in Two Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs." *Higher Education* 58: 551-62.

Nissani, Moti. 1997. "Ten Cheers for Interdisciplinarity: The Case for Interdisciplinary Knowledge and Research." *Social Science Journal* 34 (2): 201-16.

Paletz, Susannah, Laurel Smith-Doerr, and Itai Vardi. "National Science Foundation Workshop Report: Interdisciplinary Collaboration in Innovative Science and Engineering Fields." Accessed December 16, 2010. https://sites.google.com/site/interdisciplinary2010/home.

Peterson, Valerie V. 2008. "Against Interdisciplinarity." *Women and Language* 31 (2): 42-50.

Pfirman, Stephanie L., James P. Collins, Susan Lowes, and Anthony F. Michaels. 2005. "Collaborative Efforts: Promoting Interdisciplinary Scholars." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 11, B15.

Pinn, Vivian W. 2005. "Research on Women's Health: Progress and Opportunities." *JAMA* 294 (11): 1407-10.

Sá, Creso M. 2008. "'Interdisciplinary Strategies' in U.S. Research Universities." *Higher Education* 55: 537-52.

Schatz, Edward. 2009. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Shteir, Ann (Rusty). 2007. "Beyond the Big Divide? The Humanities and Social Sciences in Women's Studies." *Resources for Feminist Research* 32 (3/4): 9-12.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2008. "What is Historical Social Science?" Paper presented at "Contention, Change, and Explanation: A Conference in Honor of Charles Tilly," Social Science Research Council, New York, October 3-5, 2008. http://www.ssrc.org/hirschman/content/2008/texts/Wallerstein.pdf.

———. 1996. *Open the Social Sciences: Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Yanow, Dvora. 2009. "Dear Author, Dear Reader: The Third Hermeneutic in Writing and Reviewing Ethnography." In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power,* edited by Edward Schatz, 275-302. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.