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FROM THE CENTER
This is a season of celebration and change for the Center for the Study of Women in Society. We’re celebrating 40 years of feminist research, teaching, and activism at the University of Oregon with a three-day series of symposia, including a new documentary by CSWS’s Gabriela Martínez and Sonia De La Cruz about the founding of the center. In honoring our beginnings, we also pay tribute to the incredible support of our university partners. I am thankful to our many generous sponsors for helping us make this possible: the Sally Miller Gearhart Fund; Department of Women’s and Gender Studies; College of Arts and Sciences; University of Oregon Libraries; Oregon Humanities Center; School of Architecture and Allied Arts; Robert D. Clark Honors College; Office of Equity and Inclusion; Office for Research, Innovation, and Graduate Education; Vice President of Academic Affairs; Center on Diversity and Community; School of Journalism and Communication; Jordan Schnitzer Museum of Art; the Departments of English, Ethnic Studies, Romance Languages, Anthropology, Sociology, International Studies, Political Science, and Psychology; and the Comparative Literature journal (sponsors correct at time of printing).

In terms of change, I will with some regret be stepping down as director at the end of this year. It has been my privilege to work with the committed, creative, and talented CSWS staff—without them, none of this would work—and the remarkable faculty members and graduate students CSWS exists to support. But change is vital within an organization like CSWS, and new directors allow for new networks, connections, and ideas to spark and catch fire. The center’s next director, Professor Michael Hames-García (see article on p. 24), is going to bring ideas, experiences, and talents to CSWS that are going to amaze, provoke, and delight all of us. I am so very pleased to be able to pass the baton into his very capable hands.

— Carol Stabile, Director
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FUNDING FEMINIST FUTURES

Financial support makes a world of difference

by Carol Stabile, Director
Center for the Study of Women in Society
Professor, UO School of Journalism and Communication
and the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies

RESEARCH IS A FUNNY THING, I’ve learned over years of working with graduate students and faculty members. Never a one-size-fits-all process, it’s rarely straightforward, especially when it comes to interdisciplinary work that needs to reckon with scholarship and perspectives other than those of the scholar’s home discipline. The work of interdisciplinary feminist researchers is made even more complex because of the need to grapple with relations of power, like gender, race, class, sexuality, ability, and other dimensions of oppression too long to list, but that make for deadly combinations.

Think of it this way: you’re researching how “Ugly Laws” (ordinances that made it illegal for persons with “unsightly or disgusting” disabilities to appear in public) affected women in San Francisco, California. The problem with this formulation is, as gender scholars have argued over the past thirty years, laws like this affected different groups of women in very distinct ways, depending on race, ethnicity, class, and ability. In order to do justice to the research question, then, the researcher needs to look at relationships among gender and race and ethnicity and class and ability, if she wants to understand how these ordinances affected this diverse, unwieldy category of “women.” Even if she narrows the focus further—perhaps with a concentration on Chinese women—she still needs to have a sense of how the laws affected other groups of women in order to evaluate the specific impact on Chinese women.

It might help to think of this by way of another analogy. When Rachel Carson wrote Silent Spring (Houghton Mifflin, 1962), the book galvanized attempts to ban DDT, a pesticide toxic to many birds and mammals. Years ago, environmental activists often focused on a single chemical and its effects. But today, they understand that what they need to be studying—in all its complexity—are not single causes, but the relationships among chemical compounds, which interact with one another and in ecosystems in intricate and tricky ways.

If we think about discrimination and oppression as forms of social pollution, we can carry this analogy further and say that twenty-first century feminist researchers and their allies need to be studying the relationships among oppressions in their specific historical and cultural contexts, a job that’s manifestly more complicated than previous ways of knowing. In intellectual cultures accustomed to telling straightforward narratives about single causes and discernible effects, it goes without saying that research like this can be challenging.

At CSWS, we recognize that this kind of research requires resources. Many of us have watched as support for social scientific and humanistic research on gender has slowed to a trickle. In this context, the funding CSWS provides for research that’s innovative, unusual, creative, and unorthodox makes an enormous difference in the research of graduate students and faculty researchers who study the multiple causes and interactions of oppressive cultures, as well as strategies for resistance. In the years I’ve been director, very few days go by when I don’t quietly thank Jane Grant and her husband, William Harris, for their gift that makes the work of CSWS possible.

The impact of the Harris gift is also difficult to assess. I could tell you that we’ve funded over two million dollars worth of grants. I could tell you that CSWS grantees have gone on to publish dozens of books, secured multimillion-dollar grants at UO and elsewhere, and won numerous awards. I could tell you stories about faculty awardees, like anthropologist Lynn Stephen, who used her funding to conduct research that was published as a book in 2005, titled Zapotec Women: Gender, Class, and Ethnicity in Globalized Oaxaca. I could share the words of professor of French and vice provost of academic affairs Barbara Altmann, who expressed her gratitude for the support a CSWS grant gave her “at a crucial transition from associate to full professor. The term off teaching it allowed gave me a chance to finish that research despite becoming department head.” Or I could point to the work of historian Elizabeth Reis, whose 2004 CSWS grant funded research for what became her influential book on intersex, Bodies in Doubt: Intersex in America, 1620-1960. I could also mention the impact of CSWS funding on professor of anthropology Aletta Biersack, who found that her CSWS award was “a powerful ‘seed’ grant for subsequent research and writing,” including research on changing marriage and sexual practices in Papua New Guinea.

Like research on gender, evaluating impact in the humanities and social sciences can be complicated. As one of our Jane Grant Dissertation winners, now a professor of speech communication at Oregon State University, put it about the funding she received in 1987, “How does one assess a particular effect of a single piece of one’s life? What is the measure of the relief I felt as a single mother in graduate
school to be given such largess to allow me possibilities otherwise not available!"

The support she received did not register immediately, or through the publication of a single article. Rather, rhizome-like, the impact of her grant grew and extended over years. She graduated, secured a job, got tenure, and saw two children through college. That's impact.

Or take the work of Dr. R. Charli Carpenter, who received a Jane Grant Dissertation Award in 2002. Dr. Carpenter published her first book, *Innocent Women and Children: Gender, Norms and the Protection of Civilians*, in 2006. Over the years, Dr. Carpenter has, in her words, generated “empirical data on a number of understudied phenomena: gender-based violence against civilian men and boys, children born as a result of wartime sexual violence.” Dr. Carpenter has published three books in the years since she completed her PhD in political science at the University of Oregon and has served as a consultant to UNICEF on the needs of children born of wartime rape or exploitation. That's impact.

Like Dr. Carpenter, Kate Harkness’s grant blended theory with practice. In Dr. Harkness’s case, her research focused on women’s mental health. According to her, CSWS funding resulted not only in the completion of her dissertation, but the publication of six papers published in top-tier peer-reviewed journals. Sociologist Jill Weigt similarly credits her Jane Grant Dissertation Award for an impressive scholarly output: one book and four separate articles on welfare reform.

Creativity, originality, and self-confidence don’t always go hand in hand, for feminist researchers in particular. CSWS funding gave some graduate student researchers confidence and the sense that their work mattered. Shannon Elizabeth Bell, a sociologist and grantee whose first book, *Our Roots Run Deep as Ironweed: Appalachian Women and the Fight for Environmental Justice*, will be published in October of this year, told us that “CSWS was the first organization that funded my research. CSWS has a long history and is very well-respected, so receiving its support was a big confidence booster early in my graduate career. Receiving this funding helped me believe at a critical time in my development as a scholar that my research really mattered.” Another Jane Grant awardee wrote of the funding she received decades ago, “It may have been twenty-two years ago, but I still remember the incredible feeling of affirmation when I received the Jane Grant Dissertation Fellowship Award. During a doctoral program, one can become disoriented and lose perspective—especially after taking the graduate school vows of obedience, celibacy, and poverty! The timing of the award was perfect. It told me that my work was worthy and that there would be life after graduate school!”

Although CSWS specifically funds research, research directly impacts teaching as well. Lea Williams, now an associate professor, told us that the research her Jane Grant Award supported allowed her to develop several new courses over a period of years. Teaching at a private military college, she observed that “the research I did about women and war has been enormously useful in introducing students here to the way conceptions of

gender contribute to the development of war narratives, a view most of the students know little about.” Another grantee told us that her research allowed her to teach a lecture course on gender and communication that over a period of twenty years reached more than two thousand students.

CSWS’s impact further stretches beyond college settings or conventional research publications. Seri Luangphinth used poetry from her dissertation in a workshop she conducted on indigenizing assessment on multiculturalism—showing participants what she described as “the entrenched divide between idealized multiculturalism and indigeneity.” Kathleen M. Ryan used her research grant to visit archives on the East Coast for an oral history on the WAVES of World War II, a project that she is currently turning into a feature-length film. And the Fembot Project—an online platform devoted to publishing feminist research, launched with CSWS support and sustained with additional funding from the School of Journalism and Communication—has reached tens of thousands of readers in just over a year of publishing.

A lesser known part of Jane Grant and William Harris’s story lies in their mutual love of gardening. In the late 1930s, they bought an old barn in Litchfield, Connecticut—a weekend retreat for the two journalists (Harris was editing for *Fortune* Magazine, Grant continued to write freelance columns and features) from their working lives in New York City. They quickly discovered that American gardening in the 1940s was backward, to say the least, and their efforts to procure new plants, to innovate in garden design, and to share the knowledge they were acquiring resulted in the founding of White Flower Farm, a pioneering nursery that remains in operation today (proceeds of Harris’s sale of White Flower Farm became part of his gift to UO). Over the decades, Harris’s gift to CSWS has provided seed funding that has transformed—and continues to transform—the University of Oregon itself. CSWS funding helped create the Center for Latino/a and Latin American Studies, and it has supported the Center on Diversity and Culture and the Center for Race, Ethnicity, and Sexuality Studies (the last, unfortunately, a casualty of defunding). The seeds of that original gift, and the work of generations of feminist scholars and leaders—Joan Acker, Miriam Johnson, Marilyn Farwell, Sandi Morgen, and many others—that made those seeds flourish here in Eugene, continues to unfold today in the research, teaching, and activism of a new generation of feminist scholars and researchers.

—Carol Stable is in her final of six years as director of the UO Center for the Study of Women in Society. A professor in the School of Journalism and Communication and the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies, she is the author of Feminism and the Technological Fix, editor of Turning the Century: Essays in Media and Cultural Studies, co-editor of Prime Time Animation: Television Animation and American Culture, and author of White Victims, Black Villains: Gender, Race, and Crime News in US Culture. She is currently finishing a book on women writers and the broadcast blacklist in the 1950s, entitled Black and White and Red All Over: Women Writers and the Television Blacklist, and working on research on gender in massively multiplayer online games. She is also a founding member of Fembot, a scholarly collaboration promoting research on gender, media, and technology.
FOR LOVE OF A FEMINIST:

Jane Grant, William Harris, and the “Fund for the Study of Women”

by Jenée Wilde, PhD candidate
UO Department of English (Folklore)

In 1975, retired financial analyst and Fortune editor William B. Harris willed most of his estate to establish the “University of Oregon Fund for the Study of Women.” By the end of 1984, the sum of his endowment amounted to just over $4 million, the largest single gift the university had ever received. At a time when women’s studies was struggling to gain ground in the academy, what led Harris to fund research on women? The story of the Center for the Study of Women in Society’s greatest benefactor begins and ends with his love of a feminist, Jane C. Grant.

EARLY YEARS

Jane Grant learned early how to handle herself in the domains of men. Raised in a family with lots of males, she successfully navigated pressrooms, poker games, and variety shows in early twentieth-century New York City and wartime Paris. As she would write in 1943, “Adjusting myself to their world is one of the things at which I have been rather competent.”

Born in 1892, Grant was raised in rural Missouri and Kansas. While the women in her family were expected to marry or become schoolteachers, Grant wanted neither. At 17 she moved to New York to study voice, where new friends introduced her to a sophisticated society life she grew to love. As a performer, however, she struggled to make ends meet. A steady job was the only way she could stay in her beloved New York.

So like growing numbers of young women seeking independence in progressive-era New York, Grant took a business course and got a stenography job at the New York Times in 1914. “[T]he Fourth Estate glowered at women in those days,” she later would write, “and despite warnings . . . that there would never be advancement for a woman at the Times, I began my career.”

Grant learned the publishing world from the bottom up, working her way from the stenography pool to the society desk to hotel reporter after the First World War. By 1923, she was writing several syndicated weekly columns and had become the first woman promoted to general-assignment reporter at the Times. Married in 1920 to editor Harold Ross, the couple shared a publishing dream and cofounded The New Yorker magazine in 1925. Thanks to her keen financial sense and social aplomb in a business world dominated by men, Grant saved the magazine from ruin twice, once in its early days and once during the Second World War.

While Grant had learned early to use male power to her advantage, it was only after her first marriage to Ross that she began to understand the price that women paid for that power. On the day of her wedding, when called “Mrs. Ross” by a witness, “I was jolted out of my apathy,” she wrote. “My heart stood still at the realization that my own little name had dissolved.”

So she worked hard to keep it. In 1921, Grant and friend Ruth Hale founded the Lucy Stone League to fight for a woman’s right to her name in marriage. From property ownership to passport renewals, the roadblocks she tackled by maintaining her birth name awakened Grant to the larger problems of pervasive sex discrimination. But her growing feminism also irritated her husband. By 1929, even as The New Yorker succeeded, their marriage failed. “My marriage to Miss Grant split largely on the reefs of women’s rights,” Ross later wrote.

ROMANCE

When William Harris met the divorced Grant at a cocktail party in 1934, her feminism was in full view. Having just returned from a seven-month trip around the world, her journalistic forays in China, Manchuria, Russia, and Europe included, among other stories, interviewing the director of the Nazi Foreign Press Bureau
But Harris was married to another woman, so while his affair with Grant was passionate, it was hidden from public view. In September 1935 he told her, “Not that I even dare to hope that you ‘ll ever marry me—but at least I should like to be in a position to be seen with you on the street.”

Grant had little financial incentive to marry again. As a journalist and New Yorker shareholder, she was assured of her ability to live as an independent woman. Her 1936 and 1937 letters to Harris describe not her feelings but her travels abroad and the people whose company she was enjoying, including good-looking men.

The scales tipped in his favor in 1938. Sometime that year, Harris began divorce proceedings, having secured a stable position as literary editor at Fortune magazine. Also, Grant purchased acreage in Litchfield, Connecticut, including an old barn that she planned to renovate as a weekend and vacation retreat, accompanied by Harris. But when Grant told the woman who had owned the property of her plans, the woman said that neighbors would not take kindly to an unmarried couple living there.

Grant and Harris wed in 1939, before the renovations were complete. Splitting time between New York and their Connecticut retreat, which later became White Flower Farm, Grant and Harris lived their lives together until her death in 1972.

THE CAUSE

Grant’s feminism began with the Lucy Stone League’s fight for women’s names in the 1920s, but in the following decades she became well versed in problems of women’s civil and social rights. “Beginning mildly with names,” she wrote, “I soon worked up indignation over other feminine taboos.”

Though the League ceased activities in the late 1920s, Grant continued to write about women’s rights in news columns and letters. She joined the Connecticut Committee for the Equal Rights Amendment when it was founded in 1943 and was active in the National Woman’s Party, which was devoted to passage of the ERA. In 1955, Grant joined the national advisory committee of the Massachusetts Committee for the Equal Rights Amendment, the most successful state committee in the 1960s.

Harris joined her quest, becoming a feminist advocate in his own right. He was a member of the Connecticut group’s national advisory committee and later was a member of the same committee of the Massachusetts ERA group. In 1955, he prepared a written brief countering an anti-ERA argument, which Grant then used at an American Civil Liberties Union debate to argue in favor of the ERA. And of course Harris joined the Lucy Stone League’s advisory committee after Grant revived the organization in 1950.

As president, Grant initially guided the league toward what she knew best—a woman’s right to her own name. But times had changed, and new members were more troubled by widespread sex discrimination in postwar America. In 1951, members approved changing the organization’s scope to include “activities to safeguard and extend all civil, legal, social and political rights of women” and to serve as “a center for research and for information on the status of women.”

In the 1950s, Lucy Stoners made a practical difference by establishing small libraries honoring women’s contributions to society and by funding scholarships for women studying in male-dominated fields. Grant also took to heart the League’s new function as a research center. She wrote to countless authors and organizations to gather data and studies, drawing on this information in her many speeches and letters protesting sex discrimination. Her work helped the League become known as a useful feminist resource, and she was asked to consult with the Women’s Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor in 1961 and the President’s Commission on the Status of Women in 1962.

While Grant saw many of the requests for information the League received and personally collected much of the material it distributed, she also realized more research was needed if the problems of women were to be addressed. In 1964, Grant and League vice president Doris Stevens established the Harvard-Radcliffe Fund for the Study of Women to finance and promote “research and instruction in the problems of women in present and past societies anywhere.”

Harris and Grant plunged into raising money for the fund, eventually collecting about $35,000 at a time when women’s studies was not yet an academic discipline. In addition, Grant assigned to the fund all the income from publishing her memoir Ross, “The New Yorker” and Me. The couple also planned to will their estates as an endowment for a chair for the study of women.
But Harvard “dragged its feet” on the fund and objected to their independent fundraising, Harris said later, so in the early 1970s, “we finished up with that institution.”17

THE LEGACY

Grant’s death in 1972 left Harris to decide what would become of her papers and their unfinished dream to fund the study of women. He found a solution to both in a letter from Ed Kemp, the acquisitions librarian for what was then called the University of Oregon Library Special Collections Department.

As a man who valued women’s accomplishments, Kemp had long been searching out the papers of women whom larger institutions had overlooked. After seeing Grant’s obituary in the Times, a little research told him that she was special. A year later when his travel schedule permitted, Kemp sent Harris a letter asking to see Grant’s papers. Harris agreed to a visit but had more on his mind, mentioning in his letter the couple’s attempt “to get some of the Eastern universities interested in a chair for the study of women.”18

In November 1974, Kemp met Harris in New York, looked over Grant’s papers, and gladly told him that they were valuable. Harris then asked if the University of Oregon had a women’s studies program, to which Kemp replied that it had just started a very small one. Harris said he would donate the papers, but as the two men continued talking over a long lunch, Kemp gradually realized that Harris also expected him to ask for the funds originally earmarked for Harvard, perhaps for Oregon’s women’s studies program. Stunned at the opportunity but knowing nothing of fundraising, Kemp returned to Eugene and went straight to president Robert D. Clark. “He jumped,” Kemp said later. “There was no persuasion needed.”19

Conditions at Oregon were ripe for the fund Harris wanted to establish. In 1970, an interdisciplinary research group reported that women were woefully underrepresented among faculty tenure-track and staff positions. A year later, students organized the University Feminists (later becoming the ASUO Women’s Center) to fight for women’s services and the institutionalization of women’s studies on campus. Meanwhile, the research group had established a small center to encourage research on women across disciplines. By 1973, Center for the Sociological Study of Women (CSSW) had received a three-year funding commitment from the university, and the State Board of Higher Education had approved the formation of a women’s studies program, the first of its kind in Oregon.

As a dean in the 1950s, Clark had tried and failed to create a program addressing women’s issues at Oregon. But the 1970s were different. “Because of the courage and foresight of feminists and their supporters,” he wrote to Harris, “we have a new perception of the role of women in our society.”20

Harris’s past dealings with Eastern universities made him wary, but his talks and letters with Clark and Kemp, as well as a visit with CSSW faculty affiliates in Eugene, convinced him that Grant’s wishes would be fulfilled at Oregon. In May 1975, Clark received a letter from Harris’s attorney announcing a new will had been prepared in which “Mr. Harris intends to bequeath a very substantial portion of his estate to the ‘University of Oregon Fund for the Study of Women.’”21

Harris died in 1981, and CSSW worked to develop a women’s research center with a vision befitting the legacy of Jane Grant and the Lucy Stone League. After two years of planning, the renamed Center for the Study of Women in Society (CSWS) launched an expanded program of generating, supporting, and disseminating research on women through faculty and student grants, conferences and visiting scholar support, institutional collaborations, publications, the Jane Grant Dissertation Fellowship, and more.

While women have been leaders in feminist research and activism, it remains important also to remember the advocacy of men such as Harris, Kemp, and Clark. For love of a feminist, CSWS became possible. Its mission continues today through women and men who love equality for all. ■
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1. **Postdoctoral Fellowship in Gender, Race, and Sexuality**

Over the past forty years, the Center for the Study of Women in Society (CSWS) has witnessed massive changes in the everyday lives of women, as well as a commensurate shift in the ways in which feminists understand the category of “women.” Theories of difference, intersectionality, and the multiple aspects of identities are common in feminist studies, along with a commitment to modeling these in our work and communities alike. It might be said that feminists seek to celebrate, study, and enhance the diversity of university communities so as to mirror the diversity of the biological and social worlds that we live in. Supporting and encouraging such diversity is one way of honoring the legacy of Jane Grant, who broke new ground for women in the early twentieth century.

As part of our commitment to intellectually and structurally diversifying CSWS, and, in support of University of Oregon’s diversity plan, CSWS is launching a campaign to endow a postdoctoral fellowship for junior faculty members working on gender, race, and sexuality in any field across the Humanities and Social Sciences. In order to endow this post-doctoral fellowship, CSWS will need to raise $1.5 million.

The CSWS diversity fellowship has multiple intents. Postdoctoral fellows bring new life and energy to institutional settings, allowing CSWS and its partner departments to benefit from intellectual interests, disciplinary connections, and networks. It also demonstrates our commitment to thinking about critical studies of gender, race, and sexuality and puts UO on the map in terms of supporting scholars who are conducting such research.

2. **The Le Guin Feminist Science Fiction Fellowship**

The intention of the Le Guin Feminist Science Fiction Fellowship is to encourage research within UO collections in the area of feminist science fiction. The Knight Library’s Special Collections and University Archives (SCUA) houses the papers of authors Ursula K. Le Guin, Joanna Russ, Kate Wilhelm, Suzette Haden Elgin, Sally Miller Gearhart, Kate Elliot, Molly Gloss, Laurie Marks, and Jessica Salmonson. SCUA is also in the process of acquiring the papers of James Tiptree, Jr. and other key feminist science fiction authors. For more about these collections, visit http://library.uoregon.edu/node/3524.

This fellowship supports travel for the purpose of research on, and work with, the papers of feminist science fiction authors housed in the

3. **CSWS Graduate Research Awards**

Since 1983, CSWS has awarded funding for graduate students engaged in research that reflects scholarly and/or creative work on women and gender from a range of disciplines. Over the past five years alone, we have funded graduate students working on issues as wide-ranging as the following sample:

- An anthropologist studying organic farming, gender, and sustainability in the Caribbean
- A media scholar researching lesbian, gay, transgendered, and bisexual youths’ use of digital media
- A team of psychologists studying a program devoted to preventing depression and enhancing maternal self-efficacy in pregnant women who are in recovery from substance dependence
- A literary scholar studying the use of silence in women’s experimental poetry
- A scholar in international studies researching how women with disabilities are responding to the AIDS crisis in their communities
- A sociologist researching how poor and working-class women have been mobilizing for environmental justice in the West Virginia coalfields

While in a typical year we award $20,000 to graduate student research, the need far exceeds this amount. Therefore, we are seeking to supplement these graduate student awards with an additional $10,000 per year.

4. **Road Scholars Program**

As the public lecture program of CSWS, Road Scholars is intended to fulfill a key part of our mission—to disseminate research on women and gender—by offering audiences the opportunity to engage in conversation with UO scholars about gender-related issues critical to our region and beyond. In the past decade, our presenters have spoken to more than 2,700 community members in at least 45 venues across the state. In 2013-2014, we celebrate forty years with three special presentations by UO faculty and researchers (see csws.uoregon.edu for details).

We are seeking to expand and sustain the Road Scholars Program by providing funding for outreach, publicity, and stipends for research and development of public lectures. Support could take the shape of annual corporate sponsorships that would allow us to support and enhance our offerings, or individual contributions to the program.

5. **Annual CSWS Northwest Women Writers Symposium**

The CSWS Northwest Women Writers Symposium (NWWS) is a series of readings, panels, roundtables, and workshops held in early May that provides learning and writing opportunities for 300-1,000 participants ranging in age from high school through retired, as well as professional development for 12-15 creative writers, scholars, and teaching writers. NWWS was successfully launched in 2012 as “MemoirFest,” a one-day event held on the UO campus, and expanded in 2013 to three days with a strong off-campus focus more inclusive of non-university participants. “Common Ground: Land, Language, Story” featured a Saturday program of morning panels and afternoon writing workshops held at the downtown Eugene Public Library, in addition to a Thursday evening panel and Friday night reading held on the UO campus. NWWS 2014 will once again mix venues between town and gown, with an evening panel and evening literary reading at UO, and a full day of panels, roundtables, and workshops to be held at Eugene Public Library. Karen Joy Fowler (We Are All Completely Beside Ourselves; The Jane Austen Book Club) will be the keynote author.

With an advisory board of professional writers and scholars, NWWS aims to go beyond the usual writer’s conference by drawing on the strengths of its host research center and university—namely, giving creative writers and thinkers an opportunity to talk and write about ideas affecting our threatened planet. CSWS is seeking annual individual and corporate sponsorship in support of NWWS.
1973—More than thirty University Feminists loudly take over the steps of Johnson Hall to demand services for women on campus. The Oregon State Board of Higher Education signs off on the state’s first women’s studies program at University of Oregon. A librarian searches out the papers of early feminist Jane C. Grant for UO Library’s Special Collections. And the library not only received Grant’s papers but also discovered a benefactor for women’s research. With the Harris endowment of more than $3.5 million in 1983, CSSW blossomed into the Center for the Study of Women in Society.

In the forty years following those pivotal events, several women’s advocacy groups came together to form the ASUO Women’s Center. Four years ago, the Women’s Studies Program achieved independent status as the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies. And the library not only received Grant’s papers but also discovered a benefactor for women’s research. With the Harris endowment of more than $3.5 million in 1983, CSSW blossomed into the Center for the Study of Women in Society. CSWS has provided a home for interdisciplinary research on women and gender, support of gender, race, and sexuality.”

This year, CSWS celebrates the legacy of feminist research, teaching, and activism at the University of Oregon with special 40th Anniversary events and exhibits. “The significance of this event lies in the research and leadership CSWS has provided on the UO campus for four decades,” said CSWS director Carol Stabile. “Since its beginnings as the Center for the Sociological Study of Women, CSWS has provided a home for interdisciplinary research on women and gender, supporting generations of graduate students, creating an environment on this campus that nurtures and provides a home for feminist research, and serving as a pool for leadership on issues of gender, race, and sexuality.”

In collaboration with the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies and ASUO Women’s Center, CSWS presents our 40th Anniversary Celebration, November 7-9, 2013, in UO’s Erb Memorial Union. The three days of events—free and open to the public (with advance registration)—offer multiple opportunities to witness the long reach of feminist thought and production through engaging narratives about our past, present, and possible futures.

On Thursday, Nov. 7, 3-6:30 P.M., the celebration kicks off with the premiere of Agents of Change, a documentary feature film that chronicles the development of the Center for the Study of Women in Society within the broader context of the women’s movement. Through a combination of archival footage, photographs, documents, and interviews, the film provides new insights into the efforts and challenges of creating a program for the study of women, and the struggle for amplifying discourse about women in academia. Eugene mayor Kitty Piercy will be a special guest speaker for the kick-off. Registered participants will also attend a catered reception.

On Friday, Nov. 8, 9 a.m.–5 p.m., the “Women’s Stories, Women’s Lives” Symposium explores four decades of feminist research and activism through the personal narratives, visual illustrations, and dialogue of more than twenty women activists, professionals, scholars, and community leaders. To help illuminate some of the local, cultural, and global issues at stake across forty years of feminism, speakers will weave together themes of women’s rights, violence against women, women’s health, activism and policy, and education and employment in four panel sessions, each focusing on a decade from the 1970s through the twenty-first century.

Among the panelists, local activist Kate Barkley will talk about domestic violence and the creation of Womanspace in the 1970s, sociologist Shannon Elizabeth Bell will discuss how women helped to shape the environmental justice movement in the 1980s, Eugene Weekly owner Anita Johnson will offer how changing legislation affected workplace equity in the 1990s, and Mobility International co-founder Susan Sygall will provide insight into women and the disability movement in the new millennium. Panelists also include Yvonne Braun, R. Charli Carpenter, Jan Eliot, Lynn Fujiwara, Shelley Grosjean, Margaret Hallock, Cheris Kramarae, Nichole Maher, Marion Malcolm, Gabriela Martinez, Sandra Morgen, Elizabeth Reis, and Barbara Pope (see csws.uoregon.edu for details).

In addition, “Women’s Stories, Women’s Lives” offers registered participants a catered luncheon and special reading by award-winning Oregon writer Molly Gloss, author of The Hearts of Horses, Wild Life, The Dazzle of Day, and The Jump-Off Creek. Tables for local women’s organizations, vendors, and books authored by guest speakers will also be available all day Friday and Saturday.

On the evening of Friday, Nov. 8, the celebration transitions into narratives about feminist futures. “The first half of our 40th Anniversary Celebration...”
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involves considering where CSWS has been,” Stabile said. “We wanted to end on a more speculative note.” Set for 6:30–9 p.m. in the EMU Ballroom, “A Conversation with Ursula K. Le Guin” sets the stage for feminist speculations of future worlds.

Popular and widely known both inside and outside the science fiction genre, Le Guin started publishing science fiction and fantasy in the 1960s and has won the Hugo, Nebula, Locus, and World Fantasy awards, each more than once. Her work has often depicted futuristic or imaginary alternative worlds in politics, natural environment, gender, religion, sexuality, and ethnography, such as her well-known novel The Left Hand of Darkness. Le Guin will read and discuss her work with the hosts and will conclude the evening, along with Gloss, by signing books for registered participants.

The celebration continues on Saturday, Nov. 9, 9 a.m.–6 p.m., with the Sally Miller Gearhart “Worlds Beyond World” Symposium, featuring several major figures in the field of feminist science fiction: Vonda N. McIntyre, author of Dreamsnake, Superluminal, and The Moon and the Sun, which is being adapted for film; Suzy McKee Charnas, author of Motherlode and Walk to the End of the World; Andrea Hairston, author of the Redwood and Wildfire; Kate Wilhelm, who lives in Eugene and is the author of the science fiction classic Where Late the Sweet Birds Sang; L. Timmel Duchamp, author and editor with independent feminist science fiction publisher Aqueduct Press; as well as author Gloss and feminist science fiction scholars Grace Dillon from Portland State University, Alexis Lothian from Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Joan Haran from University of Cardiff (Wales), and Michael Hames-Garcia and Margaret McBride from UO.

During Saturday’s symposium sessions, authors Charnas, Duchamp, McIntyre, and Wilhelm—with Hames-Garcia—will discuss how the science fiction genre has been used as a vehicle for exploring feminist political theory; Duchamp, Gloss, and Hairston—with McBride—will share their insights about feminist creativity and world building; and Hairston with scholars Dillon, Lothian, and Haran will offer directions in feminist science fiction research (see csws.uoregon.edu for details). Registered participants can also take part in an author book signing during the noon break. Wrapping up the celebration is a catered reception and viewing of the “Women’s Stories, Women’s Lives” photography installation, both at the Jordan-Schneider Museum of Art. Go to: http://jsma.uoregon.edu/csws#sthash.Z3UUBWav.dpuf.

Stabile said the idea for the feminist science fiction symposium grew out of two impulses. “The first was to take advantage of feminist science fiction’s ability—to theorize—to rehearse—alternate universes and possible futures,” she said, “to consider in very sophisticated philosophical terms what might happen or be if circumstances were different, particularly regarding gender and race.”

The second impulse, Stabile said, was “the richness of the Knight Library’s special collections in this area. Special Collections and University Archives houses the papers of authors Ursula K. Le Guin, Joanna Russ, Kate Wilhelm, Suzette Haden Elgin, Sally Miller Goehart, Kate Elliot, Molly Gloss, Laurie Marks, Jessica Salmonson, and Damon Knight. To help draw attention to these important collections, the “Worlds Beyond World” symposium also includes presentations of archival research projects by UO Clark Honors College students, as well as announcing the recipient of the first annual Le Guin Feminist Science Fiction Fellowship for short-term research in these special collections.

Because the faces of feminism are so diverse, we must traverse wide ground in order to grasp what has been accomplished and what challenges still lie ahead. The three-day 40th Anniversary Celebration brings those faces and stories and lives together to give participants a sense of our trajectory and how far we’ve come—and have yet to go.

To register for any or all of the 40th Anniversary Celebration events, go to http://guestlist.st/164928. Additional event information is available at csws.uoregon.edu.

—Jenée Wilde is a PhD candidate in English (Folklore) and Development GTF for the Center for the Study of Women in Society.
The future of feminism may be over sooner than we think. So goes talk in the public sphere and blogosphere about how celebrities-du-jour and political women alike are running in horror away from the “F” word. You would think the feminist waves were a plague on all our houses. (Curiously, some of their male counterparts are embracing the word; see Patrick Stewart and Dr. Jackson Katz.)

How do we understand what is going on and why? One could say to the runners, who we know are not just famous women but also a significant portion of GenX and GenY: “Go ahead, run far and fast. Decry the feminist label as old fashioned, out of touch, irrelevant, etc.” After all, the word feminism has never been the source of or the salve for our collective grief. Women and girls are not born, they are made, as are men and boys. Rigid constructions of gender that promote inequity and overly determine our lives womb to grave—that is what keeps us in a place where women are overrepresented in positions of vulnerability and underrepresented in positions of power. A name change is not going to change that.

“We should all wonder what feminism really means if women in homeless shelters and women in boardrooms do not care about its future in equal measure. That is the point after all, to have it mean something to all of us—across all gender, race, age, class, sexuality, nationality, and ability spectrums.”

In some ways, the future of moving the dial on gender inequity is here already, just unrecognized by those looking for a savior. The multivoice, multiphase, multiperspective hodgepodge we live in has multigenerational, multiracial, multicultural, multieconomy shoulders setting against the wheels that will move us forward. Those shoulders believe in “no justice no peace,” but look to act in places that might be perceived as antithetical to Feminism. For example, historically, feminism has not been comfortable aligning too closely with capitalism. Current research shows that women’s earning power in 2014 is projected to be more than double the combined GDP of China and India. Likewise, women at all levels of society drive spending—as direct consumers and through their influence on men’s purchases—more than any other factor, period. That research can be employed to support a feminist agenda, one that is driven by power women already possess and are not likely to lose anytime soon. An activist’s awareness laid atop buying decisions can lead to immediate worldwide effects.

Research like this can and should anchor feminism’s future. Research with a gender lens gives context and perspective to stories we hear every day so that we understand when supposed progress is real, overstated, or underappreciated. Women’s research centers in universities across the United States are striving to make research a living, evolving, meaningful endeavor that extends far beyond campus walls. Centers connect with women in surrounding communities as partners, not research subjects, to co-define the gender-based inequality active in all their lives. It is an engaged, two-way learning process that allows findings to be translated into functional tools for education, awareness, and action.

Gender-based research is the leading edge for setting and implementing a gender equity agenda in this country. With solid data, it will not matter whether or not the agenda is deployed by feminists-in-name or feminists-in-practice.

—Áine Duggan was named president of the National Council on Research for Women in November 2012. She served previously as vice president for Research, Policy, and Education at the Food Bank for New York City and director for Public Education at the Coalition for the Homeless in New York. She was born in Cork, Ireland, and trained at University College Dublin.
COLLABORATION AS A CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by Yvette Alex-Assensoh, Vice President for Equity and Inclusion, University of Oregon

Former U.S. Secretary of State and university professor Madeline Albright, in one of her many publications, underscored the need for women to be supportive of one another, spelling out that there is a special place in hell reserved for women who do not help one another. Her assertion stems from the fact that, invariably, genuine assistance and collaboration are factors that are central to everyone’s success. After all, no woman is an island unto herself, and every successful leader has, in one way or the other, benefited from the advice, guidance, advocacy, and support of others.

From my own capacity as a chief diversity officer in higher education, I see collaboration and the willingness to be helpful to others as one of women’s greatest challenges as well as our brightest opportunity in the area of diversity. In identifying collaboration as both crucial and a challenge, I do not mean to imply that all structural barriers have been undermined, and that no glass ceilings or unfair discrimination remains. Indeed, a casual glance at the suite of presidents or chief executives of academic institutions as well as governing boards and leadership teams at many of our educational institutions goes a long way to reveal that white males still dominate most aspects of decision-making, despite the fact that women are the majority of undergraduate students and increasingly comprise a majority of many graduate programs and professional schools.

At the same time, women and racial minorities have advanced far beyond what existed in the eighteenth century, when the vise of discrimination kept access to education, political participation, employment, and military service outside their reach. Therefore, as women and other minority groups continue their efforts to dismantle all visible barriers, those of us who have reached positions of authority, trust, and prominence must now think about the extent to which we are leading and operating in contexts that are still fundamentally unfair, exclusive, and inequitable.

As Professor Albright’s quoted assertion, one example of women collaborating with other women in ways that make all of America better is in the U.S. Senate. At least twenty women now serve in important roles on the Senate Appropriations, Armed Services, Finance, and Foreign Relations Committees, which are among the most powerful committees on Capitol Hill. Those women are not using their positions to polish their own résumés, but they are leveraging their positions on the committees to open or bring into the fore important issues that are usually swept under the rug. One example of this phenomenon is the issue of sexual assault in the armed forces. Female legislators are tackling this issue through collaboration in writing several powerful bills intended to end or minimize incidents of sexual assault against women in our military. These collaborations are taking place with women in bipartisan ways and across different generations.

We can also realize the positive benefits of collaboration in higher education, where there are a multitude of issues to address. These issues include the dearth of women in the C-suite; inadequate transparency in tenure, promotion, and other advancement processes; institutionalization of family-friendly policies and anti-racism policies; and mentoring, coaching, and professional development on campuses. In higher ed, we have a captive audience of students, many of them women, who are watching us as models for their own lives. As feminist scholarship has evolved, some of its most powerful works have highlighted the salience of intersectionality. Other writers have extended invitations for scholars to reconceptualize their notions of and about society through the lens of anti-racist as well as feminist scholarship and practices. Yet, there is much work for all of us to do together in producing new knowledge, insights, and practices that can bolster local as well as global forms of resistance to all forms of repression and marginalization.

—Yvette Alex-Assensoh is the University of Oregon’s vice president for Equity and Inclusion. She is a political scientist and attorney and served previously as dean of the Office for Women’s Affairs and Director of Graduate Studies and Admissions in the Department of Political Science, both at Indiana University.
last fall, I was asked by the editor of *Feminist Studies* to write a review essay on four recent books in the broad field of queer studies. I titled the forthcoming essay “What’s after Queer Theory? Queer Ethnic and Indigenous Studies.” The question might as easily be asked about “women’s studies” or even “feminist studies.” Indeed, it has been asked in various ways over the years, with answers ranging from “third wave feminism” to “gender studies” to (disingenuously) “post-feminism” to (ironically) “queer theory.” Often, such questions posed of feminism imply that contributions by women of color and antiracist feminists are crucial to whatever new configuration might follow, suggesting that feminism up to that point has not adequately addressed race and racism. However, the scholarship and activism of those working to dismantle racialized gender hierarchies are most often understood as an addition, a new limb to be grafted on to the feminist trunk. This grafting process will produce a new fruit, one that draws from the best characteristics of each of the original plants, one supposes.

My own scholarship and the books I have just reviewed for *Feminist Studies* break with the logic of a botanical graft. To give a sense of how that break has taken shape, let me reproduce here the two epigraphs I use for my review essay:

The decision to exercise intellectual sovereignty provides a crucial moment in the process from which resistance, hope, and most of all, imagination issue.

To what historical trajectory would queerness attach itself, so that it could be legible to itself and to others? Which geographic locations would be meaningful for queer theory’s central inquiries?

The first of these come from Robert Warrior’s *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions*; the second from Sharon Holland’s *The Erotic Life of Racism*. These lines suggest, shockingly perhaps, that queer ethnic and indigenous studies need not be grafted onto the trunk of an intellectual tradition that did not have queer people of color in mind when it first established itself. The call for intellectual sovereignty suggests that it might not be necessary to figure out how to make Julia Kristeva or Judith Butler antiracist. One might simply ignore them altogether and look for different historical trajectories than modernism-postmodernism, different geographic locations than Europe and North America. One can hear echoes of earlier calls by Egyptian economist Samir Amin for “delinking” or Tanzanian revolutionary Julius Nyerere’s call for an “African socialism.”

Does this break represent the end of coalitional politics? The end of any engagement with, for lack of a better term, “white” feminist and queer theorists? I don’t think so. What I see in these polemic calls for independence of thought and tradition is an end to dependence on intellectual traditions that at best have nothing to say about their own whiteness and at worst perpetuate ethnocentric and Eurocentric bias. To the extent that some scholars continue to find value in Eurocentric intellectual traditions, they should work to graft them on to a trunk more thoroughly grounded in liberationist concerns. That trunk, however, cannot itself be Eurocentric.

Aztec codices and African folktales may not be any more liberatory for women than classical Greek philosophers, but they are arguably no worse. However, the effort to shift our attention away from (exclusively, relentlessly) European origins for knowledge production can have a profoundly democratizing impetus that will make feminist and queer studies better and more relevant to a wider number of people. One of the things that I love about Roderick Ferguson’s 2003 *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique* is his assiduous avoidance of any citation to Michel Foucault, Eve Sedgwick, and Judith Butler—theorists whom graduate students of my generation were taught to revere as the founders of queer theory. Thinking about the politics of sexuality and culture without them was believed to be impossible. They supposedly enabled the very possibility of critical thinking about sexuality. What their constant invocation actually made very difficult, however, was what Ferguson achieved in his book: a thorough engagement with the complex legacies of sexuality for African Americans.

The future of feminist studies—if it has one, and I fervently hope that it does—will be a future in which feminist studies are antiracist and anti-imperialist studies. Not some of the time, or even most of the time, but all of the time from beginning to end. For those of us trained in the Euro-American feminist canon of the ’70s, ’80s, and ’90s, this might mean learning to let go of our cherished foundations.


Michael Hames-García / photo by Ernesto Javier Martínez.
It is well known that a strong science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) workforce is crucial for sustaining a prosperous economy. In a broader context, a diverse STEM workforce is vital to a thriving modern society. From enhanced intellectual output, fueled by a diverse approach to inquiry and innovation, to the obvious societal benefits of increased opportunity for high-pay careers, the advantages of establishing a diverse STEM workforce are clear. Focusing on gender diversity, the past thirty years have witnessed numerous efforts for increasing the proportion of women in STEM careers. While their representation has been steadily rising, women are still significantly outnumbered in areas such as engineering and the physical sciences. In fact, a recent National Science Foundation report shows the proportion of bachelor’s degrees awarded in 2010 to women in computer sciences—one of the fastest-growing sectors in industry—was half its reported value in 1985.

While at a recent conference, I picked up a flyer from the National Photonics Initiative. The NPI is a call by the National Research Council to establish an extensive collaboration among industry, academia and government organizations. The goal: significantly increase national investment in key technological areas such as energy, health and medicine, and communications, all of which are intimately related to applications of light, lasers and optics. In the current climate of shrinking federal funding and divestment from basic research, this is welcome news to many of us working in the optical sciences. Similar to the National Nanotechnology Initiative, established in 2000 and currently estimated to be responsible for 23 percent of growth in the workforce during the following decade, the NPI could spur significant economic growth, both in the United States and around the world.

Women’s integration into the STEM workforce is bound to remain elusive, unless colleges and universities begin implementing programs to address this problem. Women’s integration into the STEM workforce is bound to remain elusive, unless colleges and universities begin implementing programs to address this problem. Studies from the past three decades have resulted in highly effective interventions for enhancing the participation of women in STEM. Institutions that have prioritized reducing gender imbalance have made impressive gains in female representation, additionally witnessing marked improvements in their social climates. More women in STEM benefit entire organizations and the communities in which they exist. More women in STEM will take the NPI places we are now yet to imagine.

Women’s integration into the STEM workforce is bound to remain elusive, unless colleges and universities begin implementing programs to address this problem. Studies from the past three decades have resulted in highly effective interventions for enhancing the participation of women in STEM. Institutions that have prioritized reducing gender imbalance have made impressive gains in female representation, additionally witnessing marked improvements in their social climates. More women in STEM benefit entire organizations and the communities in which they exist. More women in STEM will take the NPI places we are now yet to imagine.

—Miriam Deutsch earned her PhD in physics from The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, in Israel, in 1997. After postdoctoral research at Princeton University and the NEC Research Institute, she joined the faculty of the physics department at the University of Oregon, where she was recently promoted to full professor.
Perspectives on Feminist Futures

ACTIVIST RESEARCH and the Fight Against the Polluter-Industrial Complex

by Shannon Elizabeth Bell, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Kentucky

The future I hope to see for feminist research is more scholars engaging in activist research aimed at fighting the tremendous number of environmental injustices that are devastating the lives of women and other vulnerable populations around the world.

According to the Environmental Protection Agency's Toxics Release Inventory, in 2009 alone, U.S. industries self-reported releasing 3.37 billion pounds of toxic pollutants into the air, water, and land. Of these toxic substances, approximately 700 million pounds are known or suspected carcinogens (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2009). Again, these are self-reported numbers; it is impossible to know how many more millions of pounds of released toxins are not reported by these companies.

Polluting—both legally and illegally—is profitable for corporations, far more profitable than implementing pollution-prevention technologies (Faber 2008). Not surprisingly, these companies work hard to retain their ability to pollute. The largest corporate polluters in the United States, including chemical, oil, natural gas, and coal companies, have created a powerful network of think tanks, policy institutes, research centers, foundations, nonprofit organizations, public relations firms, and political action committees that are organized with the purpose of waging war on environmental regulations. This network, which Faber (2008) terms the "polluter-industrial complex," is “committed to discrediting the environmental movement and to dismantling state programs and policies that promote environmental justice, protect public health, and safeguard the earth” (p. 15).

This polluting corporate power elite is able to wield inordinate influence through employing a number of strategies, such as contributing enormous sums of money to political campaigns and Political Action Committees (Jenkins 2011, Faber 2008); influencing regulatory agency leadership appointments and oversight (Harrison 2011; Faber 2008); acting as informal “advisors” to political leaders (Switzer 1997); hiring researchers and enlisting think tanks to obfuscate and cast doubt on incriminating scientific findings (McCright and Dunlap 2000); reshaping public opinion through astroturf organizations and front groups (Bell and York 2010; Boudet and Bell Forthcoming); and through pouring millions of dollars into lobbying efforts (Jenkins 2011). According to Faber (2008), this final tactic—special interest lobbying—is a particularly powerful mechanism for "colonizing the state." In 2009 and 2010, special interests spent nearly $7 billion on lobbying (Beckel 2011), and there are approximately 90,000 people engaged in or supporting lobbying activities in Washington, DC alone (Faber 2008; p. 97). Corporate polluters enjoy nearly unfettered access to policy-makers and are woven so deeply into the environmental regulation-making and legislative process that their proposals “are frequently adopted with little modification.” In fact, these corporate lobbyists are often the very individuals who are actually writing the policies and regulations in their entirety (Faber 2008).

Most often, the voices of ordinary citizens are completely excluded from the policy-making process. Furthermore, the people who are the most affected by environmental injustices tend to have the least political power and fewest resources, such as time, money, and education. Thus, their voices are the least-often heard by policy-makers.
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IS FEMINIST POETRY A THING OF THE PAST?

by Maggie Evans, PhD graduate, UO Department of English

T

 asked with composing a short riff on the future of feminist research in American poetics, I set out, naturally, for the library, determined to explore a few beginning questions that sprang to mind. Among them: How do contemporary women poets enact or represent feminism(s) in their poetry? How have the changing political and social goals of feminism affected the thematic and formal choices of feminist writers? How do feminist writers depict or imagine the future? Library, here I come!

“I think a lot of young women, poets or not, are leery of calling themselves feminists. And certainly marketers, of poets and everything else, are steering clear of the word. This poses a unique challenge when we depend so much on search engines to find what we’re looking for. It’s relatively newly important for practical Search Engine Optimization reasons to say ‘feminist.’”

—Maggie Evans / e-mail communication with editor

On my way, I stopped for coffee and to do some preliminary online searching to pick out a handful of useful books to begin (and hopefully narrow) my investigation. But, as I began entering search terms into the university-provided database, it occurred to me that this might not be the best way to ferret out future feminisms. I closed WorldCat and opened Google, curious to see what I could find out about new feminist voices and emerging women poets using the resources familiar to those uninitiated into the peculiar joys of academic research.

Of course, popular culture and readily available information are not the only measures, and perhaps not even the best measures, of the future of any kind of feminist undertaking. Indeed, popular culture often actively suppresses or restricts access to feminist artists and expression. However, the results of a Google search on “feminist poetry” describe the scope of information interested non-experts are likely to access.

And the information such a search retrieves overwhelmingly suggests that feminist poetry is not a young woman’s game.

On the Wikipedia list of feminist poets, there are only two who were born after 1960. Elvia Ardalani, fifty, is a Mexican-born poet who lives, writes, and teaches in Texas, publishing many of her books with bilingual presses. The other, Nandini Sahu—by far Wikipedia’s youngest feminist poet at forty—is an Indian poet who writes in English. A narrower search for “new feminist poets” doesn’t lower the age limit, either. In 2012, on the occasion of Adrienne Rich’s death, Flavorwire published a list of “10 Feminist Poets You Should Know.” I sincerely hope the list introduced scores of new readers to the likes of Lyn Hejinian, Anne Waldman, Alice Walker, and Katha Pollitt (the youngest on the list at fifty-three). But the impression Flavorwire’s recommended reading gives is that feminist poetry is something to be remembered reverently—a legacy of our foremothers—and not an ongoing endeavor.

Disappointed with the results of my Google search, I decided to trawl with a tighter net, targeting more reputable sources of literary information that might still be on the radar of a newcomer to feminist poetry. The Poetry Magazine website, arguably the organ of poetry with the deepest pockets and the widest public reach, doesn’t fare much better than Wikipedia. Erin Belieu and Laura Wideman—neither of whose poems are included anywhere on the website—are the only poets younger than fifty filed under “feminist.”

Even explicitly feminist enterprises yield paltry results. The Feminist Press lists ten times fewer poetry books than fiction publications. There are twenty-one poetry titles, only three of which are single-author volumes, all by dead authors. Sor Juana, Meridel Le Sueur, and Grace Paley, however meritorious, are beyond whatever material benefit or encouragement that publication by The Feminist Press might bring to new feminist poets.

As a researcher in feminist poetics, and a feminist poet myself, I know that both the history and the future of feminist poetry are infinitely richer and more complex than my cursory web crawl revealed. But I worry for the new poets and the new readers who may not have the excellent teachers I had, who may not have the resources or the inclination to seek out formal education at all, much less an education with room for feminist poetry in its curriculum. How will such readers know that feminist poetry is alive and well in magazines and journals, in new volumes put out by tiny independent presses and international giants, in slam and performance poetics, in YouTube posts and hip hop? How will the young poets who could create the future of feminist poetry know that feminist poetry isn’t a fading art, an admirable accomplishment of past masters, but a thriving art form evolving to meet the changing needs of women and of feminism?

By decrying the dearth of younger contemporary poets in the popular picture of feminist poetry, I do not mean to imply that it isn’t useful or inspiring for new readers and writers to discover the likes of Emily Dickinson or Adrienne Rich. I certainly don’t intend to suggest that established feminist poets like Katha Pollitt or Carol Ann Duffy are finished writing or that they can’t inspire new poets. But there are contemporary feminist poets that have not yet won prizes or even published a book. There are women today, right now, women who don’t show up on any list, who are doing strange, sustaining, inspiring, provoking feminist work in their poems. And I fear that, if we keep ignoring them, there may not be for long.

So, dear reader, if you have any pull at The Feminist Press, you know what to do. For the rest of us, isn’t it time the Wikipedia list of feminist poets got an update?

—Maggie Evans was awarded the 2011 Jane Grant Dissertation Fellowship from CSWS. She defended her dissertation, “Sounding Silence: American Women’s Experimental Poetics,” in December 2012. She now lives and writes in Albuquerque, New Mexico.
University of Oregon is home to one of our nation’s oldest women’s research centers – the Center for the Study of Women in Society. CSWS actively engages in generating, supporting, and disseminating research on the complexity of women’s lives and the intersecting nature of gender identities and inequalities. Made possible through a gift honoring early feminist Jane C. Grant, the Center’s history is deeply rooted in four decades of feminist research, teaching, and activism on campus. This timeline traces a few key moments in this history and the evolution of CSWS.

1970s

1970: A report on “The Status of Women at the University of Oregon” finds women woefully underrepresented among faculty tenure-track and staff positions, earning lower wages, and clustered around stereotypically female disciplines.

Joan Acker teaches “Women’s Role in Society” through the Sociology Department, the first course to focus solely on this subject.

1971: Federal audits find UO guilty of discriminatory policies against women.

Students organize the University Feminists to fight for women’s services and the institutionalization of women’s studies on campus.

University Feminists secure gynecological services at the student health center. Women who had been denied health services for decades now had access for two hours each week.

1972: Congress passes Title IX legislation prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex in any educational program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

The first Introduction to Women’s Studies course is offered at UO, taught by a graduate teaching assistant.

1973: More than thirty university feminists take over the steps of Johnson Hall to demand childcare facilities for all university women, immediate hiring of a full-time coordinator for a women’s studies department, funding for women’s studies faculty, free access to continuing education for low-income women, increased access to women’s health care, and a campus women’s research center.

The Center for the Sociological Study of Women (CSSW) is founded within UO’s Department of Sociology, with Joan Acker serving as director. Faculty members pursue research on women, and graduate students begin writing dissertations on women.

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education approves the formation of a Women’s Studies Program at UO, the first of its kind in Oregon.

UO librarian Edward Kemp writes to Fortune editor William Harris to ask about acquiring the papers of his late wife, Jane C. Grant, an early women’s liberationist and cofounder of The New Yorker. Harris offers to show Kemp Grant’s papers.

Looking back... JUNE 5, 1973

“A proposal for the establishment at the University of Oregon of an Institute for Research on Women. The Institute would be under the Graduate School, and its function would be to encourage and carry out multi-disciplinary research as well as graduate research training on the processes of sex differentiation and the changing roles of women and men in society.

“The Need for the Institute: Human societies are universally differentiated on the basis of sex or gender. This differentiation is an integral part of the culture; it affects the structure of social institutions and the distribution of power. Almost universally females are subordinate to males. Although the phenomena of differentiation and stratification are well-known, little is understood of the processes by which they develop, are maintained, and evolve. In addition, much of the previous scholarly and scientific work on the social situation of women and on the differences between the sexes has been done in the context of accepting cultural stereotypes of the nature of women and men as immutable and inevitable. This view has prevented researchers from dealing creatively with the processes of change now obviously underway. Consequently, there is a need which is becoming widely recognized to raise new questions from new perspectives. In the social sciences and the humanities there has been great growth in the last three years of interest in previously neglected theoretical and empirical questions relating to women and men and changing sex roles. Evidence of this development is that almost every major social science journal has, in the last two years, devoted an entire issue to the subject....”

— from the Executive Committee Minutes
1974: Kemp meets with Harris in New York to examine Grant’s papers. Harris asks if UO has a women’s studies program, and Kemp tells Harris about the Center for the Sociological Study of Women. Harris donates Grant’s papers and talks about establishing a fund for the study of women at UO.

UO President Robert Clark meets with Harris in New York to discuss the fund. Harris expresses frustration that other universities have wanted to use the money he intends to donate for purposes other than women’s studies.

1975: President Clark receives a letter from a law firm announcing that William Harris intends to bequeath a very substantial portion of his estate to the “University of Oregon Fund for the Study of Women.” Harris visits Eugene as the guest of President Clark and meets with leading UO faculty doing research on women.

Two years following its approval by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, the Women’s Studies certificate program is launched at UO.

University Feminists change their name to Women’s Resource & Referral Service and continue advocating for women’s rights on campus.

1976: The UO Library Special Collections Department receives the papers and photographs of Jane Grant, as well as her personal book collection.

1977: William Harris sells White Flower Farm and changes his will to reflect, with a few small exceptions, that his entire estate is to go to “the University of Oregon Fund for the Study of Women.”

The Women’s Resource & Referral Service (WRRS) coordinates the first weeklong Women’s Symposium.

1979: The WRRS organizes the first campus Take Back the Night rally, march, and speak-out in conjunction with Sexual Assault Support Services, called the Eugene Rape Crisis Center at that time.

1980s

1981: The UO Foundation receives a $3.5 million endowment from the estate of William Harris for a women’s research center. At the time it was the largest gift UO had received from a single donor. Planning begins to expand the mission of the Center for the Sociological Study of Women (CSSW).

1983: CSSW changes its name to the Center for the Study of Women in Society (CSWS) to reflect its broader mission to generate, support, and disseminate research on women.

1987: CSWS expands its annual publication into a glossy magazine format with full-color cover. The CSWS Review is designed to acquaint a broad scholarly audience with the center and its ongoing research projects.

1988: Project Safe Ride, the Women’s Resource & Referral Service, Women in Transition, and the Women’s Task Force join to form the ASUO Women’s Center.

Looking back… 1988

“The New Pioneers” Lecture

“We wanted to have a dream circle around what was the future of the women’s movement, so we gathered on this land and we kept close to the middle of the circle. We were all going to sleep in the dream circle. And from the coast we brought rope to make weavings, and everyone wove a weaving that she was going to sleep under, in her sleeping bag. Some women wove very beautiful weavings. Now mine was a symbolic weaving. It lasted through the night. Some women wove beautiful weavings with shells and feathers.

“One of the dreams I remember was dreaming of a woman who was going down a spiral, down, down, down into a forgotten city where there was treasure. She was going down to find her treasure, which I think is what we have been doing in the second wave of feminism, finding our treasure.”

Artist Ruth Mountaingrove delivered a slide-illustrated lecture on her photographs and her personal history in the feminist communal movement in the winter of 1988 at the University of Oregon, sponsored by the Center for the Study of Women in Society and the Photography at Oregon Gallery, which also jointly sponsored an exhibition of Mountaingrove’s work at the UO Museum of Art’s photography gallery. At her talk she underscored the need for feminists to preserve their history and promised her papers and photographs to the UO Libraries Special Collections and University Archives, a promise made good.

—from the 1988 CSWS Review
1990s

1990: CSWS implements “A University for Everyone,” a two-year curriculum program to integrate scholarship on women of color into large survey classes in the social sciences and humanities. It represents the first full-scale attempt to promote curriculum integration of materials on either race or gender at UO.

1992: Further shaping its identity as a center for research on women, CSWS launches Women in the Northwest—a major initiative to promote, support, and disseminate research on women in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest, as well as across regions, national borders, and racial, ethnic, and class lines.

1993: The Women’s Studies Program and the Center for the Study of Women in Society move to the third floor of Hendricks Hall. CSWS hosts “At the Epicenter: Women, Research & Communities” to celebrate ten years since the $3.5 million gift from William Harris made the Center’s mission possible.

1995: CSWS honors life-long Oregon resident and centenarian Mazie Onorato Giustina for her gift of $100,000 to support the Women in the Northwest Research Project. In the coming decades, the initiative will fund numerous visiting scholars, research conferences, and publications.

1997: The State Board of Education approves the Women’s Studies major at UO, though the Women’s Studies Program remains without independent departmental status.

1999: CSWS launches Policy Matters, a series of reports that consider issues of public policy affecting women and their families and communities in Oregon, the Pacific Northwest, and beyond. Policy Matters was produced as part of the Center’s Women in the Northwest research initiative.

The UO Knight Library exhibits materials from the Jane C. Grant collection, “Talk of the Town: Jane Grant, ’The New Yorker,’ and the Oregon Legacy of a Twentieth-Century Feminist.”

2000s

2000: Major research initiatives at CSWS include the Women in the Northwest project, the Feminist Humanities Project, the Women’s Health and Aging initiative, and Ecological Conversations: Gender, Science, and the Sacred.

2005: CSWS provides support to establish the Center for Race, Ethnicity, and Sexuality Studies at UO. The goal of CRESS is to highlight intersectional research being done by faculty at UO and to generate a climate of intellectual exchange and conversation about that work.

2007: Through a Research Interest Group on the Americas, CSWS begins incubation of a new center that will focus on Latin America and U.S. Latino/a populations.

2009: The Women’s Studies Program becomes the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies at UO. The Queer Studies minor is established in WGS, and the Sally Miller Gearhart Fund for Lesbian Studies is established to enable WGS to bring outstanding scholars to campus.

2010: After three years of development within CSWS, the Center for Latino/a and Latin American Studies is established as an independent research center at UO. The purpose of CLLAS is to facilitate collaborative research, scholarship, intellectual community, and community outreach focused on Latin America and U.S. Latino/a populations.

2013: On November 7-9, CSWS, WGS, and ASUO Women’s Center present a 40th Anniversary Celebration of feminist research, teaching, and activism on the UO campus.

Right: A poster from the project: Women’s Acceptability of the Vaginal Diaphragm (2001, 2002), a project of the Women’s Health and Aging Initiative led by Dr. Marie Harvey. Harvey received funding to study whether women are willing to use a diaphragm not just to prevent pregnancy but also to protect them from sexually transmitted diseases. The three-year project interviewed current and former diaphragm users and tried to get young women at risk of contracting STDs to use the device.

Funding Source: National Institutes of Health
Principle Investigator: Marie Harvey
Department: Center for the Study of Women in Society
Amount Funded: $1,000,000

Clockwise from top: An ASUO- Women’s Center “Take Back the Night” rally, 2013. • Then–CSWS director Sandi Morgen with visiting CSWS-Rockefeller Scholars Primila Jayapal and Brinda Rao, participants of the CSWS-hosted Rockefeller Foundation resident fellowship program Ecological Conversations: Gender, Science, and the Sacred, which brought together a diverse group of scholars and activists over three years to engage in dialogue on a host of scientific philosophical, political, and spiritual discourses addressing our human interactions with the non-human world / May 2002. • At the first UO Sally Miller Gearhart Lecture in Lesbian Studies (from left): Donella-Elizabeth Alston, coordinator, Ethnic Studies Department; Sally Miller Gearhart, founder and designer, Women’s Studies Program at San Francisco State University; Carol Stabile, director, Center for the Study of Women in Society / 2009.
my first book, Women’s Work: Nationalism and Contemporary African American Women’s Novels, has one chapter on cooking as a practice of nationalism in the works of poet, playwright, and novelist Ntozake Shange. When that chapter became twice as long as any other, I realized I had a second project on my hands and began compiling the notes and stacks of books that became the skeleton for my new project, Revolutionary Recipes: Foodways and African American Literature.

A CSWS Faculty Research Grant allowed me to make significant progress on the research and writing of Revolutionary Recipes. My project argues that African American cookbooks, poetry, and fiction use culinary discourse and the recipe form to describe, theorize, and demand specific ways of performing racial and gendered identities. My manuscript focuses on the work of contemporary African American women writers who use foodways to identify and communicate various aspects of identity. From slave narratives that inspired the abolitionist movement to Black Arts poets who wrote to foment revolution and Toni Morrison’s notion that her readers should “fulfill the book,” the recipe joins a tradition of African American writing that makes real demands of readers. As Revolutionary Recipes will demonstrate in each chapter, no form is more suited to this work than the recipe. Recipes are didactic, proceed through linear time, and are explicitly printed for repeated reproduction beyond the page. The formal conventions of the recipe invite the reader to perform the text.

The proliferation of food television; new Food Studies programs like the one at UO, bestselling books such as Michael Pollan’s The Omnivore’s Dilemma (2007), and a growing number of interdisciplinary Food Studies conferences, demonstrate that academic and popular audiences have a boundless appetite for thinking about food. However, as students in my seminar “African American Foodways” note, arriving at a clear definition of “foodways” is not a simple task. At a moment when culinary television flirts with racial caricature on programs like Food Network’s Down Home with the Neelys, when the face of local and organic food movements seems uniformly white and middle class, and when healthcare discourse about obesity and diabetes risks resurrecting the 1980s stereotype of a monstrous, black welfare queen it is crucial to restore specificity to conversations about food. Through study of African American literature, Revolutionary Recipes makes race, class, and gender central to the growing field of Food Studies. Simultaneous efforts to articulate and practice identity shape much African American literature, but take on increasing stakes in foodways writing, which uses culinary discourse and recipe forms to articulate identity. The “melting pot” has failed as a culinary metaphor for race and ethnicity in the United States. Foodways texts give us a more useful language for talking about race.

With the support of a CSWS Faculty Research grant, I completed the first chapter of my manuscript, “Vertamae Grosvenor’s Revolutionary Recipes.” This chapter uses Grosvenor’s 1970 Black Power cookbook Vibration Cooking to define and illustrate radical black culinary writing. Grosvenor’s work defines African American foodways as a set of paths and practices—ways of doing culinary work and routes that foodstuffs travel—that record the history of people of African descent in the United States. Among a group of foodways scholars from around the country and the globe, I presented a version of this work in October 2012 at the University of Toronto as part of the conference “Foodways: Diasporic

Diners, Transnational Tables, and Culinary Connections.”

Chapter two, “Culinary Conservatives: Cookbooks as Racial Uplift” will consider works including Darden Sisters’ Spoonbread and Strawberry Wine (1978), which records generations of one family’s economic self-determination, and Jessica Harris’s Iron Pots and Wooden Spoons (1989) and High on the Hog (2011), which study African cultural retentions in the foodways of the United States. These works are conservative in the sense that they conserve (sometimes literally in recipes for pickles and preserves) a static black history. With the possibilities of foodways established by two chapters on cookbooks, I will turn to poetry in chapter three, “The Recipe as Poem: Foodways in African American Poetry.”

Gwendolyn Brooks, Lucille Clifton, Harryette Mullen, and Evie Shockley use culinary discourse and the recipe form to insist on a complex, varied, and specifically African American experience. Chapter four, “Culinary Experiments in African American Fiction” will look at novels like Ntozake Shange’s Sassafrass, Cypress & Indigo (1982), which include actual recipes, and novels like Gloria Naylor’s Linden Hills, which thematize food as a site of racial and gendered identity.

Chapter five, “Ntozake Shange’s Culinary Diaspora,” returns to where the fascination with foodways in African American Literature began for me. I argue that Shange’s multi-generic If I Can Cook / You Know God Can (1998) theorizes identity in recipes that ask readers to practice diaspora, to do everyday culinary work as a way of both describing and inviting others to perform an international black identity. If I Can Cook is a gumbo of genre; it brings together recipes, personal recollection, diasporic theory, and travelogue to show that “how and what we cook is the ultimate implication of who we are.”

—Courtney Thorsson is an assistant professor in the UO English Department, where she teaches African American literature. Her book, Women’s Work: Nationalism and Contemporary African American Women’s Novels, was published by the University of Virginia Press in 2013. Her writing has appeared in Callaloo and Atlantic Studies. Professor Thorsson’s current book project, “Revolutionary Recipes,” is a study of culinary discourse and the recipe form in African American cookbooks, poetry, and fiction.
CHANGE IS SLOW TO COME FOR WOMEN IN ZIMBABWE

Jane Grant Fellowship winner studies the implications of a land reform program
by Easther Chigumira
PhD candidate
UO Department of Geography

Zimbabwe inherited a racially-skewed land ownership structure at independence from Britain in 1980. At that time, 6,000 white farmers held 15.5 million hectares of prime agricultural land, and one million blacks held 16.4 million hectares of marginal land (Moyo and Yeros, 2005). Only in the year 2000, after nationwide “politically motivated and organized” violent occupations of mostly white-owned large-scale commercial farms by blacks, did the government embark on the radical Fast Track Land Reform Program (FTLRP) with the intent to alter this skewed land structure.

This unprecedented program constitutes the first major shift in property rights to peasant farmers since the post Cold War era and signifies a historic epoch that scholars like Mamdani (2008) and Moyo (2011) position as progressive—marking Zimbabwe’s true moment of decolonization, and achieving social justice and black economic empowerment. Despite these claims, however, and although the FTLRP policy states that women should receive 20 percent of the reallocated land, there is no data disaggregated by gender to track this. Further, Zimbabwe’s late Vice-President Joseph Msika claimed that giving women land under the FTLRP would “destroy people’s marriages” and that “men would turn against the government” (Goebels, 2005).

These issues expose a serious disjuncture between FTLRP policy and practice and the urgent need for a gendered analysis of the outcomes of the program. Unequal access to land remains one of the most important forms of economic inequality, which has dire consequences for women both as social and political actors in society.

My project asks who counts as “legitimate recipients” under the FTLRP across race, class, ethnic, and gender divides, and assesses the impact of this program on gender equity and on the physical environment in Zimbabwe’s rural landscapes. My field-based project, at one level, generates work on gender identities and inequalities and documents the daily lives of women on newly resettled farms. At another level, Zimbabwe’s situation is of international interest for policy-makers, environmentalists, and scholars because it offers an important case for advancing or challenging knowledge on the ecological impacts of small-family versus large-scale farming practices in the twenty-first century. This is because sustainable and ecologically-sound farming practices are vital to the integrity of the physical environment and rural development.

The majority of my time in the field involved conducting surveys (questionnaires), observing and interviewing households in three resettled communities in rural Sanyati District, Zimbabwe. I also relied on narratives in order to understand the dynamics, experiences, and outcomes of resettlement under the FTLRP. This technique provided more information about the daily lived experiences of new farmers, issues of conflict—some related to boundary disputes, theft, religion, witchcraft, and how the community responds to this commoditization of land, corruption in the land allocation system, and obstacles to farming.

In all three communities, my observations reveal a highly patriarchal community where women are invisible in the decision-making process. I found it difficult to interview women alone, as often a male head of household or male child was present and would answer the questions instead. In some cases women would defer questions to the husband or male child. However, when I interviewed households run by women or where the husband was not present at the time of the interview, these women spoke freely and often revealed more dynamics and issues of conflict in the village.

My survey reveals that less than 5 percent of the women in these communities acquired land through the land reform program, contrary to the government’s land policy and proclamations. Thus, in as far as the land reform program is concerned, Zimbabwean women are yet to realize their full potential as land owners. Furthermore, it was disheartening to notice young girls of the ages of 16–18 married to older men in the villages, which shows that Zimbabwe has a long way to go with women’s empowerment, particularly in the rural localities.

—Easther Chigumira is a PhD candidate in the Department of Geography. She was awarded the 2012 CSWS Jane Grant Dissertation Fellowship.

REFERENCES
Upon starting the doctoral program in the Department of Sociology five years ago, I was confronted by the common first year graduate student problems of regularly questioning if I really belonged in the profession and whether I would find support for my work. These feelings only started to fade upon my first contact with CSWS through joining the Social Sciences Feminist Network Research Interest Group (SSFN-RIG). Since then CSWS has provided tremendous support for my research and numerous opportunities for growth during my time as a graduate student at the University of Oregon. As a funding recipient and RIG member and coordinator, the encouragement and mentorship from these overlapping communities of feminists have not only provided me with the feeling that I do, indeed, belong here, but also with vital support for my research and development as a leader.

Through CSWS funding I have realized one of the central aims of my research of increasing understanding of transgender people’s lives in understudied regions and rural places. With the support of graduate research grants I have travelled to the Midwest and Southeast to interview transmen—female to male transgender people—about their experiences as men. Due to this funding I have been able to recruit a wider range of research participants, which has helped tease out how race, sexuality, and gender intersect in transmen’s lives. With the support of the Jane Grant Dissertation Fellowship I will be able to focus solely on my dissertation inAY 2013-2014. The dissertation project combines the interviews in the Midwest and Southeast with interviews from California as a comparative regional analysis of the lives of transmen. This support from CSWS has enhanced the research itself, but also demonstrated that I had a community of feminists who saw the value of my intellectual work.

Beyond support for my research, the RIGs have also been a key source of intellectual community and support. The Queering Academic Studies RIG has provided a rich environment to engage with queer texts and research with graduate students and faculty from across the university, as well as professionalization workshops that have been invaluable as I learned to navigate the academy as a queer scholar. My involvement with the SSFN-RIG has provided significant research and leadership experience in my time at the UO. The SSFN-RIG was a lifeline during my first two years in the doctoral program in sociology. Through the group I grew closer to other feminist graduate students and faculty without whose mentorship and support I would not have developed the confidence and institutional knowledge that led to many of my achievements. Through our collaborative research project on inequality and time use among academics—carried out over two academic years—I developed a wider range of research skills that have been helpful in completing my own research. These experiences were crucial for learning how to study inequalities in a collaborative process while being conscious of not reproducing them among this group of feminists.

“From a first year student beset with impostor syndrome, to being on the cusp of completing my dissertation as the recipient of a prestigious fellowship, CSWS has been a crucial source of support, mentorship, and leadership experience that will fuel my work as a scholar for years to come.”

My most formative experiences with the SSFN-RIG were my two years as co-coordinator [AY 2010-11 and AY 2011-12]. Coordinating a non-hierarchical feminist research group provided me leadership experience in facilitating the development of a group’s vision and putting it into action. In the first year I was lucky to work closely with co-coordinator Sarah E. Cribbs, now an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology at Georgetown College. In the RIG, Sarah found the kind of critically engaged dialogue that she needed to be able to grow as a feminist scholar. We worked together in that first year to coordinate the completion of the analysis portion of our research project and hold a symposium, “Inequality in Academia,” to disseminate our findings to the university community and beyond. For Sarah, me, and other RIG members the project and symposium provided valuable connections to graduate students and faculty at the UO as well as researchers from elsewhere doing similar work. This close working relationship with an advanced graduate student was wonderful leadership training. I continued to grow and learn in my second year working with co-coordinator Stephanie Raymond, a doctoral student in sociology. We worked to develop the community aspects of the RIG by focusing on the research of individual members, RIG building, and professionalization workshops. Stephanie recounted that she gained valuable leadership experience as a co-coordinator in addition to meaningful support through a CSWS travel grant to present her work on adoption loss at the Pacific Sociological Association’s annual meetings.

From a first year student beset with impostor syndrome, to being on the cusp of completing my dissertation as the recipient of a prestigious fellowship, CSWS has been a crucial source of support, mentorship, and leadership experience that will fuel my work as a scholar for years to come.

—Miriam Abelson, PhD candidate, UO Department of Sociology, has been the recipient of two CSWS Graduate Student Research Awards in addition to the 2013 CSWS Jane Grant Dissertation Fellowship. She is also working toward a graduate certificate from the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies and has served as a graduate teaching fellow in sociology, ethnic studies, and women’s and gender studies.
Effects of mother-daughter communication on adolescent daughters’ beliefs and experiences of teen dating violence

by Kali Lantrip, UO Department of Counseling Psychology

A generation of young women that can celebrate emergent freedom and choices in their lives are also faced with a glaring reality: one in five women experience sexual violence, physical abuse, or stalking by an intimate partner before the age of seventeen. Adolescent dating violence is defined by elements of control and power, and thus, perpetrators rob individual freedom and personal agency of those that they affect. Teen dating violence, including physical, sexual, and emotional abuse, affects nearly one third of adolescents in the United States and is increasingly one of the largest public health concerns of health researchers and practitioners. In 95 percent of physically abusive relationships, men abuse women. However, increasing research in this area has shown that young women can be violent, and young men are also victims. Gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered teens are just as at risk for abuse in their relationships as anyone else.

Parent involvement, and specifically messages communicated to children about healthy and unhealthy relationships, has potential to be a vital element of dating violence prevention and intervention. Previous research has clearly explored and showed that there are positive effects of quality parent-adolescent communication on a multitude of adolescent risky behaviors. Specifically, most people have heard the phrase, “Talk to your kids about sex!” and know the positive results this communication with their child is supposed to have, and yet, there has been no research to date exploring the relationship between parent-adolescent communication and the rising epidemic of dating violence. Studies have shown that mothers are more likely than fathers to speak to their daughters and sons about topics of sexual intimacy, relationships, gender, and healthy dating. And thus, in an epidemic largely framed by issues of gender, power, and control, mothers have a unique role in implicitly and explicitly communicating values, norms, and expectations for healthy dating relationships.

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between mother-daughter communication about teen dating violence, mothers’ and daughters’ beliefs about coercive dating, and daughters’ experiences of dating violence. It was hypothesized that mother-daughter communication and daughters’ coercive beliefs about dating would mediate the relationship between mothers’ coercive beliefs about dating and their daughters’ experiences of teen dating violence. Over the past year, I worked with three schools to allow me to recruit in their classrooms, spoke to 1,400 adolescent girls, and ultimately met with fifty-eight mother-daughter pairs. These videotapes were coded for quality communication by trained research assistants.

Parent-daughter communication and daughters’ coercive beliefs about dating would mediate the relationship between mothers’ coercive beliefs about dating and their daughters’ experiences of teen dating violence. Additionally, higher levels of coercive beliefs about dating were related with more experiences of being a victim of teen dating violence. These dissertation study results show that the quality of mother-daughter communication may impact the beliefs that daughters hold about dating, which in turn, could influence their experiences of dating violence victimization.

This study represents a first step at looking at gender, family, and parent-adolescent communication in addressing the widespread epidemic of dating violence during adolescence. Future research and clinical studies are required to further examine the relationships between parent-adolescent communication and teen dating violence, and the potential effect that parents may have on rates and experiences of violence in adolescence. Ultimately, prevention and intervention efforts to curb dating violence should include work within families, specifically mothers, to improve knowledge of, and communication about, healthy and unhealthy aspects of adolescent dating.

After six months of data collection and observational coding, these fifty-eight mother-daughter pairs gave us a window into parent-adolescent communication’s effect on coercive dating beliefs and dating violence. Reports of having had no supportive communication about dating with their mother in the past year, as well as observed elements of negative mother-daughter communication, were both related with more coercive beliefs and acceptance of aggression by the adolescent girls. Additionally, higher levels of coercive beliefs about dating were related with more experiences of being a victim of teen dating violence. These dissertation study results show that the quality of mother-daughter communication may impact the beliefs that daughters hold about dating, which in turn, could influence their experiences of dating violence victimization.

This study represents a first step at looking at gender, family, and parent-adolescent communication in addressing the widespread epidemic of dating violence during adolescence. Future research and clinical studies are required to further examine the relationships between parent-adolescent communication and teen dating violence, and the potential effect that parents may have on rates and experiences of violence in adolescence. Ultimately, prevention and intervention efforts to curb dating violence should include work within families, specifically mothers, to improve knowledge of, and communication about, healthy and unhealthy aspects of adolescent dating.

Total Dating Violence

Out of total sample (N=58), 37 girls had dated and reported on their dating violence during high school. Percentages of victimization and perpetration of emotional, physical, and sexual violence are reported.

Statistics in the first paragraph came from:
Center for Disease and Control (http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimate-partnerviolence/teen_dating_violence.html)
National Domestic Violence Helpline: http://www.thenhotline.org/is-this-abuse/teens-and-dating-abuse/
Highlights from the Academic Year

CSWS Awards over $70,000 in 2013 Research Grants to UO Scholars
In March, CSWS awarded more than $70,000 in graduate student and faculty research grants to support research on women and gender during the 2013-14 academic year. Nine UO graduate students will receive awards ranging from $2,000 to $16,000. Six faculty scholars will receive awards of up to $6,000.

Miriam Abelson, a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Sociology, was awarded the prestigious Jane De Hart Dissertation Fellowship. Her field-based research looks at “Transgender Experiences and Transmasculinities in Three U.S. Regions.” Abelson conducted a portion of her research during the summer of 2010 in the southeastern United States. On that trip, funded in part by an earlier CSWS graduate research award, she traveled a total of 3,000 miles in three weeks and interviewed sixteen transmen—“people whose bodies had been assigned as female at birth who transitioned to live as men.” She also has interviewed transmen in the San Francisco Bay area and the Midwestern United States and is engaged in a comparative regional analysis of their experiences.


Michelle McKinley Honored by Law School
Michelle McKinley—a member of the CSWS Advisory Board and co-coordinator of the Americas Research Interest Group—was awarded the Bernard B. Kliks professorship, an honor given to law school faculty with demonstrated strength in teaching, high ethical standards, and having made significant contributions to the legal community.

Michael Hames-García Named New CSWS Director BeginningAY 2014-15
When current CSWS director Carol Stabile completes her six-year tenure in June 2014, Michael Hames-García will step in as the new director. Hames-García, professor, UO Department of Ethnic Studies, is no stranger to Michael Hames-García leadership positions, having served as head of ethnic studies from 2006-2011 as well as director of the the UO Center for Race, Ethnicity, and Sexuality Studies (CRESS). Hames-García earned his PhD in English from Cornell University and is the author of Identity Complex: Making the Case for Multiplicity (Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 2011) and Fugitive Thought: Prison Movements, Race, and the Meaning of Justice (Minneapolis University of Minnesota Press, 2004). He also coedited three books, including the Lambda Literary Award winning Gay Latino Studies: A Critical Reader with Ernesto Martínez (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011).

“Michelle is an acclaimed scholar, an innovative teacher, an active member of important national professional societies, and a generous member of our law school and university community,” UO School of Law Dean Michael Moffitt said in making the announcement.

Playwriting Nomination
Theresa J. May’s community based play, Salmon Is Everything, was a Region VII nominee for the KCACTF David Mark Cohen Playwriting Award and is forthcoming from Oregon State University Press. Other recent publications include, “Meditations on the Pain of Others,” in Theatre Topics, and Readings in Performance and Ecology, coedited with Wendy Arons (Palgrave 2012).

Promotions
CSWS faculty affiliates who received promotions in 2013 include three promoted to full professor—Karen Guillemin (Biology), Sara Hodges (Psychology), and Mary Wood (English). Those promoted to associate professor with tenure include Suzanna Lim (Honors College), Theresa J. May (Theatre Arts), and Priscilla Yamin (Political Science).

Janis Weeks Brings a “Grand Challenges Explorations” Grant to UO
Janis Weeks, a CSWS faculty affiliate and professor in the UO Department of Biology, Institute of Neuroscience, and African Studies Program, is the first UO researcher to be awarded a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. UO was named a winner of a Grand Challenges Explorations grant for a project proposed by Weeks that “involves the implementation of a neurophysiology-based tech-ngology to accelerate discovery of drugs to eliminate intestinal worm infections, specifically human soil-transmitted helminthic infections,” which are carried by two to three billion of the world’s poorest.

Bonnie Mann Named Williams Fellow
A UO associate professor of philosophy and CSWS faculty affiliate, Bonnie Mann is one of two UO faculty members designated as a Williams Fellow for 2013-14. UO President Michael Gottfredson announced his acceptance on May 24 of the formal recommendations of the Williams Council for Undergraduate Education, which named the two Williams Fellows and the funding of five innovative projects.

Carol Stabile Receives 2013 Farrar Award in Media & Civil Rights History
Carol Stabile—director of CSWS and professor, School of Journalism and Communication and the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies—received the 2013 Farrar Media and Civil Rights History Award for her article “The Typhoid Marys of the Left: Gender, Race and the Broadcast Blacklist” published in the Summer 2011 issue of Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies. Her article was one of a competitive field of entries judged by a national panel of experts.

The judges said her essay “offers a fresh look at the intersection of anti-communism and civil rights activism during the 1950s, focusing on the broadcast industry as a primary arena of struggle.”

Six CSWS Faculty Affiliates Receive “Fund for Faculty Excellence” Awards
Six CSWS faculty affiliates were among fourteen UO faculty chosen to receive the Fund for Faculty Excellence Awards forAY2013-14. Each recipient will be awarded $20,000 in recognition for his or her research, teaching and leadership. They are: Juliet (Jill) Baxter (Education Studies); Michael Hames-García (Ethnic Studies); Mary Jaeger (Classics); Kate Mondloch (History of Art & Architecture); Carol Silverman (Anthropology); and Anita Weiss (International Studies).

Weiss a Resident at Rockefeller Center
Anita Weiss, professor and head of the Department of International Studies, held a month-long residency at the Rockefeller Center in Bellagio, Italy, during February and March 2013. She was there to work on her book manuscript, “Interpreting Islam, Modernity and Women’s Rights in Pakistan.”

CSWS faculty affiliate Anita Weiss at Villa Serbelloni, Rockefeller Center, Bellagio, Italy.
“Racial Representations” Symposium Highlights

Students, faculty and community members enjoyed a full day of literary readings and commentary on race at the University of Oregon on April 26, 2013, when a group of innovative scholars who specialize in African American literature gathered to share and discuss their research. “Racial Representations: African American Literature since 1975,” was organized by Courtney Thorsson, UO assistant professor of English and a CSWS faculty affiliate. CSWS was a major sponsor of the symposium.

The morning panel, moderated by Professor Mark Whalan (UO Department of English), focused on African American poetry. Anthony Reed, assistant professor of English and African American studies at Yale University, examined the science of mourning in contemporary African American poetry. His talk addressed the importance of community building and love as sites for intellectual work. Matt Sandler, who teaches literature in the UO Clark Honors College, addressed the reception of and use of metaphor in Will Alexander’s experimental poetry. In the final morning talk, Evie Shockley, associate professor of English at Rutgers University, used verse plays by Rita Dove and George Elliott Clarke to deconstruct the contemporary notion that we live in a “postrace” and “colorblind” society.

During the afternoon panel, Howard Rambsy, associate professor of literature at Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, highlighted a golden age of inspiration for black men writers between 1977 and 1997. He examined the works of Kevin Young, Ta-Nehisi Coates, Colson Whitehead, and Aaron McGruder to argue for the role of “eclectic creative domains,” from horror movies and Star Wars to father-son relationship and hip hop in shaping the work of these writers. Erica Edwards, associate professor of English at the University of California, Riverside, analyzed Condoleezza Rice’s Extraordinary, Ordinary People: A Memoir of Family and the Mother,” was published in 2012 in the book.

The day concluded with two author readings. Evie Shockley returned to the podium to share poems from her award-winning volume the new black (2011) as well as several new pieces. In speech and song, Shockley’s reading displayed the lyricism and musicality of her poetry. Her poems engaged the day’s conversations asking how race looks dependent on where you “enter the stream of history.” David Bradley, associate professor of creative writing at the University of Oregon, shared a self-proclaimed “diatribe” against the NAACP’s burial of the n-word in a provocative and powerful piece of creative nonfiction. He also read selections from a new work that highlighted the extraordinary and complex jazz of Miles Davis.

Weiss told a UO reporter: “The book is about the reality of how different Muslim communities are interpreting—in this case within Pakistan, but it is a phenomenon occurring worldwide—the intersections of Islam and modernity, and where women’s roles and rights fit into that equation. There are a lot of misunderstandings and stereotypes about women’s positions in Pakistan. In the book, I try to capture the cacophony of views that exist regarding women’s rights in that country, but also understand how people interpret what these are through the lens of Islam. Indeed, what is understood through their interpretations vary dramatically. This is how I can share my expertise with the UO community and the wider public, to promote understanding.”

Amanda Powell Receives NEA Fellowship

Amanda Powell, senior lecturer in Spanish (Romance Languages) and a CSWS faculty affiliate, was awarded a FY2014 National Endowment for the Arts Literature Translation Fellowship of $12,500 to support the translation into English of the groundbreaking novel El gato de sí mismo (working title: “Cat on His Own Behalf”) by Uriel Quesada (Costa Rica, 2005).

Outcomes: Katherine Logan Guy

Katherine Logan Guy, a 2010 CSWS Graduate Research Grant awardee and now a PhD student in philosophy, recently published an article and presented a paper related to her CSWS-supported research. “Foucault, the Modern Mother, and Maternal Power: Some Notes Toward a Genealogy of the Mother,” was published in 2012 in the book Foucault, the Family and Politics (ed. by Robbie Duschinsky and Leon Antonio Rocha, 63–81. New York: Palgrave Macmillan). She presented her paper “The Mother-Infant Bond: Attachment Parenting, Attachment Theory, and Biopower” at the 2012 annual meeting of the Society for Analytical Feminism, Vanderbilt University.

Guatemala Collaborative Team Receives Grant from UO Genocide Prevention Initiative

CSWS associate director Gabriela Martinez (SOJC) is a member of the Guatemala collaborative team awarded a $13,500 grant from a cross-campus initiative that seeks to motivate greater responsiveness to the prevention of genocide and mass atrocities. Other members of the team are Carlos Aguirre (History, LAS), Lynn Stephen (Anthropology), CSWS advisory board member Michelle McKinley (Law), and Stephanie Wood (Wired Humanities Projects).

The initiative, “Genocide and Mass Atrocities: Responsibility to Prevent,” examines personal and political responses to mass atrocities from the perspective of numerous disciplines and was spearheaded by the OU School of Law’s Appropriate Dispute Resolution Center, in partnership with the Carlton and Wilberta Riple Sevage Endowment for International Relations and Peace, and the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs. A total of four inaugural project grants were awarded for AY 2013-14.

The Guatemala collaborative team, which forms the Center for Latino/a and Latin American Studies Human Rights Research Group, will implement a series of projects related to human rights and the prevention of violence in Guatemala. These projects include educational initiatives for UO faculty and students, Oregon teachers, and Guatemalan educators and human rights advocates. The proposal, entitled “Preventing Further Genocide in Guatemala and Beyond,” includes a two-day workshop on litigation led by renowned international human rights attorney Almudena Bernabéu, a tool kit for journalists, a workshop on education and prevention of violence to be held in Guatemala City, a one-day retreat for Oregon teachers, and several other initiatives.

“Faculty Wives” Transferred to JSMA

CSWS transferred the painting “Faculty Wives” by Anne McCosh to the Jordan Schnitzer Museum of Art on the UO campus in fall 2012 to allow more people to see and enjoy it. The painting was given to CSWS in 1992 by the artist. JSMA featured the McCosh painting in the show “Living Legacies,” which ran from June 1 through September 1, 2013.

“Pioneer Mother” Statue Scrutinized

In November 2012, CSWS sponsored a visit by Dr. Brenda Frink, research associate at The Michelle R. Clayman Institute for Gender Research at Stanford University. Frink delivered a lecture at the Many Nations Longhouse focused on “Pioneer Mother: Race, Gender, and the Politics of Public Monuments in the U.S. West.”

In addition to cosponsorship from the Departments of Ethnic Studies, History, and Women’s and Gender Studies, Frink’s visit to UO...
was partially funded by an inaugural Academic Support Grant for the 2012-13 academic year in support of programming related to an exhibition organized by the Jordan Schnitzer Museum of Art, The Female Figure: Artistic Multiplicities. Funding for these Academic Support Grants was provided by JSMA, the School of Architecture and Allied Arts, and the College of Arts and Sciences, along with University Relations and the Provost.

Special Projects at CSWS

Fembot—In 2009, a group of feminist scholars came together to create a research interest group organized around the theme of “Gender, New Media, and Technology.” The group was interdisciplinary—drawn from graduate students, art history scholars, scholars from communication and English and East Asian Languages. Diverse as they were, what they shared was a common interest in changing academic publishing. In the utopian spirit of imagining how they’d run publishing if they were in charge, they began a wish list for an online publication: open access so that other scholars around the world would no longer have to pay for access to feminist scholarship, open source so that the code and the tools they used and created could be freely and widely shared, interdisciplinary so that feminist scholars across social scientific and humanistic fields could collaborate with one another, and—crucially—with special attention to a peer review process that could be more rigorous, generous, and accountable than the peer review processes they’d encountered in the past.

The Fembot Collective was born of such conversations, although its official start was in spring 2010, at a Feminist Passions conference held at the University of Oregon, when a group of international feminist media studies scholars met to consider the future of publishing in the context of ongoing transformations enabled by digital tools and social media. The group agreed to participate in these changes, and to create new formats and forms of scholarship publishing for a fast-paced, production-oriented context digital world. Fembot caught on quickly—from its beginnings with a group of less than a dozen scholars at the University of Oregon, in less than two years, the Fembot Collective has grown to include 101 faculty and graduate student members who serve as peer reviewers, content creators, and cultural aggregators from nine different countries.

Today, the Fembot Collective publishes an online, open source, peer-reviewed media studies journal (Ada: A Journal of Gender, New Media, and Technology), hosts an active listserv (with 270 members), and produces a monthly podcast featuring interviews with authors of recently published feminist books (Books Aren’t Dead, or BAD). Ada has pioneered an online, open peer review process that has been adapted for use in other collaborative settings, including graduate courses and undergraduate writing classrooms. This peer review system allows for branching commentary and conversations among reviewers, with the express purpose of creating a transformative, transparent, and generative review process. Since Ada’s launch in November 2012, the site has received over 71,000 page views, with over 15,000 unique visitors from 115 countries around the world, while Books Aren’t Dead has received over 1,000 listens since it began in December 2012.

These projects have directly resulted in mentoring and practical opportunities for graduate student participation in the conference and exhibition. The Fembot Unconference on Feminist Multimodal Publishing and Collaboration was held in February 2013. Left to right: Panelists Karen Alexander, Alex Juhasz, Sarah Kember, Sarah Stierch, and Nina Huntemann.

Ada in particular is flourishing, with two issues already published and an innovative, interdisciplinary issue on feminism science fiction set for publication in November 2013 and an issue on queer feminist digital media that includes multimedia contributions slated for publication in May 2014. Fulfilling CSWS’s commitment to disseminating feminist research, the Fembot Project is creating new modes of publishing, peer review, and collaboration.

Women of Color Project—In its fifth year of existence the Women of Color project was coordinated by CSWS associate director Gabriela Martinez. WOC started the year by welcoming several new junior women of color faculty in the fall term and establishing a yearlong set of goals. Developing and maintaining a supportive and collaborative community centering the experiences and circumstances of women of color in the academy continued to be the project’s main emphasis. Toward this end, its first major workshop was with Doug Blandy, UO senior vice provost for academic affairs, who discussed candidly among project members the institutional process of third-year reviews and tenure and promotion. This allowed project members the opportunity to meet and engage with the Office of Academic Affairs, while also being able to ask sensitive questions in a safe and comfortable space. Members say this workshop has proven essential and beneficial through the years, as numerous project members have advanced to associate professor.

Supporting the members’ individual and collective research projects also continued to be a priority this year. Many project members are engaged in research projects that are not well represented across the UO campus. Thus, the WOC project has allowed its participants to bring in scholars, researchers, community members, and activists that are fruitful for their research endeavors. This year, WOC cosponsored award-winning journalist Joan Morgan, author of When Chickenheads Come Home to Roost: A Hip-Hop Feminist Breaks It Down; Deborah Varagas, associate professor (Ethnic Studies) at University of California Riverside and author of Dissonant Divas in Chicana Music: The Limits of La Onda; and in the spring quarter, with the UO Department of Ethnic Studies, critical race feminist scholar Dorothy Roberts, who spoke to a packed audience about the dangers of the human genome movement around race and science.

As WOC enters its sixth year, the group looks forward to continuing the support of project members in their research endeavors, building a collaborative and supportive community, and celebrating accomplishments and advancement at UO.

Women Writers Project—After receiving 2012-2013 CSWS Special Project Funding last year, the Women Writers Project produced the 2013 second annual CSWS Women Writers Symposium—“Common Ground: Land, Language, Story,” held in early May in collaboration with the Eugene Public Library. Overall, about 300 people attended the symposium, which took place over three days on the UO campus and at the Eugene Public Library.

Highlights included:

• More than 100 people attended a Thursday evening panel “Too Many P’s? Personal, Political, Publics and Potatoes,” featuring symposium headliner and American Book Award–winning writer Ruth Ozeki reading from her novel, All Over Creation, and joined at the table by an interdisciplinary panel of scholars in a conversation about the politics of food and kinship. Panelists included professors Jennifer Burns Levin (Clark Honors College); Mary Wood (English); Judith Eisen (Biology) and Kim Leval, Executive Director, Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides. Joan Haran, Research Fellow, CESAGEN at Cardiff University, served as moderator.

• A Friday evening appearance on campus by Ruth Ozeki, reading from her newest novel, A Tale for the Time Being (Viking, March 2013).

• The Saturday morning panel “Common Ground: Land, Language, Story” at Eugene Public Library. Focused on story, community, and people’s relationships to the natural world, the morning panel included readings and discussion by featured presenters on the

Left to right: After the writer’s conference, headliner / novelist Ruth Ozeki (A Tale for the Time Being; All Over Creation; My Year of Meats); Thursday evening moderator Joan Haran (Cardiff University, Wales), and UO associate professor of Japanese Languages and Literatures and Women Writers Project advisory board member Alisa Freedman took time to relax in the Oregon countryside / photo by Carol Stabile.
theme “common ground”—and in particular how this applies to Northwest communities, women writers, and women artists. Morning panelists included Ruth Ozeki; novelist and narrative nonfiction author Karen Barbo (How Georgia Became O’Keefe); poet and OSU director of creative writing Karen Holmberg (Axis Mundi: The Perseids), winner of the John Ciardi Prize; and Theresa May, assistant professor, UO Theatre Arts and artistic director of Earth Matters on Stage; with moderator Barbara C. Pope (The Blood of Lorraine; The Missing Italian Girl), professor emerita, UO Women’s and Gender Studies.

- Five afternoon workshops: “Fiction: The Incendiary Nature of Setting and Place,” led by novelist and screenwriter Cai Emmons (His Mother’s Son); “Memoir: The Narrator’s Journey,” led by Debra Gwartney (Live Through This); “Finding the Resonance: Poetry,” led by Cecelia Hagen (Entering); “Finding Sustenance and Meaning in the Natural World: Nature-Writing,” led by Evelyn Hess (To the Woods: Sinkings Roots, Living Lightly, and Finding True Home); “Crafting a Writing Life: A Real Writer is One Who Really Writes,” led by UO journalism professor Lauren Kessler (Counter Clockwise: Stubborn Twigs).

CSWS is looking forward to hosting New York Times-bestselling author of The Jane Austen Book Club, Karen Joy Fowler, at the CSWS Northwest Women Writers Symposium May 1–3, 2014. Fowler’s latest novel, We Are All Completely Beside Ourselves, promises to open channels of conversation about the ethics of research on animals as well as the challenges of family dynamics.

**Research Interest Groups at CSWS**

**Americas RIG**—The core objective during AY 2012-2013 was to develop a series of linked activities that appealed to RIG members from a variety of disciplines, and that stimulated intellectual conversation and community among RIG members. The topic was “Sex, Race, and the Body,” which built on RIG efforts in 2011-2012 and extended into some new areas that reflect evolving interests of RIG members (e.g. nineteenth century constructions of the body in the context of slavery in the United States). This included a well-attended November reading and discussion of the novel Wench led by April Haynes (History, UO). In winter quarter Sharon Block (UC Irvine) gave a public lecture “Race, Power and Politics in Early America.” Spring quarter the RIG brought in Mireille Miller-Young (UC Santa Barbara), who spoke to a packed audience on “Putting Hypersexuality to Work: Black Women and Illicit Eroticism in Pornography.” The next day the RIG held a discussion on a chapter of her book manuscript. The RIG also held work-in-progress events in May for Michelle McKinley (Law) and Erin Beck (Political Science).

The RIG’s theme for AY 2013-2014 is “Gender and (Un)Civil Society in Latin America.” The RIG will explore how and if the contemporary contours of civil society in Latin America (including a range of actors such as social movements and NGOs) contribute to robust citizenship, democracy and development in the region—particularly in terms of gender equity and intersecting hierarchies of race, class, and sexuality.

**Feminist Philosophy RIG**—In the 2012-13 academic year, the Feminist Philosophy RIG (FPRIG) was primarily dedicated to reading and discussion of feminist philosophy, usually focused around the visits of invited departmental colloquium speakers. This year, the reading centered on the work of Ladelle McWhorter (University of Richmond), Kelly Oliver (Vanderbilt University), and Alia Al-Saadi (University of Wisconsin-Madison). In the spring term, the RIG organized a public talk in May by visiting guest speaker Karma Chávez entitled “Queer Fields, Queer Methods: Advancing an Activist Research Methodology.” Chávez, who is an assistant professor of Rhetoric, Politics, and Culture at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, also led a colloquium for graduate students to discuss a chapter from her forthcoming book, Queer Migration Politics: Activist Rhetoric and Coalitional Possibilities.

The RIG held two reading groups, Warnes’ Savage Barbecue: Race, Culture, and the Invention of America’s First Food (collaborative event with the Escuela de Américas RIG—arguably one of the most vibrant RIGs)—and Miss American Vigilante’s book historicizing dietary reform, Eating Right in America: Food, Health, and Citizenship from Domestic Science to Obesity, to a group of about 30 students and 40 community members.

UC-Davis American studies and food science scholar Jennifer Burns Levin paired with Oliver Kellhammer, a Canadian permaculture artist, writer, and teacher specializing in ecological restoration and land art, for a fireside conversation on “Botanical Interventions: Rebuilding Landscapes, Reshaping Communities.”

**Queering Academic Studies RIG**—Since its formation, the Queer RIG has worked to fill a graduate-level curriculum gap in queer theory by meeting to discuss foundational and current readings in the field of sexuality and gender studies.

This academic year, the RIG continued its queer theory reading group with Sharon Patricia Holland’s The Erotic Life of Racism and selections from Queer Indigenous Studies: Critical Interventions in Theory, Politics, and Literature, edited by Qwo-li Driskell, Chris Finley, Brian Joseph Gilley, and Scott Laura Morgensen. Ethnic Studies visiting professor Chris Finley joined assistant professor from another institution. An invited speaker who spoke at the 2013 Sally Miller Gearhart Lecture and planned its next major research project on the annual retreat. During the spring term, the RIG hosted a documentary screening and discussion about how RIG members could use the film’s messages in graduate teaching courses. The RIG also hosted a lunch and workshop with Deborah Gould, who spoke at the 2013 Sally Miller Gearhart Lecture in Lesbian Studies. During this workshop, RIG members discussed ways to incorporate research on emotions into their own feminist research.

**New Research Interest Group**

**Medieval and Early Modern Intersections in Gender and Sexuality (MEMIGS) RIG**—This RIG promotes intellectual exchange among scholars interested in the study of women and of questions of sexuality and gender in the Middle Ages and the early modern period. Interdisciplinary in practice and comparative in scope, it will seek to further ongoing dialogue among scholars and graduate students whose paths might otherwise rarely cross. In the coming academic year, MEMIGS will organize quarterly events involving graduate students and graduate students as well as the visit of a scholar from another institution. An invited speaker will participate in a workshop on a recent publication for which interested faculty will prepare a reading group and a public lecture. Marc Schachtier, Romance Languages, serves as faculty coordinator.

**Research Matters**

Looking at Books

*A ground-breaking collection of essays focuses on how theatre, dance, and other forms of performance are helping to transform our ecological values. Leading scholars and practitioners explore ways that familiar and new works of theatre and dance can help us recognize our reciprocal relationship with the natural world and how performance helps us understand the way our bodies are integrally connected to the land.* —from the publisher

Blind to Betrayal: Why We Fool Ourselves We Aren’t Being Fooled, by Jennifer J. Freyd, UO Professor, Psychology, and Pamela J. Birrell (John Wiley & Sons, 2013)
Betrayal is fundamental to the human condition and yet because of betrayal blindness often goes unseen. Drawing on empirical research, clinical thought, and real stories, this book explores central questions about betrayal and betrayal-al blindness: What is betrayal? What is its scope? How do we become aware of it and heal from its effects? —from the publisher

Modern Girls on the Go: Gender, Mobility, and Labor in Japan, ed. by Alisa Freedman, UO Associate Professor, Japanese Literature and Film, Laura Miller, and Christine R. Yano (Stanford University Press, 2013)
*This spirited and engaging multidisciplinary volume pins its focus on the lived experiences and cultural depictions of five forms of women’s work as organizing, dancing, mapping, cooking, and inscribing, she shows how these writers reclaimed and revised cultural nationalism to hail African America.* —from the publisher

Women’s Work: Nationalism and Contemporary African American Women’s Novels, by Courtney Thorsson, UO Assistant Professor, English (University of Virginia Press, 2013)
*Thorsson reconsiders the gender, genre, and geography of African American nationalism as she explores the aesthetic history of African American writing by women. … Identifying five forms of women’s work as organizing, dancing, mapping, cooking, and inscribing, she shows how these writers reclaimed and revised cultural nationalism to hail African America.* —from the publisher

Development Challenges Confronting Pakistan, ed. by Anita M. Weiss, UO Professor and Head, Department of International Studies, and Saba Gul Khattak (Kumarian Press, 2013)
*Although scholars and practitioners have identified explicit structural impediments that constrain countries’ efforts to alleviate poverty and promote sustainable social development, there has been limited research conducted to identify the specific barriers to development that prevail in Pakistan today. The authors … go far toward filling this void.* —from the publisher

Race and Ethnicity, by Naomi Zack, UO Professor, Philosophy (Bridgepoint Education, Inc., 2012)
This textbook combines Naomi Zack’s earlier philosophical work, examining the concept of race as culturally relative with a look at the social aspect of race being associated with oppression. The book is intended for students to access online, in a multi-media format, where they will have direct access to sound and video material.

FOR MORE BOOKS BY CURRENT AND FORMER AFFILIATES, GO TO CSWS.UOREGON.EDU/?PAGE_ID=8191

Trafalgar, by Argentine writer Angélica Gorodischer; translated by Amalia Gladhart, UO Professor, Spanish, and Head, Department of Romance Languages (Small Beer Press, 2013)
*Trafalgar, a novel-in-stories, was originally published in Argentina in 1979. It starts off light and refreshing right from the very first short “Who’s Who in Rosario” listing for Trafalgar, although there are occasional clouds that pass through Trafalgar Medrano’s bright and happy stories.* —from the publisher

Coming to Life: Philosophies of Pregnancy, Childbirth and Mothering, ed. by Sarah LaChance Adams and Caroline Lundquist, both UO graduates (Fordham University Press, 2012)
*A superlative collection of essays that … takes seriously the philosophical significance of women’s lived experience. Every woman, regardless of her own reproductive story, is touched by the often restrictive beliefs and norms governing discourses about pregnancy, childbirth and mothering. Thus the concerns of this anthology are relevant to all women and central to any philosophical project that takes women’s lives seriously.* —from the publisher

Counterclockwise: One Midlife Woman’s Quest to Turn Back the Hands of Time, by Lauren Kessler, UO Professor, School of Journalism and Communication (Rodale Books, 2013)
*Guided by both intense curiosity and healthy skepticism, a sense of adventure and a sense of humor, Kessler sets out to discover just what’s required to prolong those healthy, vital, and productive years called the ‘health span.’ In her yearlong journey, Kessler investigates and fully immerses herself in the hope and hype of the anti-aging movement.* —from the publisher

From Enron to Evo: Pipeline Politics, Global Environmentalism, and Indigenous Rights in Bolivia, by Derrick Hindery, UO Assistant Professor, International Studies and Geography (University of Arizona Press, 2013)
Although gender is not a central focus of the book, there are sections that focus on gendered impacts of the Cuiabá pipeline, says author Derrick Hindery. *Throughout the Americas, a boom in oil, gas, and mining development has pushed the extractive frontier deeper into indigenous territories. Centering on a long-term study of Enron and Shell’s Cuiabá pipeline, From Enron to Evo traces the struggles of Bolivia’s indigenous peoples for self-determination over their lives and territories.* —from the publisher

Racial Formation in the Twenty-First Century, ed. by Daniel Martinez HoSang, UO Associate Professor of Ethnic Studies and Political Science, Oneka LaBennett, and Laura Pulido (University of California Press 2012)
*Racial Formation in the 21st Century … brings together fourteen essays by leading scholars in law, history, sociology, ethnic studies, literature, anthropology and gender studies to consider the past, present and future of racial formation. The contributors explore far-reaching concerns: slavery and land ownership; labor and social movements; torture and war; sexuality and gender formation; indigeneity and colonialism; genetics and the body. From the ecclesiastical courts of 17th century Lima to the cell blocks of Abu Grahb, the essays draw from Omi and Winant’s influential theory of racial formation and adapt it to the various criticisms, challenges, and changes of life in the 21st century.* —from the publisher
Fembot Rocks!
And if you haven’t yet seen Ada, please consider taking a look at this dynamic, new online journal.

Did you know?
Fembot grew out of a CSWS Research Interest Group and was developed as a CSWS Special Project.

http://fembotcollective.org
5 WAYS TO SUPPORT
Women’s Research & Creativity at CSWS
See page 7 for details!

1. Identity Complex
   Postdoctoral Fellowship in Gender, Race, and Sexuality
   Making the Case for Multiplicity
   Michael Harper-Garcia

2. Le Guin Feminist Science Fiction Fellowship
   "I’d Kiss You Now But I Have to Save the World"
   October 22, 2009
   3 p.m. - 5 p.m.
   Browsing Room
   Knight Library
   Panel members include: Rebecca W. Wers, associate professor of Women’s Studies and English at the University of Oregon; Helene Blumberg, assistant professor, UO Department of Sociology; and Mike Wilson, a local poet.

3. CSWS Graduate Research Awards
   Front cover art for Ada Issue 3 by Jeanne Gomoll

4. Road Scholars Program
   Sponsored by Center for the Study of Women in Society

5. Annual CSWS Northwest Women Writers Symposium
   The Northwest Women Writers Symposium at the UO Center for the Study of Women in Society presents, Common Ground: Land, Language, Story
   Saturday • May 11, 2013 • 9 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.
   Downtown Eugene Public Library • 1001 S. 13th Street
   Free & Open to the Public
   Sponsoring Organizations:
   Center for the Study of Women in Society (CSWS), University of Oregon; College of Liberal Arts, University of Oregon; Women in Society, University of Oregon; Women in Media, University of Oregon; Women's Center, University of Oregon; Women’s History Project, Eugene, OR; Women’s History Project, Portland, OR; Women’s History Project, Salem, OR; Oregon Women’s History Collaborative; Oregon Women’s History Project; Oregon Women’s History Network

To support the work of CSWS, call (541) 346-2262 or email csws@uoregon.edu. To send a check, mail to: Center for the Study of Women in Society, 1201 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1201 • Find us online at http://csws.uoregon.edu