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CSWS thanks the many individuals who joined us at our celebration in November 2013.

Photos from the top: With renowned Oregon author Ursula K. Le Guin onstage, it was a packed house at the keynote event of the CSWS 40th anniversary celebration. The audience stretched to the back of the EMU Ballroom.

- Yvette M. Alex-Assensoh, UO Vice President for Equity and Inclusion, spoke at the opening ceremony.
- Oregon Book Award-winning author Molly Gloss introduced Ursula K. Le Guin and earlier gave a reading of her own.
- Charismatic scholar and science fiction author Sally Miller Gearhart (right), whose papers are housed at Knight Library in the UO Libraries Special Collections and University Archives, talks to SCUA librarians James Fox and Linda Long.
- Eugene mayor Kitty Piercy (right) chats with then-CSWS director Carol Stabile and former director Marilyn Farwell / photographs by by Jack Liu.

One way to keep the flame burning is to make a donation in support of student and faculty research on women and gender at the University of Oregon!

Call (541) 346-2262 or email csws@uoregon.edu for more information.

To send a check, mail to:
Center for the Study of Women in Society
1201 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1201

csws.uoregon.edu
FROM THE CENTER

I had the pleasure of being on the CSWS Advisory Board when the director search committee interviewed and made the recommendation to hire Carol Stabile for director of CSWS. I vividly remember looking through applicant files and writing samples and being floored in particular by Stabile’s highly insightful White Victims, Black Villains: Gender, Race, and Crime News in U.S. Culture (Routledge, 2006), and thinking, “We would be incredibly lucky to get this woman to the UO!” Thanks to the efforts of then-interim director Linda Fuller and others, we did get her to the UO, and CSWS has prospered under her directorship.

In addition to the events surrounding the 40th anniversary celebrations, the inauguration of the Le Guin Feminist Science Fiction Fellowship, and Carol’s impact on the RIGs, her most notable accomplishment in my view is the midwifing of Fembot, a collaborative project promoting research on gender, new media, and technology. Fembot’s journal, Ada, is now in its fifth issue, and Fembot has launched several other initiatives, including un-conferences, hackathons, a monthly author interview series titled Books Aren’t Dead, a zine, and a newly hatched feminist model of open peer review. It is thus with mixed emotions that CSWS bids adieu to this powerful feminist leader, although we know that she will remain involved with the center in her new capacity as professor of women’s and gender studies and journalism and communication. As we move forward, we hope to continue developing new directions for CSWS, while strengthening our core commitment to fostering scholarship on women, gender, and sexuality.

— Michael Hames-Garcia, Director

CONTENTS

An Interview with Director Michael Hames-Garcia 2 by Jenée Wilde, PhD candidate, Department of English (Folklore)

Special Section: Collaborative Research

The Collaboration Continuum 4 by Michael Hames-Garcia, Director, CSWS

Collaboration through Conversation 5 by Jenée Wilde, PhD candidate, Department of English (Folklore)

Plugging into the Recharge Station 7 by Mary E. Wood, Professor, Department of English

Creating Visibility for Feminist Philosophy 8 by Megan Burke, PhD candidate, Department of Philosophy

Harnessing Hearts and Minds: The Power of Activism in Academia 8 by Marina Rosenthal & Carly Smith, PhD candidates, Department of Psychology

A Documentary Experience 9 by Sonia De La Cruz, Adjunct Instructor, School of Journalism and Communication

Research, Interviews, and Columns

A Conversation with Gabriela Martínez 10 by Alice Evans, CSWS

Women, Development, and Geographies of Insecurity in Post-Conflict Southeast Turkey 12 by Jessie Clark, Instructor, Department of Geography

BiSciFi Project: Researching Speculative Fictions and Bisexual Lives 13 by Jenée Wilde, PhD candidate, Department of English (Folklore)

Identity, Culture, and Communication: LGBTQ Youth and Digital Media 14 by Erica Ciszek, PhD candidate, School of Journalism and Communication

“The Other Lives”—Locating Dis/Ability in Utopian Feminist Science Fiction: An Interview with Kathryn Allan 15 by Alice Evans, CSWS

Discovering the Other Lives 17 by Kathryn Allan, 2013 Le Guin Feminist Science Fiction Fellow

Highlights from the Academic Year 18

Looking at Books 24
An Interview with Director

MICHAEL HAMES-GARCÍA

As the first male and person of color to lead CSWS, Hames-García is a committed feminist whose scholarship addresses women, gender, and sexuality.

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

Michael Hames-García is a professor in the Department of Ethnic Studies at University of Oregon. Originally from Portland, he earned his PhD in English from Cornell University and taught on the East Coast before returning to his home state to direct the Department of Ethnic Studies at the University of Oregon for five years. He also directed UO’s Center for Race, Ethnicity, and Sexuality Studies for six years, and he has been involved for more than a decade with the Future of Minority Studies Project, a national research initiative funded in part by the Mellon Foundation. Among his honors, Hames-García was the recipient of the 2011 Martin Luther King, Jr. Award for promoting cultural diversity and racial justice at the University of Oregon. Author of *Fugitive Thought: Prison Movements, Race, and the Meaning of Justice* (2004) and *Identity Complex: Making the Case for Multiplicity* (2011), his research examines the complex interplay of gender, race, sexuality, and colonial legacies in U.S. society and the interrelatedness of different forms of social identity. His current research is focused on gender, race, and sexuality in literary production about gay men during the period between World War II and the Stonewall Rebellion.

Q: In forty years, you are the first male director of the Center for the Study of Women in Society. Why did you want to lead a women’s research center?

MHG: That’s an interesting question, and I’ve heard versions of the question already. One of the things I think is interesting is that I actually suspect that it will be more impactful in the long run—or I hope it will be more impactful in the long run—that I’m the first director of color for CSWS in forty years, rather than the first male, or in addition to being the first male director of CSWS. I wanted to direct CSWS not specifically because it’s a women’s research center, but because I’m passionate about research. I’m passionate about feminist and anti-racist and anti-homophobic research, and CSWS is the place to make an impact on that research and that scholarship, particularly at the University of Oregon. It is an amazing opportunity to really influence the course of feminist scholarship on the campus but also beyond the campus, and I couldn’t pass it up.

Q: What other kinds of collaborative research and leadership processes have you been a part of?

MHG: I was on the National Coordinating Committee for the Future of Minority Studies [FMS] research project. It was a consortium of faculty and graduate students across the nation who were doing scholarship on race, gender, sexuality, and colonialism, and really trying to make an impact on the state of intersectional feminist scholarship in the humanities and social sciences. We ran, among other things, a summer institute for six years at Cornell University and Stanford University to bring advanced graduate students and junior faculty into a seminar to work intensively with senior scholars. We also organized a number of national conferences over the course of a little more than a decade.

Q: You must realize that some CSWS affiliates are nervous about a man taking over as director. What would you say to those who fear that the concerns of women and girls will get lost, or take a back seat, to your own areas of interest?

MGH: I think it’s a legitimate concern. I think that it’s a concern that I would have about a man taking a directorship of a center for the study of women in society. That said, what I would say in response is that my own interests are, in fact, the study of women in society, the study of women and girls, as well as the contexts for that study—namely, the
study of gender and sexuality. And I think that my desire to be involved with CSWS is largely a desire to be involved with that scholarship and to promote the scholarship on women, gender, and sexuality at the University of Oregon. I’m not sure what else to say but that is my scholarship.

Q. How have feminist mentors influenced your development as a scholar?

MHG: My development as a scholar has been almost entirely under the influence of feminist mentors. They’ve influenced it profoundly—the way I think, the questions that I ask, how I define knowledge in a research topic. All of that is influenced by feminism and feminist mentors and feminist scholarship.

Q. Can you give me an example?

MHG: Going back to the beginning with my dissertation, I did that at a time when very little of the scholarship being done in critical prison studies paid any attention to gender. And it never really occurred to me as a possibility for myself to do a project on prisoners that didn’t take gender and the construction of gender as a central framework, rather than gender as some kind of variable or as a kind of essentialized or natural category. There’s a lot of research, particularly on men in prison, that takes masculinity as this thing without question- ing it at all as a social construction.

Q. How do you see yourself as a feminist leader and mentor?

MHG: I’ve always tried to be the kind of mentor that my best mentors were. When we were departmentalizing ethnic studies, one of the things that we were explicit about was to specify that our department did not run on Robert’s Rules but on consensus. I do think that consensus is a good process that lends itself to feminist ideals more so than other kinds of decision-making practices. And it’s almost always worth it. It’s amazing to me how often I’m more happy with the results of a consensus process than with the initial proposal I developed for group discussion. Other people are very smart, and their input nearly always improves an idea. I don’t know if that’s a feminist style of leadership per se, but it’s certainly something I strive to make compatible with my feminism.

Q: What other leadership roles have you held on campus, and how were they related to your decision to lead CSWS?

MHG: In addition to directing the Department of Ethnic Studies, I also directed a research center, the Center for Race, Ethnicity, and Sexuality Studies [CRESS] at the University of Oregon, which was around for five or six years. I think that part of what I wanted to do with CRESS was expand the kind of work that CSWS was already doing, but specifically offering opportunities that CSWS at that time wasn’t able to offer. So we did a lot of works-in-progress among faculty and graduate students with other faculty commenting, and we also did a number of publishing workshops with press editors.

Q: How have you been involved with CSWS, and how has that involvement supported your development as a scholar?

MHG: It’s always been for me a place of intellectual community on campus, a place where exciting things are happening and where exciting work is being generated. I was on the board of CSWS shortly after I arrived at the University of Oregon in the late 2000s. I’ve been involved tangentially with a couple of RIGs but not centrally. I applied for some CSWS travel grants, but I haven’t had any major funding from CSWS for my research. It definitely has been a place that has sustained me as an intellectual just through its presence and its events and the kinds of projects that it has developed and the kinds of people that it attracts.

Q: What are your goals as director?

MHG: My goals as director are to continue the work that has been done to grow the endowment, to expand CSWS’s capacity for supported research on campus—particularly expanding the capacity for supporting graduate student research and undergraduate research. I really hope to build CSWS’s profile off campus in the Oregon community as well.

Q: Is there anything else you would like to tell our interested audience?

MHG: I’m very excited about the challenges and opportunities that CSWS poses. I think that it’s amazing to step into a legacy of forty years. I feel the weight of the work that people have done in those decades to build this center, and I feel as someone who grew up in Oregon, and someone who’s learned from feminist scholars my whole life, and someone who is committed to the University of Oregon, I feel a responsibility to that legacy—to build on it, to improve on it, and to steward it for generations to come.

For the full interview with Michael Hames-García, please go to csws.uoregon.edu.

—Jenée Wilde is a PhD candidate in English (Folklore) and served in 2012-14 as the Development GTF for the Center for the Study of Women in Society. She also holds an MFA in creative nonfiction and has worked as a magazine writer and editor. She is the 2014 recipient of the CSWS Jane Grant Fellowship Award and a member of the CSWS Advisory Board.
THE COLLABORATION CONTINUUM

Power in the academy often masks the contributions of collaborators, and yet, collaboration is all but essential. As a feminist research center, CSWS prioritizes the formation and support of intersections among scholars, writers, artists, and documentary filmmakers.

by Michael Hames-García, Director, CSWS; Professor, UO Department of Ethnic Studies

I am aware of the irony of writing a column by myself on collaborative scholarship. Most likely, any insights contained here would have been strengthened by the participation of others in the writing process. And yet, part of what I would like to say is that in some sense all scholarship is collaborative. Even this column that I am writing by myself is informed by the ideas of many others (some of whom I have met and many of whom I have not met), and someone other than myself will copyedit it. Collaboration exists on a continuum that includes the participation of interviewees and study participants, the aid of research assistants, the suggestions of editors and readers (both known and anonymous), the published and unpublished ideas of other scholars who have worked on a given subject, and the influence of one’s teachers, students, and mentors. The most common referent for collaboration in the academy is actually at the far end of this continuum: coauthorship. However, across various disciplines there isn’t even a clear consensus on what constitutes coauthorship. This points to the absence of any natural break along the continuum of collaboration—where participating in a study, providing input on an article or experiment design, assisting in the collection or interpretation of data, or offering editorial suggestions becomes coauthorship.

It’s not uncommon to hear a distinction made between collaborative scholarship in the sciences and some social sciences and individual scholarship in other parts of the social sciences and in the humanities. What people usually mean by this distinction is that coauthorship is much more standard practice in science and social science disciplines. Thus, for example, the Wikipedia entry on “Academic Authorship” references a range of diverging definitions of authorship from professional associations in chemistry, medicine, psychology, and other sciences, whereas the Modern Language Association does not offer any guidelines at all for determining authorship. It is not unheard of for articles in fields like particle physics to have hundreds of authors, often listed alphabetically. In such a case, where being a coauthor means that one contributed to the design of an experiment or worked at a facility where an experiment was being conducted, the very notion of authorship has been removed far from what it means to the average humanist. The understanding of what it means to author in the humanities and many social sciences is more or less indistinguishable from the act of writing. Thus, a graduate student in the humanities whose work is substantially revised according to suggestions from her dissertation advisor is published with only the student’s name attached to it. Similarly, a history professor who comes up with an idea for a project while co-teaching a class with a colleague and who then employs two graduate student assistants to help collect archival data and to transcribe oral history interviews might list herself as the sole author of the final product.

My goal here is not to suggest that authorship practices in the humanities are less democratic than those in the sciences. To be sure, both ways of understanding authorship have their critics. Many have argued that lengthy alphabetical lists of coauthors can mask the central role of primary contributors. They can also result in scholars building impressive curricula vitae while doing very little work, simply by associating themselves with productive students or junior scholars. In such cases, critics charge, the naming of everyone involved with a study as a coauthor can result in a maldistribution of credit, often along lines established through hierarchies of institutional power and access.

The expansion of author lists in the sciences, however, has arisen in part as a response to the historical erasure of contributions to important discoveries by graduate students and research assistants. These erasures have not been without implications for gender equality. One of the most infamous examples is that of Lise Meitner who, with her nephew, Otto Robert Frisch, developed the explanation for nuclear fission in letters to her collaborator, Otto Hahn, in 1938. Meitner, a Jew, had been forced to flee Germany to Sweden months earlier. Hahn went on to publish both the results of his experiments with Meitner and her explanation under his own name, eventually receiving a Nobel Prize in Chemistry for the discovery. Of course, authorship has not always settled the issue of credit for scientific discoveries. An example is the case of Jocelyn Bell Burnell, the Cambridge University graduate student who discovered the existence of pulsars, and who was listed second on the 1968 paper publishing the discovery. Her advisor, Anthony Hewish, was listed first of the five authors. Hewish went on to receive a Nobel Prize in Physics for the discovery, which he shared with his colleague Martin Ryle. Similarly, Rosalind Franklin and her graduate student, Ray Gosling, published their discovery of the structure of DNA in the same issue of Nature that included Francis Crick and James Watson’s article on the double-helix. What was never apparent from this simultaneous publication was the fact that Crick and Watson had been helped in their research by being provided access to Franklin’s X-ray analyses of DNA without her knowledge.

The complex nature of collaboration in these examples and the impossibility of any of these “scientific breakthroughs” happening without the efforts of many different people suggests that the issue is larger than one of just authorship or of giving proper “credit.” Rather, what is ultimately reinforced by both the attachment to individual models of authorship and prizes like the Nobel is the idea of the “lone genius,” an individual who is responsible for some great achievement or innovation that takes place independently of others or outside of a social context that makes the discovery possible. Feminists and other scholars have long criticized the lone genius model of research and innovation. Furthermore, the work of social psychologists Hazel Rose Markus and Shinobu Kitayama on models of self and agency suggests that particular cultures (notably those

Continuum, continued on next page
COLLABORATION THROUGH CONVERSATION: How CSWS Developed the Research Interest Group Model

by Jenée Wilde, PhD candidate, English

In 1994, the Center for the Study of Women in Society (CSWS) launched a bold new vision—to foster scholarly collaboration through research interest groups, or RIGs. While the center had primarily funded individual research in earlier decades, the RIG model was designed to support a variety of intellectual and social connections among scholars working on gender in broadly related fields.

The idea for RIGs developed out of the center’s long-range planning process, launched in 1991 when Sandra Morgen arrived at the University of Oregon.

“I came here because I had a very political sense of feminist scholarship,” Morgen said. “I took the job [as CSWS director] largely because I saw so much possibility with the combination of a strong group of feminist scholars and the base funding from the endowed centers. If there was anywhere a vision of intersectionality and collaboration would work, I thought it would be at a place with resources.”

Building on her experiences with other women’s research centers, Morgen envisioned an expansive approach to research at CSWS that drew connections between individual and collective efforts. “I had a vision of where I wanted the center to go,” she said, “but I realized that if we didn’t get a general buy-in for that vision, it wasn’t going to work.”

The new process began with a year of “Research Conversation” events where faculty from a variety of disciplines came together to discuss issues involved in doing feminist research. “Conversation” topics included research praxis beyond the classroom, the use of autobiography and narrative in research, the pitfalls and possibilities of doing collaborative research, and the integration of gender, race, and class into the research process.

While the approach achieved some refinement of the center’s research direction, Morgen felt a stronger process was still needed. “If we were going to become known as a key research center on campus, we needed to build an identity as more than funding individual research,” Morgen said. “We decided to build the new vision for CSWS from the ground up by not predetermining what the areas of strength or interests were. We wanted to know, what could CSWS generate in terms of collaborative projects and research?”

From 1992 to 1994, planning committees worked to develop group research opportunities that allowed both interdisciplinary work and research within a specific discipline, without being mutually exclusive. A key concern was how to maintain a vibrant community of scholars and affiliates while also focusing in-house...
A WORD ABOUT THE ORIGIN OF RIGS
Comments from 2014 by Sandra Morgen, CSWS Director 1991-2006

“In the larger feminist research community, there was a lot going on and there was a tremendous amount of exchange, so I can’t claim I initiated the idea of RIGs. There had been clusters of research-type groups on other large campuses. But at the time, RIGs fulfilled a couple of things at the University of Oregon. Soon after I got here and got to know the campus better and the fabulous people here, we were envisioning more collaboration and more research identified with CSWS, rather than just individual scholars, and it was already clear CSWS was a home away from home for people who felt like strangers in their own departments. They cared about women and saw themselves as part of a very large national and international project of developing feminist scholarship, and some were particularly concerned to develop work that recognized women’s race and class identities and experiences. CSWS was always an intellectual community; the RIGs and initiatives were ways of creating opportunities to make collaboration and inter- and transdisciplinary research more viable with institutional support—not just rhetoric of the importance of doing it, but facilitating it, including with financial support.”

1995 photo of Sandra Morgen (left) with Mazie Giustina, who endowed the Women in the Northwest Initiative.

Looking Back: 1995

“Collaboration does not have to mean abandoning one’s dedication to individual work. Research interest groups can be intellectual salons where scholars bring their latest ideas, their thorny theoretical conundrums, their methodological or ethical questions, or an article/paper just needing polish, into a forum where others with related interests can share, listen, critique, and perhaps occasionally see a strong enough connection to propose a joint project. Collaboration might mean envisioning a grant proposal to do joint work or to develop an umbrella that will support different but related projects.

“CSWS has taken this bold step to create new opportunities for real inter- and multidisciplinary research because many of us believe that this path has great promise in fostering innovative research and theoretical development. We also are hopeful that the RIGs can contest the intellectual isolation that is endemic in higher education today as we have all become so busy with the multiple (and increasing) responsibilities of teaching and institutional service and governance in a changing university.”

—Sandra Morgen, then-CSWS Director (Spring 1995 CSWS newsletter From the Center)

Looking Back: 2003

“From its start, ‘Reclaiming the Past’ seemingly went against the stream in several ways. The RIGs aimed to foster collaborative work, but joint projects are unusual in the humanities. Moreover, CSWS itself, in its origins and founding vision, was oriented towards the social sciences and professional schools. Fortunately, we feminists are accustomed to operating not only in, but also alongside and outside the ‘mainstream’ of academia, which rarely regards feminist projects as central to funding goals. Our participants were eager to explore collaborative models, learning from feminist scholars in other disciplines, and seeing what forms we could adapt to our own work. Perhaps our totem should be the salmon; upstream progress has been fruitful.”

—Dianne Dugaw, English; Amanda Powell, Romance Languages, Spanish, and Latin American Studies; and Barbara Altmann, Romance Languages and French (Fall/Winter 2003 From the Center)

wrote external grant funding proposals; and explored collaborative relationships with other scholars and organizations.

By 1997, the RIG process had yielded two more major program initiatives: the Feminist Humanities Project, which grew out of the extraordinary success of the Reclaiming the Past RIG, and the Women’s Health and Aging Research Initiative.

Over the last twenty years, RIGs have served many purposes for those involved. Some RIGs have been ephemeral, meeting a need for connection and intellectual community at a given moment, but many have had lasting impacts on the research communities of UO and beyond.

Conversation, continued on next page
When I think of my involvement with the Narrative, Health, and Social Justice Research Interest Group sponsored by CSWS, I imagine myself as an electric car plugging into the recharge station. Like many of my colleagues, while I love the daily work of being a professor, it’s easy to get distracted from the deep intellectual engagement and exchange of ideas that drew me to the profession in the first place. In the RIG I’ve found a group of like-minded colleagues (both faculty and graduate students) from a range of different academic disciplines and departments who spark each other’s research interests and writing projects.

This particular RIG was the brainchild of three faculty—myself (a literary and cultural studies scholar from English), Kristin Yarris (an anthropologist from international studies) and Elizabeth Reis (a historian from women’s and gender studies)—who share an interest in the cultural construction of conceptions of health, illness, and wellbeing and in the ways that social inequalities and injustices infuse healthcare delivery systems in the United States and worldwide. All of us felt constrained by the disciplinary limitations imposed by institutional divisions among departments and found that cross-disciplinary connections stimulated both our research and our teaching. By creating the RIG a year ago, with the enthusiastic help and support of CSWS, we were able to foster a way not only to meet regularly for an exciting and inspiring exchange of ideas but to connect with others—both faculty and graduate students—who share those interests.

This past year, in addition to beginning a works-in-progress series for our members, we were able, with the help of CSWS funds earmarked for RIG events, to bring Cheryl Mattingly to campus as a speaker. A medical anthropologist from University of Southern California, Mattingly bridged all of our interests. In addition to scheduling a public lecture, we offered a methodology workshop that brought together graduate students and faculty from a range of disciplines. This and other RIG events have fostered mentorship and community learning in ways that stimulate the scholarship, and ultimately the productivity, of all involved. In 2014-15, our RIG will bring another speaker to campus—Johanna Crane, who works on the global politics behind AIDS-related healthcare practice and policy in Africa—as part of a national student-led global health conference coming to UO in the spring.

For me personally, participation in the RIG has had a profound effect on my scholarship, which has been influenced by our readings, discussions, and speaker events as well as by our sharing of teaching ideas (some of us have co-taught or done guest lectures in other RIG members’ classes). Sometimes cross-disciplinary discussions can be challenging, as we work to understand each other’s perspectives and priorities. The RIG has pushed me—in positive ways—to ask hard questions of my own discipline (why do literary and cultural studies matter when people are sick and dying?) and to confront my simplistic preconceptions about what other disciplines do. As we explore each other’s points of view our understanding expands, and this can only have a positive impact on our research and writing.

—Mary E. Wood (English) is a member of the CSWS Advisory Board. Her books include Life Writing and Schizophrenia: Encounters at the Edge of Meaning (Rodopi Press, 2013) and The Writing on the Wall: Women’s Autobiography and the Asylum (University of Illinois Press, 1994).

---

**LOOKING BACK: 2003**


“The SSFN [Social Sciences Feminist Network] has meant for me from the beginning a different way of understanding social sciences and academia. It is a platform not only where feminist research is done but also where we see and understand the world from a feminist perspective. Our goals are to support each other’s work and to create a nurturing environment where everyone can feel free and comfortable to share and exchange scholarship.”

—Sandra Ezquerra, Sociology (Spring 2003 CSWS newsletter From the Center)

---

The RIG was conceived at a coastal retreat for a discussion of feminist theory. Joan Acker (Professor Emerita, Department of Sociology) described the event for the Spring 2003 newsletter: “[The students] discovered that they knew little about each other and were isolated in individual worlds of academic work. Fortunately, CSWS was there to provide them with support and encouragement to form a RIG. . . . The retreats have been a rare experience for me, a time to talk and think with students in nonhierarchical ways that are not possible in ordinary faculty-student interactions.”

In addition to retreats and works-in-progress sessions, SSFN has produced multiple conferences and collaborative research projects, including research on gender and time use among faculty in five university departments, presented at their 2011 In/Equality in Academia Symposium.

“That legacy of an informal time to give each other support is still what happens in the SSFN,” said Norgaard. “It may have to do with its longevity. I know it was critical to my success at the time and who I am now.”

—Jenée Wilde is a PhD candidate in English (Folklore) and winner of the 2014-15 Jane Grant Dissertation Fellowship from CSWS. She also holds an MFA in creative nonfiction and has worked as a magazine writer and editor.
CREATING VISIBILITY FOR FEMINIST PHILOSOPHY

by Megan M. Burke, PhD candidate, UO Department of Philosophy

In the world of academic philosophy, feminist philosophers occupy a marginalized space. This, of course, is not unique to philosophy as most academic disciplines give marginal status to those working on issues of gender and its intersections with sexuality, class, and race.

Like most feminist scholars, those of us practicing feminist philosophy seek out spaces to do and share our work. For me, the Feminist Philosophy Research Interest Group (FP-RIG) has been one of these spaces. As a previous coordinator for the FP-RIG and an ongoing participant, this group has served as an important space for my pursuits in feminist philosophy. While there are many practices the RIG engages in—discussions, paper workshops, conference and event organizing—from my perspective, one of its most important functions is to foster visible feminist conversations within our department and beyond. This is important for members like myself to have a space to improve scholarship.

But, beyond this, it also serves to address larger issues of climate bias in relation to gender that plague the discipline of philosophy at large. In fall 2013, for instance, I coordinated, along with the assistance of members of the FP-RIG, a conference panel, “The Status of Women in Philosophy at the University of Oregon and Beyond,” at the Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy. As a product of the RIG, this panel brought the issues of gender inequity and sexual harassment in philosophy to a larger philosophical audience.

The problems that feminists work to dismantle within philosophy are made visible in this way. Without this visibility the possibility for implicit bias and explicit discrimination within the vast field of philosophy would remain prevalent and go unnoticed. And within our own department, each year the FP-RIG organizes the event “Women and Diversity in Philosophy” to promote recognition of marginalized groups and marginalized work within the discipline.

While research interest groups are generally recognized for the traditional scholarship—the production of conferences, articles, intellectual discussions—to me, it is events like the ones mentioned here that make the FP-RIG of fundamental importance for feminist philosophers on campus. The space this RIG carves out for conversations and disciplinary biases, which are ultimately a part of our scholarship endeavors, contributes to the security of feminist practices within our discipline. At the same time, the visibility created by the RIG allows others to become aware of and invested in our efforts, which is vital if we are to continue to make philosophy a space for feminist philosophy.

—Megan Burke, ABD, focuses on feminist philosophy, existential phenomenology, twentieth century continental philosophy, and social-political philosophy.

HARNESSING HEARTS AND MINDS: The Power of Activism in Academia

by Marina Rosenthal and Carly Smith, PhD candidates, UO Department of Psychology (Clinical Psychology)

Psychology of gender and trauma has a long, fraught history balancing scientific rigor with impassioned activism. In a constant struggle to appear objective, researchers often deny any broader purpose to their work. “We just happen to study trauma, it’s not personal,” or “Our gender does not render our research subjective,” we say. Yet as trauma researchers, we do have a stake—indeed, our entire society is at stake. How can we, as researchers, walk the tenuous line between scrupulous, precise scientific methods and fervent, social-justice-seeking activism?

We grapple with these questions, as do all psychologists who fervently or frankly strive to change the world. Yet many examples of social scientists engaging in research that is indistinguishable from activism in terms of intention, implementation, and impact pepper our lineage.

One landmark example of science informing social-justice activism is evident in the use of Kenneth and Mamie Clark’s research on the psychological impact of racial segregation (1947; 1950). The Clarks’ research indicating the deeply damaging effect of life in an unequal society on black children was ultimately used as evidence that segregation created inherently unequal educational experiences in Oliver Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas (Clark, 2004). The Clarks faced an outcry of opposition in response to both desegregation and the use of social science to compel desegregation. Kenneth Clark aptly summarizes the resistance faced by researchers whose work approaches activism, stating: “the accessory role of social scientists in [desegregation] subjects them to the criticisms of those who are identified with and seek to perpetuate the racial status quo and the related power controls” (Clark, 1960, p. 225). Fusion of science and justice is both effective and dangerous; when we as a culture know with both our most visceral instincts and our most methodical research that social oppression is harmful to some and beneficial to others, we cannot deny the need for change. Change, to those whose privilege is in jeopardy, is never welcome and will always provoke defiance.

Yet as researchers and as activists, inevitable hostility must not hinder the application of science for social change. In the present, a new permutation of the same frightened opposition subsists. When we are told that our research cannot possibly capture the complexities of institutions like universities, that we are wrong when we say violence against women is frequent, unfettered, and institutionally tolerated if not encouraged, we can look to Clark, who said that we as researchers will persevere in our activism because “as scientists [we] cannot do otherwise” (Clark, 1960, p. 240). And indeed, we cannot.

We cannot stay silent when empirical studies consistently reveal an inequitable educational environment, one where women are assaulted, silenced, and left to cope with few resources and little justice. We must continue asking questions, accumulating evidence, and synthesizing information, in part because as scientists we bring these skills to the table, but also because without a clear vantage point of individual and institutional patterns, our society will be unable to dismantle the destructive power structures in which all violence occurs.

Recently, the White House implored universities to listen to their community members and look at their own problems with sexual violence (White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, 2014). In the spirit of this recommendation, we ask researchers, administrators, and institutions alike to be brave. Science is not easy, nor is activism, but the reality that students at acclaimed research universities are daily denied equal access to education because of sexual violence is far harder. Social-science activism takes bravery, as the Clarks and others knew: bravery to conduct, distribute, and defend research that threatens the status quo. Researchers are ideally located to shine light inward on our institutions, to demand that our administration listen when we tell them that our community is neither safe nor healthy. Despite costs and opposition, we must speak louder when we are not heard, be bigger and brighter when we are not seen. Science demands dissemination; activism demands justice. When our research reveals violence, these demands are one and the same, both declaring truth, both compelling liberation.

Harnessing, continued on next page
Reflections on Weaving 40 Years of Feminist History into a 52-minute Film

by Sonia De La Cruz, Adjunct Instructor
UO School of Journalism and Communication

The documentary Agents of Change: A Legacy of Feminist Research, Teaching and Activism at the University of Oregon (2013) recounts the struggles of women scholars, students, and leaders who fought to institute the Center for the Study of Women in Society (CSWS) on campus. This intricate story is told in the voices and from the perspective of the individuals who over the last forty years have been involved with CSWS—and whose commitment to equality helped broaden the dominant narrative of scholarship into a more diverse and inclusive vision of knowledge and education, including the establishment of the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies, as well as interdisciplinary feminist research and interest groups, numerous conferences, and feminist activities at UO.

Piecing together the story of a center that has been in existence for over four decades was not an easy undertaking. For that reason, this documentary was made in the spirit of collaboration, where during the pre-production of the film, CSWS leadership and staff helped identify key individuals, stories, and events important to the history of the center. One such person whose story was crucial to address was Jane Grant, a writer and journalist who cofounded The New Yorker magazine, and in whose name husband William Harris committed a posthumous endowment that made it possible to formally establish and institutionalize CSWS at UO. Other key figures interviewed for the film included some of the founders of the center, faculty members who contributed to and led the center over the years, and graduate students who received grants from CSWS to expand their research. In addition to the interviews, a good deal of archival research of video, photographs, newspaper articles, and other documentation was also carried out to piece together the history of the center.

The production of the film, that is, developing a storyline, as well as filming and conducting the interviews, was a joint effort between Gabriela Martínez and me. We shared the responsibility of producing the film and as coproducers had many discussions about the narrative and overall aesthetic of the film, which included making the decision to construct the story across a historical timeline to highlight some of the struggles and hard work and dedication of women in academia, perhaps motivating future generations of women scholars and leaders. To me, this film serves as recognition to the many advancements of women in society; but it also meant creating visual bridges to move the narrative of the film across time, and collaborating with the CSWS leadership and staff to more clearly understand the personal and collective perspectives that were part of establishing and growing CSWS.

I spent a few months editing the film into a manageable and time-sensitive rough cut that was later screened for feedback to some of those involved in the project. After the viewing of the rough cut, I spent a few more months cutting the film into a final 52-minute piece for public screening at the CSWS 40th Anniversary Celebration. From start to finish, the documentary took about fourteen months to complete.

On a personal note, the collaborative process of making the film was a truly enriching experience. Having the support and participation of the CSWS leadership and staff, which allowed us to speak with and attain direct feedback from those individuals who have been and continue to be involved with the center, helped me to clearly understand the history of the center and to connect more deeply with the project. Also, as a woman of color and as filmmaker coproducing and editing the documentary, I appreciated working on a film that allowed me to hear and learn from women who are game changers—and who continue to forge a better path for future generations of women scholars and leaders. To me, this film serves as recognition to the many advancements of women in society; but at the same time, it is also a sobering reminder that there still remains much to be done in the pursuit of feminist ideals, within and outside of academia. It is my hope that this documentary offers an insight into the hard work and dedication of women in academia, perhaps motivating future generations of women to be agents of change.

—Sonia De La Cruz finished her PhD in June 2014 and now teaches as an adjunct instructor in the UO School of Journalism and Communication.
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Médium, democracy, and the construction of collective memory

A conversation with Gabriela Martínez

by Alice Evans, CSWS Dissemination Specialist

CSWS last interviewed Gabriela Martinez for the Annual Review in summer 2012, when she was the incoming associate director of CSWS. Now entering her third and final year as associate director, Martinez talks about her research, documentary filmmaking, and teaching; her tenure at CSWS; and her upcoming year as a resident scholar at the Wayne Morse Center for Law and Politics.

Q: You’ve been the CSWS associate director for two years. What has your role been, and what will it be in the coming year as you fulfill your appointment as resident scholar at the Wayne Morse Center for Law and Politics?

GM: My main administrative role was overseeing the administrative process for internal research grants for faculty and staff, for the Jane Grant Dissertation Fellowship for PhD students, and for general research grants for other graduate students. Gearing up for the CSWS 40th Anniversary Celebration, I coproduced and directed the documentary Agents of Change: A Legacy of Feminist Research, Teaching, and Activism at UO and oversaw the research for its production. I also conducted most of the interviews, along with Sonia De La Cruz, the coproducer. In addition, Jamie Lay assisted me initially.

I have also headed up the Women of Color Project for two years, for which I was one of the founding members. During those two years we’ve focused on issues of tenure and promotion, and on strengthening our research and academic writing for publications. We have sponsored tenure and promotion and writing workshops for group members.

Another thing I did was to serve as a sounding board for conversations that came up on a regular basis, such as for the organization of the 40th anniversary celebration, which was a huge task that involved everybody at CSWS. But also for issues that always come up, that are not part of either the director’s job or my job, but which we have to deal with because CSWS is an important research center, to which many in the campus community come for support.

My continuation as associate director is a little bit unusual. However, I was asked to stay one more year to help with the transition of directors. I have some institutional memory that may ease the transition, given that I was a board member for several years before becoming associate director. I will continue doing the things that I have been doing as associate director. I don’t see any major shift in terms of my overall role in working for CSWS.

Q: CSWS has a new director, Michael Hames-García. How do you see yourself collaborating with his goals as director of CSWS? How do you see CSWS changing under Michael’s directorship?

GM: I haven’t worked with Michael before, but we have a collegial relationship from participating together on other groups or boards, such as the Center for Latino/ Latina and Latin American Studies. I have no doubt that we will work well together. We have similar interests in terms of our research and our political views about the world and society. We also share a vision of making the center and the university more engaged internationally, in terms of women’s and gender issues.

I think Michael is going to build on what CSWS has already been doing, and he will add, perhaps, new research areas or ways of attracting new research. One area that he may want to strengthen in the center could be the study of race and class in conjunction or relationship with gender and women’s issues. Based on preliminary conversations with him, I think that he’s going to push more in terms of these intersectionalities for CSWS’s research agenda and for the grants that CSWS gives out. Also, the vision of promoting more international research is another area where I see him adding to what we already do.

Q: Have you enjoyed your time working with outgoing director Carol Stabile? Has the associate directorship been fruitful for you in particular ways?

GM: Absolutely. It’s been a real treat to work with Carol. I learned a great deal from her as a colleague, as a researcher, and also as a director in terms of administration. She’s been an outstanding director. I learned from the way she managed the center, and from how she relates to the staff and to the wider campus community. My two years at CSWS have provided me with a good sense of what a research center is and should be, and how to run one.

Q: Do you see yourself, past your one remaining year as associate director, in an administrative role as part of your professional future?

GM: I have contemplated the idea, and I think that it’s a possibility. But I have to consider how much I love teaching and doing my research and creative work, and how much the administrative work takes—it zaps your time. Currently, in addition to being associate director at CSWS, I am serving as director of the School of Journalism and Communication’s Professional Journalism Master’s Program, something I took on this academic year. I like doing some administrative work, but I also know that I still need to keep learning.

Q: Does your appointment as resident scholar free you from other UO duties, such as teaching duties in SOJC?

GM: Yes. Next academic year I’m teaching two classes in the fall. Basically the mix of my administrative roles and the Wayne Morse Center fellowship are freeing me from teaching the rest of the year. In the fall I will be connected to the Wayne Morse Center and preparing for my research. After I finish teaching in the fall, I will focus the rest of the year on my research and writing, while in residence at the Wayne Morse Center. In addition, I will be planning a symposium for a day at the Wayne Morse Center around the theme of Media and Democracy, which is the center’s theme for the year.

Q: Your particular project for which you were given this residency—“Media, Democracy and the Construction of Collective Memory”—focuses on “how media shape collective...
mats. I published a book on political economy informs my research as well. I know that many documentary work, and my documentary work the other. I do a great deal of research for my stant dialogue, and that one doesn’t exclude my research and creative work are in con-
tity depend on each other. I like to say that

Q: As a documentary filmmaker and a teacher, does this research project take you away from your documentary work?

GM: No, not at all. My research and creativ-
ity depend on each other. I like to say that
my creative work and my research are in constant dialogue. One doesn’t exclude the other. “One thing to understand about my work is that my research informs much of my creative work, and my creative work informs my research. I always like to say that my creative work and my research are in constant dialogue. One doesn’t exclude the other.” — Gabriela Martinez

Q: Would you elaborate on what you were doing in these three locations?

GM: In Oaxaca, Mexico, I produced the document-
tary Women, Media, and Rebellion in Oaxaca (available on the CSWS website). It tells the story of a media takeover that changed the nature of politics, and how we understand media, social movements, and in particular the role of women in both media and social movements. Following a teacher’s strike in Oaxaca, Mexico, in August 2006, about a thousand women or more marched to the installations of COR-TV, taking over the stations to voice their political, social, economic, and cultural concerns while also calling for the resignation of the state’s governor. Those involved in the events speak for themselves. Issues of justice, globalization, women’s rights, and human rights violations converge at the core of a social uprising, in which media becomes an important site for the struggle.

During the production of this documentary and afterwards I have been conducting research in Oaxaca on topics related to women, media, social movements, and the development of collective memory related to what is now a contemporory historical moment that took place almost a decade ago in 2006.

In Guatemala, I produced the documentary Keep Your Eyes On Guatemala (RT 54 min.), which tells the story of Guatemala’s National Policie Historical Archive (Archivo Histórico de la Policía Nacional—AHPN) intertwined with narratives of past human rights abuses and the dramatic effects they had on specific individu-
als and the nation as a whole. This documentary highlights present-day efforts to preserve collec-
tive memories and bring justice and reconciliation to the country. Similarly to the case of Oaxaca, I have been conducting research on this subject during the production of the document-
tary and also afterwards.

In Peru, I’ve been looking at the use of jour-
nalistic photography from the wartime (1980-
2000) and probing how journalistic photography travels over time between its original infor-
mational purpose to become evidence in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and ulti-
ately items of collective memory permanently displayed as museum photographic pieces. I haven’t yet done a documentary about this, but I’m thinking of doing so at some point in the future. Then, I would have a trilogy covering these three different, but at the same time similar, countries that have experienced in contemporary times serious social and political struggles and now are grappling with issues of historical or collective memories.

Q: You described your book about Telefónica as being about the “political economy” of telecommunications. You use that term again in talking about the research you will be working on at the Wayne Morse Center—the “political econ-
omy of memory.” Could you explain that term?

GM: Political economy studies the relationship between institutions or social structures with political and economic issues that affect these institutions or social structures. It studies how they are built and how they may (or may not) influence society. For example, my work on Telefónica, a Spanish global telecom, is based on political economy. I looked at the historical development, geographical expansion, and eco-

memories, and what it means to ‘construct’ collective/historical memory through media.”

You plan to examine how media production
can address human rights violations, promote social change and strengthen democratic process. Is this research going to result in a written project?

GM: I’m planning to write a book on the political economy of memory, and what I will be working on at the Wayne Morse Center is part of this book. I am hoping to, at least, develop a couple of chapters, if not more, during my residency there.

Q: As a documentary filmmaker and a teacher, does this research project take you away from your documentary work?

GM: No, not at all. My research and creativ-
ity depend on each other. I like to say that
my creative work and my research are in constant dialogue. One doesn’t exclude the other. “One thing to understand about my work is that my research informs much of my creative work, and my creative work informs my research. I always like to say that my creative work and my research are in constant dialogue. One doesn’t exclude the other.” — Gabriela Martinez

Q: What does it mean to you to be selected as a resident scholar at the Wayne Morse Center?

GM: This is an important center for the study of law and politics. By way of selecting themes, it goes beyond law and politics, promoting the intersection of interdisciplinary work and reaching to various other fields. For somebody like me who works in journalism and documentary-making, working with scholars from other fields and at a place dealing with law and politics is of great interest. The Wayne Morse Center is well recognized on our campus and across the country; this fact can only add positive things to my career. I’m very thankful and honored to be included among such fine colleagues and predecessors who have held this residency. [Interview]

—Alice Evans, CSWS research dissemination specialist and CSWS Annual Review editor, interviewed Gabriela Martínez in June 2014.
The landscape of Southeast Turkey today looks starkly different than it did fifteen years ago. From 1984 to 1999, much of the Southeast region was caught up in a civil war between the Kurdish-separatist group the PKK and the Turkish military. Approximately 4,000 villages were burned, 40,000 people killed, and approximately 900,000–4 million individuals displaced (numbers vary depending on the source).

In 2002, a new government, the Justice and Development Party, came to office and implemented a series of reforms focused on socioeconomic and gendered development—over and alongside military intervention. This shift in government policy has significantly reshaped the role of the state in the lives of Kurdish residents.

Women are emerging as the primary targets in development efforts, tasked with translating political and social knowledge to their homes and communities. In migrant neighborhoods in the urban Southeast, women’s education centers—offering Turkish literacy, citizenship, and family planning classes—are the most visible face of the state and a central point of contact between displaced families and the government. The impact of these programs is significant, altering where and how families access resources, ideas about family size and character, and ultimately the practices of how family members care for one another.

“Women are emerging as the primary targets in development efforts, tasked with translating political and social knowledge to their homes and communities.”

In spite of declared efforts to socially secure Kurdish women, past fieldwork indicates that development efforts have disrupted family relations in ways that leave women more vulnerable to gendered violence in the home and judicial system. In Southeast Turkey, development interventions are shaped by a set of liberal economic and cultural values that do not always align with local values of family, Islam, and care that have historically served as mechanisms of social security. My research project examines how gendered development programs geared toward democracy and citizenship building intersect with ideas about community, family, and care.

With a CSWS Faculty Research Grant, I conducted preliminary field research in Southeast Turkey in summer 2013 with my research partner, Saadet Altay, a doctoral student in Diyarbakir. Our main goal was to understand the day-to-day geography of security among women. In other words, how are feelings of security and insecurity felt across and between different spaces (the classroom, the home, the courtroom, and so on)? To address this question, we administered a mental mapping and focus group activity that asked women to draw maps of their daily movements around the neighborhood and city and to discuss the spaces identified. Conversations addressed issues of urban mobility, family life, development impacts, and meanings of security. Out of this work, we realized that it is young women aged eighteen to thirty who most intensely experience the tensions between family expectations and state modernization efforts, and our future work will focus more specifically on this group.

Broadly, our work addresses tensions between secularism and Islam. Rather than focus on government policy, however, we examine how political life and religion are exercised and debated in the daily operation of family and work.

―Jessie Clark, PhD, is an instructor and adviser in the UO Department of Geography.
The BiSciFi Project: Researching Speculative Fictions and Bisexual Lives

CSWS Jane Grant Fellowship winner seeks “to achieve a more complex recognition and understanding of multsexual lives.”

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

As a PhD candidate, my research has resulted in part from frustrations I have felt with the lack of serious treatment given to bisexuality as a position from which to theorize sexual knowledge within humanistic scholarship. While studies of gay, lesbian, and transgender communities and cultural production have dramatically increased over the past two decades, research on bisexuality remains highly undervalued in much of the humanities and social sciences.

This situation led to a “formative moment” early in my English/Folklore program. While I embraced queer theorizing and reading practices in graduate coursework, I kept bumping into a noticeable absence of bisexuality and bisexuals in the majority of the research I was introduced to. I felt both excited by queer perspectives and perplexed by their failures to address my own standpoint as a bisexual woman. Then one day in class, we discussed a study on “straight” women in gay and lesbian spaces—only the researchers, it appeared, had not bothered to ask any of the “straight” interlopers if they identified as something else. When no one else seemed to notice this issue, I finally blurted out, “Where are all the fucking bisexuals?”

I began conducting interdisciplinary research under an umbrella I call “The BiSciFi Project.” Unlike more traditional humanities scholarship, half of this research involves ethnographic fieldwork conducted in Philadelphia and Minneapolis in communities where bisexual and science fiction fan identities overlap. My purpose is to challenge the dearth of research on bisexuality in humanities fields and to demonstrate the untapped potential of bisexuality studies across academic disciplines.

The BiSciFi Project combines methodologies from literary studies, queer cultural studies, and folklore to explore multiple aspects of bisexuality and its representations in non-realistic or “speculative” literature and television. Imagining alternatives to “normal” human life is what speculative fiction does best, making it an ideal site for exploring bisexuality and its representations in non-realistic or “speculative” literature. Archival research of a 1980s bisexual fanzine, cultural analysis of contemporary genre television shows, and ethnographic research with bisexual identified speculative fiction fans in multiple settings. So far, the project has yielded several national conference presentations, two published articles, and my PhD dissertation-in-progress, “Speculative Fictions, Bisexual Lives: Changing Frameworks of Sexual Desire.”

The dissertation is concerned with bisexuality on three cultural levels—bisexual identity and community, bisexual representation and interpretation, and bisexuality as a category of knowledge. On the level of group identity, I am not so much interested in understanding how bisexuality is defined by individuals but rather why some people choose to self-identify as bisexual rather than (or in addition to) queer, pansexual, fluid, genderqueer, or other terms that resist binary categorization or refuse them outright. I’m interested in how this self-definition helps some people to understand their social and cultural experiences and to find communities. Moreover, I’m interested in how non-realistic or “speculative” fiction genres may have contributed to some bisexual people’s experiences of group identity and community.

The connection to speculative fiction brings me to the second cultural level—bisexual representation. Here the issue I am interested in is how we “read” and interpret images of non-binary sexual desire in cultural production. In other words, what does bisexuality look like? The question isn’t as straightforward as it may seem since in the United States our cultural codes for “knowing” the sexual orientation of another are directly linked to binary gender categories. We assume straight, gay, or lesbian sexual orientations by the gender of one’s partner in relationship, but non-monosexual people don’t neatly line up with this coding for a person’s “real” sexual orientation. So again, speculative fiction plays a role by representing that which doesn’t seem to “exist” within a particular socio-historical moment. It helps us to imagine what dissident, queer, non-binary sexualities might look like—a critically important function for self-identified bisexuals seeking validation and community.

I’ve already touched on the third level because it is impossible to extricate from the other two—bisexuality as a category of knowledge in U.S. culture. This epistemic level governs what can or can’t be “known” about bisexuality and is utterly conflicted over what bisexuality is, what it looks like, who counts as bisexual or not, or whether it is even real. Since bisexual first appeared in late nineteenth century medical and sexological debates, the term has accumulated a cargo hold of pathological baggage that was later retooled with Stonewall and gay liberation, rejected by lesbian separatists, demonized during the AIDS crisis, and ignored in the remaking of gay marriage as the poster child of homonormativity. Reverberations of these discourses have passed through cultural representations of bisexuality as an evolutionary or developmental phase, a utopian ideal, a lavender menace, a typhoid Mary, a ratings booster, and as a letter in an acronym that remains stubbornly invisible. As a lived identity and experience, bisexuality remains outside the dominant framework used to organize sexual knowledge in U.S. culture—heterosexuality and homosexuality.

“Speculative Fictions, Bisexual Lives” asks how these gender-linked binary categories affect cultural understandings of bisexuality, and how some bisexuals use non-realistic or “speculative” fiction to help negotiate oppressive cultural norms and assumptions in the lived world. At the heart of these lines of inquiry is “Changing Frameworks of Sexual Desire,” or the idea that the “both-and” logic upon which bisexuality is structured may be a key to reframing the “either-or” logic that now dominates categories of sexual knowledge. To achieve a more complex recognition and understanding of multisexuality, I propose dimensional sexuality as an alternative hermeneutic model and framework for analysis. My thesis argues that we must shift away from sexual “knowing” that is singular, static, exclusive, and oppositional to that which is multiple, temporal, relational, and indeterminate. Dimensional sexuality helps to facilitate this shift by providing a new method of interpretive analysis for humanities scholarship as well as a flexible analytical model for social science research.

—Jenée Wilde is the 2014-15 Jane Grant Dissertation Award recipient from the Center for the Study of Women in Society. More information on her research can be found at jeneewilde.com or at The BiSciFi Project on Facebook.
IDENTITY, CULTURE, AND COMMUNICATION: LGBTQ Youth and Digital Media

by Erica Ciszek, PhD candidate, UO School of Journalism and Communication

In winter 2013, I spent five days in Atlanta at the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force’s 25th annual Creating Change conference, the largest LGBT activist and advocacy conference in the United States. I was in attendance with more than 3,000 LGBT activists and advocates. Over the course of five days, I had the opportunity to attend more than 250 workshops and caucus sessions, four keynote plenary sessions, meetings, receptions, and social events. I was surrounded by community organizers, outreach volunteers, lobbyists, and activists who have been working on behalf of LGBT rights for more than thirty years—people who have devoted their entire personal and professional lives to doing this work and building and sustaining momentum for the movement.

Since 1988, the conference has been a space for activists to gather for skill building, community building, and to build political power from the ground up. The executive director of the task force, Rea Carey, noted, “We are living in a watershed moment for LGBT equality in America” because of “25 years of mobilizing, strategizing...celebrating our right to love and be ourselves” (Creating Change Program, 2013). In the opening statements to the conference and in the first few pages of the program, the movement’s dedication to legislative action is apparent. The issues on the agenda that year included the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, the repeal of the Defense of Marriage Act, the Uniting American Families Act, the Student Non-Discrimination Act, immigration reform, protections for reproductive rights, economic security, and combating HIV/AIDS.

Other concerns addressed by advocates and activists included issues facing LGBT youth. Recently, bullying has come to the forefront of public attention as a result of the suicides of a number of teens and young adults believed to have been victims of anti-gay bullying. In an opening letter to the 2010 Creating Change conference, Carey wrote:

Let us not forget the tragic losses we have faced this year—and in past years—in the suicides caused by violent harassment faced by our community’s young people. Our nation is facing a serious epidemic that must be faced by our schools and administrators. Our elected officials must act promptly on federal legislation aimed to protect LGBT students from harassment. (p. 7)

Through strategic outreach campaigns, advocacy organizations have been increasingly responding to the needs of LGBT youth. The issues of bullying and suicide continue to be at the forefront of activists’ agendas on local, regional, and national levels.

During a conference panel on safe schools and LGBT youth, Allison Gill, the Government Affairs Director for The Trevor Project—the leading national nonprofit organization providing crisis intervention and suicide prevention services to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning youth—articulated the need for more research and data on issues pertaining to LGBT youth. My dissertation is a direct response to that call.

As a communication practitioner, I have worked with theories and models and statistical data to provide strategic insights to clients. I had come to believe that having a strategic plan for researching/implementing/evaluating communication is necessary for effective communication. However, over the past four years, I have sat with piles of qualitative data and now have interviewed twenty-four teens and six adults. Meaning-making around identity cannot be reduced to statistical models in which every participant is a data point and those who do not fit the norm are seen as “outliers.” Herein lies the struggle: how do I empower LGBT people and stay true to my queer feminist ideals that every participant’s position is unique and important, but also stay true to my roots as a communicator who understands the need for strategy, planning, and order as well as the realities of working for an organization with resource limitations and intersecting interests?

Similarly, organizational members experience the same issues with balancing their roles as strategic communicators and members of the LGBT movement. In the face of youth suicide, the organization was born out of an eight-minute YouTube video by Dan Savage and Terry Miller, delivering a message of hope to LGBT young people. Hope has allowed the message to reach mass audiences who adopt and adapt the message in different ways. Hope made possible the widespread accessibility and buy-in from a variety of stakeholders, many from the very institutions that the project was critiquing.

The It Gets Better Project faces an identity crisis of its own: can it stay true to its roots as a lifeline for young people while simultaneously partnering with mainstream organizations? Can it challenge cultural inequalities and bring about social change while advocating for acceptance into social and economic institutions that benefit some but not others? The project seems as if it may have outgrown itself, needing human and financial resources that require a strategic shift. The project struggles with its own fate, never originally aiming to be a nonprofit organization, simply a message of hope. In order to sustain its efforts, the organization needs the support of funders who rely on metrics. But the beauty and curse of hope is its ambiguity: everyone can relate to hope, but no one can agree on a way to define and measure it.

Flashback to 2013, the Creating Change conference in Atlanta. I am sitting in the crowd, among hundreds of LGBT activists, wondering what could be done to address the bullying and suicide epidemics plaguing our young people. What I have learned since that time is that instead of assuming we know the issues facing young people today, we should be talking to young people in the places they frequent, both on and offline, about their lives and experiences. They share many concerns with those of the more established LGBT movement, but they bring forth new and relevant issues that resonate with their day-to-day lives. LGBT young people are much more than a single demographic, and campaigns, to be effective, must embrace the multiplicity of their identities.

I am grateful to the funders of CSWS for supporting my research with a graduate student research grant.

Erica Ciszek is a doctoral candidate at UO’s School of Journalism and Communication. A New England native, she worked in Boston as a strategic analyst for Mullen Advertising and Public Relations. She also has worked in market research and has contributed to LGBT newspapers and magazines in New England.
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Q: How does it feel to be selected as the first winner of the Le Guin Feminist Science Fiction Fellowship?

KA: It is the best honor I've had in my academic career by far. Having left academia after I finished my degree in 2010, I didn't really think that I'd have the same kind of opportunities to keep going with my research. But if I did, it was going to be out of pocket, which wasn't going to happen for a long time. The fact that the committee chose someone who identifies as an independent scholar was astounding to me.

Q: You're doing research in UO Special Collections and University Archives. What materials are you exploring? How do you know where to look?

KA: I'm going through Ursula K. Le Guin's papers at my beginning. Most start in the late '60s. I'm capping off discussion around '74–'75, because there needs to be a cap somewhere, unless it's with another feminist author like Joanna Russ. I'm interested in Joanna Russ and Sally Miller Gearhart and their correspondences with other writers. And if I have time, Suzette Haden Elgin. That's my main focus right now.

The Le Guin collection is massive, with 250 boxes of information. All the archivists have containers to look at. I started with Le Guin's letters to her agent, Virginia Kidd. I think it was nine boxes, and I made it through about one and a quarter in a day and a half, and that was only from about 1968 to 1973. The amount of material is overwhelming, and it has required self-discipline not to keep reading stuff that is interesting but not necessarily what I am here for.

When I first conceived the project I thought I'd look at manuscript notes. But that's not going to happen. I'm probably going to spend the most time in Le Guin's archive, because she was a prolific letter writer. She must have been writing up to ten letters a day sometimes. They're not like, "Hey, it's raining." They're philosophical, political conversations that are really engaging. I'm looking at correspondences, mostly, among the writerly community. And fan letters. I want to look at Le Guin's fan letters.

There's no sign in any of the material that says, "Here, this is the research you want." It requires me to skim many letters, be as strict as I can with myself not to go down what one of the archivists called yesterday a rabbit hole, where I'm just fan-girling. It's quite a challenge because it's my first time doing archival research. I was prepared for the non-linear nature, but it's still another thing to actually keep to a focus. I've been writing reflection notes every morning from what I had looked at the previous day. Those help remind me of the most significant things I've discovered, but also help me work out my feelings around the ethical implications of talking about a person's experience. I'm basically trying to download and archive for myself as much information as possible and not worry about synthesizing that information until later, because it's not possible.

Q: The title of your research project is "The Other Lives'—Locating Dis/Ability in Utopian Feminist Science Fiction." What are the goals of your research? What are some of the challenges?

KA: I'm reading with two different goals, which is part of the challenge with my project. The first overarching goal is to read with disability studies in mind. That means I'm reading for any kind of conversation with the awareness of bodily difference, whether it's cognitive or physical—where there's advocacy and discussion about, "We need to start including people with disabilities." One challenge with that line of inquiry is that the writers talk about their personal ailments. I don't necessarily record these, because I don't feel like it's ethically responsible, for example, to write, "Oh, by the way, in 1971, this person was suffering from this ailment." But I do pick up on conversations where, say, they're talking about Phillip K. Dick and his kind of situation with mental illness. That's something that is interesting because it's reflected in his work.

And the other, secondary aspect that I'm reading for are conversations around utopia. Much of the conversation Le Guin is having with people when she's writing The Dispossessed focused on what a feminist utopia looks like. I found excellent conversational threads with her and Joanna Russ. And this morning I'm going to return to a philosophical conversation that Le Guin is having with Darko Suvin, the great SF theorist.

Q: What inspired you to do research at the intersection of disability and science fiction?

KA: Personal experience was one factor. I became quite ill during the second year of my dissertation. I realized that the project I had then was not speaking to me. I changed supervisors, and I started focusing on science fiction. Star Trek, actually, was a big inspiration. I thought, "What's going on here with all these cures and these weird things about who gets to be gendered in what ways just because they are aliens dealing with technology?" I started getting excited. Then my committee began giving me materials dealing with feminist theorization of embodiment and the vulnerable body. I began reading people like Margrit Shildrick and Rosemary Garland Thomson. I thought, "Wow, this is amazing."

My PhD ended up being on feminist post-cyberpunk. It was definitely a feminist project, and I was reading for the idea of the vulnerable body. I was starting to look at disability studies, and there was nothing really published about reading disability and science fiction, which

"THE OTHER LIVES”—LOCATING DIS/ABILITY IN UTOPIAN FEMINIST SCIENCE FICTION

by Alice Evans, CSWS Dissemination Specialist

CSWS interviewed Kathryn Allan, inaugural winner of the Le Guin Feminist Science Fiction Fellowship, during her CSWS-supported visit to do research at the UO Libraries Special Collections and University Archives. Allan immersed herself in the archives, reading the letters of Ursula K. Le Guin, Joanna Russ, and other feminist science fiction authors, seeking out conversations about disability and utopia, and delighting in her discoveries.
Interview, continued from previous page

is quite shocking. There was an article maybe here and there, but an absence of that discussion within science fiction studies.

When I finished my conclusion to my dissertation in 2010, I figured, this is a gap that somebody needs to address. That really resonated with me, and I thought, I cannot wait for somebody else to do it. When you’re in the academy, there’s a lot of pressure on you to do something marketable, or something that’s going to get you funding. Because of the marginalization of disability studies and science fiction studies, I knew it would take a long time for those two things to come together. In disability studies, while there is some science fiction or genre text studied, academics are still looking at what would be considered high literature. That propelled me into doing it on my own. I still wanted to be a researcher; I went to graduate school for seven years, and I feel strongly about maintaining that part of my life. That led me to put out a call for papers to do a disability and science fiction collection of essays, which ended up in a project called Disability in Science Fiction: Representations of Technology as Cure, published by Palgrave Macmillan in 2013. That’s really the first book-length work that is investigating disability in science fiction.

Fans that I’ve met were really supportive of me in the early days before I got anything going. I went to a Worldcon [World Science Fiction Convention] in Reno, and told people, “Hey I’m thinking about doing a collection on disability and science fiction.” People were telling me, “Do it.” I’ve had a lot of support from the fans, and from actual science fiction writers, and from various academics. I found a community while doing this work.

I knew that my next task, after an essay collection, would be to write a book on my own. And why not? We should set challenges for ourselves. People are excited about thinking about disability, since they haven’t really been in the academic science fiction community.

Q: Why is feminist utopian science fiction important to your current book project?

KA: I came to science fiction kind of late. I literally started reading science fiction when I was changing my project in my second year of my PhD to science fiction. When I was reading the feminist utopias, things like The Dispossessed or Sally Miller Gearhart’s The Wonderground, those were really the first works where I was seeing disability, or disabled characters, being taken up in a way that is not necessarily to cure them, or to erase them. I’m thinking of Octavia Butler’s Kindred as well; that story starts with a woman losing her arm. The way in which disability was taken up in those books in that period of literature, which is so invested in talking about sexuality, and talking about gender, there was already that idea of a spectrum of ability. In utopian SF there’s a growing awareness that all people need to be included, without this idea of being forced into, “This is what is normal.” That’s part of what impelled me to propose this project.

For the book that I am working on, I plan to do a survey about disability and the idea of temporality and cure, in terms of, “Do we have a future that is utopic because there is no more disability, or do we have a dystopia because it is rampant?” Of course, disability is socially constructed, so it can be anything. Maybe blue eyes in the future will mark you as being other and undesirable. There’s something going on in the ’70s, and to some extent in the early ’80s, with the works of Marge Piercy, where these kind of conversations are coming up. That’s what I’m really interested in, seeing if I can find the awareness that the body suffers, and that it differs in multiple ways. A lot of this is ignored in masculine-driven SF, where if a body suffers, it’s because that person is evil, or they deserved it from some kind of moral wrong-doing. Or they are kind of a monstrous thing that needs to be cured. There are not a lot of positive depictions. When I’m reading feminist utopian SF from that era it doesn’t seem to be quite as much. There is of course genetic engineering, but the possibility of a more productive and positive discussion of disabled embodiments is coming to the forefront.

Q: How do you think the Le Guin award will make a difference in your research project?

KA: It’s going to definitely inform an article, maybe several articles, and it’s basically helping support me write the monograph that I have planned, and honestly, it’s probably going to help me in ways I haven’t conceived of yet. I haven’t had time to synthesize it. But I know that being awarded as the inaugural Le Guin Fellowship winner has made me far more popular at conferences. As an independent scholar I don’t have a university affiliation. And sometimes in the academic community when people just see an independent scholar, they’re like, “uhh...” There are more conversations that I am able to have with people. I think it’s going to open up opportunities in the future and that it’s an honor that will last, not just something useful only in 2013-2014, but something that is going to be useful in my life as an academic, or, as a scholar. Kind of a nice feather in my cap, so to speak.

Q: Would it have changed your book quite a bit to have not been able to come?

KA: It would be a different book. Even now there’s so much background that I know about the writers. How can you really ignore all this personal experience that I’ve been reading? It’s impossible. It’s going to definitely change and inflect the way I write about The Wonderground, or the way I write about The Dispossessed. The book still would have happened, but it would not be the same book. I wouldn’t have had the same opportunity to write different kinds of articles and write on my blog.

I have a bunch of places where I want to disseminate this information. I want to let people know that the fellowship is there; not only to apply for it, but I hope that people will put money into it, to sustain it, because I want to be able to give back. I’m on Twitter as my social media outlet. My followers are about half academics and half people who are involved in the science fiction community, which is its own thing. I’ve been trying to advocate through there. I’ve been tweeting this whole time. In the morning and afternoon I send out some tweets, just about the research in general, not about my
DISCOVERING THE OTHER LIVES
Researching in the Feminist Science Fiction Archives

by Kathryn Allan, PhD, 2013 Le Guin Feminist Science Fiction Fellowship awardee

It is an honor to be the inaugural recipient of the Le Guin Feminist Science Fiction Fellowship. Announced during the Sally Miller Gearhart “Worlds Beyond World” Utopian Feminist Science Fiction symposium last November, the fellowship enabled me to spend ten full days researching the archived collections of Ursula K. Le Guin, Joanna Russ, Suzette Haden Elgin, and Sally Miller Gearhart. My goal was to read with disability studies in mind, with secondary interests in feminist politics and utopian SF. I was privy to the often intimate thoughts of these women, and also to those on the other side of the letters (James Tiptree, Jr., Virginia Kidd, Philip K. Dick, Samuel Delany, and Marge Piercy were particularly engaging correspondents). I feel that I’ve met many of the luminaries of science fiction through their personal correspondences detailing her motivations behind writing. These archived letters tell the story of what it was like to be a woman, and a feminist, writing in a genre dominated by men and sexist politics. After ten days of researching, my head was filled with the dynamic and inspiring lives of these writers.

Due to the depth and complexity of the material collected, the feminist SF archive holds a great deal of interest for scholars from a wide variety of disciplines. Linguists will find a treasure trove in Elgin’s archive: there are files full of her careful documentation of Láadan, the women’s language she created and included in her Native Tongue trilogy. Fan studies scholars will be particularly interested in exploring the many hundreds of fan letters (from adults and children alike) in Le Guin’s archive that span her entire writing career. Gearhart’s collection will appeal to anybody studying the gay and lesbian rights movement of the 1970s. Not only does her archive include personal correspondences detailing her motivation behind writing The Wandering Girl, there is a variety of material that documents how rights activists organized in a pre-Internet era. For anyone wanting to better understand the fecundity of the feminist SF classic, The Female Man, Russ’s archived letters are a biographer’s dream: full of sharp political commentary, critical literary analysis, intense self-reflection, and motivating lessons in how to be a Feminist.

Through my fellowship research, I have grown as both a scholar and a feminist. In the lives of these brilliant women—Le Guin, Russ, Gearhart, and Elgin—I found a kinship of passion and persistence. No matter what personal or professional challenges they faced (and there were many), none of them gave up advocating for the betterment of other people’s lives. We can see their dedication through the stories they tell of fantastic and alien worlds where other communities of belonging are possible. I would like to thank the Le Guin Feminist Science Fiction Fellowship and its sponsors (Center for the Study of Women in Society, Robert D. Clark Honors College, and UO Libraries Special Collections and University Archives) for providing me with this amazing research opportunity.

—An independent scholar of feminist science fiction, cyberpunk, and disability studies, Kathryn Allan runs Academic Editing Canada and is editor of the interdisciplinary collection Disability in Science Fiction: Representations of Technology andدعو to me this amazing research opportunity. I say monograph because that’s one way to say a book and make it clear that it’s not a collection. I keep going back and forth about how academic I want to make the voice, because I would really like it to be accessible to fans. When I did the collection on disability and science fiction, I tried to keep it accessible to all readers. If I talk about theoretical concepts, I want to make sure that they’re accessible.

One of the things I’ve been doing in preparation for the trip is reading and rereading texts I haven’t read in disability studies for a few years. I revisited Susan Wendell’s The Rejected Body, which was published in 1996 originally. I read it when I was doing my dissertation studies—but when I was rereading it, just before I came, I was saying, “This is what I need to emulate for my writing voice, if I want people who aren’t trained by the university to read it.” Wendell talks about very difficult concepts of feminist disability theory and embodiment, and it’s so accessible. She’s kind of my road map for language. I definitely want fans, and other people who are interested, to read it. I don’t like inaccessible writing. Theoretical language, I think, can be accessible.

—Alice Evans, CSWS research dissemination specialist and CSWS Annual Review editor, interviewed Kathryn Allan in May 2014.
Highlights from the Academic Year

Grants from CSWS to Fuel Twenty Projects

Nearing more time to finish her doctoral work, Jené Wilde in the UO’s English department was thrilled to learn she is the winner of the Jane Grant Dissertation Fellowship for the 2014-15 academic year. The fellowship, which provides $12,000 and tuition remission, is the top award given each year by the UO’s Center for the Study of Women in Society. In all, twelve graduate students and eight faculty members will get grants totaling $80,000 for research issues related to women and gender.

Jane Grant, for whom the fellowship is named, was the first female news reporter in the New York Times city room and cofounder of the New Yorker and the Lucy Stone League, which sought to help women keep their maiden names after marriage. Her contributions to feminist thought are detailed on a CSWS webpage. After her death in 1972, Grant’s second husband, William Harris, agreed to fund a center, CSWS, at the UO that engaged in research on women and gender studies. Grant’s papers came to the UO in 1976.

“After this year, I no longer will have graduate-teaching fellowship funding, so the Jane Grant Fellowship is crucial to the completion of my degree,” says Wilde, whose dissertation is titled “Speculative Fictions, Bisexual Lives: Changing Frameworks of Sexual Desire.” She will defend her dissertation in Spring 2015.

“While studies of gay, lesbian, and transgender communities and cultural production have dramatically increased over the last two decades, research on bisexuality remains highly undervalued in humanities and a majority of social science disciplines,” she wrote in her grant application.

Eleven other UO graduate students were chosen for grants, which begin at $2,400.

April Lightcap, in the psychology department’s Personal Relationships, Interpersonal Stress, and Mindfulness lab, will use her grant to conduct a randomized controlled study to test the effectiveness of Birth Your Way, which she developed.

“Birth Your Way is a prenatal intervention that aims to increase childbirth satisfaction, reduce postpartum depressive symptoms, and improve psychological flexibility,” says Lightcap, who for a decade has been working with pregnant mothers and their partners in mindfulness-based childbirth practices. “The CSWS award also will allow me to gather critical information to further develop the program and target additional health outcomes in future trials.”

Tongyu Wu, in sociology, will apply her grant toward her doctoral dissertation, which considers “how and why the intersection of race and gender becomes an active part of work culture, labor politics, and productivity and discipline in a professional workplace as different groups of workers draw boundaries toward each other.”

Her framework focuses on racial masculinities of white and Chinese male engineers in a large high-tech company. “The CSWS award is critical to the second phase of my research, which includes completing thirty to forty interviews and a two-month participant observation on the site and a three-month data analysis on campus,” Wu says.

“I have completed the first phase, which involves conducting a three-month ethnography and fourteen interviews, negotiating entrance, and recruiting further participants.”

Among the eight faculty members, who will receive $6,000 each, are Theresa May, associate professor of theater arts, Priscilla Peña Ovalle, associate professor of English, and Sara Hodges, professor of psychology. The CSWS grant to May will allow her to develop the “The Women and Rivers Project,” a community-based theatre initiative by and about regional Native American women and their role in the health of the Northwest’s rivers. The project is an extension of work done in her recently published book Salmon is Everything: A Community-Based Play from the Klamath Watershed.

“This grant allows me to begin a collaborative creative project that explores the relationships—both historic and contemporary—of women in the Pacific Northwest to the many rivers of our region,” May says. “The grant will fund the first step of the project: a residency of a prominent Native theatre artist, Muriel Miguel of Spiderwoman Theatre, who will conduct a workshop with UO students and community, building toward a collaborative theatre piece.”

Ovalle will apply her grant to project called “Media/Hair/Style,” which explores the historical, industrial and cultural function of hair in mainstream media. The project, which will result in a

40TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION: A BRIEF OVERVIEW

When Ursula K. Le Guin took the stage as keynote speaker at the CSWS 40th Anniversary Celebration, it was abundantly clear that this prolific Oregon writer had the gravitas, popularity, and wisdom to represent not only the world of speculative fiction, but the CSWS mission itself: to generate, support, and disseminate research on the complexity of women’s lives and the intersecting nature of gender identities and inequalities. In the realm of literature, and with a professional life spanning many decades, Le Guin’s work exemplifies this mission.

More than a thousand people attended the celebration, which took place November 7 – 9, 2013, at the Erb Memorial Union and featured two days of symposiums in addition to a documentary premiere and a keynote literary address. Held in collaboration with the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies and the ASUO Women’s Center, the celebration highlighted forty years of research, teaching, creativity, and activism on the UO campus.

Opening activities featured the world premiere of Agents of Change, a documentary by Gabriela Martinez and Sonia De La Cruz that chronicles the development of CSWS within the broader context of the women’s movement. The “Women’s Stories, Women’s Lives” Symposium took a decade-by-decade look at feminist issues, featuring a mix of more than twenty scholars, teachers, students, and activists who addressed themes of women’s rights; violence against women; women’s health, activism, and policy; and education and employment. The Sally Miller Gearhart “Worlds Beyond World” Feminist Science Fiction Symposium featured a tribute to its namesake, a feminist scholar, teacher, and writer of utopian science fiction—and was led off by the keynote address from Ursula K. Le Guin, author of The Left Hand of Darkness, The Lathe of Heaven, and other science fiction classics. This evening keynote, followed by a full day of panels, put the spotlight on UO Libraries Special Collections and University Archives, which is home to the most important archive of feminist science fiction authors in the country. In addition to Le Guin and Gearhart, several other authors who participated in panels have papers housed in the archives, including Kate Wilhelm and Molly Gloss. Donor Carla Blumberg provided funding for the Gearhart Symposium.

Keynote: A Conversation with Ursula K. Le Guin—Michael Hames-Garcia, professor of ethnic studies and then-incoming director of CSWS, joined Naomi Wright, Robert D. Clark Honors College student, onstage to moderate a conversation with renowned author Ursula K. Le Guin.
In the midst of a national firestorm over sexual assaults on college campuses, CSWS brought in a series of legal specialists and campus activists to share their experience and expertise in using and interpreting Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 as a means of protecting the civil rights of women on campus.

The keynote Lorwin Lecture took place April 3, delivered by lawyer Wendy Murphy. “How Title IX Finally Won Its Rightful Seat at the Civil Rights Table of Justice—and Why the Legs Are Still So Wobbly” focused on “civil rights violation“ and the overt and covert subjugation of violence against women as something other than a civil rights harm. Murphy, a specialist in the representation of crime victims, women and children, is the author of And Justice For Some: An Exposé of the Lawyers and Judges Who Let Dangerous Criminals Go Free.

When a February snowstorm shut down campus during the first two events of the series, members of the newly formed UO Coalition to Prevent Sexual Violence Research Interest Group were still able to meet with activists and record portions of their planned talks. Although the public was unable to attend due to the closure, Rig members acquired valuable information and inspiration to continue their efforts toward reform.

“Reforming Sexual Violence Prevention at the University of Oregon,” a planned lecture with Caroline Heldman and Danielle Dirks, morphed into a presentation to Rig members and a few others who fought their way through snow and ice to attend. As professors at Occidental College in Los Angeles, Heldman and Dirks have been leaders in the fight to strengthen campus sexual-assault policies and enforcement.

In conjunction with their visit, a teach-in about networking to combat sexual assault on the college campus had been scheduled for Feb. 7 with Andrea L. Pino and Annie Clark. While students at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, they filed a Title IX complaint with the federal government against UNC-Chapel Hill for its handling of sexual assault cases on campus. Clark and Pino, who consult with survivors nationwide to enact change at educational institutions, made it to Eugene despite the snow and participated in the Rig gathering but were unable to lead the teach-in because of the campus closure.

Additional Lorwin Lecture funds were devoted to a collaborative conference, led by graduate students, to create interdisciplinary solutions to gender discrimination. Held April 18, “Academia/Activism: Reimagining Education Without Gender Discrimination“ included the panel “Women’s Experiences of Violence in Higher Education: Considerations for Preventive Intervention,” with Krida Cronister, Leah Heng, Harpreet Bahia, Kelsey South, Anjuli Chitika, Colleen McCarthy, Anna Reichard, Yollanda Valenzuela, and Catherine Woods.


The Lorwin Lectureship on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties is funded by a gift from Val and Madge Lorwin to UO College of Arts and Sciences and School of Law.

Hodges says the CSWS grant is a big boost for a complex study she is launching on why women often interpret some communications—even some comments meant to be encouraging—differently than men in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields as discouraging and lead them to leave STEM educational programs. She is focusing on how female and male undergraduates interpret feedback about their prospects for graduate school.

Women are underrepresented in STEM fields, she says, “almost certainly due to multiple factors such as a lack of role models, unwelcoming environments and a history of discrimination,” Hodges says. “Together, these factors create an environment that makes women uncertain whether they belong in STEM. I hypothesize that this uncertainty negatively affects women’s perceptions of the feedback they receive in STEM, which in turn may lower their intentions to persist in STEM fields, perpetuating women’s underrepresentation.

“The grant is essential to run this study,” she says. “I’ll be using the money largely to pay our research participants. This is not a short survey study. It will require a lot of their time. I’ll also use the funds to pay undergraduate and graduate students to help me collect the data.” —reported by Jim Barlow, Office of Public Affairs Communications, for AroundtheO (published April 2014)


Linda Forrest Receives Lifetime Award
Linda Forrest, professor emeritus, counseling psychology, received the 2014 Award for Lifetime Contributions to Education and Training in Counseling Psychology given by the Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs.

Carol Stabile Receives 2014 ACLS Fellowship
Carol A. Stabile, a professor in the School of Journalism and Communication and the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies, was awarded a prestigious American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) Fellowship for 2014. She was selected as an ACLS Fellow for her book project, “Pink Channels: Women and the Broadcast Blacklist.” Based on archival research on women working in television in the late 1940s and early 1950s, Stabile’s book “examines the forms of employment progressive women were seeking in the new industry, as well as the opposition they faced from anti-communist men and women opposed to viewpoints they considered un-American.” The fellowship provides salary replacement for scholars embarking on six to twelve months of full-time research and writing.

Stabile ended her six-year-term as director of the Center for the Study of Women in Society on June 30, 2014.

Louise Bishop Wins Teaching Award
Louise Bishop, associate professor of literature in the Robert D. Clark Honors College, received a Thomas F. Herman Faculty Achievement Award for Distinguished Teaching. Bishop has been at the UO for more than twenty-four years. “Students and faculty repeatedly note her remarkable breadth of knowledge, infectious enthusiasm for her subject matter, deep care for her students as learners, and the ability to engage them deeply and widely in inquiry and dialogue,” said an article in AroundtheO.

McKinley Selected as Princeton Fellow
Michelle McKinley—an outgoing member of the CSWS Advisory Board—was one of five of a large number of outstanding women who were selected as Princeton University’s 2014 Excellence Award winners. She received the award for her book project, “Colonial Latin America” explores the issues with enslaved women acting as legal actors within the landscape of Hispanic urban slavery in reference to women who are socially disfavored, economically active, and extremely litigious. An associate professor of law, McKinley’s research has been supported in the past by a CSWS Faculty Research Grant.

Frances White, a 2014-15 Williams Fellow
Professor of anthropology and department head Francois White has been designated a Williams Fellow for this year. The fellowship recognizes professors who have demonstrated an extraordinary commitment to undergraduate education by challenging their students academically, creating an engaged learning environment, striving to improve the learning process, and fostering interdepartmental collaboration.

Cecilia Enjuto Rangel Wins Excellence Award
Cecilia Enjuto Rangel, associate professor of Spanish, Romance Languages, was recently named one of three winners of the UO Graduate School’s 2014 Excellence Awards. She was selected for Outstanding Mentorship of Graduate Students and was noted for “providing unique mentorship opportunities to her students by actively bringing academic and artistic events to UO—events that keep her students up to date on scholarly advances and conversations, and provide opportunities to meet influential academics and artists in the field. Student nominators describe her as a challenging, but fair, teacher who fosters a love of culture and literature and expects only the best of her students.” / reported in AroundtheO.

Courtney Thorsson Wins Early Career Award
In March 2014, Courtney Thorsson gave a keynote lecture drawn from her recent book, Women’s Work: Nationalism and Contemporary African American Women’s Novels (Virgina 2013) at the “Radical Historiographies” conference at Rutgers University. In recognition of her scholarship, she received the UO’s Early Career Award from the Office of Research, Innovation and Graduate Education in May 2014.

Marie Vitulli AWM-MAA Falconer Lecturer
UO professor emerita of mathematics Marie A. Vitulli delivered the 2014 AWM-MAA Falconer Lecture at MathFest 2014 in Portland, Oregon, in early August. In making the announcement, the Association for Women in Mathematics (AWM) and the Mathematical Association of America (MAA) noted Vitulli’s original and important contributions to commutative algebra and its interactions with algebraic geometry, her numerous research articles, and book chapters, her lectures presented on her work throughout the United States, Europe, and South Africa, and her tireless work for the advancement of women in mathematics. She created and maintains the award-winning website Women in Math Web Project.

Lisa A. Mazzei Wins “Critics Choice” Book Award
Thinking with Theory in Qualitative Research: Viewing Data Across Multiple Perspectives, (Routledge, 2012) by Alecia Y. Jackson and Lisa A. Mazzei was named a 2013 Critics Choice Book Award Winner by the American Educational Studies Association. Mazzei is an associate professor in the Department of Education Studies and affiliated faculty, Department of Philosophy.

“Distinguished Book” Award: Eileen Otis
Markets and Bodies: Women, Service Work, and the Making of Inequality in China (Stanford University Press, 2011), by Eileen Otis, associate professor of sociology, received the American Sociological Association, Sex and Gender Section, Distinguished Book Award.
CSWS NORTHWEST WOMEN WRITERS SYMPOSIUM

First a research interest group, then a CSWS special project, the Northwest Women Writers Symposium has now been taken into the fold as a central CSWS offering. After hosting 2013 keynote author Ruth Ozeki, whose novel A Tale for the Time Being was shortlisted for the Man Booker Prize for Fiction, CSWS hosted Karen Joy Fowler as keynote in 2014. Her novel We Are All Completely Beside Ourselves was named the 2014 winner of the PEN/Faulkner Fiction Award. The third annual CSWS Northwest Women Writers Symposium: Family, Animal, Story took place May 1–3, 2014, on the UO campus and at Eugene Public Library and was financially supported by CSWS, the Eugene Public Library, Oregon Humanities Center, the Departments of English and Women’s and Gender Studies, and the School of Journalism and Communication. At a Friday night reading that was warmly personal and funny, Karen Joy Fowler delighted her audience by spinning stories about her life, her upbringing, her writing, and the background for We Are All Completely Beside Ourselves, which was made into a movie. Highlights of the three-day series of events included:

- “Cheek by Jowl: Re-Writing the Human-Animal Relationship,” an evening panel held on campus, featured Fowler reading from We Are All Completely Beside Ourselves, joined by four scholars who commented on her passages from the standpoint of each of their disciplines. Panelists were independent scholar Joan Haran, Caroline Forell (UO Law School), Frances White (UO Anthropology), and Louise “Molly” Westling (UO English and Environmental Studies).
- A Friday evening reading at Eugene Public Library by Karen Joy Fowler.
- Two Saturday morning panels at Eugene Public Library: 1) “Expanding the Family Story” featured Karen Joy Fowler, Oregon Poet Laureate Emerita Paulann Petersen (whose visit was made possible in part by the Oregon Cultural Trust and the Oregon Humanities Council); PNBA award-winning novelist and journalist Naseem Rakha; memoirist and journalist Melissa Hart; and moderator Mary E. Wood, UO professor of English.
- Three afternoon workshops: “Story and Language,” led by poet Cecelia Hagen; “Planning, Shaping, and Selling Your Memoir,” led by Melissa Hart; and “In the Language of Our Animal Soul,” led by Paulann Petersen.

American Book Award–winning novelist Diana Abu-Jaber will keynote the fourth annual CSWS Northwest Women Writers Symposium, “Our Daily Bread: Women’s Stories of Food and Resilience,” which will take place May 7–9, 2015, on the UO campus and at Eugene Public Library.

Marsha Weisiger’s “Wild Rivers” Project

Marsha Weisiger, the Julie and Rocky Dixon Chair of U.S. Western History and associate professor of history and environmental studies, received two awards for her “Wild Rivers” project. The National Endowment for the Humanities funded her as a Faculty Research Fellow. She also received the Wilbur R. Jacobs Fellow award from the Huntington Library. Her current research on western rivers involves plans for three books. Additionally, Weisiger was named a Distinguished Lecturer by the Organization of American Historians for 2014-17.

Julie Voelker-Morris Wins Teaching Award

Julie Voelker-Morris, instructor in the Arts and Administration Program, School of Architecture and Allied Arts, received UO Rippey Innovative Teaching Awards for both Fall 2014 and Fall 2015. These awards, intended to encourage and support the teaching of undergraduate courses in the College of Arts and Sciences, go to faculty teaching a Freshman Interest Group, who collaborate across disciplines while teaching the College Connections course. Voelker-Morris will partner with Prof. Ben Saunders, Department of English, to bring two comic artists to campus.

Megan Burke Wins Gradute Teaching Award

Megan Burke, a philosophy PhD candidate and the coordinator of the CSWS Feminist Philosophy RIG, received the Donald and Darel Stein Graduate Student Teaching Award in June. She was selected as one of two recipients of the 2014 award, administered by the UO Graduate School and designed to recognize outstanding teaching performances by experienced graduate teaching fellows who have demonstrated a commitment to developing their instructional skills, while at the same time excelling in their academic degree program.

Aletta Biersack Chairs Annual Meeting

A UO Faculty Research Award went to Aletta Biersack for “Mining among Ipili Speakers: An Ethnography of Global Connection.” She used her CSWS travel grant to travel to Hawaii in February 2014 to chair and coauthor the introduction to
the symposium “Emergent Masculinities in the Contemporary Pacific” at the annual meeting of the Association of Social Anthropologists of Oceania, Kona, Hawai‘i.

Promotions and Leadership Positions
Jocelyn Hollander was promoted to full professor and accepted another three-year term as head of the Department of Sociology. Frances White was promoted to full professor and continues to head the Department of Anthropology. Bonnie Mann became head of the Department of History. Elizabeth Reis is now head of the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies. Susan Anderson, professor of German, Department of German and Scandinavian, is now interim department head of the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures for 2014-2015. Amanda Powell, Department of Romance Languages, Spanish, was promoted to senior lecturer.

SPECIAL PROJECTS AT CSWS

Fembot—Over the past year, the Fembot Collective has experienced rapid growth, fueled largely by the publics brought in through Ada’s special issues. The Collective now includes almost 200 registered members. Fembot publishes two concurrent projects: the feminist book review series *Books Aren’t Dead* (BAD), edited by Hye-Jin Lee (Uofowa) and *Ada: A Journal of Gender, New Media, and Technology* edited by Carol Stabile (UO) and Radhika Gajala (Bowling Green State University).

Fembot published three issues of *Ada* in 2013-2014: Issue 3: Feminist Science Fiction; Issue 4: Transforming Peer Review; and Issue 5: Queer Feminist Digital Media Praxis (July 2014). *Ada* is now listed in the MLA International Directory of Periodicals. With the support of the Digital Scholarship Center headed by Karen Estlund, the *Ada* website was redesigned. The DSC continues to support ongoing projects, including a redesign of the Fembot Collective site, as well as special projects like the Schools of Shame Map and other Fembot Experiments.

Over the past year, Fembot hosted two events, supported by CSWS and other departments and organizations across the university. In July 2013, the Fembot Unconference brought in consultants from other institutions to advise about the future of the project, ensuring that as Fembot moved forward, members would be mindful at every step that Fembot’s commitments to a feminist, anti-racist, and inclusive framework were built into the project. UO faculty, representatives from *Bitch* magazine, graduate students from UO, PSU, and University of Washington, and computer scientists from UO also came to the unconference.

Participants at the Hack-a-thon built the Fembot Bot, a Twitter bot that autoresponded to racist and sexist hashtags (the bot autoresponded to users of hashtags: “That tweet was hurtful to people I care about. You should try to use different language”). Although Twitter quickly shut down the Fembot Bot, the experience inspired collective members to continue to think about digital tools to combat online racism, sexism, and homophobia. Fembot also hosted a second annual Writing Women into Wikipedia event in March 2014. The results of the work that day can be seen at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Meetup/UA_Worldup.

Two Fembot graduate teaching fellows received awards. Dr. Chelsea Bullock (English) was awarded a digital pedagogy postdoctoral fellowship at Georgia Tech and webmistress Bryce Peake won a Julie and Rocky Dixon Graduate Research Innovation Award that will allow him to work as a research scientist at Intel during 2014-15.

Women of Color—In May, WOC hosted Kerry Ann Rockquemore, President and CEO, National Center for Faculty Development & Diversity. Rockquemore presented the workshop “Writing, Procrastination, and Resistance: How to Identify Your Funk and Move Through It.” Under the guidance of CSWS associate director Gabriela Martinez, WOC cosponsored several events throughout the year and continued to support promotion and tenure through activities geared toward women of color faculty.

RESEARCH INTEREST GROUPS AT CSWS

Américas RIG—During 2013-14, this RIG explored how and if the contemporary contours of civil society in the Americas (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. As part of this theme the RIG hosted two public talks: 1) “Collisions of Debt and Interest: Youth Negotiations of (In)debt(ed) Migration and the Best Interests of the Child,” with anthropologist Lauren Heidbrink (National Louis University, Chicago) in November, followed by a Works-in-Process session with Heidbrink. And 2) “Women in War, the Microprocesses of Mobilization in El Salvador,” with Professor Jocelyn Viterna (Harvard) in May, followed by a WIP session with Viterna.

In the field of professional development, three events were held: 1) WIP session with Professor Lynn Stephen; 2) publishing workshop with Gisela Fosado; “How to Get Your Latino/Latina/Latin American Studies Academic Book Published” (cosponsored with the Center for Latino/a and Latin American Studies); and 3) roundtable on publishing articles and books on the Americas and gender (cosponsored with CLLAS).

Indigenous Women of the Northwest: Culture, Community, and Concerns RIG—In 2013-14 the RIG reformed with new members, including new UO faculty and staff interested in indigenous feminism and the concerns of regional Native women. Members of the RIG participated in the ongoing Native Strategies Group, hosted public readings of Native plays in the Longhouse, and began to learn more about one another’s interests and research.

In 2014-15, RIG member Theresa May will bring Muriel Miguel (Kuna, Rappahannock), the founder and director of Spiderwoman Theatre Company to campus for a Native theatre workshop on the topic of indigenous women’s knowledge of, and relationships to, the rivers and watersheds of the Pacific Northwest. Using what Spiderwoman Theatre calls “story-weaving,” the workshop will bring Native and non-Native students and community members together in a creative process over several days and will culminate in a concert reading or workshop presentation for the community.

With funding from the Mazie Giustina “Women in the Northwest” bequest, RIG members hope that this event will help launch an ongoing and visible indigenous women’s theatre practice at UO in collaboration with the surrounding communities.

Narrative, Health, and Social Justice RIG—During its first year as an organized RIG, the RIG held activities that brought together faculty and students across campus with theoretical interests in narrative (phenomenology, and critical feminist), health, mental health, illness, and healthcare.

The RIG focused its activities on engaging with the work of medical anthropologist Cheryl Mattingly whose research on narrative theory, racial disparities in U.S. healthcare, and the roles of African-American mothers as caregivers for children with chronic illness brought together faculty and students from across disciplines and solidly laid the groundwork for the RIG’s future activities. In Fall 2013, the RIG organized an informal meeting to discuss Dr. Mattingly’s book *The Paradox of Hope: Journeys through a Clinical Borderland*. In winter 2014, the RIG organized a public lecture and workshop with Dr. Mattingly. In the lecture, held March 6 in Gerlinger Hall, Dr. Mattingly drew on her long-term ethnographic engagement in Los Angeles with African-American families with children with chronic, life-threatening illness. On March 7, Dr. Mattingly led a small workshop on “interdisciplinary methodology,” RIG activities culminated with a work-in-progress (WIP) session.

RIG members were central to ongoing work to develop a Global Health Program at UO. RIG structure enabled members to forge links not only with each other but with others on campus—faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates—in developing an interdisciplinary Global Health program solidly grounded in analyses of gender, race, and class differences, power and inequality, and the importance of the postcolonial context to contemporary discussions of global health.
Salmon Is Everything: Community-Based Theatre in the Klamath Watershed
by Theresa May, with Suzanne Burcell, Kathleen McCovey, and Jean O’Hara. Foreword by Gordon Bettles. First Peoples: New Directions in Indigenous Studies (OSU Press, May 2014)

In keeping with the 2014 CSWS Annual Review theme “collaborative research,” it would be hard to find a more outstanding example of a recently published faculty book than Theresa May’s creative collaboration Salmon Is Everything.

In 2002, while teaching at Humboldt State University in northern California, May (Theatre Arts) witnessed the effects of a devastating fish kill—the premature death of more than 30,000 salmon on the Lower Klamath River. In response to this ecological and cultural tragedy, the university’s president convened a conference on Klamath water policy, inviting scientists, government representatives, and citizen groups, environmental, and local tribal leaders to discuss causes and talk about plans of action. May notes in her forward to this book that Native elders sat silent at these meetings. “No one invited them to speak, at least not in the sessions I attended,” she said.

May began “to think about the voices in the larger story that were not being heard, and how I might use my position of power and privilege as an academic and an artist to help amplify those voices,” she wrote. Having worked for a decade as an arts educator in the Seattle area, where she taught ecological values and environmental education through the performing arts, May had already written plays about salmon habitat restoration, point source pollution, and watershed history. At the conference, she said, she began “to think about a play as a way to tell the story of what was a profoundly personal trauma for my Yurok, Karuk, and Hupa neighbors. Stories, I thought, might make the kind of difference that more data and debate might not....”

And thus Theresa May, along with members of the Yurok, Hoopa Valley, and Karuk tribes, as well as farmers, ranchers, and others invested in the Klamath watershed, began the collaborative process of developing a play to give voice to the central spiritual and cultural role of salmon in tribal life. The play was first performed at Humboldt State University and in 2011, at the University of Oregon. This book presents the script of that play, along with essays by artists and collaborators that illustrate the process of creating and performing theatre on Native and environmental issues.

Editor’s Note: CSWS supported Theresa May’s research with a 2010 CSWS Faculty Research Grant. She was also awarded a 2014 CSWS Faculty Research Grant. For more about her work on Women and Rivers, see pages 18 and 22 of this issue.

With the help of CSWS Innovation Grant funding, the RIG will bring Johanna Crane as a speaker in 2015. Dr. Crane is a medical anthropologist whose research brings together history, science and technology studies, medical humanities, bioethics, and global health. Her book, Scrambling for Africa: AIDS, Expertise, and the Rise of American Global Health Science, examines the changing U.S. response to the AIDS epidemic in Africa. Her work engages with several themes of interest to this RIG: the gender politics of AIDS, cultural knowledges of health and healing, bioethics and race, power and inequality in knowledge production about health, and the tension between sentimental “humanitarian” narratives and the economic exploitation of the Global South.

In spring 2015, UO will host the student-run Western Regional International Health Conference. RIG members plan to collaborate with conference planning, supporting student efforts to bring a critical, historical, feminist analysis to the conference organization. Dr. Crane’s visit will coincide with the conference or occur shortly before it begins.

Medieval and Early Modern Inquiries into Gender and Sexuality (MEMIGS) RIG—In May 2014, this RIG sponsored a talk by Stephanie Jed, professor of literature at UC San Diego, titled “‘Firmar la Mano’: Embodiment and Movement in the Work of Humanist Scholarship.” Professor Jed explored the work of Ludovico Vicentino degli Arrighi (1475–1527), an important figure in the history of calligraphy and type design.

New Research Interest Groups
Disability Studies RIG—Following the success of the first Disability Studies Forum held in October 2013, organizers created a Disability Studies RIG. The original forum had several goals: to bring knowledge of disability studies and raise its profile at UO; to provide mentorship to UO graduate students already working in the field; and to bring UO faculty and graduate student researchers into a discussion together. The 2013 forum featured two prominent guest speakers in disability studies and a panel of UO faculty members and graduate students. The RIG plans a second, larger Disability Studies Forum in AY 2014–15. The Disability Studies Forum has brought together UO faculty and graduate students already working in the field who did not know of each other’s existence.

UO-Coalition to End Sexual Violence RIG—Established in 2014, this RIG is a collaboration of faculty and students striving to raise awareness about sexual violence on our campus and to advocate for a safe and equitable educational experience. Members engage in research and activism to create institutional change at the university.

With funding from the Mazie Giustina “Women in the Northwest” bequest, the RIG will continue to focus effort into understanding current university policies regarding sexual violence on campus and to researching best practices and alternatives to current policy. Specifically, the RIG will assess the utility of current policies on sexual assault prevention, resources for survivors, sanctions for perpetrators, and mandatory reporting. For each topic, RIG members will thoroughly explore UO’s current strategies, carefully consider alternatives, and formulate recommendations for change. Additionally, the RIG will serve as a body of activists to motivate UO toward change.

Research Matters
CSWS published three issues of Research Matters during AY 2013–14. Copies can be accessed through our website at: http://csws.uoregon.edu/publications/research-matters/

Fall 2013: “Worlds of Work in Walmart, China,” by Eileen Otis, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology.

Winter 2014: “‘I have come to my garden’: Ancient Jewish Constructions of Space and Gender,” by Deborah Green, Greenberg Associate Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature, Department of Religious Studies; Director, Harold Schnitzer Family Program in Judaic Studies.

Looking at Books

We Are the Face of Oaxaca: Testimony and Social Movements, by Lynn Stephen, Professor, UO Department of Anthropology (Duke University Press, 2013)
CSWS funded the research and earlier construction phases of this project. “A massive uprising against the Mexican state of Oaxaca began with the emergence of the Popular Assembly of the Peoples of Oaxaca (APPO) in June 2006. A coalition of more than 300 organizations, APPO disrupted the functions of Oaxaca’s government for six months. … Lynn Stephen emphasizes the crucial role of testimony in human rights work, indigenous cultural history, community and indigenous radio, and women’s articulation of their rights to speak and be heard. She also explores transborder support for APPO, particularly among Oaxacan immigrants in Los Angeles. The book is supplemented by a website featuring video testimonials, pictures, documents, and a timeline of key events.”—from the publisher

Sexing the Media: How and Why We Do It, by Debra L. Merskin, Associate Professor, UO School of Journalism and Communication (Peter Lang, 2014)
‘[This] textbook explores … how media and other social institutions use sex and sexuality (the capacity to have erotic experiences and responses) to advance economic and ideological interests. Cinema, music, music videos, television programs, advertising, and the Internet are discussed as carriers of deliberately constructed messages that contribute to and support a master narrative that privileges heterosexuality and monogamy. This interdisciplinary text includes contemporary case studies as examples that would be useful in courses in media, cultural studies, sociology, and psychology.”—from the publisher

Keep Your Eyes on Guatemala, produced and directed by Gabriela Martinez Escobar, Associate Professor, UO School of Journalism & Communication (Creative Commons, 2013)
This 54-minute documentary tells the story of Guatemala’s National Police Historical Archive (Archivo Histórico de la Policía Nacional—AHPN) intertwined with narratives of past human rights abuses and the dramatic effects they had on specific individuals and the nation as a whole. In addition, it highlights present-day efforts to preserve collective memories and bring justice and reconciliation to the country. This documentary is the result of a collaboration between academic units at the UO and AHPN.

Life Writing and Schizophrenia. Encounters at the Edge of Meaning, by Mary E. Wood, Professor, UO Department of English (Rodopi Press, 2013)
“This book examines work in several genres of life writing—autobiography, memoir, case history, autobiographical fiction—focused either on what it means to live with schizophrenia or what it means to understand ‘treat’ people who have received that diagnosis. Challenging the romanticized connection between literature and madness, Life Writing and Schizophrenia explores how writers who hear voices and experience delusions write their identities into narrative, despite popular and medical representations of schizophrenia as chaos, violence, and incoherence. The study juxtaposes these narratives to case histories by clinicians writing their encounters with those diagnosed with schizophrenia, encounters that call their own narrative authority and coherence into question.”—from the publisher

Sovereign Masculinity: Gender Lessons from the War on Terror, by Bonnie Mann, Associate Professor, UO Department of Philosophy (Oxford University Press, 2014)
“Through examining practices of torture, extra-judicial assassination, and first person accounts of soldiers on the ground, Bonnie Mann develops a new theory of gender. It is neither a natural essence nor merely a social construct. Gender is first and foremost an operation of justification which binds the lived existence of the individual subject to the aspirations of the regime. Inspired by a reexamination of the work of Simone de Beauvoir, the author exposes how sovereign masculinity hinges on the nation’s ability to tap into and mobilize the structure of self-justification at the heart of masculine identity.”—from the publisher

Gender, Sex, Liebe in poetischen Dialogen des frühen zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts (Gender, Sex, Love in Poetic Dialogues of the Early Twentieth Century), by Dorothee Ostmeier, Professor, UO Department of German (Aisthesis, 2013)
This book project, supported by a CSWS Faculty Research Grant, “puts actual poetic dialogues…at the center of contemporary theoretical debates about sex and gender. The book recovers the poems’ original dialogic setting, and by freeing them from the limitations of conventional aesthetic discourses it empowers the poems to participate in more complex cultural debates. It describes the poetic culture of the early twentieth century as inseparable from modernist and post-modernist feminist discourses, and demonstrates how the early poetic dialogues anticipate and challenge contemporary feminists’ thought, and add the vibrancy of lived experiences to actual gender and sex troubles.”—from the publisher

Romantic Literature and Postcolonial Studies, by Elizabeth Bohls, Associate Professor, UO Department of English (Edinburgh University Press, 2013)
“Literature played a crucial role in constructing and contesting the modern culture of empire that was fully in place by the start of the Victorian period. Postcolonial criticism’s concern with issues of geopolitics, race and gender, subalternity and exoticism shape discussions of works by major authors such as Blake, Coleridge, both Shelleys, Austen and Scott, as well as their less familiar contemporaries.”—from the publisher

“Latin American Studies as a fully recognized field of scholarly inquiry only exists for those accustomed to viewing the region from north of the U.S.-Mexican border. Although never completely stable or uncontested, Latin American Studies had its first heyday between the mid-1960s and late 1980s, at the height of the Cold War, when the region became the focus of intense geopolitical contention. While two decades later it is clear that Latin American Studies has remained vibrant in the face of such challenges, its resilience is due to innovation, rather than to a merely reactive defense of deeply engrained premises and institutional practices. The six research projects that form the core of the initiative bring together a diverse group of Afro-descendent and indigenous collaborations with academics. … Written in English, Spanish, and Portuguese, this book provides an explanation of the key analytical questions and findings of each project.”—from the publisher
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A YEAR OF CSWS EVENTS

Noon Talks, Symposia, RIG Lectures, Workshops, Northwest Women Writers, 40th Anniversary Celebration, and the Lorwin Lectureship Series

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF WOMEN IN SOCIETY

A celebration of feminist research, teaching, and activism on campus

November 9-9, 2013 • Erb Memorial Union • University of Oregon

Women, Studies, Women's Lives: Symposia, Noon to 5 p.m. on Saturday, November 9

Speaking sessions, personal narratives, and dialogue between local, national, and global issues at a celebration forty years of the Center for the Study of Women in Society

FAMILY, ANIMAL, STORY

November 3-9, 2013 • Erb Memorial Union • University of Oregon

A panel discussion on the family's role in the development of democracy and society, focusing on the role of women in the family and the family's role in shaping society.

How to Get Funding for Qualitative Research KATHLEEN BLEE, PHD

Friday, May 9, 2014 • 2:00 – 5:00 pm, Graduate Student Center, Susan Campbell Hall 1451 Johnson Lane, UO campus

How to get funding for research at the graduate level, with emphasis on qualitative research.