Marlen Bidwell-Steiner/Karin S. Wozonig (Hg.)

# A Canon of Our Own?

## Kanonkritik und Kanonbildung in den Gender Studies

StudienVerlag
Innsbruck
Wien
Bozen

Die Herausgeberinnen danken folgenden Förderern für die Unterstützung: Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur in Wien, Stadt Wien (MA 7).




e-mail: order@studienverlag.at
Internet: www.studienverlag.at

Satz: Rosa Reitsamer
Umschlag: Gabi Damm

Gedruckt auf umweltfreundlichem, chlor- und säurefrei gebleichtem Papier.

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek
Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

ISBN-10: 3-7065-4340-0
ISBN-13: 978-3-7065-4340-8

# Inhaltsverzeichnis

## ZWISCHENRAUM

**VERHANDELTER RAUM**

Gabriele Griffin

# Women's and Gender Studies – The Quintessential Subject in Process

You may never be able to step into the same river twice but you may sure feel the urge to. I feel that urge, sentimentally, nostalgically, when I go back to feminist writings from the 1960s and 1970s, the beginnings of the institutionalization of Women's and Gender Studies in many Western European countries, because those writings have the energy of struggle, passion, political investment and desire for change that I now often miss in the heady cerebrations of feminist work of the 21st century. "We are older now," writes Adrienne Rich already in her poem "Splittings" in 1974:

*We are older now*
*we have met before these are my hands before your eyes*
*my figure blotting out all that is not mine*
*I am the pain of division creator of divisions*
*it is I who blot your lover from you*
*and not the time-zones nor the miles*
*It is not separation that calls me forth but I*
*who am separation And remember*
*I have no existence apart from you*

We may be older, but we do connect to that work from the 1960s and 1970s in which Women's and Gender Studies were born. One of the excitements of that period and one of its key challenges was the need to discover, produce and accumulate the knowledge necessary to develop the disciplines called Women's and Gender Studies. There was no canon, no existent body of work, no critical or theoretical apparatus on which one could readily draw – it all had to be made or found, and both the production of new know-ledges about and by women, and the re-discovery of forgotten knowledges, the archaeological projects that re-found Mary Wollstonecraft, Simone de Beauvoir and Virginia Woolf, for example, but also Olympe de Gouges, Anna Akhmatova and Christina Rossetti, engendered a great sense of necessary activism and empowerment amongst Women's Studies students and staff in western countries. There was, without

question, a sense of a new dawn breaking and of women's liberation, with the energy derived from the feeling of embattlement and the possibilities for transformation, fuelled by the adrenaline of action, translating into enthusiastic activity, an urgency of purpose, and a new self-assertiveness among at least some women. Of course, "woman" or "women" were not in question then – sisterhood could still be imagined to be global and it was possible for groups such as the Radicalesbians (1970) to make pronouncements like "A lesbian is the rage of all women condensed to the point of explosion." (17) The sheer energy of such unwarranted assumptions – crystallized in words and phrases such as "rage", "condensed", "the point of explosion" – was thrilling, inspiring, worrying, in any event disturbing and unsettling, demanding action and response. And respond we did. Feminist action preceded and/or occurred simultaneously with feminist knowledge production in the 1960s and 1970s, and much of that knowledge production derived from the concerns that had driven women into the streets, into civil rights movements and other forms of political activism.

When Women's Studies first began, it was taught, at least in many Western European countries, by women who were also activists and in disciplines with significant numbers of female staff and students, such as the arts, literature, history and sociology. Much of the early concern of Women's Studies was focused on "presencing" women in those disciplines, getting their forgotten works read in literature, getting their role in history acknowledged, and interrogating their role in the family (Griffin 2006).

Much has changed since those early days which, in any event, were experienced in somewhat different ways across the various European countries. The whole issue of whether Women's Studies should become institutionalized or remain an autonomous or extra-mural terrain was debated very differently in the diverse European countries but impacted powerfully on what happened to the discipline – and I know that some would argue with the idea that Women's Studies is indeed a discipline (see Bowles and Duelli Klein 1983; Hanmer 1991). In an EU-funded project we conducted between 2001 and 2003 on "Women's Studies Training, Women's Employment and Equal Opportunities" (www.hull.ac.uk/ewsi), we found that the degree to which the women's movement in a given country had been supportive of the institutionalization of Women's Studies or not was an important factor in what happened to the discipline, which in any event and already had to be set up in opposition to institutions and disciplines dominated by men whose very positions and privileges were being challenged by feminism (Griffin 2005: 45–60). In countries such as the

UK, with little state bureaucracy, a weak relation between state and education, and no history of fascism, the institutionalization of Women's Studies was a relatively unproblematic process, not least because the women's movement was not anti-institutional. In Italy, on the other hand, the women's movement was strongly anti-institutional, with the consequence that much feminist work was carried out extra-institutionally in the famous Milan Women's Bookstore Collective, and by feminists working in the media, and simultaneously it was difficult establishing Women's Studies in the academy. In France we have the paradoxical situation that as a country it has produced some of the most widely renowned feminist theoreticians – even if they are not all "home-grown" (we need only to think of Hélène Cixous, Julia Kristeva, Luce Irigaray) – but these women notwithstanding, Women's Studies is not at all institutionalized or recognized. One major reason, a reason that also applies to Finland where, however, Women's Studies has become somewhat more established than in France, is France's and Finland's public discourse of *égalité* or of gender-neutrality which makes it difficult to make demands on behalf of a particular group such as women. If we are all meant to be equal, after all, why should we need special provision for a particular group? In sum, as I have argued elsewhere (Griffin 2005), the institutionalization of Women's Studies has developed unevenly across Europe and it has done so for a range of historical and contextual reasons.

The same cannot exactly be said as regards the development of a canon of Women's Studies work. In the 1970s and 1980s there was a period when we still suffered a scarcity of material and any feminist book that came on the market was eagerly adopted and consumed. In the UK, we all had the same books on our bookshelves because they were, in fact, the only ones one could get. But the situation has changed drastically over the past two decades. The explosion of feminist research of the last twenty or so years, which has gone hand in hand with the feminization of academe – we have more women now than ever working in universities – and the concomitant explosion of feminist publishing, has resulted in a wealth of material which we can now draw on. Paradoxically, that is despite this vast amount of material, and simultaneously we have seen the emergence of a canon of work in Women's/Gender Studies.

We can speak of that canon in a number of different ways. At a meta-discursive level we can argue that there are three areas of feminist work that we now expect to see, and probably the world over, in Women's Studies degrees, namely:

Feminist theory
Feminist methodology
Applied feminist research

By "applied feminist research" I here mean feminist research on topics such as women's health, women's cultural production, development studies, literary and historical feminist research etc., that is to say the broad range of substantive issues that might be discussed in a Women's Studies course. In other words, I don't use 'applied' here in opposition to 'theoretical' work but rather to refer to substantive areas of feminist investigation.

Once we drill down beneath these three meta-discursive levels – feminist theory, feminist methodology, applied feminist research – we begin to see the ways in which Women's Studies courses around the world are embedded in the local as well as the global, with all the specificities that that implies (Griffin 2002a), including the uneven production and distribution of knowledge, and the very different aspirations underlying these. Such aspirations include, in many countries, and as part of a response to the gender agendas of international funders and organizations such as the World Bank, the World Health Organization, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations etc, the education at a tertiary level and the professionalization of women, and their integration into the administrative middle classes. The Asian Institute of Technology (2001) Women's Studies course, for instance, has as two of its objectives "to facilitate increased participation of Asian women in professions in science, technology, environment and resource management" and "to gain for women access to the status and authority in the larger society that participation in technological planning and decision-making bring". This is about the education of a new ruling elite of professionals. Whilst one may well ask – and countries such as many Eastern European ones but also China, for instance, serve as counter-indicators here – how much *actual* access to status and authority women's participation in technological planning and decision-making brings[1], the aspiration articulated here is clear enough. It is also articulated within a framework which sees this aspiration as firmly embedded in a politics that connects the teaching in the university with the women's

[1] Significantly, the Moscow Center for Gender Studies (2001), an NGO, has as one of its mission statements "withstanding sexism in the humanities, mass consciousness and social policies under the present conditions, with the growing tendencies to consider women in the light of traditional role stereotypes".

movement and women's activism outside of the academy. Thus Gender and Development Studies within the Asian Institute of Technology has as a further objective "to contribute to empowering women at professional and at grassroots level in Asia through gender sensitization and the extension of scientific knowledge." It places "high priorities" on "regional outreach and extension activities'" and regards itself as "functioning as an academic arm of community-based efforts for the advancement of women, equity-based sustainable development and the environment." I doubt that any Women's Studies program in a British university, for example, would describe itself in its publicity as "the academic arm of community-based efforts for the advancement of women," simply because that connection has become increasingly tenuous. The mission of the Department of Women and Gender Studies of Makerere University (2001), Kampala, Uganda is "to contribute to the development of Uganda through ensuring that the gender component is an integral part of the development process." Its first objective, more bluntly, is "to train a cadre of various backgrounds who will serve in government, academic and non-governmental organisations, where they will act as catalysts for change and will facilitate the integration of gender in decision-making and policy formation." The terminology may surprise – again, I doubt that many north-western Women's Studies courses would use words such as 'cadre' – but the underlying intention is, again, very clear: the program is committed to educating the administrators and professionals who will lead the country as "catalysts for change." Similarly, the Gender and Women's Studies Graduate Program at the Middle East Technical University in Ankara, Turkey (2001), has as one of its objective "to train civil servants for institutions and departments dealing with gender issues and problems." Such aspirations inform Women's Studies course contents as part of international agendas which portray women as an under-utilized resource[2]. Where countries have not developed their own literatures in their own languages on the related topics, they are likely to adopt the literature available elsewhere and in a language they are familiar with. Recently, for example, I was contacted by a Japanese woman wanting to set up a "Gender and Technology" course and asking about reading lists and syllabuses that she could use. Such adoption of others' curricula on the

[2] Women are, in fact, not an under-utilized resource; portraying them as such depends on the masculinist notion that only paid employment "counts" as utilization whereas, in fact, women conventionally carry the double burden of all domestic labour as well as significant amounts of other unpaid labour in the 'employ' of their families and communities.

one hand facilitates the process of establishing such courses as well as giving them certain legitimacy, but on the other it may reduce the amount of actual thinking that goes into working out what a relevant syllabus in one's own context might look like. This is clearly one of the dangers of such adoption which itself, of course, contributes to canonization processes.

The word "canon" in academe is one that tends to be, certainly from the point of view of many Western feminists, negatively invested, having almost invariably connotations of "dead white men", "privilege", fossilization, exclusion, and stasis attached to it. As Virginia Woolf in *A Room of One's Own* (1929) made amply clear, it was canons that kept women outside the realms of knowledge both as objects and as subjects. The so-called "canon wars" of the 1970s and 1980s in many Western European countries were in no small part fought by feminists and contributed significantly to the admission of women as subjects and objects into academe. However, the negative connotations of the concept "canon" should not lead us to dismiss out of hand or underestimate the value of a canon of feminist work. First of all, it is a body of knowledge that has been established and can be built on. Secondly, it means that we do not have to keep "re-inventing the wheel" as we say in English – we now have some of the knowledge Virginia Woolf found so sadly lacking in 1929, and we can and should make use of these – but *not* uncritically. Thirdly, bodies of knowledge, canons, have always served to legitimate disciplines and we should acknowledge that it is on the backs of the canon or canons of feminist work now available that many feminist degrees and research projects have been founded, legitimated and recognized. We should not, in that sense, forget "our mothers" or refuse to use the knowledge accumulated by them productively.

However, that is not to say that whatever canons of feminist work we now have do not require that ingredient which has been so prominently associated with feminist methodology, namely reflexivity (Harding 1987, Oakley 2000, *Signs* 2005). One of the most important aspects of feminist work since its inception has been its critical engagement with existing canons, including and in particular its own bodies of knowledge. Feminism has lacked the complacency that has tainted many traditional disciplines through their unquestioning attitude towards their accumulated knowledge. Feminism's internal struggles and critical engagements during the 1980s, for example, shifted us on from the notion of a universal sisterhood to one of diversity politics. This is an intellectual and socio-emotional accomplishment which we should celebrate, since it demonstrates what I hold to

be one of the key characteristics of Women's Studies, namely its status as a subject or discipline in process, rather than a *fait accompli*. We have struggled, and continue to struggle, between ourselves as much as across the gender divide – if I may use such essentializing vocabulary for a moment – over the knowledge and insights we have produced, and that struggle itself has resulted in major shifts within Women's Studies over the past thirty years.

These struggles have highlighted some of the limitations of contemporary canons of feminist work for us. For instance: every woman doing Women's Studies now – and not only in the western hemisphere – will know the name, if not the work, of Judith Butler. But how many of us, and by 'us' here I refer to Western feminists, can name a Hungarian, or a Finish, or a Russian feminist academic writer? The canon of Women's Studies in western countries, such as it currently is, has very specific traits. It is frequently Anglo-American dominated. Its focus has shifted and diversified over time, moving, for example, from the more activist and empirical to the more theoretical. Where once in the West we had courses on "Women and Health" or "Women and Literature," we now tend to have courses on "Gender, Body, Technology" or "Gender and Culture," also known as "the cultural turn" in the social sciences. These changes become very evident when one teaches Women's Studies students from other countries. Here is what one Indonesian Masters student on a Women's Studies course in the UK in 2002 said, talking about her surprise at the curriculum she was confronted with:

> Indonesia is still struggling with education, with poverty, with working conditions and some things like that . . . and [in Women's Studies in Indonesia there's always] discussion about poverty, inequality, marriage, how Indonesia is . . . in the classroom [in the UK] we don't talk about tha t . . . wetalk about self-identity and things like that that we haven't the laxity at home to talk about . . . there's a lot of self-indulgence . . . (Griffin andHanmer 2003)

What this student identified was in a sense a trend in certain Women's Studies curricula, particularly in Northern and Western European countries, and much influenced by Anglophone agendas, towards a culturalization of Women's Studies, away from certain material conditions that shape women's lives and towards what one might describe as sublimated knowledge. The Indonesian student on this postgraduate degree was left with the impression that poverty, working conditions, and education are all no

longer issues for or in Women's Studies but this is clearly not the case. We know that the material conditions of women across all European countries remain worse than those of men. We know all about the class ceiling, the pay gap, the poverty trap, the uneven distribution of wealth, and domestic and care labour across the sexes. National labour surveys and OECD statistics endlessly parade these realities before us. We know it and, I would argue, it has become the mantra of a certain kind of experience of disempowerment, a sort of midlife crisis in Women's Studies in some of the countries where Women's Studies was established very early. My own view is that this sense of disempowerment and a concomitant retrenchment into certain kinds of highly theorized research is the result of the gradual divorce of Women's Studies from the grassroots movement and political impetus that had once fuelled its very inception. The conservative politics of the 1980s in the UK, for example, which through legal changes forced a division between campaigning and service work in charitable organizations, heralded a depoliticization of certain NGOs whose funding was threatened should they pursue campaigning, that is political, work (Griffin 1995). The sense of that divorce between activism and the academy which is quite widespread in north-western Europe was also reinforced in our research project on "Women's Studies and Women's Employment" by, for instance, the views of two Hungarian interviewees. One of them described her experience of the relation between the academy and activism as follows:

> Academic life is separate from activist life. And as I see it . . . there are some who see it as an opportunity to get money from abroad, and build their own careers. It doesn't occur to them to spread this, and involve others. On the contrary, if they involve others, they might be a danger to their own advancement. (Juhasz 2003: 15)

The other stated: "[Women's Studies has] very little to do with activism ... There are no professors who are interested in this." (Juhasz 2003: 14). And a Spanish student who had been active in women's groups thought that doctoral training should focus on theory:

> [The active and practice aspect] you must do that later on your own. The place for activism, for street action, is not the doctoral. The relationship between women's groups and the doctoral could be a good thing, but I approached feminism from the groups, and through the street, and then I got into theory. So I have both points of view and connecting them is easy for me. Of course, it's true that what you read in the books is one thing and what we experience every day as women is another. I

> know both things and I don't think that the doctoral is the place to work on the daily life issues; there are other places for that. If the doctoral goes into the streets, then where are you going to learn the theoretical framework? You can't go to a women's group with theoretical issues because they won't understand you, but you can use what you have learnt and apply it to that specific situation. ... For me it was more like: 'that theory is very good, let's see now what it means in real life' (Carrera Suarez and Vinuela Suarez 2003).

As I have maintained elsewhere (2002a: 22-3), this divorce between activism or a politicized grassroots movement, necessary and perhaps inevitable as it may have been, has resulted in the emergence during the late 1980s and early 1990s of two types of female, no longer always feminist, professionals: academics teaching Women's Studies and paid women NGO workers whose preoccupation has increasingly turned to, and maybe has had to turn to, questions of their professional identity, that is to their (self-)legitimation in changing and increasingly politically muted professional contexts.

This process has, in the context of academe, been fuelled by the increasing bureaucratization of higher education, born out of the "accountability-for-public-funds" drive that became prominent in the 1990s on the one hand, and, more recently and more trenchantly in some European countries, the Europeanization, or harmonization, or convergence of the so-called European Higher Education Area through the Bologna process, officially begun in 1999 with Bologna Declaration, on the other. The background to this process is important. Its underlying agenda is two-fold:

1) to create a knowledge-based society in an age when Europe, depleted of manufacturing industries and with a highly paid industrial labour force, can, by and large, no longer compete on the international markets with the cheap labour available in China, India and Africa, and therefore needs to underpin its growth and competitiveness by moving into different kinds of production from the traditional industrial ones;
2) the recognition of the "importance of education and educational co-operation in the development and strengthening of stable, peaceful and democratic societies... paramount, the more so in view of the situation in South East Europe." (Bologna Declaration) which goes together with the development with Europe's cultural dimensions.

The Bologna process, to which interestingly not only European Union members but many non-member countries such as Switzerland and Montenegro, for example, have eagerly subscribed, requires as you all know, *inter alia*, the restructuring of higher education curricula into 3-cycle degrees (3 yrs Bachelor; 2 yrs Masters; 3 yrs PhD); the labour-market orientation of first cycle; and a streamlined system of quality assurance of higher education. Since 2000, most European countries have thus suddenly acquired quality assurance agencies of various kinds, and, increasingly we are seeing across Europe both the auditing of degrees and the auditing of research in a bid to claim scientific excellence *vis-à-vis* the rest of the world through a variety of assessment regimes. Indeed, the Bologna process and the creation of the European Higher Education Area have gone hand in hand with the creation of the so-called European Research Area, emblematized by current discussions about a European Research Council and the so-called ERA-Net initiative by the European Commission, an initiative intended to get national research councils across Europe to develop common agendas and research programs. Both Bologna and the development of the European Research Area have a powerful agenda of convergence, a convergence achieved through, for example, the internationalization of audit processes (having international reviewers involved, for example) through whom a creeping and convergent education and research agenda at global level is beginning to emerge. For instance, if one looks at research council and research funder agendas across the world, one can see that the same research topics are top of the list everywhere from Australia, through Europe, to the United States of America: security; nanotechnology; migration. We are thus beginning to see a convergence of research agendas on the one hand, and, in a not dissimilar way, we are seeing a convergence of teaching agendas, driven as I've just said not least by the way in which contemporary audit culture encourages comparison across countries and thus – in the bid for 'recognition' – drives us towards greater and greater similarity in terms of teaching content.

There is another factor which comes into this process: the European Union's mobility agenda. Since English has become the global *lingua franca*, and given that the Bologna process as well as a whole range of other European funded teaching and research programs are designed to increase mobility within and into Europe including the attraction of third-world scholars, European universities in both East and West are increasingly driven towards delivering syllabuses in English, and if their own scholars have not published in English, the easy thing to do is to use others'

texts published in English. In Germany, for example, researchers who want to apply for "Centre of Excellence" status now have to apply in English – they cannot write these applications, although they are to a German funding body, in German.

In this process, feminist academics rarely have time to sit back and ask, what kinds of knowledge do we want to transmit to our students and what sorts of knowledge do we want to produce? However, it is precisely these questions that we need to ask if we want to maintain the *critical* role that Women's Studies as a discipline has played in its relation to institutions, to knowledge production, and to women's situation in the world. These were indeed some of the questions we asked ourselves when Rosi Braidotti and I, together with a dozen or so European feminist academics, embarked on the project that turned into our book *Thinking Differently – A Reader in European Women's Studies* (2002b). We were very aware at the time of how much Women's Studies was dominated by Anglo-American agendas. I think two points need making in connection with this:

1) that feminist publishing started relatively early in the UK and the USA and, moreover, that the UK and the USA have the largest number of publishing houses and publish the largest number of different titles – these are two important reasons why that agenda became so dominant; and
2) that the USA in particular has to date the largest education market in the world which is why publishing in English-speaking journals and with UK and US publishers remains such an important driver in the academy.

These are, if you will, some of the market realities that have determined the dominance of the Anglo-American feminist agenda in many countries. However, those realities should not deter us from the critical interrogation of the appropriateness of that dominance. One of the questions that we asked when we did the *European Women's Studies Reader* was what is specific about European Women's Studies – note the emphasis here on "European" as opposed to narrower, more specifically national versions of Women's Studies. In discussing this question, "What is specific about European Women's Studies?" one of the key differences between Europe and the United States and Japan that we focussed on is Europe's fundamentally unstable nature, its uncertain identity, its status – politically, economically, culturally and geographically as – if you like – the quintessential sub-

ject-in-process, always becoming, never just being. For unlike Japan and the United States, Europe has not enjoyed stable structures either politically or economically. Unlike the USA, we have experienced not only terrorism but also recent wars, such as in Northern Ireland and in the Balkans, on our own territories. We also have the current ructions about which countries and under which conditions should join the European Union, the question, is Turkey more eastern than western, for example, different positions on the war in Iraq. These and other major issues and differences across the various countries that make up Europe are indicative of the divisions that exist among and within the countries that consider themselves European. In developing the volume *Thinking Differently: European Women's Studies* we – that is the academics who contributed to it – therefore started from the recognition that Europe as an entity, politically, culturally, geographically, is significantly different from the United States and indeed from Japan, the two main nations that the European Union sees itself as competing with, because Europe, an unstable entity, consists of nation-states, manifesting high degrees of internal diversity, poly-lingualism and multiculturalism. This gives rise to all sorts of different experiences and life practices regarding women and gender relations, which might usefully be reflected in Gender Studies curricula. For instance, under the heading "Identity, Subjectivity and Difference," we focus on the fact that Europe, in contrast to the United States, has extended recent histories of war on its own soil. We argue that a certain version of Europe, evidenced in the resurgence of macho nationalism and patriarchy in the eastern states, belongs to men. This is linked to the decreasing participation of women in the public sphere in post-1989 Eastern European countries, in the erosion of their rights there, and in the increasing liminality that women as carriers of national cultural experience in states that are themselves liminal to Europe. Here we have some of the differences that might emerge between European Women's Studies agendas and Anglo-American ones.

Difference and instability are key to understanding not only the construction of Europe but also, for example, the issue of how race and ethnicity function in Europe, since these are not predicated upon the binary of visible difference – black and white – as it is configured in the United States but, equally murderously and more complexly, upon the visibilization of a difference that is not visible. The issue of "othering" one's neighbour, prominent as much in the Holocaust as in the ethnic cleansing that dominated the Balkan wars of the 1990s, is eminently, though not exclusively, European. It raises questions, discussed in *Thinking*

*Differently*, of the role of feminism in anti-Semitism, for example, and about how different ethnic and racial groups are constructed in the European imaginary, and treated in actuality. Here one needs to consider the difference between the idea of the "melting pot" as it figures in the United States, compared to the very different ways in which each European country deals with its immigrants, and with the ways in which whiteness, associated with nationalist politics and eugenics, figures in the European imaginary.

Finally, and as a last example of some of the ways in which European Women's Studies might be different from the Anglo-American agenda, I want to mention the issue of research on violence against women. In *Thinking Differently,* we argue for the recognition of violence against women operating differently in diverse contexts, and in particular for the need to understand such violence not only within stable – as is usually the case in Anglo-American feminist research – but also importantly within unstable societies, societies that live, as one woman from Russia put it to me, in countries where there is "no war, no peace." Jalna Hanmer (2002), for instance, talks of "badly lived heterosexuality" to foreground the issue of stationing military personnel in proximity to civil communities and the impact these bases have on such communities. As Europe moves towards enlargement, and under current global political conditions, we need to develop a much more sophisticated understanding of violence in un/stable, even if highly developed, societies.

The point I want to make with these examples, and they are just a few, is that whilst the canon of Women's Studies, such as it is, provides useful knowledges and bases for the legitimation of the discipline of Women's Studies, it needs to be tailored to the specificities that inform our local situations. This means engaging in research and producing the work that will offer us insights into *our* situations, and the priorities that inform these. Such priorities might not be issues of queer theory and transgender, for example, or cybernet identities, but instead may be about the interface between the notion of "societies in transition" and women's situation within these; it may be about gathering data on how women manage under different political regimes; it may be about the role of religion in public life and its impact on women, and so on. The point is that Women's Studies, if it is to maintain its transformative agenda, should remain responsive to women's situation, both within the local and in the global context. That will mean both utilizing the accumulated knowledge we already have – the canon if you like – but critically, *and* producing new knowledge, relevant

to current concerns and preoccupations. This, in my view, is the attitude with which we should approach what canon there is of feminist work:

I refuse these givens the splitting
between love and action I am choosing
not to suffer uselessly and not to use her
I choose to love this time for once
with all my intelligence

(Adrienne Rich, 'Splittings' 1974)

## Bibliography


Bowles, Gloria and Renate Duelli Klein, eds. (1983): *Theories of Women's Studies*. London: Routledge.

Carrera Suárez, Isabel and Laura Viñuela Suárez (2003): *Qualitative Data Report: Spain*. Unpubl. report. www.hull.ac.uk/ewsi.

Griffin, Gabriele (2006): Gendered Cultures. In: *Handbook of Gender and Women's Studies*. M. Evans, J. Lorber and K. Davis (eds). London: Sage.

Griffin, Gabriele (2005): The Institutionalization of Women's Studies in Europe: Findings from an EU-funded Research Project on Women's Studies and Women's Employment. In: *Women/Gender Studies: Against All Odds*. E. Blimlinger and T. Garstenauer (eds). Innsbruck: Studienverlag. 43-55.

Griffin, Gabriele (2002a): Co-option or Transformation? Women's and Gender Studies Worldwide In: *Societies in Transition – Challenges to Women's and Gender Studies*. Opladen: Leske and Budrich. 13-33.

Griffin, Gabriele (1995) *Feminist Activism in the 1990s*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Griffin, Gabriele and Rosi Braidotti (eds) (2002b): *Thinking Differently: A Reader in European Women's Studies*. London: Zed Books.

Griffin, Gabriele and Jalna Hanmer (2003): *Qualitative Data Report: The UK*. Unpubl. report. www.hull.ac.uk/ewsi.

Hanmer, Jalna (2002): Violence, Militarism and War. In: *Thinking Differently: A Reader in European Women's Studies*. G. Griffin and R. Braidotti (eds). London: Zed Books. 267-84.

Hanmer, Jalna (1991): On Course: Women's Studies – a Transitional Programme. In: *Out of the Margins: Women's Studies in the Nineties*. London: Falmer Press. 105-114.

Harding, Sandra, ed. (1987): *Feminism and Methodology*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.

Juhasz, Borbola (2003): *Qualitative Data Report: Hungary*. Unpubl. ms., accessible at www.hull.ac.uk/ewsi.

Oakley, Ann (2000): *Experiments in Knowing*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Radicalesbians (1970): The Woman Identified Woman. In: *For Lesbians Only: A Separatist Anthology*. S. L. Hoagland and J. Penelope (eds) (1988). London: Onlywomen Press. 17-22.

Rich, Adrienne (1974): Splittings. In: *The Dream of a Common Language*. (1978). New York: W. W. Norton. 10-11.

*Signs* (2005): Special issue on Methodologies. 30/4.