DEADLINES APPROACH

Each year, CSW offers several funding opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students, as well as for faculty and CSW research scholars. The deadlines for some of the student awards are coming very soon: Applications for the Elizabeth Blackwell Awards (April 6), the Constance Coiner Awards (April 23), the Renaissance Award (April 23), and Travel Grants (April 23) can be downloaded from our website. Please see our website: www.csw.ucla.edu for information on deadlines and criteria.

JMEWS at UCLA

NANCY GALLAGHER AND SONDRA HALE ARE NOW CO-EDITORS OF THE JOURNAL OF MIDDLE EAST WOMEN’S STUDIES

HAVING moved into its new home at the UCLA Center for the Study of Women in July 2006, the Journal of Middle East Women’s Studies celebrated its arrival with a two-day conference on Gender and the Transnational Middle East. The conference program announced a visionary agenda, inviting research informed by transnational feminist, cultural, and modern historical studies, new forms of ethnography, and the emerging intersections of science and philosophy.

JMEWS was launched in 2005 as the official journal of the Association for Middle East Women’s Studies (AMEWS), an international multidisciplinary organization founded in 1984 by anthropologist Suad Joseph of UC Davis. AMEWS started the
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CSW ANNOUNCEMENTS
I had the great pleasure this past weekend of attending a walk-through of the “WACK! Art and the Feminist Revolution” show at the Geffen Contemporary at MOCA in Little Tokyo. The massive exhibition contains over 400 works, brought together to illustrate the signal importance of feminist art of the 1970s as a postwar art movement. It is thrilling to see all this work in one place and to be able to viscerally experience the concurrence and difference of feminist aesthetic and political preoccupations through and across media that includes sculpture, painting, photography, installation, video and film. The list of video and film in and of itself is staggering and contains many works very difficult to see. I will definitely be going back to watch pieces that I have read about but have never had the opportunity to view—for example, the short films of Theresa Hak Kyung Cha. The walk-through, organized by Professors Jennifer Doyle (English, UCR) and Catherine Lord (Art, UCI) featured artists and critics commenting on selected works in the show. Of particular interest to me was artist and UCLA Professor Mary Kelly’s *Post-Partum Document 1973-1979*, an installation documented in a book of the same name that I have taught many times in courses on experimental autobiography. The piece addresses in six phases the intersubjective interactions between mother and infant from birth to the child’s acquisition of language, using the material productions of this interaction—from dirty diapers to paper scribbles to the
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On October 10, 2006, in a report to the General Assembly of the United Nations, Secretary-General Kofi Annan presented an in-depth study on all forms of violence against women. According to the report, “at least one out of three women experienced violence at some stage in their lives”; violence against women is thus not a characteristic of some countries. It is a global problem and “a serious public policy problem in all stable democracies,” according to Weldon. For example, in France, the human rights organization Amnesty International reports, “one out of ten women is victim of domestic violence.” Official data indicate that perpetrators of domestic violence kill on average one woman every three days in France.

Violence against women, as spelled out in Article 1 of the 1993 United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women, refers to acts – happening specifically to women because they are women – that restrict, impair, or nullify women’s ability to exercise their equal rights and freedoms as citizens, that is, threats, coercion, and arbitrary deprivations of liberty that “result in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women” whether it happens “in public or private life.”

Over the past two decades, these issues concerning gender-based violence in the private sphere and women’s rights to equality and freedom have most prominently been discussed by feminists in two areas of scholarship: the genre of political theory popularly known as multiculturalism and the human rights literature – especially the line of inquiry on protection for women. In these two fields of study, the same arguments are made, namely, cultural rights and human rights do not serve women’s interests; in fact, private-sphere violence against women is ignored by male advocates of cultural rights and human rights. Yet to my knowledge, the two literatures have not been brought together in a systematic study. To remedy this defect, and in so doing, develop an alternative account of human rights that makes an advance over how the problem of private-sphere violence against women has so far been addressed within the multiculturalism and human rights literatures is, in the main, the undertaking of my dissertation.

On the received and conventional view, promoting women’s rights as human rights in the mainstream holds the best promise as demonstrated by international documents such as the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the 1993 Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women, the 1993 Vienna Declaration, the 1994 Cairo Declaration recognizing women’s reproductive rights as human rights, and the 1995 Beijing Platform for Action. In sharp contrast to this conventional wisdom, I argue that creating the gender-specific category
of women’s rights is redundant and incoherent; it creates more problems than it solves. Human rights need be, therefore, not rejected but reinterpreted. It is this view of human rights that I defend in my work.

So what are the implications of reinterpreting human rights? One is that the two concepts of freedom have to be brought forward. Another is that the concept of negative freedom has to be enlarged so as to include the idea of freedom as absence of hierarchy. Taking negative freedom in this sense, namely, as the absence of domination and subjugation, it is possible then in the private sphere where patriarchal norm of domination and subordination is pervasive, we may begin to detect how for the vast majority of women, freedom is wanting. In contrast, taking the conventional view that equates freedom with autonomy – a view found in the political theory of liberals such as Joseph Raz and Will Kymlicka, where autonomy means having the appropriate mental conditions,10 a range of options to choose from, and independence as the ability to revise traditional beliefs – this view of freedom as autonomy almost completely ignores the women problem because the issues relating to gender hierarchy and the exclusion of women, matters known to exist in all societies, are hardly addressed. To grapple with the women problem and to see violence against women as a problem undermining the integrity of women, freedom as non-hierarchy is a concept that has to be developed and brought forward. But this is a starting point only. While this conception of negative freedom can bring into relief women’s risk of falling into victim of violence in the public and private spheres, simply because they are women, it says nothing about the positive steps to take for ending hierarchy, in the direction of, for example, providing proper social support and proper social respect for women.

REFERENCES

NOTES
1. In English, available online: http://dacscessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/No641974/PDF/No641974.pdf?OpenElement
3. See “En France, une femme sur dix est victime de violences conjugales,” Le Monde, 8 February 2006. Amnesty International calls the situation in France a “state affair.”
6. It is true that men experience internal violence. Cathy Young comments in her op-ed piece, “There are also battered men,” International Herald Tribune, 11 January 2006, p.6, that “the most reliable research shows that up to 35 percent of victims injured by violent partners are men.” But my focus is on violence against women.
7. To be sure, attention to these issues dates back further than the last two decades. “From the nineteenth century, feminists (including J.S. Mill) have drawn attention to the impunity with which husbands could use physical force against their wives” (Pateman 1989, 185). Yet many countries did not begin to address violence against women as a problem of public policy until the latter half of the 1980s, and many more only in the first half of the 1990s (Weldon 2002, 19).
8. Carole Pateman pointed out to me the parallel feminist critiques of cultural rights and human rights. I am indebted to her for this important insight.
10. Put another way, autonomy that structures the defense of cultural rights puts up blinders to how hierarchical relations — constitutive of autonomous lives — frustrate the rights of women to freedom from being interfered with, bullied, threatened, harmed, and even killed. Autonomy confines the field of inquiry into freedom.

Steve On is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Political Science at UCLA. His advisor is Carole Pateman. His areas of research are multiculturalism, human rights, and freedom. In the past two years, he has contributed articles on the headscarf case in France for the Journal Contemporary Political Theory and on the “relative universality” of human rights for the Journal Perspectives on Global Development and Technology. He is currently writing his dissertation; two chapters of it will be presented in international conferences in the United Kingdom. He presented a version of this article at the 2006 annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association at Albuquerque, New Mexico. A CSW Travel Grant helped defray his expenses.
“Mansfield Park and the ‘Womanly Style’ in Fiction”

Emily Hodgson Anderson’s

Review and Summary by Brad Pasanek

In "Mansfield Park and the ‘Womanly Style’ in Fiction" Emily Hodgson Anderson, an assistant professor of eighteenth-century literature at USC, considers how style is read as “a sign of sex.” In particular, the adjective “womanly” and the quality of womanliness fall under her scrutiny. This interesting, original reading of dramatic and fictional performances concludes by presenting Jane Austen’s Fanny Price as an emblem of a “womanly style” of indirection and mediation.

To be “womanly” is to possess “the qualities (as of gentleness, devotion, fearfulness, and so forth) held to be characteristic of women,” or so we read in the OED. But we learn from Anderson that to write in a “womanly” way is not quite that. A “womanly style” is not what Norman Mailer describes in Advertisements for Myself as—and here I cite where Anderson has not but Francine Prose and Terry Castle have—“fey, old-hat, Quaintsy Goysy, tiny, too dykily psychotic, crippled, creepish, fashionable, frigid, outer-Baroque, maquillé in mannequin's whimsy, or else bright and stillborn.” To write in a womanly style, we learn from Anderson, is to dodge if not repudiate such fulsome characterizations.

Anderson’s treatment of Mansfield Park proves to be much more than a reading of a novel: her argument incorporates feminist theory, the history of drama, and narratology. Anderson departs from Virginia Woolf’s honoring of Jane Austen as the inventor of a “woman's sentence” and David Marshall’s understanding of Fanny Price’s self-effacing manner as performance. For Anderson the “womanly” sentence is a performance, a performance conditioned by genre and the history of genres, a performance staged for changing audiences. Striving to compress her historical observations of the period preceding and following the turn of the nineteenth century, Anderson claims that “womanly style” becomes increasingly “androgynous”—a descriptor that Anderson, may come to revise if not regret, and as such I’ll pass over the choice and substitute the term “impersonal” in its place. Admittedly, “impersonal” may be no more felicitous. In a gendered context it may even be misleading.

D. A. Miller’s Jane Austen, or the Secret of Style is invoked as an important point of reference by Anderson. But beware, here there be gender trouble: the Austen Style, as characterized by Miller, is impossibly impersonal, inhuman, omniscient, and universal. It is No One’s style. Austen (or Fanny Price) is then no exemplar of “womanly” style. Indeed, Miller would seem to anticipate his interlocutors: “in short, that what we took for Style, everyone else took for Woman.” The novel of manners is a novel of style, and
Austen's novels are novels of Style with a capital “S.” Jane Austen, author and woman, disappears.

“Manner” and “style” prove interchangeable in more ordinary usages, and it is this overlap of the words’ senses that occasions the slip from style to authorial persona—from literary style to personal style. Who is to say which way we slip and slide? One can try to follow Miller into impersonality or Anderson (who Miller might class with “everyone else”) into womanliness. Miller’s stylothe is his own way; and perhaps, as was suggested in the discussion of Anderson’s presentation, a flight into impersonality entails a refusal to engage with feminist scholarship, a refusal which is too easily interpreted as an arch and stylish snubbing of many of those women who produce such scholarship.

Trying a different approach, Anderson insists womanliness is a strategy, a woman’s strategy. Anderson’s expertise includes eighteenth-century drama, and she understands “womanly style” as feigning—not a disappearing act exactly, but a mask, a way of being present in propria persona under a proscenium arch. Austen’s impersonal style then “marks the culmination of a process in which theatricality was repositioned into new, narrative forms”—specifically Jane Austen’s novel of manners. Fiction in particular, treated broadly by Anderson as “an act of feigning,” is described in gendered terms.

Anderson observes that fictions, like women, may be thought of as duplicitous, showy, costumed, hypocritical—or rather, were held to be so in evolving eighteenth-century imaginings. (What is characteristically “womanly” or “fictional” is, of course, a moving target.) The culture that believes every woman is an actress turns public theater into a “covert, protected space for expression,” and Anderson believes it “was the very antitheatrical assumptions about theater’s insincerity that attracted women writers” to dramatic genres. In a setting in which expression is assumed to be feigned, a “woman could speak her mind to an audience that was both broader and more receptive than it would have otherwise been.”

Anderson produces an array of near paradoxes—in which the “womanly style” is synonymous with feigning and indirection, in which fiction itself is born etymologically of feigning and yet becomes a mode of self-expression. Finally, she claims an androgynous style comes to convey womanly sentiments. Style is then a “conduit for authorial beliefs.” The process “characterizes, in its very effacement of gender, a gendered approach to expression.”

Miller, Marshall, and Anderson are in agreement that Austen’s prose masks any personal “womanliness,” and I am sympathetic if not yet fully convinced by Anderson’s claim that the masking of womanliness is just that, a mask—a “womanly” mask. Fiction here is speech act and the “womanly style” is a way of creating a persona to speak through. Personare, notes Anderson, is “sounding through;” Fanny, a speaker who speaks only when spoken through. The etymology implies that personhood is performed—but by whom?

Exploring these complications, Anderson emphasizes “womanly” indirection and the freedom of actresses to speak in a covert manner. Keeping in mind the historical development of novelistic devices, we see that eighteenth-century authors exchange soliloquy for free indirect discourse (le style indirect). Here Anderson might work harder to connect the two modes: the soliloquies found in Sarah Fielding novels, say, from the middle of the eighteenth century and the free indirect discourse that serves some of the same functions in the novels of the early nineteenth century.

In fact, I can’t help but think—without having tallied all the relevant passages in her novels—that moments of free indirect discourse in Austen involve more female than male characters. It is these moments of free indirect discourse in which the impersonal narrator speaks in the person of her characters, in which ventriloquizing not soliloquizing occurs, in which the narrator borrows language and thought from her female characters and speaks both freely and indirectly.

If Anderson is right, examples of free indirect discourse would not be “unspeakable sentences,” as described by linguists and narratologists, but moments of theater. A generic distinction between fiction and drama is here abandoned. It is not unusual to draw lines of influence between and among novels and plays, but it is quite startling to do as Anderson has and treat fiction itself as dramatic.

Brad Pasanek is a Postdoctoral Fellow in the USC Annenberg Center for Communication.
Middle East Women's Studies Review in 1988 and continued to produce the newsletter over the next sixteen years as the organization and its affiliated scholars developed the ideas, the networks, the determination, and the funding to support the thrice-yearly research journal now published by Indiana University Press.

The journal’s first home was the Center for Middle Eastern and North African Studies at the University of Michigan. Its first editors were Professor Marcia Inhorn, director of CMENAS, and Professor Mary Layoun, Department of Comparative Literature, University of Wisconsin–Madison. Professor Layoun stepped aside after the first year, and Inhorn and managing editor Alissa Surges saw the journal through its second year, and passed it on in good health to the new editors at UCLA.

Thanks to funding by the Office of the Dean, Social Sciences, and additional support from the Center for the Study of Women and the Center for Near Eastern Studies at UCLA, and the Middle Eastern Studies Program at the University of California, Santa Barbara, JMEWS has tripled its editorial team.

Co-editor Sondra Hale is Professor of Anthropology and Women’s Studies at UCLA. She formerly chaired Women’s Studies at three universities, including UCLA, coordinates UCLA’s Global South Gender Initiative, and co-facilitates the Migrating Epistemologies workshop series at CSW. Her research specializations are gender, cultural studies, politics, and social movements in the Middle East and Africa. She is the author of Gender Politics in Sudan: Islamism, Socialism, and the State, and is currently coediting a book project on “Sudan’s Killing Fields: Perspectives on Genocide.”

Co-editor Nancy Gallagher is Professor of History, Chair of the Middle East Studies Program, and Co-director of the Center for Middle East Studies at UC Santa Barbara, and president of AMEWS. Her book on Quakers in the Israel/Palestine Conflict is forthcoming in 2007, and she is working on a book entitled Women in Islam: Human Rights and Activism, to be published by Routledge.

Managing editor Diane James is a Research Associate at the UCLA Center for Near Eastern Studies. Her interests include media, language, and performance in academia, theater, radio, and virtuality.

Book reviews editor Lara Deeb is a cultural anthropologist and Assistant Professor of Women’s Studies at the University of California at Irvine. She is the author of An Enchanted Modern: Gender and Public Piety in Shi‘i Lebanon. Her current projects include an analysis of the intersection of public religiosities and understandings of temporality, and “interfaith intimacies” in relation to transnational discourses about sexuality and religion. She is also a member of the editorial board of the Middle East Research and Information Project (MERIP).

Editorial assistant Rana Sharif is a first-year graduate student in the UCLA Women’s Studies program. A hybrid Palestinian-American with Latin American influences, she began her academic life as a molecular biology major, but found that her true passions lie in the humanities and social sciences. Her research interests include Palestinian gendered identities, women’s participation in irredentist social movements, law, Islamic feminisms, and racial and ethnic formations. She has traveled extensively in the Middle East and speaks Arabic and Spanish.

Editorial assistant Fiazuddin Shuayb is a Ph.D. student in the UCLA Islamic Studies program. A Trinidad-born journalist and writer and a Mellon-Mays Fellow, he earned a B.A. in Political Science/Anthropology at Queens Col-

The Winter 2007 issue, guest edited by Martina Rieker, director of the Cynthia Nelson Institute for Gender and Women’s Studies at the American University in Cairo, includes a history of the Tunisian women’s movement by a key scholar and activist; an examination of the “White Turk” discourse by a Turkish political scientist; a study of Kurdish women’s organizing in diaspora; an analysis of Palestinian camp women’s life stories; and a study of the translation of “gender” into Arabic.
lege, New York. He is fluent in Classical and Modern Standard Arabic and is studying Persian and French. His research interests include Islamic political thought, gender discourse in Islam’s sacred texts, Islamic sciences, and the historiography of Islamic law.

The JMEWS editorial team is supported by five associate editors, an editorial board of 28 scholars based at universities in the U.S. and the Middle East, and the Association for Middle East Women’s Studies.

AMEWS developed its publication goals during a quarter-century that saw an explosion of research on Middle Eastern women’s lives, identities, agency, and activism. There was tremendous institutional growth and disciplinary expansion in women’s studies during this period as well, and feminist theory was greatly expanded and revised. The new scholarship has been deeply informed by scholars from the global South who have encouraged and contributed to the re-evaluation of Western feminist assumptions.

From a traditional area studies perspective, the Middle East stretches from North Africa through Iraq, and encompasses non-Arab Turkey, Israel, Iran, and Afghanistan, as well as sub-Saharan Sudan. But in the age of globalization and transnationalism, this geographically bound notion is too limiting. Middle Eastern peoples are living in diasporic communities around the globe, and thus the Middle East also exists “abroad.”

There are other ways of mapping the Middle East. Islam transcends the region, connecting Muslims in Europe, the Americas, Africa, and Central, South, and Southeast Asia. These considerations give JMEWS an expansive conception of its field of inquiry. Not limited by borders, neither does it limit its attention to women. JMEWS is committed to an inclusive gender studies perspective, welcoming research on men and masculinities, sex and sexualities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transsexual communities in relation to the Middle East and Islam.

Since September 11, 2001, the Middle East has been in the global media spotlight. Not surprisingly, Middle Eastern women are being used symbolically to reinscribe negative images of Islam and culturally embedded patriarchy. There are far too many media pundits commenting on Middle Eastern women’s lives without any first-hand knowledge of those lives. JMEWS aims to serve as a corrective and scholarly antidote in an era of pervasive misinformation.

JMEWS is reaching out to scholarly communities in several directions. The Winter 2007 issue, guest edited by Martina Rieker, director of the Cynthia Nelson Institute for Gender and Women's Studies at the American University in Cairo, includes a history of the Tunisian women’s movement by a key scholar and activist; an examination of the “White Turk” discourse by a Turkish political scientist; a study of Kurdish women’s organizing in diaspora; an analysis of Palestinian camp women’s life stories; and a study of the translation of “gender” into Arabic.

To engage young scholars, JMEWS will announce this month a bi-annual open competition for the best graduate student research paper in Middle East women’s studies, and plans to publish the prize-winning entry in Winter 2008.

On April 5, JMEWS presents its first annual distinguished lecture, to be hosted by the UC Santa Barbara Center for Middle East Studies. Susan Slyomovics, Professor of Anthropology and Near Eastern Languages and Cultures at UCLA, will lecture on “Mary’s Well in Nazareth: Photography, Gendered Space, and Water Law,” at 4 pm in the McCune Room, HSSB 6th floor. The event is free and open to the public (for more information, visit http://www.cmes.ucsb.edu/, or telephone 805-893-4245).

On April 27th to 28th, JMEWS, Duke University, and the University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill will co-sponsor a workshop at Duke on Marketing Muslim Women. Organized by Miriam Cooke and Ellen McLarney at Duke and Banu Gokariksel at UNC-CH, the workshop will consider works in progress by local (east coast) scholars and lay the groundwork for an international conference co-sponsored by JMEWS, AMEWS, Duke and UNC-CH, to be held at Duke University in March 2008.

Diane James is the Managing Editor of JMEWS.
NEW CLASS!

Gender and Sustainability
Local – Global Connections

WS 185 (4 units)
Fridays, 10am to 1pm

Do you want to get your hands, feet, and mind into the relationship of Gender to Sustainable Development? For Spring Term '07, we'll inquire into the relationship of Gender to the sustainability of our food system. Questions we may pose are...Who controls how food is grown, marketed and consumed? Who benefits from these decisions? How equitable and gender sensitive is this process? To what extent do women vis-à-vis men have access to the science, technology, and regulation of foods? What are the local – global dimensions of this process?

This is a project-based, community learning course. An emphasis is on field work with a community group or organization involved in food (Farmer's Markets, Urban Farms, Food Co-ops, Permaculture...). Our main task will be to develop a pilot project or activity framed by the following:

- Gender Analysis (as used in International Development Projects)
- Just Sustainability Assessment: Environmental Justice

In class, you will have an opportunity to facilitate classroom activities, organize with classmates, exchange with 'expert' guest lecturers, and learn about a variety of cogent food related issues such as ... Community Supported Agriculture (CSA), Organic Agriculture, Permaculture, GMO's/Biotechnology, Fair Trade/Certification, Food Security-Sovereignty-Safety.

For more information, contact:

Michael Silverman, Postdoctoral Fellow
Institute of the Environment, La Kretz 300
310-267-5353 (office)
silvermanmc@ucla.edu
Elizabeth Blackwell, MD, Award
For a publishable research report, thesis, dissertation or published article by a UCLA graduate or undergraduate student relating to women, health or women in health-related sciences. (Examples include medicine, biological and other sciences, public health, sociology of medicine, history of science, medical education, or health policy.) Multi-authored articles will be considered, as long as the applicant has made a significant contribution to the research.
DEADLINE: 12 NOON, APRIL 6, 2007

Renaissance Award
The student must be a UCLA undergraduate woman who returned or is returning to college after a period of years. Students transferring from community college to UCLA as juniors and continuing UCLA undergraduates are eligible to apply. Student must be eligible for financial aid or student loans.
DEADLINE: 12 NOON, APRIL 23, 2007

Constance Coiner Undergraduate Award
Upper-division students (with a GPA of 3.0 or higher) who demonstrate an active commitment to both working-class and feminist issues and involvement in community activities for social change.
DEADLINE: 12 NOON, APRIL 23, 2007

Constance Coiner Graduate Fellowship
The student must be enrolled in a Ph.D. program at UCLA and be engaged in research focusing on feminist and working-class issues, must demonstrate excellence in teaching and a commitment to teaching as activism, and must have advanced to candidacy by one month prior to award deadline. Students who advanced to candidacy after the deadline are not eligible.
DEADLINE: 12 NOON, APRIL 23, 2007

Travel Grants
This program assists students with travel expenses related to their research (at the dissertation or pre-dissertation level) and to enable them to present papers at professional conferences. Students may apply for a grant to fund travel that has occurred since the last award deadline (the prior 6 months) or travel that will occur within the following 6 months. Awards may be used only for transportation costs to and from the conference or place of research.
DEADLINE: APRIL 23, 2007

For more information on funding opportunities, visit our website at www.csw.ucla.edu.