DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 963 HE 032 671

AUTHOR	Mencher, Joan P.; Nash, June; Francis-Okongwu, Anne; Susser, Ida.
TITLE	Anthropology. CUNY Panel: Rethinking the Disciplines. Women in the Curriculum Series.
INSTITUTION	Towson Univ., Baltimore, MD. National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, NY.; Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
ISBN	ISBN-1-885303-09-2
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	58p.; For related documents in this series, see HE 032 663-689.
AVAILABLE FROM	Towson University, 8000 York Road, Baltimore, MD 21252; Tel: 800-847-9922 (Toll Free); Fax: 410-830-3482; Web site: http://www.towson.edu/ncctrw ($10).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Anthropology; Archaeology; *College Curriculum; *College Instruction; Ethnicity; Females; Feminism; *Feminist Criticism; Higher Education; Race; *Sex Bias; Sex Differences; *Sex Fairness; Sexual Identity; Social Class; Social Science Research; Teaching Methods; Theories
IDENTIFIERS	Cultural Anthropology; Gender Issues; Latin America

ABSTRACT

This collection of four essays examines the ways in which anthropology, as a discipline, reflects ongoing scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, social class, and sexual orientation. In "The Impact of Gender Studies on Anthropology," Joan P. Mencher reviews the effects of gender studies on physical anthropology, archeology, and developmental anthropology. In "Gender Critique of Social Science Models in Latin America," June Nash argues that feminist models have upset preconceived models based on structural dimensions. In "The Study of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class: Anthropology and Social Change," Anne Francis-Okongwu reviews theoretical shifts that treat gender relations as one of the central sets of social relations for structuring and organizing the functioning of societies. In "Reflections on the Changes in Anthropology, Especially Medical Anthropology, in Relation to the Scholarship on Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Class, and Sexual Orientation," Ida Susser points out that since the 1960s and 1970s feminism and the social movements concerning sexuality and sexual orientations have shaped much rethinking in anthropology. Each essay contains references. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 432 963

ANTHROPOLOGY

CUNY Panel: Rethinking the Discipline

WOMEN in the CURRICULUM

HE032671

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Women in the Curriculum

ANTHROPOLOGY

CUNY Panel:

Rethinking the Disciplines

Joan P. Mencher
Herbert H. Lehman College,
and Graduate Center, CUNY

June Nash
City College, and
Graduate School, CUNY

Anne Francis-Okongwu
Queens College, CUNY

Ida Susser
Hunter College, and
Graduate Center, CUNY

**National Center for
Curriculum Transformation
Resources on Women
1997**

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women
Institute for Teaching and Research on Women
Towson University
8000 York Road
Baltimore, MD 21252
Phone: (410) 830-3944
Fax: (410) 830-3469
E-mail: ncctrw@towson.edu
http://www.towson.edu/ncctrw

Copyright © 1997
National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women
Reprint of "The CUNY Academy for the Humanities and Science: Rethinking the Disciplines," 1994.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women.

The National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women is partially supported by grants from The Ford Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, whose support is gratefully acknowledged. The viewpoints expressed herein, however, do not necessarily reflect those of the funding agencies.

Printed on recycled paper by Uptown Press, Baltimore, MD

ISBN 1-885303-09-2

CONTENTS

Preface v

The Impact of Gender Studies on Anthropology 1
Joan P. Mencher

Gender Critique of Social Science Models in Latin America 10
June Nash

The Study of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class: Anthropology and Social Change 20
Anne Francis-Okongwu

Reflections on the Changes in Anthropology, Especially Medical Anthropology, in Relation to the Scholarship on Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Class, and Sexual Orientation 32
Ida Susser

Contributors 39

Preface

In 1992–1994 the SEMINAR ON SCHOLARSHIP AND THE CURRICULUM: THE STUDY OF GENDER, RACE, ETHNICITY, AND CLASS, under the aegis of the **City University of New York Academy for the Humanities and the Sciences**, and generously funded by the Ford Foundation, undertook a series of meetings devoted to "Rethinking the Disciplines." The Academy Seminar had already spent four years examining ways in which the study of gender, race, ethnicity, and class has been slowly transforming the curriculum of the university. Panels had explored women's studies, ethnic studies, area studies, interdisciplinary studies, pedagogical issues, and teaching about such topics as AIDS. The Academy Seminar has involved faculty at CUNY who are members of the CUNY Academy, faculty, students, and administrators interested in these specific issues, and faculty who have themselves taken part in one of the several curriculum transformation projects within CUNY beginning in the 1980s.*

* Two curriculum projects, funded by the Muskawini Foundation, were introduced at Hunter College, in 1983 among those teaching introductory courses and in 1985 among faculty in the professional schools (Health Sciences, Nursing, and Social Work). Two more projects were undertaken with the sponsorship of the Center for the Study of Women and Society, with grants from the Ford Foundation, one for the Community Colleges and one to Integrate Materials on Women of Color into the Senior College Curriculum. Four semester-long curriculum seminars for faculty involved in vocational education in the Community and Technical Education

It was timely, therefore, that in its fifth year the Academy Seminar should ask directly how much the introduction of this new scholarship, its theory and impact on the curriculum, had actually affected the pursuit of various disciplines in institutions of higher education. The seven areas targeted—Literature, History, Sociology, Biology, Psychology, Anthropology, and Education—represent scholarly arenas in which a great deal of "theory" has been produced, new journals have proliferated, and considerable activity has occurred under many aegises to identify, explicate, and disseminate the transformed perspectives thus formulated. There is now no lack of materials, no absence of theoretical frameworks, no question of the level of sophistication and argumentation, and no dearth of pedagogical analyses demonstrating the importance of these new methodological approaches, this new knowledge base.

For ANTHROPOLOGY, each panelist was asked to consider these issues from a set of questions framed to bring forward what is happening from her/his perspective in the field. These questions probe the ways Anthropology as an academic field currently reflects ongoing scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class: Have the ways the field is conceptualized undergone any radical changes? Are there any shifts in the ways theory and research are taught to graduate students in this field? Have there been changes in the way introductory textbooks explain the field? And if

---

colleges within CUNY, funded by the New York State Department of Education's Program for Sex Equity, took place from 1987 to 1991, and eight year-long Faculty Development Seminars, under the aegis of the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs, were offered from 1987 to 1995 for Balancing the Curriculum for Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class. The CUNY Academy Seminar on Scholarship and the Curriculum: The Study of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class has been in existence since 1988.

little major change is reflected in these areas, in the light of so much new scholarship, what has been the source of resistance to change in the practice of the field? Finally, we have sought to probe the ways new knowledge has affected teaching in the classroom. These papers are the answers to these questions by the panelists who discussed them April 25, 1994.

Dorothy O. Helly

Series Editor

April 25, 1994

ANTHROPOLOGY

The Impact of Gender Studies on Anthropology

Joan P. Mencher

This short paper focuses on three subfields of anthropology: physical anthropology, archaeology, and development anthropology. I have worked in the subfield of development anthropology over the past fifteen years, both as a researcher and a consultant for various international organizations. My particular interests have been focused on: women's involvement in agriculture, land relations, and international health. Here, however, I will concentrate on the changes in the questions asked by at least some anthropologists over the past fifteen to twenty years.

Physical Anthropology and Archaeology

While I do not work in either physical anthropology or archaeology, I do teach this material on these topics on the undergraduate level. The following questions are some that have come to be hotly debated in the United States. Many of the questions relate to the extent to which differences between women and men can be explained by biology or culture, or by both. In the field of physical anthropology there are a number of new ways of looking at human evolution that have developed as a result of taking women into account. Most earlier discussions of human evolution,

which developed out of the work of Darwin and other late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century scientists, all were posited on the assumption that human evolution took place as a result of male hunting activity. Four related assumptions seem to have governed all earlier views of humans. The first is that men were stronger and larger and that this gave them a superiority; and now the work of the cultural anthropologist Lila Leibowitz has challenged the link between sexual dimorphism and sex role patterns. The second is that men are better able to form close bonds among themselves and that this is genetically programmed; but a wide range of data from early human societies now indicates that women were often the social center of groups (Zilman 1989). Looking at and talking about gender considerations has led to an awareness of the importance of gathering in human evolution, to the realization that hunting of large game was a relatively late phenomenon in human development, and to the discovery that many of what were earlier called remains of the hunt were actually the remains from animals such as deer and wild cattle caught by other animals (like tigers or lions).

The third assumption attempted to explain male dominance with reference to the biological basis for aggression. The fourth assumption, noting an absence of women in current societies in nondomestic cooperative and political activity, uses this absence as evidence for why they are subordinate to men. This conclusion is based on the idea that women are biologically adapted for reproduction and not much else.

Questions raised by those who have challenged these traditional assumptions include, for example: What is meant by dominance and submission? What is the biological basis of male aggression? Is aggressiveness necessarily an important characteristic of a good hunter (male or female)? Which primates are our most immediate relatives?

Is dominance or aggressiveness in any way correlated with reproductive advantage? Who are the main victims of crimes in most hunting and gathering societies? (Data seems to indicate males.) The fact that women bear children and nurse them was frequently used for the basis of an assertion that men lacked the ability to nurture. This claim has also been challenged by recent research. All these questions are now the subjects of a significant body of research by female physical anthropologists and some male physical anthropologists. There are other issues as well raised by current research, but time does not permit me to explore this further.

Archaeology, in part because of its domination by males, was the last field within anthropology to begin to pay attention to new questions about gender. One of the first indications of new interest in the field was a publication based on a symposium run by Joan Gero and Margaret Conkey (1991). Questions that have now begun to be raised by archaeologists include issues around the sexual division of labor: when it came into being, whether or not it was correlated with differential status between women and men, whether or not there were societies that were essentially gender equal (though men and women might not do the same things), and what the circumstances were under which sexual inequality arose. From these questions have sprung further ones. What is the relationship between the rise of structured inequality (i.e., rulers and ruled) and the rise of gender inequality? Under which circumstances did women and men fight on a basis of equality (as noted by Vianna Muller for some of the Germanic groups who fought with the Romans)? Did the breakup of corporate ownership of land and the rise of private ownership (at least in some regions) lead to a lower status for women? What other factors precipitated structured inequality between women and men?

Clearly these issues should be discussed in greater detail, and could be discussed far better by women working in these fields, but I did not want to let this panel totally ignore these fields. To what extent this new research is taught to graduate students in these fields depends very much on who is teaching the course and which college or university we look at. It is my impression that many male physical anthropologists and archaeologists have not changed their way of teaching very much, while most women professors and some men in these fields have changed their courses considerably.

Cultural and Development Anthropology

My own work led me to get involved in gender issues at two points of time. When I first went to India in 1958, it was to carry out a study of family life and child rearing practices in two parts of Kerala State in south India. Because of the nature of the work, I spent a great deal of time working with women. When I returned to the United States at the beginning of the 1960s I found that most colleagues in India studies were surprised at what I had done. I was told: "How could you spend so much time with these women when they are so boring?" or "What is the use of paying so much attention to women when they do not know much about the significant issues of our times?" This was distressing and because I needed to get a job and to obtain some professional recognition, after publishing two articles on this data, I decided to write up my other data, material more in line with what was then in vogue. This was ten years before the women's movement began in the United States, and there was really very little interest in women's lives in mainstream anthropology (or any place else in the field). At that point, I did not even write up and publish any of the women's life histories that I had collected.

In 1985, I obtained funds for a young Indian woman colleague and myself to return to the two villages where I had collected life histories in 1958–60 and to do follow-ups of the women who were still alive. The plan was also to take new life histories from women belonging to a few categories not included in the earlier study, and to interview the descendants of women who had passed away. We are now working on that data.

In recent years the fields of anthropology in which I have been carrying out most of my own work have been development anthropology, women in development (WID) and gender and development (GAD), farming systems research, and issues of cross-cultural health. Therefore, the rest of this paper deals with how these areas have been affected by the new focus on gender. Anthropologists have been increasingly collecting data on gender and class and practice, and raising both theoretical and applied issues. It should be noted that this is an interdisciplinary field and therefore it has involved using not only anthropology but also such areas of knowledge as women's studies, economics, and development theory.

In the 1970s, with the recognition that neoclassical and Marxist economists, as well as economic anthropologists working in nonwestern societies, had neglected issues of inequity between the sexes—both within the family and within societies at large—and with the growing awareness of the various ways in which women were tied to a world system of economic dependency, anthropologists joined other social scientists to start to examine an entirely new set of issues. Etienne and Leacock (1979) explored the impact of the colonial experience on the role, status, economic opportunities and political power of women. Their co-edited book became a milestone in this effort and now informs not only introductory texts but also much current research. The fields of Women in Development (WID) and

Gender and Development (GAD) have moved through a number of stages, from looking at women as passive victims of the colonial experience to seeing their role as survivors and as manipulators of the systems that oppressed them, transforming whatever they could to their own and their family's advantage. Furthermore, the field has gone from looking at women only, to an examination of issues of gender and how gender intersects with all other issues, such as racism, ethnicity, and power.

One of the many important theoretical points raised in these investigations relates to the distinction between women's practical roles and needs and women's strategic roles and needs, first explicitly developed in 1989 by Caroline Moser (1993). Today this distinction has come to inform almost all of the work of not only development anthropologists but also most people working in development fields from related social sciences. Women's practical needs refer to their needs for physical well-being, better access to jobs or other sources of income and clothing for themselves and their children, better nutrition for themselves and their children, improved medical care, and other related issues. It also includes their right to a safe environment, including freedom from physical abuse in warfare, or at the hands of landlords or their own relatives, including husbands. Women's strategic needs involve their needs for autonomy, for a greater control over their own lives, and for a greater role in decision making about those things that affect their lives.

Research has shown how women have not only experienced disruptions in their traditional livelihood as well as their social, economic and political positions and power, but also how women have had limited access to new modes of wage labor production. Many more questions are asked today about women's roles in the day to day life of their societies. Detailed studies that I and other colleagues have

conducted indicate the significance of paying attention to women and their multiple activities, thoughts, and other behaviors. Research has raised questions that have ranged from examining the role and functions of women in farming systems research, to studying women and the differential use of income by women and men, to discovering how women manage to find a place for themselves in situations where fundamentalist religions are strong. One of the areas where WID or GAD research has had a strong impact is in opening up the "forbidden box" of intrahousehold dynamics. Exploration has been conducted into what is meant by a "family income." Theoretically related questions have included what is a "household" and what is a "head of a household"? In many parts of the world, women and men, in fact, have separate purses and vastly different economic responsibilities both to their children and to their homes. In other words, the classical concept of the "family purse" has now been greatly revised. The recognition of this revision is slowly influencing both economic anthropology courses as well as development economics courses. As a result, intrahousehold resource allocation has come to be a respectable subject for research.

Investigation of the intersection of state policies with women's roles and status is now carried out systematically. A classic case explored in this area is the Gambia swamp rice project that failed because women refused to work without wages. During project planning, male development workers had failed to consider the issue of paying women for their work, and saw their plans fail because of it.

Another arena where looking at gender has had a significant impact is agricultural studies. Earlier studies of the use of pesticides in rural parts of third world societies had looked only at men's activities, but nowadays what women as well as men do is studied, and the health implications for women and their children considered seriously,

especially because women and their children are often at greater risk as a result of exposure during pregnancy and subsequently during lactation.

New theoretical analysis and practical research has shed considerable light on nutrition issues for adult females and girl children and made it another arena of attention. The ramifications of these issues intersect with a wide variety of actual programming for women.

I have only been able to touch on a few of the many important areas that have been influenced by the new paradigms of gender and to offer only a few examples of the issues involved. A far more detailed paper would be needed to explore them fully. However, I would like to raise one last point. There are today an ever increasing number of textbooks focusing primarily on the issues of gender and anthropology, and there has been a profusion of articles on gender-related topics. The interest is clearly growing, and, as a result, research that considers gender is rapidly increasing.

Bibliography

Etienne, Mona and Eleanor Leacock, eds. 1979. *Women and Colonization: Anthropological Perspectives*. New York: Praeger.

Gero, Joan and Margaret Conkey, eds. 1991. *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Leacock, Eleanor. 1978. Women's Status in Egalitarian Society: Implications for Social Evolution. *Current Anthropology*, 19(2):247–54.

Leacock, Eleanor. 1981. *Myths of Male Dominance*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Leacock, Eleanor. 1983. Interpreting the Origins of Gender Inequality: Conceptual and Historical Problems. *Dialectical Anthropology,* 7:263–84.

Leibowitz, Lila. 1978. *Females, Males, Families: A Biosocial Approach*. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press.

Moser, Caroline. 1993. *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice, and Training*. New York: Routledge.

Muller, Vianna. 1985. Origins of Class and Gender Hierarchy in Northwest Europe. *Dialectical Anthropology,* 10:93–105.

Zilman, Adrienne. 1989. Woman the Gatherer: The Role of Women in Early Hominid Evolution. In *Gender and Anthropology: Critical Reviews for Research and Teaching*, edited by Sandra Morgen. Washington, D. C.: American Anthropological Association.

Gender Critique of Social Science Models in Latin America

June Nash

As members of each new sector of the population enter the discourse of the social sciences, they open the discourse related to existing models. Shortly after World War II, the entry of working-class veterans into the formerly privileged stream of college students expanded the inquiry into issues of class and race. With the independence of formerly colonized people in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, the questions of racism and its link to colonial domination exploded with the publication of Franz Fanon's *Wretched of the Earth*. These explorations into the bases of domination and control entered a surging feminist consciousness in the 1960s that questioned existing models of social science for their failure to take into account gendered aspects of world domination.

The opening up of critiques to those who were the objects rather than the generators of social science inquiry clarified the dual nature of scientific inquiry in which the models used serve both as analytic guides and ideological rudders. Where women had always been treated as the camp followers of civil wars, historians in the 1970s awakened to the significance of women's autonomous actions in the Mexican revolution of 1910 (Turner 1967). Until the 1980s political scientists had seen only housewives clamoring for food, not the generators of new social movements that were changing the way political action is formulated (Jelin 1990). Economists began to realize that nations could double their gross national product simply by devising a measure of women's productivity. Because of their

emphasis on subsistence societies distant from the centers of industrialization and modernization, anthropologists were not as likely to omit female-centered roles, yet they often made premature generalizations when called upon to consider the evolution of humankind.

Simultaneous with the gendering of perspectives came the critique of the models that dominated the social sciences. Neomarxists, like their nineteenth-century progenitors, limited their analysis to exploitation in the wage workforce until Mariarosa Dalla Costa (1972) analyzed how women's unpaid or low-waged domestic labor subsidized the cost of reproducing labor. Dependency analysts who followed Frank's (1965) thesis of "the underdevelopment of development" neglected dependency relations in the home where male-female roles provided the models for subordination. Development agents were concerned with women only as far as their reproductive and social consumption functions affected capital accumulation. Their projects, designed with males as actors, neglected the contribution that women could make to their society, often subverting their productive roles in the process of modernization (Mencher 1978). Modernization theory assumed the male status to be the universal measure of change, ignoring the decline in women's status with development (Boserup 1970).

Scientific methodology itself was premised on a male model of behavior. "Objective" statements of social reality, premised on divorcing personal perspectives and eliminating empathetic understanding of the observer, accepted the terms of universal discourse without recognizing particulars. Noting that male commentators are characterized by mastery, ego separation and enhancement of self which enters into their performance in the sciences and other fields, Jessie Bernard (1973) stated that "We are now in a liminal state in the art of social sciences. The values on

which our selective criteria are premised are being questioned by people who were never before significant enough a part of the profession as to challenge them."

In 1971 as I was writing my book on the Bolivian tin mining communities, I reviewed what women in the past century-and-a-half had written about working class movements of their time. Flora Tristan, a woman of French and Spanish parents who spent part of her life in Peru, wrote—itself an immodest proposal for a woman—in the 1830s, *Peregrinaciones de una paria* (1959), "In my narration, I often speak of myself. I reflect on my sufferings, my thoughts, my affections. All result from the orientation that God has given me, from the education I have received and from the position that the laws and prejudices have made us." Rosa Luxemburg was the only Marxist of her time in the early decades of the twentieth century who recognized the importance of the subsistence economies that persisted in early capitalism and provided industrialists with the cheap labor and resources that contributed to the accumulation of capital.

The approaches of these women, one of whom (Tristan y Moscoso 1837) called for a union of all workers, domestics, prostitutes, and thieves before the Communist Manifesto was published and the other (Luxemburg 1921, 1951) a critic of Lenin who had her ostracized from the Communist party, are clearly precursors to contemporary feminist critiques. Journals, articles, and books by women in the social sciences and humanities proliferated in the 1970s. By the late 1980s what some like to consider as "mainstream" social science began to pick up on reflexivity, multivocality, and the move away from an authoritative stance characteristic of feminist writers of the preceding decades. By that time, the absurdity of Eurocentric, male dominant stance was becoming uncomfortable even to its

progenitors as the world was passing beyond the predictions based on the modernity model. As Marjery Wolf (1992) suggests, "the critiques feminist social scientists have used for years are now being translated in postmodern terminology and taken very seriously." Where postmodernists have gone beyond the narrative and reflexive approaches cultivated in feminist writing they have again imposed their own imagery onto the world in a text that takes priority over the observed world.

In this deviation, postmodernism departs from the spirit and purpose of feminist inquiry. We conceived our task not only as that "of setting the record straight on women or on revising anthropological categories" as Clifford and Marcus (1989) misrepresent it, but of subverting the paradigms regarding not only gender, class, hierarchy, revolution but the very nature of social transformation. To adequately relate to women's issues, we had to shift the boundaries of public and private, of production and reproduction.

In this process of subversion feminist analysts in Latin America have made original contributions in the following arenas: (1) the origin of sexual hierarchy in preconquest societies; (2) the contribution of women in domestic production, social reproduction, and production for a market; and (3) gender implications of the new international division of labor. Earlier exercises in the anthropology of gender often reaffirmed Aristotelian and Cartesian paradigms such as man is to culture as woman is to nature (Ortner 1974) and the public private dichotomy or universality of female subordination (Rosaldo 1974). Etienne and Leacock (1980) edited an anthology of articles that asserted the importance of historical changes in the wake of conquest and colonization leading to dominance-subordination hierarchies that are then taken as universals. Spaniards imposed

European models on gods and humans, choosing societies that exemplified male hierarchy and leaving out the counter cases. The repugnance of the hierarchy of church and state powers to evidence that denied the Spanish sense of universal roles led the official historians to suppress the early chroniclers who reported female mercenary warriors, who in fact inspired the name of the Amazon River (Medina 1934). Modern ethnographers have encountered similar distortions as that of Napoleon Chagnon on the "fierce people" or Yanamamo, whose characterization of these men as natural savages is challenged by Judith Shapiro's (1976) analysis of the structural bases for gender inequality. Ellen Basso (1973) complements our view of Amazonian indigenous people with her study of the Kalapalo, revealed as a cooperative people with egalitarian tendencies. Buenaventura-Posso and Brown (1980) show even stronger tendencies toward egalitarianism and female autonomy among the Bari. In a surprisingly frank statement, Robert Murphy (1960) reversed his portrait of the Mundurucu as fierce headhunters in his book with his wife Yolanda (Murphy and Murphy 1985). Leaving aside the putative objective scientific focus of his first book, the Murphys show the ambiguous basis of male dominance. The men's house, instead of a citadel of power as Robert depicted it in his first ethnography, is seen as a retreat to defend themselves from the women.

Research focusing on women's work in the domestic and informal economy has revealed new dimensions to the formulation of the gross national product. One major problem is getting the data on which to base policies. Neuma Aguiar (1986) addressed the issue of census gathering in her summary of a conference funded by the Ford Foundation in Rio de Janeiro in 1978. The importance of eliciting data from women informants in the census process, avoiding the assumption that the "head of household" is the only

active provider, along with ethnographic inquiries in which women's invisible work is assessed are basic to improving data bases. Elsa Chaney and Ximena Bunster (1985) did an innovative study engaging children in their study of women's struggle for survival in the informal economy of Lima. Florence Babb (1986) explains how these vendors ensure the survival of their families while they contribute to social value. The expansion of artisan production is the most recent development project in which women's traditional arts have found a global market (Nash 1993). NGOs and national development projects recognize the low capital and direct return to family income in artisan production since the proceeds go to the women producers.

Feminist scholars have shown that the exploitation existing in the home and the workplace, as the double and triple burden women bear, enables men to play more active political roles in unions and parties. Far from pooling and sharing wages brought in by members of families, women as wives or daughters give more and receive less than male members. They still bear the double burden of wage work and domestic work despite increasing employment.

Because of their disadvantaged position in the labor market women are the preferred employees in the export processing zones, as Safa (1981) and Fernandez-Kelly (1984) have shown. With the growing unemployment of men, women are the chief breadwinners. The flight of factories from industrialized countries to these new zones has raised competition among workers to an international level as women's devalued wage is pitted against that of men. The net effect is to challenge male authority in the home.

Studies focusing on gender reveal that aggregate data eventually must be interpreted in terms of actual human beings. Structuralist premises are good as post mortems, but rarely provide the basis for predicting what

people will do or what choices individuals will make. Feminist studies, by favoring a more intimate, personalized account of human actors, laid the basis for rethinking political movements. Women's roles in what are called the "new social movements" (Escobar 1992; Jelin 1990) are changing our perceptions of what revolutionary demands are and how women make their aims known.

Feminist studies have conduced to multidimensional analyses that have upset preconceived models based on structural dimensions. They have changed the language in which social science is cast, and contributed to a personification of figures and trends. If these trends already set in motion by feminists have been coopted by postmodernist theory, so much the better. However, in so far as these protagonists have denied any objective truth, placing the text at the center of social science inquiry and denying the importance of structural conditions, then the advances made by feminist scholars concerned with overcoming authority and liberating the human potential of all subjects may be nullified. As Marjery Wolf so prophetically states (1992) "Following a postmodern Pied Piper might lead us away from the commitment to research and struggle."

References Cited

Aguiar, Neuma. 1986. Research guidelines: How to study women's work in Latin American. In *Women and change in Latin America*, edited by J. Nash and H. Safa. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.

Babb, Florence. 1986. Producers and reproducers: Andean marketwomen in the economy. In *Women and change in Latin America*, edited by J. Nash and H. Safa. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.

Basso, Ellen B. 1973. *The kalapalo indians of central Brazil.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bernard, Jessie. 1973. My four revolutions: An autobiographical history of the American Sociological Association, *American Journal of Sociology* 78(5):739–91.

Boserup, Ester. 1970. *Women's role in economic development.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Buenaventura-Posso, Elisa and Susan E. Brown. 1980. Forced transitions from egalitarianism to male dominance: The bari of Colombia. In *Women and colonization: Anthropological perspectives.* New York: J. F. Bergen.

Bunster, Ximena and Elsa M. Chaney. 1985. *Sellers and servants: Working women in Lima, Peru.* New York: Praeger.

Chagnon, Napoleon A. 1983. *Yanomamo: the fierce people.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Clifford, James and George Marcos. 1986. *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dalla Costa, Mariarosa. 1972. Women and the subversion of the community. In *The power of women and the subversion of the community,* edited by Selma James and Mariarosa Dalla Costa. Bristol: Falling Wall Press.

Escobar, Arturo. 1992. *Making of social movements in Latin America.* Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Etienne, Mona and Eleanor Leacock, eds. 1980. *Women and colonization: Anthropological perspectives.* South Hadley, N.J.: J. F. Bergin Publishers, Inc.

Fanon, Frantz. 1965. *The wretched of the earth.* New York: Grove Press.

Fernandez-Kelly, M. Patricia. 1993. *For we are sold, I and my people.* Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.

Frank, A. Gundar. 1965. *The underdevelopment of development.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Jelin, Elizabeth. 1990. *Citizenship and identity: Women and social change in Latin America*. London: Zed.

Luxemburg, Rosa. 1921, 1951. *The accumulation of capital.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Medina, José Torribio. 1934. *The discovery of the Amazon according to the account of Friar Gaspar de Carvajal and other documents.* New York: American Geographical Society.

Mencher, Joan. 1978. Why grow more food? An analysis of some of the contradictions in the green revolution in Kerala. *Economic and Political Weekly* 23–30: A988Al04.

Murphy, Robert F. 1960. *Headhunters heritage.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Murphy, Robert F. and Yolanda Murphy. 1986. *Women of the forest.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Nash, June. 1993. Household production in Amatenango del Valle. In *Crafts in the world market: The impact of global exchange on middle American artisans,* edited by June Nash. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.

Ortner, Sherry B. 1974. Is female to male as nature is to culture? In *Women, culture and society,* edited by M. Z. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Rosaldo, Michele Zimbalist and Louise Lamphere. 1974. *Women, culture and society.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Safa, Helen. 1993. Women, production and reproduction in industrial capitalism: A comparison of Brazilian and U.S. factory workers. In *Women, men, and the international division of labor,* edited by J. Nash and M. P. Fernandez-Kelly. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.

Shapiro, Judith. 1976. Sexual hierarchy among the Yanomama. In *Sex and class in Latin America,* edited by J. Nash and H. Safa. New York: Praeger.

Tristan y Moscozo, Flora. 1837. *L'union ouvrier.* Paris.

— 1959. *Peregrinaciones de una paria; seleccion portico y notas de Catalina Recavarren de Zizold.* Lima: Tierra Nueva.

Turner, Frederick C. 1967. Los efectos de la participacion feminina en la revolucion de 1910. *Historia Mexicana* 16:602–20.

Wolf, Marjery. 1992. *A thrice-told tale: Feminism, post-modernism, and ethnographic responsibility.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

The Study of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class: Anthropology and Social Change

Anne Francis-Okongwu

The invitation to participate in this panel discussion acted as a catalyst on me to take the occasion to reflect on the experiences that have influenced my research focus and related professional activities. My reflections have centered primarily on issues relating to the family experiences of urban women and children in the United States.

It is important to state that in 1973, when I entered the graduate program in Anthropology at CUNY, I emphatically rejected being defined as a "feminist." This position stemmed in part from my years of experience as a social worker, community organizer, and civil rights activist, and my own family situation, in which I was the working mother of two young sons. These experiences enabled me to view directly the deleterious effects of race and class relations on women, men, and children who struggle to sustain households, and to carry out basic family functions. Thus, the focus primarily on gender relations that emerged during the Women's Movement of the late 1960s held little appeal for me. In my view, the goals of this movement were not to alter the American system of social stratification, but rather to improve the placement of women within it.

Given this perspective, I decided that it would be interesting to discuss the streams of scholarship that subsequently informed, and shifted, my thinking about the processes of race, class, ethnicity, and gender formation. I also will dis-

cuss the specific feminist contributions which alerted me to the critical importance of including gender relations in our analysis of social systems and their articulation in the global economy.

As I thought about this matter, I realized I was extremely fortunate to have begun my graduate studies in anthropology during this important period of change. For example, during the 1970s and 1980s much of the reconceptualization of race, class, ethnicity, and gender formation that informs our current work emerged (Dalla Costa & James 1972; Leacock 1972; Rosaldo and Lamphere 1974; Reiter 1975; Mullings 1978; Davis 1981; O'Laughlin 1975; Gilroy 1987). This reconceptualization occurred as a result of new questions concerning the nature of these diverse relations in different contexts and during various historical periods (Leacock 1969; Meillassoux 1973). In addition, issues related to the emergence and expression of social stratification were being revisited (Meillassoux 1972 & 1973; Terray 1975). Furthermore, the processes of development and underdevelopment were being reconceptualized, as one critically linked and interrelated global process, rather than as separate and distinct cases of historical development (Frank 1967; Rodney 1982; Dupré & Rey 1973; Wallerstein 1974; Oxaal et al. 1975; Amin 1976; Wolf 1982).

Thus, in reflecting on the ways that anthropology has been affected by scholarship on gender, race, class, and ethnicity over the past two decades, I found it impossible to separate the work in these areas from three major theoretical shifts that have importantly and simultaneously influenced the training and work of anthropologists: (1) the expansion of the unit of analysis from a bounded societal unit to a world-systems framework; (2) the use of Marxist frameworks with careful attention to differing modes of production and their articulation within, and between, social

formations; (3) the treatment of gender relations as one of the central of the sets of social relations which structure and organize the functioning of societies.

In concert, these paradigmatic shifts have forced a rethinking of such traditional areas of study within the discipline as kinship, social evolution, systems of stratification and analysis of political and economic structures, and the related ideologies of each. Moreover, these theoretical perspectives have transformed the ways in which we conceptualize some of the basic concepts in anthropology such as culture, families, households, tribes, exchange systems, and the processes of race, ethnicity, class, and gender formation. In combination, these fundamental changes in analytical frameworks and reconceptualizations of basic anthropological concepts have critically informed the ways in which we carry out processes of anthropological inquiry, and the uses to which we put our work. This is so much so that, at this point, we are even asking, where is the field (D'Amico-Samuels 1991). And what is ethnography? Is it a form of carrying out social science inquiry, or is it an expression of literary criticism (Clifford 1986; Harrison 1991)?

These last two questions have led us to rethink seriously the informant/researcher dichotomy, and have encouraged us not only to do field work abroad, but also to conduct research in our own societies. Furthermore, contemporary anthropologists are more frequently engaged in applied work. Anthropologists can be found working, for example, in community based health centers (Sanjek 1987); in agencies serving the homeless (Dehavenon 1990); in union worker education programs (D'Amico-Samuels 1991); and in schools of education (Francis-Okongwu). It is also true that anthropologists are increasingly seeking contexts to use their skills, and work to influence

public policy on both the national and international levels (Blanc 1994; Okongwu 1995).

In this discussion, I will focus on my own training and work to illuminate how these changes in the discipline have influenced my work as an Anthropologist. I entered the doctoral program in Anthropology with the goal of developing innovative ways of integrating my graduate training and experience as a social worker with the study of Anthropology to create effective, culturally congruent approaches in social service delivery programs, in both the United States and West Africa. My primary academic interests were West Africa, development and underdevelopment, and various forms and systems of social inequality. I was particularly interested in precapitalist African states in what is now called Nigeria. Based on my experiences living in Nigeria, I was interested in exploring some of the distortions I saw in the literature on the nature of male/female relations, and the characterization of Igbo society as egalitarian. Interestingly all of these issues have been addressed since that time (Stevenson 1968; Dike & Ekejiuba 1978; Dike 1982; Sudarkasa 1973; Okonjo 1976; Afonja 1986). The work of these social scientists has served to raise questions about processes of state formation in West Africa, the content and expressions of female/male relations among different African ethnic groups, and the impact of colonialism and its aftermath on female/male relations.

During this same period feminist anthropologists were actively addressing the issue of the origin of female subordination. There was general agreement among cultural anthropologists that the sexual division of labor and related ideologies concerning the content of female and male roles were socially constructed; however, there were major disagreements about the origins of female subordi-

nation and the indices by which to determine the status of women cross-culturally (Rosaldo and Lamphere 1974; Reiter 1975). At that time I was taking a course with Eleanor Leacock, and reading her paper on "The Montagnais-Naskapi Band" (1969) and her introduction to *The Origin of The Family, Private Property and the State* (1972). These discussions, in combination, argued that gender and class inequalities evolved simultaneously. For me, this was the first convergence between my primary interests in social inequality and the processes of state formation and gender. This experience also convinced me that a Marxist theoretical framework was the most useful for the questions I wished to explore.

In the years that followed, I became increasingly interested in feminist inquiries into the role of women's unpaid labor in families, and the relationship of that work to capitalist production. Of particular interest to me were: (1) discussions of the artificial division between the public and private domains, and the ways this distinction acts to obscure connection of "women's work" to capitalist production (Rapp 1987); (2) discussions of the three dimensions of women's reproductive work, biological reproduction, daily reproduction, and social reproduction; and (3) arguments rejecting the separation between productive and reproductive activities, suggesting instead that they are more usefully conceptualized as a unified interconnected process (Dalla Costa & James 1972). The power of these theoretical works, particularly that of Dalla Costa and James, found expression in the grassroots movement of women in Britain in the "Wages for Housework" struggle. This movement demonstrated the potential of Marxist feminist theory, when shared beyond the academic community, to inform direct practice and grassroots social movements.

The issues raised by this approach to Anthropology, combined with scholarship exploring the intersections of race, class, ethnicity, and gender in the United States—which demonstrated the critical importance of moving beyond a "homogenous" conception of womanhood—informed my decision to do fieldwork in the United States (Mullings 1986; Dill 1979; Furstenberg et al. 1981; Davis 1981).

I was concerned, in this regard, that although we were regularly using the concepts race, class, and gender and recognized that these sets of social relations differentially shaped the ways that women experience family life, we were not giving adequate attention to the ways these historically developed structures of inequality became crystallized in the "lived" experience of people. Furthermore, although there was a voluminous literature on Black families in the United States, this work tended to focus on Black female-headed families living in poverty. I therefore felt it was important to do a comparative study of urban Black and White female-headed families of differing socioeconomic positions. My study was designed to expand our understanding of the ways in which the historical intersections of race, class, and gender have shaped the contours of family life among urban female-headed families. Female-headed families were conceptualized in this study as intergenerationally linked units, embedded in complex kinship/friendship network systems. Viewed in this way, the past experiences of the mothers' natal families and the content of resources exchanged through their social network systems could be related to the options and constraints of these mothers' survival strategies. This approach also allowed me to include the men connected to these families as fathers, partners, and grandparents in order to integrate them into my analyses of the structure and organization of the families (Okongwu 1993). The design of my study also enabled me to look more closely at marginally

middle-income families, a group often ignored by researchers and policy makers. The study also acted as a catalyst for me, and spurred me to do a comparative study of sixty Black and White marginally middle-income families in New York City (Okongwu 1995).

The findings of these comparative studies suggest that we need to move away from using education, income, and occupation as the central indicators of class location, and to make a clear distinction between socioeconomic position (based on individually held attributes) and class location (a historically developed group position rooted in a system of social production). This distinction has important implications for family-oriented public policy, and in particular for the criteria used to determine the types of government support needed by families.

Currently one of my major concerns is the failure of the academic community to share the results of their research with direct practitioners. As a social worker, I was often unaware of the shifts in theoretical perspectives and the findings of research that could have informed my work with families in important ways. As researchers we tend to talk only to ourselves, and not to create ways to build links between our work and the work of direct practitioners. Communication of this kind could contribute in significant ways to both the types of questions we explore and the strategies employed by people working directly with communities, families, and individuals.

Anthropologists can, in addition, make important contributions to the field of education. The issue of multicultural education, for example, has seized center stage in current debates on curriculum and school reform. Few of us, however, have shared in education circles how our understanding of culture, transculturation, and the inter-

play between the macro and micro levels in the process of identity formation relates to academic outcomes.

In closing, my thinking about the impact of scholarship on race, class, ethnicity, and gender over the past two decades is that we have moved increasingly toward doing direct work with individuals and groups. It has also forced many of us to see our work as a mechanism for social change. Finally this voluminous body of research has placed us in a good position to comment on pubic policy, and to press for needed social and family public policy reforms.

References Cited

Afonja, Simi. 1986. Changing modes of production and the sexual division of labor among the Yoruba. In *Women's work,* edited by Eleanor Leacock and Helen Safa. New York: Bergan and Garvey Publishers.

Amin, Samir. 1976. *Unequal development: An essay on the social formations of peripheral capitalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Clifford, James. 1986. Introduction: Partial truths. In *Writing culture: Poetics and politics of ethnography*, edited by James Clifford and George E. Marcus. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dalla Costa, Mariarosa and Selma James. 1972. Women and the subversion of the community. In *The power of women and the subversion of the community,* edited by Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James. Bristol: Falling Wall Press.

Davis, Angela T. 1981. *Women, race and class*. New York: Vintage Books.

D'Amico-Samuels. 1991. Undoing fieldwork: Personal, political, theoretical and methodological implications. In *Decolonizing anthropology*, edited by Faye Harrison. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

Dehavenon, Anna Lou. 1990. *The tyranny of indifference: A study of hunger, homelessness, poor health and family dismemberment in 1,325 New York City households with children in 1989–1990*. Prepared by Action Research Project on Hunger, Homelessness, and Family Health.

Dehavenon, Anna Lou and Anne Okongwu. 1993. Policy planning for single female-headed families: What is needed. In *Where did all the men go? Female-headed/female supported households in cross-cultural perspective*, edited by Joan P. Mencher and Anne Okongwu. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Dike, Onwuka and Felicia Ekejiuba. 1978. "The Aro state: A case study in state formation in southeastern Nigeria." *Journal of African Studies* 5:268–300.

Dike, P. C. (1982). Origins of pre-colonial states in Africa: The case of Igala." *African Notes* 9(1):1 15–26.

Dupré, George and Pierre-Philippe Rey. 1973. Reflections on the pertinence of a theory of the history of exchange. *Economy and Society* 2(2): 131–63.

Frank, Audre Gunder. 1967. *Capital and underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Furstenberg, Frank, T. Hershberg, and J. Modell. 1981. The origins of the female-headed black family: The impact of the urban experience. In *Philadelphia: Work space, family and group experience in the 19th century*, edited by Theodore Hershberg. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gilroy, Paul. 1987. *"There ain't no black in the union jack": The cultural politics of race and nation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Harrison, Faye, ed.. 1991. *Decolonizing anthropology for liberation*. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

Leacock, Eleanor. 1969. The Montagnais-Naskapi band. *National Museums of Canada Bulletin*, 228. Contributions to Anthropology: Band Societies. Paper No. 1.

Leacock, Eleanor. 1972. Introduction. In *The origin of the family, private property and the state*, by Frederick Engels. New York: International Publishers.

Meillassoux, Claude. 1972. From reproduction to production: Marxist approaches to economic anthropology. *Economy and Society* 1(1): 96–105.

Meillassoux, Claude. 1973. On the mode of production of the hunting baud. In *French perspectives in African studies*, edited by P. Alexander.

Mullings, Leith. 1978. Ethnicity and stratification in the urban United States. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 318:10–22.

Mullings, Leith. 1986. Uneven development: Class, race and gender in the United States before 1900. In *Women's work*, edited by E. Leacock and H. Safa. New York: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

O'Laughlin, Bridget. 1975. Marxist approaches in anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 4:341–68.

Okongwu, Anne. 1993. Some conceptual issues: Female single parent families in the United States. In *Where did all the men go? Female headed/female supported households*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Okongwu, Anne. 1995. Looking up from the bottom to the ceiling of the basement floor: Female single parent families surviving on $22,000 or less a year. *Urban Anthropology* 24:3–4, 313–56.

Okonjo, Kamene. 1976. The dual-sex political system in operation: Igbo women and community politics in

midwestern Nigeria. In *Women in Africa: Studies in social and economic change,* edited by Nancy Hafkin and Edna Bay. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Oxaal, Ivar, Tony Barnett, and David Booth. 1975. *Beyond the sociology of development: Economy and society in Latin America and Africa.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Rapp, Rayna. 1987. Urban kinship in contemporary America: Families, classes, and ideology." In *Cities of the United States,* edited by Leith Mullings. New York: Columbia University Press.

Reiter, Rayna Rapp. 1975. *Toward an anthropology of women.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Rodney, Walter. 1982. *How Europe underdeveloped Africa.* Rev. ed. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.

Rosaldo, Michelle Z., and Louise Lamphere. 1974. *Women, culture and society.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Sanjek, Roger. 1987. Anthropological work at a gray panther health clinic. In *Cities in the United States,* edited by Leith Mullings. New York: Columbia University Press.

Stevenson, Robert. 1968. *Political systems in tropical Africa.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Sudarkasa, Niara. 1973. *Where women work: A study of Yoruba women in the marketplace and in the home.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Szanton Blanc, Cristina. 1994. *Urban children in distress: Global predicaments and innovative strategies.* Langhorne, Penn.: Gordon and Breach.

Terray, Emmanuel. 1975. Classes and class consciousness in the Aaron kingdom of Gyaman." In *Marxist analyses and social anthropology,* edited by Maurice Bloch. New York: Wiley.

Thornton, Bonnie Dill. 1979. The dialectics of black womanhood. *Signs* (Spring):543–55.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The modern world-system: Capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century*. New York: Academic Press.

Wolf, Eric. 1982. *Europe and the people without history*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reflections on the Changes in Anthropology, Especially Medical Anthropology, in Relation to the Scholarship on Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Class, and Sexual Orientation

Ida Susser

When I began my undergraduate career at Barnard College in 1966, there was no feminist organization on campus, no Women's Center or Women's Studies Program. There was not even a gynecologist available at the Student Health Center. Women students had to sleep in the dormitories at night and periodic fire drills were used to check whether all the "girls" had actually gone to their own beds in time for the curfew. In the spring of 1967, Linda Leclaire was caught out when a fire drill was called at night and she was not present. Instead of inventing an excuse, she told Barnard administrators that she had spent the night with her boyfriend. This immediately became a controversy and made front page news (in both the Columbia *Spectator* and *The New York Times*). Students' demonstrations and picketing surrounded the campus. In response, Barnard College organized a hearing with a jury of both students and faculty. On the recommendation of this committee, Linda Leclaire was expelled from the school. Thus, interestingly enough—and rarely remembered—one of the first protest movements at Columbia University in the 1960s concerned sexual freedom for women. It was not self-consciously feminist and certainly never dealt with

issues of class and race, but it did mobilize large numbers of women and men and set the scene for the later demonstrations of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). In the 1990s, of course, Barnard dormitories are co-ed. In response to demands by students in the 1970s, a Women's Center, Women's Studies Program, and a gynecologist were made available at Barnard College and many other academic settings.

Changes in the curriculum of anthropology, while they may not have been as dramatic as the changes in dormitory policy, have followed the demands of the feminist movement and other emerging movements of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. Again, in the sixties, material that I read on women and work, women and the family, and similar topics was largely distributed through photocopied pamphlets and a kind of underground discussion group of pink and blue articles which seemed to be distributed from some place in New England. Many of the articles which I read in that form have since become classics printed in respectable publications and their authors well-known university professors. Authors such as Naomi Weisstein, Mariarosa Della Costa, and others were first distributed through new women's consciousness raising groups and other feminist networks. Concepts such as the idea of the personal is political, the subordination of women in the nuclear family, and the inequality of women in terms of paid and unpaid work were presented in early formulations in this literature. A little later, *Our Bodies Ourselves*, by the Boston Women's Health Collective, was published as a formal publication and incorporated the issues of women and health into the feminist movement.

In my junior year at Barnard, I wrote a paper concerning women's inequality in the workforce (based mostly on the pile of circulated articles I had collected). My an-

Towson University, Baltimore, MD

thropology professors were not repressive, but they did not recognize women's experiences as an important topic and I was asked why I was not focussing on class or something more politically significant. However, from the 1960s to the 1980s, there were no tenured women in the anthropology departments of the two schools where I did graduate work (Columbia and Chicago). At Columbia University, three women were denied tenure and forced to leave before a woman was finally given tenure in the 1980s. Thus, although the anthropology faculty of the 1960s, like most other university faculty, did not think issues of gender were significant at that time, the women, at least, came to recognize the problems through their own experiences.

When either men or women studied political anthropology in the 1960s and early 1970s, they focussed on men because women were not viewed as leaders and therefore not seen as politically relevant. When I studied kinship structure at the University of Chicago, no faculty nor most students questioned the idea that the most significant role of women was to be exchanged back and forth in cementing kinship alliances. The concept of women as agents in "primitive" societies had not yet become integrated into discussions of systems of kinship and marriage. Kathleen Gough's reanalysis of the Nuer in 1971 and work by Joyce Riegelhaupt on the political importance of gossip reflected the new formulations that began to emerge at that period. Analyses of complex societies were no less sexist; or perhaps one might say that women were just as invisible in analyses of complex societies. I was very lucky to have an untenured feminist anthropology professor who was willing to argue for me as one of my readers for my second exam in the doctoral program at Columbia when the second reader wanted to fail my essay on women and work. He regarded women in the economy as important only as consumers.

Work by Eleanor Leacock, June Nash, and Helen Safa, established anthropologists able to support graduate students addressing feminist issues, redirected much of the research in anthropology of gender of the 1970s toward questions of women, work, colonialism, and the state. In addition, two now classic edited volumes appeared in the 1970s and pulled together the early formulations of feminist anthropologists: *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, edited by Rayna Rapp Reiter; and *Women, Culture and Society*, edited by Michelle Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere. Feminists had graduated from pamphlets to publications. Studies of the profession of anthropology in the 1990s show women over-represented in graduate school, generally still paid less than men when they find academic work, and under-represented in the ranks of tenured professors.

In the late 1980s, Sandra Morgen edited *Gender and Anthropology*, which documented the major shifts in anthropology in specific geographic areas that had been precipitated by feminist challenges. Since the 1960s, anthropology has been forced to recreate itself with attention to political economy, ethnic identity, race, gender, and sexual orientation. Views of agency, the construction of categories, and the processes that generate inequalities of class, gender and race have become integrated into ethnographic analysis.

The battle still continues for women to be read, cited, hired, and tenured. In spite of political demands dating from the early 1970s, day care was only instituted at the national anthropology meetings in the 1990s. An interesting dispute emerged in 1993, when two women were unable to attend the Executive Assembly because children were not permitted at the conference center where it was held. This dispute certainly reflected the fact that women with children were now being elected to important official positions in the Association, and needs for child care had climbed to the top rank.

Towson University, Baltimore, MD

I will now outline three areas—medical anthropology, sexuality, and labor studies—where the demands of the feminist movement and awareness of class and race have transformed anthropological thinking since the early 1970s. I have selected these areas because I am most familiar with them and also because they constitute different aspects of anthropology from those covered by others on the panel.

The women's movement forced a rethinking of the politics of health and the relationship between doctors as experts and patients as unquestioning clients. The publication of *Our Bodies, Ourselves* initiated a movement to take control of knowledge of one's own body and to question the premises of expert knowledge and the basis for decisions about health; the consequences went far beyond the feminist movement. Within anthropology, it precipitated a rethinking of clinical situations and the inherent inequality along lines of class, race, and gender between medical experts and their patients. Later, when HIV infection became a major concern, feminist researchers had to fight to reconstruct diagnosis, the classification of the problem, and the conceptualization of sexuality in order to incorporate the experiences of women.

A focus on the process of reproduction, precipitated by feminist anthropology, led to a reexamination of the concept of work, both paid and unpaid. Feminist anthropologists rethought the rituals of birth, the life cycle and death and the relationship between biological reproduction, kinship, and gender. In the process, they reconceptualized sources of power and began to recognize forms of resistance in the creation of fictive kin and social networks outside recognized political arenas.

Population experts had to reevaluate population control in the light of feminist research. They had to con-

front the silences and resistance to their efforts to introduce contraceptive technology. They had to learn that women do make decisions about fertility, that such decisions may not be the same as men's, and that employment and education for women were the most effective form of population control.

A rethinking of female sexuality was a basic tenet of the women's movement, beginning early on in the demands for free and legal abortions and reexamination of Freudian dogma concerning the female orgasm and sexual orientation. Issues of sexuality and power were discussed by feminist anthropologists such as Rayna Rapp, Muriel Dimen, and others. In her biography of *Nisa, a !Kung woman,* Marjorie Shostak reconceptualized women's sexuality in terms of her own decisions and agency.

Research concerning class and race emerged within the literature of sexuality and power as illustrated by Ann Stoler's work on the control of sexuality in the service of the racism of colonialism. Other studies began to examine the control of sexuality by the state, as exemplified in the regulation of inheritance, marriage, abortion, and contraception.

Similar questions were developed in works such as that by Emily Martin, *The Woman in the Body*, which began to deconstruct the metaphors for women's bodies and reproduction in the medical profession and how this varied by class. Such questions emerged from early feminist research by Barbara Ehrenreich and others that, as mentioned above, challenged the hegemony of medical expertise.

The other area in which feminist anthropology has transformed ethnographic research is with respect to the connections between work and home. Feminist anthropol-

Towson University, Baltimore, MD

ogists, including Karen Sacks, Louise Lamphere, Patricia Zavella, Micaela de Leonardo, Sandra Morgen, Anne Bookman, Leith Mullings, Carol Stack, myself, and others demonstrated over and over the importance of community relations in determining work experience and the emergence of social movements. The distinctions between public and private, domestic and political, work and home, the body and the body politic, local and international have all been broken down by feminist anthropologists who have demonstrated the interconnections between apparently separate aspects of people's lives. As many have documented, the contemporary concern with reflexivity and the significance of the ethnographer's experience to her ethnographic account was clearly outlined in feminist writings of the 1970s. The preparation of graduate students in anthropology has definitely been changed in relation to discussions of gender, class and race, at least in the Doctoral Program at City University of New York, with which I am most familiar. Many introductory anthropology texts reflect the new concerns. A project funded by the Anthropology Association and a federal grant was partly devoted to working with the writers of introductory texts to integrate the discussion of gender more centrally into the texts and to provide material on gender issues for introductory courses (as noted above, Sandra Morgen, ed. 1989. *Gender and Anthropology: Critical Reviews for Research and Teaching*. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association).

Thus, although many of the ideas of earlier feminist anthropologists are so integrated into the field and their originators so embattled that their roots are often not recognized, feminism and the social movements concerning sexuality and sexual orientation have shaped much rethinking in anthropology. Although major political challenges remain, the impact of movements for gender, racial, and class equality have shaped the best of contemporary anthropology.

Contributors

Note: These biographical notes were current as of 1994 when these essays were first published.

ANNE FRANCIS-OKONGWU is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Early Childhood and Elementary Education at Queens College, where she is also a Lecturer in Africana Studies. She has taught in the Department of Special Programs there and was the Director of the Teacher Opportunity Corps in 1988–89. She has also taught anthropology at the Philadelphia campus of Antioch College and worked as a Social Worker at the Graduate Hospital in Philadelphia. She earned her B.A. from Boston University in sociology, an M.S.W. from Fordham University, an M.A. from Queens College in anthropology, and a Ph.D. in anthropology from the CUNY Graduate Center. Her dissertation research dealt with "Different Realities: A Comparative Study of Nineteen Black and White Female Parents in Philadelphia."

Prof. Okongwu is coeditor with Joan Mencher of *Where Did All the Men Go? Female-Headed Households in Cross-cultural Perspective* (1993), to which she also contributed two essays on "Some Conceptual Issues: The Female Single Parent in the United States" and "Policy Planning in the United States: What is Needed." The book is a major cross-national and cross-cultural examination of female-headed/female-supported households and the dif-

ferent forms of family organization in which women provide primary economic support for their households in the face of continued decline internationally in support to their well-being and that of their children.

Prof. Okongwu has also written (with S. Pflaum) a chapter on "Diversity in Education: Implications for Teacher Preparation" for an edited volume, *Celebrating Diverse Voices* (1992), and prepared a report funded by UNESCO on "Female-headed Families in New York City: A Comparative Study of Black and White." Among current projects for publication are "The Underclass Revisited: Race, Class and Gender Implications," and "Looking Up From the Bottom to the Ceiling of the Basement Floor: Female Single Parents Surviving on $20,000 or Less in New York City."

DOROTHY O. HELLY is Professor of History and Women's Studies at Hunter College and The Graduate School at the City University of New York. She has worked with CUNY curriculum transformation projects since 1983 and has co-facilitated the CUNY Faculty Development Seminar in Balancing the Curriculum for Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class. She created the Seminar on Scholarship and Curriculum at the CUNY Academy of the Humanities and Sciences to provide a general forum for discussing these issues, and is a member of the advisory committee of the National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women, located at Towson State University, Maryland. She is the author of *Livingstone's Legacy: Horace Waller and Victorian Mythmaking* (1987), coauthor of *Women's Realities, Women's Choices: An Introduction to Women's Studies* (1983, 1995), and coeditor of *Gendered Domains: Rethinking Public and Private in Women's History* (1992). She has also written on "Doing

History Today," in *Revolutions in Knowledge: Feminism in the Social Sciences* (1992), ed. S. R. Zalk and J. Gordon-Kelter, and (with H. Callaway) "Crusader for Empire: Flora Shaw/Lady Lugard," in *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance* (1992), ed. N. Chaudhuri and M. Strobel.

JOAN P. MENCHER is Professor of Anthropology at Herbert H. Lehman College and the City University Graduate Center. Her B.A. was in Physics and Mathematics from Smith College, while her Ph.D. in Anthropology was earned at Columbia University. She has held a Fulbright to India, has been an Ogden Mills Fellow at the American Museum of Natural History, a National Science Foundation Postdoctoral Fellow, and a Guggenheim Fellow. She is the author of *Agriculture and Social Structure in Tamil Nadu: Past Origins, Present Transformations, and Future Prospects* (1978), the editor of *Social Anthropology of Peasantry* (1983), and coeditor (with Professor Okongwu) of *Female Headed/Female Supported Households: A Cross Cultural Comparison* (1992). Her most recent publications are *Mixed Blessings: Gender and Religious Fundamentalism Cross Culturally* (1996) and "Walk On My Back So I Can Work Tomorrow: Health and Work Among Female Agricultural Workers in Tamil Nadu and Kerala," *Critical Survival* (1995). She is working on books on "Let the Women Talk: Women and Rice Cultivation in Three Parts of India," and "Women's Lives: Some Kerala Life Histories 1900–1988." She has also published numerous articles and book chapters and her current work of this kind includes essays on "Population Policy in India: What Could It Mean for Women?" and "Women and Irrigation in South India."

Towson University, Baltimore, MD

Prof. Mencher has been the coordinator of Women's Studies at Lehman College, has chaired the Committee on the Status of Women of the American Anthropological Association three times since 1969, and most recently has organized two major symposia on Women and Religion and Women and Agriculture in South Asia. She is a member of the Association for Women and Development, the Society for International Development, the Association of Asian Studies, and the Indian Sociological Society and Anthropological Association. She has consulted for the United Nations and the Holdeen India Fund in India and for the World Bank in Sri Lanka.

JUNE C. NASH is Distinguished Professor of Anthropology, City College of the City University of New York and the Graduate School and University Center. Her undergraduate degree was earned at Barnard College and her M.A. and Ph.D. in Anthropology are from the University of Chicago. Since coming to CUNY she has been a visiting professor at SUNY Albany and Quito, Ecuador and held a distinguished visiting chair at the American University in Cairo and the University of Colorado. Her major publications include: *In the Eyes of the Ancestors: Belief and Behavior in a Maya Community* (1970); *We Eat the Mines and the Mines Eat Us: Dependency and Exploitation in Bolivian Tin Mining Communities* (1979); *From Tank Town to High-Tech: The Clash of Community and Industrial Cycles* (1989); and *Crafts in the World Market: The Impact of International Exchange on Middle American Artisans* (1993). Some of the journals in which she has published numerous articles are: *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, Human Organization, Journal of Black Studies, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, American Ethnologist, International Labor and Working*

Class History, Anthropology of Work Review, and Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies. Her most recent article is: "Global Integration and Subsistence Insecurity," *American Anthropologist* 96:2 (1994). Prof. Nash has been involved in making two films, "I Spent My Life in the Mines" and "Community and Industrial Cycles."

She is currently Associate Editor of *Urban Anthropology*, the President of the Society of Feminist Anthropology and the Society of Latin Americanists. She has been a Fellow at the Bellaggio Center of the Rockefeller Foundation, and received the 1992 Conrad Arensberg Award from the Society for the Anthropology of Work. She has received grants from the National Science Foundation, the National Institute for Mental Health, the Social Science Research Council, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Research Foundation of the City University of New York, and the MacArthur Foundation.

IDA SUSSER is Professor of Anthropology at Hunter College and a member of the Doctoral Faculty in Anthropology at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. She earned her A.B. from Barnard College, her M.A. from the University of Chicago, and her Ph.D. from Columbia University, all in Anthropology. She has also taught at the College of Staten Island, the New York Institute of Labor Studies, Columbia University, Case Western Reserve, and the New School for Social Research, and SUNY Old Westbury. Her publications include *Norman Street: Poverty and Politics in an Urban Neighborhood* (1982), numerous articles, mostly recently in *Critique of Anthropology and Medical Anthropology*, and she has guest edited special issues of *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* (June 1988) on Anthropology of Health & Industry; the *Journal of Women and Health* (Summer 1988)

Towson University, Baltimore, MD

on Women and Aging; and *Critique of Anthropology* (Fall 1993) on the Widening Gap between Rich and Poor. She has received several grants from the National Institute for Mental Health, the Charles Riley Armington Foundation, and the Research Foundation of the City University of New York. Her most recent research has focused on a women's cooperative in a squatter settlement in South Africa, HIV prevention among rural and township women in South Africa, and HIV prevention in rural Puerto Rico.

Prof. Susser has been a consultant for the Edna McConnell Clarke and Robert F. Wagner Foundations for issues involving the relocation of homeless families and homeless women in New York City. She is a member of the Advisory Board of the Family Policy Center at Hunter College and organized panels on Women and Aids for the Fourth International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women held at Hunter in 1990. She is a member of the Advisory Board of the Metropolitan Medical Anthropology Association and of the American Anthropological Association's Task Force on Homelessness. She is President of the Society for the Anthropology of North America, a new unit of the AAA.

Reader Comment

Rethinking the Disciplines: Anthropology

Thank you for taking a few minutes to provide us with your response to this group of essays. If you have shared it with others, please feel free to copy this form and provide it to them.

Circle the appropriate number:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
◆ These essays informed me about the analysis of gender, race, and class in anthropology	1	2	3	4	5
◆ These essays pointed out how theories, concepts, and methods have or have not changed	1	2	3	4	5
◆ Concepts and vocabulary were easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5
◆ The information in the main body of the essay was useful for course revision	1	2	3	4	5
◆ The references were very useful	1	2	3	4	5

How did you learn about this essay? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Publication notice
- ☐ Faculty workshop
- ☐ Conference presentation
- ☐ Internet listing
- ☐ Summer institute
- ☐ Other (what?_____)

What use did you make of the essay? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Read it for my own knowledge
- ☐ Used to revise a course
- ☐ Shared with colleagues
- ☐ Assigned as classroom reading

Please tell us something about your institution. Is it a:

- ☐ high school
- ☐ two-year college
- ☐ four-year college
- ☐ research university
- ☐ other (what?_____ _____)

Also tell us something about yourself. Are you: (check all that apply)

- ☐ a faculty member (If so, what is your discipline of training? _____)
- ☐ a student (If so, what is your major? _____)
- ☐ an administrator
- ☐ other (what?_____)

How much formal academic training have you received in this discipline?

- ☐ none
- ☐ one or two courses as an undergraduate
- ☐ undergraduate major
- ☐ some graduate training
- ☐ master's degree training
- ☐ Ph.D. degree training

For additional comments, please write on the back of this card or attach additional pages.

Thanks!

Name:
Address:
City/State/Zip:
Phone:
Email:

TAPE HERE TAPE HERE

Comments: We would welcome additional comments. Please be specific. Write in the space below, or use additional pages if necessary. Thank you!

NO POSTAGE NECESSARY IF MAILED IN THE UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

FIRST CLASS PERMIT NO. 9560 BALTIMORE, MD.

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women
Institute for Teaching and Research on Women
Towson University
Towson, MD 21252

Publications of the National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women

WOMEN IN THE CURRICULUM

The following publications consist of directories, manuals, and essays covering the primary information needed by educators to transform the curriculum to incorporate the scholarship on women. The publications have been designed to be brief, user friendly, and cross referenced to each other. They can be purchased as a set or as individual titles. Tables of contents and sample passages are available on the National Center Web page: http://www.towson.edu/ncctrw/.

➢ ***Directory of Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities in the U.S.***

The *Directory* provides brief descriptions of 237 curriculum transformation projects or activities from 1973 to the present. It is intended to help educators review the amount and kinds of work that have been occurring in curriculum transformation on women and encourage them to consult project publications (see also *Catalog of Resources*) and to contact project directors for more information about projects of particular interest and relevance to their needs.

386 pages, 8½X 11 hardcover, $30 individuals, $45 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-07-6

➢ ***Catalog of Curriculum Transformation Resources***

The *Catalog* lists materials developed by curriculum transformation projects and national organizations that are available either free or for sale. These include proposals, reports, bibliographies, workshop descriptions, reading lists, revised syllabi, classroom materials, participant essays, newsletters, and other products of curriculum transformation activities, especially from those projects listed in the *Directory*. These resources provide valuable information, models, and examples for educators leading and participating in curriculum transformation activities.

(Available fall 1997)

➢ ***Introductory Bibliography for Curriculum Transformation***

The *Introductory Bibliography* provides a list of references for beginning curriculum transformation on women, especially for those organizing projects and activities for faculty and teachers. It does not attempt to be comprehensive but rather to simplify the process of selection by offering an "introduction" that will lead you to other sources.

15 pages, 6 x 9 paper, $7, ISBN 1-885303-32-7

➢ ***Getting Started: Planning Curriculum Transformation***

Planning Curriculum Transformation describes the major stages and components of curriculum transformation projects as they have developed since about 1980. Written by Elaine Hedges, whose long experience in women's studies and curriculum transformation projects informs this synthesis, *Getting Started* is designed to help faculty and administrators initiate, plan, and conduct faculty development and curriculum projects whose purpose is to incorporate the content and perspectives of women's studies and race/ethnic studies scholarship into their courses.

124 pages, 6 x 9 hardcover, $20 individuals, $30 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-06-8

➢ ***Internet Resources on Women: Using Electronic Media in Curriculum Transformation***

This manual gives clear, step-by-step instructions on how to use e-mail, find e-mail addresses, and access e-mail discussion lists relevant to curriculum transformation. It explains Telnet, FTP, Gopher, and the World Wide Web, and how to access and use them. It discusses online information about women on e-mail lists and World Wide Web sites. Written by Joan Korenman, who has accumulated much experience through running the Women's Studies e-mail list, this manual is a unique resource for identifying information for curriculum transformation on the Internet. Updates to this manual will be available on the World Wide Web at http://www.umbc.edu/wmst/updates.html .

130 pages, 6 x 9 hardcover, $20 individuals, $30 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-08-4

➢ ***Funding: Obtaining Money for Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities***

This manual is intended to assist educators who lack experience in applying for grants but are frequently expected to secure their own funding for projects. The manual provides an overview of the process, basic information and models, and advice from others experienced in fund raising.

150 pages,6 x 9 hardcover, $20 individuals, $30 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-05-x

➢ ***Evaluation: Measuring the Success of Curriculum Transformation***

This manual outlines several designs which could be used when assessing the success of a project. *Evaluation: Measuring the Success of Curriculum Transformation* is written by Beth Vanfossen, whose background in the teaching of research methods as well as practical experience in conducting evaluation research informs the manual's advice. Evaluation is an increasingly important component of curriculum transformation work on which project directors and others often need assistance.

(Available fall 1997)

➢ ***Discipline Analysis Essays***

Under the general editorship of Elaine Hedges, the National Center has requested scholars in selected academic disciplines to write brief essays summarizing the impact of the new scholarship on women on their discipline. These essays identify and explain the issues to be confronted as faculty in these disciplines revise their courses to include the information and perspectives provided by this scholarship. The series is under continuous development, and titles will be added as they become available. See order form for essays currently available.

27 - 60 pages, 6 x 9 paper, $7 each

➢ ***CUNY Panels: Rethinking the Disciplines***

Panels of scholars in seven disciplines address questions about the impact on their disciplines of recent scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class. The panels were developed under the leadership of Dorothy O. Helly as part of the Seminar on Scholarship and the Curriculum: The Study of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class within The CUNY Academy for the Humanities and Sciences. For this seminar CUNY received the "Progress in Equity" award for 1997 from the American Association of University Women (AAUW).

56 - 85 pages, 6 x 9 paper, $10 each

ORDER FORM 1-800-847-9922, 8:30-4:00 EST, M-F or Fax: 1-410-830-3482

National Center for Curriculum Tranformation Resources on Women
Towson University, Baltimore, MD 21252

SHIP TO:

Name_____

Institution_____

Address_____ *(no P.O. Boxes)*

City_____ State_____ Zip_____

Phone_____ Fax_____ E-mail_____

***All orders must be prepaid* by charging the total to a credit card by phone, fax, or mail or by enclosing a check for the total amount with the order form. No purchase orders.**

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Visa ☐ Mastercard ☐ Discover

Account #_____ Exp. Date____/____

Signature_____

Printed Name_____

CUT HERE

WOMEN IN THE CURRICULUM

Title	Quantity	Total Cost
Complete SET of all titles listed below at 10% discount $251 set (individuals); $292 set (institutions) + $20 shipping		$
• **Directory of Projects & Activities,** Hardcover: $30 (individual); $45 (institutions)		$
• **Introductory Bibliography,** Paper: $7		$
• **Getting Started,** Hardcover: $20 (individual); $30 (institutions)		$
• **Internet Resources on Women,** Hardcover: $20 (individual); $30 (institutions)		$
• **Funding for Projects & Activities,** Hardcover: $20 (individual); $30 (institutions)		$
• **Discipline Analysis Essays,** Paper: $7 each		$

___Anthropology ___Education ___Philosophy
___Art ___European History ___Political Science
___Biology ___Geography ___Psychology
___British Literature ___Health ___Sociology
___Composition ___Music ___U.S. History
___Economics

• **CUNY Panels: Rethinking the Disciplines,** Paper: $10 each		$

___Anthropology ___History ___Sociology
___Biology ___Literature
___Education ___Psychology

Subtotal	$
Sales Tax (MD residents add 5%)	$
Shipping/Handling (UPS, $4 first book, $1 ea. addl.)	$
TOTAL	$

Make checks payable to: **TU UNIVERSITY STORE**
Mail order to: **University Store, University Union Bldg, Towson University, 8000 York Rd., Baltimore, MD 21252**
Phone orders: **1-800-847-9922**

Printed in USA 1997

Panels of scholars in seven disciplines address questions about the impact on their disciplines of recent scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class. The panels were developed under the leadership of Dorothy O. Helly as part of the Seminar on Scholarship and the Curriculum within The CUNY Academy for the Humanities and Sciences. This series received the 1997 "Progress in Equity" award from the American Association of University Women (AAUW).

Publications available in WOMEN in the CURRICULUM series

- Directory of Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities in the U.S.
- Catalog of Curriculum Transformation Resources
- Introductory Bibliography: Basic References for Curriculum Transformation
- Getting Started: Planning Curriculum Transformation Work
- Internet Resources on Women: Using Electronic Media in Curriculum Transformation
- Funding: Obtaining Money for Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities
- Evaluation: Measuring the Success of Curriculum Transformation
- Essays on Selected Topics and Issues
- Discipline Analysis Essays:
  - Anthropology
  - Art
  - Biology
  - British Literature
  - Composition
  - Economics
  - Education
  - European History
  - Geography
  - Health
  - Music
  - Philosophy
  - Political Science
  - Psychology
  - Sociology
  - U.S. History
- CUNY Panels: Rethinking the Disciplines
  - Anthropology
  - Biology
  - Education
  - History
  - Literature
  - Psychology
  - Sociology

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women

Institute for Teaching and Research on Women
Towson University

58

ISBN 1-885303-09-2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

END

Date Filmed
March 03,2000

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☐ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☑ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").