MARIA IRENE RAMALHO DE SOUSA SANTOS

AMERICAN STUDIES AND FEMINIST SCHOLARSHIP IN PORTUGAL

Abril de 1998
Oficina nº 112

MARIA IRENE RAMALHO DE SOUSA SANTOS

AMERICAN STUDIES AND FEMINIST SCHOLARSHIP IN PORTUGAL

nº 112
Abril, 1998

Oficina do CES
Centro de Estudos Sociais
Coimbra

OFICINA DO CES

Publicação Seriada do

Centro de Estudos Sociais

Praça de D. Dinis

Colégio de S. Jerónimo, Coimbra

Correspondência:

Apartado 3087, 3000 Coimbra

Maria Irene Ramalho de Sousa Santos
Faculdade de Letras e Centro de Estudos Sociais
Universidade de Coimbra

American Studies and Feminist Scholarship in Portugal*

With two exceptions at the postgradute level, in Portugal there are no official, degree-awarding programs either in Women's Studies or American Studies. The exceptions are the two-year old M.A. program in American Studies and the one-year old M.A. program in Women's Studies, both offered by the Open University in Lisbon. Although the reasons why this is so and why the Portuguese Open University has suddenly appeared with such protagonism in both developments can be easily explained, I shall not deal with them here. Regarding American Studies, the nonexistance of first degree-awarding programs in Portuguese universities simply means that, as is still the case in several other European countries, degrees in English, or, as we prefer to call it at my university, in Anglo-American Studies, in either case with a strong theoretical and methodological component in cultural studies, are still the major umbrella for the study of the United States. In any case, I wish to make the point that this situation by no means precludes the production, in my country, of a significant range of very fine scholarship, both in American Studies and in Women's Studies, though very often by scholars who do not identify themselves by each of the respective field.[1] Furthermore, as in many other countries, not excluding the US, and for reasons that I hope my presentation will make clear, it is possible to see, in Portugal, a distinct link between the academic development of Women's Studies and the study of the United States. The encouragement of such a combination in the broader, transnational context in which we situate ouselves in this panel may thus be

expected to further the adequate consolidation of both fields on a local/global world scale.

The link, which has a lot to do with the interdisciplinary philosophy underlying both fields, has been very noticeable in the United States since the very beginning of Women's Studies. As early as 1974, Annette Baxter ackowledged the affinities of both disciplines in their "uses of the interdisciplinary."[2] Ten years later, Joanna Zangrando chose to emphasize the importance of Women's Studies scholarship for a continuing reshaping of "the study and teaching of American culture and to inform methodologies and interpretations within and across academic disciplines." At the same time, in a way that at first may seem surprising (but I shall come back to this point), Zangrando insists that a feminist perspective is "direly needed" in the area of Women's Studies itself.[3] In an essay published about the same time in *Signs*, while providing an exhaustive overview of the field of Women's Studies in the US up to the early 80s, Marilyn Boxer underscores the formidable contribution of English and American Studies for the earliest academic developments of Women's Studies, no doubt because these two fields, by the very nature of their relationship with language and linguistic constructs within the broader spectrum of the humanities, have always been more concerned than any others with interrogating rigorously traditional or conventional assumptions about knowledge and value. If it did not take long for American Studies to raise questions about the Western tradition and American culture, the role of Women's Studies has always been to probe more deeply into the discriminatory patriarcal roots and structures of all cultures. It can in fact be argued that the problematization of American culture as a totality was made more stringent and exacting in the US by feminist scholarship.[4] Boxer mentions, for example, the theoretical, critical, and methodological pioneer work in the late 60s and early 70s of such fine Americanists and feminists as

Annette Baxter, Florence Howe, Paul Lauter, Catharine Stimpson, Deborah Rosenfeld, and many others.[5] On the other hand, in the 60s and 70s the centered fragmentariness that American culture had proven to be up until then finally exploded and totally decentered the very notion of American Studies. Different and often contradictory theories and praxes (including feminist ones) of race, ethnicity, gender (as well as class, though perhaps to a lesser degree) gradually inspired a multiplicity of area studies (Black Studies, Ethnic Studies, Women's Studies, Gay and Lesbian Studies, Material Culture, etc.) with vested interests in understanding and reshaping American culture, now increasingly and more appropriately referred to as 'cultures.'[6] The decentered fragmentariness and problematical multiculturalism of American Studies appeared suddenly to sum up the accumulated crisis of postcolonial Western modernity, thus emerging for some of us, for its patent "cultural hybridity" and apparent rejection of any "claim to exclusivity," as the substance and content, and perhaps even the proper subject of postmodernism itself.[7] Thus reconsidered, American Studies provided a privileged field for a rigorous interrogation of established (or canonical) notions of authority and truth, or, as Bonnie TuSmith aptly wrote, of "monolithic cultural assumptions."[8]

This is all the more interesting because the field of American Studies was conceived after the Second World War, both in the US and in Europe, as an imperialist project, though not without its critics from the very beginning both outside and inside the United States.[9] Commenting very recently on the tremendous transnational development of American Studies in the past thirty years, Doris Friedensohn wonders: "Who could have imagined, thirty years ago, that our self-study project would be re-invented as a global growth industry and that so many of us would become frequent fliers for American Studies?"[10] But surely the first architects of the American Studies Project, broadly speaking, should be credited precisely with such an outcome. Writing

early this year during her residency as a scholar of American Studies at the Salzburg Seminar (where the European Association for American Studies was founded with strong USIS support in 1954), Friedensohn actually begins her essay by reminding us that the Salzburg Seminar was established in 1947 "to educate young Europeans about American Civilization." However, after the Second World War and right at the beginning of the Cold War, the project for an education in American Civilization in Europe, no matter how idealist its beginnings, could not but rapidly develop a very palpable political agenda.[11] It was inevitably bound to become an education against a so-called anti-American education. An education *against* an imperialism, but itself *for* an imperialism. The stories that Friedensohn tells us about USIS's use of American Americanists, like herself, to further American Studies, for example, in a Mozambique devasted by years of Portuguese colonialism, then civil war, and ironically further depleted by the constraints of World Bank and IMF 'aid' and US-imposed 'structural adjustment' and 'stability,' denounce as many projects today to educate young people in new developing countries (or in older countries newly released from the thralls of a rival civilization) about American Civilization.[12] Self-study of this sort easily translates into indoctrination, and inevitably results in, or facilitates, American commercial penetration.[13] Friedensohn wishfully argues that American Studies, the umbrella trans-discipline that served at times the hegemonic objectives of US foreign policy, could and should be used today in less national and far more transnational ways. But only the critical alertness of nonAmerican Americanists as globalized locals, like ourselves, can actively bring about such a goal—from bottom up, so to speak.

The political attentiveness ever required of us as American Studies scholars, American and nonAmerican alike, must be brought to bear as well on the encouragement that ASA provides in this panel for a meaningful

articulation, in and amongst all our countries, between American Studies and Women's Studies. So that the dream of a common language for a strong Women's Studies international community does not end up being simply (American Studies) English, or even the language of American American Studies. At the Center for Social Studies of the University of Coimbra, where a Nucleus for Feminist Studies was recently created, one of the ongoing research projects concerns an inquiry into what I would call, borrowing from Marie Cardinale, "les mots pour le dire" [the words to say it] in Portuguese feminism.[14] This is no mere translation project; it is rather part of a larger comparative cultural study, including American Studies, and dealing with the issue of identity as a social construct that is vulnerable to all kinds of influences.

What I am suggesting is that the articulation between American Studies and Women's Studies must not entail the Americanization of Women's Studies, just as the internationalization of American Studies must not mean the global, top down Americanization of American Studies. Americanists inside and outside the United Studies must be critically aware of the consequences for knowledge of its location. American Studies abroad cannot be just what it so often has been: a globalized localism.[15] As Boaventura de Sousa Santos says, the globalization of a localism may, in itself, be neither good nor bad; the fact that American Americanists seem to be increasingly aware of the phenomenon and its processes, as a recent essay in *American Quarterly* indicates, cannot but be particularly welcomed by nonAmerican Americanists.[16] But for such self-critical positioning on the part of American Americanists who, as Friedensohn so charmingly puts it, are frequent flyers for the discipline, globalized localism would easily fulfill the originally intended totalizing outcome of the creation of American Studies and, particularly, American Studies abroad, this time around with the help of Women's Studies.

However, the very articulation between American Studies and Women's Studies and their cross-fertilization since the late 60s may actually prove to be the right kind of protection against the risk I am here concerned with. Perhaps if we manage to avoid the Americanization of global Women's Studies, transnationalized American Studies will have a better chance to continue to evolve henceforth more like a cosmopolitanism than as what is generally known as globalization, a concept that is not easy to distinguish, at least for nonAmericans, from Americanization (as witness, for example, the cases of transnational economy or law).[17] Paradoxically, then, we may all eventually come to the conclusion, American and nonAmerican Americanists alike, that a post-imperial, counter-hegemonic conception of American Studies calls for a certain deAmericanization of American Studies.

At the University of Coimbra in Portugal, it all started in the mid-70s, immediately after the April 25, 1974 Revolution, when a lot of interrogation and experimentation was made possible, even at a very traditionalist school. In 1976, Angela Gilliam, an African American sociolinguist from SUNY-Westbury, who had conducted her field work on language and class, race and gender ideology in Brazil, was crucial to help us make problematical and expand the very notion of American Studies. Gilliam's name is for us still today charged with strong symbolic meaning. She was not sent to us as a Fulbrighter nor paid for by USIS, we had hired her directly to assist us in redefining the field of American Studies, and she wasn't even officially considered an American Studies scholar! The inspiration of that early critical work from the outside, as it were, did not get lost. Actually, Pat Limerick's firm refusal in her 1996 Presidential Address to define neatly notions of inside and outside the field could not make more sense to me: American Studies (or Women's Studies, for that matter) as basically a "comparative discipline," as Paul Lauter has urged.[18] After Angela Gilliam, we have had *some* wonderful Fulbright scholars in

Coimbra, whose contribution has been invaluable as well for our understanding of a nonhegemonic internationalization of American Studies and, more recently, Women's Studies. In the late 70s, Nancy Armstrong's teaching of English at the University of Coimbra encouraged a more rigorous reconsideration of literary and cultural theory in feminist terms. In the late 80s, Doris Friedensohn's syllabi for the teaching of American Studies at the same university was an incitement for a scholarly discussion of both race and gender in arguably the most conservative school of a supposedly uni-ethnic Portugal. In 1991, the Department of Anglo-American Studies organized a colloquium on "The Canon in Anglo-American Studies," which was presided over not only by the current (or ongoing) theoretical tensions between Literature and Cultural Studies, but also by the crucial concepts of race, class, ethnicity, and gender—and feminist theory.[19]

Though, as I started out by saying, in Portugal no university offers students the possibility of graduating in American Studies even today, the field is steadily expanding. In the mid-70s, not even I (who actually hold a Ph.D. in American Studies) supported the creation of American Studies undergraduate degrees in Portugal because the over-specialization would be a luxury in a country just rid of over 40 years of dictatorship.[20] Today, for the same reason, to which a theoretical feminist consideration must be added, I am no more in favor of creating degree-awarding programs in Woman's Studies in my country. Feminist research and criticism necessarily entail an interruption of patriarchy. In the nineteenth century, hegemonic science believed, for example, that it could 'prove' that engaging in academic endeavors, though capable of enlarging female minds, would inevitably bring about a shrinking of the uterus, obviously fatal for women's major, if not only and obligatory, maternal function. But we must find ways of accomplishing this interruption without defeating its overall objectives.[21] Separate departments of Women's

Studies and single-subject degree-awarding programs in the field would quickly create an easily dismissable female ghetto. Rather than *Kinder, Kirche, Küche*, it would henceforth be *Women's Studies*, not interrupting, but at the margins of, patriarchy. This discussion is only too well known of American (feminist) scholars, and I won't go into it here. Suffice it to say that all the arguments in this country in favor of integrated, rather than separate, Women's Studies programs apply with a vengence in my very small country.[22] More perhaps than in a larger, more resourceful country, in Portugal Women's Studies as a separate subject would run the risk of becoming just a 'women's thing,' with a few women (and no men) faring very well with degrees in the field, and women continuing to fare less well in all the other fields (this, by the way, is what happens in some Northern countries of Europe, like The Netherlands, where there are a relatively good number of women full professors in Women's Studies and amazingly few in all the other fields put together).

But it is not just the ghetto that I am concerned about. It is mainly the impact I would like a feminist critique to continue to have in Portuguese culture as a whole. I therefore agree with those scholars who recommend that the substance of scholarly and social concerns implied by the concept of Women's Studies be integrated in general education and scholarly inquiry by redefinition and expansion of basic required courses and perspectives, rather than offered as an alternative general education curriculum and research agenda. I strongly support the increasing concern with issues pertaining to Women's Studies, Gender Studies, and Feminist Studies, which is steadily developping in various research centers in Portugal, particularly in relation to sociological, anthropological, historical, and literary studies. The various activities of all these centers, particular the more interdisciplinary ones, whether by means of publications, conferences, colloquia, or even by the mere

public intervention of their research fellows in social and cultural debates in the media, are slowly having the desired impact on Portuguese society as regards feminist issues as well.[23]

At the theoretical level, also, integration seems to me to be far more productive than separation. It is not possible, nor, I think, desirable, to define an epistemology specific to Women's Studies alone. But it is imperative to adopt a feminist critical epistemology, that is to say, a philosophy/methodology of inquiry which refuses to be blind not only to the social construction of sexual difference and the social/sexual bias and discrimination derived therefrom, but also to the scientific/scholarly construction of sexual difference and the biased and discriminatory sexual evaluations derived therefrom. Such an epistemological inquiry cannot be accomplished without taking into account several other biases of modern (post-enlightenment) Western scientific and scholarly research and cultural analysis, such as class, race, and ethnicity; but also science itself, law, and nation; it is, therefore, an epistemology not exclusively specific of Women's Studies, but part of an ongoing major critical interrogation of modern conceptions of knowledge. Such *unthinking* I would like to identify here with an emancipatory conception of postmodernity. Feminist theory has actually emerged, at its best, as one of the most productive faces of the collapse of modernity as an epistemological and cultural project, at its best, an earnest, demanding face that constantly interrogates and puts severely into question the most cherished myths of Western modernity—progress, rationalism, objectivity, liberalism and essentialized individual autonomy—and points to the possibility of a non-capitalist, eco-socialist future. In other words, feminist theory is part of the transformation of modernity's knowledge-as-regulation into knowledge-as-emancipation, as recently traced by Boaventura de Sousa Santos in his *Toward a New Common Sense*.[24]

This is why I strongly support what has been slowly but steadily happening in Portuguese universities for the past two decades, after the Revolution of April 24, 1974: an increasing awareness (particularly emerging in the humanities and social sciences) of the need to take the theoretical issue of sexual difference into practical account in all areas of university research and teaching, including the so-called hard sciences. At the University of Coimbra the seeds are now beginning to be officially and methodically sown with the full support of the Rectorate, rather than somewhat randomly and at the discretion of individual scholars and teachers. Graça Abranches, a colleague of mine in the Department of Anglo-American Studies has just replaced me as the Portuguese representative on the Steering Committee of the European Association for Women's Studies, which is really called (and you'll see why in a minute) Association of Institutions in Feminist Education and Research in Europe: carefully selected initials make the acronym AOIFE, pronounced 'ifa' and meaning Eve in Gaelic. AOIFE is to be the major instrument for developing and strengthening Women's Studies research and teaching networks amongst European institutions of higher learning. At the University of Coimbra, Graça Abranches has now a full-time appointment for the development of feminist research and education. She has created a course that is an "Introduction to Feminst Studies" and another, particularly addressed, but not restricted, to students in different fields who are being trained as high-school teachers, titled "Sexism in Education." She herself coordinates and teaches both courses with the collaboration of several other colleagues. Her collaborators come from different fields, though, perhaps not surprisingly, the Anglo-American Studies Department provides her with the great majority. She helped found the Group for Feminist Studies at The Faculty of Letters, and is also a research fellow of the Center for Social Studies, with a particular affiliation with its Nucleus for Feminist Studies, where, alongside other feminist scholars from other

Portuguese universities, she works on feminist theory, identities, and linguistic and literary constructions of sexist ideology. She was one of the organizers of the Third European Feminist Research Conference, held at the University of Coimbra in 8-12 July, 1997.

Because Portuguese first degrees already grant specialization in a specific field leading on to professionalization (for example, a degree in law or medicine is really a first degree, that is to say, high-school graduates have direct access to Law and Medical School), subtle feminist work is called for at the level of secondary and primary education. Subtle, I emphasize, because that is where patriarchy, ever so subtly ingrained in young minds, needs to be interrupted most efficiently, not by well-trained demagogues, but by sophisticated, self-reflective feminist educators (a similar preoccupation was surely what Zangrando had in mind when she called, in the early 80s in the US, for a "direly needed" feminist perspective in the field of Women's Studies itself). Thus, I also welcome in my country efforts to strengthen feminist instruction for future teachers. In Portugal, most students of what we call 'letters' are bound to become high-school teachers. And the same is true in many courses in the 'sciences'. I have already indicated that the relevance of "teaching feminists" concerns all fields of academic instruction. But since in my country high-school teaching is overwhelmingly feminized, specially as regards 'letters' and language teaching, a feminist pedagogy, which entails the need to take into account sexual difference as a critical factor in understanding precisely phenomena like the sexual/social distribution of roles in the culture, is particularly crucial in teacher training. Since in the Department of Anglo-American Studies at the University of Coimbra we have also had a teacher-training program for the past ten years, the task of educating feminists has been our double concern.[25]

Double, I stress, because, as university professors and educators in the postmodern era, at a time when all centers of authority, knowledge and power have been put into question, and *that* questioning has started to be questioned in turn, we cannot but be committed to educating feminists. In my own case, however, since my major field is poetry, whether or not I teach American literature, in all its ethnic variety (and it is important to stress that I teach mainly, but by no means exclusively, female students, and in a "mainly invisibly ethnic" context), I am primarily concerned with what, for lack of a better term, I shall call 'the poetic', that is to say, that which in the verbal work of art most radically interrupts all cultural assumptions. I do tend to agree with Ezra Pound that "[a] sound poetic training is nothing more than the science of being discontent."[26] A feminist perspective in the teaching of poetry, though it can and should also account for the social (and other) conditions of literary production, must not be a "pathological viewpoint." I borrow this phrase from Doris Davenport, who is right to denounce so many all too condescending appreciations and teachings of literatures written by women or so-called ethnic minorities.[27] I am also interested, though I find *this* extremely difficult to accomplish, in discovering ways of articulating poetry, and particularly the lyric, with the current notion of 'cultural work', without falling into what might prove to be another, perhaps even more reductive, kind of 'pathological' perspective.

In my own research work, as well as in my teaching, there is one stance I privilege at all times: as in any other field of knowledge, nothing in the literary tradition, and in the poetic tradition, we deal with must be taken for granted or go unquestioned. Not even the very notions of 'the literary' or 'the poetic'. In a recent essay, Leonard Tennenhouse has shown us once again very eloquently how 'our' culture goes on constructing difference to legalize sameness.[28] Tennenhouse is taking off from recent cases of abuse or misuse of (legal) power in the US (Waco, Texas; Ruby Ridge, Idaho; MOVE,

Pennsylvania). But an analogy could be drawn with perceptions and definitions of 'the poetic' in the culture across centuries. For reasons so memorably sorted out by Virginia Woolf early in the century, the literary tradition some of us mainly work in and teach is overwhelmingly the product of male authors, who have sublimely re-invented 'woman' for their poetic purposes, if not comforts.[29] Partly for that reason also, some feminist literary scholars have chosen to deal with female authors alone. As a literary scholar, I do have some problems with that (as I have with dealing with so-called 'ethnic' authors in isolation); but, at least, let's keep the 'pathological viewpoint' always at bay. In any case, I prefer to encourage the attempt to grasp and critique the tradition with the greatest respect and the utmost rigor. I agree with Gayatri Spivak when she says, in her more recent "negociations" (between feminism and deconstruction), that no literary scholar today can afford to "ignore the powerful currents of European [post-Nitzschean] antihumanist thought that influence us." But neither, can anyone (let alone a feminist scholar) decline to understand the roots of their "masculism."[30]

In other words, I also agree that it is important for teachers of modern and contemporary literature, for example, not to forget to ask themselves the question very recently posed once again by Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar: "What is the relationship of the female imagination to the modernist aesthetic?"[31] Perhaps, in spite of Woolf's pathbreaking work, this question has not yet been fully answered. Gubar and Gilbert may well be right when they read some of the most famous and influential pieces of Anglo-American modern(ist) critical discourse as a kind of apotropaic male self-certification against the emergence of a self-valorizing female tradition that threatens a literary history in which women have had hardly any recognizable part.[32] Just think of Ezra Pound's letters to John Quinn and consider the poet's misogynist remarks about the damned mob of female editors of little magazines who at

the beginning of the century were impeding true (i.e., male) professionalization of 'belle lettres'.[33] One of the most interesting questions in the Western poetic tradition, however, has to do, as far as I am concerned, with the sublimated catachrestic images of 'woman' that male authors have projected in poetry through centuries: beautiful sleeping, or even dead, women who are seemingly the sole source of inspiration and poetic power for male poets; inspiring these women-figures are, but never inspired; empowering but never power-full; muses but never poets themselves, even if at times *singing* muses.[34] A careful reading of Derrida's brilliant analysis of Nietzsche's style-as-woman's-*abduction* in *Spurs* may might well be a step in the right direction.[35]

In other words, rashly dismissing or sidestepping Derrida and his unparalleled critique of Western metaphysics is out of the question. But perhaps we might try to avoid following some of his followers all the way down the rarified path of a tradition which, now that poetry by women no longer appears to be the rare example of isolated female *genius*, seems suddenly to have turned sterile. Lawrence Lipking once wrote that, though we can now delight in so many Shakespeare's sisters, the sister of Aristotle is hardly yet in sight.[36] I think he is wrong. Not that I believe any feminist theorist today would want to claim the ambiguous title of Arimnesta, the somewhat hypothetical sister of Aristotle. But because feminist theory has been raising important questions concerning dominant conceptions of art and aesthetics, not excluding the notion of a 'poetic' so powerfully defined in the tradition by the misleadingly seductive myth of the *ewig weiblich* of 'the woman within'.[37]

* Presentation to the American Studies Association Convention, Kansas City, Oct./Nov. 1996, included in the chapter on "Global/Local Intersections: International Conversations on Women's Issues and Feminist Work in American Studies."

NOTES

In the United States, also, American Studies evolved in the thirties and forties mainly from Departments of English and History.

[1]For Women's Studies, see Maria Irene Ramalho de Sousa Santos, "Women's Studies in Portugal." National Report for the SIGMA Project. *Oficina do CES* (Coimbra: Centro de Estudos Sociais, 1995). As far as American Studies are concerned, besides the scholarship produced in Departments of English or Anglo-American Studies, a lot of interesting work that easily qualifies as 'American Studies' is being done, for example, inside departments of History, Sociology, Anthropology, Communication Arts, etc.

[2]Cf. Annette Baxter, "Women's Studies and American Studies: The Uses of the Interdisciplinary." *American Quarterly* 26.4 (October 1974): 433-39. For a good survey of the work pertaining to both fields and produced between 1970 and 1975, see Donna Gerstenberger and Carolyn Allen, "Women Studies/American Studies, 1970-1975." *American Quarterly* 29.3 (1977): 263-79.

[3]Joanna Schneider Zangrando, "Women's Studies in the United States: New Sources." *Sources for American Studies*. Ed. Jefferson B. Kellog and Robert H. Walker. (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1983) 233.

[4]Cf. Phillipa Kafka, "Another Round of Canon-Fire: Feminist and Multi-ethnic Theory in the American Literature Survey." *MELUS* 16.2 (Summer 1989-90): 31-49.

[5]Marilyn J. Boxer , "For and about Women: The Theory and Practice of Women's Studies in the United States", *Signs* 7.3 (1982): 661-95.

[6]For an important problematization of the field of Women's Studies from an African American(ist)'s perspective, see Barbara Christian, "But who do you really belong to—Black Studies or Women's Studies?" *Women's Studies* 17 (1989): 17-23.

[7]For an appropriation for American Studies of Homi Bhabha's notion of "cultural hybridity," see John Carlos Rowe, "A Future for 'American' Studies: The Comparative U. S. Cultures Model." In *American Studies in Germany: European Contexts and Intercultural Relations*. Ed. Günter H. Lenz and Klaus J. Milich (Frankfurt: Campus; New York: St. Martin's; 1995) 262-78. Cf. Homi Bhabha, "DissimiNation: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation." In *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi Bhabha (New York: Routledge, 1990). On the other hand, the rejection of Weberian modernity's claim to exclusivity is one of Kwame Anthony Appiah's characterization of postmodernism. If American Studies does indeed embody such "rejection," is perhaps matter for debate. See Appiah, "Is the Post- in Postmodernism the Post- in Postcolonial?" *Critical Inquiry* 17 (Winter 1991): 336-57 [342].

[8]Bonnie TuSmith, "The Cultural Translator: Toward an Ethnic Womanist Pedagogy." *MELUS* 16.2 [Summer 1989-90]:17-29.

[9]In the United States, two early voices concerned with the risks of excessive nationalism in the development of American Studies were Richard H. Shryock, "The Nature and Implication of Programs in American Civilization," *American Heritage* 3 (April 1949): 36-7; and Arthus E. Bestor, Jr., "The Study of American Civilization: Jingoism or Scholarship?" *William and Mary Quartely* 9 (1952): 3-9. For an analysis of the impact of the Second World War on the development of the "ideology of American Democracy" at home, see Philip Gleason, "World War II and the Development of American Studies." *American Quarterly* 36.3 (1984): 343-58.

[10]Doris Friedensohn, "Towards a Post-Imperial, Transnational American Studies: Notes of a Frequent Flyer." *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais* 45 (Maio 1996): 167-83 [169].

[11]For a first-hand account of the intellectual and idealist origins of the Salzburg Seminar as "an educational institution and an effort to promote international understanding," see Henry Nash Smith, "The Salzburg Seminar." *American Quarterly* 1.1 (Spring 1949): 30-7.

[12]For a critical assessment of the economic situation in Mozambique today, cf. Joseph Hanlon, "Strangling Mozambique: International Monetary Fund 'Stabilization' in the World's Poorest Country." *Multinational Monitor* (July/August 1996): 17-21.

[13]For a recent account of the joys and sorrows of American Studies abroad, see Richard P. Horwitz (ed.), *Exporting America: Essays on American Studies Abroad* (New York: Garland, 1993).

[14]Marie Cardinal's novel *Les mots pour le dire* was first published in 1975 (Paris: Grasset). It is the story of a woman who learned how to live by learning how to say the words the culture had forbidden her.

[15]The phrase "globalized localism" I borrow from Boaventura de Sousa Santos, *Toward a New Common Sense: Law, Science and Politics in the Paradigmatic Transition* (New York: Routledge, 1995) 262-63; see also 374-75.

[16]For the kind of cautionary internationalization of American Studies many of us would perhaps have no objections to, see Jane C. Desmond and Virginia R. Domínguez, "Resituating American Studies in a Critical Internationalism." *American Quartely* 48.3 (September 1996): 475-90. This essay also mentions, as an internationalizing asset, the traditional association of American Studies and Women's Studies (p. 483).

[17]For the concept of cosmopolitanism as counter-hegemonic globalization, see Santos, *Toward a New Common Sense*, esp. chap. IV.

[18]Cf. Paul Lauter, "The Literatures of America: A Comparative Discipline." In *Redefining American Literary History*. Ed. A. LaVonne Bron Ruoff and Jerry W. Ward, Jr. (New York: MLA, 1990) 9-34. Indeed, Lauter's work as a whole is a fine example of such a conception.

[19]Cf. *O cânone nos Estudos Anglo-Americanos / The Canon in Anglo-American Studies*. Ed. Maria Isabel Caldeira. Coimbra, Minerva, 1994 (bilingual edition).

[20]On the other hand, and perhaps not surprisingly, in the late 70s and early 80s, the Portuguese Ministry of Education received a lot of help from the American Embassy for the reform of the official programs for the teaching of English in high schools. In debates held at conventions of the Portuguese Association of Anglo-American Studies at the time, some officers of the Embassy were clearly eager to have Democracy-as-the-American-Idea strengthened in Portugal by making it the major content of English language textbooks.

[21]My formulation in this sentence I derive from Magda Gere Lewis, "Interrupting Patriarchy," the title of the last chapter of her *Without a Word: Teaching beyond Women's Silence* (New York: Routledge, 1993).

[22]The controversy is well presented in Marilyn Boxer's carefully structured essay, "For and about Women" (n. 2 above). For a cogent defense of integrated curricula, cf. Carolyn C. Lougee, "Women, History and the Humanities: An Argument in Favor of the General Studies Curriculum" *Women's Studies Quarterly* 9.1 (Spring 1981): 4-7. For a very severe critique of what went wrong in the (separate) field in the US, see Daphne Patai and Noretta Koertge, *Professing Feminism: Cautionary Tales from the Strange World of Women's Studies* (New York: Basic Books, 1994).

[23] See Maria Irene Ramalho de Sousa Santos, "Women's Studies in Portugal" (n. 2 above).

[24]Cf. Boaventura de Sousa Santos, *Toward a New Common Sense*, esp. 92; 25-26. Chapter VI includes an analysis of the production of power in the workplace of capitalist societies in the world system.

[25]The phrase "educating feminists" I borrow from Gesa E. Kirsch, "Feminist Critical Pedagogy and Composition" *College English* 57.6 (October 1995): 723-29. Kirsh's essay is a review of Carmen Luke and Jennifer Gore, eds., *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy* (New York: Routledge, 1992); Sue Middleton, *Educating Feminists: Life Histories and Pedagogy* (New York: Teachers College P, 1993); and Magda Gere Lewis, *Without a Word: Teaching beyond Women's Silence* (New York: Routledge, 1993).

[26]Ezra Pound, *Literary Essays*. Ed. T. S. Eliot (new York: New Directons, 1968) 216.

[27]Doris Davenport, "Pedagogy and / of Ethnic Literature," *MELUS* 16.2 (1989-90): 51-62. "Invisibly ethic" above also comes from Davenport.

[28]Leonard Tennenhouse, "The Case of the Resisting Captive." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 95.4 (Fall 1996): 51ff

[29]Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own* (1929). Foreword by Mary Gordon (San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace, 1981). For a fine example of such a poetic re-invention of 'woman,' already at a time when the gradual emancipation of women begins to render the device increasingly

problematical, see the second parenthetical apostrophe in Fernando Pessoa's "Tabacco Shop" that starts, "You who comfort, who do not exist and therefore comfort . . . " In *Poems of Fernando Pessoa.* Ed. and trans. Edwin Honig and Susan M. Brown (New York: Ecco Press, 1986) 88. I have slightly modified the translation.

[30]Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Feminism and Deconstruction, Again: Negociations," *Outside in the Teaching Machine* (New York: Routledge, 1993) 121-40 [128]. The 'again' in the title of this chapter refers to an earlier, more oppositional critique of Derrida's *Spurs,* in which, Spivak has come to think, she had missed an important theoretical aspect of Derrida's argument [128]. For the earlier essay, see Spivak, 'Displacement and the Discourse of Woman," in Mark Krupnik (ed.), *Displacement: Derrida and After* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1983).

[31]Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, "Introduction: The Female Imagination and the Modernist Aesthetic." *Women's Studies* 13 (1996):1-10.

[32]The titles Gilbert and Gubar have in mind are "Tradition and the Individual Talent," *The ABC of Reading, Studies in Classic American Literature, Seven Types of Ambiguity,* and *The Well-Wrought Urn.*

[33]See *The Selected Letters of Ezra Pound to John Quinn.* Ed. Timothy Materer (Durham: Duke UP, 1991). Pound's resentful, sexist remarks on the work of Margaret Anderson (*Little Review*) or Harriet Monroe (*Poetry*) are scattered all over.

[34]In an interview with Albert Gelpi and Barbara Charlesworth Gelpi, Adrienne Rich has spoken eloquently of this problem. See *Adrienne Rich's Poetry and Prose.* Ed. Barbara Charlesworth Gelpi and Albert Gelpi (New York: Norton, 1975) 105-22.

[35]Jacques Derrida, *Spurs: Nietzsche's Styles / Éperons: Les styles de Nietzsche.* Intr. Stefano Agosti. Tr. Barbara Harlow. Drawings by François Loubrieu (Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 1979).

[36]Lawrence Lipking, *Abandoned Women and Poetic Tradition* (Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 1988). Esp. chapter VII, "Aristotle's Sister: A Poetics of Abandonment."

[37]For an important contribution to feminist aesthetic theory, see the essays collected in Peggy Zeglin Brand and Carolyn Korsmeyer (eds.), *Feminism and Tradition in Aesthetics* (University Park, Penn.: The Pennsylvania State UP, 1996); of particular relevance for the question of the

"'feminine' Otherness mythologized and embraced by so many post-Kantian philosophers" is Christine Battersby's "Stages on Kant's Way: Aesthetics, Morality, and the Gendered Sublime" (pp. 88-114; quote from p. 105). For my use of the phrase 'woman within,' cf. Diane Long Hoeveler, *Romantic Androgyny: The Women Within* (University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1990), a fine understanding of the romantic 'muse' and her traditional sexual and psycho-social origins.